UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 4

MARCH 15, 1963, TO APRIL 3, 1963
(PAGES 4307 TO 5658)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109
pt. 4

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Msgr. Bela Varga, chairman, the Hungarian Committee, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Almighty Father, Thou hast made this day, the ides of March, forever memorable to the people of Hungary. Thou gavest strength to them on March 15, 1848, to rise as one man in the struggle for freedom, as Thou didst aid them in 1956.

Freedom is the greatest treasure Thou hast given to man; and now this great treasure of mankind is being threatened with annihilation. Throughout the world, evil forces are destroying the happiness of nations who succumb to this diabolical power, even though free individuals are ready to fight this evil to death. Strengthen in the hour of temptation those who are suffering in the fight for freedom. Lend, O Lord, Thy guiding hands to the spiritual leader of Thy Hungarian nation, that he may fulfill his national and universal mission.

The Hungarian people have shed rivers of blood for liberty. Grant, O Lord, that their sacrifices alleviate their sufferings under the yoke of the cruel oppressor. As I am praying to Thee, O Almighty God, here in this great hall of freedom, I implore Thee to strengthen the Nation, Thy blessed people of America, that has become the leader of this struggle for freedom.

Give them, O Lord, Thy never-ending succor to their President, to their Senate and Congress, that they may never falter in their brave endeavors to secure the final victory of freedom throughout the world for Thy greater glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the committee I did not object to the nomination of Mr. Hartigan, nor do I object now. But I believe the RECORD should show that on August 3, 1961, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings on the nomination of William J. Hartigan to be Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Transportation. The committee reported favorably his nomination to the Senate on August 3, and the Senate confirmed his nomination on August 4, 1961.

On March 3, 1962, Mr. Hartigan resigned as Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation, to return to his State of Massachusetts to engage in a political campaign. After the election, he returned to Washington, and the President resubmitted his nomination for the same job as Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation.

On March 13, 1963, this nomination was again before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for approval. Again the committee has reported it favorably to the Senate.

In the committee, I did not object to his nomination, nor am I objecting now. But I do think the RECORD should show that in less than 8 months after confirmation, Mr. Hartigan resigned from the Post Office Department, to actively engage in a State political campaign, and that after the campaign was over, he asked to be reconfirmed by the Senate.

I do not think it is good Government policy for a man to come in and serve a little while, and then have the idea that he can leave, and can manage a political campaign, and subsequently can return and can get his job back.

As I stated at our committee meeting, I am not very happy about this procedure, and I hope it is not a precedent; but I am not going to raise an objection to confirmation of this nomination. Such a practice as is here indicated, if carried out extensively, would not lend itself to good government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the new reports.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

A letter from the Acting Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A., INC.

A letter from the National Quartermaster, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF INEFFECTIVE REPAIR PARTS SUPPORT FOR COMBAT AND COMBAT-SUPPORT VEHICLES BY ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER, DETROIT, MICH.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich., dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT UNDER MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the Manpower Development and Training Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 19

"Joint resolution relative to Edwards Air Force Base

"Whereas the State of California contains within its boundaries Edwards Air Force Base, an existing Government-owned facility, adequate in size and almost fully developed as a ground recovery station for orbital space vehicles, over which astronauts in the X-15 rocket plane have been launched more than 50 miles into space and returned; and

"Whereas the weather at this location provides more nearly perfect visibility than any other spot in the continental United States, having visibility in excess of 10 miles and a ceiling higher than 10,000 feet 94 percent of the time, and being absolutely clear more than 60 percent of the time; and

"Whereas, the existing facilities at Edwards Air Force Base include the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Flight Research Center and the Air Force Astronaut Training Center, with more than $250 million worth of complementary, NASA and Air Force buildings, radar, radio telemetry, computer and modular display equipment; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base contains nearly 400 square miles of flat and moderately hilly uninhabited land, with several thousand square miles of sparsely inhabited land adjoining to the east and north, over which air traffic is restricted; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base and its NASA installation are only 90 miles from Goldstone Radar Tracking Station (one of the best in the world), only 150 miles from Vandenberg Air Force Base and the Pacific Missile Range, and are less than 100 miles from three major universities and NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and only 100 miles from the highly skilled labor pool and sophisticated research and test facilities of the Los Angeles aerospace complex; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base is only 3 degrees north of the 32.5-degree inclination of the Mercury flight orbits and is at the same time well away from international boundaries, providing adequate security in case of secret payloads: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and all Federal agencies with jurisdiction in the matter to designate, actuate, and further develop Edwards Air Force Base as the primary U.S. space vehicle ground recovery station; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution relative to the establishment of a new national cemetery

"Whereas the Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery is the only national cemetery in southern California; and

"Whereas there being an average of 15 interments for each working day, available space for interments is diminishing at an alarming rate; and

"Whereas it is, and will continue to be, traditionally proper to provide fitting memorial cemeteries for the interment of deceased veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States and for their eligible dependents, as is now evidenced by the memorial cemeteries now in existence; and

"Whereas in the area which contains the counties of San Diego, Riverside, Orange, Imperial and San Bernardino, State of California, there resides a population composed of an extremely high percentage of veterans, as compared to other sections of the United States; and

"Whereas in 1945, the office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, recommended to the then Congress that a new national cemetery of an adequate size be established in the San Diego area, and if and when legislation is enacted, steps be taken toward the selection of a site and acquisition of the necessary property on which to establish a national cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery of an adequate size on U.S. Government-owned property at former Camp Elliott Naval Reservation, now declared excess to the General Services Administration, or at another suitable location on U.S. Government-owned property; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure. I ask that this concurrent resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 196

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

Whereas the enacting into law the President's proposal will most certainly affect the economy of the State very adversely; and

Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have, through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memoralized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS BY COMMITTEES IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by these committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Young, Stephen:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	439.56	109.89	487.00	121.75	80.00	20.00	100.00	25.00	1,106.56	276.64
Italy	Lira	38,191.50	61.50	39,278.25	63.25			15,525.00	25.00	92,994.75	149.75
France	Franc	362.90	74.06	445.9	91.00	98.00	20.00	98.00	20.00	1,004.80	205.06
Spain	Peseta	2,151.05	36.44	3,459.17	58.60			590.30	10.00	6,200.52	105.04
Austria	Schilling	2,314.80	90.00	4,243.80	165.00			941.35	36.60	7,499.95	291.60
Galloway, Eilene:[1]											
Austria	do	2,315	90.00	2,624	102.00	1,286	50.00	775	30.16	7,000	272.16
Germany	Deutsche mark					5,154.8	1,288.70			5,154.8	1,288.70
Cannon, Howard:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	196	45.50	175	40.00	35	8.00	44.00	10.00	450.00	103.50
Do	Deutsche mark					2,356.49	590.60			2,356.49	590.60
Total			507.39		641.60		1,977.30		156.76		3,283.05

[1] Included Bulgaria.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,283.05

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

MAR. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Gordon Allott:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	73.70	16.96	63	14.51	21.80	5.02	13.30	3.07	171.80	39.56
France	New franc	260.40	53.12	163.15	33.28			303.45	61.97	727	148.37
Italy	Lira			41,216	66.37	164,862	265.48	22,784	36.69	228,862	368.54
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,392.19	1,100.80			4,392.19	1,100.80
Total			70.08		114.16		1,371.30		101.73		1,657.27
Senator Allen J. Ellender:											
Spain	Peseta									2,365	[1] 39.25
Morocco	Dirham (franc)									81.15	[1] 16.20
Guinea	Franc									3,275	[1] 13.40
Ghana	Pound									3-8-2	[1] 9.52
Nigeria	do									67.7	[1] 188.58
Republic of South Africa	Rupee									70	[1] 98.70
Egypt	Egyptian pound									17.200	[1] 39.56
Libya (Benghazi)	Libyan pound									5.12	[1] 14.33
Tripoli (Libya)	do									29.95	[1] 83.86
France	New franc									119.20	[1] 24.33
Do	do						1,481.80			7,260.90	[2] 1,481.80
Total							1,481.80				2,009.53
Senator Roman L. Hruska:											
United States: Hawaii	Dollar		249.40		102.86		790.68		73.25		1,216.19
Tokyo	do				9.89				8.84		18.73
Tokyo Crown Province	Yen	9,762	27.34	6,115	17.13			14,123	39.56	30,000	84.03
Okinawa	Dollar		1.50		3.50				5.00		10.00
Taipei	do		10.20		.89		1.50		2.97		15.56
Hong Kong	do		7.03		10.25		7.50		10.87		35.65
Vietnam	do				1.25						1.25
Vietnam Crown province	Piaster	2,020.20	28.25	579	8.09			300.40	4.20	2,899.60	40.54
Republic of Philippines	Dollar		19.27		14.93		3.50		48.22		85.92
Guam	do		2.00		3.94				.25		6.19
Kwajalein	do				5.94				4.05		9.99
Total			344.99		178.67		803.18		197.21		1,524.05
Senator Hubert Humphrey and administrative assistant:											
Venezuela	U.S. dollar		240.00		117.50		50.00		35.00		442.50
Panama	do		32.70		23.50		7.50		5.00		68.70
Costa Rica	do		88.20		48.00		12.00		15.00		163.20
El Salvador	do		27.00		23.50				5.50		56.00
Honduras	do		28.36		21.25		5.35		7.25		62.21
Guatemala	do		75.00		41.00		20.00		13.50		149.50
Mexico	Peso	4,937.50	395.00	2,509.75	200.75	1,312.50	105.00	240.62	19.25	9,000.37	720.00
Do	U.S. dollar				21.50				11.74		33.24
Total			886.26		497.00		199.85		112.24		1,695.35
Senator Estes Kefauver: France	New franc	1,068.20	218.00	1,151.50	235.00	294.00	60.00	122.50	25.00	2,636.20	538.00
Total			218.00		235.00		60.00		25.00		538.00
Senator Thomas H. Kuchel:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	129.17	32.37	339.63	85.12	89.93	22.54	281.97	70.67	840.70	210.70
Italy	Lira	33,170	53.41	20,797	33.49	90,398	145.57	10,000	16.10	154,365	248.57
The Azores, Germany, Spain, and Italy.	U.S. dollar										121.74
Total			85.78		118.61		168.11		86.77		581.01
Senator Gale W. McGee:											
French Oceania	U.S. dollar		17.54		17.28		3.66		38.61		77.01
American Samoa	do						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands	do		3.08		4.06				9.38		16.52
New Guinea	do		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia	do		39.72		20.73		4.91		25.49		90.85
Malaya	Malayan dollar			203.02	66.86	72.51	23.88	14.50	4.78	290.03	95.52
Do	U.S. dollar		21.54		14.16		5.04		25.49		66.23
Cambodia	Rial	1,128	32.38	2,506	71.94	5,136	147.48	1,080	27.91	9,850	279.71
Do	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.92		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam	Piaster	2,046	28.08	2,728	37.44	3,136	43.64	2,115	28.53	10,025	137.69
Do	U.S. dollar		41.10		3.08				17.70		61.88
Philippines	Peso			490.55	126.37	173.10	43.16	132.32	33.03	795.97	202.56
Do	U.S. dollar		22.00		18.32		.75		41.75		82.82
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	261	45.44	569	99.12	282	46.73	342	56.93	1,454	248.22
Do	U.S. dollar		29.46		35.11				15.42		79.99
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar	508	12.72	660	16.54	787	19.72	585	14.62	2,540	63.60
Do	U.S. dollar		18.75		5.02				3.85		27.62
Okinawa	do		1.50		5.37						6.87
Korea	Hwan			2,109	16.32	1,974	15.26	2,732	21.05	68.16	52.63
Do	U.S. dollar								3.33		3.33
Japan	Yen	21,660	86.16	22,863	90.95	37,750	151.05	7,583	30.52	89,856	358.68
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		22.60		1.40		11.05		75.97
Total			472.91		710.30		521.99		431.84		2,137.04
Senator Milton R. Young:											
United States	Dollar						251.35				251.35
Puerto Rico	do		168.00		170.13		3.00		50.08		391.21
Haiti	do		24.00		37.95				22.50		84.45
Guantanamo Bay	do				5.00						5.00
Total			192.00		213.08		254.35		72.58		732.01

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Patricia M. Byrne:											
United States	Dollar						251.35				251.35
Puerto Rico	do		136.00		55.87		3.00		32.53		227.40
Haiti	do		24.00		22.00				23.09		69.09
Guantanamo Bay	do				4.85						4.85
Total			160.00		82.72		254.35		55.62		552.69
Sebastino J. Castro:											
France	New franc	459.75	93.83	341.63	69.72	41.65	8.50	56.94	11.62	900	183.67
Yugoslavia	Dinar	16,360	21.81	8,201	10.93	937	1.25	1,835	2.45	27,333	36.44
Egypt	Egyptian pound	38.26	91.44	10.48	25.05	1.73	4.13	4.53	10.83	55	131.45
Israel	Israeli pound	344.54	114.84	117.50	39.17	29	9.67	32.29	10.76	523.33	174.44
Turkey	Turkish lira	555.27	61.69	239.94	26.66	214.62	23.85	28.50	3.17	1,038.33	115.37
Pakistan	Rupee	91.33	19.35	107.38	22.75	9.44	2.00	25.18	5.33	233.33	49.44
India	do	473.27	100.27	342.20	72.50			44.15	9.35	859.62	182.12
Indonesia	Rupiah	827	2.33	1,486	4.19			235	.67	2,548	7.19
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	151.94	26.66	59.09	10.37	14.24	2.50	4.43	.78	229.70	40.30
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,052	23.38	187.53	4.17			373.80	8.31	1,613	35.86
Japan	Yen	36,156	100.43	24,660	68.50	3,000	8.33	6,611	18.37	70,427	195.63
Korea	Hwan	23,863	18.36	16,406	12.62			3,900	3.00	44,169	33.98
France (airline ticket)	New franc					328.30	67.00			328.30	[3]67.00
Yugoslavia (airline ticket)	Dinar					1,334,662	1,779.50			1,334,662	[4]1,779.50
India (airline ticket)	Rupee					3,314	695.95			3,314	[5]695.95
Total			674.39		366.63		2,602.68		84.64		3,728.34
Paul J. Cotter:											
Spain	Peseta	3,082.25	51.50	2,214	36.99	344	5.75	209	3.50	5,850	97.74
France	New franc	459.75	93.83	341.63	69.72	41.65	8.50	56.94	11.62	900	183.67
Yugoslavia	Dinar	16,360	21.81	8,201	10.93	937	1.25	1,835	2.45	27,333	36.44
Austria	Schilling	563.82	21.69	123.77	4.76			62.40	2.40	750	28.85
Italy	Lira	47,360	75.10	20,309	32.64	6,531	10.50	4,074	6.55	77,625	124.79
Greece	Drachma	897	29.90	532	17.75	94	3.15	151	5.03	1,675	55.83
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	38.26	91.44	10.48	25.05	1.73	4.13	4.53	10.83	55	131.45
Israel	Israeli pound	344.54	114.84	117.50	39.17	29	9.67	32.29	10.76	523.33	174.44
Turkey	Turkish lira	555.27	61.69	239.94	26.66	214.62	23.85	28.50	3.17	1,038.33	115.37
Pakistan	Rupee	91.33	19.35	107.38	22.75	9.44	2.00	25.18	5.33	233.33	49.44
India	do	473.27	100.27	342.20	72.50			44.15	9.35	859.62	182.12
Indonesia	Rupiah	827	2.33	1,486	4.19			235	.67	2,548	7.19
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	151.94	26.66	59.09	10.37	14.24	2.50	4.43	.78	229.70	40.30
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,052	23.38	187.53	4.17			373.80	8.31	1,613	35.86
Japan	Yen	36,156	100.43	24,660	68.50	3,000	8.33	6,611	18.37	70,427	195.63
Korea	Hwan	23,863	18.36	16,406	12.62			3,900	3.00	44,169	33.98
Dollar expenses in foreign countries	U.S. dollar				25.50				30.50		56.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					8,972.96	2,243.24			8,972.96	2,243.24
Total			852.58		484.27		2,322.87		132.62		3,792.34
Franklin B. Dryden:											
French Oceania	U.S. dollar		12.21		27.93		2.83		32.87		75.84
American Samoa	do						1.50		.83		2.33
Fiji Islands	do		3.18		1.52				7.36		12.06
New Guinea	do		9.92		9.11		11.13		2.98		33.14
Indonesia	do		39.72		27.17		4.91		29.49		101.29
Malaya	Malayan dollar			232.24	76.48	93.65	30.84	12.20	4.05	338.09	119.37
Do	U.S. dollar		21.55		12.80		5.54		25.68		65.57
Cambodia	Rial	1,128	32.38	2,819	80.95	4,235	121,65	1,365	39.75	9,547	274.73
Do	U.S. dollar		46.12		31.29		2.68		17.06		97.15
Vietnam	Piaster	1,309	18.00	2,728	37.50	935	15.00	1,752	24.50	6,724	95.00
Do	U.S. dollar		24.66		27.39		3.89		14.70		70.64
Philippines	Peso			165.44	41.36	202.76	50.69	37.44	9.36	405.64	101.41
Do	U.S. dollar		18.85		26.38				22.91		68.14
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	162	28.80	449	78.34	136	22.67	204	34.13	951	163.94
Do	U.S. dollar		53.04		16.68		.11		18.98		88.81
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	614	15.38	736	18.44	982	24.59	736	18.44	3,068	76.85
Do	U.S. dollar		13.75		4.01				3.74		21.50
Okinawa	U.S. dollar		1.50						4.57		6.07
Korea	Hwan			1,999	15.44	1,874	14.88	2,375	18.33	6,248	48.65
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		2.50				3.63		10.13
Japan	Yen	19,994	79.54	26,658	106.05	34,250	137.91	7,000	28.37	87,902	351.87
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		24.09		4.49		35.32		104.82
Total			463.52		665.43		455.31		397.05		1,981.31
Stephen Kurzman:											
Germany	Dollar		21.70		13.22		41.80		2.52		79.24
Switzerland	do		17.81		8.66		27.70				54.17
Italy	do		39.75		32.14		109.30				181.19
France	do		28.70		30.68		60.40		8.19		127.97
Belgium	do		14.78		3.46		7.00				25.24
United States	do						218.00				218.00
Total			122.74		88.16		464.20		10.71		685.81
James Minotto:											
United States	Dollar				21.25		99.50		19.00		139.75
France	New franc	1,210	246.00	713	145.50	222	45.00	260	53.50	2,405	490.00
Belgium	Belgium franc	2,000	40.00	1,800	36.00	900	18.00	500	10.00	5,200	104.00
Luxembourg	do	650	13.00	900	18.00	700	14.00	250	5.00	2,500	50.00
Netherlands	Florin	120	43.00	92	33.00	31	11.00	34	12.00	277	99.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	81	221.00	640	160.00	[6]8,081.56	2,145.29	406	59.60	10,514.56	2,585.79
Denmark	Danish kroner	598	88.00	490	72.00	240	36.00	210	30.00	1,527	226.00
Sweden	Swedish kroner	225	45.00	225	45.00	79	15.00	65	13.00	594	118.00
Norway	Norwegian kroner.	90	12.60	88	12.30	15	2.10	57	8.00	250	35.00

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Minotto—Continued											
Great Britain	English pound	26-16-0	75.00	22-10-0	60.00	16-2-8	45.00	5-14-0	16.00	71-2-8	196.00
Portugal	Escudo	1,995	70.00	1,110	60.00	685	24.00	741	26.00	5,133	180.00
Spain	Peseta	1,560	26.00	1,620	27.00	1,080	18.00	1,020	17.00	5,280	88.00
Italy	Italian lira	187,810	303.00	137,760	223.00	145,390	234.50	58,500	94.50	529,460	855.00
Do	U.S. dollar						14.00		4.00		18.00
Greece	Drachma	2,940	98.00	2,530	84.00	1,470	49.00	1,020	34.00	7,960	265.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	1,026	113.00	882	97.00	492	54.00	362	40.00	2,762	304.00
Lebanon	Lebanese pound.	216	70.00	144	48.00	75	25.00	60	20.00	495	163.00
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound.	21	48.00	15.60	36.00	9.50	21.80	7.90	18.20	54	124.00
Austria	Schilling	3,120	120.00	2,392	92.00	1,560	60.00	702	27.00	7,774	299.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	297.50	70.00	195.50	46.00	85	19.00	68	16.00	646	151.00
Yugoslavia	Dinar	9,000	12.00	7,500	10.00	[7] 134,850	[7] 180.00	2,500	3.50	153,850	205.50
Total			1,713.60		1,326.05		3,130.19		526.20		6,696.04
Mary L. Vaughan:											
Spain	Peseta	3,082.25	51.50	2,214	36.99	344	5.75	209	3.50	5,850	97.74
France	New franc	459.75	93.83	341.63	69.72	41.65	8.50	56.94	11.62	900	183.67
Yugoslavia	Dinar	16,360	21.81	8,201	10.93	937	1.25	1,835	2.45	27,333	36.44
Austria	Schilling	563.82	21.69	123.77	4.76	[2]		62.40	2.40	750	28.85
Italy	Lira	47,360	75.10	20,309	32.64	6,531	10.50	4,074	6.55	77,625	124.79
Greece	Drachma	897	29.90	532	17.75	94	3.15	151	5.03	1,675	55.83
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	38.26	91.44	10.48	25.05	1.73	4.13	4.53	10.83	55	131.45
Israel	Israeli pound	344.54	114.84	117.50	39.17	29	9.67	32.29	10.76	523.33	174.44
Turkey	Turkish lira	555.27	61.69	239.94	26.66	214.62	23.85	28.50	3.17	1,038.33	115.37
Pakistan	Rupee	91.33	19.35	107.38	22.75	9.44	2.00	25.18	5.33	233.33	49.44
India	do	473.27	100.27	342.20	72.50			44.15	9.35	859.62	182.12
Indonesia	Rupiah	827	2.33	1,486	4.19			235	.67	2,548	7.19
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	151.94	26.66	59.09	10.37	14.24	2.50	4.43	.78	229.70	40.30
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,052	23.38	187.53	4.17			373.80	8.31	1,613	35.86
Japan	Yen	36,156	100.43	24,660	68.50	3,000	8.33	6,611	18.37	70,427	195.63
Korea	Hwan	23,863	18.36	16,406	12.62			3,900	3.00	44,169	33.98
Dollar expenses in foreign countries	U.S. dollar				25.50				30.50		56.00
Germany (airline ticket)	Deutsche mark					8,972.96	2,243.24			8,972.96	2,243.24
Total			852.58		484.27		2,322.87		132.62		3,792.34
Group expenses: [8]											
Malaya	Malayan dollar			67.40	21.90					67.40	21.90
Cambodia	Rial	1,820	52.00	5,705	163.20	4,305	123.41	1,404	41.39	13,234	380.00
Vietnam	Piaster	1,952	24.00	12,817	168.15	743	10.60	3,160	42.75	18,672	245.50
Philippines	Peso	137.85	36.00	987.20	259.30	133.80	33.70	1,321.96	342.99	2,580.81	671.99
Do	U.S. dollar		12.00		28.00						40.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	412	67.40	1,773	290.54	224	37.28	1,580	259.58	3,989	654.80
Japan	Yen	10,261	41.60	31,258	125.10	17,250	68.90	49,196	194.40	107,965	430.00
Total			233.00		1,056.19		273.89		881.11		2,444.19

---

[1] Includes lodging, meals, miscellaneous and transportation.

[2] Transportation.

[3] Transportation: Paris to Belgrade.

[4] Transportation: Yugoslavia to Indonesia, via United Arab Republic, Israel, Turkey, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, and return to Frankfurt, Germany.

[5] Difference in ticket cost to permit travel from Indonesia to Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, and return to Frankfurt, Germany, via Washington, D.C.

[6] Of which 7,669.56 deutsche marks for airline tickets for 2 trips.

[7] Airline tickets.

[8] Represents group expenses of trip of Senators McGee, Church, Moss, staff member Franklin B. Dryden, and departmental escort officers.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	28,312.46
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Department of Defense	4,989.26
Department of State	1,245.60
Total	34,547.32

MAR. 11, 1963.

CARL HAYDEN, *Chairman.*

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, Rome, Italy, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jennings Randolph: Italy	U.S. dollar		113.00		37.67		655.24		47.48		853.39
Gordon Allott: Italy	do		13.33		8.00				23.20		44.53
Geo. B. Galloway:											
Italy	do		86.50		119.99		677.22		79.90		963.61
England	do		10.00		3.50						13.50
Total			222.83		169.16		1,332.46		150.58		1,875.03

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other (22 U.S.C. 276a)	$1,875.03

MAR. 13, 1963.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Senate delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group Conference, May 14–24, 1962, Washington, D.C., New York, and Los Angeles, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Clair Engle: United States	U.S. dollar		65.65				323.49				389.14
Thomas Kuchel: United States	do		178.85								178.85
Delegation staff:											
Joe Gonzales: United States	do		124.41		33.15		214.60		6.55		378.71
Milrae Jensen: United States	do		166.75		21.40		226.35		52.90		467.40
Arthur Kuhl: United States	do		199.52				[1] 388.20		20.00		607.72
Delegation expenses	do		280.38						180.00		460.38
Darrell St. Claire: United States	do		203.62		43.70		[2] 265.70		55.21		568.23
Delegation expenses	do		366.67		4,231.84		875.68		3,751.03		9,225.22
Total			1,585.85		4,330.09		2,294.02		4,065.62		12,275.65

[1] $43.12 of this amount rebated and placed on deposit to Mexico-United States accounts.

[2] $33.33 of this amount rebated and deposited to Mexico-United States accounts.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420	$12,275.65

J. W. **Fulbright**,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 6th meeting of Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, Canada, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George Aiken: Canada	U.S. dollar		40.85		1.85						42.70
Maurine Neuberger: Canada	do		39.00		3.85				.90		43.75
Claiborne Pell: Canada	do		58.00		13.21				36.53		107.74
Roman Hruska: Canada	do		71.50		7.75				7.72		86.97
Pat McNamara: Canada	do		52.50		10.71						63.21
Delegation staff:											
Lola Pierotti	do		33.00		1.35				.15		34.50
John Newhouse	do		30.00		25.12				5.25		60.37
Milrae Jensen	do		48.00		21.66		2.30		7.65		79.61
Delegation Expenses:											
Baggage handling									27.50		27.50
Food en route and official reception					230.50						230.50
Total			372.85		316.00		2.30		85.70		776.85

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other (Public Law 86-42)	776.85
Total	776.85

George D. Aiken,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

Mar. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, United States, British, and Canada, Parliamentary Conference, Bermuda, British West Indies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman: Bermuda	Pound			42-12	120.55	1	2.83			43-12	123.38
	Deutsche mark					246.76	62.00			246.76	62.00
Claiborne Pell: Bermuda	Pound	27-6-6	77.10	35	99.05					62-6-6	176.15
Carl Marcey: Bermuda	do	40-13-3	114.80	100	283.00			3-3-10	9.00	143-17-1	406.80
Darrell St. Claire: Bermuda	do	20-4-6	57.03	19-4	54.14					39-8-6	111.17
	U.S. dollars				76.00		9.00		15.00		100.00
Delegation costs:											
Official receptions, luncheons, rentals				51-4-3	144.42			2	5.66	53-4-3	150.08
Taxis, tips						3-7-11	9.58			3-7-11	9.58
Gratuities, airport and baggage costs								25-5	71.20	52-5	71.20
Total			248.93		777.16		83.41		100.86		1,210.36

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,110.36
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 246 (87th Cong. 2d session)	100.00
Total	1,210.36

J. W. **Fulbright**,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Fulbright, J. W.:											
France	U.S.dollar		113.88		196.08		26.50		48.81		385.27
Netherlands	Guilder					11,335	371.60				371.60
Byrd, Harry F.: France	U.S. dollar		89.45		25.34				15.00		129.79
Kefauver, Estes: France	do		128.69		242.29		20.00		43.92		434.90
Smathers, George A.: France	do		68.33		72.11		10.50		20.20		171.14
Randolph, Jennings: France	do		122.07		111.81		39.50		15.72		289.10
Cannon, Howard: France	do		125.69		174.66		19.97		39.62		359.94
McCarthy, Eugene J.: France	do		134.96		197.71		40.00		68.63		441.30
Capehart, Homer: France	do		126.53		191.06		45.00		111.86		474.45
Hickenlooper, Bourke B.: France	do		20.24		30.50		5.50		14.00		70.24
Mundt, Karl E.: France	do		121.46		116.42		202.23		26.52		466.63
Kuchel, Thomas H.: France	do		166.81		157.63		22.00		30.97		377.41
Cooper, John Sherman: France	do		130.71		68.91						199.62
Javits, Jacob K.: France	do		270.01		109.35		43.79		63.89		487.04
Marcy, Carl: France	do		81.56		139.83		25.50		105.57		352.46
Tillman, Seth: France	do		60.73		105.94		21.80		28.07		216.54
Jensen, Milrae E.: France	do		122.42		75.02		86.65		10.82		294.91
Saffer, Penelope:											
France	do						12.46		11.81		432.40
Netherlands	Guilder		60.73		57.90	1,040.80	289.50				
Drakert, Marcelle: France	U.S. dollar		131.60		163.30		18.50		29.19		342.59
Conlon, Jack: France	do		60.73		182.85		45.00		96.57		385.15
Blitz, Herbert: France	do		138.32		149.82		88.00		32.76		408.90
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons and receptions, France.	do				246.51						246.51
Office and conference room rental and supplies, France.	do								678.14		678.14
Gratuities, France	do								51.02		51.02
Transportation, France	do						94.36				94.36
Overtime for Embassy personnel, France.	do								233.47		233.47
Total			2,274.92		2,815.04		1,528.36		1,776.56		8,394.88

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	661.10
Appropriated funds: Public Law 84-689	7,733.78
Total	8,394.88

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Delegation, Eighth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

MAR. 11, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation to attend 8th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harrison A. Williams, Jr.:											
Nigeria	U.S. dollar				39.00				9.00		48.00
Turkey	Lira	195.50	21.72	162.50	18.06			109.50	21.16	467.50	60.94
Greece	Drachma	422	14.07	472	15.73			192	6.40	1,086	36.20
Denmark	Kroner	220	31.88	134.55	19.49			46.95	6.80	401.50	58.17
Germany	Deutsche mark			64	16.00					64	16.00
Do	do		4.00		1.70				10.50		16.20
United States	U.S. dollar						42.50		14.00		56.50
Quentin N. Burdick:											
Nigeria	do				35.00				13.00		48.00
Do	Pound			2	5.60	3	8.40			5	14.00
Turkey	Lira	195.50	21.72	167	16.33			93.65	10.41	456.15	48.46
Greece	Drachma	422	14.07	444	14.80			423	14.10	1,289	42.97
Denmark	Kroner	220	31.88	176.40	25.57					396.40	57.45
Germany	Deutsche mark			64	16.00					64	16.00
Do	do		4.00				4.40		6.00		14.40
United States	U.S. dollar						183.26		8.00		191.26
Wallace B. Edgerton: Nigeria	Pound			4-15	13.30			3-10	9.80	8-5	23.10
Do	U.S. dollar				14.00				2.00		16.00
Turkey	Lira	161	17.88	156	17.33			112.90	12.54	429.90	47.75
Greece	Drachma	272	9.07	183	6.10			40	1.34	495	16.51
Denmark	Kroner	150	21.74	130.95	18.82			27.45	3.98	308.40	44.54
Germany	Deutsche mark			63	15.75			17	4.25	80.00	20.00
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		8.50						12.50
United States	do						4.40		12.50		16.90
Arthur M. Kuhl:											
Nigeria	do				16.00						16.00
Turkey	Lira	161	17.88	145	16.11			62.35	6.91	368.35	40.90
Greece	Drachma	272	9.07	216	7.19					488	16.26
Denmark	Kroner	150	21.74	142	20.58			121.30	17.54	413.30	59.86
Germany	Deutsche mark			78	19.50			11	2.75	89	22.25
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		1.30				4.70		10.00
United States	do						5.20		53.35		58.55
Delegation expenses:											
Ambassador's reception, Nigeria	Pound			75	210.00					75	210.00
Official meals, Nigeria	do			14	39.20					14	39.20
Transportation, Nigeria	do					3	8.40			3	8.40

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation to attend 8th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Gratuities, Nigeria	do							4	11.20	4	11.20
Consul general's reception, Turkey	Lira			782.42	86.93					782.42	86.93
Official meals, Turkey	do			608	67.55					608	67.55
Transportation, Turkey	do					111	12.33			111	12.33
Gratuities, Turkey	do							100	11.11	100	11.11
Postage, Turkey	do							56	6.23	56	6.23
Communications, Turkey	do							882	99.12	882	99.12
Ambassador's reception, Greece	Drachma			1,050	35.00					1,050	35.00
Conference room rental, Greece	do							1,338	44.60	1,338	44.60
Overtime, Embassy drivers, Greece.	do					3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Official meals, Greece	do			3,196	106.37					3,196	106.37
Communications, Greece	do							2,268	75.60	2,268	75.60
Gratuities, Greece	do							450	15.00	450	15.00
Postage, Greece	do							90	3.00	90	3.00
Official meals, Denmark	Kroner			449.26	65.11					449.26	65.11
Communications, Denmark	do							542.65	78.55	542.65	78.55
Transportation, Denmark	do					199.65	28.93			199.65	28.93
Gratuities, Denmark	do							120	17.39	120	17.39
Official meals, Germany	Deutsche mark			251.92	62.98					251.92	62.98
Communications, Germany	do							230	57.60	230	57.60
Transportation, Germany	do					90	23.00			90	23.00
Gratuities, Germany	do							45	11.25	45	11.25
Total			248.72		1,070.90		420.82		681.68		2,422.12

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,917.81
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res. 379 (87th Cong.)	504.31
Government Department (identify each): Department of Navy	531.89
Total	2,954.01

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAR. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Senate delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brasilia, Brazil, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
A. Willis Robertson:											
Mexico	U.S. dollar		33.62		39.35				3.08		76.05
Peru	do		24.19		49.48						73.67
Argentina	do		30.06		22.55				.14		52.75
Brazil	do		116.11		169.20		3.22		53.82		342.35
Trinidad	do		10.53						1.60		12.13
Herman Talmadge:											
Mexico	do		48.03		9.16				5.60		62.79
Peru	do		29.20		8.00						37.20
Argentina	do		35.07		37.25				19.16		91.48
Brazil	do		96.38		128.63		1.77		23.42		250.20
Trinidad	do		16.05		30.36				1.60		48.01
Strom Thurmond:											
Brazil	do		58.06		25.01				12.70		95.77
Trinidad	do		11.03						1.10		12.13
Oren Long:											
Mexico	do		39.63		30.80				.24		70.67
Peru	do		35.38		29.60						64.98
Argentina	do		35.07		13.53				1.26		49.86
Brazil	do		96.38		109.11				46.77		252.26
Trinidad	do		16.05						1.60		17.65
Maurice J. Murphy, Jr.:											
Mexico	do		48.03		41.27				50.11		139.41
Peru	do		28.33		42.20				12.00		82.53
Argentina	do		35.07		55.51				9.01		99.59
Brazil	do		96.38		216.62		3.22		89.58		405.80
Trinidad	do		16.05		3.96				1.60		21.61
Ralph Yarborough:											
Mexico	do		48.03		15.13				21.84		85.00
Peru	do		29.30		40.00		1.80		28.00		99.10
Argentina	do		35.07		72.02		4.39		39.61		151.09
Brazil	do		101.60		175.37		10.23		146.99		434.19
Trinidad	do		16.04		11.07				1.60		28.71
George B. Galloway:											
Mexico	do		48.03		49.93		1.70		6.00		105.66
Peru	do		42.07		54.20				3.00		99.27
Argentina	do		35.07		69.73		2.80		7.46		115.06
Brazil	do		97.62		151.75		1.61		24.56		275.54
Trinidad	do		16.05		12.50				1.60		30.15
Elizabeth Bond:											
Mexico	do		42.03		9.97				.08		52.08
Peru	do		20.13		13.92						34.05
Argentina	do		31.15		3.60				.03		34.78
Brazil	do		71.10		88.91		10.24		28.04		198.29
Trinidad	do		11.03		.80				1.21		13.04

***Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Senate delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brasilia, Brazil, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962*—Continued**

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Eleanor Thurmond:											
Mexico	do		42.03						.12		42.15
Peru	do		20.16								20.16
Argentina	do		30.06		4.71				.11		34.88
Brazil	do		71.10		9.38				5.61		86.09
Trinidad	do		11.03						1.10		12.13
Pat M. Holt:											
Mexico	do						7.08		8.48		15.56
Do	Peso	525	42.03	2,049	164.04	116	9.28	54.75	4.22	2,744.75	219.57
Peru	U.S. dollar						2.00		12.50		14.50
Do	Sol	602.60	24.10	1,585	63.40	50	2.00	25	10.00	2,262.60	99.50
Argentina	U.S. dollar				9.89		7.00		18.00		34.89
Do	Peso	4,104	30.06	23,387.30	171.25	7,500	54.94	5,342	39.12	40,333.30	295.37
Brazil	U.S. dollar				11.00		13.30		24.75		49.05
Do	Cruzeiro	46,950	75.72	91,407.50	147.42	11,830	19.08	19,222	31.00	169,409.50	[1]273.22
Trinidad	U.S. dollar		11.03		11.95		2.84		1.10		26.92
Darrell St. Claire:											
Mexico	U.S. dollar								15.25		15.25
Do	Peso	525	42.03	239.50	19.16			1	.08	765.50	61.27
Peru	U.S. dollar								8.00		8.00
Do	Sol	472.10	18.88							472.10	18.88
Argentina	Peso	4,104	30.06	4,937.50	36.16			276	2.02	9,317.50	68.24
Brazil	U.S. dollar								12.45		12.45
Do	Cruzeiro	46,950	81.86	60,326.40	115.26	1,900	3.72	42,531	84.06	151,707.40	284.90
Trinidad	U.S. dollar		11.03		8.79				5.55		25.37
United States	do						9.00				9.00
Delegation expenses:											
Mexico	Peso			3,710	296.97	837.50	67.05	6,471.50	518.13	11,019	882.15
Peru	Sol			4,064.57	151.39	2,474	92.31	810.25	30.23	7,348.82	273.93
Argentina	Peso			106,868.55	782.00	8,500	62.24	12,862.30	94.22	128,230.85	938.46
Brazil	U.S. dollar				2,323.76		1,569.35		125.80		4,018.91
Do	Cruzeiro	2,500	5.43	261,215	570.03	90,714	197.20	511,373.40	1,111.68	1,018,509.40	1,884.34
Trinidad	U.S. dollar				42.96						42.96
Total			2,145.54		6,770.10		2,159.37		2,807.99		13,883.00

[1] $20 of this sum rebated to the U.S. Treasury.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	5,299.83
Appropriated funds: 22 U.S.C. 276a	8,583.17
Total	13,883.00

MAR. 14, 1963.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Interparliamentary Union Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. W. Fulbright:											
Germany	Deutsche mark							50.00	12.50	50.00	12.50
Italy	Lira	27,000.00	43.20	55,000.00	88.00	1,000.00	1.60	7,000.00	11.20	90,000.00	144.00
Homer E. Capehart:											
France	Franc	276.20	56.38	260.50	53.15	3,435.88	701.20	170.00	34.60	4,142.58	845.33
Italy	Lira	51,762.00	83.49	80,243.00	129.41	31,000.00	50.00	25,946.00	41.85	188,951.00	304.75
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:											
Uruguay	Peso			266	24.17	99	9.00	50	4.55	415	37.72
France	U.S. dollar		20.24		30.50		5.50		14.00		70.24
Wayne Morse: Uruguay	Peso			1,055	91.78	260	23.74	703	64.20	1,968	179.72
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:[1]											
Greece	Drachma	2,000	66.66	853	28.44					2,853	95.10
Turkey	Pound	950	105.55	300	33.00			120	13.33	1,370	151.88
Egypt	do	36.9	85.00	14.9	34.00			3.5	8.10	57	127.10
Lebanon	do					332.50	110.50			332.50	110.50
Pakistan	Rupee					210	44.53			210	44.53
India	do	500	100.00	220	44.40	200	40.00	80.35	16.00	1,000.35	200.40
Burma	Kyat							171	36.30	171	36.30
Thailand	Baht	2,800	135.60	1,800	87.10			1,595	77.00	6,195	299.70
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,918	336.50	970	170.20	114	20.00	998	175.00	4,000	701.70
Japan	Yen	60,000	166.66	25,000	69.40					85,000	236.06
Netherlands	Guilder					6,568	1,827.64				1,827.64
Frank Church:											
French Oceania	Dollar		17.44		13.75		7.52		36.61		75.32
American Samoa	do						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands	do		3.18		4.06				9.38		16.62
New Guinea	do		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia	do		39.72		21.21		4.91		36.74		102.58
Malaya	Malaya dollar			172.79	56.91	66.41	21.89	26.58	8.76	265.83	87.56
Do	U.S. dollar		21.33		14.66		5.56		29.72		71.27
Cambodia	Rial	980	27.58	2,660	75.85	4,805	137.91	1,155	33.43	9,600	274.77
Do	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.92		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam	Piastre	2,291	31.50	3,437	47.25	3,139	43.25	349	13.00	9,216	135.00
Do	U.S. dollar		24.66		1.58				26.43		52.67
Philippines	Peso			136.60	34.85	168.10	42.43	72.12	18.80	376.82	96.08
Do	U.S. dollar		22.00		18.17		.75		34.62		75.54
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	205	35.89	463	80.76	109	28.79	78	13.65	915	159.09
Do	U.S. dollar		29.46		23.86		.11		17.98		71.41

[1] $435 of Senator Hickenlooper's total rebated to the U.S. Treasury on account of personal expenses.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank Church—Continued											
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	560	14.02	560	14.02	827	20.72	486	12.19	2,433	60.95
Do	U.S. dollar		17.50		4.39				3.74		25.63
Okinawa	do		1.50		4.57				11.18		17.25
Korea	Won			2,306	17.81	21,147	16.58	3,499	27.02	7,952	61.41
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		2.65				3.33		9.98
Japan	Yen	21,984	87.45	21,983	87.46	34,750	139.51	8,750	35.86	87,467	350.28
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		21.31		1.40		11.05		74.68
Carl Marcy:											
Netherlands	Guilder					6,568	1,827.64			6,568	1,827.64
Egypt	Pound	40	92.00	23	52.90			12	27.60	75	172.50
Lebanon	do					332.50	110.50			332.50	110.50
Pakistan	Rupee					210	44.53			210	44.53
India	do	275	55.00	195	37.00	266	53.20	33	6.60	769	151.80
Burma	Kyat			100	21.23			111	23.50	211	44.73
Thailand	Baht	2,700	130.75	2,400	116.22	2,255	152.22	2,595	125.13	9,950	524.32
Hong Kong		1,079	190.52							1,079	190.52
Japan	Yen	27,754	77.09	21,246	59.01			2,246	6.24	51,246	142.34
Henry F. Holthusen: The Netherlands.	Guilder					7,281.02	2,025.88			7,281.02	2,025.88
Pat M. Holt:											
Uruguay	Peso	1,500	136.98	1,841	168.12	994	90.77	665	60.73	5,000	456.60
Peru	Sole	193.60	7.01	300	10.86	170	6.15	136.40	4.94	800	28.96
Colombia	Peso					7,918	934.94			7,918	934.94
Mexico	do	400	32.00	721	57.68	41.30	3.30	366.70	29.34	1,529	122.32
The Virgin Islands, Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, and the United States.	U.S. dollar		129.32		166.84		61.38		52.57		410.11
Seth Tillman:											
Germany	Deutsche mark							244	61.00	244	61.00
Italy	Lira	37,200	60.00	38,000	61.29	2,000	3.22	12,800	20.64	90,000	145.15
	U.S. dollar						6.00				6.00
Austria	Schilling	706.55	28.26	900.45	36.01	293	11.72			1,900	75.99
U.S.S.R.	U.S. dollar		48.78		80.50		59.72				189.00
Poland	Zloty	402	16.99	375	15.38					777	32.37
Hungary	U.S. dollar		7.50		24.15				11.75		43.40
United Kingdom	Pound	3-8-9	9.62	8-11-3	23.97					12	33.59
	U.S. dollar						6.00		2.00		8.00
Netherlands	Guilder					2,058.97	572.89			2,058.97	572.89
	U.S. dollar		49.00		31.50				3.50		84.00
Washington, D.C., to New York, and en route.	do						7.90		24.60		32.50
Total			2,720.77		2,430.36		9,298.31		1,374.66		15,824.10

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	15,824.10
Department of Defense	702.21
Total	16,526.31

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 14, 1963.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Joao Andre Senos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat wholesale distributors of automobile glass as manufacturers for purposes of the tax on automobile parts and accessories; and

S. 1104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of the Kauders-Steuber Co., and Max N. Tobias and the Max N. Tobias Bag Co., Inc.; and

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Juan Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Louisiana when he introduced the second above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S.1107. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and

S. 1108. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Louisiana when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Sparkman, and Mr. Stennis):

S. 1109. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1110. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Engle):

S. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Nicola Tamborra; and

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Stamatis Zeris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1115. A bill to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF HEARING ON "SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS," 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand additional copies of its hearings of August 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11, 1961, Eighty-seventh Congress, entitled "Space Satellite Communications".

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, A REPORT ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS 1963, BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress 1963", submitted by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations and that seven thousand additional copies be printed for the use of those committees.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN NOMINEES FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 114) relating to qualifications of certain nominees for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1105 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 115); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1105) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Kauders-Steuber Company, and Max N. Tobias and the Max N. Tobias Bag Company, Incorporated", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT ON MARKET PROFITS REALIZED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1104) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanation presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT PROVIDING CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT ON MARKET PROFITS REALIZED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

The bill eliminates the required accrual of market discount on municipal bonds purchased at less than par value by small mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies. For tax years after December 31, 1962, these taxpayers alone are required to accrue yearly a ratable portion of the difference between the cost of a bond and its par value under sections 818(b)(1) and 822(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The enactment of the Revenue Act of 1962 gave mutual fire and casualty insurance companies having gross income in excess of $500,000 capital gains treatment on market profits realized from discount on both taxable and tax-exempt bonds for tax years after 1962. This is explained in the Senate Finance Committee report on the 1962 act as follows:

"Under the bill, as passed by the House and approved by your committee, the rules applicable to mutual fire and casualty companies accruing market discount on bonds are changed. Under present law all mutual fire and casualty companies (and life insurance companies) are required to accrue each year a ratable portion of market discount on bonds and pay tax thereon at ordinary income tax rates (Rev. Rul. 60–210; 1960–1 CB 38). Stock fire and casualty insurance companies, on the other hand, are not required to accrue such discount but when the bond is sold or redeemed they are required to pay tax on the amount of gain resulting from market discount at capital gains rates (if the bond is held for more than 6 months). Since under the general rule of the bill the starting point in computing 'mutual insurance company taxable income' is the gross income computed as if the taxpayer were a stock company, the effect is to treat market discount on bonds for mutual companies, other than the small companies taxable on investment income only, as it is treated by the stock companies." (Pp. 61 and 62, S. Rept. No. 1881, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

All other taxpayers treat gains realized from market discount on bonds as capital gains subject to tax when the bond is sold or redeemed. The elimination of the required accrual of market discount on municipal bonds for small mutual fire and casualty companies and life insurance companies will similarly allow these taxpayers to treat their market profits as capital gains.

This bill is limited to discount on municipal bonds and does not also apply to discount on taxable bonds as did the 1962 act amendments for medium and large mutual fire and casualty companies. While there is no reason for not eventually allowing capital gains treatment on market profits from bond discount on taxable bonds, the allowance of such treatment is needed immediately for discount on municipal bonds to avoid litigation which will be costly both to taxpayers and the Government.

This litigation will inevitably result from taxpayers challenging the correctness of Revenue Ruling 60–210 which was issued by the Internal Revenue Service in 1960. In this ruling, the Internal Revenue Service for years after 1960 held that discount placed on municipal bonds by broker-dealers was not interest which was tax exempt but was market profit, taxable at ordinary income tax rates and which was to be accrued ratably by mutual fire and casualty and life insurance companies.

From 1942, when the corresponding 1939 Code provisions of sections 818(b)(1) and 822(d)(2) requiring the accrual of bond discount as interest were first enacted, until the issuance of Revenue Ruling 60–210 in 1960, mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies treated discount on municipal bonds as interest which was exempt from tax. The applicable regulations and tax return forms were not in conflict with this industrywide understanding and treatment.

Revenue Ruling 60–210, however, stated that the position of the Internal Revenue Service was governed by early rulings applicable to other taxpayers who were not required to accrue discount as interest. These early rulings held that the only discount on municipal bonds which was to be considered tax-exempt interest was discount actually placed on the bond by the issuing municipality or State. The application of these early rulings to other taxpayers is that if the discount is not tax-exempt interest, it is market profit subject to capital gains taxes when the bond is sold or redeemed. The application of these rulings to mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies is that if the discount is not tax-exempt interest, it is ratably accrued as taxable interest.

Revenue Ruling 60–210 applies to years beginning after 1960. Undoubtedly affected taxpayers will litigate the correctness of the ruling on the basis that since they are required to accrue all discount as interest, rules applicable to other taxpayers who are not required to accrue discount do not apply, and, therfore, any municipal bond discount which is accruable is tax-exempt interest.

The issue of differentiating between bond discount which is properly interest and bond discount which is properly market profit has always been a troublesome one for the courts to resolve. In this respect the denial by the U.S. Supreme Court of the taxpayer's petition for certiorari on March 5, 1963, from the decision of the Court of Appeal for the Fifth Circuit in *U.S.* v. *Harrison, et al.* (5th Cir., 1962, 304 F. 2d 835) should be noted. The effect of the denial of certiorari here was to resolve an almost 20 year conflict between the courts of appeal on a bond discount question affecting taxable bonds. Litigation of the correctness of Revenue Ruling 60–210 would start again litigation similar to that which has just been closed by denial of certiorari in the Harrison case.

The enactment of this bill would avoid such litigation by allowing capital gains treatment for bond discount on municipal bonds which does not qualify as tax-exempt interest under Revenue Ruling 60–210 and the early rulings applicable to other taxpayers who are not required to accrue bond discount. By not requiring life insurance companies and mutual fire and casualty insurance companies to accrue market discount on municipal bonds, these companies are placed in the same position as all other taxpayers with respect to bond discount which is tax-exempt interest and bond discount which is market profit. The proposed legislation would deny mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies the right to treat any bond discount on municipal bonds as tax-exempt interest which such right is not available to other taxpayers. At the same time, the legislation would allow such insurance companies to treat municipal bond discount which is not exempt interest as capital gains when the bond is sold or redeemed, the same treatment accorded all other taxpayers.

The bill is made applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, the effective date of Revenue Ruling 60–210. This gives the same treatment of municipal bond discount to all mutual fire and casualty companies and to life insurance companies that mutual companies having gross income of over $500,000 were given by the 1962 Revenue Act for years after December 31, 1962. The bill is necessarily retroactive in order to achieve full correlation with the effective date of Revenue Ruling 60–210.

DUAL DISTRIBUTION AND FAIR-PLAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing, for appropriate reference, two bills that I sponsored in the 87th Congress. One is entitled the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act." The other is entitled the "Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments."

I stated at the time of my prior introduction of this proposed legislation—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21407—that I was not "wedded" to this proposed legislation. That is still true. However, I do believe that public hearings on these two bills by the appropriate legislative committee—presumably the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee—would serve a useful purpose in furthering the understanding of the Congress, the public, and the business community of the problems with which the bills are concerned.

The Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments I reintroduce today is a bill in all respects identical to S. 2641 of the 87th Congress. The Dual Distribution Reporting Act I am reintroducing today is in all respects but one identical to S. 2640 of the 87th Congress. The one change in the elimination in the definitions section, in section 2(h), of the grey area for businesses between $5 million and $2 million of annual net sales. In the version introduced today, the indicator is fixed at $3 million, with no grey area. The general idea of the proposed Dual Distribution Reporting Act is that companies engaged in dual distribution should disclose publicly certain information on each of their establishments that competes with independent customers, so that the antitrust agencies and the public can form a judgment on whether the captive operation is being subsidized as a loss operation for predatory and monopolistic purposes.

The idea of section 2(h) is that a company of very small size could hardly succeed in predatory and monopolistic efforts even if it wanted to, so such companies might as well be exempted from the reporting, unless someone with an interest in the matter can carry the burden of proof that the company's operations do in fact affect and threaten competition. In the first version of this bill there was a rebuttable presumption that any company having between $2 and $5 million a year in sales could not significantly affect commerce by its dual distribution practices and was therefore to be exempt from making the reports called for by the bill. The presumption was to be conclusive as to companies with under $2 million a year in sales. In the new version, the presumption is to exist but be rebuttable for companies with $3 million or less in annual sales.

Undoubtedly, there are many other revisions and amendments that should be made in these bills before they are enacted into law, if, indeed, they ever are or should be enacted into law. I reiterate that my purpose in introducing them is not so much to press earnestly for passage of these particular bills, but rather to provide a focus for an enlarged and enlightening discussion of the problems of dual distribution.

As the Senate Small Business Committee said in its 12th annual report:

> It is * * * incumbent upon the small business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own, but in the national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point the statement of the Senate Small Business Committee in its 12th annual report with reference to these two bills. It is an excellent brief summary of the provisions of the legislation and an indication of the problem area in the distribution system with which these bills are intended to deal.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record as requested.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1107. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and

S. 1108. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products.

The statement presented by Mr. Long of Louisiana is as follows:

Excerpt From the 12th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Senate Report 1491, 87th Congress, 1st Session, Pages 31–35

C. DUAL DISTRIBUTION

Dual distribution, a term applied to competition by vertically integrated producers with their own fabricator, wholesaler, and retailer customers, has been the subject of study and concern by your committee for several years. As early as 1953, dual distribution in the automotive tire industry was noted in a staff report[1] and became the subject of hearings[2] conducted by Senator Humphrey's Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices[3] in 1959. Senator Russell B. Long's Subcommittee on Monopoly held hearings[4] in 1958 which dealt, in substantial part, with dual distribution in the flat-glass industry, and the full committee issued a report[5] thereon in 1959. In addition, the committee has had extensive correspondence and numerous staff-level conferences with small businessmen who complained of dual distribution and vertical integration problems in a number of other industries. The committee has been consulted on this subject within the past 2 years by representatives of, at least, the following classifications of independent small business: Manufacturers of aluminum siding, manufacturers of wire rope, assorted steel product fabricators, paint retailers, zinc die-cast alloyers, shoe retailers, and gasoline retailers. Glass and tire dealers have continued to urge remedial legislation.

On September 26, 1961, Senator Long of Louisiana introduced two bills which he described as "a conscientious effort to deal constructively with (these) most vexing problems."[6] The bills are S. 2641, the "Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments of 1962," and S. 2640, the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act of 1962." The were introduced as a legislative "package" under the heading, "Dual Distribution and Fair Play."[7]

1. S. 2641, 87th Congress, 1st session

The basic premise of the first[8] of Senator Long's two bills, as he explained them to the Senate upon introduction "* * * is that it is harmful to competition and also unfair for producers to charge their own captive plants and stores lower prices than they charge independent customer plants and stores which compete horizontally with the captives. The purpose of (the bill) is to make such discriminations unlawful."[9]

Senator Long acknowledged that this basic premise and purpose were shared with H.R. 2729, 86th Congress (often referred to as the Bentley equal pricing bill) which was the subject of hearings by a House subcommittee in 1959;[10] but he pointed out that

---

[1] Committee print, "Problems of Independent Tire Dealers," staff report to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 83d Cong., 1st sess., July 27, 1953.

[2] Hearings, "Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry, 1959," Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 1st sess., June 17, 18, 19, 1959, pt. 1; id., 86th Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 31, 1959, pt. 2 (supplemental materials).

[3] In January 1961, the name of this subcommittee was changed to Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices.

[4] Hearings, "Competitive Problems of Independent Flat-Glass Dealers" (dual distribution), Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 85th Cong., 2d sess., July 30 and 31, and Oct. 9 and 10, 1958.

[5] S. Rept. No. 1015, "Studies of Dual Distribution: The Flat-Glass Industry," 86th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 31, 1959.

[6] Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21409.

[7] Id., pp. 20205–20208. Reprints are available from this committee.

[8] The bill identified by Senator Long in his explanatory statement as his "first" bill was unfortunately given the higher number by the bill clerk.

[9] Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21409.

[10] Hearings on H.R. 2729 before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

S. 2641, 87th Congress, differs from H.R. 2729, 86th Congress, in these respects:

(a) The Bentley bill would have made price discrimination by a producer in favor of its captive stores and against its independent customers an "unfair method of competition in commerce * * * within the meaning of section 5" of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Long bill would ban such discriminations by an amendment of the Clayton Act, applying to them the rationale and explicit prohibitions of the Robinson-Patman amendments to the act.

(b) The Bentley bill would have applied only to those establishments of a producer which operate in the field of retail distribution. The Long bill would apply not only to retailing but also to those captive establishments of a producer which compete with the producer's independent customers in wholesaling and secondary manufacturing or processing operations.

(c) The Bentley bill would have gone a step further than would the Long bill, in that the former would have attempted to regulate the level of prices charged by direct-selling manufacturers to consumer customers, without the intermediary services of a captive wholesale or retail distribution establishment, while the latter would not. Senator LONG stated:

"I recognize the problem with which Mr. Bentley was concerned in that provision of his bill, but, I reiterate, my bill would not attempt to legislate a floor under any price charged by any seller to a consumer. In those situations where it is practicable for a consumer to buy direct from a maker's factory, without any middlemen whatsoever, that would seem to me to be the course which prudence, economy, and efficiency dictate be taken, and I see no reason for Congress to interfere in the process by which demand and supply considerations establish price in such transactions.

"But in those situations in which a producer first induces an independent distributor or manufacturer to make an investment in plant, equipment, inventory, and time in order to carry out a certain function with regard to the producer's product, then turns around and sets up his own store or plant to perform the identical function, in direct competition with the independent, it seems to me to be simple equity and sensible economic regulation to require the producer to treat his captive and his customer alike. If the Robinson-Patman Act makes sense, then this does, too."[11]

(d) An additional provision of S. 2641, not contained in the Bentley bill, would require producers, in times of short supply brought about by strikes or fires or other causes beyond a producer's control, not to cut down supplies to independent customers unless supplies to captive competitors of those customers were reduced in the same proportion.

2. S. 2640, 87th Congress, 1st session

Senator LONG's second bill, the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act of 1962," is intended, according to its sponsor "* * * to meet one of the most telling and forceful of the criticisms of the Bentley bill which were offered by the Federal Trade Commission at the 1959 hearings."[12]

The Commission had pointed out to the House Commerce Subcommittee that enactment of the bill would be "* * * without meaningful consequences. * * * A manufacturer could deliver to its own retail outlets at the same price at which deliveries are made to other retailers, but the manufacturer-owned retail outlet could resell at a low markup which no independent retailer could meet."[13]

Acknowledging the accuracy of this observation, Senator LONG stated that this was "* * * precisely the point which is most often and most loudly decried by independent small businessmen who are suddenly confronted by competition from their suppliers.

"* * * * *

"The theory of my Dual Distribution Reporting Act is that, if a producer influences independent small businessmen to make an investment in the product of that producer, then decides to jeopardize the independent's investment by competing with him, the producer owes the independent a duty, in equity and fairness, to operate the captive establishment on the basis of a separate profit on its own function, not as a no-profit operation subsidized by other functions of the company. The purpose of my reporting bill is to require companies engaged in dual distribution to make public certain operating data on each product and each establishment that is involved in the dual distribution process. The bill would not require a dual distributor to adhere to any particular level of prices or markup or to make any specified profit at any level of operation. It would require that information be disclosed by which competitors, consumers, and the agencies that administer the antitrust laws could discern whether a particular product or a particular establishment were being utilized, not for separate profit but as a tool of power for purposes of monopolization.

3. Summary and recommendation

Vertical integration is a growing trend and is coming to be widely recognized and accepted, by large and small business alike, as a means—often legitimate, logical, and even necessary—to more efficient and economical operations in today's vigorously competitive markets. But vertical integration by smaller businesses, whether forward from manufacturing or backward from distribution activities, is practicable, if at all, only through contractual relationships with other independent businesses, while big businesses, with vast capital resources, are able to establish or acquire and carry on integrated operations under a common ownership.

It is indisputable that the antitrust laws seriously limit the extent and flexibility of vertical integration by contract; but many practices, including the most blatant sort of price discriminations, which are forbidden to the small-business contract-integrator are quite lawfully available to the big-business ownership-integrator.[14] Your committee believes that, under conditions of perfect (if now somewhat visionary) justice and equity, the law should deal evenly and equally with that mode of vertical integration available to small business—contract integration—and the mode which, in the nature of things, is available only to big business—ownership integration. But this is a goal more easily stated than attained. Those who accept the goal as desirable and practical will differ on the approach and methods to be pursued—and some reasonable men and friends of small business will reject the goal itself. One approach might be to loose some of the shackles on contract integration; and consideration might be given to restraints on ownership integration more nearly comparable to those now applicable to contract integration. The Long bills embody such an approach. S. 2641 would simply make the Robinson-Patman prohibitions against price discriminations among horizontally competing customers of a seller, which now are one limitation on the freedom of maneuver of contract integration systems, equally and identically applicable as limitations on ownership integration systems. S. 2640 would not extend to ownership integration systems the stern law that is imposed by the natural laws of the market on contract integration systems: that each establishment make a profit on its own functional operation or close. But the bill would draw the contract and ownership integration systems a step closer to competitive parity by removing the veil of secrecy from operations of ownership-integration establishments at low profit, no profit, or a loss.

Your committee agrees with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly that the problem and these legislative proposals deserve—and recommends that they receive—close scrutiny, including public hearings, by the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which they have been referred. Your committee notes with pleasure that Senator KEFAUVER's Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has indicated that such hearings will be held. At that time it will be incumbent upon the small-business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they have averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own but in the national interest.

---

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21409–10.

[12] Id. at 20208.

[13] Statement of Hon. Earl W. Kintner, chairman, Federal Trade Commission, hearings, op. cit., supra, note 31, at p. 69.

[14] For an exhaustive review of existing law on this point, together with penetrating discussion of the thorny questions of business management and public policy that arise thereunder, see: Kessler and Stern, "Competition, Contract, and Vertical Integration," 69 Yale Law Journal 1 (1959). At p. 116, the authors, note: "In addition to the antitrust laws, the laws regulating pricing significantly affect ownership and contract as vertical integration devices. The form of integration adopted—contract or ownership—may vary considerably the impact of such legislation on the integrated firms. For example, the principal statute—sec. 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act, which forbids price discrimination—is applicable only to contractual relationships."

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT OF 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators KUCHEL, METCALF, and ENGLE, a proposed Water Resources Planning Act and request that it lie on the desk for 3 days to permit any Senators who desire to do so to cosponsor it.

There is already pending S. 2, a water resources research bill. This bill, which deals with river basin planning, should not be confused with the research measure.

The original draft of the bill I now introduce was sent to Congress by President Kennedy on July 13, 1961. On the following day it was introduced and became S. 2246 of the 87th Congress.

On July 26, and again on August 16, 1961, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works held joint hearings on the President's proposal.

At that time, the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments had not completed a survey of State views on the proposed planning bill. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee consequently held a further hearing on the message on March 2, 1962. The interstate conference then presented an extensive redraft of the proposed legislation. Some felt that the revisions would amount to a surrender of Federal prerogatives in the water field, to which there was considerable objection. Some members despaired of ever being able to reconcile State and Federal views and achieving comprehensive planning of the Nation's major river basins by the Federal Government and the States. I hope that this is now on the way to being done.

The bill was originally proposed by President Kennedy in response to recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources:

The first recommendation of the select committee read:

> 1. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States. Such plans should take into account the prospective demands for all purposes served through water development giving full recognition to non-revenue-yielding purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and keeping in mind the ultimate need for optimum development of all water resources. All practicable means of meeting demands should be considered. The executive branch is requested to submit plans to the Congress in January 1962, for undertaking and completing such studies in all basins by 1970. Once prepared, the reports should be brought up to date periodically. Reports on individual projects submitted to the Congress for authorization should specify how the project fits into the comprehensive long-range program, and the range of alternative purposes that might be served by the resources needed for the recommended projects.

The second recommendation of the select committee was for a 10-year program of aid to States to stimulate more active participation by the States in planning, development, and management of our water resources. A minimum program of $5 million annually in grants to the States for 10 years—the funds to be matched by the States—was recommended.

The fourth recommendation of the select committee was for preparation of a biennial assessment of the water supply-demand outlook for each of the water resource regions of the Nation. The executive branch was requested to submit the first such report during January 1963.

The President's water resources planning proposal was designed to meet all three of the recommendations I have summarized.

Title I of the bill authorized the establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare. It is to be the Council's functions to coordinate Federal river basin planning operations and to prepare the biennial supply-demand assessment, as well as to review basin plans when completed.

Title II of the President's bill was a proposal to authorize him to establish river basin planning commissions which would include representatives of affected States appointed by the President. Governors were extended the privilege of nominating persons for appointment as State representatives.

The bill was and is a nonpartisan proposal. To illustrate this fact, I point out that this title, title II, recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy, was first transmitted to us as a separate bill by the Eisenhower administration on January 16, 1961. In his last budget message to the Congress, President Eisenhower discussed the need for coordinated planning of water resources to assure optimum development. Subsequently, on January 16, 1961, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, then Mr. Maurice H. Stans, transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, a draft bill to implement President Eisenhower's recommendation by authorizing Presidential establishment of the river basin planning commissions. It was that draft bill which subsequently became title II of President Kennedy's bill.

Title III of President Kennedy's water resources planning measure provided for the 10 year, $5 million matching fund for water resources planning by the States which the Select Committee on National Water Resources recommended. The title is essentially identical to measures which both the late Senator Robert S. Kerr and I introduced in the 87th Congress.

President Kennedy continues to urge the enactment of legislation to achieve optimum river basin planning and development. In his budget message in January, the President said:

> Major emphasis is being given within the Federal Government to coordinated planning of river basin development and research on water resources. In addition, legislation is again recommended to provide for comprehensive and coordinated water resources planning by Federal and State agencies and to authorize limited grants to strengthen State planning.

There has been little or no opposition to titles I and III of the President's bill, providing for the establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council composed of four Secretaries whose departments have major water resource programs, and authorizing State aid. They have been little changed in the revision I have just introduced.

Opposition to the other title of the bill, title II, has been directed at the nature and mechanics for establishing the individual river basin planning commissions rather than at the basic idea of creating commissions or getting at the planning job.

The President proposed, as his predecessor had proposed, that the commissions be established and appointed by the Federal Chief Executive when one or more States in a basin requested the establishment of a commission.

The States objected, among other things, to establishment of a river basin planning commission at the request of only one State; they contended that two-thirds of the States involved should participate in any such request before a commission could be established.

The States objected also to appointment of the States representatives on the commissions by the President, and the consequent Federal nature of the commissions; they insisted on the right to appoint their own representatives who would have no master but the State that each represented.

The States also sought language which would recognize their primary interest in water resources.

The matter of State versus Federal rights in water resources is a dispute nearly as old as our Nation itself. It is still unsettled. States and the Federal Government have argued about it, carried lawsuits to the Supreme Court about it, and made it an issue in political campaigns. Few Congresses in recent decades have failed to have hearings on bills proposing a settlement. None has been enacted.

During the hearings on the President's planning bill last year, I challenged one of the witnesses to name an instance where this longstanding dispute has actually held up a water project. The instance is yet to be cited.

At my direction, a revision of the Water Resources Planning Act has been worked out with the representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments which is intended to preserve the status quo in regard to water rights; to let the debate over State versus Federal rights proceed without any disturbance whatsoever, but at the same time to let State and Federal planners proceed to work out together much-needed, comprehensive development plans.

The revision, which is the bill I have just introduced, proceeds on the basis of two fundamentals, stated in the bill.

First, that nothing in the act is to be construed as either expanding or diminishing either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibilities or rights in respect to water.

Second, it is recognized that in any instance where necessary agreement cannot be reached on the establishment of a river basin planning commission under the provisions of the act, the Federal Government may, if it considers such planning needed, proceed itself by any of the conventional, alternative methods now followed, or in a new and proper way, to plan for the development of a river which is of Federal concern. Similarly, if a Federal-State commission set up under the provisions of the bill should disagree and be unable to report a development plan, other means of planning could be substituted.

As revised, the bill provides that a river basin planning commission may be established by the President when the Federal Water Resources Council and one-half the States involved agree to it. The President will appoint a chairman. Representatives will be appointed by

Federal agencies concerned. The American section of any international commission which may be involved will also have a representative. The States will appoint their own representatives to the commissions. Any interstate compact compact commission involved may name its own representative.

To assure that neither Federal nor States rights will be overridden in the planning, the revised bill provides that there shall be two and only two votes in each commission. The chairman, appointed by the President, will cast one vote for the Federal agencies. The vice chairman, elected by the State representatives, will cast one vote at the instruction of the States.

Planning thus must be either by agreement or by the presentation of alternative plans to the President and Congress, and to the States involved. Planning decisions will not become a matter of whether the Federal Government or the States have the most representatives on a particular commission. It will be by agreement, or the final decision will be referred to the governments involved. If a commission is entirely unable to agree on a plan, then another means of planning will have to be substituted.

To those of us in political life, where issues are all finally settled by vote, this arrangement for equal Federal-State voting may appear impractical. Stalemates are not impossible. But they are not likely, for the planning process is one of arriving at a consensus based on facts—of devising engineering works and management plans for water which will yield the greatest benefits to the area involved. If studies are done thoroughly, then the facts make the decisions—not philosophical points of view. Both the differing nature of the planning process from the political process, and our experiences with planning commissions in the past, are assurance that stalemates will be rare and, if they occur, the alternatives can be submitted in the final report of a commission and the choice can be made by the Congress and the States involved.

The commissions will be entities of themselves—not Federal commissions or State commissions, but Federal-State partnerships with individual identity much as Interstate Compact Commissions are entities in their own right.

Copy of the draft of the bill has been submitted to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Mr. Frank Bane and including Senators MUNDT, ERVIN, and MUSKIE from this body, for it could become a significant new pattern for Federal-State relationships in more than the water resources planning field. A report on the proposal is expected from that Commission.

Observers for the executive branch of the Government have been present at all meetings between the committee staff and representatives of the State governments. The measure as revised will now be sent to the executive agencies for their review and recommendations. There will be further hearings. Doubtless we will have suggestions for further revision, and suggestions to restore the original Federal nature of the commissions.

To the extremists in the State-Federal water rights issue, who would prefer to waste our water resources than to concede a drop of authority or jurisdiction to their antagonist, I would like to say they are hopelessly behind the times.

The Federal Government has responsibilities and authorities in the water field, and so do the States. And we cannot do comprehensive water resources planning without involving both State and Federal prerogatives. Water within a river basin cannot be separated into "State water" and "Federal water" which are planned separately.

I have not heard it contended yet that States cannot regulate withdrawals of ground water under non-Federal lands within their borders. It is admitted that in many water-short areas of the Nation we must have conjunctive surface water and ground water management if we are to have comprehensive management for optimum benefits. Translated into political terms, that means we are also going to have to have conjunctive Federal-State planning and management of water resources, or we will fall far short of the optimum benefit goals that we seek.

Here in the Congress of the United States we legislate in very much the same fashion as is proposed in the new, revised river basin planning commissions. The House and the Senate either agree on legislation, or there is no legislation. As total entities, the House of Representatives has one voice and the Senate has one voice in this Congress.

Sometimes we fume considerably about it, but almost every year we pass necessary appropriations and get the other essential legislation passed. In my judgment, the Federal-State water commissions, realizing the necessity for water planning, also will get the job done. Their task will be much more of an engineering nature, with fewer philosophical and political issues to resolve, than the decisions we manage to make regularly between the House and Senate.

There is assurance that State governments will vigorously support the measure as revised.

The Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, meeting in Chicago in December, approved the nearly-completed work of the consulting group and directed their representatives to "continue * * * their work aiming toward passage of a bill."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the conference resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON WATER PROBLEMS OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS IN REGARD TO FEDERAL-STATE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Whereas the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, by resolution at previous annual meetings has urged coordination of and financial support for Federal and State water resources planning; and

Whereas there was considered in the 87th Congress legislation to provide for water resources planning on a comprehensive and coordinated basis; and

Whereas the executive and policy committees by direction of the conference at its last annual meeting conferred with staff representatives of the appropriate committees of Congress and relevant Federal agencies in an effort to evolve amendments to such legislation that would more nearly reflect the views of the States; and

Whereas at this meeting the conference received a report on these consultations indicating that progress is being made in implementing the policies set forth in the resolution adopted at the last annual meeting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive and policy committees be authorized and directed to continue along the lines of their work during the past year aiming toward passage of a bill that will conform to the above policies.

Mr. ANDERSON. Subsequent to the interstate conference's annual meeting in Chicago, the revised bill was completed and I have received a hearty endorsement of it from Dr. Garland Hershey, chairman. I request unanimous consent to have Dr. Hershey's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON
WATER PROBLEMS,
Chicago, Ill., January 22, 1963.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I am enclosing a copy of the water resources planning bill introduced by you in the 87th Congress as S. 2246, with suggested revisions which have been worked out in conferences between the policy and executive committees of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems and Mr. Benton J. Stong of your staff.

The bill as revised is one we believe to be acceptable to the States. In title II, it provides for genuine Federal-State river basin commissions to serve as the principal agencies to coordinate Federal, State, interstate and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in the areas they would serve. Elsewhere in the bill changes have been made to carry out this concept. With respect to titles I and III, on the other hand, we have made relatively fewer changes. The attached measure, or one similar to it, is one that the Interstate Conference on Water Problems will support with enthusiasm.

On behalf of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, I wish to thank you for your courtesy in giving the conference, and through it the States, an opportunity to present its views on this very important matter. I should also like to thank you for having made available to us the services of Mr. Stong. His knowledge and advise were very useful to us.

Yours very truly,
H. GARLAND HERSHEY,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Conservation Commissioner Harold Wilm, of New York State, who is chairman of the interstate conference's policy committee, has also written that "I shall do all that I can to urge that the States support" the revised bill. He declares the revision an excellent bill. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wilm's letter printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Interstate Conference on
Water Problems,
Albany, N.Y., January 18, 1963.

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Anderson: I have been informed by Dr. Garland Hershey, chairman of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, that he has sent you a copy of the water resources planning bill as it has been revised by the policy and executive committee of the conference in consultations with your staff.

As the chairman of the policy committee, both last year and this, I have attended almost every meeting of the State officials with Mr. Benton J. Stong of your staff at which the revised measure was hammered out. In my view, the amended bill is an excellent one. I shall do all I can to urge that the States support it.

Thank you very much for making it possible for the Interstate Conference on Water Problems to take part in the revision of the bill. I can assure you that the policy committee will continue to cooperate with you and the committee in your further consideration of this legislation.

Yours very truly,

H. G. Wilm,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Upon completion of the revision of the President's bill, it was submitted to Theodore M. Schad, who served as staff director of the Select Committee on National Water Resources. Mr. Schad has written:

> In accordance with your instructions, I looked at the bill from the viewpoint of whether it would be an adequate vehicle for carrying out the first, second, and fourth recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.
>
> My general reaction is that the bill would be adequate for the purpose desired.

Mr. Schad raised questions and suggested revisions to further improve the bill which have been adopted, or will be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as the measure is studied.

It is my hope that hearings can be held at an early date.

If we can enact river basin planning legislation during the present Congress, we will have accomplished a feat which has been more than a half century in the making.

As I have pointed out before, the first recommendation for comprehensive planning of the river basins of America for optimum development was made in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt's National Waterways Commission.

In the intervening 55 years we have, with the single exception of the Tennessee Valley, done our planning mostly in bits and pieces as the exigencies of the occasion required.

We now face shortages of water of good quality in many areas of the Nation. Perhaps we can now finally tackle this much-needed work on a nationwide basis.

In closing these remarks, I want to express my appreciation to the State people who have worked patiently and persistently on the revised draft.

They include Sam Thompson of Senator Eastland's staff, who is also chairman of his State's water board and was chairman of the Interstate Conference on Water Resources during the year 1962. Sam was a regular participant in working sessions.

Mr. Harold Wilm, the New York State conservation commissioner who is the interstate conference's policy committee chairman, commuted from Albany to attend nearly every meeting. We are indebted to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York for having made Mr. Wilm's participation possible. Mr. Wilm has been a constructive force at all times.

Also, Mr. Charles Schwan and Mitchell Wendell of the staff of the Council of State Governments here in Washington, who have made major contributions to the work.

Mr. Sid McFarland of the House Interior Committee, Mr. Henry Caulfield and Mr. E. D. Eaton of the Interior Department have been present from time to time.

Finally, Mr. President, for myself and other members of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which completed its work and went out of business 2 years ago, I want to express appreciation to President John F. Kennedy for following up and keeping before Congress and the country the urgency of meeting our water problems.

Although the President comes from a State where water shortages are not so acute as they are in my own Southwest, he demonstrates an awareness of the crucial problems of each of the regions of this Nation by pressing for water legislation, and for wise management of our natural resources of every kind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of the proposed Water Resources Planning Act which I have just introduced so it will be available to Members considering cosponsorship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources throughout the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act of 1963".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Sec. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

Sec. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein, and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

Sec. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water resources projects.

Sec. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation;

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(4) recommend such modifications in such plan or revision as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(5) transmit such plan or revision, including its recommendations and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) Hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ such personnel as it deems advisable, including a staff director at civil service grade 18; (5) place one position, in addition to the staff director, above the level of grade GS-15, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by such section; (6) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the region, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located. Such concurrences shall be in writing. Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a commission be established, the Council may find that the national interest requires: coordinated and comprehensive planning in the region, river basin or group of river basins with respect to which it has made a request and shall, in the event of such finding, recommend to the President an alternative means of accomplishing such planning.

(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related land resources;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its region, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

Membership of commissions

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations of the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, but a retired commissioned officer of one of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may be appointed chairman without prejudice to his retired status and may receive the compensation payable under section 206(c) of this Act in addition to his retired pay, provided that the combined rate shall not exceed the applicable maximum rate or rates set forth in such section for the chairman;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created.

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the council and not less than one-half of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided,* That studies, data and other materials useful in water resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided,* That the chairman and vice-chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) At such time as voting is considered necessary in conducting the business of a commission, the voting shall be only by the the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and by the vice-chairman, upon instruction from the State member.

Duties of the commissions

SEC. 204. (a) Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act:

(2) submit to the council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, and any major necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major revision to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each

such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan or revision.

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem; (5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency; (6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel; (7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (8)) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the chairman shall be governed by the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof.

Compensation of commission members

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government to finance each commission shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended. The Chairman and the State members shall negotiate an appropriate amount to be furnished by each State as that State's share in financing the commission. The Federal appropriation requested by the commission each year shall be the total of the commission's budget for the year less amounts paid by the States during the twelve months ending the preceding June 30. Funds received from the States shall be deposited in the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements shall be audited by a qualified public accountant who, where practicable, shall be licensed or certified by a regulatory body of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States if the planning and other activities authorized by this Act are to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing comprehensive water resources plans and in participating in the development of the comprehensive water resources plans authorized in title II of this Act.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under section 305) of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal and State agencies having responsibilities in such fields;

(2) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(3) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(4) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

SEC. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Federal share

SEC. 305. (a) The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(b) The Federal shares shall be promulgated by the Council on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the entire United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for the first fiscal year for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and the succeeding fiscal year, and a promulgation shall thereafter be made for each succeeding two years and shall be conclusive for such years.

Payments

SEC. 306. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

SEC. 307. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

SEC. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council, its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Employee benefits

SEC. 405. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with any commission established under section 201 of this Act for coverage of the river basin commission's employees in the employee benefit programs of the Federal Government, as provided in section 205(a)(6) of this Act.

EXTRA $600 TAX EXEMPTION FOR STUDENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would, if enacted, provide an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student in an institution of higher education.

In this age of rockets and missiles, of progress and constant hurry, it is becoming more and more important that we have a well-educated citizenry. There is a crying demand for technicians and specialists of all kinds and less and less of a place in our work force for the unskilled and untrained worker.

At a time when our society is demanding more and more educated people, the costs of college education are rising. In its report on S. 1241, the higher education bill which was before the Senate last year, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare pointed out that college "tuition and fee charges alone have increased 86 percent in the past decade and promise to increase still further;" that "during the past school year, the average expense incurred by a student living away from home was $1,650 per year." The committee said that each year, "between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates in the top 20 to 30 percent of their class fail to go on to college for this reason." This, in my estimation, is a very real loss to America, and we should do something about it.

The extra $600 tax exemption for which my bill provides would aid ambitious young people and would make a college education possible for many who otherwise would not be able to afford college. I do not believe we can afford to do less for our young people than to offer them every possible opportunity for an education. Therefore, I am hopeful that every consideration will be given to my proposal and that ultimately favorable action will be taken on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1114) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LOANS TO STUDENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 2 years ago, I first introduced a bill to provide Government guarantees on loans to students for higher education. This year, I was pleased to note, President Kennedy endorsed this idea and made it a part of his message on better schools and schooling for our Nation. I, therefore, introduce a bill for this purpose, for appropriate reference.

In essence, this measure would set up a system of loan insurance for needy youngsters in colleges and universities. It would be similar in nature to the highly successful Federal Housing Administration system. If the FHA was successful in promoting homeownership without outlay of large sums of Federal money, so can this school insurance loan program be successful in putting college within the reach of more of our talented young people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1115) to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STRIP MINING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] have asked that they be permitted to become cosponsors of the strip milling bill (S. 1013), which I introduced on the 7th of this month. I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the bill, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD M. DECKER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 22, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge, Northern District of Illinois, recess appointment.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address entitled "Challenge to Americans," delivered by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON before the National Advertising Council, in Washington, D.C., on March 12, 1963.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

Address on the budget, delivered by Senator HARTKE before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution, in Washington, D.C., on March 11, 1963.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 63, House bill 2438, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill which is before the Senate for consideration involves a 4-year extension of five separate provisions of law, all of which relate to maintaining the strength and health of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The following provisions of law would be extended for a period of 4 years:

First, the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces;

Second, the authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists;

Third, the suspension of permanent limitations on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces;

Fourth, the authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and

Fifth, the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

REGULAR DRAFT

Perhaps the most significant objective of the bill is the extension of authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces. Unless extended, this authority would expire on July 1 of this year. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension until July 1, 1967.

Under existing conditions, draft calls are relatively low. In the fiscal year 1962, the number of men inducted totaled 157,500. About 76,000 inductees will be required during the fiscal year 1963, this being a relatively low replacement year. For the 4-year period from 1964 through 1967, the estimate is that in the absence of any unforeseen contingency, the inductions will average about 90,000 a year.

These figures should not mislead one to believe that the authority to induct is unimportant to the procurement of the necessary manpower for our Armed Forces. Beyond the number inducted each year, about 400,000 persons volunteer for enlistment in one of the many programs available throughout the Department of Defense. All the manpower authorities I know recognize that the existence of the draft causes many of these enlistments. The indirect effect of the draft is not limited to voluntary enlistments by noncommissioned members of the Armed Forces. The draft also encourages participation in the ROTC programs, enrollment in officer candidate schools, and applications for direct appointment of officers from civilian life.

While at the moment the Army is the only military service that requires inductees, elimination of the draft would drastically affect the manpower situation in all the other Armed Forces. Ending the draft not only would adversely affect the active duty strength of the Armed Forces, but also it would seriously reduce the strength of our Reserve forces.

The draft has been continuously in effect since 1940, except for the period of March 1947 to June of 1948. In this hiatus the strength of the Armed Forces dropped to about 1,384,000 at a time when the desired strength was slightly more than 2 million. I think this experience is clear evidence that we cannot safely rely on purely voluntary service to maintain the strength of our Armed Forces.

I believe no thoughtful person would seriously contend that existing law and its administration are perfectly equitable or are completely free of injustices. Only a system involving universal service would be completely nondiscriminatory. I would remind the Senate, however, that our existing system for selection and induction is the product of many years of experience, that it is administered largely by unpaid volunteers at the local level, and that no one has yet proposed a substitute that would be practical, effective, or more fair, and that would supply the military establishments with the necessary personnel.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the extension of this law should be for a period of only 2 years, and that a commission or a study group should be appointed to examine other ways of procuring military manpower. In my opinion this approach only temporizes with a serious subject. The law has been extended for a period of 4 years consistently since 1951. This does not mean, of course, that a 4-year extension is an inviolable requirement, but an extension of this duration does provide a sound basis for planning and it does not mislead the few persons who may be trying to evade military service into thinking that by postponing a decision they may completely escape liability.

Nor does the proposal for a study commission have a great deal of appeal for me. I know this is an era of commissions, boards, factfinding groups, and panels. The mere naming of a group for further study provides no easy solution for difficult problems, however, and if anyone has a workable alternative to the draft he has not yet communicated the details of this substitute to the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee report contains a summary of the major features of the existing Selective Service procedures. I shall not discuss these features in detail. I do wish to point out, though, that a young man may select almost any point between his reaching the age of 18½ and the age of 26 for the performance of his military service. Some persons have urged that since the average age of induction is between 22 and 23, and that since relatively few persons are being inducted, the maximum age of liability should be reduced. Reduction of the maximum age of liability would cause some year groups not to bear their normal share of service, and also it would compress the period within which a young man must make a decision. If the existing ages of liability prolong one young man's uncertainty about service, they also permit many other young men to elect the time that is the least inconvenient to them for the performance of their service. Some young men prefer to discharge their obligation before undertaking further schooling, and others choose to postpone service until after their formal education is complete. "Option" is a popular word in the defense lexicon of today and this system certainly provides abundant options, not only in connection with the age for service, but also in connection with the branch of service or the program that is most suited to an individual's personal preference.

Neither do I believe that the Selective Service System is as inequitable as it has been alleged to be by its critics. An analysis of manpower statistics shows that of the persons who are not performing military service, the two largest categories are fathers and those who are not qualified for physical or mental reasons, or for both. About 6 out of every 10 young men who reached age 26 last year had performed military service, or were in the process of discharging their obligation. About 3 out of 10 had been found unfit for service. The remaining 1 out of the 10 was either a father or had received a statutory deferment because of his occupation.

Some religious groups have earnestly suggested that the draft should be ended. I do not question their good faith, but I am utterly unable to understand their reasoning. If we are not militarily strong the chances are that we would be conquered by a system that does not believe in God and that discourages religious worship. Until the Communists show some of the religious characteristics that we are urged to demonstrate by those who would end the draft, termination of Selective Service would tend to suppress a religious point of view instead of promoting it.

In summary, Mr. President, I think the need for extending the draft is unquestionable.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Section 2 of the bill would continue a suspension of several limitations on the personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

Under the permanent ceilings the strength of the Army is limited to 837,000, the Air Force 502,000, and the Navy to 500,000. The strengths of these services on December 31, 1962, were:

Army	952,000
Navy	581,000
Air Force	863,000

Thus it is obvious that unless section 2 of the bill is approved on July 1 of this year the Army would have to reduce its strength by 115,000, the Navy would have to lose 81,000 enlisted members and a proportionate number of officers, and the Air Force reduction in strength would be 361,000. Obviously the permanent ceilings cannot realistically be imposed at this time and the suspension must be continued.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

Section 3 of the bill contemplates continuation of the authority for paying quarters allowances to enlisted members in the lower pay grades.

There is no permanent authority for the payment of quarters allowances to members of the Armed Forces in the lower pay grades because the peacetime policy of the military services prohibits the enlistment or reenlistment of members of the lower three pay grades and part of the fourth pay grade if these members have dependents. This peacetime policy has been modified continuously since 1950 and it seems that it will be necessary to continue to encourage service by persons in the power pay grades even though they have dependents.

Under the Dependents Assistance Act, the quarters allowances that are payable to enlisted members in pay grades E-1 through E-4—with 4 years or less of service—vary from $55.20 a month to $105 a month for those with three or more dependents. To receive these allowances a member must have in effect an allotment payable to his dependents in an amount equal to these allowances, plus $40 of his pay. If this law is not extended enlisted members in these grades would be entitled to a quarters allowance of only $45 a month, irrespective of the number of their dependents. Termination of this authority clearly would create a financial hardship for these persons.

SELECTIVE INDUCTION FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Section 4 of the bill would continue authority for the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists and to order physicians and dentists who are members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they had not already served on active duty for at least 1 year.

Despite some special inducements for physicians and dentists, the Department of Defense has been unable to recruit enough Regular doctors and dentists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. For this reason it is necessary to provide for the temporary service of a sufficient number of doctors and dentists to bridge the gap between the number of Regulars and the requirements of the Armed Forces.

Persons deferred under the Universal Military Training and Service Act remain liable for induction until they reach the age of 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur a liability for induction until age 35. A 1957 act authorized the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists and to order physicians and dentists in the Reserve components to active duty. The combination of these authorities normally results in acceptance of Reserve commissions by physicians and dentists, who are ordered to active duty after completion of their training. These authorities would expire on July 1, 1963, and this bill would extend the authorities for another 4 years, until July 1, 1967.

If these special authorities were permitted to expire, the number of physicians and dentists on active duty unquestionably would be reduced to unacceptable levels.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

As an inducement to the procurement of more physicians and dentists for active military service and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians has been in effect for several years. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty receive special pay of $100 a month; those with 2 to 6 years of service receive $150 monthly; those with 6 to 10 years of service receive $200 a month, and those with more than 10 years of service receive $250 a month. Veterinarians receive $100 of special pay a month, irrespective of their length of service.

If section 5 of the bill were not enacted, physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would not receive this special pay, although those officers in these categories who entered on active duty before July 1, 1963, would continue to receive special pay. Since the military services continue to need more officers in these categories, the authority for special pay should be continued.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on the bill. The bill is one of the more important items in the legislative program of the Department of Defense this year.

Mr. President, I believe that the committee report on the bill explains each provision of the bill in detail. The program has been operational for a number of years. The extension of the bill is of vital importance to the maintenance of our defense posture as well as to maintain the program of the Department of Defense even for this year. I hope the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today the harsh necessities of the cold war require that Congress take action to extend the compulsory draft law for another period. I think all of us are satisfied that the large manpower requirements of our Armed Forces at their present levels of strength require a form of compulsion to encourage enlistments as well as make up any other needed personnel. These are the hard facts of the cold war; our forces are required around the world in varying degrees of hardships and discomfort to combat aggression by a determined foe. Some of them are fighting; all of them are ready to fight. This is the price we must pay to maintain freedom, and this this country is determined to do.

But although we recognize the necessity of this program for induction into the Armed Forces, most of us are not unmindful of the inequities it causes to many of our youth who must carry this burden of defending freedom for all of us. Only around one-half of the young men subject to the draft ever serve a substantial period of military duty. Their contemporaries forge ahead in the competitive race of civilian life. I am satisfied that the various combinations of requirements of the armed services and the exemption policies of the Selective Service System are administered on a fair basis, but these various policies, justified as they may be by other goals of necessity, still result in the overall inequity by which one young man is required to serve while another is not. I know many Senators share my concern that this Nation is not doing enough to redress this inequity that our national policy places on so many men.

To correct this inequity, 39 of us are cosponsoring S. 5 the cold war GI bill. We hope through this plan to repay in some way the young men who served for the time, effort, and courage demanded of them to defend freedom. We propose educational and training allowances and home loan guarantees for these veterans to help them catch up with their contemporaries who were allowed to stay in civilian life. Almost all of these young men consider it an honor to serve their country, and would be reluctant to insist that the Government owes any special obligation to them, but we who create the inequity by setting the policies do feel the necessity for providing an adequate compensation for their sacrifices.

So as we vote to extend the draft for another 4 years, let it not be said that we are insensitive to the needs of the cold war veteran. It is my expectation to bring to the floor of the Senate this session the cold war GI bill. In this way, before many weeks pass, we can demonstrate to the youth of the country that the draft laws do not operate as an arbitrary capricious roulette wheel which penalizes some but not others. We shall provide adequate recognition and compensation for the burden that our young veterans have carried for all of us.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2438) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was necessarily absent from the Chamber earlier in the day when the Draft Extension Act was passed. His staff has asked me to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Oregon, indicating that he desires to be recorded against the extension of the draft. He is necessarily absent, inasmuch as he is joining the President on his trip to Costa Rica.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2438

It is with real regret that I am asking to be recorded against extension of the draft. Had I been present today, instead of on my way to Mexico and Costa Rica, I would have offered a substitute amendment, extending the draft for a 2-year period, rather than for 4 years.

I offered such an amendment in 1959. It was my hope and expectation that during those 2 years, manpower studies would be undertaken that would produce alternatives to selective service as a means of assuring adequate manpower for the Armed Forces. That year, the congressional critics of the waste of manpower under selective service were "sweet talked" by both the executive branch and the Armed Services Committee with pledges that steps would be taken to review manpower policies. Senator CASE of South Dakota offered an amendment on the Senate floor which I supported, to set up a civilian commission to do this job. We were told that such a commission was not needed, because the Armed Services Committee of the Senate was going to appoint a subcommittee to conduct continuing studies of the utilization of military manpower.

That was sufficient to defeat the 2-year extension, with its proposed manpower study.

So far as I know, that was the end of the matter. If any studies were ever made, their results are not apparent. Not a thing has been done; not a change for the better has been made. Selective service remains just as discriminatory in its selection as before, and just as unfair to the young men of the Nation. For the injustices it works upon American citizens, the Congress must bear heavy responsibility.

But it is first of all the responsibility of the Pentagon to provide an efficient means of acquiring essential manpower. It is an astonishing thing to me that in a Pentagon building bulging with the so-called whiz kids and slide-rule minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair method of filling the ranks of the Army.

Why, I ask Mr. McNamara, has not the same attention gone into the human component of your Department that apparently goes into your decisions relating to weapons systems? Does not American industry require efficient use of people just as much as efficient use of machinery, or in this case, of weapons and supplies? Is it possible, Mr. Secretary, that manpower utilization has a low level of priority simply because with the draft in effect, it is possible to bring in however many men are needed without regard to efficiency?

In the last 4 years, I have seen absolutely nothing to restore my confidence that the draft law is really needed. It remains the manpower crutch of the Army alone, not the Air Force, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. The Pentagon can always come to Congress with extensive proof that a substantial pay raise is needed, as it is doing again this year. But where are the studies that will eliminate the criticisms of the inefficient use of drafted men by the Army that were voiced by the Cordiner report and by many other reports?

I submit that I know something about "featherbedding" and "work rules" in industry, and I think it is about time the Secretary of Defense provided some real "work rules" for the Army in the interest of efficiency, as well as in the interest of the young men who are now subject to the lottery of selective service.

Since there is no opportunity to vote for a 2-year extension with a manpower review, I therefore cast my vote against another 4 years of selective service.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senate in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate now returns to the morning hour, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senator from Mississippi recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Is not the Senate in the morning hour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, for the moment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor with the understanding that I will be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT GOES ON?—BAY OF PIGS INCIDENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am fully aware that the problem of a Soviet military presence in Cuba and what to do about it far outweighs past mistakes and what really happened at the Bay of Pigs. I am also aware of the fact that only the administration can provide the action and the answers required to meet the current threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere. But I certainly do not agree with the administration spokesmen who argue that because we have a danger-fraught situation existing 90 miles off the southern coast of America we must declare a complete moratorium on all discussion of one of the blackest episodes in American history. As I have pointed out before on this floor, it was not the Republicans or the critics of the New Frontier who reopened the public discussion of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—rather, it was reopened by the Attorney General of the United States, who enjoys the unique status of being the President's brother and one of the three men appointed by the President to conduct an official postmortem on the ill-fated invasion attempt in April of 1961.

Since the Attorney General saw fit to reopen this discussion by providing a selected group of reporters with his personal version, I believe those interested in the full and truthful facts attendant to the Bay of Pigs incident have both the right and the duty to demand an accurate accounting to the public.

Mr. President, I am confident that it will do no good for those in official positions to keep telling us that we should stop talking about the Bay of Pigs or the Cuba story. The reason is—and we have only to look at the daily newspaper to understand this—that the American people will not stop talking about it. And all the exhortations of the Vice President and majority leader will not stop them or the opposition. To them, the administration's supersecret attitude on this official failure has become something in the nature of a "whodunit" which they want solved.

Mr. President, I am again forced to ask "What goes on?" Why cannot the American people be given a complete, unvarnished version of the events that occurred back in April of 1961? Why must we keep getting the details of those events piecemeal from obscure sources? Why must we go constantly to the newspapers and the magazines for more enlightenment?

In this connection, I recommend to the Senate some required reading. My reference is to an article in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting."

Now, Mr. President, this magazine has had a record of accuracy and consistency in the reporting of emergent facts concerning the Bay of Pigs. And for that reason, I believe some of the statements made in this article should be answered by the administration. They suggest a much heavier American involvement in the Cuban invasion attempt than any of us heretofore have suspected. Some of the disclosures I have never seen before in any official or unofficial statement or any printed versions of the Bay of Pigs episode. For example, let me quote some of the statements made in this article:

> For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.
>
> U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.
>
> A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight deck, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.
>
> In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.
>
> On D-day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught by chance in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.
>
> At least one American is known to have piloted a planeload of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the

beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over the American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day of the invasion—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and a copilot, were in a C–54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B–26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro's jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene, not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B–26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

Mr. President, if this report be true in part or full, I believe the administration owes it to the American people to give us a full and complete rundown on just what occurred at the Bay of Pigs. In light of the Attorney General's insistence that no American air cover was ever planned for the Cuban invaders, it would help to know what, if the report is true, was the meaning of the Navy jets with their insignia painted out? Why was an aircraft carrier standing by with her jets ready, if the report is true? What were the Cuban invaders led to believe about American support? These questions have been begging for answers too long. The American people have a right to know.

I ask unanimous consent to have the U.S. News & World Report article reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BAY OF PIGS: THE CURTAIN IS LIFTING

(Note.—That clamp of secrecy on what happened at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, just will not stay put. Information keeps leaking out. Now it shows: Americans were in far deeper than officials admit. And U.S. air power was ready to go on a moment's notice.)

More and more details are breaking through the curtain of secrecy to show how deeply Americans were involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight decks, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

American frogmen scouted the beaches in advance of the attack. American combat veterans flew B–26 bombers into the battle zone and piloted planes carrying Cuban paratroopers who were dropped in advance of infantrymen.

None of these men were members of the regular U.S. Armed Forces, although several were Air National Guardsmen. All were volunteers. But after word got out that four American pilots died in combat at the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy said this at his news conference on March 6:

"Let me just say about these four men: They were serving their country."

How United States helped: These details can now be told.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-Day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught, by chance, in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a planeload of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over an American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and copilot, were in a C–54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B–26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B–26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

U.S. B–26 pilots hired: On March 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that Air National Guard pilots from Alabama, Arkansas, and Virginia, "were offered $2,500 a month by the Central Intelligence Agency to take part in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961." The newspaper said pilots from the three States were "sought out because the Guard units of those States were the last to fly the B–26 bombers used in the invasion. The World War II bomber was retired from the State units in 1959."

The Chicago American identified Brig. Gen. George Reid Doster of the Alabama Air National Guard as tactical commander of the anti-Castro force. General Doster refused to confirm or deny the report, but indicated he would like to tell his story to a congressional committee. He said: "I wish they would call me and let me put my feet on a desk and talk for about 8 hours."

It had been reported earlier by U.S. News & World Report that at least 18 American airmen went to Guatemala to train Cuban pilots of the B–26 bomber fleet that the invaders had assembled. These men were recruited for combat duty. Later their orders were changed, limiting them to the role of instructors. But when things started to go wrong at the Bay of Pigs, those who wanted to were permitted to go on combat missions. At least 10, maybe more, did so.

There still is no public report by the administration on how many Americans were involved in the invasion, or what they did. But gradually, after 2 years of silence, some of those Americans are beginning to tell their experiences. And as their accounts are pieced together, the curtain of secrecy is lifting from the Bay of Pigs.

WASHINGTON VOGUE OF PLANNED PERMANENT DEFICITS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, on February 21, the Wall Street Journal contained a very interesting article about the current "Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits." This article points out an interesting fact which many may have overlooked in the present controversy being waged on the Federal level about the budget. That fact is simply this: Considerable importance is still attached on the State and local levels to budget balancing.

The people more closely connected with the State and local budgets, Mr. President, are the ones who are much closer to the people than any of us here in the Congress of the United States.

This excellent article continues by pointing out, however, that there still is considerable concern in the Congress about the Federal deficit way of life. And I believe there is no Member of Congress more concerned with this present situation than Tom Curtis, of Missouri, ranking Republican member of the Joint Economics Committee.

Representative Curtis is a man who is outrightly proud of his Puritan ethics, and he has remained close enough to his constituents in Missouri to know that his people—and people throughout the country—will not be taken in by the New Frontier's so-called new economy talk.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee myself, I can personally attest to the ability and dedication of our conscientious ranking minority member. All of us bow to his knowledge at one time or another, and I deem it a privilege to serve with Representative Curtis on the Joint Economic Committee. I particularly would commend him on his questioning of witnesses in our recent hearings.

This Wall Street Journal article brings out clearly Mr. Curtis' opinion about what will happen to the economy and the budget if the administration's plans are followed, as well as other interesting facts so important to all of us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the body of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OF MINDS AND BUDGETS

A curious thing about the Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits is that it is still not accepted by a number of other governmental entities in managing their own affairs.

No matter how much phoniness may go into some State and local budget-balancing acts, considerable importance is nonetheless attached to the principle. The giants of California and New York, which sometimes seem to be racing each other in spending as well as population, try to keep up the appearance of balanced books. Even New York City does so; an unplanned deficit is regarded as a fiscal crisis.

This suggests that State and local politicians, closer to the people than Washington's "new" economists are, realize the voters wouldn't care for a different policy. The politicians themselves would doubtless feel guilty about deliberately planning big deficits year in and year out. So it is a bit puzzling why what is considered sound policy and politics in certain important governmental units is flouted by the biggest of all.

Actually, plenty of concern can be found in Congress, as in the country, about the Federal deficit way of life. Perhaps as a result, even some administration spokesmen are beginning to sound a little defensive about it—which may or may not be an encouraging sign.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, for one, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the current hope is to achieve a balanced budget in the fiscal period beginning 3 years from this summer. That's a good way off, but at least the man mentioned the possibility.

With that in mind, Mr. Gordon said any tax cuts should be accompanied by efforts to hold down the Government's spending for purposes other than defense and space.

Savings could be made, he indicated, through such means as switching from direct Government loans to private credit whenever possible and generally lowering Government costs and raising efficiency through better management. In addition, of course, the tax cuts themselves are supposed to stimulate the economy so that it will produce much bigger Federal revenues from the lower rates.

If all this is how the Government proposes to balance the budget in some remote future, we fear it adds up to a feeble effort.

Even if some savings attempts were made, and pursued diligently, they could not offset deficits estimated at nearly $9 billion in this fiscal year and nearly $12 billion in the next and Heaven knows what thereafter. And the hope of stimulation through tax cuts, which must deepen deficits initially at least, is hardly enhanced by the complexity and lethargic pace of the proposed program.

No wonder Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, told Mr. Gordon he thinks administration economy talk "isn't going to be believed by the people"; the administration's first 3 fiscal years will have seen a spending rise of around $17 billion. With rising spending and lower taxes, Mr. CURTIS estimated the budget couldn't be balanced until fiscal 1972. For all we know, that may be unduly optimistic.

It certainly can't be balanced until the administration gives convincing proof of abandoning its fetish of deficits of indefinite duration. Almost everybody else in the country knows that running constantly in the red, whether in a family, a business, a local or a national government, is a policy of folly.

As the International Monetary Fund's managing director, Per Jacobsson, put it, the notion that there should be permanently unbalanced budgets strikes him as "the emanation of permanently unbalanced minds."

Balancing the budget is necessary not for the sake of appearance but for the sake of the integrity of the Nation's financial foundations. In Washington as elsewhere, integrity is the key to all. It is the key the people and the Congress must persuade the Government to find.

WALTER LIPPMANN TELLS "THE STORY OF THE CONGO"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have the privilege of bringing to the attention of Senators a most perceptive article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Story of the Congo." The article appeared in the March 4 issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The article should serve to remind us of the troubled past of the Congo as well as of the tremendous efforts which are required in order to put this richly endowed African country on the road to ordered progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking in an entirely different context—and for the purpose of discrediting U.S. policy in Europe—Pravda of March 11 called Walter Lippmann the "dean of Washington journalism" and conceded that he is a "man who is not customarily given to hyperbole." While rejecting the purpose for which these words are used, I agree wholeheartedly with this apt description of an outstanding American commentator.

The fact is, Mr. President, that in the Newsweek article referred to, Mr. Lippmann has accurately traced the difficulties which beset the Congo immediately following Belgium's grant of independence in 1960. He also makes the very important point that President Eisenhower suggested that Patrice Lumumba turn for assistance to the United Nations rather than rely upon the intervention of American troops to save the Congo from a complete breakdown of law and order. Let those who still question the wisdom of our Congo policy remember that the United Nations has done us the inestimable service of preventing a direct United States-Soviet confrontation in the Congo. It forestalled a situation in which Americans would have performed police functions in the heart of Africa. Either course might have entailed disastrous consequences. In retrospect, as in 1960, I am heartily thankful that the former President of the United States took his wise decision.

Finally, Walter Lippmann gives a brief but telling account of the vital technical and educational services being performed by U.N. and Belgian personnel in the Congo today. We must remember that the Congo today needs first, educated citizens; second, competent and trained administrators; third, engineers and technicians to solve the manifold problems of disrupted or nonexistent public services; fourth, a buoyant economy and a market for the rich natural resources of the country; fifth, and finally, the firmest of links with Western Europe.

In this connection, the Belgians have an all-important role to play. I am pleased to note that they are playing this role—both in their own interests and in the interests of a viable Congo. Not all Belgian businessmen have horns on their heads. Even the mighty Union Miniere is not the archenemy that it was frequently depicted during the Katangan secession. Honesty compels us to recognize that the Congo and Belgium have organic ties which should bind them for years to come. I am glad that Walter Lippmann has indicated the importance of this new relationship between a former colony and its former colonial rulers. I am pleased that he has stressed the role of the U.N. in helping the Congo through the hard days that lie ahead.

EXHIBIT I

WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE STORY OF THE CONGO

No one in our time is likely to be happy about the Congo. For it presents a problem which has no quick and obvious solution. What the U.N. has done in the Congo and what the United States has done in the U.N. can be judged properly only if we begin with the basic fact—that the Congo is a large, rich, independent state which is not now prepared to govern itself without outside help.

When people say that the U.N. did not originally contemplate any such large military and technical operation, they are quite right. The authors of the charter in 1945 did not foresee the situation of the Congo in 1960 or what would happen when the old colonial empires were liquidated. There was, as I recall it, a vague assumption that the colonies would be liberated eventually after the imperial rulers had educated them for self-government, as the British had done in India and the Americans in the Philippines. Insofar as any thought was given to the problem, this was to be the model for the liberation of the other colonies.

But in fact the Belgians did not follow that model in the Congo, and the Portuguese are not following it now in what is probably a second Congo—namely, Angola. The controlling fact in the Congo is that it received political independence without adequate preparation.

There was no university in the Congo until 1954, and only a handful of Congolese received European university training. When independence came in 1960 there were only about 30 Congolese university graduates. As late as 1958, only about 18,000 Congolese, out of a population of over 13 million, were attending academic secondary schools. The Belgians prided themselves on the primary and vocational education and the health services of the Congo. It was not an idle boast to say that the Belgian Congo was a showcase colony. But a colony and only a colony it was until the day it was liberated.

Too much, too soon: Naturally we ask ourselves whether independence could not have been delayed. The Belgian Government did not think so. After the riots in Léopoldville in January 1959, the Belgians accepted the idea of eventual independence. Then, under the pressure of the Congolese leaders, Belgium conceded independence for June 30, 1960. This was, of course, much too soon. For there were almost no safety valves, that is to say preparatory steps for independence.

The crucial event occurred 6 days after independence when the uneducated Congolese troops mutinied against their Belgian officers. The mutiny was followed by atrocities, by the flight of Europeans and by the occupation of the key cities by Belgian paratroopers against the wishes of the Central Government. It was in this chaos that the Congo Government appealed to the United States for troops.

President Eisenhower's reply to this appeal was decisive for the whole future. He declined to send American troops and he advised the Congolese to appeal to the United Nations. That is how the U.N. got into the Congo in the first place.

The U.N. was not pushed into the Congo by the Afro-Asian bloc. President Eisenhower did not turn to the U.N. because he was starry eyed about the U.N. and about the Congo but because the only alternative was American intervention. That, considering all of our other involvements all over the world, would have been, to say the least, imprudent. And to have done nothing would have virtually guaranteed the Russians an invitation to help force out the unwanted Belgians.

The education gap: This background is essential to anyone who wishes to think clearly and fairly about what has been done in the Congo and what will have to be done. The story shows that, with the end of the secession of Katanga, the problem of the Congo is the lack of officials, military officers, technicians, and teachers. Until that lack is made up by the education of the Congolese, which will take at least a generation, many positions in public and private services will have to be filled by outsiders and some authority outside the Congo will have to help maintain law and order.

That is the job which the U.N. and the Belgians have already begun, and it should go forward rapidly now that the civil war is over. Some 2,000 Congolese are in U.N.-sponsored training programs. The U.N. has provided a thousand foreign teachers and technical experts, and Belgium is giving the services of 2,000 trained people—teachers, doctors, agricultural experts. Altogether 40,000 Belgians are in the Congo, mostly in business, helping to develop the country.

If the U.N. can provide the authority and protection the Congo needs, keeping the services of the foreigners and providing the additional technical help necessary for its development, it will have a success which could not have been achieved by any other authority in the whole world.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of March 13 Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, our representative at the United Nations, appeared before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The chairman of the meeting was the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. The meeting was very well attended by members of the full committee.

Adlai Stevenson gave to us a complete and comprehensive report of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the role of our country in that session.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson is one which I think ought to be read by every Member of the Senate. Indeed, the entire transcript of the hearing, which is far more detailed than the prepared statement by the Ambassador, should be "must" reading for every Member of Congress, and for every interested citizen.

Adlai Stevenson described the work of the United Nations in very measured and careful terms, neither exaggerating its importance nor underplaying its significance.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson, particularly as it relates to the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations is to my mind very worthwhile reading and of great importance to every Member of the Senate, for we are all concerned about our international relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement by Mr. Stevenson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 13, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the United Nations is a big subject—one which can be approached from many points of view. From one point of view it is a symbol of the aspirations of most of humanity for peace, decency, and human dignity. From another point of view it is an institution of 110 members pioneering the arts of parliamentary diplomacy on a near-universal level. From still another, it is a very large operating mechanism performing such varied activities as stopping a war, spraying tropical villages with DDT to combat malaria, and drafting a convention on some aspect of human rights. There is even a point of view—albeit a narrow one—from which the United Nations appears to be the symbol of wicked one-worldness, a sinister threat to the national sovereignty, and a joint convention of international do-gooders and bobby-soxers.

So like a novelist approaching some universal theme, anyone preparing to say or write something about the United Nations must somehow come to grips with his material, determine his point of view, decide where to focus—what to put in and what to leave out. In the process, many arbitrary choices must be made.

My arbitrary choice for this occasion—which I hope will meet with your approval—is to focus briefly but sharply on this question: how and to what extent does our membership in the United Nations serve the foreign policy interests of the United States of America? Or, more crudely, what's in it for us?

I make no apology to the most sensitive supporter of the United Nations for phrasing it that way. After all, if the very considerable effort and time and money which we have invested in the United Nations has not been a good investment from the U.S. point of view, then we should say so and behave accordingly—as, I feel sure, every other Member does.

I shall try to test this question of what's in it for us against two criteria: first against the record of the 17th General Assembly which had just over 100 items on its agenda; and second, against the roles of the U.N. in two of the greatest crises of recent history—the collapse of the Congo and the discovery of Soviet missile bases in Cuba. These are tough tests: one covers a virtual compendium of the on-going problems which beset the modern world; the other raises specific issues of peace and war in specific areas at specific times.

But before coming to these two tests of how well or how badly our membership in the U.N. serves the national interest, it is worthwhile to pose a prior test: is the United Nations relevant to the real world of the second half of the 20th century? For if the United Nations does not reflect the real world, it is unlikely to be able to do anything useful about it.

What then are the dominant factors that make the real world what it is in the second half of the 20th century? I think we can limit ourselves to brief mention of five dominant facts of life in our tumultuous times?

First is the great confrontation which goes under the name of the East-West conflict or the cold war—and the nuclear arms race which is its most dangerous manifestation. This has brought into conflict two sets of ideas about the value of human dignity which cannot be bridged philosophically. It also has brought into conflict two great and powerful nations whose national differences must be bridged politically if either is to survive. The proceedings of the United Nations consistently reflect both aspects of this so-called East-West confrontation.

The second factor dominating contemporary history is the revolutionary wave of national independence which, in an incredibly short period, has brought political independence to nearly one billion people, leaving less than 2 percent of the former colonial peoples in dependent status—an historic convulsion which perhaps offered communism its greatest opportunity to absorb vast areas of the world. The United Nations itself administered a number of these changes from dependent to independent status and is deeply involved with the difficult and emotional final stage of liquidating the old colonial system and the race problems embedded in it.

The third factor is the so-called revolution of rising expectations, which has put a spotlight on the glaring gap between the material conditions of the rich minority and the poor majority among the world's peoples. Some 85 percent of the entire staffs of the U.N. system is occupied with the first systematic effort at international cooperation in the field of economic and social affairs—certainly one of the great phenomena of contemporary times.

Fourth is the fantastic pace of discovery and invention—which romps ahead oblivious to the political and social consequences and which makes the demands for a decent life for all a practical proposition for the first time in history. The United Nations is concerned increasingly with the complex and little-understood problems of how to transfer effectively science and technology from one cultural setting to another.

Fifth is the fitful emergence of a restless, teeming, volatile, frequently quarrelsome open society of nation-states—a society of enormous diversity of cultures, races and political, economic, and social systems. The United Nations is, of course, the institutional center of this open international society—partly the cause and partly the result of the forces which impel an inter-dependent world into more intimate association on an expanding agenda of political and human problems.

If these are the principal factors which mold our times—the cold war, the liquidation of colonialism, the pervasive demand for a better material way of life, the thundering impact of science, and the emergence of a vast, new open society on the international plans—then we must conclude that the United Nations is indeed relevant to these times—that it is part and parcel of the contemporary scene. And being relevant, it is theoretically in a position to be effective.

Let us come, then, to the question of how effective from our point of view. What's in it for us? How—as the most recent example—does the record of the 17th General Assembly stand the test?

I said a moment ago that the agenda of the 17th General Assembly was a virtual compendium of the on-going problems of the modern world.

Listen to this list of trouble spots and sore spots: the Congo, the Gaza Strip, southern Rhodesia, southwest Africa, the Portuguese African territories, Kashmir, Yemen, west New Guinea, and the Arab refugee camps.

Mark this string of contentious issues: Chinese representation, North Korea, Hungary, colonialism, troika, and sovereignty over natural resources.

Consider this list of universal concerns: disarmament, nuclear testing, outer space, world food, world trade, world science, and the training of manpower for economic and social development.

All of these issues, in one form or another, came before the United Nations for some kind of action during the 17th General Assembly, even if each one did not appear formally on the Assembly's agenda. Many of them are among the most complex, the most intractable, the most ancient troubles of the human race. And many come to the United Nations as a court of last resort—because nobody else has been able to cope with them at all.

Obviously, the United Nations did not solve all, or many, of these problems; but it worked on them. On a few it took conclusive action; on some it made progress, and on others it did not.

We have made full reports on the record of the 17th General Assembly—item by item and vote by vote; I shall not take your time to repeat the record. The point to be made is simply this: the U.S. view was the majority view in over 80 percent of the 40 key votes cast in committees and full Assembly. On several issues we abstained, and on two extreme resolutions recommending sanctions against member states we voted against the majority.

This is the measure of the extent to which our membership in the United Nations served the foreign policy interests of the United States across the spectrum of issues represented by the agenda of the 17th General Assembly.

Meanwhile, the impact of the twin crises in the Caribbean and the Himalayas raised our credit—and our credibility; had the opposite effect on the stock of the Soviet Union; improved Western Hemisphere solidarity; activated the members from NATO; and gave pause to those who tend to equate the bona fides of the United States and the Soviet Union.

I am not saying for one moment that the 17th General Assembly—or any other meeting or organ of the United Nations—was the handmaiden of the Department of State. I am not even saying that there were no disappointments or no cause for apprehension: for example, we expect continuing fireworks over the hard core cases in the remnants of European empires, and we are most gravely concerned at the lack of evidence of financial responsibility on the part of all too many members. But I am saying, most emphatically, that in no case was U.S. interest damaged, in most cases our objectives were furthered in a positive fashion, and in other cases we have reason to hope for a better result on another day. In short, it was very much in our national interest to be there, paying our considerable share of the cost and exercising our considerable share of the leadership.

The political problems before the General Assembly tend to be those anguished issues which have roots in the past and drag on from year to year—so hardy or so virulent that sometimes our best efforts succeed only in keeping them from going from bad to worse.

But now I should like to discuss, if I may, two crises which had sudden beginnings, which directly and immediately involved the United Nations, and which now seem to be ended—at least in the form in which they arose. I refer to those most dangerous events which raised the dire threat of great power confrontation—and thus of war—in the Congo and the Caribbean. The point is to ask in each case whether the role of the United Nations in these crises served the foreign policy interests of the United States.

What were our aims in the Congo affair? Our aims in the Congo are the same as our aims for all of tropical Africa. They are quite simple to state: to help create an area of truly free and independent African states, safe from external aggression or subversion, working out their own destinies in their own way, cooperating with each other and with those who wish to help in their overwhelming task of progressive modernization. In the Congo, as elsewhere, this requires national unity and a reasonable degree of political stability.

Contrasted to this, the collapse of the Congo in its first week of nationhood offered these sudden prospects: national disunity, political chaos, civil disorder, social disintegration, and external penetration—prospects made to order for Communist exploitation. And because of this, the ultimate prospect for the Congo was for the forces of the nuclear powers to find themselves face to face in the heart of central Africa in the infancy of independence—about as messy and dangerous a state of affairs as one can imagine.

The story of the struggle of the United Nations—with unflagging support from this country—to bring order out of chaos in the Congo is too well known to members of this committee to review it here. I am all too conscious of every bit and every kind of criticism that has been leveled against this operation; and it has been of every kind—from honest doubts about the legal basis for U.N. action to purple propaganda and outrageous lies. I also will state that in this unprecedented, almost fantastic operation, some decisions were not perfectly coordinated, some operations were not fully efficient, some judgments were not later justified, and a few actions were not excusable. My point is neither to tabulate the accomplishments nor to count the mistakes.

My point is, rather, to look at the results and state that, as of today, civil war has been replaced by national unity, political chaos has been replaced by reasonable prospects for political stability, total disorder has been replaced by order, social disintegration has been replaced by an evolving program for social progress, and the scavengers have been sent home packing. None of this is yet guaranteed to be permanent. But this is what has happened in the Congo; this is what the United States wanted to happen in the Congo; and it could not have happened under any other auspices than that of the United Nations.

It therefore is difficult—indeed it is impossible—to avoid the conclusion that the foreign policy interests of the United States have been served well by the United Nations performance in the Congo crisis—and this, of course, would have been out of the question without our membership and our full support. I know no way of putting a dollar value on the restoration of peace in central Africa.

The U.N. role in the Congo was, of course, an extremely large operational task, involving nearly 20,000 troops from 21 nations, supported by a massive airlift, and by hundreds of civilian technicians recruited through a dozen international agencies.

The U.N. role in the Cuban crisis was entirely different. Actually, the U.N. had three roles in the Cuban crisis—two of which were played out while the third was frustrated but nonetheless useful to us. Because the naval quarantine of Cuba was the first dramatic move in that crisis, and because of the critical part played by the Organization of American States, it is easy to forget how the United Nations fitted into the pattern of these supercharged days when the world stood at the edge of the abyss in late October.

You will remember, of course, that the President called into play at one stroke all the available instruments of diplomatic action—U.S. military power, the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and an appeal to public opinion around the world.

The first role of the United Nations was to serve as a world forum where the facts could be laid on the table. When the Security Council met in emergency session, I was able to present the U.S. case not only to the members of that Council, but to all other members of the United Nations who crowded the tense room, as well as to the press and microphones and the cameras which carried our story to our own public and to every corner of the world reached by the mass media of today. Our case was right; our case was thoroughly documented; and our case was vastly strengthened as it unfolded before the bar of world opinion in the Security Council of the U.N.—the only bar of universal public opinion there is. Just how much this revelation of Soviet deceit and recklessness shocked the innocent bystanders in the cold war, I can't guess. Nor, of course, can I estimate how much this blow to confidence in Russia's word and influence among the new nations contributed to Mr. Khrushchev's decision to pull out quickly and make the best of a bad mistake.

The second role of the United Nations—or, more precisely, of the Secretary General of the United Nations—was that of third party to the issue. At a critical moment—when the nuclear powers seemed to be set on a collision course—the Secretary General's intervention led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for Cuba and interception by our Navy. This was an indispensable first step in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis. The mere existence of an impartial office which could perform such a service in the middle of the night at such a time, is no small asset to the human race.

The third role of the United Nations in the Cuban crisis—the one which could not be played out—was that of an international inspector ready and willing to go at once to Cuba to verify the removal of the missiles. As we all know, Castro refused a United Nations presence on Cuban soil—and so prevented a quicker and a cleaner liquidation of the crisis. But the fact is that at the height of the most dangerous crisis of the postwar world, Chairman Khrushchev agreed—even proposed—an international inspection team under United Nations auspices, a proposal to which we could quickly agree and which became part of the formula for disengagement between the United States and Soviet heads of state. And Castro's refusal of U.N. inspection converted a quarrel between the Soviet Union and the United States into a defiance of the United Nations by Cuba.

Finally, and I won't detain you longer on this subject, the United Nations provided a site where Mr. McCloy and I could meet with Mr. Kuznetsov and the Soviet negotiators for those long weeks to conclude the transaction.

Mr. Chairman, I should not care to speculate on how or when the Cuban crisis might have been resolved—or whether it could have been resolved—without the United Nations. But I do say that the United Nations played a large part in a complex exercise in diplomatic action which averted the threat of thermonuclear war; and for this I think we can thank our stars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have put the record of the United Nations at the 17th General Assembly, during the Congo crisis, and during the Cuban crisis, to the test; and we have seen that, in very large measure, the performance of the U.N. served well the foreign policy interests of the United States. There was, indeed, much in it for us.

But I should prefer, in the end, not to read that record as though it were a score board on which victories and defeats are recorded. I prefer to avoid the specious habit of treating the course of human affairs—even the massive conflicts in world affairs—like some sporting event which ends when the timekeeper blows his whistle.

The real world of international politics is not that simple. We are dealing with fitful tides of history which ebb and flow. We are wrestling often with problems which, when solved in their immediate forms, promptly give rise to new forms and new problems—as witness the case of the Congo today.

We can, of course, say with assurance that, in this case or that, our policies prevailed and our objectives were gained. We can point to objective proof of progress here and there. We can show that unfriendly moves X and Y were defeated or diverted—and that in all of these cases the United Nations had a useful part to play.

But to form mature judgments as to the real value of the United Nations to the interests of the United States, it seems to me that we must raise alternatives—that we must ask questions which challenge the imagination to say what might have happened if the United Nations had not been there at all. For example:

Would the Communists have fared better or worse in their efforts to divert the independence movement into a Communist mold—their supreme opportunity to extend power—if the United Nations had not existed?

Would the prospects of peace be better or worse—in Iran, in Greece, in Korea, in Kashmir, in the Middle East, in the Western Pacific, in central Africa—if there had been no United Nations during the past decade and a half?

Would U.S. foreign policy interests in the Congo and the Caribbean have been served better or worse without a United Nations during the past few months?

Could the United States put its ideas, its beliefs, its policies before the watching world more—or less—effectively if the United Nations did not exist?

I shall not attempt to speculate on these alternatives for, it seems to me, the questions answer themselves.

But I should like to conclude my remarks with a few comments about the position of those who favor the United Nations in principle but want to withdraw or restrict our support on those relatively few occasions when the United States finds itself in a minority position.

The basic point here, of course, is that the United States does not own or control the United Nations. We are no more and no less than the most influential of the 110 members. If we were less we would be failing to exert the influence of freedom's leader; if we were more we would destroy the effectiveness of the U.N., which depends precisely on the fact that it is not an arm of the United States or of any other government, but a truly international organization—no better or worse than the agreements which can be reached by the controlling majorities of its members.

Before such agreements are reached—or not reached—debate and negotiation bare differences and reveal similarities which frequently lead to accommodation and compromise. And I ask: Is this not the heart of the democratic method? Is this not the parliamentary system in action? Is this not our own idea of how we are most likely to make more wise decisions than foolish ones—how the weak are most likely to be protected from the strong—how the will of the majority and the rights of the minority can both find expression without injustice to either?

The answer to these questions is "Yes." And if we were to pick up our marbles and go home whenever there is a disappointment, we would not only destroy the effectiveness of the U.N. but would abandon hope that nations can work out their problems most of the time by the same methods by which conflicting interests get resolved within democratic nations and communities. This would deny on the international level the principles, methods, and techniques which we swear by on the national and local levels.

Even faith in our kind of institutions would not, however, be enough to justify support for the United Nations if it worked against us. But this dilemma does not exist, and the record proves it. The fact is that the story of the last General Assembly—when the U.S. position was the majority position better than four times out of five—is the standard story of succeeding Assemblies over the past decade and a half. The fact is that in 17 years the Soviet Union has never once succeeded in building a majority for any proposition of substance against the opposition of the United States. And the fact is that in 17 years the United States has never felt obliged to exercise the veto in the Security Council to protect its interest, and the Soviet Union has vetoed 100 times.

That's the record and there is a fundamental reason for it. The reason should be recalled frequently—for in this fact lies one of our greatest assets in the world today: The fact that the foreign policy interests of the United States are generally in harmony with the foreign policy interests of all nations which want to see a peaceful community of independent states working together, by free choice, to improve the lot of humanity. And since the majority of the nations of the world shares this goal, the majority consistently sides with the United States—or we side with them, depending on your point of view—when the roll is called and the yeas and nays are counted. It's as simple as that.

But let us take a couple of blemishes in the record and the performance of the U.N. and its members—the kind of blemishes that lead some of our people who favor the U.N. in principle to want to restrict it in practice.

First, take a case where the United States could not agree with a majority of the decisionmaking group in a U.N. agency. A recent case was the decision of the United Nations Special Fund to help finance an agricultural research project in Cuba. We objected to that project and still do. Yet the whole story is that out of 288 projects assisted by that fund, in the course of its existence, we approved of 287. So we face a choice: should we retaliate by withholding or limiting our support for an agency which we invented, which has allocated 97 percent of its funds to nations which we ourselves are aiding, and which represents an economical way for the United States to contribute to the decade of development because in 1 out of 288 instances we were unable to persuade a majority that our view was the correct one?

Let me refer also to a situation which seems to agitate some of our people—the fact that the Soviet Union does not make the voluntary contributions which it is well able to make to such programs as technical assistance, the Special Fund, malaria eradication, the world food program, and so forth. Their delinquency is deplorable but understandable from their point of view. These programs do not serve Communist ends; on the contrary. So it is hardly surprising that the Soviet Union makes little or no voluntary contributions to agencies whose work cuts straight across their own objectives. But should we support these programs less because they fail to win applause from the Kremlin?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I rather suspect that the Soviet Union and other Communist countries will tend to participate—and contribute—somewhat more in the work of these agencies in the years to come. There is some evidence of that already. And I think that the reason is clear. The policy of self-ostracism from the specialized agencies has not worked well for the Soviet Union, even though it has made life with them a bit easier for us.

If this in fact happens, it will raise some day-to-day problems for us but, in my view, it also will raise problems for them and opportunities for us. For while the so-called Communist states operate more or less closed societies at home, once they step out into a United Nations forum they enter an open society.

In an open forum, over a period of time, ideology becomes transparent, dogma wears this and becomes tiresome, and the myth of the magical solution evaporates slowly in the free air of a marketplace of ideas. There is contention in all this; there is frustration and the stuff of headlines; there is danger that the fearful and the insecure will want to withdraw from the free interplay of conflicting ideas and concepts and terminology—especially if, now and again, things do not go exactly the way we would like them to.

Yet it is we who do best in the open forum—for this is our natural habitat. And if we have the nerve to go ahead—if we have the stomach for the test of the open society—if we have the courage to build even that which is not perfect from our point of view—I can foresee nothing but a more meaningful dialog coming out of it, a gradual erosion of tension, and finally the dominance of a set of ideas which are better—and better able to stand the test—than the Marxist ideas as revealed to his successors.

All this would require, on our part, a degree of responsibility, of restraint, of maturity, and of political sophistication which never before has been demanded of a democratic public and its elected representatives. It will not be easy and it will not be without temporary disappointments; but I, for one, have no doubt of the outcome—for this, too, would serve and serve well the foreign policy interests of the United States of America.

"THE VIEW FROM THE HIGHWAY"—SENATOR NEUBERGER STATES THE NEED FOR BILLBOARD CONTROL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by my colleague Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER of Oregon, entitled "The View from the Highway" which was published in the March 1963 issue of Country Beautiful.

Senator NEUBERGER's article details the fight for adequate billboard control legislation. It was a pleasure to work with her in the previous session of Congress in enacting legislation to extend for 2 years the period in which the States might elect to participate in billboard controls in the Federal National Defense Interstate Highway System. To date 17 States, including Kentucky and Oregon, have billboard control legislation and the States will receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent for such controls. I note that the present law permitting States to participate in this program expires on July 1, 1963, and I know that numerous State legislatures are presently considering their States' participation.

Senator NEUBERGER writes in her article:

> To erase the harsh picture of an America with an automobile-based economy that disregards esthetics is the objective of all billboard control legislation. We have learned that "a thing of beauty" is not a joy forever and the words of one of our great ballads may become meaningless unless we hurry.
>
> That ballad sings of "purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain," and I like to think of schoolchildren throughout our land joining in that paean and to know that as they take to the open road they will find the land they sing of stretching out from every town and city.

Mr. President, I salute the junior Senator from Oregon for her fine article which I commend to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIEW FROM THE HIGHWAY—AMERICA'S NEWEST ROADS ARE IN DANGER OF BECOMING CORRIDORS LINED WITH BILLBOARDS IF THE STATES DO NOT SOON TAKE ADVANTAGE OF FEDERAL LAW

(By MAURINE B. NEUBERGER)

(NOTE.—MAURINE B. NEUBERGER was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1960 to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger. She was reelected recently and serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

Since the vast Interstate Highway System was inaugurated by Congress in 1956, 17 States have taken advantage of a special provision of the Federal-Aid Highway Act which gives additional money to those States which meet specified standards for control of billboards along their roadways. During the current legislative sessions it is hoped that even more will take action to qualify for this bonus award before the provision expires in June 1963.

To start with, it must be realized that it is the motorist's money which makes the billboard of value. If the highway were not there, the sign would not be worth a Continental dollar. The highway, paid for by the motorist with his various taxes, makes valuable the signboard which the motorist is forced to look at while traveling through the land. Surely our Federal and State Governments owe it to the touring public to keep the magnificent American outdoors from being scarred and marred by a vast jungle of billboards. But the signboard companies can lobby individual legislators whether at the State capitol or Washington, D.C., while there is no one to lobby for the motoring public except the Congress itself.

The first great travelers across our continent were Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whom President Jefferson sent forth almost 160 years ago to see what lay beyond the Missouri River, which was then the limit of man's horizon.

Meriwether Lewis, who had been President Jefferson's private secretary, sent fabulous reports about what is now Oregon—its swift rivers, high mountains, deep harbors and riches in timber and pelts.

Captain Lewis wrote in his diary on Sunday, May 26, 1805, the day he glimpsed the highest mountain range in his native land: "I beheld the Rocky Mountains for the first time. * * * While I viewed these mountains I felt a secret pleasure."

Many areas of our country, whether mountain or prairie, lake or desert, make this enduring impression on residents and visitors alike, for nature covers all her works with a subtle quality that evokes a deep response in man.

It was to preserve a portion of that untouched and untrammeled America that Congress enacted in 1956 a $41 billion Federal-Aid Highway Act and this began a new era of highway transportation. Streams of asphalt and concrete are pouring over the land and will eventually connect every corner of the country with modern, fast roads. A total of 41,000 miles of this network will constitute the National Interstate and Defense Highway System. This is a system of high-speed, limited-access, almost wholly four-lane separated roads, which will carry the bulk of the long-distance automobile and bus travel throughout our country.

The construction of these thousands of miles of new highways gives us two choices: The opportunity to preserve the esthetic as well as the merely economic values of travel throughout our America, or the opportunity to provide valuable roadside accommodations for lanes of billboards.

The new highways, once built, will not be relocated in this generation. Unless we give thought now to the question of what the motorist is to see, as he cruises through the fields and forests and mountains and prairies of America, we know that it will be what he sees along other highways today: signs and billboards.

To put controls on certain advertising signs along the Interstate Highway System, the bonus award system was created after Congress passed a bill which was offered in January 1957 by my late husband, Senator Richard L. Neuberger. The bill also aimed at encouraging similar controls on lands adjacent to the national system.

Under this bill the Secretary of Commerce was directed to prepare a set of standard limitations on the erection of billboards to carry out a national policy of protecting scenic beauty as well as traffic safety along the Interstate System.

These standards are really recommendations and advisory for highways which are built on land under the control of the States. The bill does not force any State to accept these standards, if the government of the State does not want to do so. However, if the State complies with these standards and excludes commercial advertising billboards along its new, limited-access interstate highways, it will receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the roadbuilding moneys allocated to the State.

The standards themselves are to restrict signs within 650 feet of the right-of-way of the interstate highway to those necessary for highway information and directions, those advertising properties for sale adjacent to the highway and those advertising services to the motorist on premises which are adjacent to the highway.

The billboard industry failed to impress the Congress with the argument that it is performing a public service by preventing lazy motorists from falling asleep at the wheel, hypnotized by the natural scenery and the road. The industry's view seemed to imply that if the billboards were not there the driver might doze at the wheel because he would have nothing to look at except the spectacle of sky and mountain or lake and forest and waving fields of grain.

The billboard control bill specified that those States wishing to take advantage of the bonus provision must do so by July 1, 1961. At the urging of many roadside beautification groups and garden clubs, Congress later extended this deadline to July 1, 1963, so that more State legislatures could pass laws to meet the standards of the bills. It is doubtful, however, that Congress will again extend the bonus offer and many States will be without roadside protection unless they act immediately.

Though Oregon is one of the States which has met the standards promulgated by the Department of Commerce, this control measure applies to only 220 miles in the entire road system of over 10,000 miles in this Western State of large vistas and great open spaces. Civic-minded citizens, outdoor enthusiasts, and progressive State legislators were not satisfied with this meager effort and the State legislature saw the need to create a Scenic Area Commission to protect other highways and roadside areas from the inexorable encroachment of disfiguring billboards—billboards that seemed to creep across the land in competition with the creeping sand dunes along the Oregon coast.

In the legislative act, "scenic area" is defined as an area adjacent to a highway, within a park or having "a view of unusual natural beauty." To determine these areas a Commission was created having members representing varied interests such as labor, outdoor advertising and roadside services, as well as members from motor clubs and the motoring public.

There has been no harsh ban against all billboards, either in the Federal act or the Oregon law; rather there has been a realistic recognition of the need for protection—protection that will enhance the value of the land through which the roadway passes by making attractive routes to beckon the tourist and traveler.

But the work of the Commission is fraught with frustrations and despair, as were the Members of Congress in setting up these desirable standards. Organized lobbies are at work constantly to throttle the legislatures, to influence the community, to present an extremely distorted picture of what a world without billboards would be like.

Those who scoff at Government interference in our way of life should ask themselves what the condition of our landscape would be if Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot had not called for Government preserves for our seemingly endless miles of standing timber. Some of the beauties of our waterfalls and national parks would not be here. If only ancient Lebanon had had a wise ruler to preserve the dense stands of the cedar that covered that land in Biblical days.

It is altogether fitting that the Congress and the States accept the principle of roadside protection and of preservation of scenic beauty in America through which a modern, efficient, high-speed Interstate Highway System will link this farflung Nation.

As we become more a nation of urban living, it is even more essential that we preserve some of America's natural beauty in our daily lives. The growth of the highway system, the development of storage dams creating lakes for boating and the reawakening of interest in our wilderness areas have created a whole new industry. Family trailers, small boats that can be easily transported behind the family car, convenience foods to take by pack into the high country—all these are taking the city family on a new trek 160 years after Lewis and Clark.

The highway protection legislation is still not "controlled" by faraway Washington. It has that magic phrase "States' rights" and leaves the choice entirely to the various State governments by offering assistance to those who wish to act. Ninety percent of the financing of the Interstate Highway System is done by the Federal Government. Is it unreasonable to protect this vast public investment by a slight additional offer of financial assistance to States which elect under their own State laws to safeguard roadside scenery along these new highways?

The limited-access nature of these transcontinental routes has been accepted by Congress without controversy although this has denied direct highway frontage to roadside businesses such as motels and restaurants. Should a special exception exist to permit one single roadside business—the billboard business of America—the privilege of direct access to travelers?

When the billboard control feature of the highway bill was debated in Congress, the opposition hurled the threat of "stifling private enterprise," yet it was pointed out that for many years outdoor signs have been effectively regulated in places extremely attractive to tourists, such as Hawaii, Alaska, and Switzerland.

The Federal Government is not a behemoth, wishing to exterminate an element of the business community—the outdoor advertising business. The State governments which have already accepted the bonus from the Federal Government for regulating signboards have provided for some outdoor advertising.

Few people would propose prohibiting billboards everywhere. In fact, there are many places in the cities and in the midst of industrial developments where they do not seem out of place. Reasonable people do not object to outdoor advertising but they do object to it where it obstructs the scenic view or creates a traffic hazard. They accept the fact that signboards are here to stay.

From Maine to Oregon, I have seen evidence that the States are beginning to appreciate the resource that their highway system provides by their planting of trees, flowering shrubs and local native flora in the divider strips. At the exits there are beautifully landscaped areas covered with a variety of blooms from the raucous Scotchbroom in Oregon to the delicate pink azalea in Virginia.

This has led to an appreciation of the need for a respite for the traveler who welcomes, for safety as well as enjoyment after a day of driving, an attractive roadside rest and picnic area. At the turnoffs there may be established directional signs advising the motorist where to find food, lodging, and fuel in the area.

Day in and day out, every American is assailed by advertising from the moment he hears the morning news broadcast until he puts down his evening paper. Would it be such a sacrifice to let him escape even briefly when he takes to the open road to travel across the open country—the country which has fields and streams as well as factories and shacks that we have learned to describe as "America the beautiful?"

It isn't just the modern-day outdoor enthusiast who has taken up the cudgel for control of signboards. Mark Twain wrote of his experience in Switzerland in "A Tramp Abroad" in 1880:

"I was sitting on a bench inspecting, with strong interest, a noble monolith * * * a monolith not shaped by man, by Nature's free great hand—a massy pyramidal rock 80 feet high, devised by Nature 10 million years ago against the day when a man worthy of it should need it for his monument.

"It is said that 2 years ago a stranger let himself down from the top of it with ropes and pulleys, and painted all over it, in the big blue letters * * * these words: 'Buy Sun stove polish, try Benzaline for the blood.'

"He was captured, and it turned out that he was an American. Upon his trial the judge said to him:

"'You are from a land where any insolent that wants to is privileged to profane and insult Nature, and, through her, Nature's God, if by so doing he can put a sordid penny in his pocket. But here the case is different. Because you are a foreigner and ignorant, I will make your sentence light; if you were a native, I would deal strenuously with you. Hear and obey—you will immediately remove every trace of your offensive work * * * you will pay a fine of 10,000 francs; you will suffer 2 years' imprisonment at hard labor; you will then be horsewhipped, tarred and feathered, deprived of your ears, ridden on a rail to the confines of the canton and banished forever. The severest penalties are omitted in your case—not as a grace to you, but to that great republic which had the misfortune to give you birth.'"

To erase the harsh picture of an America with an automobile-based economy that disregards esthetics is the objective of all billboard control legislation. We have learned that "a thing of beauty" is not a joy forever and the words of one of our great ballads may become meaningless unless we hurry.

That ballad sings of "purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain," and I like to think of schoolchildren throughout our land joining in that paean and to know that as they take to the open road they will find the land they sing of stretching out from every town and city.

PROTECTION OF POLICE OFFICERS FROM RECKLESS AND IRRESPONSIBLE CHARGES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Case of CORE and Officer Klimecke," published in the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1963. The editorial relates to the case of Officer Klimecke, who fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. The editorial comments on a telegram signed by Julius W. Hobson, president of the Committee on Racial Equality, and sent to the press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF CORE AND OFFICER KLIMECKE

We have a few comments to make on the following telegram, signed "Julius W. Hobson, president" which the District of Columbia Commissioners received from CORE (Committee on Racial Equality), with copies sent to the newspapers by CORE.

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. Officer Giles mentioned too frequently recently in connection with brutality and trigger-happy rookies should not be given guns before completing training. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public. CORE suggests that both investigation and training program be conducted by persons not connected with police department. Also suggest thorough tests of emotional stability for recruits and periodically for all police."

Only one James Wall has been shot here. Only one policeman shot him. His name is Officer Frank Klimecke. (There was no "Officer Giles" involved.)

It seems to us that CORE and its officials are, quite likely, open for a suit of criminal libel. Officer Klimecke was doing his duty. CORE publicly calls it murder.

Policemen, it seems to us, should have the same protection from reckless and unproved charges as has the ordinary citizen, and have the same recourse to the courts when libeled.

The facts on record show Officer Klimecke fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. Colored witnesses support the policeman.

CORE goes on to refer to "trigger-happy rookies." Insofar as this might be supposed to refer to Officer Klimecke, we checked and learned that he served in France with the Army's military police for 3 years.

Nobody hates trigger-happy policemen more than we do. We hate them as much as we hate trigger-happy stickup men, or muggers who throttle peaceful citizens, or gangs (no matter how young they are) that beat people to death, or cowardly lifelong criminals—such as the one Officer Klimecke nailed—who ruthlessly attack defenseless women on the city's streets.

We hate them whether they are white or Negro, or whether their victims are white or Negro.

We'd like to think CORE shares our feelings, but we don't know.

We do know we don't share CORE's feelings about Officer Klimecke. Rather than denouncing him as a murderer, we think he deserves—if not a medal—at least a citation for doing his duty.

Neither do we share CORE's suggestion that the training of policemen should be done by persons not connected with the Police Department. That's about as silly a notion as we've heard in some time.

CORE suggests there should be tests of emotional stability for recruits and, periodically, for all police. This is a good idea, but we thought we'd already heard of it somewhere. So we checked with the Police Department. CORE might be interested to know that this is already being done, and has been for years, by a trained psychiatrist.

Perhaps some of CORE's officials could profitably take similar tests for emotional stability, or lack of.

Racially oriented champions of less rigorous police safeguards for Washington overlook the fact that the respectable, law-abiding colored citizens are endangered as much or more than white citizens by a tiny tribe of almost hopelessly uncivilized brutes who can best be described as urban Mau Maus. This minuscule fraction of the city's population circulates in and out of our courts and jails, and causes nearly all the violent crime.

The great body of colored Washingtonians is, as is demonstrated every day, made up of upright, decent and law-abiding citizens. They suffer, along with the rest of us, from the depredations of this small group of habitually lawless primitives which can only be controlled by force.

The statistics to back these facts up are well known and easily proved. Rather than face them, CORE suggests another cat-hauling of the Police Department.

In the present instance, which has so exercised CORE, the criminal, shot down while fleeing after committing an outrageous robbery, turned out to have a record as long as your arm.

We suggest that rather than another investigation of the Police Department, the incident indicates there should be an investigation of the parole system which returns career predators, with jail terms still uncompleted, to the city's streets where they resume preying on defenseless citizens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, twice before—in 1956 and 1957—I submitted resolutions which would have required that at least one of each two successive nominations confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court should have had at least 10 years of prior judicial service for confirmation. I am resubmitting the same resolution at this time, being all the more persuaded that the adoption of and adherence to such a resolution would be in the interest of a better judiciary at the highest level, and consequently the best interests of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, I may submit the resolution for myself and for the Senator from Virginia

[Mr. ROBERTSON], and that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, of the Justices now sitting on the Court, three Associate Justices have been regularly appointed since, on February 18, 1957, I last submitted the resolution, and at that time another, Mr. Justice Brennan, was sitting under a recess appointment. The three Justices in question are Mr. Justice Stewart, who received an interim appointment on October 14, 1958, and a permanent appointment on May 7, 1959; Mr. Justice White, who was appointed on April 12, 1962; and Mr. Justice Goldberg, who was appointed on September 28, 1962. Five years is the total of prior judicial experience for Mr. Justice Stewart, Mr. Justice Goldberg, and Mr. Justice White; and all of it is concentrated in Mr. Justice Stewart, who sat on the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit from June 1, 1954 to May 15, 1959. Apart from Mr. Justice Black's service on a minor rung of the judicial ladder—police court in Birmingham, Ala., 1910–11—the total prior judicial experience of the nine justices now sitting is only 14 years, consisting of 8 years for Mr. Justice Brennan, 5 years for Mr. Justice Stewart, and 1 year for Mr. Justice Harlan. As I have stated, Mr. Justice Brennan was sitting on the Court when I last submitted the resolution, and after that was permanently appointed on March 21, 1957.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. The junior Senator from Wyoming joined with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] on a bill, S. 222, which states that "no person shall be appointed to the office of Chief Justice of the United States or to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court unless, at the time of his appointment, he has had at least 5 years of judicial service."

The resolution of the Senator from Virginia would require that at least one of each two successive nominees have judicial experience. Does not the Senator feel that the Supreme Court would be materially strengthened if all the Justices had at least 5 or 10 years of judicial experience?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Wyoming and think it would strengthen the Court and would serve the very purpose the Senator from Mississippi here has in mind. The resolution of the Senator from Mississippi takes a different approach to the matter of trying to bring more prior judicial experience to the personnel of the Court.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me say that the Senator from Wyoming agrees wholeheartedly with the approach of the Senator from Mississippi. I was just wondering about the reason for leaving out the requirement that one out of the two successive nominees have such experience.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his support and his inquiry. The question has been raised as to whether or not a statute requiring prior judicial practice would be valid under the Constitution. A serious constitutional question has been raised on that point. Also, if there were a requirement of judicial experience for all the nominees, a considerable part of the talent of the Nation in that profession would be excluded.

Now, as a start, as a beginning point, and also as a simple way of getting at the problem by a Senate resolution, the Senator from Mississippi has proposed that we just announce in advance, under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution, that in passing on these nominations at least one out of two will have to have had 10 years of judicial experience; otherwise, the nominations just will not be confirmed. It will not refer to any individual. The Senate, under its constitutional responsibility of advice and consent, will merely be announcing a rule in advance.

The Senator from Mississippi thinks that would be a salutary start toward a reform that is overdue and also be another assertion by the Senate, for the legislative branch of the Government, not only of its power but of its responsibility of looking into this matter in advance.

I thank the Senator very much for his fine support. I hope he pursues his bill further.

Resuming with my prepared remarks, I deem it necessary that some qualifications of judicial experience should be a requisite for at least one-half of the nominees for this post and because in recent years such experience has not been considered of prime importance by those persons who advise the President on his selection of nominees. In respect of what I consider to be the prime ingredient for service on the Supreme Court, namely, experience on the bench, I believe that this highest of tribunals has been sadly neglected in the past 30 years or so and that the Nation has greatly been the loser thereby. In our tripartite system of Government, with each branch complementing the other, distinctions perhaps should not be drawn as to the comparative importance of its various branches. Yet the Supreme Court authority is so vast and far reaching with its power to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional that it may be said in a sense that it is the most important segment of Government; in so many cases, it is the final arbiter, the last word. Yet, it is this branch of Government which has a total of only 14 years' prior judicial experience, all of it distributed among only three Justices although all nine sit on cases of vital consequence to the 188 million people of this country.

Mr. President, this expression of opinion on my part constitutes no attack on any particular Justice.

I am bringing to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the country a serious defect in the functioning of our system of government.

It is interesting to compare the previous judicial experience of the present members of the Court, at the time of their appointment, with that of judges appointed through the years. Since John Jay was appointed as the first Chief Justice in 1790, there have been 98 judges appointed to the Court, including 14 Chief Justices.

From 1790 until 1900, 58 judges were appointed, and only 19 of them had no prior judicial experience. In the years from 1900 to 1932, 20 judges were appointed, with the majority—11 of them—with previous judicial experience. But in recent years, from 1932 until the present time, those appointed without prior judicial experience have outnumbered those with such experience 12 to 8. Unfortunately, we now have only 3 judges on the Court who possessed prior judicial experience at the time of their appointment. This is not a healthy trend.

At my request, the American Law Section of the Library of Congress has compiled a list of all the Chief Justices and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, including a reference to the prior judicial experience of those who possess such experience, and I think the Senate will be interested in this list. I request unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF JUSTICES, SUPREME COURT SERVICE, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL SERVICE

John Jay, 1790–96, chief justice, New York, Supreme Court, 1776–79.

John Rutledge, 1795–95 (4 mos.), chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.

Oliver Ellsworth, 1796–1800, judge, Governor's Council, Connecticut (Supreme Court of Errors), Colonial, 1780–85, judge, Supreme Court, Connecticut, 1785–89.

John Marshall, 1801–35, none found.

Roger Brooke Taney, 1836–64, none found.

Salmon Portland Chase, 1864–73, none found.

Morrison Remick Waite, 1874–88, none found.

Melville Weston Fuller, 1888–1910, none found.

Edward Douglas White, 1910–21, justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.

William Howard Taft, 1921–30, judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1887–93, judge, Federal Circuit Court, Sixth Circuit, 1892–1900.

Charles Evans Hughes, 1930–41, none found.

Harlan Fiske Stone, 1941–46, none found.

Frederick Moore Vinson, 1946–53, Associate Justice, U.S. Court of Appeals, 1938–43, D.C.

Earl Warren, 1953 to present, none found.

ASSOCIATE COURT SERVICE, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL SERVICE

John Rutledge, 1790–91, chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.

William Cushing, 1790–1810, probation judge, Lincoln County, Maine (Colonial) 1760–72, judge, Superior Court, Massachusetts (Colonial) 1772–75, judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1775–77, chief justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1777–89.

James Wilson, 1789–98, none found.

John Blair, 1789–96, general court, Virginia (Colonial) 1778–86; judge, high court of chancery, Va. (Colonial) 1780; judge, Virginia First Court of Appeals, 1780–1789.

James Iredell, 1790–99, superior court judge, North Carolina (Colonial) 1777–78.

Thomas Johnson, 1792-93, chief judge, general court, Maryland. (Colonial) 1790–91.

William Paterson, 1793–1806, none found.

Samuel Chase, 1796–1811, chief judge, criminal court, Baltimore, Md. (Colonial) 1788; chief judge, general court, Maryland, 1791.

Bushrod Washington, 1799–1829, none found.

Alfred Moore, 1800–04, judge, superior court, North Carolina, 1798-99.

William Johnson, 1804–34, judge, court of common pleas, 1798–1804.

Henry Brockholst Livingston, 1807–23, judge, Supreme Court of New York, 1802–06.

Thomas Todd, 1807–26, judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1801–06; chief justice, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1806–07.

Gabriel Duvall, 1811–35, none found.

Joseph Story, 1811–45, none found.

Smith Thompson, 1823–43, associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1802–14; chief justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1814–19.

Robert Trimble, 1826–28, judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1807–09; Federal district judgeship, Kentucky, 1817–26.

John McLean, 1830–61, judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1861–22.

Henry Baldwin, 1830–44, none found.

James Moore Wayne, 1835–67, judge, Superior Court, Georgia, 1824–29.

Philip Pendleton Barbour, 1836–41, judge, general court, Virginia, 1825–27; judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern, Virginia, 1830–36.

John Catron, 1837–65, judge, Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals (then court of last resort), Tennessee, 1824–31.

John McKinely, 1837–52, none found.

Peter Vivian Daniel, 1842–60, judge, U.S. district court, Virginia, 1836–41.

Samuel Nelson, 1845–72, judge, 6th circuit, New York, 1823–31; associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1831–45.

Levi Woodbury, 1845–51, judge, New Hampshire Superior Court, 1817–23 (6 years).

Robert Cooper Grier, 1846–70, presiding judge, district court, Allegheny County, Pa., 1833–46.

Benjamin Robbins Curtis, 1851–57, none found.

John Archibald Campbell, 1853–61, none found.

Nathan Clifford, 1858–81, none found.

Noah Haynes Swayne, 1862–81, none found.

Samuel Freeman Miller, 1862–90, justice of the peace, Barbourville, Ky., (date?).

David Davis, 1862–77, judge, 8th judicial district, Illinois, 1848–62.

Stephen Johnson Field, 1863–97, justice, Supreme Court, California, 1857–63.

William Strong, 1870–80, judge, Supreme Court, Pennsylvania, 1857–68.

Joseph P. Bradley, 1870–92, none found.

Ward Hunt, 1873–82, New York Court of Appeals, 1865–73.

John Marshall Harlan, 1877–1911, judge, county court, Franklin County, Ky., 1858–59.

William Burnham Woods, 1880–87, judge, U.S. Circuit Court, Fifth Circuit, 1869–80.

Stanley Matthews, 1881–89, judge, court of common pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, 1851, judge, superior court, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1863–65.

Horace Gray, 1881–1902, justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1864–81.

Samuel Blatchford, 1882–93, district judge, New York, second district, 1867–73; circuit judge, second judicial district, 1873–82.

Lucius Quintas C. Lamar, 1888–93, none found.

David Josiah Brewer, 1889–1910, commissioner, Federal circuit court, district of Kansas, 1861–62; judge, probation and criminal courts, Leavenworth County, Kans., 1862–65; judge, first judicial district of Kansas, 1865–69; Supreme Court of Kansas, 1870–84; Federal circuit court, eighth district, 1884–89.

Henry Billings Brown, 1891–1906, circuit judge, Wayne County, Mich., 1868–(?); U.S. judge, eastern district, Michigan, 1875–90.

George Shiras, Jr., 1892–1903, none found.

Howard Edmunds Jackson, 1893–95, circuit court, sixth circuit, 1886–91; presiding judge, circuit court, appeals, 6th circuit, 1891–93.

Edward Douglas White, 1894–1910, justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.

Rufus Wheeler Peckham, 1896–1909, justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1883–86; Court of Appeals, New York, 1886–96.

Joseph McKenna, 1898–1925, judge, Circuit Court, Ninth Circuit, 1892–97.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, 1902–32, associate judge, superior judicial court, Massachusetts, 1883–1889; chief justice, superior judicial court, Massachusetts, 1889–1902.

Rufus William Ray, 1903–22, judge, court of common pleas, 1886–89; U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1899–1903.

William Henry Moody, 1906–10, none found.

Horace Harmon Lurton, 1910–14, justice, Supreme Court, Tennessee, 1886–93; U.S. Circuit Court appeals judge, Sixth Circuit, 1893–1909.

Charles Evans Hughes, 1910–16, none found.

Willis Van Devanter, 1910–37, chief justice, Supreme Court, Wyoming, 1889–90; U.S. Circuit judge, Eighth Circuit, 1903–10.

Joseph Rucker Lamar, 1911–16, associate justice, Supreme Court, Georgia, 1906–08.

Mahlon Pitney, 1912–22, associate justice, New Jersey Supreme Court, 1901–08.

James Clark McReynolds, 1914–41, none found.

Louis Dembitz Brandeis, 1916–39, none found.

John Hessin Clarke, 1916–22, U.S. District judge, North District of Ohio, 1914–16.

George Sutherland, 1922–38, none found.

Pierce Butler, 1923–39, none found.

Edward Terry Sanford, 1923–30, judge, U.S. District Court, Middle and Eastern District, Tennessee, 1908–23.

Harlan Fiske Stone, 1925–41, none found.

Owen Josephus Roberts, 1930–45, none found.

Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, 1932–38, judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1914; associate judge, Court of Appeals, New York, 1914–32.

Hugo Lafayette Black, 1937 to present, police judge, Birmingham, Ala., 1910–11.

Stanley Forman Reed, 1938–57, none found.

Felix Frankfurter, 1939–62, none found.

William Orville Douglas, 1939 to present, none found.

Frank Murphy, 1940–49, judge, recorders court, Detroit, Mich., 1923–30.

James Francis Byrnes, 1941–42, none found.

Robert Houghwout Jackson, 1941–54, none found.

Wiley Blount Rutledge, 1943–49, U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, 1939–43.

Harold Hitz Burton, 1945–58, none found.

Thomas Campbell Clark, 1949 to present, none found.

Sherman Minton, 1949–56, Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, 1941–49.

John Marshall Harlan, 1955 to present, U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, 1954–55.

William J. Brennan, Jr., 1956 to present, superior court judge, New Jersey, 1949–50; appellate division judge, 1950–52; justice, Supreme Court, New Jersey, 1952–56.

Charles E. Whittaker, 1957–62, U.S. District Court, Western District of Missouri, 1954–56; Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, 1956–57.

Potter Stewart, 1959 to present, Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1954–58.

Byron R. White, 1962 to present, none found.

Arthur J. Goldberg, 1962 to present, none found.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am fully cognizant, of course, that there are a number of examples of fine and outstanding Justices of the Supreme Court who enjoyed no prior judicial experience. Among these were Chief Justice Marshall, Chief Justice Hughes, and Mr. Justice Brandeis, and there are others.

This resolution, of course, gives a President latitude for the appointment of such men so there can be no dispute on that aspect of the case, but there are powerfully persuasive reasons, policy reasons and others, which commend the principle that there is no substitute for judicial experience in the other high callings.

John Locke said in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding:

> No man's knowledge here can go beyond his experience.

And Patrick Henry, speaking in the Virginia House of Delegates on March 23, 1775, said:

> I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience.

Mr. President, a seasoned Justice is not created overnight. Judicial maturity is attained only after long years of painstaking study, research and analysis. This experience should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts. He will be ready for Olympus only after he has felt the bolts from the high places. He should not be placed in a position where his errors will be perpetuated on the books for years to come. A judicial approach is the result of years of development; it is the essence of self-restraint.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I warmly commend my distinguished colleague from Mississippi upon his able discussion of a most vital issue.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I heard him say, and I want to repeat it in order to emphasize it, that—

> This experience—

Referring to previous experience as a judge—

> should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts.

Do we not often speak of a man having a judicial temperament?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A judicial temperament, as I construe it, is a temperament by which a judge, when he hears the evidence, will evaluate it calmly and dispassionately, and when he seeks to apply that evidence, he will apply it to the law as it is written, and not as it would be if he had written the law. Is that not judicial temperament?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a very excellent definition of it. It has been illustrated that such a temperament can be gained only by experience.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Senator from Mississippi graduated in law from Thomas Jefferson's university, and made Phi Beta Kappa there. I graduated in law from what is now Richmond University, and made Phi Beta Kappa. But I think he will agree that neither he nor I were lawyers until we had had experience. We knew the theory of the law and the holdings in a few cases like Marbury against Madison, and the rule in Shelley's case, and things like that, but we had to get out under the spreading chestnut tree and before a justice of the peace, and then before a jury, before we were lawyers.

Mr. STENNIS. That is where real legal knowledge starts.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore, last year I was happy to join in the resolution of my colleague providing that one out of two successive nominees to the Supreme Court should have 10 years experience. There is only a total of 14 years prior judicial experience among the members of the Supreme Court at the present time.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have seen some appropriate statistics, speaking of the self-restraint that occurs out of respect for the law as it was written, and not as that person would have written it if he had had his free way.

Ever since President Roosevelt had Senator Ashurst introduce in this body in 1937 a bill to pack the Supreme Court on the ground that it was composed of what one might call reactionary fossils who could not interpret the Constitution in terms of 20th century conditions, the Supreme Court has overruled previous decisions of the Court 36 times, whereas previous to that time the Court in all the history of our Nation, from 1789 down to 1935, had made such overrulings only 26 times.

Mr. STENNIS. Those are striking figures. I am glad the Senator brought them out, with that dividing line, because the Senator from Mississippi had a dividing line at 1932, which is another basis, but it was in 1937 when these overrulings and reversals really started picking up, for the reasons that the Senator has given.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The reason the Senator from Virginia has paid so much attention to the dividing line of 1937 is that he has always contended that the general welfare clause was a limitation upon the powers specifically delegated; that these powers must be exercised, as Jefferson and Madison had held, for the general welfare, and that they cannot hold out a sugar plum to some little town or some selected groups.

When President Roosevelt got on the neck of the Court about the NRA decisions, and about the decision that he could not put a processing tax on wheat and distribute it to the farmers because they were in violation of the 10th amendment, along comes the Supreme Court in Helvering against Davis, in 1937, and nullified the 10th amendment so far as any limitation on spending is concerned. They said in substance, "The general welfare clause gives us the power to spend for anything we please."

We used to go through the formality of putting a preamble on a bill, providing, "Whereas, the general welfare will be promoted," and so forth, and then the resolving clause. We do not bother with that any more. We just spend for anything we please. That is the reason the Senator from Virginia has paid so much attention to the fact that the Supreme Court as now constituted has no regard whatever for what those who wrote the Constitution said it meant, and has no regard for all of the great justices, from John Marshall on down, and for the 10th amendment, as being a part of the Constitution.

I warmly commend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The Senator from Virginia is one of the great constitutional lawyers of his generation and is an able and experienced Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would not the Senator from Mississippi agree that the appointments to the Supreme Court over the past 30 years, at least, were based more on the principle of repayment of political obligations than upon any judicial experience of the appointees?

Mr. STENNIS. That has certainly been the case as to many of them, most unfortunately. It is partly the Senate's fault, I think, because it had not vigorously maintained its prerogatives and its clear responsibilities.

Mr. SIMPSON. I cannot agree with the Senator more.

Mr. STENNIS. Historically, until the last 30 years or so, the most effective check on the Supreme Court has been its own self-restraint. In the rumbles of dissenting justices since that time may be perceived their understanding within the court that the bounds of self-restraint have been violated time after time.

Mr. President, in that connection and on that subject, I quote from the Conference of the Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, at the convention held on August 23, 1958, at which convention they passed by a vote of 36 to 8 the following report, paragraph 5 of which I shall read, with emphasis:

> 5. That this conference hereby respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States, in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of National and State powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the Federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of Federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government.

That paragraph 5 is a notable landmark. It was adopted almost unanimously by the Conference of Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, at a critical time in our history. I believe that this resolution has done a great deal of good. However, alone it is not enough, persuasive as it is. What we need here, in this form, to pass on a very practical part of these selections, is a new start, a new approach, and a new formula, whereby these men are chosen.

I emphasize that I am not attacking any one of these Justices. I am not attacking the judicial branch of the Government, which I believe is the most important branch, and which can and will finally be restored.

Mr. President, may we have order? Conditions are almost intolerable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. STENNIS. A new start is necessary. What I propose is a constitutional way and a logical way to make that start. If we do not take some action in this direction, I believe it will come from some other source, and in the years to come could come in a violent form.

Located as it is at the very apex of Government with its vast power to strike down State and congressional laws and any and all parts of State constitutions requires that men selected to fill its numbers be the best qualified in the United States. Certainly the best qualification is experience in the same type of work, experience enabling the Justice to distill and refine the conflicting positions presented, experience that insulates against deep-set philosophy springing from representation of special groups, experience that provides the buffer between political affiliation and juridical determination.

What then are the constitutional provisions with respect to the Senate in respect to the process of appointment?

The Constitution provides in article II, section 2, that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law or in the heads of departments."

In the earliest days of our history, George Washington solicited advice on his appointments and considered recommendations at great length before making his nominations to fill positions. With the growth of the two-party system in our country, however, the Senate's advice to the Executive in regard to nominations has been a totally neglected constitutional obligation. The function is now performed apparently by the Department of Justice or the Attorney General of the United States, himself an appointee of the President. It is indeed curious that this constitutional duty of the Senate should have, through neglect, crossed the line of the separation of powers and devolved to the Department of Justice—or the Attorney General—the chief litigant in our Federal courts. Add to this the power in the Attorney General to recommend appointment of sitting judges to higher courts and the enormity of our withdrawal from our duty becomes all the more apparent.

The phrase "advice and consent" is not a new or novel concept, nor was it original at the time it was written into the Constitution. While its origin may be obscure, former Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, in his oral argument before the Supreme Court in *Myers* v. *U.S.* (272 U.S. 52, 1926) traced this important phrase back to 758 A.D. when he said:

> The story, in English constitutional history, of the phrase "advice and consent" is coincident with the whole story of the rise and development of English parliamentary government. I find the phrase first used back in the eighth century, 759, when a Northumbrian king does such and such things with the "advice and consent" of his wise men. It comes down through Magna Carta. It comes down through all the ages. And when in 1787 it became necessary, as between those who were championing a strong executive and those who were championing the legislature, to find a middle ground, it was provided, in the language of old English law, that such-and-such things should be done by the President "with the advice and consent" of the Senate.

In America, I find that it was used in the second charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in 1691.

Records of the Constitutional Convention indicate that when the question of the appointive power was considered, an impressive group of delegates, including Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, urged that the Senate should have this sole responsibility. Alexander Hamilton, the great Federalist, although insisting upon executive nominative power, suggested that the Senate should have the power of rejecting or approving a nomination made by the President.

It was, however, Delegate Gorham, of Massachusetts, who, after pointing out that this method had been in use in his Commonwealth for 140 years, was successful in having "advice and consent" inserted in our Constitution, as it remains today.

"Consent" may well have been the power which Hamilton sought to have conferred on the Senate. It implies and means a concurrence of will or agreement. Hearings preceding confirmation usually determine whether consent to the appointment will be given or withheld.

However, no action is normally taken by the Senate to advise the Executive prior to the nomination of a particular person to fill a vacancy in a constitutional office.

After a nominee has been selected and his name is sent to the Senate with the prestige and power of the President of the United States committed to him, and with the power of the party to which the President belongs usually committed to him, unless there is some flaw in the character of the nominee, his nomination, as a practical proposition, is not rejected. The question no longer is, does the nominee have the basic qualifications of a judicial mind? Or does he have the proper background of experience as a judge? Those questions have fallen by the wayside by the time the nomination has reached the floor of the Senate. The primary consideration then deals with other points.

We know that as a practical matter many times, unfortunately, promises seem to be made far in advance, based upon other contingencies; and the happening of intervening events then decides when the actual nomination shall be made.

A system has been developed which is far removed from the Constitution. A system has been adopted which is dangerous to follow. My resolution, simple as it is, would bring us back on the right track.

This I suggest can and should be done by action of the Senate, and I am today submitting a resolution to set forth and prescribe the minimum qualifications which the Senate would apply in confirming future appointments.

Mr. President, for emphasis, I point out that this device in no way interferes with the discretion of the President in making his selection but is, in essence, a restraint upon the future discretion of the Senate in its unique function of conformation.

Other qualifications may occur to Senators and, while more restrictive criteria than mere professional experience may be the subject of debate on their merits, I feel that by the use of the Senate resolution our constitutional duty to provide a lawful and helpful guide to the President, regardless of who he may be, is one method of returning to the spirit and letter of our Constitution. My resolution is as follows:

> *Resolved,* That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in sec. 451 of title 28, U.S.C.), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, had this standard of selection obtained for the last 25 years, I doubt that we would have heard of paramount rights which produced, instanter, a new Constitution law doctrine in the submerged and tidal land cases; I doubt that we would have seen the finger of scorn pointed judicially at judicial precedent and contemporaneous legislative construction in order to open a new area of Federal power in locally maintained public schools throughout the country. I doubt whether many other changes which have suddenly been made because the Court changed its mind would have occurred.

The results of the present selection of Judges are well known. A constitutional revolution has taken place in the last 30 years or so as is illustrated by the number of cases in which the Supreme Court had overruled prior decisions of the same Court. From 1789 until 1932, 27 such cases had been overruled. Since 1932, through 1962, 39 such cases have been overruled. These are all cases in which the Supreme Court expressly overruled its prior decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of those cases be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(1) *Hudson* v. *Guestier* (1810) 6 Cr. 281, 285; (2) *The Genessee Chief* (1815) 12 How. 433, 456; (3) *Gazzam* v. *Phillip's Lessee* (1858) 20 How. 372, 377–378; (4) *Mason* v. *Eldred* (1868) 6 Wall. 231, 238; (5) *Hornbuckle* v. *Toombs* (1874) 18 Wall. 648, 652–653; (6) *Railway Co.* v. *McShane* (1874) 22 Wall. 444; (7) *County of Cass* v. *Johnston* (1877) 95 U.S. 360; (8) *Fairfield* v. *County of Gallatin* (1879) 100 U.S. 47; (9) *Tilghman* v. *Proctor* (1880) 102 U.S. 707; (10) *U.S.* v. *Phelps* (1883) 107 U.S. 320, 323; (11) *Kountze* v. *Omaha Hotel Co.* (1883) 107 U.S. 378, 387; (12) *Morgan* v. *U.S.* (1885) 113 U.S. 476, 496; (13) *Leloup* v. *Port of Mobile* (1888) 127 U.S. 640, 647; (14) *Leisy* v. *Hardin* (1890) 135 U.S. 100, 118; (15) *Brenham* v. *German-American Bank* (1892) 144 U.S. 173, 187; (16) *Roberts* v. *Lewis* (1894) 153 U.S. 367, 377; (17) *Garland* v. *Washington* (1914) 232 U.S. 642, 646; (18) *U.S.* v. *Nice* (1916) 241 U.S. 591, 601; (19) *Rosen* v. *U.S.* (1918) 245 U.S. 467, 470; (20) *Boston Store* v. *American Graphophone Co.* (1918) 246 U.S. 8, 25; and *Motion Picture Co.* v. *Universal Plan Co.* (1917) 243 U.S. 502, 518; (21) *Terral* v. *Burke Construction Co.* (1922) 257 U.S. 529, 533; (22) *Lee* v. *Chesapeake and Ohio Ry. Co.* (1923) 260 U.S. 653, 659; (23) *Alpha Cement Co.* v. *Massachusetts* (1925) 268 U.S. 203, 218; (24) *Gleason* v. *Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co.* (1929) 278 U.S. 349, 357; (25) *Farmers Loan Co.* v. *Minnesota* (1930) 280 U.S. 204, 209; (26) *East Ohio Gas Co.* v. *Tax Commission* (1931) 283 U.S. 465, 472; (27) *Chicago and E.I.R. Co.* v. *Commission* (1932) 284 U.S. 296; (28) *New York ex rel. Northern Finance Corp.* v. *Lynch* (1933) 290 U.S. 601; (29) *Funk* v. *U.S.* (1933); (30) *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (1937) 300 U. S. 379; (31) *Helvering* v. *Producers Corp.* (1938) 303 U.S. 376; (32) *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins* (1938) 304 U.S. 64, 69, 79; (33) *Graves* v. *N.Y. ex rel. O'Keefe* (1939) 306 U.S. 466; (34) *O'Malley* v. *Woodrough* (1939) 307 U.S. 277; (35) *Madden* v. *Kentucky* (1940) 309 U.S. 83; (36) *Helvering* v. *Hallock* (1940) 309 U.S. 106; (37) *U.S.* v. *Darby* (1941) 312 U.S. 100; (38) *U.S.* v. *Chicago, M. St. P. and P.R. Co.* (1941) 312 U.S. 592; (39) *Nye* v. *U.S.* (1941) 313 U.S. 33; (40) *California* v. *Thompson* (1941) 313 U.S. 109; (41) *Olsen* v. *Nebraska* (1941) 313 U.S. 236; (42) *Alabama* v. *King and Boozer* (1941) 314 U.S. 1; (43) *State Tax Commission* v. *Aldrich* (1942) 316 U.S. 174; (44) *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (1942) 317 U.S. 287; (45) *Brady* v. *Roosevelt S.S. Co.* (1943) 317 U.S. 575; (46) *Jones* v. *Opelika* (1943) 319 U.S. 103 (reargument); (47) *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (1943) 319 U.S. 624; (48) *Smith* v. *Allwright* (1944) 321 U.S. 649; (49) *Girouard* v. *U.S.* (1946) 328 U.S. 61; (50) *Angel* v. *Burlington* (1947) 330 U.S. 183; (51) *Lincoln Union* v. *Northwestern* (1949) 335 U.S. 525; (52) *Commissioner* v. *Church* (1949) 335 U.S. 632, 637; (53) *Oklahoma Tax Commission* v. *Texas Co.* (1949) 336 U.S. 342; (54) *Cosmo-*

politan Co. v. *McAllister* (1949) 337 U.S. 783; (55) *U.S.* v. *Rabinowitz* (1950) 339 U.S. 56, 66, 85; (56) *Joseph Burstyn Inc.,* v. *Wilson* (1952) 343 U.S. 495, 502; (57) *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (1954) 347 U.S. 483, 491, 494–495; (58) *Reid* v. *Covert* (1957) 354 U.S. 1; (59) *Vanderbilt* v. *Vanderbilt* (1957) 354 U.S. 416, 419; (60) *Ladner* v. *U.S.* (1958) 358 U.S. 169 (on rehearing); (61) *S.S. Monrosa* v. *Carbon Black, Inc.* (1959) 359 U.S. 180; (62) *U.S.* v. *Raines* (1960) 362 U.S. 17, 27; (63) *Elkins* v. *U.S.* (1960) 364 U.S. 206, 210, 212–213, 283; (64) *James* v. *U.S.* (1961) 366 U.S. 213, 215, 221, 223, 241; (65) *Mapp* v. *Ohio* (1961) 366 U.S.; (66) *Gladden Company* v. *Zdanok* (1962) 370 U.S. 530, 542, 585.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition, Congress has in the 30-year span between 1931 and 1961 enacted 27 specific pieces of legislation to nullify Supreme Court decisions to correct the mischief wrought by the decisions of the Court.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the decisions in questions and their nullifying acts.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. *Milliken* v. *United States,* 283 U.S. 15 (1931) (gifts in contemplation of death; estate tax). Nullifying acts: 46 Stat. 1516 (1931); 74 C.R. 7078–7079; 7198–7199 (1931).

2. *Kessler* v. *Strecker,* 307 U.S. 22 (1939) (deportation of alien Communists). Nullifying acts: 54 Stat. 670, 673, sec. 22 (1940).

3. *U.S.* v. *Underwriters Assn.,* 322 U.S. 533 (1944) (Federal regulation of insurance companies). Nullifying acts: 59 Stat. 33 (1945); 15 U.S.C. 1011–1015.

4. *Brooklyn Bank* v. *O'Neil,* 324 U.S. 697 (1945). Nullifying act: 61 Stat. 84 (1947).

Schulte Co. v. *Gangi,* 328 U.S. 108 (1946). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 84 (1947); 63 Stat. 910, 920 (1949).

Anderson v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.,* 328 U.S. 680 (1946) (portal-to-portal pay under FLSA). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 84 (1947); 63 Stat. 910, 920 (1949).

5. *Packard Co.* v. *Labor Board,* 330 U.S. 485 (1947) (foreman and supervisory employees entitled as a class to bargain collectively under NLRA). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 136, 137, sec. 2 (1947); 29 U.S.C. 152(3).

6. *United States* v. *Silk,* 337 U.S. 704 (1947) ("employees" for purpose of social security employment tax). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 438 (1948); 26 U.S.C. 3121(d), 3306(i).

7. *Taucey* v. *N.Y. Life Ins. Co.,* 314 U.S. 118 (1941) (Federal courts forbidden to stay in personam proceeding in a State court embracing a cause already litigated in Federal tribunal). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 969, 968 (1948); 28 U.S.C. 2283. (See H. Rept. No. 308; 80th Cong., 1st sess., pp. A 181–182 (1947).)

8. *Dobson* v. *Commissioner,* 320 U.S. 489 (1943) (nonreviewability of certain Tax Court determinations). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 869, 991 sec. 36 (1948); 26 U.S.C. 7482(a).

9. *United States* v. *Wyoming,* 331 U.S. 440 (1947) (rejection of State's claim of title in certain school lands included in a Federal petroleum reserve). Nullifying act: 62 Stat. 1233 (1948).

10. *Bay Ridge Co.* v. *Aaron,* 334 U.S. 446 (1948) (payment of overtime on overtime under FLSA). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 446 (1949); 29 U.S.C. 207(d).

11. *Comm'r* v. *Estate of Church,* 335 U.S. 632 (1949); *Estate of Spiegel* v. *Comm'r,* 335 U.S. 701 (1949) (estate tax). Nullifying acts; 63 Stat. 891, 894, sec. 7 (1949); 26 U.S.C. 2035–2037.

12, *Martino* v. *Mich. Window Cleaning Co.,* 327 U.S. 172 (1946) (coverage under FLSA of local window-washing contractor whose customers manufactured goods shipped in interstate); *Roland Co.* v. *Walling,* 326 U.S. 657 (1946) (covering under FLSA of local electrical contractor who serviced nearby industrial establishments); *Farmers Irrigation Co.* v. *McComb,* 337 U.S. 755 (1949) (covering under FLSA a farmers' irrigation cooperative). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 910, 911, 917 (1949); 29 U.S.C. 203j, 213(a) (2, 6).

13. *Commissioner* v. *Smith,* 324 U.S. 177 (1945) (compensation through exercise of stock option-taxability). Nullifying acts: 64 Stat. 906, 942, sec. 218 (1950); 26 U.S.C. 421.

14. *Commissioner* v. *Korrell,* 339 U.S. 619 (1950) (amortization of bond premium-taxability). Nullifying acts: 64 Stat. 906, 941, sec. 217 (1950); 26 U.S.C. 171(b)(1).

15. *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath,* 339 U.S. 33 (1950) (application of Administrative Procedure Act to deportation of aliens). Nullifying act: 64 Stat. 1044, 1048 (1950).

16. *Commissioner* v. *Tower,* 327 U.S. 280 (1946); *Lusthaus* v. *Commissioner,* 327 U.S. 293 (1946); *Commissioner* v. *Culbertson,* 337 U.S. 733 (1949) (taxation of family partnerships). Nullifying acts: 65 Stat. 452, 511, sec. 340 (1951); 26 U.S.C. 704.

17. *Wilmotte Park Dist.* v. *Campbell,* 338 U.S. 411 (1949) (amusement tax). Nullifying acts: 65 Stat. 453, 519, sec. 402 (1951); 26 U.S.C. 4233(a)(4).

18. *Bindczyck* v. *Finucane,* 342 U.S. 76 (1951) (Nationality Act precludes State courts from annulling their own naturalization). Nullifying act: 66 Stat. 163, 262, sec. 340(j).

19. *Cline* v. *Kaplan,* 323 U.S. 97 (1944) (party against whose property a trustee in bankruptcy had asserted a claim is competent to withdraw from summary jurisdiction of bankruptcy court at any time before judgment). Nullifying acts: 66 Stat. 420–421, sec. 2 (1952); 11 U.S.C. 11(a) (7) (see S. Rept. 1395; 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 3 (1952)).

20. *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Corp.,* 341 U.S. 384 (1951) (inapplicability of Federal fair trade law to nonsigners of resale price maintenance contracts). Nullifying acts: 66 Stat. 631 (1952); 15 U.S.C. 45(a).

21. *United States* v. *California,* 332 U.S. 19 (1947); *United States* v. *Louisiana,* 339 U.S. 699 (1950); *United States* v. *Texas,* 339 U.S. 707 (1950) (Federal dominion over offshore oil (submerged lands)). Nullifying acts: 67 Stat. 29 (1953); 43 U.S.C. 1301–1314.

22. *United States* v. *Cardiff,* 344 U.S. 19 (1952) (inspections under Pure Food Drug and Cosmetic Act). Nullifying acts: 67 Stat. 476 (1953); 21 U.S.C. 374.

23. *Power Comm'n* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.,* 338 U.S. 464 (1950) (regulation of distributors of natural gas selling exclusively to local consumers in one State). Nullifying acts: 68 Stat. 36 (1954; 15 U.S.C. 717(c).

24. *United States* v. *Wunderlich,* 342 U.S. 98 (1951) (nonreviewability of Government contracts having finality clauses). Nulifying acts: 68 Stat. 81 (1954); 41 U.S.C. 321–322.

25. *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin,* 347 U.S. 672 (1954) (Federal regulations of rates of facilities used in production and gathering of natural gas). Nullifying acts: Natural gas bill of 1956 (vetoed) 102 C.R. 2897 (1956); H. Rept. No. 992 on H.R. 6645; 84th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1 (1955).

26. *Maritime Board* v. *Isbrandtsen Co.,* 356 U.S. 481 (1958) (dual shipping rate contracts unlawful). Nullifying acts: 72 Stat. 574 (1958), 75 Stat. 762 (1961), 46 U.S.C. 812, 813b.

27. *Guss* v. *Utah Labor Board,* 353 U.S. 1, 15 n. 7 (1957) etc. (no man's land; State courts and agencies precluded from asserting jurisdiction over labor disputes as to which NLRB had declined to cede or to assert jurisdiction). Nullifying acts: 73 Stat. 519, 541, sec. 701 (1959); 29 U.S.C. 164.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the foregoing compilations of cases I am indebted to the American Law Section of the Library of Congress.

Mr. President, what are we to conclude from the constitutional upheaval that has taken place? Are we to conclude that superior wisdom has inhered in the Justices of recent vintage, as compared with those sitting during the first 143 years or so of the Court? Granting that the Constitution is a living, breathing organ which allows for growth and has the vitality to be accommodated to the changing times is one thing; discarding the learning or pretty much of all the learning that has previously prevailed is another thing. I think it may fairly be stated that there is not contempt alone for all that has gone before but an excessive devotion to doctrines imported from extralegal domain that is responsible for this legal revolution. Certainly a proper reverence for the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of the centuries does not comport with what has been taking place on the Court.

When the proper domain of the law is invaded by social theories and hypotheses that have no legitimate claim to recognition, sound legal doctrine suffers thereby and the foundations of a hallowed judicial system begin to totter.

But if we honor the admirable method of the common law and restore it, we could be on our way back to restoring the legal system that has served us so well. This was the Anglo-Saxon legal system described by the judge in John Galsworthy's play, "Justice," as a "majestic edifice, sheltering all of us, each stone of which rests on another."

Let us not substitute sand for stone in our highest legal edifice. Rather, by this single proposal, let us supply the stone of judicial experience.

I emphasize again that this is no attack on the Court as such, nor is it an attempt to discredit any member of the Court. This is a plea for recognition of time-honored and time-tested values of judicial experience and judicial maturity in at least one-half of the nominees to the highest Court of the land.

Further, it is a plea that the U.S. Senate shall forthwith return to its constitutional duty and power of giving advice in the choice of the nominees before they are nominated. This can be done in advance without reference to any individual and without embarrassment to any President. The Senate in the exercise of its constitutional power should announce that at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall have at least 10 years' prior judicial experience. This would be a salutary start, and other steps could follow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DAIRY LEGISLATION HEARINGS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in the past 5 years the Congress has enacted laws modifying our programs on wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and also our cotton and rice programs. But somehow we have failed to modify the milk or dairy legislation which we now have on the statute books, notwithstanding the fact that the dairy program is one of the most costly programs we have.

Mr. President, beginning on next Monday morning, the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on proposed dairy legislation. It is my hope that at the conclusion of the hearings, the committee will be able to recommend legislation for improvements in our current dairy programs. I have invited representatives of the various dairy and milk producer organizations to give testimony. I am hopeful they will be able to make some constructive suggestions toward developing a means of adequately supporting the income of milk producers, without the recurrent accumulation of excessive quantities of dairy products by the Government, at a high cost, as has been the case under the present law.

The dairy price-support program has been one of the most costly programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. The realized losses by the Goverment on this program over the past 10 years have exceeded $2.5 billion. Milk is an important commodity, and I realize that these expenditures have represented only about 5 percent of the income received by milk producers; but this is still a very costly program.

Two years ago, major dairy organizations were urging that the price-support level for milk be increased because producers incomes were too low. No one disputed the fact that dairy farm income was low; and in the Congress there was strong bipartisan support for increasing the support level above the $3.22 per hundredweight level which prevailed at that time. The Secretary of Agriculture, in good faith, granted an increase to $3.40 per hundredweight for the 1961–62 marketing year.

Without any means of keeping milk supplies in check, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of surplus dairy products began to rise. They rose both as a result of increasing milk production and an inopportune decline in milk consumption. Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of dairy products doubled, and Government expenditure for dairy price support increased from less than $300 million to over $600 million in a year's time. As a result, it was necessary to lower the support level again to the minimum support level permitted by the law; and, even so, it appears that we shall continue to spend in the neighborhood of $500 million a year.

In the last few months, milk production has fallen off slightly from the levels of a year ago; but at this early date we cannot be assured that it is the beginning of any sustained downward trend in production.

With slightly lower beef prices in prospect for the coming year, it is unlikely that there will be any great reduction in cow numbers; and with just an average increase in productivity, milk production will set a new record in the coming year, leaving little possibility that the surplus problem will disappear.

One of the biggest problems in developing new dairy legislation is that we really have separate programs, one for fluid milk and one for manufacturing milk. Neither of these programs is adequate to keep us from getting into surplus problems.

While we usually speak of the dairy problem in terms of the surpluses of manufactured dairy products acquired under the dairy price-support program, the milk-marketing-order program, which started 30 years ago, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, certainly has been a contributing factor. This program was established in the early 1930's to deal with the serious problems of pricing fluid milk around metropolitan markets.

It is impossible for a fluid milk market to operate without having some amount of milk in excess of what is needed for bottling purposes. Both milk production and milk demand change seasonally, and even from day to day. Because of this, it is necessary to have a reserve of at least 10 to 15 percent, to assure that the market will have an adequate supply of milk for fluid use. When the reserve is not needed, it is diverted to other uses. Before the days of Federal orders, farmers found that the presence of this reserve supply tended to result in lower and lower prices for their fluid milk, because there was no orderly way of keeping the reserve supply separated from the milk used in the higher valued uses. Thus, the price for all milk would tend to drop toward the surplus price. This was an intolerable situation, because milk for fluid use must be of the very highest quality, produced on farms where an exceptional degree of sanitation is maintained, and requiring high capital investments in the best of milk handling and cooling equipment.

To remedy their problems, farmers first resorted to collective bargaining through cooperative associations, attempting to price the milk used for fluid purposes separately from the reserve supplies. But these collective-bargaining arrangements were only partially effective, because a minority of the producers or handlers could disrupt the agreement by taking advantage of those who were bearing the responsibility for handling the reserve supplies. These arrangements broke down almost completely in the early years of the depression of the 1930's.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 authorized licenses and agreements to regulate the handling of milk. This early authority was designed primarily to permit enforcement of the arrangements which had previously been developed by the cooperative. Later, however, this authority was spelled out in greater detail by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, under which our present Federal milk marketing orders are operated.

The main point I want to make is that these Federal orders were established to provide for the orderly marketing of fluid milk, geared to the markets needs. They were not designed to encourage the production of surplus milk. The important thing they were to accomplish was to permit the carrying of the small quantity of reserve supply which is so necessary to the efficient operation of a market, without allowing this reserve supply to set the price for the whole market.

The marketing orders accomplish this by providing, for fluid milk, a minimum price, commensurate with the higher cost of producing milk, which will meet fluid milk quality requirements. They set a separate minimum price for the reserve supplies consistent with the manufacturing uses to which they are put. It was never intended that these pricing arrangements should be used to encourage the marketing of ever-increasing amounts of surplus milk.

As the early program has grown, so has the amount of surplus associated with these markets. Since 1940 the number of markets covered by Federal orders has increased from 17 to 83. The amount of milk regulated under these orders has increased from less than 20 percent to almost 50 percent of all the milk marketed in the United States. Over the same period, the percentage of Federal order milk used for manufacturing purposes has increased from less than 30 percent to almost 40 percent. In some of the larger markets the amount of milk used for manufacturing purposes exceeds the milk used for fluid purposes. For example, in the Chicago market only 39 percent, and in the New York-New Jersey market 49 percent was used in class I in 1962, that is, for direct consumption.

If the milk supplies in the Federal order markets had been held to the original objective of supplying the fluid needs of the markets plus a reasonable reserve, the large dairy surplus would not be as great as it is today. Excess milk in three of our largest milk-marketing orders alone is greater than the amount of milk represented by the surplus products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation this past year. Of course, I do not mean to imply that these three markets alone are responsible for the large Government purchases, but surely they did contribute much.

One of the bills which will be considered at the hearings next week is a bill I introduced last August and again this session. This bill requires that each Federal milk-marketing order contain provisions under which the Secretary would determine the amount of milk necessary to meet the fluid requirements for the market, including necessary reserves. When a market's supply of milk is in excess of this necessary quantity, each producer will receive an allotment representing his share of the market's necessary fluid and reserve requirements. I want to emphasize that my bill does not in any way change the existing procedures for setting the minimum prices paid for fluid milk and the necessary market reserves. In other words, the intent of my bill is to assure farmers a good price for the milk produced to meet the needs of the market. I repeat, the farmer would get a good price for the milk produced within his allotment. However, the payment he receives for any milk which he markets in excess of his allotment shall be fixed at a level sufficiently below the manufacturing price to discourage his production and marketing of this excess. This might be 50 cents, a dollar, or $2 lower than the manufacturing price, depending on the market. In any event, it must be low enough to discourage the production of surplus milk.

I should like to make it clear that my bill in no way affects the minimum class price paid by the handler, but only affects the manner in which the producer shares in the total amount paid by the handlers. The handler would continue to pay whatever the minimum class price might be, but the producer would receive only the discouraging price for the milk produced in excess of his allotment. The balance of the handler's payment for that milk would go into the pool to enhance the amount paid the producers for their allotment milk. For instance, let us assume that the minimum price for milk used for fluid purposes is now $6 per hundredweight and the minimum price for milk used for manufacturing purposes is $3 per hundredweight, and that about half of the milk is used for each purpose. The producer in such case now receives a blend price of about $4.50 per hundredweight; that is, the average paid by handlers. Under the present law, as the proportion of milk going into manufacturing use increases, this blend price becomes lower and lower. The price goes down whether the farmer tries to keep production within reasonable limits or not.

Under my bill the handler would continue to pay $6 for milk for fluid consumption and $3 for milk for manufacturing use. But the producer would receive a price below $3—for example, $2—for his excess milk. For his allotment milk, he would receive in this example a blend consisting of the average of first, the market's requirements for fluid use multiplied by $6; second, the market's reserve requirement multiplied by $3, and third, the amount of excess milk delivered to the market multiplied by $1—the difference between the amount paid to the producer for excess milk and the amount paid into the pool by the handler. This would take the producer off the treadmill he is now on, where he must continue to increase his production above market requirements in order to maintain his gross income at the same level. As each producer reduced his production toward his allotment, his return per hundredweight would increase. If any producer wanted to increase production without regard to market demand, he would hurt only himself. He would not lower his neighbor's price. In fact, his excess production would tend to increase the price of the producer who was trying to maintain production at a fair level. By giving farmers an incentive to reduce production, the bill would help to bring supplies down to the market requirements.

Apparently these provisions sound severe to some. However, the objective of my bill is exactly what the objective of the act has always been, that is, to provide a good price for milk needed to meet fluid requirements, including the reserves necessary thereto. I believe that producers in Federal-order markets would be better off under this type of program than they are at present. Today they are producing substantial quantities of surplus in excess of what can be justified for operation of the milk markets. These surpluses dilute their returns from the class I market and drag the average price down. I believe a base plan of the type I suggested would be effective in reducing these surpluses, and as it did so, it would reward those dairy farmers who had reduced their production. There is no logic whatsoever in encouraging the production of $3 milk in an area where producers need $5 to $6 to cover the cost of producing milk.

I can see how this approach may appear severe to producers in those markets where surpluses have grown far beyond the level that can be justified as a necessary operating service. Some consideration may have to be given to permitting these markets to adjust at a reasonable rate over a period of time. I hope that this will be fully explored at the hearings and that constructive suggestions for meeting this problem will be forthcoming. I am convinced that we can no longer tolerate the carrying of excessive surpluses in these markets if this program is to survive and do the job for dairy farmers which it was intended to do.

Dairying is the only major segment of American agriculture which has had the benefit of continued price support and market stabilization and yet has not faced the responsibility of keeping its production system in check. It would appear to me that producers and their representatives should assume this responsibility in light of the adverse criticism the program is now receiving. Over the past 2 years I have heard repeated reports of milk markets where the surplus was so great that good wholesome milk had to be dumped. The milk marketing orders are a wonderful instrument through which producers can develop a marketing system tailored to each individual market's unique problems. It would be unfortunate if this system collapsed because producers failed to recognize the need for making changes in their program as problems such as these arise. They have an opportunity at this point to support legislation which would correct these problems and put this system back in good working order.

My bill also provides for discretionary price support for manufacturing milk and butterfat at zero to 90 percent of parity.

Price support for milk, as we know it today, originated with the Agricultural Act of 1949. Before that, from 1938 through 1941, loans had been made to the Dairy Products Marketing Association to buy butter at prices specified by Commodity Credit Corporation. Prices were not to exceed 75 percent of the current parity price. With the advent of wartime shortages of fats and oils, a price support announcement was made on April 3, 1941. This was done to encourage increased production. Subsequent similar announcements were made under the so-called Steagall amendment which expired December 31, 1948. The Agricultural Act of 1948 provided price support for the next year, following which the Agricultural Act of 1949 became effective.

The support level under the Agricultural Act of 1949 is directed to assuring an adequate supply and has been made available through purchases of products. Dairy supports have never been intended to encourage excess production, nor to change in any way the objective of milk pricing under fluid milk marketing orders.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was placed on the statute books in 1937. In effect, this law reenacted the marketing order provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 with certain important amendments. This act forms the basis for the many milk marketing orders now in effect.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 providing for price supports for manufacturing milk and butterfat was enacted in 1949. Since that enactment there have been no major revisions of either law as regards milk.

It is not that the Congress has not been aware of the many shortcomings which have become increasingly evident in these laws as time has passed.

Under these laws, and including the school milk program, the Government has spent a total of $3.5 billion since 1953. About $3 billion was spent directly in supporting the price of milk, while about $500 million was spent for the school milk program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point table 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Annual net expenditures for dairy programs, fiscal years 1954–62*

[In millions]

Fiscal year	CCC net expenditures [1]	Military and veterans' milk program [2]	Sec. 32 expenditures [3]	Total (excluding special milk)	Special school milk	Grand total
1953–54	$400.6	----------	$74.0	$474.6	----------	$474.6
1954–55	221.0	$1.0	24.4	246.4	$17.2	263.6
1955–56	218.0	7.3	39.0	264.3	45.8	310.1
1956–57	206.0	16.4	75.6	298.0	60.4	358.4
1957–58	195.4	30.4	123.7	349.5	66.3	415.8
1958–59	99.3	23.0	106.2	228.5	74.2	302.7
1959–60	149.9	23.6	35.1	208.6	80.5	289.1
1960–61	170.4	25.3	82.1	277.8	84.3	362.1
1961–62	529.9	25.9	47.1	602.9	88.5	691.4
Total	2,190.5	152.9	667.2	2,950.6	517.2	3,467.8

[1] CCC purchase and other costs (processing, repackaging, transportation, storage, and handling), less proceeds from sales (including sales to sec. 32).

[2] CCC reimbursements to military agencies, Veterans' Administration, and other participants.

[3] Sec. 32 expenditures for purchases from CCC and direct purchases in the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Government has been required to purchase a total of 2.6 billion pounds of butter, 1.7 billion pounds of American cheese, and about 9 billion pounds of dry milk which was produced in excess of market needs. And, notwithstanding the tremendous efforts to dispose of this surplus, as of December 31, 1962, the Department of Agriculture still had about 294 million pounds of butter, 63 million pounds of cheese, and about one-half billion pounds of dry milk.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point table 2.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table 2.—*Dairy products: U.S. Department of Agriculture price support purchases, foreign and domestic utilization, and uncommitted stocks, cumulative 1949–62*

[In million pounds]

CCC activity	Butter	American cheese	Nonfat dry milk
CCC purchases, net	2,622.6	1,743.8	8,970.0
CCC utilization: Domestic	1,665.7	905.7	1,956.6
Foreign sales	152.9	134.4	2,014.3
Transfers and donations	509.7	640.5	4,485.1
Total, foreign	662.6	774.9	6,499.4
Total, utilization	2,328.3	1,680.6	8,456.0
CCC uncommitted stocks, Dec. 31, 1962	294.3	63.2	514.0

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year alone the Government spent $602.9 million supporting the price of milk, plus $88.5 million for the school milk program.

As I see it, the Congress must come to grips with this problem. It cannot any longer be ignored because the industry representatives cannot agree on a new program.

In the past, when laws relating to other commodities have developed weaknesses, Congress has seen fit to act. And yet in the case of milk, which is the most costly program of all, there has been no action. This is intolerable. There must be a change. For if there is not, the taxpayers of this country may well demand that the entire program be sacked.

Now, the bill which I have introduced provides a basic framework for the development of a sound, healthy, and prosperous dairy industry, and certainly one that will be less costly to the Government.

I want it clearly understood, and I want to emphasize, that this legislation is not designed to lower the income of dairy farmers. Rather, it is designed to correct the inequities and shortcomings of the present law.

For example, it will in no way—and I repeat—positively in no way will it lower the price received by farmers for the very wholesome milk produced for use in fluid form by the consumers of this country. This milk is produced under the highest and strictest of sanitary requirements at a very high cost to farmers. Producers must receive a good price for this milk. And under my bill they will.

My bill will not in any way curtail the production of milk which is required for fulfilling the needs of the fluid markets. As a matter of fact, it will encourage farmers to gauge their production to fully meet market needs. My aim is only to discourage the production of unneeded milk—milk that is produced in excess of market needs. This excess milk is giving both the farmers and the Government problems. This is the milk that is costing the Government money.

My bill is not designed to penalize those farmers who produce for the manufacturing markets. In my estimation, proper corrections in the market order areas will minimize the problems in the manufacturing milk areas. In addition, proper correction now of deficiencies in the price support program will preserve that program for the manufacturing milk producer. As a result, both parts of the milk industry will benefit and enjoy a prosperous future.

OUR CASTRO FIXATION VERSUS THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last Friday the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], one of the wisest and most thoughtful Members of the Senate, warned against irresponsible discussion of American foreign policy and especially the Cuban question. The Senator from Montana expressed the view that "much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba," said the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], "but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and perversion of fact."

Recognizing that the late Republican Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, offered the Nation a classic example of constructive bipartisanship during the critical years after World War II, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] quoted Senator Vandenberg's warning to the Senate:

> Only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of premature and ill-advised expressions of its advice to the Executive.

As a freshman Senator, Mr. President, I have been reluctant to add my voice to the current clamor over Cuba and Castro. I wholeheartedly endorse the majority leader's warning that on this and other foreign policy issues, no Senator should speak his mind until he has though through the consequences of his words.

But keeping in mind the counsel of Senator Vandenberg and the majority leader, I am constrained to speak out against what seems to me to be a dangerous fixation on Castro that is not worthy of this great Nation. I submit that we have become so involved in charges and countercharges about our Cuban policy that we have come close to losing sight of the real interests of the Nation in the hemisphere. We have ignored the biblical warning against straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

I have often wondered why the wily Khrushchev would invest so heavily in both capital and personnel in the kind of risky enterprise which Fidel Castro is frantically trying to establish in Cuba. If his purpose was to enhance the influence of Castro and Castroism in the hemisphere, he must be bitterly disappointed with the results, for the Castro-Khrushchev embrace has had the opposite effect. By turning his revolution over to Moscow, Castro has sacrificed much of his appeal to revolutionary leaders and followers in other Latin American States. No thoughtful observer of Latin American affairs has failed to note the decline of Castro's influence in the hemisphere since his marriage to the Kremlin.

But if Mr. Khrushchev's purpose was to create in Castro a gadfly designed to divert the attention of the United States from the real dangers and challenges of Latin America, then he must indeed feel that his investment has paid off handsomely. For each day brings some mighty blast at Castro from a highly placed American politician or commentator.

Meanwhile, the basic dangers to our security in the hemisphere—the economic, political, and social ills of Latin America—continue to fester. The United States has atomic bombs in its security arsenal, but on the side of insecurity we have a smouldering blockbuster on our doorstep to the south which makes Mr. Castro appear like a mouse trying to bring down an elephant.

I refer to the 200 million people of Latin America who occupy a vast land, potentially rich and fruitful but actually beset by misery, sickness, injustice, illiteracy, malnutrition, and misrule. It is a continent cursed by a social system that concentrates enormous wealth in the hands of the few and consigns the many to lives of desperate poverty. But make no mistake about it, powerful social forces are stirring to the south of us. Latin America is in a state of ferment; it is, as one observer put it, "dynamite on our doorstep."

Neither Fidel Castro nor Nikita Khrushchev nor international communism is at the base of this explosive situation. They are the exploiters and the would-be beneficiaries of the tensions and illness which threaten the security of the hemisphere, but they are not the fundamental factors. They are effects rather than causes.

Castro climbed to power over the carcass of a decadent political and social system which he shrewdly exploited, but which he did not create. The appeal of Castroism and communism in other parts of the hemisphere springs from the same corruption and social injustice which paved the way for the collapse of Batista and the triumph of Castro.

The real bombshells of Latin America are fused to the following conditions:

First, 2 percent of the people of the continent own more than half of all its wealth and land while most of the remainder of the people live in hopeless poverty.

Second, 80 percent of the people dwell in miserable shacks or huts.

Third, illiteracy grips well over half the population.

Fourth, more than 50 percent of the people suffer from hunger and disease and most of them will never in their lifetimes see a doctor, nurse, dentist, or pharmacist.

Fifth, most of the peasants live under primitive feudal conditions with no hope for land ownership, reasonable credit, or escape to a better life.

Sixth, several key countries depend on one-crop economies afflicted by depressed commodity prices.

Seventh, most governments are weakened by unjust tax structures, excessive military budgets designed to keep the people under control, bad land ownership and utilization, and indifference to shocking social problems.

Eighth, a population growth rate several times faster than the production of goods and services exists in several Latin American countries.

Two years ago, at the request of the President, I led a food-for-peace mission to Latin America which took us to northeast Brazil. In this benighted section of the largest and most populous nation of Latin America our mission came face to face with the real challenge to the hemisphere. There we saw the wretched life of Brazil's 27 million peasants who are trying to survive in the feudal, drought-stricken sections of the northeast. There we saw the miserable mud huts, the total absence of sanitation facilities, the villages devoid of doctors, teachers, and adequate water and food.

We saw, too, Fidel Castro's counterpart and alter-ego, Francisco Juliao, the flaming peasant leader, urging his wretched followers to seize the land and destroy the suppressors.

I ask the Senate to consider the real problems that confront us in this area. Is it Juliao or Castro? Or is it the unstable, frightful conditions on which they thrive?

It may very well be that in the long view of history, the Castros and the Juliaos for all their mischief and violence, will have indirectly performed some service in that they have forced us to give closer attention to our neighbors to the south. Likewise, they have confronted the ruling classes of Latin America with a stern choice between making long overdue reforms or seeing themselves swept aside in a series of violent Castro-type revolutions. Sometimes the hand of providence moves in strange ways. There can be no mistaking the fact that much of Castro's appeal to the oppressed rests on the knowledge that his presence has forced every government in the hemisphere to take a new and more searching look at the crying needs of the great masses of human beings.

The real issue, it seems to me, turns upon the question of whether or not the people can overturn an unjust social order through a peaceful democratic revolution, or whether they will do it by a violent Communist-led upheaval.

The Alliance for Progress is a mutual effort to raise standards of living through the painstaking, often frustrating, method of democratic reform and constructive economic development.

The Communists call for a quick upheaval that promises a new day through Marxist shortcuts Castro-style.

The Alliance for Progress will test the patience and toughness of all of us who believe in its promise. It does not appeal to the politician who wants a quick headline and a fast answer.

It is far easier to make loud speeches against an irritable, bearded dictator than to face the tough and sometimes painful tasks of making the Alliance for Progress work.

I suggest that we have had too many who are willing to shed the blood of our soldiers in an invasion of Cuba, and not enough courageous and thoughtful men giving their attention to the real problems confronting the Alianza.

We have too many self-styled experts telling the President the inside dope from their private intelligence sources and not enough expert analysis of depressed commodity prices, rural credit problems, land reform, and population pressures.

We have had too many postmortems over the ill-conceived Bay of Pigs invasion, which might have damaged our standing in the hemisphere more if it had succeeded through American military intervention, than it did as a miserable flop. We had no more legal right to undertake air cover or any other military aggression against Cuba than the Russians would have in invading Turkey. We have offensive nuclear weapons, not 90 miles from Russian territory, but in Turkey on the Soviet border, capable of pulverizing Russian cities in a matter of minutes.

The Cuban invasion, originally conceived in the previous administration, was a tragic mistake both in conception and execution for which President Kennedy has bravely taken the blame. Why compound the error by probing the ruins of a mistaken venture and then calling for a repeat performance?

I applaud President Kennedy's policy of wisdom and restraint since the Bay of Pigs fiasco. He has been firm and courageous in resisting the clamor of the warhawks.

Last October he rejected the counsels of those who called for a naval blockade before we knew the nature of the Russian arms shipments. The President also rejected the strong advice of those who favored an immediate air strike against Cuba. By waiting until he had positive proof of the Soviet-Cuban offensive missile threat before invoking a naval sanction, the President won unanimous support for his action from our Western allies and the countries of Latin America. He forced Khrushchev to back down, but he did it without war. He has since resisted those who have shouted for blood and battle and blockades.

Perhaps this is why for the first time the American people have indicated in a current Gallup poll that they have greater confidence in the capacity of the Democratic administration to preserve peace than they do in the opposition spokesmen. In another recent Gallup poll the American public registered its overwhelming opposition to an invasion of Cuba. The people understand better than some political figures that such an effort misses the real nature of the challenge before us.

The President put it this way:

> I think the big dangers to Latin America—are the very difficult, and in some cases, desperate conditions in the countries themselves—unrelated to Cuba.

He has cited political and economic injustice, poor housing, illiteracy, and inadequate commodity prices as the big dangers to the security and well-being of the hemisphere.

As the President has said these are problems which must be faced and solved in the main by the people of Latin America. But he has also proclaimed our willingness to help.

Hence, the hopeful and inspiring promise of the Alliance for Progress.

Hence, the Peace Corps units which through the dedication and idealism of American youth are bringing new hope and pride to the villages of Latin America.

Hence, an expanded food-for-peace program which among other accomplishments is now providing a nutritious meal daily to 8½ million Latin American schoolchildren and to 5½ million babies and pregnant mothers.

Hence, the U.S. medical teams that are developing in Central America.

Hence, the growing exchange of students and teachers between the universities of North and South America.

These are the tools of hope and life and strength with which America is fighting the truly significant battles of the hemisphere. This is our best answer to communism and Castroism.

It is not yet clear that the ruling groups of Latin America are aroused sufficiently to their responsibilities to make the Alliance succeed on a broad scale. Nor is it clear that we have grasped fully the nature and scope of the leadership demands that are upon us as a great and powerful nation.

I earnestly hope that we will not dissipate our energies in a senseless fixation on Castro. Our mission is to point the way to a better life for the hemisphere and, indeed, for all mankind.

I conclude on this additional note, Mr. President: we dare not let our preoccupation with Mr. Castro and other irritants abroad blind us to our domestic responsibilities. If America is to fulfill its promise both at home and around the globe, we must move ahead on vital domestic fronts. We have a gigantic agricultural plant to be nurtured and stabilized; we are faced with the necessity of creating new job, educational and recreational opportunities for our young people; and older citizens are confronted by rising medical and hospital costs; we need to consider seriously the relationship of our tax and fiscal policies to a sluggish national economy—these and many other mounting challenges call for clear minds and steadfast spirits.

It is no longer possible to separate America's domestic health from our position in world affairs.

Let us then move forward with a courage and prudence commensurate with our traditions and our responsibility as a great nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on what I believe is his maiden speech. Is it not?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota has briefly, tersely, and very ably indeed allied himself with the Presidential party in the Senate. I am sure this will be a source of substantial comfort to the White House. I particularly like to commend my friend from South Dakota for his very able analysis of our Cuban policy, which I support as strongly as he does, for his able defense and his statement of hope for the future, for the Alliance for Progress, which I also support, as he does, and for his short and penetrating analysis, at the conclusion of his speech, of the major domestic issues which confront our country.

In the 7 years that I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate I do not believe that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to such an able maiden speech as that delivered by my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very kind and generous remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said:

Mr. President, in relation to my remarks made a few minutes ago about the Alliance for Progress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles written by Roscoe Drummond which were published recently in the Washington Post. One article relates to the general attitude of the American people toward foreign assistance; the other details some of the advances made by the Alliance for Progress.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT IS A MYTH

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentially made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview, the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden, one-twentieth of the budget, and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence:

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955.

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

LATIN REDS ARE DISHEARTENED

Latin American Communists are becoming downright disillusioned—and disheartened—by the Alliance for Progress. It isn't failing adequately. For them it is succeeding too well.

While some of its supporters in the United States, who expected it to perform miracles overnight, are disappointed that the Alliance hasn't gotten off the ground faster, its Communist opponents are finding to their dismay that it has gotten off the ground too well for their comfort.

I am not suggesting that the first year's work of the 10-year Alliance for Progress has alone thrown the Communists on the defensive. It has helped, visibly helped. The Communists are most on the defensive where the Alliance has been most active. Here is some of the evidence:

In most of the Latin-American countries, notably in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, the Communists are abandoning nearly all effort at peaceful persuasion and turning to violence and subversion as the only means of attaining their ends. They can't win converts from people who see even modest progress in the present, hope in the future.

The Latin American Communists are continuing to lose their influence in the labor movement where they thought their prospects were best. Today the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in South America embraces 8 million workers; the Red-dominated labor organization, not over one million.

Through Alliance aid 37 U.S. universities are now working with 57 Latin institutions in 18 countries to improve education. There is already evidence of a trend away from longtime Communist control of the universities in Central America.

All the ravages of a long-outdated economic system cannot be repaired in 12 months or 12 years, but the evidence is now sufficient to report that the Alliance is making a sturdy and steady beginning—and can succeed.

Here are some of the things that are right with the Alliance for Progress and show that, after an understandably slow beginning, more can be expected:

Fourteen Latin-American countries have either passed new and tighter tax legislation or improved their tax collections; in seven of these countries the reforms are on a major scale.

The Alliance is pursuing a rational and constructive course on agrarian reform. It is not promoting a casual, ineffective program of just cutting up large estates. It is promoting a modernizing of agriculture. Venezuela has succeeded in resetting nearly 60,000 farm families. Since last spring hundreds of families in the Dominican Republic have been resettled. In Chile, Colombia, Bolivia and elsewhere, similar programs are getting under way.

The Alliance is enlisting new financing for Latin America from Western Europe and from Japan and is carrying forward a positive campaign to attract more and essential investments by U.S. private business with guarantees against the risk of expropriation, inconvertibility and war.

I am not relying merely on Government figures to justify the report that the Alliance for Progress is beginning to make itself felt, is starting to pay dividends. The latest report on "Latin-American Business" from the Chase Manhattan Bank cites economic progress in Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela as improving and encouraging. No wishful thinking from that source.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Latin American Communists would breathe a sign of relief if we would give it up.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which is presently being considered by the legislatures of the respective States of the Union. The two new States are Washington and Vermont, bringing to 22 the total number of States which have ratified the amendment.

I was informed late yesterday by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that the House of the Washington Legislature on February 26, 1963, approved the amendment unanimously by a vote of 95 to 0, and that the Senate on yesterday, March 14, also approved the amendment unanimously by a vote of 44 to 0. I salute both of my friends from Washington, Senators MAGNUSON and his distinguished colleague, Senator JACKSON, each of whom not only cosponsored my resolution in the 87th Congress which proposed submission of the amendment to the States but vigorously supported its approval by the Senate and then followed through aggressively to obtain its ratification by the legislature of their State.

Mr. President, it is most interesting to note for the record that when Senator MAGNUSON was a Member of the House of Representatives in the State of Washington in 1933, just 30 years ago, he introduced and vigorously supported a memorial in the Washington Legislature aimed at removing the poll tax as a requirement for voting, in an effort to start a movement whereby those States which had the poll tax requirement would eliminate it.

I believe that at the time there were 11 States in which a poll tax or other tax was a requirement for voting in Federal elections. I warmly congratulate Senator MAGNUSON for his long-time interest and effective leadership in this field.

The House of the Vermont Legislature only this morning ratified the amendment on final reading of the enabling resolution which it passed yesterday by a vote of 157 to 63, the Vermont Senate having previously ratified the amendment on February 6 by a unanimous voice vote.

I am greatly indebted to my good friend, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for this encouraging information and to both Senator AIKEN and his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], each of whom have shown their dedicated interest in this movement toward eliminating the poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections by their support and cosponsorship in the Senate last year and by their aggressive and constructive work this year with the Vermont Legislature.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to explain the Vermont situation in a little more detail. The Senate of the Vermont Legislature unanimously approved this constitutional amendment many weeks ago—I believe on February 6. It was then referred to the house. There was some opposition in the house from an organization which does not believe in this constitutional amendment. It was successful in postponing action on it.

Yesterday there was a vote in the Vermont House with the result which has just been stated by the senior Senator from Florida, 157 to 63. That vote, however, permitted the amendment to be brought before the House for a third reading today. It is my understanding that the amendment passed the Vermont House without opposition this morning; that there was no vote recorded against it, although I expect there were a few members who were still against it. Nevertheless, they were completely ineffective.

I wish to say something more. The senior Senator from Florida has referred to the work of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which started more than 30 years ago. It is my understanding that 26 years ago, in 1937, when the senior Senator was a member of his State's senate, he started to work toward the same objective in the Florida Legislature. I think that now, when his objective seems fair to be accomplished, we ought really to respect the long years of effort which have been devoted by the senior Senator from Florida to making it possible for all people to vote for President, Vice President, and Federal officials without making the payment of a poll tax a condition for their voting.

The senior Senator from Florida has performed an outstanding service, even if it is taking well over 25 years to accomplish it, and his goal is now in sight. I know the satisfaction he must feel that what he foresaw years ago as a necessary change in the Constitution is now on the way to accomplishment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the more than kind statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I am not ready, as we say in the South, to throw up my hat yet, because we still have 16 more States to go. But we are hoping for ratification by those additional 16 States at a relatively early date. We are working toward that end, just as the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. PROUTY] have worked so effectively in securing the action of the Vermont Legislature, which was completed just this morning.

I do not believe we would have had success with the Vermont Legislature had it not been for the determination, persistence, and continued efforts of the distinguished Senators from Vermont. I salute them upon their success.

Mr. AIKEN. My only regret is that Vermont was not the third State. It could not possibly have been the first or second, because the Vermont Legislature was not in session at that time. I regret that Vermont had to be the 21st or 22d, instead of the 3d State, which it could have been had the Vermont House not been delayed in reaching a final vote on the question. However, I am much gratified to report that the amendment passed the Vermont House on third reading this morning without opposition, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. In completing my statement, I am not surprised to find that there are determined and persistent people in Vermont. We have seen evidence of the fact that Vermont produces that breed of sons. I am glad that by their continued effort the two Senators from Vermont have been able to persuade some of their fellow citizens in Vermont to a better solution and conclusion than seemed to have been possible just a few days ago.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to state my concurrence in the views expressed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] about my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is the author of the constitutional amendment. Had it not been for his tenacity, determination, and strong belief that this was a forward and progressive step, even among the Southern States, as well as throughout the United States, toward giving the people greater voting privileges, the objective would not be so near accomplishment.

As my colleague has said, he is not yet prepared to throw up his hat. There is still some ground to be covered. However, I am satisfied that he and others who believe with him in this endeavor will see to it that it is accomplished, and that finally we shall have in Florida the proud realization that one of our most distinguished sons is the author of a constitutional amendment. There are only 22 constitutional amendments now. I do not know exactly in what States they originated. But I believe that very few States have the honor of having had represent them those who were in point of fact the authors of such a useful, beneficial constitutional amendment as I know the one which has been introduced by my colleague from Florida will be.

I join with the able Senator from Vermont in his expression of commendation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am most grateful to my colleague from Florida for his kind words.

Since he came to the Senate, which I believe was in January 1951, he has been a cosponsor and coauthor of this amendment since almost the first day, in every session of the Senate, and in every Congress since that time. If there be any credit eventually, he is entitled to a full share of it.

WASHINGTON POST SERIES DESCRIBES INDIAN PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I called the attention of the Senate to the first two installments of an excellent series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves currenly appearing in the Washington Post. Mr. Graves has given us a superb account of some of the basic problems, achievements, and prospects of the Oglala Sioux Indians of South Dakota.

These articles in effect are a description of the Indian problem as a whole. I strongly urge the Members of Congress and others interested in this most important field to read Mr. Graves' articles thoughtfully.

I ask unanimous consent that the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth installments of these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, III—OGLALA SIOUX FIGHT POVERTY AND DISEASE

(By Aubrey Graves)

Now that the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to reservation improvement, are Indians still so miserably housed that they have been dying from the extreme cold of this bitter winter?

In a nation burdened with food surpluses, can it be that American Indians are starving to death, or even going hungry?

The answers to these two questions were among the objectives of my recent 4-day visit to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. Here live the Oglala Sioux, one of the largest and most poverty-stricken Indian communities in the Nation.

To the first question, the answer is yes. As for the second, some Indians are going hungry at times but it is not due to lack of a food distribution program.

Because of exposure, improper diet, and unsanitary conditions, the infant mortality at Pine Ridge is shockingly high—44 deaths per 1,000 live births. This compares with a mortality rate of 26 among non-Indian babies throughout the Nation. But even this high rate is an improvement over that for 1954, when 66 out of every 1,000 Indian infants died before reaching the age of 1.

The average age of Indians at death is 42; the country's non-Indians live to an average age of 62.

The incidence of tuberculosis among Indians, though still high (285 per 100,000 population in 1961) has dropped from 600 per 100,000 in 1954. Ten years ago tuberculosis was the chief cause of Indian deaths. Today it ranks ninth.

Here the comparison with the disease's incidence among all other races in the Nation is striking. For them the figure was 62 in 1954; it is only 37 today.

At Pine Ridge during 1961, the principal causes of death were influenza and pneumonia. Heart diseases were second. In third place were accidents—many resulting from operation of unsafe automobiles and driving while under the influence of alcohol.

Cancer was killer No. 4.

Next come dysentery and diarrhea, which are directly attributable to the lack of sanitation. The Indians at Pine Ridge (except for those moving into 51 new public housing units) have no water systems; water is hauled from wells in cans and buckets and, because of the hardships of carrying it, often from considerable distances, water is not used freely. Human wastes are disposed of, for the greater part, in primitive privies or directly onto the ground.

Trachoma (an infection of the eye which can cause blindness) is common. Measles and whooping cough are prominent killers.

Projects are under way to improve conditions in the village of Pine Ridge. Under the Sanitary Facilities Act, Public Law 8–6121, $295,000 has been made available for a water supply system and $240,000 for a sewage disposal project, both designed to accommodate 440 homes.

Individual running-water-and-sink-units, from well to kitchen, are being planned for four reservation communities: Kyle, Manderson, Allen, and Wakpamni Lake. At Calico a $18,500 project, nearing completion, will provide about a dozen families with a central water supply.

At the Pine Ridge Hospital, the U.S. Public Health Service staff consists of 8 physicians, 19 registered nurses, 13 practical nurses and a ward clerk. Working in field clinics are four PHS nurses, two practical nurses, three dentists, and one nutritionist.

"Pneumonia is our greatest difficulty," said Dr. James Morphis, a young North Carolinian who has been the resident pediatrician for 6 years. The hospital has a capacity of 48 beds but more than 70 filled beds were jammed in rooms and corridors the day I was there.

"And there's lots of ear trouble," Dr. Morphis continued. "Babies are brought in with visibly infected ears. Mothers seem to regard this as a normal condition. It is hard to make them understand that such neglect can lead to deafness, meningitis, and other diseases—and sometimes death.

"Children are brought in with arms and legs full of running sores."

He reported a great incidence of rickets: "The Indian mothers breast feed their babies until they are 3, in the mistaken belief they cannot get pregnant as long as their babies are nursing. Then, at 3, the babies are put on bottles until they are 4 or 5 years old. Milk is not a complete diet; a great many children become anemic."

Because of the enormous scope of their job, trying to protect the health of 8,303 human beings, the doctors and nurses often feel frustrated.

"But there are also rewards," Dr. Morphis said. "A little peanut will come in here, undernourished, full of sores and shriveled up. In a couple of weeks we have him fattened up and his mother takes him home."

The discouraging thing is that in many, many instances, "in a few more weeks the child is back here again."

Sometimes, because of lack of transportation or gumbolike roads, mothers cannot get their babies to the hospital for several days after they become acutely ill. At other times sheer neglect is to blame. "They'll leave their kids in the rattletrap autos outside a bar in cold weather. And they will go away from home, leaving 6-year-old babysitters in charge."

Unwed mothers present a disheartening, continuing problem. "For an unmarried woman to have four or five children by as many fathers is not unusual," Dr. Morphis said. "In cases where the mothers show both desire and ability to take care of their babies, they are left with them." Otherwise, they are placed in foster homes both on and off the reservation.

Six babies of unwed mothers were at the hospital, up for adoption, the day I was there.

"We have just about run out of foster homes," said Dr. Morphis.

Under a project conducted by the child welfare league, some children are sent to two adoption agencies in New York City and one in Delaware.

On the subject of food, Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash recently said: "If any American Indians are starving, it is because someone isn't doing his job."

The Oglala Sioux Tribe operates a surplus commodity program in cooperation with the South Dakota Department of Public Instruction.

During my visit, I saw surplus foods (real butter, dry milk, lard, cheese, rice, beans, flour, cornmeal, peanut butter, rolled oats, and chopped meat) being doled out on a ration basis that seemed liberal. In fiscal 1962 the wholesale value of such commodities distributed on Pine Ridge was $327,567.

But there are two difficulties.

The food is made available once a month, and some families tend to gorge for the first 2 or 3 weeks—going hungry for 10 days or so as a result.

The second cause of whatever hunger exists is the fact that surplus food is not always eaten by the recipients.

Bartering food is strictly forbidden, under pain of being cut off the dole list. Nevertheless, surplus food does find its way to off-reservation bars where a 3-pound head of the finest cheese may go for a six-pack of beer or a bottle of cheap wine.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, IV—LIQUOR IS BIG PROBLEM OF SIOUX, HARD-DRINKING HUNTERS OF OLD

(By Aubrey Graves)

The repeal by Congress in 1953 of the law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians anywhere under any circumstances created new problems on the great majority of reservations.

A notable exception was the Pueblos of New Mexico, who were mostly farmers. After the white man came in, there was not a breakdown in their culture comparable with that suffered by most of the tribes.

The Pueblos kept right on farming. Today, excessive drinking among them is not the problem it is on, say, the Oglala Sioux Reservation in South Dakota.

In the old way of life, the Sioux women performed the labor; the males provided the meat and fought. When the buffalo herds were killed off, their role of hunter also ended. The warriors no longer had a part to play in the economy of the tribe.

IDLENESS ENCOURAGED

For more than a generation after the Sioux wars of the 1870's, the Federal Government encouraged idleness and dependence through a ration system. At regular intervals, heads of families received handouts of food and clothing. The ration system was sharply reduced after 1910 and it had closed down entirely by 1930.

Seeking an escape from depressing realities, the more desperate Sioux (and their brothers on most other reservations) turned to the bottle. As one observer put it: "When a Sioux drinks, he drinks hard."

After 1953, the sale of liquor to an Indian off the reservation in a wet State was no longer illegal. On the reservations, the various Indian tribes had the option of keeping absolute prohibition or letting liquor in, but in such a way as not to violate State laws. In other words, liquor could not be sold to Indians on a reservation in a dry State.

In 1954, the Oglala Sioux men and women of voting age voted in the ratio of 11 to 7 to retain prohibition within the boundaries of their reservation although in adjoining areas of South Dakota and Nebraska intoxicating beverages were and are legally sold.

CONSPICUOUS MINORITY

Any faithful account of conditions on the Oglala Sioux Reservation must make it clear that alcoholism is a serious problem there. The offenders, to be sure, are a minority—but a conspicuous one.

Sit through a morning in the tribal court presided over by Chief Judge John Richard and you find that 95 percent of all the cases he and his associate judges hear stem from liquor, with drunk driving the chief offense.

Those convicted are fined $50 and jailed for 30 days. "And it doesn't do them a damn bit of good," declared Richard, himself half Indian and an influential member of the tribe. "Turn them loose and within a week they're right back in here."

Church membership is high at Pine Ridge. Of the members, about half are Roman Catholics (the Black Robes, as he called the early missionaries, were invited to establish a mission by Chief Red Cloud in 1888). The others who are affiliated with churches are

Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Seventh-Day Adventists, in that order.

Many Indians are teetotalers, a notable example being Dick Whirlwind Horse, the tribal president. His predecessor, Johnson Holy Rock, also was an abstainer. Generally, the tribal members, whether they themselves drink or not, insist on electing to high tribal office only men known for their sobriety.

The churches teach moderation and a small alcoholics chapter is at work on the reservation. Despite their conscientious efforts, however, there is much drunkenness.

Bring up the subject, as I did, with welfare workers, ministers, Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel, doctors and tribal leaders and all acknowledge the magnitude of the problem and discuss it freely.

Over and over you hear that the Indian gets drunk because he is unbearably frustrated, pitifully poor, miserably housed, jobless, bored stiff and simply not equipped to deal with conditions of life he must face.

Despite prohibition in the village of Pine Ridge, one does not have to be exceptionally resourceful to find a bootlegger nearby.

OASIS 2 MILES AWAY

Or, 2 miles south of the reservation, across the Nebraska line, is the community of White Clay, where bars—and sometimes lawlessness—flourish. The prudent stranger does not linger around this sordid oasis after dark.

Here whisky-craving Indians come in their $50 jalopies (some without brakes, mirrrors, lights or horns) and get tanked up. Some, I was told by a tribesman, tend to revert to savagery when very drunk.

In the bars at White Clay the Indian is served drinks as long as his ability to pay or barter holds out. Nebraska police, according to reservation residents, do not go into the bars and intercede to keep a South Dakota Indian from drinking too much.

But usually, 'tis said, they are not far away when the unfortunate staggers, or is thrown, out. He is tossed into jail, held there until his $50 fine is paid and then released—unless his friends manage to hustle him back onto the reservation ahead of the gendarmes.

TWO THOUSAND MILES OF HIGHWAYS

Once on the reservation, his risk of arrest decreases. Here there are 2,000 miles of highways many of them all but impassable at times, and only 14 officers (7 tribal officers and 7 furnished by the BIA) to patrol them.

There is growing sentiment at Pine Ridge for legalizing, and taxing, liquor sales in tribally controlled stores—as a means of keeping the inherent problems (including the Indian money Nebraska collects in fines) on the reservation where they could be "better controlled."

Among leaders who hold this view is Father John Bryde, principal of the Holy Rosary Mission, where 546 Indian children live and study for 9 months a year.

"Legalized, controlled whisky sales would be better," insists Father Bryde, "than having drunk-driving hazards strung out, as they now are, over many miles of public highways."

"The Indian," the priest continued, "has no tradition of social drinking. He doesn't take a couple of martinis before dinner and leave it at that. He drinks until the bottle is empty. Provided with an opportunity to drink at home, perhaps after the novelty of it had worn off, he would learn to control his drinking."

Father Bryde also stressed the financial advantages: "The Indians would get their liquor for about one-fourth the price they now pay and it would be better to have the $50 fines remain on the reservation where they could help build homes for orphans and the aged, rather than benefit the coffers of Nebraska."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, V—INDIANS BLAME ALLOTMENT ACT FOR THEIR ECONOMIC WOES

(By Aubrey Graves)

For their sorry economic plight today, Indian tribes of the Midwest and Northwest blame the General Allotment Act of 1887. Under it, surplus tribal lands were allotted to individual Indians and held in trust for them by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Individual Indians, beginning in 1902, had the right to sell their holdings if the original allottee had died and if the Interior Secretary approved the sale as being in the Indian's best interest. Later, only the Secretary's approval was needed.

If the Secretary disapproved, the Indian still had the right to petition Congress and, as a result, many private bills were passed conveying to specific Indians the right to dispose of their lands.

The net result has been to enable white cattlemen and farmers to acquire ownership of a substantial, if not a major, portion of the land on many reservations.

The case of the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., is illustrative. Today 45 percent of its area is held by white owners and more than 75 percent of all the land of the original reservation is either owned, or being used, by non-Indians.

Originally, the Oglala Sioux Reservation contained 2,721,597 acres; it has been whittled to 1,525,835, much of which is leased to non-Indians.

Particularly in the Southwest, notably New Mexico and Arizona, there was strong tribal resistance to individual allotments, and there the reservations as originally established have remained in tribal control.

But on reservations where allotments were made, substantial land losses occurred in successive waves. One came around 1910 when, in the case of the Oglala Sioux, most of the good farmland, on the eastern end of the reservation, was sold off to white settlers.

There were more losses in the 1920's. These came to a halt in 1934 after passage by Congress of the Indian Reorganization Act "to conserve and develop Indian lands and resources." Interior Secretary Harold Ickes flatly refused to sanction further transfers to non-Indians. Because of successful pressure by grass-hungry Western stockmen, and Indians who wanted to sell, land sales were resumed in 1948.

After many tracts of choice grazing land had passed out of Indian ownership, sales to non-Indians came to a halt in the late 1950's with the gradual abandonment of termination policies.

Since 1959 the Federal Government has assisted the tribes financially to enable them to purchase key tracts of land when individual Indians put them up for sale.

Under the present program, purchases are made by the tribe with money available from the Indian Revolving Loan Fund. This tribal enterprise operates at a profit and over a period of years the Federal loans will be repaid. Meantime, the lands are being used for the economic development of the Indian community.

Ninety percent of the money Indians received for the land they sold to white men was quickly spent—without lasting benefit to the Indians who sold it. Some who have disposed of all their land now exist precariously, largely as recipients of welfare programs.

During the years when resettlement of Indians off the reservation was the big idea, there was no consistent, continuing program to help the Indians use their lands.

Again, the experience of the Oglala Sioux is typical. A recent BIA survey shows that, of their 1,900 family units, only 126 graze their own cattle on their own acreage or on land leased from other Indians.

Another 450 families lease range and farm land, mostly to non-Indians who pay them $15.50 to $20.50 per head per year.

Income from unit leases for 1962 distributed by BIA as of last December amounted to $873,608 ($579,909 from grazing fees, $287,538 from farm land rentals and $6,161 from hay permits). This averages out to $1,941 for the year for each of the land-leasing families.

On permanent, year-round relief are 246 family groups. Some Indians are on BIA's payroll or work in the village of Pine Ridge. The remainder, except for the 224 heads of families who tie fishhooks for Wright & McGill, live mostly by part-time, seasonal work off the reservation, supplemented by relief payments during idle months.

The Oglala Sioux had no experience as cattlemen or farmers. Actually, it would have been impossible for a family to make a living off its holdings. Allotments were 160 acres. From 24 to 26 acres of South Dakota grazing land are required to support 1 cow. The natural thing was to lease the holdings to white cattlemen who were big operators.

No allotments were made after 1934.

Today the Oglala Sioux Tribe holds 362,144 acres; allotments in trust to 4,573 Indians amount to 1,163,691 acres. Of the allotments, about three-fourths are in heirship (multiple ownership).

Responding to an invitation extended by President Kennedy during his campaign for election, the Oglala Sioux presented BIA with a proposed land reform program. Its gist was that their remaining land base must be retained and developed in Indian ownership, "so that the Oglala Sioux people will always have a home."

Formation of a Domestic Peace Corps would be provided for in legislation now before Congress. Already, the tribe has invited the Corps to send volunteers to Pine Ridge to instruct Indians in, among other things, land use and management, including irrigation farming. Pine Ridge has been given first priority.

The corpsmen will also assist in developing self-help housing, day care centers for children and recreation programs. The tribal council envisions the extended presence of corpsmen as embodying the person-to-person service pattern so long sought by concerned Indian leaders.

The tribe, working with the Realty Branch of BIA, is already embarked upon a program to consolidate various undivided inherited interests of Indians into contiguous tracts.

The method is to trade scattered and fragmentary heirship holdings to the tribe in exchange for a single usable entity of equal size or value that can be managed according to needs and desires of a single individual, rather than the often conflicting interests of many heirs.

There are only 577 tracts in which there are more than 15 heirs. There are only an additional 900 tracts in which there are more than 5 heirs.

Clearing these tracts of heirship status and exchanging them for consolidated tracts has the virtue of requiring no exchange of money. And it would greatly reduce the BIA's administrative workload in managing allotments.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, VI—1962 LAW SPARKS SIOUX ADVANCE

(By Aubrey Graves)

A special law sponsored by Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, and passed by Congress last year, amended the Accelerated Public Works Act so as to make American Indians eligible for Federal help in developing their homelands, on the same basis as any other American community.

This legislation reflects the conviction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Congress that earlier resettlement policies had failed. Today the accent is on improving living conditions on the reservations and providing vocational education, both on and off the tribal preserves, to fit Indians for jobs wherever they may be found.

The first South Dakota community, Indian or non-Indian, to apply for help under the act was the Oglala Sioux. They came up with plans for a $200,000 municipal center in the village of Pine Ridge, for smaller community buildings in five outlying areas, each to cost about $35,000 and for a $45,000 youth camp.

The Pine Ridge building would include a tribal council meeting room, a bowling alley, a gymnasium suitable for basketball games and dances, and a kitchen to be used by homemakers' clubs.

NEW PLAYGROUND

Tribe plans also call for enlisting the aid of the Domestic Peace Corps in setting up a complete recreational program for adolescents and young adults now sadly lacking, based on the municipal centers.

An Oglala Sioux project, already authorized, is the $300,000 Felix S. Cohen Memorial Home for the Aged, named after the attorney who formerly represented the tribe in Washington.

It will have 21 rooms accommodating 42 persons. (No Sioux voluntarily lives alone.) Funds have been obtained through the Public Housing Administration. Old-age pensions received by occupants will pay for their room and board, with margins left for other necessities.

All these plans grew out of a self-appraisal that tribal officials conducted about 5 years ago. They found that of the 1,900 or so families on Pine Ridge, which is typical of other reservations, not more than one-third were economically and socially well adjusted.

The remaining two-thirds constituted a chronic problem of poverty, disease, and social maladjustment reflected in broken homes, alcoholism, and a disturbing crime rate.

ASSISTANCE FROM BUREAU

Assistance and improvement programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, other than welfare grants, covered principally (1) education, (2) business loans, particularly to put tribal members in the cattle business, and (3) relocation.

Valuable as far as they went, these helped only the fairly well adjusted people. They made little dent on the two-thirds who were poorly adjusted. These were the people who dropped out of school and those who did complete school but were unable to find anything useful to do with their education.

These were also the people who failed if they were set up in the cattle business and those who failed in relocation.

The one-third group was being helped to move closer to complete adjustment to the general American culture. But the two-thirds were falling further behind.

Social rules of the older Indian culture, they found, were discarded as the younger generation rejected its parents. But nothing took their place. The Indian youths were rootless and aimless.

PILOT PROGRAM PROPOSED

The tribe drew up plans for reservation improvement and moved to put them into effect. The Oglala Sioux proposed that a pilot program be initiated on their reservation, designed to create a healthier climate for human development by providing a better economic foundation.

Leslie Towle, BIA superintendent at Pine Ridge, was, and is, uniformly well liked, trusted, and respected. The tribal council unanimously adopted a resolution of appreciation of his work. His presence, it argued, made the situation at Pine Ridge ideal for a cooperative venture by the tribe and the Bureau.

The program moved forward. Although some skeptics argued that industries would not locate on the reservation, Wright & McGill fishhook plants did move in and are operating at a profit.

Plans for further economic development are on the drawing board. The tribe is particularly interested in developing recreational opportunities on the reservation and attracting tourists.

TRIBE WANTS MOTEL

The Black Hills interest many tourists. Some would like to stay on the Pine Ridge Reservation, it was felt, if adequate facilities were available for them. So the tribe wants to build a motel and furnish Indian guides to take visitors on horseback through the Badlands, which lie within the reservation.

In Pine Ridge village it proposes to create additional job opportunities. In the works are plans for a motel there, also a supermarket, a barber and beauty shop, a bakery, laundry, and restaurant. Virtually all reservation shopping is now done in Nebraska towns, at great inconvenience and travel costs.

SECRETARY McNAMARA DESERVES SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S BACKERS IN SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carry an attack by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] on the action of the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, in connection with the award of a contract for the so-called TFX all-purpose warplane to General Dynamics Corp.

I support the Secretary of Defense. In my opinion, the chief of any Government agency is entitled to a presumption that he acts in the public interest. The supporters of President Kennedy—and I count myself one—should be slow, indeed, to condemn Secretary of Defense McNamara for the decision he made in the TFX case. This is particularly true in the light of the vast experience of the Secretary in the field of procurement, both when he was a top executive of the Ford Motor Co. and since he has become Secretary of Defense.

I suggest that civilian control over the military is at stake in the TFX case. Our law and our practices require that the Secretary of Defense, not Air Force, or Navy officers, is entitled, in our democracy, to make the final decision in a case like the present one.

We should be constantly on guard against the efforts of the military-industrial complex in this country to force on us their views as to defense expenditures.

In my judgment, President Eisenhower was clearly right when he warned the country against the danger of domination by this powerful establishment. Mr. President, all the establishments in the world are not in the U.S. Senate; there are some outside it.

All of us are aware of service divisiveness. For years the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have tended to go their separate ways. Now the Secretary of Defense makes a decision which, in his opinion, will give us one all-purpose tactical warplane for the Navy and the Air Force, in the least time, at the least risk, and with the least cost. I, for one, will be slow, indeed, to disagree with him. From where I sit, it looks as though the Secretary is right.

Surely, he was correct in his instructions to his subordinates that the proposed plane should first, satisfy both the Navy and the Air Force that they would get a significantly improved warplane; second, provide minimum divergence from a one-plane concept; and, third, provide realistic cost estimates.

Secretary McNamara tells us that his decision will save the taxpayers $1 billion.

Even in a day when we are spending $1 billion a day for our defense program, this is a not insignificant sum. Secretary McNamara chose General Dynamics Corp. over the Boeing Co., because the latter company's proposal "simply did not meet the fundamental requirement of minum divergence from a common design" and, in the long run, would cost the taxpayers more money.

Mr. President, I hope the Presidential party in the Senate will rally behind the President's Secretary of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a very able news article, published yesterday in the Washington Post, under the byline of John G. Norris, outlining Secretary McNamara's stand before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

TFX AWARD BEST, MCNAMARA SAYS—DEFENDS CHOICE OF GENERAL DYNAMICS

(By John G. Norris)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara said yesterday that he had chosen General Dynamics Corp. to develop the all-purpose TFX warplane because he felt it could do the job in the least time, at the least risk and at the least cost.

He told Congress in a detailed statement that a purportedly lower bid by the rival Boeing Co. was based on unreliable cost estimates and, in effect, contemplated building two separate airplanes for the Air Force and Navy.

CITES $1 BILLION SAVING

McNamara made it very clear that throughout the long competition he had insisted on the Air Force and Navy developing one tactical fighter—suitable for land and carrier use with minimum changes—because it should save the Nation $1 billion.

Selection of the Boeing proposal, he said, would have evaporated the prospects of such a saving.

The Defense Secretary sent his lengthy chronicle of the TFX program to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee to be read by an aide. He had protested that the American people were getting a wrong and harmful impression of the matter and of Pentagon chiefs by the piecemeal evidence produced before the subcommittee.

DISCREPANCIES SEEN

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the group, issued a statement at the same time, declaring that there were discrepancies between McNamara's statement and other facts before the subcommittee, including an earlier Pentagon memorandum submitted for the record.

"Testimony of Defense Department witnesses," declared McClellan, "shows that the Government evaluated Boeing's design as superior in operational capacity in that it had a 1,100-mile greater ferry range, more than 50 percent greater weapon-carrying capability, and the ability to land at low speeds on carrier flight decks and short airstrips."

McClellan said McNamara will be called later for cross-examination on this, or evidence that the Boeing cost estimates were lower, and on some errors brought out about the cost estimates that the Secretary did not discuss.

At the same time, the Senate group released some earlier testimony given in a closed session by George Spangenberg, a Navy aircraft evaluation expert, who said that McNamara had dictated what the requirements for the TFX should be. He said the Navy feels the final TFX design is satisfactory, but declared that separate airplanes would be better for both services.

"We do not think that they fully meet the operational requirements initially established by the Navy, and we do not think they meet the combined requirements of the Air Force and the Navy," said Spangenberg. "And we know they do not meet the initial requirements established by the Secretary of Defense."

POORER PLANE SEEN

The many changes made in the designs submitted by both General Dynamics and Boeing over the long competition, the Navy evaluation expert said, will produce a "poorer" plane than the one originally demanded. Boeing's design comes closer to the original specifications, he added.

McNamara's statement conceded that Navy and Air Force officers always seek the "ultimate" in performance. But he said this does not take into consideration either the overall cost involved, or the risk of delays if advanced designs prove difficult to perfect.

"I decided to select General Dynamics as the development contractor," he declared, "since I concluded that it was best qualified to design the most effective airplane that could be produced at the least cost, in the least time, to meet our military requirements."

He added that "it should be unnecessary to add that no other considerations entered into my judgment."

The Defense Chief also stressed the fact that he was charged by the President to build the military forces required by the Nation, without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings, but that he also has been instructed to get such forces at the lowest possible cost.

TRIED TO CUT COSTS

In accordance with these instructions, McNamara said, he has been trying to cut the tremendous cost of developing new weapons by refusing to accept unrealistically optimistic cost estimates and two systems where one would do.

When he became Secretary 2 years ago, McNamara said, both the Air Force and Navy planned to develop a new tactical fighter plane. But, he went on, he became convinced that one such fighter could be developed that would meet both services' needs.

Most people in both services, he admitted, "said it couldn't be done," and even after 8 months of mutual discussions, reported to him in August 1961, that developing a single plane to meet the requirements of both "was not technically feasible."

McNamara said this attitude, "based on years of going separate ways," was "understandable" but not a "realistic approach" considering advances in technology. He declared he decided that it was feasible and so insisted over the next 14 months until the two services agreed on a single program.

A source selection board made up of people from both forces was created to review manufacturers' designs, assisted by a 235-man evaluation group of Air Force and Navy experts. Their successive recommendations were reviewed by the regular staffs and weapons commands of the services.

McNamara recounted in detail what the recommendations were at each level in four successive evaluations made of a series of design proposals submitted by the manufacturers.

His account made it plain that statements on Capitol Hill that on four separate occasions the evaluation board recommended Boeing were inaccurate. On the first go-around neither the Boeing plan nor General Dynamic proposal was found suitable, but the board did recommend that Boeing be allowed to go ahead alone with new "design definitions" because its ideas seemed more promising.

But the Air Force Systems Command proposed that both contractors come up with new studies and this was approved. New proposals were submitted April 2, 1962, but the Navy staff took the position, he said, that neither plane would suit its needs and recommended to Navy Secretary Fred Korth that the plan to develop a joint fighter be abandoned.

NEW PROPOSALS ASKED

However, this was rejected and new proposals called for. This time, Navy evaluation experts again ruled that neither met Navy needs. But both Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, recommended that Boeing alone be allowed to come up with new designs.

At this point, McNamara said, he concluded that not only were neither contractors meeting Navy requirements, but that his "primary goal" of developing one airplane was "not accepted or not fully understood" by the Navy and Air Force.

Therefore, for the fourth and last design proposal, Boeing and General Dynamics were given firm new instructions of what was wanted. They must:

Satisfy both the Navy and Air Force that they would get a "significantly" improved plane.

Provide "minimum divergence" from the one-airplane concept.

Provide realistic cost estimates.

When the fourth evaluation report was presented, approved by LeMay and Anderson, McNamara said, both the General Dynamics and Boeing designs were held to be "acceptable" with some further development. But, the Secretary added, the report "did not choose as between the contractors" because the advantages and disadvantages of each came out "very close."

His own review of the proposals, McNamara said, convinced him that the Boeing proposal was far inferior to General Dynamics on the second and third criteria he had laid down.

FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENT

"Boeing simply did not meet the fundamental requirement of minimum divergence from a common design," he declared. "No amount of peripheral technical argument should be permitted to obscure this central and crucial fact."

Boeing was still proposing what amounted to two airplanes, the Secretary said.

Furthermore, the Boeing plan called for some "technically risky" innovations in design to achieve better performance, including the use of titanium and untried engine thrust reversers to slow down in flight or in landing. The General Dynamics proposal, he said, followed more conventional lines.

While the new Boeing features were not "insuperable obstacles," McNamara said, they introduced problems that the company's cost estimates and development schedule did not allow for.

He said that Boeing, experienced only in building big bombers and transports, "simply did not understand the complexities" of supersonic fighters, as did General Dynamics and its affiliate, Grumman, long time fighter manufacturers.

In deciding the issue, McNamara concluded, he had to "balance the promises held out by competing contractors, against the hopes and aspirations of military officers and the limiting realities of economics and technology."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Although at one time when I served on the Armed Services Committee, I undertook to find out something about defense costs, I know nothing whatever about the technical facts in dispute between the Boeing Co. and the General Dynamics Corp. I do believe, however, that we should recognize that whenever someone states what he bid on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, the bid is absolutely meaningless, because he does not have to produce the article for that amount. The actual cost would have to be estimated by the person responsible for negotiating this contract; and the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows that these cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts—different from a contract on which one bids a specific price—are mere estimates of the cost, and sometimes the estimate can be 100 percent wrong.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution.

SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it will be recalled that last year I placed in the Congressional Record a list of my financial holdings. I did so because I felt then, and I feel strongly now, that across the country there is widespread criticism of Senators, on the ground that too often we have a conflict of interest with respect to votes which we may be called upon to cast, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

A number of other Senators have also filed, for the public record, statements of their financial holdings. I commend them for doing so, and I hope the number will grow as time goes on.

Clearly, Mr. President, with respect to conflict of interest we impose on the executive branch higher standards than those we impose on ourselves. It may well be that in due course we should pass a conflict-of-interest law applying to ourselves and to the Members of the other body. But certainly a first step would be complete public disclosure of what our financial interests are, so that it may be determined whether, when we vote, we are violating the principle of a conflict-of-interest situation.

There have been a few changes in my list of holdings since my last statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I have brought it up to date; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I add the footnote that the oil royalties paid to me by the Humble Oil & Refining Co. on wells drilled on my family property in Louisiana are the principal source of my income outside my Senate salary.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, OF PENNSYLVANIA, JANUARY 1, 1963

COMMON STOCKS

American Telephone & Telegraph: 100 shares.

Armstrong Cork: 160 shares.

Avery Island, Inc.: 800 shares.

First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co.: 490 shares.

Franklin Life Insurance Co.: 55 shares.

Insurance Co. of North America: 100 shares.

International Business Machines: 19 shares.

Johns-Manville: 150 shares.

Oxford Paper Co.: 300 shares.

Pepsi-Cola Co.: 100 shares.

Rohm & Haas Co.: 91 shares.

Scott Paper Co.: 12 shares.

Sel-Rex Corp.: 100 shares.

PREFERRED STOCK

Newmont Mining Corp., 4-percent cumulative preferred: 150 shares.

BONDS

Allegh Co., Pennsylvania Peoples Rd. Bond: 15M.

Ambler jt. high school auth., Montgomery County, Pa.: 5M.

Bethlehem School Dist. Counties of Northampton & Lehigh: 2M.

City of Philadelphia, Pa., loan of July 8, 1929: 10M.

City of Philadelphia, Pa., loan of August 4, 1949: 15M.

City of Lebanon, Pa., 2.30 percent gen. obligation imp.: 10M.

Com. Pennsylvania Turnpike rev. ref. and ext. bonds: 4M.

Cumberland Co. inst. dist. gen. obl. series of 1959: 15M.

Gettysburg School Authority Adams County, Pa., sch. rev.: 5M.

Haverford twp. school dist. auth. Pennsylvania: 5M.

Pennsylvania State Public School Building Auth. 3½ percent: 5M.

Radnor twp. school dist. auth., Delaware County, Pa.: 5M.

State hwy and bridge auth. of Com. Pennsylvania 2½ percent: 10M.

State hwy. and bridge auth. of Com. Pennsylvania 3½ percent: 10M.

West Coshen sewer auth. Pennsylvania 3 percent: 5M.

MISCELLANEOUS

Bayhil fund.

Oil royalties paid by Humble Oil & Refining Co. on wells drilled on Clark family property at Avery Island, La.

POPULATION GROWTH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it has often been said that the two most critical problems confronting the world today are the imminent danger, in which we live, of having our civilization destroyed by a nuclear holocaust resulting from war between the United States and Soviet Russia. This is the first problem. The second is the undeniable fact that two out of every three human beings will go to bed hungry tonight. The latter fact places in high order of priority the problem of population control. This is a controversial subject and one on which, in my opinion, our Government has been slow to speak out.

However, I have before me two statements made earlier this year, before the United Nations, by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II of the United Nations—that is to say, the Economic and Financial Committee—during the course of the debate on the item "Population growth and economic development." I believe these statements indicate a somewhat new policy on behalf of the United States in this controversial area. I commend our Government for moving forward in this area; and I commend Mr. Gardner, as our spokesman.

I call particular attention to the summary of the U.S. policy which appears near the end of the first statement; and I ask unanimous consent that the two statements and the summary be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements and the summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION GROWTH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Following are two statements made by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II (Economic and Financial) during debate on the item "Population growth and economic development," together with the text of a resolution adopted in plenary session on December 18.)

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 10

The United States welcomes the initiative of the cosponsors of the resolution now before us[1] in drawing further attention to the subject of population growth and its relation to economic development. This is a subject of transcendent importance for the United Nations and all its members.

There are today some 3 billion people in the world. It required hundreds of thousands of years, from the beginning of life on earth to the beginning of this century to reach 1½ billion. Within the last 60 years we have doubled that number. According to United Nations estimates we will double that number again to 6 billion by the end of this century.

It is obvious from these statistics that the world's population is not merely growing in absolute numbers. The rate of population growth has increased at an extraordinary pace. The annual growth rate has doubled from 1 percent in 1945—itself an unprecedented high in world history—to 2 percent today. It is expected to go even higher. But even if the present rate of growth of world population is maintained at its present level, the numbers we have to contemplate are staggering.

Whether the growth of world population continues at its present rate, whether a reduction in that rate is brought about by increases in the death rate or decreases in the birth rate, and whether, to reduce the birth rate, measures are found which are consistent with the economic, cultural, ethical, and religious circumstances of the members of the United Nations—these are all questions of paramount importance.

The resolution before us is entitled "Population Growth and Economic Development." The United States agrees with the sponsors of this resolution that the impact of population growth on economic development and of economic development on population growth is a subject deserving of increased attention. Our governments are pledged under articles 55 and 56 of the charter to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations—including higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

In the opinion of my Government progress toward these high aims of the United Nations Charter cannot be measured merely by increases in gross national product. The object of economic development is the welfare and dignity of the individual human being. We must concern ourselves, not with aggregate statistics, but with progress made in assuring each person a full and satisfactory life—adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, and also satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

If the condition of the individual, and not gross statistics, is to be the measure of our progress, then it is absolutely essential that we be concerned with population trends. Population changes are one of the most important single factors determining our progress or lack of progress toward the high aims of the United Nations Charter. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life we have no choice but to be concerned with the quantity of life.

Experience of California

We believe these statements are true not just for some but for all nations. My own country, blessed though it is with abundant resources and high living standards, recognizes the fundamental importance of the population factor in its efforts at economic and social development.

Within the United States our local, State, and Federal governments are all devoting attention to population trends as part of their planning for the improvement of individual welfare. This is true in areas of great wealth as well as in areas less fortunately endowed. For example, California, a region which has one of the highest living standards in the entire world, has been obliged to pay increasing attention to population trends. The total population of the State, now something over 17 million, is increasing at an average annual rate of about 3.8 percent. It has approximately doubled its population every 20 years over the past century. About 60 percent of the present growth results from migrations; natural increase adds almost 250,000 new residents annually out of the total annual growth of about 600,000 persons.

Three aspects of California's rapid population growth are shared with other regions of the United States and with other countries of the world. First, it involves large-scale internal migration—the movement of about a third of a million people annually from other parts of the Nation—rather than international migration. Second, population gains are concentrated in the urban areas, which account for about 90 percent of the growth, so that 86.4 percent of the State population was reported as urban in the 1960 census. Third, the high growth rate has posed many problems for government—the need for more schools, highways, and hospitals, for example, must be considered in terms of the ability to finance construction and operation—and there must be more jobs to provide employment needed to support the new residents.

---

[1] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657 and L.709.

Faced with these problems, the State government has turned to the analysis of its current population and projected gains as a basis for planning its programs for action. It is also examining the social and economic implications of rapid growth rates in order to employ its human and material resources most effectively in the future. Because an adequate water supply is vital to continued growth, the State is engaged in a multibillion-dollar project of dams, reservoirs, and canals, the largest State-financed water project ever undertaken in the United States. A master plan for higher education has been prepared and accepted, and planning for highway needs over the next two decades is well advanced. And a comprehensive study of the economic basis for future growth and development is now underway.

The California experience demonstrates the importance of continued study and analysis of population growth at every level of economic development. The population of the United States as a whole is growing at about 1.7 percent a year—somewhat below the world average—with no foreseeable end in sight. We have come to recognize that this growth has both advantages and disadvantages and that we cannot fail to take account of it in seeking a better life for our citizens, specifically in planning for such things as medical care, education, conservation of natural resources, recreation areas, public housing, and urban transportation.

Population problems of developing countries

Population trends are clearly important for high-income countries in the advanced stages of economic development. As many speakers in this debate have already indicated, population questions may be even more significant for countries in an earlier stage of economic development.

There are at least two reasons why this is so:

In the the first place, the rate of population growth in a great many less developed countries is much higher than in developed countries—about 70 percent higher on the average. In many less developed countries the rate of population growth exceeds 3 percent a year. About 80 percent of the one-half-billion growth in world population in the last decade took place in the less developed areas. In the years ahead the highest rates of growth will continue to be in these areas. It is estimated, for example, that, if present rates of growth were to continue, between now and the year 2000 the population of North America would grow from 200 to 300 million, while the population of South and Middle America would grow from some 200 to 600 million.

This extraordinary differential in the rates of growth between more developed and less developed countries reflects some important differences in historical experience. In the countries that are now more developed the effect of improved medical and public-health services came only gradually over many years, while in the case of the newly developing countries these services have recently developed very rapidly with decisive and overwhelming impact. Furthermore, the gradual effect of improved health services in the case of more developed countries came simultaneously with industrialization and rapidly rising living standards which tended to reduce the birth rate and slow the rate of population growth. However, in the case of the newly developing countries, modern medicine and public health have not only hit all at once; they have hit before industrialization and rising living standards have had the effect—as has been the case in many countries—of reducing the rate of population growth.

Thus, while all countries are concerned with population trends, the population problems of the newly developing countries are of a new and different order from those encountered now or in the past by the more developed countries. For there is little immediate prospect that the factors which reduced the rate of population growth in developed regions such as Europe will take effect in the less developed countries in the immediate future.

In the second place, rapid population growth is obviously of greater concern to countries in an earlier stage of economic development. The problem for developed countries is to increase already relatively high per capita income levels and to devote increasing portions of already large national savings to services such as medical care, health, and housing. But less developed countries whose economy is at the subsistence level may be able to save little or nothing at existing income levels for improvements in social infrastructure.

It is all many of the developing countries can do to enlarge the total economic product as fast as the added people. Yet they have not merely to provide additional facilities for increased population but to create new and adequate facilities for the existing population as well.

For newly developing countries the problem of population growth is not, as some people think, the problem of avoiding starvation or finding standing room. It is the problem of finding sufficient savings after current consumption needs are met to assure a tolerable rate of progress toward modernization and higher standards of living based on self-sustaining economic growth. In some of the world's poorest areas population increase is outpacing the increase in gross national product. As a result there are no resources available for capital formation and no increases in living standards. The prospect is for more and more people to share less and less income.

Just 1 year ago the General Assembly set as its goal for the United Nations Development Decade the attainment by 1970 of an annual growth rate of 5 percent a year in aggregate national income in each of the developing countries. The achievement of this goal will require enormous efforts. It has been estimated that in the decade of the 1950's the developing countries overall had a growth rate of 3 percent a year and a population growth of 2 percent a year, with annual per capita increases in income of 1 percent a year. Making the generally accepted assumption of a capital-output ratio of 3 to 1, these countries will have to increase their savings and investment from 9 to 15 percent in order to achieve the goals of the Development Decade. This is obviously a formidable task at present levels of population growth.

Assuming that the goals of the Development Decade are achieved, prospective increases in population will greatly dilute the impact of overall increases in income on individual levels of welfare. For example, gradual progress toward the 5 percent annual growth goal during the Development Decade would by the end of this decade increase a $100 per capita income to $123 in a country with a 2 percent rate of population growth and to $111 in a country with a 3 percent rate of population growth.

Obviously there is much that we do not know about the relationship of population trends to economic and social development. But from an examination of these and other facts one conclusion seems inescapable—that in certain less-developed countries it may be virtually impossible at the present time, even with maximum external assistance and maximum self-help, to bring about a rate of economic growth which will provide the rate of improvement in individual living standards which the country seeks to attain and which, more fundamentally, is essential to the exercise of the individual's human faculties.

Summary of U.S. policy

These are facts which the members of the United Nations must take into account in considering the subject now before us. Let me turn now from these facts to define the policies of my Government on this important question. I can summarize these policies as follows:

1. The United States is concerned about the social consequences of its own population trends and is devoting attention to them.

2. The United States wants to know more, and help others to know more, about population trends in less developed countries where present levels of population growth may constitute a major obstacle to the realization of goals of human economic and social development.

3. The United States would oppose any effort to dictate to any country the means to be employed in dealing with its population problem. The population policy of any country must be determined by that country and that country alone.

4. While the United States will not suggest to any other government what its attitudes or policies should be as they relate to population or the adoption of specific measures in its implementation, the United States believes that obstacles should not be placed in the way of other governments which, in the light of their own economic needs and cultural and religious values, seek solutions to their population problems. While we will not advocate any specific policy regarding population growth to another country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems.

5. The United States believes that there is a great need for additional knowledge on population matters. There is a need for more information about the actual size and composition of existing populations and about future population trends—and both private organizations and governments as well as international organizations can help to provide it. There is a need for more facts about alternative methods of family planning that are consistent with different economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances. There is a need for more facts about the impact of economic and social development on population trends and of population trends on economic and social development.

6. The United States believes that the United Nations and its affiliated agencies can have a significant role to play in the population field. My Government has actively supported the demographic work of the United Nations from the very early days of the organization and wishes to commend particularly the Population Commission, the Population Branch of the Bureau of Social Affairs, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Economic Commission for Africa, and the Regional Demographic Research and Training Centers for their excellent work. It is the hope of the United States that these valuable efforts will be substantially expanded.

Role of the United Nations

Let me close with more specific observations about the role of the United Nations. The United States believes that member countries should be able to obtain from the United Nations and its agencies such assistance as they may need and request in connection with their efforts to deal with their population problems. We believe that the United Nations should focus its efforts on three areas: first, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; second, the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and third, the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

In the area of demographic information there is much that remains to be done. The demographic section of the Secretariat was downgraded from a division to a branch in the Secretary-General's 1955 reorganization and its staff substantially reduced. It is time to consider whether the resources being devoted to this subject in the Secretariat are adequate to the needs. We should also consider ways to strengthen the demographic staffs of the regional economic commissions. The commissions are in a particularly good position to extend effective assistance to member governments in the context of the problems of particular regions.

In the field of demographic training much more should be done to train nationals of member governments so that they may acquire the demographic information on which to base sound economic plans. This would include the training of people in census taking, in the making of population projections, and in analyzing the economic and social consequences of demographic statistics. We welcome the establishment by the United Nations of regional demographic research and training centers in Bombay, Santiago, and Cairo and would support the establishment of further centers if they were desired by the countries concerned.

In the field of discussion the United States will continue to play an active role in the work of the Population Commission and the regional commissions of the United Nations. Moreover we look forward with great interest to the Asian population conference scheduled for 1963 and the world population conference later on.

With experience in these forms of collaboration, the needs of individual countries and the present and potential resources of the United Nations would become better known and future collaboration more fruitful.

These, in sum, are the views of the United States on population growth and economic development. We consider the resolution now before the committee to be broadly consistent with these views. We are, accordingly, prepared to give it our support.

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 13

The United States wishes to explain its affirmative votes on the first and second amendments submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain.[2] In our view these amendments did not constitute significant changes in the substance of the resolution, and we have supported them in the interest of accommodating the views of the widest possible number of members.

The United States also wishes to explain its abstaining vote on the third amendment submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain to delete operative paragraph 6 of the resolution on population growth and economic development.

In the opinion of the United States, operative paragraph 6 does not add or subtract from the authority which the United Nations already possesses as a result of resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council concerning the granting of technical assistance upon request to member nations. In our view, the paragraph is therefore superfluous.

While the United States believes that the authority to lend technical assistance in all aspects of population problems already exists, we also believe, as I stated earlier in the general debate, that assistance by the United Nations should emphasize those three areas in which there appears to be broad agreement among members, namely, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

It was in the light of these considerations that the United States decided to abstain on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States wishes to explain its votes on the various parts of operative paragraph 6 of the resolution. The United States voted for the phrase "as well as other aspects" because it believes that the United Nations should assist members who wish help in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies in all aspects of their economic and social development. The United States abstained on the phrase "and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by governments, for national projects and programs dealing with the problems of population" for the same reasons it abstained on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States voted for the resolution as a whole because of the importance we attach to the relation between population growth and economic development and because we regard the resolution as broadly consistent with the views of the United States as put forward in our intervention during the general debate.

The text of the resolution[3] follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that rapid economic and social progress in the developing countries is dependent, not the least, upon the ability of these countries to provide their peoples with education, a fair standard of living and the possibility for productive work,

"Considering further that economic and social development and population policies are closely interrelated and may be carried out simultaneously to secure maximum benefits,

"Recognizing that the health and welfare of the family is of paramount importance, not only for obvious humanitarian reasons, but also with regard to economic development and social progress, and that the health and welfare of the family require special attention in areas with a relatively high rate of population growth,

"Recognizing further that it is the responsibility of each Government to decide its own policies and devise its own programmes of action for dealing with the problems of population and economic and social progress,

"Reminding States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies that according to recent census results the effective population increase during the last decade has been particularly high in many low-income less developed countries,

"Reminding Member States that in formulating their economic and social policies it is useful to take into account the latest relevant facts on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development and that the forthcoming World Population Conference and the Asian Population Conference might throw new light on the importance of this problem, especially for the developing countries,

"Recalling General Assembly resolution 1217 (XII), which, inter alia, invites Member States, particularly the developing countries, to follow as closely as possible the interrelationships existing between economic and population changes, and requests the Secretary-General to ensure the coordination of the activities of the United Nations in the demographic and economic fields,

"Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 820 (XXXI) which contains provisions aiming at intensified efforts to ensure international cooperation in the evaluation, analysis, and utilization of population census results and related data, particularly in the less developed countries, and which requests the Secretary-General to explore the possibilities of increasing the amounts of technical assistance funds which may be made available for these activities,

"Recognizing that further studies and research are necessary to fill the gaps in our knowledge about the causes and consequences of demographic trends, particularly in the less developed countries,

"Recognizing that removals of large national groups to other countries may give rise to ethnical, political, emotional and economic difficulties,

"1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Acting Secretary-General, entitled "The United Nations Development Decade, Proposals for Action"[4] which, inter alia, refers to the interrelationship between population growth and economic and social development;

"2. Expresses its appreciation of the work on population problems which has up to now been carried out under the guidance of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to conduct an inquiry among the Governments of States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes;

"4. Recommends that the Economic and Social Council in co-operation with the specialized agencies, the regional economic commissions and the Population Commission, and taking into account the results of the inquiry referred to in paragraph 3 above, intensify its studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities within the framework of their general development programmes;

"5. Further recommends that the Economic and Social Council report on its findings to the General Assembly not later than at its nineteenth session;

"6. Endorses the view of the Population Commission[5] that the United Nations should encourage and assist the Governments, especially of the less developed countries, in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects, as well as other aspects, of their economic and social development problems;

"7. Recommends that the second World Population Conference pay special attention to the interrelationships of population growth with economic and social development, particularly in countries that are less developed, and that efforts be made to obtain the fullest possible participation in the Conference by experts from such countries."

TENNESSEE RIVER BASIN WATER POLLUTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Hon. Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee, delivered a very able address in Nashville, Tenn., on March 4, 1963, on the occasion of the meeting of the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Compact. The Governor spoke of the problems arising from the pollution of our streams. His able analysis and treatment of the subject is of sufficient significance that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that many more people may read his remarks.

---

[2] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.709/Rev. 2.

[3] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657, as revised; adopted in plenary session on Dec. 18 by a vote of 69 (U.S.) to 0, with 27 abstentions. In a separate vote (34 to 34, with 32 abstentions (U.S.)) the following phrase was deleted at the end of operative paragraph 6: "* * * and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by Governments, for national projects and programmes dealing with the problems of population."

[4] U.N. doc. E/3613.

[5] U.N. doc. E/3451, paragraph 15.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. FRANK G. CLEMENT

It is my privilege and pleasure as Governor of the host State to extend greetings and a warm welcome to the distinguished representatives of our sister States who have convened with us here in Nashville for the purpose of organizing and initiating the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission.

Within our time the Tennessee River has become known throughout the world if for no other reason as the river which is the scene of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

With the control of water in the main channel of the Tennessee and the development of adjacent lands and resources of the basin, changes have taken place which scarcely could have been imagined 25 or 30 years ago.

The magnitude of these changes almost tax the ability to comprehend. Freight movements on the Tennessee rose from 32 million ton-miles in 1933 to nearly 2½ billion ton-miles per year at the present time.

Private investment in Tennessee River waterfront industrial plants and terminals has amounted to about $875 million since 1933.

These factors contributed to the rise in personal income within the Tennessee Valley region which is today nine times as great as it was in 1933 and the rate of increase has far outdistanced the growth of the Nation in general.

Much or most of this spectacular growth is based, in one way or another, on the waters of the Tennessee and its tributaries.

In the future, economic growth is going to depend to a greater degree, rather than a lesser degree, on the availability of water and the quality of that water.

Almost every branch of manufacturing activity today uses more water than it did a few years or a few decades ago.

Also, as new products and new processes are developed the quality of water necessary to make them successful becomes more important and purification processes necessary to rid the water of pollutants become more expensive and exacting.

While the industrial growth was taking place along the Tennessee still other things were happening involving a great many people and the public interest generally.

The people turned to these manmade lakes and to the controlled-flow streams of the tributaries to enjoy the great new recreation resource.

Today there are 13 State parks located on the lakes of the Tennessee River system.

Supplementing these are 33 county parks and 32 municipal parks.

In less elaborate, more decentralized and convenient locations are 413 public access areas where the people without cost or obstacle can have access to the lakes, may launch their boats, spread their picnic lunches, and enjoy the waterfront.

In addition, there are wildlife refuges, national parks, national forests, many camps and clubs located on the lakes and literally thousands of residences bearing some relation to the lakes.

The investment in recreation facilities along the shore of the lakes on the Tennessee and its tributaries now represents approximately $150 million.

The use of the recreation facilities has grown tremendously—presently representing 50-million visitor-days a year and if the waters remain usable, this visitation may double or triple in the next 10 or 15 years.

Perhaps I should emphasize what I have just said—"if the waters remain usable."

We have no desire to see the dead hand of pollution strangle either the industrial or the recreation use of these waters so precious to our several States.

Both uses are needed for the full development of our economy and for the enjoyment of our people.

Both industrial and recreational uses can continue to grow if pollution is controlled and the water is always left in good condition satisfactory for the reasonable use of the next downstream user.

We are happy to announce that during the past 15 years—a period of unprecedented industrial development and urban population growth in Tennessee—we have actually achieved a net reduction in the amount of pollution going into the surface waters of this State.

This means that the people of this State have actually improved the quality of the water leaving Tennessee, near Chattanooga, and flowing into and across northern Alabama and becoming part of the water resources of Alabama and Mississippi.

Similarly, the waters flowing out of Tennessee and across western Kentucky, in Kentucky Lake, are improved or are less hazardous than was the case 15 years ago.

It is our intention that this process shall continue and it is our determination that our actions and pollution arising in this State will not contaminate and render unusable the waters which we are exporting in our streams to our neighboring States.

But we cannot do the job alone.

We are conscious of the sovereignty of the State of Tennessee.

In such a posture we can do no other than respect the sovereignty of other States.

We cannot, and we do not wish to, exercise controls within the boundaries of other States.

However, water obeys the law of gravity and flows downhill without regard to State lines and the territories of the several States.

If we at some future date poured hurtful pollution onto our neighboring States they, under present circumstances, would have scant hope of relief except through appeal to the Federal Government for assistance.

This course of action we do not relish, for this inevitably undermines the sovereignty and the responsibility of the several States and yields to the central government still another area of responsibility which it is not necessary that we yield.

The way is still open for cooperation among the seven States represented in the Tennessee watershed.

This program of cooperation can be effectively and predictably carried out through the channels of an interstate compact.

Beginning almost 10 years ago, the then Governors of these seven States appointed delegates to meet together and to work out the draft of a mutually acceptable and thoroughly workable interstate compact. Tennessee was proud to ratify that compact in 1955, thus, placing this State on record as ready to engage responsibly in a joint effort with neighboring States in controlling pollution in the Tennessee and its tributaries.

As their respective legislatures met Mississippi and Kentucky added their ratification actions.

The consent of Congress was given in Public Law 85–734.

We are now assembled to organize the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission which will be made up of the appropriate delegation of three members from each of the ratified States selected in the manner prescribed in each State by its act of ratification.

We are pleased that representatives of other eligible States are present on this occasion so that they may add their voices in an advisory capacity and thus help in launching a course of action in which they have confidence and will, we hope, soon participate officially.

We recognize that there have been legal or procedural obstacles in the way of ratification by some of the eligible States, at least until recently.

We trust that these have been or will be overcome and we look forward to early ratification by all of the States and anticipate a truly joint regional effort in this great undertaking.

OIL STACKS PRESIDENTIAL SURVEY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the actions of some of the leading administrators in the Federal Government relating to the oil industry. Before I start, I wish to make it clear that I have the greatest respect and admiration for those in the oil industry. They have made a contribution to our society and Nation—a contribution in terms of our economy, employment, and standard of living. In no sense should the remarks that I make be deemed as critical of the hundreds of thousands of fine people in that great and important industry.

At the same time, I think it is appropriate to place the subject in context and point out that there is no industry which has greater political power, greater influence and, at times, dominating influence than the oil industry has.

Perhaps most conspicuous and most frequently discussed is the tax power the industry has and the tax favoritism which it enjoys. Of course, the industry does develop and exploit a national resource. Much of that resource is on federally owned land. Some of it is on State land. In addition, the industry has vast international influence. In the past some distinguished Senators have pointed out that in at least one administration, and I suspect in many, whenever the oil industry caught cold, the administration sneezed.

The oil industry has a great influence throughout America in education, with newspapers, and with many service organizations of various kinds.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR OIL PUBLIC RELATIONS

The API, an important trade organization in the industry, has estimated that the industry has spent about $50 million a year in public relations. The industry influences the Government in many ways. One is through political contributions. In my own State of Wisconsin, I doubt if we produce a gallon of oil. Yet it is usual for candidates for Federal office, at least, to show contributions from leading figures in the oil industry from Texas, California, and many other States.

Few people realize that this is such a vast and profitable industry that its members actually operate—or at least did in 1953, the most recent year for which figures are available—more aircraft than all the airlines do. They use the aircraft in many ways. For example, in the State which I represent, aircraft are used to transport political figures. It is a very flattering gesture and service on the part of members of that industry.

Usually the oil industry gets what it wants; and, in the judgment of many people, sometimes what oil wants is not in the public interest.

OIL NAMES GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS

The fundamental way in which the oil industry has achieved its aims is not merely through getting the legislators it wants—although it is quite successful in that regard—but in influencing appointments to top policymaking positions in our Government.

One conspicuous recent example is that of a very able and distinguished man who is now Governor of a great State. John Connally was appointed Secretary of the Navy at a time when he was executor of one of the largest private oil estates in the world. Of course, the Navy buys all the oil for all the armed services. That position is a position of great influence and benefit for the oil industry.

Another example was the appointment of Lawrence O'Connor, confirmation of which I also opposed. Mr. O'Connor spent his lifetime in the oil industry and was the first oil lobbyist in history appointed to the Federal Power Commission, which, of course, has great power and influence over the kind of prices the oil industry can charge.

One appointment which I felt particularly strong about and protested vigorously on the floor of the Senate was that of John M. Kelly. It is about John Kelly that I wish to speak briefly today. John Kelly was appointed 2 years ago as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals. In that capacity he supervises the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Oil Import Administration, the Office of Mineral Exploration, the Office of Oil and Gas, and the Office of Geography.

Also in this connection I want to discuss the policies and actions of Jerome O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien was appointed the head of the Office of Oil and Gas. In this capacity he does the following:

He provides staff advice and assistance to the Assistant Secretary in the development, coordination, and management of oil and gas programs and functions which are assigned to the Department by the President or by the Congress.

Secondly, Mr. O'Brien provides leadership in obtaining coordination and unification of oil and gas policies and related administrative activities of all Federal agencies, and he enlists their cooperation to assure adequate development, distribution, and utilization of petroleum and gas resources and facilities to meet civilian, industrial, and military requirements in time of peace or national emergency.

In the third place, Mr. O'Brien serves as the principal channel of communication between the Federal Government and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, State regulatory bodies, and the petroleum and gas industries.

Both Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Kelly have long, long records—virtually lifetime records—in the oil industry.

PRO-OIL FIX

What I should like to discuss this afternoon is the action on the part of Mr. Kelly and Mr. O'Brien which I would term to be action to perpetrate a "pro-oil fix" of a Presidentially requested oil survey. I refer to the Interior Department's representation on a study to be made jointly with the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which is made up of representatives of oil-producing States.

Secretary Kelly held millions of dollars worth of oil properties, at the time of his appointment and even after he was appointed to his position to be a public referee over the Nation's oil and gas programs.

This statement was contested yesterday, apparently by those associated with Mr. Kelly, and the Washington Post this morning indicated that Mr. Kelly had disposed of his oil holdings. This was an issue which came up at the time Mr. Kelly was appointed. I discussed that on the floor at the time, and I pointed out that the disposition of the oil holdings by Mr. Kelly was not as it might seem.

In his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, before appointment, Mr. Kelly said:

> I will sell all my stockholdings in oil and mining companies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In regard to any Federal leases, wells on Federal lands, overrides and payments, I will set up a trust and transfer all such interests to a trustee who will sell all such interests. Any such interests which the trustee has been unable to sell he will convey to the Elk Oil Co.
>
> I will resign as president of the Elk Oil Co. and make an irrevocable gift to my minor children of all the stock that I own in this company pursuant to the Gift to Minors Act of New Mexico.
>
> I intend to maintain my current operations on State and fee lands.

It was on the basis of this statement that members of the committee seemed to conclude that Mr. Kelly had disposed of his oil holdings and that there was no conflict of interest. Technically, there was none. Technically, Mr. Kelly complied with the law. He complied with the precise requirements in the law. He disposed of his holdings of properties and interests on Federal lands.

Of course, in his position as Assistant Secretary of the Interior, he would have direct jurisdiction over the Federal lands.

What he held on to is quite interesting. Later in his testimony before the committee he said:

> Senator, I do not believe that I will continue to operate my properties. I do not intend to continue to operate my properties. I will hold ownership of them. But the actual operations would be carried on by other people.

He also said:

> I am divesting myself of probably 50 percent or better of my properties in order to place myself in the position in which I feel that I can assume the duties of my office with complete impartiality toward the decisions that I might make as Assistant Secretary. As you understand, I operate as an individual——

And so forth.

Mr. President, if Mr. Kelly was disposing of 50 percent of his holdings, and they were described in the hearings as being very great, for Mr. Kelly held millions of dollars worth of property—he was obviously holding on to 50 percent of his holdings, or nearly 50 percent of his holdings. He still owns oil land. He still has an interest in the oil industry amounting to millions of dollars.

While this may not be a direct and immediate legal conflict, I submit the fact is that he is still involved, or that he was at the time of his nomination. There has been no evidence whatsoever that, after making the statement to the committee, he subsequently divested himself of any of his holdings. It seems he is still involved in substantial oil holdings.

Mr. President, Mr. Jerome O'Brien, who became Kelly's prime assistant on oil matters, came to the job from the vice presidency of the Humble Oil Co. and a lifetime in the oil industry. I feel now—as I felt at the time that these appointments of pro-oil men were made—that they put the American consumer at a gross disadvantage.

HOW OIL INDUSTRY IS "CASHING IN"

Now the oil industry is really cashing in. The most powerful special interest group in Government—the oil crowd—is making sure that the findings of this oil survey, which is an oil survey requested by the President of the United States, will be in its interest.

In a memorandum written by Allen Calvert, Jr., a member of the Interstate Compact Commission, reporting on a conversation with Secretary Kelly and O'Brien, it is clear that this oil duo is intent on confining the Interior Department's representation in the oil survey largely to themselves.

In addition, Secretary Kelly would load the Compact Commission—which is supposed to be making the investigation—with men like Texas Gov. John Connally, described by Secretary Kelly as "primarily from the oil industry." He is indeed. In fact, he is executor of one of the largest private oil estates in the world. He gets a very large proportion of his income—almost all of his income—from this estate.

The Calvert memo reveals the arrogant contempt Secretary Kelly feels toward the Interior Department career officials not connected with the oil industry. Secretary Kelly characterizes these officials as "Red-Hot Bureaucrats."

Why? Because, as might be expected, they have a far different view of Federal responsibility toward the oil industry from that of Secretary Kelly or Mr. O'Brien.

Secretary Kelly's conduct should be a supreme example to the Senate of the vital importance of insisting on an absence of conflict of interest as a prime prerequisite in approving Presidential nominations.

Mr. President, I wish to read and discuss the memorandum which brought to the attention of the country the plans and programs of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for the oil industry.

THE CALVERT MEMORANDUM

This is a memorandum written by Mr. Allen Calvert, Jr., the Oklahoma representative on the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. These are Mr. Calvert's notes of the conference with Assistant Secretary John Kelly and Jerome O'Brien in their offices in Washington on February 12—in other words, notes concerning his conversation with the two men in the top policy positions in our Government dealing with the oil industry.

This memorandum has been published in the "Oil Daily." The memorandum has been attacked. To some extent it has been disowned. But I think that the frankness and straightforwardness of this memorandum speaks for itself.

Without implying any hidden, ulterior motives or Machiavellian attitudes on the part of anyone, it seems to me it is very difficult to read this memorandum, which has been published, without recognizing what Mr. Kelly and Mr. O'Brien are up to.

The memorandum is a brief memorandum, and I will read the text of it:

> On this date Lawrence Alley, executive secretary of Interstate Compact, and I called upon Messrs. Kelly and O'Brien as a follow-up to a request made by Governor Welsh, chairman of the Interstate Compact, at the executive committee meeting held Monday, February 4, in Oklahoma City.
>
> Governor Welsh had taken note of John Kelly's inability to meet with the compact on that date and had designated Mr. Alley and myself to determine the subject matter that had caused Mr. Kelly to make the appointment in the first place.
>
> Mr. Kelly commenced our interview with the statement that a year-end cabinet report or summary of various departments' activities had been presented to the President and that as a result thereof a directive from the President had been given to Mr. Kelly to implement a study of Federal-State relations as they pertained to oil and gas production and related matters.

In other words, this was a directive from the President, a Presidentially requested and directed survey.

Reading from the memorandum:

> Mr. Kelly further amplified the objectives as being an interest of his Department, of the President, and of the Government in making domestic oil as competitive as it possibly could be with foreign oil. He offered as one of the reasons from which the directive resulted the explanation that the domestic producers had gone to the Government for foreign import controls and that for that reason and others certain elements of the Government took the position and believed that they should know more as to what the various States were doing to bring uniformity to regulations, assure conservation, complying with the Connally hot oil act, etc. Mr. Kelly used, I believe, the term that there were some "red hot bureaucrats," chiefly career people, who had nurtured the idea—as we have always known—that the domestic production of oil and gas should be federally controlled or at least more than it is now.
>
> Mr. Kelly stressed that it was his intense desire to present these thoughts to the proper officials of the compact with as full an explanation as possible and with every precaution being taken so as not to cause alarm. He indicated that if a working group were jointly established that he thought that it should be small as to both sides and he inferred that he and Jerry O'Brien, his chief assistant, and other top level people in the Interior, if necessary—as opposed to career men—would represent their half of the group.

In other words, the position taken by Mr. Kelly at the conference was that the representation of the Interior Department should be primarily by himself, as one who had been in the oil industry all his life, who has heavy investments in the oil industry, and Mr. O'Brien, who was formerly with the Humble Oil Co., and a man who also had an oil industry viewpoint. The memorandum continues:

> After some discussion, Mr. Alley and I told them that we would report our conversation to Governor Welsh on the presumption that the matter would then be referred to members of the compact's executive committee for further consideration. In our discussion it was mutually assumed that Gov. Jack Campbell might have the most continuous cognizance and knowledge of activities which might be covered by such a study (rather than an investigation), however, Gov. John Connally also might have such knowledge, they both being primarily from the oil industry. Secretary Kelly stressed that he was not a hurry-up or haste-makes-waste man and that while he was under the stern directive to get started, he did not want the beginning to be of a character that would alarm people. He stated that he would await word from Governor Welsh and that some time after the first of March he would be available at the convenience of Governor Welsh either to visit him at Indianapolis or to confer with him in Washington preliminary to setting up the working group. He assumed that Governor Welsh would wish to process the suggestion with various parties to the compact and repeated that we should take all time necessary to do so. Mr. Alley and I did not compare our immediate reactions to the conference inasmuch as we both had traveling or other appointments, but Mr. Alley did comment to me that the conference results and purposes were much more important than he had assumed and despite his long background with the compact, I believe he was considerably surprised.

Before I read the last paragraph of the memorandum, let me say it is surprising that these gentlemen should be so concerned about the study of the Compact Commission. It is surprising that they felt that somehow, some way, it might be a threat to the oil industry; that if the so-called bureaucrats who had no financial interest in the oil industry, who were appointed for the public interest, and who had no ax to grind, were represented on the Commission, and it was viewed as an investigation commission, the oil industry might be in for some trouble. How sensitive Mr. Kelly is about what the Oil Compact Commission does; how it contributes to the economic advantage and profits of the oil industry; how, conversely, it might lead to higher prices for the consumer and, in the lack of competition, into a monopoly position, is disclosed in the second paragraph. I am again reading from the memorandum:

> Secretary Kelly, in referring to the bureaucrats, mentioned the fact that the Department of Justice had had many very critical reports of the compact and he further stated that an individual who represented the Department at the last executive committee meeting was one of those who was critical of the compact and would like more Federal intervention. This point is obviously pertinent and important in view of the necessity of renewing the compact's life every 4 years, such renewal being considered at this time by a bill introduced by U.S. Senator Clinton Anderson.

Mr. President, let us take a look at the compact and what the compact amounted to, what it did, what its responsibility has been, and what its influence has been.

What I have done is secure these reports from the Attorney General's office. I called the Attorney General's office and secured every report on the compact commission made by the Attorney General.

Before I discuss these reports, however, I want to read from an excellent book by Robert Engler in which he discusses the commission. Engler, frankly, has been a critic of the oil industry, but a scholarly critic. He has said this in his book:

> Nominally an organization of State officials, the commission is under the constant surveillance of the oil companies who have always recognized it as an instrument for forestalling Federal regulation. In past years oil companies have flown State members to the meetings, and the natural gas industry has footed banquet bills. The technique is more sophisticated today, although as usual the industry's vast private airplane fleet remains one of the significant ways the industry has for flattering and serving modestly paid political and administrative personnel at all levels.

SENATOR WHERRY'S CHARGES OF PRICE FIXING

Mr. President, when this commission was in its early operation, a distinguished Senator, now deceased, and a very conservative man, a man who was a great friend of American business and free enterprise, Kenneth Wherry, discussed the way the Commission operates and the way the oil industry operates, in very telling language, which I shall quote from briefly.

First, Mr. Engler said in his book:

> Potential oil States are fitted into this system by conservation (market demand) laws introduced even before oil is found. After the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, Republican, of Nebraska, never noted for his hostility to business investigated this entire operation, he suggested that the President should suspend the Connally Act because of its use to create shortage and maintain price. Concluded his Small Business Committee: "There is a mechanism controlling the production of crude oil to market demand that operates as smoothly as the finest watch."
>
> Currently much of big oil favors the use of State power to force recalcitrant producers to cooperate in the joint operation of fields. This has merit as a conservation measure.
>
> It also reveals oil's willingness to use Government coercion when convenient, raising intriguing questions as to the industry's presumed commitment to the competitive system. (In the early thirties, the head of Standard of New Jersey even proposed that the Government operate the flowing east Texas fields on a unitized basis.)
>
> The industry is always careful to supply appropriate agencies of the Federal Government with a steady stream of temporary suitable personnel.

ATTORNEY GENERAL IN 4-YEAR DEFAULT ON REPORT

When I talked to the Justice Department they gave me very shocking information this morning. They said that the Attorney General has been in default of the law for 4 years in failing to meet the requirement of annual reports of the interstate compact. In other words, since 1959 the Attorney General has not filed a single report, although the law requires him to file a report each year. The resolution as adopted in 1959 clearly required this annual report.

I asked the Justice Department why it had not complied with the law. The Justice Department, far from being critical of the oil compact or having an ax to grind said that the Department is in default because it is the feeling of the Department of Justice that the Compact Commission has not been an instrument of monopoly or price fixing; that, there is monopoly resulting from the power of, a few dominant companies which enjoy a vertically integrated domination, including pipeline control. This gives them the ability to fix prices.

They tell me that the reports were discontinued when Robert Bicks was head of the division. That was in the Eisenhower administration under Attorney General Rogers. No one has been on it since, and the reports have never been resumed.

Anyone who feels that these reports of the Attorney General might have been critical can get some idea of Mr. Kelly's ideas of criticism by considering a few excerpts from these reports. The very first report by the Attorney General said this:

> The ultimate purpose for which the report requirement was enacted seems clear: To provide the Congress with an informed judgment by the Attorney General on the competitive effects of the system by which oil production is regulated.
>
> That article of the compact states:
>
> "It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."
>
> In this article, the interstate agreement sets forth clearly the "* * * purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the physical waste thereof."
>
> Article V also undeniably embraces the additional purpose of opposing price stabilization or monopolization, although this purpose is stated indirectly by the express withholding of authority under the compact to achieve such ends.

Mr. President, Congress set this up because Congress was concerned with the very real possibility that in the guise of conservation and preventing improper exploitation, the compact commission might act to fix prices and raise profits of the oil industry and to penalize, of course, the consuming public.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator does recognize, does he not, that there is a real problem in the petroleum industry, in that production should not become in surplus to the extent that it exceeds the amount of aboveground storage for the production? After all, the oil is located in underground reservoirs, in the first instance. It will stay there for a thousand years or longer. If we take it above ground, it will evaporate, or, if we do not have enough storage facilities, there is no alternative but to have it in overflow tanks, and in that way eventually contaminate the streams.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I think it is absolutely right that with this kind of resource it is necessary to have some kind of regulation of production, the kind that Texas has, and the kind, I presume, that Louisiana has.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Louisiana has much better regulation than Texas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know that in Texas they regulate the oil flow so that at the present time they are pumping about 8 or 9 days a month, or have that amount of production.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Unfortunately, in Texas the production of oil is regulated by the railroad commissioners, and they, in turn, must run for office. Therefore in Texas a great number of wells, particularly the older wells—and I would hope not their better wells, but a great number of the wells—are not under any regulation at all, and they can produce as much as they can pump out.

In Louisiana every producing well is under control. It is only by control and prorating how much each producer can bring to the surface that any equitable way can be arranged so that the production will not completely exceed the market for the problem; not only exceed it, but greatly exceed the amount of storage available above ground.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is making my point very well. He is right; there has to be that kind of regulation. There has to be Government regulation. What I am saying is that this regulation should be dispassionate, objective regulation, in the public interest. It should not be guided primarily by people with a vested interest in the oil industry, or people who are motivated by their own holdings in the oil industry, and obviously are suspect of having an interest in maximizing profits in the oil industry, which might contradict the interest of the consumers and of all the citizens, who want to preserve a great resource.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The regulation in Louisiana is by the conservation commissioner. So far as I know, the conservation commissioner has no interest in oil production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure he does not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that State law may require that he should not have an interest in oil production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it should.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Generally speaking, however, these conservation commissioners in Louisiana have tended to favor the small producer as against the interest of the large producer. They have tended to favor the fellow who has a small well that might be able to produce only 8 or 10 barrels a day as against the larger wells, owned by large companies, that could produce, perhaps, 500 barrels a day without pumping.

As it is, Louisiana is entitled to about 10 percent of the market. I would imagine that Louisiana would produce a great deal more than that if we were permitted to produce to capacity. The difficulty is that it is completely within the capacity of the oil producers of Louisiana and of other States to greatly exceed the demands for the product in the country. Therefore, about the only way to pace production, so that it does not exceed the capacity to use and store, particularly above ground, is to regulate the rate at which it is produced.

I cannot see that there is any special interest involved here in working out some system in each State under which each State would undertake to keep its production at a certain percentage of its capacity to produce. I know of no other way it could be worked out, unless the Federal Government wanted to step into the field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And unless the Federal Government wanted to regulate a great many things which more logically is a local function.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe, as I continue, the Senator from Louisiana will see that the argument which I am making is not that such an arrangement is unnecessary or undesirable; but that this kind of regulation does involve some very serious problems as far as the oil consumer is concerned, and that the administration should be objective and should not be colored by those who have a vested interest in protecting only the private oil industry.

The industry needs protection, and very careful consideration. It should be protected. It is a vital industry. What I am trying to say is that that is exactly what the Attorney General did in a very dispassionate way. I think the Attorney General should be criticized for not having lived up to the letter of the law or for not coming to Congress and asking for relief, or for not filing a report, or not filing at least a pro forma report. He files no report at all.

As I proceed, the Senator will see how carefully the Attorney General approached this. I am not talking about the present Attorney General, but about the Attorney General in the Eisenhower administration. I am pointing out how carefully he approached this matter to make sure that no one would be harmed and no prejudice would result against the oil industry or against anyone in the oil industry. In the light of all this, criticism by Mr. Kelly of the Attorney General as being too zealous and too much interested in Government regulation, is, to me, very shocking

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has made some reference to the fact that a number of oil companies possess airplanes. Of course, he is correct in that statement. The oil industry does possess a large number of airplanes. I hope he will keep in mind that in many instances these planes are essential in the conduct of the oil industry's business.

I have in mind one company, for example, which is more in the construction of pipelines, than it is in the production of oil. They try to train each of their foremen to go to his job flying a little amphibious airplane. It is much cheaper to have the man at home at night and then fly a small airplane which can land on a lagoon or lake or canal in Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about it. The Senator is making an excellent correction of what I have said.

I think it is essential in the industry. It is a very useful tool which the industry employs for its technical work and exploration.

The point I wish to make and emphasize is that this is a vast, powerful, rich industry. I think the point is dramatized when we consider that it has more planes than all the airlines combined. I am sure that the planes are used overwhelmingly for immediate business purposes. But the fact is that they are also used to assist politicians. I have seen that practice followed in my State, and I know it is followed elsewhere.

This industry has an enormous interest in securing the right kind of representation in Washington, not only from the oil-producing States, but also from the nonoil-producing States. This is one of the instruments which it uses to assist, and I have called attention to it in passing. But certainly the Senator from Louisiana is correct in stating that that is not the main reason for maintaining so large a fleet of airplanes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The great majority of the planes to which the Senator is referring are small, light aircraft. Of course, there is a substantial number of executive planes; but I believe that most of the planes to which the Senator is referring are small light aircraft, designed to fly into hard-to-reach places, such as some of the locations in Louisiana which the planes reach on pontoons, where there is no road available to reach the place at all.

One of the big aircraft, such as a jet plane, probably costs more than the price of two or three hundred of the kinds of planes to which the Senator is, in part, referring. I am sure the Senator realizes that the great majority of the planes are very small ones.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the first report of the Attorney General, issued under the 1955 resolution:

> To read the words of the joint resolution at face value, with no regard to the long history of Congressional concern, would seem to limit inquiry to the conservation activity directly authorized and carried out "* * * under the provisions of the compact * * *," thereby apparently excluding any consideration of price stabilization or monopolization. Those problems, however, have been the Congress' chief concern.
>
> The purpose of the statute, as disclosed in the legislative history, is to secure a consideration by the Attorney General of the ultimate effect on the industry of the whole regulatory operation, in which the States, the Compact, and the Federal Government all play a part. The relevant legislative history includes not only consideration of this particular provision by Congress. It includes, as well, the long history of the part which the Congress has played in conservation of oil and gas, and the concern it has long displayed over the effects of conservation measures on competition in the petroleum industry.

The report goes on to say:

> When the compact was brought before the Congress for renewal in 1955, the Senate amended the consenting resolution. The amendment required an annual report by the Attorney General whether the activities of the States had "remained within the purpose of such compact," and whether such activities had "* * * resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation of perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production of oil or gas * * *." Before the House committee, certain objections to the report requirement were raised on behalf of the Attorney General. The committee recommended that the report provision be amended into its present form, and the proposed amendment was adopted.

Further, the report states:

> Accommodating these considerations to the language of the statute, I conclude that the report requirement directs (1) an examination of the petroleum industry to determine if it evidences the existence of anticompetitive practices, including monopolization and price stabilization, and (2) a determination whether any such practices result from this regulatory system. This would, in my opinion, meet the primary concern of the Congress without requiring any investigation or determination of the motives or purposes of the actions of State agencies.
>
> This consideration of the "results" of the operation of the regulatory system on industry practices finds support in the legislative history of the report requirement. As the provision was first added in the Senate, it required a report on whether the activities related to the compact "have resulted' 'in price fixing, monopoly or regimentation, a clear direction to consider the industrial results, and not the object or motive of State action.

Then, I read one more brief excerpt:

> Accordingly, it would appear that the statutory requirement for reports calls for an inquiry into the practices and organization of the oil production industry. That inquiry must ascertain whether price-fixing or monopolistic practices have grown around the production limitations adopted for conservation purposes, regardless of whether or not such practices involve a violation of present law, or are an intended or an accidental result of the regulatory system. Only on the basis of such an inquiry can an informed conclusion be made as to the competitive effect of the pattern of regulatory action.

That was the purpose of this investigation by the Attorney General, required by Congress, and very carefully handled by the Attorney General to make certain that there was no prejudice against the oil industry, or particularly the Compact Commission, made by representatives of the oil-producing States.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CONCLUDES MONOPOLY, BUT NOT BY COMPACT

In the last report, the conclusion is generally favorable to the oil compact. It is not completely favorable to the industry; it is critical to some extent, but in a very mild way. I read from page 61 of the fourth report of the Attorney General:

> Analysis of crude oil prices shows a stability coincident with the beginnings of conservation.

This was the conclusion after 4 years of analysis.

> But stabilization of supply was the necessary and intended result of the Federal action approving and implementing State prorationing under the Connally "Hot Oil" Act. With that aid and approval, State prorationing operated to curtail the amount of excess oil available to disturb the market by wide local or national price swings. At the same time, price history shows that the price responded to economic pressures, both upward and downward, before the war. Thereafter, the record shows crude oil prices rising steadily, rather unrelated to increasing supply or economic changes.

The report concluded that there was an upward bias, an upward trend, in oil prices from World War II on, as the conservation commissions began to work together to control the available supply of oil.

I shall now read from two of the most pertinent additional observations:

> For this phenomenon there is little evidence that State action is responsible. State regulatory bodies normally do not collect price data in connection with their determinations on permissible production.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The pipeline system was capable of absorbing temporary local cuts by resort to unregulated sources of supply. No "shortage" of oil created by State action could be held responsible for any price movement. Considering the complex and varying bases of decision faced by each of the State agencies, and the constant pressure of local producers to be allowed the fullest share of production, the task of prorating to achieve a desired price level would be virtually impossible.

These are the concluding observations by Attorney General William P. Rogers:

> A different problem, however, is posed by the present pattern of pipeline ownership and operation. Only one possible pipeline connection is usually available to a well, and, considering its cost, is likely to endure for the life of the well. The economies of size in trunkline operation logically impel building one large diameter line to a field or area, sufficient to carry anticipated production and therefore preclusive of economical operation of other lines.
>
> The position of each pipeline owner is greatly magnified by reciprocal use of pipelines among the select group of integrated companies owning pipelines. Logical and efficient operation of pipelines as a transportation system urges cooperation between lines and avoidance of duplication and crosshauling. But the pipeline system is more than a transport agency, it is the crude oil market. And cooperative use of pipelines has a grave potential for control of crude oil markets.
>
> Antitrust litigation can perhaps deal with particular cases of pipeline abuse. But the problem is more far-reaching, covering the broad spectrum of this industry's transportation and buying operations, and singularly suited to legislative action. Precise definition of the problem requires compulsory process to insure complete information; and any policy decision on the appropriate solution seems best suited to legislative determination.

Mr. President, in the light of the Attorney General's reports which by law, according to the Attorney General's Office, are still required and are, in fact, in default for 4 years—ever since 1959 there has been no report—in view of the moderation, so far as the conduct of the Commission is concerned, what in the world is Assistant Secretary Kelly afraid of? What are these red-hot bureaucrats or officials in the Department of Justice up to, in view of the fact that these are the only reports which have been made, and no others have been made for 3½ or 4 years.

It seems to me that the memorandum disclosing the position of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior is most significant, because the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and the head of the Office of Oil and Gas take the position that even this kind of mild, hesitant, reluctant inquiry by the Department of Justice is not proper, they do not want it, and they feel that it is likely to prejudice the oil industry.

ARROGANCE OF OIL-ORIENTED OFFICIALS

I think this is an obvious commentary on the enormous influence the oil industry now has in the Department of the Interior, in our administration, with those who are responsible for regulating the oil industry; and I think it is also an obvious commentary on the arrogance of the oil industry and the great need, in my judgment, that we have these reports.

The Department of Justice did indicate that, as of 1959, it concluded that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission was not being used to fix prices—at least, not in a way which the Department of Justice felt was a violation of the antimonopoly laws. However, I can see no reason why there should not be a continuing report to Congress in view of the real temptation for the Commissioners and for the States—in view of their great power and in view of the authority the Federal Government has given them—to fix the flow of oil from the oilfields, as the Senator from Louisiana has set forth so well.

We have a responsibility to the consumers of the country to make sure that this enormous power over the most profitable industry in the United States is not used to exploit the consumers. The fact that we have not had a single report—and that this is in violation of the law—on this matter from the Office of the Attorney General in 4 years indicates to me how urgently we need more concern for the consumers.

SENATE SHOULD INSIST ON REPORTS

I would think that at the time when the life of the Compact Commission comes up for renewal, this year, in connection with the joint resolution which I understand the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has introduced, and which will come before Congress this year, Congress should give very careful consideration to insisting on obtaining a regular report from the Department of Justice on the possibilities of using the Compact Commission as a means of fixing prices, establishing prices, and pushing prices up. The Attorney General did conclude that prices have been moving one way, since 1946, and that is up.

VITAL IMPORTANCE OF CONFIRMING OFFICIALS FREE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. President, I should like to conclude this part of my presentation this afternoon by saying that I think all Senators should be aware of what this revelation really means. We confirmed the nomination of John M. Kelly as Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of minerals—the top policy position in regard to oil—with full knowledge not only that Mr. Kelly had spent a lifetime in the oil industry, but also that he had millions of dollars of interest in State and private oil lands and that he said he would hold on to them, and also—as I have said—Mr. Jerome O'Brien, the head of the office of oil and gas—spent a lifetime in the oil industry, most recently in the Humble Oil Co., as vice president.

If we are to have a detached attitude in the public interest on the part of high-policy officials—indeed, I think we should on their part have a zealous attitude in the public interest—obviously we should not have in the top position, with the duty of representing the public viewpoint, one whose interest obviously is very often against the public interest and in his own personal interest.

DEFICIT SPENDING NO SOLUTION TO LAGGING ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, throughout the country the President of the United States has been criticized—and our mail indicates it very plainly—for being irresponsible in regard to the proposed budget and the deficit. Although I disagree with the President in this area, I think the attention of the Senate and the attention of the country should be called to the fact that the President is much more conservative in this respect than are many of his critics and many businessmen. In fact, a majority of the Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee, excluding this Senator, asked for a larger deficit, and all of the Republican members did likewise. Republicans asked for a slight cutback in spending; but the cutback they proposed adds up—according to the spokesman for the minority members, Representative CURTIS, of Missouri—to a larger deficit than the one which would result from the budget the President has proposed for 1964. I think the people of the country should realize this fact. I have been one who has criticized the President for his tax-cut proposal; but, Mr. President, after all, we find that on the Joint Economic Committee, which is supposed to be the chief congressional committee on economic policy, the minority members, as well as the majority members, argue that the President has proposed too small a deficit, not too large a deficit.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has analyzed the proposal of the Governor of New York in this regard, as to how it would compare.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have not precisely analyzed the proposals of the Governor of New York. It is true that he advocated a reduction of spending. However, I do believe that his proposal comes very close to the position taken by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee. The difficulty with the position of the Governor of New York is that he does not specify how much the cut in spending should be. He does not indicate what spending should be cut. He uses the term "low priority programs." Of course, everyone is against "low priority programs." But there is no specification. The Governor has asked for a bigger tax cut than has President Kennedy. I am talking about the proposed tax cut the first year, the tax cut which would affect the coming budget. He has asked for a bigger tax cut, and unless he can do a better job of suggesting ways to reduce spending than he has done in New York State, or than his Republican colleagues have done in the Congress of the United States—the House or the Senate—he will end with a bigger deficit than President Kennedy has.

Mr. President, one of the outstanding businessmen-statesman in our country is the distinguished Frazer Wilde, who is chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. He was head of the Commission on Money and Credit appointed by President Kennedy, I believe—a very able, fine, and distinguished man. But Mr. Wilde, who speaks with great ability, perspicacity, and knowledge of finance, and as a spokesman of the financial community, also has asked for a far bigger tax cut, and what would amount to a much bigger deficit, the first year at least, than President Kennedy has asked for.

I make that statement in preface to remarks I should like to make in criticizing the proposal for a tax cut and a proposal for increasing our deficit.

MAJORITY RIGHT ON MONETARY POLICY—WRONG ON TAX POLICY

I was the one Democratic member of the Joint Economic Committee who filed individual views dissenting from the majority report. I wish to make clear that I support the majority of the committee on monetary policy. I consider it the finest statement of Government policy in the monetary field that I have read for a long time. It is brilliant. It is absolutely correct. I earnestly hope that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Reserve Board, who establish our monetary policy, will read the report with the greatest of care. It is based upon the best monetary advice the Joint Economic Committee could get.

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX CUT NOW

Mr. President, I should like to discuss now the case against a tax cut.

OVERWHELMING DRIVE FOR TAX CUT

All Americans, of course, desire relief from the heavy burden of taxes they must bear to support our Government.

A tax cut now is powerfully supported by the President, leading business organizations, top labor groups, a heavy consensus of economists, and many of the most influential opinion-leading commentators.

TAX CUT NOT RESPONSIBLE

But I submit that tax reduction under the following conditions is not responsible in a period of relative prosperity in the economy:

First. The current deficit is expected to approach $9 billion.

Second. The administration plans to ask for an initial increase in spending of about $4.5 billion. Based on past experience, Congress is more likely to increase than to decrease the President's initial spending proposals.

Third. The national debt exceeds $300 billion. It is greater than the national debt of all other nations in the world combined. Service costs on the debt are already $10 billion.

Fourth. The tax cut would increase the size of the deficit, the national debt, and the burden of servicing the debt.

TAX CUT SURE TO INCREASE DEFICIT AND NATIONAL DEBT

The easy assumption has been made by many administration witnesses that the tax cut, far from deepening the deficit, eventually would reduce it and, in fact, is the surest way to a balanced budget.

This is almost certainly wrong.

Calculations based on the whole sweep of witnesses appearing before the committee show that the longrun net loss of revenues flowing from the $10 billion tax cut would be between $1 and $6⅔ billion.

The most typical assumptions on the multiplier effect of the tax cut by witnesses before the committee were that it would be between 2 and 2½. In other words, that a $10 billion tax cut would increase the gross national product by $20 to $25 billion.

The consensus was clear that monetary restraint of the kind the Nation's money managers told the committee they expected to practice would reduce this multiplier. One monetary expert estimated that such a monetary policy would probably result in a multiplier of 1½, or a $15 billion increase in the gross national product from a $10 billion tax cut. All things considered, a multiplier of 2 or a $20 billion gross national product increase from a $10 billion tax cut would seem to be as reasonable a guess as any.

What would such an increase in the gross national product flowing from such a tax cut mean to ultimate Federal revenues?

Here again the expert witnesses differed. Dr. Arthur Burns, of Columbia University, and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, estimated it would be about one-sixth. His estimate is confirmed by relating Federal tax revenues to the size of the gross national product. The relationship is about one-sixth.

On the basis of such an estimate, the net loss from a $10 billion tax cut allowing for a $3⅓ billion increase in revenues would be $6⅔ billion.

On the other hand the Council of Economic Advisers testified that the Federal tax recovery from increased gross national product is 30 percent. Even on this cheery basis, Government revenues would increase only $6 billion as a result of the $10 billion tax cut and the net loss would be $4 billion.

Even if we take the most optimistic multiplier assumptions of the Council: that the multiplier is 3 and that a $10 billion tax cut will increase the gross national product by $30 billion, and apply the optimistic Council 30-percent figure for Federal tax recovery, the total recovery of revenues would still be $9 billion and the net loss would be $1 billion. The Council has suggested that the multiplier may be somewhat higher than 2 because of induced investment through the so-called accelerator principle. They have, however, wisely refrained from estimating the quantity of this additional amount since, with the present high levels of excess capacity, it seems doubtful that any additional investment will be encouraged by the tax reduction.

The conclusion that the kind of sharp across-the-board tax reduction recommended by the President would result in an eventual as well as an immediate tax loss is borne out by economic analysis as well as by commonsense.

ADMINISTRATION RELIES ON STIMULATION FROM DEFICIT

Argument by administration witnesses for a tax cut has been made primarily on the grounds that it would increase demand in the economy, and that with unemployment close to 6 percent and plant utilization at 82 percent, the economy needs a surging demand.

Indeed, most administration witnesses frankly see little difference in economic impact between a reduction in Federal taxes and an increase in Federal spending. Both, in their view, would increase demand. Both would do so by increasing the Federal deficit.

The theoretical result: As the deficit increases, the Government puts more into the economy in demand—spending—than it takes out in taxing.

DEFICITS HAVE NOT BROUGHT SOUND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE PAST

Will deficits in fact stimulate sound long-term growth? Our recent history has plenty to say about the answer to this question.

In the past 32 years this Nation has become thoroughly experienced in Federal deficits. Deficits have been a continuous way of life for our National Goverment almost throughout this period. These deficits have been so immense that the national debt has exploded twentyfold since 1930: from $16 billion to over $300 billion.

With this experience, this Nation should be expert on the stimulative effect of deficits on the economy. What has been the result?

Except in World War II when deficits were astronomical, there is no evidence that continuous deficits have promoted economic growth. The evidence is all to the contrary.

The biggest growth in peacetime Federal debt, for example, was in the decade of the 1930's and in the period since 1957. The 1930's period was characterized by disastrous economic stagnation and record unemployment, coinciding with 10 years of such heavy deficits that they would be equivalent to $20 billion annually today. From 1957 to date, Federal deficits have averaged a heavy $6 billion per year. And yet, economic growth has been the slow-moving despair of current economists during this very period.

Advocates of the deficit route point to the impressive economic progress in Europe during the past decade to support the deficit stimulus theory. The economic situation in European countries during the past 10 years is so vastly different from ours—particularly in terms of demand—that the comparison is not a valid one.

But even here what does the record show? The industrial star of Europe, Germany, enjoying a mammoth 92-percent growth in industrial production in the 8 years between 1953 and 1961 (most recent year for which figures are available) compared to 20 percent in this country; but its deficit averaged 0.1 percent of gross national product during this period compared to an average deficit of 0.4 percent of gross national product in the United States. In terms of gross national product, Germany had one-fourth the deficit and four times the growth of this country.

This is not to argue that deficits retard growth. It is to argue that in a $550 billion economy, even the $12 billion deficit programed by the administration is swamped by the impact of private economic forces.

DEFICIT FOR GROWTH: A RADICAL DEPARTURE

Until this year, 1963, the President had contended that deficits might be necessary public policy in periods of recession. But on the upturn of the cycle, the Federal Government should run a surplus and over the business cycle balance the budget.

But now we are asked to follow a radically new theory. The deliberate deepening of the deficit this year is not planned for the purpose of overcoming a recession. Indeed, the President talked of 22 months of uninterrupted recovery in his state of the Union message. The planned deficit is billed for the purpose of promoting long-term growth.

But sound long-term growth can no more be based on the deficit gimmick than on any other easy panacea. Growth of an individual, a family, or a nation depends on the hard, long work of many years, on the sacrifices and forbearance required for education, the gradual development of skills, and the painful processes of research.

The preeminent economic success of America has been based squarely on individual self-reliance, with minimum Government participation and maximum individual freedom and incentive. Indeed, the starkest economic difference in the world today is between the economic stagnation of Communist collective economies and the dynamism of free Western economies.

SOUND TAX CUT REQUIRES SPENDING CUT FIRST

All of this suggests that the right prescription should indeed be a tax cut to free the economy's productive force from the burden of Government taxes but unless Federal spending is reduced—at least to keep pace with the reduction in Federal taxes—the reduced burden is a mirage.

Tax reduction with increased Government spending gives the impression of a lighter Government burden. But the lessened tax burden when spending is increased is then quickly translated into higher prices and an evaporation of the increased purchasing power of the tax cut. The taxpayer's aftertax income may be higher. But his income buys no more.

The sure inflationary impact of a tax cut this year was freely conceded in the hearings by such an eminent authority as Professor Duesenberry of Harvard. No enonomist disputed it.

SPENDING CAN BE CUT

If a tax cut with increased spending is not the answer, can, as a matter of practical fact, spending be reduced or at least stabilized without sacrificing major goals of this Nation such as national defense, space exploration, and indeed the development of skills through education on which long-term growth must be based?

Can spending be wisely reduced? It can indeed.

Although the President implied that spending other than defense, space, and interest will remain the same in 1964 as in the current fiscal year, the fact is that this spending will increase by more than $2 billion.

DOMESTIC SPENDING TO CLIMB $2 BILLION THIS YEAR

This year's budget by various bookkeeping transactions conceals the real increase in spending in the domestic sector.

The reason the $2 billion increase doesn't show up is because the administration plans to sell $700 million of the cotton surplus, $423 million of Export-Import Bank holdings, $315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages, $300 million in Commodity Credit Corporation loans, $150 million in farm housing loans, and $150 million in college housing loans. This total of $2 billion of liquidated assets will be used to offset increased spending in almost every department of Government.

GOVERNMENT SALE OF HOME MORTGAGES SURE TO SLOW DOWN RECOVERY

The administration's announced intention of selling $315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages during the coming year is sure to tend to drive up interest rates for home buyers.

The Budget Director told the committee at the hearings that the general impact on interest rates would not be significant because in the absence of the sale of mortgages the administration would be required to sell other Federal securities—presumably Treasury securities—to finance the deficit.

But the impact of the sale of such a large amount of mortgages could be quite different from the effect of selling a similar amount of Treasury securities. Interest rates on Treasury securities have only a secondary effect on mortgage rates. Some Government experts have testified to the committee the effect is relatively unimportant.

There can be no question, however, that the sale of more than $300 million of home mortgages by the Government will have a definite tendency to drive up interest rates.

If interest rates on home mortgages do indeed rise, unemployment would be sure to increase.

The biggest cost in home buying is interest. A rise in mortgage interest rates will surely reduce home construction. Home construction contributes directly and heavily to employment. Any cutback in home starts would seriously retard economic recovery.

Government sale of $300 million of mortgages could significantly reduce whatever expansionary effect the tax cut might have on the economy.

BIG INCREASES IN GOVERNMENT PAYROLLS

Let us consider the surest index of expanded spending: The Defense Department is the only department of Government which will actually reduce the number of its employees in the coming fiscal year. Every other department, without exception, will increase its employees in the coming budget year. Here are a few examples: Agriculture by a whopping 5,000, or 4 percent; Treasury by 4,000, or 5 percent; Interior by 4,000, or 6 percent; Health, Education, and Welfare by 6,000, or 7½ percent; General Services Administration by 3,000, or 9 percent; Commerce by 3,500, or 11 percent; and Labor by 1,300, or 14 percent. All of these increases will come in a single year—next year.

Asked about this sharp increase in employees in the coming year when they appeared before the committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and others all told the committee the increase was the result of new programs the Congress had passed.

But the Secretary of Commerce was most revealing when asked to defend the huge 11-percent increase in 1 year in personnel in his Department. He said that if he were given a free hand to reduce or eliminate old programs he could, in fact, reduce personnel by 10 percent and operate a better Department.

The Secretary of Commerce wisely pointed to the failure of the administration and Congress alike to look with critical scrutiny to economy in old programs which have developed powerful bureaucratic and often special interest support but no longer serve our national interest.

EXTRAVAGANT SUBSIDIES TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

The explosive expansion of some of the older programs with the hell-bent support of special interest shows how extravagantly generous with the taxpayer's money Congress has become when it teams up with subsidy-seeking interests.

For instance, just since 1957—to the coming year's 1964 budget—Federal spending for water transportation subsidy to shipbuilders has leaped from $365 to $677 million or 85 percent—these figures only include direct expenditure subsidies; in addition, the water transportation industry obtains substantial hidden subsidies in the form of preferential tax treatment—subsidies to privately owned commercial aviation have zoomed from $219 to $885 million, or fourfold; and promotion of business from $127 to $617 million, or an incredible fivefold.

Reducing entrenched, special-interest-supported spending is one of the toughest jobs of Government. It will become even tougher as "the establishment" persuades the Congress and the American people to accept the theory that larger Federal deficits fed alike by tax cuts and/or increased Government spending would lead to sound long-term growth.

But the theory is wrong. In fact, reduction of unjustified Government spending not only will not hurt economic expansion, it will help it. Wasteful Government spending diverts resources of skilled men and scarce material from constructive private uses. As the Government's massive purchasing power moves in, prices move up. The eventual burden on the taxpayer is sure and heavy.

SOME DOMESTIC SPENDING ESSENTIAL

This is not to say that all Government spending can only be an anchor that private enterprise must drag along—far from it. Spending that encourages manpower training, vocational education, industrial research, contributes to the very essence of a growing economy.

The tough job of Government is to adopt and advance the programs that will, in fact, advance the economy as well as to eradicate the programs that burden it.

There is no question in this Senator's mind, however, that in every phase of Government activity, including defense and space, spending can be reduced an aggregate of billions below the President's requests, possibly to a level permitting a sound tax cut.

ECONOMISTS FAIL TO PROVE TAX CUT WILL WORK

The case for the proposed tax cut, timed to coincide with both a present deficit and increased spending, and calculated to deepen the deficit, has not been made. It has not been made in these respects:

RECORD OF PREVIOUS TAX CUTS

First. The tax cut may have little or no stimulative effect on the economy. After only four of the nine tax cuts in the past 40 years did business significantly improve. There were times it actually got worse. This does not prove the so-called stimulative multiplier did not appear; it does show it can be washed out by other factors. This would seem to be almost certain for the $2.7 billion net tax cut proposed for the first tax cut year in this $550 billion economy.

Even the ultimate $10 billion net tax cut would seem to be likely to be washed out. For this ultimate grand total would amount to less than 2 percent of the gross national product. During the thirties, deficits that averaged more than twice this—4 percent—of the gross national product seemed to have little effect on economic growth.

MONETARY RESTRAINT WILL WEAKEN TAX CUT STIMULATION

Second. Any substantial stimulative effect of the tax cut would almost certainly be sharply cut and perhaps even destroyed by the restraining effect of monetary policy. The country's top monetary authorities, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, both told the committee that they expected interest rates would be likely to rise if the economy moved ahead in 1963 and 1964. In view of the monetary power of these gentlemen, it is almost a sure thing that this expectation will be translated into reality. Interest rates will go up. Monetary authorities have publicly indicated that they will raise interest rates on savings bonds to 4 percent within the next year.

Monetary authorities appearing before the committee, other than the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, universally agreed that rising interest rates would slow down economic expansion. Dr. Meltzer, of Carnegie Tech, argued that the stimulative effect—multiplier—of the tax cut would depend almost entirely on the degree of monetary tightness.

The virtual certainty of this monetary tightness will surely develop for two reasons: (a) a policy of raising interest rates is regarded as the prime weapon for diminishing the adverse effect of the tax cut on the balance of payments; (b) rising interest rates are accepted as the ready tool to try to forestall the inflationary effect of the tax cut.

The majority report, in my view, does an excellent job of describing the problems of monetary policy with which we will be concerned in the months to come. Moreover, it indicates clearly the weaknesses in some of the monetary policies followed during the last few years. I wish to be specifically on record in support of the monetary section of the majority report.

TIGHT MONETARY POLICY WILL NOT IMPROVE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

Incidentally, the preponderance of evidence from the joint committee's hearings last August and this year suggests that interest rate differentials can have only secondary effects on the balance of payments through influencing capital flows. Harverford Professor Philip Bell and Federal Reserve Economist Robert Gemmill have made the only available studies of the effect of interest rate differentials on capital flows and they have found the effect is far less significant than speculation and of far lesser significance than previously supposed. Neither of these studies was contradicted by any other studies that were brought to the attention of the committee, although witnesses appearing before the committee were systematically challenged to show any evidence to contradict the Bell and Gemmill studies.

This means the Government's monetary policy will be restrictive, will tend to counteract any stimulative effect of the tax cut, largely because of a false assumption—now exploded—that interest rates must be higher in this country to stem capital flows from this country overseas.

As for using rising interest rates to forestall the inflationary effect of the tax cuts, the principal architect of this policy, Chairman William Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, himself indicated that the policy would have only moderate effect in restraining rising prices. And yet this policy of monetary restraint to raise interest rates is the widely accepted answer to whatever inflation may develop in the future: not reduced Government spending, not increased taxes. Both are regarded as politically impossible.

The basic economic design—increased Government spending and lower taxes to stimulate the economy and rising interest rates to stabilize prices—is likely to lead to a cruelly oppressive debt burden as rising deficits are matched by rising interest rates required to service the heavier national debt.

What is worse, it means an economy-wide restraining force, slowing down homebuilding—where interest is the biggest cost—small business borrowing, and generally shifting a heavier burden to such debtor groups as farmers and consumers.

CASE FOR CORPORATE TAX CUT NOT MADE

Third. The heaviest and most consistent support for the tax cut came from those who argued that it was necessary to stimulate investment. No witnesses contradicted the alleged wisdom of such a tax cut. Almost all argued it was desirable to promote economic growth in the economy.

And yet the case for such a tax cut this year seems to be even weaker than it has been in the recent past. Let us review the record:

In 1954 the Nation enjoyed its last major tax cut. It was generally agreed that the prime beneficiaries of that tax cut were corporations. That tax cut was said to have been designed to stimulate investment in view of both its individual impact—most of the benefits went to persons in investment income brackets—and its large corporate reduction.

Now, 9 years later, the Congress is asked to make another sizable corporate tax reduction. One distinguished Senator remarked as the committee hearing opened that the 1954 tax cut seems to have had a long-term adverse effect on the economy because it stimulated investment between 1955 and 1957 to such an extent that the economy has been characterized by idle investment facilities, overbuilt plant capacity, unemployment, and slow growth ever since.

Just last year investment was stimulated by two additional tax reductions. First, depreciation guidelines were revised to provide the equivalent of a $1.5 billion stimulant to investment—and relief to corporations.

Secondly, the investment credit was rifle shot into corporate taxation to provide a specific and high-powered stimulus to investment through a 7-percent tax credit for every dollar of investment made.

The argument for further stimulation by tax cut is feeble indeed in view of these facts: First, the overwhelming preponderance of recent tax reduction on the side of stimulating investment; second, cash earnings in 1961 exceeded investment by a record absolute amount of $18½ billion and a record of 62 percent; third, although later figures are not available, cash earnings have been soaring since then while plant and equipment outlays have been about the same. The result: corporations have never been in a better cash position to invest in plant and equipment.

All the tax-incentive stimulation of the past seems to have done little to move business investment in plant and equipment ahead. In view of the recency of the 1962 corporate tax reductions, it would seem to be wiser to give these "investment stimulants" a chance to work rather than to hit again in a time of deficit spending with another "trickle down" investment tax cut.

MANY GROUPS HURT BY TAX CUT

Finally, there are many groups in the American society who would be hurt, not helped, by this tax cut.

FUTURE TAXPAYER BURDENED

The preeminent victim, of course, is the future taxpayer. As Dr. James Buchanan, chairman of the Economics Department of the University of Virginia, has written, the inevitable tendency of the politician is to spend for the present voter, reduce taxes for the present taxpayer, and mitigate the consequences by raising interest rates, thereby passing the whole burden to the future taxpayer. When Congress's economic experts on this committee, to whom Congress must look for advice, contend that such a policy is sound economics as well as effective short-run politics, the combination may be all but irresistible.

FARMER HIT

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman testified for the tax cut but conceded that a substantial majority of America's farmers owe no income tax. Obviously for these farmers—who make a heavy investment of work, property, risk, and efficiency in their farms—the tax cut is meaningless. No one argues that America will buy or consume more food because of the tax cut. To the extent the tax cut sparks inflation and forces increased interest rates—and it seems certain to do both—the farmer is sure to be hit and hurt, and badly.

LITTLE BENEFIT TO UNEMPLOYED

Above all, this planned tax-cut deficit has been justified in the name of the unemployed. But the tough question that this Senator has encountered in talking to unemployed in Wisconsin is, "What good is a tax cut to an unemployed man with no income? He doesn't pay any taxes now. He doesn't need a tax cut. He needs a job."

An answer that the tax cut may stimulate the economy to provide more jobs is, as the previous analysis suggests, far from perfect.

It is especially ironic for the three groups which the Secretary of Labor told the committee form a disproportionately heavy part of the unemployed: the high school dropout; the unskilled; the minority groups. According to the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, each of these groups suffers not 6-percent unemployment but more than 12-percent unemployment.

Tax cuts will not begin to solve the problems of high school dropouts, unable to get jobs because of inadequate education and low or zero skills. Tax cuts will do little to knock down the prejudice barriers barring the minority groups from employment.

Few of the unskilled are likely to win jobs because of the tax cut. Their barrier is their lack of skill in an automating, technologically changing society. These people need training. A tax cut to solve their problem seems as heartless and stupid as Marie Antoinette's "Let 'em eat cake," for starving Parisians.

The unemployed in these groups will enjoy little benefit in income with a tax cut. They pay no Federal income tax; nor is it likely to help them get jobs.

To the extent the deficit drives up interest rates, these people who are likely to be debtors will suffer. To the extent the deficit drives up prices, they will all be hurt as consumers.

OLD PEOPLE HIT HARDEST

Of all groups in America, the hardest hit by this tax cut-sparked deficit will be the retired old people.

On February 15, 1963, the Treasury Department released a fact sheet showing that of the 18 million Americans 65 years old and over, 14½ million, or 80 percent, have such low incomes that they pay no Federal income tax now.

So 80 percent of the older people could not possibly receive any benefit from an income tax cut. Since the overwhelming majority of the 20 percent of oldsters who do pay income taxes pay very little, the benefit would in aggregate be very small indeed.

On the other hand, many of these older people are debtors. The rising interest rates which seem to be the certain concomitant of the income tax cut will come out of their already pitifully inadequate incomes. Rising prices—a likely companion of any Federal deficit stimulation of the economy—would likewise diminish what little they could buy with the income they have.

PROPOSED TAX CUT REGRESSIVE

Administration witnesses have contended that the proposed tax cut is a progressive one which will give low-income groups the greatest benefit. This is simply not true.

The following table shows the benefits to various economic groups from the personal income tax cuts—including the progressive reforms recommended by the administration. This table shows a precisely opposite effect from the table usually shown by the administration. This is because the administration table shows the percentage reduction of the income tax paid by persons in each income bracket. Because persons in high-income brackets of course pay higher income taxes, the administration table suggests the tax cut would be progressive.

Income	Federal income tax	Other taxes [1]	Total tax before cut	Total tax after cut	Percent reduction
$3,000	$60	$600	$660	$614	7
$5,000	420	1,000	1,420	1,296	8
$10,000	1,372	1,500	2,872	2,568	10
$15,000	2,616	1,700	4,316	3,776	13
$20,000	4,124	1,900	6,024	5,182	14

[1] Property (or imputed rent), sales, excise, auto, etc.

That the tax cut is, in fact, regressive, is demonstrated in the above table which shows the percentage reduction in all taxes paid that results from the administration recommendations. Because all Federal taxpayers pay heavy State and local taxes in addition to Federal taxes, this table shows a far more accurate picture of what actually happens to the taxpayer's total liability.

The impact of the President's tax proposal on various income groups was dramatically shown in a table submitted to the committee by Dr. Leon Keyserling. This table eloquently dramatizes the regressive effect of the proposed tax cut.

President's proposed tax structure in 1965 compared with present structure (1962), at various tax levels (for married couple with 2 children)

(1) Taxable income level	(2) Present tax [1]	(3) Present income after tax	(4) Proposed tax [2]	(5) Proposed income after tax	(6) Percent tax reduction	(7) Percent increase in after-tax income	(8) Percent tax to income	
							Present	Proposed
$3,000	$60	$2,940	0	$3,000	100.0	2.0	2.0	0
$5,000	420	4,580	$280	4,720	33.3	3.1	8.4	5.6
$7,500	877	6,623	663	6,837	24.4	3.2	11.7	8.8
$10,000	1,372	8,628	1,068	8,932	22.2	3.5	13.7	10.7
$15,000	2,486	12,514	2,076	12,924	16.5	3.3	16.6	13.8
$25,000	5,318	19,682	4,605	20,395	13.4	3.6	21.3	18.4
$35,000	9,037	25,963	7,814	27,186	13.5	4.7	25.8	22.3
$50,000	15,976	34,024	13,837	36,163	13.4	6.3	32.0	27.7
$100,000	44,724	55,276	38,542	61,458	13.8	11.2	44.7	38.5
$200,000	115,224	84,776	95,072	104,928	17.5	23.8	57.6	47.5

[1] Assuming 10 percent deduction for taxes, interest, contributions, medical, etc.

[2] Assuming President's proposal, as revised by Dillon's testimony, of $400 minimum deduction for married couple and $100 for each child; 10 percent for incomes between $6,000 and $10,000; $10,000 flat deduction between $1,000 and $20,000; and 5 percent deduction for $20,000 and up.

Actual slight deviations from these workable assumptions would not in the slightest change the general import of the analysis.

Because tens of millions of American adults earn so little income that they pay no Federal income taxes, it is obvious that a significant share of our citizens will get no benefit but will almost certainly have to pay higher interest rates because of the tax cut and, very possibly, higher prices.

TAX CUT WORSENS ADVERSE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Witnesses were systematically asked what effect the proposed tax cut would have on the balance of payments.

It was generally conceded that the tax cut would worsen our balance of payments because the main thrust of the cut is to increase demand in the consumer sector. This would mean that purchases of imports would rise sharply.

On the other hand, far from reducing American prices to enable us to sell more abroad and increase exports, this tax cut, as Professor Duesenberry properly pointed out in the hearings, will certainly, inevitably, tend to increase prices and reduce our exports.

So the proposed tax cut would worsen our balance of payments by first, increasing imports and second, decreasing exports.

HEAVY COST OF TAX CUT FAILURE

Administration witnesses argued that if the tax cut fails to stimulate the economy as advertised, little has been lost. This is emphatically not true. If this highly questionable gamble, this radical new departure from American fiscal policy, is adopted and fails, the consequences will be serious indeed.

First. The already heavy national debt will be even more burdensome.

Second. Our present progressive income tax system will have been seriously jeopardized with little real political prospect of restoring it. It is hard to imagine a more difficult political task than increasing taxes back to their present rate once Congress cuts them. The alternative frankly advocated by Dr. Burns and other witnesses: a national sales tax. In the judgment of this Senator, this would be a first-class economic disaster as well as a gross injustice.

Third. Our antirecession ammunition—the real justification for a tax cut—will have been used up, leaving us far less equipped to cope with economic adversity.

Fourth. Our balance of payments will have been worsened both because imports will have been increased relative to exports and because the great American economy will have failed to respond to the prime economic prescription of its President and suffered a growing deficit.

Fifth. The most essential ingredient in economic success for a free nation—public confidence—will have been severely and needlessly damaged because of the failure of a highly advertised prime economic policy of our Government.

Sixth. The essential ingredient for discipline in Federal spending—that tax relief depends on spending reduction—will have been lost. This adverse consequence is even more sure to follow if the tax-cut prescription succeeds than if it fails.

And, in the long run, this may be the most serious threat of all in the tax-cut-for-a-deficit philosophy. For once the conviction takes hold that economic prosperity can be firmly based on deficit financing then the incentive to spending discipline will be lost and the trend to bigger and bigger government that is the consequence of unrestrained spending could become irresistible.

DOVER EDITORIAL COMMENDS LAUSCHE STRIP-MINING BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio is know by all of us to be an outstanding example of prudent and thoughtful conservatism. He is a man who is opposed to excessive Government spending. I think that the proposed legislation he has introduced also shows he has a wider conservative viewpoint. He is deeply concerned with what may happen to our resources, and is anxious to fight and fight hard to preserve our resources for future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial published in the Daily Reporter of Dover, Ohio, which discusses the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], as to regulating strip mining, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been much discussion recently, and no little amount of controversy, over strip-mining operations. Most of the criticism has been aimed at operators who have not engaged in restoration after stripping a given area.

An Ohio law requires strip operators to post bonds to assure they will try to put the land back into decent shape. But the law admittedly lacks sharp teeth and those fighting for backfills maintain that too many strippers are simply ignoring the law.

Generally speaking, strip-mining control has been viewed as a problem for individual States, because they must contend with the yawning canyons, which are hazardous for man and animal alike; the sulfur water, which contaminates springs and streams, and the disrupted land which, for the most part, is useless except reforestation, even when it is put back into some semblance of order.

But last Wednesday Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, involved the Federal Government in surface mining when he introduced a bill calling for the Secretary of the Interior to make a study of strip and surface coal operations and report back to Congress.

Admitting the economic benefits of strip mining, Senator LAUSCHE also deplored the fact that such operations have "destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars."

The Senator further charged that in his home State of Ohio, where he served as Governor, "there are large areas where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened."

Senator LAUSCHE cited Ohio's current strip-mine reclamation law as having been helpful in land restoration but added: "I've always felt it should have required more strict conservation measures."

The senior Buckeye Senator said he feels "Congress should determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation."

If Congress eventually enacts a reclamation law governing coal-stripping operations, the taxpayers will foot the bill for its administration. Considering that only 35 cents of every tax dollar sent to Washington comes back, it would be far less expensive for Ohioans if the general assembly would wake up and amend the Buckeye laws covering reclamation. A well-teethed law would put the burden on the strip miners and not the taxpayers.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have a statement which I made this morning before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations relating to the urgent need for an appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis., printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to appear in support of a $3.8-million appropriation for a badly needed addition at the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis.

Last year this committee recognized the vital importance of the project and recommended an appropriation of $380,000 to carry out the planning stage of the Laboratory's expansion program. The Senate stood behind this recommendation, but the House cut it back in conference to $200,000, or just enough to cover the costs of the most essential planning.

I am happy to report that this initial appropriation has been used wisely. After careful screening and negotiation, two firms have been chosen to design and engineer the highly-specialized, 170,000-square-foot addition to the Laboratory's crowded, 30-year-old plant. Within a year the blueprints will be completed and the project will be ready for its long-overdue groundbreaking on 12 acres of adjacent land donated by the University of Wisconsin.

To carry out the program smoothly and economically, construction funds must be appropriated now. This will allow bidding for the construction job to take place next spring, when a buyer's market for construction services is expected. Waiting until next year to make this grant will almost certainly postpone construction until the summer months, a time when the building trade is normally operating at near-maximum capacity.

Mr. Chairman, the existing condition of the Forest Products Laboratory plant, its keystone role in the wood products industry, and the industry's significance in our national economy all point up the necessity of making this requested investment of Federal funds. The laboratory plant is simply substandard for the work that now goes on in it.

This work is universally acclaimed as the finest and most extensive in the world today, and it is a tribute to the Laboratory's excellent staff that so much has been done for so long in so little space. But talking to scientists, technicians, and administrators has convinced me that the miracle of the forest products research cannot continue under conditions as they now exist at the Laboratory.

Even without considering the many new avenues of research which are closed off for lack of adequate facilities, there are several older projects which cannot be fully developed for the simple and exasperating reason that the present structure cannot adequately contain them.

Among these I would cite as a critical example the case of high-speed paper formation. Here is an area which is on the verge of a real breakthrough, one which industry is anxiously awaiting because it would unfold new vistas for the use of secondary-quality hardwoods. To achieve this breakthrough, extensive experiments with new processing machinery are required.

Only the Laboratory can do this in a manner which will benefit the entire paper and pulp industry, yet the present laboratory building has neither the space nor the modern load-bearing requirements to support the necessary equipment. As a result, further progress toward perfection of this process and the consequent stimulation of a multimillion dollar industry, must await congressional approval of these construction funds.

In 1961, the wood products industry provided direct employment for more than 1.1 million people—over 7 percent of the total manufacturing labor force. In the same year the value of all forest products after shipment was $25 billion, or roughly 5 percent of the Nation's gross national product. Of this amount, only $1 billion is attributable to the value of the raw materials; of the remaining added value, a great percentage can be traced to processes and techniques which originated at the Forest Products Laboratory.

Here is an industry which ranks sixth in terms of employment and eighth in terms of value added in the hierarchy of the American economy. Yet, public and private expenditures on research now average only a pitiful 0.35 percent of its annual contribution to gross national product, while the national average in all manufacturing industries is 2.5 percent—higher by a factor of 7.

Back in 1957, the President's Commission on Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products pinpointed this deficiency as an urgent one and recommended a more than fourfold expansion in Forest Products Laboratory research. In outlining a 10-year program during which funds for research would be increased over $1 million in each year, this bipartisan Commission estimated that the resulting ratio of research expenditures to product value would still be worse than the 1957 figure. From this it is clear that the Commission's recommendations represented the absolute minimum in intelligent research planning.

But today—6 years later and at a time when industrial research commands an unprecedented priority in our economy—the Forest Products Laboratory is confined to a building which has been unimproved during the entire 30-year period since it was constructed. And I want to emphasize that approval of this construction appropriation of $3.8 million would fall far short of meeting the Presidential Commission's 1957 recommendations.

Because we failed to heed the Commission's warning, the wood products industry has come in for some rough sledding. A sure indication that research has not kept pace with economic realities is the mounting level of foreign competition. In 1961, for example, exports of lumber and wood products dropped 12 percent from 1960, while imports rose a full 8.3 percent.

This unfavorable trend in our pattern of trade reflects rising costs of production here at home. The cost of harvesting and sawing raw timber has alone risen four times faster in the last decade than the general wholesale price index. This cost-price squeeze has meant that many stands of second-quality timber in the midcontinent forest regions are simply not being cut to allowable or desirable limits, and many other stands are being sold at very depressed stump prices. The result is that Government revenues from sales of forest land stumpage are substantially reduced for lack of new cost-saving processes in the industry and new methods of wood resource utilization.

Of all the uses to which $3.8 million of Government funds could be put perhaps no other would pay off so quickly in the form of direct returns. The 1957 Presidential Commission report I referred to a moment ago states that for every $1 invested in the Forest Products Laboratory, $70 has come back to the Federal Government by way of resulting tax revenues.

There is still another return on investment which the Forest Products Laboratory yields to the Federal Government, one which is even more direct than the revenues resulting from the Laboratory's research. The Government, by virtue of its ownership of forest lands, is the major supplier of the wood products industry's raw materials. Recently about one-fifth of the annual cuttings in the country have been from Government-owned and managed lands. And Government holdings are greater than this would indicate; they comprise 45 percent of the national wood resources at the stump. The value of these holdings is directly related to the value of the products which can be made from them. This in turn is immediately dependent on the development of new uses and new techniques of manufacture. And that is the mission of the Forest Products Laboratory, one which it alone can perform for an industry whose small enterprises account for 60 percent of the boardfeet produced.

I would like to submit several exhibits for the record which expand on my statement today and indicate some of the many significant contributions which the Laboratory has made in the past, as well as promising projects for future research. I am confident that the committee will give this request for construction funds the close and favorable attention it deserves, just as it last year treated the appropriation for planning expenses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin has the smallest amount of Federal spending per capita, I believe, of any State in the Union. I know Wisconsin has the smallest number of Federal employees per capita of any State in the Nation.

This Forest Products Laboratory is one of the few Federal installations in Wisconsin. The installation has paid for itself many times. A Presidential commission in 1957 estimated that for every dollar spent in the research institute in Madison, the Federal Government has received $70 in direct tax revenues back, because of the enormous benefits which the Forest Product Laboratory research has been able to develop for our economy.

I think it would be a real disservice if the appropriation were delayed, because this money will return itself to the Federal Government many, many times in research, which is desperately needed.

I think we have grossly neglected our industrial research in this country, while concentrating on necessary space research and defense research.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RELAXATION OF CONTROLS ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I find very little good news for the people of Maine in the announcement today of the so-called relaxation of controls on residual oil imports.

I fear that it will actually falsely raise the hopes of the people of Maine who have been going through a very severe winter. Recently the president of the United Mine Workers in emerging from a conference with President Kennedy announced that President Kennedy had given him assurance that there would be no meaningful relaxation of restrictions against residual oil imports.

A close examination of the announcement today reveals that such assurance has been carried out and that this does not constitute a meaningful relaxation of existing restrictions against residual oil imports.

What was reported in the Washington Post yesterday by reporter Julius Duscha is proved true today by the announcement. I quote excerpts from his article:

> The hottest international oil issue facing the White House reportedly has been resolved largely in favor of domestic economic and political considerations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Last month Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, recommended to President Kennedy that the administration undertake "a careful and meaningful relaxation" of the controls.
>
> Despite this recommendation, the White House was reported yesterday to have decided to permit a smaller increase in imports than it allowed in the last year.
>
> The decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers.

The announcement today establishes Mr. Duscha's accurate prereporting for the increase is smaller than it was last year and "the decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers."

In that victory for the coal producers and domestic oil producers—like the Texas oil millionaires—the decision is a significant defeat for the people of Maine and for the little consumers. For the gain of the Texas oil millionaires by the Kennedy decision is a loss by the man in the street and the woman in the home in Maine.

As the United Mine Workers president reported the other day on President Kennedy's assurances of no meaningful relaxation of the restrictions, so today the truth of his report is confirmed by the announcement of the fact that the small increase is even smaller than it was last year. In other words, as far as the people of Maine are concerned the trend is not forward with vigor—the President has not made a meaningful relaxation.

I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that today's announcement and the grandiose claims made in connection with it are dangerously close to constituting "false and misleading advertising" creating false hopes and designed to make things seem what they are, in reality, not.

The most charitable thing that can be said about today's announcement is that it is "too little and too late"—too little since it is even less of an increase than what we received a year ago—and too late since it comes just a week before the official end of winter, and highest heating oil prices, when the need for the residual oil was at its greatest.

This pattern is getting old and worn out as far as Maine is concerned. In connection with this matter, there is an excellent editorial in the March 8, 1963, issue of the Bangor Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MORE LIKE THE HORSE AND BUGGY DAYS

> Senator **Margaret Chase Smith** had some pungent and pertinent criticism to make of the New Frontier administration at the recent monthly meeting of the Maine delegation in Congress.
>
> The Kennedy administration, she declared, devotes too much time to talk and studies, and too little to action. For this reason, she declined to join the delegation in sending another appeal to the President for the removal of quotas on residual oil imports.
>
> "I don't think a letter from the delegation amounts to a row of pins," she told her colleagues. "I think a pattern has developed. The President talks about oil, textiles, and equalizing the pay for shipyard workers at Kittery. First, there's a study, then a report, then a letter. What good does a study do? It's a case of too much words and too little action."
>
> Unfortunately for the State of Maine, what Senator Smith says is all too true. The administration continues to dawdle over restricting textile imports that are hurting Maine and other textile States. It does nothing about lifting oil import quotas which are adding some $30 million annually to New England's fuel bill, though Kennedy himself urged just such action when he was serving Massachusetts as a U.S. Senator. Equalization of shipyard pay is another perennial and unresolved issue.
>
> Of course, it is an old bureaucratic custom to stall when a matter is controversial. But for an administration that rode into office on a campaign stressing vigor and action, the New Frontier is uncommonly prone to balking and shying. It needs spurs—and perhaps a burr or two under the saddle.

THE FLOODS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today I introduced before the Senate Public Works Committee, resolutions directing the Corps of Engineers to review its reports of survey on flood protection facilities for the Kentucky, Upper Cumberland, and Big Sandy Rivers, taking into consideration the extensive damage caused in these valleys by floods in the last few days. The last resolutions for the survey of the Big Sandy and Kentucky Rivers were introduced by Senator Earle Clements and myself in 1953-54. The last such survey on the Upper Cumberland River, that is above Cumberland Falls, was introduced by me in 1957.

The purpose of the three resolutions which I have introduced today is to enable the Corps of Engineers to determine whether additional reservoirs and local flood-protection facilities in the three valleys can now meet the cost-benefit ratio required by the Corps of Engineers, under law, by reason of the additional information of great damage caused by the flood which has just ravaged these valleys. Specifically, one purpose is to have the corps reexamine the following sites which were previously studied:

Kentucky River Valley: Line Fork Reservoir site above Hazard, Ky., and Lothair, Ky., which suffered great flood damage.

Walker's Creek Reservoir site in Lee County.

Hazard and Lothair, for local flood protection facilities.

Upper Cumberland River: Martin's Fork Reservoir site above Harlan, Ky.; Cumberland, Ky., and Harlan, Ky., for local flood protection; Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky., to determine if height of flood walls should be increased and walls should be strengthened.

Big Sandy: Paint Creek Reservoir site, to protect Paintsville; Pond Creek Reservoir site on Tug Fork branch of Big Sandy; Beaver Creek, channeling and deepening to protect Martin, Ky.

While I have named these specific sites, my resolution would also authorize the Corps of Engineers to determine if other reservoir sites and local flood protection facilities, such as flood walls, cutoffs, and channel improvement, would provide adequate protection.

I point out that several of the reservoir and local flood protection sites I have specified were studied by the Corps of Engineers under the authority of the surveys which Senator Clements and I introduced, but that it was found by the Corps of Engineers—on the basis of information available from past floods—that construction could not be approved, because they did not meet the cost-benefit ratio required by law. I believe that the new evidence of damage caused by the present flood will provide the Corps of Engineers with facts which could bring the cost-benefit ratio of some of the additional projects within the requirements of the law, and make them eligible for approval and construction.

I have talked to officials of the Corps of Engineers, and they have told me that my resolutions providing authority to them to study additional flood protection in the three river valleys would be useful.

I have also written today to the President and to Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, asking that the Corps of Engineers be requested to provide to the Bureau of the Budget a statement of its highest capabilities in terms of appropriations to speed up the construction of Fishtrap Reservoir on the Big Sandy, presently under construction; to increase its funds for preconstruction engineering at Carr Fork; to provide funds for preconstruction engineering at Laurel River; and for funds to initiate construction of Cave Run Reservoir on the Licking River. These are the only projects which are ready for appropriations. I believe that funds can be added to speed up the completion of these projects by at least 1 year. Funds are now available to complete construction of the local flood protection project at Carbon.

The Kentucky, upper Cumberland, Big Sandy, and Licking Rivers have been swept by floods for almost 100 years, and many of them have been recorded by the Corps of Engineers. The people of these areas have suffered property losses running into the millions of dollars. The 1957 flood caused damage in the Kentucky River Valley alone on the order of $10 million. Further, these floods deter and prevent the economic improvement of eastern Kentucky which, unfortunately, has been designated as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. And most tragic, many lives have been lost in the floods which have swept these valleys.

Within the last 10 years, the Congress has initiated the first substantial efforts to give flood protection to eastern Kentucky. On the Big Sandy River, Fishtrap, Pound, and Flannagan Reservoirs are under construction, and Prestonsburg has been provided partial local flood protection. On the Kentucky River, Buckhorn Reservoir has been completed and local flood protection provided at Jackson. Funds are in the present budget for the preconstruction work at Carrs Fork Reservoir; Booneville Reservoir had been previously authorized.

On the upper Cumberland River floodwalls have been constructed at Pineville and Barbourville, and funds are now available to complete construction of flood protection projects for Corbin. All preconstruction work has been completed at Laurel for Laurel Reservoir, and it is ready for construction appropriations. Funds are included in the 1964 budget to complete the survey of Rock Castle Reservoir. We are urging the authorization of Devils Jump Reservoir.

All of this has been done since 1953, but full protection for these valleys must be provided.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I will urge a speedy review by the Corps of Engineers of projects which can give the best possible protection to these valleys; and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee for Public Works, I will urge the increase of appropriations for projects under construction, and projects ready for construction during this session of the Congress.

The members of our Kentucky delegation in the House and Senate, of both parties, have worked together to secure flood protection for eastern Kentucky, as well as other sections of Kentucky, and we will continue to do so in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McGOVERN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, before this week ends I believe there should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine piece of political writing which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Star, on March 10, 1963, under the caption "McGOVERN's Political Unorthodoxy." The article was written by George W. Oakes, a contributing writer in the Washington Star.

It is a fine piece of political interpretation, as well as narrative writing and historical writing, about the reorganization of the Democratic Party in South Dakota under the leadership of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. McGOVERN in the chair], who was inspired by Adlai Stevenson in 1952 to give up a position he held, as a Ph. D., of a professorship in a college and to get out into every day politics; and how his long organizational effort revitalized the Democratic Party in South Dakota and placed him in the Senate, and gave great impetus for better government in his State.

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota for his great contribution to better government in America and the two-party development in his State and to greater participation by many of the young people in his State in politics, as well as widespread participation by many groups in his State who theretofore had been quiescent.

I am proud to serve in this body with one who has contributed so much to the revitalization of governmental activity and to the political life in his own State.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed with my remarks at this point in the RECORD. I regret that the accompanying fine photograph cannot be printed under the rules.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McGOVERN'S POLITICAL UNORTHODOXY

(By George W. Oakes)

The South Dakota election which sent GEORGE McGOVERN to the U.S. Senate last fall was one of the most unusual in the State's history for many reasons.

In the first place, his victory by 597 votes out of more than 250,000 cast wasn't determined until completion of an official recount on December 6. It was the first recount in South Dakota in 26 years.

In second place, Mr. McGOVERN almost singlehandedly built up the party that barely elected him. In 10 years the 40-year-old former history professor at Dakota Wesleyan University completely revitalized the Democratic Party in a traditionally Republican State by working at the grassroots.

"The job was really a one-man show," he said the other day in his Senate office. "I raised the money to pay my salary as executive secretary of the party and had no paid help at all. I spent long, hard days and nights traveling throughout the entire State.

"As a professor of history and government (Senator McGOVERN took a Ph. D. degree in history at Northwestern under Prof. Arthur S. Link, Princeton historian and editor of the Woodrow Wilson papers) I naturally was interested in politics. Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign inspired me to take an active part myself. The fact that Adlai plunged so vigorously into the political battle made me want to help him. While I was teaching political science, I wrote a series of semihistorical articles for the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic tracing the record of the political parties. These articles caught the attention of the youthful Democratic State chairman who then asked me to work full time on the reorganization of the party which was in such a low state that there was no competition for leadership.

THE SLATE OF 1954

"Therefore the organization, such as it was, gave me a free hand. I developed a list of candidates and in 1954 we were able for the first time in years to offer the voters a full Democratic slate for county, State, and National office.

"At least once a week, I issued a press release on some State problem. Either I took issue with the Republicans or we offered a positive proposal. In 1955 I gave serious thought to becoming a candidate myself and began to take on a heavy speaking schedule, addressing meetings of Chambers of Commerce, Kiwanis, church groups, PTA's, etc., and spoke five or six times a week throughout the entire year.

"In January 1956, I announced my candidacy for Congress and resigned as executive secretary of the party. No one in South

Dakota history ever campaigned more intensively. I made as many as 10 or 12 appearances a day in that many different towns and went to every village in the eastern half of the State.

"We won, not only because of hard work and good party organization, but also because many Republicans realized that a two-party structure was in the best interests of the State. Competition improved each party and meant that South Dakota's representatives in Congress would be more responsive to the State's needs."

At the completion of his second term in the House, where he fought vigorously for agricultural reform, Mr. McGovern decided in 1960 to enter the senatorial contest against Senator Karl Mundt. He was defeated in a Nixon statewide landslide carrying the entire Republican ticket. Observers attributed his defeat largely to voter uneasiness over the prospects of a Catholic President. Whereas Mr. Nixon won by 50,347 votes, Senator Mundt received only 14,920 more votes than Mr. McGovern.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE JOB

For 2 years Mr. McGovern served as Director of Food-for-Peace in the Kennedy administration. He expanded the school lunch program so that 37 million youngsters in 80 countries are now fed with U.S. surplus farm products. He also started the plan for use of surplus grain in paying workers in developing countries.

The official canvass of the November senatorial election gave Mr. McGovern a 100-vote lead (128,581 to 128,481) over Republican Senator Joe Bottum who had been appointed to fill the unexpired term after Senator Francis Case's death last summer. Confident he could overturn the result, Mr. Bottum demanded a recount. Then the McGovern organization had to train its staff, mostly lawyers working on a voluntary basis, on procedures to be used. Recount schools were formed and a handbook was prepared. In each county a recount board, composed of the county judge and one member of each political party, undertook the task of checking each ballot in 94 percent of the State's precincts. In some counties the recount, which started November 26, lasted more than a week.

The board did not find any fraud but did discover many cases of ballots with identifying marks which are illegal in South Dakota.

A native South Dakotan, Senator McGovern is the son of a Methodist minister, an early settler in the State. After working his way through public school and Dakota Wesleyan University, he distinguished himself as a bomber pilot in World War II and received the DFC while serving with the 15th Air Force in Italy.

A six-footer, he is known among his colleagues on the Hill for his "quiet strength." As one of them remarked, "he doesn't push hard but he doesn't give ground either." One prominent Republican Congressman, who worked with the new Senator, recalls that he was a "civilized, self-effecting Member who expressed his views effectively and always was constructive."

APPRAISED BY A COLLEAGUE

"George is a shy person," commented a liberal House Democrat.

"He seems to shrink from the rough and tumble of politics. George will have influence in the Senate by winning gradually the confidence and respect of the other Members but it will take time."

During the recent fight over the Senate rules, Senator McGovern cast his vote with those Senators supporting the Anderson resolution which would have killed the filibuster by either a majority or three-fifths vote of the Senate.

Senator McGovern, though he may be shy and have a disarming manner, isn't afraid of tackling tough issues. He was the only Senator in this session to request assignment to the Agriculture Committee, which he received as well as Interior. A quarter century ago Agriculture was considered one of the most desirable posts.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, a native South Dakotan, an old friend of McGovern's and an important influence in his political career, commented recently that "George is a patient man which I am not. He is geared temperamentally to the legislative process which many outstanding Senators are not. He is strong mentally and morally."

George McGovern comes to the Senate acclimated to the political and social life of Washington which is very important. The hardest period in a new Senator's life is the first 2 years because most new Senators are lost among the important people who crowd the Washington scene. But George has broad horizons—from Spink County, S. Dak., to New Delhi, India. He understands the world with which Congress must deal.

As Senator McGovern sees the task confronting him and the other freshman Senators, one quality "we will desperately need is a sense of history."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join with the able Senator from Texas in extending congratulations to the Senator from South Dakota on what he has accomplished. I congratulate also the people of the State of South Dakota for the great wisdom and judgment they exercised in sending him here as a U.S. Senator, where they will be most effectively served and represented by him.

I might say further that I understand that the present occupant of the chair made his maiden speech in the Senate today. He picked a most appropriate subject to talk about, because the junior Senator from Florida, in 1951, when he made his maiden speech, talked about Latin America. The able Senator from South Dakota has made his maiden speech on the same subject.

I listened with great interest to his speech. It was excellently done. I agree with most of his conclusions, though not with all of them. I now have him as a captive audience, and he will have to listen to my speech. It is possible that I may be able to convince him. At any rate, I join the Senator from Texas in congratulating the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his remarks, and I join him in congratulating the able and distinguished Senator from South Dakota and in congratulating the people of South Dakota for their good judgment. I desire to congratulate both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota on making their maiden speeches on the subject of Latin America. Having been reared in a State that adjoins Latin America, and having lived for 3½ years in El Paso, Tex., at a border point, I assure both Senators that the subject has not been exhausted, and probably will not be in the lifetime of the three of us. I again congratulate the Senator from South Dakota.

PROPOSED NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have heard some inaccurate and premature criticism of the proposed National Service Corps. Many of its critics did not have a clear idea of what the Service Corps would and would not do. Recently, George Kentera, a fine reporter for the Newark News, interviewed David L. Hackett, a special assistant to the Attorney General's office who played an important role in the planning of the Service Corps.

One important point made by Mr. Hackett when asked what control the Federal Government would have over Service Corps projects was:

> Control and supervision would be in the hands of the local community or the agency. There would be no people from Washington telling them what to do. This would be a locally supervised and initiated program. The volunteers would be under local supervision.

The rest of the forthright interview will provide my colleagues with a clear idea of how the proposed Service Corps will work. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article and interview be included in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article and interview were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On the Record—Domestic Corps Seen "Conscience"

(By George Kentera)

Washington.—The major purpose of the proposed National Service Corps is to stimulate the American conscience about the vast problem of underprivileged Americans.

In the view of David L. Hackett, special assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the domestic corps is intended as an example, a catalyst, that would motivate millions of Americans to voluntary service in meeting grave community problems.

Hackett, 36, is Executive Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and he played a leading role in setting up the proposed program for a domestic corps of full-time volunteers who would work for a year in problem areas.

INTERVIEWED BY NEWS

His comments on the National Service Corps, which under President Kennedy's proposals would reach a maximum size of 5,000 volunteers in 3 years, were made in a copyrighted "On the Record" interview with the Newark News, Detroit News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Washington Star.

Hackett stressed that the domestic corps—operating in the same spirit of Peace Corps volunteers overseas—would work on locally supervised and locally initiated programs, and upon invitation by local agencies and institutions. An exception would be on Federal reservations, such as Indian lands; another might be work with migratory labor groups that cross State boundaries in their travel.

During preliminary studies on the advisability of a domestic corps, Hackett said, suggested programs were submitted by more than 40 localities.

"We expect a great many more requests once the program has passed Congress, many more requests than we can supply," he said. He added later, "we are not pretending this is going to solve all of these problems, but we think it is going to highlight them."

Hackett said he thought it would be more difficult to recruit volunteers into the domestic corps than had been the case in the Peace Corps. Serving in problem areas of the United States, he said, would not be considered as glamorous as serving overseas, and in some areas the work would be more difficult.

EXPECTS LOCAL ACTION

The domestic corps would have to be careful, he said, that its recruits recognized the temptations of working in big cities. At the same time, he thought that domestic volunteers might be shocked at some conditions they might encounter.

"Many of us live in very comfortable circumstances," Hackett said, "and do not know the plight of the migratory worker or the Indian, or the Negro in Harlem. I think that is a role the catalyst is going to play."

He expressed the hope that the National Service Corps would, besides stimulating Americans to voluntary service on community problems, lead the individual States and communities to establish their own counterparts of the corps.

There are about 35 million volunteer workers in the United States now, Hackett said, but many more are needed, and the President's call on citizens "to serve their country will be the catalyst needed to get people who have talent and resources, who do not now involve themselves in community problems."

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS WOULD GIVE UNITED STATES AN EXAMPLE

(Following is the transcript of an "On the Record" interview with David L. Hackett, special assistant to the Attorney General, copyright 1963 by the Newark News, Detroit News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Washington Star.)

Question. Mr. Hackett, the President has now proposed to Congress a National Service Corps and you, among others, were instrumental in shaping up the program. Could you tell us briefly what the National Service Corps is, how it is different from the regular Peace Corps and what its members will do?

Mr. HACKETT. Basically, the National Service Corps is conceived as an instrument by which a small group of people who give a year of their time will serve in locally initiated projects in this country.

The major purpose of the program would be to serve as an example. It is hoped that men and women serving full time in the corps would motivate many more Americans to serve in their local communities on a part-time basis.

Question. How large a corps do you envisage?

Mr. HACKETT. The recommendation that went to the President recommended not more than 5,000 at the maximum. This would be built up over a period of perhaps 3 years.

Question. Then the program would end?

Mr. HACKETT. I think it would continue; we would hope it would continue.

Question. Why not then have this program start on a local basis, rather than having a Federal group like the National Service Corps?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, there are approximately 35 million volunteers now in the country, and we feel that there is a need for many more. We feel that a certain amount of the prestige of the President in the call to serve their country will be the catalyst needed to get people who have talent and resources, who do not now involve themselves in community problems.

Question. Would the first National Service Corps workers go to work on a Federal reservation or in a Federal hospital, or would they start right in at the local community level?

Mr. HACKETT. I think they would start right at the local community level. There are areas where some people think the Federal Government has more direct responsibilities, such as the Indian problem, and perhaps migratory labor. But during the study, we asked some local communities to develop model programs to see how they would use people, and we received over 40. We expect a great many more requests once the program has passed Congress, many more requests than we can supply.

Question. Where are some of these cities and States?

Mr. HACKETT. We had models from New York, Chicago, a migratory labor camp in California, several of the Indian reservations, and mental hospital plans in Massachusetts.

Question. Those five would be where you would probably start?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, they might be. There was no promise given.

Question. If there are 35 million volunteers already at work in this country, why do you think recruiting 5,000 federally paid people to assist them will have a big impact on the amount of volunteer work that is done?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, that is a good question. We would hope that these programs, developed at the local level, would be in the areas of greatest need. We would hope the programs would get more and more of the citizens within the community to concern themselves with the problems in the areas of greatest need.

For example, in Massachusetts young people from Harvard and Radcliffe work in mental hospitals. What these hospitals want to do now is to expand it statewide, and to attract young people from the colleges throughout Massachusetts. They would request, say, 30 to 40 corps people who would really act as agents to involve more and more young people from the colleges. There are in this country many examples of this. We are not at all critical of the volunteers who now serve. We just think that there need to be many more.

Question. If this is designed essentially as a catalyst process would it not be better to have professionally trained people go in and form the nucleus?

Mr. HACKETT. That is the problem. There are just not enough professionals.

Question. The Federal Government could not recruit 5,000 professionals?

Mr. HACKETT. I think that it could, but the cost would be great. We say that volunteers are one method by which this manpower shortage can be met. We are not pretending this is going to solve all of these problems, but we think it is going to highlight them.

Question. How costly will this effort be?

Mr. HACKETT. We have no definite figures, but the estimates for 1,000 volunteers run between $4 million and $6 million. The final cost will depend upon what the local contribution might be and what termination pay the corps volunteers might receive. The Peace Corps volunteers get $75 a month, and there is a question of whether these will get the same.

Question. On recruitment, you sent out 22,000 questionnaires to college students, and 18,000 to elderly persons. Can you give us a breakdown of their replies?

Mr. HACKETT. They are still coming in. Of the ones we have received, the majority has shown a great deal of interest. I think recruiting is going to be a problem. I think it will be much more difficult to recruit in the domestic corps than the overseas Peace Corps.

Question. Why is that?

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is not as glamorous as serving in a foreign country. In some ways, the work there will be much more difficult than overseas. The temptations of working in the big cities are there, and we are going to have to be very careful in making sure that we get people who realize this.

The 60 Peace Corps people who trained in New York for Colombia, South America, came from middle-class backgrounds. I think that they were appalled by the conditions they found in the slum areas in which they worked.

Some of them said, "why send us to South America?" They didn't really realize that these conditions existed in this country, 20 people in a room, with rats, and this type of thing. So we think it is going to be very much more difficult.

Question. What kinds of people are you looking for?

Mr. HACKETT. We know there is considerable interest among young people in college. There has been tremendous interest on the part of old people, retired people. I think these are two places where recruits could come from, but we would also hope there would be people in between who would give up a year to help. For example, the Attorney General is working with 20 young businessmen from around the country. I think there would be a variety of skills, from all types of backgrounds.

Question. Well, would the National Service Corps people be working in their own hometown or will you be assigning midwesterns to New York, or New Yorkers to the South?

Mr. HACKETT. Probably they would not work in their hometown, but in other parts of the country.

Question. How would they live?

Mr. HACKETT. They would live in the area in which they go to work. If they worked in a mental hospital, they would live there.

Question. And the Government would pay them enough for their room and board?

Mr. HACKETT. That is right.

Question. And subsistence?

Mr. HACKETT. Yes. We estimate between $6 and $8 a day, depending on the area. It would be on a par with the people with whom they are working.

Question. Do you anticipate any opposition in Congress from those Members who might be opposed to having Negroes and whites working together in, say, a depressed southern area?

Mr. HACKETT. I would hope not. The key to the whole thing is that this would be on invitation only. The local community would have to decide whether they would want these corps people.

Question. You wouldn't likely have a corps of volunteers in some parts of Mississippi, would you?

Mr. HACKETT. This would be up to the people in Mississippi. When you are talking about 3,000 to 5,000 people, obviously they can't be everywhere. We would hope that cities or States would set up their own counterparts, and begin to move into similar areas. Many of us live in very comfortable circumstances, and do not know the plight of the migratory worker or the Indian, or the Negro in Harlem. I think that is a role the catalyst is going to play.

Question. Will the Federal Government have any control over these projects?

Mr. HACKETT. I think that there would be some basic criteria established. Then I think the control and supervision would be in the hands of the local community or the agency. There would be no people from Washington telling them what to do. This would be a locally supervised and initiated program. The volunteers would be under local supervision.

Question. What, if any, safeguards are there to prevent the National Service Corps volunteers from being used as political workers at campaign time?

Mr. HACKETT. Well, I would doubt whether an application would get through if this was the intent. It is not anticipated that any of these people would be used as political workers.

Question. Would they be barred from any political activity?

Mr. HACKETT. I think so. I would assume so; yes.

Question. Will those volunteers be permitted to work on projects that are sponsored by religious organizations?

Mr. HACKETT. I think it is a difficult question to answer, but I think it would depend upon the job that the applicant wants to do, regardless of who it is, and the amount of support from the local community.

Question. But there is no flat ban against a project that is inspired by some religious organization?

Mr. HACKETT. It would depend on the project. The intent is not to further an agency's aims or ambitions, but to give service and try to help in these various problem areas.

Question. Would it be permissible for a National Service Corps volunteer assigned, for example, to a migratory worker camp to lobby for improved housing or better schooling or higher pay?

Mr. HACKETT. I doubt whether these people would be sent in to do that. This would be under the complete control of the local community. If they did not follow or behave according to the plan, there would be no question that they would be removed.

DOES FEDERAL AID MEAN FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most perisistent fears in the debate over Federal aid to education is the fear of eventual control of education and the imposition of restraints on academic freedom.

Mr. McGeorge Bundy, now special assistant to the President and formerly dean of the faculty at Harvard University, is especially well qualified to discuss this important question.

He has seen Federal aid to education in action from both sides of the fence, and last fall in a speech to the American Council on Education, he said:

> I will say flatly that American higher learning is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.

After pointing out the self-evident fact that Federal support has been extraordinarily productive and helped make possible levels of educational achievement that would have been impossible without Federal assistance, Mr. Bundy makes the point that—

> Freedom is the opportunity to act as well as the absence of restraint. Without Federal money our scientists would not have been free, in the most precise sense of the word, to do what they have done in the last 15 years.

He then goes on to make the quite cogent observation that—

> Nearly all the money which supports higher education in this country carries with it some risk of limitation upon the freedom of academic life, and the record of the Federal dollar does not suffer by comparison with any other major source of funds. In the best of our institutions, the Federal dollar has been, on the average, as good as any other—always excepting the wholly unrestricted gift. In American academic life as a whole the qualitative rating of Federal money would in my considered conviction be better than that of any other major class of income.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Bundy has given a penetrating speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLESSING THAT IS FEDERAL AID

(By McGeorge Bundy)

Of propositions which in my judgment have been demonstrated beyond doubt, two are of high importance. The first is that Federal investment in the higher learning has been extraordinarily productive, both for the national security and for the quality of our civilization. The second is that the processes of this investment have on the whole been such as to enhance the freedom and independent strength of American colleges and universities.

The productivity of Federal investment in higher education is probably a notion that needs little demonstration in this audience. Whether we consider the principal immediate objectives of advancing the Nation's defense and improving the Nation's health—or the wider issue of the quality and quantity of American science, we can say quite frankly that without the Federal Government our present levels of achievement would be impossible. This proposition is self-evident to responsible scientists, responsible university administrators, responsible Government officials, and responsible members of leading committees of Congress. Its self-evidence is the primary cause of the very rapid curve of growth in Federal support for science and technology. Within this proposition there can be many questions and reservations, but its essential and sweeping validity is clear.

The second proposition is equally plain, at least in my judgment, but I recognize that it needs more argument. We are so accustomed to a nervous suspicion of "Federal control" that it is not easy to accept the notion that the Federal dollar may in fact be a reinforcement of freedom. So let us look at the facts.

Let me at once recognize that the general proposition is subject to substantial reservations and qualifications. There are many, and there is no better place to become acquainted with them than to serve as dean at a place like Harvard where the faculty has a cantankerous habit of independence. I know about the problem of project support, the problem of paperwork, the problem of the undersupported field of inquiry, the problem of badly designed fellowship or loan programs, the problems of oaths and affidavits, and above all, the problem of the internal hemorrhage which can be created by Federal money which does not meet overhead costs. These are all real problems, and unless he has changed since I used to work for him, President Pusey will have said some sharp things about them earlier.

FEDERAL DOLLARS PRODUCE FREEDOM

But all of these weaknesses can be repaired, and progress is being made on most of them. And neither singly nor in combination do they outbalance the overwhelming positive effects of Federal money. I will say flatly that American higher learning is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.

There are a number of ways of demonstrating this proposition, but I content myself with three. The first is quite simple: it is that freedom is the opportunity to act as well as the absence of restraint. Without Federal money our scientists would not have been free, in the most precise sense of the word, to do what they have done in the last 15 years. It is no good to talk about academic freedom when antiquated laboratories, inadequate instruments, and overcrowded teaching schedules make serious inquiry impossible. When it is not given under crippling limitations and restrictions, money is quite simply an instrument of freedom, in the universities as elsewhere in life. This is a point so obvious that we frequently forget it.

My second supporting argument is comparative in form. My claim is simply that nearly all the money which supports higher education in this country carries with it some risk of limitation upon the freedom of academic life, and that the record of the Federal dollar does not suffer by comparison with any other major source of funds.

All of us know that the national academic budget, on the income side, is a many-colored mixture of funds from a wide variety of sources: from tuition, from legislative appropriations, from annual gifts, from endowments, from contracts, from foundations, from Government, from alumni, from church and state, from industry and individuals. We also know, although we don't always admit it, that almost every one of these sources of funds carries with it the hazard that it may limit our freedom of action. It is a standard pleasantry in our private gatherings that members of public universities should speak in envious tones to their colleagues in private colleges of the beauty of life without a State legislature to placate, and when this joke is trotted out the man from the private college is likely to reply by offering to match his five most critical alumni against any legislative committee in the country. All of us here know that suspicion of the principles of academic freedom is endemic among legislatures and alumni. It is endemic—seldom dominant, but always present—and the freedom of American higher learning as a whole cannot be measured by the unusual independence of action of a few colleges and universities with strong traditions.

FEDERAL GRANTS BEYOND CRITICISM

Even when we leave aside the cruder forms of attack upon freedom of inquiry, there is little reason to single out the Federal dollar for criticism. An unbalanced allocation of resources is more characteristic of alumni than of Government agencies, and the over-administered grant was invented by the large private foundations long before the Government became a significant force in academic life. Indeed, my own experience as an academic administrator leads me to the view that on balance the Federal Government makes its grants and signs its contracts with a better perception of the real needs of the higher learning than one can find, on the average, in the major private foundations.

When we look at the overall pattern of higher education, the record of the Federal dollar is still less open to comparative attack. The Federal dollar has not been used, as State dollars have been, to support whole departments and majors in subjects that don't belong at the college or university level. The Federal dollar has not been used, as private gifts have been, for overly luxurious athletic facilities that are reminiscent more of the country club than of the academy. The Federal dollar has not been used for the subsidy of athletes or the construction of pretentious and egocentric memorial buildings. In the best of our institutions, the Federal dollar has been, on the average, as good as any other—always excepting the wholly unrestricted gift. In American academic life as a whole the qualitative rating of Federal money would in my considered conviction be better than that of any other major class of income.

My third claim for the quality of Federal money is that the decisions by which it is allocated are made by processes more nearly fitted to the great tradition of academic life than is the case with any other major source of funds. Within the broad lines of authorizations laid down by statute, what governs the decisions of the Federal Government on the whole is the collective judgment of outstanding members of the academic community itself. Statutory provisions may not be perfect, but the Congress has encouraged intelligent administrative interpretation, and in practice the qualitative performance of Federal money has been set by the judgment and taste of Federal administrators in seeking and using the counsel of qualified academic men. On balance that judgment has been excellent.

I emphasize this point because it is one of cardinal importance for the future of relations between government and universities. The greatest single safeguard for this relationship is the interplay of thought and decision of large numbers of individuals with proper professional qualifications on both sides of the line. This principle is embodied historically in the statute which established the National Academy of Sciences. It was followed in practice during the extraordinary events of the Second World War, when the Federal Government and the academic community first worked at full pressure together. This is a meeting of academic administrators and as a former member of that club I recognize and even share the feeling many of you must have, that real wisdom and judgment in academic budgeting belongs to the president, or at least to the dean. The institution in which I myself was an administrator has a tradition of quite highhanded and centralized executive behavior—and it has not suffered, on balance, as a consequence. Yet the fact is, and we all know this too, that executive energy in academic administration always depends for its effectiveness on a most intensive process of consultation and consensus. Our colleges and universities serve best when they serve in their own way, under processes that meet their own requirements. The most serious mistake a lay granting body can make is to try to decide for itself how a given objective can be met by academic institutions. In some statutory provisions and in some administrative practices the Federal Government has certainly made this mistake—but—again on balance—its major granting agencies have followed a very different and much more constructive course.

ABANDON FEAR OF FEDERAL AID

Assuming that you are not in violent revolt against the argument so far, we now have two propositions: First, Federal money has repaid its cost production in most important ways; second, it has been a reinforcement of the freedom of the higher learning. From these conclusions it should follow that the traditional fear and hostility to Federal aid to higher education would be abandoned—and certainly there has been some progress in this direction. The anguished prophecies of earlier decades are heard less often—and from less respectable sources. One incidental benefit has been that representatives of private colleges, as their annual accounts begin to show large admixtures of Federal money, have somewhat muted the warnings against the low standards and political pressure of public institutions with which they have too often sought to attract private funds.

But much remains to be done. Too much of our time is still spent—even in speeches like this one—in arguing a case which, at least among ourselves, we should have learned to take for granted. Too many of us are acting still as if Federal participation in the higher learning were still an uncertain experiment, instead of the stable and growing reality which it is. And this is what I mean by my somewhat foolish title: [1] generalized hostility to Federal money is as senseless as tilting at a windmill. The windmill is here to stay, and it is no man's enemy. Indeed this whole business of Federal money in higher education represents a constructive partnership which benefits both sides—and I will press my title just a bit further—to suggest that the analogy of the windmill can be applied in two quite contrasting ways, both of them fitting to the case.

A windmill, as you know, and as Don Quixote did not, is a peaceful agency for making wind do work. The wind may blow from many directions, but a well-designed windmill gets results in terms of grain ground. So it is with a well-designed university. It exists to advance learning and the winds of financial support—whatever their course—are caught and turned to the university's purpose. So it is also with a soundly conceived program of Federal aid: Such a program also can be seen as a windmill—in which the university's winnowing breezes provide the force that serves the program's purpose. The analogies are labored, I fear—but in this clumsy way they both hold true. This is what has been demonstrated conclusively in the last 20 years—and this is what we must take for granted as we examine the real issues of the present and future.

But what we take for granted we should also never fail to preach. Nothing is plainer about the partnership between Government and the higher learning than the simple fact that most Americans are deeply unaware of it. That is not a healthy situation, for over the long run we will not, as citizens, support with taxes what we do not understand. This is not the place for a study of the unusual pattern of circumstance, which has produced the curious present situation—there is nothing discreditable about it—nor has it been done in any secretive way. The people's Representatives in Congress have followed the whole process closely—and for those who have followed it closely this has been a fine example of responsible government in action. But the ordinary citizen really has not followed it at all, and in the universities and colleges we have not done nearly enough to tell him about it. This is a mistake, for in the American governmental process it is the immediate beneficiary of Federal activity whose job it is to assure public understanding that the benefits he receives are in the public interest. It is not enough to persuade ourselves, in private discussion, that the help we get is deeply in the public interest. The taxpayer deserves explanation, acknowledgment, and thanks. He has every right to an understanding pride in the degree to which he is himself a partner in one of the most productive and effective activities in all our great society, and if he does not feel that pride, the fault is ours.

The partnership exists; it is productive; it needs our energetic and continuous defense. So far so good. But what can we do to improve it? Each of us I am sure can think of a dozen immediate and concrete answers to that question—but let me offer instead a few more general comments.

First, I think we need to give constant attention to all the multiplicity of details which affect our relationship. It is all well and good to make sweeping statements such as those I have already offered, but these statements stand or fall on what is actually done in a hundred different programs. The Government, most fortunately, presents not one but many faces to the university world, and if at any given moment the best face is very beautiful, the worst is likely to be quite a mess—and it may even have effects like those of Medusa. Law by law, program by program, office by office, and even case by case we must ourselves police the partnership. I have already indicated my belief that a critically important role in these matters belongs to the qualified scholars in each relevant field, but you who are responsible to the wider public, as heads of institutions, cannot safely leave this labor to your scholars alone. The same hazards and necessities which justify alert and active central administration within our universities demand your attention in the relation between your institution and the Government: Cliques can form in the process of counsel to Washington as readily as in a closed and self-satisfied university department. And the intrusion of unhealthy influence from the donor is not always resisted by professors with special interests; like bad alumni and misguided legislatures, Washington bureaucrats require the vigilance of administrations as well as faculties. I well remember myself, from my years at Harvard, how often along the battleground of negotiation with Government agencies it was the quite unscholarly administrative officer in charge of contracts, and not the high-minded and learned professor in search of funds, who maintained the true principles of academic autonomy. And on the rare, but real, occasion in which Federal assistance becomes excessively generous, it is unfortunately very unlikely that the immediate beneficiaries will complain. Someone else should, and I think administrators are nominated.

Our responsibility is still more clear in a second field: The prevention—or repair—of imbalances in American learning which may be created—quite unintentionally—by Federal programs. I am not an alarmist on this point—there are very learned men whom I hold in great affection who seem to me just plain wrong in their fear of the rise of science. Nevertheless it seems certain to me that the general welfare does require us to be watchful against distortions. And my own conviction is that the best single remedy is to seek for ways of gradually expanding the flow of Federal money so that it works for the reinforcement of the higher learning as a whole. This can be done, I believe, without any loss of effectiveness in meeting the particular and legitimately urgent purposes which have inspired existing programs. But we will have to help.

To do this job and others, I believe, we will have to show, individually and collectively, a new level of attention to this whole problem. So my third recommendation is that we must do much more, in the future, in our Washington work. Until now, you know, the Federal dollar has been badly underprivileged in its share of attention from high-level academic administrators. To put it quite bluntly, most of us have simply let the money roll in, contenting ourselves from time to time with well bred complaints about bureaucrats or less well bred sneers when too much money seemed to be going to someone else. We are beginning to do better, but there is a lot still to be done.

And that brings me to my last and most important point. The case for higher education—and for its partnership with the Federal Government—is not merely a matter of our common interest in technical progress, or in the national defense, or in medical research. It is not merely a matter of the evident need for improved facilites, the obligation to open doors for young people, or the honorable race for space. It is not even a matter merely of the health and strength of the higher learning as a whole. What is going on here is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people. We have built great private institutions—small and large. We have developed magnificent State universities, and we are going to have more of them. In the last 20 years it has become plain that this whole vast enterprise requires—and is required for—the interest of the Nation as a whole. This is a cause for care, and for attention to detail, for new organization and effort, for explanation and for advocacy. But it is also a cause for pride and hope. For what has been accomplished so far proves beyond doubt that there is good for all America in this new partnership. Surely it is our responsibility—and our urgent duty—to see to it that what is done continues to be good—gets better—that what needs to be done gets more and wider understanding—and that the larger meaning of this high achievement of our Federal democracy is understood and recognized. This great chapter of accomplishment, properly understood and properly sustained, can be a major reinforcement to our whole society—as a demonstration of effective action for high purposes. It is time for us to speak and work a whole lot harder to this end, so that the winds may blow, the windmills work—and all of us be proud.

---

[1] "Of Winds and Windmills: Free Universities and Public Policy."—Editor.

PROBLEMS OF URBAN GROWTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are all pretty much aware of the tremendous population growth and changes that are taking place in the major metropolitan areas of the country, but we have badly ignored the problems that have arisen and neglected ways of coping with them, so that we might achieve the best possible living environment for the vast majority of the American people who are urban and suburban dwellers.

A most interesting article on this subject recently appeared in the Jersey Journal, February 4, written by Dr. Stanley Worton, of Jersey City State College.

After describing the implications of downtown deterioration, suburban sprawl, and traffic congestion, Dr. Worton suggests that our metropolitan areas consider reviving "the old natural corridor-type development that came with the railroads in the last century" as a way of shaping a more satisfying environment for all.

While obviously no one solution will meet the almost infinite variety of needs and desires of our urban areas across the country, this pattern of development certainly warrants very careful study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Broader Regional Approach Will Help Solve Urban Blight—JCSC Professor Considers "Spread City" Problem

(By Dr. Stanley N. Worton)

The bulldozers are busy. The countryside is being subdivided into larger and larger plots for ranch-style, split-level, and colonial homes. Shopping centers are springing up like mushrooms. Industry is spreading out in all directions along the highways or on scattered sites.

Meanwhile, urban blight continues to spread. The problems of congestion, dirt, noise, air pollution, and lack of parking and play space are on the increase. There is an exodus from the older cities of families with children.

Does this mean that the great metropolis of which we are a part is on the way out, fated to extinction like the dinosaur or the dodo bird?

Will the entire region soon become a sprawling mass of continuous residential and industrial development without 1 inch of open space?

Will our central cities be left to the old couples, the single people, the wealthy, the very poor, and to minority groups who are not welcome elsewhere?

The answer to all these questions must be an emphatic "No."

The New York metropolitan area is the greatest region in the Nation, if not in the entire world. It is unsurpassed as a center of industry, commerce and finance, of entertainment and culture, of education, and, yes, of living as well.

More than 16 million persons—1 out of every 11 Americans—live here. They inhabit 22 counties in 3 States; 9 of the counties—our own Hudson is 1 of them—are in New Jersey.

How can this region change the direction of its development and avoid its fate? It can do so only when we the people who live and work in it recognize what will be happening to us and then decide to do something about it.

But first we must see how we got to be the way we are.

Basic to any human settlement are the opportunities for jobs present in the area. The New York metropolitan region got its start as a port of entry for people and for goods. It continued to grow, not only because it developed into a great port, but because of the forms of economic activity that developed out of its role in commerce.

In addition to light and heavy industry and all forms of transport, there are concentrated here the financial community, the printing trades, advertising, public relations, and management experts, designers, wholesale and retail centers, nonprofit corporations and foundations, health and welfare leadership, cultural and entertainment facilities, and a host of specialized services.

Such an economic mix requires a tremendous reservoir of manpower, skills, and talent. The residents of this region provide these qualities to a degree unmatched anywhere in the world.

So concentrated are the enterprises involved that one-third of the more than 6½ million jobs are in lower Manhattan. Another one-third are in the harbor band—the rest of the core area—in cities like Jersey City, Bayonne, Kearny, Hoboken, Weehawken, Union City, West New York, and North Bergen. One-fifth are in the inner ring of suburbs, and the remainder in the outer ring, or hinterland.

However, in recent years there has been an outward movement of jobs. The trend has been to go suburban. Industry has found that the time factor is more important than the distance factor and it has been locating along the highways or in industrial parks. Here they establish themselves on large tracts of land in sprawling, one-story plants with plenty of parking space. Acreage is cheap and taxes are low—at first.

The movement to the suburbs got its start at the end of World War II because of the pent-up demand for housing and the fact that it was cheaper to buy a house in the suburbs under a veterans' or FHA mortgage than to rent an apartment in the city.

But it was more than just a matter of economics. Suburbia became a form of status and a choice of a way of life—open space, grass and trees, a big backyard, community life, small local government, good schools, and low taxes.

Many of those who rushed into suburban life soon found that although each had more space in his backyard, he also had space to cover to reach his destination—the job, stores, and other facilities. Hence the two-car family and the need to chauffeur the children around from activity to activity. As more people moved to the suburbs, the countryside was pushed farther and farther away. In addition, the price tags on homes rose rapidly.

With the need for more schools, sidewalks, sewers, and new services, taxes shot sky-high. Taking care of home and lawn became almost a second job. Direct personal contacts proved to be no more effective in influencing local government than the energetic civic organization with know-how in the city.

If this is the way things are now, what does the future hold for us? What will the metropolitan region be like 25 years from now?

The Regional Plan Association, a nonprofit civic organization engaged in research on the development of the metropolitan area, has made a number of projections on the region's growth. It is estimated that by 1985 the population of the 22-county area will increase from 16 million to 22 million, an addition equal to the present populations of Chicago and Philadelphia combined. The increase will be the largest of any 25-year period in our history, even including the years of heavy immigration early in the century.

As for the kind of residential development that is taking place outside our cities and will continue to develop if present trends continue, Regional Plan Association has coined a phrase to describe it: "spread-city."

It is a sparsely settled, homogenized Los Angeles. It is not a true city because it lacks centers. It is not a suburb because it is not attached to a central city. Nor is it truly rural, for it is loosely covered with houses and urban facilities.

There will be no "downtown" where shops, restaurants, movies, and specialized services are concentrated. The pulse and excitement, the variety, the culture that has attracted man to the city throughout history will be gone.

The effects of spread-city will not be felt only by those who live in it, but by all the inhabitants of the metropolitan region. Traffic congestion and travel time will continue to mount. Although factories may move farther out in the hinterland, their workers will not follow because they won't be able to afford the new one-family houses on large lots. It will be the executive-professional classes who will move out, but their jobs will continue to be in the core areas. This will result in a form of reverse commuting.

As Mason Gross, president of Rutgers University, has so aptly put it: "The greatest evil that we face is not the slum or even the inextricable traffic jam, but rather an emptiness or meaninglessness of our day-to-day existence. A tremendous amount of time which could be lived through and enjoyed has been thrown carelessly away on utterly meaningless experiences—most of them behind the wheel of the automobile. I suggest to you further that meaninglessness is a malignant disease. If we allow it to feed on 2 hours of our day, it will soon begin to spread to the rest.

What is bringing about the development of spread-city? Do the people of the metropolitan region prefer this mode of living? If we can find a cause, perhaps a solution will follow.

The answers to these questions can be found in the fact that the vacant land now being subdivided for housing is zoned at an average of two-thirds of an acre for a one-family house. This land is found in about 200 towns in the metropolitan area with an average population of 10,000 each.

The main reason for this policy is local taxes. Bigger lots mean fewer houses, fewer houses mean less families and fewer children, fewer children means fewer schools, fewer schools mean less taxes. Apartment building and industry would help, but they cause a loss of prestige.

What is at the heart of the problem, then, is the best use of land—new land to be developed and the reuse of old land.

A workable solution to the problems of the region already exists. What needs to be done is to revive the old natural corridor-type of development that came with the railroads in the last century. As the railroads fanned out in different directions from the major cities into the countryside, towns sprang up along the way spaced like beads on a chain. If this pattern were repeated again, we would have commercial centers and industrial clusters springing up around train stations and highway interchanges. Here, too, would be most of the apartment houses. Spreading out from these centers probably would be garden apartments and attached houses; further out would be one-family houses on small lots; still further one-family houses on large lots.

The alternative to building the region around exclusive automobile travel would be investment in a much faster and cheaper commuter rail service. The railroads are losing money on their commuter lines and seem most willing to abandon them. A public agency could supervise the region's rail network as a whole and fit it to total needs. It could set standards and fares and provide higher speed, up-to-date equipment, frequent service, and more convenient stops and transfers.

A loop system or network of rapid transit facilities connecting cities and inner suburbs and in turn linked to the outer towns by express buses or existing rail lines would provide a logical pattern for the industrial and residential development of the future. A start has been made with the port authority's takeover of the Hudson and Manhattan lines. But this is just a beginning.

All these programs would have a direct effect upon improving the core cities. But specific action must also be taken along the following lines to make urban life more attractive:

1. Dramatically increase State aid for low- and middle-income housing and for improved schools.

2. Revamp taxation so that high-rise apartment houses (the potential slums of tomorrow) are not the sole form of urban renewal. Congestion is bad for family life.

3. Encourage individual home improvement; do not discourage it by penalizing the owner with a higher assessment when he makes improvements.

4. Spread public housing into the suburbs, rather than raise the density of the core cities.

5. Recognize that a city is more than just a mass of buildings. Families, especially new arrivals, need training and education in group living and civic responsibility.

6. Allow minority groups, whose purchasing power has risen meteorically in recent years, to make their contribution to urban living.

No metropolitan area in the world can offer more than this one. Whether we allow it to get out of joint or make use of the technology and planning at our disposal to improve conditions depends on how many people care and how much they care.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that it comes 10 years too late, I would be most gratified by the unprecedented interest expressed in this body in the conduct of our foreign relations with Latin America—particularly Cuba—and our newly developed attention to the political and economic conditions existing on that continent.

PRESENT INTEREST IN CUBA

There used to be whole weeks, indeed months, when no word concerning the aspirations and needs of our Latin neighbors was spoken in the Congress. Sometimes years would go by without any tangible action being taken by this body to alleviate the problems in Latin America, or to enable those people to better solve their own problems. Latin America was not in vogue then. Headlines proclaiming what a prominent American statesman or ordinary Member of Congress said about South America did not come easily in those days. Now it seems the whole Nation, including those—or perhaps I should say especially those—who were most quiet then talk of little but the southern continent. There has been a change in interest and focus. What brought about the change? It was the admission of Communist adherence by a man, named Fidel Castro, who followed the typical pattern of shouting for liberty and democracy, while totally crushing the Cuban people and burying their once bright aspirations for a better life in an improved democracy.

I hope that after the present danger exemplified by Castro's Cuba has ceased to exist—and one day it will, for I fully believe the Cubans will again one day be free—our interest in the welfare of our Latin neighbors will continue.

I hope that we will not quickly forget these dangerous and unhappy days, but will forever be mindful that our own Nation's security and well-being are inextricably bound up with that of Cuba and our Latin neighbors to the south.

One of my deepest convictions is that in today's world, where jet-powered airplanes, missiles, and rocketry pull us ever closer physically, our dependence on and need for each other grow proportionately. The two continents of this Western Hemisphere are indissolubly bound together. Like the legendary Siamese twins, one cannot maintain a viable existence without the other. Recognition of this fact by the Congress is a necessary step in insuring that our own Nation's future remains economically and politically secure.

SMATHERS' LONG-STANDING INTEREST IN LATIN AMERICA

It was with this in mind that, over the past 12 years, I spoke more than 170 times in the Senate—sometimes briefly, often at length—trying to call attention to the progressive deterioration in our relations with Latin America from that time in World War II, when we collaborated closely with them in joint efforts to stop the Nazis.

I recall, shortly after reaching the Senate in 1951, warning, I believe in my first speech on this Senate floor of our indifference to our Latin neighbors, and urging our Government to increase its economic assistance to the countries of Central and South America. When the Foreign Relations Committee in August of that year proposed to reduce even the small amount of technical assistance proposed by the administration for Latin America, I told the Senate:

> It seems to me that we must not lose sight of our own security, which means of course the well-being and welfare of the entire Western Hemisphere. Above all, we should remember who our friends are. One of the great errors for us to make would be to forget these people who not only are in our own neighborhood, but with whom we have had friendly and beneficial relations for many years.

In July 1954, in another effort to direct our thinking southward, I warned of the Communist threat in that area by saying: "We must assist the anti-Communist forces in Latin America to eliminate the conditions of poverty and illiteracy in which the seeds of communism blossom and flourish. The time for action is now."

With administration and congressional apathy continuing, I declared in June 1956, that "today the Soviet Union is moving into Latin America in an attempt to fill the vacuum we have left there."

Our national leaders in those days were apparently acting on the premise that the good neighbor policy, enunciated and started in the mid-1930's, would somehow work in the 1950's, even though we as a nation did no more about it than, from time to time, make a speech calculated to assuage their feelings, but nothing more.

And so, while the United States with generosity and good will unparalleled in world history granted or loaned over $85 billion to foreign countries around the globe during the years 1947–60, the 21 nations of Latin America—our neighbors, our friends, with 180 million people and with the fastest growing population on the face of the globe—received on the average less than one-fourth of 1 percent of this $85 billion total.

FIDEL CASTRO COMES TO POWER

Fidel Castro's coming to power in January 1959 was the beginning of the change in attitude.

We all remember that in the early months of 1959 Castro was the most heroic figure in all the hemisphere in the eyes of the general public. He was the modern Robin Hood, or, more appropriately, a Cuban "Zapata," the legendary hill fighter who fought always against tyranny.

Here was that type of man, it was said, who could revitalize the Latin American nations, who could and would throw off the shackles of inequity and oppression, who would give the people dignity and self-respect, who could operate a government like our own—one of, by, and for the people.

However, Mr. President, there were some of us who never believed this propaganda.

On January 17, 1959, 2 weeks after he came into power, I stated on a television program:

> I reserve judgment on the quality of his (Castro's) ambition, his capacity to administer the affairs of Cuba, his understanding of democracy and his judgment and tolerance.

I questioned if "the people of Cuba have improved their position by merely the change of governments."

These were unhappy and unpleasant days for me—unhappy because I saw communism taking a foothold in the Caribbean with the unwitting assistance and unstinting applause of many here in our own country; unpleasant because my opposition to Castro won for me the disapproval of not only a large portion of my constituents, but virtually all of the press.

During the first week in January 1959, following Batista's flight but before Castro had completed his triumphal march from the Sierra Maestra, I was so concerned about this youthful Caesar, and the danger he constituted to his own people and to the hemisphere, that I made special calls to Assistant Secretary of State Roy Rubottom. I urged him, and subsequently Secretary of State Herter, not to recognize any government set up by Castro until that government had held at least one free election.

I shall never forget being advised by Mr. Rubottom that the American public demanded recognition of Castro's regime, and this recognition was blithely given on January 7. My records reflect that 2 days later, on January 9, Mr. Rubottom and I had further discussion about Castro in my office, and on January 11 I met with a State Department delegation in still further discussion of the subject of Castro, communism, and Cuba. However, the act had been done and frankly met with overwhelming approval.

I took a trip around Central and South America from January 19 until February 10, 1959, and wherever I went in my talks with labor leaders, clergymen, government officials, and others, there was quiet but nonetheless great apprehension as to the quality of Castro's intentions.

I remember well my personal dismay when Castro was invited to address the American Society of Newspaper Editors here in Washington in April 1959. I recall that he subsequently was invited and did appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

The chairman was kind enough to invite me to listen in, and I particularly remember the general warmth with which Fidel Castro was received. I endeavored to ask him a few questions, but had little success as he realized I had some doubts about him. When I kept asking him when he was going to have an election, I recall he responded that "the people of Cuba don't want an election." When I pressed him further on the question of elections, he said, "I might have one in 3 or 4 years."

Despite his ominous statements, support for him was so overwhelming that I began to have doubt in my own judgment about this man.

According to my files, that very day after his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, I stated in a written press release that—

> Serious trouble is brewing in the Caribbean area. The source of danger is centered in Cuba, a country which historically has always been our friend. Cuba could easily become a prisoner of the Reds. Fidel Castro, during a meeting today with several Senators, told me that elections in Cuba were 3 or 4 years away. That is not very heartening news. I asked him about his anti-American statements and he denied having made them.

I went on to say:

> It is clear that he has not yet learned you can't play ball with the Communists for he has them peppered throughout his government.

In early April 1959, even more disturbing news began to come. Because I had expressed doubt about Castro, others who had doubt began to call me about their concern. I received two cablegrams from the President of Haiti expressing fear over an anticipated invasion from Cuba. I came to the Senate floor and stated:

> The President of Haiti appealed to me for help by cablegram to help forestall an invasion of his country. I sent today, April 17, 1959, a telegram to Dr. Jose Mora, Secretary-General of the OAS, urging that he take immediate action to set up a voluntary police force to keep the peace in Latin America. I suggested this police patrol be made up of the 21 member states of the OAS including the United States. We have to relieve tension in the Caribbean and put a halt to Communist troublemaking. An inter-American police force could do the job but we don't have much time to act.

It was shortly after this warning of April 17, specifically on April 24, that Castro sent against the Republic of Panama an invasion force that he had permitted to be organized and trained in Cuba. Even after this act of aggression, I don't recall any concern having been expressed by any of the Senators or news commentators who are so loudly and persistently talking today. I do recall the late Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, talking about the danger of Fidel Castro to Central and South America, and all he got for his trouble was criticism.

However, there began to be some ripple of criticism of Castro in May of 1959 when he confiscated the property and assets of 117 companies, the bulk of which were American-owned. I recall at that time making a statement to the press and on television that we should not sit idly by—that the confiscation of American property should not be ignored and that immediate and effective steps should be taken to stop it.

A month later, in June 1959, the State Department began for the first time to express some concern about Castro's acts and specifically about the need of having adequate compensation paid to those Americans who had lost their property.

On May 26, 1959, I offered, on the floor of the Senate, amendments to the Mutual Security Act which were designed to create an Inter-American Police Force, and Inter-American Court of Justice. No action was taken by the committee to which referred.

On the 31st of May 1959, after Fidel Castro and his Communist cohorts had, through executions and the use of raw power, subdued all resistence in Cuba, he again turned his eyes toward new conquests and launched an invasion of the country of Nicaragua.

That invasion was successfully turned back and incontrovertible evidence was obtained by the defenders of Nicaragua, proving beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the invasion had been financed, organized, and launched by Castro from the Island of Cuba. So far as I have been able to ascertain there was no protest or outcry about the invasion of Nicaragua by the State Department or anyone else in position of authority.

I again emphasize that there were very few people in that particular time, the summer of 1959, who were interested in clipping the wings of Fidel Castro.

He still had the bulk of the American people's support. He still had many newsmen lyrically writing about him as a great revolutionary, despite the fact that his drumhead courts-martial had executed close to 600 of his fellow countrymen—including some who had fought alongside him in the hills against Batista—and despite the fact that he had completely flouted the rights of U.S. citizens and property owners and had launched invasions of Panama and Nicaragua.

On June 14 and June 20, 1959, invasion forces organized in Cuba were directed against Santo Domingo. These were stopped and, from the sketchy reports, it appeared that every member of that expeditionary force from Cuba was exterminated. Once again, sufficient evidence was recovered from the bodies of the invaders to establish that these forces were sent on their mission by Fidel Castro and the Communists.

On October 13, 1959, the little country of Haiti was invaded, again by forces from the Island of Cuba, and again under the direction of Castro's Communists. This invasion was again defeated by Haitians who had been trained in military tactics by a detachment of 50 U.S. Marines.

On October 26 Castro, becoming ever more arrogant and contemptible in his conduct toward the United States and his neighbors in this hemisphere, and feeling ever more secure in his relationship with the Communists, accused the United States of aggression.

He reestablished his drumhead military courts and began to summarily execute political prisoners without recognition of any of the elementary personal rights whatsoever. As of this date it was estimated the Castro regime had executed over 500 people. Later the total was to reach well over 1,000.

In January 1960 and through the early part of February I made another trip to the Central and South American countries and upon my return I outlined in a Senate speech on February 24 an eight-point program calculated to limit the activities of Castro's Communists in Central and South America.

Among other things, I asked that we turn over to the OAS all the information which the FBI, CIA, and our other intelligence agencies had in their files on communism in Cuba and Castro's connection with it.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover had at this time—and long before—a dossier on Castro and his Communist connections that should have convinced the most ardent fan of Castro in the State Department, of his allegiance to communism, but I doubt if they ever asked for this information or saw it.

In that speech, I urged the United States to urge the OAS to act. I said the United States should not act unilaterally. I suggested that the OAS should examine the possibility of imposing economic sanctions on Cuba. I also said that "Castro has now identified himself for what he is— a man who, if not himself a Communist, is certainly doing the work of the Communists with the direct help of the Communists."

On March 5, 1960, Castro accused the United States of complicity in the explosion of a munitions ship in the Havana Harbor which killed hundreds of people.

On March 25 in a TV interview I said "I deeply regret the administration's return of Ambassador Bonsal to Cuba" from where he had been withdrawn on January 21, and I pointed out that this move would be mistaken by the people of Latin America.

I had visited in my office with Ambassador Bonsal prior to his return. I suggested to him that he not return, arguing that it would appear in the minds of many of our friends in Latin America that, in fact, we wanted to see the government of Fidel Castro succeed and that his action would be interpreted as endorsement of Castro's actions. Bonsal said the decision was not his to make.

Again I took the matter up with the State Department and other officials without any success, for Ambassador Bonsal was returned.

It was because of this action that I said in the television interview mentioned above, that "even though we claim in our press and elsewhere about our desire to get rid of dictators, it would appear that we are standing behind this dictator."

At this particular time I recall distinctly having a visit with Secretary Christian Herter, for whom I personally have great affection and respect, and asking him to withdraw Mr. Bonsal for the second time as Ambassador to Cuba.

I pointed out that "Che" Guevara, who was at that time the head of the National Bank of Cuba, in a recent speech in Havana had five times said that the Soviet Union was the best friend Cuba ever had.

None of my warnings seemed to convince anyone. Shortly thereafter in a TV program I said:

> For many, many years this administration has talked about the appeasement they thought had gone on in the Far East and other areas of the globe—they made a great to-do about the statement that they would under no conditions appease—that they would stand strong in the face of the Communist movement. But in this particular instance I think we have some sickening appeasement.

On April 7, 1960, I made another general speech on the floor of the Senate in which I recommended a six-point program to strengthen ties between the United States and Latin America.

On May 23, 1960, Castro seized U.S. oil refineries and said they would be required in order to process Russian crude oil.

On May 27, 1960, the U.S. State Department announced that the U.S. economic aid program to Cuba, which had been running between $150,000 and $200,000 a year, would be terminated on December 1, 1960.

It was further announced that the U.S. military aid which was at that time consisting of training Cuban air cadets in Texas would be terminated in June of 1960.

I praised President Eisenhower on this action and I said:

> I am glad that the President has now taken a realistic and sensible position with respect to the Communist-dominated Castro government. It has never made sense to me to have our Government giving aid and comfort to another government which is openly vilifying us and our way of life.

I went on to say that—

> I hope that those who have up to now sought a continuation of a very partial and preferential sugar legislation as it pertains to Cuba will be willing to reevaluate their position to revise the legislation in a realistic and up-to-date manner.

Shortly thereafter on May 28, 1960, I introduced a bill revoking Cuba's preferential sugar quota and distributing it to five friendly Latin-American countries which never up to that time shared in the U.S. sugar market.

I said:

> We are permitting Cuba to sell into the United States over 3 million tons of sugar on which we are giving her a premium price of over 6 cents per pound—3 cents over the world price. This means Cuba gets $390 million a year from the U.S. housewife. That money, I presume, would be used to further entrench the pro-Communist government and propagandize the Cuban people against the United States and for the Soviet Union.

On June 11, 1960, Castro seized U.S. owned Havana Hotel and Nacional Hotel.

On June 30, 1960, on the floor of the Senate, I urged the establishment again of the hemisphere police force to preserve the peace and security of this hemisphere against the menace of communism and also expressed support of the administration's protest to the OAS of Castro's campaign of lies and slander against the United States.

On July 13, 1960, I again urged the recall of our Ambassador Bonsal and reaffirmation of our treaty rights to Guantanamo Bay, and the placing of the case of Cuba and its control by the Communists before the OAS.

On August 10, 1960, in a public statement, I urged U.S. agencies, particularly the border patrol—Immigration and Naturalization Service—to cease harassing Cuban exiles operating from Florida in their efforts to open lines of communication with democratic forces inside Cuba.

On August 12, 1960, I wrote a letter to President Eisenhower in which I proposed that consideration be given to withdrawing preferential tariff treatment to the Cuban Government in connection with all imports, particularly with respect to sugar, fruit, and vegetables.

I also suggested that the United States impound payments for any commodities received from Cuba and hold until such times as concessions were made with respect to U.S. interests, since Castro had seen fit to prevent American dollars paid for U.S. commodities sold in Cuba from getting out of the country.

On August 31, 1960, after the close of the conference of the OAS in San Jose, Costa Rica, I issued a statement in which I criticized strongly the State Department's support of the watered-down, milk-toast, slap-on-the-wrist type of condemnation of international Communists.

It will be remembered that even with Secretary Herter as our representative at that meeting, the conference did not have the forthrightness to mention the name of Fidel Castro or the Communist government of Cuba. I called it then, "a diplomatic defeat of the first magnitude."

On the floor of the Senate I noted that the San Jose Conference called for the overthrow of the government of Trujillo but refused even to mention the government of Fidel Castro. I went on to say that the Dominican government "is a government we surely do not approve of; its leadership is undemocratic and dictatorial"; but I asked, "Is there any doubt concerning the real threat to our freedom today?" "It, of course, is communism, and where is the fountainhead of international communism in Latin America today? Not in the Dominican Republic, but in the Communist government of Fidel Castro, and every informed person knows it, and most will admit it."

I asked in that speech:

> Who is it in the State Department or in the administration who believes that the 30-year-old government of the Dominican Republic is a greater threat to the freedom of the Western Hemisphere than the Communist government of Cuba?
>
> Who is it that really believes that the government of the Dominican Republic needed to be ostracized and expelled, but that the government of Cuba should go along threatening freedom without even so much as a verbal spanking?

In that speech I said that—

> The administration has failed in its leadership because it was unable to cause our friends in the hemisphere to see the difference between an ancient, static, expiring, nonexportable dictatorship and a new, inflammatory, virulent, belligerent, expanding military dictatorship of the Communist variety that is working hand in glove with Khrushchev and Red China.

I asked, "Can fairminded men call this result a great victory?" "I warn my friends in Latin America that Castro's communism aims to destroy them."

I closed the speech by saying:

> We must stop deluding our friends in Latin America and stop deceiving ourselves into a sense of false security by adopting pious declarations, which dismay the Communists not at all. We stand on the thin edge of disaster. This is no place for the timorous. This is no time for listening to those who do not realize or refuse to admit we are now in the throes of a tremendous struggle between the free world and the Communist world.
>
> We must stop penalizing those nations who have befriended us. We must take our position as firmly and defiantly as the Communists have taken theirs—and we must encourage every nation and all peoples everywhere to take their stand with us and make their choice for freedom now—or the world will have no choice at all.

On September 21, 1960, I again called on the Government to bring Ambassador Bonsal home; I asked it to ban shipments to Cuba of U.S. machinery or equipment or replacement parts, and to start increasing our long-range broadcasts from the United States to Cuba.

On November 15, 1960, I urged Secretary Herter to call for a plenary session of the OAS to investigate the threat of Castro's communism to this hemisphere and for the United States to assume the leadership for the formation of an Inter-American Police Force.

On January 7, 1961, I wrote a letter to outgoing Secretary Herter and incoming Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging the banning of all Cuban imports to the United States in order to put an economic squeeze on Castro's government and try to bring it down. There was criticism of this by some Florida industries who depended upon Cuban products, but I felt the situation called for such action.

On February 15, 1961, after the change of administration, in another speech on the Senate floor, I said:

> The time has come for action in the Cuban situation. We should adopt an economic embargo calculated to bring Castro to his knees and the Cuban people to freedom.

BAY OF PIGS

On April 17, 1961, we remember, less than 4 months after this administration had come into office, an attack was launched by a group of 1,500 Cubans who had been trained in the far reaches of Guatemala under the supervision of military experts recruited in the United States.

This plan for the invasion at the Bay of Pigs had not been some new development of the new administration because we know that, as a matter of fact, these men were gathered together and sent to Guatemala for training in 1960, before the change of administration.

From my own personal knowledge I know that these men had been held and trained for so long a time in Guatemala and other Central American countries that most of them had become discouraged, and some had left the ranks in their belief that the U.S. Government would never permit them to try to win back freedom for their own country.

Here in the United States there was great concern as to what determination should be made with respect to these Cuban invasion forces. This occurred prior to the beginning of the invasion. Should they be returned to the United States and dispersed, or should they be permitted to make the effort to free their own homeland?

While I was not consulted officially about this matter, my opinion was asked for by some people in lower echelons of the Government, and it was my judgment that the men should be permitted to make the effort to free their country, for they would never be happy until they had made this noble effort; but, of course, it should be made only after sound military judgment had been obtained that the endeavor had some chance of success.

Everyone now knows of the enormous miscalculations and mistakes that were made.

I think the President, whose final decision it was, did the right thing when he assumed the full responsibility for the fiasco. This was the manful and courageous thing to do. But the fact remains that there was considerable misjudgment on the part of many agencies and persons who had a part in the decision. No one man—be he even the President of the United States—can make correct judgments when he is proceeding from inadequate information.

The Bay of Pigs is now sad history. Had it succeeded, Cuba would have been free and our problems would have been lessened to a great extent, although, of course, not totally eliminated.

Some, it is now revealed, counseled against the invasion before it occurred. I thought, and still think, the "Go" signal was the correct one, based on the facts then available.

I never did subscribe to, nor do I now, the theory that the Latins would be appalled by our impetuosity or by our show of strength. Latins like leadership and strength; they always have, and they always will.

They have a history of 400 years of respecting, admiring, and looking up to strong leadership. That is why they still continue to admire strong leadership.

Everyone has 20-20 rear vision.

That judgment on the Bay of Pigs can be debated a long time. But surely the man who gave the word "Go; rescue your homeland; defeat and overthrow the Communists" cannot now in fairness have it even suggested that he is timorous or afraid of action. Couple this with the acts of October 1962, his quarantine, his confrontation with Khrushchev, and no man can fairly say that this President is not always prepared to act.

But to continue with the chronology, before discussing broader concepts, on June 21, 1961, shortly after Castro's May 1 declaration of Cuba as a Socialist, or Communist state, and some 2 months after the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs, I again warned that "to hope Castro communism will wither away and die on the vine is both woolheaded and dangerous. Western Hemisphere nations must act now to expel Castro before he wins his race with time."

On July 20, 1961, in a speech on the Senate floor I urged U.S. recognition of the Cuban Government-in-exile and the creation of an Inter-American Military Force again.

I continued to urge on this administration the placing of an import embargo on trade with Castro, and I was highly gratified when on February 3, 1962, this administration took such action. Thereafter, the many millions of dollars which they had been receiving in trade were denied to them, and conditions were obviously made worse for Fidel Castro.

In a Florida speech on May 3, 1962, I stated that "Castro continued to work full throttle against the hemisphere's free nations," pointing out that Cuba has set up subversive schools, indoctrination centers, and propaganda classrooms to instruct teachers, students, intellectuals, political leaders, and revolutionaries from all over Latin America. I said:

> The plan is to send these Communist-indoctrinated people back to their homelands and set them to work subverting their countries with the hoped-for Communist takeovers scheduled 1, 5 or even 10 years from now.

On June 18, 1962, I called for the establishment of a four-point program designed to make the policy of the United States toward Latin America, as I said, "one of realism and not romanticism."

I recommended the welding of our economic program in Latin America with our political goals; the establishment of an Under Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs reporting directly to the President; and again called for recognition of a Cuban Government-in-exile, stating, "We are going to have to meet this Red challenge with determination, and I am confident we will do so."

On September 5, 1962, I made this statement:

> The presence in Cuba of 5,000 so-called technicians from the Soviet bloc makes even more compelling the need for an inter-American Police force to back up inter-hemispheric treaties based on the Monroe Doctrine which pledges to keep communism out of this hemisphere.

In addition, I urged, as I have time and again in the past, that the United States recognize and support a democratic Cuban Government-in-exile, whose first purpose is the liberation of the Cuban people from Communist tyranny. I said:

> Such a free Cuban regime could openly receive support from the United States towards the accomplishment of this goal and the eventual restoration of their liberties to oppressed Cuban citizens.

On September 18, 1962, I introduced in the Senate two resolutions. One called for recognition of the Cuban Government-in-exile and the other supporting establishment of an inter-American military alliance.

Mr. President, some people may wonder why I have gone to such lengths to recite the record in such detail.

My answer is that I am trying to point out, among other things, why this problem of Cuba is not now and never has been the problem of a single political party, but instead, is the problem of both parties and all Americans. It is the problem of the Nation as a whole.

It goes without saying that so far as removing Castro and the Communists from Cuba is concerned, it would have been considerably easier to have done it in 1959 or 1960 than it would have been in 1961 or 1962, or than it will be in 1963 or 1964.

For the Island has been continuously fortified and militarized, and more and more modern and sophisticated weapons have been emplaced.

But no programs were developed in 1959 or 1960; and in January 1961, at the change of administrations, the outgoing one merely passed along the growing problem of Cuba to the incoming Administration, as one passes a very hot potato from his own hand to that of his unsuspecting dinner partner.

I have recited some—and only some—of the instances when I spoke in the Senate and elsewhere in 1961 and 1962, calling the attention of this administration to the need for developing a program having for its ultimate goal the freedom of Cuba. While I have yet to learn of a long-range program, this administration did put into effect, in 1961, the economic embargo which had as its result the denial to Castro of the use of many millions of dollars which he had previously realized each year from trade with this country.

The administration also diligently exercised pressure in an effort to get other allies to stop trading with Castro's Cuba. In this endeavor, the administration was moderately successful.

The administration did, in 1961, initiate a meeting of all the members of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este, in Chile, and did succeed in getting three-fourths of the nations of the hemisphere—for the first time—to strongly condemn Fidel Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba.

That was the first time that such a specific resolution had ever been gotten from the Organization of American States. Since that time, several other minor measures have been adopted, looking toward making life more difficult for the Communists in Cuba; but the problem of communism in Cuba remains and constantly grows.

Mr. President, Cuba is a serious problem equaling in importance, in my judgment, any that we have in Europe or in southeast Asia or anywhere else in the world. It cannot be swept under the rug, ignored, or minimized; and I do not believe that anyone, or any government, is today trying to do that, because all recognize now the total seriousness of the problem of Cuba.

It is a problem that, if not handled correctly, could quickly lead to nuclear war. It is a problem that may lead to the involvement of the United States and its allies in a bloody conventional war. It is fraught with peril of most every kind; and certainly, therefore, it should not be discussed or debated in partisan terms.

Our Nation's future and the future of the free world are too important to become topics of partisan discussion. At the same time, they are important enough to deserve and bear discussion by troubled and conscientious men and women who are sincerely seeking solutions.

The problem of Cuba, therefore, deserves the best nonpartisan attention of all of our minds in the best and highest tradition of Americans who are earnestly concerned about the future of our country.

RUSSIAN TROOP BUILDUP

Mr. President, in September 1962, while many of us were campaigning, we began to see in the press and to hear over the radio reports about the now-famed buildup of Russian offensive missiles and bombers.

I must say that prior to that time, on many visits in and out of Miami, where the refugee colony makes its headquarters, I had been advised by Cuban refugee friends that they thought missiles were being erected in Cuba. Some gave me handmade maps depicting the location of the alleged missiles; others wrote letters describing them; others merely poured into my ears their suspicions and fears.

I turned over every scrap of this information to the Central Intelligence Agency, where I thought it should go for proper examination and evaluation.

However, Mr. President, it is eminently clear that prior to October 14, the day when the "picture" was finally obtained of missiles actually on site, there was really no hard, provable evidence on hand, not the kind of certain and demonstrable evidence on which a great and responsible nation could act.

There were circumstances and there was considerable talk on the part of refugees regarding a missile buildup; and to me it was apparent that this word was getting to the CIA and to our intelligence outfits for the U-2 flights, which all through the summer had been occurring on a basis of two every month, and which were stepped up to four a month in September.

In September, there were flights on September 5, 17, 26, and 29; in October there were flights on the 5th and the 7th, and, of course, on the 14th. None produced any evidence of the missiles, although the reports continued to come in, and many people began to believe the missiles were there, even though no photograph had shown them. Then, I think, some adjustments began to be made even prior to October 14, although I have no exact knowledge of this. In any event, the overflight of October 14 showed the missiles.

Thereafter, the President of the United States called off his speaking trip, returned to Washington, met with the heads of the CIA, the Defense and the State Departments, and others, and, after great soul searching, evolved a program as to what would be done.

All of us know now that the congressional leadership on both sides was called back to Washington, prior to the President's speech on October 22.

The President announced to those of us gathered at the White House what had developed in Cuba; and, after discussion, he stated what he intended to do. There was comment with respect to additional steps which some of those present thought should be taken. However, the President fully and satisfactorily explained why he felt it was more correct to pursue the course upon which he had determined.

Everyone there, publicly or privately, I am sure, pledged his support to the President and the course of action which the President outlined for the Nation to follow.

I am sure that everyone of us was greatly moved and deeply concerned as the President delivered his magnificent message, in which he clearly pointed out that there would be no toleration of Communist offensive missiles or bombers in Cuba; that the offensive missiles had to be removed; that if any of them was launched at the United States or at our neighbors, the United States would fire back—not at Cuba, but at the source of the problem, the Soviet Union.

I am sure that all of us recall vividly with what great apprehension and concern we lived in the next few hours and the next few days. And as the build-up of our manpower and might in south Florida and the Caribbean speeded up, I am sure we all recall with what final consummate relief we heard the announcement that Mr. Khrushchev had, in effect, backed down; that he had agreed to the withdrawal of the offensive weapons.

We truly, as the Bible says, "walked through the valley of the shadow" and emerged unscathed.

Mr. Khrushchev did not wish, at this time at least, to start a war over Cuba, for he agreed to back his missiles and bombers out of Cuba, which must have been humiliating and awkward for him. While we did not get the on-site inspection asked for, because of Castro's intransigence, nevertheless the Communists permitted our planes to fly at low altitudes over the missile sites, without gunfire being directed at them, and permitted inspection by our airplanes and our surface ships of the missiles and bombers being returned to the Soviet Union.

It is also worthy of note that today our planes are daily flying low and high over Cuba, for inspection purposes; and none of the very effective antiaircraft weapons—the SAM, the SA-2, and others which have great efficiency—have been fired at our planes. Mr. Khrushchev realized that the President was and is ready to go to any extremity to get those offensive weapons—a threat to U.S. security—removed from Cuba, and, furthermore, that he had to be satisfied that they were removed. That is why the Communists have permitted the flights every day over Cuba, to observe what is happening with respect to missiles, troop concentrations, and removals. No shot has been fired at our photographic planes, and none will be fired, because the President has made it crystal clear he will not permit it without instant retaliation.

Mr. Khrushchev, having also agreed to withdraw some of the 17,000 troops remaining in Cuba after the missiles and bombers left, is now in process of doing that. How many have left, I do not know. But State Department sources indicate that some 2,500 have left, and also even some of the units of the four armored groups that were there.

I was pleased to note in the March 9 issue of the Washington Star, however, that Mr. Antoly Dobrynin, Soviet Foreign Minister, stated that a substantial pullout would be completed by mid-March, as Mr. Khrushchev had promised. I am certain that President Kennedy is exerting all the influence he can to see to it that all the Russian forces are withdrawn from the island.

It is interesting to see what some people—now that the critical danger has receded—have chosen to criticize. When the President, in late October, held our national and individual destinies in his hands, few voices were heard; almost everyone was breathless while the President spoke clearly and firmly. I, for one, did not have much to say, and I do not recall that anyone did.

Now, however, there are loud cries and criticisms of an intelligence gap between September and October, of interagency confusion, over concessions made or imagined, and so forth. But the important thing to remember is that the President when confronted with the actual direct threat to the security of the United States acted with consummate courage and skill to protect our national interest. He acted in accord with the highest traditions of American statesmanship and successfully eliminated a threat of monstrous proportions to our national existence.

Because the Constitution of the United States puts into the hands of the executive branch of the Government—or the President of the United States—the final authority and responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, I think he should be permitted without personal harrassment or political attack to proceed along this logical line of getting Soviet troops removed from Cuba, for I would challenge anyone to suggest that there is a more useful course of action looking toward the total solution of the problem of Cuba than that of removing the troops and technicians of the Soviet Union from Cuba.

But, Mr. President, what of the future? What are our long-range goals?

Certainly, they are to see Cuba freed. But do we have a program or a plan of action? If the President has, of course he does not have to tell it to anyone. I have not heard of any plan, and I think if we are to free Cuba and keep the respect of our Latin neighbors we have to have a plan or a program which we can logically follow to a final and happy solution of a free Cuba.

Now I would like to offer a program, or plan of action, but before doing so I want to make it clear I speak only for myself. I speak only for the junior Senator from Florida. I have not cleared this speech with anyone. This voice is speaking only for me.

In the past I have recommended all sorts of programs of action. I have talked about a combination of measures, embargoes, quarantines, economic measures, political measures, propaganda measures, diplomatic measures, and others. But at no time have I recommended that the United States declare war on Cuba or act unilaterally with our own military force.

Since the buildup of weapons and men in Cuba last fall by the Soviets, the situation has changed. We now have a new dimension to consider, the possibility of direct confrontation of Soviet troops and United States troops.

Furthermore, in the light of the enormous amount of military equipment put into Cuba, we have a much more difficult situation to deal with than we did in 1960 or 1961.

When we talk about strong measures today, particularly when we imply force even though we may not say it, we are in reality talking about a direct confrontation of the military forces of the United States with the military forces of the Soviet Union, unless we first are successful in getting these forces out of Cuba. Such a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States forces we have not had thus far in our history.

During the Korean war, while we fought the Red Chinese and undoubtedly many Soviets, nevertheless they operated clandestinely under color of the North Koreans and/or Red Chinese. However, so long as the Soviet military troops remain in Cuba, the prospects of escalating action in Cuba into total war are infinitely greater because any unilateral action against Cuba, or even action led by U.S. forces puts, for the first time, U.S. military forces in direct confrontation with those of the Soviet Union.

As stated, I think this adds a new dimension of danger to our already difficult problem.

I do not go so far as to say that we should never act, or that we should not proceed, even if some of the military of the Soviet Union stay there. I would emphasize, however, that the solution to the problem of Cuba, which means the elimination of communism from Cuba, is infinitely easier without the Soviet forces there. I say that their removal will diminish greatly the prospects of whatever action is finally taken in Cuba escalating into a total world and nuclear war. It has been the consideration of this problem, the gravity of it, the enormity of it, the complexity of it, which has made me feel that the President is on the right track in first getting removed from Cuba the offensive missiles and bombers and, thereafter, insisting upon the removal of the Soviet personnel.

Furthermore, we must keep in mind that today, when we suggest further action, either in the form of a blockade or a raid, this involves the use of force. And force, of course, means war. It might be limited and small—or it might be unlimited and staggering in its consequences. When we embark on a blockade of an island like Cuba, for it to be effective the blockader must make up his mind he may have to go to the length of shooting and sinking a surface ship as one starts into Cuba with supplies and personnel, or of shooting down an aircraft which is loaded with supplies and personnel.

In any event, the act of shooting a plane or a ship is an act of war and, as the President said in his last news conference, any such action on our part will probably call up an immediate response.

Furthermore, let us be sure when we talk of force and war we know what we are talking about. This use of force, this war we are talking about, is not a cold war waged in the daily press and over the conference tables. It is not a war of words in which our Secretary of Defense corrects the blusterings of the Soviet Defense Minister on the number of operative U.S. missiles or the size of our thermonuclear bombs. Not even a guerrilla war in which railroad bridges are destroyed and crops burned or sugar mills sabotaged.

We are talking about a war in which troops storm a beachhead, where platoons are sent to knock out a bunker, a war in which villages are destroyed by artillery fire, a war in which lives would be lost and men maimed and crippled for life, a war which could well leave fatherless thousands of children.

There may be some who think that now is the time for war. Some who advocate, rather glibly, that American forces turn quickly on Castro's Cuba—and get the job over with. It may come to that, but everyone should know exactly what they are talking about. I hope they have given thought to not just the phrases but the consequences as well.

How many American troops, for example, would be required to die in order to land a large effective fighting force on an island which has 150 coastal defense missiles and operational sites for most of them? These missiles can reach troop ships 40 miles out. How many troops, landing craft, and even transports could be sent to the bottom of the Caribbean by a dozen operative missile launching torpedo boats, whose launch range is 15 miles, which the Cubans now have?

How many aircraft would be lost in attaining air superiority over a small island with 500 surface to antiaircraft missiles and defended by 100 Migs, over 40 of them capable of matching our F-104 Starfighter in performance and all piloted, we must presume, by skilled aviators and directed by 200 modern radars?

How many soldiers would be lost in subduing a force of some 75,000 regular and, we must presume, fanatically indoctrinated troops, fighting on their home ground, and backed by at least 100,000 militiamen and 100,000 home guard troops?

They are fully equipped with tanks, field artillery pieces, antitank guns and other modern weapons. They are a formidable force and would be operating defensively, taking a tremendous toll of any liberating force.

Once a beachhead for the liberating force was established how long would the battle for the island take?

How many casualties, American casualties, would it cost to subdue Cuba?

I have no access to contingency plans but we hear figures such as a month and 100,000 casualties. I gather that our military planners see no quick, glorious charge up San Juan Hill now. Rather they envision a long, grueling, and bloody war waged in the most exhausting and savage tradition of the 20th century world wars.

And would the war for the liberation of Cuba remain limited?

I challenge anyone to say he knows. We can carry on some logical speculation. It might be a war confined to the island of Cuba and the waters surrounding it.

Or it might be a war which precipitates a Soviet move into Berlin with all that implies. Or action in Cuba might precipitate full-scale conflict in southeast Asia, particularly South Vietnam or Laos.

Or how do we know that the war to liberate Cuba will not really touch off the total thermonuclear conflict which each of us prays daily will not occur. Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky says it will. Can we assume he does not mean it?

Our Defense Secretary has said we will defend Berlin—with nuclear bombs if necessary—and I am sure every man in this Chamber approves this stand and knows that Mr. McNamara spoke for the President when he said it. We know the United States means it, that we will defend West Berlin and if necessary with nuclear weapons.

Malinovsky has said essentially the same thing about Cuba. Can we be certain he does not mean what he said?

Can we be as certain that he does not mean it as we are certain that Secretary McNamara does?

I do not know. To take action which could imperil the national existence on the basis of a pleasant and encouraging assumption would be one of the greatest gambles in history. I believe that it is within the context of real and violent warfare that the calls for a blockade or an all-out assault on Cuba must be evaluated. Well, if war is the final answer, if any Member of this Chamber feels it is worth it at this point in order to clear Russian troops from Cuba, he is in the right place to call for it.

As we all know, Congress has the right to declare war on Russia, on Cuba, and the first step is for one of the Members of the body to submit a resolution declaring the existence of a state of war. This has not yet been done, and I do not think it will be done any time soon.

However, while the consequences of any meaningful action are extremely grave, we must nevertheless not be frightened out of doing our duty or living up to our traditions of fighting for freedom.

As we look at the present situation and talk about it with some appreciation of what we are talking about, let us not fail to offer solutions, if we think we have them, but let us make whatever suggestions we have in the realization that the problem is a bipartisan matter and that if we become totally involved, bullets do not merely pick out Democrats or Republicans. Neither red-blooded Americans nor bullets know partisanship.

In this context of understanding, without political motivations and only in an effort to be helpful to the President of the United States, who, of course, has to make the final decision for all in this Nation on matters of this character, I would like for the next few minutes to discuss the situation as it exists today, and what I think we may have to do in the future, and why.

I think we must first settle in our minds whether or not this Nation can long abide Fidel Castro and communism in Cuba.

I know that there is a small body of opinion that would say because Cuba is now too dangerous for us to fool with, therefore, we should do nothing about it except ignore it and hope it goes away.

I am not one of those who subscribe to that theory of hoping it will go away. For hope has yet to remove a Communist dictatorship anywhere in the world.

Tightly controlled police states do not wither on the vine. I do not believe the Communists will surrender merely because we hope they will.

There are others who subscribe to the containment theory as the policy to follow under present circumstances—the easiest policy to follow. Containment is the recognition of the status quo within a country, while at the same time restricting its overt actions outside its borders. However, the danger from Cuba today does not lie solely in the fact that it may attack over the border a neighbor country. We are pledged to and we can easily stop that.

The danger in a continuing Communist government in Cuba, even though contained within Cuba's physical boundaries, lies in that Cuba will continue as it is now, the fountainhead of subversion, propaganda, and training. We can stop the exportation of its troops to other lands, but we cannot stop the exportation of its ideas, its propaganda, its training of subversives.

Millions of tons of literature depart Cuba for other Central and South American countries every month. Propaganda broadcasts to Central and South America have been increased in the last 18 months from 80 hours a week to over 150 hours.

John McCone, Director of the CIA, admitted recently, and it was made public, that some 1,500 revolutionaries from other Central and South American countries trained in Cuba last year. This type of activity is almost impossible to stop, short of extirpating the Communist government itself.

However, the greatest danger of a "contained" but "continuing" Cuba under communism is that it negates and renders ineffective our long-range program of helping our Latin American neighbors through the Alliance for Progress.

As we all know, Alianza Para el Progreso is a program calculated to build up the economy, the standards of living, and the literacy of the people, through economic and technical aid from the United States, while simultaneously effecting tax, land and social reform from within.

It envisions the expenditure of U.S. funds in the neighborhood of close to $1 billion each year for 10 years. For this noble purpose, however, Mr. President, Latin America needs 90 percent more funds than this. It was reasoned that these additional large sums would be supplied from two sources: First, the country itself; and second, private capital. However, neither of these two sources is available if communism remains in Cuba.

As the Alliance was planned, 80 percent of the contribution was to be made by the Latins themselves, both through their governments and through private investment. However, with local governments, such as Venezuela, expending their time and energies in building up their armed forces, staying busy putting down Cuban instigated riots, spending their money and energies on day-to-day existence, the deep economic and social problems will never get either the attention or the money which their solution require.

And private investment, either of Latin American or United States origin, is obviously going to look for more stable and secure markets, even if the interest rate is not as high as it currently is in Latin America. A corporate executive is not going to put his stockholders' money into an area where it might be confiscated without any reimbursement, as was done in Cuba, nor is a private individual going to invest his savings in a land which may fall under a Communist influence at any given moment.

As an example, the flow of new U.S. private investment in South America has plummeted in recent years. In 1957 U.S. citizens and businesses put $1,164 million in direct investment into the area. By 1961 direct new investment had dropped to only $141 million, a drop of more than 70 percent. This figure comes from the Bureau of International Commerce of the Department of Commerce.

Government sources estimate that when the 1962 totals are finally calculated they will show a flow back to the United States of more than $10 million. In other words, more U.S. private capital was pulled out than was put into Latin America in 1962.

In the case of needed private investment from Latin sources themselves, the situation appears equally critical.

Because of the threat of a Communist-type dictatorship in most every country of South America, local capital is fleeing in enormous amounts out of Latin America into banks and investment in Switzerland, Great Britain, the United States, and even Hong Kong.

The Alliance for Progress is the most realistic, long-term attempt we have ever made to help the Latin American nations out of the cycle of poverty, ignorance, and illness, in which for centuries they have been caught. It must not fail if we are to keep the countries to the south of us in the column of the free world. Yet there can be no doubt that the continued existence of Castro's Cuba insures its eventual failure. Because the Alliance, operating by itself does not have the money to do the job, because the U.S. Treasury cannot fill the vacuum caused by the fear of investment on the part of outside private capital and the flight of local capital.

This means, Mr. President, that Fidel Castro and communism must go before we can get moving on the big job of realizing the aims and ambitions of the Alliance for Progress.

How then can we get Castro and communism out of Cuba? I see only two alternatives.

First, we can, through various sources, attempt to foster an internal defection and uprising against Castro—in effect, turn Castro's own weapons back on him. This has some appeal primarily because it looks easy, but the lessons learned from East Germany and Hungary cause some pessimism. A rebellion against a tightly controlled police state is not likely to succeed.

No doubt there are in Cuba huge numbers of people among the military, the campesinos, the laborers, and, in fact, among all groups and classes, who are praying for the demise of Castro and the Communists. But in a land under communism, overridden with informers, and disciplined by brutal secret police, the organization and execution of a revolt or mass defection is an infinitely difficult thing. Perhaps it could be successful in Cuba, but being realistic rather than romantic, we should not count on it.

It seems to me in searching for a plan of attack, we must face up to the fact that there is no easy or inexpensive short-run solution to the problem of Castro and communism. There was in 1959. It might have still been easy in 1960, but no longer.

Realizing the problem of Castro and communism will not be solved overnight, I suggest putting into action a long-range plan which envisions only ultimately, and, in the final analysis, if need be, the use of force in order to get rid of Fidel Castro.

However, if it comes to force, the program envisions Latins and Cubans, who believe in freedom, leading that force against the Latin Communists of Fidel Castro. In other words, the program envisions Latins-for-freedom versus Latins-for-dictatorship.

After all, the problems posed by Castro are greatest with respect to the Latin American nations, and as such it is the Latin nations which should begin to bear an increasing responsibility for bringing about a solution.

More specifically, communism has established its hemispheric fortress in Cuba and, in the final analysis, it should be, and can be the Cubans who assume the leadership in what will have to be of necessity a joint undertaking.

The value of turning to the Latins to provide the leadership and most of the manpower required to do the job, returns the problem to its proper place as a Western Hemisphere problem, to be handled within the framework of already existing treaties and agreements entered into by all the Western Hemisphere countries.

Furthermore, there is no sense in purposely bringing about a situation in which Mr. Khrushchev, already ignominicusly removing his missiles from Cuba, is required once again to either back down or fight, because of direct confrontation with our troops, or a specific challenge from us.

I do not know, and I do not believe anyone does, just how far Mr. Khrushchev believes he can back up before he destroys his own position, with his ally the belligerent Chinese Reds, or with his own military leaders within the Soviet Union.

I see no point in plotting a course at this time that does not afford Mr. Khrushchev a door through which he can move to avoid confrontation with us, if he wants to. This program which I shall suggest, in which the action taken is called for and lead by Cubans and Latins, in some measure avoids the confrontation and thereby lessens the possibility that, if and when force comes into use, the encounter will escalate into total war or nuclear war.

If the Cubans and other freedom-loving Latins are to take charge of the Castro problem, there must be a rallying point for them, a central body which can focus and direct their efforts. I see no group which can do this, which can speak in the name of all the Cuban people, except a fully constituted Government-in-exile which is recognized by us and other hemispheric nations. We should acknowledge its power to make treaties, conduct foreign relations, borrow money, establish armed forces, and enter into all activities of a regularly constituted government. As I understand it, from international lawyers dealing regularly with such matters, our recognition of an exile government would be preceded by withdrawal of recognition of the present regime.

The only argument I have heard against such a government-in-exile is, How will it be formed when all the exiles are divided as to who or what group will lead it?

First, I am certain that any government selected by the Government of the United States and announced as the exile Government of Cuba will, in fact, be the Government-in-exile. However, there is a more democratic method of procedure if our officials want to follow it.

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and Refugee Committee have the names and addresses of every refugee in the United States and Puerto Rico. Why not send each one a ballot, asking him or her to write their first, second, or third choices down—sort of like an absentee ballot here in all our States of the United States.

It would be relatively simple to carry out a poll by mail and under the supervision of a group of prominent exiled Cuban jurists, in which each exiled Cuban adult is asked for a free expression of who should head an exile Government. No doubt, there would be some errors and duplication—this is inevitable—but it would provide a consensus and would give support to the man or men who finally act as the Government-in-exile.

Once it was established who the Cuban people had selected to lead the fight to free their homeland, U.S. recognition should be immediate.

This would emphasize to the other hemispheric nations that the efforts of free Cubans to expunge communism from Cuba have our full support and lead to recognition of the exile Government by other hemispheric nations.

Moreover, there are nations in Latin America which would act as host to the Government-in-exile. I will not bring about their subjection to pressure and harassment by mentioning their names here. But they have made it clear that they would allow a Cuban Government-in-exile to operate from their soil.

I am not suggesting that the Government-in-exile be the government which takes over the power of Cuba once the freedom of the Cuban homeland has been regained. On the contrary, it should be understood that the Cuban Government in exile maintains our recognition only so long as it takes to free Cuba and, thereafter, hold a democratic election on Cuban soil with all the people of Cuba participating.

Once formed and established, the Cuban Government, under the Rio Treaty of 1947, the Caracas Agreement of 1954, the Punte del Este agreements of 1961, and, in fact, the basic provisions of the Organization of American States, could call upon all the nations of the Western Hemisphere for military and financial assistance. And under those provisions we and the other nations are legally and/or normally obliged to help. With this military equipment, they could begin to tighten the noose on Fidel Castro.

The Cuban Government-in-exile would itself be able to, with the use of PT boats and other craft acquired from throughout the hemisphere, place a selective type blockade on the Island of Cuba, cutting off the supply of oil and other essential supplies needed for Castro's armed forces.

Simultaneously, it could foster defection within Cuba by providing arms and munitions to those who would turn against Castro. This, I submit, is the only realistic course to follow for those who rely on the defection from within alternative. Help from outside Cuba is needed, and Cubans could supply it all.

Propaganda barrages could be established with Cubans talking to Cubans. The Government-in-exile could ask and insist, under the treaties, that all Latin American nations which had not already done so, close their shores to Castro's embassies. This would stop most of the subversive propaganda now flowing out of Cuba. The Cuban Government, acting in the name of freedom, could ask that all trade with Castro be stopped. They can ask this cooperation from all members of the OAS, whereas the United States which is, technically, not directly involved, could not.

Cubans could easily smuggle goods to the underground in Cuba without having to run the gauntlet of the U.S. Immigration and Border Patrol officials, who now stop them and defeat their major efforts.

There is a good chance that such an exile Government, supported and supplied by all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, could nourish sufficient defection within Cuba to topple Castro, and, of course, that is to be desired.

But, if in the final analysis it were needed, that exile Government could undertake the liberation of its home by the force of arms. As a member of the OAS, and under the provision of the treaties of Rio and Caracas this Government could call on other member nations for whatever assistance would be required—including arms—to bring about a successful conclusion to their efforts. Under the commitments imposed on the United States and the other hemispheric nations by longstanding treaties, we would be legally bound and acting within the dictates of our international obligations in answering the Cuban exile Government's request for help.

Surely, we and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere would respond, just as we responded to the call of the English and French in World Wars I and II. We would respond because we believe in freedom and the right of self-determination, and it is just as precious and dead in this hemisphere as in the Continent of Europe or the far away reaches of southeast Asia.

The proposal is not a roadmap to utopia. Liberation of Cuba by forces directed by a government-in-exile is a long-range prospect. There would have to be a time-consuming buildup of governmental organizations, operating funds, and troops. The problems would be large.

But similar problems have been faced before and overcome. There is more to bind together the various groups of Cuban exiles than there is to divide them. And the promise of realistic help in returning to a free homeland would be a powerful lever in bringing about pressure in the direction of unity.

Properly organized and motivated, I feel that it could take effective action. I believe that people by the hundreds of thousands on the Latin American continent—from the humblest campesinos to chiefs of state would realize that this Government was acting for all of them and would make common cause with it. Tens of thousands of young men from all over the continent would, I believe, join the ranks of its fighting forces. This exile-Government could provide a living illustration that the battle cry of freedom still rings clearest in the human heart.

A Cuba Government-in-exile is the force which, acting on behalf of and in the name of the Cuban people, can bring about the liberation of their island. This is the group which can properly take any and all action necessary to successfully wage a war of liberation.

Once communism and Castroism are eliminated in Cuba the United States must continue its interest in Latin America. We must continue our program of long-range assistance to enable the Latin governments to bring about a better life for their people. We must reform our thinking and remember that we exist side by side, interdependent, whether communism threatens or not.

Mr. President, I said early in my remarks that I believe one day Cubans will again enjoy the blessings of liberty, freedom, and self-government. No member of this body wants more than I to see that day come and to hasten its approach.

I have today presented a plan which I think can free Cuba. I feel it is a sensible and logical course of action and commend it to those who are searching for ways to free Cuba and drive communism from the hemisphere. In the final analysis the President of the United States makes the final judgment—the ultimate decision, as to what will be this Nation's course of operation. I am sure he is prayerfully considering all proposals suggested as to what course to follow. Whatever his decision I intend to support the President in whatever action he takes. I know that all citizens and patriots will do likewise.

SENATE SHOULD INVESTIGATE THREATENED CHANGES IN IRS FIELD STRUCTURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, since the Secretary of the Treasury announced the proposed changes in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service on March 5, a number of Senators have voiced deep concern. Let me say that I fully share this concern. The cogent reasons supporting such protests merit the careful attention of those responsible in the administration for the proposals.

Apart from the political implications involved in the proposed changes, they would have a drastic effect on a substantial number of Nebraskans, most of whom have served the Internal Revenue Service faithfully for many years. Certainly the same would be true in the other affected areas.

In order to give Commissioner Caplin an opportunity to justify his proposals, I requested specific information about the claimed savings.

I had thought that my letter did not impose unusual demands on the Commissioner, because the high level ad hoc Committee on Resources Utilization which he appointed early in 1962 to study revisions was to have its recommendations available by December 1962. However, apparently I raised some questions that this "high level" committee had not considered because, as of this time, the Commissioner has not replied.

Thus, I think it is appropriate to discuss the matter here.

The Commissioner's claim that he can accomplish a $5 million annual savings without reducing the service to the taxpayer is attractive. However, there is serious doubt that it can be accomplished.

Further doubt has been cast on the proposals by the Secretary of the Treasury who, upon encountering opposition, announced to the press that action would be deferred until he has had more time to review the plans.

However welcome this decision is, it will not settle the question. The time for review has passed.

According to a letter sent to all Internal Revenue Service employees, the recommendations of the Committee on Resources Utilization were in the hands of the Treasury Department officials prior to February 7 of this year. Hence, the Secretary has had a whole month to review the program.

If a further review is to occur, I strongly recommend that the Secretary get together with his Commissioner, because the Commissioner continues to act as if he does not intend to change his plans.

It is important that there be a complete investigation of the proposals by the Senate Finance Committee. Otherwise, the plan may be fully implemented while we are still awaiting a report from the Secretary. Such an investigation would, among other things, scrutinize the inconsistencies that manifest themselves in the Commissioner's proposals.

Consider first the case of Omaha, with which I am most familiar. By January 1, 1964, the Commissioner intends to reduce the present Omaha staff of 297 to 83. He has indicated that he will try to reduce the adverse impact on these people as much as possible. He has reaffirmed this position in a recent statement to the press, and a member of his staff advised my office that those who wished to remain in the Service will be retained for at least 2 years at the same GS rating whether their position is downgraded or not.

Mr. President, I do not know how the Department can incur the expense of moving employees and their families, maintain them at the same salary until after the 1964 presidential election, and still accomplish a net savings.

Furthermore, the Commissioner indicated that most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated have risen to their present positions by doing their work well and have experience and skill that the Internal Revenue Service does not want to lose. Nevertheless, he indicated that he expects to lose some of their positions.

While Commissioner Caplin is in the process of eliminating skillful and experienced personnel the President is proposing to increase the number of Internal Revenue Service employees from an estimated 60,300 in fiscal year 1963 to 64,086 by the end of fiscal 1964. Obviously, if the President sees a need for increasing the present personnel level in the Internal Revenue Service by approximately 3,700, then certainly he must also feel the need to replace the employees that will be lost through the proposed changes. The replacement of long time skillful and experienced personnel with new and inexperienced personel does not seem to me to be consistent with the President's goal of obtaining a lean, fit, and efficient establishment.

When the Internal Revenue Service was reorganized in 1952, two primary objectives were to decentralize service to taxpayers and restore integrity and public confidence where it was lacking.

The proposed plan is hardly consistent with the sound objective of decentralizing service to the taxpayers. On the contrary, Omaha, which is the most nearly central location that could be obtained for all the various States in the present region, is being eliminated in favor of Chicago. Chicago, on the other hand, is at the extreme eastern edge of the proposed region. It is difficult to visualize how the Commissioner expects to accomplish a savings by this move when he is obviously increasing the cost of employee travel within the region?

Furthermore, in an attempt to justify the move from New York to Boston, the argument has been advanced that it will place the regional office closer to the Automatic Data Processing Center at Lawrence, Mass. If this is the reason for the New York move, then how can the Omaha move be justified? Under the present regional structure, the ADP service center is scheduled for Kansas City, Mo., just 175 miles from Omaha. If the regional office is moved to Chicago, the ADP center will be 500 miles away.

In his fiscal 1962 report, Commissioner Caplin referred to the "blue ribbon" program which was launched by the Service in 1956 for the purpose of increasing the caliber and productivity of its work force. The Commissioner noted that—

> Since that time the Service has been conducting vigorous college recruitment campaigns to attract top-quality applicants to enter revenue employment, and, at the same time, has provided training to enhance employees' ability to perform at the full-working level.

According to the report—

> These recruitments and training programs have been geared into well-developed career programs designed to encourage top-caliber people to stay in the Service and assure their orderly progression to more responsible positions. Through its "blue ribbon" program, the Service has been advanced to the forefront as one of the most progressive agencies in the Federal service.

Commissioner Caplin notes in his yearend report that he has followed the "blue ribbon" recruitment program. Nevertheless, he now proposes changes which will undermine his program for recruiting top-caliber people. The insecurity of working for a service which eliminates top-caliber personnel after many years of service could hardly be encouraging to young college recruits.

The obvious political implications involved in transferring the New York regional office to Boston have been adequately discussed by my colleagues in this Chamber. At first it appeared that the elimination of the Omaha office in favor of the Chicago office was done so that the proponents of the changes could answer their critics by referring to the elimination of not one, but two, regional offices. However, one could wonder whether the favor granted to Chicago is not as politically bold as the favor granted to Boston. These moves are hardly designed to restore public confidence in the service, one of the prime objectives of the 1952 reorganization.

Mr. President, since the changes were announced, I have received many letters protesting the changes and calling for congressional investigation and further study. Unless there is a clear statement from either the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that implementation of these plans is suspended, it is my hope, Mr. President, that the Senate Finance Committee will call for an accounting of these disturbing and unfortunate proposals at the earliest possible time.

SALUTE TO "CAP" SANDERS AND THE NEBRASKA STATE SAFETY PATROL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the mobility of Americans is one of the phenomena of our times. Faster than we can build superhighways up and down and across our States, cars and trucks fill the lanes from shoulder to median strip. This striking similarity to a river at floodtide once prompted a friend of mine to describe Highway 30 as "running bankfull."

Unnerving as this situation may be to the ordinary traveler, it would be completely unmanageable except for a largely unappreciated group of young men whose job it is to protect life and limb and property along the roadways, America's 50 State highway patrols.

I am reminded of the exceptional quality of their work by the recent announcement of the retirement of Col. C. J. "Cap" Sanders, one of the original members of the Nebraska Safety Patrol after over 25 years of service in that organization. He will leave his post on June 13 of this year, having reached mandatory retirement age.

Colonel Sanders was 1 of the 14 members of the original force of 44 men still in Nebraska's 25-year-old patrol. He is its third commander, a position he assumed in 1941.

It has been my pleasure to know and work with him throughout that period. He is one of the most dedicated and loyal public officials I have ever known. No department of Nebraska's State government can surpass the record of the patrol under his inspiring leadership. No agency is more respected by the public it serves.

Mr. President, as sentinels of law, order, and peace, our State patrolmen undergo hardships and often risk their lives to protect the lives and property of our citizens. Too frequently their activities are taken for granted and go largely unnoticed.

The fact that States have delegated local police powers to counties, cities, and townships has not impaired their authority to exercise their primary police responsibilities whenever situations have arisen which have demanded such action. In response to such a demand, the formation of State police forces began in the early 1800's, but not until the first half of this century did the movement spread to all the States.

The genesis of the present State police was in the Texas Rangers, recruited in 1835 as a border patrol. They were followed in 1865 by Massachusetts where a few State constables were appointed and were given police power to be exercised in the rural areas. Connecticut followed suit in 1903 with a small State police force patterned along the lines of the force in Massachusetts.

In 1905, with the organization of the Pennsylvania State Constabulary the first really authentic State police department came into existence, thus introducing a new idea in State police systems. Its purpose was to provide an executive arm for the State, to assist in handling disturbed conditions in the coal fields, and to provide protection in the rural areas that were without adequate law enforcement agencies. From the beginning the Pennsylvania State Constabulary operated as a uniformed and mounted force.

The rapid rise of rural crime and the universal use of the automobile, with its attendant problems of crime and traffic, led to the development of similar State police organizations within all the States during the first half of this century.

In Nebraska the State Safety Patrol was established in 1937. Its motto, "pro bono publico," "For the good of the public," has been and continues to be the basis for its every activity. During the 26 years of its operation, the force has grown from the original 44 patrolmen to 209. The highest standards of personnel selection and training have been maintained, which with the use of the latest technical equipment, have combined to provide the citizens of Nebraska with quick and efficient law enforcement. This is a commendable and admirable reflection on Colonel Sanders and his predecessors, R. F. Weller, and R. T. Schrien.

Because of the effective and high-quality work of the Nebraska State Safety Patrol, the traffic death rate has been kept well below the national average. In 1960, Nebraska's death rate per hundred million vehicle miles was 4.3, while the average rate in the United States was 5.3. This figure also represents a new low from the 12.8 death rate which prevailed in 1937 when the Nebraska State Safety Patrol came into being.

The activities of State patrolmen in Nebraska as well as in other States range from rescue work in the wake of violent storms and floods, to the apprehension of dangerous criminals; from courteously helping a traveler change a tire, to directing, controlling, and patrolling traffic. The State police movement has built a fine tradition of courageous service and unselfish devotion to duty.

A patrolman's working conditions are far from the best. Owing to the large areas which must be protected, he is subject to the demands of his job day and night. In the face of difficult working conditions, he remains a symbol of courtesy and willing helpfulness.

For the past quarter of a century, the Nebraska Safety Patrol has been "Cap" Sanders' life. While there are many who will agree with the Hastings Tribune which observed editorially that his mandatory retirement at 60 is "a terrific waste of manpower," there are none who will not wish him Godspeed and congratulate him on a difficult job commendably done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record stories on Colonel Sanders' retirement, taken from the February 17 editions of the Lincoln Journal & Star and the Omaha World-Herald, together with an editorial from the February 25 edition of the Hastings Daily Tribune.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune, Feb. 25, 1963]

Colonel Sanders' Motive in Adding 80 Men to the Nebraska Patrol Is To Save Lives

"If the patrol is given a sufficient number of men, we'll put a terrific dent in the number of people killed last year," Col. C. J. Sanders, director of Nebraska's State Safety Patrol, told the members of the legislature's budget committee. Colonel Sanders asked the committee to approve an expenditure of $2,250,000 a year for support of the patrol during the 1963–65 biennium which starts next July 1.

When Colonel Sanders, several months ago, proposed increasing the patrol by 80 as a means of reducing the State's traffic death toll there were many critics. Some of them contended that Colonel Sanders, like so many other directors of public agencies, was merely trying to add to his own prestige by having more patrolmen under his command.

That statement wasn't true then and it isn't true now. The patrol commander has just made public the knowledge that because of age he is being forced to retire from duty next June. This in itself is a terrific waste of manpower, because there are few men who have his experience in traffic enforcement work. He will be only 60 years of age. In a great majority of instances mandatory retirement age is 65.

Colonel Sanders made a strong case in behalf of his request for an increase in the number of patrolmen.

For example, he pointed out that although there are 209 patrolmen, 17 are involved in administrative work leaving 176 for patrolling highways. But these men can't work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The result is there are 63 men to cover the vast highway system of the State.

Is it any wonder that you can drive halfway across the State without seeing a single patrolman. Besides their patrol duties the men have to check on stolen cars, overweight trucks, remove articles from the highway, and assist motorists.

Before the end of this year, according to promises from the State highway department, another segment of the Interstate

Highway will be open. This will require more patrolmen. It is expected that by 1970 the entire 400-mile Interstate will be completed. This will add to the load of the patrol.

If Colonel Sanders says a larger patrol can put a "terrific dent" in the State's highway death toll he should be believed. He isn't going to gain anything from such action personally except the satisfaction of saving some lives, and that is the thing he has been most concerned with in the 26 years he has been a member of the patrol.

His is the only concrete suggestion made by any State official for reducing Nebraska's staggering highway death toll. Four hundred were killed in 1962 alone. This is a tremendous waste.

Experience of other States has demonstrated that strict law enforcement does help to reduce highway accidents and fatalities. There is no reason it won't in Nebraska.

Unless the plea of Colonel Sanders is approved by the legislature they will have only themselves to blame if the State's highway death toll isn't reduced. They have been given the solution and it is now their responsibility.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald, Feb. 17, 1963]

SAFETY PATROL CHIEF PLANNING TO RETIRE EFFECTIVE JUNE 13

The retirement of Col. C. J. Sanders as Chief of the Nebraska Safety Patrol on June 13 was announced indirectly Saturday in the letter of Mrs. Helen Greene in which she informed Governor Morrison of her immediate resignation as State Traffic Safety Coordinator.

"Colonel Sanders' retirement date has been common knowledge and I am assuming he is retiring, although I've not discussed a successor with him," Governor Morrison said.

Colonel Sanders confirmed his retirement plans Saturday night.

"Under our law it is mandatory that you retire on your 60th birthday and June 13 is it," Colonel Sanders said.

"I haven't been making much of an issue about it."

In her letter, Mrs. Greene recommended that the Governor appoint Capt. O. H. Witt to succeed Colonel Sanders.

Captain Witt "has done a truly outstanding job as head of the patrol's training and education program," Mrs. Greene said.

Colonel Sanders, 59, is 1 of the 14 members of the original force of 44 men still in the 25-year-old patrol. He was in the gasoline and oil business in Beatrice, Nebr., before joining the patrol. He was named chief in 1941, taking over from R. T. Schrien. The first chief was R. F. (Bub) Weller, onetime Nebraska football great.

In leaving her nonpaid position, Mrs. Greene recommended that the Governor appoint Thomas P. Ryan, chief of the accident records bureau, as her successor.

She said Mr. Ryan is "capable, thoroughly devoted to the cause of traffic safety, and highly qualified for the job."

In resigning, Mrs. Greene, mother of five, said "my first responsibility belongs to my family."

A native of Lincoln, she is the wife of William H. Greene, assistant manager of accounting at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant, Lincoln. The family lives at Greenwood.

During World War II she worked for the Office of War Information in San Francisco, Calif. She was a reporter on the Lincoln Journal from 1945 to 1947.

She was Nebraska publicity chairman of the Citizens for Kennedy organization during the presidential election. She was appointed January 26, 1961, to coordinate a State safety program.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal & Star, Feb. 17, 1963]

SANDERS RETIREMENT DATE SET; SUCCESSOR SPECULATED

June 13 has been set as retirement day for Col. C. J. Sanders, chief of the Nebraska Safety Patrol. Setting of the date touched off speculation as to his successor.

One name mentioned is that of Capt. O. H. Witt. It was advanced Saturday by Mrs. William H. Greene of Greenwod as she disclosed her own resignation as Gov. Frank Morrison's traffic safety coordinator.

Another well-informed source indicated that Capt. Dan Casey also should be considered among the leading candidates for the patrol's leadership.

In accepting Mrs. Greene's resignation Gov. Frank Morrison said her recommendaions would be considered, but this was not interpreted as a commitment.

The Governor was in Grand Island Saturday night for a Democratic Party meeting, as was his chief administrative assistant, Norman Otto.

Reached there by telephone, Otto said he was positive Governor Morrison has not yet decided on a successor for Colonel Sanders, and indicated it would be some time before the decision is made.

Colonel Sanders, whose retirement is mandatory by age—he will be 60 on June 13, said he has three or four recommendations about his successor, but he said he has not yet discussed them with Governor Morrison. Colonel Sanders did not divulge who his recommendations to the Governor will be.

Captain Witt of Lincoln is the patrol's safety education and training chief.

Captain Casey, also of Lincoln, is commander of the patrol's headquarters troop here.

Like Colonel Sanders, both men have been with the patrol since it was established in 1937.

It was considered probable that Colonel Sanders' successor would be from among the patrol's ranks.

In addition to Captains Witt and Casey, other topmen in the patrol, and all captains are:

Vern Byler, H. F. Nash, M. T. Doyle, and W. P. Simon, all of Lincoln; D. R. Shearer of Omaha; E. L. Schottler of Norfolk; M. J. Wiley of Grand Island; and H. D. Robinson of North Platte.

Colonel Sanders, of 4531 South 43d, has been with the patrol since it was organized November 22, 1937.

The colonel started to work in Lincoln that year as a trooper. In 1938, he worked 4 months in Norfolk, then returned to Lincoln in 1939 and was made a sergeant.

In 1940, he was promoted to lieutenant and was then sent to Fort Crook, where he worked during construction of the bomber plant there.

In 1941, Sanders returned to Lincoln, was promoted to colonel, and named head of the patrol.

When the patrol was organized it had 44 members. Today it has 210.

Colonel Sanders and his wife, Maude, have two daughters—Patricia, of Lincoln, and Mrs. Joan Ketterer, of Scottsdale, Ariz., and two grandsons, C. J., and Bill, ages 4 and 7.

In announcing her resignation, Mrs. Greene also recommended that Tom Ryan, chief of the State accident records bureau, be her own successor.

Mrs. Greene said her first responsibility belongs with her family. She has been an unpaid volunteer in the coordinator's post.

Morrison commented that the State was deeply indebted to Mrs. Greene.

Mrs. Greene said Ryan was capable and thoroughly devoted to the cause of traffic safety and is highly qualified for the job.

Noting the Governor has committed himself to establishing an office of director of safety, she wrote, "This is one of Nebraska's most pressing needs. The State of Nebraska will be much better off with a paid, full-time, well-qualified safety director than with the sporadic though well-meaning services of a volunteer worker."

Mrs. Greene said her only unfinished business is with the driver education bill and "the momentum we have already gained may carry it through."

Regarding Colonel Sanders' retirement, she urged that the line of succession should be kept within the organization.

Although Captain Witt is a Republican, she told the Governor, "I say that the patrol is above politics, and should be kept that way."

Captain Witt, she said, has done an outstanding job heading the patrol's training and education program.

"The breakthrough in the field of traffic safety will be accomplished not by something dramatic but by diligence, attention to detail, coordination, and the assurance that there is something that can be done," Mrs. Greene said.

"Maybe the new team of Ryan, Witt, and Morrison will accomplish just that."

NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, research and development programs of the Federal Government have grown in the past two decades out of all proportion to any other segment of the national budget.

And they are threatening to outgrow our ability to manage them intelligently.

Just before World War II, the Government spent a mere $75 million on science and technology. The figure proposed in the 1964 budget is just under $15 billion.

This means that where a dollar was spent in 1940, there will be $200 spent in 1964.

No one argues with the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. We still have vast frontiers to conquer. No one wants to put a price tag on the cure for cancer or the common cold or heart disease. No one fails to recognize the literal life-or-death seriousness of maintaining our military strength. No one underestimates the importance of our programs in space.

That is not the point. The point is whether the Congress is intelligently providing ample funds for all these efforts and whether the money is being spent in the most effective way.

There is strong reason to believe that the answer is "No" to both questions.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can testify that we do not have a sound basis for making the decisions which each year confront us and I am more than reasonably certain that those who administer the science and technology programs in the Government are seized with similar misgivings.

The fact is, as Dean Don K. Price of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard University has said:

> Science has become the major establishment in the American political system; the only set of institutions for which tax funds are appropriated almost on faith.

Or, as Dr. Mortimer Taube, an eminent specialist in the field of Government research, told the Senate Committee on Government Operations last July:

> Science in our time is more properly described as "big science" [which] makes necessary a reexamination of our administration of science.

Dr. Taube was testifying in behalf of a bill to create a Commission of Science and Technology. A similar bill, S. 816, was approved by the Senate on March 8 of this year.

For some reason, difficult for me to understand, administration spokesmen have been opposed to this legislation. The printed hearings on previous bills of this type show that time after time the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], sought to pin down the administration witnesses as to the reason for their lack of enthusiasm about the bill. About the best answer he got was that we should wait and see how the newly formed Federal Council on Science and Technology worked out. Wait, they said. Wait and see.

Mr. President, the bill, S. 816, passed by the Senate last week, proposes no revolutionary change in our research and development programs. It simply calls for a Hoover-type commission which will undertake a comprehensive review of these programs and recommend to the President and the Congress what action, if any is indicated.

One scarcely needs such a commission to sense that something is terribly wrong. The papers with discouraging frequency report on mismanagement and questionable practices under the name of research. On Sunday, March 3, the Washington Post carried an article concerning the National Institutes of Health, which said in part:

> The first sharp reaction in Congress to its own prodigality with the NIH research budget came only last year in two biting reports of a House Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, and an unsuccessful move in the Senate to hold down NIH appropriations to the level requested by the Kennedy administration.
>
> The nub of the Fountain committee's indictment was its conclusion that "Congress has been overzealous in appropriating money for health research."
>
> "The conclusion is inescapable," the report continued, "from a study of NIH's loose administrative practices, that the pressure for spending increasingly large appropriations has kept NIH from giving adequate attention to basic management problems."
>
> The committee found that grant funds were used last year to buy more than $1 million in office equipment and furniture, to pay travel bills totaling $7.5 million (of which 15 percent was for trips abroad) and to bolster salaries of researchers above regular institutional scales.
>
> In one case the Fountain group found that an NIH adviser collected a double salary of $145.98 a day as an Institutes consultant and as head of a research firm financed primarily by NIH grants. NIH put his company in business, equipped it, and also paid a profit, the committee found.
>
> In another instance, $3,500 in grant funds, intended by law to foster medical research, were used to hire a Spanish ballet group at a professional conference in Washington.
>
> A current example, not developed from the Fountain committee's files but which has raised eyebrows on Capitol Hill, is a 2-year, $74,000 planning grant to a Columbia University professor of public health research to outline a history of American medical research, with emphasis on the history of NIH.
>
> This summer the researcher plans a 6- or 7-week trip to Europe with his grant funds to study at close hand medical research in Scandinavia, France, and England. Next month the National Mental Health Advisory Council of NIH will act on his application for a new 5-year grant to advance the history project.
>
> Such cases as these, while not typical, help to explain the growing unrest in Congress over whether the Institutes' ballooning grant program hasn't become a runaway proposition.
>
> The grant system is one of the principal targets of NIH's congressional critics. This year nearly $700 million will funnel through the grant program to universities and other non-Federal institutions, equivalent roughly to 80 cents out of every NIH dollar.
>
> Institutes officials defend the system as a model of nonbureaucratic management of scientific enterprise, although under recent congressional prodding they have acknowledged that the funnel has sprung some leaks.
>
> Deciding where these hundreds of millions of dollars go is the job of 46 NIH study sections in the various fields of medical science. A study section is a body of scientists sitting on a large body of money, upon which some members have ultimate designs.
>
> Not infrequently the committees find themselves faced with grant requests from fellow committee members. In such cases it is up to the applicant to step out of the room and thus, symbolically at least, to purge the committee of conflicts of interest.
>
> The great system is not without its critics among medical men. Louis Lasagna, associate professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins University and author of "The Doctor's Dilemma," made this observation about the system in his book.
>
> "Once appointed to a study section, a scientist is eligible to become a full-fledged participant in the game of musical chairs played by a small minority of the country's researchers. One finds certain people moving from section to section, section to council, governmental to nongovernmental advisory bodies."
>
> And 2 years ago, Dr. Freddy Homburger, Cambridge, Mass., cancer specialist and NIH grantee himself, charged at a closed appropriation hearing that the study section system has "led to formation of an oligarchy of scientists inside NIH who hold power over the majority of scientists who are on the outside."
>
> He appealed for an independent study of the problem. But getting independent opinion, Congress has discovered, is itself a problem in the area of medical research.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, that we in the Congress, together with the public generally, have the seriously mistaken notion that any problem can be solved simply by drenching it with money, as one douses a fire with a bucket of water.

This, of course, is not the case, and the history of the medical grants to the National Institutes of Health is proof. Because of its embarrassing oversupply of congressional generosity, the NIH has been forced to find ways to spend its money. European trips and ballet dancers aside, those charged with spending our largess, have been forced to make grants to less-than-first-rate scientists who, understandably, do less-than-first-rate work.

The real limitation, in many cases, is not money, but men. There is just so much that can be profitably done. We have actually promoted research in some pretty dubious areas because we insisted that the money be spent.

These were funds appropriated, as Dean Price said, "on faith."

There is not available to the Congress the professional assistance necessary to make the kind of decision we must make in appropriating these funds. I have asked the General Accounting Office, which serves the Congress so well in overseeing many Government programs, whether it is capable of providing this scientific assistance. The answer was no.

Mr. President, in its report to the Senate on an earlier version of S. 816, the Government Operations Committee said:

> The inevitable conclusion was reached that it is the desire of the present administration to continue to center within the Executive Office of the President all control over civilian science operations. Unless legislative action is taken by the Congress to establish some medium through which reliable information and supporting technical data is made available to Congress by officials who are responsive to its needs, the committees of the Congress will continue to be denied access to facts and reliable information necessary to the legislative process in establishing policies in the fields of science and technology. Under the present policy, Congress is denied access to such information through the appointment of officials in the Executive Office of the President and Presidential advisory groups composed of the leading scientists and engineers throughout the country. These appointees are responsible only to the President and the field is preempted insofar as the Congress is concerned in its efforts to obtain reliable and factual information which is essential to the legislative branch if it is to perform its normal constitutional functions.
>
> It is the conclusion of this committee, therefore, regardless of the recommendations of administration spokesmen, that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study the problems relating to the proposed establishment of a department of science and technology in order that the Congress may have access to officials who are responsive to its requirements, and provided with the necessary information to effect an equitable solution to the present problems relating to Federal science programs as may be determined by the President and the Congress.
>
> As an essential first step in achieving these objectives, the committee recommends the enactment of S. 1851, so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendations of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering, and technology, upon which appropriate legislative action, directed toward the improvement of Federal science programs and operations, may be taken.

Mr. President, it is possible that the Senate may have the idea that my concern is limited to the Public Health Service, the Defense Department, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On the contrary, I am equally disturbed about the $187 million in research funds sought by the Department of Agriculture, the $122 million by the Department of the Interior, the $105 million for the Department of Commerce.

And I am concerned about the overlapping of medical and health-related research among the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation, no one of which is proposing to spend less than $25 million in this one category, in all $1.2 billion.

I wonder about the dozen-odd agencies who are working on meteorological research. Are they working together, at cross purposes, or do they overlap? Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know. And the present scheme offers little hope that I, or anyone else in the Congress, is likely to find out.

The same thing could be said of oceanography, where the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and Treasury are cooperating—or is it competing—with the AEC, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Conversations with people knowledgable in this field indicate, Mr. President, that the administration may be changing its mind about opposing the Hoover-type commission. I certainly hope so. This Nation badly needs a Commission on Science and Technology. And the Congress needs it, if it is not to lose altogether, its control over some $15 billion of the people's money.

It is my earnest hope that the measure dealing with this subject will be enacted into law at an early date.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until Tuesday, March 19, at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Tuesday, March 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3188:

To be second lieutenant

Solomon, Eckwood H., Jr.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Andrews, Raymond G., O95706.
Benson, Richard D., O96733.
Benson, Roger R., O96945.
Davis, Don M., O96752.
Harvell, Kenneth E., O96482.
Kenney, Donald R., O96766.
Naumann, Walter E., O93285.
Paquette, Edward H., O93336.
Peters, Shelton V., O96845.
Raley, Michael D., O96713.
Sasai, Calvin Y., O96793.
Shafer, Harold S., O96799.
Snow, Edward F., Jr., O97038.
Zebarth, Roger L., O95251.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Tilden, Carol J., L617.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Dolson, James F. (MSC), O78646.

To be first lieutenant

Miles, Peter D. (MSC), O82806.
Murphy, Joseph H., Jr. (MSC), O88852.

To be second lieutenant

Griffith, Ronald H., O94755.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Bender, William J., O4010103.
Boehme, James A., O4071580.
Clancy, John D. S., O4031447.
Darden, Fred A., O4005660.
Doniphan, Vernon G., O4031454.
Ellis, Warren H., O1886083.
Farrell, James J., Jr., O4030755.
Fiesler, Robert J., O1688674.
George, Donald B., O954038.
Giese, William, O4031461.
Gordon, Robert L., Jr., O1890693.
Hamner, Charles T., O1882319.
Hayes, Aldric M., O2003436.
Hendrickx, Edward J., O2265134.
Howard, Lonnie T., O4012706.
Hussey, Donald P., O4074825.
Jorgensen, Norman E., O4011136.
Kells, Robert A., O4006152.
Kunkel, Edwin R., O4028024.
Labrozzi, Anthony, O1884156.
Lewis, Glenn W., O1885295.
Lillis, Francis X., O4038850.
Lundquist, Donald C., O4031492.
Mason, Phillip H., O4010512.
Mattson, Melvin R., O4038412.
McKee, Jona, O4002128.
Morley, Thomas L., O4006932.
Oswald, Philip L., O1889761.
Phillips, Fred E., Jr., O4031251.
Rathburn, Thomas K., O982444.
Schmale, William O., O4062844.
Shattuck, William M., O67369.
Thompson, Roy M., O4031267.
Wagner, Rudy J., O1941158.
Wells, Lester H., O4036537.
Wilson, Charles F., O4033524.

To be first lieutenants

Balberde, Alexander, Jr., O5702833.
Blair, John C., O5300468.
Bradshaw, Charles W., O5303336.
Brokaw, Francis L., O5502898.
Cook, Donald M., O5402276.
Courts, Philip E., O5304308.
Davis, Kenneth M., Jr., O5405239.
Downs, George M., Jr., O5304434.
Gordon, Jack T., O5202481.
Gordon, Thomas J., O5509754.
Grove, Robert N., O5201664.
Hankins, James A., O5402245.
Heaton, Harold K., O5306089.
Hoagland, Jackson, Jr., O5702174.
Johnson, Henry O., III, O5301980.
Kannady, Donald R., O5401342.
Lynch, David J., O5005864.
McNamara, Vincent E., O5301995.
Miller, Sheron W., O5702077.
Molthen, Theodore J., O5703405.
Ogden, George C., Jr., O5303341.
Peate, Laurence R., O5502182.
Phelan, Frank J., O5307263.
Riley, Larry L., O5307398.
Schuler, William D., O5308488.
Scott, John O., O5300938.
Simmons, Jerry W., O5402253.
Stokes, Orville P., O5210280.
Wallace, Woodrow W., Jr., O5308383.

To be second lieutenants

Aldrich, Harold B., III, O5005427.
Carver, William G., O2304695.
Denny, James B., O5305854.
Farley, George P., O5008694.
Hyde, Thomas A., III, O5211064.
Johnson, Ben A., O5208369.
Johnson, Lidge O. J., O5310897.
Liewert, Karl H., O5512379.
Medley, Thomas J., O5312452.
Moody, Robert D., O5705324.
Powers, Gary R., O5410369.
Reynolds, William E., O5211918.
Robertson, Robert S., O2305421.
Robison, Thomas W., O5311649.
Schaffler, Albert B., O5706744.
Scott, Kenneth G., O5512697.
Sturdivant, Clifford R., O5403785.
Tierney, James L., O5706407.
Wenz, Henry F., O5008630.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3291, 3292, 3293, and 3294:

To be major, Medical Corps

Greene, Calvin E., O1892614.

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Hagopian, Jacob, O1685608.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Street, Dorothy R., J100214.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Foley, Mary A., N901824.
Locke, Ruth A., N902283.
McCausland, Muriel J., N805331.
Mizelle, Anne S., N900286.

To be captains, Chaplain

Lucky, Carl E. L., Jr., O4055590.
McCullagh, John P., O2297095.
Moskowitz, Seymour, O2289163.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Neaverth, Elmer J., Jr., O5200548.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bright, Fred, Jr., O2296259.
Trail, Sebert L., O2293243.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Abramson, Ira J., O5703184.
Corby, Donald G., O5500683.
Culp, Neil W., O5004726.
Ledbetter, René B., O5312588.
Metzger, Marshall T., O4001077.
Olson, Hardin E., O5209206.
Rowland, Wade R., O4044895.
Seaton, Robert W., O5312890.
Spaulding, Harry S., Jr., O2300368.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Castleman, Glynna K., N2293584.
Heer, Edith J., N5407165.
McLoughlin, Audre J., N2291953.
Scheerer, Marjorie J., N2291750.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Prout, Gordon R., O4055973.
Reswik, George V., O5501018.
Van Meter, James W., Jr., O5407892.
Wilson, David L., O4070544.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Barringer, Michael L., O5306862.
Burr, Donald C., O5408347.
Caras, Thomas S., O2309200.
Choolitch, Melvin P., O2309201.
Davis, Robert N., O2309252.
Harshaw, William G., Jr., O5205790.
Hays, Leonard L., O5703767.
Kaplan, Gerald, O2305166.
Mani, Carl J., O2309231.

Ruymann, Frederick B., O2305313.
Schwindt, Robert R., O2309244.
Severance, Richard C., O2305674.
Sills, Theron G., O5502463.
Slaughter, Robert L., O2309247.
Smith, Henry I., O2305597.
Smith, Samuel G., O2305429.
Stephenson, Jackie D., O5402462.
Volpe, Joseph A., O2309207.
Waldron, Frank D., O2309256.
Wills, William R., Jr., O5305310.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Blachly, Carol A., N5411463.
Saunders, Martha E., N5707201.

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Bradford, Jackie E.
Carlson, Ronald O. J.
Cottman, Robert E. L.
Greene, James W.
Hanson, Larry L.
Hardgrave, Newt L.
Hula, Roger P., II
Johnson, Vernon E., Jr.
Lawrence, Frank M.
Morgan, John W., Jr.
Mortensen, Eugene P.
Nadig, Carroll C.
Olson, Jimmy L.
Redden, William L., Jr.
Starr, Gerald R.
Trader, Michael W.
Vorpahl, Kenneth W.
Watts, Stephen S.
Zigarmi, Andrea, III

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adler, Kenneth H.
Ahrens, Alfred J.
Allen, Harold F.
Anastas, John M.
Andersen, Ronald J.
Anderson, Carlton L.
Anderson, Randall J.
Andre, David J.
Appuzzio, Louis R.
Armstrong, William B., Jr.
Arrington, Theron R.
Atkins, George M., Jr.
Aubuchon, James M.
Aufdemberge, Robert L.
Baker, Alfred W.
Barrett, Paul S.
Barrick, Charles R.
Barylski, James E.
Baumann, Bruce W.
Beaupre, Christopher A.
Bell, Clarence D., Jr.
Bennett, Jerry C.
Bishop, Alexius O.
Bitter, David D.
Bleam, William D.
Blevens, Andrew
Bolden, Frank A.
Brandon, Lawson W., Jr.
Brant, Arthur
Brown, Elwyn L.
Brown, Harvey E.
Brown, Russell W.
Brunel, Pierre E.
Bryant, Earl W.
Brysen, Frank D.
Buchanan, Samuel J.
Buchly, Howard L.
Buelow, Edward H., Jr.
Buffardi, Louis N., Jr.
Buffington, John D.
Bunting, Josiah, III
Butler, Alvin L.
Byrd, Robert L.
Caldwell, Marion L., Jr.
Carlile, Thomas R.
Carlson, Paul D.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Chaney, Martin L.
Chien, Kenneth
Clark, Francis M., Jr.
Clark, James F.
Clark, Robert L.
Clifford, David M.
Cloud, Earl W.
Clouse, Charles L.
Cone, Fred M., Jr.
Conrad, Robert S.
Conti, Thomas L.
Conwell, Gary K.
Cook, Stephen W.
Coonfield, Derrill G.
Cosby, James W.
Creasy, Joseph L.
Crisp, William G.
Cronise, Ronald V.
Cummings, Peter M.
Cunningham, Frank, III
David, James R.
Davis, Harley C.
Davis, James L., Jr.
Day, Doel D.
DeHayes, Daniel W., Jr.
Demarest, Alfred A., Jr.
Denmon, James L.
Diamond, Richard J.
Dobras, Victor E., II
Dodge, Ira D., III
Drake, Francis D.
Drescher, Donald R.
Dysart, James E.
Edgerly, David E.
Eifried, Gary
Eilbeck, Edward L.
Emrath, John P.
Eschweiler, Leonard W.
Estes, James F., Jr.
Ewers, Rayburn O.
Fenwick, Victor J., Jr.
Flynn, Michael J.
Fore, Calvin R.
Forrest, Harold R.
Forrester, Philip R.
Fortner, John P.
Foster, Edward T., Jr.
Frasche, Robert M.
Freeman, Lawrence W.
Fried, Page G., III
Fulford, Ernest L.
Fulmer, Frank E.
Fygi, Eric J.
Gaddis, Thomas W.
Garner, Bruce C.
Garvais, Richard A.
Gee, Bobby J.
Geoghegan, John L.
Gillespie, James J., Jr.
Glantz, David M.
Godfrey, Thomas G.
Goetz, Robert C.
Gold, John E., Jr.
Goldberg, Sherwood D.
Goodridge, Clair L.
Gorman, Francis J.
Gragg, Robert L.
Graning, Harald M., Jr.
Graves, Harold R.
Graves, Scott A.
Green, Harry G., Jr.
Gregory, Stephen E., Jr.
Griffin, James A.
Grimsley, Turner E.
Gross, Graham L.
Gruber, Lewis A.
Gulstrand, Rudolph E., Jr.
Gurecki, John J., Jr.
Gustafson, Melvyn D.
Hacker, Gary L.
Hagman, J. Michael
Hall, Robert C.
Hamm, Michael R.
Hancock, Louis A.
Hansen, Albert, III
Hanson, Charles T.
Hardt, Jerome D.
Harrison, James M.
Harvey, John R.
Haselton, Mark B.
Hayes, William G., III
Heinig, William J.
Hendriks, Warren K., Jr.
Hinkle, Carl V., Jr.
Hitchcock, Gary
Hocevar, August E.
Hoebeke, Terrall A.
Hoffecker, Wilmer A., Jr.
Hoggard, Patrick L.
Holland, Michael C.
Holtry, Preston W.
Homan, Richard P.
Hubing, James N.
Huff, Keith M.
Iannarino, Thomas E.
Ippolito, Peter J.
Irwin, Arthur E.
Jackson, Ernest R.
Jacobs, Paul A.
Jandras, John S.
Jeffress, Edwin B.
Jenkins, Kenneth E.
Jennings, Logan R.
Jessen, Otto W.
Jones, James M.
Jordan, Kenneth M.
Keath, Medford E., Jr.
Keim, David W.
Kemp, Tommy W.
Kessel, Mark
Kindred, Jon D.
Kinker, James L.
Kjelson, Martin A., III
Klein, James W.
Kneedler, Harry L., III
Koga, Malcolm T.
Kohler, Mark H.
Kramer, Charles H. R.
Kramer, William J.
Krannawitter, James C., Jr.
Kraus, Kenneth L.
Krewson, David S., Jr.
Kripowicz, Robert S.
Kubek, Donald R.
Kuypers, John C.
Lackman, Albert L.
Lacy, John J., Jr.
La Forge, William G.
Lanahan, George W.
La Rocco, Angelo A.
Lawhon, Edward H.
Ledwin, Norman A., Jr.
Leigh, Fredric H.
Lenhart, Michael E.
Letson, Laurence R.
Liberti, Joseph C.
Lineweaver, Robert N., III
Little, John H.
Little, Joseph R.
Locker, William J.
Loop, Carlos A., Jr.
Lorenzo, William E., Jr.
Luther, Herbert H.
Lychmanenko, Eugene
Mack, Victor A.
Mackey, David R.
Mandagaran, Gilbert F.
Mansi, Leo J., Jr.
Marchant, Robert D.
Marcy, Richard C., Jr.
Martin, Gerald A.
Maslinski, Donald R.
Mayberry, Robert L.
McCarley, Michael M.
McDevitt, Coleman J., Jr.
McDonald, Daniel W., Jr.
McFarlane, Thomas C.
McGinnis, James J., Jr.
McGrath, Vincent A.
McIntyre, Peter E.
McKee, David L.
McLeod, Joel E., Jr.
McLoughlin, Robert E.
Melin, Jeffrey N.
Meyer, James F.
Meyers, Jerrold B.
Miller, Henderson I.
Miller, William G.
Minor, Gary L.
Mitchell, Charles M.
Mitchell, William F.
Modarelli, Robert O.
Montgomery, William A.
Mooney, Philip D.
Morrison, Fred K.
Mueller, Paul G.
Nanney, Joe W.
Necessary, Kenneth A. J.
Nevers, David G.
Noble, Donald H.
Noto, Samuel R.
O'Laughlin, Michael F.
Oldfield, John F.
Olds, William K. S.
Olson, Walter E., Jr.
O'Malley, Thomas E.
Ostovich, Rudolph, III
Pacelli, Joseph A.
Pansze, Arthur J., Jr.
Parkin, Curtis W.
Pastore, Joseph M., Jr.
Patterson, Daniel J.
Piechocki, John R.
Pilsch, Martin C., Jr.
Pitts, Willard C.
Plaxe, Jack R.
Pocreva, Michael A.
Pond, David W.
Powell, William E.
Powers, George E.
Przybylski, Robert J.
Reid, John F.
Renaud, Timothy J.
Rendeiro, Antonio C.
Reynolds, Roger D.
Riccobono, James C.
Rice, Richard E.
Richter, Otto, Jr.
Riley, William W.
Roark, Stanley L.
Robins, David S.
Robinson, James A.
Robison, Donald R.
Ross, Norman E., Jr.
Rust, David H.
Ryan, Kevin M.
Sagerser, Roy P.
Salzer, James R.
Sander, Lawrence W.
Sasaki, Raymond N.
Savage, George N., III
Savells, Jerald O.
Schmidt, Lawrence G.
Schuetze, Irving P.
Schwartz, William W.
Scott, William W.
Sitter, Laurance F.
Skender, Louis E.
Skierkowski, Paul
Skinrood, Norman A., Jr.
Smallwood, Edward K.
Smith, Freddie G.
Smith, Gardner W.
Snetzer, Michael A.
Snook, Larry
Spessard, Richard L.
Spring, Michael C.
Sprinkle, Edgar E., III
Standley, Warren R.
Stanley, Douglas S.
Steele, Charles T.
Stephens, Jeffrey L.
Sterrett, John D., III
Stocks, Robert B.
Strauss, Robert E., Jr.
Strock, Arthur H., II
Swarthout, John E.
Taft, John M.
Takata, Alvin M.
Talbott, Charlie Y., Jr.
Talley, Thomas A.
Tateyama, Joseph T.
Terry, Millard D.
Thomas, Michael T.
Tilelli, John H., Jr.
Trainer, Charles D.
Trotter, Kenneth E.
Troxler, Robert C.
Tucker, James E.
Urban, Gerald G.
Uyenoyama, Dennis H.
Valencia, Romolo
Vande Hei, Thomas F.
Vanderploog, Paul J.
Venokur, Steven M.
Verstegen, Keith J.
Vittas, George P.
Vlasak. Walter R.
Wagner, Dale N.
Wall, Thomas F.
Wallace, Terrence M.
Walsh, William F., Jr.
Walstad, George H.
Walton, Charles M.
Ward, Stephen R.
Waters, John K., Jr.
Watson, Charles H., III
Wells, William A.
Whipple, Robert E.
White, Perry S.
Whitley, Bobby
Wicks, John R.
Williams, Gomer R.
Williams, William J.
Wilson, John C., Jr.
Wilson, Leslie E.
Wojciechowski, John J.
Womack, Charles H.
Wood, Samuel E.
Worthington, Douglas L.
Wykle, Kenneth R.
Yoshimura, John P.
Younger, William E., Jr.
Yurachek, John P.
Zeltner, Richard L.
Zentis, Joseph J.
Zinni, Gabriel J.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1963:

Post Office Department

William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Department of the Army

Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Department of Justice

John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. Attorneys

Richard D. Fitzgibbon, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 4 years.

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York for the term of 4 years.

U.S. Marshals

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for a term of 4 years.

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1956.

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1963.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1969.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admirals

Capt. James D. Craik.
Capt. Louis M. Thayer, Jr.

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Academy as an instructor with the permanent grade indicated:

To be lieutenant

Frank S. Kapral.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

James H. Blumer
Charles W. Mathisson
Bruce I. Williams
Archibald J. Patrick
R. Lawrence Swanson
James Collins
George A. Maul
Robert A. Trauschke
Ralph J. Land

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Archibald J. Patrick
R. Lawrence Swanson
James Collins
George A. Maul
Robert A. Trauschke
Ralph J. Land
Francis D. Moran
Robert E. Lushene
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Charles K. Paul
Dee E. Kimbell
Dewaine Seets
Andrew Tczap
Sigmund R. Petersen

To be ensigns

Kenneth V. Marovich
Edward P. Cline
Jeffrey G. Carlen
David L. Des Jardins,
Norment A. Barnes, Jr

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Vice President's "Challenge to Americans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 12, 1963, the Vice President of the United States, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, spoke before the National Advertising Council at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.

His remarks were titled "Challenge to Americans."

His remarks are so brilliantly eloquent that they deserve the attention, not only of those members of the National Advertising Council who heard the Vice President personlly, but of the Members of the Senate, and Americans everywhere.

In his prepared text, Vice President JOHNSON said:

> As a nation, we are challenged. As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

Since I have been a member of this Senate I have had the honor of serving with the Vice President, not only since he has been Vice President, but when he was the majority leader of the Senate. When he was summoned, I know personally he has searched for the answers which would keep "America free and the home of the brave." But whatever position of service to America he has held, the Vice President, has been, to paraphrase his words, in this order, a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat. He has never been partisan at a time when the need called for a patriot.

Because he is a patriot and a statesman, and because he is a Democrat, last and always, he is able to bring to the country leadership for Americans in his speech to the National Advertising Council which is so worthy of us all. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS

(Address by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, National Advertising Council dinner, Presidential Room, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963)

On this occasion, others of the administration have spoken of the programs and policies by which our Government seeks to meet the challenges to our system. For my part, I want to speak of our system itself, and of the challenge it presents to us for maintaining the effective and responsible functioning of our Government.

Whatever our programs, whatever our policies, if our country is to succeed, if our cause is to prevail, if the challenge to Americans is to be met, our political system, the system by which we govern ourselves, must function effectively and responsibly.

I wish that I might objectively say that such is now the case, beyond all doubt. But no honest observer, no matter what his persuasian, could be entirely content with the performance of our political system at this period of our history.

In the arena of national public affairs, we are debating more and resolving less. On issue after issue, our energies are exerted more to frustrate answers than to find them. Inaction is exalted by many as a greater virtue than decision. If we are not defaulting our basic national responsibilities, the question does arise whether we may not be forfeiting or compromising valuable national opportunities.

I do not believe that any discussion of our national programs, policies, and purposes would be complete without a full and frank acknowledgment of this problem, its causes, and its extensive implications.

Let me say that my interest in this is the product of my own experience, service, and convictions. The office I now hold is the one constitutional office which exists solely to assure the orderly and effective functioning of our system. Before becoming Vice President of the United States, I was, as leader of the majority party in the Senate, confronted with unique responsibilities for helping to maintain the functioning of our system during the longest period of divided party responsibility in our Nation's history.

This is a subject with which I have lived closely, and about which I feel strongly. While I intend to speak candidly in these remarks, I mean only to speak constructively, remembering that I am a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat, in that order, only and always.

Your council is now engaged in an effective and intelligent campaign to bring home the "challenge to Americans." I congratulate you on the quality and contribution of that effort.

As a Nation, we are challenged.

As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

But I believe both our understanding and our response begin with a clear understanding of our Nation's position in the world. Challenged as we are, we still do not live in an America besieged, an America beset, an America grimly imperiled.

The vital truth of this last half of the 20th century is that while we are challenged, we are also the challengers, challenging all the oppressors and oppressions of humankind.

Since time began, the weak have been at the mercy of the strong; the peaceful have been the prey of the aggressor; the vanquished have been victimized by the victors; the poverty of the world's masses has been of concern only to the poor themselves. Disease has been the concern only of the sick. Human despair and deprivation have mattered only to the despairing and deprived.

We of America has been the first to challenge this age-old order of human affairs and we have challenged it successfully. We have demonstrated that men can be strong without being selfish, can become powerful without becoming unprincipled, can be victors without being vandals, can be saviors without being spoilsmen.

The fruits of this are many.

Of the 50 nations which have gained their independence in the postwar years, not one has chosen to ally with the Communist tyranny.

Nations which have warred against one another for centuries have in these times joined together in mutual alliances and binding friendships.

The example of the political and economic unity of our 50 States is reshaping the future of virtually every continent where men are free.

We can with good cause believe that a new age is coming in the affairs of man, and we can with sure knowledge know that it is an age which had its beginnings and takes its inspiration from these shores.

It is against this standard that we must today, and always, test and measure the performance of our system. It is not enough for our system merely to guard the present, although that it must surely do. It is imperative that our system continue to challenge the future.

This imperative is more than any other the special burden of this period of our national affairs and public policy. We have over the past 20 years committed our national resources and our national efforts to programs which have succeeded. Because of that success, not because of failure, as some would have it, we must now respond to new conditions and new challenges with new programs.

Because containment of Communist aggression did succeed in Europe and the Middle East and Southeast Asia, we are now faced with the Communist effort to escape that containment by penetrating into the Western Hemisphere.

Because economic assistance did succeed in the Atlantic community, we must now deal with upright allies instead of prostrate friends.

Because independence fashioned after our own example did succeed in Asia and Africa, we must at the United Nations hear many more voices, the voices of men speaking for themselves, as we do, instead of being spoken for by others.

By every measure, the tide runs with us. But if "the winds and waves are always on the side of the ablest navigators," we must at this period adjust our sails to hold true to our course. That is the clear and compelling necessity of our public policy at home as abroad.

But we can question, in fact we must question, whether our system is now functioning effectively and responsibly to accomplish this.

In the sum of our national experience, success is the predominant reality, success domestically, success internationally. Mistakes have been made. But we stand virtually alone as a nation which has never experienced a mistake fatal to its national existence, integrity or independence. Yet, despite this record, the predominant theme of our public discussions of national policy is talk of failure rather than success. Our system is disgorging much afterthought about what we should not have done and offering little forethought about what can be done.

In this context, the example of Cuba is obvious. But it is a fitting commentary on the problem that most of the discussion on Cuba has obscured two essential points:

First, that our system cannot function effectively if it is paralyzed by irresponsible conflicts which tear down confidence in our system; and

Second, that our system cannot function responsibly if we disregard the purpose and importance of the constitutional concept of the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government.

On these matters, I speak from intimate personal experience. During the period to which I have referred, when I served as majority leader of the Senate, the majority position in Congress was held by one party, the executive position was held by another party. Such a division could not have occurred or have been tolerated in any other government, representative or totalitarian.

What was impressed indelibly upon me during that period was that either party or both parties had the power then to bring the functioning of our system to a halt, and, in so doing, to collapse the strength as well as the hope of the cause of freedom. Furthermore, in that same situation, those same consequences could have come had the congressional majority sought to transgress and usurp the powers of the Executive.

I do not recall these circumstances to give or claim any partisan credit. It required the patriotism of two parties, not one, for divided government to work at all. My purpose is to make these points:

1. In the design of our system irresponsible partisanship, and irresponsible partisanship alone, holds the power of paralyzing and immobilizing our Government.

2. Our Constitution did not base itself upon the concept of an opposition party with the sole duty to oppose. On the contrary, our system is based on a concept of the duty to decide by full and thoughtful debate, and our system will not function if that duty is defaulted.

3. In parliamentary systems, issues make the election calendar. In our system, election calendars make the issues the partisans. Thus, we must seek to avoid the hazard that the issues we debate will be false or obsolete or worse.

4. When we allow the constitutional separation of powers between legislative and executive to fall into disarray, we invite the serious danger of the subversion of our system. There must be no back door to the American Government in its dealings with foreign governments or nationals or we will not long be masters of our own house. Under our Constitution, the Executive and only the Executive speaks for and acts for this Nation in relations abroad—and no partisan cause can justify disregard of this standard.

5. Finally, I would make the point that if our system is to function successfully, the central focus of partisan attack cannot continue to be the people's confidence in the institution of the Presidency of the United States.

No head of state in the world bears more responsibility than the President of this Nation, yet none has less free exercise of authority. As an individual, he is subject to law. His vetoes can be overridden. His appointments can be rejected. He is Commander in Chief but he cannot raise armies and fleets on his own authority. These provisions are in the Constitution and we would not have it otherwise. They are legitimate and based upon the studied consideration of men of wisdom.

But beyond the Constitution, there has grown up in our times an inordinate preoccupation with frustrating the Chief Executive, thwarting his recommendations, controlling his course by weakening or destroying the public confidence in him. Beyond the parties themselves, this is an activity indulged by many effective segments of our society, business and labor, races and religions, regions and States. And it has made little difference whether the President has been Republican or Democrat, Dwight Eisenhower or John F. Kennedy.

I am a partisan. I have practiced my partisanship with enthusiasm in proper partisan seasons. But I have never, and will never, seek to destroy before the Nation or the world the confidence of free men in the institution upon whom the success of freedom's cause must depend.

I speak as I do tonight because, as I have said, it is imperative that our system challenge the future.

If we are to succeed in the future as we have in the past, we must in many realms of public policy cease to do what there is no longer need for us to be doing and begin to do what we should already have done.

We must not permit partisanship to paralyze us.

We must not permit conservatism defined 40 years ago or liberalism defined 30 years ago to prevent us from defining for ourselves the progressiveness, prudence and patriotism required for these times today.

We must not permit the search for failures to lead us away from the exploitation of our successes.

We must not permit the valid purpose of preventing a single office from becoming too powerful to be perverted so that we cause the whole Nation to become too powerless.

We must not allow the separation of powers within our system to be subverted and thus invite the subversion of our freedoms as well.

The tides of these times run with us. That revolution of freedom which began on these shores still challenges and changes the world. The challenge to Americans is to understand how great and how successful is their cause, and that they serve that cause by being patriots before they are partisans.

In partisanship, as in patriotism, there must be standards by which responsible men abide. If patriotism knows no season, partisanship must never forget its season. America will not be served by a perpetual and unending campaign for power between its partisans who contest with each other for the seizure of power rather than the resolution of issues.

In our policies, foreign and domestic, this is a time for reform.

It is no less a time for reform in our politics, and in those free institutions through which our system functions. This is important work and vital work for us all, and none is more important now. For if a house divided against itself cannot stand, a system contending against itself for the sake of contention alone cannot succeed.

The thoughts I have expressed here tonight are not new with me. They are thoughts that I have expressed when I was the Democratic leader under a Republican President. The same thoughts, I believe, are valid now that we have a Democratic President and must always be valid.

There is a legitimate role for partisanship in our society. We must and should have partisanship because issues must be debated, must be discussed from all points of view, if they are to be resolved.

The danger—and this I say to my colleagues of both parties is that we will debate issues not to solve the problems of our country but solely to solve the problems of the next election. The danger is compounded when we debate just to find areas of disagreement and to ignore the areas of agreement.

I have always sought the areas of agreement. Without such an effort, our society cannot long endure because we live under government by consent and unless we know what we consent to, effective government is impossible.

As patriotic Americans, let us seek out the areas of agreement upon which we can preserve our freedoms. Let us debate those issues upon which we disagree with dignity, with candor, and with the objective of finding a solution.

On that bedrock, our freedoms will endure. The united voice of free men will solve not only the problems of the next election but the problems of the next generation and the words "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable" will remain a living reality for all time.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is easy to get excited over Federal expenditures, the national debt, and this country's unbalanced budget.

It is very difficult, however, to explain these problems so that they can be understood by most of the people. I believe there was delivered recently a speech which did a great deal toward explaining these problems and toward attempting to eliminate much of the emotionalism tied up with them.

This was the very interesting speech delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] on March 11, before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution. As a good explanation of some of the basic facts which have to do with this Government's fiscal policies, I recommend the address by Senator HARTKE and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARTKE DISCUSSES BUDGET IN BROOKINGS INSTITUTION APPEARANCE

Let's do away with the budget. After all, it is the subject of plenty of adverse comment. After all, as some claim, it is out of control, out of date, and out of balance.

Then let's do away with the Federal debt. After all, as some claim, the Federal debt is too high, dangerous, a burden on us, a millstone around our children's necks.

To you experts, this may sound like a lot of tomfoolery. Yet to most Americans, this is what they hear and some believe about Federal fiscal affairs. I am sure each of you recognizes these slogans for what they are worth. But of all the affairs of Government the matter of fiscal affairs is least susceptible to slogans. It is a matter of simple bookkeeping and difficult economics. It is difficult to explain in simple terms.

We are a big country with awesome responsibilities and tremendous obligations. The budget is an estimate of what these responsibilities and obligations are costing.

In estimating the budget we attempt to judge the future economic conditions using past conditions as guidelines. What are some of these basic past facts and conditions? We have now had about 2 years since the last recession trough. During this time the gross national product rose $61 billion; personal income increased by $43 billion, and corporate profits increased by $11 billion. These figures are quite remarkable for a period of about 24 months and in general language would be called times of prosperity. Output of steel mills is on the rise at its highest level since April of 1962. The auto industry is on the verge of near record sales, and auto sales last year were generally exceptionally great. The first 20 days of February ran far ahead of a year ago and are not far under the level of February 1955, the year of recordmaking sales. Retail sales are very brisk, following a record year. Although unemployment is a nagging problem, the truth is that employment is at an alltime high.

Yet, the President has complained about a lagging economy and business is complaining about a profit squeeze, what they want is more "pep" in the prosperous times we are having.

The cynics might easily look at the condition of our business and economy and say: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

The truth is that the rate of growth in the United States has been good but it should have been better. More than that, the growth in 1962 was slower than in 1961 and there is no reason to expect it to accelerate in 1963. Therefore it is deemed desirable to stimulate the economy.

One method of stimulation is a tax cut. In considering enactment of a tax cut, it is necessary to give an estimate of some future economic conditions. Let's look at the future. The prosperity of the past 2 years is probably going to continue. The gross national product reached an all-time high of $554 billion in the calendar year of 1962, more important, the fourth quarter of 1962 brought the gross national product to an annual rate of $562 billion. It will probably go close to $580 billion in 1963. Here again, if we follow the reasoning of the cautious cynics, the question would again be proper: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

In the field of corporate profits it is expected that we will reach still more record-breaking heights by increasing another $2 billion. Personal income is expected to increase by about $20 billion. These almost staggering prosperous figures are enough to warm the breasts of all even the gloom and doom prophets.

The truth, as I see it, is in a very simple proposition: "Times are good."

Now that times are good, why should we have a budget with a deficit? Well, in fact the choice this year is really not a deficit with a tax cut or a deficit without a tax cut. The fact is there will be a deficit either way. Now for the sake of the partisans, those of the Eisenhower years must first meet two basic facts:

1. The Eisenhower years produced a deficit of over $22 billion for 8 years, and no peacetime deficit has ever exceeded the one Eisenhower had in 1959 in the amount of approximately $13 billion.

2. Congress cut the budgets of President Eisenhower by $20 billion. If this had not been done we would have had a total deficit of over $42 billion for the 8 Eisenhower years.

Now to calm the waters in regard to all expenditures, it is normal that Congress usually cuts the budget submitted by the President. This statement is true, although the wisdom of such action is frequently challenged.

The fact that times are good and that we are going to have a deficit point up a truism, the Nation which leads the world is going to have excellent times in order to continue our role as world leader. The proposed budget, submitted by President Kennedy, recognizes this international responsibility. In this budget the following costs of Government are increased:

1. Defense expenditures are proposed to be increased by $2.4 billion.

2. Space expenditures are proposed to be increased by $1.8 billion.

3. Interest costs will be up $900 million. All other costs combined are proposed to be less than last year.

With this background I would like to briefly approach some of the more common questions concerning our fiscal policy for next year.

IS GOVERNMENT SPENDING GOING OUT OF CONTROL?

All levels of Government have been subject to sharp pressures for increased expenditures during the postwar period as our population has grown, as wages and prices have risen, and as demands for improved governmental services have expanded. Since 1948, State and local government expenditures have more than trebled and Federal expenditures for nondefense purposes, including a rapidly expanding level of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, have only doubled. The Federal Government has also borne a sharply increased burden in the areas of national defense, international affairs, and space.

However, the economy has been growing at a slightly faster percentage rate than Government spending. As a result, Federal budget expenditures today bear about the same relationship to gross national product (total value of all goods and services produced in this country in 1 year) as they did in the latter 1950's:

Ratio of Federal budget expenditures to GNP

Fiscal year:	Percent
1955	17.1
1956	16.2
1957	15.9
1958	16.2
1959	17.2
1963 (estimate)	16.7

Apart from defense, space, and interest, budget expenditures between 1961 and 1964 will increase less than they did between 1958 and 1961.

WHAT ABOUT INCREASING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT?

Since the war, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government has grown less rapidly than the population and much less rapidly than State and local government employment:

[In millions]

Calendar year	U.S. population	State and local government employment	Federal civilian employment in executive branch
1948	146.6	3.8	2.0
1962	186.6	6.8	2.5
Percent increase	27	79	25

One force making for increased employment is simply the steady increase in our population, which puts an added burden on many programs. At the end of 1964, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government will be 189,000 higher than it was a decade earlier; yet the percentage increase in Government employment over this period will be less than the percentage increase in population.

Federal civilian employment under the 1964 budget provides for the same number of people to serve every 100 persons in our populations as was true when the present administration took office, a smaller ratio than prevailed 10 years ago.

Federal civilian employment is actually lower today than it was in 1952, while State and local government employment over the same period has increased 67 percent.

CAN WE EVER HOPE TO ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET UNDER PRESENT POLICIES?

Yes, there is always hope. Realistically, the experience of the past generation shows that as long as we are operating under a restrictive tax program there is little hope to achieve a balanced budget. The present tax policy is based on war taxes.

It is restrictive. We should remove the wartime tax shackles. Then the law of supply and demand could again operate more closely to normal. This would increase purchasing power, increase production, reduce unemployment and increase profits. The net result would be an expanded economy, a greater prosperity, increased tax revenue, and a balanced budget.

SHOULDN'T ANY TAX REDUCTION BE OFFSET BY A CUT IN EXPENDITURES?

In the first place, Congress will more than likely cut the amount proposed in the President's budget. But to merely cut expenditures without considering the consequences would be plain stupid. Cutting expenditures is a desirable aim of all government. But you cannot increase our Army and cut the cost; you can't go half way to the moon; you can't default on our Government debts; you can't cut generalities, you have to be specific. Little attention need be given to the individual who speaks of general reduction in expenditures unless they are specific.

WON'T THE DEFICIT OF NEARLY $12 BILLION ANTICIPATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964 TEND TO CAUSE INFLATION?

Under present economic conditions there need be little fear that the President's tax program and the deficit for fiscal year 1964 will tend to cause inflation. The law of supply and demand are such that inflation comes only when there is full employment and full production. Today, there is still unemployment and unused production facilities.

IS IT A GOOD POLICY TO PROPOSE A REDUCTION IN TAXES WHEN THE BUDGET IS ALREADY IN DEFICIT?

As I have previously said, our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. Rather our choice is between chronic deficits resulting from chronic slack in the economy, on the one hand, and transitional deficits temporarily enlarged by tax revision designed to promote full employment, thus increasing revenues and making possible an ultimately balanced budget.

CAN WE AFFORD A FURTHER INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT?

Whether measured by the total size of the debt or by annual interest payments, the Federal debt is becoming a progressively lighter burden on the economy:

Calendar year	Federal debt end of year (billions)	Percent of GNP	Annual interest payments (billions)	Percent of GNP
1947	$256.9	109.6	$5.0	2.1
1952	267.4	77.1	6.1	1.8
1957	274.9	62.1	7.6	1.7
1962	303.5	54.8	9.6	1.7

The public debt as a proportion of our gross national product will fall to 53 percent of the gross national product in fiscal 1964, compared to 57 percent when this administration took office. Last year the total increase in the Federal debt was only 2 percent, compared to an 8 percent increase in the gross debt of State and local governments. Taking a longer view, the Federal debt today is only 13 percent higher than it was in 1946, while State and local debt increased over 360 percent and private debt by 300 percent.

MY CONCLUSION

We are a leader in the world. We are a growing nation. We have an unfilled destiny. By bold action, clear thinking, and high hopes we will be able to lead in a manner which makes us all proud.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 4: 8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair.*

Almighty God, may our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative body daily seek to impart from their lofty places of leadership the blessings of encouragement and hope to struggling humanity.

May noble principles and purposes permeate their minds and hearts, constraining them to contribute the best they have of wisdom and energy in loyal and loving service to our country and all mankind.

Grant them the inspiration and courage to believe that the very stars in their courses are fighting for and with them as they strive with might and main to steer the Ship of State, during these perilous times, into deeper and wider channels.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 112

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung);

S. 97. An act for the relief of Purificacion Siat;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Michelina Lanni;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Young Wai;

S. 234. An act for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro;

S. 421. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 436. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 574. An act for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Roswitha Seib;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Krystyna Ratay;

S. 688. An act for the relief of Ronald Whiting;

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration;

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof;

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to chapter 5, section 243, Public Law 87-794, has recommended Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to be members of the U.S. delegation for trade negotiations.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-420, has appointed Mr. McGOVERN to be a member of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, vice Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, resigned.

THE LATE WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to my colleagues the death last Thursday of William W. Blackney, who represented Michigan's Sixth District in the House during the 74th and the 76th through the 82d Congresses. I know Mr. Blackney has many friends here who served with him during his years of service to our Nation who will be saddened by this news.

My first recollection of Congressman Blackney, or "Uncle Bill," as I have affectionately called him, was during my college days when I visited his congressional office. I have always felt indebted to Mr. Blackney for his warm welcome, and his instilling in me a deep interest in the legislative affairs of our country.

I have valued his friendship through the years. Since I have been a Member of Congress, Mr. Blackney has offered me his assistance on numerous occasions and frequently accompanied me about our district which he knew so well. I have always appreciated his sage advice and looked forward to seeing him whenever I visited Flint.

Mr. Blackney was born in Clio, Mich., which is part of the district he represented for 16 years. He moved to Flint when a young man in 1905 and began his public service as Genesee County clerk. After his graduation from the law school at the University of Michigan and his admission to the bar in 1912, he commenced law practice in Flint and the very next year served as assistant prosecuting attorney for the county. He was a member of the Flint School Board for 10 years, a member of the Republican State Central Committee for 5 years, and a teacher in the General Motors Co. technical night school for 16 years.

As a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee and later the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. Blackney contributed immeasurably to the vital work of these committees during the eventful World War II and Korean war years. He was an able and determined legislator and his outstanding service was recognized by his being returned to Congress term after term.

Although it has been over 10 years since Mr. Blackney voluntarily retired from Congress, I know with what warm regard and esteem he was held by those who knew him then because of the frequent inquiries I have continued to receive about his health and well-being.

He was a fine man, a gracious man, a man of integrity who commanded deep respect, dedicated to the welfare of those he served.

We have lost a distinguished patriot who was noted not only throughout his district and the State of Michigan, but throughout the country for the diligence and honor with which he served his Nation.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join other Members in expressing deep regret over the death of William Blackney, of Flint, Mich., a former colleague of ours. Bill Blackney was a Member of the House of Representatives when I first came here and I never met a more friendly or kindly man. He always had time to offer sound advice and words of wisdom to the newly elected and less experienced Members. He served with distinction on the House Armed Services Committee and was one of the ablest Members of this body on military matters. I wish to extend my condolences to all of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of the late William W. Blackney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WEST VIRGINIA AND EASTERN KENTUCKY FLOODS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House no doubt have read the reports of the flood situation in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. The muck and misery are almost unbelievable. I spent last weekend in this area, and I would only urge, when the opportunity comes to make appropriations for such dams as the Justice Dam on the Guyandotte River and the East Lynn and Beech Fork Dams on Twelve Pole Creek and other necessary projects to prevent such destruction in the future, that the Congress will support these projects up to the capability of the Corps of Army Engineers. We cannot stand any more of this human misery on top of economic misery in the valleys of West Virginia and Kentucky.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as one of the supporters of a number of Hawaiian statehood bills, including the one that finally granted statehood to the beautiful islands, I certainly wish to join in extending felicitations and congratulations on the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Hawaiian statehood bill. I also wish to send greetings to my many friends in the islands where I have spent many happy days in the past.

AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House resolution that would amend the rules of the House so as to require that in the future those who put in bills must indicate thereon an estimate of the cost of the bill in Federal funds should it be enacted. I believe that such a requirement would be a healthy caution to the sponsors of many proposals that, on their face, are politically attractive but are at the same time fiscally irresponsible.

Not only is this desirable, but I am sure that it is no imposition upon a bill's sponsor to require that he tell us what he thinks his proposal will cost the taxpayer. My resolution also calls for the bill's sponsor to indicate if no cost will be involved.

I am sure it will come as a shock to many sponsors of a wide range of legislative proposals to find out how much they will cost should they become law. The fact that the cost of a particular proposal may be so high as to be a caution is a desirable yellow light in this body where so many proposals are unsound and unnecessary.

It is imperative that our great country conserve its economic strength to meet the stresses that are bound to be involved in future emergencies. This proposal to put a price tag on House bills would be a constructive step in the direction of achieving a greater degree of commonsense in the legislative process.

EXPERIMENT TO REDUCE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of this body an interesting experiment that is being conducted in Indiana to reduce traffic accidents.

This experiment consists of placing a small light with a 21-candlepower bulb on the front center of motor vehicles to burn during daylight driving. This experiment is being sponsored by the Indianapolis Star and has produced some interesting results.

Results of this experiment show that the daylight burning light has reduced the accident rate by 15 percent.

This program of keeping a small light burning on the front of a vehicle during daylight driving is both inexpensive and simple. Before we discard such a plan because of its simplicity we must remember that possibly the greatest single improvement in reducing traffic accidents was painting a line down the center of our highways.

The Greyhound Lines showed a 15-percent drop in accidents after installing these daylight burning lights. The Indianapolis Star is placing a daylight burning light on its 75 staff cars and trucks. The same applies to many businesses in Indianapolis and to city and State vehicles.

The Indianapolis Star is certainly to be congratulated on its important and effective efforts toward reducing our catastrophic traffic carnage.

SEDITION

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress, I authored the bill which became Public Law 87-369. The effect of that legislation was to extend the reach of chapter 37, title 18, United States Code—relating to espionage—to acts committed by U.S. citizens overseas. Before passage of Public Law 87-369, application of the espionage statute was limited to the United States, the admiralty, and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and the high seas. As limited, it failed to cover such acts of espionage as those committed in the Scarbeck case.

This year, I have introduced H.R. 4897 which, if enacted, will have precisely the same effect with reference to the wartime sedition statute, 18 U.S.C. 2388. That statute makes it a criminal offense, punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, for a person during time of war to make a false report designed to interfere with the operation of the Armed Forces, or to attempt to cause mutiny, or to obstruct the military enlistment service, or to conspire with another person to commit such acts. Under section 2391 of title 18, the provisions of section 2388 will remain in full force and effect "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950," unless sooner terminated by Congress.

The justification for this legislation parallels that under which Public Law 87-369 was enacted. By reason of our military, diplomatic, and commercial commitments around the world, American citizens are traveling in or resident in every quarter of the globe. The same is true of aliens who have been admitted to the United States as permanent residents in preparation for naturalization. Under the sedition statute as now written, they would be immune to prosecution for any seditious act which they might commit on foreign soil.

Wherever such an act is committed, it is directly injurious to the United States, and the Supreme Court has already decided in the case of *U.S.* v. *Bowman*, 260 U.S. 94, that regardless of the place committed, such acts can be punished if they fall within the jurisdiction of the statute. All that remains is for the Congress to broaden the jurisdiction of the sedition statute as H.R. 4897 provides.

I can foresee no substantial opposition to this legislation, and I earnestly trust that action can be expedited at this session of Congress.

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOFT MONEY

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 1963 issue of the magazine Realty and Rental Register entitled "The Drift Toward Soft Money":

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOFT MONEY

When Franklin Roosevelt became President, the national debt was around $25 billion. At that time, Fort Knox held about $35 billion in gold. The United States of America owed nothing to foreign countries. The English economist Keynes then entered the area of influence in Washington, D.C. and deficit spending started in a decisive way. Both Republican and Democratic administrations succumbed to the Keynes doctrine that a government is not subject to the same fiscal rules that apply to an individual or a business, in short, that deficit spending is wholesome. The Manchester Guardian, which largely reflects the Keynesian code, in an editorial of January 31, 1963, says this: "Millions of solid American citizens still believe that it is possible for a nation to spend itself into disaster." The implication is clear that followers of Keynes do not believe it is possible for a nation to spend itself into disaster. Many American economists have now embraced this philosophy with the result that the last three administrations have lifted the debt to $300 billion, and within 2 years it appears it will rise to $320 billion. The argument that we owe it to ourselves no longer is valid, because our goldpile is down to $15 billion and we owe Europeans $20 billion, leaving us with little or no gold backing to our currency. Everyone who owns a home, a banking account, or an interest in a business, should be acutely aware of this situation. Unless policies are reversed more heavy inflation is inevitable. To argue otherwise is to say that the nabobs of the new arithmetic are going to be able to expunge the facts of life.

HENRY BRODERICK.

MOTHER SETON BEATIFIED

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the eyes of the entire world turned to a simple building at Emmitsburg, Md. The "stone house" where Elizabeth Seton founded the Sisters of Charity. The focus through which this worldwide attention came to a secluded shrine in Maryland was through the magnificent, age-old ceremony in Rome when Mother Seton was beatified at the Vatican in a service conducted by Pope John XXIII.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans can be proud of this unique honor which has come to one of our own native daughters. All Americans can seek to exemplify in their own lives the charity and virtue of Mother Seton which have been recalled and published to the world in yesterday's ceremony in St. Peter's.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on this side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed deep interest in this event. It is a privilege and an honor to call it to the attention of the Congress.

An evaluation of Mother Seton's work by the editors of the Baltimore Sun speaks of the "manifold ways" in which her influence continues to benefit Americans.

The editorial of today is appended:

BLESSED MOTHER SETON

The beatification of the first native-born citizen of the United States, baptized in the Episcopal Church, the granddaughter of an Episcopal clergyman, comes in a year when continents and communions alike are drawing closer together. Americans and Europeans, Christians of all persuasions and members of other religious groups look more to the things that join them and less to old divisions. Yet the present always roots in the past and Blessed Mother Seton's work began in a community which even in that earlier day was various and outwardlooking.

To consider that work, the testing time that preceded it and its brevity in terms of years is to appreciate all over again what human excellence and religious inspiration are. Elizabeth Ann Bayley, born into an old and wealthy New York family, was 3 when her mother died and a troubled childhood followed. At 23, the mother of two children, she became responsible for the six minor children of her father-in-law upon his death. Her husband died when she was 29, having lost his fortune and leaving her with five children of their own.

Two years later she entered the Catholic Church; 3 years after that she moved into the small house on Paca Street, Baltimore, where she launched the first American parochial school and in 1809 she and four associates organized the American Sisters of Charity. She had been a Catholic only 4 years and she had less than a dozen years before her death, but she left an order which planted schools, colleges, hospitals, orphanages across the whole face of America and through which her influence lives today in manifold ways and not least in the new comity among believers.

CENTRAL WISCONSIN TELEVISION, INC.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the Federal Communications Commission or Charles J. Frederick, hearing examiner, at the new Post Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C., to testify on March 20, 1963, at 10 a.m., in the matter of Central Wisconsin Television, Inc., Federal Communications Commission docket No. 14933-14934. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF CENTRAL WISCONSIN TELEVISION, INC., ET AL.—DOCKET NO. 14933-14934

The President of the United States of America to ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, *Greeting:*

You are hereby commanded under penalty of law to be and appear in your proper person before the Federal Communications Commission or Charles J. Frederick, hearing examiner, New Post Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C., on March 20, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m., then and there to testify on behalf of Wisconsin Citizens' Committee for Educational Television, Inc., in the above-entitled cause now pending before this Commission.

By order of the Federal Communications Commission, this 8th day of March 1963.

CHARLES J. FREDERICK,
Hearing Examiner.

CENTRAL AMERICA READY FOR U.S. LEADERSHIP ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President stated in his press conference of March 6:

> I think we have indicated very clearly that what we feel is the wisest policy is the isolation of communism in this hemisphere.

This policy of isolation should have ready acceptance at the conference of Central American leaders meeting this week in Costa Rica with the President and congressional representatives. It is at this meeting that we have an excellent opportunity to provide the basis for action to isolate Cuba by the Organization of American States. It is in Central America that cries for firm, positive U.S. leadership in providing this action are loudest.

I urge again that the United States take the first step of leadership by closing its seaports to nations allowing their ships to trade with Cuba. Then this Government should suggest the following steps to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships trading with Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights to Cuba.

Third. Ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

Fourth. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Adoption of these steps would place Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere. From events of recent weeks, it has become clear that we are faced with a master plan for subversion of continental proportions. I urge that this Government press for positive multilateral action to isolate Cuba at the current conferences in Central America.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS IN BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out that there is a report from the Bureau of the Budget in reference to this bill and to the previous bill. The Bureau of the Budget in these two reports does object to the approval of the two legislative proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF "MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS" SECTION OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 200) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.
>
> (b) The table of chapters immediately before chapters 1 and 31 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out
>
> "43. Mustering-Out Payments .... 2101".
>
> (c) Subsection (c) of section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate into one Act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration", approved September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-857), is repealed.
>
> SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect as of January 31, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 200 will repeal the obsolete mustering-out pay provisions of existing law effective January 31, 1965. Mustering-out pay was authorized by the Korean GI bill for active service in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, for all ranks up to and including captain.

Like other readjustment programs established by the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, mustering-out payments were intended to aid persons who served during the Korean conflict in the transition to civil life. Consistent with this purpose, it was designed to be a temporary program.

Inasmuch as the program has long since served its purpose, H.R. 200 will repeal the authority to make mustering-out payments. The date of repeal, January 31, 1965, is the date on which all provisions of the so-called Korean GI bill except the loan guaranty program will terminate. I urge its passage.

NEW MODIFIED LIFE PLAN FOR NSLI POLICYHOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 220) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AND CHIEFS OF STAFF AT VA MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, last year when the general Federal employees pay increase bill was enacted by Congress there was contained therein legislation dealing with directors of veterans' facilities. I understand this bill would repeal certain provisions of the law passed last year when the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service handled the legislation. I am not sure what the justification for the repeal of the law passed only last year may be; therefore, I want time to consult with the chairman and the members of the committee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS TO UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make inquiry to find out the extent to which this waiver may be granted.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit waiver of recovery from veterans or their spouses of any indebtedness owed the United States resulting from payment of loan guaranty claims or from default of direct loans under circumstances in which there has been default on the loan and loss of the property and the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or where collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon him.

The existing law provides that the Administrator may pay, compromise, waive, or otherwise dispose of claims of the

United States incident to the veterans' loan program. But the Veterans' Administration is officially requesting the enactment of this legislation in order to provide for more equitable settlements to veterans who come within the general meaning of the terms of the legislation. The Veterans' Administration believes that administrative action granting total forgiveness of indebtedness would, on the basis of hardship, be questionable without the specific authority which this legislation would provide.

The Veterans' Administration believes that the resulting financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative cost would not be significant.

An identical bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but failed of approval in the other body.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman from Tennessee indicate whether there is a limit on the amount that may be waived?

Mr. EVERETT. There is no limit other than set by the law. Each case will be decided on its merits.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman indicate the amounts that we are talking about on these loans?

Mr. EVERETT. $15,000 is the maximum direct loan and $7,500 on guaranteed loans.

Mr. FORD. Is there not an equity against which the Government can proceed in these cases to make itself whole?

Mr. EVERETT. Yes, there is.

Mr. FORD. In other words, these cases arise where the equity that was supposed to exist for the protection of the Government was insufficient; is that correct?

Mr. EVERETT. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. And now the Government proceeds against the individual veterans; is that correct?

Mr. EVERETT. That is right.

Mr. FORD. In other words, this proposal would give the Veterans' Administration authority to waive the collection?

Mr. EVERETT. That is correct in cases of special hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the following is data concerning guaranteed, insured, and direct loan programs which I submit for the information of my colleagues:

Data Concerning Guaranteed, Insured, and Direct Loan Programs As of December 31, 1962 (Cumulative Basis)

Number of VA guaranteed or insured loans: 6,206,729.

Principal amount of VA guaranteed or insured loans: $54,654,052,953.

Number of direct loans made: 216,472.

Principal amount of direct loans made: $1,876,284,319.

Average amount of VA guaranteed or insured loans: $8,806.

Average amount of direct loans: $8,668.

Number of claims paid—guaranteed or insured loans: 122,386.

Claims paid as a percent of loans closed: 1.97 percent.

Number of direct loans foreclosed or voluntarily conveyed: 2,651.

Foreclosures and voluntary conveyances as a percent of direct loans made: 1.41 percent.

Principal amount of veterans' debts established—guaranteed and insured loans: $91,050,090.

Principal amount of veterans' debts collected—guaranteed and insured loans: $22,210,385.

Principal balance of veterans' debts, uncollected—guaranteed and insured loans: $68,839,705.[1]

Principal amount of veterans' debts established—direct loans: $1,037,063.

Principal amount of veterans' debts collected—direct loans: $92,630.

Principal balance of veterans' debts uncollected—direct loans: $944,443.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to call the attention of the House to a number of cases which have been brought to the attention of our committee and which presented the background for bringing this bill to the House. We have had a number of direct and guaranteed loans in which the veteran has sold his property and the property has since changed hands four, five, or six times. The veteran may even have moved out of the area. The Government has found it necessary to foreclose and in reselling the property is not able to realize the full amount of the outstanding indebtedness. Under the law, when the original veteran purchaser has not been relieved of liability he is held responsible and the Government tries to recover from him. Other cases have been called to our attention in which the veteran is without fault. This is particularly true in areas that have been devastated by floods throughout the country. If a home on which a loan has been made and on which the security was good is suddenly wiped out by a tornado, flood, or in some other manner not covered by insurance, the Veterans' Administration has no choice now but to proceed against the veteran. The purpose of this bill is to allow the Veterans' Administration in cases of this nature to waive the collection procedure if recovery would create severe hardship on the veteran.

The existing law provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Administration may pay, compromise, waive, or otherwise dispose of claims of the United States incident to the veterans' loan program. Although the authority of the Veterans' Administrator to waive or release claims in connection with the loan assistance program is cast in broad terms, the Veterans' Administration believes that total forgiveness of the indebtedness could not be granted on the basis of financial hardship without specific legislative indication. In actual practice, the only cases in which the indebtedness is waived in its entirety are those relatively few in which it is determined that the Government was at fault. This has not prevented appropriate compromises which, in some instances, involve a relatively small payment on the outstanding indebtedness. The enactment of this bill will not permit general waiver of the indebtedness where action would be contrary to the purpose of the loan program, but would arm the Administrator with authority to forgive an indebtedness in cases where the veteran was without fault and collection would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

The Veterans' Administration has indicated that the financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative cost would not be significant.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1820(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after the semicolon the following: "and the authority to waive or release claims may include partial or total waiver of payment by the veteran, or his spouse, following default and loss of the property where the Administrator determines that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 243) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to call to the attention of the House that this measure and also the following measure are opposed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

---

[1] $12.8 million of the principal balance of veterans' debts remaining in the guaranteed and insured programs and $74,240 of the principal balance remaining in the direct loan program have been charged off since the liability of the obligors has been terminated by discharge in bankruptcy, through compromise, etc. Continuing efforts to collect on the outstanding balances of the indebtedness owed the Government are made by the VA, GAO, and the Department of Justice. In addition, interest totaling slightly over $1 million has been collected on veterans' debts established in the guaranteed and insured programs through Dec. 31, 1962, and $4,600 in the direct loan program. Current collections on veterans' debts in the guaranteed and insured programs are running at a rate of about $3 million per annum plus interest of about $122,000. Collections on veterans' debts in the direct loan program are about $20,000 principal and $1,300 interest per annum. We have no data identifying administrative costs allocable to collection of veterans' debts arising out of the GI loan program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PARAPLEGIC HOUSING PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 248) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION IN PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 249) to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs several questions concerning this legislation?

According to the information which I have, our Government built a hospital in the Philippines with 722 beds, a memorial hospital in Manila. It was dedicated and opened in 1955. Information I have indicates that the average daily patient load in the hospital phase of the program in the fiscal year 1960 was 211; but this patient load dropped to 166 in the fiscal year 1962. Do these figures indicate that in the fiscal year 1962 we had only 166 patients in this hospital when the hospital had a bed capacity of 722?

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. EVERETT. The figures the gentleman has cited apply only to service-connected patients. These patients are service-connected veterans of the commonwealth army of the Philippines who served with U.S. forces in World War II.

Mr. FORD. How many non-service-connected do we have occupying beds in that hospital?

Mr. EVERETT. Those are the Philippine veterans or Philippine citizens and are paid for by the Philippine Government. They total 184. We pay $4.96 per diem for 229 service-connected U.S. veterans.

Mr. FORD. How many occupied beds are there in this hospital?

Mr. EVERETT. Approximately 500. I believe the average daily patient load, from all sources, is 577.

Mr. FORD. And they are Americans?

Mr. EVERETT. Two hundred and twenty-nine are U.S. citizens, the balance are citizens of the Philippines.

Mr. FORD. Veterans?

Mr. EVERETT. Veterans and some civilians of the Philippines, yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say further to the gentleman from Michigan that this bill provides for the continuation of an existing temporary program. In the case of service-connected Philippine veterans we set a limit on it of $500,000 for any one fiscal year in the next 5-year period and it is expected to be less than $2 million for the entire 5 years.

It is quite true that all of the facilities of this hospital are not required for service-connected veterans of the commonwealth army. The figures the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned are accurate. But those rooms and those facilities which are not required for service-connected people are of no concern to us under this bill and are the responsibility of the Philippine Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe the gentleman got a complete answer to his question. I would like to know whether Philippine civilians are being treated in this hospital.

Mr. EVERETT. If the Philippine Government pays the bill, the answer is yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. There are certain research programs carried on in this hospital which would involve civilians. Furthermore, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa if there are beds which are not used by service-connected or non-service-connected Philippine veterans the Philippine Government has the right to use them for civilians and to pay for such services.

Mr. FORD. As I understand this program, following World War II the U.S. Government built this 722-bed hospital in Manila.

Mr. ADAIR. That is correct. At a cost of between $9 and $10 million. I believe it was $9.4 million to be exact.

Mr. FORD. We paid the whole shot, so to speak. At the time this legislation authorizing and appropriating for the construction of this hospital was enacted into law was it contemplated that we were to continue to have an annual subsidy for the operation and maintenance of the hospital?

Mr. ADAIR. It was for a temporary period required to take care of the service-connected cases. No permanent figure was agreed upon. As the gentleman himself has pointed out, the number is decreasing.

Mr. FORD. Why do you have to have this extended now? At least I gathered the implication from the original authorization that at the end of that existing period of time it was expected that the Philippine Government would take over the duty and the responsibility.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say to the gentleman, if he would yield, that this is a 5-year extension and not an extension without limit. These men were involved in fighting with American forces under U.S. control. We in the United States had a stake, obviously, in the outcome of that fighting and in the welfare of these injured individuals.

We have an obligation to these service-connected commonwealth soldiers who served with U.S. Armed Forces during World War II.

Mr. FORD. Is it not fair to say that since we as a Government provided them with a 722-bed hospital and have paid *x* dollars annually up until the expiration of current law, that we have paid a fair amount in this regard for the valiant, valorous services rendered by these individuals?

Mr. ADAIR. It can be said that we have paid a fair amount. However, when this is measured and compared with our expenditures elsewhere in the world, which run into the billions of dollars, for people who have not fought for our flag, we should not end this program at this time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me because I had the privilege of being in Manila and representing along with others this Congress and this Government at the time the hospital was turned over to the Magsaysay government in the Philippines. I can tell my colleagues of the House from that experience at that time and from observation of the reaction of the people at that dedication there is nothing we have done in the Phillippines since World War II which has scored such an impressive victory in good will and appreciation among the people of the Far East as this hospital.

The gentleman from Indiana has correctly stated the understanding that it was our commitment to help with the expenses of the hospital in caring for the service-connected disabled over a period of time necessary to accomplish an orderly transfer of responsibility to the Philippine Government.

There may be differences as to how long the time may be, but I can assure the gentleman nothing we are doing in the Philippines today is doing more for the American image and for appreciation of American policy than our policy of assisting in the care of those veterans who fought alongside our troops in liberation of the Philippines.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have listened to this colloquy with great interest. It has been said here that we received great benefits because of the Filipinos who assisted us in winning the war. That is true. I am sure there is no one in this House or in America, to my knowledge, who does not feel a great appreciation for the Philippine people. But it must be said that the

Filipinos had no greater case in World War II than did the United States. Certainly had we not won that war in which our American fighting men played a major part, the Philippine Government today would be in the hands of someone else besides the Filipinos.

We built this hospital. We spent over $9 million to build it. I was very much in favor of that expenditure, but certainly we have discharged our responsibility. We have shown our appreciation to our great Philippine friends by the act which this Government did for those great people.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason at this time, especially when we have this distressing fiscal picture facing us today, to spend more money for this purpose in the Philippine Islands. Certainly the Philippine people and the Philippine Government are better able to pay this bill than are the people of the United States under the present fiscal condition of our Treasury.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DESIGN OF U.S. FLAG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1048) providing for the design of the flag of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 1 and 2 of title 4, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Flag; design

"The flag of the United States shall have thirteen horizontal stripes of the same width, alternate red and white, with a union consisting of as many white stars on a field of blue as there are States in the Union.

"§ 2. Same; additional stars; dimensions

"(a) Whenever a new State is admitted to the Union, the President shall cause a plan to be made setting forth the positions of the stars in the union of the flag. He shall also cause to be fixed the proportionate dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag.

"(b) The addition of each new star to the union of the flag shall take effect on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

"(c) All flags of the United States on hand on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State may be continued in use until unserviceable, but all flags manufactured for use after that date should conform to the design and specifications adopted pursuant to this section."

SEC. 2. Items 1 and 2 of the chapter analysis of chapter 1 of title 4 are amended to read as follows:

"Flag; design.

"Same; additional stars; dimensions."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL REGISTER ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2837) to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish someone would give us a few words of explanation of which this bill purports to do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIS. This bill would authorize the committee of the Federal Register to do away with expensive and presently mandatory production of pocket supplements in producing the Code of Federal Regulations. It would substantially cut down the cost of supplements at the end of each year and save money.

If the gentleman will permit me, for instance, I hold in my hand a volume of the Code of Federal Regulations. As we pass an act of Congress, it has to be administered. Regulations are proposed by the agencies and put in the Federal Register and finally these are codified and the Code of Federal Regulations comes into being. Then there are supplements from time to time. Under present law, as a supplement comes out, it has to be put in a pocket slot manufactured into each particular volume. That is expensive. The practice with reference to the United States Code, for instance—and we have some 50 volumes of those—instead of having 50 pocket supplements annually after each edition, we have 1 or 2 volumes of supplements of all the titles of the code. That is all this bill would do. It would save money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with the assurance of the gentleman from Louisiana that this will save the Government money, I hasten to withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended (44 U.S.C. 311), is further amended as follows:

(a) By amending subsections (b), (c), and (d) thereof to read as follows:

"(b) Any codification published pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be printed and bound in permanent form and shall be designated as the 'Code of Federal Regulations.' The Committee shall regulate the binding of the printed codifications into separate books with a view to practical usefulness and economical manufacture. Each book shall contain an explanation of its coverage and such other aids to users as the Committee may require or authorize. A general index to the entire Code of Federal Regulations shall be separately printed and bound.

"(c) The Committee shall regulate the supplementation and the collation and republication of the printed codifications with a view to keeping the Code of Federal Regulations as current as practicable: *Provided,* That each book shall be either supplemented or collated and republished at least once each calendar year.

"(d) The Office of the Federal Register shall prepare and publish the codifications, supplements, collations, and indexes authorized by this section."

(b) By substituting a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require codification of the text of Presidential documents published and periodically compiled in supplements to title 3 of the Code of Federal Regulations."

SEC. 2. Section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended by the first section of this Act, shall apply to the Code of Federal Regulations previously authorized and published as well as to future publications made pursuant to that section as so amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE GRAND VALLEY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2821) to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to subsection 8(i) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), to modify the contractual obligation of the Grand Valley Water Users' Association (1) by deducting from such obligation the unaccrued construction charges in the amount of $109,158.19 against one thousand three hundred sixty-six and two-tenths acres originally classified as productive and now reclassified as permanently unproductive; (2) by crediting to the next annual installment from the Grand Valley Water Users' Association due to the United States under its contract of January 25, 1945, after enactment of this Act, the sum of $4,531.93, which represents construction charges paid by the association on one hundred twenty-three and six-tenths acres of land in canceled farm units included in the above acreage.

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, strike out "January 25, 1945" and insert "January 27, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN WATER SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 131) to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF CADMIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 307) authorizing the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill is something of a pilot piece of legislation in the field of stockpile disposal and that the committee report in connection with this bill contains a number of conditions and guidelines associated with the disposal which are not stated in the bill itself. I take this time for the purpose of making a little legislative history on the floor in connection with it. And, in the second place, to ask the committee whether they have received assurances that both the General Services Administration and the Office of Emergency Planning will follow the guidelines that are set forth in the report on pages 8 and 9 thereof.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I might say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that first of all I do not agree that the bill itself is a pilot bill, because there have been many such bills enacted by the Congress.

Perhaps the committee did go much further in the language in the report after obtaining from the General Services Administration the fact that they were in agreement with the same objectives that the committee itself was trying to attain and that the assurances in the report represent something that the committee—both the subcommittee which handled this legislation and the full Committee on Armed Services—could certainly continue to support and back up.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I certainly want to express my appreciation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the care with which the committee has outlined in its report certain points essential to the protection of the domestic industry from disruption of domestic markets. Those points, incidentally, occur in the final two paragraphs on page 8 of the report, and several paragraphs on page 9 of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those paragraphs headed by the phrase "Disposal Plan" be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The notice of disposal published by the Administrator of General Services in the Federal Register simply indicates that the initial offering of cadmium will be 300,000 pounds with subsequent offerings scheduled at intervals of not less than 60 days.

The committee questioned representatives of the General Services Administration as to more specific details of the proposed disposal action. The committee learned that GSA proposed to initially dispose of 150,000 pounds of cadmium in an unrestricted sale on the world market. This unrestricted sale would establish the so-called world market or upset price. This offering would be open to both big and small business concerns, both domestic and foreign buyers, and the lowest price accepted by the Government on this unrestricted offering would constitute the new market price. This new market price would then be utilized as a benchmark in subsequent offerings of cadmium by GSA. GSA then proposed to offer the balance of the initial offering of 300,000 pounds or 150,000 pounds in a restricted sale. This restricted sale would be a set-aside for domestic small business concerns who would be permitted an opportunity to purchase this commodity in 1-ton lots on a competitive sealed bid basis. The committee had no quarrel with this initial offering of 300,000 pounds of cadmium since it would enable GSA to accomplish two objectives:

(1) To ascertain the fair and going market price for cadmium which would, in turn, insure the highest return to U.S. taxpayers for this commodity; and

(2) To insure that half of the initial offering of cadmium would be allocated to small business to alleviate the existing domestic scarcity of this commodity.

The committee was not satisfied, however, that the allocation of 150,000 pounds of cadmium to small business would completely satisfy the requirements for the domestic economy and, therefore, was of the opinion that the balance of 1,700,000 pounds of cadmium be restricted to the domestic market. Therefore, the committee wishes the Administrator of General Services to restrict the balance of this cadmium disposal to the domestic market by limiting its sale to domestic purchasers willing to pay not less than the current market or upset price for this commodity. Such purchasers would be required to certify that the cadmium being purchased will be used solely for consumption in the United States.

The committee understands that in the event the cadmium market becomes unstable and the so-called upset price or new market price is no longer an accurate reflection of the current market price for cadmium, the General Services Administrator would then proceed to establish a new upset or market price by making another unrestricted offering of cadmium. The new market price thus obtained would then again be used as a benchmark for subsequent restricted offerings of cadmium to the domestic market.

In summary, the committee is not adding any restrictive language to H.R. 307 which will inhibit or complicate the disposal of cadmium by the Administrator of General Services. However, the committee is recommending congressional approval of the proposed disposal action with the understanding that the safeguards inherent in the disposal plan as outlined above will be observed.

As indicated, the proposed disposal action should result in approximately 1,850,000 pounds of cadmium being made available to the domestic market while at the same time insuring the highest return for this commodity to the American taxpayer.

The committee wishes to emphasize its interest in the progress of this disposal action and will insist that the Administrator of General Services provide the committee with periodic reports as to the progress of the individual offerings and their effect on the cadmium market. In the event the executive branch fails to observe the recommendations of this committee, it may then be necessary to incorporate in future disposal authority restrictive language relating to the manner and circumstances of future disposal actions.

THE CONCERN OF INDUSTRY WITH FUTURE DISPOSAL ACTIONS

The Congress is well aware that the national stockpile includes huge quantities of materials now considered excess to our requirements. It is evident that it is in the national interest that these materials be disposed of as soon as possible with, however, a minimum disruption of regular commercial markets.

Representatives of industry have indicated their deep and serious concern over the fact that no adequate machinery presently exists within the executive branch to provide industry with an opportunity to discuss with the executive branch details of individual disposal actions. The committee is sympathetic to this concern of industry and is, therefore, happy to note that the President of the United States on January 30 approved a recommendation of his Executive Stockpile Committee relating to this specific problem.

Recommendation No. 12 (a) and (b) of the Executive Stockpile Committee relates to development of disposal programs. The committee subscribes unanimously to these recommendations and urges its implementation at the earliest possible time. The Committee on Armed Services believes that early implementation of this recommendation including committees in consultation with industrial representatives, will provide an assurance to industry that stockpile disposal actions contemplated by the Federal Government will not adversely affect regular commercial markets.

The recommendation together with the views of the Office of Emergency Planning on this matter are as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 2, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to questions raised by your counsel, Mr. Frank M. Slatinshek, I am setting forth the position of the Office of Emergency Planning with respect to consultation with interested parties in connection with future disposal plans.

The Executive Stockpile Committee recognized the desirability of consultation with interested parties in connection with the development of long-range disposal programs, and included recommendations on this subject in its report to the President. The President has approved those recommendations. Appropriate consultation with interested parties will thus become a regular part of the development of future long-range disposal programs.

In the interim period, pending the development of long-range disposal programs, it is the intention of this Office, when directing that new disposal plans be developed, to provide that there will be appropriate consultation with interested parties as a part of the procedure of developing the plans.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his statement in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point that is not covered by the language which appears on pages 8 and 9 with which we have had some conversation. The distinguished and able Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. McDermott, in his letter to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], stated that existing laws governing exportation of materials should provide assurance that any sales of this material abroad would be confined to use in countries in the free world.

I would like to be assured that that understanding has also been had on this point with the General Services Administration by the committee.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield, it has. May I point out to the gentleman some effective and reassuring language which appears at the bottom of page 9 of the committee report, and which states better than I can in my own words the feeling of the members of the committee and expresses their determination to follow this matter very closely:

> The committee wishes to emphasize its interest in the progress of this disposal action and will insist that the Administrator of General Services provide the committee with periodic reports as to the progress of the individual offerings and their effect on the cadmium market. In the event the executive branch fails to observe the recommendations of this committee, it may then be necessary to incorporate in future disposal authority restrictive language relating to the manner and circumstances of future disposal actions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am wondering why it is impossible to write the guidelines into the bill. Congress for so many years has been delegating authority to various boards, bureaus, and commissions without sufficient guidelines and very little attention is paid to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the bill can embody the safeguards that have been discussed here by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I might say that actually the restrictive language that applies to this particular bill is contained in the basic law, and we have assurance from the General Services Administration that this basic language will be followed by the General Services Administration in this particular disposal.

We have passed many bills such as this. I felt and the committee felt that it was not necessary to repeat this language in each one of the bills that we act upon in our subcommittee.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, but we are constantly faced with the fact that they do not live up to some of the laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the full committee and Subcommittee No. 2 of this House Armed Services Committee, I am anxious to associate myself with the intent and purpose of the legislation made here on the floor by our colleagues from Oklahoma and Illinois.

It was crystal clear to the members of the committee that this is, in fact, a test case; and as my colleague on the committee has so well read into the Record from the last sentence, page 9, of Committee Report No. 87 on H.R. 307, we expect to write such restrictive legislation into plans for future disposals, if the will of this House is again circumvented.

Mr. Speaker, we have been assured this report and the legislation here made would be honored by the executive branch disposing agency, GSA. The industry and the producers who have kept the consumers supplied even though on a rationed basis lately have suggested three amendments. I wish the Record to show that if the above is true they are better off; as we are here incorporating these five principles:

First. Domestic preference after the first sale, to establish a new market price.

Second. Allotments in times and fraction lots of the 2 million surplus pounds calculated to be sold, without upsetting the market.

Third. The new market price is expected to be initially between $1.95 and $2.10 per pound in usable form and/or usually distributed to consumers, although no floors are established as such.

Fourth. Arrangements in being per Federal directive will be implemented to incorporate business and producer representatives in committees to consult with the disposing agency, GSA, on the most mutual, beneficial, and protected ways to handle such disposal of surplus.

Fifth. That reports will be made to the committee periodically, which means after each parcel is offered for disposal and/or actual bid sales by GSA.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be watching and waiting expectantly, and with hope.

RELEASING RIGHT IN CERTAIN STREETS IN HEYBURN, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1087), to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Harding] I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LANDS TO COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION, NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 277) to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Act of April 22, 1960 (74 Stat. 74) is amended as follows:
>
> (1) In section 2, strike out "five years" and insert in lieu thereof "ten years"; and
>
> (2) In section 3, strike out "five-year period" and insert in lieu thereof "ten-year period".
>
> (3) In section 4(a), strike out "The Commission, within three years of the effective date of this Act shall submit to the Secretary a proposed plan of development" and insert in lieu thereof "The Commission, within three years after receipt from the Secretary of the Interior of an appraisal of the property involved as of the effective date of this Act, shall submit to the Secretary a proposed plan of development".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, through page 2, line 6, strike out all of paragraph (3) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (3) In section 4(a), strike out "three years" and insert in lieu thereof "eight years".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING THE PITTMAN ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1892) to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351-355, 357-360).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, subject to any valid rights and obligations existing on the date of approval of this Act, the Act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351-355, 357-360), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

> Sec. 2. Any valid application for permit under that Act, on file with the Secretary of the Interior on the effective date of this Act, may be processed in the same manner as if this Act had not been enacted.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENURE FOR JUDGES, U.S. DISTRICT COURT, PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2844) to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges shall hold office during good behavior."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this section to sections 134 and 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall not affect the tenure of office or right to continue to receive salary after resignation, retirement, or failure of reappointment of any district judge for the district of Puerto Rico who is in office on the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF RETIRED CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2835) to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (b) of section 43 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each court of appeals shall consist of the circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service. The circuit justice and justices or judges designated or assigned shall also be competent to sit as judges of the court."

(b) Paragraph (c) of section 46 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Cases and controversies shall be heard and determined by a court or division of not more than three judges, unless a hearing or rehearing before the court in banc is ordered by a majority of the circuit judges of the circuit who are in regular active service. A court in banc shall consist of all circuit judges in regular active service. A circuit judge of the circuit who has retired from regular active service shall also be competent to sit as a judge of the court in banc in the rehearing of a case or controversy if he sat in the court or division at the original hearing thereof."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (b) of section 132 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each district court shall consist of the district judge or judges for the district in regular active service. Justices or judges designated or assigned shall be competent to sit as judges of the court."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 332 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "The chief judge of each circuit shall call, at least twice in each year and at such places as he may designate, a council of the circuit judges for the circuit, in regular active service, at which he shall preside."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COURTS IN CONTINUOUS SESSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2845) to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court, and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right, what is proposed here?

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. Merely to modernize the practice as recommended by the Judicial Conference.

Mr. GROSS. This means that the Federal courts will be open at all times; is that the story?

Mr. TOLL. It will be open at all times so that the transaction of business shall not be hampered. There is no cost involved in this particular bill.

Mr. GROSS. The Federal judges will still take vacations but will work harder? Is that the story?

Mr. TOLL. I think this will encourage them to work harder.

Mr. GROSS. This will encourage them to work harder?

Mr. TOLL. I think so.

Mr. GROSS. And "justice delayed is justice denied" will be overcome under this plan of making the judges work harder?

Mr. TOLL. I hope so.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so, too. Is this one of the reasons why the caseloads have piled up in the past?

Mr. TOLL. No, it is not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 138, 139, 140, and 141 of title 28, United States Code, be amended to read as follows:

"§ 138. Terms abolished

"The district court shall not hold formal terms.

"§ 139. Times for holding regular sessions

"The times for commencing regular sessions of the district court for transacting judicial business at the places fixed by this chapter shall be determined by the rules or orders of the court. Such rules or orders may provide that at one or more of such places the court shall be in continuous session for such purposes on all business days throughout the year. At other places a session of the court shall continue for such purposes until terminated by order of final adjournment or by commencement of the next regular session at the same place.

"§ 140. Adjournment

"(a) Any district court may, by order made anywhere within its district, adjourn or, with the consent of the judicial council of the circuit, pretermit any regular session of court for insufficient business or other good cause.

"(b) If the judge of a district court is unable to attend and unable to make an order of adjournment, the clerk may adjourn the court to the next regular session or to any earlier day which he may determine.

"§ 141. Special sessions; places; notice

"Special sessions of the district court may be held at such places in the district as the nature of the business may require, and upon such notice as the court orders.

"Any business may be transacted at a special session which might be transacted at a regular session."

SEC. 2. Sections 452 and 1869 of title 28, United States Code, and sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, are each amended by striking out the word "term" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "session" and the catchline to section 452 is amended by striking out the word "terms" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "expiration of sessions".

SEC. 3. (a) Items 138, 139, and 141 in the analysis of chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 81, are amended to read as follows:

"138. Terms abolished.

"139. Times for holding regular sessions.

"141. Special sessions; places; notice."

(b) Item 452 in the analysis of chapter 21 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 451, is amended to read as follows:

"452. Courts always open; power unrestricted by expiration of sessions."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING SCIENCE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 824) to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purpose indicated by Public Law 85-875.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Wallace R. Brode, District of Columbia; Douglas Whitaker, New York, New York; William W. Rubey, Los Angeles, California; Harlow Shapley, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Philip Bard, Baltimore, Maryland; Henry Allen Moe, New York, New York; Leonard Carmichael, District of Columbia; John R. Dunning, New York, New York; Benjamin H. Willier, Baltimore, Maryland; Michael J. Ogden, Providence, Rhode Island; Ralph B. Curry, Flint, Michigan; O. W. Riegel, Lexington, Virginia; Ludwell Denny, District of Columbia; Charles E. Scripps, Cincinnati, Ohio; and Edward J. Meeman, Memphis, Tennessee, and their successors are created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia by the name of Science Service, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained. The corporation is hereby declared to be the corporation whose chartering by the Congress was contemplated in the first section of the Act of September 2, 1958, entitled "An Act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science".

(b) The tenure of the persons named in subsection (a) of this section, and the election of their successors, shall be in accordance with the bylaws of the corporation.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES AND OBJECTS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to—

(1) develop an interest in science on the part of the young people of America,

(2) provide an opportunity for the exchange of scientific information and ideas among members of the clubs,

(3) encourage the promotion of science fairs at which members of the club may display their scientific works and projects, and

(4) develop an awareness of the satisfaction to be derived through a career devoted to science.

POWERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to conduct, operate, and furnish press service for the collection, preparation, distribution, and sale of scientific matter and information, current events, and fundamental conceptions or topics of interest to general readers, to newspapers, periodicals, journals, magazines, educational institutions, and government;

(2) to print, publish, and distribute books, documents, journals, newspapers, proofsheets, or parts thereof;

(3) to organize and conduct lectures, symposia, conferences, and meetings for the presentation and discussion of scientific information, discoveries, and theories: and to arrange for the presentation of scientific matters by the use of motion picture films and other forms of photography;

(4) to maintain an information and reference bureau and library and to furnish a science service to libraries, newspapers, journals, periodicals, individuals, educational institutions, and governments;

(5) to receive, hold, and administer personal and real property received by gift or purchase and to acquire such property as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

(6) to receive moneys from time to time by way of income and to authorize and provide for the payment of expenses properly incurred in the management and operation of the corporation;

(7) to acquire, and pay for in cash, obligations of this corporation or otherwise, the goodwill, rights, assets, and property, and to undertake or assume the whole or any part of the obligations or liabilities of any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(8) to acquire, hold, use, sell, assign, lease, grant license in respect of, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of, letters patent of the United States or any foreign corporation, patent rights, licenses and privileges, inventions, improvements and processes, copyrights, trademarks and trade names, relating to or useful in connection with any business of this corporation;

(9) to guarantee, purchase, hold, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of shares of the capital stock of, or any bonds, securities, or evidence of indebtedness created by any other corporation or corporations organized under the laws of any State, county, nation, or government, and while the owner thereof, to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership;

(10) to issue bonds, debentures, or obligations of this corporation from time to time, for any of the objects or purposes of the corporation and to secure the same by mortgage, pledge, deed of trust, or otherwise;

(11) to have one or more offices; to carry on all or any of its operations and business and to purchase or otherwise acquire, hold, own, mortgage, sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of real and personal property of every class and description in any of the States, districts, territories, or colonies of the United States, and in any and all foreign countries, subject to the laws of such State, district, territory, colony, or country; and

(12) in general, to carry on any other business in connection with the foregoing, whether manufacturing or otherwise, and to do any or all of the things hereinbefore set forth in the same extent as natural persons might or could do.

It is hereby expressly provided that the foregoing enumeration of specific powers shall not be held to limit or restrict the powers of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; TERRITORIAL SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; RESIDENT AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Washington, District of Columbia, or in such other place as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 6. (a) The corporation shall have no capital stock. The number of members of the corporation shall be fifteen, five of whom shall be elected annually by the members for a period of three years and for the five memberships one nomination shall be made annually upon request of the corporation by each of the following:

(1) The American Association for the Advancement of Science.

(2) The National Academy of Sciences.

(3) The National Research Council.

(4) Such body representing the journalistic profession as may be from time to time designated by the board of trustees.

(5) E. W. Scripps or his representatives, administrators, or executors.

(b) The method of application and acceptance, or rejection and expulsion from membership, and the conduct of the members, dues, assessments, and other qualifications, except as above, shall be governed and controlled by the bylaws.

(c) Fees for membership and dues and assessments from members shall be fixed, levied, assessed, and collected as the corporation, by its bylaws, rules, and assessments, together with fines or penalties, imposed upon the members of the corporation, shall be adopted to furthering the purposes for which the corporation is formed.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SEC. 7. (a) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred by this Act, the governing board of the corporation shall consist of a board of fifteen trustees, each of whom shall be a member of the corporation, which said board of trustees is hereby expressly authorized:

(1) To make and alter the bylaws of the corporation; to authorize and cause to be executed mortgages and liens upon the real and personal property of this corporation.

(2) If the bylaws so provide, to designate two or more of its members to constitute an executive committee, which committee shall for the time being, as provided in a resolution of the board of trustees, or in the bylaws of the corporation, have and exercise all or any of the powers of the board of trustees in the management of the business and affairs of the corporation and have power to authorize the seal of the corporation to be affixed to all papers which may require it.

(b) The corporation may in its bylaws confer powers upon its trustees in addition to the foregoing and in addition to the powers and authorities expressly conferred upon them by statute.

(c) Both members and trustees shall have power, if the bylaws so provide, to hold their meetings and to have one or more offices within or without the District of Columbia and to keep the books of the corporation, subject to the provisions of the statutes, outside of the District of Columbia at such places as may be from time to time designated by the board of trustees.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OR ASSETS TO MEMBERS; LOANS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director, who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 9. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 10. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 12. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS; REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 13. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF ASSETS UPON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 14. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction, of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

ACQUISITION OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF EXISTING CORPORATION

SEC. 15. The corporation may acquire the assets of Science Service, Incorporated, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, upon discharge or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liabilities of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of Delaware applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 11, strike out the first sentence in section 13(a) and insert the following:

The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States.

On page 11, strike out lines 17 through 23, and on page 12 strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert the following:

(b) A report of such audit shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States not later than 6 months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Science Service, Inc., is a nonprofit, privately supported institution controlled by a board of trustees representing in equal number the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council, the National Academy of Sciences, the journalistic profession and the Scripps Estate which provided the original endowment.

The organization, which would be incorporated in H.R. 824, has been continuously serving teachers and pupils in a broadening school-centered science program for youth since 1941 through Science Clubs of America, the National Science Talent Search, State Science Talent Searches and the National Science Fair International. These programs now operate under direct teacher auspices and supervision in 50 States, the District of Columbia, all possessions of the United States, and in scores of friendly nations.

The objective of Science Service programs is to help teachers encourage increased interest in science in all students, not simply to influence careers or to provide further motivation and experiences for those planning work in scientific endeavors. It is based on the concept that the more familiar all people are with the rewards and disappointments of challenging research, the greater will be their understanding of the problems this Nation's scientists face.

At this time I insert a statement by Gordon B. Fister, associated editor of the Morning Call, Allentown, Pa., and chairman of the National Science Fair-International Advisory Council, in support of H.R. 824, "a bill to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875":

On behalf of the 208 regional high school science fairs affiliated with the 1962 National Science Fair-International, it is my privilege to support H.R. 824, a bill to incorporate Science Service, Inc. for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875, and to urge that you recommend it for approval by the House of Representatives.

This bill is identical to H.R. 11711 which the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress approved June 18, 1962, on the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary.

My endorsement is both personal and in accord with the action of more than 300 teachers and other sponsors of 208 regional science fairs at their meeting May 2, 1962, at the 13th Annual National Science Fair-International in Seattle, Wash. With but one dissenting vote, this group adopted resolutions asking that if the Congress charter any group to stimulate the interest of young people in science under the terms of Public Law 85–875 the group be Science Service Inc. of Washington, D.C.

The resolutions originated with the Advisory Council of the National Science Fair-International and were in no way prompted by Science Service Inc., its staff or its board of trustees. They were the result of certain reports that interests within the U.S. Office of Education were preparing to ask the Congress to charter a new organization in which the Office of Education would undertake the establishment and direction of programs similar to those which Science Service, Inc., the National Science Teachers Association and others have been developing voluntarily over a period of 22 years. These disturbing rumors now have been substantiated by draft proposals suggesting two members of the staff of the U.S. Office of Education among the incorporators of a new organization and calling for the national adviser and executive secretary to be staff members of the U.S. Office of Education appointed by the Commissioner.

We believe that H.R. 824, providing a Federal charter for the long active and widely accepted Science Service, Inc., is the most effective, economical and sound means of implementing Public Law 85–875 for the following reasons:

1. Science Service, Inc., is a nonprofit, privately supported institution incorporated in the State of Delaware and controlled by a board of trustees representing in equal number the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council, the National Academy of Sciences, the journalism profession and the Scripps Estate which provided its original endowment. These trustees are the incorporators listed in section 1 of H.R. 824.

2. Science Service, Inc., has been continually serving teachers and pupils in a broadening school-centered science program for youth since 1941 through Science Clubs of America, the National Science Talent Search, State Science Talent Searches, and the National Science Fair-International. These programs now operate under direct teacher auspices and supervision in 50 States, the District of Columbia, all possessions of the United States, and in scores of friendly nations.

During the last school term (1961–62) 19,929 science clubs in 18,781 public, private and parochial schools in 50 states and the District of Columbia were affiliated with Science Clubs of America. They had a total membership of 437,010 pupils. In addition there were 128 affiliated clubs in high schools in the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and 359 in some 50 foreign countries. Science Service, Inc., provided the sponsoring teachers with appropriate guides, program plans and other literature without charge. There are no fees, dues or affiliation charges. Costs of the program are paid by Science Service, Inc., from its other income supplemented for several years by a nominal grant from the National Science Foundation.

During the last school term, 3,559 seniors in 1,296 public and parochial high schools in 50 States and the District of Columbia completed entries in the 21st National Science Talent Search which provided $34,250 in scholarships and awards for 40 seniors planning careers in science. The funds for the program and the awards are provided by the Westinghouse Educational Foundation.

Through arrangement with Science Clubs of America, science talent searches were conducted in 41 States and the District of Columbia.

During the last school year, 947,502 pupils in junior and senior high schools developed science projects for the 208 regional science fairs affiliated with the 13th annual National Science Fair-International. These projects came from several thousand schools in 45 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Japan, Canada, Western Germany, France and Italy. Regional fairs pay affiliation fees ranging from $100 to $300 and are required by contract to pay the traveling and living costs of the two students each is permitted to send to the national fair. There are no other costs to regional fairs. There are no charges or fees for students. Total fees collected from regional fairs affiliated with the 1961 National Science Fair-International were $30,100. Science Service added $14,832 of its own funds to cover the total cost of $44,932. The approximate cost of the affiliated regional fairs was $625,600 of which 95.5 percent came from industries, business concerns, colleges, professional groups, and civic organizations. Business and industry does not control the policies of any of these regional fairs. Control is for the most part vested in high school and college teachers.

3. The programs Science Service offers and for which it provides guides and other materials are used and implemented at the discretion of individual schools and science teachers. Where they are used they supplement classroom and laboratory work and offer incentives for individual effort beyond normal requirements. The work nearly 1 million pupils did this year in developing science fair projects is one example. The 3,559 research papers they wrote for the talent search programs is another.

4. Science Service Inc., offers its youth programs to all public, private, and parochial schools through their own teachers but makes no effort to impose them on any. Classroom teachers control and direct the programs they elect to use and implement them according to the needs, the aptitudes, and the interest of their pupils and the activities of their schools. The assistance and support they receive from other scientists, from scientific organizations, from business and industry, and community groups is at their own request and within the limits schools and teachers determine.

5. The objective of Science Service programs is to help teachers encourage increased interest in science in all students, not simply to influence careers or to provide further motivation and experiences for those planning work in scientific endeavors. It is based on the concept that the more familiar all people are with the rewards and disappointments of challenging research, the greater will be their understanding of the problems this Nation's scientists face. The programs are, therefore, open to all students regardless of the careers they anticipate. They are not only for future scientists.

6. Affiliation with Science Clubs of America is not a requisite for participation in science fairs or science talent searches nor is it a barrier to active membership in any other groups. Science Service recognizes the distinct contributions of such programs as Future Scientists of America, sponsored by the National Science Teachers Association, JETS and the Berg Foundation and welcomes the opportunity to work with these groups and others of similar caliber in many schools. The most avid science students are active in all the programs offered in their schools. The Federal charter H.R. 824 proposes to grant Science Service would not alter these relationships or interfere with any existing organizations.

7. Through Science Clubs of America, Science Talent Searches and the National Science Fair-International, Science Service has convincingly demonstrated its ability to join teachers in effectively stimulating a broader interest of the Nation's youth in science and scientific pursuits. It has helped science teachers win the aid and cooperation of scientists, scientific organizations, colleges and universities, professional groups and business and industry for both their classroom and extracurricular teaching programs. Among those joining them in the National Science Fair-International are the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Chemical Society, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Society for Microbiology, the Entomological Society of America, the National Pest Control Association, the Optical Society of America, the Society of Women Engineers.

8. Science Service is the only organization in the United States that makes available to all schools a program offering so many opportunities and challenges in science to so many pupils. There are no comparable national programs in any other secondary school field.

9. These programs are for the most part privately financed. H.R. 824 carries no request for appropriations of tax funds and asks no Federal services.

10. We believe the scope and extent of the programs offered by Science Service, Inc., adequately and completely fulfill the intent of the Congress of the United States expressed in Public Law 85–875.

The National Science Fair-International Advisory Council is opposed to chartering a new organization to promote these cocurricular science activities among the Nation's youth because:

1. The existing structure, including the activities successfully sponsored by Science Service, Inc., already offer programs most science teachers have found to be adequate, satisfactory and helpful to them and to their pupils. If teachers or administrators find revisions or additions desirable, they can be accomplished within the framework of the present organization.

2. Chartering by the Congress of any new organization to engage in parallel activities would result in confusion, duplications and misunderstandings in local schools and at broader levels. This would weaken rather than strengthen the laudable objectives of Public Law 85–875.

The Council, on whose behalf these arguments are being presented, is convinced that the soundest and most effective means of implementing Public Law 85–875 is by strengthening Science Service, Inc. by granting it the Federal charter proposed in H.R. 824. This would considerably enhance its prestige and help strengthen sound programs that constantly are proving their effectiveness across the Nation. We most earnestly urge your support for this measure.

Respectfully submitted,

GORDON B. FISTER,

Chairman, National Science Fair-International Advisory Council.

I certify that I am not a member of the staff or board of trustees of Science Service, Inc., or of any agency or board of the Government of the United States of America.

GORDON B. FISTER.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, Science Service is the only organization in the United States that makes available to all schools a program offering so many opportunities and challenges in science to so many pupils. There are no comparable national programs in any other secondary school field.

Science Service does recognize the distinct contributions of such programs as Young Scientists of America, sponsored by the National Science Teachers Association, the Junior Engineering Technical Society, and the 4-H Clubs, and welcomes the opportunity to work with these groups and others of similar caliber in many schools. The most avid science students are active in all the programs offered in their schools. The Federal charter H.R. 824 proposed to grant Science Service would not alter these relationships or interfere with any existing organizations.

Through its youth programs, Science Service has convincingly demonstrated its ability to join teachers in effectively stimulating a broader interest of the Nation's youth in science and scientific pursuits. It has helped science teachers win the aid and cooperation of scientists, scientific organizations, colleges and universities, professional groups and business and industry for both their classroom and extracurricular teaching programs.

H.R. 824 providing a Federal charter for the long active and widely accepted Science Service, Inc., is the most effective, economical, and sound means of implementing Public Law 85–875.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIMINAL OFFENSES NOT COMMITTED IN ANY DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2842) to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3236. Offenses not committed in any district

"The trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district in which the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought; but if such offender or offenders are not so arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or if no such residence is known the indictment or information may be filed in the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION OF ATTORNEY FEES IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2833) to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the very substantial increase in the number of bankruptcies that are taking place in this day of alleged moving forward with great vigor, I am glad to see this legislation before the House to regulate the fees paid to attorneys in bankruptcy cases. I simply want to state my approval of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) is amended to read as follows:

"d. If a debtor shall, directly or indirectly, in contemplation of the filing of a petition by or against him, pay money or transfer property to an attorney at law, for services rendered or to be rendered, the transaction may be examined by the court on its own motion or shall be examined by the court on petition of the trustee or any creditor and shall be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable amount to be determined by the court, and the excess may be recovered by the trustee for the benefit of the estate.

"If, whether before or after filing, a debtor shall agree orally or in writing to pay money or transfer property to an attorney at law after the filing, the transaction may be examined by the court on its own motion or shall be examined by the court on petition of the bankrupt made prior to discharge and shall be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable amount to be determined by the court, and any excess obligation shall be canceled, or if excess payment or transfer has been made, returned to the bankrupt."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPOSIT OF FUNDS OF BANKRUPTS' ESTATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2849) to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (2) of the first paragraph of section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 75(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) deposit all money received by them in designated depositories initially in demand deposits; and subsequently, if authorized by the court, in interest-bearing savings deposits, time certificates of deposit, or time deposits-open account;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS.** Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have a brief explanation of this bill.

Mr. **FORRESTER.** I do not know whether I can make it so very brief or not.

Mr. **GROSS.** I am acquainted with the original legislation that was introduced. It is my understanding, and I did not have an opportunity to go through this bill as carefully as I might like, that it is a vastly different bill than that which was originally offered in this session of Congress. Perhaps the gentleman can satisfy my curiosity about the bill if he has the answers to a few questions.

I should like to ask him if it is still possible to carry on a campaign of promotion of social welfare under this bill. Are there any restrictions that have been placed upon that feature of the original bill?

Mr. **FORRESTER.** I am delighted to answer that question. The gentleman is evidently referring to the original bill known as H.R. 2. That bill was before the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman. After consideration of that bill, the present bill we have before us is the culmination of the work of the subcommittee, approved by the full committee.

On the particular question the gentleman has asked, I am glad to report that it was the opinion of the subcommittee, that has had quite a bit of experience in dealing with Federal charters, that the word "social" should be stricken and the word "economic" inserted in lieu thereof. I believe that is the question about which the gentleman asked me.

Mr. **GROSS.** What about the provision in the original bill, if I recall it correctly, that this foundation could carry on a campaign of promotion for the United Nations? Has that been taken care of in this bill?

Mr. **FORRESTER.** I am happy to report to the gentleman that while H.R. 2 did contain a stipulation that the major portion of the powers would not be dealing with politics, our subcommittee found out a long time ago that any organization chartered by this Congress should be expressly prohibited from engaging in politics. As you will find, in this particular bill, there is an express provision to that effect and it is identical with the language that was used with reference to the American Legion, the VFW, and other organizations and, by the way, is the same language as is now contained in the science bill which was passed here by this body a few minutes ago.

Mr. **GROSS.** Then do I understand there is an express provision in the pending legislation which restricts this corporation, or whatever you want to call it, from engaging in political campaigning and influencing legislation?

Mr. **FORRESTER.** That is correct. That is stated on lines 19 through 23 of page 7 of H.R. 4715, the bill now under consideration.

Mr. **GROSS.** Is there any cost whatsoever to the taxpayers of this country now or does the gentleman from Georgia think there may be in the future any cost to the taxpayers for the support of this corporation?

Mr. **FORRESTER.** No, there is no cost to the Government at this time or contemplated in the future. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman might be interested in this, there was a provision in the legislation originally that this corporation would be permitted to solicit funds for an indefinite period. At the insistence of the son of Mrs. Roosevelt, our colleague, Mr. James Roosevelt, he asked us to limit this solicitation of funds until January 1, 1965, giving as his reason the fact that he believed his mother would want a cutoff date so far as the solicitation of funds are concerned.

Mr. **GROSS.** If this bill is approved by the House, I hope the gentleman from Georgia will assure us it would be unacceptable to him if it is amended so as to take out any substantial part of the restrictions that the Committee on the Judiciary has, in my opinion, wisely inserted in this legislation.

Mr. **FORRESTER.** I would say to the gentleman, everything has been done in this bill and everything put into this bill that through experience of Subcommittee No. 4, who has handled numerous bills, of this kind has felt it is wise and expedient to put into this kind of legislation. I want to remind the gentleman and the House there are many purposes for which the States can grant charters. In most instances, probably the States should do it because the States have fuller laws regulating the granting of charters and more explicit statutory authority to deprive a person or persons of a charter which we do not have. Of course the Congress has the right to revoke charters. But we feel that from the very nature of things, we have to be quite careful as to the type of charter legislation that we bring to the floor. I think I can tell the gentleman that Subcommittee No. 4 and the House Committee on the Judiciary will in this case and in all other cases insist that any provision putting the corporation in politics will not be consented to and that any provision of this bill which would give to any corporation rights which really should be handled or disposed of by the Government itself and through the machinery of the Government will not be permitted by us to remain in this bill. At least that is my opinion that that would be the case.

Mr. **GROSS.** I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **PELLY.** Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like clarification with regard to the political aspects of this bill. The gentleman from Iowa referred to the United Nations. I notice in reading the bill that section 10 provides the corporation and its officers and directors shall not contribute to or participate directly or indirectly in any local or national political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation. But it does not refer to any international organization. I wonder if there might be some enlightenment or clarification on that point.

Mr. **FORRESTER.** Let me say to the gentleman that point has never been raised with us before. I have thought that when we say they are not engaged in political activity that we mean it. I think that is reinforced by the original bill, H.R. 2, if the gentleman will look at it.

Mr. **PELLY.** Would you call this political activity if it were designed to influence action in the United Nations? Or would you call that international politics?

Mr. **FORRESTER.** I think it would be the same thing, in my humble judgment. The gentleman will recall that language was stricken out of that particular bill with regard to teaching of certain matters. If the gentleman and the House are interested in knowing what the actual powers are now, they will be found on page 3 beginning with line 10 and ending with line 16. Let me call the gentleman's attention specifically to the words "more particularly" on line 14.

An amendment will be offered as part of this bill striking out the words "more particularly" and substituting for them the words "to wit" and a colon. In other words, "the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged; promotion of economic welfare; and the promotion of public health." They are the powers that would be granted to the corporation under this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Would the gentleman amplify a little further as to whether or not this would cover, for example, UNESCO organizations?

Mr. FORRESTER. So far as political aspects are concerned I would think so. We have tried to deal with this as we did with the American Legion, VFW, and other patriotic organizations.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say that the preponderating reason the subcommittee had in this legislation was the desire to give a Federal charter because of the objectives of the proposed organization, and to carry out the wishes of Mrs. Roosevelt in that respect. I think that was the preponderating reason so far as the granting of this charter is concerned; and I note with pleasure that the son of Mrs. Roosevelt is nodding approval of what I said.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt was a great woman. The very mention of her name evokes in millions of people around the world memories of a woman who tirelessly worked for all humanity. Her heart had no boundaries; it embraced the lowly, the sick, the poor, the oppressed.

In her way, she was the symbol of one of our greatest traditions, for no country, in all history, has proven its inate generosity, its warmth, and concern for the needy and oppressed as has the United States. We are a much maligned people. Again and again we are accused of being a materialistic country. Eleanor Roosevelt gave lie to that accusation and, in her person, embodied the humanitarian ideals that run like a strong current throughout all of our history.

Therefore, it is well that her ideals be perpetuated by the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation Memorial, Inc. In giving a Federal charter to this group, we not only pay homage to this First Lady but, in a sense, we help keep alive the true image of our country. Far better than a statue, far better than a piece of stone, or a slab of marble, would be a living monument dedicated to the purposes to which Eleanor Roosevelt gave of her strength, her mind, and her heart. It is a simple incorporation bill—it asks for no money, it asks only that we give to this organization the dignity of Federal incorporation. This is little enough that Congress can do to honor the manner of life Eleanor Roosevelt lived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following persons designated by the President of the United States of America:

The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, New York, New York, as Chairman;

Miss Marian Anderson, Danbury, Connecticut;

Robert S. Benjamin, New York, New York;

William Benton, Southport, Connecticut;

Doctor Ralph J. Bunche, New York, New York;

Henry Crown, Chicago, Illinois;

David Dubinsky, New York, New York;

Myer Feldman, Washington, District of Columbia;

Mrs. Ruth Field, New York, New York;

Raymond Firestone, Akron, Ohio;

Arnold Grant, New York, New York;

Arthur Hanisch, Pasadena, California;

Doctor John R. Heller, New York, New York;

Mrs. Audrey Hess, New York, New York;

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, New York, New York;

Mrs. Trude Lash, New York, New York;

Mrs. Mary Lasker, New York, New York;

Herbert Lehman, New York, New York;

Archibald MacLeish, Conway, Massachusetts;

Doctor Charles Mayo, Rochester, Minnesota;

John J. McCloy, Washington, District of Columbia;

George Meany, Washington, District of Columbia;

Mrs. Agnes Meyer, Washington, District of Columbia;

Walter P. Reuther, Detroit, Michigan;

Dore Schary, New York, New York;

Herman Steinkraus, Westport, Connecticut;

and their successors are created and declared to be a body corporate in the District of Columbia by the name of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act are hereby authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be exclusively charitable and educational. It shall devote itself to continuing certain major interests to which Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated her life, more particularly, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged; promotion of economic welfare; and the promotion of public health.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(3) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may from time to time require;

(4) to adopt, amend, and alter its bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(5) to solicit, prior to January 1, 1965, and to accept, receive, hold, invest, reinvest, and to use, administer, expend and otherwise dispose of, in the sole and absolute discretion of the board of trustees, gifts, legacies, bequests, devises, grants, funds, money and property of every kind and description, and to apply the income and principal thereof exclusively for the purposes of the corporation by such agencies and means as shall, from time to time, be found appropriate therefor, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limited or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property;

(8) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws; and

(9) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the bylaws of the corporation may provide.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES: COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. (a) Upon the enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of trustees of the corporation shall consist of the persons named in the first section of this Act and such additional persons, if any, as shall be appointed by the President of the United States of America.

(b) Thereafter, the board of trustees of the corporation shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of trustees shall be the governing board of the corporation, and a quorum thereof shall be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation and for the control of all funds of the corporation. The board of trustees may appoint committees which shall have and exercise such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws or by resolution of the board of trustees, and which may be all of the powers of the board of trustees.

OFFICERS: ELECTION AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SEC. 7. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer, and such other officers as may be provided in the bylaws.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE, SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; RESIDENT AGENT

SEC. 8. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Washington, District of Columbia, or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of trustees, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the territory of the United States, and in the discretion of the board of trustees elsewhere in the world.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OR ASSETS TO MEMBERS; LOANS TO OFFICERS, TRUSTEES, OR EMPLOYEES

Sec. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, trustees, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of trustees of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, trustees, or employees. Any trustee who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to a member, officer, trustee, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

Sec. 10. The corporation and its officers and directors as such shall not contribute to or participate in, directly or indirectly, local or national political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

Sec. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

Sec. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

Sec. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of trustees, and committees having authority under the board of trustees, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 14. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the President of the United States and to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF NAME

Sec. 15. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to the name the "Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Incorporated", and to have and to use in carrying out its purposes, distinctive insignia, emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases, as may be required in the furtherance of its functions. No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

Sec. 16. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets if any, of the corporation shall be distributed only in furtherance of the purposes of the corporation to one or more organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable and educational purposes within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code.

ACQUISITION OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF EXISTING COMMITTEE

Sec. 17. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation Committee, an unincorporated association formed in anticipation of the present incorporation upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liabilities of such committee.

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 18. The corporation shall report annually to the President of the United States and to the Congress concerning its proceedings and activities for the preceding calendar year. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHAPTER

Sec. 19. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: Page 3, line 16, strike out "more particularly" and insert "To-wit:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to support H.R. 4715 to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. This bill is similar to H.R. 4673 which I sponsored. The enactment of this legislation is a positive way in which the Congress can testify to the valiant leadership and constant inspiration which Mrs. Roosevelt gave our Nation and the United Nations. It is a way in which we can further the goals to which Mrs. Roosevelt dedicated her life.

Mr. Speaker, I have a 2-hour special order for March 27 at which time I have invited all Members of the House to join me in paying tribute to the ideals and life of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Today we have the opportunity to vote for the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation which will prove a fitting tribute to the work and ideals of Mrs. Roosevelt.

No doubt all Members are familiar with the efforts which have led to the establishment of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. You will remember that shortly after Mrs. Roosevelt's death President Kennedy called a meeting of distinguished persons who were interested in a meaningful tribute to our First Lady emeritus. Under the chairmanship of the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, meetings were held which resulted in the formation of the foundation. The stated purpose of the foundation bears testimony to the honored name which it will carry. The purpose reads:

> The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be exclusively charitable and educational. It shall devote itself to continuing certain major interests to which Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated her life, more particularly, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged; promotion of economic welfare; and the promotion of public health.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the purposes of the foundation embrace a philosophy which centers upon the worth and dignity of all individuals.

Mr. Speaker, in a world which has yet to solve the problems of poverty, misery, and want, and find the way to a just and lasting peace, the voice of Eleanor Roosevelt was a voice of reason and hope. She spoke out against injustice and for freedom. She spoke out of a deep understanding of the fundamental principles of our free and democratic society. She dared to espouse the unpopular when she was convinced of the rightness of the cause.

The progress and development of our Nation and of the free world are enhanced by individuals such as Eleanor Roosevelt. Let us enact legislation which will perpetuate her good works and set into motion the activities of a foundation which will bear the honored and loved name of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Vivian Gordon, of the Library of Congress, has expressed in an original poem a thought which I believe indicates something of the national loss of Mrs. Roosevelt but yet indicates the directions she left for the future:

Would that I could know another
Quite as strong:
Yet from the seeds that she has sown
Among the mighty throng,
I know that there will come
Leaders: strong and new
To take up the work yet undone
The work that she would do.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on the Status of Women at its last meeting endorsed the purpose and aims of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. Mrs. Roosevelt in her usual brilliant and compassionate fashion was chairman of the President's Status of Women Commission at the time of her death. I, as a member of the Commission, was honored at being asked to serve on the Commission whose work she so ably directed.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the body of the RECORD the Commission's statement on the foundation:

> Members of the President's Commission on the Status of Women welcome the creation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation. Initiated by President Kennedy and chaired by Adlai Stevenson, the foundation is dedicated to continue and extend the great good Mrs. Roosevelt did throughout her life.
>
> The foundation's work in the fields of human rights and dignity, world peace, health research and social development will follow the principal areas of Mrs. Roosevelt's interests, which are also, we believe, the principal challenges facing the world.
>
> The Commission endorses the purpose for which the foundation was created: to coordinate private efforts to make meaningful and lasting the tangible memorials to Mrs. Roosevelt. Thus we hope all individuals, groups and organizations dedicated to such worthwhile aims will consult with the foundation and, where feasible, will coordinate their efforts with it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on this day the House will soon pass the bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc. I think it appropriate, then, that others throughout the Nation might have the opportunity of enjoying a splendid article written by Miss Helen Bullard, of Atlanta, and published in a recent edition of Plumb, a publication of the Associated Plumbing Contractors of Georgia:

A TRIBUTE TO A LADY

(By Helen Bullard)

To try to pay tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is to be reminded of the inadequacy of words. Because there are no words to rightfully and accurately assess or capture the essence of this truly great lady. At most one can only hope to imprison under glass some of the impressions, some of the remembrances of this woman who became in her own lifetime, and in ours, a symbol of the human spirit. Perhaps in the word "human" lies some of the essence, for Mrs. Roosevelt was a person to whom the word human meant not human frailty but strength. All the qualities of warmth, compassion, humor, and acceptance of one's self and one's fellow man * * * these are the qualities which Mrs. Roosevelt ascribed as "human."

Perhaps a certain blitheness was another attribute, a certain philosophy of "this is right, so let's do this because it is right." At the age of 72 a reporter asked her what her philosophy was and she replied, "Well, life has to be lived, that's all."

More than any person in our history she pushed back boundaries, pushed back horizons, so that imaginary state and country boundaries were removed, and horizons were enlarged to include the world. She brought a certain perspective to the world; she made survival seem a very worthwhile project to pursue.

She was no ivory tower philosopher. Philosophy was translated into action on the premise that if something was important enough to be disturbed about, it was important enough to do something about. She moved in the area of action quietly and efficiently. "Better to light a candle than to curse the darkness" was something she subscribed to heartily, but whenever possible she efficiently chose a rather large candle.

She knew thousands of people: the great, the near great, the rich and the poor, and no person she ever met failed to respond to the impact of her charm, her warmth and her naturalness.

Perhaps the nearest approach to an appropriate tribute that can be paid Mrs. Roosevelt is to quote the words of St. Francis (words which she loved so much that she requested they be read at her funeral). People who knew her long and well, feel that these words were indeed the words she lived by.

"Lord, make me an instrument of your peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon.
Where there is discord, union.
Where there is doubt, faith.
Where there is despair, hope.
Where there is darkness, joy.
O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console;
To be understood as to understand;
To be loved as to love;
For it is in the giving that we receive;
It is in the pardoning that we are pardoned.
And it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TAXATION OF CERTAIN DISPOSITIONS OF PROPERTY MADE PURSUANT TO ORDERS ENFORCING ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2826) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of dispositions of property—other than stock—pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to distributions pursuant to orders enforcing antitrust laws) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1112. DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY (OTHER THAN STOCK) TO EFFECTUATE ANTITRUST POLICIES

"(a) NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If property (other than stock) is sold or exchanged as the result of judgment, decree, or other order (or the threat or imminence thereof while the proceeding is pending) of a court or of a commission or board authorized to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), such sale or exchange shall be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033.

"(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply—

"(1) to any sale or exchange which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax; and

"(2) to any sale or exchange of property occurring after the date of the enactment of this section, unless the judgment, decree, or other order includes a finding by the court, or by the commission or board, that the disposition of such property is required because of acts with respect to which, at the time of such acts, there was no substantial reason for believing that such acts would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

"(c) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) The purchase of other property shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033 unless—

"(A) the Attorney General of the United States, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

"(B) the commission or board, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board, certifies that such purchase is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a), is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act, and is not inconsistent with the Clayton Act.

"(2) The purchase of stock for the purpose of replacing the property described in subsection (a) of this section shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033.

"(3) In applying section 1033, the determination as to whether other property is similar or related in service or use to the property sold or exchanged shall be made without regard to section 1033(g)."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1112. Disposition of property (other than stock) to effectuate antitrust policies."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the first section of this Act) shall apply only with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960.

(b) In the case of amounts received after December 31, 1960, with respect to a sale or exchange described in section 1112(a) of such Code which occurred on or before such date, section 1112 of such Code shall be applied as if the sale or exchange occurred on January 1, 1961, and section 1033 of such Code shall be applied with the following modifications:

(1) In determining the amount realized upon such sale or exchange, there shall be taken into account only amounts received after December 31, 1960. The gain taken into account shall be that portion of the gain which is properly allocable to amounts realized after December 31, 1960.

(2) The period specified in section 1033 (a)(3)(B) shall be treated as beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on December 31, 1963.

(3) The time for making the election referred to in section 1033(a)(3)(A) shall not expire before the close of the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The **SPEAKER.** Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means is the same bill, except for a minor date change, that was passed by the House on September 17, 1962. The bill deals with the taxation of the proceeds from the sale or exchange of property other than stock where such sale is pursuant to an antitrust proceeding.

Under the present law, it might happen that a taxpayer would be required as a result of proceedings instituted under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act to dispose of certain business properties, but under the spirit of those acts, he would not be prevented from buying new property that would serve to keep him in the same business but would not be a violation of the antimonopoly statutes. Under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, for example, a taxpayer might be required to sell a store or a hotel in one city because he already has too many stores or hotels there, but there may be no reason for preventing him from using the proceeds to buy or build a store in a new city.

The present tax law imposes a rather harsh result in this situation. Frequently, the sale of the old store or hotel will be at a price above the adjusted basis. This is the consequence of inflation in recent years. Under the tax law, despite the involuntary nature of this sale, that gain is subject to tax, and the taxpayer only has reduced proceeds available to acquire the replacement property. In a number of other situations, a taxpayer who is forced to sell property is permitted to postpone recognition of taxable gain. This is not an exemption from tax, but simply a deferral. This nonrecognition provision applies where property is sold, for example, in obedience to orders from the Securities and Exchange Commission or to effectuate certain policies of the Federal Communications Commission. The bill would extend a similar treatment to sales which are the result of a judgment, or decree or other order of a court, commission, or board in a proceeding brought under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

The legislation applies with respect to amounts received by the taxpayer after December 31, 1960. It is made clear that the nonrecognition of gain applies only where these proceeds are reinvested in similar property where the acquisition of the new property is not inconsistent with the basic antitrust order and is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. The amount of gain not recognized is subtracted from the cost of the replacement property in determining the adjusted basis of the replacement property for tax purposes.

It is also provided that for sales or exchanges of property on or after date of enactment, the new provisions will apply only if the basic antitrust order includes a finding that the sale of the property is required under circumstances where the taxpayer had no substantial reason at the time for believing a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act was involved. This is consistent with the general principles under which the Congress has allowed nonrecognition of gain for sales. It denies the nonrecognition where the taxpayer knowingly violated the law.

The legislation now before the House has certain similarities in general intent to the legislation enacted last year dealing with certain distributions of stock pursuant to antitrust orders, the legislation concerned particularly with the divestiture imposed on the Du Pont Co. on its holdings of General Motor stock. The basic intent of both pieces of legislation is to improve the application of the antitrust statutes by removing the tax penalties on individuals involved. This legislation does not serve to provide tax favors. It only removes tax penalties.

Furthermore, it does not remove any penalties on particular acts that might be contained within the antitrust statutes. It does appear to be unreasonable, however, to impose tax penalties over and above the provisions contained in the antitrust statutes themselves. Certainly these tax consequences were not intended when the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act were passed by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House last September, on the 17th of September, as far as I know, there were no dissenting votes. There were some comments by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. However, I think I am accurately describing his position when I say he did not oppose the principle of this bill but felt that we should have provisions on the books that would take care of all situations in general.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe this House passed the bill under suspension of the rules, but there was a minority report filed last year by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Missouri filed a minority report. I do not recall whether or not the gentleman voted against the bill. I did not mean to imply the bill passed unanimously, but it was passed under suspension of the rules by voice vote.

After it passed the House of Representatives, the bill was reported by the Finance Committee of the other body and, as far as I have been able to ascertain, there were no minority views filed in the other body.

On February 4, 1963, the Committee on Ways and Means reported the bill, and it was unanimously reported.

Last year the bill was sponsored by myself, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the gentleman from Illinois, a former distinguished Member and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MASON].

The bill seeks to give in the case of civil—and I emphasize the word "civil"—antitrust proceedings the same treatment that is now accorded in other cases involving the involuntary disposition of property in carrying out public policy. I could give many instances.

For example, the Federal Communications Commission, when it enters a decree requiring a given person to divest himself or a corporation itself of given television or radio properties, or whatever other properties might be involved, no tax consequences follow as an immediate result. This is all spelled out in the report on the bill.

It will be noted there that the same applies in similar cases including the SEC. Similar situations also arise under the Bank Holding Company Act.

This is not a question of tax reduction or of tax forgiveness. It is a question of tax deferment. It takes cognizance of a situation which may come about in the law through no fault of the particular parties involved, and it permits the reinvestment of these funds in similar properties where the law is not in question.

That, basically, is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The report of the committee does not include the statements filed by the Treasury Department or the Justice Department in regard to this particular piece of legislation. It is my understanding that both the Treasury and the Justice Department have filed adverse reports on this particular piece of legislation; is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. They did last year. We did not receive formal reports this year. But, their reports were adverse last time. Basically this involves antitrust policy. Justice, as I recall, wants to study this and come up with possibly a general, overall approach.

Mr. LAIRD. Now, this particular piece of legislation will help the Hilton hotel chain tax problem resulting from the sale of the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington as well as some other properties outside of the city?

Mr. BOGGS. I am informed it will apply to any organization or group that will qualify under the terms of the legislation. I am informed that the Hilton hotel people do qualify.

Mr. LAIRD. Under the interpretation of this bill, if it does become law, the taxpayer will have to prove good faith; is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. Positively. Under this proposal he has to prove good faith.

Mr. LAIRD. But not retroactively?

Mr. BOGGS. This applies only in a civil case. It has no application in a criminal case, and many people associated with these cases, who are interested in the enforcement of antitrust laws, for instance, the former head of that section of the Justice Department, Mr. Bicks, feel that this type of legislation will actually facilitate the enforcement of antitrust laws.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand the gentleman is referring to cases now and in the future. The only taxpayer interested in the retroactive provisions of this legislation would be the Hilton hotel corporation chain; is that not correct?

Mr. BOGGS. As far as I know, the only retroactive effect has to do with certain installments paid in 1961 so in that respect it is retroactive. The filing date for 1962 is not yet here.

Mr. LAIRD. Now, it just seems to me when we consider legislation like this under suspension—and I object to the procedure of considering legislation like this under suspension this early in the session—we have an adverse report from the Justice Department, an adverse report from the Treasury Department, and yet we bring this bill up under suspension where the provisions cannot even be amended on the floor of the House. Certainly, the gentleman from Louisiana has made a good case so far as the future is concerned, so far as being able to use good faith in the determination of the tax liability in the future. I object to this procedure of using suspension today to consider a bill which has the opposition of the Justice Department and the Treasury Department and not giving the House an opportunity to work its will as far as amendments are concerned here on the floor.

Mr. BOGGS. As the gentleman knows, I would say that generally the bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means either come with a closed rule, which does not allow amendments on the floor, or sometimes the chairman calls them up under unanimous consent, because of the preferential status enjoyed by the committee, or sometimes by suspension. Suspension is not unusual.

Mr. LAIRD. Even under unanimous consent procedure or on the Consent Calendar we could consider amendments to this bill, but we cannot under this particular procedure. This bill should be considered under regular procedures and not under suspension of the House rules.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I would say that the bill passed the House last year, and the only reason the bill was not finally passed last year was that it was not reported by the committee in the other body until nearly the adjournment of the Congress. As far as I am able to ascertain in that body there was no opposition to the bill. But, it just came up too late in the session.

Now, this bill has strict limitations that must be met before it can apply.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record the debate which occurred last year on September 17, which gives a very succinct statement which was made by the former minority ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason]. I would like to have all of the debate and the discussion included in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Congressional Record, Sept. 17, 1962]

Taxation of Certain Dispositions of Property

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8846) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws, with committee amendments as printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to distributions pursuant to orders enforcing antitrust laws) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 1112. Disposition of Property (Other Than Stock) to Effectuate Antitrust Policies.

" '(a) Nonrecognition of Gain.—If property (other than stock) is sold or exchanged as the result of a judgment, decree, or other order (or the threat or imminence thereof while the proceeding is pending) of a court or of a commission or board authorized to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1-7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12-27), such sale or exchange shall be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033.

" '(b) Exceptions.—Subsection (a) shall not apply—

" '(1) to any sale or exchange which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax; and

" '(2) to any sale or exchange of property occurring after the date of the enactment of this section, unless the judgment, decree, or other order includes a finding by the court, or by the commission or board, that the disposition of such property is required because of acts with respect to which, at the time of such acts, there was no substantial reason for believing that such acts would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

" '(c) Other Limitations.—For purposes of this section—

" '(1) The purchase of other property shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033 unless—

" '(A) the Attorney General of the United States, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

" '(B) the commission or board, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board, certifies that such purchase is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a), is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act, and is not inconsistent with the Clayton Act.

" '(2) The purchase of stock for the purpose of replacing the property described in subsection (a) of this section shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033.

" '(3) In applying section 1033, the determination as to whether other property is similar or related in service or use to the property sold or exchanged shall be made without regard to section 1033(g).'

"(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '1112. Disposition of property (other than stock) to effectuate antitrust policies.'

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the first section of this Act) shall apply only with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960.

"(b) In the case of amounts received after December 31, 1960, with respect to a sale or exchange described in section 1112(a) of such Code which occurred on or before such date, section 1112 of such Code shall be applied as if the sale or exchange occurred on January 1, 1961, and section 1033 of such Code shall be applied with the following modifications:

"(1) In determining the amount realized upon such sale or exchange, there shall be taken into account only amounts received after December 31, 1960. The gain taken into account shall be that portion of the gain which is properly allocable to amounts realized after December 31, 1960.

"(2) The period specified in section 1033 (a)(3)(B) shall be treated as beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on December 31, 1962.

"(3) The time for making the election referred to in section 1033(a)(3)(A) shall not expire before the close of the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The Speaker pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I trust that we will not have to consume all of the time which has been allocated. This bill can be explained rather simply, I think. What it seeks to do is to put antitrust suits of a civil nature in the same category that we have put other similar matters in the law. For instance, under existing law if an order is entered by the Securities and Exchange Commission having to do with the disposition of utility holdings, let us say, that does not result in any tax incident. Or, if an order is issued under an order of the Federal Communications Commission, this too does not result in a tax incident. Or, there is the well-known case of eminent domain where the government, whether it be State, municipal, or Federal, takes a piece of property for the public good, this does not result in a tax incident.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other examples. The case of a fire is the best example about which I can think. If your building burns down and you collect the insurance policy, then the tax incident transfers itself to the new property. Basically, this is what this bill seeks to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will agree to the proposal now pending before it, as amended.

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Boggs. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Keogh. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], that I am delighated to join with the gentleman in urging favorable action on this bill. But, permit me to make this statement and ask the gentleman if he agrees with it: In the first place, this applies only to civil antitrust actions?

Mr. Boggs. That is eminently correct.

Mr. Keogh. And in the second place it requires that the proceeds of the divestiture be invested in income-producing properties of the same or similar nature?

Mr. Boggs. Subject to the approval of whatever agency prosecuted the civil action.

Mr. Keogh. Precisely. Now, is it not a fact that it has been noted officially that courts are reluctant to enter civil antitrust decrees where the divestiture order would result in a heavy tax impact?

Mr. Boggs. That is quite correct. That is the main purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

(Mr. Keogh asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for H.R. 8846. This bill merely extends present law governing involuntary conversions to the disposal of assets under the antitrust laws.

When the Government steps in to break up an existing business enterprise, Congress has been conscious of the rights of the owner in such cases.

For example, the dissolution by the Securities and Exchange Commission of public utility holding companies is tax free. The distribution under a Federal Reserve Board order of nonbanking assets of a bank holding company is tax free. The proceeds realized from the sale of a radio or television station at the order of the Federal Communications Commission may be reinvested in another station without recognition of tax. And, last year tax relief was given to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co. when they received General Motors stock pursuant to an antitrust decree.

I understand that in civil cases arising under the antitrust laws, courts are often reluctant to order the breakup of enterprises because of the heavy tax penalties attached. This bill would remove that stumbling block from antitrust enforcement. At hearings on this bill, Herbert A. Bergson, Esq., the former head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, testified that legislation of this character was necessary because of the reluctance of courts to order divestiture because of the heavy tax consequences. This sentiment was echoed by many other witnesses.

I submit that the principle of involuntary conversion as applied in the tax laws should be extended to divestitures of property under the antitrust laws.

The Supreme Court has held that the remedy of divestiture in antitrust cases is equitable in nature and not punitive.

I further submit, in all fairness, that an antitrust defendant should be permitted to reinvest the proceeds from forced dispositions in other business assets without the recognition of gain as provided for in this bill.

Mr. King of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Boggs. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. King of California. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to state that I, too, favor the enactment of the bill

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

(Mr. Boggs asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, the bill which the Committee on Ways and Means has reported to the House, H.R. 8846, deals with property other than stock which is disposed of as a result of antitrust proceedings. The bill does not provide tax reduction, merely tax postponement. It provides in the specific cases covered that the taxpayer should be able to readjust his holdings in a way consistent with the antitrust laws without the added burden of a current capital gains tax.

At the present time, there are various provisions in the Internal Revenue Code which provide this sort of deferred tax treatment where the taxpayer is compelled to divest himself of property. The basic provision on which the present bill is modeled deals with property involuntarily converted, for example, as a result of fire or catastrophe. The taxpayer is not taxable on the insurance proceeds even though these might involve a gain. The amount of this gain not recognized is, however, subtracted from the cost of the replacement property in determining its basis for tax purposes. Thus, the gain would ultimately be taxable if the replacement property is sold or if the replacement property is not sold the adjustment will involve smaller depreciation deductions and more ordinary income.

This involuntary conversion treatment is allowed under present law for certain dispositions of property in obedience to orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is also provided for certain sales to effectuate the policies of the Federal Communications Commission. In general, the Congress has allowed this involuntary conversion treatment where the taxpayer was not in a position to know that he would sometime later be required to sell a particular piece of property. This, however, is frequently the case in antitrust legislation. The specific meaning of the Sherman and Clayton Acts has developed considerably in the court interpretation.

Under the committee bill, involuntary conversion treatment is provided for the disposition of property as a result of an antitrust judgment, decree or order, or threat thereof. Two very important restrictions are laid down, however. Ordinarily in the area of involuntary conversions the law requires the taxpayer to buy similar replacement property in order to qualify for the tax deferral. In this case, because of the antitrust problem, it is required that the body instituting the antitrust action must certify that the purpose of replacement property is not inconsistent with the terms of the antitrust order and not inconsistent with the Sherman or Clayton Acts. The other safeguard in the bill provides that for future application there must be a finding by the body issuing the order that the disposition of property is required because of action which at the time the taxpayer had no substantial reason to believe would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

The tax laws should try to operate in a neutral fashion with respect to property transfers resulting from the application of antitrust law in relatively unpredictable cases. The tax law should not impose harsh penalties on these transfers of property nor should they result in any unexpected tax benefit. This result is achieved by the present bill.

(Mr. Herlong (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. Herlong. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill, H.R. 8846, which has been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

This bill is a fair solution to an important problem in the development of a reasonable antitrust program.

As is well known, the Sherman-Clayton Acts have been subject to a great deal of reexamination in the courts since they were first placed on the statute books. Partly this has involved finding further meaning in the language of the laws and partly it has resulted from judicial revision of other concepts, such as the scope of interstate commerce. The result is that business firms frequently do not have reason to anticipate that particular property acquisitions will ultimately be held to be in violation of these antitrust laws.

In circumstances such as this, the bill simply provides some tax deferral if property must be sold because of an antitrust order. The taxpayer is not required to report the gain on that sale provided he reinvests the proceeds in similar property, the acquisition of which is consistent with the antitrust order.

The cost of the new property is reduced for tax purposes by the amount of gain that was not recognized at the time of the original forced disposition. This means that there will be no net tax forgiveness. Actually, in a great number of cases the reduction of basis on the new property will result in lower depreciation deductions and consequently more ordinary income. This treatment of deferral on the gain will come into operation only where the disposition of the property was required under an antitrust law and in future cases it will be required also that the basic order finds that the taxpayer, at the time of acquiring the property involved in the antitrust order, had no substantial reason for believing that his acquisition would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

The concept of tax adjustment following an antitrust order was approved by the Congress in connection with the bill that was passed last year dealing with the divestiture of General Motors stock by the Du Pont Co. Like the Du Pont bill, the present bill is not intended to reduce the tax liability in the long run but to permit a reasonable adjustment by the taxpayer to the developments in antitrust law. I believe the current bill is completely sound and deserves the support of this House.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have minority views that were filed with H.R. 8846. Due possibly to some misunderstanding—I think that is what it was—these views were not printed with the report of the committee and so the Members of the House may have been unaware that there are minority views. They are available here in the well. They are not lengthy and I am going to read them because this, in essence, is the reason I am opposing the bill.

I opposed H.R. 8847, commonly called the Du Pont Antitrust Divestiture Act, because it was special legislation and not general law applicable to any antitrust divestiture where criminality was not involved.

For the same reason I oppose the present bill, H.R. 8846, although it clearly is more general than the Du Pont bill

This bill could be amended to make it general law, and good law, by eliminating its restriction to property other than stock and making it applicable to all property and by vesting the power of determining alternative tax treatments of the sale or transfer of divested property in the court, commission, or board hearing the matter.

How the property which must be divested is to be treated for tax purposes is very much a part of the economic aspects of the decree of divestiture ordered by the tribunal. Certainly the tribunal would be more prone to decree divestitures in noncriminal cases if it has more discretion over the economic penalty to be imposed. The tax incident can be the major part of the economic penalty and if the court has no discretion in making this penalty conform to the nature of the case it might be reluctant to enter a decree in the first place.

Above all, we should have government by law and not by men. As I said in the Du Pont case neither the Congress nor its Committee on Ways and Means is the proper forum to weigh the equities of these antitrust divestiture cases. Nor is the executive branch of the Government the proper forum to grant relief to one and deny it to another. Both the legislative and executive branches of the Government are politically motivated, and properly so. Who gets relief or does not get relief should not be a matter of political action.

This is a judicial matter and the Congress should write its laws to make it clear that the judiciary is the proper forum in which to seek relief.

At the time the Du Pont case came up I made some remarks on the floor of the House to the effect that we were probably going to have the Hilton Hotel case come up. And I can predict that there will be other cases that will come along. These are noncriminal antitrust cases. Actually, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House would be a better forum to evaluate this matter, in many respects—in fact, in all respects except for the tax feature—than the Committee on Ways and Means. We are talking about the economic impact of whether or not to give a company the benefit of the capital gains treatment concerning whatever they may have made on their investment, which they must divest themselves of, or whether it will be treated as ordinary income.

The court in the Du Pont case or the Hilton Hotel case or any of these cases has to go into some depth in determining how the divestiture can be effected under any circumstances so that it will minimize the economic impact. Indeed, the Du Pont divestiture, as I understand, is going to take place over a period of years.

I am not going to make much of a fuss about this bill because I happen to think there are equities in the Hilton Hotel case, just as I said I thought there were proper equities in the Du Pont case. In fact, in many respects I was more sympathetic to the Du Pont case because there the divestiture came because of the court's undoing something that happened as long ago as 1920. In the Hilton case, there is not that kind of equity. On the other hand, this particular bill has the merit that it is considerably broader than the Du Pont bill and does cover a great many instances that might occur in many divestiture suits. In that respect it recommends itself in a better way than the Du Pont case did.

I think it is advisable for the Committee on Ways and Means to desist from writing this kind of special legislation, particularly when good general legislation looks like it can be written, and thus we would remove ourselves from the position of being a special forum before which these cases are tried.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman states his position very well; namely, that what he prefers is broad general legislation that will eliminate this problem, which is a very definite problem. As the law now stands, it restricts the courts in their finding of whether there has been a violation of the antitrust laws because of the potential severity of the penalty resulting from the violation of the law.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I do think the gentleman might point out that in the attempts we have had within the committee to look at this on a broader base we have had extreme difficulty getting the Department of Justice to come to some kind of agreement as to what should be done on a general basis. They agree, generally speaking, that something should be done, but there is a constant conflict among themselves as to what should be done. I think the House should know that.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. I think the gentleman has made an accurate statement. In fact, our difficulty in the Committee on Ways and Means was that the Department of Justice had not made up its mind. But I think it behooves our committee in this instance and the Congress in general to go ahead if they see a proper course open to them. This problem is before us. As has been emphasized by the gentleman from Louisiana, this relates to noncriminal divestiture cases. These are cases where the court has held there is a violation, but no criminal action is involved. It is simply an economic attempt to carry out the proper intent of the antitrust laws. These are, in effect, civil cases, and we are discussing an economic problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason], who is the coauthor of this legislation, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. Mason. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, that the bill before the House, H.R. 8846, is good legislation. This bill does not provide tax reduction. It merely says that under narrow circumstances the sale of property and the acquisition of replacement property because of an antitrust order will not be the occasion for collecting Federal tax. The tax liability potential, so to speak, will be left precisely where it was.

The treatment provided under this bill is consistent with sound tax principles. If an investor loses his factory by fire or flood and uses his insurance proceeds to buy a new factory, the tax law does not recognize this occasion as an appropriate time to collect capital gains tax even though in a technical sense his insurance proceeds might have exceeded the cost of his first factory. He will end up in substantially the same position if he reinvests the insurance money in a new factory. The law requires that the amount of any gain which is not recognized in a situation must be subtracted from the cost of the new property in determining its basis for depreciation or for future sale so, as a longrun matter, there is no tax reduction. The question is simply when is the tax payable and it is reasonable to answer this question by trying to collect the tax when we would have collected it if there had been no fire.

This is all the present bill does. It provides this same kind of treatment that we provide for a taxpayer who lost his property due to a fire. It provides this treatment where the property that the taxpayer holds must be sold in compliance with an antitrust order and it is made applicable to future cases where the court finds that the taxpayer did not, in effect, deliberately violate the antitrust laws.

My colleagues have ample reason to know that very few people can predict the kind of decisions that will be reached in the courts. This has been very much the case in the antitrust field where the courts have done more legislating than the Congress. This is a good bill and it deserves the support of the House.

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien], who is ill but who seems to be happily recovering, may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'Brien of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Record.]

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8846, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of dispositions of property (other than stock) pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOGGS. Surely; I would be glad to yield.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the Department of Justice was opposed to the bill in the last Congress, what were the grounds of the opposition? I noted that the gentleman stated——

Mr. BOGGS. Well, the Department of Justice also opposed the so-called Du Pont bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. We passed that bill a little earlier than this bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason I asked the question is that earlier the gentleman said that the Department of Justice had indicated that this bill would facilitate the antitrust laws rather than hamper them.

Mr. BOGGS. If I said that, I gave the wrong impression. I said that the former head of that Department, Mr. Bicks, in testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, said that many judges in these civil matters—mind you, these are civil actions, and it has nothing to do with any criminal violations—are reluctant to give a decree to the Department because they say this is going to put the parties in a tax situation that they never anticipated. This really becomes an added penalty. That is what the bill really does.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand, but I just was trying to say——

Mr. BOGGS. It is similar to the SEC and other situations. The SEC entered some decrees in my own area where they required some of the utilities to dispose of their various holdings. They did that, but there was no immediate tax impact as a result of that; not at all.

Mr. LINDSAY. The question I have is this: Can the gentleman tell us the grounds upon which the Department of Justice addressed itself in opposition to the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. They said the same thing that they said in the Du Pont situation—that they wanted to study this entire area looking toward general overall recommendations.

With all due respect to them, they can study this for a long time as you know. We take the position that the committee has studied it very carefully and has come to the conclusion that this involves equity and justice in the tax structure while at the same time fully protecting our antitrust policy. It is just that simple. There is nothing complex about it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] asked about the Hilton Hotel——

Mr. LINDSAY. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I am just trying to find out some of the facts with respect to this matter.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes; surely.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further, I gather that there are no reports in this Congress on this matter? Were reports requested?

Mr. BOGGS. No. I will explain exactly what we did. We called up early in the session in the Ways and Means Committee all the bills that had been reported to the House of Representatives in the last session and did not become law and considered them in the committee. Most of them have already repassed by unanimous consent, but because of the fact that the gentleman from Missouri had filed a minority report and had made some observations on the floor last September, I requested that this bill be put on suspension rather than unanimous consent so that everyone could have a chance to discuss it if they wanted to do so.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the Treasury Department was in opposition to this bill in the last Congress. Is it safe to say that they are in opposition to this bill in this Congress?

Mr. BOGGS. As far as I know they are.

Mr. LINDSAY. What is the amount of tax money that would be lost?

Mr. BOGGS. It is a very small amount.

Mr. LINDSAY. Can the gentleman guess at how much it is?

Mr. BOGGS. We have an expression in the Committee on Ways and Means, which is "negligible," but that might not be appropriate in this instance.

Mr. LINDSAY. Could the gentleman guess at it in round figures?

Mr. BOGGS. There are only two installments I think that are covered in the Hilton situation—I would say it would be very small. But let me say this: There will probably be other cases involved so that it could amount to some millions of dollars. My answer is that this must be approved formally by the Department of Justice so as to be in accord with their antitrust policy before anything can happen along this line.

I also refer the gentleman to the report, page 3, the third paragraph, which sets forth some of the various criteria that the parties involved have to meet in order to qualify for this treatment.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Surely.

Mr. LAIRD. So far as the retroactive provisions of the bill are concerned, are any other concerns involved?

Mr. BOGGS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. LAIRD. It is just the Hilton Corp. that would be involved?

Mr. BOGGS. I say "not to my knowledge." I do not recall any at the moment but as you can see from the provisions it is possible.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman asked a few minutes ago unanimous consent to insert in the Record certain remarks of the various individuals with reference to the bill——

Mr. BOGGS. I meant to insert all the debate. It is very short, including the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the gentleman would object to including the reports, filed with his committee, of the Treasury Department and the Justice Department.

Mr. BOGGS. I would not have any objection at all.

Mr. LAIRD. I think it would be helpful.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I include that in my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 27, 1962.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for this Department's views on H.R. 8846 relating to divestitures of property other than stock pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws.

H.R. 8846 would add to the Internal Revenue Code a new section 1112 which would, at election of the taxpayer, treat a sale or exchange of property, other than stock, pursuant to certain antitrust decrees as an involuntary conversion of property entitled to the nonrecognition of gain provisions of section 1033 of the code. If, therefore, as a result of an antitrust judgment, decree, or other order, property were exchanged for other property similar or related in service or use or were sold and the proceeds reinvested in such other property, gain on the sale or exchange would not be recognized. However, section 1112 would not apply if one of the principal purposes of such sale or exchange were the avoidance of Federal income tax.

Proposed section 1112 and the relating amendments are similar to the provisions contained in H.R. 8126 in the 86th Congress and are also similar in purpose to H.R. 7628 in the 85th Congress. The enactment of the latter was opposed by the Treasury Department in a report submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on July 24, 1957. This report noted that special relief measures are objectionable in the absence of overriding considerations of general policy and the Treasury Department was unaware of any considerations which would justify any special tax relief for this type of antitrust divestiture.

In a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means dated September 14, 1961, this Department opposed the enactment of this bill. That letter cited certain technical defects in the bill which have since been removed. However, this Department also stated certain basic objections to the bill which are still applicable.

The bill would apply to the divestiture by the Hilton Hotel Corp. of certain depreciable property which it disposed of in 1956 in accordance with an antitrust divestiture decree. The sales which occurred in that case were made on the installment basis, and the bill would apply to the income which has already been received since December 31, 1960.

On February 6, 1956, the Hilton Hotel Corp. entered into a consent decree requiring the corporation to divest itself of the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, the Mayflower Hotel in Washington and either the Hotel Roosevelt or the Hotel New Yorker in New York City. From information submitted by representatives of the Hilton Hotel Corp. we understand that during 1955 and 1956 the corporation sold the above-mentioned hotels (including the stock of a subsidiary corporation which owns the Hotel Roosevelt). At the end of 1960, approximately 30 percent of the total consideration received from these sales remains unpaid and was represented by installment notes which will be collected periodically through the year 1966. We are informed that the Hilton Hotel Corp. sold these installment obligations in 1961, and therefore the entire amount of the gain realized on the disposition of these hotels has already been recognized.

Information made available to us by the Department of Justice on March 19, 1962, indicates that insofar as the Department of Justice is able to ascertain, none of the cases presently pending in its Antitrust Division in which divestiture is sought would result in the application of the bill. It appears, therefore, that at this time the only known application of the bill is the 1956 divestiture by the Hilton Hotel Corp.

It should be noted that the sale of the depreciable property in that case was subject to capital gains rates (and that would normally be the case with respect to a sale of business property under a divestiture decree). Hence, the gain from such a sale, under existing law, is taxed at a rate of only 25 percent. Furthermore, the sale was a 10-year installment sale subject to the installment method of reporting provided in section 453 of the code. Thus, the tax on the gain was spread out over the period during which the proceeds were received. The Department believes, therefore, that existing law provides ample relief in the case of a sale of business property under the antitrust laws.

It is true that with respect to the so-called Du Pont legislation (Public Law 87–403) this Department took the view that it did not object to that relief legislation if Congress believed that the equities of the situation justified such relief. Those equities included the protection of 800,000 stockholders of General Motors Corp. (which corporation had not been found in violation of the antitrust laws), as well as protection against an adverse impact upon the stock market generally due to the divestiture of stock acquired many years ago under circumstances which did not then appear to involve any violation of antitrust laws. An additional consideration was the antitrust advantage obtained in this case if the divestiture was achieved within 3 years, as opposed to the anticipated period of 10 years in the absence of legislation. Moreover, in the Du Pont case the relief accorded permitted what would otherwise have been ordinary income to be treated generally as capital gains, whereas in the Hilton case, as indicated above, capital gains treatment is already accorded under existing law. Finally, the Du Pont legislation, which did not confer any tax relief on the Du Pont Co. itself, was entirely prospective in application.

No equities comparable to those involved in the Du Pont case are present here. The hotels which were sold by the Hilton Hotel Corp. had been acquired by it in 1954, shortly prior to the institution of antitrust proceedings in 1955. (The requirement in the bill that there be a finding that the divestiture is required because of acts with respect to which "there was no substantial reason for believing that such acts would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act" applies only to divestitures occurring after date of enactment, and does not apply to the Hilton Hotel case.) If the sale of the hotels resulted in any adverse impact on the market value of the stock of the Hilton Hotel Corp. (which is listed on the New York and Pacific Coast Stock Exchanges), presumably this impact occured in 1955 and 1956, when the hotels were sold and the tax consequences were established. Granting retroactive tax relief now would provide a windfall not only to the corporation and its shareholders generally, but particularly to those shareholders who acquired their stock since 1956. The Hilton Hotel case involves no aspect of improving the enforcement of antitrust divestiture, since the divestiture was successfully completed several years ago under the rules of existing tax law. Moreover, the Department of Justice, in its report on H.R. 8846 to the Committee on Ways and Means, stated that no useful antitrust purpose would be served by the bill.

Finally, it should be noted that the bill is retroactive not only because it changes the tax consequences of sales occurring several years ago, but also because it changes the character of payments already received by the Hilton Hotel Corp. after December 31, 1960.

For the above reasons, the Department opposes the enactment of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1961.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the request by the committee on September 7, 1961, for the views of the Department of Justice concerning H.R. 8846.

Essentially, H.R. 8846 provides that whenever property is sold or exchanged solely as the result of an antitrust decree, such sale or exchange shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be treated as an involuntary conversion of property within the meaning of section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code.

H.R. 8846 is substantially the same as section 2 of H.R. 7348 which was the subject of letters from the Department to your Committee dated July 19, 1961, and August 1, 1961. H.R. 8846, however, differs from H.R. 7348 in that it applies to all property sold or exchanged as the result of an antitrust order whereas H.R. 7348 applies to property other than stock or securities. Also, the effective dates of the two bills differ. While both bills would be retroactive in application, H.R. 8846 would apply with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960, irrespective of the time of the sale or exchange whereas H.R. 7348 would apply only with respect to sales or exchanges in taxable years ending after December 31, 1955.

The Department of Justice has carefully considered H.R. 8846 and similar proposed legislation in the light of the Hilton Hotel company divestiture. The Hilton Hotel company, under the terms of a consent decree was required to dispose of certain hotel properties which this Department concluded Hilton had acquired in violation of the Clayton Act. The sales were for a profit, the proceeds to be received on an installment basis. Applying H.R. 8846, the proceeds received by Hilton after December 31, 1960, would be treated as on an involuntary conversion of property within the meaning of section 1033 and, if these proceeds are reinvested within the provision of H.R. 8846, they will not be subject to capital gains tax. Thus, H.R. 8846, unlike many of the other bills before the committee, would apply to the corporation and not to the stockholders.

As we have indicated previously, we cannot say that general legislation along the lines of H.R. 8846 would serve any useful antitrust purpose. It may even tend to reward antitrust violators in certain cases. Accordingly, the Department does not recommend enactment of H.R. 8846.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

BYRON R. WHITE,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the controversy over tax reduction, tax matters of all kinds, it seems more than passing strange that there is no report from the Justice Department or the Treasury contained in the report accompanying this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to try to clear up the gentleman's understanding, because it is not passing strange. I said just a moment ago that the committee called up all of the bills that the committee had reported out and that the House had passed which did not become law last year, and, none of the reports from the various Government agencies were included in any of those bills as we called them up. The committee does not generally ever put departmental reports in its committee reports; there was nothing strange about it because, as I have said to the gentleman from Wisconsin, as far as I am concerned, I am very happy to have these reports included right now. We always have them on the floor with us if they have been submitted.

Mr. GROSS. That scarcely helps us today when we are being called upon to vote on this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. I told the gentleman that the Departments were opposed to the bill and if the gentleman wants to oppose it that is his business. But I want to make it clear that this is not tax reduction.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2826?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 35, noes 27.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HISTORIC SITES ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1935, the Historic Sites Act became law.

Its purpose was to designate and register historic landmarks possessing exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States. The responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the act rests with the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Last week it was my privilege and pleasure to participate in appropriate ceremonies when the former Carlisle Indian School, now the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., received this recognition. This site represents something unique in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the proceedings may be recorded for posterity, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks made in connection with this event made a part of the RECORD at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM F. TRAIN AT PRESENTATION CEREMONY, NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK PLAQUE AND CERTIFICATE, CARLISLE INDIAN SCHOOL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

Congressman Goodling, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: as commanding general of Carlisle Barracks it affords me the greatest pleasure to welcome you to this historic Army post for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially designating the Carlisle Indian School as a Registered National Historical Landmark.

Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act passed by the Congress of the United States in 1935, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to make a survey of the historic sites of the United States "for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States."

A program for the registry of such landmarks was initiated by the National Park Service some years ago, and on July 3, 1961, the commanding general of Carlisle Barracks was notified that the Carlisle Indian School had been designated as such a site.

We are here today for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially marking this designation.

As you are all aware, this post is one of the oldest active Army installations in the Nation, with a history going back to the year 1757 when Colonel Stanwix, and a reinforced battalion of the Royal American Regiment, first established a camp just northeast of the town of Carlisle at the site of what is now Carlisle Barracks.

In the years since this first occupancy, Carlisle Barracks has served the Nation well, in both peace and war, beginning with the French and Indian Wars, the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, World War II, and now in the so-called cold war.

The post is particularly notable as having been the home at one time or another of almost every branch school in the Army.

This educational role was climaxed by the location here in 1951 of the reestablished Army War College.

But Carlisle Barracks is equally proud of another educational chapter in its history of service to the Nation—namely, the 39-year period from 1879 until 1918 when it served as the home of the Indian Industrial School, commonly referred to as the Carlisle Indian School.

The inspiration for the establishment of the school came from Lt. Richard H. Pratt, who believed the only solution to the Indian problem was to sever his tribal connection by teaching him to speak, act, and think like a civilized man.

As superintendent of the Indian School at Carlisle Barracks for 25 years, from its founding in 1879 until 1904, Lieutenant Pratt, later General Pratt, raised the school to a level of eminence for which it acquired a just measure of fame.

The registering of the Carlisle Indian School as a national historic landmark gives due recognition to the important role of the school and this site in the cultural history of the United States.

One of the objectives of the Army's historical program is to insure that, where eligible, all historic landmarks at active Army installations are designated as such.

It is with the greatest pleasure, therefore, that we serve as host to what is in truth a community gathering.

For we have with us on the platform and in the audience, many individuals and representatives of many organizations who have demonstrated through the years, by both word and deed, their own profound interest in the history of this area generally, including the notable chapter provided by the Indian School.

We are particularly pleased that you could be with us.

One of those who has shown a special interest in the event we commemorate today is the distinguished Congressman from the 19th District of Pennsylvania.

He contributed greatly toward the attainment of the designation of the Carlisle Indian School as a registered national historic landmark, and we are honored that he has been able to take time from his very busy schedule to be here today.

I am very happy to be able to introduce the Honorable George A. Goodling.

Remarks of Congressman Goodling at Dedication of Carlisle Barracks as National Historic Landmark, Thursday, March 14, 1963

General Train has made an excellent statement concerning this historic site and has pointed out the long and glorious history the Army has had here. This site stands for something unique in the history of the world. When our country was first settled there were differences between the Indians and ourselves. It was the Army that went out to fight. The Army and the Indian fought each other during the formative years of our country's history, and yet today we remember this site as a symbol of the Army reaching out to help these people whom it once fought. Among those interested in helping the Indian was General Pratt, founder of Carlisle Indian School. General Pratt was a very interesting person with a distinguished military career. At the outbreak of the Civil War he enlisted in the 9th Indiana Infantry and served until 1865. Receiving a commission in the Regular Army during 1867, he served against the Cheyenne, Comanche, and Kiowa Indians. During his 8 years of fighting the Indians, General Pratt was a commander of Indian scouts. This provided him with an excellent insight into their mind and character. During his service career General Pratt was placed in charge of some Indian prisoners of war being held at St. Augustine, Fla. These prisoners were some of the most savage of all Indian warriors, yet within months they were attending school and making and selling curios under General Pratt's instructions. Here was a man who recently had been fighting these selfsame people, yet now his faith in them is almost incredible.

A very interesting story is told about the general and his Indian prisoners. While he was in charge of the prisoners, he requested permission for them to guard themselves. The reaction of his superiors was not favorable. However, he managed to convince everyone that these Indian prisoners should indeed be allowed to guard themselves and they were issued weapons. This took place only 4 months after these warriors had arrived at St. Augustine. So General Pratt armed them and they provided their own 24-hour-a-day guard.

After his experiences with the Indian prisoners, their ability to work, and in fact their happiness at being given work and opportunities to learn, the school idea was conceived by General Pratt. He felt that the future of the American Indian lay in the education of his young. Consequently, a long drawn-out campaign was begun with the War Department and anyone else who would listen, requesting space, materials, staff, and other things necessary to or organize a school for Indian children.

In 1879, General Hancock, in command of the Department of the East, approved a request by General Pratt to use Carlisle Barracks as an Indian school. Subsequently, the Congress passed an act approved July 31, 1882, authorizing the use of vacant posts and barracks for Indian schools, "so long as they may not be required for military occupation." Under this law, of course, the military could request return of any installation needed at some future date. This then was the genesis of the Carlisle Indian School. What was once a cluster of buildings used as an ordnance base by the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War and later as a cavalry barracks, is now to become a school to educate those we fought.

To say this was a startling innovation, would be stating it mildly. The destruction of Custer's command had not been forgotten. Chief Joseph's retreat was even more recent, yet they came to learn.

The first to arrive were Sioux, coming with long hair, painted faces, their bodies wrapped in decorated blankets. One can imagine the sensation caused by the influx of strange people into a quiet and peaceful community.

The school was organized with two large farms and shops where courses in engineering, blacksmithing, painting, masonry, carpentry, printing, domestic sciences, nursing, and home econmics were taught. A very unusual program referred to as "outings," was used quite effectively. This program placed Indian students in non-Indian homes where they worked for their keep and lived as a member of the family, sometimes simply attending the local public school along with the other children of the family. This was excellent for the Indian, giving him an opportunity to really learn all about the white man's culture by living with him. In addition, it helped cement the relationship between Indian and non-Indian by letting the white man have the opportunity to live with and understand the Indian. This could well have been the inspiration for current student exchange programs.

It was quite natural for the Indians, being out-of-doors people, to participate and excel in sports. For many years Carlisle had one of the greatest football teams in the country and furnished several competitors to the Olympic games. The Carlisle students were not only excellent at sports but they had an enviable record for clean sportsmanship and gentlemanly conduct. Jim Thorpe of this school was the prime example of this. Considered by many as one of the world's greatest all-round athletes, Charles "Big Chief" Bender was another outstanding graduate. He was the leading pitcher of the American League in 1910–11 and later in 1914. After his playing career he became the coach at the U.S. Naval Academy.

One cannot do justice to all, but Alex Arcasa was among the best. When he was not running with the ball he was throwing terrific blocks for Jim Thorpe. I would be most inconsiderate if I did not pay tribute to one of the greatest coaches who ever lived. To Glenn "Pop" Warner goes the credit of molding what was probably the rawest group of rookies ever assembled on one field into some of the greatest teams of all time.

In 1918 the Army needed this location for a hospital and the school was closed. Actually it did not do a disservice to the Indian, since many of the students had joined the services, enrollment was low, and it had served its purpose. This school had been and still is the guiding light in Indian education.

Now the U.S. Park Service has declared the Carlisle Indian School a national historical landmark. It is a landmark that will forever point out the joining of our two cultures in settling this great country. A landmark that will remind us that here was a pioneer of a school system unique in our country and the world. This is a truly historic location, not only in its traditions and memories but because it was the laboratory that provided our Indians with the possibility of demonstrating their capabilities. It is also a landmark which reminds us that a man who dedicated his life to our Armed Forces, fought in many battles, yet still maintained his humanitarian attitudes and led our enemy to peace.

General Train, I congratulate you, your staff, and all who serve here for the recognition this installation receives today. One year ago similar recognition came to parts of another outstanding institution in this area, Dickinson College.

What we do here today is further evidence of the bond between two races, as represented by the Carlisle Indian School.

Remarks by Frank E. Mastland, Jr., Member, Advisory Board, National Parks, Historical Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at Presentation Ceremony, National Historic Landmark Plaque and Certification, Carlisle Barracks, March 14, 1963

I count it a signal honor to participate in this ceremony. As a citizen proud of historic Carlisle and as a longtime member and Chairman of the National Park Service Advisory Board, I find it doubly pleasing to take part in the designation of the old Carlisle Indian School as a registered national historic landmark. There are other reasons for my gratification that this honor is mine. They are significant only to me but on me they left a lasting imprint. I refer to those Indian massacres in which I participated as a youth. Each week we members of the Dickinson football team scrimmaged with the Indians. Those were friendly occasions. Once each year we played them for keeps. Those occasions were not exactly friendly. Memory, however, is a wonderful thing. I have forgotten all the gory details of those massacres and recall only the friendships that developed during the other 51 weeks in the year. Since then my semiannual extended visits with the Navajos on their reservation have resulted in the development of many friendships and of increasing respect for those whom I first learned to admire here on the field of battle.

But it was different in the days following the Civil War. Then, like an unwelcome weed in a thriving garden, the Indian was regarded as a bothersome individual in a growing America. Indeed, to many he was a pesky red man, the only good Indian a dead Indian. There were a few compassionate people, however, who, recognizing wrongs committed and experiencing remorse, felt an obligation to aid the Indian, to help him adjust to the new world so suddenly forced upon him.

Brig. Gen. Richard H. Pratt ranks as an understanding and benign friend of the Indians. He had fought against the redskin warriors in the West but around 1875 he became involved in an effort to educate an Indian prisoner. This undertaking led him into his life's work. With a vision that went beyond just teaching Army captives, Pratt conceived of a school for Indians, one that would not be on a reservation. He requested and gained permission to use the barracks at Carlisle and there established the first nonreservation Federal Indian school.

With Pratt leading them, the initial Indian students arrived at the Carlisle Barracks on October 6, 1879. What a strange sight it must have been when 82 Sioux entered this onetime frontier town, especially since the Indians wore their tribal regalia. Three years later Congress formally authorized the school, which tradition-breaking institution continued to train Indians until 1918. General Pratt remained the head of the school for 25 years, shepherding some 5,000 Indian boys and girls through it by the time of his retirement in 1904.

The students left the Carlisle Indian School much better equipped to exist in an alien culture. That was Pratt's aim. Many Indians first had to learn English, but when they had they could then be given academic and vocational training. Ultimately, the student's education could include the first 2 years of high school and some teacher training; a goodly number went on to college.

Pratt's school and its methods did not escape criticism. Individuals, both within the Federal Government and without, decried his work, but there is no doubt that the school remained a noble chapter in American relations with the Indians.

As we all know, the students excelled in athletics. The school's team forged amazing triumphs, humbling many larger, richer and better known institutions. To this day Jim Thorpe's feats excite universal admiration. Prodigious athletic achievements have preserved a memory on the part of many who have never realized the deeper meaning of the Carlisle Indian school.

Several buildings at the Carlisle barracks are tangible reminders of the school. The commandant of the Army War College lives in the house occupied by Pratt. It dates from 1821. The structure was the only building on the post to escape destruction when the Confederates set every other building to the torch during the Gettysburg campaign of 1863. Thorpe Hall, erected with money raised by pupils of the school and private contributions, remains a gymnasium. The Coren apartment, built in 1863, served as a girls dormitory. Armstrong Hall, quarters No. 2, and Washington Hall are also inheritances from the Indian school.

These buildings testify to the exceptional nature and historical importance of the Carlisle Indian School. Like the mute stones of a fallen Greek temple, they help us to recall a meaningful moment in history.

Since 1957 the National Park Service has been conducting the national survey of historic sites and buildings, seeking to identify the exceptionally valuable survivals of our past that merit the Nation's recognition. Historians, archeologists and architects are combining their efforts to study America's prehistory and history, carefully investigating literally thousands of sites and buildings in order to determine which of them deserve national recognition. As the survey progresses, its findings will be published. The service expects that published volumes will be useful and interesting to the ever-increasing ranks of those citizens whose appreciation directly or indirectly helps to preserve our historical heritage.

The establishment of a registry of national historic landmarks is another prime objective of the national survey of historic sites and buildings. With the aid of a consulting committee of specialists, and wth the guidance of its National Advisory Board, the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior carefully select historic sites of exceptional value for this registry. By means of the registry, the Federal Government formally recognizes the outstanding significance of certain historic sites and buildings by the issuance of an official certificate and, if desired, a bronze plaque. Such notable historic sites as the Maryland Statehouse in Annapolis, where Gen. George Washington surrendered his commission after the American Revolution; Nassau Hall, at Princeton University, in which building the Second Continental Congress met, Faneuil Hall; in Boston, where patriots stimulated revolt against British tyranny have either been or soon will be issued certificates as registered national historic landmarks. The plaque and certificate, we hope, will help to create a tie between the owners of registered national historic landmarks and the National Park Service. "All our past acclaims our future" and it is hoped that all our efforts to honor the past will complement each other as we move into the future.

Those sites and buildings already on the register of national historic landmarks are joined by a worthy companion today. No one can deny the significance of the Carlisle Indian School and of the part it played in the development of a national awareness of universal brotherhood. It was an early indication of a budding sense of responsibility for the welfare of our fellow man. It was a great step forward in the field of racial relations. It was a practical effort to rectify a wrong.

General Train, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and the Director of the National Park Service, Conrad L. Wirth, I am happy to present to you the bronze plaque that commemorates the occasion and this certificate which reads: "The Carlisle Indian School of Pennsylvania is hereby designated a registered national historic landmark under the provision of the Historic Sites Act, August 21, 1935. This site possesses exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States of America."

GENERAL TRAIN'S CLOSING REMARKS

It is with a deep sense of personal satisfaction and pride that I accept this plaque and certificate on behalf of Carlisle Barracks and the U.S. Army.

While no final determination has been made as to the most suitable location for mounting this plaque and displaying the certificate, we receive this marker and official registration in trust to commemorate the location of the Carlisle Indian School at this installation.

It is our hope that in time it will be possible to provide here at Carlisle Barracks an appropriate facility for a museum to preserve and display mementos and memorabilia of the Indian Industrial School.

This plaque and this certificate support this objective.

This concludes our presentation ceremony, and I want to thank all of you for being here today.

We are honored by your presence and hope that this occasion will long live in your memory.

I will ask Chaplain Malanowski to give the benediction.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA—THEIR JOINT TASKS IN A CHANGING ERA

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, March 16, I was privileged to address a convention of the Liberal Party International at Baden-Baden, Germany. Attending the conference were representatives of the Liberal Parties of Great Britain and Canada, the Venstre Party of Denmark, the Free Democratic Party of the Federal Republic of Germany, and of other liberal parties from some 10 European countries. A partial text of my remarks, "Europe and North America—Their Joint Tasks in a Changing Era," follows:

Although American liberals and European liberals share a name, the name sometimes means somewhat different things. In full awareness of the difference, I am nonetheless delighted to be with you on this occasion and to share in the continuing search for political wisdom represented by this Congress. For the truth is that while our two kinds of liberalism have diverged dramatically in the past on domestic issues, American liberals and European liberals think alike internationally.

One example will suffice. In the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, the principal legislative achievement of the New Frontier was the trade bill authorizing the United States to negotiate tariffs downward, and, in unfortunately rather special circumstances, to negotiate some of them all the way down to zero. Liberal American thought was therefore concentrated on free trade—the same free trade that is one of the pillars of Adam Smith's classical liberal economics. This new American enthusiasm for free trade reminds me of Mark Twain and his father. At 16, you will recall, Mark Twain was certain his father had no idea what made the world go round. At 21, he reported, he was amazed at how much the old man had learned in 5 years. Well, we Americans are amazed at how much you Europeans have learned in the last 5 years.

Right now, on the edge of spring 1963, is an urgent time for liberals to talk together. For during this last winter it has become clear that cooperation between the United States and Europe to provide for each other's security and economic advancement, as parts of the free world community, can no longer be taken for granted.

The Common Market shows a tendency to make the Six not a pattern for the future for all free nations, but rather a protected area from which the partners turn self-satisfied and indifferent faces to the world. More dramatically, President de Gaulle has for the time being vetoed the entry of the United Kingdom into the Common Market.

Worst of all, at just this moment, the forces leading the free world toward greater unity seem to have lost their momentum. Disillusion has led many to consider again the wisdom of cultivating their own gardens.

Bearing in mind that I am in no sense a spokesman of the Government of the United States, I shall talk about three aspects of this crisis:

1. What the goals of free world liberals ought to be;
2. The nature of current threats to those goals; and
3. How such threats can be met.

Our goal is and must be nothing less than a free world community of both the industrialized and the developing nations, dedicated to economic and social progress, to human welfare and happiness. In that community, the industrialized countries—Western Europe, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, Japan and perhaps others—will join their efforts to bring about full employment and rapid growth in each of them, to remove trade barriers between themselves and with the developing countries, and to create a mechanism of international exchange and payments which will avoid crises and permit each country to pursue policies leading to full employment. As partners in progress, the developing countries will find in the industrialized countries growing export markets and an energizing source of public and private capital.

The readiness of my country to devote itself to this goal was stated very clearly last July 4 by President Kennedy. Speaking in Philadelphia, the city where the American Declaration of Independence was signed almost two centuries ago, he announced that the United States is now ready to subscribe to a new "declaration of interdependence."

The President described the massive power for good that can flow from a partnership between Europe and America in the building of the free world community. He said:

"We can assist the developing nations to throw off the yoke of poverty. We can balance our worldwide trade and payments at the highest possible level of growth. We can mount a deterrent powerful enough to prevent all aggression. And ultimately we can help achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion.

"For the partnership * * * would not look inward only, preoccupied with its own welfare and advancement. It would look outward to cooperation with all nations in meeting their common concerns. It would serve as a nucleus for the eventual union of all free men—those who are now free and those who vow some day to be free."

Europe and America, by themselves, do not make a world. A free world community is the only policy compatible with the two great revolutions of this century. I speak of the revolution in human communications, and of the revolution of rising expectations of the developing nations.

We have made enormous advances in the transmission of information and in the transportation of people and goods. We have so tied the world together that it is no longer necessary or reasonable to divide it according to groupings largely based on geography. The telestar satellite, which has already permitted direct television transmissions between our continents, and the space vehicles orbiting the earth, are harbingers of even more spectacular advances. We can fly from Frankfurt to New York to New Delhi by jet in not much longer than the time needed to drive a few hundred miles. So we must expand our view and our world relationships. Europe, in short, is no longer a unit of the world isolated by geography.

Then there is the second revolution. It used to be that the way to talk to Asia or Africa or the Middle East was through London or Paris or Brussels. Now one deals directly.

Another aspect of this revolution is the determination of the developing peoples to make progress. They just don't believe that poverty is inevitable. And so the poor of the free world cause trouble for the rich, and demand attention.

For all these reasons, the scope of the community with which we must concern ourselves is as broad as the free world. It cannot be confined to just Europe, or just the United States, or just the Atlantic Powers. What about Australia, or even just the West (what about Japan)?

America, in its pursuit of the goal of a free world community, has placed much emphasis on its relations with Europe. At first, this was fully justified.

After the war, the United States devoted its efforts to the rebuilding of Europe. We invented the Marshall plan to help Europe to its feet. At the same time, we encouraged the formation of European regional institutions: the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, the Coal-Steel Community, Euratom. All of these continental institutions achieved their logical development in the Common Market of France, Italy, Germany, and the Benelux countries.

Seen in the immediate postwar period, the evolution of the Common Market is wholly good. Against the historical background of three great wars across the Rhine, the Common Market helped to bind together France and Germany. The new arrangement opened mass markets to the participating countries and gave each of them the spur of competition.

In this same postwar period, the United States also took steps to insure that the enterprise developing in Europe was not a parochial one, but one aimed at a community of free peoples all over the world. In 1945, the conference at Bretton Woods saw the foundation laid for a universal monetary order. In 1948, again at American initiative, the nations of the free world established the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the GATT which provies the multilateral tariff-cutting procedures vital to free world unity. Then, in the early 1950's, the United States extended the benefits of the Marshall plan to the developing peoples of the free world through the point 4 program. In that same period, too, the United States and other industrialized countries for the first time adopted national policies of full employment.

Now we face serious threats to the realization of a free-world community. These threats stem, I believe from a continuation in one-sided concentration on the organization of Europe—by both Europeans and Americans—long after the time in which it was justified. The threats stem from a confusion of ends and means.

Against the hopeful background of postwar cooperation, for Americans and Europeans alike, General De Gaulle's veto of the British entry into the Common Market fell like a thunderbolt from a blue sky. If we had looked hard, however, we would have seen that the sky was not so blue. Clouds of particularism, and especially of European particularism, have been gathering for some years. The French veto is by no means an isolated sign of that particularism. The French leader has also expressed a fervent desire for an independent nuclear striking force, despite the additional risk to the peace of the world, despite the huge investment such a force entails.

The six of the Common Market has grown increasingly protectionist. As the Common Market steadily approaches its own goal of a completely free exchange within the market, its tariff walls against the outside world become increasingly formidable, increasingly less likely to be dismantled by the will of its members. The very success of the Common Market imperils one larger goal of free world community.

If these protectionist tendencies in the Common Market countries continue unchecked, we Americans know too well where they will lead. We know because we have been there. They lead to isolationism, and we have been there. In the twenties, following World War I, we Americans, behind a similar wall of protectionism, deluded ourselves that we had opted out of the community of mankind. We thought that we could raise our tariffs at just the time when the free world needed freer trade.

We soon found out that our resignation from the human race had not been accepted.

These protectionist tendencies lead also to recession and we have, all of us, been there.

If the Common Market continues on its present, protectionist course, and if the other nations of Europe and the New World do nothing, it is easy to predict we shall all be there again.

This need not happen. What is called for above all else is to sort out again in our own minds what are ends and what are means. As I have pointed out, it is clear that the Common Market was first conceived as a step along the road to a free world community. If, as I believe, much of our trouble today comes from general acceptance of the halfway house of the Common Market as our journey's end, it is a mistake readily corrected.

The Common Market is precisely such a halfway house. Since the free world itself is endangered by the exclusiveness of the Common Market, clearly the Common Market must be deemphasized. It must be replaced as the center of our thought and attention by the original, wider goal of a free world community. In this, I emphasize, there is more than ample scope for a vital, expanding, outward-looking Europe.

The task for America and Europe, and particularly for liberals on both continents, is to direct our policies and efforts once again toward our real goal. What then are the specific actions that are needed?

In trade, the United States must take the lead in bargaining down tariffs on a multilateral most-favored-nation basis, for the benefit of the whole free world. As a starter, I hope that my country will rather promptly amend the dominant-supplier clause of President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act, thus permitting down-to-zero bargaining on a wide range of industrial products even though the United Kingdom is not in the Common Market. Under the existing law, the President of the United States is authorized to bargain tariffs down to zero on only two items, margarine and aircraft.

In the last session of Congress, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and I jointly introduced an amendment to allow zero bargaining on some 26 major categories of goods regardless of the fate of Britain's application. It did not appear in the legislation as passed into law. Senator DOUGLAS and I have reintroduced our amendment. The Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress only this week strongly urged its enactment.

Moreover, negotiations for freer trade should come sooner rather than later. I would be less than frank if I did not acknowledge that some Americans became so bemused with the idea of Britain's entry into the Common Market that they have not yet really recovered from the shock of the Gaullist rejection. They propose, vaguely, that all negotiations be put off until 1964, when presumably the position of Britain will have been clarified. Again I can promise you my personal participation in the fight for immediate tariff-eliminating negotiations. And I feel confident that more Members of the American Congress will share my views now that the rejection of Britain has left the widely hailed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 largely a collection of conditional clauses.

Under the GATT, an America bargaining with the Common Market countries under the most-favored-nation procedure will help all the rest of the free world, especially the developing nations which need outlets for their manufactured products. The other five countries of the Common Market must make an all-out effort to bring France into agreement with this course.

Next, in the field of full employment, both the United Kingdom and the United States have lagged far behind the standard the West has wisely set for itself. One reason for this lag is clear enough, at least in America. The fear is that expansion at home will damage our currency abroad. But the answer to that fear is available, too, in recent history. What is needed is an international agreement akin to the European payments union of the last decade. Through such an instrument, our currencies would be protected abroad; and the corresponding relaxation at home would permit the effective pursuit of full employment policies.

The whole field of aid to the developing countries needs joint review and new efforts by the industrialized countries. To date there has been much too little coordination and continuity. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has made a beginning in the necessary coordination of all our foreign-aid efforts. This good beginning needs to be followed up thoroughly.

Clearly, at this moment, in trade and aid, in international payments and in our mutual defense, there is much that needs discussion and change. I suggest that what we need is a free world summit meeting to commence action in all these areas. Ministers concerned with technical problems are not likely to think very big. What is needed is people like Macmillan and Adenauer and Kennedy and Fanfani and the others—including De Gaulle, if he wants to come.

Only in steadfast devotion to the overall goal of a free-world community can we nations of the free world avoid shaking ourselves apart over momentary but severe problems such as who can join the Common Market, and when; such as who shall have nuclear weapons, and under what conditions. As the focus shifts to the free-world community, the U.S. nuclear deterrent will perhaps again be viewed as the free world's deterrent, as it has been and is in fact. It is the spirit of a new self-assertive nationalism, a new inward-looking European parochialism that looks to new national and European nuclear forces, reckless of the dangers and the cost. It is the same mischievous spirit in economics that rejects the opportunities that the creation of a free-world community offers.

In this winter now ending, I need not remind you, we saw our unity suddenly in jeopardy on questions of nuclear weapons and membership in the Common Market. Other hard problems that will test us lie ahead. If we are not fortified with strong attachment to joint goals, we shall be unable to meet the challenge.

The advance toward the free world community that I urge as the proper concern of liberals need not be manifested initially in any new governmental structures of organizations or in any subordination of the sovereignties of the member countries. Existing political machinery—like the GATT for trade, the International Monetary Fund for payments, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development for growth and aid—can do the job for a long time to come.

Indeed, more elaborate political machinery might do more harm than good. Far better, let parliamentarians—not just ministers—from the industrial countries of the free world meet from time to time to debate trade or payments or growth or aid. This would give to these free-world leaders the opportunity to think and speak in a larger frame than that of their normal activities. Thinking of my own country, I can testify that the former State legislator who comes to Washington is privileged not least in the vision of the whole American reality he can have as a Member of Congress. The same experience can take place on the level of the whole free world.

But the pattern of development of these meetings of legislators should not be predetermined. Instead, supranational political institutions should be allowed to evolve from progress in economic and social cooperation.

Right now is the time for America and Europe to get back upon the road to a free world community. We need to stop crying the blues over the rejection of Britain by the Common Market.

To speak candidly, much of the Europe that is the Common Market is ruled by old men, endlessly reluctant to transfer their power to the next generation. When that transfer is made, conditions are bound to be confused. It would be well if the path of future world cooperation is clearly laid out while the present stability endures, for there is a predictable term set upon that stability by life itself.

There is another reason why we should act now to form a free world community, rather than dawdle for decades. The vision of a world community that has most insistently been offered the developing world in the past decade is not that of a free world community. It is, instead, the apocalyptic vision of one Communist world. Right now, we see before us signs of deep disagreement between the Russian and the Chinese Communist centers of power. We shall prove ourselves unworthy if we fail to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the cracking of the Russo-Chinese monolith. Now is the time for our side to erect the standard of a world community based on freedom and dedicated to joint action in aid and trade and payments and growth.

How can the people of the free industrialized nations be persuaded to support a renewed, revitalized program for the community of the free world? Such a program can win the support it needs because the industrial nations involved are democracies. The citizens of 20th century democracies are receptive to programs in which the interdependence of domestic policy and foreign policy is clear and apparent. This political principle has been demonstrated in the United States in the almost universal support given the Peace Corps, with its unexpected but logical coupling of foreign aid with a remedy for the problem of youthful apathy at home; and in the same broad support given the Trade Expansion Act, with its linking of trade abroad and the problem of lagging growth at home.

Similarly, the concept of a free world community would have its charms for the voters of the industrialized democracies. They would, I believe, be able to see the connection between a joint effort for aid and trade and payments and growth abroad, and activity at home which could bring the pleasures of prosperity and the blessings of peace.

A final word on the task of persuasion: I can think of no task more noble to engage, for the years ahead, the energies of persons and parties everywhere who call themselves liberal—that ancient name which means above all "free"—than the task of directing men's vision toward the world community of the free.

THIRD REPORT TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE BY ITS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESING

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

• Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing continues to monitor developments in its jurisdiction. Based on recent testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Nuclear Testing Committee has issued its third report as follows:

Third Report to the Republican Conference by Its Committee on Nuclear Testing

Your committee has carefully examined testimony on technical and other aspects of the nuclear test ban problem heard by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the period March 5–11, 1963. Witnesses include Defense Department scientists and representatives of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Based on their testimony, we submit to you our third report.

I

The administration is drafting and proposes to offer the Soviet Union a revised test ban treaty proposal in the very near future. A portion of the terms of the new draft were revealed, including the following features of special interest:

1. Detection of underground events: Primary reliance will be on a network of seismic stations operated outside the U.S.S.R., principally by the United States and Britain. Hopefully the system will be backed up by: (a) data furnished by the Soviets from their own seismic stations; and, (b) information gathered by three to seven unmanned, "black box" seismic stations inside the Iron Curtain.
2. Identification of underground events: The seismic network will be expected to identify from ordinary earthquakes such suspicious earth tremors as would become candidates for onsite inspection. Some 400 such earthquakes occur annually in the U.S.S.R. These are shocks producing early signals "equivalent to a 3 kiloton or larger underground explosion in alluvium formations." Some number of underground manifestations of lesser magnitude may be detected, but capability to identify them as possible cheat test rather than earthquakes will be essentially zero.
3. Location of suspicious underground events: The network also will be depended upon to supply seismic data of sufficient discrimination to locate any suspicious events requiring onsite inspection within an area smaller than 200 square miles.
4. Onsite inspections: Not more than seven onsite inspections will be permitted per year of the Soviet Union's entire 8½ million square miles. These will be subject to the following conditions and limitations: (a) readings from at least four different stations must be produced which have detected the event, identified it as a possible, and firmly located it within a radius of less than 10 miles; (b) areas subject to onsite inspection shall be elliptical in form and total not more than approximately 193 square miles in size; (c) locations specified by the U.S.S.R. as military areas shall be totally excluded from the onsite inspection privilege; and (d) inspections parties shall be limited in size to approximately 14 people, of whom not more than 10 may be American or British, the remainder being neutrals.

II

The administration's witnesses argued that the above-described verification system will, in fact, deter the Soviets from cheat testing to develop nuclear weapons which could affect the military balance between communism and the West.

Whenever questions by Joint Committee members cast practical doubts on the system's alleged capability to deter, the witnesses consistently took refuge in secrecy. They hinted the United States has, or will have, classified seismic stations which cannot be discussed publicly and inferred these would back up the unclassified ones, and together they would safely deter cheating.

On the final day of the hearings, the classified station roadblock was bypassed by a line of technical questioning disclosing the inherent physical limitations on any seismic stations, classified or unclassified, to spot cheating when a cheater goes about it intelligently.

These limitations on detection, identification, and location capabilities of all seismic stations are imposed by the background noise present everywhere in the earth. Its effect on seismographs is like static on radios—signals must be considerably stronger than the background noise, otherwise they are drowned out.

Under questioning, the scientists admitted detection and location of underground events require signals at least twice the size of this seismic background noise. Before one can begin to identify, or distinguish underground explosions from earthquakes, the scientists admitted signals 10 to 20 times the background noise must be recorded.

With these admissions on public record, the scientists next were questioned about the actual size of seismic signals created by underground cheat shots of 3-kiloton yield equivalents and smaller. At the distances from the Soviet Union which we can install seismic stations, these turn out to be so small they are not subject to verification at all.

This testimony makes it unnecessary for this report to discuss the doubts and weaknesses of the administration's verification scheme against sneak tests large enough to be spotted—because it reveals an area of undetectable cheating—a big hole in the new treaty draft—through which the Russians clandestinely can prepare a nuclear Pearl Harbor without any fear whatever of being caught.

III

The big hole

The big hole is simply underground tests far enough inside Soviet borders to produce seismic signals outside those borders smaller in size that the 3-kiloton seismic signal threshold of nondetectability.

This can be done either by limiting actual explosions to less than 3 kilotons, or, if larger ones are desired, firing them in an underground cavity. This "decouples" blast from surrounding earth, thereby shrinking the size of the earth signal to a level below the threshold.

Tests under these conditions—just 620 miles (1,000 km.)—inside the Soviet border cannot be detected outside the Iron Curtain. By the time signals reach the Iron Curtain, they are small enough to be drowned out by the earth's normal seismic background noise. If by chance detection should occur, the impossible job of identifying suspicious events among thousands of small earthquake signals of comparable size still will hide the cheater inside the big hole.

IV

Now, what kind of clandestine weapon development can be carried on in the big hole with no risk of getting caught?

The AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, told the Joint Committee exactly what secret nuclear weapons can be developed surreptitiously in the undetectable big hole. These are: (1) All tactical nuclear weapons of interest to the military; and (2) a "substantial fraction" of strategic nuclear weapons of interest to the military.

Left out of the big hole is only the meager "unsubstantial fraction" of strategic weapons which cannot be scaled up from low-yield underground cheating. These are the superyield H-bombs the Soviets already have developed anyway.

Inside the big hole is the entire remaining broad spectrum of nuclear weapons—including even the pure fusion neutron bomb.

As an indication of the spectrum of developments "of interest to the military," Betts said "approximately one-half" of all U.S. underground tests in Nevada—even without any need to mask detection—are made precisely in this low-yield range of undetectability.

V

If President Kennedy carries out his intention to offer the Russians the new treaty draft with its big hole it will be tantamount to offering to stop all significant U.S. nuclear weapons developments and, as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their promise to do likewise.

Up to the present moment our Nation has distrusted Communist promises sufficiently to spend over 50 million defense dollars a year to forestall communism's aggressive design for world domination.

Yet the President of the United States now is on the verge of trusting a Communist promise not to develop secretly a superior nuclear weapon's arsenal for use, on some future day, to back up a brutal "surrender or die" ultimatum to complete that grand design.

The President's fuzzy-thinking disarmament advisers tell him this "sign now—pay later in blood" treaty draft is "less risky" than no treaty at all. This they tell him notwithstanding the prospect that the delayed payment well may be fulfillment of Khrushchev's promise "to bury" us.

VI

The danger point of no return in the Geneva negotiations is swiftly approaching.

If an enforceable test-ban treaty would—and this is quite possible—help evolve a less risky world than the one in which we now exist, why must Mr. Kennedy throw away the chance to achieve an enforceable treaty by offering any unenforceable treaty—one with a big hole in it?

We respectfully urge the President to shake off his fuzzy-thinking advisors—to regain the initiative at Geneva—to preserve the opportunity to conclude an enforceable test-ban treaty.

Specifically respecting the upcoming new treaty draft your committee strongly recommends provision be added for the following: Fully manned seismic detection stations inside the Soviet Union in sufficient numbers and at all locations required to close the big hole.

When this is done then, and then only, will it become less than academic to review the adequacy or inadequacy of the proposed treaty draft's other provisions supposed to deter cheating by the Communists.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Chairman.
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
Ex officio:
CHARLES A. HALLECK.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
GERALD R. FORD.

A UNITED NATIONS FISH STORY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks I have been fishing into the murky mysteries of the United Nations Special Fund. May I say that I have found an ocean of confusion despite a firm hand at the helm.

The confusion has developed faster and faster as my angling into the operation of the Special Fund has continued, and the particular confusion about which I advise the House today is over and above the amazing contributions to Communist nations by this Fund about which I have talked here at length—this Fund the American taxpayers subsidize 40 percent.

Throughout my investigation of the Special Fund I have been spontaneously assured by various United Nations officials that—contrary to popular opinion—the United States of America has, indeed, received aid from the United Nations. In each case the officials cited aid that is said to have involved a Chinese expert who counseled American rice farmers on how to grow fish in their paddies.

But details about this piscatorial paddy project—when, where, how much—have been few and far between. Neither the U.N. nor the American executive branch has adequately explained it.

My colleagues, I find that the submerged truth of the matter is that the United States in fact paid the Chinese expert for his services.

Is that not a wonderful way to get aid? Just pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Interior asking him to provide the Congress immediately with the amount of the salary American taxpayers paid this Chinese expert. The project apparently was carried out at the request of and under the direction of that Department's Fish and Wildlife Service.

Whether the Chinese expert's advice was worth it we cannot yet say, since we do not know where his project is and since we do not know what we paid for this U.N. aid. As a sample of the advice he rendered, I can offer the following:

> In their wild state they (the fish in the rice paddies) only spawn when they are happy. Our problem is how to make them happy in captivity. We might have to feed them special vitamins, make sure they get their calories and even give them hormone injections to make them more peppy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point at issue here is not the merit of this fish-and-rice project, be the fish happy or sad; nor is the point the merit of the United Nations as an organization.

The point is that news management knows no national boundary. News management flourishes also in international pastures, and apparently in the best of fishing circles.

The point is that U.N. officials have knowingly told fuzzy half-truths in an attempt to reassure the American taxpayers who, although burdened with a deficit budget of their own, pay heavily to the United Nations to keep it financially solvent.

My colleagues, it is for the American taxpayers to decide how heavily they wish to subsidize the United Nations' myriad programs. My purpose here—and I can guarantee this House that it will be a continuing purpose—is to see to it that the American taxpayers have the straight truth upon which to base their decision.

Until the U.N. develops more built-in checks and audits upon itself, it is up to the American Congress to audit U.N. actions and U.N. facts for the American people. Perhaps we should turn the General Accounting Office loose for a complete audit of the United Nations' aid projects. The U.N. has hundreds of projects going on all over the world. I certainly hope they have better information about the others than they do about the aid project for the United States.

Let me briefly illustrate the confusion I found surrounding just this one U.N. aid project.

I have been told by the United Nations Information Center here in Washington that this rice-fish project was conducted in Kansas—a startling revelation since Kansas has no rice paddies.

Also, I have been told by way of the New York office of the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization that this project was not in Kansas but in Arkansas.

Then, I read for myself in "World Without Want," a book written recently by Mr. Paul Hoffman who is manager of the U.N. Special Fund, that this project is not in Kansas and not in Arkansas but in Louisiana.

Later the information center here advised me that the Kansas-Arkansas mixup was caused by the pronunciation of a Swedish secretary on a long-distance telephone call.

Still later, in response to a letter from me, Mr. Hoffman, a dedicated and talented American who is now an international civil servant, wrote to me that his book contained a "regrettable mistake." But he neglected to correct that mistake and to locate the project in any State.

And we still do not know where it is, or was, or how much we paid for the U.N. aid.

Since American taxpayers apparently contributed the expert's salary for this lost, strayed, or stolen project, I thought we at least ought to know what State of our Union benefited. So, last Friday, I issued through the press an appeal for help from the amateur sleuths and detectives of the great American midlands.

I asked for their help in solving "the case of the fish in the rice paddies," an international intrigue that now has defied solution by the massive bureaucracies of the United States and the United Nations. The best hope, if we are to confirm the veracity of the United Nations is a quick response to this challenge by the many and able American mystery fans.

I have appealed to them to apply their magnifying glasses in the vicinity of Topeka, Little Rock, Baton Rouge, Schenectady—who can tell where this piscatorial-paddy will turn up next?

I have asked these sleuths to look for fish even though the spring bass season is not yet open in their area; to look for a mysterious Chinese expert, perhaps wearing a light-blue U.N. helmet; to be alert for white jeeps loaded down with goldfish bowls.

I am anxiously awaiting word from the Secretary of the Interior, from the United Nations, or from any of the amateur fish-hunters. And, I will report promptly to the House just as soon as the slippery evidence of the U.N.'s unique aid to the United States has been hooked and landed.

CASTRO COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a subcommittee report.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has completed its report resulting from recent hearings into Castro Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I believe the hearings and this report will prove of great value in focusing the attention of the American people and other friends of the inter-American system on the Communist subversive threat to the Americas.

This report contains subcommittee findings and recommendations growing out of testimony given by members of the executive branch and by other authorities in Latin American affairs. The members of the subcommittee, Democrat and Republican alike, have conscientiously worked toward keeping the hearings on the high level of national interest. I believe this contribution is reflected in the responsible, objective nature of the report.

It is to be hoped that the subcommittee's efforts will serve to aid our Government and our friends and allies throughout the hemisphere in the continuing fight to eliminate the threat of communism to the inter-American system.

The report follows:

Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere

On February 18, 1963, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs began exploratory hearings intended to (1) probe the nature and extent of the Communist subversive threat to the hemisphere in the light of recent developments in Cuba and throughout Latin America; (2) inform the American people of the danger of this threat to our national and hemispheric security; and (3) explore possible legislative or other means to spur U.S. action toward curbing and ultimately eliminating Communist subversion in the Americas.

In the weeks following, the subcommittee heard testimony from officials of the executive branch, as well as other witnesses having knowledge of conditions prevailing in Latin America. Mindful of national security interests, the subcommittee heard pertinent testimony from some witnesses in closed session. Release of portions of such closed session testimony was made through the subcommittee by the witnesses themselves, only after their examination of transcripts for security purposes.

The subcommittee's special interest in Communist activity in the hemisphere is of long standing. History, geography, and traditional bonds of friendship are ample reason for the concern of the American people, and their elected representatives, in the plight of the Cuban people. These hearings, however, were specifically aimed at gathering information concerning Communist use of Cuba as an island base for subversive aggression in the Americas. The urgency of this threat to our hemispheric security was spelled out in detail in testimony before the subcommittee.

As a result, the subcommittee is more than ever convinced of the need to inform and alert the American people to the nature of Communist designs and operations in Latin America.

THE GROWTH OF COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

As noted at the outset of the subcommittee's hearings, these designs and operations antedate the coming to power of Fidel Castro in Cuba. Latin America has been a target for Communist conquest since the early 1920's, when the Third Communist International (Comintern) initiated a program to organize and coordinate Communist political and organizational activities in Central and South American nations. Comintern agents, operating under orders from Moscow, were active during this early period in recruiting and training Latin American party leaders. The Confederación Sindical, a Moscow-controlled labor organization, was another instrument of Communist efforts to create a Soviet Latin America. By 1929, the First Conference of the Latin American Communist Parties was held in Buenos Aires, drawing delegates from 14 of the 20 Latin American nations.

From this nucleus, the Communist movement in Latin America grew rapidly in the 1930's and 1940's. The global depression spurred Communist organizational efforts among workers. Communist-controlled labor unions and hemispherewide labor associations served as the center of expanding party operations throughout the area. Moscow's control over party activities throughout Latin America was complete and thorough, acting through centralized command posts in Uruguay, Mexico, and Cuba. Montevideo served as command headquarters for South America, Mexico City for Central America, and Havana for the Caribbean area.

By the end of World War II, the Latin American Communist movement was flourishing and its party organizations operated openly in virtually every country in the hemisphere. The Communists were represented in nine national congresses, had at least three members in the Chilean Cabinet, and were influential on lower levels of government in several other nations.

The first Communist government established in the Americas came to power through the election of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala in 1951. The Communists dominated the Arbenz government, establishing effective control over the country's labor and peasant organizations. However, the Guatemalan regular military establishment's resistance to Communist subversion resulted in the overthrow of the Arbenz regime by anti-Communist liberation forces in 1954.

In the late 1950's a number of Latin American nations which had broken diplomatic ties with Russia and Soviet bloc countries renewed them. Although Communist Party membership in Central and South America was relatively small, the party's influence could be discerned in the activities of many other political, labor, and student groups. Anti-U.S. propaganda remained the consistent theme of Communist and Communist-line groups throughout Latin America.

With the coming to power of Fidel Castro in Cuba, in 1959, the existence of an operational base in the heart of the Americas brought a grave new dimension to the Communist threat to the inter-American system.

From its inception the Castro regime has sought to export revolution to other countries of the hemisphere. Direct military efforts, in the form of small rebel force landings in Nicaragua, Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti, failed in 1959. Cuba rapidly became a base for subversion and guerrilla training, as well as propaganda campaigns aimed at the overthrow of existing Latin American governments.

By 1960, Soviet and outside Communist influence and control over the Castro revolutionary apparatus had become obvious, thus clearly violating the Monroe Doctrine and all inter-American agreements affecting the security of the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. In December 1961, when the Cuban dictator proclaimed his allegiance to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, his appeal to indigenous non-Communist elements in Latin America diminished, but the campaign to export revolution by subversive aggression was intensified.

This campaign continues to be carried out by three basic means: (1) the exploitation of nationalist and ultraleftist groups; (2) the dissemination of propaganda; and (3) intensive ideological indoctrination and the development of antigovernment forces through guerrilla training.

EXPLOITATION OF NATIONALIST AND ULTRALEFTIST GROUPS

Castro has stepped up his campaign to exploit indigenous nationalist and ultraleftist movements in behalf of his own subversive aims in Latin America. Infiltration of political, social, and economic movements remains a primary Communist tactic in carrying out subversive activities in the various nations of the hemisphere. The Arbenz regime's failure to successfully infiltrate and subvert the Guatemalan regular military establishment led to its downfall. Evidence submitted to the subcommittee indicates that Communist strategy now recognizes the need to undermine and infiltrate the military of target nations wherever possible.

DISSEMINATION OF PROPAGANDA

Propaganda is an important arm of the Communist subversive apparatus in Latin America. Tons of Communist literature, featuring antigovernment and "hate America" themes, are shipped to entry points throughout the region. Such material, along with funds for subversive operations, is often transmitted through Cuban Embassies in countries maintaining diplomatic relations with Havana. In countries where Cuba has no diplomatic relations, dissemination is effected by Castroite or Communist groups. Much of this material is aimed at students, from the university to grade school levels.

The principal direct and mass audience medium in Cuba to carry subversive propaganda to Latin America is shortwave radio. The Castro regime inaugurated an international broadcasting service, Radio Havana, on May 1, 1961, which has increased its broadcast time to a total of 266½ hours a week. The total Communist effort, including the Cuban, Soviet, European satellite, and Chinese shortwave broadcasts, is 415 hours per week. The Cuban broadcasts concentrate for the most part on the Latin American scene, making great claims about Cuba's progress and denouncing the United States. Time is regularly allotted on Radio Havana to groups of foreign nationals residing in Cuba such as the so-called Peruvian Anti-Imperialist Movement, the Honduran Liberation Movement, the Guatemalan Information Committee, and the Dominican Liberation Movement. All of these broadcasts incite their listeners to revolt against their present governments. In the aftermath of the missile crisis, the Cuban broadcasts have grown increasingly explicit in their attempts to incite violence.

INTENSIVE IDEOLOGICAL INDOCTRINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ANTIGOVERNMENT FORCES THROUGH GUERRILLA TRAINING

Testimony given the subcommittee by top intelligence officials of the United States established that from 1,000 to 1,500 Latin Americans traveled to Cuba last year for ideological and paramilitary training. The number of trainees is increasing in 1963. Some graduates of such Cuban training return to their homelands to foment disorder and chaos aimed at the ultimate overthrow of legitimate democratic governments. Others remain behind to receive more intensive training and to form the nucleus of military units which can be returned to their respective homelands at the appropriate time to lead a "liberation army." Operating under a facade of nationalism, these trainees represent a Communist revolutionary cadre for the establishment of other Castro-type regimes in the hemisphere.

In effect, this Cuban-based program for revolution constitutes more than subversive activities as that term is generally defined. The program is so extensive in concept and execution as to be branded subversive "aggression," a modern totalitarian form of warfare against the nations of the free world.

CURRENT U.S. POLICY

Current U.S. policy regarding efforts to meet this threat was enunciated by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin in testimony before the subcommittee. Said Mr. Martin: "Without being complacent, we in the United States can derive certain satisfaction that as a result of actions of the United States and other American governments, working individually and collectively, some headway is being made to reduce the influence and capabilities of Cuba and the bloc and in controlling local subversive activities of all kinds in each country. Current U.S. actions may be summarized as reducing the appeal and capabilities of the Cuban regime, spreading knowledge of what a Castro Communist regime does for a people's freedom and well-being, providing equipment and training to Latin American military and police forces to deal with riots and guerrilla actions, working through the OAS to stimulate individual and collective action on the problem, and through the Alliance for Progress helping our partners attack the basic discontent on which subversion feeds."

While the value of this policy must be judged by future events, the subcommittee makes the following findings and recommendations regarding the current status of Communist subversive aggression in the Western Hemisphere:

FINDINGS

I

Although the inter-American collective security system is prepared to meet the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against nations of the hemisphere, no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect.

Since the Korean conflict, subversive aggression rather than traditional military aggression has been the primary instrument of Communist expansionist strategy in the cold war. Subversive aggression against Latin American nations follows the pattern of Communist aggression in other parts of the world.

The traditional concept that "subversion remains primarily the task of each government to handle in accordance with its own laws and resources"[1] hampers collective action in meeting the primary Communist threat to hemispheric security. Moreover, "the security machinery of the inter-American system was originally conceived to deal primarily with forms of direct aggression,"[2] and the nations of the hemisphere have been slow to device new collective security arrangements to meet subtle forms of aggression.

Castro Communist subversive aggression in Latin America is an integral part of Communist global strategy. In January 1963, Fidel Castro acknowledged the international nature of this subversive offensive as follows: "The liberating movement is fighting in Angola, in Vietnam, in Latin America, and this fight needs all the united forces of the Socialist camp."[3]

II

Communist potential for aggression cannot be measured solely in terms of regular military forces or offensive capabilities. The fact that Casto Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of mounting successfully a traditional military offensive blow in the hemisphere does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security.

Strategic concepts and traditional diplomatic and military definitions of terms such as "aggression" and "offensive" are misleading standards by which to assess the threat of subversion. Emphasis on such words and definitions and on Castro Communist conventional military capabilities tend to blur policy and public understanding of the seriousness of subversive aggression.

Since 1959, Communists have stepped up "the tactics of infiltration, popular front action and insurgency * * * with a marked shift toward more violence"[4] in Latin America. The threat such tactics pose to hemispheric security cannot be measured only in terms of conventional military capabilities.

III

Since the primary thrust of the Communist offensive in Latin America is paramilitary, relying on force and violence, economic aid alone cannot cope with immediate threats of subversive aggression. In fact, the success of the Alliance for Progress or any other long-range economic aid program for the region is dependent on reducing and finally eliminating the threat of subversive aggression to the hemisphere.

As Assistant Secretary Martin testified, "The Alliance was not undertaken as a response to Castro,"[5] and it cannot be considered as an adequate response to the immediate threat of Castro Communist subversion.

So long as Castro Communists conduct subversive operations in the hemisphere, the Alliance for Progress will be "a constant object of their scorn and attacks."[5]

Success of the Alliance and hemispheric plans for the economic and social development of Latin America will be endangered by continuing Castro Communist efforts to increase the political tensions and dangers of the region. Hence, long-range economic and political plans must be complemented by immediate steps to meet the threat of subversive aggression.

IV

In the absence of a clear and unified hemispheric policy dealing with the threat of Castro Communist subversion, some member nations of the Organization of American States have not devised effective internal methods of controlling subversive traffic in and through their territories. Whether due to failure to recognize the danger posed by Castro communism, or for other reasons, this situation endangers the security of all nations of the hemisphere.

Although ample provision for hemispheric cooperation in dealing with subversion exists through inter-American agreements, no clear collective plans have emerged to implement the words of Bogotá, Rio, Caracas, and Punta del Este with decisive action.

Internal methods of dealing with the Castro Communist threat vary from country to country. The difficulties of controlling clandestine subversive operations and traffic are great "even for governments with the most elaborate security machinery."[6]

These difficulties are further complicated by the failure of some member nations of the

---

[1] Testimony of Ambassador deLesseps S. Morrison, hearings, p. 199.

[2] Testimony of Ambassador deLesseps S. Morrison, hearings, p. 196.

[3] Fidel Castro quoted, the Washington Star, Jan. 16, 1963.

[4] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 5.

[5] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 23.

[6] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 22.

Organization of American States to deal with subversive traffic. For example, Mexico remains a "neutral ground," to all intents and purposes, for Castro Communist traffic and travel in the Americas. Internal policies permitting such subversive traffic weaken inter-American treaty obligations and endanger the security of the hemisphere.

V

Communist Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete. The Castro Communist movement, although claiming to represent indigenous Latin American interest and aspirations, is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union must be held accountable for such subversive aggression in the Americas.

The Castro regime is a wholly dependent Soviet satellite and Castro communism is the instrument of Soviet aspirations for the Americas. Thus, subversive aggression emanating from Cuba is Soviet-directed and represents a "far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly"[7] effort than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids conducted by Castroites during the early months of the regime.

International Soviet agents, experts in the field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist tactics, and guerrilla warfare, are operating schools for violence in Cuba, training and indoctrinating Latin American subversives. The Soviet Union as well as its Cuban puppet regime must bear the responsibility and consequences for subversive attacks on nations of the Western Hemisphere.

VI

Training of guerrillas and terrorists at Cuban camps is on the increase. At these camps, experts in subversive warfare are organizing the cadre for an "alliance for violence" that will send agents trained in sabotage, espionage, and revolutionary techniques throughout Latin America. At present, Castro Communist assistance to these cadres takes the form of funds, guidance, and technical assistance.

"In many ways, Cuba under Castro is the Latin version of the old Comintern, inciting, abetting, and sustaining revolution wherever it will flourish."[8]

Undisputed evidence exists that "Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America."[8]

Toward this end, from 1,000 to 1,500 persons from other Latin American countries made the pilgrimage to Cuba during 1962 to receive ideological indoctrination and guerrilla training. Additional thousands are traveling the route to Havana this year. To date, training emphasis has been on acquiring weaponry from "the enemy," i.e., government arsenals, but Castro arms shipments to other Latin American countries can be expected to increase if needed to further revolution.

Castro Cuba has furnished financing for subversive operations throughout the hemisphere, and tons of Communist propaganda material are shipped from Cuba for dissemination throughout Latin America. Some of this material is detected and destroyed by customs officials of target nations, but substantial amounts get through to the people.

VII

Venezuela is the primary target for Cuban-based Communist subversive aggression.

Castro Cuba has provided training in subversive warfare to more nationals from Venezuela than from any other country. An estimated 200-plus Venezuelans received such training in Cuba during 1962. Although "the Communists have not demonstrated the ability to stand up to the armed forces, or seize and hold government buildings,"[9] increased terrorist activity in Venezuela poses one of the most immediate Communist threats to any country in the hemisphere.

Creation in 1962 of the so-called Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) is the result of a unification of command to coordinate Castro Communist subversive activities in Venezuela.

VIII

Purported differences between Soviet and Chinese branches of international communism have had no discernible effect on the increased intensity or course of Communist subversive aggression in the hemisphere. Violent overthrow of existing governments remains the unified aim of Communist forces in Latin America.

"To date the Latin American Communist Parties seem to have been reluctant either to admit the existence of basic differences between the U.S.S.R. and Communist China or to take sides even when the differences are admitted."[10]

There is no reason to believe that purported ideological differences in the Communist camp have affected or altered Cuba's role as communism's spearhead in the Americas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

In accord with the joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, section (a), immediate steps should be taken by the United States to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere.

The joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, declared U.S. determination to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the extension of Castro communism to other parts of the hemisphere by aggressive or subversive activities.

The distinction between aggressive and subversive activities is without significance. Subversive activities, as conducted by Communist forces in the world today, represent as certain a form of aggression as direct military aggression.

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy responded to the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba in accord with section (b) of the congressional determination of October 3. Section (b) declared U.S. determination to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States * * *.

It is recommended that the threat posed by the aggressive capability of Castro Communist subversion be dealt with by whatever means may be necessary in the security interests of the United States and all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

II

The United States should be prepared to act with military force, if needed, in response to the request for help and assistance of any nation of the hemisphere in danger of being overthrown by Castro Communist subversive aggression. This recommendation is in no way to be considered as a substitute for or a bar to unilateral action by the United States in defense of its own security.

The United States must be prepared to do in our own hemisphere what we are willing to do in other parts of the world in defense of freedom. Certainly the sacrifices of Korea and Vietnam would be futile if Communist tyranny were to be allowed to extend its power by force and violence over nations of the Americas.

In compliance with solemn treaty obligations, the United States, along with other nations of the hemisphere, must make clear our intention to act not only in our own defense but in the interests of collective security and for the defense of the nations of the inter-American system.

III

Every effort must be made by the United States to assure collective action by the Organization of American States, and by OAS member states individually, toward the curbing of Castro Communist subversive activities and traffic in the hemisphere.

Failure of any nation of the hemisphere to curb subversive activities and traffic within its borders endangers all the nations of the inter-American system. The chain of hemispheric security is only as strong as its weakest link.

The United States, as leader of the hemisphere's defense, must seek early implementation of strict national policies to control and eliminate the flow of Communist traffic between Cuba and other countries of the hemisphere.

IV

The United States should seek the complete diplomatic and economic quarantine of Communist Cuba by other nations of the hemisphere.

Recognizing the aggressive nature of Cuban-based subversion, the United States should exert efforts to quarantine the aggressor by means of diplomatic and economic sanctions applied by nations of the hemisphere. The Declaration of Punta del Este furnishes ample legal basis for the complete ostracism of the Castro regime from diplomatic and economic contacts with other American states. Recent months have established even more clearly that the Castro regime is not the legitimate representative of the people of Cuba, but is a mere instrument of international communism.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

I believe no reference to the situation in Latin America can be made without calling attention to the fact that U.S. aid must be based upon long-range economic and political reforms dealing with the rampant economic and social underdevelopment, which will lead to freedom of the individual and representative governments.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN.

NEW YORK.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ADAIR-HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the Congress this body amended the Foreign Assistance Act to provide that aid be suspended to those countries that expropriated American-owned property without prompt and adequate compensation. My purpose today is to advise the House on the effectiveness of the so-called Adair-Hickenlooper amendment since its enactment and approval on August 1, 1962.

HISTORY OF AMENDMENT

As you know, there was, in the early part of 1962, an expropriation of International Telephone & Telegraph holdings by the Brazilian State, Rio Grande do Sul. Although these holdings had been recently valued at over $7 million, the State Governor offered only $400,000 as full and just compensation. As a matter of further importance, we recall that nearly 3 years earlier this same State had taken over properties belonging to the American & Foreign Power Corp. No compensation had been received by the company and expropriation proceedings had been stalled for a year and a half.

---

[7] Statement of Hon. John A. McCone, Director, CIA, p. 65.

[8] Statement of Hon. John A. McCone, Director, CIA, p. 63.

[9] Statement of Hon. John A. McCone, Director, CIA, p. 64.

[10] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 9.

During April, May, and June, 1962, just at the time we were considering in committee the foreign aid bill, Ceylon took over 83 gasoline stations and other properties belonging to 2 American oil companies, Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., and Caltex Ceylon, Ltd.

In view of these expropriations, coupled with the increasing tendency toward nationalization of public utilities and other industries by many of the countries receiving U.S. aid, I felt that some protection should be afforded American citizens and businesses in countries throughout the world. Therefore, I proposed in the Committee on Foreign Affairs amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act to cut off aid to those countries that took over property of U.S. citizens and failed to provide adequate compensation promptly. Some action was taken in the committee, but I felt that we had not given adequate protection. Hence, when this section was further considered on the floor on July 11, 1962, I offered additional amendments that were adopted by the House and which changed the section in three principal respects:

First. A retroactive feature was added which made the requirements applicable to expropriations on or after January 1, 1962.

Second. The authority of the President to allow aid to continue to countries that had expropriated U.S.-owned properties when he found it in the national interest was deleted.

Third. Provision was added that the requirements of the section could not be waived by the use of any other authority available under the act.

The Senate bill (S. 2996) also included a provision prepared by Senator HICKENLOOPER against expropriation of American-owned property similar in requirements though not in language to section 620(e) as it passed the House. In conference the Senate agreed to the House language with two minor amendments. The first specified that appropriate steps to be taken "may include arbitration"; the second qualified "obligations" of the expropriating country toward the U.S. citizens or entities as obligations "under international law."

The language as it now appears in the act reads:

> (e) The President shall suspend assistance to the government of any country to which assistance is provided under this Act when the government of such country or any governmental agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—
>
> (1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or
>
> (2) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,
>
> and such country, government agency or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action or after the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is later) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including equitable and speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be, and such suspension shall continue until he is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROVISION

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult to assess acurately the effect that this amendment has had in the past few months toward encouraging settlement by Brazil or discouraging expropriation by others. However, I am certain that it has been powerful and salutary in the case of the expropriation of I.T. & T.'s properties. For example, a satisfactory agreement has been reached between the Government of Brazil and I.T. & T. Instead of the $400,000 as initially proposed by the State of Rio Grande do Sul as full and just payment, I.T. & T. will receive $7.3 million which is more closely related to the actual value of their holdings. One-half of the settlement was allowed to be repatriated in dollars and the remainder is to be reinvested locally by I.T. & T. in Standard Electrica S. A., its wholly owned Brazilian manufacturing subsidiary. I understand that this settlement is satisfactory to I.T. & T.

In the case of American and Foreign Power Corp.'s expropriation problem settlement has not been reached. I am informed, however, that the company and the Brazilian Government are moving toward agreement with respect to the company's Brazilian holdings and that the company considers progress to be satisfactory.

ASSISTANCE SUSPENDED

On February 8, 1963, the Department of State suspended development loans and technical assistance to Ceylon. From my study of the record, the determination made to suspend aid in this case was entirely warranted by the facts. No mutually satisfactory negotiations were going on which might be considered appropriate steps under the law. The Ceylon Petroleum Act, authority for the expropriation, did not provide satisfactory procedures for arriving at a fair compensation, the means of payment, or currency of payment. Ceylon's history on the expropriation issue generally, as well as their bargaining posture on this expropriation, in that no offer was made nor would they agree to arbitration, fully justified the suspension. The Department is to be commended for this forthright action. Food-for-peace programs are being continued, as well as training abroad for some 57 Ceylonese being financed from development grants under the Foreign Aid Act. The requirements of section 620(e) do not extend to food-for-peace assistance under Public Law 480. However, that section does apply to training assistance with development grants; therefore, the failure of the Government of Ceylon to act will require the speedy termination of these training programs.

In addition to those expropriations I have just enumerated, I am aware of several instances where countries enacting agrarian reform measures which were expropriatory in nature have been heavily influenced by the requirements of 620(e). When advised of the effect of this section as it would apply to them should they move under such agrarian reform law, either changes were made in the law or changes are being requested of the legislature.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the enactment of these requirements by the Congress was a good thing. It furnishes a weapon with which the Department can protect American business interests, and, I believe, its effective implementation can very much serve the Department's interests. Amendments may be desirable, however, and they will be considered in connection with the foreign aid bill this year. We were told repeatedly that the Alliance for Progress and similar programs could not succeed without the flow of large amounts of private capital. This will be encouraged and made possible by the passage and application of the Adair-Hickenlooper amendment.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS—COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT POINTS TO SAVINGS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS BY PURCHASING RATHER THAN LEASING ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Florida). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss the possibility of saving the taxpayers and the Federal Government $150 million over the next 5 years and $100 million each year thereafter. This is the appealing prospect pointed out in Comptroller General Campbell's March 6, 1963, report to the Congress entitled "Study of Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government."

I am sure that every Member of Congress has read, heard about, or has some knowledge of electronic data processing equipment. Sometimes these machines are referred to as electronic brains, sometimes robots and monsters, or just plain computers. Their abilities are phenomenal. They consume prodigious amounts of raw data, digest them in short periods of time, and print the results with extreme rapidity. They can perform tasks which were heretofore impossible. They will do everything but think, and indeed progress is being made in this direction. Companion machines now are being built to read the printed page while others are being developed to react to the spoken word.

Mr. Speaker, back in the 86th Congress, the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, under the able chairmanship of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], began studying the problems related to mass data processing equipment of the Federal agencies. Later, in the 87th Congress, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], who succeeded the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] as chairman of the subcommittee, continued the surveillance of the Federal Government's use of electronic data processing equipment. The subcommittee held hearings on the subject, issued reports and releases, and attempted to contribute to the efficiency with which the machines are utilized. As the new chairman of this important subcommittee, I intend to continue this work.

Now, one of the problems which our subcommittee raised back in 1959 was that many Federal agencies were leasing rather than purchasing these costly computers. At that time, we urged both the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget to go into this matter because we suspected that the Federal Government was wasting millions of dollars each year in machine rentals. In the early days, some manufacturers would sell their machines, others would not. They would furnish them by lease only. As a consequence, large numbers of electronic data processing systems were leased by the Federal Government, and agencies became accustomed to the leasing arrangement.

At the present time, however, manufacturers will sell their systems. They will sell them outright or they will lease them with the option to purchase. They will rent their systems if the users wish to engage the equipment on that basis.

Federal Government agencies have not responded quickly to the possibilities of purchase. They seem to feel that it is more convenient to rent; that the rental arrangement is more favorable in that they can replace old machines with new ones almost at will; that renting avoids the maintenance problem and that congressional appropriations for rental are more easily obtained than for purchase.

In the earlier stages of development these attitudes may have been justified, but as stabilization has been introduced into the manufacture and utilization of electronic data processing systems, Federal agencies can now be more selective about whether they purchase or rent.

As General Campbell pointed out, progress in converting to purchase has been slow. This is in spite of guidelines issued by the Bureau of the Budget describing the circumstances under which electronic data systems should be purchased and the circumstances under which they should be leased.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that by purchasing electronic data processing systems the Federal Government stands to save $150 million in 5 years and $100 million each year thereafter. In order to accomplish this objective General Campbell recommends basic changes in the Government's overall management system. He states:

> Decisions as to the financial advantages of purchasing will have to be made from the standpoint of the Government as a whole, and not primarily from the standpoint of individual using agencies as has been the practice in the past. In addition, more attention needs to be given to obtaining complete utilization of the equipment acquired. We believe that the only practical way in which this kind of coordinated management can achieve the financial savings cited is through the establishment of a small, high-placed central management office in the executive branch of the Government. Accordingly, we are recommending to the President of the United States that he establish such an office in his organization.

General Campbell recommends further that the heads of all using departments and agencies "arrange for a prompt and complete reappraisal of their current plans to lease data processing equipment and take such action as is possible to realize the financial savings that may be available from purchasing such equipment and fully utilizing it."

I am wholly in accord with General Campbell's proposal and hope that the President will act favorably upon the establishment of the office that General Campbell recommends.

In order that we may start realizing savings immediately through the purchase of electronic data processing equipment, I am directing a letter today to the Director of the Budget emphasizing the importance of immediate action. I am requesting the Bureau of the Budget to act promptly regarding General Campbell's recommendation that departments and agencies reappraise their plans to lease electronic data processing equipment with a view to saving funds by switching to the purchase arrangement. The Bureau of the Budget is being requested also to keep our subcommittee fully and promptly informed of the progress the departments and agencies make in their review.

Before closing these remarks, I want to commend General Campbell and the General Accounting Office for this splendid report. Once again, the General Accounting Office lives up to its title of "watchdog of the public purse."

FLOW OF AMERICAN GOODS AND KNOW-HOW TO SOVIET BLOC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, last year following recommendations of the House Select Committee on Export Control, the Congress by near-unanimous vote provided strengthening amendments to the Export Control Act to stem the flow of American goods and know-how to the Soviet bloc. My remarks today are to report on some of the serious developments since that time and to emphasize the need for continued congressional attention to this problem.

The administration of the Export Control Act is a matter of great concern to all Members of the House because of the importance of the program to our national security. I would like to discuss with the House various instances of where export licenses have been granted which I believe are completely at variance with the expressed intent of Congress.

On February 21, 1963, the Department of Commerce issued a license authorizing the shipment to Communist Yugoslavia of $3,692,000 worth of rolling mill machine parts that will be installed in a steel mill in Jesenice, Yugoslavia.

The license, which had been applied for on January 31, 1963, only 3 weeks earlier, covers equipment and spare parts for a combination blooming, slabbing, and plate mill. This type of mill which is used to reduce steel ingots to intermediary sizes and shapes before further processing into steel plates, rails, wheels, sheets, skelp—which is used in the manufacture of pipe such as oil pipes—bars, tubes, rods, and a variety of other items. Obviously such equipment is essential to the manufacture of many strategic goods.

On February 25, 1963, a few days after the license for the rolling mill equipment was granted, a license was granted by the Commerce Department to authorize shipment to Yugoslavia of a 7,000-horsepower electric motor, two 600-horsepower electric motors, and special purpose controls and parts valued at $685,120 for this same rolling mill at Jesenice, Yugoslavia. This license was also applied for on January 31, 1963.

According to the Department of Commerce, the products of this mill are to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries.

Incredibly, these purchases are being financed through credit extended to Yugoslavia by the Export-Import Bank, which extended credit totaling $13,591,862 for the Jesenice steel facility in Yugoslavia. Of this total, $6,217,436 is scheduled for procurement of the equipment I have just discussed and other items which will require validated licenses from the Department of Commerce.

In response to my request to the Department of Commerce for comment on the issuance of these licenses, in view of the amendments to the Export Control Act enacted in 1962, the Department of Commerce advised that the application for the equipment was approved in accordance with the U.S. policy to encourage the development of economic ties between Yugoslavia and the free world through the maintenance of normal business relations. In carrying out this policy, which helps maintain Yugoslav independence against Soviet pressure, we permit Yugoslavia to purchase commodities from the United States subject to safeguards similar to those governing exports to free world countries.

The Commerce Department's statement seems to indicate that the floodgates on exports to Yugoslavia are completely open and that we are accommodating Tito's so-called independent communism. I simply do not believe there is such an animal as independent communism.

Why should the United States build up Yugoslav industry when all indications are to the effect that Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. are drawing closer together all the time? In view of the relationship between Yugoslavia, U.S.S.R., and other Communist nations, I do not see how it can be seriously contended that Yugoslavia is not part of the Soviet bloc and I do not accept this determination.

There was an exchange of visits last year between Soviet President Brezhnev and Premier Tito. According to statements put out at that time Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. were reported to hold identical or similar views on international affairs.

Yugoslavia has been engaging in shipping and trade with Cuba, which certainly is contrary to our national interest.

Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. are currently engaged in a large scale trade agreement, which is to double for 1963 the total amount of trade between those two nations as compared with 1960.

According to information presented to the Select Committee on Export Control last year by the Department of State, commodities listed for delivery to the U.S.S.R. by Yugoslavia under the original trade agreement, signed in March 1961, are as follows: Cables, lead, ferrous and nonferrous industries products, chemical industry products, various industrial equipment and machinery, footwear, furniture, knitted articles of wool, cold-storage installations for commercial firms, food preparation equipment, electrical equipment, universal drying plants, complete installations for processing fruit and vegetables, and power transformers. Also called for were 16 tankers, of 25,000 gross tons each, 9 tramp steamers of 10,000 tons each, and 3,500 tank cars.

The March 1961 agreement has been modified by subsequent protocols. Commodities covered in a July 8, 1962, protocol are oceangoing ships, rail tank cars, steel pipe, nonferrous plates, lead, mercury, rubber products, chemicals, furniture, and others. This protocol reduced the amount of oceangoing ships to be produced by Yugoslavia for the U.S.S.R. to nine 20,000-ton tankers and five 12,000-ton freighters.

The Department of State advised the select committee concerning the subsequent agreement on the vessels:

> Delivery is scheduled for 1965, but there is some question whether even these new planned levels will be met since Yugoslav shipyards have all the hard currency business they can handle and the Soviets need larger tankers than the Yugoslavs can produce.

It would certainly appear in view of the loan for the steel rolling mill and the sale of steel mill equipment to Yugoslavia for use in ship construction that we are doing our best to assure that Yugoslavia is able to deliver these vessels on time.

How is the U.S.S.R.-Yugoslav trade program going? Interesting comment is provided on U.S.S.R.-Yugoslav trade expansion in the Soviet magazine Vneshnyaya Torgovlya—Foreign Trade—as reported in a January 17, 1963, Tass radio broadcast which stated:

> The U.S.S.R. now occupies a leading place—between 46 and 98 percent—as a buyer of Yugoslav exports of caustic and calcinated soda, polyvinyl raw materials, leather, woolen fabrics, footwear, cable goods, transformers, and other important goods. The overall volume of mutual deliveries in 1963 will amount to 162 million rubles, or about $180 million, which is almost double Soviet-Yugoslav trade in 1961. The magazine emphasizes that trade between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia is based on the principles of complete equality and mutual interest. This policy of the U.S.S.R. contrasts with the discriminating trade policy of the Common Market countries, which are also trading partners of Yugoslavia.
>
> It is pointed out in the article that the forms of Soviet-Yugoslav scientific-technological cooperation are multiplying. Since December 1955, Soviet organizations have received 242 series of technological documentation from Yugoslavia. During that period, 265 Soviet specialists in various economic fields have visited Yugoslavia. The Soviet contribution to this cooperation has been in the form of technical documentation on 342 subjects. Among other things, blueprints of modern metal-cutting machine tools and documentation on the production of cameras, refrigerators, and presses have been sent to Yugoslavia.
>
> Economic cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia will increase each year, the magazine stresses.

Yugoslav supplying of ships to the U.S.S.R. is very significant in view of the fact that the U.S.S.R. is currently working on a massive maritime buildup. Currently it is about midway in a 7-year plan which by 1965 is to provide it with a merchant fleet double the size of the one it had in 1960. It is reported that this plan is to be succeeded by a 5-year plan to provide a fleet in 1970 three times the 1960 level, and that its programed goal for 1980 is a fleet five or six times that of 1960.

Many Members of the House may have had an opportunity to read the report on the Soviet economic offensive in Western Europe by a special study mission to Europe comprised of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who certainly are knowledgeable about this serious problem. Included in the special study mission were Representatives EDNA F. KELLY, of New York; HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr., of Delaware; CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire; PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., of New Jersey; and ROBERT R. BARRY, of New York.

The report was filed with the House on February 7, 1963, during the time the applications for the licenses in question were pending before the Commerce Department.

The report comments critically on the lack of coordinated policy in the West to face up to the challenge of the Soviet economic offensive. As part of the overall problem, the committee cited the seriousness of the Soviet oil offensive.

The committee's comments are very pertinent to what I am discussing here today, and I am setting forth a portion of those comments. At page 6 of the report, the study mission states:

> One more factor has an important bearing on the Soviet Union's ability to intensify its oil offensive; namely, improvement and expansion of Soviet transportation facilities. In this respect, the Soviet pipeline system, and the enlargement of the Soviet tanker fleet, are of particular significance.
>
> The current 7-year plan calls for the construction of 10,500 kilometers of petroleum pipeline and 16,000 kilometers of gasline. The petroleum pipelines now under construction which are of most significance from the Western point of view are the Urals-Volga-Leningrad pipeline; the Comecon pipeline system from the Urals-Volga oilfields to the European satellites and the Baltic ports of Ventspils and Klaipeda; and the Stalingrad-Tikhorestsk-Tuapse and Tikhorestsk-Novorossiysk pipeline to the Black Sea. These pipelines have military as well as economic implications and will enable the Soviet Union to deliver oil economically to export terminals on the Baltic and the Black Seas.
>
> Concurrently, the Soviet Union is rapidly expanding its oil tanker fleet. As of September 1, 1962, U.S.S.R.-flag vessels reported in petroleum service represented deadweight tonnage of 1,219,800. On the same date, orders for new construction in the Soviet bloc yards totaled 23 ships with a combined capacity of 641,400 deadweight tons. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union's orders for new construction in Japan, Italy, Finland, and Yugoslavia totaled 51 ships with a capacity of 1,253,000 deadweight tons. It is obvious that the delivery of these vessels will greatly assist the bloc in its oil offensive.

As is noted, the study mission concluded, with regard to delivery of new ships to the U.S.S.R.:

> It is obvious that the delivery of these vessels will greatly assist the bloc in its oil offensive.

Yet, only 14 days after this report was filed with Congress, the Commerce Department licensed shipment to Yugoslavia of steel rolling mill equipment to be placed in a new $13.59 million steel mill in Yugoslavia being constructed through an Export-Import Bank loan, when, in the words of the Commerce Department itself:

> The products of this mill are to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries.

It does not seem to me there can be any other conclusion but that the authorization for the shipment of these commodities to Yugoslavia will contribute greatly to the economic and military buildup of the Soviet bloc.

I have on various occasions over recent months requested the Department of Commerce to comment on its issuance of licenses in view of the amendments to the Export Control Act and in each case the Department at least went through the motions of providing assurances that in its view the issuance of the particular license in question would not be detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States. Following is a typical comment along these lines:

> With respect to Section 3(a) of the Export Control Act of 1949 as amended by Public Law 515, 87th Congress, we do not consider that this export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of * * * which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

Significantly, no such assurance, to the effect that it would not be contrary to our national security and welfare, was provided by the Commerce Department concerning the licenses to ship to Yugoslavia the rolling mill equipment.

It will also be remembered that the Department of Commerce advised that we permit Yugoslavia to purchase commodities from the United States subject to safeguards similar to those governing exports to free world countries. One of the major problems in the field of export control discussed by the Select Committee on Export Control was the problem of postshipment followup of licensed goods to determine that they are not illegally diverted or transshipped. The select committee found that we definitely have access to more sources to check on illegal diversion or transshipments in connection with friendly countries than with Soviet bloc countries. The following, on this point, is from the select committee's report:

> The committee heard testimony that to a large degree our Government has to rely on the assurances of those Communist governments that commodities imported will be utilized according to the stated end use specified in the application for a validated license. This is an important consideration in authorizing shipments to the Soviet bloc countries, as there appears to be no reasonable means of verifying that commodities or end products thereof will not be diverted to Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam, the latter countries being under a total embargo.
>
> This is even a more important consideration in connection with shipments to Poland, treated as a member of the bloc but, until recently, permitted to import more freely than other Iron Curtain countries, and Yugoslavia, treated essentially as a friendly nation.

I do not see how the Department can say that these commodities licensed for export to Yugoslavia are subject to safeguards similar to those governing exports to free world countries. We do not have similar safeguards in the case of Communist countries and the Commerce Department assurances in this regard amount to so many words with but little validity.

There are many other examples of licenses issued to ship goods to Yugoslavia besides the steel rolling mill equipment which in my view are contrary to our welfare and security.

On February 19 the Department issued 12 licenses authorizing shipment of $2,028,015 in copper scrap to Yugoslavia. In response to my inquiry about these licenses I was advised that the Yugoslavian Government reported it would be used basically for conversion into copper sulphate for use as in agricultural spray. It is of interest to note that according to information presented to the Select Committee on Export Control, among the commodities supplied by Yugoslavia to the U.S.S.R. were copper rods, copper plates, and copper tubes and pipes. All these of course are important in the manufacture of many strategic commodities.

Following is a partial list of some of the licenses granted to authorize shipments from the United States to Yugoslavia just since the first of the year:

January 2: Industrial instrument, $850.

January 7: Semiconductors, $540; electronic computer, $1,695; land type communications equipment, $1,082; semiconductors, $1,279; industrial instruments, $2,041; industrial furnace, $3,689.

January 14: Semiconductors, $240; electronic components, $142; electron tubes, $100; electron tubes, $288; resistors, $105; industrial instrument parts, $397; construction machinery parts, $25,329.

January 17: Borates, $22,394.

January 18: Construction machinery parts, $3,607; electronic physical properties testing and inspecting machines and parts, $1,610; electrical testing instruments, $210; industrial instruments and parts, $231; electronic computer and related equipment, $9,936; electron tubes, $576.

January 21: Electron tubes, $8,926; information processing machines and parts, $1,850.

January 22: Semiconductors, $118; borates, $22,394; electron tubes, $286; semiconductors, $117; semiconductors, $559.

January 23: Industrial instruments and parts, $1,208; geophysical equipment parts, $4,197; electrical testing instrument parts, $902; semiconductors, $456.

January 25: Special-purpose vehicles parts, $46,064; petroleum and natural gas field production equipment and parts, $869; electrical quantity indicating instruments, $315; electrical testing instruments parts, $460; copper cable, $242.

January 28: Electrical testing instruments and parts, $3,839; construction machinery parts, $2,138; electrical quantity indicating instruments, $3,088; electrical testing instruments and parts, $3,675; geophysical equipment parts, $1,552; petroleum drilling and production equipment parts, $4,816.

January 29: Coaxial cable, $395; electron tubes, $435; electronic computer, $250; video tape recorders and parts, $72,670.

January 30: Construction machinery parts, $1,937; construction machinery parts, $1,087; borate, $6,583; synthetic rubber, $6,270.

February 1: Synthetic rubber, $16,650.

February 5: Electrical testing instruments, $300; waveform measuring instruments and parts, $1,375.

February 6: Industrial instruments and parts, $882; electrical testing instruments, $1,007; semiconductors, $459.

February 7: Electron tubes, $317; petroleum drilling and production equipment parts, $8,480.

February 8: Waveform measuring instruments, $9,790; electrical testing instrument parts, $5,085.

February 11: Petroleum field production equipment and parts, $2,747; coaxial cable, $315; semiconductors, $260.

February 12: Pulse generators, $642; transformer parts, $450; electrical testing instrument parts, $117; copper cable, $515; construction machinery parts, $6,781; electron tubes, $102.

February 19: Copper scrap, $142,450; copper scrap $235,718; copper scrap, $232,808; copper scrap, $258,958; copper scrap, $135,975; copper scrap, $195,635; copper scrap, $186,247; copper scrap, $290,735; copper scrap, $174,583; copper scrap, $58,146; copper scrap, $58,240; copper scrap, $58,520.

February 20: Semiconductors, $1,455; scientific and professional instruments, $454; waveform measuring instrument, $3,099; industrial instruments and parts, $413; construction machinery, $54,682; construction machinery, $106,758; electronic physical properties testing and products testing and inspecting machines and parts, $600; quartz crystals, $1,368.

February 21: Rolling mill machine parts, $3,692,600; copper alloy wire, insulated, $160; diamond grinding wheels, $295; electron tubes, $128; coaxial cable, $114.

February 25: Electrical testing instruments, $589; communication wire, $360; semiconductors, $1,678; crystalline silicon, $160; electronic physical properties testing equipment, $317; semiconductors, $689; electric motors, $450,000; special-purpose controls and parts, $235,120.

March 1: Semiconductors, $206; construction machinery parts, $3,560; construction machinery parts, $14,367; industrial instrument parts, $3,280; electron tubes, $3,182; physical properties testing equipment, $346; electronic equipment, $143.

March 4: Industrial instrument parts, $675; pumps, $485; aircraft parts, $4,992; synthetic resins, $1,452; waveform measuring instruments, $3,280; electrical testing instrument parts, $2,451; signal generator, $1,175; electronic testing instrument, $405; waveform measuring instrument, $920.

March 5: Semiconductors, $800; petroleum drilling and production equipment, $1,447; geophysical equipment parts, $865; waveform measuring instrument, $1,625; borates, $14,400; electrical testing instrument parts, $150; borates, $1,166; electrical testing instrument parts, $830; waveform measuring instrument, $1,625; electrical testing instrument parts, $220; electrical testing instrument parts, $791; waveform measuring instruments, $1,365.

March 6: Construction machinery parts, $3,187; semiconductors, $366; electron tubes, $349; semiconductors, $311; electron tubes, $640; electronic physical properties testing equipment and parts, $392; synthetic rubber, $41,005.

March 7: Pipe valves, $127; inductors, $126; synthetic rubber, $232,144; electron tubes, $298; electron tubes, $128; electron tubes, $122.

I do not mean to give the impression that it is only the export licenses authorized to ship goods to Yugoslavia which are of great concern. There are many other examples.

On February 4 of this year the Department granted a license to authorize shipment of $460,000 worth of synthetic rubber to Czechoslovakia. The Department advises that the synthetic rubber was for use in manufacturing tires.

In response to my further inquiry as to exactly what type of tires the synthetic rubber might be used for, the Department speculated on what type of tires can be constructed with the kind of synthetic rubber in question and the Acting Director of the Office of Export Control advised that "I regret that explicit answers to your questions are not available." It is difficult to know how we can have a meaningful export control program if the specific use of items we license for shipment is not known.

Late last August, the Department issued a license authorizing shipment to East Germany of what was described as "indicating, recording, and/or controlling instruments and parts, for use in air conditioning." Upon inquiring, I was advised that the equipment—instruments to indicate and control temperature and humidity—was licensed for use on 23 fishing trawlers being built in East Germany for the U.S.S.R. to equip the trawlers with, of all things, sauna baths for the officers and crew. Sauna baths are described as steam baths followed by sudden cooling. The Department stated that the instruments would permit the use of steam-generating facilities aboard ship "for sauna purposes in contrast to the less sophisticated sauna installations usually found ashore."

While it is hard to verify the story about the sauna baths, which I find exceedingly difficult to believe, it seems appropriate to mention that heat- and humidity-control instruments are very important on instrument-laden ships such as Soviet fishing trawlers, which are known to be prowling all corners of the globe collecting data and intelligence.

I am setting forth also a list of some of the licenses granted to authorize shipment of goods to other Communist nations since the first of the year:

January 2: Molybdenite concentrates, $92,400, Poland; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.

January 3: Crude sulfur, $280,350, Czechoslovakia; industrial oil burners, $22,929, Rumania.

January 7: Chemical specialty, $13, Hungary; compressors for refrigeration-type freezers, $85, U.S.S.R.; electrical quantity recording instrument, $4,964, Hungary; electrical apparatus and parts, $6, Czechoslovakia; electrical machinery parts, $22, Czechoslovakia; synthetic rubber manufactures, $7, Czechoslovakia; chemical specialty, $36; Hungary; chemical specialty, $16, Hungary.

January 14: Optical measuring instruments, $3,144, Czechoslovakia; paper pulp machine parts, $222, Hungary.

January 16: Glass forming machine parts, $32,870, Poland.

January 18: Spectrum measuring instruments, $400, Czechoslovakia; technical data erection, installation, maintenance, and operation of a wire rod mill, no value, U.S.S.R.; electronic detection instrument, $540, Germany; insecticides, $365,093, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee); insecticides, $563,864, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee.)

January 21: Thermostat, $45, Czechoslovakia; raw cotton, Mexican origin, $612,328, U.S.S.R.; spectrum measuring instrument, $1,646, Poland; electric industrial heating units and devices and parts, $65, Czechoslovakia.

January 22: Industrial chemicals, $24,802, Hungary; industrial chemicals, $30,750, Hungary; physical properties testing equipment and parts, $2,006, Hungary; physical properties testing equipment and parts, $3,205, Czechoslovakia; indicating, recording and/or controlling instruments, $6,287, Rumania; industrial sewing machine parts, $577, Czechoslovakia; shoe machinery and parts, $788, Hungary.

January 23: Biochemicals for laboratory use, $129, U.S.S.R.

January 24: Spectrum measuring instrument, $465, Poland.

January 28: Navigational instruments and parts, $100, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee).

January 29: Petroleum products, $17,250, Poland; electron tube parts, $3,930, Hungary; preamplifier, $115, Czechoslovakia; printing apparatus and parts, $11,276, Czechoslovakia; scientific and professional instruments, $4,129, Poland; film developer, $17, U.S.S.R.; metering pump parts, $693, U.S.S.R.

January 30: Technical data, no value, Rumania.

January 31: Glass bottle forming machine parts, $1,355, Czechoslovakia; tractor disk plow, $835, Rumania; scientific and professional instruments apparatus and parts, $5,485, Poland.

February 1: Rayon filament tire cord fabric, $391,375; U.S.S.R.; synthetic resin, $13, Rumania; automatic control, $36, Czechoslovakia; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.; insecticides, $220,000, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee.)

February 4: Synthetic rubber, $460,000, Czechoslovakia.

February 5: Scientific and professional instruments, $1,650, Hungary; organic rubber compounding agents, $900, Czechoslovakia; synthetic resin, $145, Rumania; carbon steel tape, $197, Poland; scientific and professional instruments apparatus supplies and parts, $42,335, Poland.

February 6: Crude sulfur, $125,575, Czechoslovakia; coal tar and other cyclic rubber compound agents, $147,400, U.S.S.R.

February 7: Synthetic resin, $1,736, Rumania; industrial chemicals, $16,755, Hungary; electronic computer, $1,545, Czechoslovakia; self-contained commercial type refrigerators and freezers, $2,156, U.S.S.R.

February 8: Gasoline engine parts, $1,862, Bulgaria; paper pulp machine parts, $2,190, Czechoslovakia; synthetic resin, $540, Poland; automotive replacement parts $40, Czechoslovakia; industrial chemicals, $4,136, Hungary; scientific and professional equipment, $896, Hungary; paper pulp machine parts, $784, U.S.S.R.; commercial automobiles and truck parts, $149, Czechoslovakia; tires and tubes, $61, Czechoslovakia.

February 11: Mexican raw cotton, $70,850, Czechoslovakia; Mexican raw cotton, $259,200, Czechoslovakia; Mexican raw cotton, $60,627, Czechoslovakia; Mexican raw cotton, $68,750, Czechoslovakia; semiconductors, $107, Poland.

February 12: Paper pulp machine parts, $1,606, U.S.S.R.; microfilms, exposed and film holders, $524, Hungary; pneumatic portable metalworking tools, $17,367, Poland; physical properties testing machine, $1,100, U.S.S.R.; automotive replacement parts, $48, U.S.S.R.; truck cab air conditioner and compressor and parts, $804, U.S.S.R.; nonmilitary watercraft parts, $420, Hungary; chemical reagents for laboratory use, $184, Czechoslovakia.

February 14: Precision boring machine, $1,410, Poland.

February 20: Industrial chemicals, $15, Hungary; hybrid grain sorghum seed, $5,705, Rumania; reagent chemicals for laboratory use, $32, Hungary; synthetic resin, $39, Rumania; disinfectants, $114, East Germany; cellulose powder, $16, Czechoslovakia.

February 21: Metalworking machines, $7,986, Hungary; metalworking machines, $12,181, Hungary; industrial sewing machine parts, $1,869, Hungary; rolling mill machine parts, $2,925, Rumania; molybdenum wire, $66,500, U.S.S.R.; chemical specialty compounds, $19,965, Hungary; electric motors, $4,400, U.S.S.R.; iron and steel staplex staples, $3,710, U.S.S.R.

February 25: Electrical testing instruments, $150, U.S.S.R.; air conditioning and mechanical refrigeration equipment, $532, Rumania; petroleum coke, $300,000, U.S.S.R.; refrigeration equipment parts, $45, Rumania; graphite powder, $240, Hungary; petroleum products, $111, Rumania.

March 1: Scientific and professional instruments, $562, Hungary; automotive replacement parts, $26, U.S.S.R.; rubber manufactures, $17, Czechoslovakia; air conditioner part, $15, U.S.S.R.; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.

March 4: Gas engine parts, $45, Rumania; industrial chemicals, $115,000, Czechoslovakia; card punching machine parts, $106, Czechoslovakia; insecticides, $1,030, U.S.S.R.; herbicides, $1,175, U.S.S.R.; motion picture studio equipment, $79, Czechoslovakia.

March 5: Industrial instruments, $17,917, Czechoslovakia; industrial instruments, $3,300, Rumania; herbicides, $35,100, U.S.S.R.; herbicides, $1,250, U.S.S.R.; moldboard tractor plow, $1,475, Rumania; biochemical for laboratory research, $2,267, Czechoslovakia.

March 6: Insecticide, $900, U.S.S.R.; herbicides, $620, U.S.S.R.; insecticides, $148, U.S.S.R.; aluminum wire, $45, Hungary.

March 7: Motion picture studio equipment, $163, Hungary; industrial instruments and parts, $14,082, Rumania; technical data, no value, Rumania; technical data, no value, Hungary; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.; industrial chemicals, $99,000, U.S.S.R.; carbon black, $227, Czechoslovakia; disinfectants, $725, U.S.S.R.; metal cutting tools, $375, Hungary; herbicides, $1,550, U.S.S.R.; technical data, no value, Bulgaria.

(In those cases where technical data is licensed for shipment and "no value" is indicated, this does not mean that the data is of no value. Rather no specific value has been placed on it by the Commerce Department, allegedly because of difficulties encountered in assessing the value of technical data. The actual value could range from relatively small amounts to many thousands of dollars.)

The foregoing outlines only certain of the activities of the export control program which I feel indicate that the program is being administered contrary to the best interests of the United States.

All pretense seems to be gone that any meaningful controls apply in the case of Yugoslavia, as the Department of Commerce seems to be saying that licenses should be issued to ship to Yugoslavia practically on par, if not on par, with exports to the free world. Many of the items shipped undoubtedly find their way in one form or another to other Soviet-bloc countries including the U.S.S.R. and Cuba.

Many exports of strategic goods are being authorized for shipment directly to other Soviet-bloc nations, as is noted from the list I have presented here today. Our control over these items is practically nil. We must simply take their word as to what they intend to do with the materials. For all we know, items we are selling the Communists are used to build Soviet missiles or armament for Castro. Certainly it helps to build up their economies which in turn supports their military potential.

The amendment to the Export Control Act approved by Congress last year provides that the significance of exports to the economic buildup as well as the military buildup of Communist nations must be taken into consideration in the granting of export licenses.

I believe it is very important for the House to recreate the Select Committee on Export Control for the 88th Congress. The Congress must keep a close watch on this program and I would urge the membership of the House to support resolutions other Members of the House and I have introduced providing for a Select Committee on Export Control. There is no time to waste.

CUBA—COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE AVOIDS SUBJECT IF UNITED STATES HAS ITS WAY—U.S. ACTIVE LEADERSHIP IS FIRM—LONG-RANGE ANTI-CASTRO COMMUNISM POLICY NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have taken the floor of this House feeling deep concern with regard to the administration's policy concerning Cuba, recognizing the threat it offers now and has offered for some time, not only the threat of Communist subversion emanating from Cuba to other Latin American countries but as a matter of fact as late as last Thursday as it relates to Communist subversion through Cuba by way of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, even in the United States.

OPEN DOOR OF SUBVERSION TO CUBA THROUGH MEXICO UNDERRATED

I brought out in the RECORD last Thursday the fact that some 73 American citizens, citizens of the United States, had used the open door subversive route through Mexico City, the Cuban Embassy therein to gain admission to Cuba to conduct—some of them at least—subversive activities and who knows, perhaps, to attend even subversive training schools. I put this information in the RECORD and it was interesting to me that Mr. McCone when he appeared before the Selden subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not see fit to bring out these facts that this subversive activity that many have evidenced concern about, at which time Mr. McCone said about 1,000 to 1,500 "Latin American citizens" had visited Cuba and had received subversive training during the period of 1962.

Mr. McCone failed to include in his discussion with the committee, apparently, the list of or number of Americans, U.S. citizens as well as Latins, who had gone to Cuba during 1962, including the 4-month period in 1962, which I discussed in the RECORD of Friday. As a matter of fact, on a very cursory examination of the list which I turned over to the House Un-American Activities Committee, it was found that at least two of them had Communist backgrounds, established through the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee; and, as a matter of fact, one of them went to Cuba for the purpose of attending the Congress of Women of America, a Communist meeting in Cuba in July of 1962.

I learned subsequently that three additional U.S. citizens visited Cuba during a similar period in 1962, and one in late 1961, all of whom likewise had a Communist background and this likewise was properly established.

So we see a rather interesting and startling situation, and I imagine a situation that is questioned by other nations of Latin America when we insist upon those nations trying to close this open door, whereas in the United States similar visitations are taking place.

I call this to the attention of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The names after being properly checked, should be submitted to the Justice Department for proper prosecution.

I put in the RECORD the statute involved, title 8 of the United States Code, which is also title 215 of the Walter-McCarran Immigration and Naturalization Acts, which makes the visitation by a U.S. citizen to Cuba at this time against the law. This is an international emergency situation, so declared in the Korean war and still carrying over, and the State Department having advised as of January 1961 that any visitation was against the law and subject to prosecution resulting in a $5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both. Why have none of these persons been prosecuted?

As a matter of fact, some of these are very blatant in their activities of going to and coming from Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. This, of course, results from the fact that Mexico is one of five Latin American countries that continue to recognize the Castro regime. The other countries are Bolivia, Chile, Brazil, and Uruguay. As a matter of fact, Brazil continues to carry on active trade with Moscow and with Russia itself; and, as a further matter of fact, it is well known that the present negotiations for a very substantial loan through AID is for the purpose of building the economy of Brazil so that it can increase its trade with Communist Russia. This I intend to discuss in just a few minutes.

The fact of the matter is that because Mexico continues to recognize the Castro Red regime in Cuba this door remains open for the flow of subversives even from the United States as well as from other places. As a matter of fact a list that has been submitted to me, that I believe to be authoritative and that I have checked and rechecked many times, indicates that there is a more substantial flow of Latin Americans for subversive purposes than even Mr. McCone indicated going to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. This is the list I have in hand. I do not intend to include the names in the RECORD. This is the list that was submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House for its investigation.

There was during this same 4-month period in 1962 a total of 2,840 passages to and from Cuba, and understand this is only a 4-month period in 1962. Certainly a visitation by any or all of these people would give them at least the opportunity to participate in subversive activities if they saw fit to do so and if an equal number gained passage during the other 8 months this would bring the figure of passages to over 8,500 and the opportunity for subversive activities to relate to far more than the 1,000-1,500 figure cited by Mr. McCone before the Selden subcommittee.

Through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico there are included 235 passages from Russia and its satellite nations.

This list by countries follows:

From:	
Argentina	149
Brazil	79
Bolivia	32
Colombia	21
Costa Rica	52
Cuba	565
Canada	49
Chile	173
Ecuador	49
El Salvador	66
United States	77
Guatemala	64
Honduras	110
Mexico	362
Nicaragua	10
Panama	29
Paraguay	14
Peru	46
Dominican Republic	2
Uruguay	78
Russia and satellites	235
From undetermined nationality	381
Other countries outside this hemisphere	161
Total	2,840

This raises the question of whether or not this influx of trainees and those engaged in subversive activities in 1962 is not far greater than the 1,000 to 1,500 as was suggested by the distinguished Director of Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. McCone. I put this in the RECORD because I feel in doing so it is a public service, and it is my duty and responsibility to do so.

CONCERN OVER CUBA CONTINUES—SUBJECT NEEDS OPEN DISCUSSION

I am one who is concerned about the constant, at least recently, lambasting of anyone in public office who has anything to say about Cuba at the present time in relation to policies concerning Cuba. So far as I am concerned, an American citizen, let alone a public official, has a duty so long as Castro and communism remains in Cuba to do what he can to see that the administration establishes and carries out a long-range and firm policy of getting rid of Castro and communism in Cuba; and, in addition, making sure that there is not an infiltration of communism or subversion from Cuba, and that major military personnel and weapons are imported further—as well as "offensive" weapons—not returned to Cuba in place of those which may or may not have been taken from Cuba as result of the too hastily lifted quarantine last October.

I think it is and has been the duty of every Member of Congress to do all in his power in helping to firm up a firm anti-Communist Cuban policy, not only this year but in previous years.

I quote Winston Churchill in answer to the Democratic big guns trying to stifle all discussion of the Cuban mess and the need for firm action—

> Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.
>
> There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves.

I could point to the RECORD, when I took the floor of the House and made remarks on the subject of Cuba, calling for action concerning Cuba, and calling for a peaceful blockade, which is exactly what the administration put into effect in October, making that request long before the blockade took place.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, page 23010. I had previously addressed to the administration a number of recommendations. As a matter of fact, a letter to me from Fred G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, in answer to a number of recommendations made by me February 3, 1962, was dated March 10, 1962, in reply to my letter asking for consideration of those recommendations made on a constructive basis as the result of information of military buildup that had not only come to my attention but to the attention of other Members of the House as well.

In those recommendations I suggested that the United States Government consider—this is February 3, 1962—such things as recognition and support of a free non-Communist Cuban government in exile.

What was the answer of the administration? Of course I make that proposal again today. My objective today is to set out proposals that deserve continuous consideration and putting into effect by the administration of a free non-Communist government in exile. That is one of the recommendations.

What did the administration reply to that request? I am speaking as of their letter of March 10, 1962, in reply to mine of February 3, 1962:

> The recognition of a government in Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the Government of the United States, because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent the U.S. interests before the Castro regime.

I thought we had withdrawn recognition of the Cuban Castro government. Now, continuing:

> Were a government-in-exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not to the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations.

What obligations? We had withdrawn recognition. And I cited this in the RECORD of October 10, 1962, and prior thereto, as evidence of the fuzzy thinking of the State Department as it relates to dealing with the Communist Castro threat in Cuba.

I further recommended—and this is February 3, 1962—the prevention of further shipping of heavy war materiel by the Sino-Soviet bloc to Cuba. This was October 10, 1962. And, in reply the State Department said:

> Underlying an announcement, such as you suggest, that the United States will not permit the shipment of war materiel to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet bloc is, of course, the intention to insure that the terms of the announcement are fulfilled.

Using the same old kernel that is now being repeated again, that blockade means war, and nobody is proposing a blockade, nobody is proposing war, but I was proposing that which finally resulted; that is, a quarantine or peaceful blockade.

I brought out that there was a some 4.5 to 5 million U.S. dollar leakage through the payrolls at the Guantanamo base to Castro, and I see one of those Members of this House that recently visited Guantanamo made the same statement just a few weeks ago and wondered why this door of American dollars could not be closed. I asked that question, too—on February 3, 1962.

I also suggested that aid to Latin American countries under the Alliance for Progress program be cut off if assistance was given to Castro. Here was the reply, and I repeat it now:

> To withhold our assistance would in many instances further weaken the very nations that for the above-mentioned reasons find that it is politically unfeasible at this time to undertake steps such as sanctions, against the Communist Cuban Government.

So, this was March 10, 1962. The State Department policy was not to withdraw aid or, as a matter of fact, not to take effective steps to discourage other Latin American countries from doing business with Castro-Communist Cuba. These were recommendations I made many months ago, and I could point to other places in the RECORD where I, for one, was calling for action relating to Cuba.

CUBAN ISSUE DOWNGRADED AT COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE

Today I want to discuss a couple of other matters relating to this overall question. No. 1 is the present Costa Rican Conference, and it is rather disturbing to me that the Cuban question is being downgraded by the United States. I have just read on the UPI wire service the President's remarks as he landed in San Jose at the airport, and I noticed a lack of reference with respect to Cuba and the Communist menace in this hemisphere, which again substantiates the statement emanating out of the State Department previously that Cuba and Communist subversion was not to be the top subject of discussion in Costa Rica at this conference of Central American States. It is also interesting to me that Mexico is left out of the Central American Conference. Mexico is where one of our principal problems exists, being one of the nations that continues to recognize Cuba and through which this flow of subversives continues through the Cuban Embassy is Mexico City. What happens is that a person who goes to Mexico, be it from the United States or any Latin American country, goes to the Cuban Embassy, and if they pass the standards set down, they get a separate visa unattached to their passport to enter Cuba and come back to Mexico and then to go back to their home country without the evidence of their Cuban visit on their home document. In that way this visa does not appear as a permanent record on the passport or visa papers of the person involved, the traveler.

Therefore, when that person, be he a citizen of the United States, comes back to the United States, it does not appear on the face of his transport papers—his visa or passport—that he had been to Cuba. This, incidentally, as I understand it, is a violation of international custom if not international law let alone U.S. law.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that going to Cuba at all at this time by a U.S. citizen without the permission of the U.S. Government is a crime.

I am particularly disturbed that the Cuban situation and the long-range answers to it, some of which could easily be carved out at the Costa Rican conference, is being played down rather than played up purposely by the United States—in a forum where firm action could easily emanate—because, after all, most of these small countries were actually invaded by Castro bands early in 1961 and their concern is natural.

SUBJECTS ON COMBATING CUBA'S COMMUNISM THAT SHOULD BE DISCUSSED AT COSTA RICA

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion such matters as these should properly and of necessity be discussed at the Central American-Costa Rican conference: For instance, first, how the large uninhabited coastal regions of Central America—and I have had the privilege of visiting many of them—can be protected against weapon drops and subversive activities by Cuban communism.

Second, how all Central American nations can act in concert if any one is threatened by overthrow by force by the Communists.

Third, how the flow of subversion to and from Cuba can be stopped at their borders as well as through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico.

Fourth, how these nations can encourage other nations to withdraw recognition and impose an economic quarantine in Cuba.

Fifth, what programs should be followed on Alliance for Progress funds for nations that do not join in this effort. And, of course, it is my opinion that such funds should be withheld.

Sixth, give an assurance to these nations that U.S. military assistance to fight threatening communism is available to those nations on the call of the free government of those nations.

In my opinion all of these subjects should not only be discussed, but they should have top priority and should be resolved upon at the Costa Rican conference. A failure to come to grips or to make plans for these actions will foredoom the Costa Rican conference to utter failure in meeting the clear and present dangers of communism, which is the most serious challenge of this decade in this hemisphere.

FURTHER STEPS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM IN THIS HEMISPHERE

Mr. Speaker, another subject upon which I wanted to touch briefly, relating also to Cuba, is this report recently issued by the Selden Committee in which some very interesting, factual findings are made, and in which there are some rather obvious omissions. Let me outline some additional steps—in addition to those which I have already suggested—which I feel the administration should seriously consider in meeting this Communist challenge emanating from Cuba.

The report itself says that certain economic and diplomatic quarantines should be put into effect by all Latin American countries in this hemisphere.

Of course, the report does not indicate how they should be implemented. I have suggested that economic aid should be withheld from countries which do not show an inclination to so implement them. That, obviously, brings up the question with respect to this open-door policy and the quickest way to close that open door of subversion is for Mexico to withdraw recognition of Cuba and thus close the Cuban Embassy and also stop doing business with Cuba. Withdrawal of recognition of Cuba by Bolivia, Uruguay, Brazil, Mexico, and Chile should be demanded as a condition for Alliance for Progress funds.

Then, we get specifically to Brazil and how it can contribute to putting an end to subversion within its own country. There have been some very interesting disclosures concerning that of recent date. The secretary sent to this country to negotiate on behalf of Brazil, the Brazilian Minister of Finance, San Tiago Dantes, made a number of statements before he left Brazil concerning what his intentions were as they relate to the Brazilian loan that he was attempting to negotiate in this country, and these are not small loans. He is asking for an addition of some $84 million to the $553 million in U.S. aid which was given Brazil since 1951 and, according to the best information available, to obtain a postponement of the $450 million Brazil has to date to pay to the United States this year on its debts. When the minister left Rio de Janeiro on February 20 of this year, this is what was reported by the United Press International:

> Rio de Janeiro.—Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million a year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States will be asked to help finance, it was reported today.
>
> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

I read that sentence again:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.
>
> A mission headed by Finance Minister San Tiago Dantas is to leave soon for Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over the 3-year period.

Likewise, in the Evening Star of March 11, as a result of an interview with Finance Minister Dantas this was reported:

> Brazil's Finance Minister said today that part of the financial help he is seeking here would be used to develop trade with all countries—including Russia.
>
> Francisco San Tiago Dantas made that statement to newsmen after conferring at the White House with President Kennedy.
>
> Mr. Dantas, a former Foreign Minister for his government who voted against the expulsion of Cuba from the Organization of American States, said of his talk with Mr. Kennedy:
>
> "I think it was a very interesting conversation and I hope that my visit will be helpful for the mutual understanding between our countries. We had a general picture of the situation and before I leave for Brazil we will have a new talk."
>
> A reporter asked whether "some of this loan you are seeking from the United States" would be used to help develop trade with Russia. No, Mr. Dantas replied, "with all the countries."
>
> "Including Russia?" he was asked.
>
> "Including Russia," he replied.
>
> Mr. Dantas is reported to be hoping to persuade the United States to add some $84 million to the $553 million in U.S. aid given Brazil since 1951, and to obtain a postponement of the $450 million Brazil is due to pay to the United States this year on its debts.
>
> He said that in his talk with Mr. Kennedy there was mention of a visit to Brazil. No date has been fixed he said, but Mr. Kennedy confirmed that it would be this year.

I made a specific request through Mr. Moscoso's office as late as last Saturday that I be informed concerning the requests that had been made by Brazil as to loans and aid and also what was being discussed with regard to trade with Russia—that is between Russia and Brazil; and it is going on now, there is no question about it. I was denied any information other than that negotiations are underway with Brazil. There is no question that the improvement of the economy of Brazil through these loans would have the effect of putting Brazil in a better position to have greater trade with the Soviet Union. I called the attention of the Department of State through Mr. Moscoso's office that according to reports Brazil has earmarked $1½ million for developing trade, including trade with Soviet Russia, and that a large portion of this sum will come from U.S. aid if the request of Goulart's nearly bankrupt administration is fulfilled.

Although the facts surrounding Brazil's request for U.S. aid, as well as how this money will be spent, can be read in the Rio press, the State Department has refused to release this same information to the people who are going to foot the bill—the American taxpayers.

I personally spoke on Saturday with a Mr. Romano in the State Department office of Teodoro Moscoso, regional assistant administrator for Latin America. Although he informed me active negotiations for a loan to Brazil are under way in Washington, he refused to give me information concerning the total amount under consideration and how it will be spent.

In light of the State Department's charges of Communist infiltration in the Government of Brazil, I am asking that no further U.S. loans be made to Senor Goulart's government until the Communists are cleaned out of it, until we receive assurances that our aid dollar will not be used to finance Brazilian trade with Russia and until Brazil follows the lead of the majority of the Latin American nations and withdraws recognition of Castro's Cuba.

I am also asking the State Department to lift the veil of secrecy surrounding this loan so that the American people will be as informed as the Brazilian people are concerning how our tax dollars will be spent.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Can the gentleman advise whether or not the State Department has lifted the veil of secrecy around this loan?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to my distinguished friend from Ohio that it has not, except to the extent that I read again on the UPI wires this morning that despite protests, a loan for $4 million has been announced to Brazil to be used in the State of Guanabara, through a local Brazilian development bank, through the aid loan program, to develop small and medium businesses in the State of Guanabara, and is to be repaid in 15 years.

That is the only answer I have gotten, to the effect that they do not think that securing any assurances from Brazil that would aid in fighting Castro communism in this hemisphere economically and politically, as well as the withdrawal of doing business and stopping them from handling business with Soviet Russia, should be a requirement for this or any other loan.

Mr. HARSHA. I have been trying for about 2 weeks to ferret out this information from the State Department, concerning this so-called negotiation with Brazil. On March 4 of this year I wrote the Secretary of State asking him who was responsible for the State Department's position in this, wanting to know why the State Department would even entertain any negotiations with a country, Brazil or any country, for that matter, to use the money of the American taxpayers to finance an expansion of Communist trade with that country. I have asked for the names of those people responsible for any such policy and as yet have not received an answer of any kind from that Department, although I have written them on a number of occasions subsequent to that letter and have received replies to my letters. Apparently we are not to be advised of the conditions of this loan or the terms or under what circumstances it is to be made. Apparently there are going to be no strings attached to it, and it will be used to finance Red trade. I do not think the American taxpayer wants his money used for any such purpose.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. I appreciate the contribution the gentleman from Ohio has made relating to the trade of Brazil with Soviet Russia, and his effort to get the State Department to make information available. I have joined in that effort.

Of course, the State Department recently, as is contained in the Selden committee report, specifically accepted responsibility for the assertion that Communist infiltration in Brazil exists, and the extent of that infiltration, which is quite substantial. It seems to me now that the Selden subcommittee report is now being made public this should give all the more reason to the State Department as justification for demanding that anti-Communist and anti-Castro anticommunistic action be taken economically and politically by Brazil.

In further substantiation of this fact, that there is a substantial buildup of communism in Brazil, interestingly enough The Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday March 17, reports on this.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this and other articles in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Worker, Mar. 17, 1963]

Brazil's Communist Party's Strength Doubles in 2 Years, Says Carlos Prestes

(By Art Shields)

Moscow.—Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture. Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general secretary

The membership of the progressive peasant unions has expanded from 50,000, 2 years ago, to 600,000 today. The movement for peace, which is the party's central issue, has made great advances.

I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

* * * * *

Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.

The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.

"The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes who used to be an army Colonel himself.

* * * * *

But socialism, he said, cannot be prevented. He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, further, the Red Continental Congress is being held in Rio March 28 as reported in the press; including prominent Brazilians who are to participate such as Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party; Gen. Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants League; Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers; Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the federal chamber; Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command; Mario Shemberg, a well-known Sao Paulo physicist; and Roberto Morena, a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

The complete article follows:

SECRECY SHROUDS AIM OF RIO RED CONGRESS

(By Julian Hartt)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—The second Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity with Cuba is scheduled to be convened here March 28.

The first such Congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru, and with organizing leftists agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

Just what the delegates hope to accomplish in the 3-day meeting this year has become the subject of broad speculation among security officials and political observers in Rio.

Most of the experts are keeping their guesses to themselves, however, chiefly because the current Sino-Soviet ideological schism makes it difficult to forecast events in the Communist world.

A possible reflection of this rift is the fact that leaders of the Rio Congress have drawn up two lists of purported sponsors.

Carlos Lacerda, the anti-Communist Governor of Guanabara state, of which this convention city is the capital. He hopes the Congress will embarrass the administration of President Joao Goulart.

It was Lacerda's State department of public security that came into possession of the two sponsor lists, which were made available to this reporter.

These lists were taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. (While the party is barred from taking an active role in Brazilian politics, membership in the party is not a crime.)

The lists show some duplication, but the principal name on both appears to be that of Gen. Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers. His name appears first on one list and second on what appears to be the original invitation, after that of Francisco Juliao, a Federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants League in the economically depressed northeast.

Both Juliao and the Communist functionary Prestes have been issuing radical statements from Havana recently. Juliao, following the line laid down in Peiping, has insisted that violence and armed struggle against democratic governments must be the Communist course. Prestes, however, has spoken out for the Moscow line of coexistence.

The so-called Juliao list of sponsors, according to Governor Lacerda's department of public security, includes the names of Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers, and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal chamber.

The second, or General Leite list, carries the names of Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command; Mario Shemberg, a well-known São Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with Communist forces in the Spanish Civil War.

Speculation on the Congress' goals has centered mainly on documents accompanying the two lists of sponsors.

The Juliao list was accompanied by a letter that thunders: "Once more Cuba is threatened with armed invasion." Papers taken along with the other list are much milder in tone, proposing a program covering:

1. Self-determination and nonintervention.
2. Solidarity with the Cuban people.
3. National sovereignty and emancipation.
4. Imperialism's policy of world domination.

These documents promised participation in the Congress by labor unions, women's groups, cultural, youth and political organizations, but held out no promise of funds for delegates' travel, food or lodging.

Some observers hopefully expect a violent split between the Peiping-oriented and Moscow-oriented factions.

Mr. Speaker, I think this, together with State Department remarks, clearly establishes the Communist buildup in Brazil.

It further leads to the obvious conclusion that any additional foreign aid money going to Brazil should be conditioned upon withdrawal of recognition of Cuba by Brazil and affirmative efforts to rid the country of the Communist influence.

ACTIONS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Thus, to summarize these remarks, and in making constructive suggestions as to how to combat the Castro and Communist menace in this hemisphere short of war on a constructive basis, I recommend that the U.S. Government consider the following actions:

First. That Cuba and the methods of combating communism in this hemisphere be made a primary topic of discussion at the Costa Rican Conference, including discussions of first, how the relatively uninhabited coastal regions of Central America can be protected against weapon drops and subversion activities from Cuba; second, how all Central American nations can act in concert if anyone is threatened by the overthrow by force by Communists; third, how the flow of subversives to and from Cuba can be stopped at their borders, as well as through Mexico; fourth, how these nations can encourage other nations to withdraw recognition and impose an economic quarantine on Cuba; fifth, how these nations can encourage and join in the withholding of Alliance for Progress funds for nations that do not become a part of this effort to rid the hemisphere of Castro and communism; and sixth, to provide adequate assurance to these nations that U.S. military assistance to fight communism will be made available to the free governments of these nations.

Second. That the U.S. policy should be to require withdrawal of recognition of and doing business with Castro and the Communists on the part of all Latin American recipients of Alliance for Progress funds, including the five countries that still recognize and do business with the Communists; namely, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

Third. The forming and implementation of strong national policies on the part of all Latin American nations to control and eliminate the flow of Communist traffic and arms from Cuba or other Communist countries to Latin America.

Fourth. The establishment of an effective trade ban by the United States, banning the use of U.S. ports by any company doing business with Cuba or by any government that has jurisdiction over those ships doing business with Cuba. The present piecemeal ban is full of loopholes restricting only individual ships from using U.S. ports that also do business with Cuba.

Fifth. The recognition of a free non-Communist government in exile to strengthen all the refugee efforts so that these efforts can have optimum effects, both externally and internally, in upsetting Castro and communism.

Sixth. Advising the Communist nations that this country does not intend to permit the continued shipment of heavy war materiel or personnel to Cuba or the transshipment of Communist subversion and/or arms to other Latin American nations, or to permit Cuba to remain as a Communist threat and that the continuation of these efforts will obviously result in a reinstatement of a quarantine.

Seventh. Volunteering military support to any Latin American country that is threatened with Communist overthrow.

Eighth. That an immediate protest to Mexico should be made by the United States against the use of Mexican territory by the Cuban Embassy for the assignment of visas and for the actual passage of United States and Latin American citizens to Cuba for subversion activities, demanding that this open door to subversion be closed;

Ninth. Securing the support of the Organization of American States for this long-range planned program, short of war, to rid the hemisphere of Castro and communism; and

Tenth. The United States should firmly state that no funds will be contributed to any fund or program of the United Nations by the United States if any of those funds are used to give aid and assistance to the Castro regime.

Many of these constructive suggestions were made months ago by me. I repeat them and add to them today, hoping that this constructive approach, providing for a sound long-range planned program to rid this hemisphere of communism, will receive serious consideration and will be put into effect.

I refuse to accept any coexistence with Castro and communism in this hemisphere doctrine as a replacement of the the Monroe Doctrine. Our ultimate objective as expressed in my resolution, House Joint Resolution 277, should be to rid the hemisphere of communism in Cuba and elsewhere as our basic policy and the steps to accomplish this will of necessity follow.

AN EXERCISE IN FUTILITY

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent developments concerning Brazil's efforts to secure additional U.S. loans and grants, I feel it imperative to put the facts in their proper perspective and to again call my colleagues' attention to this situation.

Mr. Speaker, as early as February 20, 1963, an announcement, presumably from the Brazilian Government, was issued from Rio de Janeiro stating that Brazil was about to sign a long-term $160-million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance. The announcement further stated:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

A Brazilian delegation, headed by Finance Minister San Tiago Dantas, was scheduled to visit with U.S. officials on March 4, 1963, for the purpose of negotiating these long-term loans. This meeting, for some unexplained reason, was postponed.

The reports vary as to just how much money Brazil is requesting, however, the Brazilian Government owes the United States some $630 million in short-term obligations which Dr. Dantas is attempting to defer payment on until some future date. In addition, he is asking for approximately $400 million in additional loans this year and another $400 million for next year. This adds up to the tidy little sum of nearly $1.5 billion. Over the years, we have sent the Brazilian Government more than $2¼ billion in the form of loans and grants, so you see, Mr. Speaker, we have not exactly been stingy with our Latin American friends.

Mr. Speaker, on March 4, I wrote to Secretary of State Rusk and asked him for an explanation as to why this Government would entertain the thought of loaning any sum to Brazil, or any other country for that matter, to develop trade with Russia. As yet, I have not been provided with any answer of any kind, although I have subsequently written the State Department on other matters and have received replies. Apparently, the State Department feels we are not entitled to know the answer to this question. Efforts have been made to determine just how much this loan will amount to, for what purposes, what repayment methods, and other pertinent information that we all should know, but as of this date, we have been kept in the dark or rather denied this information.

On March 11, Mr. Dantas did visit with U.S. officials and he visited with the President, himself. It was after this visit with President Kennedy, that Mr. Dantas, in response to a question by a reporter, admitted that part of this U.S. loan would be used to help finance trade with Russia. Now, the Brazilian Embassy, in a release on March 16, stated that none of the money being sought by Mr. Dantas would be used to develop trade with the Soviet Union. In that same release, it stated that apparently Mr. Dantas misunderstood the question when he said that part of the money would be used to help develop trade with Russia. It was explained by associates of Mr. Dantas that he apparently thought that the reporter was asking him if Brazil would do business with the Soviet Union and it was to this purported question that Dantas said, "Yes."

But, Mr. Speaker, let me restate the exact conversation so that my colleagues can draw their own conclusions. In my humble opinion, the question is very clear and one would have extreme difficulty in misunderstanding it. The question and conversation were as follows: A reporter asked, "whether some of this loan you are seeking from the United States would be used to help develop trade with Russia?"

"The money will be used to promote trade with many countries," Dantas said.

"Including Russia?" he was asked.

"Yes, Russia," he replied.

This conversation was reported in the Columbus Dispatch, March 12, 1963. It was heard by some 11 or 12 other reporters and reported in other leading newspapers throughout the country. Mrs. Jessie Buscher, a leading Washington reporter for the Columbus Dispatch asked the question. Mrs. Buscher is a highly respected newspaper lady and of unquestioned integrity.

Now, this question does not leave much room for misunderstanding. Add to this, some other pertinent facts and one cannot help but arrive at the same conclusion that I did. That is, that this loan will be used in part at least to develop Red trade unless we can put some strings on it. Here are these additional facts:

A news article appearing in the Baltimore Sun, March 8, reported that Brazil would soon begin trade talks with four other members of the Red bloc—Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. In fact, the Hungarian mission has already been in Brazil and it hopes to increase its trade from $7 million per year to $40 million and Poland, at the last report, is scheduled to arrive in Brazil tomorrow.

Mr. Dantas met in an off-the-record session with a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and admitted again that Brazil would expand its trade with the Communist bloc. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Brazilian Bulletin of March 1, 1963, a publication issued by the Brazilian Government Trade Bureau states unequivocally that Brazil hopes to expand her trade with the Soviet bloc countries.

From the many news releases issued by both this Government and the Brazilian Government that Brazil is practically bankrupt, has spiraling inflation and must have this money to put her financial house in order, one draws the obvious conclusion that at least part of these U.S. tax dollars will be used to enhance Communist trade. To say that this money would not find its way into Red trade, is like saying you are going to pour a glass of cream off the top of a bottle of homogenized milk. It cannot be done.

To help Brazil or any other country expand or enhance Communist trade is beyond my comprehension, it is ridiculous and blatantly points out the futility of our foreign policy. During these days when we are so concerned with Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere, when the administration is calling for $11 billion of the taxpayers' money to help Latin America stave off communism, why would the State Department even consider any such negotiation? We are spending and have spent billions of dollars to help other nations combat communism, we are sacrificing American lives in Vietnam to combat communism, we just passed a $15.8 billion military construction bill designed to protect this Nation from communism, our State Department officials have just publicly announced that this Government stands ready to give military help to any Latin American government threatened with a Communist takeover. Why then, in the name of commonsense, would we enter into any agreement that would enhance Red trade?

The expansion of Red trade is a very effective cold war weapon, it not only aids the economic structure of the Red governments, but helps expand their military posture and makes these other countries dependent upon the Russians for much of their economic existence. It completely nullifies the advantage, if any, of making these vast U.S. expenditures to combat communism. Expansion of Red trade will be eventually reflected in the loss of U.S. markets and aggravation of our own balance-of-payments problem and will certainly add to our unemployment dilemma. This muddled thinking by persons in the State Department, this desire to support both sides of any issue at the same time, has led to the chaos and confusion that swirls about our foreign policy. It is time to call a halt to this exercise in futility. Whether the loan to Brazil is for $1.5 billion, $400 million or $1, makes no difference. The American taxpayer does not want his money spent with the right hand to combat communism and with the left hand to enhance communism and Communist trade.

The Russians have already established some 84 so-called friendship stations throughout Latin America. They have completed their takeover of Cuba and are now in the process of taking over Haiti; this is being started by sending a trade mission into Haiti. On March 13, a Czechoslovakian commercial mission arrived in Haiti to start negotiating with Haiti. Thirty-year credits to build up industry are being offered by the Reds. Here again, the same old pattern is being followed as was followed in Cuba—trade missions are sent in, then technicians and advisers and next, soldiers.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to finance the expansion of Red trade with any country is foolhardy and only builds up the economic and military posture of the Reds, enabling them to expand the growth of communism throughout the world.

It is time to call a halt to this idiotic practice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as if the foregoing were not enough to call a halt to this nonsense, look at these facts.

Mr. Dantas, the gentleman trying to negotiate this loan, was the same gentleman who advocated a soft policy toward Cuba at the Punta del Este meeting last year and voted against ousting Cuba from the inter-American States system.

Brazil still officially recognizes Castro's Cuba and is today carrying on trade with Castro.

The State Department has revealed that the Communists have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, the Brazilian labor unions, and Brazilian youth movements.

The Brazilian Government has not as yet made settlements with all the U.S. firms it has expropriated property from, although the foreign aid bill unequivocally states that no aid shall be given any country until such settlements are made.

Furthermore, other American firms are being harrassed by the Brazilian Government and Francisco Juliao, leftist leader in Brazil declared on March 10, that, "if the United States invades Cuba, we will sabotage North American properties in Brazil."

It is reliably reported that Brazil will host the second Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity with Cuba on March 28. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

Under all these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it would seem little enough to ask that American tax dollars not be granted or loaned to Brazil until she has removed the Communists at least from the ranks of government, that all U.S. citizens be reimbursed for property expropriated by Brazil, and that infallible assurances be given the United States that none of our money will be used to enhance Communist trade.

TARIFF RELIEF A HOAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in the House to discuss that part of the Tariff Expansion Act dealing with assistance for displaced workers. Recently the U.S. Department of Labor issued the following memorandum contained in an official booklet. I quote from the booklet:

ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS UNDER THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

(Note.—This pamphlet discusses the eligibility of totally unemployed workers, but you may apply for a readjustment allowance or training if you are working only part time for your company because of an increase in imports, provided that increase was the result of a trade concession.)

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides adjustment assistance to workers who are laid off or working only part time because of increased imports resulting from trade concessions.

This pamphlet explains how workers may apply for assistance and the kind of assistance they may receive.

Your company has laid off a number of its workers, including you. The layoff is caused by an increase in imported products like those made by your company. If this increase was the result of a trade concession, you may apply for a readjustment allowance, training, job relocation assistance, all of the above.

Before you may receive assistance, the U.S. Tariff Commission must find that your unemployment is due to increased imports resulting from a trade concession but immediately following your layoff, inform your local employment security office that you wish to apply for adjustment assistance under the Trade Expansion Act.

This is important so that your right to apply for assistance is protected.

You satisfy all of the following:

Your layoff, the result of a trade concession, began after the Trade Expansion Act became law, October 11, 1962;

You worked for any employer or employers for 18 months out of the 3 years preceding your layoff;

You worked for any employer or employers adversely affected by imports for 6 months out of the year preceding your layoff;

You are available for work (or enrolled in an approved training program);

You are not disqualified under your State unemployment insurance law.

DETERMINATIONS BY THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A group of workers adversely affected by imports may petition the U.S. Tariff Commission for a determination covering (I) their individual company (or a subdivision of their company), or (II) their entire industry.

I. YOUR COMPANY (OR SUBDIVISION)

To determine whether you are eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance, your union representatives, or anyone you authorize to represent you, must petition the U.S. Tariff Commission on your behalf. The Commission will determine whether the layoff at your company resulted from an increase in imports caused by a trade concession and will report its findings to the President.

The President may then certify that the unemployment workers of your company are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance. His certification will specify the date that import-affected unemployment began.

NOTE.—If you continued working at the time a group of your fellow workers petitioned the Tariff Commission, but you were laid off at a later date, apply for assistance immediately. It will not be necessary for your representative to petition the Tariff Commission a second time within 2 years.

II. YOUR INDUSTRY

A recognized union, firm, trade association, or other representative of an industry may petition the Tariff Commission for tariff adjustment. In this case the Commission will determine whether increased imports resulting from a trade concession are adversely affecting your entire industry. Its findings will be reported to the President.

The President may then authorize groups of unemployed workers in your industry to request the Secretary of Labor for a determination of eligibility so they may apply for trade adjustment assistance.

When the Secretary receives a group's petition, he will determine whether their unemployment was caused by increased imports which the Tariff Commission found to be adversely affecting their industry.

If the Secretary finds that the group's unemployment results from increased imports, he will certify that these workers are eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance. His certification will specify the date their import-affected unemployment began.

(NOTE.—If you continued working at the time a group of workers in your industry requested the Secretary of Labor for assistance, but you were laid off at a later date, apply for assistance immediately. It will not be necessary for your representative to ask the Secretary for another determination within 2 years.)

To help you get a job, your State employment security agency will make testing and counseling available to you to see if there is a suitable training course for you.

Your local employment security office will find out whether training may result in a new job for you at the company you were working for.

If a suitable training program will make it possible for you to go back to the company you worked for, it will be offered to you. Or you may be offered training for a job with another company or industry.

If you refuse or discontinue training without good cause, cash allowances will be discontinued until you enter or resume training.

During your training period, you will be entitled to cash allowances and if training facilities are not within commuting distance of your home, you may be entitled to (a) an allowance up to 10 cents a mile to defray transportation expenses, and (b) a subsistence allowance up to $5 a day.

You may receive 65 percent of your average weekly wage but not more than 65 percent of the national average weekly wage in manufacturing industries ($96.72 in October 1962).

Deduct from this amount (a) any unemployment insurance payments you receive for the same week, and (b) 50 percent of any wages you receive for the same week.

(NOTE.—Your allowance may not exceed an amount which, when added to your unemployment insurance and any wages you receive, brings all three to more than 75 percent of your average weekly wage.)

You may receive a relocation allowance if you satisfy all of the following:

You are the head of a family;

You cannot find employment where you live;

You have a genuine job offer in another area;

You wish to make the move.

The relocation allowance covers the expenses of the move, and also provides a lump-sum payment of 2½ times the average weekly manufacturing wage.

HOW LONG WILL YOU RECEIVE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES?

For no more than 52 weeks unless the Secretary of Labor approves an additional 26 weeks to assist you to complete an approved training course or you were 60 years of age at the time you were laid off, in which case you may receive an additional 13 weeks of allowances. (You cannot draw both additional allowances.)

IS THERE A TIME LIMIT FOR DRAWING ALLOWANCES?

Yes. No allowance will be paid for any week of unemployment which begins 2 years after your last import-affected layoff. No additional allowance will be paid for any week of unemployment which begins 3 years after your last import-affected layoff.

And the number of weeks you can receive cash allowances will be reduced by the number of weeks you have received State unemployment insurance following your layoff; training allowances under another Federal law following your layoff.

Mr. Speaker, I call this to your attention simply because my prediction of last year has been proven by the very first case to come before the Tariff Commission for relief and assistance to displaced workers.

The first test case concerns the lead and zinc miners. After taking the testimony the Tariff Commission refused the plea of these workers for relief pursuant to the provisions of the Tariff Expansion Act and the directive from the Department of Labor. The background information and statistics on this industry can be found in the printed hearings of the Committee on Impact of Imports on American Employment—the committee I was privileged to chair during the 87th Congress.

The case of the lead and zinc miners is no different than that of thousands of other workers in other industries. I feel that all appeals under this section of the act for assistance will meet the same fate before the Tariff Commission. It can hardly be otherwise. We find a rather strange set of circumstances when we study the problems of imports and injury sustained by both industry and labor insofar as seeking relief under the act. The Board of Appeals, in this case is, of course, the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission has jurisdiction in the matter of establishing the rates of tariffs and quotas, therefore, if injury is claimed they are compelled to deny that injury had been caused by refusing assistance or admit that the tariff rates and quotas were wrong in the first place.

It appears rather odd that the sentencing judge in this case handles the appeals. It is much like placing the fox in charge of the henhouse—or even worse—letting the doctor be his own undertaker. He can bury his mistakes.

The case of the lead and zinc miners can well set the pattern for rejection all along the line of all pleas of injured workmen. The Department of Labor specifically states that workers will be displaced and the act prescribes assistance for such workers. The question is, how do they get this assistance?

It is my prediction that unless this Congress sets up a separate tribunal to act on the appeals of these workers that no assistance will be forthcoming. Therefore, the promise which was held out to labor of relief under the act may well turn out to be a well planned hoax. Before the end of the trade story is told, all labor will find that their support of the trade bill on the promise of compensation for lost jobs was a bad bargain.

If the Congress intends to give aid and relief to injured workers and industries, a court of appeals will have to be set up.

The case of the lead and zinc miners is a case in point. When is a man's job taken by imports? How do you measure the impact of imports upon employment?

The best method, of course, is to measure the consumption against domestic production. Yesterday the miners were working; our consumption of lead and zinc was X tonnage. Today our consumption is X plus, our production X minus; thus a surplus stockpile and the miners are out of work. When a nation is consuming more than it produces, imports must be providing the difference between production and consumption. When a nation's consumption is equal to its domestic production and imports create a surplus of a given commodity, then injury to both the industry and the workers follows. The best proof of injury is a relief or unemployment check.

When the trade bill was being acted upon by the Congress we were told by Secretary Hodges that as many as 6 million jobs would be created by our expanded trade. The then Secretary of Labor promised us 5 million jobs and Charles Percy of Bell & Howell went all the way to 15 million jobs created by exports.

Slogans, promises, pie in the sky smoke writing may fool the people for a while but the realities of life have a way of turning aside the shrouds of double talk and presenting the stark, naked truth in the form of growing, chronic unemployment.

If De Gaulle allows the Trade Expansion Act to be put into full operation in the next year this Nation as well as the Common Market will suffer an economic depression.

A few of us warned this House and pointed out the facts of life.

I said then and I repeat now: "No nation can survive in a free-for-all trade war if its economy is based upon a high cost plateau unless it has legislation or international covenants to protect its cost of production, its tax structure, and its built-in costs of essential services."

My studies as chairman of the committee studying the impact of imports on employment convinced me beyond a doubt that we could make and keep friends only by trading fairly and not by trading freely.

I pointed out that tariffs, as such, represent only one consideration in the trade agreements. The restraints on trade take many forms.

At this very moment, even while the workers in the lead and zinc mining fields are being denied relief, as outlined in the Trade Expansion Act, many other industries are feeling the pressure of increased imports.

I refuse to dignify the export-import trade venture as a competitive transaction.

Competition plays a minor part in the world trade picture. Even the Adam Smith theory of free trade never envisioned competition between nations producing and selling like products.

In fact, the opposite was true. Adam Smith's theory was based upon producing certain products exclusively and not competitively.

The day all nations can produce for themselves all of their needs in any specific item or product, that is the day free trade becomes a death rattle in the high-cost nation.

The import-export balances for 1962 prove this beyond a doubt. Even in the field of agriculture when we balance sales against purchases this Nation is operating a deficit trade balance.

The latest report shows a $5 billion export volume while imports of all farm products will be over $4 billion.

Simple arithmetic and free trade apologists would show a $1 billion trade balance in our favor. However, it is not what it appears to be.

Closer examination shows that there is a great difference between what we export and what we get paid for.

We exported $5 billion worth, however, we actually gave away $1,600 million worth of farm products under the food-for-peace program.

This leaves $3,400 million in export sales. In this sum there are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of subsidized products such as wheat and cotton which costs the American taxpayers 48 cents a bushel and $42.50 a bale on every sale made in world trade. How much was sold for counterpart or noncollectible foreign currency has not been announced.

However, in our imports of $4 billion there are no gifts or concessions, most of these imports outside of tropical fruits, sugar, and some specialty products displace American farm products and farm jobs.

This is particularly true in the imports of beef and beef products.

In the year just closed, this Nation imported 970 million pounds of beef and beef products, an increase of 41 percent over the previous year. The imports of mutton jumped over 100 percent to a total of 67 million pounds. The same is true in greater or lesser degrees in mushrooms, heavy creams, cheeses, and in the truck garden products such as onions, tomatoes, carrots, and so forth. The net acreage lost in the trade balance between exports and imports in beef alone is over 40 million acres idled by imports.

This Congress has before it at this time a bill calling for a 7½-percent tariff on bread.

One wonders how any free trader can vote for a tariff on the staff of life. The main argument in favor of free trade is based upon open competition between all nations and giving the consumer the benefit of low-cost products. Will he vote to raise the price of bread to the low-income families while at the same time allow the free importation of products not essential to the physical wellbeing of our peoples. My guess is he will, if the bread imports affect his district.

The plain and simple truth of the matter is, that when you scratch a free trader he bleeds like a protectionist if the needle you use comes from his own pocket.

People everywhere fight for self-survival; nations are people.

We have not heard the last or the saddest words in the matter of farm products. When the EEC finally sets its agricultural policy we will pay for everything we sell in the Common Market. I said pay and that is what I mean. We will be buying our own subsidized farm products at retail prices and selling at wholesale in the world market.

In fact, until we get closer to an equalized economy with the necessary free immigration between nations we will only be able to sell products in world competition that we subsidize.

There are some who believe it is better to pay farmers and workers out of taxes to produce surplus goods to give away in foreign countries, or to sell below costs rather than to recognize the folly of a free trade, open-door policy for a high cost, high economy nation.

This Nation's trade policy can be likened to General Motors getting into a price war with Ford, selling the Cadillac against the Falcon based upon selling price and volume, while ignoring costs of production. They would sell more Cadillacs, but General Motors would go broke in the end.

If you think this is farfetched, examine the case of stainless steel.

Recently I introduced legislation calling for an amendment to the Tariff Act to close a loophole which is causing a serious disruption in the domestic production of stainless steel. The attached memorandum covers the contents of the legislation and its purposes.

This is a very serious matter because of a veto by GATT of the tariff schedules, included in last year's Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which would have closed this loophole, but since the GATT veto in October, this act of Congress has not been put into effect, thereby creating a situation which has become acute.

Because of the discovery of a loophole by the Japanese in the spring of 1960, imports on stainless steel in 1959 totaled $14,000. In 1960, when the loophole was discovered, it jumped to $257,000, and in the first 11 months of 1962, $5,518,000.

Specifically, stainless steel carries a duty of 14½ cents per pound but by manipulation of the loophole interpretation, the Japanese—with their cheap labor—polish one side of a sheet of stainless steel, and come in under paragraph No. 309-1001 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and thereby paying a duty of only 1¼ cents a pound up until 1960 in an ad valorem equivalent to less than 3 percent. This subterfuge was not employed by any exporters to the United States, but since the Japanese steel complex has grown to a surplus production unit, they are seeking any and all means to dump their surplus into the United States.

This is not an attack against free trade as such. This is a move intended to preserve the jobs fast disappearing in the steel industry of the United States.

The following memorandum is designed to bring to your attention a serious import problem facing U.S. producers of stainless steel and their employees and to urge remedial legislation which would eliminate threat of substantial economic injury to domestic firms.

The legislation we recommend is in the nature of a technical amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, it would neither conflict with present foreign trade agreements nor interfere with trade expansion goals. It would merely close a disturbing loophole.

TARIFF LOOPHOLE

The appropriate duty rate on stainless steel sheets is at least 14 percent ad valorem. Stainless steel sheets which are polished, however, enter under paragraph 309-1001, Tariff Act of 1930, at a duty rate of 1¼ cents per pound, a figure which, based on recent import values may be expressed at 2.9 percent in ad valorem equivalent. The average value of imports of this item is 42 cents per pound.

These contrasting duty rates can be outlined, as follows:

	Specific duty per pound (cents)	Ad valorem rate (percent)
A. 1. Plates and sheets, not specifically provided for (par. 304)		9½
2. Additional duty based on alloy content of stainless steel (par. 305)		[1] 4
3. Total	5.94	14½
B. Plates and sheets, polished, planished, or glanced, total	1¼	2.9

[1] Plus 1 percent additional.

There is no justification for such a discrepancy in effective duty rate: Stainless steel sheets properly dutiable at 14 percent, are subject to a duty of less than 3 percent simply as a result of the polishing process. Ironically, since polishing necessitates greater labor content and commensurately increases the competitive labor cost advantage of foreign over U.S. stainless steel sheet, the process should militate in favor of a higher rather than a lower import duty.

The history of paragraph 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 explains its illogical impact. Tariff provision for "sheets and plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated" as found in 309 has existed with only minor changes since 1883. Stainless steel, however, is of comparatively recent commercial importance, not being in production in significant quantities until well after World War I. It is apparent that the provision was intended to apply only to high-tonnage carbon steel. This duty, when applied to substantially higher value stainless steel sheets, however, presents the opportunity for tariff evasion. The apparent discovery of this loophole in 1960 creates the present serious problem.

INCREASE IN IMPORTS

As a result of the discovery of the discrepancy, the importation of stainless steel sheets and plates has increased by more than 1,000 percent since 1960, a rate of increase which far exceeds any precedent. The level of importation itself, even assuming stabilization of the increase rate, threatens serious injury to domestic producers of stainless steel.

The import situation is clearly revealed by the following chart:

Imports—schedule A No. 6039700 [1]

	Pounds	Value
1955	32,755	$19,102
1956	30,478	18,881
1957	32,574	31,168
1958	42,952	11,020
1959	15,650	14,251
1960	736,746	257,160
1961	1,872,909	814,059
1962 (11 months)	14,056,178	5,518,943

[1] "Sheets or plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced." Over 90 percent of this total is comprised of stainless steel.

Source: Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Japan is by far the greatest source of these polished steel sheets, accounting for well over 90 percent of the imports during the first 10 months of 1962. Japan's share of imports under paragraph 309 during the month of October 1962 alone was 1,493,018 pounds, a figure which exceeds the all-nation total for the entire period from 1955 through 1960. Foreign competition of this nature threatens immediate injury to the U.S. industry. It is inexcusable that the threat is greatly enlarged by an obvious tariff loophole.

THE ANOMALY HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Acting under legislative mandate, the Tariff Commission has recently completed a series of tariff schedules which collate and simplify the U.S. tariff structure. In cognizance of the anomaly, the Commission would correct it by classifying plates and sheets in a single category, thereby eliminating the illogical result in accordance with the standards of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954. Congress authorized the proclamation of the Tariff Schedules early last year in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 when the President implements this act the schedules will have the force of law.

Unfortunately, by reason of the difficulty of conforming the schedules to trade agreements, the proclamation has been delayed. As the matter is dependent upon successful negotiation with principal foreign nations, there is no way in which domestic stainless steel producers can know when this loophole will be closed.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

Corrective legislation is the only solution which will effectively prevent the continuation of injury. Such legislation would provide for the deletion of the reference to polished, planished or glanced plates or sheets from paragraph

309. No tariff adjustment, or other adjustment, assistance relief, may be sought, since polished, planished or glanced sheets have never been the subject of a trade agreement.

There is ample precedent for legislation to correct an inequity of this sort. See Public Law 749, 83d Congress; Public Law 454, 85th Congress. Furthermore, the proposed amendment would not constitute a discriminatory duty against foreign suppliers—the current import duty on polished stainless steel sheets is 15 percent ad valorem in Japan itself.

In conclusion the industry is certain that it was not and is not the intent of Congress to permit an obvious loophole in tariff structure to imperil the continued existence of a viable segment of domestic industry.

It might be interesting to read an official publication of the Japanese Metal Bulletin dealing with this subject on stainless steel. I want to quote the exact newspaper story headed "Relieving News to Stainless Steel Mills, Exporters":

> Increase in import tariff on the imported polished stainless steel sheets by the United States is strongly indicated to be postponed again up to the 1st of January 1964.
>
> It was once reported that the current 4 percent import tariff applied to polished stainless sheets would be raised to 15 percent from the beginning of this year, with the postponement announcement made up to the end of February.
>
> Since then, in the light of GATT Convention and of the American fiscal year which is to begin on the 1st of July, the raised tariff would be enforced beginning the 1st of July; it came to be widely believed, but now the postponement up to 1964 is announced, maybe by the pressure of the U.S. importers to the Congress, and much to the relief of Japanese stainless suppliers and mills.

As a Member of this Congress I object vigorously to the implication in this Japanese news item that the Congress of the United States and/or administrative agencies of the Government have been lobbied by the powerful, rich importers' lobby into denying relief to an industry that, according to its own statements in letters and telegrams in my files, can be completely eliminated as a producing industry in the United States. It would be interesting if Congress would take time to investigate the entire import-export lobby and its efforts to measure and influence upon the Congress of the United States. Time does not permit a tabulation of the industries and businesses that have contacted me and other Members of Congress on the serious injury to the American economy already being felt even though the full impact of the Tariff Expansion Act has not been felt. This is due, of course, to the action of President de Gaulle in his rejection of British entrance into the Common Market. It is my humble opinion that what De Gaulle was aiming at was not so much a rejection of Great Britain but, in fact, a rejection of the American Trade Expansion Act which, in effect, could well destroy much of the economic growth of the Common Market, if we could dump agricultural products and capital goods in which we still maintain a production and cost advantage through our subsidy payments.

The move by De Gaulle is strictly an economic move intended to protect France's industries and workers.

Within the past week, the following newspaper item appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer which I quote, in part:

> TEXTILE PLANT IN LENNI CLOSING, EMPLOYS 260
>
> Yorkshire Worsted Mills, Inc., announced Saturday it is closing its textile plant in Lenni, near Chester, which employs some 260 persons.
>
> The 50-year-old plant will be sold at public auction on Tuesday, said John B. Lomas, Jr., secretary-treasurer, who announced the closing.
>
> SECOND IN 2 DAYS
>
> Yorkshire thus becomes the second major Delaware County industrial employer in 2 days to announce that it is shutting down.
>
> General Steel Industries, Inc., said on Friday it is closing its steel casting plant at Eddystone which employs some 900 persons.
>
> Lomas said Yorkshire has been losing money the past 7 years because of cheap textiles imported from foreign countries. Business has slumped about 60 percent during the period, he said.
>
> At one time Yorkshire operated a second mill in Chester. Together, the two mills had a peak payroll of 700 persons.
>
> UNION PROTEST
>
> Benjamin Norwitch, business agent for Local 178 of the Textile Workers Union, complained that the United States is not protecting its textile industry through tariffs.
>
> "The Japanese weaver works for 14 and 15 cents an hour," Norwitch said, "ours for $2.25 and $2.30. In 1962, the United States imported 81 percent more textile products than it did in 1961."

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering how these workers will be able to prove injury—perhaps the best proof is that they are out of work.

Just touching on a few of the items, I would like to quote a recent Wall Street Journal article which bears out my statement:

> VANADIUM CORP. PUTS 1962 LOSS OVER $1 MILLION, BLAMES SOVIET DUMPING—NET INVENTORY WRITEDOWNS DUE TO CHROME ORE IMPORTS WERE $989,000, FIRM HAD PROFIT IN 1961
>
> NEW YORK.—Vanadium Corp. of America expects to report a loss slightly in excess of $1 million last year, mostly because of inventory writedowns required by Russian dumping of chrome ore, G. La Monte Weissenburger, president and chairman, said in an interview.
>
> In 1961, the producer of ferroalloys and uranium earned $271,540, or 6 cents a common share.
>
> Mr. Weissenburger said the sharply increased imports of low-priced Russian chrome ore began late last year. The yearend inventory adjustments totaled $989,000 net after Federal income tax credits, he added.
>
> Before the inventory writedown, the 1962 loss was about $80,000 after depreciation and depletion charges of $2,744,388, the executive stated. The company had reported a 9-month loss of $125,037, indicating an operating profit of about $45,000 in the fourth quarter.
>
> Sales last year dropped to $49,744,000 from $53,647,338 in 1961, Mr. Weissenburger said.
>
> Besides Russian dumping of chrome ore on the U.S. market, Mr. Weissenburger blamed Vanadium's deficit last year on a number of other factors. They included: A decline during most of 1962 in production of stainless and other alloy steels that use ferroallys; inventory reduction by steel producers and consumers, which lowered demand for ferroalloys; accelerated imports of such alloys into an already depressed U.S. market; and "virtual chaos in the domestic ferroalloy price structure, which has continued into 1963."
>
> To counteract present adverse conditions in ferroalloy markets, Mr. Weissenburger said, Vanadium late last year began a cost-cutting program that included replacement and modernization of low-efficiency furnaces, improvement in processes and cutbacks in administrative expenses and payrolls.
>
> Mr. Weissenburger said Vanadium's financial position continued strong. Current assets at yearend were about $30 million and current liabilities about $5.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, the American ferromanganese industry made a statement on February 1, which I would like to quote at this time:

> The American ferroalloy industry generally, and ferromanganese producers specifically, face an acute and steadily increasing threat from imports. (This presentation is concerned with standard or high-carbon ferromanganese exclusively.)
>
> We will attempt to demonstrate in these pages that the ferromanganese industry has already been seriously affected by subsidized foreign competitions—much of it shipped from behind preclusive tariff barriers raised by several foreign producers.
>
> Since there is no known substitute for manganese in the manufacture of steel and since our country has virtually no reserves of recoverable metallurgical ore, we must import over 99 percent of such requirements from abroad. For this reason the U.S. Government has acquired over 9 million tons of crude manganese ore as a strategic reserve.
>
> To the extent that imports jeopardize ferromanganese smelting capacity, so do they compromise the value of the stockpile and the strategic potential of the American steel industry.
>
> The American ferromanganese industry feels quite capable of meeting equitable foreign competition. It cannot, however, be expected to meet subsidized competition. We have endeavored to demonstrate here that we do face this type of import competition.
>
> We feel that this condition should and can be rectified by Presidential decree or action of the Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board as established by the Trade Expansion Act.
>
> ### DEFINITION AND IMPORTANCE OF FERROMANGANESE
>
> Each ton of steel produced in the United States requires an average of 13 pounds of the element manganese. No suitable substitute for manganese in steel production is known. The alloy ferromanganese is the most common vehicle by which this metal is added to steel. Standard or high carbon ferromanganese, the most generally used addition agent, is an alloy consisting of 74 to 82 percent manganese, 6.5–7.5 percent carbon with the balance principally iron. Manganese functions as a scavenger, removing certain impurities as iron is refined into steel. Manganese also imparts toughness, hardenability and hardness to steel, making possible rolling or forging without tearing or cracking.
>
> On the strength of the role which ferromanganese plays in the production of steel and by reason of the fact that the United States has little or no economically recoverable ores of manganese, the U.S. Government has accumulated in the national stockpile over 9 million tons of metallurgical grade manganese ore. This ore would, in

time of emergency, have to be converted into alloy before it could be used. To the extent that this country's capacity to convert this stockpile into alloy is restricted, so is the value of the stockpile diminished.

The American ferroalloy industry is confronted with a rising tide of imports, to the extent that the welfare of the industry itself is in jeopardy and the Nation faces an unhealthy degree of dependence on foreign producers.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS

For the first time since the start of World War I, imported ferromanganese has become a significant factor in the American market. The reasons why this should be and how it is possible are discussed in subsequent paragraphs.

The strategic effects of this were touched upon in the preceding paragraphs. Some of the specific or local results are equally significant.

We have seen the number of men employed directly in the manufacture of ferromanganese fall from 5,200, or more, during the 1957-60 period to an estimated 3,500 or less, currently. We may assume that for each man employed directly, there is another man—coal miner, coke oven worker, quarryman, etc.—indirectly employed. Thus, in a span of 4 years, we have seen over 3,000 men lose their jobs. During this period total ferromanganese consumption has been relatively stable. The decrease in production is reflective of imports.

During this same period one independent producer of ferromanganese has been forced to cease production entirely. Eleven producers remain. Of these, two are integrated steel manufacturers. Of the remaining nine, two, at least, are reported to be in financial difficulties and none is winning profits commensurate with investments.

A substantial proportion of American-made ferromanganese is produced in electric furnaces. To obtain low cost power, electric furnace operators must sign long term demand contracts. With their markets dwindling, some producers may deem it imprudent to renew such contracts. This may well have the effect of eliminating entirely one or more such producers.

PATTERNS OF IMPORTS

The impact of imported ferromanganese must be viewed in the context of the markets available. Steel producers representing approximately 47 percent of total U.S. ingot ton capacity produce their own ferromanganese, leaving 53 percent of the U.S. steel industry as comprising the effective or available market. Figure I shows the proportions of the available market supplied by foreign sources during the past 10 years.

Imports 1957, 7.7 percent of U.S. market.
Imports 1962, 33 percent of U.S. market.

An analysis of these figures would indicate an established practice either premeditated or inadvertent on the part of foreign producers whereby the U.S. market has become a relief valve for their own surpluses.

Alloy smelting capacity is more readily installed than integrated steel production facilities. It has been the policy in several countries abroad to install such facilities in anticipation of eventually requiring them to support planned increases of domestic steel production—but in anticipation of such needs, to export their product to the most accessible market—the United States. We have seen this in the case of India and South Africa.

Also implicit in these figures is the evidence that the U.S. market has become a convenient outlet for surplus production of ferromanganese by established steel producing areas. Imports of ferromanganese into the United States reflect the demands of foreign local market. As the initial industrial impetus of the EEC and its complementary Iron and Steel Community diminished, Western Europe turned to the United States as an outlet which would permit continued economic operation of furnaces that might otherwise have been forced to lower production, thereby increasing their costs.

This pattern shows that when U.S. requirements are greatest, and, therefore, capacity to absorb is highest, the least imported ferromanganese is offered. As steel production falls in the United States (and reflectively abroad) a maximum effort is made to sell in this market. A case in point was 1957. That year, when both the United States and Western European steel producers were operating at record levels, ferromanganese imports reached a 10-year low. In 1962, when the United States and most foreign steel industries were depressed, imports into the United States reached an alltime high—with every indication of continuation into 1963 unless remedial steps are taken.

IMPORT ENVIRONMENT

In the preceding paragraphs we have discussed the general pattern which imports have followed as well as motives inspiring this trade. It is revealing to examine some of the conditions which make this possible.

Comparative tariffs

The following nations have supplied the bulk of imported ferromanganese to the United States: India, France, Republic of South Africa, Japan, West Germany, Yugoslavia, Norway, and Canada.

Generally these nations are shipping from behind protective tariff barriers of their own. It is interesting to note that several of these—signatories of GATT Agreements—have imposed modest import tariffs conformable with such agreements but have imposed on top of these virtually preclusive sales taxes which bar imports as effectively as duties. A case in point is France which has imposed a 3-percent ad valorem duty plus 25-percent ad valorem sales tax plus 2-percent ad valorem of total customs charges.

Figure III (not printed) shows that with the exception of Chile and West Germany, ore is entered free into the ferromanganese exporting nations (Chile has a marginal, generally uneconomic manganese mining industry which is protected effectively by the very high import duty on ore. The nominal duty levied by West Germany is too small to have any significant impact on costs of production). With duty-free ore, such import duties as may be levied against ferromanganese become net figures—reflecting the true degree of protection.

The United States follows the incongruous policy of levying duty on ore—constituting an unavoidable cost of production. The tariff on imported ferromanganese is offset to the extent that American producers pay duty on ore. For example—manganese ore pays an import duty of one-fourth cent per pound of contained manganese. Ferromanganese pays a duty of five-eighths cent per pound of contained manganese. The result is a net protection for domestic producers of approximately $6.30 per long ton or about 3 percent of current market price.

American producers suffer a significant disadvantage in this regard as compared to foreign competition.

Comparative costs

We have reason to believe that certain countries are offering ferromanganese at prices below their actual costs.

As an example—Yugoslavia has offered standard ferromanganese at $120 per long ton c.i.f. Northeast U.S. ports (with rumors of even lower prices) enabling east coast steel manufacturers to purchase at $75-$80 per ton below domestic prices.

Yugoslavia has no domestic source of ore of any consequence, nor does it have sufficient fuel for its own needs as witnessed by heavy shipments from the United States in recent years and recently announced purchase of 3 million tons of coal from U.S.S.R. We therefore, have a basis for estimating its costs of production. Figure IV (not printed) illustrates hypothetical costs in Yugoslavia for both electric and blast furnace-produced alloy. We feel that these estimates are objective—although no data are available as to wage rates, labor productivity or internal rail and handling costs. Figure IV demonstrates that $120 does not reflect true costs. Our estimates of $116.19 to $126.05 per ton delivered do not include repair and maintenance, furnace lining, overhead, commissions (this material is being offered by brokers), internal transportation costs or profits. (From the analyses of the Yugoslavian ferromanganese we assume it to be an electric furnace product.) We maintain that this is subsidized competition or sales at less than its fair value, constituting dumping as defined by the Antidumping Act. (Antidumping Act, as amended, Aug. 14, 1958, sec. 201(a).)

India has become an important source of ferromanganese in this market, where this alloy is offered at prices $30-$40 below domestic prices. The Indian alloy industry admits to sales of ferromanganese at prices below cost and has appealed to the Indian Government to increase domestic prices paid by the Indian steel industry to offset such losses sustained.

To the best of our knowledge, Italy has given up ferromanganese production, since it has found it cheaper to import its requirements—presumably from the same sources importing to the U.S. current market quotations f.o.t. Milan show prices of $169-$180 per metric ton. This would indicate that foreign producers are supplying the Italian market at higher prices than ferromanganese is being sold by these same producers in the United States.

Governmental or quasi-official practices serve to obscure the picture still further. Centralized control or manufacturing cartels—illegal in the United States—are commonplace abroad. Japan imports its ore from the same source as does the United States. Short of solid fuel, it is a large buyer of U.S. coal and coke. Hydroelectric power is in short supply—necessitating periodic curtailment of electric furnace operations when rainfall is low, yet it continues to sell in this country at $40-$50 below domestic prices. The alloy industry is intricately interrelated with the Japanese iron and steel industry and no authentic data on domestic alloy prices are available. We must assume that without any obvious cost advantage (other than labor, which represents less than 20 percent of production costs) interindustry subsidies of some nature must be employed to make these prices possible. The West German alloy industry feels as we do.

In summary, we contend that much of the ferromanganese offered on the American market enjoys artificial advantages against which domestic producers cannot compete.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

We have attempted here to demonstrate the problems confronting our industry and the probable effects that the continuation of present policies might have. With the aim of resolving these problems and assuring our country of a continued vigorous ferroalloy industry—while at the same time recognizing the position of our allies—we propose the following as possible solutions:

I. Removal of duty on ore from non-Communist sources

The United States has no economic metallurgical manganese ore reserves. Less than 1 percent of the country's requirements are domestically produced. Over 30 years of tariff protection has failed to develop any significant production. The present duty of one-fourth cent per pound of contained manganese adds approximately $4.20 per long ton to the cost of ferromanganese. At current rates it generates $5 million or less in revenues—far less than would result from corporate and individual income taxes if production was at a consistently economic level.

We feel that this is an onerous and unrewarding tariff which should promptly be removed.

II. Imposition of realistic duty on imported ferromanganese

If manganese ore was admitted duty free, the existing duty of ferromanganese (five-eighths of a cent per pound of contained manganese) would result in net protection of approximately $10.50 per gross ton (assuming ferromanganese containing 75 percent Mn). This would represent about 5 percent of the domestic market price. Even this we consider to be gravely inadequate in view of the distortions implicit in the offering price of foreign material.

It is our contention that a duty of $40–$50 per long ton is supported by the evidence submitted and would conform to the protective tariffs, or equivalent taxes imposed by the exporting countries themselves.

III. Imposition of absolute quotas

In the 10 years—1952 through 1961, foreign sources supplied an average of 7.5 percent of total U.S. industrial consumption of ferromanganese (621,000 tons out of 8,268,000) or the equivalent to 14.2 percent of the available market. This period covers extremes in levels of steel production and may thus be regarded as a fair statistical base.

Mr. Speaker, the above story of the ferromanganese industry is only the beginning if the Tariff Expansion Act is put into effect. I have faith in the Congress of the United States and in the President of the United States in that I do not believe when the chips are down, the American economy, the American defense effort, and the American free-enterprise system, including the jobs of workers, will be sacrificed in a profiteering venture which is disguised under the name of free trade. Trade is a commercial venture and all history has proven this. Although trade can be used to benefit all nations, it must be based on sound economics. This is not necessarily true however, when this Nation or any nation decides to give aid to needy peoples. However, this should not be considered as trade but should be considered for what it is—namely: Relief, assistance, or perhaps in a broad sense, a diplomatic maneuver we cannot long continue. To have industry by industry, product by product, undermined or eliminated for diplomatic gains which are neither lasting nor are they, in many cases, sincere. On November 30, I received a copy of a letter concerning an item that to many would seem insignificant insofar as its impact upon the American economy is concerned. However, when all these items are put together they add up to the largest actual unemployment since the great depression. This letter follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1962.

Mr. FRANK W. CASTIGLIONE,
Executive Vice President, Western Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR FRANK: For the past 3 years we have discontinued handling California cello carrots beginning with the month of July up to the end of November for the reason that we were forced out of this business due to the Canadian situation.

We have seen daily arrivals of carrots from Canada commencing with the later part of July up to and including December, I understand that Canadian carrots arrived in this country without duty, which has compelled many growers in California to quit the summer deal. I must say that prior to this situation, we handled from two to five cars weekly during this period, however, we are now handling none. Our principal supplier has been the Merrill Packing Co. from whom we had two cars this month. We have a good portion of the second car still on hand selling around 50 to 75 crates per day at $4.50, whereas our trade are buying Canadian carrots from $3 to $3.25. The irony of this is that most of the trade to whom we sell are service wholesalers and they in turn purchase these Canadian carrots and sell to the retail trade at prices at which we are trying to sell California carrots; so you can see the long range of profit made on these Canadian carrots.

It is my opinion that if your association in conjunction with the Texas association, as well as the united association combine their efforts to do something through Washington to have duties placed on these Canadian carrots, it would be a great help to all of us during the summer months. No doubt you are aware of the fact that Hereford, Tex., are also factors during the summer months and for this reason their association would be very much interested as they have recently been delaying their Rio Grande Valley crops to arrive at the end of the year or at the beginning of the new year due to this Canadian situation.

We know that Canada is a good customer of this country, but duties are paid to the Canadian Government on all shipments that go into Canada and there is no reason why we should not have the same situation on carrots coming into the States from Canada. I feel certain that this would help us a great deal as well as the growers and shippers in California by making available to us this carrot business during the period mentioned.

I have taken this matter up with Mr. Don Ward and he is preparing a letter addressed to Mr. Alan Rains with a copy to you as well as a copy to the Texas association. I have recently spoken to Mr. Vale Mayes, who was the former president of the Texas association, and he informed me that they had taken this up with Washington, who stated that due to the tremendous amount of business the United States receives from Canada is one of the reasons that they could not place a duty on Canadian carrots coming with three associations working collectively and meeting together at the coming convention in Los Angeles, we might be able to make some headway and possibly something can be done.

I feel sure that our local association will more than help and do everything possible to do something about it so that we can at least help ourself to stay in business, as you know, from year in to year out we seem to be always losing a commodity or two for one reason or another.

I will appreciate hearing from you.

Yours very truly,
M. & C. PRODUCE CO., INC.

Copies to Mr. Joseph Gheen, sales manager, Merrill Packing Co., Box 659, Salinas, Calif.; Mr. Frank Condello, P. & R. Brokerage Co., Box 655, Salinas, Calif.; Mr. Alan T. Rains, executive vice president, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.; Vale Mayes & Co., Box 968, Edinburg, Tex.; Comer Produce Co., Box 1608, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. John Gillardi, care of Gillson Brokerage Co., 12 East Gabilan Street, Salinas, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, the story of carrots can be duplicated many times with tomatoes, mushrooms, watermelons, and in fact, much of our truck garden products have been displaced by imports. When we talk of farm products we seem to have a mental block after we get beyond wheat, cotton, sugar, and tobacco. Many of the millions of unemployed in the cities can trace their unemployment to displacement of farm products. I have stated before and I want to repeat, that trade—whether domestic or international—is a commercial venture with its prime mover being profit.

I would like to quote from an official publication of the organization known as International Traders:

WORLD TRADE IS A TWO-WAY STREET

Unlike domestic business, world trade provides double profits. You have your choice of thousands of attractive bargains for import from abroad. And for export you can sell products made in your country that are needed overseas. Opportunities for fantastic profits are unlimited. Some I.T. members specialize on one branch of the business. But many make money both ways. Mellinger instructs you in import as well as export. You take no risk in investigating these romantic and profitable fields. Mail your inspection request today.

Earnestly,
B. L. MELLLINGER, Jr.,
President.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress will be remiss in its duties if it fails to set up a watchdog committee pursuant to a resolution I introduced in order that Congress may measure the impact of the Tariff Expansion Act upon the employment and industrial well being of our country. No amount of sloganizing or theorizing can displace the simple but proven fact: production will flow to the low cost areas and trade will flow to the high income areas. We are a high cost production economy with a high income creating purchasing power, but unless we purchase our own high cost products, we will soon be a high cost production area with a low income. As proof of this, allow me to introduce into the RECORD the following article entitled "Taking Pay Cuts To Save Jobs":

TAKING PAY CUTS TO SAVE JOBS

Wage and fringe benefit cuts exceeding 60 cents an hour are sweeping through southern plants of Chicago-based meatpacking chains—with union blessings.

Members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO) and the unaffiliated National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers have taken the cuts in an effort to stave off plant closings. Their weekly wage is now 20 to 30 percent below its former level of $100 to $125, union officials say.

One union—the United Packinghouse, Food & Allied Workers (AFL–CIO)—has held out against this trend. It has rejected the cuts with a blast against company threats to shut down plants.

MEMPHIS CLOSING

In the most recent phase of this development, Wilson & Co., closed the Memphis plant it had operated for 12 years. Some 350 UPWA members and 110 salaried employees lost their jobs.

Company officials explained the closing on the ground that Wilson's labor costs in Memphis were up to 80 cents an hour higher than those of its competitors in the area. Its rate for common labor was $2.41 an hour plus 65 cents in fringe benefits; its average wage was $2.63 an hour, the company said.

Among the competitive plants figuring in Wilson's calculations was the one that started the wage-cut trend. On July 30, Armour & Co. announced that it would close its Memphis plant—under contract with the Meat Cutters—within 90 days unless the workers accepted cuts.

A year's grace: To avoid this, and to win a guarantee that the plant would operate at least through August 1963 the workers: Took a 15-cent-an-hour pay cut; gave up 8 paid holidays; eliminated an escalator clause tied to the cost-of-living index; gave up a night-shift premium of 12 cents an hour, a 50-cent clothing allowance, and penalty overtime pay for Saturdays and Sundays—except when those are the 6th and 7th workdays in a week; lowered the starting rate to $1.25 an hour; eliminated the 4th week of paid vacation for workers with 20 years of service, canceled meal allowance, and established waiting periods for sick benefits.

Bitter choice: In all, nearly 1,600 packinghouse workers have taken pay cuts in recent months, union officials estimate. In addition to the 470 at Armour's Memphis plant, these included 500 members of the Meat Cutters at Swift & Co.'s Moultrie (Ga.) plant, 400 members of the Meat Cutters at Swift's Nashville plant, and 200 members of the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers at Swift's San Antonio plant.

"It was a choice between scrapping the plants and scrapping the contract—we chose to scrap the contract," says one union official.

Negotiations for cuts are underway at Swift's Montgomery (Ala.), Jackson (Miss.), and Ocala (Fla.) plants, which employ a total of 285 Meat Cutters members, and at Swift's Fort Worth plant, which employs 1,000 National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers members.

Unimpressed: Swift has warned its 300 workers in Atlanta that unless they authorize cuts of 60 to 65 cents an hour in labor costs, it will shut down the plant March 2. The workers have voted three times to reject the company's demand.

Their union, the UPWA, backs them strongly. UPWA President Ralph Helstein has charged that the companies are demanding cuts despite the fact that "they are operating at a very substantial profit level and are not in any financial straits."

In UPWA's view, the wage-cut drive is essentially an attempt to restore the North-South pay differential that existed in the industry 20 years ago—and to do it on a plant-by-plant basis without regard to the contract, which runs through August 31, 1964.

"The basic weapon is the threat to close the plant," Helstein says. "The workers are told, in effect, that the price of continued employment at the plant will be their acceptance of an abandonment of key provisions of the master agreement as applied to their plant. Either they accept less than what was agreed upon or they lose their jobs."

The wage-cutting pattern obviously will feed on any success it is permitted to achieve, Helstein adds. Moreover, he says, the successful use of threats to shut plants down unless wages are lowered "can encourage a pattern of similar action in other industries."

People's choice: Russell E. Dresser, who heads the packinghouse division of the Meat Cutters, says the decision to accept lower wages and poorer working conditions was "the toughest choice I ever had to make in my life." He emphasizes that the union will not allow the pattern to spread to northern plants.

"We didn't want those southern plants to shut down," says Dresser. "The employees were practically insisting that the local union officers do something to keep their jobs. Wherever any adjustment was made, it was done on a secret ballot vote by the membership—and about 99 percent of the people showed up to vote."

No roses: packing chain officials dispute Helstein's contention that the wage-cutting drive was designed to force down wages despite a rosy profit picture.

Mr. Speaker, my memory goes back to the years immediately preceding the great depression of 1929. What you have just read about, forced pay cuts in the face of a lowered consumption, was the prime factor in breaking the back of the American economy. The free traders have led the American people to believe that it was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that caused the great depression, yet the record shows the Smoot-Hawley Act did not go into effect until 2 years after the 1929 crash. I do not advocate a return to high tariffs as such; I do advocate however, a return to economic sanity and protection for American jobs. Without jobs there is no prosperity possible in an industrial complex, and this is an industrial complex.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, exactly 4 years ago the President of the United States signed Senate bill 50 of the 86th Congress, admitting Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State.

It is with a sense of deep gratitude and a feeling of great pride that I address this august House, as a Representative of the people of Hawaii, and as one of its freshman Members, for it was this House which first approved a statehood bill for Hawaii as early as 1947, paving the way for the final approval by both bodies of the Congress 12 years later.

For more than half a century the people of Hawaii had knocked on the congressional door seeking admission. Twenty-two congressional investigations were held. The results exhaustively cover 57 subjects, ranging from "Agriculture" to "War Record." More than 6,300 printed pages, available in the Library of Congress, record the hearings held and the committee reports made. These include the record of 128 days of hearings and the testimonies of more than 700 witnesses. Thirty-nine Members of Congress visited Hawaii as investigating committees. The last four of these congressional committees overwhelmingly recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii, and I am happy to be serving now with those who served on those committees.

On March 11, 1959, the Senate approved the Hawaii statehood bill by a vote of 76 to 15, and on March 12, 1959, at 3:04 p.m., this great body voted 323 to 89 to admit Hawaii into the Union of States.

How well I remember that momentous occasion. The Hawaii Territorial Legislature was then in session, and I was serving as the majority leader of its house of representatives. We were in direct telephone communication with the Honorable John A. Burns, then our Delegate to Congress, who was relaying to us over an amplifier system a blow-by-blow description of the activities on the floor of this House.

When the final vote was announced, there was a deafening cheer which must have imperceptibly raised the rafters of Iolani Palace. But only momentarily, for a strange quiet suddenly fell upon the tumultous crowd, and all present joined in prayer with heads bowed, some on their knees, many in tears, to thank God and to ask Him for His divine guidance in our new and heavier responsibility.

It was on March 18, 4 years ago today, Mr. Speaker, that President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the Hawaii statehood bill into law, with only one regrettable note: the man who had successfully maneuvered the bill through both the Senate and the House, the Honorable John A. Burns, had not been invited to witness the signing.

There were many who worked and sacrificed for Hawaii's statehood cause and who passed away before they could enjoy the fruits of their labor—men like Samuel Wilder King and Joseph R. Farrington, both former Delegates to the Congress who lived and died for Hawaii.

History will record that Hawaii became a part of the United States in a unique way. It was not by war or military occupation or by economic conquest or colonial exploitation. Hawaii became identified with the United States by an assimilation of the political and social ideals of America.

The first contacts between Americans and Hawaiians in the first half of the 19th century gave rise in Hawaiians to a profound tendency to identify themselves with the ideas of individual rights and liberties and representative government. Indeed, it was only 20 years after the first Christian missionaries from New England came to our islands that the Hawaiian people adopted their first constitution, which was modeled after the Constitution of the United States. This was in 1840, and as early as 1854 the Hawaiian people expressed their overwhelming desire to be annexed to this country. Gentlemen, I think that these facts are especially remarkable considering that the people of Hawaii at that time were almost entirely of Polynesian origin. Is it not a fact worth meditating on that the tie which binds the people of Hawaii to the United States is not that of race or history, nor that of force or economic exploitation, but that of ideals freely accepted?

Some time after the adoption of their first constitution, the Hawaiian people changed their form of government from constitutional monarchy to a republic, and in 1898, by Joint Resolution 55 of the 55th Congress, Hawaii was made a territory of the United States.

Between 1903 and 1959, the legislature of the territory of Hawaii petitioned Congress for statehood no fewer than 17 times. The first hearings in Congress on Hawaiian statehood were held by the House Subcommittee on Territories in 1935. The House passed a statehood bill in 1947, and again in 1950. The House, in 1953, and the Senate, in 1954, passed the Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act, but never both Houses in the same term, until March 1959. As to Hawaii's readiness for statehood, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported on February 11, 1959, that, "The committee members are convinced that the Nation could take in no more responsible partner than Hawaii."

The people of Hawaii are demonstrating right now the truth of that observation, for they are proving that they can make significant contributions to the United States, both in their financial support of the Federal Government and in their production of goods and services. Indeed, in just the few years between 1959 and 1961, per capita income in Hawaii—not counting income of Federal military and civilian employees—increased by $289 and surpassed the national average. In 1959, per capita income in Hawaii was $2,118, while the national average was $2,160. In 1961, per capita income in Hawaii was $2,407, while the national average had climbed only to $2,263. During the same period, Federal tax revenues from all sources in Hawaii increased tremendously. In 1959 Hawaii contributed a little more than $175 million to the United States, and in 1961, over $242 million.

The basis of the Hawaiian economy is agricultural, and most of the manufacturing industries are engaged in processing foodstuffs, of which sugar and pineapple are the most important. Processed sugar and pineapple each account for about one-third of the value of Hawaiian manufactured products. The rate of increase in productive activity in Hawaii in the years since the beginning of statehood may be indicated by the increase in sugar production. In 1959, Hawaii produced 974,632 tons of sugar worth $131 million, and in 1961, 1,092,481 tons worth $144.9 million. Other important products of Hawaii are fish, dairy products, beef, fruits, and vegetables, poultry and eggs, hogs, and coffee.

The untapped mineral and timber resources of Hawaii give promise of a flourishing economy in the future if properly developed. It has been reported that Hawaii has at least 600 million tons of rich bauxite, which could provide our country with a 100-year supply of aluminum. Hawaii also has a supply of titanium which is yet to be exploited. Timber is a great possibility. The garment manufacturing industry has expanded sizably.

The fastest growth has been in the tourist industry. With Hawaii no longer a "foreign" country, its blue and sunny skies, lovely white beaches, and rolling surf which provides wonderful surfing and swimming, attract an ever-increasing number of visitors from the mainland. Jet transportation, improved luxury ships, and new hotel accommodations facilitate tourism. Tourism has increased remarkably just in the short period of statehood. In 1959, 243,216 visitors spent $109 million in Hawaii; and in 1961, 319,071 visitors spent $137 million.

As a State, Hawaii continues to be as Mark Twain described it, "the loveliest fleet of islands anchored in any ocean." Its eternal-spring climate, its swaying palm trees and lovely hula maidens beckon to its shores peoples from all parts of the world. Statehood fortunately has not changed this.

What has changed is the stronger awareness with which the people of Hawaii have assumed their responsibilities as full-fledged American citizens. They fully realize that Hawaii today represents the westernmost outpost of the American New Frontier, that it must serve as a bridge between the East and West for international cooperation for world peace.

Much has been written about Hawaii by anthropologists and sociologists, poets, and romanticists. All agree that Hawaii is the showcase of American democracy for all the world to see. There out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, peoples of diverse cultures, have proven beyond a doubt that they can live together and work together in harmony and in concert toward their own social, political, economic, and cultural betterment. They have proven by actual experiment that the ideals of Americanism can and will work.

It is for us here in the Congress of the United States to appreciate this truth. The people of Hawaii have proven to be one of our greatest assets in our struggle to maintain our friendship with the Afro-Asian nations. We must exploit the offerings of this new State to the fullest. Its East-West center is proving as one of the best investments in peace we have made in a long time—we must continue its support. As a training ground for the Peace Corps it has proven itself beyond expectations.

In order that we as a nation may further benefit from our latest partnership we need to establish in Hawaii a diplomatic school for Americans who will be representing us in Asia. We must also look to the establishment of a free port and international trade complex in Hawaii to promote free intercourse among nations of the great Pacific basin.

We must avail ourselves of the benefits to be derived from the ideal geographic location of the 50th State and the unique character and qualifications of its citizenry.

As their representative to Congress I ask that you use Hawaii and its people to advance this Nation's cause for world peace and freedom from want and fear.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] for his very eloquent oration commemorating the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill which gave statehood to Hawaii. I am pleased to advise the gentleman that it was my honor to work with the distinguished delegate from Hawaii to the Congress at that time, the present Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, in the great fight he made to give Hawaii full membership in the American Union.

The gentleman has not overdrawn the qualities of the great State he represents. Its people, its land, its climate, its vegetation, all make for one of the most beautiful and one of the most attractive spots in all the world. It has been aptly termed the Pearl of the Pacific, the Crossroads of the Pacific, and its attractions acclaimed in many other ways. It is the furthest outpost of the American Union today, one of the great States. Despite its location 2,000 miles west of the mainland of the United States, Hawaii is an integral part of our country. On this fourth anniversary of the signing of her enabling legislation we all take pride in the fact that Hawaii now has official status in the Union of American States. We are glad to claim her as a sister State. Above all else we salute the happy and wonderful people of Hawaii where the brotherhood of man, without reference to race, creed, or national origin, has become a model for all the world.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Hawaii on his fine speech today in observance of the fourth anniversary of the signing of the act that brought his State into the Union. I happen to have been one of those who had the opportunity to vote for all four of the statehood measures that were considered, involving Hawaii, starting back in 1947. It was my pleasure to have had the opportunity to work with the last Delegate from the territory of Hawaii and now the present Governor of the great State of Hawaii, the Honorable John Burns.

Mr. Speaker, when we think back over the years and the admission of the different States, Hawaii today is closer in travel time than Illinois was at the time of its admission to statehood. I think one of the obstacles in the way of earlier admission of the new States of Hawaii and Alaska in the years we had the measures under discussion in the House was always the contention that they were too far away from the National Capital. But, when you think that you in Hawaii and our colleagues in Alaska are closer today in travel time than Illinois was upon its admission to statehood, you can readily see how the world has changed. It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to sit here this afternoon and hear you in your maiden speech as one of the earliest Representatives of this new State speak in observance of its fourth anniversary.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in acknowledging the very splendid speech which I understand is the maiden speech in the House of our colleague from Hawaii. I certainly also appreciate his generosity and fairness in acknowledging the role which had been played in behalf of statehood for Hawaii by the very distinguished Governor of that State, John-Burns, during the period of his service here as Delegate from that Territory. I have had the opportunity now to serve with a number of Representatives from the then Territory of Hawaii, now the State of Hawaii, and I think one contribution of that great people which the modesty of the gentleman in the well has precluded his mentioning has been the fact that Hawaii has sent some splendid citizens, some splendid Americans to represent her in this body.

Certainly, the gentleman in the well of the House and his able colleagues in the Congress are fine examples of American leadership, and it is a pleasure to serve with them in this body.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to join with the gentleman from Hawaii and the other Members who have already spoken in commemorating the fourth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to statehood. I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time today and I want through him to congratulate the great State of Hawaii on the accomplishments that have taken place during the 4 years which have elapsed since Hawaii became the 50th member of our Union.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have become a Member of this body just shortly before that event took place and so to have been able to cast my vote to admit Hawaii as the 50th State.

Of course, my acquaintance with the great State of Hawaii goes back to my wartime service. I well remember on my way back to the United States after the conclusion of World War II arriving in Honolulu and Pearl Harbor for the first time, and realizing then that although we were still many miles from the continental United States, we had really come home when we reached Hawaii. It seemed to me then, and I have felt very strongly ever since, that Hawaii was and ought properly legally to be declared a full-fledged member of the United States. It was indeed a privilege to me as a Member of this body to have had a small share in bringing that about more than 13 years later.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the gentleman in the well of the House for the distinguished service he has already rendered in this body and for the very able way in which he has filled the gap created in our membership by the election of his predecessor, former Congressman DANIEL INOUYE, to the other body, the Senate of the United States. As one of two Members of the House, outside of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] who have had some opportunity to become acquainted with the Japanese language as a result of World War II duties, and as one who had the privilege of serving during the war with a number of Americans of Japanese ancestry, I would like to pay special tribute to those fine Americans of Japanese ancestry who are residents of Hawaii. I think the gentleman's own service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and now his service here in this body, have underlined for all of us to see the tremendous contribution which Americans of Japanese ancestry have made and are making to the strength of our country and the great contributions which they made to our success in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished majority leader has already said, Hawaii is a living example of the ideals of the brotherhood of man, and its example should go far in stamping out prejudice from our midst. Nothing has done more to promote this kind of mutual regard than the great service rendered in this body by Senator INOUYE, the first American of Japanese ancestry to serve in Congress and now by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

I want to commend the gentleman, and to express my conviction that on the basis of his service here to date in this body he will certainly be a great and distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Hawaii on his very fine statement marking the anniversary of Hawaii's admission into the Union. I can well remember in several of our national political conventions the debate that went on about including provisions for Hawaiian statehood. Both of the major political parties of this country included such provision in their 1948 and 1952 political platforms, to provide statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I well remember the leadership of Joe Farrington and Betty Farrington as well as John Burns in this particular area. They appeared at the major political conventions and saw that provisions were made in both of the party platforms for Hawaii's admission to the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman for having this special observance today to mark this as the fourth anniversary of this fine, new State of Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend, from this side of the aisle, the gentleman in the well of the House [Mr. MATSUNAGA], from Hawaii; who has so wisely taken this time and who has spoken so beautifully about our "cross-roads of the Pacific," those lovely isles, and who has also made his maiden speech on the floor of the House in such an eloquent manner today. I recently read at some length a story of the melding of the people of different creeds and beliefs from all over the world, as indeed they have come from all over the world into the United States of America as a whole, to become effective citizens in this new State of ours, 4 years ago today. Like the gentleman I was not here to vote with this particular group for our 49th and 50th statehood, but I want him to know that, having spent a long time there—several times during the war, and the first vacation I can ever recall in 1951—I did come back and speak to various chambers of commerce in the interest of statehood for our happy and delightful island people at that time. And then, your last territorial Governor and first Governor under statehood the Honorable Mr. Quinn, was from my home State of Missouri, where his mother presently resides. So I feel twice blessed in recognizing Governor Quinn and in welcoming this State, on its fourth anniversary, now that it has proved good citizenship to our other 49.

In addition, I would like the gentleman to know that my only daughter and my son-in-law and grandchildren are in his State, where he does his Army internship at Tripler General Hospital, and they enjoy it very much.

I am not sure that I would agree in complete detail with every one of his conclusions about what schools—diplomatic—should be established there and how we should branch out to worldwide diplomacy. But certainly this would be a good jumping-off point and, as he so well stated, it has proved itself to be the bastion of the Pacific; it is the crossroad and aided and abetted militarywise—as far as peace-loving people are concerned—by our other holdings in the protectorates of the rest of the Pacific further on west and south, will serve us well if we exercise our will and remain ever alert.

Certainly if all of the individuals who make up this happy, delightful, beautiful, pleasant, even-temperatured group of islands in the midst of the Pacific will cling to their loving character and their dignity and their honor it will be even a greater State than it has proved itself during these 4 years. I am happy to be here during these days.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If the gentleman will permit me to ask him a question, he is not of the mind that Governor Quinn is still our Governor?

Mr. HALL. Oh, no. I was there last December when their new Governor was inaugurated. I miss no opportunity to go back to Hawaii, especially since my family is there.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. We are enlightened now and have a Democratic Governor.

Mr. HALL. I felt sure the gentleman would bring that in, and want him to know I was not privileged to attend the ceremony.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Missouri. I think that the gentleman from Hawaii is to be commended for bringing to the attention of the House the significant occasion which is marked by this anniversary.

I hope he will convey to the people of the State of Hawaii the very warm feeling which all of the people of America have for their fellow citizens in the islands, and particularly their congratulations upon the successful completion of the first years of statehood. As one of the original States, Maryland extends her best wishes.

The people of Hawaii are to be congratulated on the very high standards they set in sending representatives to both Houses of the Congress. I have had the greatest personal esteem for those who have come here from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to join with my distinguished colleague from the State of Hawaii on this occasion, the fourth anniversary of statehood for California's next-door neighbor. I am particularly appreciative of it because in at least some small way I had the opportunity to work for statehood for that territory for quite a number of years. As my good friend and colleague from Hawaii knows, I served on the committee which brought out the legislation which finally made it possible for Hawaii to take its place with its sister States.

I remember very vividly the visit which I had an opportunity to make to his great State, at that time a territory, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien]. The gentleman remembers the occasion. That occasion was called for by certain charges which had occurred here on the floor as to the possibility of communism in that territory. It was the purpose of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry], and myself, who accompanied him on that special mission, to determine whether or not such charges were true. Of course, I was both happy and grateful to discover that there was no question of there being any truth to the charges. There were perhaps fewer Communists in Hawaii and in that area than in almost any other area of our great country.

The hearings which we held on each of the islands which compose the great State of Hawaii proved beyond any question of a doubt in our mind that the overwhelming majority of the people on those islands were honest, law-abiding, sincere Americans dedicated to the principles of democracy and freedom to which we here on the mainland are dedicated.

As I look back now it gives me a great deal of happiness to have had an opportunity to make such a report at that time on the floor of the House and, as I say, to have had some small part in bringing about statehood for the gentleman's great State.

So today I am most happy to join with the gentleman and to extend again my congratulations to him because I know the great work he did. Of course, having been a close personal friend of Jack Burns, your present Governor, I know the great work he did in bringing about the final confirmation of statehood for the people of your area. I only hope and trust that I may in the near future have an opportunity again to visit with the wonderful people whom the gentleman is privileged to represent here today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I rise to join in this tribute to the great State of Hawaii, and I do it with affection as well as admiration. Alaska and Hawaii were partners in the race for statehood. Had Alaska not moved ahead a little faster than was expected, Alaska would have been the 50th State. We are proud to be the 49th State.

My great personal admiration for the people of Hawaii stems from my close contact with many fine citizens of that beautiful State during the stage when the issue of statehood was being fought and when the spokesmen from Hawaii, including the Honorable John Burns, then delegate, now Governor, were working closely with Alaskans to carry out the project of attaining statehood for both Territories. Both of us were trying to come in together, as occurred when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted as companion States, you might say, in 1912.

My great admiration goes to the people of Hawaii for sending Dan Inouye, who, as the first Member of the House of Representatives from Hawaii, proved so able and so popular.

I also extend my compliments to Senator Oren Long, from your great State, whom we from Alaska came to know with appreciation and respect; and Senator Hiram L. Fong, another topnotch personality whom you folks sent to the Senate. Personally, I am very proud to have all of you from Hawaii here as my colleagues but I am a bit jealous that Hawaii has already achieved its second Representative here in the House, Hawaii having attained a population of some 600,000 and over. Of course, Alaska now has that goal as its next congressional increase.

In closing I wish to say that in the short span of time since I have gotten acquainted with my distinguished colleagues, Spark M. Matsunaga and Thomas P. Gill, I have another occasion to compliment the people of Hawaii upon the high quality of their representation. Having said that, I want to thank you for yielding and affording me the opportunity of commemorating Hawaii's statehood.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDING. I am very proud to join the gentleman from Hawaii in paying tribute to his fine State on the fourth anniversary of its statehood. I believe the quotation the gentleman referred to from Mark Twain referring to Hawaii as "the loveliest fleet of islands anchored in any ocean" is one of the greatest tributes that could be paid to any State regarding its physical beauty. The thousands of Americans from the continental United States as well as people from all over the world who choose Hawaii as a vacation place would certainly add a hearty amen and readily agree that in no other place in the world is the traveler welcomed as enthusiastically and treated to such a wonderful contrast in both scenery and people as he is in Hawaii. It is these contrasts which make Hawaii our greatest showcase for democracy at work. Here East and West come together on these islands and live in peace and harmony.

I am especially proud too that the church of which I am a member, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints has chosen Hawaii for the establishment of one of our temples. It is certainly a beautiful edifice and is frequented by Hawaiian church members who add much to our church and to its educational system. Annually hundreds of Hawaiian students come to the mainland to attend Brigham Young University which is also my own alma mater. They make a real contribution scholastically, as well as to the social life and culture of this fine institution.

During the last Congress, I was privileged to have Dan Inouye as my colleague on the House Committee on Agriculture. Senator Inouye, then Congressman Inouye—did a masterful job in representing your fine State. I am pleased that my friend, Congressman Matsunaga, who is in the well, has replaced him on the House Committee on Agriculture. The people of Hawaii did themselves proud when they elected him and Congressman Gill to represent their fine State and its wonderful people. It is therefore with great pride that I join the two distinguished gentlemen from Hawaii and my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the State of Hawaii on the fourth anniversary of her statehood.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I well know the contributions that the gentleman's church has made to Hawaii, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii, my colleague [Mr. Gill].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join my colleague, Representative Matsunaga in observing this day. I think the action of the Congress and of the President in enacting the statehood admission bill deserves a lot more than the perfunctory attention that we can give it today. However, all we can do here is to merely outline briefly what has happened in Hawaii since statehood and to thank all of you for your help in making us the 50th State of the Union. Here are a few highlights of what has happened in Hawaii since the passage of the statehood act in 1959:

First, we have passed and implemented our Government Reorganization Act. It was my privilege to be associated with the State Legislature in Hawaii during this transitional period, and with this bill which reduced our 80-some departments and bureaus to 18.

We passed a bill to replace the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the antitrust field. We now have one of the foremost antitrust laws in the country today, drawn from the best of the laws of the various States which preceded us in this Union.

We have passed the first statewide Greenbelt law in the history of this country. There are, of course, some in Hawaii who do not agree with this legislation and we are still fighting the battle in the legislature.

We have passed, I believe, the first comprehensive disaster relief act in the 50 States.

We have established the East-West Center under powers granted to us by action of this Congress at about the time statehood was granted to Hawaii.

I think all of these things indicate that we are moving toward the goals that were set up by you in the Congress for our new State.

I would like to mention just one major, overriding accomplishment of statehood. Those of us who live in the center of the Pacific are perhaps more sensitive to the political winds that blow from the shores of Asia than those who live on the eastern seaboard. I think it is fair to say that the admission of Hawaii to equal status with the other 49 States of this Union constitutes the greatest blow ever struck against the Communist Parties of the various Asian countries. The propaganda advantage that they were able to maintain prior to statehood—that the United States preached democracy but did not practice it, particularly in areas where there were large ethnic groups whose forefathers came from Asia—has been completely destroyed and we hear no more of it.

I think it well to dwell on this point in a little more detail. I know that the opposition to, as well as the support for Hawaiian statehood in Congress was in some measure based on the ethnic diversity of our people. I know that many people wanted Hawaii to become a State in order to make the point at home and abroad that we have made. There were others who had reservations.

I do not want to enter upon a long dissertation of the sociological and political impact of the various ethnic groups in Hawaii. I merely want to mention an example of what has happened. I can couch this example in terms understandable by all who are in active political life. I can state without danger of contradiction that had Congressman Matsunaga been dependent wholly upon the vote of citizens of oriental extraction he would not be here today. I can also say with a great deal of certainty that had I been mainly dependent on the votes of those of caucasian ancestry I would not be here today either.

Democracy is working in Hawaii, and will continue to work. You may be sure, Mr. Speaker, that our State of Hawaii will always pull its oar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his splendid remarks.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the first group of bills I introduced when I became a Member of Congress was one to give statehood to Hawaii. I am proud to have been a sponsor of this legislation and I am equally proud today of the many fine contributions Hawaii has made to our great country.

The Hawaiians have been immersed in American traditions since 1820, and aspire to the highest principles of democracy. As I learned for myself when I visited this beautiful island a few years ago, they are a sincere and devoted people. Today, 4 years after their admission to the Union as the 50th State, the Hawaiians remain steadfast and true Americans in every sense of the word.

I salute the people of Hawaii, and wish them continued aloha.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today, March 18, 1959, the President signed into law S. 50, "An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union." It was the culmination of a 40-year struggle by the islanders for full parity with their fellow citizens of the mainland.

Although 85 percent of the people of Hawaii had been citizens of the United States ever since passage of the Organic Act in 1900, they could not vote in national elections and, indeed, were not permitted even to vote for their own Governor. Yet, even as you and I, they were subject to Federal taxation. This discrimination was a constant irritant, but it never diminished the fierce pride of the islanders in their Americanism; and it even more obviously did not affect their eagerness to defend a flag that failed to carry their own star.

Since 1903 the Hawaiian Legislature had petitioned Congress for statehood a score of times; and from 1920 to 1959, more than half a hundred bills providing for statehood had been introduced in successive Congresses. In 1950 the Hawaiian people approved a proposed State constitution by more than a 3-to-1 majority.

As for loyalty and patriotism, no group of Americans has ever surpassed the Hawaiian record in World War II.

I cite the outstanding military record of my colleague and the Senator from Hawaii, Daniel K. Inouye, who is the recipient of the Purple Heart and the Distinguished Service Cross.

The "go for broke" Japanese-Americans who fought in Europe wrote one of the most brilliant pages in all American military annuals. Of the approximately 10,000 men who were in combat, 4,500 received Purple Hearts. More importantly, their wounds and their deaths were not in vain: they were victorious in battle and they captured the hearts of all Americans.

Gratitude, of course, was not a primary factor in the granting of statehood. Hawaii itself had so much to offer the United States. The strategic importance of the islands has long been obvious. And as the "melting pot that really melts," Hawaii is a constant inspiration to all men of good will. The 50th star flashes a message that all Americans must forever heed.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of genuine pleasure that I take this opportunity to salute the State of Hawaii on the fourth anniversary of its attaining the rank of statehood in the American Union.

The history of Hawaii is a long and noble one. The roots of her multiracial population are to be found on many continents and in many eras. Today, Hawaii's over 600,000 people trace their ancestry to the majority of the racial lines of this world.

If we have considered America the melting pot of Europe, we must now consider Hawaii, and through her, America also, truly the melting pot of the world. It is a high tribute to the growth potential of the greatest democracy in the world, and to the vitality of democratic institutions, that an island State thousands of miles from the continental shore, and composed of races other than those which dominate that continental shore, should be welcomed with open arms into that Union of the brave and the free.

The admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union is dramatic evidence that the theories of our forefathers have continued to nourish and renew themselves for nearly 200 years. They are equal and adaptable to the present difficult times and are fully capable of meeting the challenges posed by the threat of communism in the 2d half of the 20th century.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Members from the new State of Hawaii and to extend my congratulations to the fine people of that beautiful area of our Nation on the celebration of the fourth anniversary of the signing of the statehood bill. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which took a leading role in the struggle for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, I watched the political developments in the two territories with more than casual interest. When I came to Congress in 1949 both territories were pressing for legislation to achieve their statehood goals. Needless to say, I was delighted when their efforts were brought to fruition. Among those who have left their mark in their achievement are the Honorable John A. Burns, present Governor of Hawaii, without whose understanding of the problems involved, in my opinion, the goal would never have been reached, and the late Honorable Joseph R. Farrington. Both of these territorial Delegates worked long and tirelessly in winning congressional support and confidence in their cause. Their efforts were aided by former Delegate Elizabeth Farrington. Behind the scenes, loyal and faithful statehood backers, former territorial Governor and former U.S. Senator Oren E. Long, Riley B. Allen, Lorrin P. Thurston, Jan Jabulka, K. C. Leebrick, and George McLean, helped tremendously in preparing the legislation out of which the Statehood Act grew. I salute them as well as the thousands of others who gave their moral and financial support to making statehood a reality.

The excellent representation that was sent to the Congress indicates the caliber of the citizens who worked so diligently to obtain this coveted goal.

I can hardly imagine how a more able, dedicated, and cosmopolitan delegation could be sent to represent our 50th State in Congress; Senators FONG and INOUYE and Representatives MATSUNAGA and GILL—each of whom is a capable and effective leader in his own right. Each adds distinction to our legislative bodies. I commend the voters of Hawaii for sending these gentlemen to Washington and for placing Governor Burns and Lt. Gov. William Richardson in office. The pattern of successful administration has been set. I am confident Hawaii will continue to elect officials who will lead the State to a successful future.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Arizona, which was for 47 years the baby State of the Union, I am most happy to note the fourth anniversary of statehood for Hawaii, that gem among all islands, which has contributed so much to our economy, culture, and sheer pleasure.

It is also most pleasant to note the high quality of statesmen this island paradise has produced. Their reputations gather respect and honor daily, and we are fortunate in this Congress to be associated with such a fine delegation.

May Hawaii continue to grow and prosper under the status and honor of being the 50th State of our great Union.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to offer warm congratulations to the citizens of the great State of Hawaii on this, the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill granting statehood to Hawaii. Since that day Hawaii has grown and prospered, amplifying its unique contribution to our Union. I wish Hawaii well, and am confident that the years ahead will bring even far greater achievement and renown.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my two colleagues from Hawaii, the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA and the Honorable THOMAS P. GILL, in commemorating the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill granting Hawaii its status as the 50th State of the Union.

Ever since my election to Congress in 1948, I have supported statehood for Hawaii. In this effort I was closely associated with the former Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, who is now Governor of this new great State.

Hawaii has become a beautiful addition to the Union, justly famed for its climate, its harmonious interracial relations, its distinguished representation in the Congress, and its contribution to American understanding of the increasingly important cultures of the Orient. I salute the Aloha State on its fourth anniversary.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, for many years my native California was the outermost frontier in America's push westward. Today we have relinquished that honor to the truly New Frontier State of Hawaii.

In both the fire of war and in the pursuits of peacetime, the people of Hawaii richly earned their statehood. Their islands remain a strategically important outpost against attack upon the continental United States. As a crossroads in what Senator ENGLE has called the great "Pacific Lake," these islands offer a rich potential for America's trade future.

Hawaii's fourth birthday is an occasion for all of us to celebrate.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in saluting our great State of Hawaii which is observing the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill by the President granting Hawaii its status as the 50th State of the Union. Sixty years after the Hawaiian Islands were annexed to the United States of America, the Congress answered Hawaii's call for admission to the Union.

Hawaii is known as an island paradise; its diverse topography, wonderful climate, rolling surf, spectacular scenery, all combine to attract many millions of visitors each year. Tourism is the island's second leading industry; agriculture leads. The people of Hawaii are modern and progressive. Their industry and outstanding capabilities are responsible for the expanding economy of the islands, high percentage of labor force employed, increased construction and manufacturing. Health conditions are excellent. Their public school system is exemplary and there is a high ratio of high school graduates who continue study in college or special training schools. Here, as in America, many groups of people with a variety of racial and religious backgrounds have learned to work together and to live in harmony.

The people of Hawaii share our ideals, love of freedom and democracy. We note that the State of Hawaii is among the first 20 States to approve the proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution outlawing the poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections. This is a true indication of its firm belief in equality, and this applies not only to voting rights but to equality of opportunity in all aspects of its community affairs.

We are grateful to Hawaii for the help she is giving us in our national and international programs. We rely upon her as a bridge between the mainland United States and the vast area of Asia and the Pacific which contains more than one-half of the world's population. We know that the people of Hawaii will perform the big task assigned to it, to help those other nations understand America.

Hawaii is referred to as the Pacific showcase of America's economic and political democracy and living evidence of Ameria's brotherhood with all peoples. We are proud to have Hawaii as a full partner in our Nation's continuing efforts to achieve a world which recognizes the inherent dignity and equality of man.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a fourth anniversary is often symbolized by the combination of fruits and flowers. This is a particularly apt symbol for the lush and beautiful islands we salute today.

Four years ago today the President of the United States signed the Hawaiian Statehood Act. In doing so, he not only fulfilled the dream of some half-million Hawaiian-Americans, but also demonstrated to our own people and to the world that we are still faithful to vital American traditions.

For the patient people of Hawaii, that act brought to a successful conclusion a long, determined, and righteous campaign for first-class citizenship. They had proved their readiness for such a status in many ways, including patriotic service in three wars. The Statehood Act granted to them a position they had clearly earned and deserved.

Many a nay-sayer in this country fought against that act with all sorts of groundless arguments: geographic, racial, and ideological. They refused to recognize, among other things, that Hawaii provided still another example of how different racial groups could live together amicably. Hawaii has by now effectively proved that all the arguments used against statehood were without foundation. This is not to say that all of the State's problems are solved. But which State's are? Hawaii's splendid record during the past 4 years demonstrates beyond question that the fears of the timid were wisely overridden when Congress passed the Statehood Act.

By admitting Hawaii as our 50th State we also provided the world with another and significant illustration of the fact that the United States remains anticolonial in deed as well as in word. We proved that the spirit of the Northwest Ordinance, with its emphasis upon the welfare of the lands we govern rather than upon their exploitation, is still dear to us. And we demonstrated that we have not abandoned the melting-pot tradition that is still one of the prime sources of America's strength and greatness.

Not the least of the rewards the House of Representatives has reaped from the Hawaiian Act is the presence in this body of two distinguished Representatives from our newest State. To them and to the people they represent, I extend my best wishes for a happy birthday and a bright future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in cemmemorating the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill by the President granting Hawaii its status as the 50th State of the Union. The distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is to be commended for giving us an opportunity to express our sentiments on this notable occasion.

Four years ago, when this body was considering legislation to give Hawaii statehood, I stated that there could be no doubt that the people of Hawaii would prove to be loyal citizens of such a new State and loyal citizens of the United States. It was apparent even then that the energies and talents of the people of Hawaii, and the resources of their territory, would provide a definite asset to our great Nation.

The 4 years which have elapsed amply confirm that our faith in Hawaii and its people was not misplaced. Indeed, the efforts of our island citizens have far exceeded the expectations of even the most ardent advocates of Hawaii statehood.

Moreover, Hawaii stands as a reminder to the world that the United States has no colonial ambitions. Instead of extracting tribute from an island possession, we have joined it to us in order that, united as 50 States, together we may find renewed strength and community of purpose.

The methods used by Soviet Russia to bring the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the U.S.S.R. contrast sharply with the procedures by which Hawaii became a State. On the one hand we see brutal aggression and a complete disregard for national self-determination. On the other, we note freely chosen, democratically achieved unity.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my voice in this chorus of praise for the State of Hawaii. May its future hold continued prosperity and progress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been moved by the eloquence and the sincere sentiment in the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga. The fame as an orator of the first order of the gentleman from Hawaii had preceded his swearing in as a Member of this historic body, and, Mr. Speaker, in his maiden speech in this Chamber, and on a most historic occasion, he has lived up to his reputation.

We are happy and proud to have him as our colleague and the House indeed is enriched by the presence of both Mr. Matsunaga and Mr. Gill. I congratulate the people of Hawaii on their rare good judgment in the selection of statesmen of such ability and such dedication. They are worthy successors of the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye who endeared himself to all his colleagues in the House and is now serving his State and the Nation in the other body. I would be remiss if I did not mention the Honorable John Burns who during his service with us as a Delegate from Hawaii was a vital factor in the attainment of Hawaiian statehood. It is a source of pleasure to us all that former Delegate Burns is now the Governor of the great and proud State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, many of the States of our Union, powerful and mighty States, in my boyhood were still serving their apprenticeships as territories. With the attainment of statehood all expanded and grew and became strong and indispensable parts of our imperishable Union. I count among the priceless opportunities given me by my congressional service that I had been permitted to work, to speak, and to vote in several Congresses for statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska. This is a heritage that I am proud to hand down to my children, to their children and to those of my blood in all the generations to come.

I am thrilled today with a sentiment of patriotism, of pride in my country and faith in its future, on this fourth anniversary of the statehood of Hawaii and the remarks of my colleagues in observance thereof; my warmest congratulations to the people of Hawaii on the magnificent manner in which they have responded to the challenge of statehood.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the House Interior Committee when Hawaii was at long last accepted into the Union, after knocking at the door for half a century; and so had the privilege of supporting her statehood, both in committee and on the floor.

Hawaii's loyalty had been demonstrated in two World Wars and the Korean conflict, during the latter of which the then Territory of Hawaii had a higher casualty per population rate than any State. We are all familiar with the magnificent record of men from Hawaii during the Second World War; every present member of the Hawaiian Democratic congressional delegation to Congress saw action in that war. Mr. Gill fought in the bitter campaigns in the Pacific theater; Mr. Matsunaga was a member of the renowned 100th Infantry Battalion in Italy, and the junior Senator from Hawaii, whom we learned to respect so much before his sojourn to the other side of this Hill, is a much decorated veteran of the famed 442d Regiment.

Mr. Speaker, I was therefore greatly honored to be privileged to have some small part in the successful passage of Hawaii Statehood, and am very pleased to be able to join the able Congressmen from Hawaii in tribute on this fourth anniversary of the signing of the statehood bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga], in observing the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill passed by the Congress which granted statehood to Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This is a memorable event for the people of Hawaii in their long and eventful history. It is also a memorable event in the history of the United States.

The people of the beautiful State of Hawaii have moved with great progress in the transition from a territory to a State. They should certainly be commended for the successful way in which this transition has been achieved.

Those of us who had the privilege of voting for the legislation giving the status of statehood to Hawaii may be assured that our support has been justified by the events of the past 4 years.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the wonderful people of Hawaii and their great Governor, the Honorable John A. Burns, who, more than anyone else, was responsible for Hawaii becoming a State of the Union.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii, spoke eloquently of our beautiful 50th State on the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill which gave statehood to Hawaii, and I am honored to be able to add my few words of celebration.

The commemoration of the fourth anniversary of the Hawaiian Statehood Act is the time to recognize Hawaii as a unique revelation of what American democracy means. In Hawaii, we see not only a realization of the democratic ideal that people of different religions can cooperate in self-government on the basis of deeply inculcated respect for the rights of the individual person. We see also that this democratic consensus makes it possible for people of quite different races to cooperate in representative self-government, and to live and work together in a remarkable unity of spirit. The success of Hawaiian-American democracy is a triumph of the democratic idea over causes of division which elsewhere have set man against man.

Hawaii comprises an unusual diversity of religions. Protestant congregations number over 400; there are 115 Catholic churches; and more than 100 Buddhist temples in the State. On Oahu, the most populous of the Hawaiian Islands, of persons 20 years and older, 39 percent are Protestant, 27.6 percent are Catholic, 15.8 percent are Buddhist, 2.7 percent are Mormon, and smaller percentages adhere to some other religion or to none. Despite religious diversity, Hawaiians are united in the democratic idea.

There is likewise a wide diversity of ethnic groups in the State. Of the 1960 population of 632,772, 31.96 percent are Caucasian, 32.15 percent are Japanese, 10.91 percent are Filipino, 6.04 percent are Chinese, and 18.94 percent are of some other racial origin. Certainly no other State in the Union is made up of people of such differing racial backgrounds, and yet her sister States could well view Hawaii as an example of interracial justice and good will. Indeed, the Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its 1961 report on civil rights in education, housing, voting, public accommodations, transportation, the administration of justice, and Government employment stated that—

> The Hawaii Advisory Committee has had no requests of any kind for action or assistance in the field of civil rights; and * * * the committee knows of no instance in Hawaii which calls for enforcement of any laws on civil rights; and * * * the committee knows of no areas in the field of civil rights that require enactment of Federal or State laws insofar as Hawaii is concerned.

Hawaii serves not only as a model for her sister States, but also mirrors for all of the peoples of Asia crushed under the tyranny of communism the possibility of popular self-government based on interpersonal respect without regard to race and creed. Hawaii's fulfillment of this possibility proves the value of the democratic idea.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express, on behalf of the citizens of the State of Connecticut and myself, our great pleasure and pride on the occasion of the 4th anniversary of the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

It is indeed with warm feelings of gratification and genuine satisfaction that the people of Connecticut are able to point to Hawaii as a sister State. Like Connecticut, Hawaii has brought together people of many different ethnic and religious backgrounds living happily and prosperously together in one of the most liberal and progressive States of the Union. Unlike Connecticut, which had a rather homogeneous Anglo-Saxon tradition, the forefathers of the Hawaiian nation were Polynesian kings, but the people of both States have consistently demonstrated over the years the same industriousness, liberalism, respect for law, order and gradual evolution, combined with the inner strength and stability in times of peace or war to assimilate people of every race and creed into a powerful force for the common good. These sterling qualities have combined to make our federation of sovereign States the most amazing nation the world has ever known.

And so I feel honored and privileged as a Representative of one of the first and oldest States of the Union to extend our greetings on this happy occasion to the newest State and to add our heartfelt hopes of peace, prosperity, and happiness to the State and people of Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

MIGRATORY LABOR PROBELM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Florida). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the 87th Congress I introduced a number of bills directed at the migratory labor problem. Only one measure was enacted into law—Public Law 87-692, which provides grants for public health clinics for migrants—and the plight of migratory laborers remains very largely unchanged. I have introduced a package of bills that aim at specific, continuing and remediable evils. The conditions under which many thousands of migratory laborers must work represent a dark corner of our society that we can no longer afford to neglect.

How very bad these conditions are has been made clear beyond doubt in several recent investigations. No one who watched "Harvest of Shame" on television could fail to be deeply distressed that American citizens should live under such conditions. Those who have read Dale Wright's series of articles in the New York World Telegram and Sun will know that our Government has not so far been able to protect migrant laborers from 14-hour days at unbelievably low wages; from cheating and exploitation at every turn; from a life of squalor, filth, and even danger. The investigations of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor have established that the great majority of migrant workers are excluded from the benefits and protections other Americans have long since come to take for granted.

The position of the migrant laborer in American society is highly anomalous. By definition he is a transient, a man whose occupation prevents him from forming stable ties with any one community. Nobody's constituent, he is also no one's responsibility. At the same time his extreme mobility throws unusual burdens on those who attempt to provide for his needs. Special arrangements must be made to adapt community facilities to the needs of the migrant worker. To take but one example, there is an inherent conflict between the demands of the average school system and the transitory character of the migrant's work.

For all these reasons, the migratory labor problem has become a problem with which the Federal Government must cope. No one State, unaided, can reasonably be expected to assume responsibility for the working and living conditions of laborers whose occupation requires them to move on to another State every few weeks. The bills I am sponsoring would, if passed, bring badly needed Federal assistance to the migrants themselves and to the State governments.

The first measure (H.R. 4902) would provide the States with financial assistance to improve the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children. As I have already pointed out, many local communities have great difficulty in making education available for their permanent residents and are unable to bear financially the seasonal burden of migratory workers' children. Since the illiteracy rate is high among adult migratory workers, this bill contains further provisions for adult education.

The second bill (H.R. 4903) would establish day-care services for children of migratory farmworkers. This measure would aid parents who at present must somehow supervise their children while at work. It would also relieve growers of the safety and efficiency problems created by the presence of young nonworking children in the fields. Thus, like most of the other bills in the package, this bill would benefit both employees and employers. It would authorize $750,000 for matching grants to States to establish and operate the day-care centers.

The third measure, H.R. 4904 regulates the employment of children in agriculture. It does not restrict the employment of children working for their parents on a home farm, but it does amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to the children of migrant laborers. It also authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations barring children below age 18 from working on particularly hazardous farm operations.

The fourth bill, H.R. 4905, is intended to correct some of the serious abuses that have shown up in every investigation of the migratory labor problem. It establishes a registration system for crew leaders, defined for the purposes of this bill as those middlemen between the workers and growers who recruit 10 or more migrants for interstate agricultural employment. All such crew leaders would be required to register with the Secretary of Labor, and their licenses would be refused or revoked for such violations incident to their activities as, first, lying to workers about wages, hours, and working conditions; second, breaching agreements with the growers; third, breaching agreements with the migrant workers; and fourth, being convicted under a State or Federal law related to gambling, prostitution, alcoholic liquors, or narcotics.

The next measure, H.R. 4906, is intended to bring existing knowledge about the conditions of migratory labor to bear upon the problem of devising policies for their improvement. Under the terms of the bill the President would appoint a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, to consist of 15 members drawn from among State officials, private citizens, farmers, and from the migratory laborers themselves. This council would be expected to advise the President and Congress about the functioning of laws, regulations, programs, and policies related to migrant worker problems. It would also have the task of analyzing specific problems and making recommendations for future policies and programs.

Finally, I propose a bill (H.R. 4907) to alleviate the extensive health problems created among migrants by grossly inadequate sanitation facilities. This bill would recognize the Federal Government's part in maintaining the general health of the community by providing $2 million annually to farmers, associations, and other appropriate parties to assist in the construction or renovation of sanitation facilities used by migratory farm families. In addition, it contains provision for surveys by States lacking adequate data regarding the need for sanitation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of migratory labor have been a matter of public concern for over 30 years. In the interval there have been many investigations of the problem, but little has actually been done. Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, has taken the leadership in focusing public attention on the need for corrective legislation. His Subcommittee on Migratory Labor has developed a comprehensive approach which is embodied in the measures I have outlined. These measures represent a first step toward a solution of the migratory labor problems. I believe now is the time for Congress to act.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand vocational education opportunities for the people of this Nation.

Cited as the Vocational Education Act of 1963, this legislation embodies the recommendations of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, an advisory group appointed in late 1961 at the request of President Kennedy. The panel was charged by the President to review and evaluate the current National Vocational Education Acts and make recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

Under the chairmanship of Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools, Chicago, Ill., this lay group worked for a year in fashioning its report "Education for a Changing World of Work."

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate these outstanding citizens who devoted considerable time and energy to this very important project. At this point I want the RECORD to show a list of their names:

PANEL OF CONSULTANTS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, OCTOBER 1961 TO NOVEMBER 1962

Benjamin C. Willis, Chairman, Chicago, Ill.
Mary C. Bingham, Louisville, Ky.
Charles F. Carroll, Raleigh, N.C.
Fred T. Corleto, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ernest H. Dean, American Fork, Utah.
Mark Ellingson, Rochester, N.Y.
Margaret C. Ells, Springfield, Mass.
Charles W. Engelhard, Newark, N.J.
Edward B. Evans, Prairie View, Tex.
Henry A. Gonzales, Santa Fe, N. Mex.
Francis A. Gregory, Washington, D.C.
Floyd D. Johnson, York, S.C.
Helen R. LeBaron, Ames, Iowa.
William B. Logan, Columbus, Ohio.
Charles E. Odell, Detroit, Mich.
James G. Patton, Denver, Colo.
J. B. Perky, Stillwater, Okla.
Thomas H. Quigley, Atlanta, Ga.
Helen R. Radke, Port Angeles, Wash.
Peter T. Schoemann, Washington, D.C.
Paul H. Sheats, Los Angeles, Calif.
Dael Wolfle, Washington, D.C.

Official representatives: Hyman H. Bookbinder, U.S. Department of Commerce; E. T. York, Jr., U.S. Department of Agriculture; Seymour Wolfbein, U.S. Department of Labor.

Staff: J. Chester Swanson, George L. Brandon, Mary P. Allen.

Mr. Speaker, in drafting this bill, I have had the benefit of the recommendations of the Panel of Consultants as well as the help and advice of vocational educators in my own State of Kentucky. The assistant State superintendent of schools, James L. Patton, has assisted me greatly in the writing of this legislation. I believe that this bill is in keeping with the needs of the day as seen by the Panel of Consultants as well as by vocational educators.

In the 1960's it is estimated that 8 out of 10 of the youngsters now in elementary school must receive preparation for occupations other than the professional occupations which require 4 or more years of college. In other words, 8 out of every 10 children now in the elementary schools will not complete 4 years of college. Mr. Speaker, this fact challenges our vision and imagination as never before. Especially is this true in view of the fact that the number of unskilled jobs is rapidly decreasing. More and more of the work of the world is demanding highly skilled and well-trained individuals. If our public schools are to underwrite this challenge, we must provide more and improved opportunities for our students through vocational education.

In addition to the vast numbers who will need vocational training at the high school level, there continues to be an increasing need for vocational education at the post high school level. Vocational education now prepares the highly skilled technician who supports the engineer and scientist of our Defense Establishment.

Vocational education will also be called upon to furnish training and retraining for thousands of workers who will be displaced by automation and technological change.

There is a crying need, Mr. Speaker, in our great urban centers to find some way to meet the needs of thousands of youngsters who are standing on the street corner with nothing to do. We are told that 7½ million youngsters will drop out of school in the decade of the 1960's. We use many terms to describe them; disadvantaged, culturally deprived, and so on. These people need special programs of vocational education. I happen to believe that vocational educators are especially well adapted to helping these youngsters, but they cannot do so with present resources.

At this point, I wish to briefly outline the provisions of my bill:

Title I authorizes for vocational education $73 million for fiscal year 1964, $175 million for fiscal year 1965, $250 million for fiscal year 1966, $340 million for fiscal year 1967, for fiscal year 1968 and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine.

After reserving 5 percent of the total appropriation to be used for special projects, the Commission allots the funds to the States on a formula derived by taking into account the relative population and per capita income of each State.

The funds may be used to provide vocational education for persons attending high school; for full-time students who have completed high school; for persons who need training or retraining to improve occupational competencies; for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that require programs specially adapted to their needs; for construction of area vocational education program facilities; for supporting services, such as research, administration and supervision; teacher training and instructional materials to assure excellence in all vocational programs.

The State, as under the other Vocational Education Acts will submit a plan setting forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in administering the program.

Title II of the bill will establish a work assistance program for students who are enrolled full time in area vocational education programs and who need the earnings from such employment in order to pursue vocational courses.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $1 million for this purpose, to be apportioned to the States that enter into agreements with the Commissioner for the purpose of establishing work-study programs. The States will pay one-half the cost of the program, and a student may receive up to $700 per year to help defray expenses of schooling. The student may not work more than 15 hours per week; must be enrolled as a full-time student, and must be capable, in the opinion of school authorities, of maintaining good standing in school while employed.

Title III of my bill provides for insured loans to students enrolled in area vocational education programs. It authorizes $5 million the first year—and up to $10 million any fiscal year thereafter. To receive a loan, a student must be enrolled full-time in an area vocational education program. The loan is to be made by note or written agreement, without security and endorsement; repayment of the principal amount is to be made over a 10-year period, with interest on the unpaid balance to be paid at a yearly rate—not to exceed the maximum rate as prescribed and defined by the Commissioner by or pursuant to regulation.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will build on the foundation laid by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. It provides for cooperation of governments at all levels, and takes full advantage of the Federal-State-local relationships in vocational education, that has worked so well over the years. It places the administrative responsibility for the program with the State boards for vocational education where it rightly belongs.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on General Education, of which it is my privilege to be chairman, will hold hearings next week on this and other bills relating to vocational education. We plan to work intensively until a bill is perfected and brought to the floor of this House.

I know of no matter before the Congress today that is of greater importance. Without a well-prepared and skilled work force, this Nation cannot maintain its position of world leadership. I submit to the Members of this body the wonderful record of vocational education in this country. Since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the dedicated administrators and teachers, who have made this program work, have helped literally thousands of people to prepare for work and find jobs. Through the public school system vocational education has helped to open wider the door of opportunity. To all who would sermonize about the "American way of life," I ask them to consider the vocational education programs that have given to so many the opportunity to help themselves by making it possible to find a place in the work of the world.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if one reads only the newspaper headlines this past week, he is likely to get the impression that everybody is mad at our Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

I rise in an effort to correct the record, and to make it clear that there are many of us in this body who admire Mr. McNamara and who feel he is doing an outstanding job in the Pentagon. And I make this statement as one member of the Committee on Armed Services who has not always found himself in agreement with the Secretary over the past 2 years. But I think we ought to get the record into some kind of perspective here.

After all, Mr. Speaker, on the first test vote in the House of Representatives, it ought to be noted that this House came within a mere 47 votes of supporting Secretary McNamara's position on the RS-70 aircraft in spite of the fact that the fight for the Secretary's position was led by five relatively junior members of the Committee on Armed Services, and despite the fact that in order to support the Secretary's position on this controversial matter Members of the House had to record themselves in opposition to the distinguished and much-beloved dean of the House, the venerable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services.

To keep the record straight, it should also be noted that the substantial minority supporting Mr. McNamara's position on the RS-70 included the minority floor leader of the House, the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and a number of other committee chairmen in this body as well.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days, we have heard a great deal about the investigation underway in the other body into the ultimate award of a contract for the controversial interservice fighter, the TFX. Within the past few days I believe every Member of the House has received a copy of Secretary McNamara's statement to the Senate investigating subcommittee on the TFX. I hope Members will take the time to read this remarkable statement, because I believe it dramatically demonstrates why Mr. McNamara is a great Secretary of Defense, as well as why he has recently become the focus of considerable criticism both inside and outside of Congress.

We have heard a lot about Mr. McNamara being a walking computer. Just take a look at that TFX statement. Here is no computer; here is no dense, cloudy, unintelligible statistician. Instead, here is a plain, direct, simple, and eloquent exposition of some of the reasoning processes that today go into making the hard decisions over in the Defense Department. Here is no mumbo-jumbo. Here is a clear argument stated in words that even a high school student could understand, so simple as to appear to be as easy as falling off a log, and yet eloquently and powerfully convincing. The Secretary's statement is a masterful job of making a difficult subject understandable and clear. And few, I think can really find it possible to quarrel with his conclusion once you take the trouble to follow his arguments step by step. It is easy to be unintelligible; it takes real ability to be clear.

Mr. Speaker, where have the Secretary's troubles with Congress come from? Mostly from his determination to save money in our Defense Department, and not just to talk about saving money. Anybody can add on expenses to the defense budget. The real hard job is to try to hold the line against apparently attractive but nevertheless unnecessary additions to our defense budget. Year after year we have talked about holding the line against unnecessary expenditures and about saving money in the Pentagon. But until Mr. McNamara arrived this talk was largely just talk. Now we have a man who takes these pledges seriously; and in a very real degree, the extent of his vocal opposition is a measure of his success in effecting the economies all of us profess to admire.

After all, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense is not expected to win a popularity contest. He is expected to do a job—to build the military forces we need to preserve our security without reference to any arbitrary budget ceiling; and to resist all attempts to increase these forces over and beyond that point.

That Mr. McNamara has carried out that assignment is demonstrated by the fact that the Defense budget this year is substantially higher today that it was 2 years ago, so he has strengthened our defenses without being limited by any arbitrary budget ceiling. It is also demonstrated by the amazing diplomatic victory which our country won last October during the Cuban crisis when the Soviet Union, in spite of years of boastful rocket rattling by its defense leaders, peremptorily backed down when finally confronted with an unambiguous challenge by superior American combat forces. Let us not forget Secretary McNamara's role in that victory.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially disturbed by the charges which have been made both on and off this floor, that Secretary McNamara is somehow a dictator in the Defense Department and that, contrary to the will of Congress, he has become a kind of civilian single Chief of Staff of our armed services. In my humble judgment, Mr. Speaker, this charge is not only sheer nonsense, but it also happens to be self-contradictory.

I will take second place to no one in this House in my opposition to a single Chief of Staff. I have frequently spoken out on this floor against such a concept. But the whole point of the opposition to a uniformed single Chief of Staff, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not believe that any single uniformed officer ought to be running the armed services. But no one in his right mind would suggest that these three armed services should therefore not be run under one single mechanism of control. Obviously there must be a single overall mechanism of control; but our American tradition has been that this overall control should be civilian and not military. We have that overall top civilian control in the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Does anybody seriously suggest that the Commander in Chief should not really run these three armed services? Does anybody seriously suggest that our uniformed military officers should have more to say about the operations of our Army, Navy, and Air Force than the President of the United States, no matter what his experience in uniform may have been?

Well, Mr. Speaker, under the law, the Secretary of Defense is the direct representative of the President of the United States. It would make no more sense to have three separate independent leaders of the Defense Department than it would be to have three separate independent leaders running the Treasury Department or the Interior Department or the State Department.

The fact of the matter is that we have a unified Department of Defense under the law and that is the very reason we do not need any single uniformed Chief of Staff. Mr. McNamara has gotten into trouble in certain quarters precisely because he has taken his assignment seriously in this regard, and has indeed provided unified civilian leadership to the Department of Defense, under the overall direction of the President of the United States. As long as that integrated leadership is being supplied we do not need any single Chief of Staff. But let that leadership falter, let the Secretary of Defense refuse to meet his heavy responsibilities because he is afraid somebody might get mad at him, and then we might indeed find the drive for a single uniformed Chief of Staff irresistible.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am glad that we have in Secretary McNamara a man who is more interested in getting a job done than he is in winning a popularity contest. And I am sure that in the long run the people of the United States will be a whole lot happier in having a man in charge of our Nation's defenses who manages to come up with most of the right answers, even though he ruffles a lot of congressional fur in the process, than they would be in having a genial and affable blackslapper who is tremendously popular on Capitol Hill and in the corridors of the Pentagon but who puts off the difficult day-of-reckoning decisions for someone else to make, later on when perhaps it is already too late for them to count.

Only the other day Mr. Speaker, this House broke precedent by voting honorary American citizenship to Winston Churchill because of his monumental contribution to the defense of freedom in World War II. But in doing so I wonder how many people remember that until the difficult days of 1940 Winston Churchill would never have won any popularity contest among the British people. He preached a hard and unpopular doctrine of preparedness during the roaring 1920's and the 1930's; and for his pains he was relegated to the back benches of his party in Parliament. In all those dark days of political unpopularity, Sir Winston had just one thing to sustain him: he was right even though he was unpopular. And he goes down in history today as a great leader, Mr. Speaker, with the special and unprecedented accolade of honorary American citizenship, because he had the courage and the fortitude to stick to his guns in spite of all the pressures of political unpopularity.

As Adm. Ernest J. King is reported to have said when he assumed top command of the U.S. Navy in the dark days immediately after Pearl Harbor, "When the going gets tough they call in the so-and-so's."

In today's crisis-ridden world, Mr. Speaker, the going we face—in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam—could hardly be tougher. I for one am glad that we have in charge of our Defense Department in such difficult times a man who does not hesitate to make the tough decisions even though some here in this

House, and elsewhere, are all too ready to pin on him the label of "so-and-so." It never fazed Admiral King, and I do not think it will faze Mr. McNamara either.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a thoughtful article by Mr. Thomas O'Neill which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of March 15, 1963.

The article follows:

POLITICS AND PEOPLE

(By Thomas O'Neill)

STERNEST TEST

WASHINGTON.—Over the period of his 2 years in office Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has engaged a full range of challengers and is unmarked from any of the encounters, although he would do well to stay out of any popularity contests at the Pentagon or on Capitol Hill.

Most of his troubles have arisen from a literal reading of the terms of the law combining the separate military services into a single department, terms that specifically set up civilian control over the generals and admirals. Most of his seven predecessors found themselves maneuvered out of control and into the position of mediator between the rival services, and one who tried to impose the letter of the statute was driven to a mental breakdown and suicide. Mr. McNamara has stolidly pushed ahead and shows no sign of any kind of breakdown. Behind his bookish mien there is a resolute resistance to being pushed around.

The dispute that now engages him, over the choice of an all-purpose plane for use by both Navy and Air Force, is much the most significant of his career in the Washington cockpit. It pits him against the military-industrial colossus against which General Eisenhower hoisted warning signals 3 days before leaving the White House. And this time, because of the sum involved, it is more vital than ever to Mr. McNamara that his judgment stand the test of subsequent experience. That sum, running at least to $5½ billion, is greater than the entire cost of the whole Federal Government in the first year (1933) of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is thought of as a big spender.

Against him are arrayed, and impatient to set up the shout of "I told you so," the overruled military men who remain unreconciled to the theory that a civilian should direct their affairs, and their carefully cultivated partisans in Congress.

The military is constrained to private utterance of its angriest observations regarding the secretarial competence, but its sense of frustration has been adequately conveyed to Capitol Hill where it has stoked a heated uproar. A Democratic solon calls for amending the law to take away some of the Secretary's current authority and indicates an attempt to compel him to spend unwanted funds voted by Congress—an undertaking with scant prospect of winning approval at the White House.

It is improbable that Mr. McNamara looks with disesteem upon Congress, as one affronted lawmaker contends, as an unnecessary evil. Closer to the mark, it appears, is the taunt of the House Republican whip, LESLIE ARENDS, that the Secretary has set himself up as a civilian dictator over the military, a dictator who knows all the answers.

The McNamara position is that he has to know all the answers because it is he who has to make the hard decisions, unless they are to be shunted to the White House. To get the answers, and speedily, he employs computers, an array of civilian aids made up of lawyers, scientists and management specialists free from the professional prejudices of West Point and Annapolis (referred to collectively and scornfully by the unhappy brass as the "whiz kids"), and a rigid system of deadlines for decisions on lower levels. Mr. McNamara is firmly committed to a minimum of hesitation over decisions, no matter how difficult.

Upon receiving the invitation to take over the grinding job from President-elect Kennedy, a choice that required giving up $400,000 a year as president of the Ford Motor Co. for the Government's $25,000, he mediated only 5 days before giving his answer: "I think I can handle it, Mr. President."

Against footdragging and condemnation, the latter both journalistic and congressional, the Secretary has the look of a man neither awed nor deterred. His independence was displayed early when he calmly vetoed White House proposals for appointments at the Pentagon.

Just as coolly he has discarded pet projects advanced by the admirals and generals, supported by the conviction that they appropriately argue for the interests of their service while it is his function to look at a larger picture. This embraces the needs of the armed services as presented by the service commanders, cost considerations for the long haul, and the diplomatic effect of American military policy.

Following these guidelines he has been brusque and abrasive, but at the same time has accomplished a considerable measure of the integration of the Armed Forces contemplated when the Department of Defense was established and successfully resisted by the separate services until the arrival of "McNamara's Band." Along the way he has achieved recognition from friend and critic as the strong man of the Cabinet, a Cabinet whose strength curiously rests upon men who never sought elective office—Rusk, Dillon, Robert Kennedy—and consequently are objects of suspicion in the elected ranks of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFF FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the American Political Science Association, sponsors of the congressional fellowship program which brings a number of young reporters and political scientists to Washington for a year's work and learning as members of congressional staffs, has recently announced a new program which deserves the attention of Members of Congress and their staffs. It is a program of fellowships for congressional staff members, offering them a chance to broaden their horizons educationally.

Similar programs of mid-service training are common in the fields of education, civil service, and industry. The American Political Science Association is to be commended for offering this opportunity to congressional staff personnel as well.

In summary, the program offers a limited number of 1-year and 6-month fellowships open to congressional staff members both in individual Members' offices and those on committee staffs. These are offered to permit personalized residence university study for those staff members interested in study and research. It would help in the effort to develop the caliber of professional staff personnel which are so necessary for the continued improvement of the functions of the Congress.

As I understand it, notices of this program are being sent to each congressional office. I would urge each of my colleagues to give this program full consideration for it offers real benefits to the Congress.

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS ENDORSE MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a news release.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our fight for adequate minority staffing, we are encouraged to have the support of recognized political scientists. Members of the House and Senate, as well as the press, will want to give careful study and attention to the thoughtful findings of this responsible group of political scientists.

The Republican House conference subcommittee on increased minority staffing welcomes these comments and suggestions in this area of study. The subcommittee is grateful for the time and effort which went into the study.

A copy of the news release which I made today, which carries the statement of the political scientists, follows:

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS ENDORSE MINORITY STAFFING

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, chairman of the Republican conference subcommittee on increased minority staffing, today announced the appointment of a number of leading political scientists as consultants to the Republican conference subcommittee.

In announcing the appointments, Congressman SCHWENGEL said, "My colleagues and I feel that we have not had the opportunity before to make adequate use of the professional political scientists who have studied our problems and have many useful ideas to offer us. It is my hope that the appointment of these consultants will aid us in our exploration of new ideas and programs to make Congress, especially the minority, more effective over the coming months."

The political scientists appointed are Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, Bethesda, Md.; Dr. Brownlee S. Corrin, Goucher College, Baltimore; Dr. George Carey, Georgetown University; and Dr. Russell Ross, University of Iowa.

In announcing the appointments, Congressman SCHWENGEL also released a statement regarding minority staffing which the political scientists prepared for his subcommittee—CURTIS, of Missouri; RHODES of Arizona; LINDSAY, and GOODELL, of New York; SCHENCK, of Ohio; and GRIFFIN, of Michigan.

The full text of the statement follows:

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS STATEMENT ON MINORITY STAFFING

"The committee staff function at the congressional level is not being fulfilled. And a failure to do so is not only unfair, but it is a threat to the traditions of representative government. Responsibility for this condition falls upon the Democratic Party leadership in Congress.

"To deny the minority in Congress access to adequate representation on committee staffs eliminates the opportunity for a minority to act responsibly after a careful examination of the problems under consideration. Congressmen, in this difficult and complex period of our history, require access to data and evaluation in those subject areas to which they are given responsibility as committee members. It is obvious that this work cannot be placed regularly with their own office staff which have functions very different from those of a committee. It is obvious, in light of policy formulation patterns at all levels of Government, that the adversarial technique of law and politics in this country requires a personal relationship in which a Congressman can develop confidence with the professional staff members. This is why, of course, the President has a high degree of control over his White House staff, as well as at many policymaking levels in the executive departments.

"Some have argued that an increase in minority staffing of congressional committees would jeopardize the recent professionalization of these staffs. We do not believe that this is true. There is no reason why such professionalization cannot take place in a bipartisan framework. What is needed are professional staff members separately responsible to the majority and the minority. The demand that a substantially larger portion of the professional staff be responsible to the minority members is wholly reasonable and within the best democratic traditions.

"Congressional committee staff members are not intended to serve the same function as staff members in the Legislative Reference Service. Nor should they. The committee staff must possess high levels of competence. It is equally important, however, that there exist mutual confidence between the Congressmen and the staff members. This confidence is not possible when a minority party, be it Democrat or Republican (and there is always the possibility of reversal of role), does not have access to adequate and qualified professional staff members of its own selection.

"The existing position is more than unfortunate; it is a subtle denial of freedom of effective speech, of which Congress as a body purports to be justly proud. It hinders reasoned debate that alone can lead to just solution of legislative problems. It prevents the minority from carrying out its major democratic function of knowledgeable criticism.

"The country cannot afford gamesmanship or petty, cheap politics at the congressional level. Yet, we are witnessing an outstanding example of partisan pettiness in the denial to the minority in Congress the right to exercise its legislative function by refusing to grant it necessary staff support."

Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn.
Dr. Howard Penniman.
Dr. Franklin Burdette.
Dr. Brownlee S. Corrin.
Dr. George Carey.
Dr. Russell Ross.

INCREASED INSURANCE PROTECTION FOR BANK DEPOSITORS AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATION SHAREHOLDERS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this Nation's banking system came to the end of decades of disgracefully numerous bank failures. After the bank holiday, the Government took decisive steps to reconstruct the financial institutions that are fundamental to modern business and to representative government. One of the great steps in building a new and stronger financial system was the creation of nationwide insurance protection for depositors in commercial banks, and later for shareholders in savings and loan associations. The success of the financial legislation is apparent to anyone who remembers or studies the differences between the years before 1933 and the present. Of the many improvements, I bring to your consideration only the fact that in 1962 not a single insured bank failed, while in the 4 years 1930–33, before deposit insurance, failures totaled in excess of 9,000.

I have introduced two bills which will add further to the confidence of depositors and shareholders in their banks and savings associations, and insure that in the rare case of failure the losses to depositors and to the community will be minimal. My bills propose to increase protection of each account from $10,000 to $25,000, establishing a range of protection that reflects the growing magnitudes of savings and of personal income. My bills propose to protect each account up to five times the amount covered for commercial bank depositors when the FDIC began operations on a permanent basis in 1935. Per capita personal income soon will equal five times as much as in 1935. Bank deposits total about four times as much as in 1935.

The increased upper limit on insurance protection will prove economical both to depositors and to banks, because it will diminish the necessity for setting up a number of accounts in order to achieve full protection for a depositor who has accumulated more than $10,000.

Bank accounts and savings association shares both would become more attractive, because of the increased safety offered for substantial amounts held in these forms of savings.

The increased protection, according to both FDIC and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, would not require increase in the insurance fees. Both Corporations now hold ample reserves against any possible losses.

RESEAL ORDER HITS FAMILY FARMER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Nation, and in my native State of Minnesota in particular, are being penalized once more. I refer to the announcement by the Department of Agriculture that the Government is not going to reseal 1959 and 1960 oats and barley or 1961 soybeans stored on individual farms. It amounts to another case of shortchanging the farmer by not permitting him to participate in the grain storage program for these respective years.

We do a lot of talking about helping the smaller farm operator to survive, but orders of this type further decrease the potential of such farms. This is the second year in a row where commercial grain storage companies have been given the nod over American farmers. If our farm population is to survive, it must be given greater consideration.

I have written the Department of Agriculture protesting this action. I pointed out that many of our Minnesota counties are now considered as feed grains depressed because of adverse growing conditions over the past 2 years. Under the assistance program, Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are made available to hard-hit farmers. This means that grains stored on family farms should be readily available in the area where such stocks might be needed.

Almost one-third of the barley, oats, and soybeans stored in the United States in the years affected by the new order are stored in Minnesota, on family farms. This means that Minnesota farmers will be deprived of almost a million dollars in storage revenues this next year. This money could have been of great assistance to these farmers, whose cash receipts last year were down 1.6 percent from 1961.

Farmers ought to be given the opportunity to participate in the storage of these crops, especially when you consider that our farmers have provided a great service to the Commodity Credit Corporation by providing and investing in storage space.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEED RESPONSIBLE APPROACH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, an incident of last week involving a law enforcement officer and a purse snatcher suspect, has provoked comment from individuals, civic organizations, and the press alike. The variance in viewpoint is well illustrated by the editorials and news articles, which, under unanimous consent, I will include in the Record following my remarks.

Although this involves a single incident, it reflects the growing need for greater understanding and cooperation among the diversified elements making up the District of Columbia population.

For some time now I have concerned myself with the problems and potentials of this sometimes-great city. I do not view the time that I have spent as having been taken at the expense of my own district, but rather in furtherance of a duty imposed on all of us in this body by the Constitution. In each of the past three Congresses, I have submitted a bill to grant the District of Columbia a reasonable degree of home rule, and I have actively campaigned for its consideration and passage.

This year I have submitted a bill which would bring the District of Columbia within the aid to federally impacted areas program, a move which would provide the District with sorely needed funds for education. I have proposed a study of the possible use of Howard University to expand the program of college level and graduate education for residents of the District, and the training of teachers for the public schools. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I have joined in the minority views on the President's Economic Report, calling for increased efforts to train school dropouts and provide adult vocational and technical education programs in expanded form. I was among the first to call on the President to implement his promise to outlaw discrimination in the sale of particular housing units.

Yet the need for something more basic than the material changes I have outlined is nowhere more graphically pointed out that in the incident of last week involving the shooting of a suspected purse snatcher by a District policeman, and the reactions that followed. Hardly had the news of the shooting become known than the Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—chapter in the District shot off a telegram which branded the affair as "murder" and used it in an attempt to prove wholesale claims of police brutality and incompetence.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that an organization which prides itself in protecting civil liberties should so callously ignore the right of a policeman to a fair and impartial examination of his case without "trial by newspaper" prior to a hearing. In fact, the suspect had been warned to stop, and had in fact been hit with a nightstick without slowing down, as four witnesses and another policeman testified at the coroner's jury which returned a verdict that the officer had acted in line of duty.

This reaction, however, is a prime example of the increasing lack of responsibility on the part of organizations who hold themselves out to be representatives of the underprivileged, particularly of the Negro race. I have personally spoken with many of our Negro citizens from varying walks of life, and I believe that CORE, the Urban League, and others may be out of touch with their own constituency. Any Negro is well aware that he can be a victim of antisocial behavior, and he is also aware that the police are in fact handicapped by rigid regulations, lenient judges, and the pressure of a sincere but misguided element of the public.

No doubt there is some correlation between poverty, lack of education, narrow job opportunities, poor housing, and crime. There is no guarantee however, that improvement in such conditions, which should be and will be forthcoming, will eliminate the problem entirely. My own district ranges from industry, to suburb, to agriculture, and in general is blessed with economic and social stability. Yet figures show an increase in juvenile crimes.

I am convinced that there is a need for increased discipline and deterrent. As the president of the National District Attorneys Association has observed, it is not necessarily the severity of the punishment, but the certainty of it. The District Police have performed well under trying conditions, and I do not think that the place to start in molding community responsibility and respect for the law is the tearing down of police force morale and dignity.

There is no more justification for using the police as a scapegoat for the ills of the society at large than there is for ignoring the needs and blaming everything on the Negro race. There is justification for increasing the effectiveness of the police and increasing the protection of the people. One spokesman for a group critical of the police has been quoted as saying that in light of the Wall case, "I would be afraid to run for a bus now." The majority of citizens, of whatever race, would probably have said that in light of the Wall case, "I would be afraid to get off of a bus now."

The 10-year record of crime with little punishment or rehabilitation of the purse snatcher suspect indicates a need in both directions. I would suggest that if those who are so critical of the results, spent more time in voluntary activity, helping the returned parolee, and increasing the respect for law and order and those who administer the same, this incident might not have occurred.

I do not ask anyone to discontinue his efforts towards improving the conditions of society, for that is furthest from my thoughts. The incident of last week pointedly indicates, however, that if certain groups within the District do not curtail their irresponsible approach to social problems, the prospects for cooperation and understanding among our citizens will be greatly undermined.

The editorials and articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ROOKIE POLICEMAN KILLS EX-CONVICT FLEEING FROM SCENE OF PURSE SNATCHING

(By Walter Gold)

A rookie Washington policeman yesterday shot and killed an ex-convict who was running from the scene of a daylight purse snatching on a busy Northwest street.

One bullet, fired by Pvt. Frank A. Klimecke, 24, instantly killed the fleeing suspect, identified by police as James Calvin Wall, 21, of the 1400 block of Swann Street NW.

The fatal shooting took place in the 1400 block of Fairmont Street NW. about 5 p.m. as scores of pedestrians and motorists watched the climax of a four-block foot chase.

Wall, according to police, had a criminal record dating back to when he was 11 years old. He had been released from the National Training School, where he was serving time for larceny, just 8 weeks ago.

Private Klimecke only recently had qualified with his service revolver. Officials said he joined the Metropolitan Police force last September but had never had an opportunity to attend the department training school. For the past several months, newly recruited policemen have been put on the streets in some assignments with only brief training to replace seasoned officers for the fight against increasing crime.

INQUEST TOMORROW

The young officer was released in technical custody of his commanding officer, Capt. Albert B. Clark of the 10th precinct and has been assigned to duty in the station house temporarily, pending an inquest at the morgue tomorrow.

Police Inspector Lawrence A. Hartnett said the dead youth was identified by Mrs. Barbara J. Hileman, 18, as the man who grabbed her pocketbook about 5 p.m. as she walked in the 1600 block of Euclid street NW.

Mrs. Hileman, a clerk-typist at the Navy Department's Bureau of Weapons, was still shaking when she gave her account of the incident.

"I had just gotten off a bus at 16th and Euclid Streets and way on my way to my apartment at 2518 17th Street when I heard footsteps directly behind me," Mrs. Hileman said.

FLEES WITH PURSE

Mrs. Hileman said she was in front of 1631 Euclid Street when a man suddenly grabbed her purse from under her right arm. Holding onto the straps of the large pocketbook, Mrs. Hileman said she wheeled on her assailant, who was wearing khaki clothing and carrying a pillowcase full of wet laundry.

The man wrenched the purse away from her and fled back toward 16th Street.

Mrs. Hileman, who said she is expecting a baby in 3 months, chased the man west on Euclid Street, then north on Mozart Place for a block, then west again on Fuller Street until her "legs gave out" at 16th Street.

"I screamed for someone to stop him, but not one person stood in his way," Mrs. Hileman said. "When I couldn't run anymore, I leaned up against a tree, but no one offered to help me, even though it was the height of the evening rush hour and the streets were crowded with cars and people."

At this point, two policemen, who had been stationed outside the Spanish Embassy at 16th and Fuller Streets prior to a diplomatic reception, observed the chase and heard the woman scream that she had been robbed.

The officer who was assigned to guard the front of the Embassy, Pvt. Clifton O. Gill, 27, started chasing the robbery suspect east on Fuller Street.

As the policeman raced past the rear of the Embassy, he yelled for his partner, Private Klimecke, to join the chase.

At the dead end of Fuller Street, just east of 15th Street, the man fled through a yard and a parking lot and raced onto Fairmont Street, still carrying his sack of wet laundry, with the two policemen several paces behind him.

The suspect slipped and fell to the pavement in the 1400 block of Fairmont Street as he attempted to dodge between parked automobiles, the two policemen said.

Private Klimecke said he also fell to the street at the same point. As the robbery suspect scrambled to his feet and attempted to retrace his steps, he somehow managed to get between the two policemen.

Private Gill said he lunged for the suspect and struck him on the head with his night stick. The suspect shook off the blow and kept running, the policemen said.

At this point, Private Klimecke, who had regained his footing, said he drew his service revolver from his holster and again ordered the suspect to halt. When the man kept running Private Klimecke said he fired one shot from the .38-caliber weapon and the suspect fell to the sidewalk in front of 1451 Fairmont Street, where he later died.

The bullet struck Wall in the back of his head and came out his right eye, Inspector Hartnett said.

During the chase, the suspect dropped the purse, the police said. However, it was recovered intact by a 14-year-old boy, who turned it over to police officials.

Police records revealed that Wall was first arrested for stealing in 1953. The youth's juvenile records show that he also was charged with petty larceny and vandalism 2 years later when he was 13.

ARRESTED AGAIN

In September 1958, when Wall was 16, he was found guilty of breaking into a home in a fashionable section of the eighth precinct and sentenced to serve more than 4 years at the National Training School for Boys.

While on parole from National Training School in 1961, he was again arrested for housebreaking. Wall was sentenced to an additional 18 months for that offense.

Again on parole, he was arrested on a larceny charge in November 1962, and sentenced to serve 90 days. He was released from National Training School on January 7 this year, less than 1 month before his 21st birthday.

Police records indicate that the youth was living with his father at the Swann Street address prior to yesterday's incident.

Private Gill joined the Department last August, the inspector said.

Meanwhile, the Washington chapter of the Congress on Racial Equality sent a telegram of protest against the shooting to several officials, reading in part:

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public."

The telegram, signed by Julius Hobson, president of the Washington chapter, also suggested the investigation be conducted by persons not connected with the Police Department. It suggested a test of stability of all police recruits and periodically of all policemen.

The telegram was sent to Charles A. Horsky, Presidential Assistant on District Affairs; Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner and Clyde Ferguson, counsel of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

Sudden Death

A 21-year-old man who snatched a purse from a young woman was shot and killed by a rookie police officer on Tuesday. It is true that the young man had a very bad reputation, having been in trouble with the law since he was 11 years old. It is also true that he was in flight after having committed an ugly crime and after having been told to halt by the pursuing policemen. Nevertheless, the snuffing out of a human life is in itself, no matter what the provocation, an awesome and terrible thing. It is, in a sense, a failure of law enforcement which must anguish the policemen whose arms achieve this summary result and the community which arms them. The policeman who has to choose between allowing a guilty man to get away and allowing him to die has to make a dreadful choice.

The dead man—he had barely reached his majority—was a victim not alone of police efficiency but of community neglect. He was a product of this city's slums, of its juvenile facilities, of its schools and of its correctional institutions. He was an outcast, an enemy of society, from early boyhood. But he was not born bad; he became bad. The community needs to know why. For it is breeding such boys—such men, if you prefer—far faster than its police can shoot them down.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 15, 1963]

The Case of CORE and Officer Klimecke

We have a few comments to make on the following telegram, signed "Julius W. Hobson, president" which the District of Columbia Commissioners received from CORE (Committee on Racial Equality), with copies sent to the newspapers by CORE:

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. Officer Giles mentioned too frequently recently in connection with brutality and trigger-happy rookies should not be given guns before completing training. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public. CORE suggests that both investigation and training program be conducted by persons not connected with police department. Also suggest thorough tests of emotional stability for recruits and periodically for all police."

Only one James Wall has been shot here. Only one policeman shot him. His name is Officer Frank Klimecke. (There was no "Officer Giles" involved.)

It seems to us that CORE and its officials are, quite likely, open for a suit of criminal libel. Officer Klimecke was doing his duty. CORE publicly calls it murder.

Policemen, it seems to us, should have the same protection from reckless and unproved charges as has the ordinary citizen, and have the same recourse to the courts when libeled.

The facts on record show Officer Klimecke fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. Colored witnesses support the policeman.

CORE goes on to refer to "trigger-happy rookies." Insofar as this might be supposed to refer to Officer Klimecke, we checked and learned that he served in France with the Army's military police for 3 years.

Nobody hates trigger-happy policemen more than we do. We hate them as much as we hate trigger-happy stickup men, or muggers who throttle peaceful citizens, or gangs (no matter how young they are) that beat people to death, or cowardly lifelong criminals—such as the one Officer Klimecke nailed—who ruthlessly attack defenseless women on the city's streets.

We hate them whether they are white or Negro, or whether their victims are white or Negro.

We'd like to think CORE shares our feelings, but we don't know.

We do know we don't share CORE's feelings about Officer Klimecke. Rather than denouncing him as a murderer, we think he deserves—if not a medal—at least a citation for doing his duty.

Neither do we share CORE's suggestion that the training of policemen should be done by persons not connected with the Police Department. That's about as silly a notion as we've heard in some time.

CORE suggests there should be tests of emotional stability for recruits and, periodically, for all police. This is a good idea, but we thought we'd already heard of it somewhere. So we checked with the Police Department. CORE might be interested to know that this is already being done, and has been for years, by a trained psychiatrist.

Perhaps some of CORE's officials could profitably take similar tests for emotional stability, or lack of.

Racially oriented champions of less rigorous police safeguards for Washington overlook the fact that the respectable, law abiding colored citizens are endangered as much or more than white citizens by a tiny tribe of almost hopelessly uncivilized brutes who can best be described as urban Mau Maus. This minuscule fraction of the city's population circulates in and out of our courts and jails, and causes nearly all the violent crime.

The great body of colored Washingtonians is, as is demonstrated every day, made up of upright, decent, and law-abiding citizens. They suffer, along with the rest of us, from the depredations of this small group of habitually lawless primitives which can only be controlled by force.

The statistics to back these facts up are well known and easily proved. Rather than face them, CORE suggests another cat-hauling of the Police Department.

In the present instance, which has so exercised CORE, the criminal, shot down while fleeing after committing an outrageous robbery, turned out to have a record as long as your arm.

We suggest that rather than another investigation of the Police Department, the incident indicates there should be an investigation of the parole system which returns career predators, with jail terms still uncompleted, to the city's streets where they resume preying on defenseless citizens.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 15, 1963]

Inquest in Purse-Snatcher's Death—Shooting by Officer Held Justified

(By Cordelia Ruffin)

It took a District Coroner's jury about 25 minutes yesterday to decide that Rookie Pvt. Frank Klimecke, 23, shot and killed a fleeing purse snatcher Tuesday in line of duty.

Witnesses and Pvt. Clifton O. Gill, 27, who took part in the chase, told the story for him. Both policemen were stationed at the Spanish Embassy where a fashion show was in progress when a man ran up the street with a young woman behind him "waving her arms and screaming hysterically" Private Gill said. The officers joined the chase.

HALT

Private Gill said he called "halt" three times as they ran 6 blocks, and he believed Private Klimecke called out twice.

Four witnesses also testified they heard the policeman call out. One woman said she was at a third floor window.

"I ran my shade up, and poked my head out. I could see it all," she said.

She saw the man run by, she said, and yelled at him, "Mister, please stop running." She said she heard the officer, Private Klimecke say, "I'm going to shoot."

"I didn't see how he could shoot from such a long distance," she said.

Shot in the head, James Calvin Wall, 21, colored, fell dead on Fairmont Street NW., near 16th Street.

SILENT

The family of the victim of 1415 Swann Street NW., refused to talk to reporters. One woman relative held her head in her hands, another rocked slowly back and forth. A woman undertaker sat with the family at this inquest and comforted the sobbing woman.

The victim of the purse snatching, 18-year-old Barbara Hileman, who is 6 months pregnant, told the coroner's jury she chased Wall for several blocks before police took over for her.

She told reporters she felt no ill effects but wouldn't do it again.

"We've been having a pretty hard time making a go of it." She added, "the bills had all been paid. The $54 in my purse was all the money we were to live on for the rest of the week. And to think of him taking it made me hysterical."

She said she's been frightened ever since. An anonymous phone caller the other night asked her, "are you the lady that's responsible for the colored boy's death?" and then hung up. It sounded like a young girl, she said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 16, 1963]

SHOOTING BY PATROLMAN STIRS CLASHING OPINIONS

The District Commissioners were confronted yesterday with strongly opposed views on the fatal shooting of a purse-snatching suspect by a policeman Tuesday.

The officer's action was described as courageous by two organizations but two others requested a full investigation of the incident.

The policeman, Pvt. Frank Klimecke, was defended by a Virginia Senator and the Metropolitan Washington Citizen's Crime Commission, which commended the rookie officer for "prompt and courageous assistance * * * rendered to a victim of crime."

Democratic Senator ROBERTSON said every policeman had a duty to shoot, if necessary, to stop a felon who has refused to honor a command to halt.

The two groups which asked Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner for an investigation are the District branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Washington Urban League.

TOBRINER RETICENT

The Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, president of the District NAACP, said after a closed conference with Mr. Tobriner yesterday that "we told him that the community was alarmed and disturbed about the apparent trigger-happiness of some policemen."

Mr. Tobriner declined to say anything after the closed meeting except that he would "make a determination later as to what, if anything, should be done."

Also present at the meeting in addition to the Rev. Jackson were Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League; Frank Reeves, an attorney for the NAACP, and the Rev. Edward Hailes, the new executive secretary of the District NAACP.

One of the shootings Mr. Jackson and the others protested was the killing Tuesday of James C. Wall.

"We feel no rookie should be allowed to earn his spurs by killing a citizen," said Mr. Jackson.

The other incident discussed at the meeting with Mr. Tobriner was the shooting and wounding of George E. Wheeler recently on Independence Avenue when an off-duty police officer was trying to make an arrest for a traffic violation.

Mr. Tucker said after the meeting with Mr. Tobriner that because of the Wall case "I would be afraid to run for a bus now. I think the whole situation is deplorable."

POLICE ASSAILED

Mr. Jackson said that in the Wall shooting the policeman had no opportunity to get a description of the suspect "but just shot at a man he saw running."

Mr. Reeves said that police here are "prosecutor, judge and executioner."

Mr. Jackson also protested that in the Wall case "no warning shot was fired and the policeman aimed to kill. He could have shot the man in the leg instead of the head."

A coroner's inquest ruled that the shooting of Wall was justifiable homicide.

Mr. Jackson said he told Mr. Tobriner that he felt that an investigation of these shootings should be conducted by persons not connected with the police department.

Mr. Reeves said that there is just as much justification for an independent probe of the shootings as there was for an investigation by a special committee of the riot at District Stadium on Thanksgiving Day.

Private Klimecke, a rookie policeman assigned to the 10th Precinct, shot Wall, a 21-year-old ex-convict, late Tuesday in the 1400 block of Fairmont Street, NW. Wall had been pointed out by a pregnant woman as the man who took her purse. He was trying to elude two policemen when he was shot.

Robert E. McLaughlin, crime commission president, said his group unanimously adopted a resolution noting with concern the criticism of Private Klimecke for performance of his duty. His pursuit of the suspected criminal as well as his aid to the victim was his duty, the resolution maintained.

Senator ROBERTSON deplored the "bleeding hearts" for the felon who had committed robbery by force while not one salty tear was shed for the young white woman who might have been caused a miscarriage because of her horrible experience.

He disputed conclusions of some critics that Wall's life was the result of community neglect and the city's slums.

Slums here 30 years ago were far worse than now, Senator ROBERTSON said, but the crime rate then was below the national average. The rate now is about the highest, he claimed.

A foe of integration in the schools, Senator ROBERTSON added: "Thirty years ago, when schools were segregated and only about 20 percent of the pupils were nonwhite, the District schools were rated as among the best in the Nation. Now, integrated, and about 80 percent nonwhite, the District schools are rated about the poorest in the Nation."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 17, 1963]

POLICE SHOOTING

The fatal shooting by a white police officer of a 21-year-old Negro purse snatcher—a distressing thing—has led to a disturbing clash of sentiment in this community.

In an irresponsible statement, CORE has accused the policeman of murder. Some individual comments, also irresponsible in our opinion, have been to the effect that "a rookie policeman should not be allowed to earn his spurs by killing a citizen," that the police in Washington are "prosecutor, judge, and executioner," and that it is dangerous in this city even to run for a bus.

On the other side, the Citizens' Crime Commission has commended the officer for doing his duty. And a coroner's jury, which included one Negro member, has held that the shooting was a "justifiable homicide."

In this situation, there should be a look at the facts. The purse snatching occurred at 5 o'clock in the afternoon at 16th and Euclid Streets. If a woman, or any citizen, is not safe at that hour and at that spot, where can safety be found in this city? The purse snatcher, with a record dating back to age 11, knew that the police were pursuing him and knew why they were pursuing him. One of the two officers in the chase had hit him with his nightstick without slowing him down. Certainly it cannot be said that the criminal was unwarned. Even so, we think that a warning shot should have been fired, and that thereafter the effort should have been to wound and bring down the fleeing man without killing him. There is, of course, no evidence that the police officer fired with an intent to kill.

Another question is of real concern to every law-abiding citizen, white or colored, in this crime-ridden city. Those in the criminal element, be they white or colored, are no respectors of race. They ply their trade—murder, rape, robbery, mugging, purse snatching, and whatever—without any regard to the color of their victim's skin. No one is safe and no one could hope to be safe if what is essentially racist propaganda should serve to handcuff the police. A police revolver or any other weapon should be used with judgment and restraint. But the mere fact that a felon can outrun a policeman does not mean that he is entitled to commit his crime and go free. Any one of us may be his next victim.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE DOYLE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague Clyde Doyle brought sadness to all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives.

I shall always remember him as one deeply dedicated to his work, his country, and his God. He was one of the kindest persons I have ever known.

As Clyde Doyle was a man of great faith, so did he constantly work for the protection of our country against communism. He also was devoted to helping our young people gain an understanding not only of the privileges of American citizenship but the responsibilities as well. And the precepts he advanced for good citizenship were always supported by good example.

Clyde Doyle's passing leaves a real void, but we can be consoled by the fact that he left us a rich store of pleasant memories.

Mrs. McIntire joins me in expressing deep sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and members of the family.

U.S. LOAN TO BRAZIL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Brazilian Embassy has issued a release that it does not intend to use any part of the U.S. loans it is seeking to expand Red trade and further states, "any forthcoming American credits to Brazil will be used exclusively to finance the importation of U.S. goods and services and for repayment of commitments to U.S. creditors." If this is an accurate statement of the purposes of these loans, then, Mr. Speaker, I submit that all that is necessary is for the U.S. Treasury to certify to the Brazilian Government that it has X number of dollars to its credit. The Brazilian Government, in turn, can certify to the U.S. Treasury the names and amounts of the American firms and American creditors it wishes paid by these loans.

Then, the U.S. Treasury can issue vouchers to those firms in the stated amounts. This will, in turn, meet the publicly declared purposes of the Brazilian loan efforts and also assure the American taxpayer that his money will not be used to finance or develop Red trade.

AN AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced an amendment to the social security law. This bill will raise the outside earnings a retired person may have without losing social security benefits.

Certain unjust limitations on outside income in the present social security law should be removed. They penalize the initiative of those drawing these benefits and foster inequitable treatment among beneficiaries.

By adopting the sliding ceiling on outside earnings which is in this bill, Congress can assure greater fairness to our retired citizens. I feel persons receiving minimum social security pensions are entitled to the same maximum income as all others in their classification.

Under the provisions of this amendment, there will be a combined pension-outside earnings ceiling. This liberalized earnings limitation will end discrimination among social security beneficiaries drawing pensions in various amounts by varying the outside earnings limit proportionately.

I have urged Congress to make this improvement in the social security program.

POLICE INVESTIGATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia yesterday reaffirmed their order placing into effect, as of March 15, 1963, a regulation severely limiting the operation of the police in their investigation of crime in the District.

This action was taken despite the resolution approved by an overwhelming vote of the House District Committee on March 7, 1963, requesting the Commissioners to rescind such order and proposed regulations implementing the same in order that the Congress might consider legislation already introduced as well as proposals of the Commissioners themselves which have not yet reached the committee for consideration.

Regardless of the action taken by the Commissioners, the Congress must itself bear the responsibility for the results of these drastic changes in law enforcement procedures which have been in effect in the District of Columbia and in practically all other States and jurisdictions for many years.

Not only did the House District Committee request orderly legislative procedures, but the position of the committee was concurred in by the Citizens Crime Commission of Metropolitan Washington, of which Hon. Robert E. McLaughlin, former Commissioner of the District of Columbia, is President.

Similar expressions were also made by William K. Norwood, chairman of the public protection committee of the Metropolitan Board of Trade; by James A. Willey, president, Federation of Citizens Associations; by James G. Ellis, president, Chevy Chase Citizens Association; by the Daughters of the American Revolution; and several other citizens associations in the District of Columbia.

Representations have been made that the position of the House committee is in support of unconstitutional procedures regarding the apprehension and arrest of criminals. Nothing could be further from the fact. No member of the House committee holds any such position. The contention that the District of Columbia police and, for that matter, police in other States and jurisdictions operate unconstitutionally, is premised upon the judgment of a small group after a study of limited scope, and does not conform with the House committee study of the law generally throughout the country and the constitutionality thereof.

Since the House District Committee is trying to give preference to legislation to curb crime in the District of Columbia, we regret we do not have the full support of the Commissioners in this regard. We feel that anything that the Congress or the Commissioners do to show the criminals that we are not solidly behind the law enforcement officials is certain to lead to additional crime or to hinder the police in their solution thereof.

Our committee intends to pursue as rapidly as possible the problem presented, conducting hearings to develop legislative procedures consistent with the responsibility imposed on the Congress by the Constitution and in conformity with constitutional provisions protecting the rights of all citizens. The committee is even now awaiting reports from the Commissioners and from the Department of Justice, on various proposed measures dealing with the crime situation in the District and which bills the committee hopes to present to Congress as its recommendations for curbing crime in the District and in support of the law enforcement officials in their terrific job.

The resolution of the House committee, the telegrams from the groups referred to, and the order of the Commissioners, I have included herewith along with my remarks:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, sitting in executive session, respectfully requests the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to rescind their instructions to the Metropolitan Police Department to cease or stop all arrests for investigation, effective March 15, 1963, if in fact such instructions have been issued, and to withhold any further action on the same and on any proposed regulations in lieu thereof pending consideration by the 88th Congress of legislation relating thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution as approved by the House Committee on the District of Columbia be delivered forthwith to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to the Attorney General, Department of Justice.

MARCH 7, 1963.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 11, 1963.*
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Copy of telegram sent to Hon. Walter N. Tobriner:

"In view of the fact that the District proposed crime legislation has not yet reached the Congress Citizens Crime Commission urges Board of Commissioners to delay effective date of its order terminating arrests for investigation to allow the Congress a reasonable opportunity to act."

ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
President, Citizens Crime Commission of Metropolitan Washington.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 11, 1963.*
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, House District Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Herewith copy of telegram sent to Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, Washington, D.C.:

"Representing the Public Protection Committee of the Metropolitan Board of Trade I strongly urge you to rescind the order discontinuing investigated arrest until such time as suitable remedial legislation is enacted. The citizens of the District are entitled to such protection."

WILLIAM K. NORWOOD,
Chairman, Public Protection Committee.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 12, 1963.*
Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram just sent to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

"GENTLEMEN: Understand you are considering investigative arrest ban this morning. We hope you will delay imposition of the ban until corrective legislation can be enacted. A few more weeks under a system in effect for years certainly can be justified by the serious consequences attendant upon a complete ban of such procedures."

JAMES A. WILLEY,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations.

MARCH 11, 1963.
Mr. WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D.C.:

Pending the enactment by Congress of appropriate corrective legislation, you are respectfully urged to rescind the order which discontinued investigative arrests in the District of Columbia.

JAMES G. ELLIS,
President, Chevy Chase Citizens Association.

Same telegram to Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D.C.; and Commissioner John B. Duncan, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D.C.

ORDER NO. 63-581

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

Subject: Police manual (arrests for investigation)—Amended Metropolitan Police Department

Ordered: That, effective at 12:01 a.m. on March 15, 1963, sections 8 and 10, chapter

XXXIII of the Police Manual are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. Any member of the police force may legally arrest without a warrant in the following cases:

"(a) When a felony has been committed or when the officer has reason to believe that a felony has been committed, whether in his presence or not, and the officer in good faith has reasonable grounds for believing from facts within his knowledge or from facts communicated to him by a reliable informant that the person to be arrested has committed the felony.

"(b) For breaches of the peace, such as assaults and batteries, affrays, riots, unlawful assemblies, and forcible entry and detainer, committed in his presence, and for all violations of municipal ordinances or police regulations when committed in the presence or view of the officer.

"A vague belief in the officer's mind, suggested by his own thoughts, is, under no circumstances, probable cause. There should be reasonable grounds for suspicion, supported by circumstances sufficient to warrant a cautious man to believe that the party is guilty of the offense. Arrests shall not be made for investigation.

SEC. 10. A police officer may legally break and enter a building to make an arrest without a warrant where all of the following circumstances exist:

"(a) When a felony has been committed or when he has probable cause to believe that a felony has been committed; and

"(b) When he has probable cause to believe that the person believed to have committed the felony is within the building involved; and

"(c) After he has identified himself, stated the nature of his business, demanded entrance and entrance has been refused; and

"(d) Where the circumstances of the case are such that to attempt to secure a warrant would, in all probability, enable the person believed to have committed the felony to flee and prevent the officer from making the arrest. In all cases where it is possible for the officer to secure a warrant he should do so before attempting to break and enter and arrest without a warrant."

By order of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

F. L. TIMMONS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary to the Board.

OUR NATION'S YOUTH

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in his message on our Nation's youth, President Kennedy quoted the great British statesman of the last century, Benjamin Disraeli, who said:

> The youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity.

No statement could better describe the important national investment which the youth of America represent.

Although the United States is a land of unparalleled opportunity for all, we are presently faced with a problem which has far-reaching implications for the youth of this country and for all our citizens. A large percentage of our young people not attending school are unemployed. In addition to the economic aspect of this situation, I need not point out that idleness is a prime cause of juvenile delinquency and its related evils.

Consider the case of the high school dropout who fails to find gainful employment. Young and restless, time hangs heavily on his hands. Without the motivation of school or a worthwhile job, he finds himself hopelessly adrift in a prosperous society which seems to be holding him back from the realization of his goals and the accomplishment of his ambitions.

It is not difficult to understand the reason why such young people succumb to juvenile delinquency. Lacking any real incentive to contribute to the welfare of the community and harboring feelings of bitterness toward society, the unemployed youth frequently turns to crime. What a waste of human resources and potential. Unlike the older person who may take unemployment as a bad break and do everything possible to find another job, young people are easily discouraged, since they have no previous experience on which to base an optimistic attitude and lack sufficient maturity to accept the situation and try to improve on it.

The Youth Employment Act of 1963 will give new hope to these young citizens. The provisions of this bill—the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps and the establishment of a program for local area youth employment in community service—will go a long way toward improving the employment status of American youth.

HE'S JUST DOING HIS JOB

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over in the Pentagon we have, what I believe, the best Secretary of Defense that this country has ever had.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is doing his best in a job that exposes him to criticism and verbal tongue lashings from all sides. He has been denounced by members of the military, by some Members of Congress, as well as by some segments of industry.

Mr. McNamara was brought to Washington to do a job. He is doing exactly what he was brought here to do; he is establishing civilian control over the officers; he has made decisions which were not in accordance with the wishes of Pentagon officers and, in many instances, with Members of Congress. In a few words, he is the manager of the Pentagon.

Because of these sharp attacks upon the Secretary of Defense, I would like to bring to your attention an editorial which appeared in the Detroit News on Friday, March 15, 1963. This is a well-written piece in defense of Secretary McNamara and I hope that the Members of this House will take the time to read it fully.

The editorial follows:

IN DEFENSE OF MCNAMARA—HE'S JUST DOING HIS JOB

Robert McNamara is generally regarded as one of the most effective Secretaries of Defense—if not the most effective—the United States ever has had. Yet in recent weeks he has been subjected in increasingly sharp attacks. Why?

It is because what he has done and is doing irritates the politicians, the Pentagon brass, and even some defense industries.

One reason McNamara irritates these critics is that he is applying to the Defense Department the same principles he brought to his civilian job as president of the Ford Motor Co. He emphasizes efficiency and economy. He demands plans that will lead to the results he wants. He insists that defense production meet the same high standards required of successful civilian production.

Another reason is that McNamara has introduced a flexible defense policy under which the U.S. arsenal contains weapons suited for the kind of response required to meet any number of challenges from the Communist world. These changes in policy necessarily require American weapons and emphasis sharply different from those in effect under President Eisenhower. Such changes upset those accustomed to traditional weapons and traditional plans for response.

In addition, McNamara is a kind of human computer who has such a quick and broad grasp of the problems that confront the Defense Department that he does not suffer gladly the uninformed, the politically minded and the special interest representatives who challenge him. His personality, like his mind, is razor sharp.

Currently McNamara is feuding with many Congressmen over the controversial TFX fighter-bomber plane contract, over funds for the RS-70 experimental bomber and over the number of nuclear submarines the Nation needs. The House overrode McNamara's objections Wednesday to add $363.7 million to the defense authorization bill for two additional RS-70 warplanes and $134 million for two additional nuclear submarines.

In doing so, however, the House let itself in for the kind of an attack that McNamara made on Representative ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, the Republican whip. McNamara pointed out that ARENDS was the ranking Republican on the committee that added $1.1 billion to the defense budget—and the Republicans at the same time are calling for a $5 billion cut in the defense budget.

As McNamara said in reply to his critics, some "dictation" is necessary in order to keep military spending below levels demanded by the Pentagon, by some Republicans, by some Democrats, and by the companies involved. McNamara conceded that he had cut $14 billion from the requests of the three services, and then added rather plaintively: "If I don't do it, who's going to do it?" Obviously not Congress, in view of the boost it gave the defense budget Wednesday.

A better public relations program obviously would help McNamara. He would have looked better in the TFX plane dispute, for example, if he had given his explanation for the controversial contract before the investigating committee got into the case. But some Congressmen obviously are trying to make McNamara look bad. And they're getting pressure from defense industries back home and information from Pentagon brass still engaged in interservice rivalries.

What is happening is that McNamara is being criticized for doing his job, which is to run the Pentagon. He's being criticized for doing exactly what other Secretaries of Defense were criticized for not doing. Naturally he's being subjected to abuse and attack by those who don't like his approach. But we think he's still serving the American public extremely well even if the politicians, the military brass, and the defense industries dislike many of his decisions.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, certain charges have been made concerning the Area Redevelopment Administration's job retraining program in Hagerstown, Md. These charges do not quite square with the facts in the case, and for this reason I am taking this opportunity to clarify the record.

Mack Trucks, Inc., moved from Plainfield, N.J., to Hagerstown in 1961. The company had made its decision to relocate and had completed the arrangements before the Area Redevelopment Act was passed by the Congress.

After the Area Redevelopment Act became law, and funds were made available for the program, an application was filed for a program to retrain jobless workers as machine tool operators for the Mack plant in Hagerstown.

Since this was a clear case of a relocation of industry, both Area Redevelopment Administration and the Department of Labor refused to approve a job retraining program citing the act's very clear bar against using Federal funds for a relocating industry.

On January 4, 1962, a training program was approved for 120 machine tool operators in Hagerstown, and on January 11, 1962, a program for training 25 machine tool operators in nearby Cumberland was approved. Subsequently a program for another 25 in Cumberland was approved on October 5, and for 60 more in Hagerstown on November 5.

In each case, the proposal contained adequate supporting data to show that vacancies in these skills existed in other firms in Hagerstown and Cumberland. It was on the ground of a demonstrable need for machine tool operators by employers other than Mack Truck that the projects were approved.

A check of the records shows that, through an error, 15 of the 120 graduates of the first grade at Hagerstown were referred to Mack Truck. As soon as this situation came to the attention of officials in Washington, the Hagerstown Employment Service Office was reminded of the bar against aiding relocating industries, and no future referrals were made to Mack. The Cumberland office at no time referred graduates to Mack Truck.

It is my understanding that a total of about 60 of the 230 workers retrained in Hagerstown and Cumberland courses are now, in fact, working for Mack. But it should be emphasized that only 15 were referred there—and this through inadvertance.

Although the remainder of the retrainees have been referred to other plants in the Hagerstown and Cumberland areas, it should be borne in mind that we live in a free society. The Government cannot compel people to go to work at certain specified companies, nor can it bar them from working at other specified companies. It is a fact of life that Mack Truck advertises its employment opportunities throughout the area. It is also a fact of life that Mack offers wages that are as much as 70 cents an hour higher than those of other companies in the area, which makes employment at that plant extremely attractive.

In no sense, however, can it be said that through its retraining programs in Hagerstown and Cumberland, the Area Redevelopment Administration subsidized Mack's relocation from New Jersey to Maryland. To the contrary, it engaged in retraining for a demonstrable need in other plants—some of which had lost their skilled operators to Mack. After the retraining was completed, people exercised their inherent right to a freedom of choice. The Area Redevelopment Administration cannot possibly be held accountable for this.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Celler (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Lindsay, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. Perkins (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Schwengel (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 40 minutes, on March 21, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hosmer in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Collier and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Willis in two instances.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Jensen.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Patman in two instances.

Mr. Flood in two instances.

Mr. Burkhalter.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 97. An act for the relief of Purificacion Siat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 193. An act for the relief of Michelina Lanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 195. An act for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 208. An act for the relief of Young Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 234. An act for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 421. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 436. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 574. An act for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 596. An act for the relief of Roswitha Seib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 635. An act for the relief of Krystyna Ratay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 688. An act for the relief of Ronald Whiting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Con. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator Allen J. Ellender; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1962, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submitted the following report for printing in the Congressional Record

pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a report on the extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, of the U.S. Coast Guard for the calendar year 1962. This report is submitted to comply with the provisions of Public Law 85-804.

Sincerely yours,
A. E. WEATHERBEE,
Administrative Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure.)

Extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense (Public Law 85-804)—Treasury, Coast Guard; from Jan. 1, 1962, to Dec. 31, 1962

Type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount claimed or requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount claimed or requested
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1. Actions involving specific dollar cost:					
a. Amendments without consideration	------	------	------	------	------
b. Correction of mistakes	------	------	------	1	$71, 125.09
c. Formalization of informal commitments	------	------	------	------	------
d. Other (specify by type)	------	------	------	------	------
2. Actions not involving specific dollar cost:					
a. Amendments without consideration	------	------	------	------	------
b. Contingent liabilities	------	------	------	------	------
c. Advance payments	------	------	------	------	------
d. Disposition of nonseverable property	------	------	------	------	------
e. Other (specify by type)	------	------	------	------	------

Remarks: Coast Guard—No actions were approved for calendar year 1962.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

550. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed appropriations for the fiscal year 1963 involving increases of $30 million for Housing and Home Finance Agency and $34,000 for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; a decrease of $59,275,000 for the Veterans' Administration; and a proposed provision for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

551. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $50 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and $1,117,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

552. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 8, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, authorized by section 101 of the 1962 River and Harbor Act, on the addition of hydroelectric generating facilities at the authorized Holt lock and dam, Black Warrior River, Ala. (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

553. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Secretary of Agriculture on the 1962 soil bank conservation reserve program, pursuant to section 108c of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1832(c)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

554. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

555. A letter from the Acting Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

556. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on operations under part B of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-415), pursuant to section 309(b) of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

557. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of administrative functions of the Department of Occupations and Professions, District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

558. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles, by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

559. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

560. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

561. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

562. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

563. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a regulation promulgated by the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard which amends CFR 171.10-20 regarding the renewal of numbers issued by the Coast Guard under the Federal Boating Act of 1958 (46 U.S.C. 527); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

565. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c)(ii) of the act of August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

566. A letter from the National Quartermaster, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting annual reports relating to the activities of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. for 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85-530; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 4926. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 4927. A bill to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with certain support orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4929. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4931. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce," approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4932. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to make it unlawful for any employer to require any employee to agree to assign patents to him as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4933. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp, the central figure of which will be the likeness of the now extinct Michigan grayling fish, after which the town of Grayling, Mich., was named; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4934. A bill to establish a national sinking fund to be used to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4936. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4937. A bill to provide that primary elections and runoff primary elections for nomination of candidates for the House of Representatives shall be held on the same day throughout the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4938. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4939. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4940. A bill to provide for the construction of a 500-bed general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital at or near Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his rights to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4942. A bill to increase from $10,000 to $25,000 the maximum amount of a deposit which may be insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4943. A bill to increase from $10,000 to $25,000 the maximum amount for which a member of a savings and loan association may be insured under title IV of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4944. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 4945. A bill to repeal one paragraph of section 105(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4947. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend section 203 of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain Canadian tourist transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4950. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup Division, Nebr., of the Missouri River Basis project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid for tuition, fees, or services to certain public and private institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operations of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4955. A bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4956. A bill to direct the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review reports on the Kentucky River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4957. A bill to provide for suspension or revocation of the license of real estate brokers in the District of Columbia who engage in discriminatory practices on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry in the sale or leasing of housing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4958. A bill to eliminate racial and religious discrimination in housing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4959. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 4960. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1950, to authorize the reconstruction and permanent repair of bridges damaged or destroyed in major disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4961. A bill to amend section 3101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the proceeds of veterans' insurance policies shall be exempt from estate taxation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 4962. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain U.S. Army officers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4963. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4964. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 329. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with other nations or international bodies in programs for the exploration and utilization of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 294. Resolution relating to the clerk hire allowance of Members of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 295. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that introduced bills include an estimate of cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by park rangers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, of the Senate of the State of Alabama, petitioning the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives on February 6, 1963; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to when a person has been either acquitted or convicted, on the merits of an offense against any State or territory of the United States, he may be prosecuted by the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a new national cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the 3(b)2 classification of federally connected students under Public Law 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that a public hearing be held in the county seat of each county affected before any final decision is made to establish dams, wildlife preserves, migratory bird refuges or parks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States to provide for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting States from denying a citizen the right to vote through imposition of a poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the present inadequacy in Public Law 874 "in lieu" funds with respect to that money which could be obtained by local governing units on a taxable basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4965. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 4966. A bill for the relief of Erskine C. McCreery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Rose Colandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 4968. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis D. Macheras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4969. A bill for the relief of Theodore Christopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Despina Kouloumoundras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene F. Lamey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4973. A bill for the relief of Abraham Abboud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Miss Hsiang-Ling Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Kwong You Huey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 4976. A bill for the relief of John T. Halloran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Constantine P. Kostopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4978. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Karafotias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4979. A bill for the relief of Joseph and Almeda Comolli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4980. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felicisima B. Dumlao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4981. A bill for the relief of Farid Selim Tawfik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Truman W. Maltby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Napoleon Elocre Magadia and his wife, Milagros De Guzman Magadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Maria B. Barreda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Josefina Evangelista Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 4986. A bill for the relief of Carleton R. McQuown, Thomas A. Pruett, and James E. Rowles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ruby G. Bridwell and others, Spring Valley, Calif., relative to stating that if a Federal aid-to-education bill is passed, that aid should go to all American children regardless of what school they attend; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Opinion Poll Results, 22d Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks I have received over 16,000 replies to my 1963 opinion poll. This questionnaire is mailed annually to each family of registered voters in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio shortly after the convening of each session of the Congress.

May I express my continuing gratitude to each person who replied to this poll for his interest in his Government and in the many important issues that face the present session of the Congress. It is only through the expression of the views of our constituents that the Congress can get the feel of the grassroots sentiment of the American public. The results of this poll should be of particular interest to the Congress because of the nearly equal number of registered Republicans and Democrats who reside in this district, with the balance of the residents maintaining an independent political status.

There appears to be strong sentiment in favor of a reduction in Federal income taxes with 74 percent of the replies to a question on this subject approving a tax cut, 21 percent opposing a tax cut, and 6 percent having no opinion. There is an even greater sentiment favoring a corresponding, or substantial reduction in Federal spending, with people basing their opinion undoubtedly on the fact that if there is to be a tax cut it will have to be one earned by the taxpayers through a cutback in Federal expenditures. Favoring such reduction in Federal spending were 75 percent of the replies, while 10 percent were opposed, and 15 percent had no opinion. A strong reaction was received in letters from many homeowners who strenuously object to any tax revision program that will not allow them to take full credit on their income tax return for real estate taxes, interest payments on their home mortgages, and contributions to charitable causes.

The steadily declining interest in a Federal health care plan tied in with the social security system was further emphasized by a 50-percent vote opposing the social security health care approach, 37 percent favoring it, and 13 percent having no opinion. The trend of thinking on this subject as reflected in these polls over the past 4 years is as follows:

[In percent]

Year	Yes	No	No opinion
1960	60.3	32.0	7.7
1961	58.0	35.0	7.0
1962	55.3	40.1	4.6
1963	37.0	50.0	13.0

This trend away from a program of health care under the social security system, does not, however, indicate a rejection on the part of a majority of people of the need for some assistance on the part of the Federal Government to help our aged in meeting the constantly increasing costs of hospital and medical care. There appears to be a realization that there are other and better ways this can be accomplished as suggested by the 41 percent favorable response to the question setting forth a program of voluntary health insurance with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year for each taxpayer over 65 years of age to cover the cost of the premium for such health insurance. It is hoped that the administration and the Congress will give serious study to this type of approach to alleviate the costly burden of health care borne by our senior citizens.

It was especially interesting to see the strong support for legislation I have introduced to permit a taxpayer to deduct from his income tax the cost of college tuition and educational expense, or that of his dependents. This legislation, if enacted, would be of substantial benefit to higher education, to families who are trying to provide a college education for their children, and would not be in conflict with the constitutional provision establishing the separation of church and state.

Those who are familiar with and have supported the efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities will be heartened to know of the strong support the work of this committee is receiving from the general public. The continuation of this committee was approved by 73 percent of the replies, opposed by only 14 percent, with 13 percent of the people expressing no opinion. The residents of the 22d District will be interested in learning that the Congress has recently approved the budget for the continued work of this committee by a vote of 385 to 20.

The growing sentiment that Congress must take some positive action in the field of labor-management relations is clearly reflected in the opinions of residents of my district who support compulsory arbitration in nationwide strikes by a favorable vote of 74 percent, with 18 percent opposed, and 8 percent having no opinion. An equally strong vote in favor of including labor unions under the type of antitrust laws now governing industry is shown with 75 percent of the replies approving of such legislation, 10 percent opposing, and 15 percent having no opinion.

Although most Members of Congress receive a great amount of mail opposing military and economic aid to foreign countries it is enlightening to know that the greater weight of opinion favors continuation of this program as one of our main forces in combating the spread of communism. In favor of this program were 53 percent of the replies, 33 percent opposed it, and 14 percent had no opinion. It is apparent also that many of those favoring foreign aid expect the Congress to review carefully every part of this program in the hope of reducing aid wherever possible, and phasing it out, or completely stopping aid, if it is determined the national interests of the United States are not being furthered.

The people of our metropolitan areas, such as Cleveland, are awakening to the need for some action on the part of the Federal Government to assist our youth, from the ages of 16 to 21 years, who either voluntarily or by force of economic necessity, drop out of school. With the high rate of unemployment—at present over 6 percent of our working force—it is difficult for these young, unskilled people to obtain work, and consequently we are plagued with increasing problems of delinquency and crime. The creation of a Youth Conservation Corps to give employment to many of these young people was approved by 66 percent of the replies, while 24 percent opposed it, and 10 percent had no opinion.

The complete results of this poll follow:

[In percent]

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1. Taxes:			
(*a*) The proposed income tax reduction of approximately $13,500,000,000 over the next 3 years	73	21	6
(*b*) A corresponding reduction in Federal spending	75	10	15
2. Medical care:			
(*a*) A compulsory health-care plan financed through the social security system	37	50	13
(*b*) A voluntary private health insurance program with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year toward the cost of the premium for each taxpayer	41	32	27
(*c*) No further Federal participation in the health-care field	32	30	38
(*d*) Participation by the State of Ohio in the existing Federal Kerr-Mills health care program covering persons in low income brackets	36	27	37
3. Education:			
(*a*) An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition and educational expenses of a taxpayer or his dependents	73	18	9
(*b*) Federal assistance to needy States for public school construction	46	39	15
(*c*) Federal aid to colleges and universities for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and research facilities	46	39	15
4. Communism: Continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities	73	14	13
5. Labor:			
(*a*) A Federal compulsory arbitration law to resolve labor-management differences when it is determined that the national interest is affected by a nationwide strike	74	18	8
(*b*) Including labor unions under antitrust laws	75	10	15
6. Social security: Amending the social security law to permit continuation of benefits to children between the ages of 18 and 21 while they remain in school	68	23	9
7. Veterans: Legislation to grant GI educational benefits to peacetime servicemen	45	43	12
8. Foreign affairs: Continuation of our military and economic aid program to friendly nations	53	33	14
9. Mass transit: A Federal program to assist cities in establishing and maintaining mass transit systems	27	59	14
10. Domestic Peace Corps: The establishment of a domestic Peace Corps	37	45	18
11. Youth Corps: The creation of a Youth Corps to give employment to unskilled youth between the ages of 16 to 21 years	66	24	10
12. National debt limit: An increase in the present national debt limit of $308,000,000,000 to permit financing of a tax cut and any new domestic programs	28	58	14

Undetectable Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter to the editor appearing in the Washington Post on March 13 so the vital information it contains may have wider dissemination:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

TESTS BEYOND DETECTION

On the nuclear test ban issue you gave a generous 27 column inches to James Newman's rambling emotional outburst in defense of Deputy Disarmament Administrator Adrian S. Fisher and against Senator DODD and myself.

At this writing you have given not even a fraction of an inch to startling factual testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's Director of Military Applications. Betts revealed the big hole, even in the administration's upcoming new treaty draft, through which the Soviets can drive clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority.

Let Mr. Newman, your editorialists, and reporters quibble if they must over effectiveness of identification, location, and onsite inspection of detectable events which might be nuclear tests.

But why not also let your readers in on the fact there exists a very vital low-yield range of cheat testing—single shots or an entire series—which cannot be detected at all?

These are shots below a 3 kiloton yield equivalent in alluvium regarding which Dr. Frank Press told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, March 7, detection capability is very close to zero.

This is a testing range in which the administration proposes to forgo wholly any and all U.S. developments and, as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests to develop secretly nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons General Betts authoritatively declared could be clandestinely tested and secretly developed in the undetectable area freely open to surreptitious activity:

Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton up to much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons with such confidence as not to require proof testing.

At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest of the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing.

A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down below the 3-kiloton yield equivalent for seismic nondetection purposes.

General Betts added, as an indication of what kind of weapons development is of interest, that about 50 percent of actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is precisely in the low, undetectable kiloton range.

Only last Wednesday President Kennedy told the Nation "we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground." Yet the upcoming treaty draft being prepared by Adrian Fisher and others proposes to do exactly that. The incontrovertible result is a gap of inconsistency between the administration's words and deeds.

It is little wonder that Americans observing the administration's test ban disarray, including Senator DODD and myself, are deeply concerned with its incredible inability to match oratory with action.

This is particularly true when President Kennedy's words of March 2, 1962, are recalled announcing resumption of U.S. nuclear tests at that time. These included the following:

"A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests."

"We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium."

Those who may, somehow, become aware of General Betts' testimony, may feel as I do about the President's words of a year ago. Namely, they hardly can be erased by the unabrasive conclusions of such practitioners of "nuclear gapsmanship" as Messrs. Fisher, Newman, et al., that cheat testing in the "big hole" for surreptitious nuclear development really doesn't matter at all.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.
WASHINGTON.

Public Opinion Poll of the Honorable Harold R. Collier, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take the privilege of reporting to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the results of a very extensive public opinion poll recently completed in the 10th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor of representing.

My questionnaires were mailed to 68,000 homes throughout the 29 towns, cities, and villages, in the seven townships in Illinois' 10th District covering the west suburban and north suburban areas of Cook County. The poll was conducted by mail and drew a record-breaking response notwithstanding the fact that the participants had to provide the postage to return their completed questionnaires to my Washington office. A total of 18,853 were returned for a 27.7-percent response. This substantially exceeded the highest previous response to questionnaires which I mailed in the 85th, 86th, and 87th sessions of Congress.

I call particular attention to the fact that 83 percent of the residents of my district favor a tax cut only along with a cut in Federal spending.

This is particularly significant because I think it reflects a nationwide concern on the part of the majority of the American people with consistent budget deficits. I also direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that 73 percent of the respondents favor sharp reductions in the foreign aid program while 17 percent oppose such cuts and 10 percent indicate that they had no opinion on this issue. Eighty-eight percent of those responding oppose any aid to nations with Communist governments while but 3 percent registered approval of this practice.

The results of this questionnaire follow:

[Total returns, 18,853]

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Proposed tax cut:			
(a) Favor only along with cut in Federal spending?	83	10	7
(b) Favor regardless of budget deficit?	18	61	21
2. Federal aid to education:			
(a) To public schools only?	42	47	11
(b) Both public and private schools?	29	59	12
(c) Federal college loan program?	54	33	13
3. Foreign aid program:			
(a) Maintain at present levels?	20	63	17
(b) Reduced sharply?	73	17	10
(c) Aid to nations with Communist governments?	3	88	9
4. Medical care for aged:			
(a) Under the social security program?	35	56	9
(b) Tax allowance for private insurance?	61	23	16
5. Domestic Peace Corps: (a) For its establishment?	39	55	6
6. Department of Urban Affairs and Housing: (a) For its establishment?	24	68	8
7. Military draft:			
(a) Maintain at present 24 months?	52	28	20
(b) Reduced to 18 months?	41	34	26
8. Military pay increased: (a) For proposed 15 percent increase?	51	42	7

Costa Rica Meeting and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is scheduled to attend the forthcoming meeting of the Presidents of the Central American States and Panama at San Jose, Costa Rica. It is assumed that matters of vital concern to those countries and our own Nation will be discussed. It is likely that one of these subjects will be the Panama Canal.

Over a period of many years our Government has made concession and concession to Panama, and all without any realistic compensatory or reciprocal benefits to our country. Moreover, the rights, power, and authority of the United States concerning the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal have been steadily impaired.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that whatever weakens the authority of the United States in these regards hurts Panama and the five Central American countries as well. It is to be hoped that the President will meet any proposals which may further our treaty rights concerning the canal with a rocklike stand for our own interests.

The time is certainly overripe for a forthright and openly proclaimed reaffirmation of our treaty rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, accompanied by the declaration by our Government that what serves the best interests of the canal also serves the best interests of the countries of the Isthmian region and for the entire free world as well. The approaching meeting should supply an appropriate occasion for such declaration.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, are now viewing the Costa Rica meeting with deep concern.

Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, many of us who supported H.R. 10 over the years before its enactment, have been concerned over the lack of speed displayed by the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service in promulgating regulations to implement the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962.

Although this delay may be justified, in view of the many complexities of the statute, nevertheless the lack of guidelines has held back many interested private funding media from putting plans on the market.

However, there have been indications that a breakthrough has come even in advance of the Treasury regulations. Last week I attended a press conference at which the Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co. of Washington, D.C., announced that its plan is going on the market immediately. VALIC President John D. Marsh explained that he feels this plan will comply with the Treasury regulations, whatever they may be.

This first insured H.R. 10 retirement plan combines the features of a variable annuity and a fixed dollar annuity, with complete flexibility designed to fit the needs of every individual. Under this unique equity-funded retirement plan, the purchaser may select any range of benefits from a 100-percent variable annuity to a 100-percent fixed-dollar annuity.

It has these plus factors:

First. Simplicity—the buyer need not be concerned with the complexities generally associated with pension and retirement plans.

Second. Additional benefits—the buyer has the option of including such benefits as life and disability coverage in the annuity contracts at special premium rates. The participating employees of the self-employed individual also will be able to purchase these additional coverages if they wish.

Third. Group coverage—VALIC will write this plan on a group basis as well as on an individual basis and therefore it can be geared to fit the needs of associations of self-employed individuals—at lower group premium rates.

The Power To Not Tax Like the Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of Congress I have become deeply concerned about a recent proposal which is contrary to the basic policy of our Government, and which will materially increase Federal expenditures and decrease Federal taxes.

With an anticipated budget deficit of almost $12 billion for fiscal year 1964 and with substantial budget deficits anticipated in future years, it becomes vitally important that our Government encourage in every way possible new investment by taxpaying business.

The electric utility industry in fiscal year 1962 paid $2,680 million in local, State, and Federal taxes. That industry's annual investment in new plant and equipment of about $3½ billion is approximately 10 percent of the total annual investment in new plant and equipment by all American business.

The present administration says that its policy is to encourage taxpaying American business to invest more money in new property and thereby create new taxes. The administration's policy in connection with the taxpaying utility industry appears to me to be exactly the opposite and to be one of destruction instead of one of creation.

The most serious deterrents that I have seen to new investment by any business are the recently proposed regulations of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture regarding rights-of-way for electric power transmission lines.

These regulations, among other things, provide:

First. That the Secretary can refuse to issue a transmission line right-of-way permit if he believes that the proposed line is not in accordance with the Federal power marketing policy. This, in short, means that he could deny a permit to build an investor-owned taxpaying line in order to make it necessary that a Federal tax-free line be built.

Second. If a permit is issued it is to contain a provision giving the Interior Department the right to utilize the excess capacity of the line, to transmit power to any Federal customer. This would place the Interior Department in a position to take away present customers and future customers of taxpaying utilities, thereby reducing the future investment of those taxpaying utilities in generation, transmission, and distribution facilities.

In my judgment these regulations are not only wrong in principle but they make the Interior and Agriculture Departments a dictator in connection with the use of the transmission facilities of the investor-owned utilities when those utilities are directly in competition with the Interior Department electric power sales program.

Unless the Interior and Agriculture Departments decide against the issuance of these transmission lines right-of-way regulations, I strongly believe that Congress should take some very direct and affirmative action in this connection to reduce Federal expenses in connection with the Federal power program and to encourage the creation of new taxpaying facilities.

Tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1963, Lewis Deschler had served the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States 35 years as its Parliamentarian. On March 4, 1963, this House duly celebrated the event here in this Chamber, with the passage of a resolution—unanimously—that did Parliamentarian Deschler a high, appropriate and immensely deserved honor. This resolution—House Resolution 274—expressed the thanks and appreciation of the House for what the resolution called Parliamentarian Deschler's "wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members" and for his "exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules."

This pertinent and official language in the resolution has very considerable implications and we in the House, especially those of us who have served here a long time, know precisely what the correct and meaningful phrases of the resolution mean. The words "wise" and "impartial" could hardly be improved upon and I can vouch for their precision because I, too, happen to have toiled in this Chamber since 1928, and I am fully aware that parliamentary impartiality and wisdom can be the lubricating medium that explains efficient and correct parliamentary practices. All this, as I have witnessed Mr. Deschler's service at close hand, attests to a judicial temperament, a punctilious dedication to the essential subtleties of orderly procedure, that again and again has won him, certainly from me, the highest order of respect and confidence.

What I would like to point out today is that Lew Deschler's service over these three and one-half decades has been a remarkable contribution as much to the country as to the several Speakers and the House Members who have served here, and who so constantly and exhaustively availed themselves of his talents and his knowledge. It is not enough to say that he enjoys an extraordinary mastery, as the tips of his fingers, of the infinite minutiae of parliamentary law. This happens to be his basic and—for this House—his indispensable tool, for the guidance that governs our tasks here. But over and above this knowledge and the immediacy of his judgment we recognize the quality of the man. This is an essentially inherited factor and all his own. It could not have been grafted onto his intellect from any of the good and distinguished schools he attended in Ohio or here in Washington.

In this quality of the man I emphasize especially the element of character, without which I doubt he could have maneuvered his way successfully among the strong and sometimes overwhelming personalities that again and again occupied this Chamber. He has a force of personality which is persuasive and decisive and restrained without being at all obtrusive, and which is never lacking in respect for the dignity of those who depend upon him for consultation, advice, judgment, and knowledge. He has again and again, almost constantly in the work-a-day affairs of this House, demonstrated a genius for understanding the political and personal problems of his distinguished clients, helping always, without abdicating by one jot or tittle the sacred precincts of his impartiality. He has been the diplomat extraordinary who, more than most diplomats, has always been clear and informative, and so diligently devoted to what is right and just, irrespective of rank or position, that the highest and the most powerful, as well as the humblest, have honored him for his integrity.

President Kennedy wrote to Parliamentarian Deschler emphasizing his "unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives." Vice-President LYNDON B. JOHNSON has been quoted in this Chamber for his high opinion of Mr. Deschler, and, of course, the late Sam Rayburn, as we have been told, spoke of him as "a big brain man." To the encomiums of these very great leaders of our time, and to the excellent expressions of appreciation that have already been uttered in this Chamber, I add my own brief tribute to one of our mostly unsung heroes of the parliamentary system. For, Mr. Deschler and his performance is to the efficient operation of this House what grammar is to the correct employment of language—an indispensable discipline.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen I extend to Lewis Deschler my compliments, my respect and my gratitude.

National Rice Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from one of the major rice-producing States, I am pleased to call attention to the observance of National Rice Week now under way.

Rice is produced in greater abundance than any other food and it has been the principal—frequently the sole—sustenance for half the people of the world for thousands of years. It is produced on every continent, in every hemisphere and in practically every country. The U.S. rice industry customarily participates in 15 to 20 percent of world trade in rice.

Rice was brought to the United States in 1694 by a ship, en route from Madagascar to England, which was blown off its course during a storm and forced to land at Charleston, S.C., for repairs. When the ship had been made ready to continue on its voyage the captain gave the Governor of the colony a small parcel of rough rice, from which enough rice was soon grown to supply South Carolina and neighboring colonies. From South Carolina production moved to Louisiana, then to other States. Today rice is produced in 13 States, with the major production in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and California.

Rice, the energy food, is relatively low in price but high in nutriment. It is a favorite with housewives because it is easy to prepare, economical, tasty, and versatile—it goes well with any meal, almost any dish.

In celebration of National Rice Week, March 17 to 23, an extensive advertising campaign is being conducted in news media. Newspaper and magazine food editors all over the United States are being provided with rice recipe material and photographs to be used in giving the public detailed information concerning the importance and value of this vital food. The advertising is being done by private brand distributors and by the Rice Council, a national organization of the rice industry for promoting domestic consumption, supported by voluntary contributions from all rice growers and millers.

Also active in the interest of the rice industry is the Rice Millers' Association, a nonstock, nonprofit, incorporated trade association of the rice milling industry. Organized in 1899, it is composed of a majority of the commercial rice mills of the United States, and is headed by Mr. J. P. Gaines as executive vice president, with headquarters in Washington. For a great many years, until his retirement, Mr. William M. Reid, who has done so much for the welfare and development of the rice industry, served as president.

The Rice Millers' Association has announced that in observance of National Rice Week, the rice industry will sponsor a free serving of a rice dish to all persons who dine at the restaurants and cafeterias at the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, March 20. There will be table notices announcing that the rice is being provided with the compliments of rice growers, millers and Members of Congress from the rice growing States, each of which will be named. I am happy to join with my colleagues from these States in extending a hearty invitation to all Capitol diners to share in this treat.

Disaster Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the RECORD a telegram I recently received from the Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia, which offered to replace all uninsured Smith, Kline & French medicinal supplies that were damaged or destroyed as a result of the recent disaster in Alabama caused by the floods.

This is an instance of cooperation that can only be accomplished in a democracy where each one is interested in the health and welfare of his neighbor:

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Smith Kline & French Laboratories expresses deep sympathy for the citizens of Alabama whose lives have been tragically disrupted by the disaster of the recent floods. My company stands ready to help as best it can the process of recovery to normal conditions. We have arranged through the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association to replace at no cost uninsured SK&F medicinal products which have been damaged or destroyed by the floods. We hope our aid will be of economic benefit to the pharmacies affected and of genuine service to all citizens of your State who require our products for their good health.

WALTER A. MUNNS,
President, Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

I would also like to place at this point in the RECORD my reply to Mr. Munns, expressing my thanks for the assistance rendered by his laboratories:

Thank you so much for the wonderful display of cooperation and interest your laboratories have shown in rendering assistance to those affected by the disaster caused by the recent floods and tornados. I know I speak for all Alabamians affected and this is indeed a noble gesture on your part. I want to commend you and your company as well as the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association for your efforts in replacing these uninsured drugs at no cost.

KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Member of Congress.

Statement of Hon. Everett G. Burkhalter, Member of Congress, Before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement delivered by me before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963:

STATEMENT OF HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER BEFORE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 18, 1963

The No. 1 problem in America today, I feel, is air pollution. Some sections of the country refer to it as smog, but regardless of what it is called it is a daily detriment, a serious daily detriment, to the health and welfare of each and every community in the land.

Certain of the scientists and air pollution experts and some health authorities try to say that this problem is confined to parts of California and a few of the other large metropolitan areas. However, I have also discussed the problem of air pollution with many other individuals who feel that they are as well qualified to speak about the problems as any other authorities; and this latter group is of the opinion that air pollution is fast becoming the No. 1 problem in the Nation.

Physicians and health authorities have long held that air pollution is certainly a contributing factor, and perhaps one of the major causes, of lung cancer, heart ailments, asthma, tuberculosis, and other respiratory ailments.

The general public is still skeptical about what is really causing smog, or air pollution. Most experts still insist that the automobile, rather the motor vehicles, contribute in excess of 60 percent of all the pollutants and irritants which are discharged into the atmosphere. The other factors which constitute the remaining 40 percent are spread out in smaller percentages. The following are some of these sources of air pollution: Petroleum refineries, steel mills, chemical plants, rubber processing and finishing establishments, foundries, electroplating plants, open dumps and even the municipally-owned incinerators and a host of unlisted and unnamed industrial processing plants. Air pollution is also contributed to by each little community restaurant, each open burning of trash and leaves; in Los Angeles all backyard incinerators were outlawed because of the solid pollutants carried into the air each day.

The first conclusion a person was apt to jump to was if you didn't see smoke or dust, no air pollution was occurring. However, because of the intensive research and public educational programs presented today concerning the many reasons for the pollution of air the public has become well aware that it is for the most part, the unseen vapors and chemicals which react one with the other to cause one's eyes to water and burn and to cause terrific pains and discomfort in breathing to some individuals.

It has been pointed out that local, city, county, and even State laws are not the answer. Why? Because today there are thousands of individuals who commute to and from their daily occupations or businesses who may travel well over 50 miles a day, and these people may cross and recross many local, county, and even State boundaries during the day. It is easy to see that these local ordinances which attempt to control air pollution are meaningless, because the moving, fleeting pollutants are carried out and beyond the local boundaries of their origin by the changing wind and weather patterns. The same rule naturally applies to the tourist, as well as to the commuter.

In the face of ordinary facts such as these it is imperative for any control which is to be really effective to originate at the Federal level.

Today there are four or five different devices which have been tested and proven effective for the control of motor vehicle exhaust by the State of California Air Pollution Control Board. These have also been tested by the automobile manufacturers. These devices may be installed on automobiles at the factory as standard equipment, and should be, if we really intend to combat this vital problem in America today.

Unfortunately these devices will cost the consumer money; but the comfort and contribution to the well-being, of not only the consumer and his family, but to every citizen in the Nation, far overrides the expenditure. These devices, I refer to, would cost approximately $7 or more, or up to as much as $150, the more costly device being a permanent type which would not have to be periodically replaced or recorded, as in the case of some of the less expensive ones.

In regard to the other 40 percent of air contamination, the control of the pollutants from the small and large industrial establishments is a factor which can be a financial drain on companies which are still paying interest and prinicpal on original loans, and will be for the next 10 to 20 years. A large portion of these new industrial plants have been started and established in the last 15 to 18 years, and a high percentage of the owners are veterans who received their initial loan from the Small Business Administration.

In talking to many of these individual owners, I have found, that although they are encumbered with present financial obligations they would be more than willing to seek further loans which would make it possible for them to install air pollution control devices on any and all processes they employ which are presently contaminating the atmosphere, if such loans would be made available from the Government agencies at a low-interest rate.

It is not the desire of any of us advocating the enforcement of controls of air pollution to harass or close down any of our industrial, commercial, or any firms which are contributing to the economic well-being of our country. However, this is a two-way street and the public health is of the first importance. Due to this dual involvement, and to the ready cooperation of many of the firms to install devices to control the emission of pollutants from their establishments, I believe that those of us in the legislative branches of the Federal Government are obligated to make low-interest loans available to this group because of the very important contributions to the welfare and health of the Nation this control of air pollution would be.

I therefore urge all members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to weigh the responsibilities involved in the interest of public health and urge that Mr. Roberts' bill, H.R. 4415, be supported and passed by this committee.

Thank you so much for the time allocated to me for the presentation of my remarks dealing with this subject.

Were Our Turkish Missile Bases Bargained Away During the Cuban Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me a portion of the transcript of a broadcast on October 27, 1962, over station KPFA in Berkeley, Calif., by Reporter John Cooper. I submit that portion herewith:

> This is a copy of a message sent to Acting Secretary U Thant by Chairman Khrushchev of the Soviet Union:
>
> "You were concerned about the fact that we helped Cuba with weapons with the aim of strengthening its defense capacity, but Turkey is located next to us and sentinels walk and look at each other. You have located in Turkey destructive rockets literally next to us, at our side. We agree to remove these weapons from Cuba which you regard as offensive weapons. We agree to do this and to state in the United Nations this commitment. Your representative will make a statement to the effect that the United States, on its part, bearing in mind the anxieties and concern of the Soviet States, will evacuate its analogous weapons from Turkey. Let us reach an understanding what time you and we need to put this into effect."
>
> Khrushchev said he thought it would not be difficult to get Cuba and Turkey to agree to permit United Nations inspection teams on their territory to police the dismantling of rocket bases.

Mr. Speaker, this was just 5 days after President Kennedy announced his quarantine against the shipment of offensive weapons to Cuba. It was undoubtedly at the time of intensive and delicate negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In light of the subsequent decision by the Kennedy administration to remove missile bases from Turkey, the message to U Thant from Khrushchev, if it was in fact sent, raises very serious and basic questions. It definitely points to the distinct possibility that the Kennedy administration did agree to withdrawing our Turkish bases in exchange for the Russian agreement to remove its missiles from Cuba.

This is a question that the administration should forthrightly answer. No American would object to removing our bases for military reasons but we would certainly object to being bluffed into such action by the boss of the Communist world.

Were our Turkish bases bargained away during the Cuban crisis?

Unveiling of Portrait of Hon. Emanuel Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 12, in the committee room of the Committee on the Judiciary, a portrait of our chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, was unveiled. Present were your distinguished self, the distinguished minority leader, members of the Committee on the Judiciary, about 50 Members of the House together with the family of Mr. CELLER and his dear friends. This was the culmination of months of preparation. In September of last year, a Celler Portrait Committee was organized, of which Representatives FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio, and RICHARD H. POFF, Republican, of Virginia, and myself undertook gladly the task of securing contributions for the painting of the portrait and appropriate ceremonies.

We believed that under the chairmanship of EMANUEL CELLER this committee had made a valuable contribution to the course of free government and felt that his 40 years of experience in the House and over a decade as chairman, added to the qualities of scholarship, warmth, and understanding, called for this tribute before our colleagues of the House, before his family and friends. Mr. MCCULLOCH and myself, reflecting the bipartisanship spirit of this committee, were honored by having this opportunity to express our admiration and esteem for MANNIE CELLER. His reply to our remarks, I believe, are such that they reflect the character and quality of this man and will underline and explain why the members of this committee feel as they do about him, and so I wish, at this point, to insert MANNIE CELLER's statement at the ceremony of the presentation of his portrait to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, AT THE UNVEILING OF A PORTRAIT IN HIS HONOR

> I thank you for this moment. A lifetime gathers only a few moments of this kind. Here, with my family, my dear wife, daughters and son-in-law, my friends, my colleagues, I feel that all the strands of my life have been woven together, and I am moved and humble and proud and grateful, and do not know where one emotion begins

and the other ends. I would be less than candid if I did not say the words uttered of me warm the cockles of my heart.

In the first sitting for this portrait, after Mr. Margulies had made but a few strokes on the canvas, I began to see, much to my amazement, the resemblance emerge. It was like being recreated. At first, I was as restive as a colt in a saddle but after awhile I ceased flouncing. I believe it was Cromwell who said to his artist, "Paint everything including the warts." Mr. Margulies has painted, in a way, a biography. He has reflected the qualities of character, the shades of personality, in short, a painted biography. "How can you do this," I asked, "with only a few strokes?" He replied, "In those strokes lie 40 years of work." And so I feel as if 40 years of my work in Congress symbolized in this moment.

If any man has reason for gratitude, I am that man. I have been privileged to sit as chairman of this committee for more than a decade, and I say without reservation that a finer group of men exists nowhere. We have debated, and argued, and questioned in the best tradition of a free society. Never has any member discarded the basic courtesies nor the willingness to listen. The work we have done together has created for each man his own passport to immortality. It is my prayer that my portrait and that of Judge Sumners, and portraits of other chairmen who will come after me, will look down upon a like group of men who, in honor and in graciousness, have followed their concessions and disciplined their minds so that they can bequeath to their people a just and enduring and a free government.

Thank you everybody.

Panama Canal: Congress Must Act To Prevent Threatened Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 18–20, which will be attended by the Presidents of the Central American Republics and the President of the United States, has again focused attention on the Caribbean situation in which the Panama Canal is the key element. It was, therefore, with much gratification that I noted the introduction by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of House Concurrent Resolution 105, which aims to clarify the present confused understanding of the U.S. sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

In this connection, it will be recalled by those Members who were present in the House on February 2, 1960, that this body adopted by the vote of 381 to 12 House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, which, in effect, was aimed at preventing the display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

Within a matter of days, after the adjournment of that session, and as predicted by me in an address to this body, this specific evidence of the will of the Congress as regards the Panama Canal was ignored by the President in Executive order on September 17, 1960, directing the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory at one spot. Instead of meeting the situation, this surrender merely led to more demands as shown by the subsequent authorization by the executive of the wide display of the Panama flag in the territory, which even includes one at the Canal Zone administration building.

Such formal displays of the Panama flags in the Canal Zone are not harmless gestures but symbols of weakness on the part of the officials responsible for what amounts to deliberate collaboration with those who would subvert the sovereign rights, power, and authority over the canal enterprise. Such treaty obligations and responsibilities, for some time, have been verging toward liquidation through the process of piecemeal surrenders.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize what I have often said that where there is responsibility there must be authority; otherwise there will be chaos. The process of liquidation has now gone so far that if the Panama Canal is to be saved, it must be rescued by the Congress of the United States.

To this end, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 113, which is identical with House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The indicated resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 113

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange or ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world; and for which rights, the United States has paid the Republic of Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations; and

Whereas, on February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives in the Eighty-sixth Congress, by an overwhelming vote, approved H. Con. Res. 459, favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That it is the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty."

Whereas, because of continuing claims of sovereignty over the Canal Zone by Panama which, if granted, would liquidate United States control of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, a further declaration by the Eighty-eighth Congress is deemed necessary and timely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (*the Senate concurring*), That (1) the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and will lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

(4) That the provisions of H. Con. Res. 459, Eighty-sixth Congress, are reiterated and reemphasized.

Administration Test Ban Proposals Blueprint for National Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during early March pertinent terms of a new test ban treaty offer soon to be made to the Russians by the Kennedy administration were revealed to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. These proposals contain the seeds of a potential nuclear Pearl Harbor. They amount to blueprints for a U.S. suicide weapon or a Soviet murder weapon, depending only upon which side of the Iron Curtain they are viewed from.

The proposed treaty's elaborate onsite inspection provisions need not be discussed because they are utterly meaningless. This is because the treaty's contemplated machinery to spot test cheating is so inadequate that suspicion of monitors will never be aroused and no on-site inspectors ever will be dispatched.

Disarmament Agency and State Department advisors have censored data and withheld from President Kennedy scientific evidence proving there is a big hole for Soviet test cheating in these upcoming proposals.

This evidence definitely exists and is ignored completely by these officials who also are trying to keep it from the public. A well-organized campaign of distortion and half-truths is being carried on aimed at brainwashing the American public into meek submission to a disastrous agreement-for-agreement's sake cave-in in the form of drastically scaled down treaty demands incorporated in these new proposals. The latter have already been drafted. They merely await a propitious time at Geneva to be given as an official offer to Communist negotiators.

The well-organized campaign I refer to is carried on by statements and letters to the editors of key newspapers over names of well-known personalities who want an effective test ban treaty, but who have not been informed of the facts proving administration proposals will result only in an ineffective treaty—one which stops all U.S. weapons progress while simply trusting an unpoliced Soviet promise not to continue theirs secretly and attain the nuclear weapons superiority needed to back up a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

Facts establishing the "big hole" for Soviet cheating in these proposals were placed on public record by Atomic Energy Commission and Defense Department expert witnesses during the above mentioned joint committee hearings March 5 to 12.

Rather than face them, admit errors in judgment and mistakes in evaluation, the Presidential advisors on the test ban question stubbornly have refused to budge from dangerous positions which undermine the very foundation of national defense against communism's drive to achieve world domination and bury the United States as part of the process.

It must never be forgotten that these people are part of the same crew which so badly misjudged the Bay of Pigs situation that disaster followed. In the present instance the magnitude of disaster which could follow only a few years of clandestine, one-sided Soviet nuclear progress is infinitely greater.

Only demands by an aware, aroused American public can reverse the administration's sure-lose test ban strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation. In the end that strategy will bring a terrifying rain of H-bombs on America if we choose not to surrender when the ultimatum is hurled. Only if we demand and get an effective test ban treaty—one which stops nuclear progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain—might the risks our country faces in the nuclear war be somewhat reduced.

The indisputable facts which establish the existence of the "big hole," brought to light during the joint committee's hearings were these:

First. Disarmament Agency witnesses testified that both current Anglo-United States proposals, and new ones, already drafted and soon to be offered to the Soviets, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. Only a token number, nine, of unreliable, delayed reporting, tamper-prone unmanned and, as yet uninvented, "black box" devices will be demanded for placement inside the U.S.S.R.

Second. The Defense Department's top seismologist, Dr. Carl Romney, testified that the capability of seismographs to record intelligible data is physically limited by natural earth background noise which occurs everywhere. Its effect on seismographs, wherever located, is similar to static on a short wave radio—unless a seismic signal is larger and stronger than background noise, it is simply unintelligible.

Seismic signals double the background noise level are needed to "detect" seismic disturbances, whether they be created by man or by nature. Signals 10 to 20 times the background noise level must be recorded to be able to "distinguish" unnatural seismic events in the U.S.S.R. from the many hundreds of similar-sized earthquakes which occur there annually.

Recording signals big enough to make this distinction is the key to arousing the suspicion of monitors and of setting a treaty's onsite inspection machinery into motion. This is where the "big hole" comes in.

Although the earth's normal background noise averages about 15 millimicrons in signal size—the common flu virus is 60 millimicrons in diameter—by combining quiet locations with electronic and mechanical suppression, it is claimed that some seismic observatories might be installed with background noise levels approaching only 1 millimicron.

Assuming this is possible, then 10 millimicron seismic signals created by a series of cheat tests would be detectably recorded along with similar-sized earthquakes. However, they still would be too small to be distinguished from those earthquakes and, therefore, would not be identified as originating from cheat tests.

The key to arousing suspicion and dispatching onsite inspectors would be missing. Cheating would be undiscoverable by the administration's proposed seismic monitoring network. Very significant underground nuclear tests could be carried on in the over 2½-million-square-mile area of the interior of the U.S.S.R., which lies 500 to 600 miles inside its borders, without discovery from the outside.

This is because Soviet scientists can keep seismic signals from clandestine test in the "big hole" smaller than 10 millimicrons in size as they travel outside their country's borders by the following means: First, holding yields down below 3 kilotons and testing in formations like alluvium which transmit seismic waves poorly; second, testing in underground cavities which "decouple" explosive shock from surrounding earth and drastically reduce the seismic signal; or, third, a combination of the foregoing.

Third, the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very large yield super H-bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability. As an indication of where military interest lies, General Betts revealed that even without a need for secrecy approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at these very low, undiscoverable yields.

These are the facts of record. These are the facts which establish the "big hole" for clandestine, undiscoverable cheating through which the Soviets could sneak undetected to gain overwhelming nuclear weapons superiority. These are the facts which must be faced if nuclear test ban negotiations are to be carried on with the realism American citizens demand of their Government.

It is little wonder the Americans are unwilling to trust an unpoliced promise by the Soviet Government not to sneak through the "big hole." Less than half a year ago that same Government was caught redhanded while sneaking nuclear rockets into Cuba. Americans distrust communism enough to spend willingly over $50 billion a year to forestall its threat of world domination. They have a right to insist the "big hole" be closed. The present state of the seismic art indicates it only can be closed by returning to demands for adequate numbers of manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union.

Even the most ardent test ban proponents should join in vigorously demanding closure of the "big hole." They seek to reduce the risks the U.S. faces in today's nuclear world with a test ban treaty. But it is only by an effective treaty—one which inhibits nuclear progress to the same degree on both sides of the Iron Curtain which might have any chance of doing so.

An ineffective treaty only would serve to exchange whatever risks exist from continued unrestrained testing for the obvious risks involved in stopping nuclear weapons progress on our side, while providing opportunity for the other side to proceed with it surreptitiously and achieve the military superiority needed to back up a "surrender or die" ultimatum.

Discussing what may or may not be effective treaty terms, however, must not divert attention from an even more imperative inquiry. It is the basic question of whether or not even an effective treaty actually will, on balance, reduce the risks we face. Under it the Soviet Government still could keep topflight Soviet scientists secretly at work in Iron Curtain laboratories for many years devising the weapons which would give it nuclear superiority. Whereupon that government could wantonly abrogate the treaty and provide those scientists sudden opportunity to test their work.

Mr. Foster, Director of the Disarmament Agency, states this risk of surprise abrogation can be minimized by a U.S. policy of maintaining our laboratories and continuing our readiness for testing.

Yet, on March 2, 1962, discussing such a possibility, President Kennedy stated:

> But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or incon-

venient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution.

The survival of the United States well could depend on widespread informed public discussion to ascertain which of these gentlemen is correct.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 16, 1963)

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

The first of several key bills voted on in the House this week was House Resolution 2438 to extend the draft law for an additional 4 years. It passed by a vote of 387 to 3. Although I voted for the extension I raised several pertinent questions. The bill had five purposes: (1) to extend the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years; (2) to extend the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces for 4 years; (3) to extend the Dependents Assistance Act, the law under which E–1's, E–2's, E–3's, and E–4's with 4 years of service or less are entitled to increased allowances, because of dependents, for 4 years; (4) to extend the so-called doctor's draft law for 4 years; (5) to extend for 4 years the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before July 1967. Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act there are six categories in class 1–A, men available for induction in order: (1) delinquents; (2) volunteers; (3) men between 19 and 26 who are nonfathers; (4) men between 19 and 26 who are fathers; (5) men over 26 years of age; (6) men between 18½ and 19 years of age.

In raising questions during debate on the bill I said: "We are disrupting our youth and their education. * * * We are affecting many civilian programs and certainly the educational institutions in our country. We are taking 90 percent men who will be noncombatant and do not need to have A–1 physical condition. Take these men who are driving staff cars. They are to be drafted to do what? Drive cars? Be PX salesmen, clerks, warehousemen, cooks, and countless other services? We need to get the best men we can and use their civilian skills. These jobs can be done as civilians. Why take a man out of civilian life and make him do something he would do as a civilian. Has the committee gone into why the Seabee technique was disbanded? In World War II the Seabees did an outstanding job. They wrote a proud chapter in the history of our Nation and we could do worse than to give qualified civilians now the same great opportunity to serve their country. In this way many noncombatant jobs could be done by civilians instead of drafting men to do these operations."

U.S. CITIZENSHIP FOR WINSTON CHURCHILL

A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States (H.R. 4374), passed 377 to 21 with ALGER against. In voting against this bill I give quarter to none in my admiration and respect for the greatness of Winston Churchill and his place in history. I do not believe that citizenship can be given as an award. I do not believe in degrees of citizenship, but rather in all citizens enjoying the same advantages and responsibilities, including taking part in their government and sharing as a taxpayer in the cost of such government. I, too, would quickly bestow any appropriate honor on Winston Churchill in appreciation for his courage, wisdom, and leadership of the free world.

MILITARY HARDWARE

The bill known as the "military hardware" measure (H.R. 2440) is to authorize appropriations during fiscal 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. The measure authorized $1.7 billion for the Army; $6.6 billion for the Navy and Marine Corps; $7.4 billion for the Air Force. It would buy 3,000 planes; 6,000 missiles; 43 new ships; and $3.4 billion for research. This was the first major opportunity in this session to make a sizable cut in President Kennedy's recordbreaking budget. Instead the House increased the President's request by $363,700. Voting on this measure was in three phases: (1) To increase the amount requested for the development of the RS–70 bomber and to increase from six to eight the authority for additional "killer" submarines (2) a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to trim 5 percent from the overall procurement budget (with the exception of the amount for the "killer" subs) and 12.5 percent from the research and development budget (with the exception of the RS–70 bomber item) (3) final passage of the bill.

I voted for the increase in the RS–70 program because, as I stated in debate, "the RS–70 should be developed beyond transportation level to weapons carrier and missile-launching platform and whatever other military purposes it can fulfill. There must be no gap between our present manned bomber system and a future fully capable missile program. Even at worst, we must leave no stone unturned in new weapons and also protect our present investment in RS–70." I support the increase in killer subs for the obvious reason that we must maintain defensive and offensive superiority. On the motion to recommit to make overall cuts, I voted "Yes." When this motion failed, I voted against the entire bill, stating on the floor: "Failing to take the responsible action outlined in the recommittal, I could not consistently agree to final passage. * * * Under no circumstances does this mean I am opposed to military preparedness and these weapons. But I shall at the same time expect the greatest value received for every defense dollar spent."

Very important observations were made by Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, a member of the Armed Services Committee, who said in part: "The Secretary of Defense in testimony before the committee stated he feels by better management in the procurement area alone over $2½ billion could be saved." Congressman LAIRD pointed out the improper procedures resulted in increased costs wherein cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were placed rather than contracts awarded through competitive bids. Several examples from GAO reports included the AN/SPS 10 radar $3.9 million overpayment, AN/APS 88 airborne radar $561,000, AN/PDR 43 radiac set $600,000, AN/WRT 1 and 2 radio sets $15 million. I believe the time to stop such reckless spending procedures is in the authorization bill. When Congress passes an authorization with the excuse that we can trim later in the appropriation bill, we are kidding the people because when the appropriation bill comes down we will be told we have to pass it because we have already authorized it.

THE M'NAMARA MONARCHY

Important in the debate on the military bill was the recognition by several Congressmen, including Democrats, of the autocratic rule of the Department of Defense by Secretary of Defense McNamara. A devastating article by Hanson W. Baldwin in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, states: "Mr. McNamara is the first and foremost trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition. * * * Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the Chiefs of the services and their Secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed, or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." In the debate on the military bill Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, a Democrat, asked: "If Congress itself will meet its responsibilities in the discharge of its duty under the Constitution to raise and maintain an Army and Navy or whether the Congress is prepared to continue its abdication of authority and failure to discharge its responsibilities." Congressman HÉBERT, in a resounding speech said: "In my 23 years here and 21 years association with the Armed Forces of this country, I have never seen the morale of the Pentagon at such a low ebb." It is time Congress and the American people demand a return to constitutional government with its separation of powers.

Quote of the week on Cuba (from the hearings on H.R. 2440):

"Mr. WILSON. Let me ask you bluntly: Do you think the Monroe Doctrine has been violated?

"Secretary MCNAMARA. I don't personally believe it has, but this is a question for the State Department to answer and for the lawyers to answer, and not for me."

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I recently wrote to the Honorable Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in which I called to his attention the reasons why, in my opinion, Farmers Home Administration must be provided with additional funds for administering its increased workload:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. GORDON: It has very recently come to my attention that the gradual attrition of private credit sources available to farmers in northeast Texas has now reached a point where something has got to be done. The responsible Federal agency in this field is the Farmers Home Administration. The purpose of this letter is to tell you that in my opinion FHA must increase their lending capability and augment their staff, otherwise they cannot assume the added burden. The reluctance or inability of private credit institutions to provide farm credit has been obvious for many years, not only in loans made to farmers by State and National banks but also in loans made by various production credit association over the State of Texas.

Farmers' Home has extended the effectiveness of their available funds by using their loan authorizations to pay interest and depreciation to prior lien holders of essential livestock and farm equipment, in an attempt to encourage private institutions to continue their line of credit rather than require refinancing by FHA. Even this has not offset the trend. Bank officials in northeast Texas will tell you:

1. The percent of agricultural loans made compared to other purpose loans has declined in the past 10 years from 50 percent to 20 percent. Even though there has been a decline in the number of farmers in this area, it has not been as rapid as the decline in agricultural credit.

2. Less than 10 percent of agricultural loans are made to young farmers, in spite of the fact that the average age of bank customers who farm is between 55 and 65. Because of this trend it is extremely difficult for young farmers to obtain credit sufficient to enable them to become successfully established.

3. Farmers who have repaid their indebtedness to Farmers Home experience great difficulty in returning to private sources of credit. Even though their assets have been increased considerably and they are free of debt, these farmers cannot obtain a relatively small loan for annual operating expenses.

4. Statutory loan limits and other legal limitations are not contributing factors toward the policies of credit institutions in making fewer agricultural loans.

5. Individual comments:

"The number of our agricultural loans, including part-time operators who are fully employed and own only a few head of cattle, is around 400 to 450. This compares with around 1,000 loans some 10 years ago. The average age of the families financed by our bank is around 60 to 65 years. Only a very few young farmers are being financed by the bank, and most of these farmers have other income."

"We have approximately 150 agricultural loans, and about 90 percent of these are combination crop and livestock operations. The average age of the farm families being financed is around 50 years. There is little need of a farming operation of such size as to require a line of credit in excess of $6,000 or $7,000. We are financing no young farm families who conduct a full-time farming operation. The young farm families that we do finance are fully employed and have considerable nonfarm income. These operators usually have only a few head of cattle."

"Our bank is financing some 500 farm families, with an average loan of around $2,000. The average age of these families is a little over 65 years. The bank's experience in farm credit is very disappointing. In fact, agricultural losses have almost offset all the profits made by other departments of the bank. The number of farm loans made has declined some 40 to 50 percent in the last 10 years. The trend is toward larger and fewer operators and farmers who have other sources of income."

"This bank is financing some 189 farm loans; about five are young farm families. The percent of loans made to farmers in 1951 was 53 percent while the percentage of loans made to farmers in 1962 was 21 percent. We have had no loss on farm loans during the last 3 years but we are not interested in financing farmers and ranchers."

"Agricultural loans made by this bank decreased 40 to 50 percent during the last 10 years. The types of farming operations have changed and most of those being financed have nonfarm employment. Practically no loans at all are being made to assist young farmers to become established in the farming business. Only a very few large crop farmers are being financed. We are reluctant to finance cotton."

"It appears that most of this bank's customers are livestock and combination farmers. Our bank is not making agricultural loans for cropping operations, and we have made only a few loans to new young farmers. These young families are mostly going into livestock operations with nonfarm income."

"Ten years ago 75 percent of the loans made by this bank were agricultural loans and about 80 percent of those were to crop farmers. Today about 60 percent of the loans are farm loans, and practically none of the operators are straight crop farmers. Nearly all are livestock operators. The average age of the farm families being financed by this bank is from 55 to 65 years. We only make small farm loans, and very few loans are being made to young farm families."

"Ten years ago 85 percent of the loans made by our bank were agricultural loans. Of these approximately 60 percent were crop farmers. Today only about 25 percent are agricultural loans, and only 10 percent are crop loans. Agricultural loans in this area are getting larger as the need for operating credit increases each year. Farm families are getting fewer in number."

"This bank finances mostly cattle operations. It finances very few young farmers, and all of these have nonfarm income. We are reluctant to finance cropping operations, and we do not like to make farm loans unless the farm operator has nonfarm income of at least $2,400 or more annually. Even then, the average loan is from $400 to $1,500. Most of the families receiving this credit are from 55 to 60 years of age."

"We make few farm loans and those farm loans being financed are very small operators with outside income. We do not believe cropping operations are sound and consequently we make practically no crop loans."

"I have referred some of my customers to FHA due to the bank's inability to continue providing credit to them, then, after their operations have been reestablished on a sound basis, they have returned to this bank for their credit needs. Most of our farm loans are to older people, and the operators are getting larger in size and fewer in number. Most of our loans are for dairy and livestock enterprises, and we have practically no crop loans."

"The banks in this area are making fewer and fewer agricultural loans each year. Very few crop farmers are being financed by the banks. Many farmers, mostly tenants, are quitting because of lack of adequate financing. Larger amounts of credit are needed each year to conduct a sound farming program because of the need to carry out improved farming practices such as increased use of fertilizers, insect control, etc. Consequently, an increasing number of farms are becoming idle because of the lack of operators. These farm lands are being purchased by larger operators and are being made into much larger farming units. These larger units are producing less agricultural income because of the change from cropping programs to livestock programs. The decrease of this income and the lack of people formerly engaged in crop farming operations are having an adverse economic influence on the local communities. Many of the farm families that have left could have stayed and conducted sound farming programs had they been able to receive adequate credit with FHA supervisory assistance that would enable them to carry out the necessary changes in farm management due to the advance in agricultural technology now needed to carry out a profitable farm operation."

"The present 'cost-price squeeze' being experienced by farmers will require longer repayment periods than are presently being extended by most private credit institutions. The banks are handicapped in providing the additional needed credit due to a lack of trained personnel necessary in servicing farm loans. The amount of annual credit needed by the average farmer has almost doubled in the last 10 years. This is due to the necessity for farmers to producer higher yields of crops in order to maintain an adequate volume of income which includes increased costs for fertilizer, insecticides, labor, machinery, repair."

"FHA may be the only source of future agricultural credit. Many good crop farmers are rejected for bank loans. I do not believe the banks are making loans that they could or should make. The trend is toward fewer agricultural loans in most banks. I know of many family-type farm operators that could not get adequate credit from private sources at the present time."

"There has been a change away from row to crop production due to the reluctance of the banks to provide this type of credit. A change from row crop production to livestock is not the answer now, nor is it the answer in the future to the adverse direction the rural economy is now taking; production credit is only assuming risks that any bank would take in making agricultural loans and, therefore, do not provide any additional credit to offset this trend toward fewer agricultural loans."

"A great number of our farmers are of the age where they cannot get a job, and not old enough to draw social security, they are at the crossroads of life. Unless they can get help from some source to farm, I do not know what some of them will do. Most of the farmers would quit if they could get anything to do. I have noticed that as soon as a farmer can draw his social security, he is out of the farming business. But, something is going to have to be provided for that man until he can retire. We do not have any young men that are starting their career farming. Something must be wrong with the setup when no young men want to farm."

I am especially concerned regarding this trend in private credit since it is requiring a tremendous increase in the responsibility of the Farmers Home Administration to supplement private credit without adequate personnel to staff their local and State offices, personnel that are needed effectively to meet the increased credit demands of eligible farmers and ranchers. Since the present appropriation for administering the FHA program is insufficient, it was recently necessary for the agency to terminate the employment of 27 county office personnel; this is in spite of the fact that at the present time FHA has loaned in Texas $11 million more than for the same period a year ago. Another indication of approaching crisis is the increasing number of applications received by FHA for credit assistance which has caused a rapidly increasing loan volume.

During the 1961 fiscal year, FHA in Texas loaned $48 million for all types of loans, both initial and subsequent. In the 1962 fiscal year, they loaned $60 million in Texas. In fiscal 1962 over 9,000 applications for initial assistance were received. If adequate funds are available there will be a tremendous increase in both the number of applications and the funds needed to meet the farm operating costs of sound family farming operations. Of the over 9,000 applications for new or initial assistance that were received, 4,500 new or initial loans of all types were made. This ratio discloses that FHA has made diligent efforts to provide credit assistance only to those families who have a reasonable chance of success and who can be profitably reestablished in farming operations.

As previously stated, FHA found it necessary to restrict the use of loan funds for refinancing purposes only to cases of absolute necessity to enable the farmer to continue an otherwise sound operation. Despite FHA's careful efforts to reduce loan funds for this purpose, it was necessary this year to use $2.3 million in contrast to the $1.9 million used in the 1961 fiscal year.

It is clear to me that the need for the services provided by the Farmers' Home Administration is expanding at a tremendous rate. It is also apparent that unless there is an immediate increase in available funds for administering this increased workload, individual farm families will be seriously and adversely affected, as will the entire rural economy.

I will very much appreciate your comments on this situation as I have described it in this letter.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincererly yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, we bow daily at this altar of prayer, lest we be tempted by the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own strength. In a world whose uncertainty we share about so many things, we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge from the beating storm but in Thee.

Our faith seems but a tiny thing; but just as through the smallest window streams the light of a vast and distant sun, so Thou, whose light fills all, canst flood the shadowed rooms of all our being—areas which are dark only because we shut Thee out.

With all that saddens and perplexes in this tortured yet splendid day, give us who toil at its tasks an inner radiance, humbly glad that in a world that lieth in darkness, we are called to be heralds of Thy light which even now is gilding the dawn.

We ask it in the name of the Master who bids us to let our light shine. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 200. An act to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 824. An act to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85-875;

H.R. 1048. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 1892. An act to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351-355, 357-360);

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association;

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service;

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311);

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 2844. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 200. An act to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1892. An act to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351-355, 357-360); and

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 824. An act to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85-875;

H.R. 1048. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service;

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311);

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 2844. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed construction relating to the national program of aeronautical and space activities at the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON SOIL BANK CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1962 soil bank conservation reserve program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

A letter from the Chief, National Guard Bureau, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27, 87th Congress, 1st session (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Section 309(e) of Communications Act of 1934, Relating to Filing of Certain Petitions

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Regulation of the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a regulation promulgated by the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, regarding the renewal of numbers issued by the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Federal Airport Act, To Extend the Time for Making Grants Thereunder

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Review of Administrative Functions, Department of Occupations and Professions, District of Columbia Government

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of administrative functions, Department of Occupations and Professions, District of Columbia government, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Activities of, Expenditures by, and Donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, S. Dak.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 2 of Atomic Energy Act of 1954

A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution

"Whereas the capital gains tax treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code has been the major factor responsible for the vast progress of Alabama in forest management and the growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

"Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands would constitute the most severe setback in this generation to the continued growth of the forest products industry; and

"Whereas the jobs of thousands of employees and many hundreds of communities are affected by the forest industries of Alabama and are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Alabama petition the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the Federal House of Representatives on February 6, 1963; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama be requested to use their full power and influence in defeating the proposed change; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerks of both Houses of the Federal Congress and to each of the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama.

"Attest:

"J. E. Speight,
"*Secretary of Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 180

"Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost.

"Whereas on September 6, 1962, the President of the United States, following the Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation for an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports to offset the difference between the price of raw American cotton to foreign mills and the price which American mills are required to pay for the same cotton, stated the following:

" 'Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

" 'I am, therefore, requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end. Such a program will undoubtedly require enabling legislation'; and

"Whereas in his farm message of January 31, 1963, the President stated:

" 'A healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. Over a million persons are engaged in producing our cotton crop. Another million and a half are employed in converting the raw cotton into consumer items. Additional millions supply goods and services to this industry. Cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance-of-payments position.

" 'Our cotton industry—both producers and mills—is confronted with many problems which it alone cannot resolve. Because domestic prices are much higher than those of foreign producers, our cotton mills must pay substantially more for cotton than their off-shore competitors. Domestic cotton textile products are being displaced not only by substitute fibers in consumer products but also by increased cotton imports. Cotton exports are sharply lower.

" 'Loss of markets for U.S. cotton increases surplus stocks held by the CCC, causes higher and higher Government costs, and reduces the cotton farmer's income'; and

"Whereas the textile industry in Georgia is and has been the backbone of the economy of our State, directly employing almost 100,000 persons making it the largest single industrial employer in the State; and

"Whereas many additional thousands of Georgians are employed in supplying services and goods to the textile industry and hundreds of thousands more are dependent on it for a livelihood; and

"Whereas these imports of foreign cotton textiles and the unjust inequity of the two-price system for cotton have created a situation that seriously threatens the entire economy of our State and Nation and are responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of textile jobs, curtailment of the hours worked in the textile industry, and the closing of many textile plants; and

"Whereas it is acknowledged that the welfare of all Georgians is vitally dependent on a healthy, growing textile industry: Be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*:

"Section 1. That the Georgia General Assembly implores the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to make American cotton available to American purchasers at the same price American cotton is made available to foreign purchasers.

"Sec. 2. That the cotton textile manufacturing industry of Georgia be invited to place an appropriate exhibit on the third floor of the State Capitol which will present tangible evidence of the discrimination from which American textile mills and their employees are suffering. And the secretary of state is hereby authorized and instructed to place same in a conspicuous place on the third floor of the State Capitol.

"Sec. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

"Sec. 4. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and the Congress of the United States; the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, State, Labor, and Treasury, and the Georgia congressional delegation.

"Read and adopted in the house, March 1, 1963.

"Glenn W. Ellard,
"*Clerk.*

"Read and adopted in the senate, March 4, 1963.

"George D. Stewart,
"*Secretary.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"Joint memorial to the Congress and executive branch of the Federal Government requesting that a public hearing be held in the county seat of each county affected before any final decision is made to establish dams, wildlife preserves, migratory bird refuges or parks

"Whereas when dams, wildlife preserves, migratory bird refuges or parks are created by the Federal Government, the same often requires and includes the taking of large areas of private lands, and Federal and State lands leased and used by private individuals; that these lands when so taken may be restricted so as not to allow livestock grazing, timber harvesting, and other multiple uses, and by reason thereof the use is restricted or denied to the former owner or lessee; that this results in detriment to the operator, as well as economic jeopardy to nearby communities when the acreage is large and the communities are dependent on livestock or other products derived from multiple uses; and

"Whereas said lands often contain water historically used for livestock watering and other related purposes, and said water is necessary during periods of drought and may be the only water supply available within many miles for ordinary use; and

"Whereas the loss of hay land not only would result in a drastic devaluation of the remaining ranch land, but would in many cases force the rancher to cease operations; and

"Whereas present multiple-use operations provide a continuing source of income to the communities and a needed tax base for local government; and

"Whereas it is illogical that persons far removed from the area should arrive at an administrative decision or enact a decision into law without complete information on how a change would affect the local area; and

"Whereas the Federal Government should not take land for said purposes when communities or entire counties will suffer undue harm or economic injury: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That the Congress and executive branch of the Federal Government be requested to hold public hearings in the county seat of each county affected whenever a dam, wildlife preserve, migratory bird refuge, or park is proposed to afford those persons most vitally affected a chance to make their desires known before any administrative decision is made or law passed; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the Honorable Mike J. Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senators from Montana, to the Honorable James F. Battin and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, Congressmen from Montana, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers of the United States."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable James Battin and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, urging the passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the State of Montana

"Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

"Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

"Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitation are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods of the walking plow and horse team days; and

"Whereas the present farm acreage that one operator can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

"Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one operator can handle; and

"Whereas present acreage limitations will not permit farmers in the State of Montana to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

"Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act in 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

"Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in Montana, the acreage allowed in a single holding may be determined by the Bureau of Reclamation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana:*

"1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and any other laws and rules, be waived and not applied in the State of Montana; recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for farm units.

"2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

"3. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, and the Honorable James Battin, Representatives in the Congress from Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States unless Congress shall have sooner submitted such an amendment

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States presidential and vice presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, and each State is entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the presidential and vice presidential electors who receive a plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to that State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for electors of the opposition candidates; and

"Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

"Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introduction of various proposals to change the electoral college system by amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana,* That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall no longer have any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That this secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, and to the legislatures of each of the several States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, as amended, authorize payments to school districts in lieu of Federal taxes; and

"Whereas, of the total land area in Idaho, 64.1 percent is federally owned, nontaxable property; and

"Whereas in 1962, applications for Public Law 874 funds were made on behalf of an average daily attendance of 13,456 students, or 8.62 percent of the total number of students attending public school, in 52 of Idaho's school districts, located in 32 of the 44 counties; and

"Whereas in some school districts of our State a large percentage (in some as high as 75 percent) of the students in attendance are children whose parents live or work on Federal property, and the funds received from the Federal Government are essential to the adequate operation of such schools; and

"Whereas unless extended, said laws will expire on June 30, 1963, thereby drastically reducing the funds available for school purposes in many of the school districts, and severally curtailing the operation of many of the schools in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring),* That we must respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation extending the 3(b)1 and 3(b)2 classification of federally connected students under Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, without any change of percentage for qualification by school districts and without any change of percentage of allowable per capita costs, and extending the 5(a)2 classification of federally connected students under Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, without any changes of percentage qualification requirement or percentage of payment for average State cost of school facility construction; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the first day of March 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the fifth day of March 1963.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas certain acts are offenses against both the U.S. Government, and the various States and subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas under present laws a person who commits any act which is an offense against the U.S. Government and against a State and who is prosecuted for the offense by the State and either acquitted or convicted on the merits may be prosecuted by the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas it is believed that a prosecution by the U.S. Government after such acquittal or conviction by a State is unjust and contrary to the constitutional guarantees against double jeopardy: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein),

"SECTION 1. That the 64th General Assembly of Arkansas hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that when a person has been either acquitted or convicted, on the merits, of an offense against any State or territory of the United States such acquittal or conviction shall be a bar to prosecution for an offense against the United States when the offenses committed against the State or territory and against the United States were committed in the same course of conduct and are of the same character.

"SEC. 2. That the secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress and to each Member of the Arkansas delegation in the U.S. Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Senate joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States has passed a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; and

"Whereas this joint resolution passed the Senate of the United States on March 27, 1962, and passed the House of Representatives of the United States on July 27, 1962, and now has been submitted to a vote of the States; and

"Whereas the State of Maryland wishes to ratify this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States, viz:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, That the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is ratified by the State of Maryland to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Maryland is requested to forward authentic copies of this resolution, under the great seal of the State of Maryland, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Z

"Concurrent resolution for the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting States from denying a citizen the right to vote through imposition of a poll tax

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to-wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." ': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Whereas there are many areas throughout the State of Washington where a large part of the population consists of people employed on Federal enterprises which persons and their children must be provided with schools and other services at the local level of government which must be paid for by the local school district, towns, cities, or counties; and

"Whereas the properties and installations where these people are employed are not on the tax rolls and, therefore, are not subjected to local taxes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government partially compensates for this deficiency by paying an amount in lieu of tax known as Public Law 874 funds, which funds do not reflect the potential taxes available were these Federal properties and installations to appear upon the tax rolls; and

"Whereas those funds derived from Public Law 874 are in the nature of and were intended for money in lieu of local taxes and were not intended as any type of reimbursement to the State and are not paid in lieu of any State tax; and

"Whereas the honorable Governor of this State has recommended a procedure in the distribution of Public Law 874 funds which would deprive local governing units of moneys due them in lieu of local taxes with a consequent detriment to local school districts, cities, towns, and counties; and

"Whereas it would appear that continued attempts to deprive local governing bodies of Public Law 874 funds are at hand, whether such attempts be in the guise of construing such funds as State funds, or otherwise; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That this body address itself to the honorable Governor of the State and request that Public Law 874 funds be directed to and reserved for their intended use, as moneys in lieu of local taxes, and that such moneys and every part thereof go to such local units of government; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body call to the attention of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States the present inadequacy in the Public Law 874 in-lieu funds with respect to that money which could be obtained by local governing units on a taxable basis; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body express its legislative intent that any public body of whatever nature using local services and exempt from taxation on its properties should pay in-lieu funds equal to the property taxes lost, to insure that continued development of our local units of government so necessary for an economically sound and progressive State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Washington, and to each member of the Washington delegation in the U.S. Congress and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

OREGON LEGISLATURE URGES LARGER SHIPPING LOCKS AT BONNEVILLE DAM

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Legislature has recently adopted House Joint Memorial 18, urging Congress to appropriate funds to widen the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River, so as to coincide with the size of shipping locks at the Dalles and McNary Dams. The Columbia River is a great artery of commerce, and the narrow width of the shipping locks at the Bonneville Dam impedes the flow of larger vessels. It makes good commonsense to have the shipping locks at Bonneville correspond in size to the more recently constructed locks at the Dalles and McNary Dams.

House Joint Memorial 18 of the Oregon Legislature was sponsored personally by State Representative Don McKinnis, of Summerville, who represents Union and Wallowa Counties and is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Livestock of the Oregon House of Representatives, and by 26 other Oregon State senators and representatives.

In behalf of my senior colleague, who is presently in Central America with President Kennedy, and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Joint Memorial 18 of the Oregon Legislature.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Columbia River is the main navigation artery for Astoria, Portland, The Dalles, and other communities in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas an uninterrupted flow of commerce on the Columbia River is of vital importance to the economic development of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam are less in width than those at the upstream dams on the Columbia River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to widen the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River so as to conform with the width of the shipping locks at The Dalles Dam and McNary Dam and thereby provide for an uninterrupted flow of commerce on the Columbia River.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE ON MAPLE SIRUP IMPORTS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the domestic maple sirup industry in my State of Vermont and in other producing States is becoming more hard pressed these days due to the unfair tariff differential favoring importation of sirup produced in Canada. Canadians are the closest neighbors to many of the people of Vermont, and they have consistently been good neighbors, one with the other. I am sure that they shall continue to live and work together in close harmony and to be of mutual assistance with common problems.

The difference in tariff charges levied by our two countries on maple sirup weights the competitive advantage heavily in favor of Canadian producers. This is through no fault of the Canadian producers. It is the fault of our tariff situation, which imposes a tariff of only about 4 percent ad valorem equivalent on Canadian maple imports as against the tariff of 17½ percent ad valorem which Canada levies against maple imports from the United States.

Vermont's delegation in Congress has been working on the problem through liaison with Ambassador Herter, the President's foreign trade representative. In addition, I have asked the Tariff Commission to look into the matter, and I have written to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee asking that that committee consider this tariff problem in its legislative program for this year.

I earnestly hope that something will be done to relieve this pressing problem.

On February 28, 1963, House Joint Resolution 20, a joint resolution of the Vermont Legislature was approved. That legislation focuses attention on this problem.

Since the only remedy available is through the Federal Government in its trade relations with Canada, I think the Congress should be aware of the gravity of the situation as recognized by the Vermont Legislature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Joint Resolution 20 of the Vermont Legislature, approved February 28, 1963, be included at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the devaluation of Canadian currency, discriminatory comparative tariffs and the continuing rapid increase in Canadian maple imports have created an unfair competitive situation adversely affecting the Vermont maple industry; and

Whereas we appreciate and are sympathetic with the difficult situation which exists in the Dominion of Canada and while we wish to do everything possible to maintain and enhance the best friendly relationship between the United States and our great neighbor to the north, we believe the attempts to attain these objectives have been very adverse to our maple industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont General Assembly respectfully request the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Honorable Christian A. Herter, in charge of tariff negotiations under the Trade Development Act of 1962, to take appropriate action to relieve that situation; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully suggest that appropriate action might be an increase of the U.S. tariff on maple imports from 01.5 cents a pound to 17½ percent ad valorem to match the corresponding Canadian tariff; or a quota on imports of not more than 10 million pounds annually, or both; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the U.S. Tariff Commission, Hon. Christian A. Herter, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford.

Approved February 28, 1963.

HOWARD E. ARMSTRONG,
Secretary of State.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly requesting the Congress to reject that portion of the proposed tax revision submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States which would require those persons who itemize deductions to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total amount of their itemized deductions.

Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk this concurrent resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD in full on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REJECT THAT PORTION OF THE PROPOSED TAX REVISION SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WHICH WOULD REQUIRE THOSE PERSONS WHO ITEMIZE DEDUCTIONS TO SUBTRACT 5 PERCENT OF THE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME FROM THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THEIR ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS AND TO REQUEST MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA TO OPPOSE THIS MEASURE WITH ALL THE FORCE AT THEIR DISPOSAL

Whereas the general assembly has been informed that the President of the United States has proposed a revision of the income tax laws of the United States which would require those persons who itemize deductions in their tax returns to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total amount of their itemized deductions; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that this would seriously curtail worthwhile contributions to churches, religious orders, and charitable institutions generally which look to contributions for the major portion of their livelihood; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that this proposal should be opposed and should not become a part of the tax laws of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject the proposal of the President of the United States to revise the income tax laws of this country by requiring those persons who itemize their deductions in their tax returns to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total amount of their itemized deduction; and be it further

Resolved, That the congressional delegation from South Carolina is earnestly requested to oppose the enactment into law of this proposal with all the strength at their disposal; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the two Houses of Congress and to each Member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

WANTON KILLING OF ELK IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a joint memorial which was passed by the Wyoming State Legislature which memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk in Yellowstone National Park and to permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming. This memorial expresses the feeling of the people of Wyoming. It expresses the will of all of those people who believe in preserving the spirit of Yellowstone National Park. The people of Wyoming are proud of the national park and they want to preserve that part of the country for the enjoyment of people. They want to conserve its present condition and they want to preserve the wild birds and animals that are so abundant in our beautiful State.

For many years the people of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho have been requesting that the Secretary of the Interior prohibit the needless slaughter of the majestic elk residing in the northern part of the great Yellowstone Park. For many years we encouraged the National Park Service to institute a program of trapping and transplanting these animals, but every year we have been rebuffed and rejected.

In the winter of 1961–62 the slaughter of elk in the northern Yellowstone elk herd reached a ridiculous point when the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the National Park Service again ordered the killing of our elk—4,309 elk were slaughtered. There was a tremendous uproar of public indignation against the Secretary and the head of the National Park Service. But again this year the will of the people was ignored, and on January 16 the slaughter of the elk was resumed. On January 22 in a letter to Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and I stated in part as follows:

> Mr. Secretary, the slaughter of the animals in Yellowstone Park is a disgraceful chapter in the history of the National Park Service. It has been done in a ruthless and arrogant manner without resort to the thinking of the Game and Fish Commission of either Wyoming or Montana. It has been pursued in a dictatorial manner, careless of the interest of the people in this region. If allowed to continue, we will live to see the extermination of the Wapiti as well as other wild animals.

On January 23 I introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill, S. 451, which would prohibit the destruction of wild birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park when purposes of the killing is to control their number. My purpose in introducing this bill was to put on the books a law which would clearly spell out the intentions of the people of this country who would like to conserve these great game animals.

In spite of violent objections by the Governor of the State of Wyoming, myself, and many, many other interested persons, the slaughter of the elk continued. Four hundred and four elk were killed this winter, not counting the elk killed for biological research, which I advocate. On January 31, Secretary Udall announced that the Park Rangers had stopped shooting the elk in Yellowstone National Park, except for laboratory purposes, and that a very successful program of trapping and transplanting these animals had been started.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee reserve the right to object?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator asked for additional time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wyoming is granted. The Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I commend the Secretary for this decision and I think that it is a great milestone in the management of our game animals in the great national park systems. This trapping and transplanting program that we have been advocating for so long, and which has been recently adopted, is a conservation measure that has many advocates. I think the Secretary showed wisdom and judgment, because if this continued abuse of killing our natural resources were to continue we would have no elk, and Yellowstone National Park would lose one of its great attractions.

Mr. President, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, Clifford P. Hansen, signed on February 13, 1963, a joint memorial which has passed both the House and the Senate of the Wyoming State Legislature asking that appropriate action be taken to prohibit the killing of our great elk herds. It is my hope that the Congress will take the appropriate action to permanently stop the slaughter of our elk as requested by the Wyoming State Legislature by passing my bill, S. 451. I ask for unanimous consent that this memorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 22, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 37TH STATE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by Park Rangers

Whereas the animals that range within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park in the State of Wyoming constitute a part of the natural resources of Wyoming; and

Whereas the natural resources of the State of Wyoming should be utilized to the greatest good of the people of the State of Wyoming and of the United States of America; and

Whereas the slaughter of over 4,500 head of elk in the past 2 years in Yellowstone National Park by the park rangers was a gross waste of an important natural resource as aforesaid; and

Whereas better methods of control of these resources than those now being utilized by the National Park Service are available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior be and are hereby memorialized to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park as has been the practice in the past and permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming and if trapping and transplanting practices do not give the necessary reductions, to permit the hunting of such animals in remote areas of the park; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Interior, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved 9:23 p.m., February 13, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on March 6, 1963, at a meeting of the Broome County Federation of Labor in Binghamton, N.Y., on behalf of 15,000 workers and members, the federation adopted a resolution initiated by the United Brewery Workers Union, AFL–CIO, calling for Congress to permit the expiration of certain excise taxes upon the scheduled date of June 30, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE U.S. CONGRESS TO ALLOW THE AUTOMATIC RATE REDUCTION ON CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATES

Whereas Federal excise taxes were substantially increased to the war tax rate on many manufactured items by the Revenue Act of 1943, 1945, and 1947; and

Whereas these rates were even further increased by the Revenue Act of 1951 for the purpose of a temporary Korean wartime emergency; and

Whereas all excise rates were reduced to prewar tax rates by the Excise Reduction Act of 1954, with the exception of alcoholic beverages, gasoline, diesel fuel, cigarettes, and motor vehicle chassis, which products continued to be taxed at the highest rate, but were scheduled for automatic reduction on March 31, 1955; and

Whereas the Revenue Acts of 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961 continued to postpone the automatic reduction on these items; and

Whereas the Revenue Act of 1962 once more postponed the rate reduction date on these selected items from January 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963; and

Whereas the wartime emergency which occasioned the imposition of the additional excise on these selected items now no longer exists; and

Whereas war tax rates are so high as to substantially reduce sales in a peacetime market; and

Whereas the execessive taxation of these selected products has restricted wages and job opportunities for organized labor in the particular industries manufacturing these goods, and has prevented business expansion in these businesses because they could not keep pace with less highly taxed items: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Broome County Federation of Labor, 261 Water Street, Binghamton, N.Y., representing 15,000 workers and members, hereby goes on record as favoring the reduction of these oppressive excises and respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to permit these war tax rates to expire on the scheduled date of June 30, 1963.

Adopted at meeting on March 6, 1963.

Edward J. Mangan,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1035. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts (Rept. No. 79).

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS" — INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 80)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit the annual report entitled "Constitutional Amendments," pursuant to Senate Resolution 259, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, together with the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report together with the individual views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 81)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I am submitting a report on the activities of the committee and its subcommittees in the 87th Congress.

The report also includes an appendix on the organization and operations of the Congress, consisting of an evaluation of the effect of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative branch of the Government. This analysis of the basic Legislative Reorganization Act is considered to be especially timely, in view of the many suggestions which have been made to change the rules of the Senate in the present Congress. The recommendations made at the time this study was originally made, in the 82d Congress, are as applicable today as in 1951 when the committee held lengthy hearings and conducted extensive studies on this subject.

In view of the very comprehensive nature of this study, it is doubtful whether any commission or joint committee would be able to develop any new proposal which was not advanced or recommended by witnesses who testified at these hearings. Because of the increased interest in this subject at this time, and the fact that the hearings and the supporting data relating thereo have been out of print for 10 years, they are included in this report as an appendix. It is believed that the information contained herein will be invaluable in assisting the Congress in any proposed changes in its organization and operation and in the legislative process which Members may deem appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide coach bodies shall not be subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on motor vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1117. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1118. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield) (by request):

S. 1119. A bill relating to rights-of-way on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Kefauver, and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1121. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–657); to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 1122. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Simpson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Jordan of Idaho):

S. 1123. A bill to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1124. A bill to extend and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. Cannon):

S. 1125. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1126. A bill to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of Louis Sirota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Jean Ener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. Dominick):

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1130. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request):

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. S. Barrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1132. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the Golden Circle of National Parks and Monument and associated scenic, recreation, and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1133. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. Brewster) (by request):

S. 1134. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 1135. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the exvessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1136. A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1137. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 1138. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve or authorize, until December 31, 1964, the consolidation or merger of carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (by request):

S. 1139. A bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1140. A bill to authorize a grant for carrying out a project of construction for the expansion of the facilities of the Washington Hospital Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Stefan Copilu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1142. A bill to provide for the adoption of a perpetual calendar; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNamara):

S. 1143. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1144. A bill to change from 2 years to 1 year the waiting period for promotion to steps 5, 6, and 7 for postal employees above level 6 of the postal field service schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1145. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1146. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayako Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 1147. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1148. A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crime committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1149. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose L. Cabezon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1150. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Cumberland, Allegany County, Md., in honor of George Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1151. A bill relating to the taxable status of sales prior to September 1, 1955, of tubes for use in the production of certain component parts of television receiving sets; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of the Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, and the term of office of Senators shall be 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SUPERVISION OF FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Soviet Union has occupied, by force of arms, the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and deprived such countries of their independence; and

Whereas an unparalleled system of political oppression and tyranny has been established in such countries; and

Whereas, by deportations and dispersion of the native population to the wastes of Siberia, and by mass colonization, the Soviet Union threatens complete extermination of of these peoples; and

Whereas, despite such treatment, the spirit of the citizens of such countries is not broken and they remain overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas the desire of the citizens of such countries for national freedom remains unabated; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former free governments of these countries; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of deportation in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps;

(c) persons guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States be punished; and

(d) the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the direct supervision of the United Nations to establish as quickly as possible legal democratic government for those countries.

EXTENSION OF LIFE OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for an additional 4 years, the life of the Commission on Civil Rights. This bill would also broaden the scope of the functions and work of the Commission.

This legislative proposal carries out one of the recommendations of the President, contained in his historic Civil Rights Message to the Congress on February 28, 1963.

The bill was transmitted to the Vice President by the Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, a man who has given distinguished service in this position, and a noted citizen of the State of Michigan, Dr. John A. Hannah.

Mr. President, this is a high priority item for this session of the Congress. I am hopeful that the Committee on the Judiciary will give this bill its early consideration; and, as a member of that committee, I shall urge that this be done.

All of us who have followed the distinguished work of the Commission and its staff know of the important contributions the reports and hearings of this Commission have made to a better understanding, in all parts of the Nation, of the critical job of protecting the constitutional civil rights of our citizens.

In a sense, this Commission has been able to do what neither the Congress nor the formal departments of the executive branch have accomplished—namely, the throwing of a public spotlight on the undone job of insuring the civil rights of all Americans.

It is now in order to give the Commission a new and broadened charter and additional time in which to continue its present work and to undertake new assignments.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the President's civil rights message dealing with expanding and extending the work of the Commission on Civil Rights, the letter from Commission Chairman John Hannah to the Vice President, and the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be held at the desk until the end of business on Friday, March 22, so that other Senators who may wish to join in its sponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpt, letter, and bill will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1117) to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1963."

Sec. 2. Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975a) is amended to read as follows:

"RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION, HEARINGS

"Sec. 102. (a) The Chairman or one designated by him to act as Chairman at a hearing of the Commission shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the hearing.

"(b) A copy of the Commission's rules shall be made available to the witness before the Commission.

"(c) Witnesses at the hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

"(d) The Chairman or Acting Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum and unprofessional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings.

"(e) If the Commission determines that evidence or testimony at any hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall (1) receive such evidence or testimony or summary of such evidence or testimony in executive session; and in the event the Commission determines that such evidence or testimony shall be given at a public session, then it shall (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and (3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

"(f) Except as provided in sections 102 and 105(f) of this Act, the Chairman shall receive and the Commission shall dispose of requests to subpena additional witnesses.

"(g) No evidence or testimony or summary of evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission. Whoever releases or uses in public without the consent of the Commission such evidence or testimony taken in executive session shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year.

"(h) In the discretion of the Commission, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Commission is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings.

"(i) Upon payment of the cost thereof, a witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Commission.

"(j) A witness attending any session of the Commission shall receive $6 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 10 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $10 per day for expenses of subsistence, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Mileage payments shall be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission or any subcommittee thereof.

"(k) The Commission shall not issue any subpena for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written or other matter which would require the presence of the party subpenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the State wherein the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process except that, in any event, the Commission may issue subpenas for the the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of written or other matter at a hearing held within 50 miles of the place where the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process."

Sec. 3. Section 103(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 103. (a) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2)."

Sec. 4. Section 103(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–42)."

Sec. 5. Section 104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975) is amended to read as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

"(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;

"(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, and

"(4) serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

The Commission may, for such periods as it deems necessary, concentrate the performance of its duties on those specified in either paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) and may further concentrate the performance of its duties under any of such paragraphs on one or more aspects of the duties imposed therein.

"(b) The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as either the Commission or the President shall deem desirable, and shall submit to the President and to the Congress a final and comprehensive report of its activities, findings, and recommendations not later than September 30, 1967.

"(c) Sixty days after the submission of its final report and recommendations the Commission shall cease to exist."

Sec. 6. (a) Section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(a)) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per diem."

Sec. 7. Section 105(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof."

Sec. 8. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d) as amended by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(h)) is amended by adding a new subsection at the end to read as follows:

"(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The excerpt and letter presented by Mr. Hart are as follows:

Excerpts From February 28, 1963, Message From President of the United States to the Congress—House Document No. 75

III. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been in operation for more than 5 years and is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. During this time it has fulfilled its statutory mandate by investigating deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. The Commission's reports and recommendations have provided the basis for remedial action both by Congress and the executive branch.

There are, of course, many areas of denials of rights yet to be fully investigated. But the Commission is now in a position to provide even more useful service to the Nation. As more communities evidence a willingness to face frankly their problems of racial discrimination, there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress. Agencies of State and local government, industry, labor, and community organizations, when faced with problems of segregation and racial tensions, all can benefit from information about how these problems have been solved in the past. The opportunity to seek an experienced and sympathetic forum on a voluntary basis can often open channels of communication between contending parties and help bring about the conditions necessary for orderly progress. And the use of public hearings—to contribute to public knowledge of the requirements of the Constitution and national policy—can create in these communities the atmosphere of understanding which is indispensable to peaceful and permanent solutions to racial problems.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has the experience and capability to make a significant contribution toward achieving these objectives. It has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy changes but about the administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective. If, however, the Commission is to perform these additional services effectively, changes in its authorizing statute are necessary and it should be placed on a more stable and more permanent basis. A proposal that the Commission be made a permanent body would be a pessimistic prediction that our problems will never be solved. On the other hand, to let the experience and knowledge gathered by the Commission go to waste, by allowing it to expire, or by extending its life only for another 2 years with no change in responsibility, would ignore the very real contribution this agency can make toward meeting our racial problems. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national civil rights clearing house providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public; that in order to fulfill these new responsibilities, the Commission be authorized to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention; and that the life of the Commission be extended for a term of at least 4 more years.

IV. EMPLOYMENT

Racial discrimination in employment is especially injurious both to its victims and to the national economy. It results in a great waste of human resources and creates serious community problems. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the democratic principle that no man should be denied employment commensurate with his abilities because of his race or creed or ancestry.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, reconstituted by Executive order in early 1961, has, under the leadership of the Vice President, taken significant steps to eliminate racial discrimination by those who do business with the Government. Hundreds of companies, covering 17 million jobs, have agreed to stringent nondiscriminatory provisions now standard in all Government contracts. One hundred and four industrial concerns—including most of the Nation's major employers—have in addition signed agreements calling for an affirmative attack on discrimination in employment; and 117 labor unions, representing about 85 percent of the membership of the AFL-CIO, have signed similar agreements with the Committee. Comprehensive compliance machinery has been instituted to enforce these agreements. The Committee has received over 1,300 complaints in 2 years—more than in the entire 7½ years of the Committee's prior existence—and has achieved corrective action on 72 percent of the cases handled, a heartening and unprecedented record. Significant results have been achieved in placing Negroes with contractors who previously employed whites only, and in the elevation of Negroes to a far higher proportion of professional, technical, and supervisory jobs. Let me repeat my assurances that these provisions in Government contracts and the voluntary nondiscrimination agreements will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced.

In addition, the Federal Government, as an employer, has continued to pursue a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment and promotion programs. Negro high school and college graduates are now being intensively sought out and recruited. A policy of not distinguishing on grounds of race is not limited to the appointment of distinguished Negroes—although they have in fact been appointed to a record number of high policymaking, judicial, and administrative posts. There has also been a significant increase in the number of Negroes employed in the middle and upper grades of the career Federal service. In jobs paying $4,500 to $10,000 annually, for example, there was an increase of 20 percent in the number of Negroes during the year ending June 30, 1962—over three times the rate of increase for all employees in those grades during the year. Career civil servants will continue to be employed and promoted on the basis of merit, and not color, in every agency of the Federal Government, including all regional and local offices.

This Government has also adopted a new Executive policy with respect to the organization of its employees. As part of this policy, only those Federal employee labor organizations that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color will be recognized.

Outside of Government employment, the National Labor Relations Board is now considering cases involving charges of racial discrimination against a number of union locals. I have directed the Department of Justice to participate in these cases and to urge the National Labor Relations Board to take appropriate action against racial discrimination in unions. It is my hope that administrative action and litigation will make unnecessary the enactment of legislation with respect to union discrimination.

V. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

Wherever possible, this administration has dealt sternly with such acts. In 1961, the Justice Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission successfully took action to bring an end to discrimination in rail and bus facilities. In 1962, the 15 airports still maintaining segregated facilities were persuaded to change their practices, 13 voluntarily and 2 others after the Department of Justice brought legal action. As a result of these steps, systematic segregation in interstate transportation has virtually ceased to exist. No doubt isolated instances of discrimination in transportation terminals, restaurants, restrooms, and other facilities will continue to crop up, but any such discrimination will be dealt with promptly.

In addition, restaurants and public facilities in buildings leased by the Federal Government have been opened up to all Federal employees in areas where previously they had been segregated. The General Services Administration no longer contracts for the lease of space in office buildings unless such facilities are available to all Federal employees without regard to race. This move has taken place without fanfare and practically without incident; and full equality of facilities will continue to be made available to all Federal employees in every State.

National parks, forests, and other recreation areas—and the District of Columbia Stadium—are open to all without regard to race. Meetings sponsored by the Federal Government or addressed by Federal appointees are held in hotels and halls which do not practice discrimination or segregation. The Department of Justice has asked the Supreme Court to reverse the convictions of Negroes arrested for seeking to use public accommodations; and took action both through the courts and the use of Federal marshals to protect those who were testing the desegregation of transportation facilities.

In these and other ways, the Federal Government will continue to encourage and support action by State and local communities, and by private entrepreneurs, to assure all members of the public equal access to all public accommodations. A country with a colorblind constitution, and with no castes or classes among its citizens, cannot afford to do less.

VI. OTHER USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The basic standard of nondiscrimination—which I earlier stated has now been applied by the executive branch to every area of its activity—affects other programs not listed above:

Although President Truman ordered the armed services of this country desegregated in 1948, it was necessary in 1962 to bar segregation formally and specifically in the Army and Air Force Reserves and in the training of all civil defense workers.

A new Executive order on housing, as unanimously recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in 1959, prohibits discrimination in the sale, lease, or use of housing owned or constructed in the future by the Federal Government or guaranteed under the FHA, VA, and Farmers Home Administration program. With regard to existing property owned or financed through the Federal Government, the departments and agencies are directed to take every appropriate action to promote the termination of discriminatory practices that may exist. A President's Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity was created by the order to implement its provisions.

A Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces has been established to investigate and make recommendations regarding the treatment of minority groups, with special emphasis on off-base problems.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy now has Negro students for the first time in its 87 years of existence.

The Department of Justice has increased its prosecution of police brutality cases—many of them in Northern States—and is assisting State and local police departments in meeting this problem.

State employee merit systems operating programs financed with Federal funds are now prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race or color.

The Justice Department is challenging the constitutionality of the separate but equal provisions which permit hospitals constructed with Federal funds to discriminate racially in the location of patients and the acceptance of doctors.

In short, the executive branch of the Federal Government, under this administration and in all of its activities, now stands squarely behind the principle of equal opportunity, without segregation or discrimination, in the employment of Federal funds, facilities, and personnel. All officials at every level are charged with the responsibility of implementing this principle; and a formal interdepartmental action group, under White House chairmanship, oversees this effort and follows through on each directive. For the first time, the full force of Federal executive authority is being exerted in the battle against race discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The various steps which have been undertaken or which are proposed in this message do not constitute a final answer to the problems of race discrimination in this country. They do constitute a list of priorities—steps which can be taken by the executive branch and measures which can be enacted by the 88th Congress. Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past; and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

In addition, it is my hope that this message will lend encouragement to those State and local governments, and to private organizations, corporations, and individuals, who share my concern over the gap between our precepts and our practices. This is an effort in which every individual who asks what he can do for his country should be able and willing to take part. It is important, for example, for private citizens and local governments to support the State Department's effort to end the discriminatory treatment suffered by too many foreign diplomats, students, and visitors to this country. But it is not enough to treat those from other lands with equality and dignity—the same treatment must be afforded to every American citizen.

The program outlined in this message should not provide the occasion for sectional bitterness. No State or section of this Nation can pretend a self-righteous role, for every area has its own civil rights problems.

Nor should the basic elements of this program be imperiled by partisanship. The proposals put forth are consistent with the platforms of both parties and with the positions of their leaders. Inevitably there will be disagreement about means and strategy. But I would hope that on issues of constitutional rights and freedom, as in matters affecting our national security, there is a fundamental unity among us that will survive partisan debate over particular issues.

The centennial of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation is an occasion for celebration, for a sober assessment of our failures, and for rededication to the goals of freedom. Surely there could be no more meaningful observance of the centennial than the enactment of effective civil rights legislation and the continuation of effective Executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1963.*

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Commission on Civil Rights, I respectfully transmit herewith copies of a legislative proposal for extending the life of the Commission.

The proposed legislation would, inter alia, extend the Commission for 4 years, authorize it to serve as a national clearinghouse to provide civil rights information and technical assistance to requesting agencies, and permit the Commission to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention. The provisions of the draft bill implement the portion entitled "Extension and Expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights" of President Kennedy's message on civil rights, delivered to the Congress on February 28, 1963.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that enactment of this draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN A. HANNAH,
Chairman.

LET US TRY TO DO AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE ABROAD; LET US GET THE U.S. ECONOMY MOVING; LET US TACKLE OUR MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT REALISTICALLY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the desk until the close of business on March 28 so as to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to cosponsor this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; will lie at the desk as requested; and, without objection, will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit I.)

The bill (S. 1121) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87-658) introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I believe that my introduction of this bill will not come as a surprise.

On April 25, 1962, when S. 2965 was reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, I filed separate views in which I clearly predicted that the sum authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill—$900 million—was insufficient to do the job.

Mr. President, I wish I could stand here today and admit that my prediction was wrong—that the amount authorized to be appropriated had been sufficient—and that the serious pockets of chronic unemployment throughout the Nation had been eradicated or significantly decreased.

Eleven months ago, in my separate views, I stated:

> However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

At that time, I referred to my proposed amendment to raise the amount authorized to be appropriated to less than half the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance—namely $2,645 million.

I stated at that time, Mr. President:

> In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.
>
> I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction—for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans—of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my separate views to S. 2965 be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it may be that my suggested amendment focused attention on the insufficiency of the amount authorized to be appropriated and was instrumental in increasing that amount from $600 million to $900 million. But even that amount has not proven to be sufficient.

On March 7, the Department of Labor reported that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in February increased to 6.1 percent of the civilian labor force. This was up from 5.8 percent in January, despite the fact that customarily there is little change in the unemployment rate from January to February. The February 1962 rate was 5.6 percent.

This means, Mr. President, that in February 1963, 4,918,000—nearly 5 million—men and women were seeking employment and could not find it.

This continued chronic unemployment cannot be permitted to endure. The time has come for a massive effort to make taxpayers out of these tax consumers. They seek work. Let us give them work.

I said last year it was no time for half-measures.

It is even less a time for half-measures this year.

Consider, Mr. President, what continued unemployment does to a man and his family. Continued want and deprivation do not reaffirm a man's faith in the strength of our economic system.

And yet, Mr. President, that system is strong—as strong as it ever was. Our problem is to take sufficiently energetic steps at the correct time. Let us not do too little too late.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. President, that we did just that last year. Who can say what the results would now be if, last year, we had authorized the appropriation of three times the amount authorized under the Accelerated Public Works Program? How many of the nearly 5 million unemployed today would now be gainfully employed? How many of this nearly 5 million unemployed would today be taxpayers instead of tax consumers? How many of the families of these men and women would today have been able to hold their heads high and say that their fathers or mothers were gainfully employed and they were not dependent on handouts?

Mr. President, we will not be able to meet a serious unemployment problem with half-measures, or with quarter-measures. We tried it last year and it did not work.

Now one of the arguments advanced last year against my proposal to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works measure was that the States could not possibly spend all that money.

In an effort to prove this argument fallacious, I wrote all the States having areas of chronic unemployment asking how much could be spent on worthwhile public works projects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may have 5 more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, when I reported to the Senate on May 17, 1962, on the responses received up to that date—only 12 States—fewer than one-fourth of the total number—indicated that they could use $1,566 million.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that date and some of the exhibits inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

Mr. GRUENING. I stated at that time:

> The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greenville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku-Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?
>
> For myself the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars, then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

I am again today addressing to the Governors of all the States having serious pockets of chronic unemployment, a letter requesting the information as to the public works projects ready to go upon which unemployed men and women can be put to work.

At the appropriate time, I shall report to the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the Senate the results of this inquiry.

But I have no doubt at all that we shall find that there can be spent on useful, needed public works projects, throughout the land, more than the sum of $2,645 million which I propose to authorize to be appropriated for the accelerated public works program. In view of the $900 million already authorized, this is only an increase of $1,745 million.

As a matter of fact, the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, at a press conference on February 8, 1963, stated that at the end of January, the backlog of applications for funds for projects expected to meet program standards was $1,069 million. In addition, new projects were coming in at the rate of $300 million every month or $3,600 million per year.

It is not, therefore, a question of whether the money can be well spent in putting American unemployed men and women to work. The worthy projects exist. The necessary projects exist.

The question is: Are we willing to make the effort to get America rolling—to give America the shot in the arm it needs to get it rolling—to make an all-out effort to stimulate the American economy at the level required to drastically reduce these pockets of chronic unemployment?

For myself, I can only see an affirmative answer.

For myself, I can say only that when one considers what we are doing in the way of assisting the economies of countries abroad, there can be no question about our doing at least as much here at home for our own unemployed—for our chronically unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from Mr. Batt's press conference and a list of unemployed percentages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment expresses the amount authorized as the equivalent authorized to be appropriated for the following economic foreign aid purposes:

	Million
Sec. 202: Development loan fund	$1,500
Sec. 212: Development grants	380
Sec. 402: Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451(a): Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have drafted my amendment in this fashion, Mr. President, rather than expressing the sum in figures, because I desire to call attention to the fact that we are granting this same sum—and indeed more in various other ways—to aid the economies of foreign countries—to reduce the unemployment problem in foreign countries—and that we literally cannot afford to continue to do that unless we do at least as much for the unemployed here at home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator on his initiative, and I wish to assure the Senator that a number of his colleagues, as he well knows, have joined in reexamining the entire accelerated public works program. The President has submitted a supplemental request of $500 million under last year's authorization, which is sorely needed. In fact, the local communities have set aside by bond issue the necessary funds for local community cooperation, as prescribed by law. I am convinced that we could well use a substantially larger sum of money, at least double what we did last year, for the accelerated public works program, to meet the necessities of existing projects which are already funded and already prepared and already designed by the local jurisdictions.

I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation. I know that I can expect from him the same kind of cooperation, as we meet together shortly to get at the new program of accelerated public works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. No Member of the Senate has been more concerned about the unemployment problem, this tragic situation which is not a mere statistic but affects the lives and happiness and welfare of millions of Americans, or has shown more concern about getting the economy moving again, than the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

EXHIBIT I

A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87-658)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 87-658 (76 Stat. 541), approved Sept. 14, 1962, is hereby amended by striking out the words "the sums of $900,000,000" in section 3(b), thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 402, and 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

EXHIBIT II

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this onetime appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

	Millions
"Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500
Sec. 212—Development grants	380
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction—for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans—of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

EXHIBIT III

LET US JUST ONCE DO AT LEAST HALF AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE IN FOREIGN LANDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2965—the emergency public works bill—which it is my intention to call up at the appropriate time.

The amendment is simple.

It raises the amounts authorized to be appropriated for emergency public works from $600 million to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." Those are the exact words of my proposed amendment. However, in order that my colleagues may have the amendment before them in customary form, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have previously served notice of my intention to offer this amendment in my individual views in the committee's report on S. 2965. I ask unanimous consent that those views be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment seeks only to place our domestic program for alleviating unemployment in a position of equality with what we are doing abroad. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and I sincerely trust that it will be—there still will not be equality.

The amendment which I propose would raise the maximum authorized to be appropriated for the program of emergency public works from $600 million to $2,645 million computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund (for fiscal year 1963 only)	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

Actually the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of much more than $2,645 million for foreign economic aid. Actually, for the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1963, section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500 million for each of these fiscal years or a total of $7,500 million for the five.

Thus, even with the adoption of my amendment, there would be authorized to be appropriated for this "one shot" program of emergency public works to help our own unemployed only about one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

I wish to make it crystal clear that my amendment does not affect or apply to the standby provisions of S. 2965. Actually, it can be said that my amendment moves up the $2 billion authorized for a program of standby public works to the emergency program and says in effect that emergency intended to be met by the standby program is upon us now.

And, considering the all too many pockets of depression of the United States, that is by no means an exaggeration.

We cannot accurately judge the human misery stalking our land by looking at the overall rate of unemployment.

During the week ending April 28, 1962, insured unemployment in Nome, Alaska, was 33.5 percent. It was no comfort to the unemployed worker in Nome to know that the national rate of insured unemployment during the same week was 4.3 percent.

The unemployed worker in Fairbanks—insured unemployment rate 17.9 percent—could derive little comfort from the fact that the Congress was talking about standby public works when things get worse.

How much worse must it get, Mr. President, before the Congress acts to relieve to the extent possible unemployment in the numerous pockets throughout the Nation?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table, prepared by my office, of unemployment in Alaska for the week ending April 28, 1962. These figures have been derived from the Labor Market Bulletin issued by the Alaska Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is no time to stand by. This is a time for bold, decisive action. In my opinion, nothing can be more heartrending than a man—a husband and a father—who cannot find work to support himself and family even though, week after week after week, he trudges wearily from door to door seeking such work. It is distressing for single men with no family responsibilities.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith has written an excellent book entitled "Our Affluent Society" showing that more people in the United States are now living at a higher standard than ever before. I agree with the picture he has drawn in his book and I am happy that it is so.

But in rejoicing at the greater affluence of more and more of our people, let us not overlook the almost one-fourth of our Nation who are living in abject poverty without hope for the future or for their children's future unless prompt and intelligent measures are taken at once. The plight of these 40 million Americans is graphically pictured in a recent book by Mr. Michael Harrington, entitled "The Other America," published by Macmillan Co. this year. I commend it highly to my colleagues for it brings to our attention forcefully the need for immediate action—and action on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem.

As long as this problem exists for some 40 million Americans it is our inescapable duty to face it and to eliminate it as far as it is humanly possible. Our obligation to these Americans, in my judgment, supersedes aid for impoverished people in other lands. Moreover we shall be able to help these people in foreign countries all the betted if we raise our own living standards and put an end to the costly wastes of chronic unemployment.

In this—the richest of all lands—such a situation cannot and should not be tolerated.

Nor should we meet an emergency situation with halfway measures. We should not delude the people of the Nation. We must bring to bear on a solution of this problem all the resources that are needed. To do less is little better than doing nothing at all. To do less would be to disappoint millions of unemployed men and women throughout the country who are looking to Congress for action now.

According to the report from the Area Redevelopment Agency of the Department of Commerce as of May 1, 1962, 933 areas in the United States are designated as eligible to take part in the area redevelopment program. These are divided as follows: 148 urban-industrial areas; 735 rural and small labor markets; and 50 Indian reservations.

These areas have a population of 34.7 million people and a labor force of 13.2 million. Of the latter 1.4 million are unemployed. Thus these areas have 19 percent of the Nation's population and 19 percent of the Nation's labor force, but they have 31 percent of the unemployed of the country.

Now what is proposed to meet the persistent high rate of unemployment of these 933 areas throughout the Nation?

It is proposed in S. 2965 to authorize the appropriation of $2 billion for a program of public works on a standby basis, usable only if the total unemployment in the Nation rises to a predetermined figure. In addition, it is proposed to authorize the appropriation of an additional $600 million for an emergency, immediate public works program. This sum averages about $600 for each man and woman unemployed in these designated areas, assuming the entire amount is spent on wages, which, of course, will not be the case.

My amendment would quadruple that sum.

That quadrupled sum would be much more realistic considering the magnitude and the urgency of the problem.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that my proposal would not take a single penny from the foreign aid program. It merely uses the particular wording to point up the fact that we would be spending on this one-shot, emergency program here at home far less than we are spending abroad for economic aid.

The foreign aid program would continue as now authorized and the money appropriated for that program would remain intact, if Congress approves.

I know that the question will be raised: Can the sum you propose to spend on public works within 27 months actually be spent by the States economically and efficiently within that period of time.

It should be raised, and answered, because I do not want to propose anything here that would lead to wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. I know that none of my colleagues want to do so either.

But I do know that along with me many of my colleagues are concerned that we do enough to meet the problems of persistent unemployment in the 933 designated areas throughout the country.

In order to obtain the answer, I wired the Governors of the 50 States of the Nation and asked them the question and asked them to be specific in their replies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my telegram to the Governors of the States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have to date received replies from the Governors of only 12 States who have indicated that they are ready to go with public works projects totaling $1.6 billion.

I also ask unanimous consent that the detailed replies received from the Governors of these States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, let no one here delude himself.

We shall either spend this $2,645 million on constructive investments in the future economic strength of the United States—in schools, hospitals, roads, sewer and water works, dams, airports and the like—or we shall spend that and much more in the next 27 months and in the years to come in unemployment compensation and in welfare payments, and suffer the loss of tax revenue which fuller employment will generate.

We cannot long neglect our own resources—human and natural—while building the resources of foreign nations. At stake is not our willingness to continue to aid the less developed countries, at stake is our ability to continue without at the same time renewing our own strength.

We can renew that strength by a program of public investments of the magnitude which I propose by my amendment.

In the years 1955–61, we have granted to foreign nations, for foreign economic aid projects of exactly the same type as would be constructed under my amendment, millions upon millions of American dollars.

Can we afford to do less for our own people at a time when many of the areas of our nation are so hard pressed?

Can we afford to do less for the unemployed of the United States when we are doing so much for the unemployed and others abroad?

As one reads about the flight of capital from Latin America one cannot but compare the lack of faith of the rich of those nations with the abiding faith of our unemployed who are willing to pitch in and work but lack only the opportunity to work.

I ask, Mr. President, for an additional $2 billion to give our own citizens the same chance that we have given and are giving to the citizens of other lands.

The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greeneville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars.

For myself, Mr. President, the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

Mr. President, to date I have received replies from Governors of the following States giving the amounts which they could use for public works which could be completed in 27 months:

State:	*Amount*
Alabama	$50,500,000
Alaska	64,184,400
California	183,000,000
Colorado	20,926,000
Connecticut	28,545,000
Hawaii	24,111,912
Maryland	92,590,000
Michigan	639,000,000
Nevada	4,968,000
Ohio	329,259,645
Washington	40,000,000
West Virginia	89,155,950

It is obvious from even this response that in all the States at least four times the amount of funds which I propose could be spent on useful public works projects to relieve unemployment in areas of chronic unemployment.

My proposal is really a very modest one considering the need.

EXHIBIT 1

On page 10, line 2, and on page 11, line 1, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".

EXHIBIT 2

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

ERNEST GRUENING.

EXHIBIT 3

Private industry insured unemployment rates by administrative area and industry

By administrative area	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
State	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	6,500	19.9
Anchorage	3,005	16.7	3,198	17.8	3,315	18.4
Fairbanks	1,220	17.9	1,322	19.3	1,664	27.6
Juneau	282	10.5	294	10.9	328	11.5
Ketchikan	276	10.3	302	11.3	500	15.9
Nome	177	33.5	201	38.0	207	33.3
Petersburg	274	34.7	297	37.6	312	40.9
Sitka	88	7.2	85	7.0	165	13.8

By industry	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
Total	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	5,600	19.9
Mining	201	17.4	257	22.3	310	27.6
Construction	2,044	45.0	2,238	49.3	2,706	46.6
Manufacturing	1,035	19.7	985	18.8	1,232	21.5
Transportation and utilities	462	6.6	542	7.7	502	8.3
Trade	503	6.2	571	7.0	627	8.3
Finance	56	3.7	51	3.4	80	5.7
Service and other	1,021	19.8	1,055	20.5	1,043	21.0

[1] Insured unemployment rate.

EXHIBIT 4

APRIL 18, 1962.

Senate Public Works Committee today reported emergency public works bill authorizing appropriation of $600 million for one-shot effort for public works projects in economically distressed areas. As member of committee, I expressed concern that sum authorized was totally inadequate to meet Nation's needs. Would appreciate your writing me as soon as possible giving me as much information as possible concerning public works projects in economically distressed areas of your State which could be completed in 27 months, giving estimated costs and man-hours of work which would be provided.

EXHIBIT 5

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, May 2, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We have gathered the following information from the Alaska Department of Public Works.

Of the approximately $388,812,748 listed as capital improvement needs for the next 6 years, approximately $99 million would be paid for by the State of Alaska, exclusive of any Federal moneys made available under Federal grant-in-aid programs. A summary of this $388,812,748 program is set forth on page 8 of the attached document, "A Capital Improvement Program for the State of Alaska, 1962–68." Projects which are to be financed in whole or part from State or local funds are summarized on pages 11 through 17.

As you can see, we have a considerable inventory of buildings, structures and improvements that should be built. We do not have a great many projects ready to be advertised at this time, but we should be able to add to the list fairly quickly providing that we can obtain Housing and Home Finance Agency advances for advance planning and providing that the various bonding proposals pass. With the incentive provided by a public works act, such as S. 2965, the State could prepare a number of the more uncomplicated projects, such as classroom additions to State-operated schools, small State-operated schools for contract, and make application for Housing and Home Finance Agency planning advances and grants for the more extensive projects. Actually, we are now working on a number of applications for HHFA advances and grants for the planning and design of a number of State-operated schools and various facilities at the University of Alaska.

Accordingly, the following list of projects which are designed, are being designed, or will be designed in next year, very substantially understates our ability to utilize S. 2965 in carrying out the purpose of that act. In this connection, I should note that the capital improvement program is a conservative document. In preparing the capital improvement program many needed projects were deleted to hold the program within the State's ability to finance.

The projects which probably most nearly qualify for immediate consideration under a standby public works act are:

1. The International Airport Terminal buildings projects at Anchorage and Fairbanks, representing a value of $3.8 million and $1.8 million, respectively, are fully complete and ready for bidding.
2. Projects which are now in the planning stage with design completion anticipated before August of this year are Salcha Elementary School ($160,000), Eagle River School addition ($288,000) Soldotna School addition ($183,000), and Glen Allen refrigeration and foundation ($55,000). Funds for these projects have been provided under the 1962–63 State education budget. The total for these schools is $686,000.
3. At present, three applications are being prepared for submittal to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an "Advance for Public Works Planning." If approved, funds would be available to complete architectural-engineering design for the Ninilchik School addition ($400,000), the Metlakatla Elementary School ($600,000), and the Fort Yukon School addition ($260,000). Approximately 5 months will be required before these projects would be "set to go." The total for these schools is $1,260,000.

4. The following schools might be ready for contract this year if the $5 million bond issue for State operated schools passes:

Ambler School	$55,000
Eagle River (further classroom addition)	52,000
Delta Junction	516,000
Homer	554,000
Tanana	252,000
North Kenai	554,000
Sterling	150,000
Chugiak High School	1,200,000
McGrath	78,000
Brown's Ct	160,000
Fortuna Ledge	78,000
Total	3,649,000

NOTE.—The legislature appropriated $75,000 for planning and design for Chugiak High School. Some preliminary work has already been done on this project.

5. The vocational school at Nome, although funded under a $1,500,000 general obligation bond authorization, is another project which could qualify. Final plans could be completed within 5 months.

6. If the $7,200,000 bonding program for the University of Alaska passes, money will be available for the construction of an addition to the engineering and physical sciences building, a biological sciences and renewable resources building, completion of the university's new heating plant, and other related facilities.

7. Invitations to bid on the construction of fire and crash stations at the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports, approximately $180,000 each will be advertised this June.

8. A $160,000 addition to the Miner and Minerals Building in Anchorage may be erected in the 1963 construction season.

9. Proposed water and harbors projects scheduled for the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons which are not yet under contract are:

Angoon, docks	$50,000
Cordova, floats	50,000
Craig, dock	40,000
Douglas, floats	45,000
Homer, floats	65,000
Hydaburg, dock	25,000
Hyder, float	7,500
Klawock, dock approach	40,000
Kodiak, floats	30,000
Ninilchik, floats	23,000
Seldovia, floats	65,000
Seward, floats	46,000
Valdez, floats	38,000
Wrangell, floats	31,000
Total	555,500

NOTE.—Considerable work has been done on some of the foregoing projects or is now underway. Since this work is already contracted out, it is not reflected in the above estimated cost figures. Other projects which are now under contract are also not reflected.

10. The following bush airfields are programed for construction in the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons:

New Stuyahok	$15,000
Alitak	50,000
Anvik	15,000
Buckland	10,000
Chevak	15,000
Circle City	7,500
Egegik	20,000
False Pass	10,000
Goodnews	10,000
Holikachuk	15,000
Kasaan	5,000
Koliganek	10,000
Koyukuk	$15,000
McCarthy	49,000
Metlakatla	5,000
Nulato	25,000
Ouzinkie	30,000
Pilot Point	15,000
Quinhagak	5,000
Russian Mission	15,000
Shakeluk	7,400
Shungnak	10,000
Stebbins-St. Michael	10,000
Tanunak	15,000
Togiak	10,000
Total	393,900

I have omitted mention of projects planned for our annual $37 to $40 million Federal aid highway program and the Federal aid airport program. I gather that these programs will not be affected by the proposed standby public works act.

If I can supplement any of this information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GARY THURLOW,
Executive Assistant.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 7, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram of April 18, it is estimated that the State of California could initiate and accelerate $183 million in public works projects and complete them within a period of 27 months. These projects would utilize an estimated 18 million man-hours of labor at the job site.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *May 2, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Review of public works of our State indicates that nearly $400 million would be needed for the completion of the total public works projects contemplated in the next 3 to 4 years in economically distressed areas when limited to projects believed to have a completion date within a 27-month period. The total would amount approximately to $40 million. This latter figure would represent specific items such as buildings, utilities, etc. The larger figure given would include such items as dam completion, the canal possibility, atomic generation of electric power, and steam generation coal plants.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Public Works Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am happy to supply the information you requested in your recent telegram regarding the emergency public works bill.

The accompanying data, compiled by our department of highways, relates to roadway construction contemplated or underway in the counties of Lincoln and Mineral, the two Nevada counties officially recognized by the Federal Government as depressed under the area redevelopment program.

I trust the enclosed data provides you with the information you desire. If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Cordially,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

Road contracts to be completed within approximately the next 27 months, Lincoln and Mineral Counties, Nev.

	Estimated construction cost	Estimated man-hours
Lincoln County:		
Project S-544(10) U.S. 93 from 14 miles southeast to 1 mile north of Alamo (15 miles)	$1,600,000	150,000
Project S-544(9) U.S. 93 from 14 miles to 22 miles southeast of Alamo (8 miles)	700,000	63,000
Project F-008-1(3) SR 25, from 2d St. to 6th St. in Panaca (0.5 mile)	70,000	7.000
Subtotal	2,370,000	220,000
Mineral County:		
Project F-004-1(3) U.S. 6 from 8.6 miles east of California-Nevada State line to 3.5 miles east of Basalt (6.7 miles) (construction underway)	948,000	86,000
Project F-004-1(4) U.S. 6 from California-Nevada State line to 8.6 miles east (8.6 miles) (construction underway)	1,100,000	99,000
Project S-525(1) FAS 525 from Nevada-Scheelite mine north to U.S. 50 (19.1 miles) (25 percent of this project in Mineral County)	550,000	52,000
Subtotal	2,598,000	237,000
Grand total	4,968,000	457,000

STATE OF COLORADO
Denver, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegram of April 18, we are enclosing a list of public works projects in Colorado redevelopment areas that reportedly could be initiated and completed in 27 months subject to availability of funds.

This information was accumulated through contact with various city and county officials and State agencies.

We are not entirely familiar with the criteria for eligibility to participate under the terms of the proposed legislation or with the legislative definition of public works. We have not, therefore, attempted to evaluate whether or not all of the listed projects could qualify for assistance under the proposed legislation.

We were not able to obtain an assessment of the man-hours of work which would be provided by the projects as engineering studies are not available in connection with most of the proposals.

Very truly yours,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Alamosa		Water service to East Alamosa	$250,000
		Community youth center	200,000
		Addition to county courthouse	150,000
		Storm sewer and curb and gutter for East Alamosa	50,000
		Dike and river work on Rio Grande through city of Alamosa	50,000
		Total	700,000
	Alamosa	Paving city streets	386,000
		Extending airport runway	40,000
		New water well, mains, and extensions	100,000
		Enlarge sewer lagoons	50,000
		Storm sewer, South Alamosa	60,000
		Sanitary sewer system; new major trunkline	330,000
		Total	966,000
		Total, Alamosa County	1,666,000
Clear Creek		Georgetown Reservoir	360,000
	Idaho Springs	Short wave communication system for city and county	8,000
		City street paving	75,000
		Sewage disposal plant	20,000
		Total	103,000
	Georgetown	Sewage disposal plant and collection system	100,000
		Develop Georgetown Lake as recreational area	225,000
		Rebuild water distribution system	100,000
		Total	425,000
		Total, Clear Creek County	888,000
Conejos		No county projects reported	
	Antonito	75 low-cost dwellings for transient workers	400,000
		Waterline	60,000
		Sewer system	180,000
		Total	640,000
	La Jara	No projects reported	
		Total, Conejos County	640,000
Costilla		County courthouse and jail	225,000
		County shops	100,000
		Fort Garland community building	35,000
		Hospital addition	50,000
		San Luis Water and Sanitation District sewage system	(1)
		Total	410,000
	Blanca	Water and sanitation system	(1)
		Total, Costilla County	410,000
Gilpin		Improvement, Corona Pass Rd	225,000
	Blackhawk	Water system and sewage disposal plant	75,000
	Central City	Water system and sewage disposal plant	100,000
		Recreational development, park, etc	25,000
		Total	125,000
		Total, Gilpin County	425,000
Huerfano		County courthouse and jail	1,000,000
		Surfacing county roads to ski and other scenic areas	239,000
		Acquisition and development of irrigation system for development of recreational facilities for Huerfano-Cucharas area.	3,000,000
		Waterfowl development	110,000
		Total	4,349,000
	La Veta	Expansion of sewer collection system and disposal plant	40,000
		Water filter plant	65,000
		Total	105,000
	Walsenburg	Sewage disposal plant	158,000
		Street paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewer system	500,000
		Rebuilding and extending waterlines	100,000
		Purchase and install watermeters	108,000
		Extension of sewerlines	42,000
		Rebuilding electric distribution system and expanding electric production facilities	1,500,000
		City park recreational area	50,000
		Mine museum	18,000
		Senior high school	750,000
		Total	3,226,000
		Total, Huerfano County	7,680,000

---

[1] No estimate.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department—Continued

Area County	 City	Description	Estimated cost
Las Animas		Grade and pave Cucharas Pass for 12 miles	$1,000,000
		Construction of 2-mile connecting roads between 2 State highways	40,000
		Recreational development at fairgrounds	50,000
		Pave connecting road from Aguilar to Highway 111	200,000
		Develop mountain recreation area	100,000
		Enlargement of North Lake	100,000
		Enlargement of Monument Lake	200,000
		Alkali Creek Reservoir	100,000
		New road construction, North Fork, Purgatoire River	50,000
		Total	1,840,000
	Aguilar	Filter plant and water distribution system	200,000
	Cokedale	Pave streets	50,000
		Water distribution and storage	300,000
		Total	350,000
	Trinidad	New sewage lines and disposal plant	627,000
		Animas St. Bridge over Purgatoire River	230,000
		Rebuild water distribution system and water storage facilities	2,230,000
		Curb and gutter and paving	1,500,000
		Garbage, refuse, and disposal	40,000
		Police and fire building	200,000
		Development of Monument Lake Recreational Area	2,000,000
		Total	6,827,000
		Total, Las Animas County	9,217,000
		Grand total	20,926,000

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, April 27, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. E. S. Preston, director of highways, has estimated that in the 20 counties which have been declared as distressed areas, that his department could have the capacity to develop plans and complete $250 million worth of highway construction projects in the next 27 months. There is now under construction in the same area 102 miles of highways estimated to cost $79,797,000. He further estimates that the $250 million highway construction program would generate 28 million man-hours of work.

This area, I think, will be benefited immeasurably by the improvement of the highway situation which I think contributes very largely to the chronic depression that exists. If it is difficult to move man and materials into a community, then this community does not lend itself to industrial or economic development. Other programs can be of assistance, but there is no program that can be more helpful and is as basic as is the improvement of the manner of transportation.

I have asked our director of public works to also report on the necessities of this area with reference to public works generally and, as soon as those figures are available, we will make them available to you.

With all best personal wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Ohio Brush Creek Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Adams	$3,530,700	321,920	3	$3,000,000	Construction plans needed.
Brush Creek and Shawnee State Forests.	Timber stand improvement, roads and trails, structures.	do	442,060	268,350	1	(1)	
Trimble water system	Village distribution system	Athens	60,000	4,081	1	5,000	Plans complete.
Strouds Run State Park development.	Buildings, water and sewer, camping, swimming beach, roads and parking docks and ramps, reforestation.	do	600,000	50,000	3	50,000	Estimate 10,000 annual increase park attendance. Dow Lake in this park is an attraction which far exceeds facilities available.
Waterloo, Gifford, and Athens Park State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	74,011	45,260	1	(1)	
Belmont Lake	Road relocation	Belmont	205,000	17,083	1		Plans complete.
Barkcamp State Park	Buildings, water and sewer, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation, camping, picnic areas.	do	700,000	58,000	3	500,000	New park with lake ready for filling except for road relocation. Would serve transient trade using Interstate 70.
White Oak Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Brown	3,106,783	121,872	3	1,500,000	Construction plans needed.
Stonelick State Park development	Camping area	Clermont	250,000	20,833	1	150,000	Construction plans complete.
Salt Fork Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Guernsey	2,157,600	206,757	1	4,000,000	Construction plans complete. Includes road relocation and land needed.
Hocking State Park development	Camping area	Hocking	257,000	21,417	1	100,000	Plans complete.
Hocking and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	244,215	138,650	1	(1)	
Richland Furnace State Forest	do	Jackson	426,000	252,000	1	(1)	
Dean State Forest	TSI, roads and trails	Lawrence	48,500	30,000	1	(1)	
Forked Run State Park development	Camping area	Meigs	70,000	5,833	1	50,000	Do.
	Buildings, roads and parking, reforestation.	do	75,000	6,000	3		
Shade River State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	94,825	41,370	1	(1)	
Burr Oak State Park development	Camping area	Morgan	110,000	9,167	1	75,000	Do.
Wolf Run Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Noble	577,830	48,153	2	500,000	Need construction plans.
Pike State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	Pike	416,800	243,900	1	(1)	
Ross County Lake	Recreation	Ross	400,000	25,000	1	50,000	Feasibility report being completed.
Scioto Trail and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	526,600	329,300	1	(1)	
Shawnee Recreational Area	Construct 3 impoundments and reconstruct another for recreation.	Scioto	506,933	42,245	2	150,000	Need construction plans.
Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	1,322,400	813,900	1	(1)	

See footnote at end of table.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio—Continued

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Lake Hope State Park development	Camping area	Vinton	$86,000	7,167	1	$150,000	Plans complete.
	Cabins, water and sewer, swimming pool, roads and parking.	do	1,300,000	108,000	3	320,000	Estimate of 64,000 annual increase in park attendance.
Wheelabout Reservoir	Recreational impoundment	do	130,000	6,667	2	150,000	Construction plans needed.
Zaleski and Tar Hollow State Forests	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	533,343	320,225	1	(1)	
Muskingum River locks and dams	Repairs to locks and dams 1 to 8, inclusive for recreation and commerce.	Washington	677,870	56,489	1	233,000	Construction plans needed. Preliminary design on No. 6 completed.
	Fishermen's access and boat ramps at 8 lock and dam pools.	do	20,000	2,000	1	48,000	These facilities would accommodate 16,000 fishermen per year.
Total			18,855,645	3,582,369			

---

[1] The improvement of the timber stands on State forests will not result in immediate financial returns to the community except for the wages paid to local workers; however, ample benefits will be enjoyed in future years. Timber stand improvement includes tree planting, pruning crop trees, thinning dense stands, and removal of cull trees and vines. The increases in value to the remaining stand will result from more rapid growth and higher quality timber. Under Ohio conditions, this improvement will often double the volume of wood produced. The cutting and fabricating of the raw materials will support local industries and attract new users of wood to these dependable sources of supply. Recreational benefits will accrue also. Wild land under intensive forest management produces maximum populations of wildlife.

OHIO

Project cost summary by counties

Adams	$136,050
Athens	19,280,700
Belmont	989,630
Brown	114,080
Clermont	61,050
Gallia	7,597,360
Guernsey	3,268,563
Highland	19,080
Hocking	1,460,860
Jackson	19,080
Lawrence	101,360
Meigs	536,360
Monroe	19,080
Morgan	903,360
Noble	229,080
Pike	81,080
Portage	17,517,223
Ross	137,080
Scioto	2,580,360
Vinton	972,050
Washington	557,510
Southeast Ohio	3,823,709
Total	60,404,705

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, April 19, 1962.

The Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Senate Public Works Committee's approval of President Kennedy's $2.6 billion public works program to combat unemployment is encouraging. With 268,000 workers, 9.2 percent of our labor force, currently unemployed in our State, we feel the need of this legislation is eminent.

You ask for information concerning Michigan's ability to participate in the $600 million immediate effect provision of the program.

We currently have 53 areas in our State that qualify under this legislation as area redevelopment or eligible labor surplus areas. In an analysis I recently conducted, I found that we are ready to embark upon capital improvement programs totaling $639 million that would provide approximately 60,000 man-years of employment. These figures were developed only from those projects in Michigan that can meet the limitations of the $600 million proposal. They constitute, if anything, an understatement of the volume of activity that could be started in Michigan without delay.

While we have not projected our figures to a period longer than 12 months, it is our belief that the backlog of public works projects that could be initiated at the present time in Michigan would certainly absorb any extension of the time and financial limits of the program.

Concerning the time duration of the project, I urged the House Public Works Committee to grant a flexible time limit for project duration. Due to weather conditions in Michigan, a limit of 12 months would prohibit the initiation of some public works projects that might otherwise qualify.

My statement to the House Committee on Public Works contains a detailed breakdown of the type of projects we could initiate in Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of this statement for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, April 26, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The following is a list of public works projects as requested in your telegram of April 18:

Ansonia area:	
Ansonia-Derby flood control project	$6,000,000
Street and road reclassification project	250,000
Sewage disposal plant	1,000,000
Additional recreational facilities	100,000
Reconstruction of Route 34 in Derby from 3d Street to A Street	200,000
Reconstruction of 0.2 mile of Route 115 and railroad underpass, Maple Street to Broad Street, town of Seymour	1,000,000
Reconstruction of 1.5 miles of Route 115 in Derby and Ansonia from Route 34 to Colburn Street	800,000
Bristol area:	
City hall (Bristol)	1,630,000
Civic center (Bristol)	450,000
Fire station (Bristol)	250,000
City streets (Bristol)	2,000,000
Sewage treatment plant (Bristol)	2,535,000
Airport (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Industrial park (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Construction of truck climbing lane on Route 69, Bristol	205,000
Widening approximately 1 mile of Route 6, Bristol, in Jerome Avenue vicinity	250,000
Extension of truck climbing lane on Route 6 in Plymouth from end of 1962 construction to vicinity of Todd Hollow Road	100,000
Correcting sight line on Route 6, in Plymouth, in the vicinity of Orchard and Kellogg Streets	150,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Sewer treatment plant and pumping station (Killingly)	$800,000
Town dump and incinerator (Killingly and Putnam jointly)	700,000
Downtown renewal project (Killingly)	3,000,000
Town roads drainage and repair (Killingly)	100,000
Sewage facilities and disposal (Plainfield)	500,000
Recreational project	150,000
Correction of sight line on Route 169 1 mile south of Brooklyn town line	75,000
Reconstruction of 1.2 miles of Route 171 from Thompson town line to Quinebaug River	400,000
Reconstruction of 2.6 miles of Route 169 in Pomfret and Woodstock from Route 44 to Route 171	700,000
Reconstruction of Maple Street, Killingly, from Route 6 to Route 101	375,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 south of Route 6 underpass	200,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 in Putnam and Thompson from 300 feet south of Route 12 to 0.5 mile north of Route 193	4,500,000
Resurfacing of Main Street, Killingly	100,000

The estimated cost of the above-listed projects is $28,545,000 including $19,865,000 in local projects and $8,680,000 in State highway department projects.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 25, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Governor Tawes has asked me to reply to your telegram of April 18 regarding possible public works projects in persistent labor surplus areas of Maryland.

To date we have been able to learn of 23 projects in such areas whose total cost is estimated at approximately $92,590,000. It is estimated that total man-hours would exceed 15,600,000.

The single most expensive project would be the relocation of U.S. Route 40 as a 4-lane highway for a distance of 112 miles from Hancock, Md., to Washington County, Pa.

This would traverse five labor surplus counties. The estimated construction cost for the entire highway, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition, is $84,400,000 providing an estimated 15,275,000 man-hours of work.

The most critical Allegany County project is the construction of a new Pinto Bridge and improvement of the road from the bridge to U.S. 220. The existing bridge is wholly inadequate for the movement of employees to and from the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory and efficient delivery of some materials to the plant. The estimated cost for this project is $1 million involving 100,000 man-hours.

There are at least four projects in Washington County including the proposed North-East Highway at a cost of $400,000 and 75,000 man-hours. A new water transmission main from Williamsport to Hagerstown would cost $1,450,000. There is no estimate of the number of man-hours. A project involving sewer system extensions in Hagerstown and other Washington County towns would cost $3,500,000. Again there is no estimate of man-hours. Sewer and water main extensions and highway improvements to a proposed industrial park would cost $670,000. The number of man-hours is unknown at this time. The total cost of these Washington County projects is $6,020,000. Man-hours were computed for only one of the four projects; i.e., 75,000 man-hours.

Seventeen projects for the city of Cambridge in Dorchester County were proposed and a tabulation is enclosed. The total cost is $1,070,000 involving 196,800 man-hours.

We are also endeavoring to uncover other appropriate projects and will forward details next week.

I hope this information will be useful and please wire or phone if additional details are required.

Cordially,

ROBERT M. SPARKS,
Chief, Business and Industrial Development.

City of Cambridge, Md.—List of projects which could be completed in 27 months

No. and name of project	Approximate cost	Approximate labor-hours
1. Improvements to Race St	$19,000	4,000
2. Streets and utilities, Plaza Park, part 1	18,500	4,000
3. Improvements to Maryland Ave	12,000	3,200
4. Extension of Goodwill Ave	13,500	3,500
5. Streets and utilities, Parkside subdivision	33,000	6,000
6. Sewage pumping station, Stone Boundary Development	20,000	3,800
7. Bozarth Farms area, drainage	33,000	6,000
8. Improvements to sewage system, Jimson Rd	33,000	6,000
9. Repair shop and garage, public works department	9,000	2,400
10. Sewer, storm water separation, Fairmount Ave	70,000	12,000
11. Improvements to Leonards Lane	80,000	14,000
12. Drainage improvements, Dorchester Ave	24,000	4,300
13. Drainage improvements, Phillips Ave., Robbins St	30,000	5,400
14. Sludge disposal units, sewage treatment plant	200,000	40,000
15. Improvements to water distribution system	340,000	58,000
16. Woods road to wire cloth intercepting sewer	100,000	18,000
17. New 1,000,000 gallons per day well	35,000	6,200
Total	1,070,000	196,800

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Montgomery, April 23, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: At the request of Governor Patterson, I am pleased to furnish the information requested in your telegram of April 18, 1962, regarding emergency public works which might be completed in Alabama in 27 months.

Both the State highway department and the State conservation department, which would be largely responsible for emergency public works, made estimates and plans sometime ago. Engineering has been completed and it is believed all projects could be commenced within 6 months.

The following estimates, in broad categories, cover proposed projects in those areas declared economically depressed:

County roads and bridges	$3,500,000
State highways	8,000,000
Interstate highways	20,000,000
Reforestation, water, and wildlife conservation, State parks, fire control	19,000,000
Total	50,500,000
Man-hours are estimated as:	
Highway and roads	3,000,000
Conservation projects	6,000,000
Total	9,000,000

The Governor is in agreement that the suggested authorization would be very inadequate, particularly, if such funds are allocated to the States on the usual pro rata basis.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. WILLIAMS,
Director of Industrial Relations.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, May 3, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 18, 1962, concerning proposed public works projects in West Virginia.

I would first like to inform you of the situation with regard to public works projects in West Virginia and to give you some information relative to specific projects which could be accomplished under the proposed program.

At the present time, the State of West Virginia has a public works program based on the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program. We have elected to participate in this program with a stipulation that each recipient who receives assistance will work for that assistance. As of March 30, 12,600 men were employed under this program. As you know, this program is financed by both the Federal and State Governments on a matching basis, the State paying 30 percent of the cost and the Federal Government paying 70 percent.

One shortcoming of this program is that only individuals who are married with dependent children qualify. No employment is made available under this program for individuals who are not married or individuals who are married and have no children or whose children are grown.

Three million dollars in State funds have been appropriated for the coming fiscal year for emergency employment. I may, as chief executive, use these funds to match any Federal funds which may become available for the relief of unemployment. This, of course, means that should the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program be continued at the Federal level, these funds may be used for participation in that program.

It is my understanding that the public works plan proposed by President Kennedy will make Federal money available to various State and local governmental units on a 50–50 matching basis. I would like to strongly urge that consideration be given to a more favorable matching ratio in favor of State and local governments.

A program with a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State matching ratio would provide employment for approximately 7,000 to 12,000 persons. As only $3 million are available in State funds for matching purposes, a 50–50 matching ratio would only provide employment for 1,500 to 2,400 persons. These figures assume expenditures for material and equipment of 20 to 50 percent.

Enclosed you will find proposed projects from our State department of natural resources and from our State road commission. I would like to emphasize that these projects are only a sample of those projects which can be undertaken and completed within 27 months under this program and which would qualify under the rules and regulations of such program. It is anticipated that many projects at the community level, both county and municipal, would be submitted for accomplishment.

Again let me express my desire that Federal money be made available at less cost to the States.

I sincerely hope that this information meets your needs and that you will give every consideration possible to the suggestions which I have outlined. If I may assist you in any way or provide any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Yours truly,

W. W. BARRON,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, May 2, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is in reply to your recent cablegram wherein you requested information on public works projects which could be completed during the next 27 months in our economically distressed area (Hawaii County). The attached tabulation gives information on gross construction costs by major types of functions and the estimated number of man-hours needed to complete the projects. These represent projects which are currently authorized or those for which authorization begins on July 1, 1962, for the new fiscal year. It is estimated that all of these will be completed during the 27-month time period you cited.

I have not seen a copy of the proposed emergency public works bill. Hence, it is not possible to say if all projects included in this tabulation would be eligible for financial assistance. As you know, highways and airports now receive Federal grants. Perhaps these projects would not be eligible for further aid. It would also be of value to know if such financial assistance would be in the form of interest-free loans or grants. The mechanics of the proposed bill may affect an area's willingness to participate in the program.

Hawaii's public works program for the coming fiscal year is the largest in our history. Part of the reason for this scale of State public works is to stabilize our employment situation. However, all of us recognize that public works construction alone will not solve our Nation's unemployment problem. Increased public works construction is only one tool of many that must be utilized to spur the growth of our economy. The Area Redevelopment Act and the program of retraining unemployed persons are examples of other actions that will help. Some areas will continue to suffer chronic unemployment until new economic activities are introduced. The private sector of the Nation's economy must maintain a vigorous growth if public efforts to solve unemployment are to be successful. Thus, any public works program should be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage and promote increased employment through new permanent job opportunities.

I hope this provides you with the information you need. However, if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

William F. Quinn,
Governor of Hawaii.

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)

I. Public works division (miscellaneous public buildings and the State's share of a sewage treatment plant):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$1,351,412
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	122,184
II. Airports division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,500,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	320,000
III. Harbors division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,855,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	617,000
IV. Highways division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$14,427,500
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	1,978,000
V. Land and natural resources department (land development, parks, water develoment, forestry, fish and game):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$978,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	136,500
Total estimated contion costs	$24,111,912
Total estimated man-hours of work	3,173,684

EXHIBIT IV

PRESS CONFERENCE OF HON. WILLIAM L. BATT, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Batt. Now in terms of numbers the area redevelopment areas comprise about 1,000 counties in the United States, and in terms of numbers again the blue areas or the areas that are in only for public works comprise only 100. But these are much bigger cities, by and large. There are about the same number in the blue areas as there are in all the red areas.

The arithmetic works out a little something like this—let me see if I can recall it. In the areas taken together, these red areas and the blue areas, we have about a third of the country's population, about a third of the country's labor force, and over half of the country's unemployment. They are, of course, the areas of longtime labor surplus, the ones we work with, the coal towns, the textile towns, the iron towns, the Great Lakes, the lumber towns, Pacific Northwest, Indian reservations in the Southwest, and the cotton textile towns in the Southeast. You know the economics of them.

Now over 2,900 projects representing $361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds—because you remember the communities have got to match this 50-50—$361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds are in various stages. Some are actually underway, some are being planned, some are just in the process of approval.

Approximately 580,000 man-months of direct employment will be generated by all these projects with the same number of man-months of additional employment based on the normal ratio of direct to indirect labor on public works projects.

Now of the total, Federal agencies are using $110 million of this total $361 million for direct Federal projects for such purposes as conservation work in our national forests and wildlife ranges, medical and sanitary facilities on Indian reservations, modernization and extension of small post offices, and other authorized public works.

That is about 30 percent of the funds that have been allocated to Federal agencies who do their own construction substantially. That, of course, is 100 percent Federal.

The agencies we are talking about are the Forest Service, the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of Interior, several others in Interior; Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers.

The largest, Paul, are Interior and Agriculture?

Mr. Southwick. Yes.

Mr. Batt. Now the larger share, the 70-percent share, $251 million, has been earmarked for State and local projects. You see, the Congress said to give priority to the stuff that comes out of the communities, and this has been committed for waterworkers and water pollution control, for sewers, streets, hospitals, libraries, for police and fire stations, for public buildings, and many other types of needed community facilities for which communities put up matching funds.

About 50 percent of all the applications to CFA over here, Community Facilities Administration, are for sewer and water lines. I personally never realized how many communities didn't have any sewer lines or any water lines.

The response from local governments has been gratifyingly quick, demonstrating the strong desire of local communities to alleviate unemployment, and to get these public works built.

Our latest available figures, at the end of January, disclosed the following applications, expected to meet program standards, are on hand: Over in HHFA, CFA, $724 million. This is the backlog. This we haven't gotten to yet. HEW—and this is administered by the Public Health Service, waste treatment works $218 million, and hospitals $127 million, for a total backlog of $1.069 million.

And let me say parenthetically—this isn't in the printed statement—they are coming in at the rate of about $300 million every month.

Is that a fair statement, Paul?

The President is sending to Congress, sent to Congress yesterday a supplemental appropriation of $500 million to carry on this program. This sum was forecast in the 1964 budget recently transmitted to the Congress, and will exhaust the $900 million authorized in the accelerated Public Works Act.

It is clear, therefore, that there are already on hand more than enough applications for Federal and local projects to use up the funds authorized by the Congress for this program. Accordingly, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are suspending the accelerated public works program except for those especially hard-hit areas which have already been allowed matching ratios in excess of 50 percent. This is a relative handful of areas, about 20 percent of the total, where the unemployment is so severe that Congress directed us to provide matching ratios higher than 50 percent, going up to a total of 75 percent.

While applications from all areas will continue to be accepted and dated as to time of receipt, they will receive no further processing unless they are located in the hardest hit areas referred to previously.

Status of APW projects approved, by type of project, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Alabama	41	$4,254	7,028
Alaska	16	2,699	1,928
Arizona	15	2,935	4,192
Arkansas	60	1,274	2,542
California	62	6,916	8,732
Colorado	16	1,630	2,362
Connecticut	19	1,602	2,412
Delaware	2	93	223
Florida	25	3,099	5,407
Georgia	36	4,012	4,981
Hawaii	1	134	1,752
Idaho	37	2,367	2,645
Illinois	49	3,234	5,331
Indiana	25	1,758	3,413
Kansas	3	115	193
Kentucky	61	4,629	8,486
Louisiana	29	6,126	14,055
Maine	1	360	432
Maryland	3	158	583
Massachusetts	15	4,036	5,946
Michigan	111	15,814	20,952
Minnesota	41	4,196	6,230
Mississippi	27	2,302	5,611
Missouri	65	4,254	4,784
Montana	31	1,616	2,573
Nebraska	5	596	827
Nevada	2	200	276
New Hampshire	3	420	528
New Jersey	20	8,632	13,869
New Mexico	57	3,347	4,256
New York	28	6,284	7,130
North Carolina	46	3,032	5,370
North Dakota	2	275	528
Ohio	32	6,097	8,816
Oklahoma	23	3,430	7,944
Oregon	36	3,357	4,220
Pennsylvania	80	15,829	20,757
Rhode Island	6	2,786	2,196
South Carolina	20	1,400	1,524
South Dakota	3	650	1,104
Tennessee	32	5,538	14,112
Texas	27	2,627	4,808
Utah	34	1,211	1,746
Vermont	1	366	878
Virginia	11	100	209
Washington	46	4,144	3,281
West Virginia	56	6,017	5,365
Wisconsin	37	1,110	2,812
Wyoming	8	384	382
Puerto Rico	10	721	607
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Agriculture: Forest Service	741	$14,961	21,192
Army: Corps of Engineers	55	9,392	10,304
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads	34	8,141	5,436
Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service	181	40,004	56,951

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Community Facilities Administration	352	72,969	118,383
Interior:			
Bureau of Land Management	11	1,972	2,784
Bureau of Indian Affairs	19	5,701	9,984
National Park Service	10	1,736	5,310
Commercial Fisheries	1	380	540
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	12	2,910	5,454
Total, Interior	53	12,699	24,072
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by type of area, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Area	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months onsite employment
5(a)	340	$51,088	67,599
5(b)	809	49,771	76,607
5(br)	20	5,310	9,296
LS	247	51,997	82,836
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved by States as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Type	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on site employment
Construction and improvements:			
Hospital and health facilities	72	$21,639	31,598
Administrative building	47	12,627	19,774
All other buildings	44	5,340	6,914
Road and streets	261	20,965	24,171
Airports	5	1,374	2,448
Water, sewage facilities and other utilities	192	41,651	70,416
Waste treatment works	113	19,503	27,562
Recreational facilities	50	9,337	15,667
Water resources projects	15	3,355	3,626
Fish and wildlife facilities	9	2,180	4,662
All other construction	234	7,766	9,010
Repairs: All types of repairs	170	7,100	9,809
Conservation measures: All types of conservation	204	5,329	10,681
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN POWELL, WYO., AND THE PRESBYTERIAN RETIREMENT FACILITIES CORP.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I in-introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would permit the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp. This bill will remove impediments to the transfer of these lands. This organization, the Presbyterian Retirement Facilties Corp., intends to build a retirement home in the town of Powell, which will cost approximately $1 million. The junior Senator from Wyoming feels that the Senate and the Federal Government should do all that can be done to encourage private citizens and organizations to engage in this type of activity and development.

This retirement home will serve both the States of Wyoming and Montana.

I compliment the citizens of the town of Powell for their public spirit and for their desire to help serve the needs of their people and the people of that general area.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1122) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilties Corp., introduced by Mr. SIMPSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOWER TETON RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and for my colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], a bill to authorize construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, in Idaho.

The principal engineering feature of this project is a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site on the Teton River, a tributary of the Snake, in the high country of eastern Idaho. It includes also a pumping plant, a powerplant, transmission facilities, canals and water distribution facilities, ground water development, and related works.

The public purposes to be served by the project include river regulation and flood control, the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, the incidental generation of hydroelectric power, the conservation and development of fish and wildlife and the enhancement of recreation opportunities.

The dam itself would be an earthfill structure, 310 feet high, 2,500 feet in crest length. It would impound 315,000 acre-feet of water, of which 200,000 acre-feet would be active capacity. It is proposed to provide supplemental irrigation water to 114,400 acres of land presently under cultivation with a short water supply, and to irrigate 37,000 acres of land presently under dry land cultivation. The electric generating facilities are relatively modest, consisting of 22,000 kilowatts installed capacity, with most of this allocated to pumping and other project uses. Facilities to develop fish and wildlife resources, and to provide basic recreation facilities have been developed in cooperation with the appropriate State and Federal agencies, and are included in the project plan. Effectiveness of storage in the proposed Fremont Reservoir for flood control on the Teton River, the lower Henry's Fork, and on the Snake River below the mouth of Henry's Fork has been carefully appraised by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. President, the project has one striking feature which will be of interest to the Senate. It is almost entirely free from controversy. Idaho irrigators have long favored storage projects near the headwaters of our major river system. This is such a project. The value of the flood control features has been demonstrated by a series of losses on the Teton, Henry's Fork, and the Snake, which Corps of Engineers' studies show to be preventable only by a project of the type here proposed; local flood control works are not feasible in the areas affected. Fish and wildlife interests have been carefully protected in the project plan, and conservationists support it. The power features of the project are not controversial. In short, this is a project which clearly meets the needs of all major groups in the area, and it enjoys their full support. The principal difficulties in bringing it to the point of authorization have been largely technical, involving careful search for a location and a plan which would best serve the several purposes contemplated. These have now been resolved.

I offer the authorizing legislation with full confidence that the project proposed will stand up under the careful scrutiny it should have, in committee and in the Senate, and in the hope that it will be authorized during this session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague [Mr. CHURCH] in sponsoring this bill, which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project in Idaho. As my colleague just pointed out, this project has wide support throughout Idaho. Indicative of this wide support is the fact that both houses of the State legislature recently passed a memorial endorsing this project by a unanimous vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Memorial 3 of the Idaho State Legislature be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the senate joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas what is known as the Lower Teton project, situated in the County of Fremont, State of Idaho, and included in the recent comprehensive study of the Snake River by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers is highly essential to the uninterrupted growth and stability of Idaho agriculture; the economic benefits thereby accumulating to this great State particularly and the United States generally being many times greater than the cost of this project; and

Whereas the waters of the Teton River constitute a significant portion of the irrigation supplies available to eastern Idaho and, indeed, all of the Snake River Area and are therefore an important part of the water resource which is the foundation of our economic and industrial strength; and

Whereas if the irrigated farms of Idaho are to be maintained as secure units and survive in this technological age of specialized agriculture and its associated high operating costs, it is imperative that our present storage reservoirs be supplemented with new facilities to store the high water near its source, thereby further eliminating the danger of drought and its attendant hardships in all of the irrigated areas of the Snake River; and

Whereas each succeeding board of county commissioners has, since the creation of Madison and Fremont Counties, been confronted with the serious annual problem of the wild, ravaging Teton River, all of which conditions would be eliminated through the construction of said project; and

Whereas even in years of mild snowfall in the watershed, the Teton River can be depended upon to provide at least several weeks of round-the-clock effort to protect private and public property from the flood water of the Teton. Madison County maintains 11 bridges across the Teton, 2 with steel spans, 3 reinforced concrete and 6 lumber bridges. Many times, serious damage to these structures has resulted from the uncontrollable destructive force of the flooding Teton. The bridges blocked by ice jams and the normal debris of high water become dams—forcing the floodwaters out onto surrounding farming lands destroying its productive capacity for 1, 2, or 3 years. The Idaho State Highway Department maintains four bridges across the Teton within the boundaries of Fremont and Madison Counties and the Union Pacific Railroad system has three. Each of these bridges has, in the past, been the source of serious trouble and great maintenance expense because of the uncontrolled flooding Teton; and

Whereas each year, almost without exception, many square miles south and west of Teton City lie underwater as a result of the Teton flooding, and frequently private homes and storage facilities are jeopardized. Because of the slow and meandering course of the Teton it is impossible to predict where it will strike next; and

Whereas eastern Idaho counties maintain hundreds of miles of oil road—not including State or Federal highways—the foundations become sponge-like under the saturation of floodwaters so that even light loads break the mat into thousands of pieces making complete resurfacing necessary; and

Whereas the benefits of flood control, irrigation and associated economic expansion has justified consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers and our recommendation for construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir without delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to and construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir with the least possible delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Army Engineers and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.
PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, most of the large and important multiple-purpose dams on the principal rivers of the Northwest have already been constructed. Now it is important that we turn to the building of the smaller dams on the tributaries and feeder streams of the major rivers. If the Congress approves the construction of this dam on the Lower Teton, we will be doing much to stabilize our watersheds and protect to the fullest extent multiple uses of our downstream water. By the proper programing and development of our upper watersheds, we are not only helping the economy of those people in the local areas immediately concerned, but we are also protecting the economy of those who depend on the mainstream.

This type of operation—building smaller dams and reservoirs on the tributaries and feeder streams—is never as glamorous and spectacular as the building of the high dams with their beautiful big lakes which spread for miles. But they may be even more important in full resource development.

This particular project is in the proper place to demonstrate multiple purpose—flood control, irrigation, power, and recreation—and the fact that the local people are spontaneous in their approval indicates they believe this project at this site will give them the maximum benefits.

It pleases me very much to know that we in Idaho are now on the way to meeting the problem of stabilizing our watersheds by planning projects such as this. This is a step in the right direction, and I trust that the Congress will give speedy consideration to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1123) to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF NEVADA STATEHOOD

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, next year will mark the 100th anniversary of Nevada's statehood. In keeping with the spirit of this notable occasion, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Nevada Centennial Commission 20,000 silver medals.

At a later date, Mr. President, I shall speak in more detail on the remarkable history of my native State. At this time, however, I deem it appropriate to point out that Nevada entered the Union during a time of great conflict. Less than a year after its admission as the 36th State, the war between the States had ended, and the great President who made possible that statehood was the victim of an assassin's bullet.

Out of this modest beginning, Mr. President, grew a State that has enriched our Nation in manifold ways. From the fabulous mines of the Comstock Lode in Virginia City poured gold and silver that provided the needed stimulus for the burgeoning of San Francisco as the metropolis of the West. That same Virginia City also provided the Nation with one of its most brilliant scientists. I refer to Albert Michelson, the renowned physicist who developed techniques for measuring the speed of light, and was the first American to receive the Nobel Prize for Science, in 1907. And it was Albert Michelson's brother, Charles, a highly competent newspaperman, who gained fame as President Franklin Roosevelt's chief press strategist.

Mark Twain began his newspaper career on the Territorial Enterprise in Virginia City, having come west with his brother Orion, who was Nevada's territorial secretary of state.

Nevada's history is peopled with many luminaries, but the growth and its progress can be measured more by those nameless individuals who had an undimmed faith in their State's future and worked accordingly toward a goal of greater progress for the generations that were to follow.

Ours is a glorious history, Mr. President, and I am sure that passage of this measure providing special medals for Nevada's centennial will contribute materially to the observance that is being planned for 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1125) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GOLDEN CIRCLE DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a development survey of the recreation resources of the magnificent Golden Circle area which surrounds the four corners area of Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. The survey would be made in cooperation with the Governors of the four States and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and appropriate State, local, and Indian agencies.

At present, separate Federal and State agencies are making isolated plans for the development of this area. I feel it is time that a program be devised for overall, related development of the area, so that both Federal and State agencies, as well as private enterprise and local tourist and recreation groups in the various communities, can work more closely together. We need to assess the present situation and future needs so that all can begin to move toward a common goal.

This area is famous as the only place in our country where four States touch. More important, it is without question the most spectacular area of erosional grandeur in America. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall named it "the Golden Circle" after he and I traveled it on foot, by boat, and by helicopter in the summer of 1961. He observed at that time that it "included the greatest concentration of scenic wonders to be found in the country, if not in the world." I am sure that anyone who has seen even part of the rainbow and sunset-hued canyons, majestic spires and weird erosion formations, deep gorges, rivers, mountains, deserts, and prehistoric Indian ruins of the Golden Circle will agree.

At the present, over 80 percent of the land is in Federal or trusteeship ownership, and there are five separate Federal agencies which have land management responsibilities in the area—the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation. At least four of these five have major programs for the construction of highways, roads, and trails within the region, in addition to the Bureau of Public Roads, and State and county road construction agencies of the four States. Eight of the fifteen counties in the immediate Golden Circle area have been classified as low-income counties for purposes of the Area Redevelopment Act.

A major objective of the survey would be to study efforts now underway to establish easier public access to the national parks and monuments and to the associated scenic, recreation, and Indian areas of the four States. Recommendations would be made for additional roads or trails which must be built if the area is to be provided with the network of roads it must eventually have. Our aim should be to provide easy access not only to each of the scenic areas, but between them, so that a visitor to one of the Golden Circle attractions will be encouraged to go on and see others, and to stay in the area for several days.

Additionally, the study would be aimed at finding ways and means of stimulating economic development of the region through increased tourism and recreation activities. To do this we need an inventory of present resources and facilities, which, tied in with the inventory of present roads and the recommendations for future ones, will point the way for coordinated development by Government and private agencies, and by private capital. For example, the survey should serve as a guide for private investors who want to develop tourist accommodations, and other commercial enterprises to serve the greatly increased tourist trade expected in the area.

Within the Circle are 16 national parks and monuments, and just outside within an easy drive are 8 others. My own state has Bryce and Zion National Parks and Arches, Capitol Reef, Cedar Breaks, Natural Bridges, and Rainbow Bridge National Monuments. Part of Hovenweep National Monument straddles the Utah-Colorado line. Canyonlands National Park, which I am proposing in S. 27, lies in the heart of the Circle in southeastern Utah's colorful landscape.

In Colorado, Mesa Verde National Park lies within the Circle, and the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument is not far outside. Aztec Ruins, Chaco Canyon, and El Morro National Monuments are located in New Mexico. Arizona's portion of the Circle contains the famed Grand Canyon National Park and Canyon de Chelly, Navajo, Wupatki, Pipe Spring, and Sunset Crater National Monuments.

In addition to the scenic wonders, an integral part of the appeal of the area comes from the Indian culture there—which ranges from the modern to the prehistoric. The present-day Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations constitute a substantial portion of the land area of the Circle itself. The culture of the early cliffdwellers is preserved at Mesa Verde, and in the pueblo country of New Mexico to the east. Still further back in time, some of the earliest Indian pictographs are visible in Canyonlands and elsewhere—irreplaceable relics of a culture and a way of life which flourished in this region more than 800 years ago.

As if all of this were not enough, the miracle of modern engineering is creating in the very center of the area the great Lake Powell Reservoir which is backing up behind the Glen Canyon Dam. The left diversion tunnel of the dam was closed only last Wednesday, and it is expected that by midsummer Lake Powell will be 150 miles long, and reach a point above Hite, Utah. This heralds the beginning of boating and other year-round recreation on a great manmade lake which will eventually exceed 65 square miles in area.

The entire Golden Circle area, which sweeps across four States, possesses a unique unity, arising from the very vastness of time and space. It is a geographic, economic, and social entity, and it is to the recognition of this unity that my bill is addressed.

My fellow members on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will recall the economic study of the proposed Canyonlands National Park by the University of Utah. This survey will draw heavily on the material developed in the university study—expanding and implementing it as necessary. That study, you will remember, indicates that the establishment of Canyonlands, as proposed by my bill, could attract half a million tourists each year to the State of Utah. In reference to the Golden Circle concept, the reports point out that the proposed Canyonlands National Park would be greatly benefited if the public came to think in terms of a more or less unified area offering an enormously diversified range of recreation sites. Conversely, I venture to say that all existing parks and monuments would benefit from the establishment of Canyonlands as would associated State, local, or private facilities. It is clear, therefore, that the opportunities for economic advancement in the 15-county area of the 4 States would be further enhanced by the comprehensive and coordinated development of the Golden Circle concept.

In order to give at least a surface indication of the vast economic potential of regional park and recreation development, I should like to refer again to the University of Utah's economic study. Between 1951 and 1961, the year in which the study was conducted, the number of visitors to national parks and monuments of the Golden Circle grew at an average rate of 7 percent a year. In 1961, nearly 3 million people passed through the 15-county area and stayed anywhere from a few hours to more than a week. They bought food, lodging, personal services, and gasoline in an amount estimated to be in excess of $28 million, thus generating $7.7 million indirect personal income to retailers and employees. Based on the assumption that the Glen Canyon Recreation Area and the Canyonlands National Park are completed, university economists estimate that over 15 million people will visit the Golden Circle in another 25 years. Expenditures of these visitors could, by that time, be as much as $169 million a year.

Now the reliability of these estimates can be assessed only after the passage of time. I feel, however, that if time proves the estimates wrong, the estimate will have been made on the conservative side. In 1962, for example, 3,142,000 visitors traveled to the Golden Circle's national parks and monuments. This represents better than a 9-percent increase over 1961's attendance figure of 2,877,000 people. The largest numerical increase occurred at Grand Canyon National Park where nearly 200,000 more people visited in 1962 than the year before.

I believe the evidence at hand clearly indicates that optimum long-run economic benefits will accrue to the 15-county area only through the protection and orderly development of the Golden Circle's most valuable asset—the remarkable unique quality of the scenic resources. Since careful study is a prerequisite in any development plan, I am asking that $150,000 be appropriated to finance this first step.

On March 11, this body passed S. 20, the enabling legislation for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which points up the national need—and support—for coordinated recreation planning among Federal and State agencies. The bill I am introducing today is in harmony with S. 20—and I presume that the survey would be conducted by that Bureau.

But I emphasize that this would be a survey of and by an area—a survey in which the States and local agencies would cooperate and would have full opportunity to make recommendations. Likewise, its purpose is not only to help State and Federal agencies to direct their planning toward a common goal, but to point out opportunities for private capital in the area, and to promote the economic development of the cities and towns which lie within the circle and in its associated areas.

The success of any plans that may be recommended by the study will depend to a considerable degree on the cooperation and initiative of private interests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1132) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the Golden Circle of National Parks and Monument and associated scenic, recreation and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FISHERY MARKETING ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fishery Marketing Act.

On April 2, 1962, in the 87th Congress, Senator BARTLETT joined with me in the introduction of legislation that warranted the attention of the Congress and all who have concern for the welfare of our fishing industry. Hearings were held in Seattle, Ketchikan, Petersburg, Anchorage, Dillingham, and Kodiak on October 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and November 8, 1962. From these hearings came this decision to reintroduce an amended version of that bill, S. 3093, an act to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends.

Today's proposal has for its broad purpose the establishment of a sound economics relationship between fishermen, fish dealers, and canners—a relationship beneficial to the further development of the fishing industry and of service to the public interest.

This bill would amend the Fisheries Marketing Act of 1934, an act originally designed to provide fishermen as primary producers with the right of self-association for cooperative improvement of their conditions. The amendment seeks to bring the Marketing Act up to date by relating it to the practical problems that presently cloud the rights of fishermen to associate themselves together, whether in unions or cooperatives, and collectively bargain for a fair return on the fish harvested by their labors at sea.

The need for this legislation has grown steadily more urgent during recent years. The reasons are complex but generally boil down to a single major consideration. As a result of antitrust actions and Federal Trade Commission rulings, many fishermen find themselves in what amounts to a legal no man's land when it comes to bargaining collectively with fish buyers over the conditions and price under which they will deliver their fish. Likewise the buyers, be they dealers or canners, cannot engage in group bargaining with fishermen.

Many harmful results flow from this unusual condition. First and foremost is that fishermen and buyers, often at the height of the harvesting season, have disagreements over the price of fish. Unable to bargain out their differences around a table, they engage in a constant and sometimes lengthy bickering. Meanwhile, all suffer losses; fishery management and conservation deteriorates; needed technological improvements fail to materialize and an important basic industry slips steadily backward.

The existing unstable relationships did not arise overnight, nor are they the product of any particular group or governmental agency. The problem arose primarily because of the peculiar circumstances of the industry itself, because of the unique status of the fisherman as a sort of combination producer-worker-independent entrepreneur. In short, fishermen simply do not fit into the legal patterns created for other groups.

Undoubtedly, there is no quick prescription to produce stable relationships in the fishing industry. However, the Marketing Act does appear to offer the most constructive possibilities. It has already been relied upon extensively and can best be adapted to the special characteristics of the industry. What would seem to be in order is that the Marketing Act be amended to clearly establish the legal right of all fishermen to organize into associations of their own choosing, unions or cooperatives, and the reciprocal right of such associations and buyers or associations of buyers to engage in collective bargaining over fish prices or other methods of compensation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1135) to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

USE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD RECORDS AND TESTIMONY OF BOARD PERSONNEL REGARDING AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board relating to the bill, and a statement of the purpose and need for the proposal be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1136) relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents.

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A BILL "RELATING TO THE USE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD RECORDS AND TESTIMONY OF BOARD PERSONNEL REGARDING AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS"

Pursuant to sections 701 and 702 of the Federal Aviation Act, the Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with responsibility for investigating and determining the probable cause of accidents involving civil aircraft, and making reports concerning such accidents. This function is discharged in large measure by investigators employed by the Board's Bureau of Safety. Written reports are prepared by these investigators as to all accidents investigated by them, which embody their factual observations and conclusions. These reports are submitted to the Board and form the basis for the Board's accident reports.

Section 701 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 continues a provision of the Civil Aeronautics Act prohibiting the introduction in evidence in liability litigation cases of Board reports relating to the investigation of the accidents involved in such litigation. Since such Board reports would in any event be ruled inadmissible under the law of evidence upon objection of any opposing party, the congressional purpose in absolutely excluding them clearly is to protect the integrity of the Board's accident investigation function by preventing involvement thereof in liability litigation. The statute as now worded, however, does not literally cover expert opinion evidence given by way of live testimony of Board accident investigation personnel. Yet in some jurisdictions expert testimony is compellable by subpena.

In an effort to provide assistance to private litigants where necessary for the purpose of establishing the facts concerning a particular accident, and at the same time to avoid undue interference with its duties and functions, the Board, under authority of its rulemaking powers (Federal Aviation Act, secs. 204, 701, 49 U.S.C. 1324, 1441), has promulgated regulations governing the disclosure of information relating to accidents and the appearance of its investigators as witnesses. These regulations, in brief, provide for the disclosure of the factual observations of investigators and the withholding from disclosure of their expert conclusions and opinions. Accident investigators may testify, preferable by deposition, only as to facts observed by them, and then only after permission has been granted by the Board upon a showing that the factual information is not readily available from any other source. Investigators also are prohibited from producing Board records except where authorized by the Board. These regulations and their bases were the subject of detailed discussion in *Universal Airlines* v. *Eastern Air Lines*, 188 F. 2d 993, and apparently were regarded by the court as reasonable. The court there held that the courts ordinarily should receive the deposition of a Board investigator rather than require his personal attendance and that opinion evidence should not be required. The court stated, however (188 F. 2d at pp. 999, 1000): "That in any case where the CAB investigator is the sole source of evidence reasonably available to the parties, with regard to the precise position and condition of aircraft after a disaster, we deem it to be incumbent upon the Civil Aeronautics Authority to make his testimony available by deposition or in person; if the deposition is not forthcoming or is insufficient, the court has power to order his personal attendance."

The procedures and principles enunciated in the Universal case provide a basis whereby both private and public interests may be safeguarded. Under those procedures, no private litigant will be denied factual testimony essential to establishing his case. At the same time, requests for testimony of accident investigators are kept to a minimum since, in most cases, the physical facts relating to an accident are not in dispute, and investigators are desired as witnesses primarily for the purpose of providing expert testimony. Moreover, advance requests for permission to take an investigator's deposition or for his appearance in court permit a scheduling of duties so that minimum interference results to the Board's functions. However, the Board's regulations often are overlooked or ignored, and subpenas are served upon investigators without prior resort to the procedures established by the Board's regulations.

The Board therefore proposes legislation which, in a form binding on all courts, (1) prohibits expert opinion testimony by the Board's accident investigation personnel in liability litigation; and (2) restricts factual testimony to cases where factual evidence is not reasonably available from other sources.

Comparison With Existing Law: Title VII—Aircraft Accident Investigation Accidents Involving Civil Aircraft—Use of Board Records and Testimony of Board Personnel as Evidence

Section 701. (e) No part of any report or reports of the Board relating to any accident or the investigation thereof, shall be admitted as evidence or used in any suit or action for damages growing out of any matter mentioned in such report or reports. Members or employees of the Board who have directly engaged in the investigation of an aircraft accident shall not give expert or opinion testimony concerning such accidents in any such suit or action. Factual testimony of Board personnel on matters observed in accident investigation shall be required only where the Board initially, or the court before which such suit or action is pending, determines that the evidence is not reasonably available by other means. Unless otherwise authorized by the court, such factual testimony shall be taken only by deposition upon oral examination or written interrogatories, pursuant to regulations issued by the Board.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an Oregon Dunes National Seashore comprised of some 42,000 acres of Oregon's spectacular coastline, including adjacent forested slopes and fresh water lakes, would be established under a bill which I now introduce.

The proposed Oregon Dunes Seashore, which I visited last week with the esteemed Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, would extend south from the mouth of the Siuslaw River for about 40 miles. In addition to the magnificent beach area, the boundaries would include all or parts of 14 lakes. Most of the land area involved is presently in Federal, county, or State ownership. Acquisition costs, will be relatively modest, in my opinion.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the bill I am introducing today is substantially different from the bill I introduced in the 87th Congress. This new version excludes from boundaries of the new national park unit the highly developed residential and summer home sections of Woahink and Siltcoos Lakes. Moreover, this new bill prohibits the Secretary of Interior from acquiring improved residential property by condemnation. Property of this type within the boundaries of the national seashore can only be acquired by exchange, purchase, or donation.

I also wish to point out that the new proposal will permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters within the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, in accordance with laws of the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, in my opinion this new legislation will give Oregon and the Nation a seashore area of unparalleled beauty, with proper protection for its scenic, scientific, and recreation values. During our visit to the area, last week, Secretary Udall reaffirmed the administration's hopes for establishing the new national seashore.

Aside from its scientific and scenic significance nationally, the Oregon Dunes are of vast importance to the economy of my State. This area has great recreation potential. Present and future generations need expanded outdoor facilities for relaxation and for the enjoyment of nature. Through Federal park development, Oregon would have another magnet for bringing tourist dollars to our economy, thereby creating new payrolls and income. An economic study by Dr. Granville Jensen, chairman of the department of national resources, at Oregon State University, shows that tourist business in the Oregon coast area alone would increase $18 million annually in the years after an Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park is developed.

In redrafting this legislation, I have endeavored to meet all of the various points of view that have been expressed, and, in the process, to make certain that we shall protect an important scenic and recreational resource, while at the same time promoting both economic growth and stability in this important area along the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1137) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, at this point will the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for her great interest in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore. I realize that her interest in it is of long standing, just as the interest in it of her late, great husband, was also of long standing.

I do not recall the exact statistics; but certainly we have all too few miles of national seashores in the United States. Of course, the first was Cape Hatteras; the second was Cape Cod National Seashore, in the State represented by the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. KENNEDY]; the third was at Point Reyes, on the Pacific Coast; and the fourth was at Padre Island, on the Gulf of Mexico.

I hope we shall move forward in this direction, because very, very few miles of our national seashore are left for the development of projects such as this.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Oregon that as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, which is chargeable with the consideration of measures relating to lake, seashore, and park problems, we shall do our very best to schedule an early hearing on the bill she is introducing; and I commend her very highly for her great interest in this area.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, who has long taken a great interest in the matter of establishing these seashore parks. He has referred to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and to the Cape Cod National Seashore. I am reminded of the fact that after the Cape Cod National Seashore was established, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] sent out a delightful Christmas card, that year, with a picture of the dunes on Cape Cod, and under the picture was the caption "Massachusetts' Gift to the Nation." I chided the Senator from Massachusetts a little about that, and said I thought the caption should have been, "The Nation's Gift to Massachusetts," because the Cape Cod National Seashore is of such great value to the Nation and to the State in which that park is located.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to associate myself with the purpose of the Senator from Oregon and the remarks of the Senator from Nevada. This Oregon Dunes Seashore is a magnificent project, and I hope it will be included in our national seashores, as an important addition to those created by the 86th Congress. I concur with the comments of the Senator from Oregon, and I shall be glad to support this project.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Alaska.

DISAPPROVAL OF RAILROAD MERGERS UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of Senator Jackson and myself, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not approve any railroad mergers until December 31, 1964. This measure should settle the problems of committee jurisdiction that came into question when a bill, S. 942, designed for the same purpose but amending the Clayton Act, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The goal of the bill introduced today—as it is of S. 942—is to delay approval by the Commission of pending mergers or consolidations of railroads until such time as there can be a review of the criteria by which these mergers are judged.

The jurisdiction and authority of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to investigate mergers or consolidations in any industry which affect the public interest is not questioned. However, it is the earnest belief of the Committee on Commerce that any proposed alteration or amendment of the transportation laws should be given primary consideration by our committee. Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act sets the standards for railroad mergers—the criteria to be applied and the procedures to be followed by the ICC in passing upon applications for consolidation or merger. This section is not separate or divorced from the rest of the Interstate Commerce Act, but is an intrinsic part of the whole spectrum of transportation legislation.

Consideration of this bill is particularly timely in view of the Report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers released by the White House on March 6, 1963. The report, an executive document, listed 10 criteria "which should be pursued in the evaluation of proposed mergers in order to determine whether they are in the public interest." These standards are advisory only in their application by the agency charged with examining and deciding pending cases since the Interstate Commerce Commission is independent of the executive branch.

It, therefore, becomes the duty of Congress and, more particularly, of the Commerce Committees of Congress, to decide whether these criteria should be specifically applied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1138) to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve or authorize, until December 31, 1964, the consolidation or merger of carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and Mr. Jackson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPEAL OF PORTION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942—56 Stat. 990, 999—as amended, and for other purposes, together with a letter to the President of the Senate from Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr., Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the letter from Mr. Knott appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1139) to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with "*Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds."

The letter presented by Mr. Young of Ohio is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 9, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency "To repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the legislative program of General Services Administration for 1963.

The language to be repealed constitutes section 317 of title 40 of the United States Code, which relates generally to the purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment in Government-owned or leased buildings in the District of Columbia, and reads as follows:

"All electric fans, water-cooling units and air-conditioning equipment procured by a Federal activity, except Government-owned corporations, and which are now, or may hereafter be, installed in Government-owned or leased buildings in the District of Columbia and area adjacent thereto, operated by the Administrator of General Services, shall be and remain in the custody and under the control of said Administrator without exchange of funds and irrespective of the appropriations from which such items were procured or the source from which they were obtained, and existing appropriations or, unless specifically so provided, future appropriations, other than appropriations to the Administrator of General Services, shall not be available for the purchase or installation of the equipment enumerated herein in such buildings, such restrictions shall not apply, however, to ventilating and temperature and humidity control equipment for special laboratory, scientific, and research purposes, the cost of the purchase and installation of which may be borne from the appropriations of the particular Federal agency utilizing such equipment, but such installations shall be subject to approval by the General Services Administration and subsequent to its installation the equipment shall be maintained and operated by the General Services Administration and shall remain under the custody and control of such Administration without exchange of funds."

This act has been the subject of much misinterpretation and misunderstanding on the part of the tenant agencies and has been the source of friction between representatives of General Services Administration and other agencies for the reasons stated below. The need for this act has long since run its course, since regulations issued pursuant to title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, require General Services Administration's approval of air-conditioning equipment in buildings operated by it and provide for the installation to be made by General Services Administration on a reimbursable basis.

In this age of mechanization air conditioning has become almost a necessity, largely because of the requirement therefor in the installation and operation of electronic data processing and other heat-emitting or constant temperature machines. General Services Administration cannot possibly foresee and budget for air conditioning essential to the operation of such machines, which may be installed at any time. Under the present law we can accept reimbursement for air conditioning and similar equipment in the District of Columbia only if it is determined to be for special laboratory, scientific, and research purposes, language so vague as to make the determination extremely difficult in many instances, but at the same time too narrow to cover many purposes for which electronic data-processing equipment is now being used.

In addition, the present trend toward block-type building design and the use of interior space in other types of buildings create a particular problem when heat-emitting equipment is used in nonventilated space. The normal design does not provide sufficient cooling to compensate for process equipment necessitating supplemental air-conditioning equipment, the need for which General Services Administration cannot anticipate. Unless we are permitted to accept reimbursement for this equipment, it may render the space unusable for the purposes intended.

The entire subject of reimbursement from the various departments and agencies which General Services Administration services has recently undergone a thorough analysis and a series of guidelines have been established which are more than adequate to cover the problem of accepting reimbursement for air conditioning in the District of Columbia.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

Enactment of this legislation will not increase the budgetary requirements of the General Services Administration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Lawson B. Knott, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

A Bill To Repeal a Portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, Approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as Amended, and for Other Purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with "*Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds."

NATIONAL LAKESHORE AT PICTURED ROCKS, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new bill for the establishment of a national lakeshore at Pictured Rocks, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

This area was one of three on the shoreline of the Great Lakes which the National Park Service selected as worthy of Federal investment as units of the national park system.

Since Senator McNamara and I introduced the first Pictured Rocks bill in 1961, we have held numerous conferences with property owners in the area, with representatives on the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. We believe we have evolved a bill which will help meet the outdoor recreation needs of the Nation while at the same time preserving the rights of property owners and contributing to the economy of the area.

The bill which we introduce today embodies the following features:

It establishes a national lakeshore of aproximately 67,000 acres on the south shore of Lake Superior, stretching from Munising to Grand Marais;

It creates an "inland buffer zone," back from the shoreline but within the boundaries of the lakeshore. Within this inland buffer zone, property would remain in private ownership, first, if it is improved property; second, if it is being used for timber production on a sustained yield basis; or, third, if it is being used currently and since December 31, 1962, for commercial purposes which do not impair the attractiveness of the area;

It proposes a boundary line for the inland buffer zone in accordance with the recommendations worked out in cooperation with the largest property owner in the lakeshore—Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co. A somewhat different line, drawn at our request by the National Park Service, produces an inland buffer zone of about 6,000 fewer acres. We have asked the Michigan Conservation Department to work with Park Service and Cleveland-Cliffs representatives to reach a mutually satisfactory buffer zone line. All parties have agreed to explore this adjustment;

It provides that any determination as to whether lands within the inland buffer zone are being managed on a sustained yield basis shall be the sole responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Forest Service;

It permits hunting and fishing within the lakeshore in accordance with the laws of Michigan;

It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to continue to lease cottages or hunting lodges, which were under lease on December 31, 1962, for a period of 25 years or for the life of the lessee;

It directs the Secretary to prepare and implement a land and water use management plan in the lakeshore, including specifically a scenic shoreline drive;

It protects homeowners in the right of use and occupancy of their property for residential purposes for 25 years or life, and permanently have ownership if located in the inland buffer zone.

In drafting this new Pictured Rocks bill, every effort has been made to meet the economic needs of the area, to protect the rights of large and small property owners, and yet to make possible a national lakeshore which will be of sufficient size and quality to merit national recognition.

While we believe this bill accomplishes these objectives in large measure, we look forward to continuing suggestions for its improvement. We will request a hearing to be held in the Upper Peninsula this year, in order that we may have the benefit of the recommendations of all concerned.

The Department of the Interior has promised that an economic study will be available on this proposal in the very near future. All who see the benefits such a lakeshore development will bring to Michigan's Upper Peninsula look forward to this analysis.

The description of the "inland buffer zone" contained in section 9 of the new bill is that suggested in conferences with Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co.

The description of the boundary line for the "inland buffer zone" prepared by the National Park Service at my request is as follows:

Inner Boundary Description of Proposed Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore

Since the smallest land division as depicted on the inner boundary line map is 1/64 section or approximately 10 acres, a simplified narrative method has been devised to describe and locate the boundary at any point within a given full section. Each section is considered to be composed of 64 equal parts by dividing the linear distances of the north-south and the east-west section lines into eight equal parts and projecting a perpendicular line from each point on a given section line to the opposite section line. Therefore, each change of direction within a section is at a right angle to the preceding course and runs in the stated direction a linear distance expressed in eighths or multiples of eighths of a section line. Also at the beginning point of each range or township, the point is described in relation to either a section corner or a corner of a subdivision of the section and italicized. As stated previously the smallest subdivision used is 1/64 of a section or a quarter-quarter-quarter section.

RANGE 14 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49N, ALGER COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Section 11: Beginning at a point at the *northeast corner* of the *southeast quarter southeast quarter,* thence west ½, thence south ¼ to the south section line;

Section 14: Continuing south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ¾ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 23: Thence south ⅝, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 22: Continuing west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 27: Thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence west ⅜ to west section line;

Section 28: Continuing west ⅜, thence north ¼ to north section line;

Section 21: Continuing north full section to north section line;

Section 16: Continuing north ¼, thence west ⅓, thence north ⅛ thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 7: Continuing west ½, thence north ⅛, thence west ½ to west section line;

Section 18: Continuing west ½, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, to west section line, thence north ⅛ along west section line to the northwest section corner.

RANGE 15 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 12: Proceeding from the *southeast section corner* and running west ¼ along south section line, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 11: Continuing west full section to the west section line, thence south ½ along the west section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 10: Thence west full section to the southwest section corner;

Section 16: Thence south ⅝ along the east section line, thence west ¾, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ¼ to southwest section corner;

Section 20: Thence west ½ along north section line, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line; thence south ¼ along west section line;

Section 19: Thence west ⅜, thence south ¼, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ¼ along south section line to southwest section corner.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 25: Proceeding from the *northeast section corner* and running south ⅛ along east section line, thence west ¼, thence south ⅜, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅜ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 36: Thence south ½, thence west ⅛ to west section line, thence south ¼ along west section line;

Section 35: Thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 2: Proceeding from a point at the *northwest corner* of the *northeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter* and running south or full section to the south section line;

Section 11: Continuing south of full section to the south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 14: Thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence section lines, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 15: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to the south section line, thence west ¼ along the south section line to the southwest section corner.

Section 21: Thence south ⅛ along east section line, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west

⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛ to the west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 20: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ¼ along south section line;

Section 29: Thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 30: Continuing west ½, thence south ½, thence west ½ to west section line.

RANGE 17 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 25: Proceeding from the *northeast corner* of the *southeast quarter southeast quarter* and running west ¼, thence north ¾ to north section line;

Section 24: Continuing north ¼, thence west ¼, thence north ¼, thence west ½ to west section line, thence north ½ along west section line to northwest section corner;

Section 14: Thence west ¼ along south section line, thence north ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence north ⅛, thence west ⅝ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 15: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line; thence west ¼ along south section line;

Section 22: Thence south ⅛, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 21: Thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 28: Thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 32: Thence west ¼ along north section line, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 31: Thence west full section to west section line, thence north ⅛ along west section line.

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 36: Proceeding from the *southeast corner* of the *northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter* and running west ½, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line.

Section 35: Thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line;

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 7 NORTH

Section 2: Proceeding from the *northwest corner* of the *northeast quarter northeast quarter* and continuing south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to the south section line;

Section 11: Continuing south a full section to the south section line;

Section 14: Continuing south a full section to the south section line, thence west ⅜ along the south section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 15: Continuing west ½ along the south section line, thence north ⅜, thence west ½ to the west section line, thence north ⅛ along the west section line;

Section 16: Thence west ¾, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to the west section line, thence south ¼ along the west section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 20: Thence west ⅛ along the north section line, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ½, thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ¼ along the south section line.

Section 29: Thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 30: Thence west ¼, thence south ½ to the south section line;

Section 31: Continuing south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅝, thence west ¼, thence south 1,220 feet more or less to the north right-of-way of State Highway M–94, thence west ¼ along north right-of-way of State Highway M–94 to west section line, thence north along the west section line to the northeast corner of the Joseph Hiedzwiecki property (all of the named properties and lot numbers mentioned herein are depicted on the map of the city of Munising that was compiled and drawn by Edwin Swan, engineer.

RANGE 19 WEST TOWNSHIP 47 NORTH

Proceeding from the *northeast corner* of the Miedzwiecki property and running westerly along the northern boundary of said property to the northwest corner of said property, thence due west 750 feet more or less, thence due north 200 feet more or less to the southwest corner of C. C. I. Co. property, thence due west along the property line bounded on the south by Joseph Kolbush property and on the north by C. C. I. Co.'s property to the north-south quarter section line, thence north along the north-south quarter section line to the south side of Sand Point Road, an extension of Munising Street, thence northward and eastward along the eastern right-of-way of the Sand Point Road to a point of intersection with the southeast projection of the north-east lot line of lot 22, Sand Point Addition, thence northwestward along the southeast projection and northeast property line of said lot 22, Sand Point Addition to a point on the mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay (Grand Island Bay), thence running westward for a distance of one-quarter of a mile to a point in South Bay one-quarter of a mile offshore and westward of the said mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay. Said point falling on the offshore boundary line described in bill S. 3364, May 29, 1962, thence turning and running generally northward along said offshore boundary line stated in said bill back to point of beginning of the inner boundary.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; but, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1143) to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart (for himself and Mr. McNamara), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

Sec. 2. The area described as follows is hereby designated for establishment as the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

Beginning at a point in the city of Munising, Michigan, in section 36, lot 3, township 47 north, range 19 west, at the southeast corner of Sand Point Addition lot 1;

thence westward along the southerly line of the Sand Point Addition lot 1 to a point on the mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay (Grand Island Bay);

thence running westward for a distance of one-quarter of a mile to a point in South Bay one-quarter of a mile offshore and westward of the said mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay;

thence turning and running generally northward and eastward along a line in South Bay, Grand Island Harbor, and Lake Superior one-quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel with the mean waterline on the shores of South Bay, Grand Island Harbor, and Lake Superior within township 47 north, range 19, 18 west; township 48 north, range 18, 17, 16 west; township 49 north, range 16, 15, 14 west, a distance of approximately 39 miles to a point in Lake Superior one-quarter of a mile offshore and northward of a point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior on the north-south quarter section line of fractional section 1, township 49 north, range 14 west;

thence running one-quarter of a mile southward to the said point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior and continuing southward along the north-south quarter section lines of fractional section 1 and section 12, said township and range, to the southeast corner of northeast quarter northwest quarter, said section 12;

thence westward along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section line to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter northwest quarter, said section 12;

thence southward along west section lines of said section 12 and section 13, said township and range, to a point 400 feet northward of the southwest corner of said section 13;

thence eastward along a line 400 feet northward of and parallel with the south section line of said section 13 to a point on the east section line of said section 13 at State Highway M77;

thence southward along the east section lines of said section 13 and section 24, said township and range, to a point 400 feet southward of the northeast corner of said section 24 at State Highway M77;

thence westward along a line 400 feet southward and parallel with the north section lines of said section 24 and section 23, said township and range, to a point on the north-south quarter section line of said section 23;

thence southward along the north-south quarter section line to the south quarter section corner of said section 23;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 23 to the northeast corner section 27, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line said section 27 to the southeast corner of northeast quarter southeast quarter said section 27;

thence westward along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 27 and sections 28 and 29, said township and range, to the north-south quarter section line of said section 29 at the southwest corner of the northwest quarter southeast quarter, said section 29;

thence northward on the north-south quarter section line to the south quarter section corner section 20, said township and range;

thence westward along the south section lines sections 20 and 19, said township and range, to the southeast corner section 24, township 49 north, range 15 west, and continuing westward along the south section lines, said section 24 and sections 23, 22, and 21 to the northeast corner section 29, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section lines said section 29 and section 32, said township and range, and continuing southward along the east section lines sections 5 and 8, township 48 north, range 15 west, to the east quarter section corner said section 8;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines of said section 8 and section 7 to the west quarter section corner said section 7, said township and range;

thence northward along the west section lines said section 7 and section 6, said township and range, to the east quarter section corner section 1, township 48 north, range 16 west;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section line of said section 1 to the east quarter section corner section 2, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section lines said section 2 and sections 11 and 14 to the east quarter section corner said section 14, said township and range;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section line to the southwest corner of southeast quarter northwest quarter of said section 14;

thence southward along the west one-sixteenth meridional section lines of said section 14 and section 23, said township and range, to the southeast corner of northwest quarter northwest quarter said section 23;

thence westward along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 23 and section 22, said township and range, to the east section line of section 21, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 21 to the southeast section corner;

thence westward along the south section line of section 21 to the northeast corner of section 29, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 29 to the east quarter section corner;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines of said section 29 and section 30 to the center of said section 30, said township and range;

thence southward along the north-south quarter section line of said section 30 to Adams Trail CO 637;

thence running southwestward along Adams Trail CO 637 to an intersection with the south section line section 1, township 47 north, range 17 west;

thence westward along the south section lines said section 1 and sections 2 and 3 to the northeast corner section 9, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section lines of said section 9 and section 16 to the east quarter section corner, said section 16, said township and range;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines said section 16 and section 17 to the west quarter section corner said section 17, said township and range;

thence northward along the west section line of said section 17 to the southeast corner section 7, said township and range;

thence westward along the south section lines of said section 7, said township and range, and sections 12 and 11, township 47 north, range 18 west, to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter northeast quarter section 14, said township and range;

thence southward along the east one-sixteenth meridional lines of said section 14 and sections 23, 26, and 35 to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter southeast quarter said section 35, said township and range, at State Highway M94;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 35 to the southwest section corner at State Highway M94;

thence northward along the west section lines of said section 35 and section 26 to the southeast corner section 22, said township and range;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 22 to the south quarter section corner;

thence northward along the north-south quarter section line of said section 22 to the section center;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines of said section 22 and section 21 to the east quarter section corner section 20, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 20 to the southeast section corner;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 20 to the north quarter section corner of section 29, said township and range;

thence southward along the north-south quarter section line of said section 29 to the south quarter section corner;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 29 to the northeast corner of section 31, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 31 to State Highway M94;

thence running generally westward and southward along State Highway M94 to the southeast corner of section 36, township 47 north, range 19 west;

thence westward along State Highway M94 in section 36, said township and range, to the southeasterly corner of the city of Munising parcel of land (bounded in part by Bullivant Street and State Highway M94);

thence leaving State Highway M94 and running generally northward along the easterly lines of the said city of Munising parcel of land to its northerly corner on the easterly line of Bullivant Street;

thence northward along the said easterly line of Bullivant Street to a point of intersection with the northerly line of Salem Street (paper street);

thence westward along the said northerly line of Salem Street to a point of intersection with the easterly line of Sand Point Road;

thence generally northward and eastward along the said easterly line of Sand Point Road to a point on the southerly line of Sand Point Addition lot 1 produced eastward;

thence westward crossing Sand Point Road along the said southerly line of Sand Point Addition lot 1 produced eastward back to the point of beginning, the said southeast corner of Sand Point Addition lot 1.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said commission shall terminate ten years after the date the lakeshore is established pursuant to this Act.

(b) The commission shall be composed of five members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the county in which the lakeshore is situated;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be chairman. Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Members of the commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the commission with respect to the matters relating to the development of the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

SEC. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Michigan. The Secretary, with the approval of the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment. The Secretary shall, after consultation with such department, issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. The Secretary shall enter into agreement with the Michigan Department of Conservation providing for concurrent jurisdiction over the enforcement of the applicable hunting and fishing laws of Michigan.

SEC. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection and development of the lakeshore, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provision for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation, including a scenic shoreline drive;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization (subject to the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of this Act) of renewable natural resources, including forage and forest products, as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and does not significantly impair public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 11 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) within the boundary described in section 2 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. In considering any such offer, the Secretary shall take into consideration any hardship to the owner which might result from any undue delay in acquiring his property.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to acquire property through negotiation and purchase. Where agreement is not reached and condemnation proceedings are filed, the owner of such property shall be paid the fair market value thereof as determined in such proceedings.

(e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion, and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation, and each such report shall include a statement of the value of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

SEC. 9. (a) The area hereinafter described in subsection (b) of this section is hereby established as an inland buffer zone in order to stabilize and protect the existing character and uses of the lands, waters, and other properties within such zone for the purpose of preserving the setting of the shoreline and lakes, protecting the watersheds and streams, and providing for the fullest economic utilization of the renewable resources through sustained yield timber management and other resource management compatible with the purposes of this Act.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "inland buffer zone" means that part of the lakeshore situated south of the following described boundary; consisting of approximately 47,000 acres:

RANGE 14 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH, ALGER COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Section 1: Beginning at a point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior on the north-south quarter section line of fractional section 1, township 49 north, range 14 west; thence south along north-south quarter section line to the south section line;

Section 12: Thence south ¼, thence west ½ to west section line;

Section 11: Thence south ½, thence west ½, thence south ¼ to south section line;

Section 14: Thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ¾ to south section line, thence west ¼ to southwest section corner;

Section 22: Thence south ¾, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛ to south section line;

Section 27: Continuing south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 28: Continuing west ⅛, thence north ⅛ to north section line;

Section 21: Continuing north full section to north section line;

Section 16: Thence west ¼, thence north ¼, thence west ⅛, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 17: Thence north ¼, thence west full section to west section line;

Section 18: Continuing west ½, thence north ¼ to north section line;

Section 7: Thence west ½ to southwest section corner.

RANGE 15 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 12: Proceeding from the southeast section corner and running west ¼ along south section line, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅜, thence west ½ to west section line; thence north ¼;

Section 11: Thence west full section to west section line, thence south ¾ to southwest section corner;

Section 10: Thence west full section to southwest section corner;

Section 16: Thence south ½, thence west ¾, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 17: Continuing west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ¼;

Section 20: Thence south ¼, thence west ½ to west section line;

Section 19: Thence south ¼, thence west ½, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛ to southwest section corner.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 25: Proceeding from the northeast section corner south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ½, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line; thence south ¼;

Section 26: Thence west ½, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ½ to southwest section corner;

Section 34: Thence south ½, thence west ½, thence south ½ to south section line.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 3: Proceeding from the northeast corner of the northwest quarter and running south full section to south section line;

Section 10: Continuing south full section to south section line, thence east ½ section to southeast section corner;

Section 15: Thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ⅛ to southwest section corner;

Section 21: Thence south ⅛, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛ to west section line;

Section 20: Continuing west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ⅝ to southwest section corner;

Section 19: Continuing west ½, thence north full section to north section line;

Section 18: Continuing north ½, thence west ½ to west section line.

RANGE 17 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 13: Proceeding from the southeast corner of the northeast quarter and running west full section to west section line;

Section 14: Continuing west full section to west section line, thence south ⅜;

Section 15: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ¾ to southwest section corner;

Section 21: Thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜ to south section line, thence west ¼;

Section 28: Thence south ½, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ½ to southwest section corner;

Section 29: Thence west ¼, thence north full section to north section line, thence east ¼ to northeast section corner;

Section 20: Thence north ½, thence west full section to west section line, thence south ½ section to southwest section corner;

Section 30: Thence west ½, thence south ½, thence west ¼, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ½ to southwest section corner.

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 36: Proceeding from the northeast section corner and running west ¼, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛;

Section 35: Thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to south section line.

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 47 NORTH

Section 2: Proceeding from the northwest corner of the northeast quarter northeast quarter and continuing south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ⅜ to southwest section corner;

Section 10: Thence south full section to southeast section corner;

Section 15: Continuing south ½, thence west ½, thence north ½ to north section line;

Section 10: Continuing north ½, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ½ to southwest section corner;

Section 16: Continuing south ½, thence west ¾, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛;

Section 17: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line;

Section 20: Continuing south ⅜, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ¼ to southwest section corner;

Section 30: Continuing west ¼, thence south full section to south section line, thence west ½;

Section 31: Thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ¼, thence east ½, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south 1220 feet more or less to the north right-of-way to State Highway M–94, thence west ¼ along north right-of-way of State Highway M–94 to west section line, thence north along the west section line to the northeast corner of the Joseph Niedzwiecki property (all of the named properties and lot numbers mentioned herein are depicted on the map of the city of Munising that was compiled and drawn by Edwin Swan, engineer).

RANGE 19 WEST, TOWNSHIP 47 NORTH

Proceeding from the northeast corner of the Niedzwiecki property and running westerly along the northern boundary of said property to the northwest corner of said property, thence due west 750 feet more or less, thence due north 200 feet more or less to the southeast corner of C.C.I. Company property, thence due west along the property line bounded on the south by Joseph Kolbush property and on the north by C.C.I. Company's property to the north-south quarter section line, thence north along the north-south quarter section line to the south side of Sand Point Road, an extension of Munising Street, thence northward and eastward along the eastern right-of-way of the Sand Point Road to a point of intersection with the southeast projection of the northeast lot line of lot 22, Sand Point Addition, thence northwestward along the southeast projection and northeast property line of said lot 22, Sand Point Addition, to a point on the mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay (Grand Island Bay), thence running westward for a distance of one-quarter of a mile to a point in South Bay one quarter of a mile offshore and westward of the said mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay. Said point falling on the offshore boundary line described in Bill S. 3364, May 29, 1962, thence turning and running generally northward along said offshore boundary line stated in said bill back to point of beginning of the inner boundary, at the point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior on the north-south quarter section line of fractional section 1, township 49 north, range 14 west.

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring by condemnation any (1) improved property within the inland buffer zone, or (2) property within the inland buffer zone during all times when such property is being used (A) for the growing and harvesting of timber on a sustained yield basis, or (B) for commercial purposes, if such commercial purposes are the same such purposes for which such property was being used on December 31, 1962, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the lakeshore.

(b) "Sustained yield" in the growing and harvesting of timber as used in this Act shall mean management of the land for timber production neither more nor less stringent than the management imposed on publically owned national forest lands of comparable management classification. Any determination as to whether such property is being so managed for purposes of this Act shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the United States Forest Service.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the United States Forest Service, shall consult with and provide technical assistance to any property owner within the inland buffer zone who requests assistance for the purpose of managing his land for sustained yield timber production.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "improved property" shall mean any one-family dwelling on which construction was begun before December 31, 1962, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated (such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling) as shall be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling.

SEC. 11. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of the lakeshore and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

(c) Any land acquired by the Secretary under this Act on which there is situated a cottage or hunting lodge which, on December 31, 1962, was under lease to any lessee or lessees shall, if such lease is in effect on the date such land is so acquired, be acquired by the Secretary subject to such lease and the right of such lessee or lessees to continue using the property covered by such lease in accordance with the provisions thereof. Upon the expiration of such lease, the Secretary shall have the authority to enter into a lease with such lessee or lessees authorizing them to continue using such cottage or lodge (as the case may be) for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such lessee or lessees, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

SEC. 13. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL POLICE FORCES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement.

One of the findings of the Civil Rights Commission, reported to Congress in 1961, was that the professional level of many State and local police forces is alarmingly low. This situation is due, in part, the Commission found, to ineffective recruit selection standards and ineffective and inadequate training.

The Commission recommended that Congress authorize Federal assistance to police departments who undertake the development of more effective recruit selection standards, training programs in scientific crime detection and in constitutional rights and human relations, college-level schools of police administration, and scholarship programs for police officers.

Last year I introduced a bill, S. 2984, to carry out this recommendation. The issue of improving the quality of our police forces at every level of government is one which transcends the relationship this may well have to civil rights problems. And the mail which I have received in support of the bill bears this out.

Among those expressing favorable interest in this proposal have been the following:

The board of officers and staff of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Mr. James E. Bassett, deputy commissioner, Department of Public Safety, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Hon. George E. McNally, mayor, city of Mobile, Ala.

Chief Clarence M. Kelley, Police Department, Kansas City, Mo.

Hon. George Edwards, commissioner, Department of Police, Detroit, Mich.

Col. William E. Binder, chief of police, Louisville, Ky.

Col. E. C. Hale, chief of police, Lexington, Ky.

Chief Richard H. Quehl, Police Department, Fort Thomas, Ky.

Col. Curtis Brostron, chief of police, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Bernard R. Caldwell, director, Northwestern University Traffic Institute.

Mr. A. F. Brandstatter, chairman, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University.

Prof. John I. Griffin, the police science program, City College of New York.

Dean Joseph D. Lohman, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley.

Col. David McCandless, director, Southern Police Institute, Louisville, Ky.

Mr. Harold R. Sullivan, secretary-treasurer, Metropolitan Police Academy of Michigan, Detroit, Mich.

Members of the faculty of the Department of Political Science, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

The correspondence which I have had has evidenced interest in Federal assistance for a variety of projects and programs—the establishment of programs in constitutional rights and human relations both in police departments and in schools of police administration; the need for research to establish recruit selection standards; the development of a centrally administered and regionally conducted State program of police training; research to develop curriculums for training programs; the development of a system for providing better communication and cooperation among law enforcement agencies; the establishment of a training program to service several suburban communities.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce today has, I believe, been improved in several respects over S. 2984.

Some legitimate concern has been expressed that Federal funds would be doled out rather indiscriminately to local police departments and that the Federal Government would thereby preempt an area of historical and appropriate local responsibility.

The more specific language of the bill I introduce today makes clear that the purpose of this legislation is to provide Federal assistance to worthwhile programs and projects which will develop or demonstrate education, recruitment, or training practices which can then in turn be profitably employed by other police departments and training organizations.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that I introduce this bill today in the firm belief that local law enforcement is and must remain a matter of local responsibility and control.

Also, the new bill provides that public and private nonprofit organizations engaged in police education or training, as well as State and local governments, would be eligible to apply for Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I believe the bill introduced today provides a highly desirable and appropriate way for the Federal Government to assist in efforts initiated at State and local levels to raise the professional quality of our police forces. I am very hopeful that this Congress will take favorable action on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1145) to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SYSTEM OF ROADS AND TRAILS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce and send to the desk a bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes.

The language of the proposed bill is similar to that contained in S. 3231, which was introduced by Senator Chavez, by request, on May 1 1962, and on which no action was taken.

The declared purpose of the bill is to allow for the provision of an adequate system of roads within and near national forests for timber management and harvesting and recreation.

The bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to grant easements for road rights-of-way over land under his control. Permits of a revocable nature can now be issued, but these are not always acceptable where the Department of Agriculture is seeking permanent rights-of-way over privately owned lands. The bill would provide for the termination or cancellation of easements granted by the Department of Agriculture where there is a period of 5 years of nonuse.

Many of the roads of the forest development road system have been and will be required to be built by purchasers of national forest timber. At the present time, purchasers can be required to construct only the standard of road that is needed for each particular sale. The cost of this type road is amortized from stumpage or unit rates. In many instances a higher standard road may be desirable for general usage. The bill would permit the construction of a higher standard road, and provides that the purchaser will not be required to pay that part of the road costs necessary to meet higher standards. This additional cost would be paid for out of appropriated funds.

The bill would also authorize the inclusion in sale contracts of provisions for amortization of road costs through the retention by the purchaser of an appropriate amount of the stumpage or unit rates until the cost had been amortized. If after harvesting is completed, the road had not been completely amortized the purchaser would be compensated from the stumpage or unit rates paid.

The bill also provides for an arrangement whereby the roads may be maintained by requiring the users to deposit sufficient funds to enable the Forest Service to perform the work. At present the Forest Service has authority to require the user to perform maintenance and reconstruction; however, there is no provision in existing law which requires that a deposit be made.

Also Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter on this subject from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President of the Senate and the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1147) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes, introduce by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential if increasing demands for timber, recreation, and other uses of such lands are to be met; that the existence of such a system would have the effect, among other things, of increasing the value of timber and other resources tributary to such roads; and that such a system is essential to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) to provide for intensive use, protection, development, and management of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service, and (2) over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

SEC. 3. An easement granted under this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a five-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within sixty days after receipt of the notice, a hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from such lands tributary to such roads and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development and management thereof, and for utilization of the other resources thereof. Financing of such roads may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with private agencies or persons, or (4) by a combination of these methods: *Provided,* That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products from lands tributary thereto are to be constructed, the purchasers of national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriate.

SEC. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located. Copies of all instruments affecting interests in lands reserved from the public domain shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may require the user or users of a road under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. The Secretary may also require the user or users of such a road to reconstruct the same when such reconstruction is determined to be necessary to accommodate such use. If such maintenance or reconstruction cannot be so provided or if the Secretary determines that maintenance or reconstruction by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance or reconstruction. Deposits made to cover the maintenance or reconstruction of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided,* That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work, and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further,* That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded.

SEC. 7. Whenever the agreement under which the United States has obtained for the use of, or in connection with, the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service a right-of-way or easement for a road or an existing road or the right to use an existing road provides for delayed payments to the Government's grantor, any fees or other collections received by the Secretary for the use of the road may be placed in a fund to be available for making payments to the grantor.

The letter presented by Mr. RANDOLPH is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes."

This Department recommends enactment of the draft bill.

The draft bill is designed to provide to the Secretary of Agriculture certain authorities that are urgently needed and which will be of material aid in constructing and maintaining an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service. It specifically would—

1. Set forth findings and declarations of the Congress that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads

and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential to provide for intensive use, protection, and management of such lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

2. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service and over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

3. Provide for termination of easements so granted with provision that if cancellation is to be for nonuse the owner must be notified and, if he so requests, be given a hearing in accordance with rules and regulations of the Secretary.

4. Authorize the Secretary to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads, within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service, of maximum economy in harvesting timber and at the same time meet the needs for other protection, management, and utilization purposes (a) with appropriated funds, (b) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products with provisions for amortization of road costs, (c) by cooperation with public and private agencies or persons, or (d) by a combination of these methods. Where roads of a higher standard than that needed in harvesting timber and other products are to be constructed, purchasers of national forest timber and other products would not be required to bear any part of the cost necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary would be authorized to make appropriate arrangements to this end.

5. Direct that all instruments affecting permament interests in land executed pursuant to the bill would be recorded in the county records and copies of all affecting lands reserved from the public domain would be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

6. Authorize the Secretary to require users of the roads under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements. The maintenance to be borne by each user would be proportionate to total use. The Secretary would also be authorized to require users of such roads to reconstruct the same where such reconstruction is needed to accommodate the use. If the required maintenance or reconstruction could not be provided by the user or if the Secretary determined that maintenance or reconstruction by the user would not be practical, the Secretary would be authorized to require the deposit of sufficient funds for such purpose. Deposits made to cover maintenance or reconstruction of roads would go into a fund and would be available until expended to cover the cost of accomplishing the work. Pooling of deposits for work on adjacent and overlapping areas and the use of estimates to determine the cost of performing the work with such deposits would be authorized. Unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the work would be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded as appropriate.

7. Provide that where the agreement under which the United States obtained its rights as to a road provides for delayed payments, any fees or collections for the use of such a road could be placed in a fund to pay the Government's grantor.

There are administered by the Forest Service 154 national forests, 18 national grasslands, and other administrative units, comprising about 186 million acres of land in 44 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

An adequate system of forest development roads and trails connecting with forest highways and other highways is essential to proper management and beneficial use of the lands comprising the national forest system and their resources. The presence or absence of transportation facilities has a direct and controlling influence on all phases of forest land management and utilization. This fact determines the volume of timber that can be marketed, the size, duration, and distribution of timber sales within working circles, and the level of salvage cuttings. It is also a major factor in the level of use made of the recreation, wildlife, and forage resources of these lands. We strongly feel it is essential that an adequate system of forest roads and trails be developed and maintained to serve these lands if they are to provide their proper share to the well-being of the Nation.

As of June 30, 1961, there were in the forest development road and trail system about 179,200 miles of roads, and 106,600 miles of trails. It is estimated that the system of forest development roads and trails which will ultimately be needed in order for the national forests to provide on a sustained-yield basis the fullest practicable amount of products and services from their timber, watershed, range, recreation, and wildlife resources will be comprised of about 542,000 miles of forest development roads and about 80,000 miles of trails.

The development program for the national forests which President Kennedy submitted to the Congress on September 21, 1961, proposed for the 10-year period 1963–72 the construction and reconstruction of about 79,400 miles of multipurpose roads and 8,000 miles of trails in addition to supplemental work on roads to be constructed by purchasers of national forest timber and other products.

In order to provide and maintain such an adequate system of forest development roads and trails, it is necessary to have not only the funds to finance them, but also authority to facilitate and make possible effective arrangements for the installation and maintenance of the roads and trails.

In a great many instances, national forest lands are intermingled with lands in one or more non-Federal ownerships. The road or trail system needed in the particular area is one which will serve both the national forest land and the land in non-Federal ownership. Authority which would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make satisfactory arrangements for the construction and maintenance of roads in these circumstances is one of the keys to the installation and maintenance of a system of roads and trails to adequately serve the national forests.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

(Enclosure.)

A BILL TO ENABLE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN AN ADEQUATE SYSTEM OF ROADS AND TRAILS FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential if increasing demands for timber, recreation, and other uses of such lands are to be met; that the existence of such a system would the effect, among other things, of increasing the value of timber and other resources tributary to such roads; and that such a system is essential to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) to provide for intensive use, protection, development, and management of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service, and (2) over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

SEC. 3. An easement granted under this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a five-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within sixty days after receipt of the notice, a hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from such lands tributary to such roads and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development and management thereof, and for utilization of the other resources thereof. Financing of such roads may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with private agencies or persons, or (4) by a combination of these methods: *Provided,* That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products from lands tributary thereto are to be constructed, the purchasers of national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriate.

SEC. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located. Copies of all instruments affecting interests in lands reserved from the public domain shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may require the user or users of a road under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. The Secretary may also require the user or users of such a road to reconstruct the same when such reconstruction is determined to be necessary to accommodate such use. If such maintenance or reconstruction cannot be so provided or if the Secretary determines that maintenance or reconstruction by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance or reconstruction. Deposits made to cover the maintenance or reconstruction of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided,* That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work, and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further,* That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded.

SEC. 7. Whenever the agreement under which the United States has obtained for the use of, or in connection with, the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service a right-of-way or easement for a road or an existing road or the right to use an existing road provides for delayed payments to the Government's grantor, any fees or other collections received by the Secretary for the use of the road may be placed in a fund to be available for making payments to the grantor.

TV TUBE MANUFACTURERS

Mr. **HARTKE.** Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate an unintended pyramiding of taxes in connection with the purchase of taxable tubes by a manufacturer of nontaxable tuners for inclusion in television sets which are taxable. This should bring relief to certain manufacturers for a period between November 1, 1950, and December 31, 1954.

Last year the Senate passed such a provision late in the session. It was dropped during a conference with Members of the House owing to a misunderstanding. This misunderstanding has been cleared up, Mr. President, and there is every reason to believe the House would approve such a measure in this session.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1151) relating to the taxable status of sales prior to September 1, 1955, of tubes for use in the production of certain component parts of television receiving sets, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERMS OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **METCALF.** Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to extend to 4 years the terms of Members of the House of Representatives, and to 8 years the terms of Senators.

The arguments in favor of this amendment to our Constitution are most persuasive. This is not a partisan proposal; it is a measure designed to strengthen our democratic processes and to make our National Government more sensitive to the wishes of its citizens.

As the distinguished political scientist and student of government, Stephen K. Bailey, has written:

> The constitutional provisions for staggered elections are a significant cause of the pullings and haulings in our National Government.

My amendment, Mr. President, would remove one obstacle to efficient and responsible National Government, by eliminating the so-called off-year election of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

Adoption of this constitutional amendment would represent a big step toward reducing much of the needless—and sometimes destructive—partisan bickering that has characterized our National Government when the executive branch is controlled by one political party and the legislative branch by the other.

Under this amendment, when fully operative, candidates seeking election to the House of Representatives and to the Senate—except in special circumstances—would run only in presidential election years.

Mr. President, when the people of this Nation go to the polls, to elect a presidential candidate on the basis of a program he and his party have promised to implement, they should have an opportunity to vote for Senators and Representatives who will support that program.

Past experience indicates that election of a new Congress only in presidential election years would, in all probably, mean control of the executive and legislative branches of our National Government by the same party. If a President had in both Houses of Congress dependable majorities identified with his program, it would be much easier for the electorate to judge the performance of the party in power.

If the in-party failed to meet its commitments, the electorate could unmistakably fix the responsibility, and could vote the President and his congressional supporters out of office at the next election. But the in-party would have a full 4 years in which to fulfill its campaign pledges before going again to the voters for an expression of confidence.

The arguments in support of lengthening the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives are familiar to all of us. Those of us who have served in the House as Representatives of two-party districts need not be reminded how difficult it is to become familiar with the legislative process and to become competent legislators when the next election is "just around the corner."

In recent years, Mr. President, it has become increasingly difficult to pass needed legislation through the other House. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is the preoccupation of House Members—especially the newer ones from two-party districts—with their reelection. A Representative is sent to Congress to give his constituency a voice in its relations with the Federal Government; but he also is expected to be a legislator—to understand the legislative process and to participate effectively in it. Under the present 2-year term, a new Representative finds it extremely difficult to become an effective legislator before the time when he must face the electorate for a judgment on his performance. A 4-year term would give a Member of the House an opportunity to make a record before seeking a vote of confidence from his constituents.

I believe this amendment deserves the serious consideration of this Congress. I recognize that it would represent a departure from our time-tested election laws; but times are changing, and we must change with them. The international and domestic challenges facing our Nation today and in the years ahead demand a responsible and responsive Congress. Adoption of this amendment would be a step in the direction of making the Congress more sensitive to the needs of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a section from "The Condition of Our National Political Parties," by Stephen K. Bailey, and the text of the joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, and the term of office of Senators shall be 8 years, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The term of office of Representatives shall be four years; except that the term of office of Representatives elected for terms commencing on January 3 of any year following the ratification of this article but preceding the first election to which this section applies, shall be two years.

"SEC. 2. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Subject to sections 3 and 4 of this article, the term of office of Senators shall be eight years; except that the term of office of Senators elected for terms commencing on January third of any year following the ratification of this article but preceding the first election to which this section applies, shall be six years.

"SEC. 3. Senators elected to the Senate for terms commencing on January 3 of the year commencing after the expiration of two years after the first election to which sections 1 and 2 of this article apply shall be divided into two classes. There shall be assigned to the first class any such Senator who is from a State which is then represented in the Senate by a Member whose term expires on January 3 of the year commencing after the expiration of eight years after the first election to which sections 1 and 2 of this article apply. There shall be assigned to the second class any such Senator who is from a State which is then represented in the Senate by a Member whose term expires prior to the said January 3 date. The term of office of Senators assigned to the first class shall be two years. The term of office of Senators assigned to the second class shall be six years.

"SEC. 4. The offices of Senators from any State admitted to the Union after the ratification of this article shall be divided by lot into two classes immediately after the Senate shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Senators from such State. The term of office of the Senator assigned to the first class shall terminate on January 3 of the year following the first election, occurring after the election of such Senator, at which electors for the offices of President and Vice President are elected. The term of office of the Senator assigned to the second class shall terminate on January 3 of the year following a second election, occurring after the election of such Senator, at which electors for the offices of President and Vice President are elected.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 of this article shall first apply in the case of Representatives and Senators who are elected for terms commencing on January third of the year following the first election, occurring more than six months after the ratification of this article, at which electors for the offices of President and Vice President are elected.

"SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 2 of article I, the first three sentences of section 3 of article I, and the first two sentences of article XVII are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 7. This article shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator or Representative elected before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

"SEC. 8. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from he date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The excerpt presented by Mr. METCALF is, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM ARTICLE "CONGRESSIONAL TERMS," BY STEPHEN K. BAILEY

The constitutional provisions for staggered elections are a significant cause of the pullings and haulings in our National Government. It is equally clear that a 2-year term for the House is too short to turn a freshman Member into an effective legislator or to avoid the harassing and expensive responsibilities of perpetual campaigning. The last election and the next election are often an indistinguishable blur. Furthermore, if a truly competitive two-party system should develop across the Nation, there will be more frequent alternation of victorious candidates between the parties, thus shortening the tenure of any one Congressman.

A 4-year term for the House, if it coincides with the presidential term, should have a number of important effects. Under normal conditions, it would insure the same political complexion for the House as the President's. It would reduce the continuous campaign and constituency pressures which a 2-year term almost inevitably fosters. It would give Congressmen sufficient time to learn their trade and to make a substantial contribution to public life.

Also, if an 8-year term were provided for Members of the Senate (half of them coming up for election every 4 years at the same time as the Presidency), the likelihood that the President would have a working majority in both Houses would be overwhelming. At the same time, the conservative utility of overlapping terms would be maintained with only a slight modification in the constitutional wish for continuity.

Enhancing the possibility of one-party control of the Government would enhance the possibility of substantial governmental power and would unmistakably fix responsibility for governmental policy.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 28, 1963:

S. 942. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes: Mr. GRUENING.

Authority of March 15, 1963:

S. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning: Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HART, and Mr. MOSS.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure to broaden the legislative authority of the Select Committee on Small Business.

I also ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the resolution the name of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] may be added to the list of those Senators who are cosponsoring the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER GENERATION—S. 1007

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a public hearing for April 2 and 3 on S. 1007, a bill relating to Pacific Northwest power generation.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. on April 2 and will be held in our committee hearing room in the New Senate Office Building.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addressed, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Editorial, "Skidding on Oil," from March 16, 1963 issue of the Washington Post, and his answer in letter to the editor, together with quotes from and comments on news articles reporting Interior Department's March 15 residual oil import control order.

Excerpts from proceedings at 14th annual State of the Nation Dinner of the Specialized Business Press of America, held February 7, 1963, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Statement regarding the closure of the Glen Canyon Dam.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 12, 1963, the Houston Post, of Houston, Tex., published an article entitled "Senator RUSSELL: An Institution." The article was written by Jack Valenti. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Jan. 12, 1963]

SENATOR RUSSELL: AN INSTITUTION

(By Jack Valenti)

His name is RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, and to many students of American Government he is an institution, sturdy, wise, and irreplaceable.

RICHARD RUSSELL is the senior Senator from the State of Georgia. On this day, January 12, 1963, he celebrates 30 years in the U.S. Senate. Save one, he will have served longer than any current Member. At 32 he was the youngest Governor ever elected in Georgia. On January 12, 1933, at the age of 34, he began his remarkable career in the Senate.

To those in whose care repose the responsibility and the guardianship of the American dream, RICHARD RUSSELL is a unique and singular man.

Much of this regard comes from an appreciation of Senator RUSSELL in his role as the embodiment of the Senate's classic constitutional tradition. The Senator understands the Senate. (The severest criticism he can lay onto another Senator is: "He doesn't understand the Senate.") He knows its moods and its dignity. He guards its honor. He nourishes its heritage.

Sometimes his votes on specific issues are in the coloration of his State and his section of the country. On those votes there are many who argue and differ with him.

But the total pattern of his behavior as a U.S. Senator is a legacy that never swerves from the history of the Senate as a structure undiminished by time, undisturbed by the moment, unbudgable in crisis and controversy.

The opposition, wherever it is and whoever it is, respects RICHARD RUSSELL. On rules and parliamentary procedure he is an expert (a description the Senator might wave away as extravagant). He is a student and a fighter. He would be at home with Webster, Calhoun, and Clay. Madison would enjoy his talk. And Andrew Jackson might cuss him and trust him, at the same time.

In the brutish world of politics, he remains a scholarly warrior, who delights in Aristotle as much as he does the news columns of the Washington Post, though for widely varying reasons.

There are those who say RICHARD RUSSELL is an anachronism, the leader of a lost cause. Perhaps. None of us is clearly correct on the assessment of victory. History has a way of distorting tomorrow what is so surely in focus today.

But Senator Richard Russell in the views of many others is a gentle, tough, gifted, humane man who understands the brevity of triumph and defeat and who with good humor and grace accepts both.

OUR HERITAGE—A BLESSING AND AN OBLIGATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 12, 1962, I was privileged to speak in Richmond, Va., at the National Convention of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, upon the subject "Our Heritage—A Blessing and an Obligation." In my remarks, I undertook to describe the precious heritage we have received as Americans and the obligation which rests upon us to preserve it for our children and our children's children. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Heritage—A Blessing and an Obligation

In my remarks on this occasion, I forego discussion of the transient issues of the hour. I prefer to consider with you fundamental principles which must be preserved if the America we know and love is to endure.

1. OUR HERITAGE

As Americans, each of us can assert with the Psalmist of old: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage."

These words of the Psalmist suggest the subject of my remarks: "Our Heritage—A Blessing and an Obligation."

We received our heritage in trust for ourselves and our children and our children's children from all those men and women, both great and small, whose blood, sweat, tears, and prayers made the America we know and love a living reality.

Our heritage is liberty. While liberty has blossomed in our land, love of liberty did not have its origin here. It was brought hither by courageous men and women from the British Isles, the vine-clad hills of France, and the Palatinate of Germany, who craved above all the things of earth, the economic freedom, the political freedom, and the religious freedom denied to them by the tyrannical rulers of the Old World.

Since so many men now appear so anxious to swap the reality of human liberty for the mirage of economic security, it would be well if we would pause a moment, and ponder the choice our ancestors made when they forsook the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New. It was not without many pangs of regret that they turned their backs for all time upon the scenes of their childhood, the graves of their beloved dead, and the comparative security of the then civilized world, and journeyed in tiny barks across a boisterous ocean to establish homes for themselves and their children and their children's children in what was then a perilous wilderness in a new and strange land.

Why did they do this? Why did they exchange the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New? The answer is simply this and nothing more: They believed that only the slave, who depends upon a master for the bread of bondage, is really secure; and they knew that only the self-reliant soul, who spurns security for opportunity, is truly free. For this reason, they chose liberty rather than security.

Liberty reveals herself in a threefold guise as economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. Let us consider her attributes in each of these aspects.

2. ECONOMIC LIBERTY

The brave men and women, who brought the love of liberty to these shores, did not learn economics sitting at the feet of those who promise "abundance for all by robbing Selected Peter to pay for Collective Paul." They acquired their knowledge the hard way. Their teachers were despotic governments, which robbed them of the fruits of their labor by confiscatory taxation, and in that way reduced them to the status of economic slaves.

The valiant folk who made America great had the hardihood to accept the economic truths plainly visible to all persons who possess the capacity and willingness to meet reality face to face.

They knew that earth yields nothing to man except the products of his own labor. They knew that Adam's curse is an unchanging and unchangeable law of life: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." They knew that man has but one choice in respect to this immutable economic fact, and that such choice is simply this: Whether the bread which he must eat in the sweat of his face shall be the bread of freedom or the bread of bondage. They knew this unalterable decree of the Creator of the universe: Free men cannot be induced to produce things of value unless they are permitted to retain a fair share of the fruits of their labor for themselves and their families.

They knew, moreover, that man can be free only if he is willing to accept the responsibility for his own life which is inseparable from liberty.

3. POLITICAL LIBERTY

The political philosophy of the Founding Fathers is readily understood if one bears in mind the historical fact that the Thirteen Original States—Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia—became self-governing commonwealths 12 years before the United States had its legal birth.

The representatives of the people of these States met in constitutional convention, and framed State constitutions. These men were conversant with the story of the long and bitter struggle of the English-speaking race for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual. They loved liberty and loathed tyranny, and were convinced that government itself would have to be compelled by fundamental law to respect the inherent rights of the individual if freedom were to be preserved and oppression were to be prevented. In consequence, they inserted in the constitutions of the States declarations of rights designed to protect citizens from the States.

It was no accident that the first words incorporated in the constitutions of the Original States were declarations to the effect "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people" and "that the people of * * * (the States) * * * ought to have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof." The writers of the organic laws of the States placed these declarations in first place in their constitutions because the political concepts embodied in such declarations occupied first place in their hearts and minds. They had much cause for assigning prime importance to their beliefs in the sovereignty of the people and the rights of the States to local self-rule. They had suffered many things at the hands of a government far removed from the people.

The consciousness of early Americans that liberty is inevitably imperiled by a government far removed from the people finds further example in their implacable insistence upon the insertion of the first 10 amendments in the Federal Constitution. These amendments guarantee the personal and property rights of the individual, and declare that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The ancient beliefs that all political power is vested in and derived from the people and that the States ought to have the right to regulate their internal affairs are as valid today as they were when the Declaration of Independence was signed and the Constitution of the United States was ratified.

4. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The most heart-rending story of history is that of man's struggle against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny for the simple privilege of bowing his own knees before his own God in his own way. As Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy of the North Carolina Supreme Court so well declared in one of the great judicial opinions of all time, "men contend more furiously over the road to heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth," and history records "the tragic fact that men have gone to war and cut each other's throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut."

The men and women who gave liberty to America were devout souls. They had learned some of the sorrowful facts of the spiritual life of man in the bitter crucible of experience. Most of them dissented from the doctrines and usages of the churches established by law in the lands of their origins. They were denied the right to worship God in their own ways. They were compelled to pay tithes for the support and propagation of religious opinions which they disbelieved. They had their marriages annulled and their children adjudged illegitimate for daring to speak their marriage vows before ministers of their own faiths rather than before clergymen of the established churches.

But these cruel oppressions merely steeled their convictions that religion is a private matter between man and his God; that no human authority should undertake to control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical."

For these reasons, our ancestors staked the very existence of America as a free nation upon the principle that "all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences," and the corollary that this natural and unalienable right can be secured only by keeping the hands of the state out of religion and the hands of religion off the state.

5. A BLESSING AND A WARNING

Courageous men and women built America with "strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands." They gave us a great country dedicated to the proposition that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights ;that among these are life, liberty, the enjoyment of the fruits of their own labor, and the pursuit of happiness." They gave us this land with the knowledge, however, that God grants freedom only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it; and they left us the solemn warning that "a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty."

They bequeathed this warning to us because they had read the history of the long and bitter struggle of man for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual, and had found this shocking but everlasting truth inscribed upon each page of that history: Government itself is the deadliest foe of liberty.

This tragic truth was well expressed a third of a century ago by a great statesman and Virginian, Woodrow Wilson. He said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

6. OUR OBLIGATION

Let us ponder these words of Wilson. Let us recur with frequency to fundamental principles. Let us preserve for ourselves and our posterity our goodly heritage—economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. This is our obligation. We must perform it. As Americans, we cannot do otherwise.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 13, President Kennedy delivered an address to the 19th Conference of the Advertising Council. His remarks dealt with fiscal policy and its relationship to the state of the Nation's economy.

What the Federal Government has done or failed to do in the past, on debt limitation, on the size of the Federal budget, and on Federal taxes, has had a major impact on the avoidance or precipitation of recessions. Fiscal policies, for example, did much to take a moderate prosperity and turn it into a recession in 1959. Fiscal policies helped to convert an estimated $500 million budgetary surplus into a peacetime record budgetary deficit of $12 billion in the same year.

What we do as we face these issues in the present Congress, similarly, will have profound bearing on the Nation's economic health now and in the months ahead. In a legislative sense, the President has done what he can. He has made his fiscal proposals to the Congress. He believes that the tax cut he advocates and the policies on the budget and debt limitation which he suggests will forestall a recession. With all due respect, may I say that the President's proposals are modest. The fact is that in some areas of this country—including my State of Rhode Island—the people suffer economic recession and an intolerable rate of unemployment. And, more and more, the entire country is likely to slide into the same situation if we continue to dawdle on these essential fiscal questions.

The President has asked for legislative action on debt limitation, on the budget, and on taxes. He has spelled out the kind of action he believes desirable. He has advanced cogent reasons—historical reasons and economic reasons—for his position. He has stressed the urgency of these matters if we are to avoid further economic slippage. At this point it is largely up to Congress—not to the President—to decide by fiscal policies whether to stimulate the economy or permit it to stagnate. It seems to me that it is high time that we in the Congress begin to face this issue. It is not enough that we speak individually on these questions, whether in support of the President's proposals or in opposition. Here I desire personally to interpolate my own strong belief and hope that the administration should stand firm on its tax reform proposals, and that we in the Congress should approve them.

It is not enough that committees in their own good time mull over these questions. We need to begin to consider them in the Congress as a whole. If we do not, the responsibility will rest with us—not with the President—for the consequences to the people of the Nation, for the unemployment which is already bad and is likely to grow worse, and for the continued sluggishness of business. We can oppose the President's proposals. We can support them. We can modify them. The one thing we cannot do, in good faith, is to ignore the President's warning. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 19TH WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, DISTRICT RED CROSS BUILDING

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCNAMARA, I want to express my appreciation to you for your many services in the public interest during the past months. The Advertising Council has been of inestimable value to us in attempting to advance the public interest on projects, savings bonds, particularly the Peace Corps, and a number of other projects.

I have been particularly appreciative to your efforts, that of your executive secretary of the Advertising Council for his very constant assistance to us in the early days and also your support for it represents a very admirable facet of American life, and your service also represents a very strong indication of your devotion to your country and we are very grateful to you, and I want you to know that.

I unfortunately picked as a topic to discuss one that you have heard talked about by experts, so I move into this minefield with some degree of hesitancy.

The only reason I want to say just a very few words about our economy is that in spite of the strong feeling of many that the Federal Government should mind its own business, whatever that may be, and stay out of business' businesses, the fact is, when things go bad the chicken comes to roost on the President's house. Mr. Herbert Hoover was, we know in legend, responsible for all of the difficulties of 1929. President Truman bore responsibility for the 1949 recession. President Eisenhower was blamed for the recessions in 1954, 1958, and 1960. When the stock market had its difficulties last spring, I got a good many letters.

I receive no mail thanking me and expressing admiration for my economic wisdom when the market goes up, but when it goes down we all know who is wrong. Therefore, that being true, recognizing that the President of the United States and the Government will be responsible if we have economic difficulties, it seems to me that we have some right to present proposals which may lessen those economic difficulties.

We have some right, really, to be listened to. We are attempting to avoid those hazards which will inevitably be blamed upon us when they finally come, and people do look to Washington in all kinds of ways when difficulty comes across the country. It is also true of business and economic difficulties. So the matters we are now discussing, and the proposals we have made in regard to the budget, Federal expenditures, and the tax cut, are all representing our efforts to avoid the difficulties which, if they come, will inevitably be blamed upon the President of the United States.

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy and the next several months will be dominated by the same facts. I think that is very wise. We are attempting to do something new, and that is to talk about a tax cut at a time when we have a deficit, and at a time when we have relatively good times, even though a disturbingly high rate of unemployment, so we are talking about, in a sense, something new, and it is appropriate that we talk about it in detail; and it is necessary that we get some understanding across the country of what we are trying to do because it is important and it does represent a change in previous policies enunciated by the U.S. Government.

The fact is, of course, these questions are all highly technical. To explain the difference between a family budget and the U.S. budget, to explain why we believe it difficult, if not impossible, and certainly unwise, to attempt to secure a balanced budget this year, which we believe would put us into a recession, which we believe would unbalance the budget, these are highly sophisticated questions, far more sophisticated than those questions which occupied our attention during the 19th century of free silver, trade, and all the rest. Balance of payments and the cyclical problems and debt management are all far more complicated and every solution raises new questions.

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

The limit on the national debt.

The size of the Federal budget.

The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced legislative and executive branches before, and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it.

In front of the Archives Building there is a statue, and under it is says "The past is prologue." Not necessarily, and it is because we do not wish to relive the past, because we do not wish to regard the past as necessarily a prologue in the 1960's that we have attempted to put forward our proposals.

Economic history, specifically the history of 1957–60, which produced two recessions from which the whole economy has never fully recovered, clearly warns us now that the wrong answers to each of these three questions would spell downturn for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during these crucial years have been acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face our country at this time. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past. There is enough to go around for everyone. But we shall all be deserving of blame, we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

The Federal Government, and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of the Government, but the Government as a whole decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy, and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had rarely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. It has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957 the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer to budget and balance-of-payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The 6 succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after mid-1957, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem this balance-of-payments tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter of 1959 was operating at the level of $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit, and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who call this, and I quote, "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short-term and long-term credit. Long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster," and I quote him, "than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today's output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

Now, in 1963, the Government once again is faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures, and I quote them:

"In the second half of 1957, the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And," they said and I quote, "the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from a tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been conceived of as a surplus of $500 million.

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden as measured by a percentage of our gross national product steadily declining. As you know, it has declined for 120 percent of our gross national product, 17 or 18 years ago, to 54 percent today, and will continue to decline both as a percentage of our population per capita and as a percentage of our gross national product.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to all trends in Government, both local and State, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of last year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years, a hard defense budget which, interestingly enough, was increased by half a billion dollars yesterday in the House of Representatives. And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut because, while the total amount of the tax cut in calendar months beginning in July would take place over a period of 18 months for the fiscal year, it will result in a $2.7 billion loss in this fiscal year.

Certainly it is clear that if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut. It seems to me that the logic of our problem and the past is so clearly before us that I sometimes find it difficult to understand why so many members of the business community who live with these problems day by day, who have lived through the last 20 years, are so reluctant to accept what are obviously the facts of life in our economy.

In addition, as you know, we are pouring into the labor market every year, at the very time when automation is becoming most sophisticated, millions of people who are looking for work. In 1960, 2.6 million Americans reached 18. In 1965, it will be 3.8 million reaching 18, which is this tremendous increase as a result of the war-baby boom of people looking for work in the 1960's.

So we have all of these things coming to a climax in 1960, automation, an increase in those in the labor market, and Number 3, a slow growth in our economy. That is what we are faced with in these years. I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be learned by us all, in and out of Washington, by those of us in the administration, and the Congress, and by all of you.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote de Tocqueville in 1835, "The great advantage of Americans consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterwards repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years, if we can stick to the facts and cast out those things which really don't apply to the situation, then surely this country can reach its goals, and upon reaching its goals depends the security of the free world.

Thank you.

SOVIET DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RUSSIAN JEWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a news report from Moscow today discloses that Jews in the U.S.S.R. will again not be able to obtain matzoth for the Passover this year. For the second year, state bakeries, the only ones permitted to operate in the Soviet Union, will not supply the religious ceremonial wafers for the Passover. The news report adds that the chief rabbi of the only synagogue in Moscow told his congregation last Saturday that a new request had been rejected by the Soviet authorities. These same authorities have also refused to allow Soviet Jews to import matzoth for the religious observance this year as they did last year. At that time I acted on behalf of a group of American matzoth bakers who had volunteered to ship a planeload of matzoth to the Soviet Union in time for observance of the Passover.

This is a direct attack on the part of the Communists against Jewish religious practices, and it gives further credence to the charge so hotly denied by Chairman Khrushchev himself of discrimination by Soviet officials.

Chairman Khrushchev owes the world an explanation for this and other attacks on Russian Jews. The hundreds of words used by Khrushchev in his speech on March 8 to describe his attitude toward Jews and to deny the existence of a Jewish problem in the U.S.S.R. do not explain the repressive actions of the Soviet Government against Jews. The Soviet Union's action should be protested and an accounting demanded.

There has been international protest in these matters as well. I draw attention to the fact that at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly Social Committee, on November 1, 1962, the Australian delegate, acting on the instructions of his government, specifically singled out Soviet discrimination against Jews during the committee's debate on manifestations of racial prejudice and national and religious intolerance. The Russians again hotly denied that that was so. But the Australian delegate stuck by his guns, and the record fully bears him out. I hope the protest of the world will again be directed at the Soviet Union for this act of discrimination, again shown by acts rather than speeches, which flies directly in the face of the position taken by Chairman Khrushchev in his speech of March 8.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notation of the Australian initiative and intervention that I have described and the news article to which I have referred, datelined Moscow, March 18, entitled "Soviet Forbids Making Matzoh in Red Bakeries."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVENTIONS—AUSTRALIA'S INITIATIVE

International concern over the situation of Jews in the U.S.S.R. has been expressed in a number of interventions at the U.N. and in direct representations to the Soviet authorities. At the United Nations General Assembly Social Committee on November 1, 1962, the Australian delegate, acting on the instructions of his Government, specifically singled out Soviet discrimination against Jews during the Committee's debate on manifestations of racial prejudice and national religious intolerance.

Mr. White said that there had been violent and inflammatory examples of anti-Jewish conduct in a number of countries in recent years. "I feel that I must also mention specifically the fact that Jewish communities throughout the world have expressed concern at the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union," he added.

The Australian accusation in the General Assembly's 110-nation Social Committee touched off a series of sharp East-West exchanges. Vigorously denying the anti-Semitism charge, the Soviet Union characterized Australia's statement as "filthy calumnies" and referred to "rank racism" in the United States.

Mr. White cited official Soviet criticism directed against the Jews, restriction of Jewish religious observances, and action taken against individual Jews.

He referred specifically to the Soviet ban on the public baking of unleavened bread for the 1962 Passover observance and the unduly high proportion of Jews sentenced to death recently for economic offenses in the Soviet Union.

"Should the U.S.S.R. find difficulty in according Soviet Jewry full freedom to practice their religion, it should, we believe, permit them to leave the country," he added. "Indeed it has a moral obligation to do so under article 13, paragraph 2, of the universal declaration of human rights, which says: 'Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.' "

Exercising the right of reply, Mrs. T. N. Nikolayeva of the Soviet Union charged that Australia's accusation was a Western attempt to denigrate her country and distract attention from the racial discrimination imposed by colonialism.

"In the Soviet Union," she asserted, "there is no discrimination against Jews or any other nationality or group."

She cited statistics to show that Jews held a high proportion of professional, artistic, and political positions in the Soviet Union.

When Mrs. Ronald Tree of the United States asked why Soviet passports identified Jews by religion, a Soviet spokesman asked why "armed forces" were needed to enroll a Negro in the University of Mississippi.

"You are sitting in a glasshouse yourself," the Soviet spokesman remarked.

Earlier in the week, the Israel permanent representative at the U.N., Mr. Michael Comay, had indirectly referred to Soviet Jewry when he asked the United Nations to condemn and seek an end to cultural discrimination which deprived a people of the freedom to "maintain their distinctive language, literature, and traditions" and used Jews as "scapegoats for economic difficulties." It is painful, he said, for Israel to state that a large section of the Jewish people had been singled out for such discrimination "in a land which officially recognizes the identity of each ethnic, national, and religious group within its borders—including the Jewish group, the members of which are formally described in their documents of identity as being Jewish in nationality.

"As a religious group, too, this community is deprived of the prerogatives which are still extended to other faiths, such as the production of sacred books and articles, the training of clerics and contact between the different local communities within the country, or between them and the Jewish communities elsewhere.

"In brief, the Jewish community of that country has been tragically cut off from its own rich religious and cultural heritage, as well as from its Jewish brethren in the rest of the world. Their helplessness is aggravated by the growing (though by no means original) trend to find Jewish scapegoats for economic difficulties."

TRADE UNION MEMORANDUM

Another intervention was the circulation recently of a memorandum among all members of the U.N. by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which asserted that discrimination against Jews is "part and parcel of government policy in the Soviet Union." It called for a sweeping investigation of "government-instigated anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union."

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which has consultative status on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, demands an investigation and report similar to that which dealt with forced labor in Soviet Russia and eventually led to a U.N. convention on forced labor. Its representative, Mr. Irving Brown, attacked the "ever-expanding program of Soviet anti-Semitism, aided, abetted, encouraged, and legalized by the Soviet Government."

While the Soviet Union is "preaching the virtues of peaceful coexistence," the trade union memorandum states, it is engaged "in a program against a large defenseless minority of its citizenry which can only be characterized as cultural and spiritual genocide."

The 5,000-word International Confederation of Free Trade Unions memorandum points out that while Soviet Jews are officially considered as a nationality and are listed as such on their identification papers, they are "officially deprived of the fundamental rights accorded to nationalities in the Soviet Union."

"All Jewish newspapers, publishing houses, literary journals, repertory theaters and dramatic schools, cultural-communal associations, literary, and cultural research institutions, schools and other means of instruction in and perpetuation of Jewish cultural and historic traditions have been forcibly liquidated since 1948," the memorandum states.

"Not only are the Jews allowed no schools, they are not even allowed classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in general schools, or, for that matter, classes on Jewish history and culture in Russian."

WORLD PROTESTANTS INQUIRE

In New York on September 18, 1962, a six-man delegation of the Protestant World Council of Churches, which had returned from an official visit to the Soviet Union, said that they had questioned Soviet officials about the position of Judaism in the U.S.S.R. Leader and chief spokesman for the group was the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, the executive head of the United Presbyterian Church of America, former president of the World Council of Churches and chairman of the council's standing committee on Soviet religious affairs.

Dr. Blake stated that, in response to the delegation's expression of concern about the Jews, Soviet officials denied the existence of any problem, but nevertheless promised to look into it.

This is the first time that such a high-level Christian group has raised the problem of Soviet Jews with Kremlin officials. The significance of the delegation's intervention is emphasized by the fact that the World Council of Churches has developed increasingly close relations during the past year with Soviet ecclesiastical bodies. Last December, at its international conference in New Delhi, the council accepted the Russian Orthodox Church, the U.S.S.R.'s leading denomination, as a full-fledged member. And this past August, the council's executive committee recommended acceptance of applications for membership from five more Soviet church groups: the Georgian Orthodox Church, the Armenian Apostolic Church, the Baptists, the Lutheran Church of Latvia, and the Lutheran Church of Estonia.

This prerogative of maintaining close relations and contact with coreligionists abroad is one of the many denied to Soviet Jews.

Dr. Blake added that the delegation had visited the one remaining synagogue in Odessa, where before the Revolution several score synagogues had thrived. He described the Odessa Synagogue as dreadfully rundown and in desperate need of repair and paint. Even this synagogue, in a city with a Jewish population of some 100,000, lacks a rabbi.

In general, Dr. Blake noted that, though the Soviet Government has stepped up its propaganda campaigns against all religions, it has not resorted to "administrative measures against the Christian churches. This stands in marked contrast to the harsh administrative steps taken against Judaism in the past year. In addition to the ban on matzoth-baking and the virtual closure of the Yeshiva, these measures have included the deposition of synagogue presidents in six major cities, and the trial and lengthy prison terms meted out to Gedalia Pechersky and other Jewish religious leaders in Leningrad and Moscow last October."

COLORED PEOPLE'S ASSOCIATION ASK CLEMENCY

A request that the Soviet authorities extend clemency to 15 people in the Soviet Union sentenced to die for economic offenses, at least 12 of whom were Jews, was made in April 1962, by the National Association of Colored People. The chairman of the association, Mr. S. G. Spollswood, wrote to the Soviet Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Anatoli F. Dobrynin, that: "Representing, as it does, a group which has long suffered the troubles of discrimination and segregation, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People considers with increasing concern the fate of Soviet Jewry. The shocking events of recent weeks within the Soviet Union have brought the situation to a pass which forces us to speak out in protest."

The letter points out that many of these sentenced to death by shooting "received their sentences for offenses committed at a time when the law did not call for capital punishment. In at least three cases a lesser penalty, meted out upon conviction, was increased to capital punishment on appeal by the prosecution after enactment of the death penalty decree. Most of the convicted are denied the right to appeal. These savage practices represent an unfortunate retrogression in Soviet law as well as new and disturbing indications of anti-Semitic persecution."

The letter asked for clemency and for commutation of the death sentences.

OTHER INTERVENTIONS

In May the International League for the Rights of Man sent an appeal, signed by 223 leading Americans, to the U.N. Secretary General U Thant asking him to intercede over the death sentences.

Some other interventions were: An appeal on August 12, 1962, the 10th anniversary of the murder of 26 leading Soviet-Jewish intellectuals, by the 7 leading Jewish organizations in America calling for the restoration to Soviet Jews of "the full right to their own cultural life." The appeal declared that: "Official Soviet practice today continues the Stalin policy of depriving Soviet Jewry of continuity with its past and free expression in the present. The terror is gone, but the policy extinguishing every spark of Jewish consciousness and identity continues."

Under Soviet Premier Khrushchev, the organizations said, "the policy of cultural extinction remains essentially unaltered. There is no school, nor even a classroom, where a Jewish child may learn something of Yiddish or Hebrew language and literature. There does not even exist the opportunity for Jewish parents to have their children instructed in Jewish history and culture through the medium of the Russian language."

The statement concluded:

"Ten years after their execution, there is no way, except for public apology and full rehabilitation, that reparation can be made to the slain writers. But there is a way for the Soviet Government to rectify its crime against Soviet Jewry: To reverse this policy and to restore to Soviet Jews the full right to their own cultural life."

Signers of the statement were Dr. Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress; Label Katz, president, B'nai B'rith; Adolph Held, national chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Theodore Brooks, national commander, Jewish War Veterans; Lewis Weinstein, chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Rabbi David Hill, president, National Council of Young Israel, and Rabbi Israel Moshowitz, president, New York Board of Rabbis.

On July 15, the president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Sir Barnett Janner, appealed for mitigation of the severe sentences meted out to Jews in the Soviet Union charged with economic offenses, and asked the Soviet Government to conduct "a campaign of enlightenment against anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R."

On June 24, 1962, the Central Conference of American Rabbis deplored the "unique discrimination and persecution" of Jews and Judaism in the U.S.S.R. They said that Soviet authorities were attempting to "liquidate religious and cultural Judaism and to assimilate Russian Jews by coercion."

An American assemblyman, Bentley Kassal, asked the U.S. Mission at the U.N. to demand U.N. action on behalf of Soviet Jews in May 1962. He said that on a visit to the U.S.S.R. in December 1961, he had noted the disruption of Jewish communities, despite denials by Soviet officials.

In June 1962, 40 American and Canadian trade union leaders condemned anti-Jewish excesses in the U.S.S.R. A resolution passed by the meeting in Pennsylvania critized death sentences for so-called economic crimes, and the second-class treatment accorded to Soviet Jews in every facet of Soviet life."

Soviet Forbids Making Matzoh in Red Bakeries

Moscow, March 18.—Jews in the Soviet Union have been told again this year that state-operated bakeries will not supply them with traditional matzoh bread for Passover ceremonies next month.

Yehuda Leb-Levin, chief rabbi of the only synagogue in Moscow, told his congregation last Saturday that a new request had been turned down and that if they wanted matzoh this year they would have to bake it at home.

Last year was the first time the state bakeries have refused to supply matzoh in Moscow and Leningrad. Matzoh supplies have been cut off in a growing number of provincial Soviet cities over the last 5 or 6 years, however, and the policy now is understood to be nationwide.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection.? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appeared in the winter 1962–63 issue of American Judaism entitled "The Dilemma of Soviet Jewry," written by Rabbi Judah Cahn, spiritual leader of the Metropolitan Synagogue of New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dilemma of Soviet Jewry

(By Rabbi Judah Cahn)

One of the tragic results of recent developments in the Soviet Union is the dilemma which now faces the 3 million Jews in that nation. The roots of the dilemma are deep and complicated. It begins with the fact that within the Soviet Union, Jews are regarded not as a religious body but as a national minority. This was not always true. During the early years after the revolution, the Soviet Government had denied this status to the Jews.

The reversal of this decision was based ostensibly on the four-point definition of a nationality as promulgated by Stalin. He said that a nation or ethnic group should possess four characteristics: A common land, a common language, a common culture, and common economic interests. Within the framework of this definition it would have been logically impossible to give the Jewish population of the Soviet Union the label of a national group.

Biro-Bidjan, a region in East Siberia, was established as an autonomous Jewish Republic. This was an attempt by Soviet authorities to make the Jews in the Soviet Union conform to their definition. Of the approximately 20,000 Jewish inhabitants who were there during the early days, over 11,000 had left by 1934.

This so-called Jewish Republic turned out to be an admitted failure. All the other republics had been created on the same lands already occupied by the people who were designated as citizens of that republic. The situation with the Jews was quite different. A piece of land in Siberia which did not even have a trace of previous Jewish occupation was turned into a Jewish "homeland." The fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union were located in the great cities of Western Russia and played a very important part in the cultural and economic life of the country, made no difference. Did the Soviet authorities seriously expect these thousands of teachers, scientists, poets, actors, and musicians to leave the cultural centers of the U.S.S.R. and migrate to Biro-Bidjan?

The results of these actions were inevitable. The Jews became a national minority group within the Soviet Union without possessing any of the advantages of such a designation. When choices were made for national posts in the many areas of Soviet life, the Jews could be designated only after all others who were citizens of that particular republic had been given the opportunity. The only place where it was possible for a Jew to receive preference over others would have been in Biro-Bidjan and in this barren spot there existed none of the institutions which permitted such participation. This also applied to college admission, professional training, and opportunities, which all depend on national identity.

Thus, the Jews became subject to the whims of the dictator. When Stalin thought it desirable, he utilized a literal interpretation of the law. When he thought it expedient, he utilized a loose interpretation.

During the life of Stalin, academic life was circumscribed by political expediency. The best of the Soviet academicians were harnessed to justify and rationalize the policies of the state. With the elimination of Stalin, this academic straitjacket was, for a time, loosened and matters heretofore forbidden for discussion were now brought into the open. At a meeting with Prof. Alexi Leondyev, a member of the Presidium of the Academy of Special Sciences and chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Moscow, and Prof. Fidore Savatkin, vice director of the Institute of National Schools and professor of methods of teaching language in the professional school, this subject was first raised by me in the summer of 1956. Neither professor made any serious attempt to justify the designation of Jews as a national minority. In the course of the discussion, I pointed out that in my contacts with Jewish university students, musicians, and government officials who were under the age of 35, I had found that they had either no knowledge or a sparse knowledge of Yiddish, which was supposed to be a national language for Soviet Jewry.

I indicated to Professor Savatkin that though he had organized schools and staffs for the teaching of approximately fifty languages, there were neither teachers nor texts for the teaching of Yiddish. A call was immediately put in to the Lenin Library and this point was confirmed. Though there were texts in Yiddish concerned with the teaching of other subjects, there wasn't a single text dealing with the teaching of Yiddish. As far as Hebrew was concerned, both men refused to recognize it as a spoken tongue and referred to it as a language of prayer which was the concern and responsibility of the Jewish religious community. They claimed that they would neither help nor hinder such activities. When it was further charged that Jews were not permitted to create prayerbooks for the teaching of the language, this fact was attributed to the disinterest of Jews themselves; a common excuse among Soviet officials. Finally, both professors suggested that this was a vastly complicated question and that the complete assimilation of Soviet Jewry would be the desirable goal. Upon further discussion they admitted that the Jewish national group alone seemed superfluous in the eyes of the Soviet authorities.

The matter was then pursued with Prof. Ivan Podekhin, director of the Institute of Ethnology at the University of Moscow. This institute is responsible for the designation of national identities. After many hours of argument, it was finally divulged that the subject of Jewish identity was just then coming before the Institute of Ethnology for restudy. However, the research and discussions had not yet reached the stage where they could be made public. The latest information on this subject which we have been able to secure from the Soviet Union, indicates that the problem of Jewish identity is now very much alive in Soviet academic circles.

This creates the dilemma for Soviet Jewry: whether to be or not to be a nationality. If national identity is taken from them, all that will be left will be a religious identity. In view of the fact that only a small minority of Soviet Jewry maintains identity with the synagogue and that members of this minority, for the most part, are well advanced in years, it would mean the virtual disappearance by assimilation of this vast segment of world Jewry. Hitler destroyed 6 million Jews. The Soviet Union is suggesting to 3 million more the possibility of mass cultural suicide. The other alternative is to seek to maintain Soviet Jewry as a national minority. This would mean the continuance of certain disabilities, and perhaps an intensification of the current anti-Semitic wave now prevalent in the Soviet Union. But it would make possible the maintenance of identity for these 3 million people and the hope for their eventual freedom. These millions of Jews also recognize that even cultural and religious suicide may not necessarily destroy the virus of anti-Semitism. Among those who were liquidated in the Stalin purges were many men and women who had not only relinquished their Jewish heritage, but had become the enemies of those who insisted on retaining it.

No other Jew in the world can make this decision for Soviet Jewry. Of course, it may be that Soviet Jewry will have little voice in determining its own destiny. But where shall they, as a community, apply the little strength that they may have?

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK— MARCH 17 TO 23, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that this week is National Wildlife Week throughout the Nation.

Held during the first week of spring every year since first proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1938, National Wildlife Week has served to focus public attention on the importance of conserving our natural resources and to spotlight specific conservation problems through the years. This year the Wildlife Week's theme is "Chemical Pesticides Are Poison—Handle With Care."

This theme is especially appropriate this year in view of the nationwide impact which has been made recently by Rachel Carson's controversial book, "Silent Spring," which has detailed how man has abused and misused chemical pesticides in his attempt to control insects and other pests. The issues raised by Miss Carson's book have stressed general agreement that steps should be taken to acquaint the public with the potential dangers and hazards involved in the use of these chemical pesticides. With the protection of the public and our Nation's heritage of abundant fish and wildlife in mind, the National Wildlife Federation-sponsored Wildlife Week has devoted itself to this important educational task.

WOOLEN TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question of imports of woolen manufactures and their effect on the U.S. industry has again become a matter of public and governmental concern. The President's Cabinet Committee on Textiles met recently on this problem and the President has promised an answer to a group of distinguished colleagues from wool producing and wool textile manufacturing States on what action, if any, will be taken.

There has been much dispute, however, concerning the actual facts regarding imports and the performance of the domestic industry. This is because of the great difficulties in obtaining, analyzing and evaluating statistical material both on an overall and category-by-category basis. The U.S. industry contends that imports represent something like 20 percent of domestic consumption of wool products. Importer groups dispute this figure and contend that the statistical basis for the computation is erroneous. The U.S. industry points to a rising trend of imports. Importer groups emphasize the greatly expanded domestic consumption of woolen products, the firm market for such goods, and the satisfactory performance of the domestic industry.

Mr. President, last year the Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which provides the machinery for evaluating such claims and testing out the arguments and facts submitted by opposing interests before an independent tribunal, the U.S. Tariff Commission. My investigation of the statistical material submitted to me by various groups has convinced me that this is a case for which the machinery set up by the Trade Act could well be used.

The press reports that the Cabinet committee has recommended to the President that a section 332 investigation or an escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission be initiated. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of these reports but would endorse such a course of action on the following grounds:

First. Contradictory and incomplete data relating to woolen textile imports and their effect on domestic industry should be evaluated and fully brought to light by the agency created by Congress for this very purpose.

Second. Governmental responsibility to the consumer, who would bear the brunt of increased import restrictions in terms of prices, requires that a full and impartial investigation be conducted before any such restrictions are put into effect.

Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point both the public statement of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and the letter to the President from the wool products group. I believe that the obvious differences in the data and arguments presented by these two interests clearly indicate the need for an informed judgment in the consumer interest.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC STATEMENT BY EDWIN WILKINSON, PRESIDENT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

President Kennedy's Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee could not give him worse advice than that reported in the press today. According to these reports, it has suggested that the President order still another study of the wool textile-apparel import crisis.

The Cabinet Committee, in our view, is asking the President of the United States to close his eyes to the grave peril he long has recognized and to draw back on administration commitments to limit imports of wool products which in 1962 soared to record levels. For example, imports of woven wool cloth rose to about 65 million square yards in 1962 compared with 42,921,000 in 1961. Imports of cloth in the form of apparel were equal to 20 million yards. The combined total, 85 million square yards, was equal to about 18 percent of U.S. production of woven wool apparel cloth.

The import crisis confronting the industry did not spring up overnight. It has been developing with increasing and virtually uninterrupted virulence since the filling of the war-created void in world supply of wool textiles in consequence of the unwise and unwarranted negotiated slashes in the wool product tariff schedule.

President Kennedy formally recognized the intolerable textile import situation in May of 1961 in announcing a special program for all textiles, declaring then that it was "time for action." Clearly, he did not mean 1963 or 1964 or perhaps later. He said: "I believe it is time for action."

Since that time the administration has moved forward only on cotton textiles. All this time, however, the wool textile industry has had continuing assurances from highest officials that its problem was recognized and was to be promptly dealt with once the cotton program was operative, which it now is.

For the Cabinet Committee now to suggest that a known cancer be investigated to see if it exists is the height of futility, a disservice to the President and to the Nation. For this defense-essential industry, such a course of action could only mean accelerated liquidation with all its attendant evils, with which we are all too familiar. Since 1947 the woolen and worsted industry has suffered a severe contraction: woolen and worsted spinning spindles have declined by 65 percent, and looms by 58 percent; some 98,000 jobs have been lost, and about 300 mills have gone out of business. Imports have contributed substantially to this decline.

Industry must and does rely on the President's earnestness. Industry relies on the President to reject the Cabinet Committee's recommendation for another study. A study would be totally inconsistent with administration declarations.

Available on request are additional copies of this statement and the accompanying record of administration commitments on wool textile import limitations.

THE RECORD OF ADMINISTRATION COMMITMENTS ON WOOL TEXTILE IMPORT LIMITATIONS, FEBRUARY 1963

May 2, 1961, President Kennedy announces seven-point textile program, and point 6 said:

"I have directed the Department of State to arrange for calling an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries. This conference will seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries."

May 4, 1961, Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, in speech at annual meeting of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

"As this evidence [on the import situation] mounted, those of us who were new to Government became increasingly amazed that such a situation should have ever been permitted to exist. And it became equally clear that if the accelerated rate of imports in all segments of your industry were to continue at a rate comparable to that of the last 2 years, your industry would be faced with virtual extinction * * *. We cannot totally shut off imports * * *. But what is possible by two of the means mentioned by the President [in his seven-point program] is a reasonable control, and from there on the job is yours."

June 30, 1961, President Kennedy in letter to Congressman CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia:

"It should be borne in mind that the contemplated [cotton textile] negotiations are designed as one of a series of efforts to assist the textile industry. Our objective is to assist the industry to overcome all of the handicaps which it faces. The State Department is being instructed to get the best possible relief, not only for cotton, but for other fibers."

January 1962, Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant to President Kennedy, in identical letters to Senator PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and to Congressman VINSON:

"After the conclusion of the permanent [cotton] textile agreement, the problems of the wool and manmade fiber industries will certainly be attacked."

February 26, 1962, President Kennedy in letter to Congressman VINSON:

"I have also requested the Departments involved to implement my program for the wool, manmade fiber and silk divisions of the industry. Almost all of the points in the program announced on May 2, 1961, apply equally to each of these."

May 10, 1962, Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, in a speech at annual meeting of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

"The President's Cabinet Textile Committee last Monday appointed a three-man ad hoc committee to consider and report upon as rapidly as possible the implementation of the President's seven-point program relating to textile products manufactured from fibers other than cotton. There are * * * numerous roads down which Government can go to be of great and material help to this industry, applicable not only to the domestic front, but more importantly in the international with respect to imports. It is our desire to attempt to translate these into action at the earliest possible moment."

August 7, 1962, Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to President Kennedy, in letter to National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

"The President, under his seven-point program for textiles * * * has expressed his concern about the importation of all textiles, including those made of wool and manmade fibers, and indicated his determination to take steps to deal effectively with these imports. This concern of the President and his determination to see that these imports do not exceed reasonable levels continue unchanged and are the subject of planning and consideration now underway in this Government. Limitation of textile imports to prevent market disruption is an essential element of administration policy. We intend to implement this policy with regard to all textiles, and particularly to prevent market disruption such as would result from an increase over current levels of imports."

August 28, 1962, Secretary of Commerce Luther W. Hodges in letter to Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts:

"We are determined that imports of wool textile products will not be permitted to exceed current levels and we will take all necessary steps to prevent this."

December 11, 1962, W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and chairman, U.S. Delegation to International Wool Study Group, London:

"There is in this program [President Kennedy's seven-point textile program] in fact, a commitment by the President to the industry that * * * the administration will not permit excessively large imports or rapidly rising imports, which have a disruptive effect, effectively to destroy the stability and the survival of all sectors of this [the textile] industry."

January 18, 1963, a Washington press dispatch:

"A group of Senators from wool and wool textile States said they received assurances from President Kennedy today that 'something will be done' to restrict imports on wool products. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, told newsmen * * * that the President promised to propose within a month measures to limit such imports."

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN
IMPORTERS, INC.,
WOOL PRODUCTS GROUP,
New York, N.Y., February 11, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Wool Products Group is a representative organization of U.S. firms importing and distributing wool yarns, woolen fabrics, wool blends, and wool apparel, including knitwear. It is a commodity group affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, Inc. Its members import articles from the United Kingdom, Italy, Japan, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Eire, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Switzerland, Israel, Argentina, Uruguay, Australia, and Hong Kong.

We are deeply disturbed by reports in the press that the domestic wool manufacturing and clothing industries are intensifying their efforts for the imposition of quotas on the imports of wool products of every kind.

Our concern has been increased by reports in the press stating that 6 Senators visited the White House on January 18 to request a quota treatment for imported woolen textiles similar to that now imposed on cotton textiles. According to these reports, the Senators were told that this problem is receiving active consideration, and that if they returned to the White House in 30 days, they would receive an answer to their request.

These reports create the impression, both in this country and abroad, that the administration is planning to institute quantitative restrictions on all kinds of imported wool products soon.

There are many aspects of the present situation that must be studied and placed in proper perspective. We, therefore, respectfully urge that the U.S. Tariff Commission be directed to make an immediate investigation under section 332(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and furnish the President with the information specified in subdivisions (3), (4), (5), and (6) of that subsection without delay.

The statement has been made that competitive imports of wool products amount to 20 percent of domestic consumption. Importers of wool products say this figure is very much exaggerated, and that the correct figure will be found to be between 6 and 7 percent. In this connection, we understand that in some European countries the ratio of imports to domestic consumption is very high. The figures we have are: 57 percent for the United Kingdom; 46 percent for West Germany; and 79 percent for the Netherlands. Yet, none of these countries propose to restrict their imports of wool products by quotas or other nontariff measures.

A thorough investigation by the Tariff Commission will disclose the full facts—now not available—with respect to (1) the percentage of our imports to domestic consumption, and (2) the reasons why the domestic wool manufacturing industry has not kept pace with other domestic industries since 1955. Some domestic mills have merged with other mills, and by more efficient methods and technological changes, including automation, have decreased the number of spindles required to produce the same amount of material, and yet this decrease in spindles is often attributed to import competition.

Where these mergers have occurred, no one knows how the large textile firms are progressing financially because it is almost impossible to segregate the profits of the woolen division from the overall earnings. On the other hand, there are smaller, closely held companies that do not issue financial reports. Only the Tariff Commission can ascertain the general condition of the domestic industry by securing detailed information through its questionnaire procedure.

Another important factor is the introduction of manmade fibers. The popularity of mixtures of synthetic fibers and wool in fabrics used in clothing manufacturing is significant.

In general, we wish to point out that imported wool products similar or comparable to domestic products are not necessarily competitive, because for many imported materials and articles the pattern, style, design, and finish are important factors.

Among other considerations that should be taken into account are the following:

1. Many types of yarns, woolen fabrics, and apparel articles included in the overall statistics of U.S. imports are specialties of a kind not adaptable to domestic production. For example, yarns, fabrics, and apparel of camel's hair, alpaca, angora, vicuna, and llama, as well as expensive handmade knitted fabrics and church goods. Included in this category are specialties which are of distinctive design or pattern, including a variety of imported fabrics made with short-length warps that cannot be produced economically by the domestic industry. To limit the importation of specialties that are not produced to any extent in the United States by quotas would seriously affect our domestic cloth and garment manufacturers who use such yarns and fabrics; the American wholesalers and retailers who sell finished articles made therefrom; and would further deprive the American consumer of his freedom of choice.

2. Over the years, the importation of specialty apparel articles designed and created abroad, particularly in the United Kingdom, France, Italy, West Germany, and Austria, has furnished the domestic industry with style and fashion incentives that otherwise would have been lacking. For example, domestic industry has profited by exploiting the "London Look," "Italian Influence," "Austrian Ski Look," etc. Fashion articles with new design and style ideas are imported constantly, and are often copied to become popular mass-production items for the domestic industry.

3. The American textile industry is well equipped to meet the requirements of the average American consumer, whose numbers comprise the largest segment of our population. It is chiefly in the upper and lower levels of income where imports fill consumers' needs. The finer imported fabrics are in demand by the more affluent consumer, while lower priced imported textiles supply the consumer in the low-income classes with the type of products he needs and can afford. Actually, the degree of head-on competition is far smaller than claimed by domestic producers.

4. It is unrealistic to assume that imported fabrics and apparel replace the domestic product. Every retailer will confirm the fact that luxury wool imports furnish extra sales that could not be made if such imports were not available. At the same time, lower priced imported goods and articles account for additional retail sales that mean profitable volume. If imports were to be restricted, the effect on these merchants, many of whom are small businessmen, would be a serious matter.

5. In a preliminary examination of the statistics of increased imports, we find that in the past few years there has been a notable increase in the imports of wool fabrics and finished wool manufacturers, chiefly from Italy, and an increase in wool apparel, chiefly from Hong Kong. The main reason for these increases has been the production of new-style fabrics made from reused and reprocessed wool at reasonable prices, which has re-created an entirely new market in the United States. Furthermore, the new European fabrics made from reused and reprocessed wool have been exported to Hong Kong for the manufacture of clothing. The interesting fact is that the raw materials used in the production of these wool fabrics and finished wool manufacturers have been exported from the United States to the European countries.

6. Another factor of importance is the lack of a sufficient domestic supply of raw clothing wool, and the fact that a major portion of the supply needed by our domestic producers of yarns must be imported, and is subject to a comparatively high duty rate. Not one of the countries that export wool yarns, wool fabrics, and wool apparel to the United States imposes a customs duty upon its necessary imports of raw wool.

7. The U.S. clothing industry has just completed a survey of European markets to explore the potential for increased exports of textiles and apparel from the United States. A special mission, sponsored by the American Institute of Men's and Boys' Wear, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, recently made a month's tour of European industrial centers and reported that there is an encouraging outlook for expanded exports of American apparel to many European markets. This mission was the first U.S. trade mission ever organized and financed by any domestic industry. It consisted of eight members, and included the principals of some of the leading American clothing

manufacturers. The members of the mission were recently honored at a special ceremony by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, received a citation from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and received a congratulatory letter from you. If the United States now imposes import quotas on wool apparel, there is sure to be reaction in these European countries that might well destroy the export potential found by this mission and other manufacturers in our clothing industry.

8. It must be remembered that the United States did impose a tariff quota from October 1, 1956, to December 31, 1960, on imports of wool fabrics. As tariff quotas are not allocated, there was a speeding up of shipments wherever possible to avoid payment of higher duty rates. This not only caused an uneven flow of goods and extra warehouse expenses, but there was always uncertainty as to just when the annual quota at lower duties would be filled. Users of imported fabrics could not, under the circumstances, maintain normal purchasing procedures. Difficulties also arose because countries exporting staple materials that were produced and shipped on a year-round basis had an undue advantage over countries producing specialty fabrics of a seasonal nature. The hardships caused by this quota system eventually led to the negotiation of an increase in the duty rate and the abolition of quotas on January 1, 1961. To revert to wool product quotas at this time would surely result in vigorous protests from exporting countries, particularly in view of the fact that a higher duty is now in effect as a substitute for the previous quantitative restrictions on imports.

9. The present level of duty rates on wool yarns, woolen fabrics, and wool apparel is still very high, and affords an adequate measure of protection to the domestic industry.

10. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has been hailed by countries of the free world as a forward-looking step in the direction of liberalized trade policies, and the prospects for the reduction of nontariff barriers of all kinds under that act seem encouraging. It must be borne in mind that most of the nations exporting wool products to the United States are importing more from our country than they export to us, and are just as concerned with their unfavorable balances of trade as we are about our overall unfavorable balance of payments. During the consideration of the act by the Congress last year, there was a recognition of the need for the elimination of nontariff restrictions in various countries abroad that confront U.S. exporters.

11. In the Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to you on January 14, 1963, and transmitted to the Congress with your Economic Report, it was stated:

"Quantitative restrictions, prohibitive import duties and subsidies are out of place in the world which both the United States and other industrial nations are trying to build. They do not meet the long-run needs of producers and consumers in these developed countries; they restrict mutually advantageous trade; and they are unfair handicaps to the developing countries in other continents."

The annual report also referred to the 5-year cotton textile agreement, and said:

"Ultimately, of course, the general objective of U.S. foreign economic policy is a trading world free of quantitative restrictions."

12. Quantitative restrictions of imports, either by absolute quotas or by tariff quotas, and restrictions of imports in any country by any other nontariff measures, is the most severe form of a trade barrier. In practice, controls by quotas require governmental supervision, involve the share-of-the-market concept, and arbitrary decisions. Our own recent experience with the arrangement regarding international trade in cotton textiles has demonstrated how unsatisfactory this sort of restriction can be. Under that arrangement, it has been necessary for the Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee to decide, from time to time, to prohibit completely the importation of certain categories of cotton yarns, textile fabrics, and cotton textile apparel produced in certain countries, usually on a retroactive basis, and always without providing a reasonable grace period for the importer to clear shipments en route to the United States at that time. These sudden actions upset import operations.

The imposition of new quotas on wool yarns, fabrics, and apparel, following the present restrictions on cotton textiles and cotton textile products, will certainly lead our friends abroad to conclude that the next step will be similar restrictions on manmade fibers and products made therefrom, and then on silk, and eventually to nontextile products. This would, indeed, be an unfortunate turn of events.

While this letter contains some of the reasons for the objections of our wool products group to the imposition of quotas or other new restrictions on imports of wool products, the early investigation by the Tariff Commission which we suggest will give impôrters a fair opportunity to present further factual and technical information and our views at the public hearings that should be held by the Commission during its investigation. We are prepared to do this.

Respectfully submitted,
WOOL PRODUCTS GROUP,
By S. P. NEUMANN, *Chairman.*

THE NEW ARMY OF UNEMPLOYED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is no more serious domestic problem facing our Nation today than the unemployment problem. The unemployment rate stands at 6.1 percent today—substantially more than this Nation can tolerate. It is a complex issue, with no easy solutions. One of the most perceptive discussions of the problem was published last week in the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union and other Gannett newspapers. This series of articles was written by Jack W. Germond, of the Times-Union's Washington bureau, and will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have the series printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the series of articles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW ARMY OF UNEMPLOYED—OLDER WORKERS, DROPOUTS MAKE UP HARD CORE

(The first in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—At 49, Charles Thompson is, as he puts it, "eating entirely too many beans and not enough meat."

He has not had a steady job for more than 6 months, and his prospects are poor. He sets out each morning carrying a burden of despair and a newspaper folded to the "help wanted" advertisements.

Thompson, a former freight handler, in Inkster, Mich., is one of a growing number of Americans who may never work regularly again unless there is a genuine improvement in the economy—or a war.

He is one of the losers in the formless competition for a dwindling supply of jobs that require little or no skill.

Many of those in Thompson's situation are too old to have much hope of finding a job that will put an occasional steak on the supper table. A few are too lazy and a few too stupid.

But the most common handicap among the hard core of unemployed, which Charles Thompson shares, is a lack of education and training. His fellows include many youths who have just decided that school is not worth the candle as well as the weary elders who set an example for them by quitting a generation or two ago.

The unemployed represent the most serious domestic problem facing the Kennedy administration. The recognition of this lies behind the President's decision to give his tax program a priority before Congress that sets it in a class by itself.

At a recent news conference, President Kennedy said:

"If we don't have the tax cut, it—substantially, in my opinion—increases the chance of a recession, which will increase unemployment, which will increase the size of our deficit. So that is what it comes down to. And I think that with the record we have had in the last 5 years of over 5-percent unemployment, two recessions, I think the important thing for us to do is prevent another one."

The unemployed also represent a political hazard for the President next year.

The almost 5 million jobless are too scattered and inarticulate to make an effective lobby here. But their potential is better gaged when we realize they outnumber the populations of States like Connecticut, Wisconsin, or Minnesota.

The stickiness of the unemployment problem probably has been demonstrated most clearly by the flagging of the administration's optimism over its ability to deal with it.

Early in 1961 New Frontier economists were predicting that a 4-percent unemployment rate could be achieved in 1962. But just a year ago this was revised when the President's Council of Economic Advisers said 4 percent would be "a feasible interim goal for mid-1963."

Today, with unemployment at more than 6 percent, the target date has become late 1964 or 1965, and the predictions no longer seem to carry the same conviction.

Perhaps the best indication of the situation is the fact that 4 percent is a goal at all. The figure for normal joblessness traditionally was 3 percent until the last few years.

Underlying the change of attitude among many economists is the realization that since 1957 unemployment has not behaved at all as it should.

For one thing, it has become a persistent problem even in some of the most prosperous communities, pushing welfare costs even higher. For another, the rate no longer varies closely with such other economic indicators as industrial production, personal income, the factory workweek and the business investment index.

One key problem is long-term unemployment, which the Government defines as that lasting 15 weeks or longer.

Ten years ago there were fewer than 200,000 workers who had been out that long. But by 1956, a "good" year for the economy as a whole, the average had risen to 533,000. It reached a peak of 1.8 million during the 1960–61 recession and last year—a year of recovery—averaged 1.1 million.

Those off the job more than 26 weeks, the usual maximum period for payment of unemployment insurance benefits, rose from fewer than 100,000 a decade ago to 600,000 during the 1962 recovery.

Perhaps the most frightening and puzzling factor has been the rising floor of unemployment during periods of prosperity. In the major postwar economic cycles, recovery periods have been growing steadily shorter and less successful in restoring workers to their jobs.

After the 1948–49 recession reached its low point, the recovery lasted 45 months and cut the unemployment rate to 2.7 percent.

After the next recession, the recovery ran 35 months and unemployment fell back to 4.2 percent.

And after the 1957–58 recession, the recovery lasted only 25 months and unemployment fell only to 5.1 percent.

The 1960–61 recession now has been over officially for 24 months and unemployment refuses to drop below 5½ percent. There is even some suspicion that the peak of this latest recovery already has been reached, but no one knows because key points in economic cycles do not become apparent until several months after they have been passed.

The special change in the situation in the last 5 years can be measured by two comparisons:

Unemployment averaged 4.2 percent from 1947 to 1957 but more than 6 percent since that time.

The average duration of unemployment has risen from 10.3 weeks in 1947–57 to 14.3 weeks in the last 5 years.

None of these statistics tell the complete story, however.

They do not measure the premature retirements of men in their late fifties and early sixties who dropped out of the labor force when it became apparent their quest was useless.

Nor do the figures reflect accurately the in-and-outers who don't show up in long-term statistics because they have managed to sandwich in an occasional 2 or 3 weeks of work before being put out on the street again.

Charles Thompson is a case in point. In the 28 weeks since he lost his regular job, he has managed 7 weeks of work—1 or 2 at a time—plus about 9 days of casual labor on odd jobs. He has been on and off the welfare rolls twice.

Finally, the unemployment rates do not reflect the so-called underemployed—that is, those on part-time schedules because they can't find full-time jobs and those in jobs below their capability.

Last year there were 2.3 million workers on part time for economic reasons, including 1.1 million who ordinarily work full time.

The hard core of jobless is, as might be expected, heavily weighted with workers with the poorest chance for helping themselves and the greatest potential for becoming public charges.

Negroes, for example, make up 28.7 percent of those out of work more than 6 months although they represent only 10.8 percent of the labor force.

Those who tend to minimize the unemployment problem because they fear the cures that may be offered contend that it is not as serious as it appears. They say it includes many "fringe" workers—youngsters who never have held jobs, married women contributing a second income to their homes, and workers over 65.

But Bureau of Labor Statistics studies don't bear this out. They show that the fringe groups make up only a slightly greater proportion of the unemployed than they do of the work force.

In fact, most of those who make up the hard core—like Charles Thompson, who has three children—are married men with families.

Two Trends Will Swell Surplus of Labor

(The second in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's stubborn unemployment problem is threatening to get a great deal worse before it gets any better.

While the economy is limping forward, creating new jobs in dribs and drabs, two counter trends that will add to the labor surplus are careening along with increasing momentum.

One is the mechanization of industry that is wiping out jobs on all sides.

The other is the swelling of the labor force as the postwar baby crop moves out of the classrooms and into the job market.

Unless there is a dramatic quickening of the economy's pace, these trends may become so dominant that unemployment levels that were the high points of recessions just a few years ago will become what will be considered normal in the years ahead.

Young people are entering the labor force at a rate 40 percent faster during the 1960's than they did during the 1950's. In 1970, some 3.8 million youngsters will reach 18, compared to 2.6 million in 1960.

The result: The economy must produce 13½ million new jobs in this decade just to keep pace with the growth in the labor force, without cutting into the backlog of 4 million already out of work.

To this can be added whatever job losses result from mechanization and gains in productivity. According to one labor department analysis, this might amount to another 200,000 a year.

In short, the economy will be challenged to produce 25,000 to 30,000 new jobs a week when it has not even been able to add 15,000.

In the last 5 years the net gains and losses in the private sector of the economy have just about canceled one another out. New full-time jobs in trade, finance, insurance, real estate and service industries have been largely offset by losses in agriculture, mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation, and utilities.

What increases there have been in full-time employment can be traced almost completely to the rise in Government payrolls—particularly the schools.

The elimination of jobs in the private sector can be charged to several factors. One is changes in consumer patterns, such as the swing from railroad to air travel. Another is the problem of foreign competition.

But the key has been the growing efficiency of industry and the production of more goods with less labor through automation.

(Automation has two definitions: In the strict sense, the term applies only to advanced, self-correcting mechanized systems. But in the sense now more generally accepted, it applies to any major technological improvement.)

Just how much automation will mean in the years ahead is impossible to forecast with any accuracy. Computers can guide rockets into space, collect eggs, and operate machine tools, but they can't predict their own future impact.

Some indication can be gained, however, from the record of the past. Industrial productivity—in output per man-hour of labor—has risen 50 percent since 1947.

A ton of steel is being produced with only two-thirds the labor required in 1951. Bakeries are wrapping 7,000 loaves of bread an hour with two men, compared to 4,000 with seven men just a few years ago. Payroll computers are doing the work of 28 office workers.

Moreover, the evidence suggests that automation's pace will be accelerated. John Diebold, a management consultant recognized as a leading authority on the subject, has estimated a tripling or quadrupling of the number of computers in operation between 1961 and 1965.

A top executive of one of the world's largest corporations put it this way:

"Of course we're responsible for jobs being eliminated. Every time we put in a new machine, it suggests other steps we can take.

"There's no question but that it will speed up."

The cumulative possibilities are demonstrated by one of the classic examples of early automation—the establishment of an automatic line for engine blocks at the Ford Motor Co.'s Cleveland plant in 1952.

A Harvard economist, James R. Bright, who studied the line reported later: "In four research visits * * * over an 18-month period, the cylinder block line never appeared the same twice. Always there were changes in machinery that had taken place since the last visit."

Perhaps more important than opinions or case histories, however, is the overwhelming logic that argues for faster mechanization.

Automation offers dramatic savings to some firms. A chemical company reports savings of $50,000 to $150,000 a year from instruments costing $10,000 to $15,000. A plastics firm saves $33,000 a year from automatic controls costing $24,500. And a power company saves $400,000 a year by using a $100,000 computer to plan the distribution of its load.

American industries are under continuing pressure to take such steps if they are to compete with others at home and abroad. In foreign trade particularly, there is a compelling need to reduce unit costs.

And finally, in many industries management feels pressures—real or imagined—to lessen its dependence on its workers and union leadership.

For all of this, industry groups generally try to discourage the notion that automation is eliminating jobs.

The National Association of Manufacturers, for example, contends that productivity has been rising at an average rate of only 2.6 percent a year recently, compared to 2.4 percent for the entire period since 1900.

What the National Association of Manufacturers doesn't say is that the impact of the recent increases is much greater because demand for products has not been keeping pace or running ahead, as it had been earlier.

Industry also argues that normal turnover usually prevents layoffs from automation.

"We have an attrition rate of about half of 1 percent a month, or 6 percent a year, through normal things—deaths, retirements, quits," one executive reported, "we certainly aren't going to increase our productivity that fast."

The other side of this coin is that the eliminated jobs are not filled by the new entrants to the labor force who in other times would have replaced those who die, retire, or quit.

The central argument made for automation is that it creates as many jobs as it abolishes. The theory is that, in the long run, mechanization will mean largely a shift from blue-collar to white-collar jobs.

This trend already is quite pronounced, but there are two flaws in the theory.

First, the number of workers added in the offices is not likely to match the number dropped in the plants. In the last 5 years, manufacturing industries have added 335,000 nonproduction workers to the payrolls while cutting their production forces by 969,000.

Second, the same workers are not involved in most cases. Few production workers are qualified for white-collar work and many are considered too lacking in education or too old to train.

Perhaps the most authoritative word on the automation-jobs relationship has come from Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines Corp., the giant of the computer industry.

In a statement to a congressional committee during the last recession, Watson said:

"We can't argue that technological change and automation are not labor saving processes. Of course they are. They do cause displacement of people. In fact, to do so is one of their major purposes. They may also upgrade people or increase the prosperity of an industry so that more are employed.

Nevertheless, we do have more unemployment that we can tolerate today and some of it has come from technological change and automation."

COSTLY, OFTEN UNREWARDING—CREATING JOBS WITH CASH

(The third in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is learning that creating jobs with cash is an expensive and often unrewarding business.

That, in effect, is the method the administration has been using in two major efforts—the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs—to reduce unemployment.

Both programs are essentially attempts to relieve the most painful symptoms of the unemployment disease—chronically depressed areas—without striking at the causes.

The consensus of analysts representing labor, management, and the administration seems to be that the redevelopment program has not yet proved its effectiveness.

Since the program began in mid-1961, unemployment has been reduced no more, and perhaps less, than could be expected from the upward trend of the economy. Two years after the turning point of the 1960–61 recession, the rate remains above 6 percent.

"Of course it's a popular idea," one Labor Department official said. "We're handing out money and that's always popular."

Both programs have some political value, for they convey an impression of concern on the parts of both Congress and the administration.

The 4-year $394 million redevelopment program provides loans to both industry and local government, $75 million in outright grants for public facilities, planning assistance and some retraining of workers.

It is designed to help communities improve their competitive positions in the struggle for new industry and to stimulate activity in the industry already there.

Its principal flaw seems to be that it has come at a time when the economy as a whole is sluggish. The result, critics say, is that the gains of one community are likely to represent losses to another rather than net additions to the industrial base.

Beyond this, there is reason to doubt whether the most seriously depressed areas—the classic horrible examples of West Virginia and western Pennsylvania—can attract industry with any lures.

Some industries are wary of them, said a top executive of one big company:

"Most of the young people are leaving places like that, and you don't want to start out with an old work force. It doesn't pay."

Whatever its merits, the redevelopment program has been a costly one. So far, the Area Redevelopment Administration has approved 648 projects involving $92 million in loans and grants and 33,000 jobs. This amounts to something more than $2,800 a job created or saved.

And there is some question whether the ARA's estimates of the number of jobs will prove accurate in the long run. One company that received a loan of more than $500,000 and is listed for more than 200 jobs told a reporter that its peak employment probably won't exceed 100 workers, many of whose jobs will be seasonal.

The ARA program seems to have become a particularly rich lode for planners and consultants. So far, 151 technical assistance grants totaling more than $5 million have been made. They include such typical items as:

Sixty thousand dollars to a planning firm to study development of tourist resources in the northern Berkshire area of Massachusetts; $9,000 to a planner to study economic desirability of modernizing and expanding a Charleston, W. Va., airport; $20,000 to study ways of using a Dunkirk, N.Y., plant being closed.

The accelerated public works program, which was approved by Congress last fall, is much simpler. It finances the projects of Federal agencies such as the Post Office Department and Corps of Engineers and offers Federal grants to localities for things such as sewers, hospitals, water systems and public buildings.

After only 5 months, more than $360 million of the $400 million appropriated last fall has been earmarked, so the administration is seeking another $500 million this year.

The allocations to date include $110 million for 1,800 wholly Federal projects and $250 million for 1,100 federally-aided projects. The latter is being supplemented by about $25 million in local funds.

The ARA, which also administers this program, estimates that the total $485 million outlay will provide 580,000 man-months of direct labor plus perhaps the same amount in secondary work.

The direct labor is the equivalent of a year's work for 48,000 persons, which means that the cost per job per year amounts to about $10,000.

In sum, using the most optimistic estimates, the two programs are affecting fewer than 100,000 jobs at a time when nearly 5 million are unemployed.

This has led economists to two conclusions: First, that the programs are too small to act as an important stimulus to the economy; second, that programs large enough to do the job would be prohibitively expensive.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM—RETRAINING HAS ITS VALUE, BUT IT HAS DRAWBACKS, TOO

(The fourth in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—In Hammonton, N.J., 22 migrant workers are going to school 4 hours a day to learn to operate and repair farm machinery.

When they have completed the 16-week course, they hope to find jobs that will last the year around and put an end to the ups and downs of their days as seasonal blueberry pickers and sweet potato diggers.

The one thing they can be sure of is that they will have a competitive advantage over other pickers when year-round jobs do appear.

The 22 farmworkers are going to school under what is generally considered to be the Kennedy administration's most promising approach to the unemployment problem—the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The Hammonton program probably is not typical of the hundreds of retraining courses now being conducted under the manpower act and the earlier Area Redevelopment Act for some 38,000 workers across the Nation.

THE WORKER GETS MORE TO SELL

But it does illustrate both the value and the severe limitations of the program.

Retraining gives a worker more to sell to prospective employers, equips him for more than the strongback jobs that mechanization is eliminating so rapidly.

Essentially, it is a matching program designed to give the unemployed the skills that are in short supply in their community even during periods of extreme labor surplus. In Hammonton, for example, laborers who can fix a tractor are a rarity.

But, at best, the program is a small one that by itself can do little to cut into the Nation's backlog of 4 million unemployed. In the longrun its effectiveness will hinge on the state of economy and the chances offered the retrained for using the skills they have acquired.

In the Hammonton case, the trainees' prospects will depend on how many farmers can afford year-around help.

The 3-year $435 million program was set up with an original goal of training 400,000 workers. This year, however, no more than 50,000 are expected to begin courses, and there is serious doubt that the goal will even be approached.

The program has several major obstacles to overcome before it can become a significant force in combating unemployment.

One is the reluctance of many workers to take training courses unless certain they will lead to better jobs.

"We've got people here making $6,000 a year and signing their check with an 'X'," one manufacturing executive reported. "It's hard to convince them that they need to know more than this until they've been laid off for an awfully long time."

Worker immobility is frequently a barrier to matching skills and openings. Many of the unemployed have homes they cannot or will not sell and close community or family ties they will not loosen. Some cling to the hope that things will improve and they will be able to regain their seniority and return to their old jobs and pension rights.

MAJOR BARRIER—IT'S ILLITERACY

But the most serious barrier is illiteracy and, in some cases, an apparent lack of capacity to learn even the simplest skills. The examples are legion:

Item: The Detroit Public Welfare Commission studied 761 heads of families on relief with a view toward giving them aptitude tests for 23 occupational specialties requiring moderate skills. It found 216 unqualified even to take the aptitude tests and 299 others unable to qualify for training in any of the 23 lines.

Item: In one of the classic early retraining ventures at the State level, the Connecticut Labor Department studied the records of 3,500 job applicants and selected 2,143 for interviews. Of these, 589 were chosen for tests for possible training as machinists. The results: 201 failed to take the tests. Of those who took them, only 140 qualified for training and 43 of these either failed to show up or dropped out within a week. Finally, 84 of the original pool of 3,500 completed the courses.

Item: In Chicago, the Cook County Department of Public Aid studied 680 able bodied welfare recipients and found more than half of them to be functionally illiterate, although only 6.6 percent had failed to finish the fifth grade—the level that is supposed to signify literacy.

The manpower act makes no provision for basic education as part of the retraining program, but it does include a "research" section that is being employed as a device to experiment with the three R's.

The principal test is being conducted at Norfolk, Va., where 100 illiterate former shipyard workers are being given basic education along with training as mechanics, metalworkers, bricklayers and maintenance men.

In some other areas informal arrangements have been made with State authorities to provide help. At Hammonton, for example, the trainees—half of whom are Spanish speaking—are being given 3 hours a week of basic English after their regular classes.

Most of the training, however, is directed at spreading mechanical skills. Among the most common are courses for welders, stenographers, automobile mechanics, machine operators, practical nurses, electronics technicians and draftsmen.

NO SURE-FIRE LIFETIME JOBS

In a few instances, workers are being schooled in skills that automation is likely to replace in a few years—machine tool work, for example.

But Seymour Wolfbein, Director of the Labor Department's office of manpower, automation and training, says:

"We can't run this program by trying to outguess automation and only training for sure-fire, lifetime jobs. There are no sure-fire, lifetime jobs anymore. If we can train a man so he can hold a job for a couple of years, that's worth doing. Maybe we'll have to train him again later on."

Other courses—such as those for bank tellers and officer workers—have been criticized on the ground that the Government is offering training that employers would provide and traditionally have provided themselves.

There is no question this is true in many cases. When the economy is expanding, industry is quite willing to train its own workers to meet rising demand.

As one New Jersey executive put it:

"If we have orders piling up, we'll train the people to fill them. We certainly won't let the business get away."

The supporters of the Government role contend, however, that many of the businesses needing skilled help now are too small to risk big investments in retraining when the economy is advancing as slowly as it is now.

The proof of the pudding, they say, is the fact that more than 80 percent of those completing the training courses are moving into jobs in their new specialties.

POTENTIAL SHOWN BY OTHER PROGRAMS

This figure may be slightly inflated by a tendency in these early stages of the program to choose the cream of the possible trainees. More than half of the first groups, for example, were high school graduates.

But the experience of other similar programs demonstrates a strong potential for retraining.

In Sweden, where retraining has been going on so long it has won general acceptance in the work force, the Government annually trains and places the equivalent of 250,000 American workers.

Several States that beat the Federal Government to the punch also have been successful. A study of one of these programs, in Massachusetts, found that training program graduates' annual earnings increased four times as fast as those of untrained workers, largely because they were able to hold steady jobs.

IGNITION THE HOPE: KENNEDY RELYING ON TAX CUT PROGRAM TO SOLVE JOB ISSUE

(By Jack W. Germond)

(The last in a five-part series)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is relying heavily on a form of spontaneous combustion in the economy to solve the unemployment problem.

If it does not, both the President and Congress can expect intense pressure for the 35-hour week that organized labor insists is needed to spread what work is available among the unemployed.

President Kennedy is hoping to create this combustion with his 3-year $10.3 billion tax reduction plan.

The theory is that the $8 to $9 billion that will be added to disposable consumer income will increase demand enough to encourage industry to put more people to work, thus increasing demand and requiring still more workers.

INSTANT CUT CAN'T BE EXPECTED

But the magnitude of the problem is such that we can't expect an immediate or dramatic reduction in the unemployment rate, which stands at 6.1 percent now and averaged 5.6 percent last year.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that the gross national product must rise $20 billion—or about 3.5 percent—this year just to keep the jobless rate at the 1962 level.

To cut unemployment even 1 percent this year, the gross national product would have to rise 6.5 percent; to reach the full employment goal of 4 percent unemployment, 8 to 9 percent.

Neither of these is a practical possibility, which is why the administration now is talking about 1965—and, privately at least, 1966 or 1967—as the target date for the 4-percent rate.

Neither management nor labor is satisfied with the administration's plan.

INDUSTRY'S CHIEF COMPLAINT

Industry's principal criticism is that the program puts too much emphasis on raising consumer income and not enough on encouraging capital investment.

The National Association of Manufacturers points out, for example, that in the last 5 years of "chronic sluggishness," spending for plant and equipment has risen only 1 percent and corporate profits after taxes only 17 percent, while the gross national product has risen 25 percent, consumer income 24 percent, consumer spending 25 percent and Government spending 40 percent.

"This record on its face would cause us to doubt that either increased consumer purchasing or Government expenditures holds the key to our growth problem," the National Association of Manufacturers told a congressional hearing recently.

Administration economists concede that capital investment has been lagging, particularly last year. But they contend the President's tax program is a balanced one that offers enough incentives to business to increase capital spending.

One of these is a reduction in the corporate tax rate from 52 to 47 percent. Another is a reduction in the top individual income tax rate from 91 to 65 percent, which the administration contends will promote investment in stocks by the well-to-do.

ORGANIZED LABOR ALSO WANTS CHANGES

The criticism of the Kennedy plan from organized labor probably will prove more significant in the long run because unions carry a much bigger stick politically.

Labor does not really have a serious quarrel with the tax proposals, although it would prefer that the reductions be concentrated more in the lower income brackets.

The unions' chief complaint is that the tax reduction does not promise enough relief to the unemployment problem. The indispensable ingredient, labor says, is the shorter workweek.

As a starting point, the AFL-CIO is demanding a statutory 35-hour week and a statutory requirement that double time be paid for overtime rather than the time and a half now required.

Union economists contend that a cut even to 37.5 hours for the 40-odd million nonfarm wage and salary workers would create 2.7 million new jobs. In manufacturing alone, they say, a 5-hour cut could add more than 2 million jobs.

Union officials concede that these are theoretical figures that could not be achieved because of "structural factors" such as the fact that many of the jobless don't live where the new jobs would open up or couldn't qualify for them if they did.

But they also point out that a spreading of the work last year to bring in even 1.1 million of the unemployed would have hit the administration's 4 percent full employment goal.

Administration officials believe that a reduced workweek without reduction in pay, which the unions demand, would be inflationary and would weaken the Nation's capacity for industrial competition.

Moreover, many administration and management economists contend that the short workweek would not actually spread the work. They say that industry would prefer to pay even doubletime rather than pay more in fringe benefits to more employees.

The overtime question is a crucial one because it has been mounting rapidly. In fact, more than 7 percent of the Nation's manufacturing production is being done on time-and-a-half.

Prospects for any of labor's proposals for spreading the work—including longer paid vacations, early retirements and special severance pay for displaced workers—will depend on how the unemployment rate behaves in the next year.

WHOSE LANDS ARE THESE?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to an article by Mr. Raymond Moley in the March 11 issue of Newsweek magazine.

This article, entitled "Whose Lands Are These?" looks with great candor at the issues involved in the Federal plan to tie all Government agencies together electrically to form a nationwide, Government-manipulated power grid.

Mr. Moley notes that the present Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, in their control over vast areas of land in the 11 Western States, are making a most ambitious attempt to commandeer "wheeling" privileges over privately owned company transmission lines as an element of this high voltage grand design.

My own State—Wyoming—can hardly justify its "Equality State" sobriquet in this regard because the Federal Government owns outright 51.6 percent of our land area. This gives the Government a massive lever with which to coerce private power companies that must seek easements from the bureaus to build lines over this federally manipulated land—a situation which places the "Equality State" on the short end of the State and Federal equality ratio and places the interests of private power at the caprice of two Federal agencies.

In short, the private power companies are seeking to build a house to which the Federal Government demands the right of entry as a building prerequisite.

Mr. President, as Columnist Moley notes, generating and transmitting electrical power is a vital industry in the Western States, but it is an industry which will be forced to importune the Government for the right of existence if Congress continues to allow the bureaus to make economic weapons of the public domain. These lands belong to the people, not the Federal bureaus.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Moley's salient remarks on this issue printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE LANDS ARE THESE?

(By Raymond Moley)

An almost unbelievable proportion of the land in the 11 Western States (excluding in this context Hawaii and Alaska) is owned by the United States. For the most part the custody and care of these Federal areas have been vested in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

In the areas in those States not owned by the United States, a large population lives, owns land, produces goods, and carries on commerce. One of the vital industries there generates and transmits power. In recent years the investor-owned companies have been building and planning transmission lines to serve their customers more efficiently. Obviously, such transmission lines must pass over public lands. For such easements and rights-of-way, they pay to the Federal Treasury.

In those States there are also large Federal hydroelectric generating facilities. Through slick bookkeeping practices a large subsidy is involved. Since this administration has taken over, the Interior Department has vigorously promoted the idea of transmission lines to connect the various Federal agencies. This is in line with a master plan, well publicized by the Interior Department, to tie into one vast grid all Federal agencies from coast to coast. Such a monopoly of electric power would move all industry far along toward a "socialized" Nation.

PIGGYBACK POWER

Since the early 1930's, zealous proponents of public power, notably the late Secretary Ickes, have been waging a cold war against the privately owned companies in the West. Even under the Eisenhower administration's policy of partnership, the Interior bureaucracy carried on this fight with the strong support of Members of the Senate and House. Under Secretary Stewart Udall, the drive has been accelerated.

In December 1962, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, through their authority over public lands, proposed a plan to hitchhike Federal power over privately owned lines. A series of proposed regulations were issued which would compel privately owned companies to transmit or "wheel" public power over their lines whenever it was determined that there would be excess capacity. Also, a regulation has been proposed to withhold permission to build lines over public lands when such operations would be in conflict with the Federal marketing program. Since these regulations would be imposed arbitrarily by the two secretaries and since there is no such thing as a "Federal marketing program," vigorous protests have been made by the companies concerned and by Members of Congress from that region.

NO PRIORITIES

The regulations were planned to go into effect on March 15 unless Congress should decree otherwise. Senate hearings were scheduled for February but have been postponed. Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK, of Colorado have demanded regional hearings on these regulations.

Regulations such as these were imposed in 1948 at a time when the policies of Secretary Ickes still prevailed in the Interior Department. But under the more cooperative policies of the Eisenhower administration these were rescinded in 1954.

The issue, it would seem, comes down to this: both privately owned and Federal generating facilities are designed for the service of the people of those States. They must of necessity serve the same kind of customers. In fact, there is nothing essentially private about an electric utility except ownership. It is under regulation by State and Federal laws to see that its service is fair and that its prices are not excessive.

The proposed regulations would, however, establish a priority of authority in the Federal Government. Moreover, the public lands are not owned by the bureaucracy but by the people of the United States. To compel the owners of these transmission lines to transmit Federal power or to subject the building of new lines to the arbitrary discretion of the Federal Government would, in effect, be violations of primary rights of property. And this without due process of law. There should be no priorities in the public service.

FEDERAL DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the things that is giving great concern to my constituents is the ever-increasing Federal budget and deficit spending with the resultant inflation and rising costs of almost everything that people have to buy.

There has been a constant increase in the demands for new spending programs on both the State and National level. Far too many people seem to look upon Federal programs only as ones of assistance—not realizing that they themselves are going to have to pay for them.

Almost every American family has to do without many things they would like to have and need. Families deny themselves many things because of insufficient funds. The Federal budget is no different than the family budget. No family or organization can spend beyond its means without some disastrous effects.

Mr. President, one of the most meaningful and down-to-earth letters I have read on this subject comes from a good constituent in Grand Forks, N. Dak. The author, Mrs. Dunn, I think very effectively states the case of the average family members of which oftentimes have to hold down several jobs in order to make ends meet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have her letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.,
March 12, 1963.

DEAR SIR: Just how much longer are you people in Federal Government going to go on penalizing the common, ordinary American citizen for working at one, two, or more jobs, in order to make a living rather than accept unemployment compensation or welfare aid? Surely all of the people in Government can't be so stupid that they can't see they have made liars, cheats, and lazy bums out of millions of Americans with these two laws, to say nothing of what you have done to the rest of us with your unfair, outdated, personal income tax laws. In all of your investigations I have never heard of you investigating abuses of the unemployment compensation and welfare aid. It would seem that you have half of the people working to support the other half and it's about time something was done about it. If you ever bothered to take a poll of the working mothers you would find that they are working because after taxes and insurance are deducted from their husbands' checks there isn't enough left to meet the current bills. These are the people who strive every day of their life to get ahead and have a better life, the people who spend their money if they have any left to spend.

Oh yes, progress has been made and the American housewife has lots of timesaving devices but let us not forget that most housewives and mothers of today must also be painters, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, besides holding down a part-time job outside of the home. Sure, we are taking jobs away from professionals, but what else are we to do when you don't leave us enough money to hire these jobs done? In other words, your personal income tax laws and Government spending are to blame for all our country's problems such as unemployment, poor economy, and even juvenile delinquency. If you people bothered to figure it out they all tie in together. Your Internal Revenue Service is a nightmare with Mortimer as the dictator.

You have taken our life's blood and given it to others long enough. I still believe that charity begins at home. Most of us find great happiness and contentment in giving but it would be nice if we were allowed to choose to whom we wished to give part of the time.

My definition of a liberal is a man who tells you to live conservatively so he can spend your money liberally. My advice to him is to mind his own business.

I am sending this letter to you, Senator, as I believe you are trying to do your best for the people of North Dakota. I would only wish that the people who really deserve this letter might read it.

Sincerely,

MRS. J. DUNN.

THE ENEMY'S NAME IS KHRUSHCHEV—NOT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am taking it upon myself to perform some surgery on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I am going to direct my efforts toward removal of a cancerous growth which may have been planted in the minds of some of my constituents in Utah by a vicious little pamphlet called "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" The author is W. Cleon Skousen, and the booklet was sent to me compliments of the Citizen's Information Committee of Salt Lake City, which I suspect is a front for the John Birch Society.

What disturbs me about this little booklet is that it goes far beyond the usual distortions contained in this type of material. Playing upon the real concern of every loyal American citizen over the serious stakes involved in the Cuban problem, this booklet strikes at the very roots of our form of representative democracy. It implies that the President of the United States has betrayed and lied to the American people, and irony of ironies, it uses the words of a Communist to prove its point.

President Kennedy had made two commitments to Khrushchev which Cuban freedom fighters could scarcely believe:

First, a personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not attempt to liberate Cuba.

Second, a personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not allow any other Western Hemisphere country to liberate Cuba.

Both of those statements, as we all know, are completely, unequivocally, yes, outrageously false. But what is really galling about this poisonous little pamphlet is that it goes on and cites as proof for these statements, a letter from Soviet Premier Khrushchev which was published in the New York Times on October 29, 1962. The booklet states that the Khrushchev letter was in reply to Kennedy's secret letter to Khrushchev 2 days earlier.

Thus, Mr. President, the American people are asked to believe that their President had deceived them, and to prove it we are given the word of the No. 1 Communist in the world, Mr. Khrushchev. The American people were asked to believe in the Premier of the Soviet Union, not the President of the United States, despite the fact that America was passing through an intense period of danger at that very moment.

Any of my constituents unfortunate enough to have read this little booklet might have been misled—for sure enough, there was a quote from the New York Times of October 29, giving a portion of Khrushchev's answer to Kennedy's so-called secret letter of 2 days earlier. But how cruel and deceitful this booklet is, Mr. President. There, in the New York Times of October 29, on the very same page, not 2 inches away from the text of Mr. Khrushchev's letter, was the text of our President's letter. What utterly galling, lying hypocrisy this represents. Mr. Khrushchev, being a good Communist, distorted and exaggerated the President's letter in his reply, pretending that he understood the President to say one thing when the President clearly said another. Mr. Khrushchev, being a Communist, can be expected to lie and distort. But who are these self-appointed saviors of the American people who lie to the people and distort the position of our President in the name of patriotism? I am ashamed that this document was printed in Salt Lake City.

The President wrote to Mr. Khrushchev, and I will quote from the New York Times, October 29, 1962, and from the very same page on which Mr. Skousen found the Communists' reply to the President's so-called "secret letter." I quote from the secret letter:

> 1. You would agree to remove these weapons systems from Cuba under appropriate United Nations observation and supervision; and undertake with suitable safeguards, to halt the further introduction of such weapons systems into Cuba.
>
> 2. We, on our part, would agree—upon the establishment of adequate arrangements through the United Nations to insure the carrying out and continuation of these commitments—(a) to remove the quarantine measures now in effect and (b) to give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. I am confident that the other nations of the Western Hemisphere would be prepared to do likewise.

Now to anyone who understands English, this is quite clear. If you do X, we will do Y. But we all know that the Russians never did allow inspection and observation in Cuba, and we all know that the President has stated, and the Secretary of State has stated, that since the Soviets did not fulfill their obligations, we were not, and are not under any obligation whatsoever to undertake either of our contingent commitments.

But what disturbs me still is the question—why did the author and the publishers of this disgraceful example of yellow journalism deliberately deceive the Americans at whom this booklet is directed—citing the words of Communist Dictator Khrushchev to back up false charges against our President? Why did they state that Kennedy's letter was secret, and therefore did not cite it—although the letter was on the very same page of the same issue of the New York Times of October 29, 1962? Why did they want the American people to believe a Communist but not their own President?

The answer is very clear to me, and that is why I was so disturbed when I read this booklet. Its clear purpose is to undermine the confidence of the American people in their own form of democratic, freely elected, representative government. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in his book "Masters of Deceit," written to warn Americans of the dangers of communism says on page 312:

> Too often I have seen cases where loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans have thought that they were fighting communism by slapping the label of Red or Communist on anybody who happened to be different from them or to have ideas with which they did not agree.
>
> Smears, character assassination, and the scattering of irresponsible charges have no place in this Nation. They create division, suspicion, and distrust among loyal Americans—just what the Communists want—and hinder rather than aid the fight against communism.

I would like to believe that Mr. Skousen and the perpetrators of this pamphlet are merely "loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans." But their deceit is so calculated, their methods are so purposeful, and their objectives are so obvious that I find it difficult to forgive this booklet as merely "misguided." For my part, I will continue to do everything in my power to see that such cancerous ideas are not planted in the minds of Utah people, and if planted, are ruthlessly exposed to the light of truth in all their falseness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Because I have dealt herein with the Cuban lie, I do not overlook the vicious, if tired, old charge that "a certain body of powerful policymakers who serve in the State Department and the White House" are steering the United States into socialism and communism. The indefensible tactic of quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without identifying which of the 100 Senators or 435 Congressmen made the insert or even whether that person uttered the words or placed in the RECORD a newspaper clipping or a speech by some notorious or obscure person, should discredit the whole pamphlet.

Nor do I ignore the 15 incidents, many of them so patently and deliberately false. I just feel sick inside to note this calculated and vicious effort to destroy our democracy by destroying the confidence of our people in their leaders. Why? Why?

Mr. President, on another subject, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that the morning hour was conceivably designed to permit Senators to be recognized at 3-minute intervals. The time has run for more than 25 minutes without a Republican Member being recognized.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, after having read with such rising ire the Skousen pamphlet, "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" it was refreshing to pick up the Washington Post on Sunday morning and see the sane, factual article on Cuba written by the able president of the Post, Philip L. Graham. I hope it will be read carefully by every "armchair warrior" who insists that we must get the Castro regime out of Cuba no matter how we do it.

Mr. Graham gives a masterful account of how President Kennedy has tuned out the irresponsible demands of his self-styled critics, and turned his back on both proponents of armed invasion and of near appeasement, to restore faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy. He further reports that the Cuban exiles in the Caribbean, who are in touch with their compatriots in their homeland, know that the Cuban people do not want their country liberated by the United States or by any other outside force, and are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," written by Philip L. Graham, and published in the Washington Post of March 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this big stick was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

"RESCUE" ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should resume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," say a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already abuilding takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards, and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men or our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

THE UNIT SYSTEM OF VOTING AND POLITICAL EQUALITY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Supreme Court yesterday handed down a decision which may be as far reaching as any which it has ever issued in connection with the American political scene. I applaud the Court on the reasons advanced for making its decision and suggest it apply the same reasoning to unit voting in our electoral college.

This particular decision involves the so-called unit rule system of voting in the State of Georgia, about which I know very little; but the philosophy which impelled the Court to rule as it did, and the reasons given by the Court for its decision, it seems to me, raise a great question on the constitutionality of the use of the unit system in casting and counting votes in the national electoral college system by which we report and tabulate the votes cast in our presidential elections.

I call attention to an editorial entitled "One Person, One Vote," published in the Washington Post this morning. The editorial sets this question forth rather clearly. Strangely and curiously, whoever wrote the editorial for the Washington Post had a myopic viewpoint. He evidently kept one eye closed, because he neglected to relate the reasoning which applied to the unit rule in Georgia to the same type of unit rule which prevails in the tabulation of votes in the electoral college system of America generally under the existing system of bloc voting or unit voting. Under this system we operate with a winner-take-all formula in which there is no equality and very little similarity in the voting weight or power of the votes cast by individual citizens in their choice of President of the United States. Actually, in some States individual voters speak with 12 to 15 times the power and influence of equally well qualified voters in other States.

The arguments advanced in the editorial, supported by the decision of the Court, clearly point out the inequity of any system which gives preferential treatment to one class of voters in America. In the decision, Justice Douglas asked:

> How can one person be given twice or 10 times the voting power of another person in a statewide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county?

The editorial states:

> Surely equality in the voting booth, so far as that can be attained, is a principle that must command respect.

Let us relate that Supreme Court reasoning to our most important election, the election of the President of the United States, in which the unit vote prevails from the standpoint of our electoral college. For example, the District of Columbia has only 3 votes in the electoral college, as do the States of Alaska, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and Vermont. Those States might be classified as "Very Little Orphan Annie States," so far as voting for President is concerned. Their 3 little votes must be compared with the more than 40 votes of the States of California and New York. This would not be unjust nor unfair except for the fact that under the prevailing system of unit voting or bloc voting in the electoral college each individual voting citizen in fact actually casts the full strength of the electoral votes awarded his own State. Thus in reality a citizen of Delaware votes 3 times for President whereas his neighbor in New York State votes more than 40 times for President. Thus a glaring disparity exists in what Justice Douglas referred to as the voting power of individual citizens.

Then there are a number of States whose citizens might be called "steerage class citizens." The votes of citizens in the "steerage class" States count less than 10 percent, individually, compared with those of the voters of California, and New York, to mention our two largest States. The States in the "steerage class" are Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Utah. In those States the individual voter has less than 10 percent as much impact in his choice of President as does the individual voter in one of the major States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the entire editorial published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE PERSON, ONE VOTE

The concept of political equality advanced another long step forward yesterday when the Supreme Court upset Georgia's county unit system in a sweeping opinion. In the nomination of candidates, at least, the Court laid down a flat and unmistakable principle—"One person, one vote." Though Justice Douglas, in the majority opinion, warned that the decision in this case has no bearing on the apportionment issues still before the Court, it certainly carries American law significantly further along the road to greater equality at the polls.

To our way of thinking, the logic of the majority is conclusive. Indeed, only Justice Harlan dissented. The other eight Members of the Court could find no semblance of "equal protection of the law" in Georgia's outrageous discrimination against urban voters. The vice of the county unit system, which was used for the nomination of candidates for U.S. Senator, Governor and various other States offices, is well illustrated by the fact that it gave one resident in Echols County the same influence upon the nomination of candidates that it gave to 99 residents of Fulton County. This is not democracy or representative government but the reverse. It is true that Georgia revised the system when it came under sharp attack, but some of the taint of invidious discrimination remained.

Justice Douglas noted that if the State law gave greater weight to white votes than to Negro votes, or to male votes than to female votes, "none could successfully contend that the discrimination was allowable. How then," he asked, "can one person be given twice or 10 times the voting power of another person in a statewide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county?" Surely equality in the voting booth, so far as that can be attained, is a principle that must command respect.

The Court wisely repudiated the device that had been invented by the district court to measure the constitutionality of the Georgia system. The lower court had held against any county as exists in the electoral college which theoretically chooses the President of the United States. The Supreme Court saw no virtue in the analogy. The Federal electoral system reflects a compromise between the large and small States. It has no bearing whatever upon the relations between voters within a State.

The Court recognized once more that the States do have control over the qualifications of voters. "But once the class of voters is chosen and their qualifications specified," the opinion concluded, "we see no constitutional way by which equality of voting power may be evaded." It is heartening to have a basic principle so emphatically undergirded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Supreme Court would consider the operation and implications of the unit rule in the Federal electoral college system, it must, with consistency, rule that it also is unconstitutional, so far as the utilization of the unit rule on a State-by-State basis is concerned. Actually under existing practices we have no "first-class voting citizens" in this country except for the voters in California and New York.

I suggest that the Senate at this session of Congress pass Senate Joint Resolution 12, which provides for an equal voting opportunity and equal voting authority for every American citizen, regardless of where he lives. This would eliminate the unit rule and would provide a national election for President, instead of a sectional selection method of voting for President, such as prevails in America today. It would retain the electoral college and the total voting strength of every State, but it would eliminate the evils and injustices which have developed as a consequence of the unit voting procedures which distort the voting weight of ballots cast by individual citizens and which serve no useful purpose.

ELECTION OF SEIJI HORIUCHI TO COLORADO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the people of Colorado have once again exhibited their basic belief in a fundamental concept of this country; namely, recognition of ability in an individual regardless of race, creed, or color. I refer to the recent election of my very good friend, Mr. Seiji Horiuchi, of Brighton, Colo., to the Colorado House of Representatives. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Horiuchi is the first Japanese-American to be elected to a State legislature in the continental United States. While the great State of Hawaii led the field in this respect in Congress, it remained for the people of Colorado to take the initiative for such an achievement on the mainland.

Seiji Horiuchi was born in Auburn, Wash., October 14, 1924, but has lived in Colorado for 36 years. He is a graduate of the Brighton, Colo., High School and of Colorado State University with a major study in horticulture. He also attended the University of Minnesota Institute of Agriculture for advanced graduate work.

From 1942 to 1944 he was in the U.S. Army—technical sergeant—and was an interpreter at general headquarters in Manila and Tokyo.

After his election to the Colorado General Assembly, he resigned as president of Agriculture Consultants in Brighton, and is now a farm management consultant and farm appraiser.

Mr. Horiuchi is a past president of the Colorado Jaycees; past vice president of the U.S. Jaycees; past president of the Brighton Jaycees, and in 1954 received the Jaycee Distinguished Service Award. He is a member of the Brighton Chamber of Commerce, American Society of Farm Managers, and a board member of the Brighton Methodist Church.

He is married to a most attractive lady, the former Kay Imamura, of California, and they have three fine sons; Paul, 12; John, 10; and James, 7.

I wish to commend, first, Mr. Horiuchi for his hard work and high ideals and his tremendous campaign; secondly, the Republican Party of Colorado for its endorsement of Mr. Horiuchi; and finally, but of most importance, the citizens of Adams County, Colo., for their wisdom in electing such a dedicated gentleman.

I also wish to thank Mrs. Jane Harper, editor of the Colorado Trumpet and Public Ledger, for sending me her editorial on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO FIRST

> It turned out that Colorado made history during the last election and although it's kind of nice for the rest of us, Seiji Horiuchi thinks its all a bunch of nonsense.
>
> Seiji, who is an agricultural consultant from Brighton with a highly commendable and recognized civic service behind him, is the Republican representative from Adams County. Seiji is also the first American of Japanese extraction (or Japanese-American; we forgot to ask because it didn't seem very important) to be elected to a State legislature in the continental United States. (Hawaii isn't continental United States.)
>
> Seiji wouldn't have mentioned it, but we were inquiring about a speech Governor Love is going to make to the Japanese-American Association on February 23—a statewide meeting—and it developed that the association is going to honor Seiji at the same time. Seiji thinks to have the Governor is enough for one evening.
>
> Furthermore, in some pretty colorful, but discreet, language, Seiji lets it be known that this "first" is something he'd just as soon someone else had.
>
> We probably could have looked into this "first" and discovered it ourselves but, as we said to Seiji, it seems quite natural for Colorado to be the State to elect a Japanese-American, first or last. People in Colorado look at ability, not color or ancestors and when you have a candidate with the proven ability of Seiji, naturally you elect him.
>
> But the thing about it all that made us rush home to tell the children was what Seiji said:
>
> "I didn't get here (the house of representatives) because I'm a Japanese-American. I got here because I went out and worked like a fool to get elected. (He did, too.) You can't legislate anyone into success—we all have to go out and earn it. That's one reason I'm a Republican; Republicans go out and work for what they want. They don't sit around and wait for someone to legislate them into their goals.
>
> "Anyone could have been the first Japanese-American to get elected. It just happened to be me."
>
> We're proud of Seiji—the Adams County representative—and we're proud of his voters for electing a good man. We're proud that Colorado can claim this "first."
>
> Somehow, it makes us feel a little bigger and a little bit better to know we live in a State which does something important not because of any ulterior motives, but because it's the logical thing to do.

U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this distinguished body has already heard much praise bestowed on a program created by Resolution No. 324, known today as the U.S. Senate youth program.

We have heard praise of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation and of the American Political Science Association for the fine contribution these two organizations made in making the inaugural program for these young American high school leaders a success here in Washington.

All of us are aware of the results of this program; but I wish to take a few minutes to inform the Senate of the prologue of this important Senate activity.

Very few of us know that the original concept came from the late distinguished Senator from Kansas, Andrew F. Schoeppel. It was on May 16, 1961, during a luncheon in the Senate dining room, that he asked Randolph A. Hearst, a trustee of the Hearst Foundation, "How can we help change the impressions that many of our youth have about politicans and the science of politics?"

At that time, Mr Hearst and his associates outlined to the Senator a program that eventually was used as the basis of what we know as the U.S. Senate youth program, and Senator Schoeppel was assured by Mr. Hearst that he would continue to help in the development and research.

Subsequent meetings were held with the late Senator Schoeppel and the former Senator from Indiana, Homer E. Capehart.

Following the untimely death of Senator Schoeppel, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] moved into the breach and authored resolution No. 324, which also was sponsored by Senators MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN, and HUMPHREY.

It was Randy Hearst who cleared the way on one phase of the resolution, which stated, in part—"if such a program can be satisfactorily arranged and completely supported by private funds with no expense to the Federal Government"—when he appeared before the Senate Rules Committee on May 9, 1962, by assuring the members of the committee that if the Senators wanted this program, the trustees of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation, under the direction of the U.S. Senate, would supply the funds for its operation.

At this time I wish to pay tribute to Randolph A. Hearst, the one person who I feel was responsible, more than anyone else, for getting this program underway. He encouraged the Hearst trustees to support the idea. He gave leadership to those of us on the Senate advisory committee and to the staff who worked so hard in not only getting the program underway but also in seeing it through to its completion. He was a great inspiration to the young people who came to Washington, representing each State throughout the country. I only wish we had time to read some of the letters we have received from these outstanding young Americans.

Mr. Hearst, in his efforts, showed a magnificient way for a foundation to cooperate with the Federal Government in this indoctrination internship program for these teenagers.

I, for one, am looking forward to next year's crop of students; and I sincerely hope the William Randolph Hearst Foundation will help us with its grant for the program next year.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF PIONEER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, last Thursday marked the 60th anniversary of five Federal reclamation projects, including the Newlands project, in the State of Nevada.

Significantly, this project bears the name of one of Nevada's most illustrious Senators, the Honorable Francis G. Newlands, whose unflagging interest in behalf of conservation helped bring irrigation to many arid sections of the Western United States.

Work began on the project in 1903; and an area which was formerly classed as desert land, with only 20,000 acres under cultivation, and with an uncertain water supply, has been transformed into a fertile area by a project which conserves and diverts water from the Truckee-Carson Rivers to irrigate nearly 72,000 acres.

The Newlands project, from the time of its completion through 1961, produced almost $90 million worth of crops—the production of 1961 totaling $3 million.

Prior to entering the U.S. Senate, Francis G. Newlands served with distinction for 8 years in the House of Representatives. It was during his career there that he vigorously attacked the problem of national conservation of the water of the West and the reclamation of its vast valleys of arid, but fertile, Government lands.

The late great Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, in eulogizing Senator Newlands, following his death in 1917, recalled his colleague's persistent efforts in behalf of reclamation. Senator Pittman declared:

> The policy was then considered by almost the entire membership of Congress as an utopian dream of most radical and impracticable State socialism, unworthy, even, of the gentle ridicule of profound and distinguished statesmen. Conservation had not then become the stepping-stone for statesmen and the football for fools. Its dawn was not visible except to the few farsighted statesmen. Day by day, and month by month, his unanswerable logic and persuasiveness pleas fell upon unlistening ears. Session after session he saw his legislative provisions silently and contemptuously brushed aside. Yet for 10 years in the House of Representatives he persisted in his untiring efforts, and with that fortitude, patience, and faith that is so rare in legislators and that so peculiarly characterized our deceased colleague slowly but surely he won the country to his views and after 10 years of unceasing labor Congress passed the Newlands national reclamation act.
>
> This law has transformed hundreds of thousands of acres of desert land into blooming, productive fields; has made happy homes for thousands of citizens, and enriched his State and the Nation. Senator Newlands has many splendid acts of statesmanship to his credit, yet this alone will cause his name to live in the hearts of the West and upon the pages of his country's history.

Shortly after assuming his seat in the House of Representatives, Senator Newlands launched a campaign of educating the public mind to the national importance of irrigation. Aided by a group of western colleagues, he kept this question prominently before the people, in the debates of Congress, in public addresses, and in magazine and newspaper articles.

He introduced numerous bills for specific projects for each of the rivers of Nevada, and finally evolved the plan of a comprehensive bill embracing the entire arid region, which provided a revolving reclamation fund from the sale of public lands, to be applied to the construction of reclamation works. Compensation to the fund was made by the sale of water rights, in installments running over a period of years, with the money thus restored to the fund being used for new projects. This plan was hailed as a solution of the reclamation question by all of the friends of irrigation, and was incorporated in the Reclamation Act which finally was passed by Congress.

As we pause to observe this important anniversary of the pioneer Federal reclamation project, it seems only fitting that we salute the memory of Francis G. Newlands. It was through his vision, dedication, and energy that reclamation received its initial impetus, and today stands as the lifeblood of the great West.

DR. PAUL A. MILLER AN OUTSTANDING WEST VIRGINIAN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a distinguished West Virginian who views his work as a tremendous challenge, as well as a great opportunity to accomplish lasting benefits for his State and for the Nation. Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, typifies the best in the American tradition.

Dr. Miller is dedicated to the proposition that West Virginia University must not only offer the very best educational opportunities, but must also use its classrooms, its laboratories, and the brainpower of its students and faculty to help West Virginia and neighboring Appalachian areas achieve greater economic development and growth.

This outstanding educator and public servant holds to the premise that the development of human resources must go hand in hand with the development of natural resources, that the new frontiers of today and tomorrow for the Appalachian region are in the region itself, and that we must find new and productive ways by which to develop and wisely use our abundant natural wealth.

An account of Dr. Miller's career amply testifies to why he was unanimously chosen by the board of governors of West Virginia University to succeed Dr. Elvis J. Stahr as president, after the latter was nominated by President John F. Kennedy to be Secretary of the Army, in January 1961.

A brief résumé of Dr. Miller's career appeared in the March 10, 1963, State magazine section of the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail. I ask unanimous consent to have this sketch of Dr. Miller's career printed in the RECORD so that all may better understand why we West Virginians are proud of the president of West Virginia University.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FAMOUS WEST VIRGINIAN

Although Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, was born in East Liverpool, Ohio, March 22, 1917, he spent his early childhood in Chester, W. Va., and considers himself a West Virginian. His parents were Harry A. and Mamie E. Miller.

As a youth, Paul Miller was serious and dependable. His goal was to become a county agricultural agent, but, since he did not live on a farm, he feared that his chances were not too good. He enrolled in the 4-H movement and conscientiously sought to win blue ribbons on his projects which included 4 years of forestry, 3 years of poultry, 2 years of potatoes and 1 year of corn.

In 1933 and 1935 he won the 4-H scholarship for his poultry project and received his 4-H pin in 1934. He served as president of his 4-H club for 2 years; he was camp vespers chairman and camp assembly program chairman at the county 4-H camp in 1934.

In 1935 he was valedictorian of his graduating class at W. E. Wells High School in Newell, W. Va.

He enrolled in West Virginia University School of Agriculture with a major in animal husbandry and a minor in agricultural chemistry. At the university he was a student assistant in biochemistry, member of the university boxing team, and waited on tables at the Sigma Nu fraternity house. It was a tight schedule.

"I had to cut boxing practice short," he said, "to get to my job. But the coach didn't mind. I got in some valuable roadwork."

Apparently the roadwork was effective, because he wound up as captain of the boxing team, chancellor of Alpha Zeta, the honorary agricultural fraternity, and was named to Mountain, the ranking honorary organization for university men.

From 1939 to 1942, Paul Miller got to be what he had long wanted to be: county agricultural agent for Ritchie and Nicholas counties. At the outbreak of World War II, he was called to active duty and served as a first lieutenant in the Air Transport Command in South America, north and central Africa, and India.

"The constant traveling interested me in the social science and anthropology fields," Miller said. After his release from active duty, he enrolled at Michigan State University under the GI bill for graduate work in those two new fields of interest.

He was granted an M.A. in 1947 and joined the faculty at MSU as an assistant professor. From 1950 to 1953 he was chairman of a 2-year health study dealing with hospital, local health departments, and consumer-sponsored prepayment plan developments. In 1952 he was staff officer of the rural health panel of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation.

In January 1953, MSU promoted him to associate professor of sociology and anthropology and in May of the same year, when he was granted his Ph. D. in those fields, made him a full professor. Sixteen months later, in October 1954, he was named deputy director of the MSU Cooperative Extension Service—a post he held only until April of the next year—when he was named director.

In February 1959, he was named vice president of off-campus education at MSU and in June of the same year was given the job of provost, the chief academic officer of both on- and off-campus education.

On November 6, 1961, the WVU board of governors unanimously picked him to succeed Dr. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., as president of the university.

In making the announcement, Forrest H. Kirkpatrick, president of the University board of governors, said:

"Dr. Miller was the unanimous choice of the board of governors and we are delighted that he has accepted. He is a highly respected scholar, with high-level administrative experience and he has a sincere and dedicated interest in this State and in West Virginia University."

He is married to the former Catherine Spiker, of Harrisville, and they have a daughter, Paula, and a son, Thomas.

FOR A RECONSIDERATION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY: A WORD FOR GENERAL DE GAULLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, rapidly changing events call imperatively for the reconsideration of our foreign policy. In recent weeks President de Gaulle has become the target of much hasty criticism, and this has tended to obscure the great and memorable services he has rendered to the cause of world freedom during and since World War II, to the stabilization of government in France, and to the ending of French colonialism—all achievements of such magnitude that they bespeak for him reasoned and judicious consideration now and hereafter of his more recent actions and utterances. In any event, let us never forget, whatever may be ephemeral differences of opinion, our long and close association with France, stanch supporter of the American people in the days of our struggle for independence, our ally in two great World Wars, when Americans and Frenchmen fought, bled and died side by side for the perpetuation of liberty.

I do not propose to go at length at this time into the ramifications of President de Gaulle's recent declarations of policy and purpose. But they may briefly be summarized to point to the fact that he feels that Europe is now able to maintain and defend itself and no longer needs the massive U.S. aid which our country has extended both financially and materially to Western Europe. Critics of General de Gaulle have been saying, with an overtone of reproach, that our financial aid to France has exceeded $9 billion—the largest sum advanced to any country.

President de Gaulle's view would appear to be that this very aid, and other factors leading to France's economic recovery and prosperity, now enable France to stand on its own feet and assume, in large part, with the help of other European nations, the responsibilities for European defense which the United States has been carrying principally.

Well, what is so wrong with that? General de Gaulle may prove to be mistaken. He may be unduly optimistic. But why not give this new and important orientation full consideration? If our armed forces are no longer needed in Europe, will that not, among other things, help our balance-of-payment problems which require solution? Was it ever intended that the stationing of our troops overseas would be permanent?

Are there not great advantages in having the nations of Western Europe assume greater responsibilities for their own security? These matters deserve full reflection and well-considered appraisal by our Government and our people.

In this connection, an excellent article entitled "Reconsidering Our Foreign Policy, by Louis J. Halle, was published in the March 23 issue of the New Republic. It is highly pertinent at this juncture. I ask that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, and I recommend its reading to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RECONSIDERING OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Louis J. Halle)

In the New Republic of February 23 I observed that our present foreign policy had been designed in the late 1940's to meet a situation that no longer existed. It had been addressed to an emergency. It had been our response to the general alarm at the helplessness of European nations that lay prostrate in the path of an expanding Soviet Union. What the United States then undertook to do, on a crash basis, was to stabilize the situation by containing the Soviet Union with its own strength while restoring the strength of the West Europeans.

Today this has been largely accomplished. The West Europeans are back on their feet, their strength and self-confidence restored. The situation has been stabilized, something like the old European equilibrium of power has been reestablished. Today, then, the alarm of 15 years ago has passed away; no one in West Europe lives, any more, in daily expectation of the Red army's arrival. It is in these new circumstances that General de Gaulle, in the name of France and as the would-be spokesman of a restored Europe, has challenged the American presence on the Continent. He has denounced the notion that Europe should continue indefinitely to depend on the United States for its security. Specifically, he has rejected the NATO alliance as an indefinitely continuing arrangement.

By thus bringing his fist down on the whole postwar system, constructed under American leadership, he has made inescapable a reconsideration of American policy, a reconsideration that was overdue anyway. Two months after his stroke, however, there is no sign that such a reconsideration is as yet underway.

The fact that it should be so slow to get underway is understandable. Our Government and public alike are the prisoners of the past. They are psychologically committed to the basic conceptions on which they have been acting for 15 years, so that it hardly occurs to them that those conceptions, themselves, not just the tactics based upon them, should be the subject of reconsideration. Like all governments, our own is staffed by technicians, men of action, rather than men of vision, and to tacticians reconsideration means the reconsideration of tactics rather than the reexamination of fundamentals. It is easy to imagine the various staffs preparing papers, today, on possible moves for getting around General de Gaulle, for making NATO work in the face of his opposition. It is harder to picture them addressing themselves to the question whether there is any further use in NATO. But this is one of the questions that now has to be considered, if only because there can be no NATO without France. (There might be something called NATO, but it would be quite different.)

At this moment no one can realistically propose a new American foreign policy ready for immediate use. There will first have to be a great deal of purposeful exploration on the international scene, exploration out of which a new policy would emerge over months and perhaps years. But the exploration would have to be purposeful, it would have to have certain clear ends in view. What I offer here is merely an outline of some fundamentals that suggest the direction of exploration.

First of all, we should remind ourselves that the defense of Europe is the concern of Europeans primarily, and only secondarily a concern of ours. To the extent that the Europeans can make their own defense they must do so, and we ought indeed to refuse to do more than supplement their best efforts to the extent that they had, by common consent, to be supplemented. There is no sense, for example, in our keeping almost six divisions in Europe (to two each for France, Belgium, and the Netherlands) simply because we think the defense of the Europeans requires more divisions than they think it does. They must themselves be the judges, in the first instance, of how much military force they need to defend themselves, since it is their own survival that is immediately at stake.

Back numbers of the New Republic would show that I have consistently urged the need for us Americans to defend Berlin, even to the point of limited war. But this has not been because Berlin, in itself, has any strategic relevance to the defense of the United States. It has been simply because we were saddled with this obligation, to our German allies especially, and so completely saddled with it that a failure to meet it would have represented a betrayal and would have had the most far-reaching consequences. We ought, however, to prefer not to have the obligation at all. It has been an unspeakable burden for us, involving us in the greatest risks we have had to face since the war—indeed, the greatest risks in our national history—taking us uncomfortably close to the brink of a nuclear holocaust on occasion. For 15 years it has hung over us like a sword of Damocles, and we have seen no prospect of getting out from under. It is not too much to say that, to meet our obligation in Berlin, we have put our own cities to the hazard. Now, if General de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer and other Europeans see any prospect of being able to relieve us of this obligation, we ought surely to let them know how profoundly welcome such a relief would be.

One may ask why points so obvious need making at all. But they do need making simply because we, more than any other nation, have a way of becoming psychologically committed to undertakings for which there are no rational grounds. Beginning in 1900, for example, tempted purely by the opportunity to make a grand gesture, we committed ourselves to the territorial and administrative integrity of China—even though no national interest of ours whatever was involved. Quixotically, we committed ourselves to protecting the Chinese from their increasingly powerful Japanese neighbor; and that senseless commitment, from which we tried too late to escape, finally led to Pearl Harbor and the Pacific war of 1941–45. Again, at the beginning of the 1920's we made it a major objective of our policy to get the Japanese forces out of Siberia, even though we had less than no reason to perform such a service for Lenin's new Russia. It is in the light of this record that we would, I think, be quite capable of urging our continued participation in the defense of Berlin on the West Germans and the other Europeans, bargaining with them for the acceptance of that participation, paying them for it in effect.

If this seems bizarre when stated so plainly, we should look at our record on foreign aid. From the beginning of the point 4 program we have urged our aid upon underdeveloped countries, frequently putting them under the greatest pressure to accept it when they didn't want it. Instead of their being suitors to us, we have been suitors to them for the acceptance of our aid, and this has given them the bargaining power, which should have been ours, to set the condtions. In the light of this record it is far from implausible that, having come to regard the defense of Europe as a primarily American objective, we should plead with the Europeans to support us in its realization.

SOLDIERS NOT INTRUDERS

The first exploration that I would propose, then, is not an exploration of the means by which we can sweeten the prospect of our continued presence in Europe, and of our participation in Europe's defense, so as to keep or regain the acceptance of Europeans who are turning away from us. I would not propose that we explore with the West Germans or the French, for example, what better offer they might accept from us in return for allowing us to continue playing the leading role in their defense. I would, rather, propose that we explore with the Europeans the possibility of a program designed gradually to relieve us of that burden. We should make it clear that we would be happy if they felt that they could get along, now that they have recovered their strength, with fewer American ground forces in Europe. We should make it clear that we would be happy if they could put themselves in a position to take over from us the defense of the gallant West Berliners.

There need be no bluff, no intellectual dishonesty, in taking this line, even though we foresaw that it would produce immediate alarm at the prospect of our pulling out. There is no doubt that it would indeed produce such alarm; but, whether it did or not, the atmosphere would immediately be cleared so that the realities became visible once more. If, as is hardly conceivable in present circumstances, the Europeans showed themselves glad to have us go, it would be proper for us to go. But if, on the other hand, it aroused European alarm, it would bring out the real requirements of the situation.

We have an obligation, and if the Europeans should plead with us to stay with them, to remain on the barricades in Berlin and elsewhere, then we should not refuse them. We should merely ask that, in return, we be received with courtesy and respect, as soldiers answering their call rather than as intruders. If they did not want us we would go; but if they did want us they would have to play their part with us and accord us the common provisions of hospitality. This means that we would not be proper objects for their economic or political warfare.

The great dilemma in taking such an approach, I shall be told, lies in the problem of nuclear deterrence. If we are prepared to have them relieve us of the burden of their defense, then we must be prepared to have them develop their own nuclear armaments. But this is a choice that they have anyway, as the British and French have amply demonstrated. If they think they can produce their own effective deterrents to the Soviet nuclear threat (and, despite brave official statements, few of them do), then they will feel that they no longer need depend on ours. Immediately, we shall be relieved of the commitment to retaliate on the Soviet Union for any Soviet strikes at Paris or Rome, at Brussels or Bonn; our own cities will no longer be subject to sacrifice for the defense of European cities.

If, on the contrary, they feel that they must still have the protection of the American deterrent, then they will have to face certain simple limitations pertaining, not so much to our policy as to reality itself. They will have to face the fact that they cannot all have pushbuttons of their own with which to set our deterrent off. They will have to face the fact that they cannot each have an absolute veto on its use. If they protest that this places them before an intolerable dilemma, then we can only say that it is their dilemma, rather than ours, and they will have to resolve it as seems to them best. If they say they cannot trust us, then our reply must be that they are free not to.

I think it likely that, faced with such an attitude on our part the great preponderance of European opinion would favor the risks involved in trusting us and the restraints involved in providing hospitality. In the face of such an attitude on our part, I think General de Gaulle, who has now offered his France as an alternative to our leadership, would find his initiative ill received. But the choice would be that of the Europeans, and if they did decide to flock to his standard, that would immediately relieve us of responsibilities greater than any nation before us has ever borne, responsibilities that we accepted in darker days without joy, and that we had discharged with honor up to the moment when we were at last acquitted of them.

I do not advocate isolationism. On the contrary, I think the future of mankind depends on a drawing together of our nations until the frontiers between them have become largely academic. Nothing would be more counterproductive of this, however, than for us to insist that others accept our embrace. The best chances for the continued development of the Atlantic Community, specifically, lies in our clear willingness to accept the alternative.

IRELAND'S ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is the season to honor St. Patrick. Of course, this year St. Patrick's Day came on Sunday. Since Congress was not in session, it was not possible at that time to make a brief statement with reference to the great patron saint.

I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues the continuing interest of modern Ireland in promoting collaboration among nations through education, science, and culture.

Since the days of their missionaries who brought education and culture to the continent of Europe, the Irish have extended these activities to every continent of the world, taking care to preserve the national cultures and independence of new nations in the process.

The fact that half the world's children still receive no formal schooling, moved the Irish to set up an international educational exchange of persons. Although it is unlikely that any country is doing all that it might in this regard, it is a fact that the small country of Ireland is, voluntarily and without the urge of material gain, making a very serious effort to remedy the deplorable situation of these untaught children.

A recent survey for UNESCO found some 1,500 qualified Irish teachers working, at all levels of education, in the continent of Africa. This amounts to one teacher in Africa for every 2,000 persons of Ireland's population. In addition, they have a significant number of teachers in Asia, Oceania, and the Americas.

To encourage greater participation in this good work, the Irish Government introduced a scheme 2 years ago whereby lay teachers, primary, secondary, and technical, on their return home, receive credit for salary purposes for teaching service performed in the newly independent countries. Also, of some 10,000 students in Irish universities, about 1,000 come from Africa and Asia, and this, despite an acute problem of maintaining adequate financing for space and facilities.

I think it is well to note that many countries are helping in this great program of what we call foreign aid. It is not entirely a burden imposed upon the American people alone. I make these brief remarks today about Ireland to point out once again that countries with very limited financial resources are undertaking great responsibility.

We can all be proud of these figures which indicate the continuing concern of the Irish people with education—not only as a national problem, but as a world problem.

I salute the Republic of Ireland for their magnanimous outlook. It is a caution to the more affluent. May God prosper and bless their progress in good measure.

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, three items have recently come to my attention which effectively illustrate the need for a substantial expansion of our annual investments in higher education.

First. I have received the 1963 legislative proposal of the American Council on Education, "A Federal Program To Develop Higher Education as a National Resource." This proposal is an eloquent plea for increased Federal financial support of higher education in both public and private nonprofit institutions.

I hope every Senator who has attempted to assess the present status and to predict future needs of our institutions of higher learning will agree on the need for increased Federal financial support. There are substantial areas of agreement between these proposals outlined by the American Council on Education and President Kennedy's program contained in the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this vital legislation.

Second. I bring to the attention of the Senate an address by Harry A. Bullis, director and former chairman of General Mills, delivered at the University of Akron, December 12, 1962, entitled "Increased Corporate Aid for Higher Education as a Sound Business Investment." Mr. Bullis concisely states the need for, and the wisdom of, a rapid increase in voluntary business investment in higher education. As Mr. Bullis notes, "business can carry no wiser insurance and can make no sounder investment than to increase corporate aid for higher education and to increase it now."

This is true for business. It is certainly no less true for the Nation as a whole. We must invest and invest now in substantial amounts in the soundest of all investments, the education of our young people.

These two excellent statements illustrate a frequently overlooked fact: this is not a question of public versus private investment, or Federal versus State funds for higher education. The magnitude of the problems facing higher education today demands increased responses from every source, both public and private, Federal and State.

In our proper concern for providing more adequate financing of higher education in the United States, we must never lose sight of the absolute necessity of preserving the basic freedoms of our universities and colleges, both public and private. I use the word "freedom" in the sense of developing all aspects of a university curriculum without detriment to other subjects. The greater emphasis in recent years on science, engineering, technology, and foreign languages in higher education has detracted from certain other areas of the humanities and social sciences in terms of attracting better students, teachers and financial support.

In a recent issue of the Phi Delta Kappan magazine, Dr. Raymond C. Gibson, professor of higher education, Indiana University, presents a thoughtful analysis of this situation together with a plan for promoting integrated support of higher education. I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

American higher education is a priceless asset fundamental to the national purpose. It cannot be spoken of simply in terms of the value of buildings and equipment, the total number of persons served, the teachers involved, or the research performed. The Nation's colleges and junior colleges, universities, research institutes, and professional schools are all of these things, but something more. Broadly conceived, higher education constitutes a precious national resource essential to the achievement of great national goals and to the achievement of worthy aspirations of individual citizens. It is a resource also in the sense that, given favorable conditions, it is as capable of self-renewal as is a properly conserved forest.

As students, young men and women look to colleges and universities to help them fulfill their aspirations. Parents look to these institutions to help them realize the ambitions they have for their children. More significantly, the American people look to colleges and universities for a continuing supply of increasingly capable citizens. They expect institutions of higher education—especially universities and their associated professional schools—to explore new fields of knowledge and to apply this knowledge to the problems of business and industry, human development, and government.

Nor is it the American people alone who place a high value on their institutions of higher education. The governments and peoples of emerging nations are turning more and more for advice and assistance to our colleges and universities. There can be little doubt that American higher education must help meet the expectations not just of the Nation, but of the world as well.

Like any other resource, colleges and universities must be used wisely lest they be exploited and their values diminished. Thus far, American higher education has served without substantial impairment of its teaching and research functions. But as we approach the 1970's, it is quite clear that colleges and universities will be subject to pressures that could weaken their usefulness as national resources. To prevent such a possibility, and to develop further higher education's strength as a resource for the future, action must be taken now. Appropriate action involves individual citizens and private philanthropy, but it also involves local, State, and national governments.

The heaviest pressure on our colleges and universities—and one certain to increase—is the steadily rising number of persons who want to enter college. Not only are there vastly more individuals in the college-age group, but also more of them find it necessary and desirable to get a higher education.

Opening enrollment for the current academic year (4,175,000 in fall of 1962) shows a 17-percent increase over 1960, the start of the present decade. By 1965, it is estimated that the figure will have increased 46 percent over 1960. An opening enrollment of almost 7 million is projected for 1970—an increase of 94 percent over 1960.[1] To meet this situation, institutions of higher education, even with the most effective use of the staff and plant they now have, must enlarge their faculties and expand classroom and student housing facilities.

In addition, though more difficult to measure, the pressure of new knowledge on colleges and universities requires new (and expensive) research facilities and equipment. Our Nation cannot afford to let its institutions fall behind in the search for new and better knowledge. To move ahead, we must expand and strengthen graduate education, including postdoctoral study, for the purpose of advancing knowledge of all kinds as well as for advancing learning on all levels. Throughout our educational system, in brief, we shall have to do a bigger and a better job. Achieving this objective will be costly; failing short of it will be even costlier.

The American Council on Education believes that the problems confronting higher education transcend state and local concerns, and thus have become an urgent national concern. We believe that, to maintain and develop higher education as a national resource, the Federal Government must supplement other sources of support. The Federal Government should do this, not to aid higher education, but to meet a national obligation to conserve and strengthen a national resource.

The council therefore proposes a broad program of Federal action to help expand and improve American higher education.

Although American higher education is unified in purpose, it is varied in its forms. We can think of it as a single entity when visualizing the impact of enrollment increases and sensing the obligation this places upon colleges and universities. But this concept of unity blurs the variety and complexity which must be considered in formulating a viable program. Such a program should meet the needs of institutions ranging in complexity from small colleges to large universities comprising many divisions and professional schools, in size from a few hundred students to many thousands, and in control from private to public.

The council believes it is well within the capacity of the American people, acting through their elected representatives in Congress and in response to leadership from the President, to implement a program of adequate support for higher education as a national resource.

This assertion, we are aware, proposes the use of Federal funds for private institutions as an integral part of the American system of higher education. This is nothing new, however, in either principle or practice. Historically, the Congress and the Federal Government have drawn no line of demarcation between public and private institutions of higher education when utilizing them in the national interest. The Federal Government has repeatedly called upon both public and private institutions to perform research and to serve as training centers for military officers. The Federal Government has provided grants to both public and private institutions for construction of research facilities. The Federal Government has granted funds to both public and private institutions for graduate education under the National Defense Education Act. In these and other ways, ample precedent exists for a program designed to develop both public and private institutions of higher education as a vital national resource.

For more than a hundred years the United States has supported and taken pride in a dual system of higher education which affords our youth the freedom to choose how and where they are to pursue their advanced learning. The American Council on Education believes in the soundness of this educational tradition and urges the American people, through their Federal Government, to support and develop it to meet the Nation's growing needs.

The proposals here set forth were recommended by the American Council's Commission on Federal Relations, and approved by the council's board of directors. By its nature, higher education is diverse and comprises institutions of many different traditions and views. As may be expected there are individual differences of opinion. Nevertheless, our recommendations represent a thoughtful consensus of representatives of all segments of American higher education. They take into account the views of the council's 1,000 member institutions and 175 member organizations.

The council recognizes the need also to strengthen elementary and secondary education and believes that the Federal Government has significant responsibilities on those levels. The American Council on Education, however, represents higher education. Our proposals are concerned accordingly with the need to strengthen colleges and universities.

THE PROPOSALS

I. Physical facilities

The Federal Government should take appropriate steps to assist colleges and universities in the construction of physical facilities for instruction, research, and student housing.

Instructional facilities: The council believes the need justifies a commitment by the Federal Government averaging $1 billion annually for a program of matching grants and low-interest loans for construction of academic facilities in both public and private institutions.[2]

Classrooms, laboratories, and libraries are essential to any soundly conceived academic program. The institution which overcrowds these facilities or tries to make do with obsolete facilities risks serious impairment of the quality of its academic program.

Research facilities: Federal agencies which support research in colleges and universities should be authorized and encouraged to provide appropriate support for construction of the physical facilities and for acquisition of the equipment required for such research. Additional appropriations should be provided as needed for these purposes.

Student housing: The basic legislative authorization of $300 million annually for the college housing-loan program runs until 1965. The Government is urged to make full use of its authority to make college-housing loans and, if the demand for loans should exceed available funds, to seek additional lending authority.

II. Faculty

The Federal Government should expand programs that will help to increase the supply of college teachers and improve the quality of instruction and research in colleges and universities.

Supply of college teachers: Two principal sources of Federal support for individuals enrolled in graduate programs which would qualify them for college teaching are the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The programs of these agencies are restricted for the most part to the natural sciences. Moreover, they are directed primarily to research and only incidentally to college teaching. The NSF and NASA fellowship programs should be expanded as the number of qualified candidates increases. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that expansion of these programs does not necessarily insure that the participants will go into college teaching rather than research.

The quality of college education also depends on an adequate supply of well-prepared teachers in disciplines other than the sciences, for example, in English, history, political science, and economics. The Federal Government should support expansion of graduate education in such a way as to redress the present imbalance in favor of science, and to encourage the preparation of college teachers in many, instead of few, fields of learning.

The only Federal program specifically intended to increase the supply of college teachers in fields other than science is that authorized in title IV of the National Defense Education Act, supplemented by NDEA title VI scholarships to prepare researchers and teachers in modern foreign languages not commonly taught in the United States. To make the National Defense Education Act a more effective instrument for adding to the supply of college teachers, it should be amended as follows:

1. Increase the total number of fellowships available under NDEA from 1,500 to 5,000, distributed in these categories: (a) Up to 2,000 in the existing "new or expanded" category; (b) up to 2,000 in programs of graduate instruction in institutions which can make a major contribution toward meeting the pressing need for col-

---

[1] The conservative estimates of the U.S. Office of Education reflect the general increase in population aged 18–21, and assume that the present ratio of 38 college students per hundred in the 18–21 age group will rise to 48 per hundred by 1970. The increase in enrollment is not a temporary "bulge," but a more permanent increase which will require even greater expansion in the 1970–80 decade. The 18–21 age group in 1980 (already born and approaching kindergarten) will be approximately 3 million larger than the equivalent group in 1970.

[2] The magnitude of what the Federal commitment should be is suggested by the projections of facilities needs published by the U.S. Office of Education in 1962 as chapter 11 of Economics of Higher Education. These projections show an average annual cost of construction for needed facilities of $2.21 billion in the years between 1961 and 1975. Average annual expenditures for construction are now approximately $1.25 billion. This rate can be sustained only if all present and anticipated sources of institutional financing of facilities are fully utilized.

Another estimate of the probable magnitude of the required Federal commitment is found in the results of a November 1960 survey of council membership. Reports from 582 institutions, representing about half of total student enrollment at that time, indicated that, over a 5-year period, they would expect to request a total of $2.9 billion under a program of grants and loans. Of this amount, it was anticipated that about $2.1 billion, or 72 percent, would be for grants, and $800 million, or 28 percent, would be for loans.

lege teachers; (c) up to 1,000 1-year awards for college teachers who are within a year of completing the requirements for the doctorate.

2. Provide each institution a flat grant of $3,000 a year for each graduate student enrolled under the NDEA fellowship program with the stipulation that the institution waive all tuition and other fees (other than room and board) normally required of graduate students.

Improvement of quality of instruction: A prime factor in the improvement of academic instruction obviously is the improvement of faculty competence. In the scientific field, Federal programs presently afford faculty members opportunities for postdoctoral research as well as for carrying out research projects on their own campuses. Similar benefits to teachers in fields other than the natural sciences should be provided through amendments to the National Defense Education Act.

New legislation to support the operation of college and university libraries would also reinforce faculty research and scholarship. In many scholarly disciplines the library is a major research facility, comparable in importance to the laboratory.

The program suggested above for 1,000 1-year NDEA fellowships for college teachers within a year of completing the doctorate would add to the supply of fully qualified college teachers and, because it is directed to persons already in college teaching, would improve the competence of these persons.

In addition, the NDEA institutes in modern foreign language should be extended to college teachers of modern language without any distinction between teachers from public and private institutions. These modern language institutes should be authorized to include the teaching of English.

Finally, there should be increased use of existing legislative authority for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. The council believes that Federal agencies administering these programs should consult with the academic community in developing fresh approaches that will win support for needed and substantial increases in appropriations for international educational exchanges.

III. Students

There is need for appropriate Federal action to lower the financial barriers to higher education for qualified students.

The predicted enrollment increase of 2.8 million students between 1962–63 and 1970–71 places a high priority on the need for academic facilities and college teachers. Realization that enrollments will rise by one-fourth between 1962 and 1965 alone emphasizes the urgency of this need. Without adequate facilities and qualified teachers, our colleges and universities will have to resort to expedients detrimental to educational quality. Thus the council believes first priority should go to Federal programs designed to assure the coming generation of college students of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in which to learn, and qualified persons to teach them.

All evidence indicates that charges to students for tuition, fees, and room and board in both public and private institutions are continuing to rise sharply. This upward trend in costs has forced the student, his family, and the institution to plan more realistically the share of the cost that should be borne by grant assistance, loans, and student employment. But dangers lie ahead, since a study of trends also indicates that scholarships and institutional loan funds, even when augmented by Federal loan funds available under the NDEA, are not keeping pace either with the increase in number of students or with the upward cost trend. Furthermore, while the loan program of the NDEA has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, qualified students from the very-low-income levels are finding it more and more difficult to finance a college education.[3]

With NDEA assistance, State programs of testing and counseling, with special emphasis on early identification of talented students, have either been initiated or expanded. But it is not enough to identify the talented student who comes from a low-income family unless some hope of grant assistance can be offered by the time he must make the decision to go to college. In short, if equality of educational opportunity is to be more than an abstract slogan, the Federal Government must help colleges and universities provide grant assistance as well as loan assistance to able but needy students.

Student loans: The ceiling of $250,000 on Federal contributions to any one institutional loan fund should be removed so that institutions may request funds in proportion to the predictable demand for them. The NDEA student loan program should be made a permanent program, with the Federal capital contributions granted to the institutions as permanent revolving loan funds. From time to time additional appropriations should then be made for grants to institutions to reimburse them for the portion of loans forgiven for recipients who entered teaching, to meet the needs resulting from increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for institutions new to the program.

As a matter of equity to student borrowers, the 50-percent forgiveness of loans should be extended to all teaching, including college teaching in recognized public and private, nonprofit institutions of education.

Student grant assistance: With due regard to the priority needs for a Federal program of assistance for construction of academic facilities and for expansion of the NDEA fellowship program for training college teachers, a new Federal program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be provided to supplement the NDEA student loan program. This scholarship or grant assistance program should have as its primary objective the seeking out and assisting of students of academic promise and great financial need.

International student exchanges: In the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Congress recognized the need to increase the number of undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries and to provide special services to foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities. Congress should appropriate adequate funds to support these programs realistically if international exchanges of students are to be extended effectively to emerging nations, and if the foreign student is to obtain maximum benefit from study in an American institution.

IV. Other proposals and considerations

The focus of Federal action to sustain and develop American higher education as a national resource must be on programs to assist institutions to meet the demand for better higher education for an increasing number of students. Thus the construction of academic facilities and the recruitment and preparation of qualified college teachers must have first priority for the academic community, and should have first priority in the thinking of Congress and the Executive. The need for more student financial assistance holds a second priority.

The council will continue to support other proposals for Federal action in the field of higher education. The list below is by no means inclusive, but among the proposals for which the council intends to provide appropriate support are these:

Federal assistance for construction of teaching facilities in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions.

Payment of full costs of federally sponsored research.

Equitable reimbursement to colleges and universities for expenses incurred in providing facilities and instruction for ROTC units.

Federal assistance to programs for college-level technician education.

Extension of the urban renewal program with annual authorizations sufficient to maintain benefits to the colleges and universities at least at current levels.

Amendments to the NDEA (a) to authorize preparation of persons to teach English as a second language, (b) to permit institutions and agencies undertaking NDEA-supported research to publish the results of such research, and (c) to authorize guidance institutes for training college student personnel workers.

Implementation of international agreements providing for tariff-free importation of books and scientific equipment.

Appropriations for Federal educational programs commensurate with the known demands for such programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on adequate appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Education, for the program of the National Defense Education Act, for the National Science Foundation, for grants in support of educational television, and for international educational exchanges.

In the interest of providing better coordination and focus for Federal programs in support of education, the American Council on Education believes there should be appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

In addition the Council is convinced that the Federal Government has an immediate responsibility to assess all of its present relationships with higher education and to take such steps as may be necessary to make these relationships more conducive to the long-term strengthening of the Nation's educational resources. In such an endeavor the Council pledges its full cooperation and assistance.

THE URGENT NEED FOR DECISION

On December 15, 1962, President Logan Wilson of the American Council wrote the President of the United States: "The crisis long predicted in the capacity of our institutions to meet the demands upon them is no longer something in the future. It is now."

It takes time to enact new Federal legislation and then to get it into effective operation. It also takes times to plan and then to build new buildings, and to complete the graduate education of a college teacher. Prompt action in the first session of the 88th Congress might result in a few new instructional buildings ready for use in the middle of the academic year 1963–64 and many more ready for use at the beginning of the 1964–65 academic year. The full effect, however, of a new Federal program for construction of academic facilities would not be felt until 1965–66 and beyond.

Similarly, assuming that Congress acts promptly in its 1963 session, expanded graduate programs for training college teachers would not make a significant difference in the supply of college teachers until 1965 and after.

The crisis cannot be averted, but it can be met without resorting to hastily devised crash programs. The decision lies both with Congress and with the President and his advisers. The American Council on Education is convinced that it speaks not only for organized higher education but for a much broader American consenus when it asserts that the opportunity for quality education beyond the high school should be widened and deepened through Federal action. With wise and effective Federal assistance, higher education can be maintained as an important national resource for generations to come.

---

[3] The statements in this paragraph are based on "Financial Aid to the Undergraduate: Issues and Implications," by Elmer D. West, to be published by the American Council on Education.

INCREASED CORPORATE AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION AS A SOUND BUSINESS INVESTMENT

(By Harry A. Bullis)

The University of Akron occupies a unique position as one of the foremost educational institutions of our country, and its distinguished president, Dr. Norman P. Auburn, is one of America's top educators. I have had the privilege during the past several years of being closely associated with Dr. Auburn as a fellow member of the Board of Directors of the Council for Financial Aid to Education. For a period of 7½ months beginning August 1, 1957, Dr. Auburn was borrowed from the University of Akron and served with great distinction as Acting President of the Council. During that period, Dr. Auburn brought an invigorating and fresh vision to the important work of this group. As a director and a member of the executive committee, he continues to give the Council the great benefits of his advice and leadership.

This is the date when the University of Akron is celebrating its annual founders day. The convocation this morning and the ceremonies held in connection with the anniversary of the founding of this outstanding university, whose record is a fine one indeed, were very impressive.

I would be remiss if I did not also record my appreciation of the performance of the great industries of Akron, including that which has made your city so well known as the rubber capital of the world. The accomplishments of the tire industry epitomize the industrial record of America. The high quality of the product, the record of high wages, and the great contributions of the industry to an advancing America are the envy of us all.

ADVANCES THROUGH EDUCATION AND CAPITAL

At this luncheon, Dr. Auburn has asked me to speak on the general topic of increased corporate aid for higher education as a sound business investment.

Corporations, corporate management, and boards of directors of corporations have as their central task the development of their manufacturing activities, the distribution of their products, and the achievement of a progressively higher place in their industries—goals which can only be realized with an efficient and educated work force. The heads of every corporation are also interested in the enlargement of the productivity of the entire economy so that markets are expanded for the corporation itself in a profitable way. This results in a gain to the corporation itself by making available superior resources for use in profitable production.

In business, many questions have been raised as to the contributions to our advances toward the better life from labor—including management—and from machines—including all forms of capital. This problem of dividing the contribution of the skilled and resourceful machine and the skilled and resourceful man has recently been studied with well-informed and well-grounded results.

One such study was made by Prof. Theodore W. Schultze, of the University of Chicago. Dr. Schultze, in his presidential address to the members of the American Economic Association in 1960, said that his investigation brought him to the finding that capital in the United States could account for and be credited with no more than 50 percent of the rise in productivity in the United States since 1900. He came to the tentative conclusion that educational advances probably accounted for most of the remaining 50 percent of the total advance in our productivity in the last 60 years.

Hence, we see the importance to business of investing in education equally with investing in additional capital—in expanding, training, stretching men's minds as much as enlarging, expanding, and adding to man's machines.

THE "EDUCATED" MACHINE

Let me give an example. The purchase price of a good computer would be about $1 million. I inquired as to its weight. This was reported to me as 2 tons. So we can say a computer machine costs $500,000 a ton. This works out at $250 a pound or more than 12 times the present new high price of silver at $20 a pound. In fact, the price per pound for the computer machine may well and properly be compared with the price of gold because it is much closer to that price than to the lower levels of silver. The price today for a pound of gold is $560.

Now, reverting to the computer cost of $500,000 per ton, we may ask: What is the intrinsic worth of the machine? Well, perhaps about $500, and were it all of mere metal, it would not be worth more than $50 per ton as scrap.

The price of the computer is high, but not because it has a high intrinsic value. The price is high because there is far more of man's brains and education in the computer than there is metal or all natural resources. Our challenge is, through education, to increase the efficiency of man's mind. The development of his brain is the finest type of investment business can make.

Clearly, as we move up in education, we move up very greatly the power, capacity, intricacy, and functions our machines can perform. Here we see man's educational attainments advancing productivity right before our eyes.

When man wants to use more capital, he does not try to use a dozen shovels or four wheelbarrows. He calls upon his inventive and educational talents to make far more productive progress than that. So the enormous gains that computers and other intricate machines make possible are far more the result of educational advances than the result of ownership of natural resources or the use of labor as "toil."

UNIVERSITY AND BUSINESS EDUCATION

The development of modern industrial research laboratories and their remarkable equivalence to college and university laboratories testify to the belief business has in education. As a matter of fact, there are numerous instances of large corporations locating their facilities so as to be close to university talent. The bay area in California is an instance in point, with the Stanford Research Institute and the Radiation Laboratory of the University of California. The only difference is where the college and university education ceases and education conducted by business should start. "University" as a word tends to connote "universal," and that may give us a clue as to the allocation of corporate gifts as between the college or university and the corporation's own educational plant, more commonly called a research laboratory.

Business is dependent, particularly in this technological age, on the educated men and women who are the products of universities and colleges, and corporate voluntary contributions to higher education are helping to create a supply of these human intellectual capital goods who are so essential to business well-being.

EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND INCOME

There is quite another way in which we can see the hard financial gains which come to us from education. This way is to calculate in employment and reduced unemployment the economic gains of education.

According to the Department of Labor, a high school graduate will earn, in his or her lifetime, $46,000 more than those who fail to graduate. A college graduate will earn $170,000 more. The Ph. D. apparently will earn so much more that we now have high-quality men's suits labeled the Ph. D. brand, strictly highgrade. In the old days, we had what might best have been described as Tarzan of the Apes brands.

The record of unemployment confirms the same story. In a recent study, the Department of Labor found that only 1.1 percent of our skilled and educated labor was unemployed, while 9.9 percent of our unskilled and uneducated labor was unemployed. Because so many have seniority, only 3 percent of the married men were unemployed, and because they lack seniority, no less than 15.4 percent of teenagers wanting jobs were unemployed.

The final figure, which is almost disastrous, is furnished by former President James B. Conant of Harvard, who has been giving education and its studies his most remarkable talent and energy. He reports that in two large cities, in their slum areas, and with the slum areas having populations of around 250,000 only about 41 percent of the young people between 18 and 22 years in age were in school or at work. Here is the greatest single fester we have in our country. Dr. Conant characterizes it as "social dynamite."

Equally alarming is the fact that in 1965 the number of persons reaching age 18 will, in that single year and every year for 17 years thereafter, increase by 1 million more than are reaching the age 18 each year until 1965. This means that in the next 17 years there will be added 17 million more to the labor force than have been added in the last 17 years.

Now we see two opportunities for corporate leadership and for giving to education as well.

First, if we can induce, in every manner possible, all young people to complete the maximum education and if we can provide facilities for their education, facilities that will attract them to go as far as possible, we shall raise the income level for the entire community. If 1 million more finish high school than are doing so now, we shall raise the income from them by $46 billion. For every 100,000 more we can put through college, their lifetime contribution to the Nation's income will be $17 billion.

With the very large number in about 2 years needing a high quality education, businessmen must give every form of help to expanding our educational facilities, incentives, and assistance to students. The young may not become informed about all of these matters, but every businessman, because of his position and advantages, should understand this greatest domestic need of all in our Nation. We must not leave all leadership here even to our educational leaders, let alone our municipal and State public authorities. We must educate taxpayer groups and the electorate as a whole. To borrow the words of Daniel Webster, the need "is instantaneous, overwhelming, and not admitting of delay." Two years is indeed a short time because it takes approximately that long to build the needed new high school, and a longer time for the needed new college science laboratory.

Now my friends in business will ask: "Yes, but can we afford the program you outline?"

That question can be answered quickly. We cannot afford not to see to it that our educational facilities are very greatly strengthened in 1963 and 1964, because if we do we shall have a different kind of country than we businessmen will like. We must see to it that both our high schools and junior colleges are better equipped to take care of preparatory work for the hordes of young people who will begin reaching college age in only 2½ years. Above that, we must plan educational facilities for the training of those who finish high school, do not go on to college, but yet need further training to be equipped to keep up with today's rapidly forward-moving technology. Those facilities must be both in our schools and in our factories and offices. To know the needs ahead now and not to prepare for them at once is negligence of the first and most dangerous order.

Because of the new Common Market, there is now added need for a higher level of education in this country for economic survival in competition with Western Europe.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION TODAY

The Council for Financial Aid to Education has pointed out that higher education is financed from just three sources: Taxes: from various levels of Federal, State, and local governments; earnings: tuition, auxiliary enterprises, investments, etc.; gifts: corporate, alumni, other individual, foundation, church, etc.; and that while corporate voluntary support to higher education is increasing, it is not increasing fast enough.

According to survey reports of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, industry, in 1950-51, gave colleges and universities $43 million, and much of this was for highly restricted projects. The council now estimates that corporate support of higher education will total $200 million in 1962. While this represents $4 million a week—$800,000 every working day—we need, not $200 million annually, but at least $500 million. Twelve different corporations contributed more than $1 million each in 1960, and increasing parts of this are for general purposes. But we need, not 35,000 corporations making contributions to higher education, but 235,000. The base of business donors to higher education must be widened.

At present, there is too much of a spread among the companies that already have aid-to-education programs. Less than 1 percent of the 35,000 corporations now voluntarily supporting higher education contribute more than 50 percent of the money.

The University of Akron has been getting increased corporate support during last few years, especially from corporations who are members of Akron University Associates, many of which are represented at this luncheon.

According to the council, foundations in 1960-61 gave American colleges and universities more than $195 million, an increase of almost 300 percent in 6 years.

Nonalumni individuals contributed $180 million in 1960-61, an increase of 250 percent, 2½ times, in the past 6 years.

The American Alumni Council reports that in 1961, alumni gave their alma maters $209 million. This is an increase of 300 percent over the $53 million contributed as recently as 1953. The alumni of the University of Akron are increasing their contributions each year.

The Council for Financial Aid to Education estimates that by 1970 at least one-fifth of the total cost of higher education, or over $2 billion a year, will come from gifts from corporations, alumni, other individuals, foundations, labor unions, churches, etc.

The Cleveland plan, proposed by a group of Cleveland businessmen, is to relate corporate support of higher education to corporate earnings, and for all corporations starting where they are now to contribute within 3 years 1 percent of earnings before taxes to higher education. Thirty Cleveland companies, with current aggregate earnings of approximately $250 million annually, have joined and agreed to follow the plan. It is hoped that more corporations will follow suit; however, the important thing is for every corporation to do what it can and do it now.

THE FUTURE

Certainly, business can carry no wiser insurance and can make no sounder investment than to increase their corporate aid for higher education and to increase it now. Someone has said, "The future will be decided, not in outer space but in inner space, the space between the ears." In this era of unparalleled change and challenge, there is almost universal agreement on the necessity of an educated world citizenry. We are beginning to realize that the future belongs to the educated man. With him, we may be able to save ourselves. Without him, we cannot.

In our competitive struggle with Communist Russia, education is the greatest weapon in our favor. Our other great weapon is the industrial system of the United States. Both are extremely well exemplified here in Akron.

May I be permitted to recall the simple timeworn aphorism: "Knowledge is power." Let business assume leadership for patriotic as well as selfish motives by contributing to that power. It is my hope that the University of Akron will continue to prosper from its close association with industry here.

[From Phi Delta Kappa magazine, January 1963]

A SCHEME FOR INTEGRATED SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION—A STUDENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA AND EUROPE FINDS IN BRITAIN CLUES TO A MORE RATIONAL AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT FOR U.S. COLLEGES

(By Raymond C. Gibson)

(NOTE.—Mr. Gibson (Alpha 2608) is professor of higher education at Indiana University. On sabbatical leave last spring, he studied higher education in several European countries, including England. In 1960 he directed a statewide survey of higher education in Iowa. This year he is chairman of a panel for a similar study in Missouri.)

There is an organizational and administrative hiatus in the support of higher education in the United States that borders on anarchy. It could become the graveyard of the American idea of infinite variety in advanced learning. There has been no clear plan for the support of higher education which would not compromise its integrity both with respect to content and control.

The scheme presented here is predicated upon a few basic facts and principles:

1. It is important to preserve the private as well as the public sector of higher education.

2. Public support can be used to preserve or to destroy private colleges.

3. Massive Federal support of private universities, particularly five or six of the best known ones, is a fact that must be recognized. Moreover, we must realize that over 95 percent of research grants are in the sciences and technology.

4. No clear voice speaks out for higher education in the United States. In fact, more than 100 national organizations with their hundreds of regional and State counterparts confuse rather than clarify the policy question.

5. The Federal Government will continue to support higher education, but it must contribute part of the support for the total program rather than all of the support for parts of the program. The humanities and social sciences have been particularly ignored in Federal support at a time when they may be the key to survival.

6. Approximately 75 percent of all accredited colleges and universities participate in at least one of the Federal programs.

Higher education is linked with the social, economic, political, and military position of the United States as a world power. For this reason, the policy of governments at all levels has been to increase opportunities for higher education not only in proportion to an increasing population but, more significantly, in accordance with increasing percentages of college-age students actually in attendance.

The growing sophistication or tolerance among religious groups (apparently not so well known to the National Education Association and the 88th Congress) is certain to accelerate Federal support to both public and private colleges. There is no other equitable solution to the problems posed by burgeoning enrollments and rising costs.

Congress has been inclined to determine policy at the top and to make appropriations for higher education on the basis of that policy rather than upon the basis of intelligent consideration of needs expressed by governing boards, administrators, and faculties of the colleges and universities. This is a trend which should be reversed.

Each national crisis in higher education is approached without any long-range plan. The vacuum created by the lack of policy is an invitation for some national authority to solve the problem because of the availability of Federal funds. Educational objectives, policy, programs, curriculums, research activities, and determination of financial needs can and should originate with faculties, administrators, and governing boards alert to the place of higher education in a dynamic society. Financing should be by State and National Governments—because this is the only solution.

THE TAKEOVER BY MONEYCHANGERS

In recent years a profession of fund raisers has grown up in the university field which is destined to take over not only the administration of higher education but the whole academic program if the present scheme is continued. This group is reaching for power through a combination of clever administrative techniques, Madison Avenue salesmanship, and the inexhaustible expense account. College presidents get by on expense accounts that make them look like peasants by comparison. Staffs of 35 to 60 people working in the area of propaganda and fund raising are virtually the rule rather than the exception among many of the larger private universities. One university reports a budget of $800,000 for its public relations and development office alone in the year 1960-61. This invasion of higher education by Madison Avenue hucksters has developed because of the virtual absence of any organized scheme for supporting our public and private institutions.

Foundations have sprung up in such numbers that many institutions find it necessary to name at least one full-time employee to develop contacts with these sources of funds. Grants coming from foundations have infinitely more strings attached to them than the grants made, for example, by the British Treasury to the universities of Great Britain, as we shall see later in this paper. Boards of directors of foundations are eclipsing boards of trustees for colleges and universities in determining general policy.

Administrative personnel, public relations and development offices, and other bureaucratic establishments in the United States are absolutely astounding in the proportion of the higher education budget they consume compared with the cost of maintaining the University Grants Committee which secures 75 percent of the budget of British universities.

This situation, together with America's desire to keep the control of education decentralized, form the backdrop and the rationale for the scheme herein proposed. Another aspect of the rationale is that almost every State is concerned with the coordination of public higher education, and in some cases of all higher education, in order to approach this increasingly complex problem with the maximum utilization of limited resources.

SCHEME FOR COORDINATION

The scheme I propose for coordination would include a Council on Higher Education in each of the 50 States. The number of members could vary from 15 to 25, depending upon the size of the State, the number of educational institutions, and enrollments. Membership on the council should be drawn from the academic disciplines and professions—including the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, medicine, engineering, education—and should also include representatives of the business, industrial, and agricultural society in which higher education operates. The academicians on the committee would be drawn from both public and private colleges and universities of the State. Distinguished professors and possibly certain deans of colleges would be included, but central administrators, who would present budgetary requests to the council, would be excluded.

University staff members should make up approximately 60 percent of the membership of the council, which would be a coordinating agency, not a governing body. Governing boards of colleges and universities would continue their existing functions. The coordinating function requires the best judgment of professionals from the sciences, humanities, social sciences, professions, business, and industry. With the exception of a research staff, located on the campus of one of the universities, the members should serve without pay except necessary travel expenses.

Academic members of the council in each State would be nominated by the presidents operating as a group. Other members should be selected from among the leading citizens of the State. All appointments would be made by the Governor, subject to the approval of the legislature. In case of a 15-member council, the Governor would appoint 3 members every 2 years to serve 10-year terms.

Budgetary requests from all accredited colleges and universities, after consideration and approval by the governing boards, would be submitted to this council. Requests would indicate programs to be supported, costs, and sources of income, including tuition, fees, grants, and endowments, which would decrease the contribution from the State and Federal governments. The chairman and executive secretary of the council would be responsible for submitting a coordinated budget to appropriate State officials. Certain designated presidents representing all the college presidents of the State would be called upon to appear before legislative committees in order to interpret and justify statewide programs.

Each State legislature would make an appropriation based upon gross income and college enrollment of the State compared with other States. State appropriations could be made on a biennial basis and reflect short-range needs and changes in educational costs.

The 50 executive secretaries of the State councils on higher education would form the U.S. Grants Committee for Higher Education and would present a quinquennial request to the Bureau of the Budget to supplement institutional and State legislative funds in each State. The Federal appropriation would be made on a 5-year basis and would be in proportion to college enrollments and the ability of States to pay for higher education. Federal Government grants would go directly to the Council on Higher Education of each State for distribution to the institutions.

It would be necessary to maintain a research staff in Washington which would serve as a secretariat for the 50 State councils in the preparation of the quinquennial grants. The Washington staff would be a research and service agency, not a control or governing agency.

The secretariat operating in each State would engage in institutional research involving costs, facilities, personnel, enrollments, program development, and coordination. Each legislature should require a constant study of costs at different levels of higher education in order to approach the problem of appropriations objectively and without discrimination against any institution.

This scheme for managing the support of higher education is based upon observations of the disastrous results of centralized ministerial systems of support and control in Asia and Latin America, but more importantly upon the results of national support and local institutional control and freedom in Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain.

The following analysis of why the British system has succeeded in keeping support and control separated is presented as the frame of reference for the proposed scheme for the United States.

THE BRITISH UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE

The British Government initiated the University Grants Committee in 1919. It is composed of 19 members, appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who also appoints the executive secretary with the approval of the Prime Minister.

The paid staff of the University Grants Committee is small—a chairman, secretary, an assistant secretary, and clerical personnel. The chairman is the only full-time member of the committee. University Grants Committee has no official connection with the Ministry of Education, although a representative of the Ministry attends all meetings of the committee to provide desirable liaison. In 1961–62, the total secretariat included only 40 people, and the budget for the London headquarters of this important staff came to only $168,000 per year.

The members of the University Grants Committee, other than the chairman and executive secretary, are honorary workers. In 1962, the members included two local school administrators, four college administrators, seven professors, and six business and industrial leaders. Vice chancellors of the universities are not appointed to the committee. They appear before it to present their quinquennial budgetary requests.

Grants are made to the universities (23 universities and 2 university colleges in 1961–62) on a quinquennial basis. These 25 institutions are the only degree-granting universities and colleges in Great Britain. They enrolled approximately 110,000 students (less than 3 percent of college-age youth) in 1962. All other colleges, including technical and teachers colleges, submit their budgetary requests to the Ministry of Education. They enroll about 150,000 students.

The functions of University Grants Committee, as announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1946, were to assist, in consultation with universities and other bodies concerned, in the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of universities as may from time to time be required in order to insure that they are fully adequate to national needs. The British Government regards the universities as indispensable to the cultural, economic, and political life of the nation. This policy demands coordinated planning without centralized control.

University Grants Committee has the policy of beginning visits to each university about the middle of the quinquennium. The objective is to have at least one-half of the committee visit each university. It took 108 days to carry out this task in preparation for the 1962–67 budget.

By the end of the fourth year of each quinquennium, all requests, with supporting statistics, are submitted to University Grants Committee by the various universities. These requests include new programs as well as recurring operations.

Requests are studied, evaluated, and consolidated by University Grants Committee and then submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In March preceding the end of the quinquennium, the Government announces the grants for the 5-year period beginning the first of August. Following this announcement, University Grants Committee has the responsibility of making an equitable distribution of the total funds among the institutions involved.

Wihin the limitations imposed by the amount of grant to a university, there is internal freedom for the faculty and administration to proceed with their own plans for the next quinquennium. The exception to this would be in the case of funds earmarked for a special purpose by the treasury or by the universities in their original requests. Since the end of World War II there have been earmarked grants, especially in sciences, technology, agriculture, and Oriental studies.

Following the allocation of the quinquennial grants, the secretariat devotes its time to various problems confronting higher education. For example, during the quinquennium ending July 31, 1962, University Grants Committee, in cooperation with the vice chancellors, sponsored studies that eventuated in a recommendation to the Government that six new universities be established during the period 1962–67.

As late as 1939, University Grants Committee funds granted to the universities amounted to only $5,300,000, or 2,250,000 pounds. By 1961–62, grants amounted to $210 million, or 75 million pounds, and provided about 70 percent of the operating budgets and 95 percent of the building funds for British universities. The enormous increase during the 1939–62 period was considerably out of proportion to the increase in student population, which grew from 50,000 to about 110,000.

Beginning in the fall of 1962, every university student in Great Britain receives government support for his education. Even the son of a wealthy family receives 50 pounds, after which the means test is applied. Capable students from very poor families receive complete support for their university education.

WHY UNIVERSITY GRANTS SYSTEM SUCCEEDS

Traditions within the Government and within the universities have tended to work to the advantage of the university grants system. Many of the leaders in Government and the universities were friends as undergraduate students. Although various members of the Grants Committee are known to their peers among university professors and administrators, there is no evidence that any member of the committee uses his position to represent his own university in a partisan way.

Individuals within Government, the universities themselves, the Ministry of Education, and leaders in the British society share a common interest in maintaining their universities at a high standard; they regard their position as a great public trust to preserve freedom in the universities.

It apparently has never occurred to the English that local government could be better than National Government. Why should it? Any student of public administration knows that no one level of government (local, state, or national) has a monopoly on virtue in any nation. This being the case, it has not occurred to university officials or to leaders in British society that universities are threatened by drawing most of their financial supports from the British treasury.

The tradition of the British in permitting employees to advance in terms of competencies and growth rather than in terms of the size of bureaucracy which one develops and supervises has set a precedent for limiting the control of University Grants Committee over the universities. The executive secretary and the chairman of the University Grants Committee regard themselves and their organization as an important service agency for the universities in securing Government support, by representing the universities to the Government, by serving as catalyst to bring about greater interaction between the universities and British society, and by serving as a buffer between the support and control of British universities.

One of the most unique aspects of British Government and universities is the fact that status is not synonymous with power. The civil servant is inducted into the Government on the basis of his ability to perform a specific task and to grow in stature as a Government servant. The vice chancellor, dean, or professor in a university does not gain status in terms of the number of people whom he supervises. The drive to build up large bureaucracies and to control groups of people, so characteristic of other governments, has not become a characteristic of British Government in general or of the universities. The professor gets his status largely on the basis of competence in his field of specialization. Even if he becomes master of a house at Cambridge or vice chancellor of the university, these positions do not carry tremendous power. The absence of power as an index of status has been a psychological factor in limiting the authority of the government over the universities. When there is no tangible reward for the possession of power, it becomes less attractive to officials in Government and in education.

Most of the key officials of the British Government are graduates of the universities. They do not hesitate to defend the integrity and freedom of universities to pursue their objectives without interference from Government officials. The Public Accounts Committee of Parliament has demanded the right to probe more deeply the use of university funds. It is generally known that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other prominent members of the Government, in such cases, come to the rescue of the universities and assist them in maintaining a greater degree of fiscal independence than any other agency of the Government.

There exists among Government officials and in the universities, as well as in British society at large, a determination to maintain the freedom and integrity of British universities. This is one of the most dynamic forces in Western civilization. Freedom to pursue the truth, to do research and freely to exchange ideas are characteristic of British universities which have been shared generously with scholars from all over the world, including those who have come from British colonies. Participation of colonial scholars in a free university society contributed significantly to the disintegration of the British Empire and to the establishment of the British Commonwealth.

The center of power in the university is with the faculties. They elect the vice chancellor and limit his term of office to 2 years. If the power for directing the affairs of the university is with the faculties, it cannot be located in London nor with any other level of government. It is not uncommon in many situations and many countries to proclaim the academic integrity, responsibility, and freedom of faculties, and then to have curricular developments of the most grave consequences handed down from departments of the Central Government or space agencies bent upon accelerating research in a certain direction, even though the long-range objectives of the university and the nation may be seriously impaired by such expediency. When this happens, the faculties and administrators do not control the university.

IMPLICATIONS OF UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED STATES

Most Americans who have made a careful study of the university grants system have concluded that, while it has been a successful scheme for supporting higher education in Great Britain, it would not work in America.

One of Henry Wriston's professors at Lawrence College used to contend that anything that worked east of the Alleghenies would not work in the Middle West. So it is that many Americans in higher education conclude that success of the University Grants Committee system in England is proof positive that it would not work in America.

The question whether a university grants committee could function in the United States hinges upon whether administrators, faculty, boards of control, and officials in State and national governments can develop the intellectual and administration sophistication to work together without power struggles; can accept the theory that the survival of democratic processes hinges upon keeping the control of research, teaching, and learning within our universities even though 50 percent of the budget for U.S. higher education may be provided by the Federal Government.

Jacques Barzun has said: "England is a business civilization, the first industrial power, and once the world's greatest banker; yet despite its diminished financial strength its subsidy of learning is through a council of professionals not responsible to bureaucrats. . . . All students deemed of superior ability are put through the university at government expense. Scholarships are an honor and a full release from irrelevant drudgery." [1]

If no such system or modification thereof will work in the United States, there are causes more basic than the differences in the size of the two countries, number and size of the universities, availability of higher education, and size of budgets.

We must ask ourselves questions which bear on the fundamental reasons for the success of the university grants system in Great Britain:

1. Are we determined to keep our universities free?
2. Do we have the courage to cushion them against politics and temporary emergencies?
3. Will Government officials support freedom and integrity within the universities of America?
4. Can officials in Government and in higher education learn to trust one another?
5. Is it possible for us to recognize the fact that no level of Government has a monopoly on virtue?
6. Is it possible to develop in the U.S. Government and in universities a system which rewards individuals upon the basis of their competence rather than upon the basis of their power?
7. Is it possible to bypass the bureaucracies of Washington, D.C., and to go directly to the U.S. Treasury with requests for grants based upon careful research by civil servants and educators whose status does not depend upon the control of the expenditure of such funds?

In administering Federal funds for higher education, we have been acting as if the United States were the size of Rhode Island. Universities under the University Grants Committee enroll fewer students than the colleges and universities in the State of Indiana, but the British Government adheres to decentralized control as if the country were the size of the United States. If this principle is valid in a nation that is smaller geographically than many of the 50 American States, then only administrative and educational ineptness could ever persuade the people of the United States to adopt any policy for higher education based upon centralization of control in Washington.

RAILROAD MERGERS—REFERRAL OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago, on behalf of several other Senators and myself, I introduced S. 942, a bill to amend the Clayton Act to bring about a limited, temporary moratorium on railroad mergers.

I was advised that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] might wish to make a motion to refer the bill to some committee other than the Committee on the Judiciary, to wit, the Committee on Commerce, so that I asked that the bill lie on the desk and not be referred until the Senator from Illinois could be present.

The matter was brought up in the Judiciary Committee, and the consensus of the Judiciary Committee was that that committee should claim jurisdiction of the bill, inasmuch as all Clayton Act questions are referred to the Judiciary Committee, but that the Judiciary Committee would immediately ask the Committee on Commerce for its advice and counsel in connection with the proposal, hoping that it might get such counsel within about 60 days.

Since that time, on a number of occasions, I have conferred with the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He has also introduced, or will introduce, a rail merger moratorium bill. I do not know its contents, but I understand that it is to be an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. That bill, I understand, will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, so that that committee has the same subject matter before it.

I feel that the rail merger moratorium based on antitrust standards is a Judiciary matter. A similar bill, S. 3097, was referred to the Judiciary Committee last year. Railroads are included in the Clayton Act. They are in the Celler-Kefauver amendment to the Clayton Act, which is section 7, to a limited extent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very brief memorandum prepared by one of the senior attorneys of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Mr. Winslow Turner, which shows the antitrust and merger problems in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE JURISDICTION OF RAIL MERGER MORATORIUM BILL (S. 942) INTRODUCED BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

(Summary of basic reasons for jurisdiction in Judiciary Committee)

1. An almost identical bill, S. 3097, was introduced by Senator KEFAUVER last year and it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. It was cosponsored by the majority leader, the assistant majority leader, and 11

---

[1] Jacques Brazun, "The House of Intellect," New York: Harper & Bros., 1957, p. 202.

other Senators. Some 9 days of hearings were held on the bill, and it was voted upon favorably by a majority of the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, but did not reach final action by the Judiciary Committee. The subcommittee has recently issued a report entitled "The Railroad Merger Problem" which deals with much of the issues to which this proposed legislation is directed. Hence, the Judiciary Committee and its Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee have a background of jurisdiction and concern over railroad merger moratorium legislation.

2. The proposed legislation seeks only to halt approval of those rail mergers which would substantially lessen competition or tend to monopoly. It is related to antitrust issues arising out of proposed rail mergers. Such issues involve not only the destruction of competition and the development of monopolies in the transportation industry, but also the possible anticompetitive effects upon shippers and areas of the country which are engaged in manufacturing, agriculture, and other nonregulated industries.

3. The consideration of the bill is properly within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary since that committee and its Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee are authorized to make studies and investigations of unlawful restraints and monopolies wherever found.

4. The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee had in its program for 1962, and has again in its program for 1963, as approved by a majority of the committee, an inquiry into transportation mergers, including railroad mergers.

5. The history of the Clayton Act and railroad mergers makes this type of bill properly referred to Judiciary.

(a) Rail mergers were originally determined under Sherman and Clayton Act standards—Judiciary.

(b) In 1920, Congress immunized such mergers from the antitrust laws where the ICC approval conformed to plans for competition and maintained existing routes and channels of trade.

(c) In 1940, the immunization was continued, where new public interest criteria were satisfied, and where the ICC was to consider, but not be bound by antitrust standards.

(d) Today, the size and impact of the rail mergers raise the question—should Congress take back this antitrust immunity, altogether—or should it give a limited antitrust immunity based upon special standards—or should the ICC be permitted to create rail monopolies without restraint. Again, this is an antitrust issue of great importance.

(e) Rail mergers and concentration in the rail industry cannot be isolated from concentration in other American industries, regulated and unregulated—an antitrust problem.

6. The Clayton Act contains special sections directed to railroad antitrust issues aside from the immunity proviso in section 7.

(a) Section 11 (15 U.S.C. 21) provides for the Interstate Commerce Commission to bring its own action for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, the Kefauver-Celler Antimerger Act, the exclusive dealing and tying section, and the interlocking directorate section of the Clayton Act, and the Attorney General is permitted to intervene and appear to prosecute these antitrust matters before the Commission.

(b) Section 10 (15 U.S.C. 20) makes it illegal, subject to a fine or imprisonment, or both, for any common carrier to have commercial dealings with any other corporation which is interlocked by directorships or other official positions, unless such dealings shall be done by competitive bidding prescribed by rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is an antitrust statute.

(c) Section 4 (15 U.S.C. 14) gives private parties the right to sue for treble the amount of damages arising from violations of these antitrust laws.

All these bills—antitrust in nature—but directly relating to railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission were considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

7. There is no better expertise on antitrust implications than the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the Judiciary. This is why the bill should go to the Judiciary Committee.

E. WINSLOW TURNER,
Assistant Counsel, Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I made the point, when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee introduced his bill, that, very properly speaking, under rule XXV, it was my opinion the bill ought to be referred to the Commerce Committee. I cherish that opinion notwithstanding the fact that in the last Congress the Judiciary Committee heard 27 witnesses for a period of 9 days on a similar measure.

I observe that the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] has filed what for all practical purposes is an identical bill, which provides for a complete freeze on all railroad mergers until the 31st of December 1963. That is the essence of the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. President, now there is identic subject matter reposing in two standing committees of the Senate.

I have no objection. That will be perfectly all right. I fear, however, that if we do not mind our knitting a little with respect to the jurisdiction of the standing committees we shall get into difficulties.

I am of the opinion that there is another bill on which long hearings have been held, as to which many witnesses have been heard, notwithstanding the fact that it is a bill to amend the Clayton Act, which, properly speaking, ought to be in that committee. Sooner or later we shall have a problem with respect to committee jurisdiction.

I am going to be attentive to it, insofar as it relates to the committees on which I serve, because I want the integrity of the jurisdiction of every standing committee to be properly observed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly.

The bill which was introduced last year, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, was substantially the same as the bill introduced this year, to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act. It would not provide a complete freeze on railroad mergers, and is not intended to do so. It would make provision with respect to any railroad with assets of more than $200 million; that when the merger would substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly it would be frozen, unless it were clearly established that such an acquisition was necessary and essential to the maintenance of adequate railroad transportation facilities.

The bill is clearly an antitrust bill and is properly an amendment to the Clayton Act. Railroads have always been under the Clayton Act. They have been to a limited extent taken out from under the jurisdiction of the Clayton Act, but there is still jurisdiction over them; so I think the bill properly should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator asking that the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I am only asking that the bill I introduced S. 942 be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely make an observation, because of the fact that the chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent from the Chamber, and I happen to be present in order to make remarks on another subject.

This question was a matter of great discussion before our committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say in that connection that I advised the Senator from Washington several days ago, and again today, that the matter would be brought up today. He had no desire to comment.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. I merely wish to have the RECORD receive the benefit of my observations as to the colloquy which has transpired between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois.

It is true that questions of mergers fall under the Clayton Act, but they also involve transportation problems. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the ICC, which will hear the matter on the question of mergers. Therefore, there may be concurrent jurisdiction. I think it ought to be resolved in a very businesslike way. There is no need for two committees to work on the same problem. I think it is a question of both committees getting together and working out the problem. The idea that one committee will assume exclusive jurisdiction, and perhaps say to the other committee that it will listen to its advice, does not involve concurrent jurisdiction, and I think the Commerce Committee is very sensitive about that.

I thought the RECORD should have the benefit of that observation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Rhode Island has had to say. Either at the beginning or in the end certainly it would be quite agreeable with me for the matter to be referred to the Commerce Committee for its consideration. Of course, the Commerce Committee has a similar bill to consider. I am sure we can work out the matter so that there will not be double work.

Mr. PASTORE. I understood that a similar bill was introduced because the committees could not get together as to which committee should have jurisdiction. I am merely saying I think it is a bad precedent to get into the business of duplication. It can be avoided. It should be avoided. For the benefit of the taxpayers, I hope that the chairmen of the two committees can get together and work out the matter of jurisdiction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, if he has the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know if I have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island so that he may yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this matter was discussed in the full Committee on the Judiciary, which took an entirely sympathetic and compassionate attitude toward it. The committee decided to retain jurisdiction and to permit the other committee, for about 60 days, to deal with it and then to advise us according to its lights and according to its wisdom.

Mr. PASTORE. But the exclusive and final jurisdiction, as I understand the Senator from Illinois, is to remain in the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly what the Commerce Committee resents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly the observation I am making on the floor of the Senate. If anybody wishes to have me simplify it further, I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 942) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CITATION BY THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING TO ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, JR.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on March 8 ceremonies were held at St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands recognizing the completion of the preparation of a Peace Corps group which will work in Gabon. At that time the Experiment in International Living, with headquarters at Putney, Vt., presented to Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., its fifth annual citation.

Mr. Shriver was one of the early participants in the program of the Experiment in International Living. Now, as we all know, he is the head of the Peace Corps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of the citation which was presented to Mr. Shriver, and also a copy of the resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Experiment in International Living on October 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the citation and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fifth Annual Citation Presented by the Experiment in International Living to Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr.

If, as you have publicly affirmed, your three Experiment experiences have meant as much to you in preparing you to deal humanely and intelligently across international borders as your 4 years at your beloved alma mater, the Experiment is proud of the part it has played in shaping the career of one of the Nation's youngest, ablest, most distinguished public servants.

The wisdom, the imagination, the sheer genius for leadership are yours; they have brought you richly merited recognition in business, religious, civic, educational, and philanthropic affairs.

The deep sensitivity to the needs and aspirations of others, and an awareness of the urgency to understand their minds and hearts, so well expressed in your own paraphrase: "He who knows but one culture, doesn't even know that one well"; and so brilliantly translated into your administration of the Peace Corps—these, we choose to believe, if not imparted—were at least sharpened and deepened and developed in you through your association with the institution whose ideals your career has so eminently reflected.

For epitomizing in your character and in your personal and professional life the finest traditions of an exemplary Experimenter: humility, adaptability, warm humanity, and deep integrity—we salute you as one whose life reflects through your accomplishments your responsible membership in the family of nations.

Gordon Boyce,
President.

Resolution Adopted by the Board of Trustees, the Experiment in International Living, Putney, Vt., October 23, 1956

For a quarter of a century, the Experiment in International Living has dedicated itself to the principle that individuals of varied cultures can learn to know, respect, and understand one another best within the close comradeship of the family circle. Its participants have "adopted" new parents, sons, daughters, sisters and brothers in many ways, under many circumstances on four of the earth's continents. In 18 languages, Experimenters have faced the direct personal challenge of submerging their own cultural background and participating actively in the life of a second home, a second family, another nation.

Thousands of people have tried the Experiment way. Most have met and overcome successfully the problems inherent in every Experiment in International Living. All have returned to their home country with a new awareness and appreciation of the way of life of their second family, with a deeper insight into their own capabilities and limitations. Through their experiences, the organization in whose program they participated, has likewise broadened in its knowledge and understanding of the problems incident to peoples talking to peoples.

One of the most important lessons which we have had to learn, although we are frequently prone to forget it, is that our Experimenters represent only a portion of the international person-to-person encounters which are the essence of our philosophy and program. Whenever a human being leaves his own way of life behind him and for a month, a year, or a lifetime attempts to adapt himself to a new environment to make new friends, there is an experiment in international living. His success is in direct proportion to the way he goes about it.

Occasionally an individual is so outstandingly successful in his person-to-person relations, and so adroit at leading others to follow his footsteps, that his experiment is an example and an inspiration to us all. The Experiment, as well as those whom it serves, is particularly conscious of the inspirational debt which we owe to such leaders on the contemporary scene.

It is to acknowledge this debt, to honor those whose lives reflect their responsible membership in the family of nations, whose deeds have set an extraordinary example at the people-to-people level, that we propose this recognition. It will be given by the Experiment in International Living, on an annual basis subject to the discretion of the board of trustees, to those individuals who, in our opinion, have so succeeded in their own personal experiments that they have made a significant and lasting contribution by dramatizing the virtues of sharing the problems, joys, and responsibilities of belonging to a family group which transcends all frontiers.

AMERICA'S GREATEST COLD WAR TRIUMPH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, America's greatest cold war triumph has come as a result of President Kennedy's firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding action toward Castro and Khrushchev last October.

The objective of the Kennedy administration is not only to overthrow Fidel Castro, who appears to be a dope addict, as some Cuban exiles have claimed. Our task goes beyond that. We should eradicate Marxist teachings from the minds of Cuban children, compel all Russian army officers and personnel to follow their missiles back home to the Soviet Union, and then, by radio broadcasts in Spanish and using other means, weaken Soviet influence and destroy Castroism. Let us face it. Castro's Cuba is a problem for our country with the support of the Organization of American States. It is the problem of every Western Hemisphere nation from Canada to the Straits of Magellan. Communism grows where dictators flourish and where public officials are arrogant, corrupt, and unscrupulous, and keep the mass of their people hungry, helpless, poverty stricken, without hope, living in squalor and misery, permitting the few to enrich themselves as did Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, Batista in Cuba, and Jimenez in Venezuela.

Mr. President, except for the satellite countries in Eastern Europe taken over by the force of Russian power, communism has not made any gains whatever in the world except where the people have been oppressed and hopeless.

We Americans have reason to be thankful that photographs taken from our U-2 planes flying over Cuba proved the presence of this aggressive buildup last October and that our President acted immediately with great vigor, resolution, and courage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It is a matter of pride to us that Khrushchev turned tail and withdrew those offensive missiles without the necessity for spilling American blood. The crisis there has subsided, despite the yelping of some individuals, such as former Vice President Nixon, who recently charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion. In 1959 and 1960, when Castro expropriated the property of American individuals and corporations, such as that of the Gulf Oil Co. to the tune of $5 million without compensation except for a promissory note with no interest for a number of years, he was exceedingly silent. Now, this Monday morning quarterback is a war hawk.

Despite our triumph of last October, we must follow through. Castro's communism cannot be tolerated anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. The Kennedy Doctrine supplements and strengthens our Monroe Doctrine, and is isolating Castro's Cuba.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a fine article entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," written by Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post, which appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the United Nations.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's peremptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

"RESCUE" ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is litle desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala-type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already abuilding takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive United States efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Viet-Cong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

MANAGED NEWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, recently I received in the mail from California a clipping of a column by that distinguished columnist of the Los Angeles Times and one of the most highly respected and regarded members of the Washington press corps, Bill Henry.

By coincidence his column was on the same day and the same subject as a radio broadcast that I made over station WGAN in Portland—on March 10, 1963, and on the subject of managed news. A further similarity exists in that we separately took the view that management of news was nothing new—that the only basic difference now was one of degree, of the ultimate lengths developed by the Kennedy administration of releasing all good news through party spokesmen and thus making it appear the party in power was the only one doing anything for the people.

Our separate expressions had a further similarity in that we referred to the managed news administration of the Department of Defense and specifically on contract award announcements. I went into a little more detail and illustrated how the Kennedy administration was making Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera characters out of the legislative liaison officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and making them look like old-time comedy movie "Keystone Kops" with their synchronized-watch, split-second timing delivery of contract award notices, hours and sometimes days, after such awards had been publicly announced by the favored Democratic Senators and were already in the newspapers.

A basic difference in our expressions was in my observation that perhaps all of us were guilty of managing news—even reporters some times—and that it depended on which side of the table we sat as to our reaction.

Because I believe the Members of this body would be interested in the similar comments that distinguished columnist Bill Henry and I made on the subject of managed news from Maine to California—he in his newspaper and I on a radio broadcast—on the same day, I ask unanimous consent that my broadcast of that day and his column of March 10, 1963, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the broadcast and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR SMITH'S CONGRESSIONAL REPORT, WGAN, PORTLAND, MAINE, MARCH 10, 1963

Several days ago a member of the staff of this station made a long distance call to my office requesting a statement from me on the subject of "managed news." At the time I was in the closed session of the Senate Armed Services Committee at which the Secretary of Defense was giving classified information on our military posture and on the state of our national defense and national security.

Since that session lasted until a very late hour, it was too late by the time that I returned to my office to call back and give a statement. So I thought that on the next broadcast that I did for WGAN I would discuss the subject of managed news.

As you may have read or heard, managed news is a subject that has been very much in the news recently. For example, the Washington correspondent of WGAN and the Portland papers asked the President about the matter at a press conference. I don't think the President was very kind or courteous to her in his response.

After all, she was only asking a question that many, many people both in the press and in the public had been asking. She was entitled to a dignified answer—just as the public was entitled to the right to know. Instead the President did not answer her question but brought forth a tidal wave of laughter.

Her question was quite legitimate because the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs some weeks ago announced that the Department of Defense had a policy of managed news during the Cuban crisis—and indicated that part of that managed news was to withhold news and to make discriminating selection of what news was to be given to the public in the time of a crisis affecting the national security.

An objective view on the matter of managed news is not easily attained. Instead most of us are only human and consequently are subjective on a subject like this. We do not look at it in a detached manner. Instead we are prejudiced and inclined to view it in terms of how managed news affects us individually.

For example, during the 1960 presidential campaign, John F. Kennedy attacked the Eisenhower administration repeatedly on what he alleged to be inexcusable secrecy in Government, and thus on managed news without calling it that. For example at Mount Clemens, Mich., on October 26, 1960, he said, "I believe that the American people in 1960 are entitled to the truth, the truth with the bark off, the facts of the matter." Yet, he didn't practice as President what he preached as a candidate. Instead now he is practicing managed news.

Republicans certainly feel that the Kennedy administration has a very brazen managed news policy. It is no secret that the Kennedy administration gives the various awards and grants notices first to the Democratic Senators and Congressmen.

For example, the established Kennedy administration pattern of the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to Maine on such matters as area redevelopment projects, gives the notice to the Democratic Senator 2 days before the official release day. Then 24 hours, or a day later, they give the notice to me. Thus, the Democratic Senator is able to make an announcement a day before the Agency notifies me—and thus, the readers of the Maine newspapers get the notice even before I do. And thus, it is such a farce and a mockery to make the release date 2 days after the Democratic Senator has already been notified and made the announcement.

As a Republican, who is thus discriminated against, I would call this managed news—managed to give the erroneous impression to the people of Maine that it was the Democratic Senator who obtained such projects for Maine, when the truth is that no one person has made such an achievement.

But to some Democrats, this is not managed news but rather what they dismiss as a political fact of life.

Such were their comments when last year I denounced the news treatment by the Kennedy administration on the notice on the nuclear submarine award to the Kittery Naval Shipyard. I asked for the information 2 days before it was given by the White House to Maine's Democratic Senator but the Navy and the administration refused to give me the information.

When the Democratic Senator obtained the information 2 days later and his announcement was flashed over the facilities of the wire press services, I again asked for the information and again the Navy and the administration refused to give me the information even though it had already been publicly announced by the Democratic Senator and they informed me that they could not give me that information until 3 hours later.

How ridiculous could they get? I would call this managed news—managed in favor of the Democratic Senator and against me. Yet, to the Democratic Senator it was not managed news as he dismissed it as merely a political fact of life and asserted that the same thing had been done under the Eisenhower administration.

As far as I am concerned, this was not true of the Eisenhower administration for I did not receive such advance notice—but instead the Eisenhower administration scrupulously made it a point for military officers to give simultaneous notice to all members of a congressional delegation alike, whether they be Republican or Democrat, of defense construction awards to their States. They even went to the extent of synchronizing their watches so that they would call or enter the various offices of the then five members of the Maine congressional delegation on the same split second.

The same synchronized-watch, split-second timing operation of the military officers on notice to Members of Congress is still in effect. But now it is ludicrous since the Democratic Senator in the Maine congressional delegation receives notices from the White House many hours, or even a day or two, before the military officer marches in his office or calls his office on the telephone on the matter—and his announcement has been published in the Maine newspapers even before the military officer delivers the official notice.

I would call this "managed news"—and I say that it is "managed" to the point of being ridiculous—of making the military officers comical and looking like characters in a Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera—of having them run around like oldtime movie comedy "Keystone Kops."

I asked the Secretary of Defense about this—and he gave a very weak answer with the claim that this had been started by the Eisenhower administration. It is true that the split second timing notice had been—but the big difference is that such had been the first notice to everyone, regardless of political party—for the White House under Eisenhower did not favor Maine Republicans with advance notice like Kennedy does the Democrats.

This weak excuse of the Secretary of Defense and the "political facts of life" assertion of some Maine Democrats are examples of what the dean of Washington columnists and commentators, Arthur Krock of the New York Times and long time friend of the Kennedys, recently wrote on the subject of managed news by the Kennedy administration.

He wrote that one of the standard practices of the Kennedy managed news policy was to blame the Eisenhower administration when challenged on an unpopular matter such as I have been relating. I quote Mr. Krock's exact words of "Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

On one occasion I obtained information on a defense contract award to a Maine concern by going directly to people involved in the matter and asking for the status. I did not get it from the White House nor from the Pentagon. I was able to make the announcement—but because I did, such was apparently considered a crime by the Kennedy administration and I learned from friends that investigations were conducted to determine from whom I received the information. They were not content with one—instead they had two investigations—one by the Army Inspector General and the second by Army Intelligence.

Apparently it was all right for the Navy Department to refuse to give me information on the nuclear submarine award even after it had been announced by the Democratic Senator—but yet it was such a crime for me to get information and announced it first on the Army construction award, that not one, but two, investigations were ordered to try to find out how I did it.

This, I would say, was a part of the managed news policy of the Kennedy administration—trying to keep Republicans from being able to get the information—in line with refusing Republicans the information when requested by Republicans—frightening and intimidating people from giving such information to anyone but Democrats. This, I would say, was attempting to manage news. Others would not. Others might try to dismiss it as merely "political facts of life."

In other words, in trying to be objective on this matter, let me again observe that the concept of, and the reaction to, managed news depends upon which side of the table you are sitting and how it affects you—to your advantage or disadvantage. I think all of us are guilty to some extent of some "managed news."

For example, the Washington correspondent of WGAN and the Portland newspapers, who asked the President the very question on "managed news" at his press conference and to whom he was not kind in answering, shook hands with me at the reception line at a reception given by Representative and Mrs. McIntire—and yet when she reported in the newspapers on that reception as to those persons who attended the reception she listed all members of the Maine congressional delegation but me—thus managing to give the impression that I did not attend the reception even though she saw me there, called me by name and shook hands with me. Whether intended or not, it managed to give the impression to some that either Representative and Mrs. McIntire had not invited me or I had not extended the courtesy of attending.

From my side of the table that was managed news. From her side perhaps it was not. The same was true with respect to her story in which she stated flatly that the September 1962 Maine congressional delegation meeting was not held because of hard feeling between Senator SMITH and Senator MUSKIE—which was not true because I walked over to Senator MUSKIE's office for the September meeting—and which, even though refuted by both Senator MUSKIE and myself with incontrovertible proof, she refused to correct. That I certainly would call managed news.

Recently a representative of the Gannett Publishing Co., by which the Washington correspondent of WGAN and the Portland papers is employed, gave a private reception in his private suite at the Statler Hotel in Washington. The Washington correspondent wrote a news story stating that I had been invited to the private reception but was unable to attend. The truth was that I was not invited to the private reception and was the only member of the Maine congressional delegation not invited to the private reception.

Perhaps I am prejudiced in viewing this as managed news—but one thing is very certain—it was untruthful and managed to give a false impression just as did her stories on the McIntire reception and the canceled September 1962 delegation meeting.

Now I would not deny that I, too, am guilty of managed news for there certainly are times when I do not send press releases to those reporters who have repeatedly written false stories about me. I feel it is too risky to do so. But in that management, I do not discriminate against the newspapers represented by any reporter who may have written so many false stories about me that I feel that reporter is too unreliable to send all press releases to.

To avoid discriminating against the newspapers represented by that reporter, I make it a point to send the press releases to the Associated Press and the United Press International as they also cover for the same newspapers.

As I say, it depends upon which side of the table you sit on how you view managed news.

Managed News Is Not Really New

(By Bill Henry)

The continuing ruckus over managed news (release or withholding of information at the whim of the administration) is connected by most people with the trouble in Cuba. That was the occasion for Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester's discussion of "news as a weapon." Long before this happened, however, there was management of the news by the administration but it had to do with politics rather than with the national defense. This was the grand old custom—it has been used for years but never to the ultimate lengths developed by the Kennedy administration—of releasing all good news through party spokesmen and thus making it appear the party in power was the only one doing anything for the people. Thus, whenever a contract of any kind which would bring a measure of prosperity to a certain State was awarded, the administration would slip the glad tidings to the highest ranking party member of that State and let him announce it. In the case of Massachusetts for instance, everything is announced through Senator TEDDY KENNEDY and if you didn't know the details you'd think Republican Senator SALTONSTALL was asleep at the switch while TEDDY personally had arranged for the Pilgrim Fathers to land at Plymouth Rock and had been responsible for everything good that has happened to the Bay State ever since. Republican Senator MARGARET SMITH, at the moment, is giving the Pentagon a hard time because it withholds such military announcements from her until the White House announces them through Democratic Senator MUSKIE. Mrs. SMITH rates high on the Senate Armed Services Committee and is in a position to make it more than a little tough on the admirals and generals if they don't play ball with her.

SHE CAN MAKE SOME REAL TROUBLE

The particular incident which roused the Hell-hath-no-fury instinct in Mrs. SMITH concerned a contract to build a submarine in a Maine shipyard. She got wind of it, called the Pentagon to ask about it, and was given a runaround if not an outright denial. A couple of days later Senator MUSKIE, who is the junior Senator, was told about the award by the White House and he announced it with a great flourish. This did not sit very well with the lady from Maine. But on still another occasion she heard about a similar award and made the announcement before the White House slipped the glad tidings to MUSKIE. She found out that the Pentagon immediately started two investigations to see who had slipped up. "Apparently," Mrs. SMITH remarked acidly to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, "it was all right for the White House to give the information to the junior Senator (MUSKIE) and the Navy to deny such information to me. But when I got it first it apparently was a crime." Pentagon authorities, who depend on Senator SMITH for appropriations and promotions, are all shook up over the hostility roused by partisan politics.

IT'S AWFUL TO BE IGNORED

Not everybody takes news problems too seriously. One Washington reporter noted that Senator THRUSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, pointed out in a recent speech that President Kennedy has bawled out six newspapermen for certain stories, that three administration officials have threatened to sue newspapermen, that Robert Kennedy has bawled out four reporters, that the FBI quizzed six reporters, that Pentagon security officers had quizzed three reporters, Pierre Salinger has quarreled with a dozen correspondents, White House aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., called one columnist "an idiot" and that even Ethel Kennedy denounced a reporter for a swimming pool story. In addition to which some reporters have been "given the freeze" by the White House. With mock mourning, MORTON remarked "None of these things have happened to me—where did I go wrong?"

NEHEMKIS REFLECTIONS ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most brilliant and provocative analyses of the Alliance for Progress which I have yet seen is an address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., delivered on February 21 to the Phi Beta Kappa Association in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Nehemkis, who is the Washington legal counsel for the Whirlpool Corp., is one of the Nation's most experienced students of Latin American affairs. He combines an astute knowledge of the political, economic and psychological factors which condition the reaction of our Latin American neighbors to the Alliance with an informed appreciation of the political difficulties that beset the Alliance in Washington. I have been informed by an American officer at our Embassy in Mexico City that a group of Mexican university students who visited the United States recently were more favorably challenged by a discussion session with Mr. Nehemkis than by any other experience during their visit to our country.

Mr. Nehemkis argues, and I think most convincingly, that the basic weakness in the promise of the Alliance to build a better social and economic structure in Latin America is that to date it has failed to enlist broad support among the people. The Alianza has thus far been a series of discussions and actions between governments and technical experts. What is needed, he contends, is an increased participation in the goals of the Alliance for Progress on the part of groups who constitute the decisive centers of opinion outside of government—the involvement and participation which I urge is as broad as the sources of public opinion itself. For it is public opinion to which the Alliance must address itself, rather than to governments and their technicians, if it is to be a successful enterprise.

Mr. Nehemkis gives strong support to a recent proposal by Mr. Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, which would create a "parliament of the hemisphere" backstopped by an OEEC-type commission to generate and channel widespread political and moral involvement in the Alliance.

Mr. President, I think we all know that whatever success with democracy we have enjoyed in the United States stems from the involvement of ordinary people in the democratic process. The Alliance for Progress is basically a democratic experiment which seeks to execute by peaceful, cooperative effort a major social revolution.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Congress and those in the executive branch who have primary responsibility for our foreign relations to read Mr. Nehemkis' analysis with great care.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr.)

I

Throughout the long history of the Phi Beta Kappa Society (of whose select company I am proud to be a member) there has been consistent adherence to the oldest governing principle of the community of scholars: in a democratic society the interchange of diverse ideas must remain unhampered. In this vital interplay, the Phi Beta Kappa Society has sought to insure that dialog does not become monolog and that thinking is not relegated to dogma. In this spirit, I would ask you to consider some reflections of mine on the Alliance for Progress.

This now world-famous slogan was first minted at Harvard University in December 1960, at a meeting of members of the U.S. international business community and a number of distinguished representatives of the academic community.[1] It burst over the world in President Kennedy's celebrated inaugural address. Although stamped in the United States of America, the underlying philosophy of the Alliance for Progress is distinctly Latin American. The grand design for this inter-American partnership was first propounded in 1959 by Juscelino Kubitschek, former President of Brazil, in his Operacão Pan Americana. In 1960, at a hemisphere conference held at Bogotá, a coherent philosophy to meet Latin America's social problems was embodied in a continental doctrine through the act of Bogotá.

Alliance for Progress might have remained merely a cleverly contrived catch-phrase or slogan. As a U.S. Senator, John F. Kennedy had not shown any special interest in Latin America. His knowledge of the area was probably as limited as that of the average citizen. Yet he sensed instinctively that Latin America—as he was later to phrase it—was "the most critical area in the world today."[2] In the Presidential hands the phrase became the keystone in the arch of a new U.S. policy for Latin America. Subsequently filled out with conceptual flesh and bone[3] the Alliance for Progress was to become the most significant U.S. pronouncement affecting Latin America since the Monroe Doctrine placed the New World out of bounds for the (former) European colonial powers.

At the outset, let us be clear that, in its original conception (the operative words here are original conception), the Alliance for Progress was not designed to be another conventional foreign aid program utilizing the conventional tools of foreign aid—money, men, and materials. What was originally proposed under the Alliance for Progress was unprecedented and without parallel in the experience of the Western World. In essence, the U.S. Government offered to underwrite a social revolution for Latin America. The reforms were to run the gamut of change in better land use and distribution, more and better housing, more and better education, collection of taxes, elimination of corruption in government, reduction in the waste of overblown armies, increasing the rate of savings and economic growth, narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor. They were expected, as Ambassador Stevenson has said, "to take the bold, brave, difficult steps" to achieve peaceably and democratically the reforms which historically had been accomplished through a revolution of blood and violence.

Roughly, for a year and a half following the promulgation of the Alliance for Progress, they sat on their hands and we floundered in a swamp of bureaucratic organization. The great hopes and high expectations engendered by the President's speeches were not realized. Disillusionment, cynicism, frustration, and resentment like a blanket of wet fog enveloped the islands of intellectual interest throughout the continent. Indeed, the Alliance for Progress become the butt of jokes and a term of derision. The fortunes of the Alliance were in the dead season of its despair.

Two years after its birth the fog is beginning to lift. At long last patches of clear sky are visible. New opportunities beckon for the Alliance. But I venture to suggest that fate will not knock twice at our door if we fail to heed the lessons to be learned from the painful experience of the recent past.

In essaying the role of an amateur historian a caveat is in order. As Lytton Strachey—an eminent historian—once wrote, "ignorance is the first requisite of the historian, ignorance which simplifies and clarifies, which selects and omits." Strachey's irony is a useful reminder to the student of Latin American affairs who seeks for the thread of order and meaning in the tangled skein of Latin America's history, politics, and cultural heritage.

II

The constellation of reforms embedded in the Alliance for Progress were not actionable either immediately or through the democratic processes for a number and for a variety of reasons. Some of our expectations were grounded in illusions with respect to Latin America. Some tenets of our belief were politically unrealistic. Organizationally, the New Frontier was simply lacking in the requisite skill for managing a social revolution of the magnitude to which it had committed itself. In some situations luck deserted us.

I suspect that the root of our difficulty lay in a fundamental misconception regarding Latin America—a misconception which the principal architects of the Alliance unwittingly perpetrated as a result of their European experience with the Marshall Plan. This misconception was to look upon Latin America as a continental community in the same way as Marshall Plan Europe was regarded as a community of shared interests, possessed of a common heritage and with the instinct for a collective sense of responsibility. As Prof. John Plank reminds us, "this community does not exist" in Latin America.[4] Moreover, there is a profound difference between the motivation for reconstruction (Europe's problem in 1947) and the motivation for reform (Latin America's problem in the sixties). The Ernest Bevans, the Paul-Henri Spaaks, the Robert Schumans, the Jean Monnets were able to furnish the political drive for reconstruction. They were assisted powerfully by the Paul Hoffman-Averill Harriman axis which insisted upon a continental response to General Marshall's offer of aid.

The same kind of leverage for reform was not operative in the summer of 1961 following the first Punta del Este conference where the representatives of Latin America committed their countries to the principles of the Alliance for Progress. On the contrary, something resembling a shock effect was recorded on the hemispheric seismograph as the implications of the Charter of Punta del Este began to register on Latin America's traditional centers of power.

Latin America's land-owning aristocracy is probably one of the most unique institutions in the Western World. Despite countless revolutions, civil wars and changes in the palace, they have managed for 200 years to hold on to their land, much of their power and to all of their social prestige. In this century their ranks have been increased by the new moneyed class who have acquired land as a status symbol (and, incidentally, as a hedge against inflation). This Oligarquía, although it possesses the capacity for survival, does not resemble, for instance, the English Tories who as early as the 19th century instinctively recognized the significance of Macaulay's warning that to preserve you must reform; and who in the first half of the 20th century were able to capture the British Labor Party's welfare state and make it their own. Latin America's conservative class, on the other hand, reacted to the Alliance for Progress with psychotic fear. Having always enjoyed the friendship of U.S. diplomacy, they felt betrayed by the reformist thrust of the Alliance, particularly its emphasis on land reform. Since the shortest route to Washington is Moscow, they cried "communism;" and passed the word to their legislative mercenaries to prepare for a rear guard action.

---

[1] "Alliance for Progress, a Program of Inter-American Partnership" (a statement developed at a conference on Dec. 19, 1960, Faculty Club at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.).

[2] Press Conference, Feb. 8, 1963. For the transcript, see, the Washington Post (Feb. 9, 1963) at p. 10.

[3] See, address to the assembled Latin American diplomats at the White House on Mar. 13, 1961.

[4] Daedalus (October 1962) 804.

There were, however, still other elements which blunted the purposes of the Alliance. A formidable deterrent was—and is—anti-Americanism. Like an ocean current it runs deep and wide through the southern half of the continent. Its presence renders suspect virtually anything emanating from the Colossus of the North. Anti-Americanism destroys the possibility of the leaders of the left of center parties in appealing to their followers for support of the Alliance. Juan Bosch, the new President-elect of the Dominican Republic, illustrates the point. As passionate a democrat as will be found in the hemisphere, Bosch conducted an extraordinarily literate and sane campaign. But never once did he speak of the Alliance for Progress to the campesinos or the obreros. To have done so would have been the political kiss of death. Yet, it is upon leaders such as Juan Bosch that the Alliance for Progress must depend. This is the paradox of the Alliance.

In the intellectual circles of Latin America the Alliance was greeted with skepticism. For many, there remained the unanswered question: Does the Alliance for Progress represent a commitment of the heart? For still others the Alliance had the smell of another cold war gambit: Washington's answer to Castro and the Castro revolution.

As a personality, the new President had not yet been able to identify himself with Latin America's people as Franklin Roosevelt had succeeded with the radiance of his own personality and his Good Neighbor Policy. Then came the Bay of Pigs. Since nothing fails quite like failure, in Latin American eyes the United States appeared to be adrift in a sea of indecision: cynicism toward the Alliance became universal.

But there were even more fundamental difficulties. Washington's policymakers had assumed that the big countries—Mexico, Brazil and Argentina—would carry the torch for the Alliance. Mexico, however, is wrapped in a mystical cocoon of nonintervention. Mexicans believe that, as the senior member in the hemisphere's revolutionary business, it has nothing to learn from any revolutionaries and especially from the New Frontier. It is simply not interested in the Alliance for Progress. As a Minister once informed me the Alliance is an interesting gimmick which could help Mexico with its balance of payments. That was all.

Since the flight from the Presidency by Jânio Quadros, Brazil has for all practical purposes been without a functioning government. Its own financial chaos has been so deep that Brazil was in no position to act as a tutor for the Alliance.

The military seizure of power in Argentina under a thinly disguised civilian regime completed the political and economic bankruptcy of the nation begun by Perón. Argentina was unable to provide leadership for itself let alone for its neighbors.

Another implied assumption by Washington was the existence of a sufficiently broad base of representative, popular democracy which could overcome the resistance to reform from the traditional, conservative centers of power. Aside from Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico, Figueres of Costa Rica, and Betancourt of Venezuela the democratic leaders of the political left lacked effective political power. The parties of the Democratic left do not have a broad base of middle class support. Acción Democrática and APRA, for instance, have been unable to attract the support of the urban groups described as middle in Caracas and Lima. The parties of the democratic left of center find their strength in the rural areas, not in the cities. Chile's Socialist Party in the recent parliamentary elections returned only one deputy with some 4,300 votes in the Santiago area (which has almost 2 million inhabitants) while Salvadore Allende, the leader of the Marxist coalition, FRAP, scored a decisive victory in the Valparaiso-Aconcagua area which has been traditionally a rural, conservative stronghold. This same pattern repeats itself elsewhere in Latin America: Left-wing strength is diminishing among the urban middle sectors, but it is increasing among the peasants.

Latin America's middle groups are not hell bent for reform: they are essentially conformist: they are emotionally identified with the institutional status quo. They want a bigger slice of the pie. But they do not believe that upsetting the applecart is the way to get it. Could it be that our policymakers have hitched their reform cart to the wrong horse? Should they not look for leadership and support of the Alliance to Latin America's forgotten men—the peasants and the non-Communist intellectuals?

There is need to reexamine whether the parties of the Democratic left (the chosen instruments for implementing the Alliance for Progress) are capable of communicating the need for social change and of formulating the programs to identify social change within the context of the originally inspired Alianza.

Throughout Latin America (especially among its youth who constitute 35 percent of the population) the concept of democracy is suspect, if it is not, indeed, a dirty word. Democracy has been so debased by its mouthing at the lips of dictatorship as to have lost its value as sound currency. The paramount political challenge in Latin America is how to channel the energies and interests of its youth into democratic habits within the context of the original conception of the Alliance for Progress.

I should like to turn now briefly to what many regard as the organizational deficiency of the Alliance. Here, I believe, we ourselves misunderstood our own trumpet call. President Kennedy signaled for an Alliance. This term is commonly understood to mean joint effort, joint responsibilities, mutual involvement—in short, a partnership. But the organizational response was not commensurate with Mr. Kennedy's own vision. The Alliance became another area box in a foreign aid structure. It soon lapsed into a U.S. assistance granting agency which spent half its capital on emergency transfusions for balance-of-payments crises.

The Alliance succeeded only in lighting a spark. It must ignite into a flame or die ignominiously. As presently constituted the Alliance cannot envelop the people of Latin America in a "consumming fire or a flood of light." Because of its focus on governments and technicians the Alliance has been unable to reach the broader stratum of public opinion. Geared to a bureaucratic machinery (which communicates only with its counterpart in other governments) the Alliance can neither reach the people nor involve them in its goals. And without a sense of mutual involvement, without a sense of shared participation by the ordinary people, the Alliance is only a brooding omnipresence in the sky.

III

I spoke earlier of encouraging signs on the horizon. Although most of these omens may be no bigger than cloud puffs their cumulative impact is, nevertheless, significant. I would list them as follows:

1. The ministerial and technical meeting last October at Mexico City to review the progress of the Alliance for Progress. Without becoming euphoric over the results of the interchange of views which took place at Mexico City, there was, nevertheless, discernible for the first time since the Alliance was enunciated a sense of solidarity, an urge for cooperation and feeling for collective responsibility. These meetings revealed clearly a sense of commitment to the Alliance for Progress.

2. A realization on the part of responsible hemisphere leaders that a greater emphasis must be placed on the political orientation and direction of the Alliance which has heretofore been mainly technical. This pervading view has led to the appointment of former Presidents Lleras Camargo of Colombia and Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil as a committee to reappraise, among other things, the adequacy of the existing Alliance mechanism in achieving this objective.

3. The highly successful outcome of the first democratic elections in 38 years in the Dominican Republic last December has buoyed democratic hopes throughout the continent. That these elections were held at all is due to the unflinching determination of three very great patriots: Dr. Rafael F. Bonelly (President of the Council of State); Don Antonio Bonilla-Atiles (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs); and Sr. Donald Reid (Member of the Council of State). Out of the depth of its sickness and misery Argentina could still offer several thousand schoolteachers to the hemisphere. Tiny Costa Rica continues to be a beacon light of democracy. In Washington, its Ambassador, Gonzalo Facio, as President of the Council of the Organization of American States, provides a dynamic leadership. Puerto Rico, under the wise statesmanship of Don Luis Muñoz Marín, demonstrates that political democracy and economic prosperity can be achieved in partnership with the United States. These and other examples which might be cited are all plus signs and cannot be ignored.

4. Washington is itself, I believe, keenly aware that the Alliance must be restructured. For the Washington policymakers it is no longer a question of whether there should be a change, but only what kind of change.

5. Finally, and most importantly, the American success in meeting the Soviet Union's missile thrust in Cuba has provided the United States with its most favorable image and its highest moral authority in Latin America in a generation.

Now these are not fixed assets. They are intangibles. They can evaporate. Their intrinsic value can be exploited only if we seize the opportunity which they have provided by proceeding with swift and reassuring action to revitalize the Alliance for Progress.

Before venturing to suggest what ought to be done may I say, first, what I believe must not be done.

Tinkering with or rejiggering of the existing setup of the Alliance won't do. Latin America is in no mood to buy any half-baked U.S. apple pie full of high sounding but empty rhetoric. Latin America, if I sense her mood correctly, is ready to follow decisive and determined leadership, the kind of leadership it witnessed (and followed) at last October's United States-Soviet confrontation over Cuba.

IV

Any new implementing machinery must have as its cardinal objective the restoration of President Kennedy's original conception of the Alliance for Progress—an alliance of inter-American partners with joint responsibilities and mutual obligations. Because Latin Americans are not Anglo-Americans they can be expected to subscribe with enthusiasm to a structure which embodies both poetry and power, which dramatizes their own high destiny and has the bold sweep of Bolivarian prophecy.

Thoughtful Latin American leaders share the conviction of the European political leadership—or at least the overwhelming majority of Europe's political leaders—that the day of national sovereignty is finished. Just as it has been apparent that the European nation-state no longer made political sense, there has been increasing awareness in this hemisphere that Latin America's nation-states have outgrown their usefulness. Indeed, the bulk of Latin America's political units are more analogous to the Greek city-state than to the modern nation-state. As such, in the 20th century they are political museum pieces. The movement for a Central American Common Market and the broader grouping of a Latin American Free Trade Association are the contemporary responses to this felt need for the sovereignty of the community.

Unless my impressions deceive me, Latin America's responsible democratic leaders are now prepared to join in the first great step in erecting a political underpinning for the new sovereignty of the community.

An imaginative and practical proposal for accomplishing this objective was advanced recently by one of Latin America's most gifted and respected leaders, Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank. Dr. Herrera proposes a Parliament of the Hemisphere.[5] Such a hemispheric parliament is needed, President Herrera says, "to give proper expression to the broad public opinion of our hemisphere" rather than to "governments and experts" as is now the case. Dr. Herrera suggests that the Parliament of the Hemisphere could "become a forum for interpreting the major currents of ideas in Latin America and evaluating hemisphere policy by democratic discussion and debate." Delegates to the Parliament of the Hemisphere could properly concern themselves, Dr. Herrera believes, with such matters "as the orientation of economic relations among our countries, our collective relationship to other regional groups, and our concepts of integrated economic development." In short, the Parliament of the Hemisphere could become the opinion maker and the opinion moulder for converting the Alliance for Progress into a reality.

In addition to political representation from the national legislatures of North, Central and South America (as proposed by President Herrera), the Parliament might also have functional representation from the trade unions, the universities, private industry and other groups from North, Central and South America. So as to prevent the Parliament of the Hemisphere from becoming a mere debating society it could be vested with authority for approving the social and economic development plans for which international and U.S. financial assistance under the Alliance for Progress is required. In a word, the international public and private lending agencies would begin to look to the Hemisphere Parliament as the "guarantor," so to speak, of individual or regional economic development plans.

To provide the hemisphere parliament with technical support there should be attached to it an OEEC-type commission located in one of the Latin American capitals and composed of Ministers of the partners of the Alliance for Progress. Observers from the international agencies such as the OAS, the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Inter-American Development Bank would be attached to this commission. The commission could delegate appropriate tasks to these international organs. Also attached to the commission would be representatives from the (European) Development Assistance Group as well as Japan. Inter-American advisory bodies of private business and of the trade unions should also be associated with the commission. For its initial technical support and as a nucleus of its own eventual secretariat, the commission could draw upon the Committee of Nine.[6]

The commission would funnel its recommendations to the hemisphere parliament on such priority measures as (1) development of commodity stabilization arrangements to stem declining earnings as an immediate goal as well as to provide incentives for crop diversification as a long-term goal; (2) programs for gaining greater access for Latin American products in the mass markets of Europe and the United States; (3) development of an Inter-American policy to stimulate private investment, both domestic and foreign; and (4) measures to strengthen the Alliance's emphasis on social development.

V

From all that has been heretofore said you have gathered that the thrust of my contention is the compelling need for a greater involvement and for an increased participation in the goals of the Alliance for Progress on the part of groups who constitute the decisive centers of opinion outside of government. You have gathered, too, that the spectrum of involvement and participation which I urge is as broad as the sources of public opinion itself. For it is public opinion to which the Alliance must address itself, rather than to governments and their technicians, if it is to be a successful enterprise.

It will, of course, be argued by the legion of the timid men (who call themselves political pragmatists) that the proposals for a parliament of the hemisphere and an OEEC-type commission are too visionary; that they are not practical and realistic targets. May I remind you, first, that the proposal for a parliament of the hemisphere comes from a Latin American banker in whom the leading bankers of Europe and of the United States have imposed their confidence through the flotation of many millions of dollars of bonds of the Inter-American Development Bank. And, secondly, may I remind you that the proposal for the OEEC-type commission carries the endorsement of U.S. businessmen with international operating responsibilities who are scarcely the types given to impracticable flights of fancy.

VI

I venture to suggest that in the ensuing weeks what this country does—or fails to do—with respect to revitalizing the Alliance for Progress will have greater consequences for our future than the policy decisions which are determined for any of the other strategic world areas. For Latin America—to repeat President Kennedy's own words—is "the most critical area in the world today." Although the full meaning and all of the implications of the Gaullist explosion in Europe are as yet difficult to assess, one thing, however, seems clear: General de Gaulle has rung down the curtain on the Pax Americana. For us it is the fin du siècle of being Europe's banker and defender. He may well have provided us with one of history's great blessings in disguise: an occasion to rethink and to reshape national policy so as to conform with the actualities of power confrontation. For it is no longer the new Europe, but our own New World, where the writ of destiny summons.

CONCLUDING ARTICLE IN SIOUX INDIAN SERIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Washington Post of March 17 carries the final article in an excellent series dealing with the problems of the Sioux Indians of South Dakota, written by Mr. Aubrey Graves. Previously, I have had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the earlier articles in this superb series.

I think that Mr. Graves has rendered a most valuable service in giving us a thoughtful and carefully prepared analysis of some of the significant gains and also the unsolved problems of the American Indian. While the series centers on the Oglala Sioux Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., much of what Mr. Graves reports applies to American Indians as a whole.

I am certain that Mr. Richard Whirlwind Horse, chairman of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, his predecessor, Mr. Johnson Holy Rock, the superintendent of the reservation, Mr. Leslie P. Towle, as well as Mr. Richard Schifter, Washington attorney for the tribe who has provided such brilliant counsel to his clients—these and many other members and friends of the Oglala Sioux have been especially appreciative of this very splendid reporting achievement by Mr. Graves.

I ask unanimous consent that this seventh and final installation in the series be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION—VII: U.S. SPENDS MILLIONS ON INDIAN WELFARE

(By Aubrey Graves, staff reporter)

The question is asked: Why hasn't it been possible to assimilate the Indians into our society as readily as the Irish, Italians, Greeks and other races?

The 1880 census showed 225,000 Indians in the United States, all on reservations. In 1960, there were 552,000—285,000 on reservations, 267,000 off. Many of the latter group have adjusted to the white man's culture; others live as outcasts in shantytowns near big cities.

Those who have not found their way into the melting pot of American life are, to some extent, still hostile.

Why? "Because they were here first," is the answer given by Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash. "The other races came here because they wanted to leave their homeland and go to some other place. They wanted a change. They had a choice.

"No Indian had this choice. The white man moved in on him and conquered him. We may think of the Indian as living on reservations. In his view, he is living on his native soil.

---

[5] "Inter-American Institutions: An Appraisal," an address delivered before the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, Miami, Fla., Jan. 23, 1963.

[6] See "Revitalizing the Alliance for Progress," statement developed at a conference at Harvard University, Dec. 15, 1962, by a group from the U.S. international business and academic communities. (See OAS press release E-1/63, Jan. 3, 1963.)

CAPACITY FOR SURVIVAL

"He had a way of life that suited him and he has been holding his own as best he could, ever since. He feels he can survive only be clinging to what were his beliefs, his customs. He has shown a remarkable capacity for survival."

Something that occurred at the end of a congressional hearing on a South Dakota reservation reveals the attitude of some diehard fullbloods. As a matter of protocol, an old chief was asked to speak. He did so, in Sioux. Then, in pantomime, he jabbed his hand down into his pants pocket. The audience howled.

Representative A. L. Miller, Republican, of Nevada, presiding, asked the interpreter to explain the pocket business and the laughter. "He says you are here to stuff what belongs to Indians in your pockets."

Miller told the grandson of Chief Red Cloud he had made a serious charge. "Do you mean to say," he asked, "that I and the other Congressmen here are taking something that belongs to you?"

"Are you getting your salaries from across the ocean?" the old chief asked. The Indians howled again.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PAYS

In any event, 70 years have passed since the Indian wars ended and the Federal Government still is spending $258 million a year in their behalf.

In fiscal 1963, the budget of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is $193 million. Of this, $113 million is being spent on Indian education and cost of schools.

The Public Health Service is spending $65 million on Indian health programs.

The cost of general assistance and other services supplied by the States is substantial. In fiscal 1962, for instance, it amounted to $508,000 on the Oglala Sioux Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

Consider further the situation at this reservation, which is typical of others. Of a total 1962 school enrollment of 3,289 Pine Ridge children, ages 6 to 18, 57 percent are in Federal schools, 15 percent in 2 mission schools, and 28 percent in State-operated public schools (at BIA expense).

BURDENS TO STATE

Another 204 students, under 6 and over 18, are attending all types of schools, including 56 in colleges and universities and 22 in non-Bureau vocational institutions.

Only a small portion of the $258 million a year spent by Federal agencies on the reservations would represent a saving of tax money, should Indian programs on reservations be abolished.

Richard Schifter, who represents the Oglala Sioux in Washington, explains it this way: "If you terminate Federal assistance, you would shift a great many responsibilities to sparsely settled States which do not have the facilities nor the money to meet them.

"When it comes to such help as education, roads, law and order, you would be throwing the whole burden, in the case of the Oglala Sioux, on South Dakota. Indians are U.S. citizens and are entitled to free education. As State citizens, they are entitled also to police protection and to highways. You can be certain South Dakota would insist on Federal help, should it be faced with these demands.

"The major service that would be cut out entirely by termination is the medical service. Indians are about a generation behind the rest of the population, healthwise. Cut off the Federal health services and you would be cutting off something that is helping them close the gap."

At Pine Ridge the BIA operates 1 boarding school (for high school students) and 6 consolidated day schools which have replaced 36 1-room schools. These serve 2,038 students.

All the Bureau schools conducted summer programs for 1,085 children: classes in remedial reading and other academic work; educational trips; recreational activities; arts and crafts and camping. Adult educational units served 12 reservation communities. On-the-job training was given to 731 persons in the Wright & McGill fishhook plants.

"The dark side of the school picture," said BIA Superintendent Leslie P. Towle, "is that 65 percent of the pupils drop out by the 10th grade." For this, he blamed "lack of interest on the part of parents, bad home conditions and lack of a place to study."

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

In the last 5 years, adult vocational training equipped 245 individuals with special job skills. Enrollees were helped to find jobs—sometimes in South Dakota but more often in urban industrial areas—and helped to adjust to these new communities.

During the same period, 270 individuals and their families (718 persons in all) were assisted in moving to off-reservation locations and finding immediate employment. They also received financial help, where needed, and counseling services during the adjustment period.

Most of the building construction carried on by the BIA at Pine Ridge is that of school facilities and buildings related to these plants. Work was completed last month on the new $1,063,070 Manderson School and utilities to service it. This modern structure has eight classrooms, a multipurpose room, kitchen, shop, home economics classrooms, offices, and showers.

A dining hall and kitchen, added to the boarding school, is nearing completion at a cost of $327,000. Three classrooms and a garage for schoolbuses were added to the day school at Oglala. Also built were two 2-bedroom houses and one 3-bedroom house. Cost: $163,000.

Currently the reservation is benefiting under the accelerated public works program by a $183,000 project providing for grading and surfacing of reservation roads, control of soil erosion and improving soil productivity. This work will require 26 man-years of employment.

These are just examples of the current nationwide programs for reservations. Looking back to where they were 6 or 7 years ago, the Oglala Sioux are encouraged to tackle the huge problems that still lie ahead. They learned that goals which are still to be achieved can be achieved, if heart and muscle and mind are applied with sufficient determination.

For much of their recent progress the Oglala Sioux give credit to the enlightened guidance of Schifter. They only wish they had another building to name for him.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, more and more it is beginning to look as if the administration's program for tax cuts and tax reform is floundering. Even top officials cannot seem to agree on just what kind of a program is needed—whether or not we should have a tax cut with reform—a tax cut without reform—whether or not we will have a recession or a depression—whether or not we will have more or less unemployed.

These questions and more like them are bothering our country, Mr. President. The citizens of our country are deeply concerned. They want leadership.

Fortunately, Mr. President, leadership in this field is available from a number of persons, among them Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on tax reform and the budget by Governor Rockefeller be made a part of my remarks at this point. I commend this statement to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for reading, for study, and for action.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER

In the 1960 presidential campaign, a key issue was the acceleration of the Nation's economic growth in order to provide more jobs for a growing population.

Senator John F. Kennedy, as the Democratic candidate for President, promised in that campaign "to get the Nation moving again," setting as his goal a 5-percent annual growth rate and reduction of the rate of unemployment to 4 percent.

During the first 2 years of his administration, President Kennedy sought to achieve this goal almost exclusively through pumping up purchasing power by increased deficit spending.

This program did not work. The growth rate has not been accelerated and the rate of unemployment was back up to 6.1 percent last month.

Faced with this failure, the administration has presented a new program combining tax cuts and so-called tax reforms with further increases in deficit spending.

This program is likewise doomed to failure because it does not have the basic elements to achieve accelerated economic growth and in net effect is only a more expensive version of the administration deficit-spending approach which already has failed.

Its main focus is on further pumping up of purchasing power while giving only lip service to basic tax incentives for economic expansion. It ignores the factors which make for confidence and hope in the economic future of America.

Full public discussion of this issue is vital. I therefore present the following analysis of the economic situation and an alternative five-point economic program to meet it:

I. THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROMISES AND THE RESULTS

(a) The Kennedy administration entered on its first term with great confidence that it could get the American economy moving again.

1. It promised to break the Nation out of the pattern of slow growth which had persisted since the end of 1956—a growth trend of 2½ percent per annum as against a 4 percent per annum growth trend in the first postwar decade.

2. It promised that as a result of accelerated growth, the rate of unemployment would be reduced from 6½ percent in early 1961 to 4 percent by the middle of 1963.

3. It promised in its first economic report that its policies would lift gross national product from the then annual rate of $501 billion in the first quarter of 1961 to $570 billion in 1962.

(b) The administration's initial economic program to achieve these goals was based almost exclusively on the theory that prosperity and more jobs could be achieved by pumping up purchasing power through increased Federal spending.

1. The administration pushed up the annual rate of Federal cash spending including social security from $100 billion in the first quarter of 1961 to $117 billion in the fourth quarter of last year. This is an increase of 17 percent in 2 years—a massive dose of spending.

Over half of the increase was in nondefense programs—defense spending went up $8 billion while nondefense spending was increased by $9 billion.

2. As a result, the cash budget, which had shown a surplus of $800 million in fiscal 1960, was turned into a deficit of $2.3 billion in 1961 and $5.8 billion in 1962 and an estimated deficit of $8.3 billion for 1963.

(c) Despite this massive increase in deficit spending, the Kennedy administration did not deliver on its promises.

1. The promised increase in our national economic growth rate has not been achieved.

2. Gross national product for 1962 fell $16 billion short of the administration's prediction.

3. Unemployment averaged 5.6 percent last year and it already has risen to 6.1 percent in February of this year—a long way from the promised goal of 4 percent. Thus, many workers displaced by automation, many unskilled workers, and many of our younger people are looking for jobs.

II. THE ADMINISTRATION'S NEW PROGRAM AND ITS PROSPECTS

(a) Faced with the failure of its economic policies to generate full prosperity and vigorous growth in the first 2 years, the administration announced early this year that it was embarking on a new economic program. The President has recommended:

1. A 3-year program to reduce corporate and individual income tax rates.

2. A variety of so-called tax reforms—the effect of which is to offset part of the tax cut.

3. An increase in cash spending of $5¾ billion from fiscal 1963 to fiscal 1964.

4. A cash budget deficit of at least $10.3 billion for fiscal 1964. Under this program, according to Secretary Dillon, deficit spending will continue at least until 1967.

(b) As the details of the new approach became known, it looked more and more like the same old thing—another attempt to achieve prosperity by pumping up purchasing power through deficit spending—while paying only lip service to tax incentives for genuine economic growth.

1. While purporting to cut corporation taxes by 5 percentage points to stimulate new investment, the administration proposed to spread this out over 3 years and at the same time accelerate corporate tax collections. The net effect of this would actually be to increase corporate tax payments by the equivalent of 4 percentage points to an effective rate of 56 percent in 1964. Cuts below the prevailing rate of 52 percent would be delayed until 1966, and the full reduction to 47 percent would be delayed until 1969. This would retard added investment instead of stimulating it now.

2. Individual income tax cuts would be spread over 3 years and their impact on increased investment and consumer spending thereby diluted.

3. The impact of most of the so-called tax reforms is definitely repressive. As an example, one of the tax reforms proposed, limiting deductions by excluding the first 5 percent of gross income would increase rather than reduce inequities in the tax system for 25 million individual income taxpayers who file itemized deductions.

It would strike a sharp blow at homeowners and support of churches, charities and other institutions. This proposal has undermined confidence that the Government intends to keep its long-standing commitments to the very group in our society which is economically most creative, and thereby has an adverse effect on the climate for economic growth.

III. WHY THE NEW PROGRAM WILL FAIL TO ACHIEVE ITS STATED GOALS

(a) The basic fault of the administration's approach is its failure to understand the forces underlying growth.

1. The missing element for growth is the provision of effective incentives to modernize and develop our productive plant and equipment.

2. This is shown by the record in the period from 1957 to 1962—the 5 years of slow economic advance (about 2½ percent per annum). One will find that during this period:

A. Consumer expenditures went up $72 billion—an average annual growth of 4.6 percent.

B. Government spending for goods and services increased $30.5 billion—an average annual growth of 6.2 percent.

C. Investment in new plant and equipment increased by less than half a billion dollars—an average annual increase of only three-tenths of 1 percent.

3. Thus it is clear that the place in which our economy has lagged during this period has been in the crucially important item of business investment in new plant and equipment.

A. Such investment ran to a bit less than $37 billion in 1957 and a bit more than $37 billion in 1962—an almost infinitesimal average annual growth of three-tenths of 1 percent whereas it needed to be at least 4 percent to have brought investment to $45 billion by 1962—the rate needed to achieve an adequate growth economy performance.

B. This lag in the growth rate of investment capital was importantly caused by the squeeze on profits which characterized the period from 1957 through 1962. The impact of rising costs with stable prices and high taxes squeezed profit margins at least 15 percent. This effectively reduced the incentive to make new investments.

C. The resulting failure of investment to move ahead after 1957 is by far the most important explanation of the lag in the economy's overall growth rate. It also goes far to explain the unemployment problem because much of our unemployment and short hours of work are found in the heavy goods production areas of the country.

D. A program that provided genuine and immediate incentives for increase in lagging investment in new plant and equipment would stimulate a dynamic upward thrust to the economy's growth trend across the board. Seemingly, the administration's failure to recognize and provide for this incentive stems from a prevalent notion that not even the prospect of rejuvenated profits would induce large plant and equipment expenditures in the face of "overcapacity." That this is a misconception is attested by the following considerations:

(1) The concept of capacity has meaning only in terms of existing demand at given price levels.

(2) Available data on capacities are very inexact, and there is evidence that these capacities are importantly overstated.

(3) Plant and equipment investment itself increases demand as well as providing the means for meeting it. Expenditure in this field creates jobs, pays wages, and proliferates orders for materials and components that fan out through the economy and create further demand.

(4) Most current plant and equipment investment goes for modernization rather than for increased capacity. This cuts costs and prices, and expands demand in terms of the volume of goods that can be bought with any given dollar volume of consumer spending.

(5) By making American industry more competitive in terms of lower production costs, we can preserve more of our own markets at home and expand our exports. The result will be increased employment in the United States.

(6) Finally, an important portion of new investment, particularly under improved business profit prospects, would go into research and development. This is the core ingredient in new product development which, in turn, generates a whole series of new demands of which the consuming public is unaware until the new products are available.

4. There is a sharp distinction between tax cuts aimed at providing greater incentive for investment and tax cuts that are chiefly designed to increase deficit spending as a pump-priming device.

The administration's program purports to be the former but in actual fact it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it was designed to be the latter.

The confidence-shattering impart of this confusion in aim is certain to negate the effect of any genuine incentive inducement that the "new" program purports to offer.

5. Confidence is an imperative ingredient of sound economic growth in a free enterprise system. The President's new program undermines confidence through protracted deficit spending and creation of uncertainties as to the future.

Control of Federal spending is essential if action on the tax front is to be effective.

A. It is the height of fiscal irresponsibility to propose a $5¾ billion increase in cash spending along with a tax cut.

B. Federal spending must be controlled by a determined effort to meet only essential needs while cutting programs of lower national priority.

C. While deficits may be unavoidable in periods of recession or economic slack, our firm goal must be to balance the cash budget, and indeed to produce a surplus over the course of the business cycle.

D. If Government expenditures are provided through deficit financing to a degree and with a persistence that undermines confidence in the fiscal responsibility of Government, they can inhibit an even greater amount of private investment and expenditures that would otherwise have been made.

E. On this score, the economic vision of the current administration is astigmatic—in its new program, as well as in its old one.

Its spokesmen, with their slighting references to the "Puritan Ethics" of budget balancing, and their espousal of "Sophisticated Economics," and their bland proposal for a program envisaging deficits for a sustained period of years without any manifest effort to pare expenditures, have invited the interpretation that budget-balancing is an exercise beneath their concern.

F. The American public will accept any necessary, temporary deficit, but they will be deeply disturbed—and should be—at indications that fiscal responsibility is regarded by their Government as old-fashioned and outmoded.

IV. REAL INCENTIVES FOR GROWTH—AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

(a) I am convinced in the light of the foregoing analysis that the Kennedy proposals should be replaced by a balanced national economic program that will:

Have immediate and sufficient economic impact on both industrial expansion and consumer spending;

Be definitive and decisive;

End deficit financing quickly;

Restore confidence in our economic future, and

Achieve the growth essential to producing more jobs and thus ending chronic unemployment at the present unacceptably high levels. Specifically, I recommend:

1. Reduction of the corporate income tax rate to 47 percent, fully effective in the fiscal year beginning this July 1. This will immediately release $2.5 billion for new investment and provide the incentives required for a substantial acceleration of economic growth.

2. An equitable $7.5 billion across-the-board cut in individual income taxes also effective in the fiscal year beginning this July 1—abandoning the so-called reforms which have shaken the confidence of so many millions of taxpayers. This would stimulate saving for investment and consumer spending in the private sector as opposed to Government spending.

3. Hold Federal spending down at least to the fiscal 1963 level by cutting back sharply on low-priority programs.

4. Set as the goal—through resultant economic growth and restraint on spending—a balanced cash budget in fiscal 1965.

5. After the budget has been balanced, it would then be possible to reduce the debt and to finance essential new or expanded Government programs from rising receipts.

V. WHY THIS PROGRAM IS ESSENTIAL

(a) It is time to come to grips realistically with the problem of slow growth in America.

The Kennedy program of more spending and improperly designed and diluted tax cuts will not produce full prosperity and vital growth—but more and larger Government deficits.

(b) A balanced tax program to spur incentives combined with fiscal responsibility will enable America to realize its vast potential for economic advance.

Everyone stands to gain from growth. It means more jobs, rising real pay for all jobs, and an expanding horizon of opportunity for all. With growth, Government can restore fiscal integrity and afford sound programs which enhance individual welfare.

(c) America faces great opportunities for economic development which can support a better and fuller life for all individuals.

By prompt, effective, and concerted action to stimulate incentives, we can break out of the pattern of slow economic growth and move on to greater prosperity and meaningful improvement in the national well-being.

Only in this way can we insure our capacity to meet our responsibility in the preservation of peace and freedom.

TWO DISTINGUISHED PASADENANS GET AWARDS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last month the first National Medal of Science, established 3 years ago by Congress, was presented by President Kennedy. It went to Dr. Theodore von Karman, Hungarian-born American citizen, and now a resident of Pasadena, Calif. Dr. von Karman was cited for the "incomparable contributions" he has made "not only to the field of applied mechanics, aerodynamics and astronautics, and to education in general, but also to industrial, national, international, and human affairs in their broadest sense."

Dr. William Pickering, another eminent Pasadenan, was also honored last month. Dr. Pickering, director of Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, was named southern California's Engineer of the Year and received the accompanying George Washington Achievement Award. He was cited particularly for his part in the development of the Corporal missile in 1950 and for his work on Explorer I and Pioneer IV.

An editorial on February 27 in the Pasadena Star-News pays tribute to Dr. von Karman and Dr. Pickering. I want to join this paper in extending my warmest congratulations to these distinguished gentlemen. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News, Feb. 27, 1963]

EMINENT PASADENANS

Not many months elapse, usually, between the awards to distinguished Pasadenans that cause the community to renew its pride in itself, and burnish anew its image as a center of intellectual attainment.

Within the space of only a few days recently, two Pasadenans have brought honor to themselves and to the city. First, Dr. Theodore von Karman became the first recipient of the new National Medal of Science, established by Congress 3 years ago. The presentation was made by President Kennedy at a ceremony in the White House.

Next, Dr. William Pickering, director of Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, was designated Southern California's Engineer of the Year and received the accompanying George Washington Achievement Award at the annual Engineers Week dinner in Beverly Hills.

Other things link the work of these men, besides their residence in Pasadena. Both were notable figures on the staff of the California Institute of Technology before going on to other endeavors. And Dr. von Karman's work at Caltech led to the establishment of the Laboratory Dr. Pickering now heads.

Dr. von Karman's attainments are multifarious. He is internationally renowned as an aerodynamicist. He was was one of the founders, in 1942, of the Aerojet-General Corp., whose technical advisory board he still heads.

Dr. von Karman is known also for large contributions to applied mechanics and astronautics, as well as to education in general. He is chairman of the NATO Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development.

Dr. Pickering is himself a graduate of Caltech, and taught there until his assignment to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory on a leave of absence from the faculty. He was named director of Jet Propulsion Laboratory in 1954.

The engineers' award cited his part in development in 1950 of the Corporal missile, which was the Nation's first operational guided missile; the production of Explorer I, the first successful U.S. earth satellite, and Pioneer IV, the first successful U.S. space probe.

Both awards have sidelights. That to Dr. von Karman is additionally gratifying because it represents a kind of national recognition to scientific attainment that previously has been reserved for military heroes. We favor more of this kind of thing, extended, perhaps, to the fields of arts and education.

Dr. Pickering's award places in better perspective the tremendous achievement of Jet Propulsion Laboratory over the years and relegates to its proper place the recent criticisms, however valid, of certain work underway there.

We are happy to congratulate Dr. von Karman and Dr. Pickering on these newest additions to their long lists of distinctions, and to bask, together with our fellow Pasadenans, in their reflected effulgence.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, New Hampshire's largest daily newspaper, the Manchester Union Leader, recently featured a syndicated column and a guest editorial dealing with a matter of grave concern to the American public. The column, which was written by an acute observer of the Washington political scene, Holmes Alexander, and is entitled "Krock, Loeb, Kennedy, and the Kept Men," appeared in the Union Leader on Friday, March 15, 1963. The guest editorial, entitled "The Kennedys and the News," from Newsday, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., was reprinted in the Union Leader on Saturday, March 9, 1963.

In both instances, the writers address themselves to the chilling specter of managed news, as we have seen this phenomenon develop during the last 2 years. Insidious indeed, is what Holmes Alexander calls "Krock's Law," which postulates that purveyors of news can be managed by promise or threat, cajolery or fear. The position occupied by Arthur Krock in the world of journalism requires no comment. Suffice it to say, he represents courage and integrity among newsmen. William Loeb, as he has demonstrated repeatedly, reflects those same high qualities as a publisher. His forthright discharge of the responsibility for public service imposed upon any publisher, without compromise or equivocation, would have warranted the plaudits of Pulitzer himself.

I believe these articles direct themselves to a problem of increasingly alarming dimensions, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union, Mar. 8, 1963]

KROCK, LOEB, KENNEDY, AND THE KEPT MEN

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Let's say that Krock's law has been enunciated—and Loeb's edict has been activated. America will be cleaner if both are accepted as gospel of this free land.

Columnist Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, has been, for a good half century, a stellar performer in several fields of journalism. It is less well known that Krock also has been, for a full quarter century, the encourager of young and eager writers, including John F. Kennedy, author (1940) of "Why England Slept." At 77, twice a Pulitzer prize winner, and a secure Olympian of his profession, Krock has his say about presidential "news management" in a much-discussed article that runs in the current Fortune. Since the magazine costs $1.25 per issue and is not popularly available, Krock's piece has been more read about than read. Krock's law, which I venture to paraphrase, appears in his final paragraph and may be extracted to say:

"Not news, but the purveyors of news, can be managed by an American President who is wickedly willing and able to do so."

Publisher William Loeb, who runs successful and robustious newspapers in New Hampshire and Vermont, is a savvy and audacious survivor of the days when American journalism didn't count the cost of voicing its convictions. I have personal knowledge that early in the 1960 campaign Loeb was entertained by Ambassador Joe Kennedy and was entreated to support Senator Jack Kennedy on two grounds: One, that the Senator was fit to be President and, two, that the Senator was going to win, anyhow.

DIDN'T BUY IT

Loeb went home, mulled over the available data, concluded that the Senator's record indicated an appalling incapacity to put up a winning fight against communism, this Nation's mortal enemy. Upon those grounds, Loeb has vigorously opposed the advancement of each and every Kennedy. Only recently Loeb editorialized and threatened suit against Senator TED KENNEDY for allegedly breaking the camera of a Loeb photographer who attempted to get pictures of the Senator at a New England ski resort. Loeb's law, digested from his fulminations on the episode, may be said to read:

"Not even the presidential family in America is immune from legitimate coverage of the news."

Krock and Loeb, then, have both defied the lightning that is said to fall from heaven upon those who irk the gods that be. Both have put their hands in the fire with a brave intent to snatch and brandish a searing ember of truth. Loeb, as it happens, has always been a militant individualist with scant concern for any guidance but his own. But Krock, living in Washington and accustomed to the association and friendship of the peerage in both journalism and politics, has laid his professional reputation and personal tranquility on the line in a deed of daring that merits the admiration and gratitude of his countrymen.

Nobody can well evaluate Krock's contribution without reading the text of his Fortune article. Samples from it and gossip about it will not suffice. For he produced not mere denunciation, but documentation. Names, dates, specifications and sagacious observations on news management are all there. Until somebody can knock over this citadel of citations, it will stand against the yelping of the Yahoos at its walls.

His indictment—please note well—is not principally against the Kennedys. It is against the Kennedy kept men. Krock concedes that every White House administration tries, with varying degrees of scruple and intensity, to get good publicity and to identify itself with the "national interest." But the guilt that he imputes is laid against the "purveyors" of news who succumb to fear, flattery and humbug, which causes writers and broadcasters to prevaricate and equivocate.

So, it isn't strange that the kept men are beginning to caterwaul. Washington Post columnist Eldon Griffiths, chief European correspondent of the Post-owned Newsweek, led off the chorus on March 2. Krock, writes Griffiths, is "an elderly thunderer," who's jealous because "the President talks to other correspondents more than he talks to Krock." Krock is saying, says Griffiths, that "almost everyone—except Krock—has been taken in," and Krock is asking us to "believe that old men are always right and all young men are wrong."

Not many readers of the Fortune article, I daresay, will find this criticism just. Rather, they will find that this caterwauling of the Kennedy kept men was implicitly predicted in Krock's indictment of them.

[From the Manchester Union, Mar. 9, 1963]

THE KENNEDYS AND THE NEWS

(Guest editorial from Newsday, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y.)

Two events connected with the Kennedy family and the news have earned space in the papers.

Up in Vermont at a ski area, Senator EDWARD M. (TED) KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, snatched the camera of a press photographer and ripped out the film because he objected to being photographed unposed. This is known as controlling the news in no uncertain fashion.

In New York, Fortune magazine published a thoughtful article by Arthur Krock, columnist for the New York Times, asserting that the President and his administration have been managing the news more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

For reasons that vary, the Kennedys seem to want things printed the way they want them, or not at all.

TED KENNEDY's burst of bad temper can't be excused on the ground that he hates publicity. He thrives upon it, and he courted it during his recent, successful campaign for U.S. Senator. He is now much more a public figure than he was in the days when he was simply the President's younger brother. Public figures can't object—or shouldn't—if photographers snap pictures of them, though such pictures may be unflattering. The easy way to avoid such quick-draw photography is either to remember that photos are bound to be taken or else to withdraw from public life. The latter, in TED KENNEDY's case, is not likely to be the solution he chooses.

As to Krock's conclusions, he is stating what the administration already has admitted. Arthur Sylvester, Under Secretary of Defense, boasted after the Cuban crisis that he had helped to manage, control, and channel the flow of news.

This is a delicate issue for both sides—the President, because he found himself on the brink of war with Russia during the Cuban imbroglio; the press, because it has a responsibility to print all but the most sensitive information relating to national security. Without this freedom, the press is muzzled, and in some instances decisions may be made that constitute a real danger to our republican form of government. If situations of gravity arise, the President would be wiser to form (as in World War II) a committee of publishers to whom the facts can be confided; good citizens who can counsel as to the effect of printing or nonprinting. That system worked before and it can work again.

As to Krock's further comment that the President has gulled editors and publishers into favorable dispatches about his administration—doing so by intimate background briefings and personal enchantment—this, if so, is the fault of the recipients of a dose of his charm. Reporters and publishers are paid to be hardboiled, to accept courtesies without a quid pro quo in the news columns, and to remember that no newspaperman ever can permit friendship to stand in the way of the truth. Those who fail to live up to this principle are doing a disservice to the free press—and, what's more, to their readers. Managed news ought to be dismanaged. Managed newspapermen had better make sure that nothing is kept out of print, and that no story is colored, simply because the President is a very persuasive and a thoroughly agreeable person.

SLEEPING BEAR NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, early this month a group of prominent Michigan citizens joined together to form the Michigan Committee for a Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore. The purpose of the committee is to stimulate general public support for a Federal recreational development in that area.

This event marks an important milestone along the road we have traveled since Senator MCNAMARA and I first introduced a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in June of 1961.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks an article on the formation of the committee which appeared in the Benzie County Patriot of March 7, 1963, and a statement of intent which has been issued by the committee.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Benzie County Patriot, Mar. 7, 1963]

ANNOUNCE FORMATION OF COMMITTEE FOR A PARK

Formation of the Michigan Committee for a Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore was announced March 2 by C. T. Carland, chairman of the Citizens for a National Park in Benzie and Leelanau Counties. Its purpose is an attempt to stimulate favorable opinion for a Federal recreational area formed about the impressive Benzie-Leelanau dunes and moraines. Three bills to authorize such an undertaking are now before Congress where hearings are expected to be held during the present session.

Committee members are John C. Beukema, industrial consultant, Muskegon; Edward L. Cushman, vice president, American Motors, Detroit; George A. Griffith, former conservation commissioner, Grayling; Miss Ethel L. Larsen, conservation chairman, National Federation of Women's Clubs, Manistee; W. K. McInally, regent, University of Michigan, Jackson; Alexander G. Ruthven, ex-president, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and Harold Titus, conservation editor Field and Stream, Traverse City, chairman.

As yet the group has not endorsed any one bill but a spokesman said that it favors an acreage large enough to include besides the principal dunes and Lake Michigan bluffs several of the inland vantage points which afford spectacular views. Also while declaring that in general, private rights in developed properties within the project must be assured it recommends that Federal support for local efforts be available if needed to avoid uses which would not be compatible with park atmosphere.

Statement of intent from Michigan Committee for Sleeping Bear National Seashore:

"We, all long-time residents of Michigan, believe that Sleeping Bear Dune and its environs contain scenic and scientific values which are of national significance and should be preserved for posterity. These values are highly perishable in a period when the native landscape is rapidly being altered for one purpose or another. We are convinced that the only method of insuring the safety of these assets is in public ownership of adequate acreage. The State of Michigan is obviously unable to assume this national responsibility which makes Federal acquisition imperative.

"Several bills are currently before Congress which would establish a project here under administration by the National Park Service. We believe that this project should include not only the dune and nearby bluffs but several of the overlook sites so that the visitor may enjoy and be impressed with the panorama of lake, dune and forested moraines revealed from these vantage points.

"We heartily agree that private rights in developed properties inside the boundaries of the project be maintained in general but insist that the steadying hand of a Federal agency should be available if local efforts fail to preserve uses which are compatible with a park project. This point is emphasized because we are aware of the attraction that any large concentration of tourist activity has for enterprises which, while profitable to the owners, may prove to be highly detrimental for all other uses of the area."

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL NEEDS OF RETIRED PERSONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, several weeks ago I received a letter from Mr. Nicholas C. Vrataric, vice president and director of region VIII of the United Papermakers & Paperworkers, AFL-CIO, Ann Arbor, Mich.

This letter related the history of a retirement program established for members of that union employed at the Consolidated Paper Co. in Monroe, Mich. In short, this history has been one of requests by the private insurance carrier for increases in premiums. This has meant the necessity for either increased contributions by active members or reduced benefits to retired members.

Mr. President, it has been clearly demonstrated in this case, as in so many others, that private insurance alone is not an adequate solution to the hospital and medical needs of retired persons.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Vrataric's letter, which describes a problem likely to be found in all corners of our country, and the accompanying table, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED PAPERMAKERS &
PAPERWORKERS, AFL-CIO,
Ann Arbor, Mich., January 22, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Consolidated Paper Co. of Monroe, Mich., and our union have enjoyed collective bargaining relations since 1941, and late in 1949 we were fortunate in establishing a pension program to provide for a retirement program for our members. In 1954 the union recognized the serious problem that retired employees have in regards to hospitalization and medical expenses during their retirement and requested the company to provide for hospitalization and medical coverage for retired employees, which was agreed to by the company. In 1955 we were able to prevail upon the company to likewise provide coverage for the dependents of retired employees. Both of the above were to be provided for at no cost to the retired employee, but were paid for by the active members sacrificing a portion of the wage increase, which they would have otherwise secured.

As the number of retired employees increased, they became a burden upon the overall insurance program and in 1961 the insurance carrier requested an increase in premiums for the retired employees. Our collective bargaining agreement provided that the company pay the entire premium for both employee and dependents and since the company's financial condition in 1961, and for several years prior to that, showed it was operating at a loss instead of a profit, the company could not afford the increased premiums, a proposal was made to the union to reduce the benefits provided to the retired employees and such reduction would have reduced retiree benefits by more than 50 percent, the union bargaining committee proposed to the membership, that since these retired employees must have protection against sickness and accident in their old age, that instead of a reduction in benefits and the retirees paying an increased premium, all of the active employees would contribute 40 cents per week to pay for the increased cost of retiree insurance, which was overwhelmingly approved and instituted.

However, due to the increased utilization of insurance and primarily among the retirees, the insurance carrier has again approached the company and the union stating that its last year's operating experience has shown a loss for the insurance carrier and there must be a 40-percent increase in insurance premiums for the coming year.

At a recent union and company meeting, this problem was discussed and we are now faced with a serious problem whereby it may be necessary to reduce the benefits of the retired employees.

At this meeting it was suggested by Joseph Stanifer, an officer of our local 1000, that it would be a good idea to forward to you this letter, together with a copy of our insurance experience with the insurance carrier, which will accurately portray the usage of medical programs by retirees and clearly demonstrate that private carriers is not the solution to the medical care and needs of retired employees. We feel that our experience clearly demonstrates the need for the passage of President Kennedy's medical care program.

While the retired employees of Consolidated Paper Co. have been fortunate to have some coverage, there are many other retirees who are not as fortunate, who are paying the same medical claims out of the small pensions that they are able to receive. With best wishes and regards, I am

Sincerely,
NICHOLAS C. VRATARIC,
Vice President and Regional Director, Region VIII.

Insurance experience rating, Consolidated Paper Co., No. 559 and No. 560

Period	Premium	Claims	Ratio
Oct. 1, 1954, to Oct. 1, 1955	$225,289	$180,570	80.2
Active	220,493	173,902	78.9
Retired	4,796	6,668	139.0
Oct. 1, 1955, to Oct. 1, 1956	248,724	242,309	97.4
Active	234,923	226,779	96.5
Retired	13,801	15,530	112.5
Oct. 1, 1956, to Oct. 1, 1957	278,503	246,992	88.7
Active	260,514	221,956	85.2
Retired	17,989	25,036	139.2
Oct. 1, 1957, to Oct. 1, 1958	254,441	235,099	92.4
Active	234,425	206,290	88.0
Retired	20,016	28,809	143.9
Oct. 1, 1958, to Aug. 13, 1959	242,442	243,731	100.5
Active	222,239	214,006	96.3
Retired	20,203	29,725	147.1
Aug. 13, 1959, to Nov. 13, 1959	$42,197	$28,522	67.6
Nov. 13, 1959, to Nov. 1, 1960	227,779	184,292	80.9
Active	205,029	161,272	78.7
Retired	22,750	23,020	101.2
Nov. 1, 1960, to Nov. 1, 1961	230,503	223,199	96.8
Active	205,613	183,597	89.3
Retired	24,890	39,602	159.1
Nov. 1, 1961, to Nov. 1, 1962	244,533	272,492	111.2
Active	214,307	215,781	100.5
Retired	30,226	56,711	187.0

THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on March 8 the Michigan Committee on Immigration sponsored a 1-day conference on immigration in Detroit, Mich. Among the many excellent presentations at this conference was a speech by Mr. James J. Norris, president of the International Catholic Migration Commission, entitled "The Century of the Homeless Man."

We all hear from time to time about the refugee problem and its implications for national and international policies. In his speech, Mr. Norris speaks of what it means, in stark human and individual terms, to be a refugee. Often in discussing the definition of a refugee, the question is: "What is a refugee?" rather than: "Who is a refugee?" Mr. Norris is talking of the man and woman and child who are the refugees of this world. And I believe all of us would benefit from his thoughts.

For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech by Mr. James J. Norris be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTURY OF THE HOMELESS MAN

(Remarks of James J. Norris)

It has been said that the refugee problem in our day has been the largest single human issue facing the world community, but there has been no effort to face up to it on a global scale. Because the problem has been considered in fragments, the true dimensions of the problem have been unknown to the man in the street, and for most part governments have been just as well pleased that it remains so.

In many cases, local governments that were overwhelmed by refugee problems were, with a few exceptions, left to go it alone to face those problems.

The vast displacements of peoples since the beginning of World War II are almost incomprehensible. The more than 40 million people who have been displaced, expelled, or have fled in that period of time, represent a population larger than that of France. The majority of the 40 million have already been resettled either in the country where they took asylum or in some other land.

This resettlement means moves to another place but it does not necessarily mean that they have been integrated into the life of the country.

Any effort to go into detail concerning who these people are would be almost a dreary recital of statistics.

Many of you have taken a trip across the Atlantic, but I am sure that as you left behind you the Statue of Liberty the thought never occurred to you that you were heading eastward into a vast belt of homelessness and hunger. You have read many times of the refugee problem in Europe including the story of the 14 million people of German origin driven like animals from their homes after the Potsdam Agreement. You are also familiar with the story of the 1 million Arab refugees who are rotting away in their camps in the Near East. Likewise, I am sure, you are acquainted with the overwhelming problem of more than 1 million Chinese who have sought asylum in Hong Kong, over 200,000 of whom are said to be living on rooftops.

Not quite so well known are the problems of the 300,000 Algerians who sought temporary asylum in Morocco and Tunisia during the Algerian war, but have now returned to their homeland only to find everything destroyed and they are confronted with the task of building a new life. The majority of the 15 million refugees displaced by the partition of India are eking out a day-to-day existence, but there is still an acute problem among the refugees in Bengal.

India has added to its burden by granting asylum to more than 50,000 Tibetans who fled their country after the Chinese aggression. The 800,000 Vietnamese who fled from North Vietnam to the south were given much attention in the press at the time of the Indochina war, but once the hostilities were over, and the big movement of people finished, little attention was paid to them by the outside world. The same is true of the 3 million persons who fled from North to South Korea.

Very little has appeared in the press concerning the latest wave of refugee problems being created in Africa and yet it is apparent that this continent is going to be faced with problems of refugees for years to come. Two hundred thousand Angolese have sought temporary refuge in the Congo; thousands of Ghanaians have been expelled or fled from the Ivory Coast back to Ghana and into Togo; many thousands of refugees have fled from Rwanda into Tanganyika, Uganda and the Congo.

At our conference today there will be a discussion of the Cuban refugees who have sought asylum in our own United States; so I shall not detail their plight.

The immensity of the problem of refugees, because it is discussed in statistical terms and frequently not in human terms, almost causes us to lose sight of the fact that we are talking about individual human beings who had all the same human hopes and aspirations as everyone of us in this room today.

It is significant that when there is a discussion of the definition of a refugee, the question is: What is a refugee rather than: Who is a refugee? This lack of human approach has been taken by large segments of the international community in considering the problem of the refugee world.

A refugee neither chooses nor prepares his flight. He is not able to select the country into which he must flee. He is not protected by his own country and he arrives without identity documents. From a legal standpoint he is nonexistent. He is more a phantom than a living human being. From a symbol of being antisomething, he becomes an anonymity. The refugee must seek permission to move from one place to another and his very existence depends on the charity and goodwill of those among whom he seeks asylum. He usually lives in some kind of temporary shelter, which was formerly a military camp, a factory or a row of rotting wooden barracks, or the remnants of destroyed buildings. Not one of these shelters was intended as a home for human beings. The compound he lives in is frequently an unpaved thoroughfare that turns into mire and muck when it rains, weeds grow everywhere and broken windowpanes are plugged with paper. Doors, riddled with dry rot, hang crazily from rusting hinges. Whole families may live together in a single room, with a paraffin stove in a corner as their only kitchen. Sanitation is always insufficient and frequently the water for a whole camp may come from a single tap standing in the open. The very living in a camp forces a refugee to accept camp existence as a way of life.

Since the refugee lives at the mercy of local authorities, he becomes de facto a man without rights, in an age when the declaration of human rights is praised as one of the great steps forward of our century. The refugee's problem is legal, physical and psychological.

When a refugee seeks to emigrate he finds that it is easier to ship a newly manufactured car, or a ton of steel, than to send a man and his family from one country to another. It is inevitable that his thoughts go back to the native homeland that he loves, to his relatives, neighbors and friends whom he has left behind; to the church or synagogue in which he worshiped; to the friendly social gatherings that mean so much in the life of a human being; to the former happiness of his children. In desperation at times he seriously considers giving up refugeedom and going back because he never realized that he was not expected to make a choice between freedom from fear and freedom from want, the goals of the Atlantic Charter.

The refugee looks around him and sees the aged, the sick, the handicapped, the unmarried mother, who are the remnants of an earlier generation of refugees. He wonders whether or not his fate is to be one of this number. He suddenly realizes that the worldshaking events that created the refugee problem get far more attention than the human beings who have lost everything because of those events. He is confronted with the fact that in order to be helped he must meet the definition of the word "refugee" as spelled out by the United Nations, the U.S. Government, or some local government. He comes to realize that refugees are not simply people who have fled their homes seeking freedom, but are frequently men who are of political interest to one faction or another. He learns that a ration card may become a certificate of identity and a guarantee of security, more important at the moment than any other document in the world. He is a man who lives among men, but is not accepted by his neighbors. He is discriminated against if he seeks work or housing. He is a man who is newsworthy for a short period of time, but for whom international concern is short-lived.

The refugee looks around him and reads about or sees a small number of the people of the world who are living in an affluent society, with more food than they can consume, and with more luxuries in their homes than they can afford. He wonders if he is to spend the rest of his life in the world of the dispossessed and the exiled.

The refugee reads about international protection, international organizations helping refugees and private organization concern, and wonders whether he will ever be touched by any one of them.

This is the refugee to whom a small group of governmental agencies, governments and private organizations are striving to draw attention and for whom help is sought. The private voluntary agencies have insisted throughout the years that the refugee problem is dynamic rather than static and for that reason governmental and intergovernmental organizations must be flexible so as to meet refugee problems when and where they arise. They have insisted that the refugee problem is an international responsibility, and must not remain the burden of a single country in a time of crisis. There are times when the world does respond magnificently to such a crisis, such as it did at the time of the Hungarian uprising, but there are other times when the response is meager or nonexistent.

The persistent efforts of such men as the U.S. High Commissioner for Refugees, the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Administration for Arab Refugees, the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and the devoted staffs of the private agencies working for refugees, with sympathetic understanding from our own American and other governments, have brought about solution to a number of problems that for years appear to be insoluble. But in spite of the year-in and year-out efforts to arouse interest to bring to a satisfactory conclusion some of these problems, such efforts have been less than successful.

Recently, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees put out a publication entitled "The Opening Door." It describes the efforts of his office to help resettle the residual group of refugees in Europe. By patient perseverance, on an individual case-by-case basis, many thousands of refugees, formerly considered "hopeless" for resettlement, were given a new opportunity to resettle in Scandinavia, Switzerland, England, Australia, and Canada. This task, undertaken with determination and understanding, has proven that there are very few refugees who cannot be helped to resettle, if there is a will to do so on the part of governments and private groups working together.

But the door which has been opened for these refugees means nothing to the old Russian couple in China who are still waiting for word that the exit door from Communist China has been opened and that the welcome mat has been laid out in another land; it does not touch the refugee who this very day is fleeing from the oppression in Yugoslavia to Austria or Italy, only to be forcibly pushed back because those countries are not being given adequate help from outside to meet this refugee burden either through relief assistance or immigration; it does not help the Jewish refugee who must flee from North Africa and wait in France until another door opens for him; it is of little concern to the Chinese in Hong Kong with relatives in the United States who have not as yet been able to bring them into our land; it is of little consequence to the man and wife living on a dole in a refugee camp in Greece.

The problem of refugees will never be met adequately until it is recognized that the major free world governments, including our own, have no provision for asylum and forcibly deport men who have fled oppression; it will never be met until the international community realizes that the refugee fleeing into Austria has chosen the freedom of the Western World over the enslavement of communism, and therefore it is the obligation of the entire free West to help him; it will never be met until voluntary and private groups like ours do their job and make known to our fellow countrymen the worldwide scope of the refugee problem and until such time as all of us, governmental and private, join together to face up to a serious service on behalf of the homeless of the world wherever they may be.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—A RAPIDLY GROWING RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as many Senators may know, we have at Ann Arbor, Mich., the most rapidly growing research complex in the Midwest. Here is located the University of Michigan which in 1963 will expend over $36 million for its research programs, about $30 million of which will come from the Federal Government. And a growing number of research laboratories and new industries using research technology and methods are locating there, among them the Systems Division of Bendix Corp., Parke, Davis & Co., and Conductron Corp.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an article reporting serious doubts by some in the Boston area as to whether or not a NASA research facility which is proposed to be built there is really wanted.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to say that we in Michigan would be delighted to see this facility located at Ann Arbor, and I can assure officials at NASA that they would be welcomed there with open arms. Of equal interest to NASA, the excellence of the activities now located at Ann Arbor would assure the interest of top talent in living in one of this Nation's most delightful university communities.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE INDUSTRY

(By Cal Brumley)

BOSTON.—Electronic and other scientific Yankee businessmen are looking critically at a proffered Federal gift.

The object of this appraisal is a $50 million space electronics research center the National Aeronautics and Space Administration plans to build in the Boston area. President Kennedy asked for an initial appropriation of $8.5 million to acquire a site and begin construction in 1964. Additional funds would be requested in later years for completion.

As could be expected, many people here are clapping their hands at the prospect of a big Government plum which will employ about 2,000 people. Among others, however, the reception is cooler. Some are asking such questions as:

Will the NASA center perform research which otherwise would be contracted to private industry? Will the center compete with private industry for scientific personnel? Is it really needed or will it duplicate facilities or work private industry is doing and thus be a waste of taxpayers' money? Will Government bureaucracy stifle research inspiration?

NASA IS QUESTIONED

"These questions are being asked pretty generally" by executives of Boston's research and electronic-minded industries, says Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, chairman of Allied Research Associates, Inc., and until retirement about a year ago deputy chief of the Air Force staff for research and technology. A NASA spokesman says at least 100 people have called the NASA office in Boston with similar questions.

The Boston complex of research and electronic industries and institutions makes up one of the Nation's major scientific communities. Such electronic giants as Raytheon Co., General Telephone & Electronics Corp., Radio Corp. of America, and Avco Corp. have sizable installations in the area. Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University are centers for advanced research.

The questions probably are even more significant nationally than locally. Besides focusing on differences in basic political philosophy—big government versus reduced government—they also strike at the heart of another problem: Is the Government robbing the private sector of research?

Companies here, which already have a difficult time finding scientific brainpower and an equally difficult time keeping it from slipping away to competitors, fear that the answer is yes in the personnel field.

"When anything like the proposed NASA center is brought in it has a harmful effect on the men of local companies," says Henry Harding, president of Laboratory for Electronics, Inc. "As the NASA center builds its staff, it is sure to put pressure on research people to move around."

There is evidence that even some top-level New Frontiersmen are beginning to worry about the shortage of technical and scientific manpower. Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges in a recent speech expressed concern about the "relatively little" research directed at improving the civilian economy. He also pointed out that even if money were available for additional civilian-oriented research there is still a serious shortage of technically educated personnel.

NASA says it plans to minimize the personnel impact by staffing the center from its existing personnel, other Government agencies, and by recruiting nationwide.

If NASA's laboratories in effect compete with private industry for research assignments the impact on industry could be even greater than that of personnel raids. Massachusetts companies had about $16.5 million in NASA research contracts last year out of a national total of nearly $1.3 billion.

HELP FROM SUBCONTRACTS

New England companies probably would not feel competition from a NASA center as much as companies in other parts of the country, however. "There probably would be enough spillover, or subcontracts from the NASA center to make up for what local companies might lose, but I fear contract losses by research companies in other parts of the country," says one executive.

New Englanders have real doubts about the need for a NASA research center. One specific objection: One center's research intelligence is more limited than is industry-wide capability. "It is my feeling that the genius of the people is large,"' say Lieutenant General Wilson.

NASA spokesmen, as could be expected, stoutly defend their proposed center. One in Washington says NASA cannot expect private industry to provide critically needed increased competence in the areas of electronics and physics. He adds that NASA expects to increase contracts to private industry.

But a spokesman for a big New York company with facilities ranging over a broad field of research and hardware says, "Although it may be inappropriate for us to comment, the question remains: Is the Government doing too much research?"

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE PERSONNEL FROM BOISE TO SALT LAKE CITY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as you know, the Internal Revenue Service has announced plans to consolidate a considerable portion of its field operations. While this effort is being made in the name of economy, numerous questions as to its efficiency and necessity in Idaho have been rightfully propounded.

The Internal Revenue Service would transfer, according to some figures I have seen, almost half of its Idaho personnel from Boise to Salt Lake, with a reduction in functions which would quite obviously create hardship for many Idaho taxpayers.

Announcement of the plan has resulted in my office being flooded with sincere objections. The Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce is also on record against the proposal. The main office of the Internal Revenue Service in Boise has earned a reputation for its efficient work, and to curtail its handling of Idaho cases can assure only delay and additional expense for many of our citizens.

Like other States of the Intermountain and Pacific Northwest regions, Idaho has a sparse population, but vast distances which must often be negotiated to conduct business even in the State capital. The proposal to transfer functions of the Boise Internal Revenue Service office to Salt Lake, means—as an example—that someone living in Boise with a particular tax problem would have to travel 370 miles to Salt Lake. However, since Boise is centrally located between north and south, someone living in northern Idaho would have to travel almost twice that distance with their tax problem. The injustice of this is apparent.

In addition, it is no simple matter for the employees of the Boise IRS to make such a transfer; many are native Idahoans, owning their own homes, with children established in schools. Many are wives whose husbands are employed in jobs they cannot leave. This is the human equation, and it cannot be ignored.

I have objected vigorously to the administration, the Treasury Department and the IRS, and Secretary Dillon has given assurances that the plan will be reviewed, and that it will not be implemented pending a decision.

However, several days have passed since we received such assurances, and I want to reiterate that my State wholeheartedly opposes this move.

On March 10, 1963, the Idaho Sunday Statesman of Boise published an editorial which accurately and fairly sets forth the feelings of Idaho on this proposal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Internal Revenue Service Changes Affecting Idaho Draw Senator Church Protest, Invite Further Opposition

The announced plan of the Internal Revenue Service to make Idaho a field office for Utah headquarters in an arrangement that demands strong protest. Under the claim of effecting economics, this consolidation would bring parallel penalties to Idahoans that would cause expense, delay and inconvenience. It is to be noted that Senator Church has filed an effective protest with the Treasury Department, and it is to be hoped that he is able to make his protest stick.

Through the transfer of Idaho IRS personnel, in numbers that vary from an estimated 25 to 75, there is no contention that the department will hire fewer persons. Nor is there any indication that the IRS staff has surplus or would have extra help if the consolidation were effected. What is happening here is nothing more than another of the endless damaging changes that are thought up in Washington without any consideration for the final result.

Idahoans presently have the service of an efficient and well-administered Internal Revenue Service office in Boise with a field office in Pocatello. To either city, our residents may go with their problems and transact their business. Under the realinement they would be required to go to Salt Lake City. Since considerable contact is involved between the public and the IRS, it is immediately apparent that this transfer of personnel would leave Idaho out in left field, faced with considerable commuting to another State.

Involved in this transfer would be the payment of all Idaho Federal moneys to the Utah office which, on the involved payroll transfer, would add further penalty to State finance. Most important, a number of established Idaho families would be forced to relocate in Salt Lake City to do the same work they are doing right here in Idaho for Idaho people. It would be just as logical to locate the entire IRS operation in Washington, D.C.

The important point, of course, is that Idaho people not be deprived of the present arrangement which allows them to settle most of their Internal Revenue Department problems within their own State. Sufficient revenue is provided the Federal Government to continue Idaho offices. The department has been wasteful for many years.

Senator Church, on the job immediately, has assured concerned Idahoans that he is hopeful that this realinement of IRS offices will not be made following his personal protest to the White House and the Treasury Department. We commend the Senator for this effort. He is attempting to perform an important service for every Idaho taxpayer. He deserves the support of the other three members of the Idaho delegation and as much ammunition from Idaho sources as possible. This is one change in the working of Government that Idaho cannot accept without vigorous protest.

Undoubtedly there are hundreds of ways in which the Federal Government could effect economies. But this doesn't happen to be one. The Internal Revenue Department, covering an enormous scope of the affairs of every individual, and operating under the most complex set of rules and regulations in

Government history, must be accessible to residents of every State for conferences and guidance. Here in Idaho, where the arrangement has good prestige, is well organized, directed and manned, there is no justification for any interruption in the IRS operation. Idahoans should show concern that this change does not take place.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SALE OF CADMIUM

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 64, S. 1089.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately two million pounds of cadmium now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the report on the bill—No. 66—be printed in the RECORD at this point in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

This bill would (1) grant express approval of the Congress for the disposal by the General Services Administration from the national stockpile of approximately 2 million pounds of cadmium, and (2) waive a statutory requirement that the disposal may not be accomplished until 6 months after publication of notice of disposal in the Federal Register.

EXPLANATION

On October 16, 1962, the Administrator of the General Services Administration caused to be published in the Federal Register a notice of a proposed disposal of approximately 2 million pounds of cadmium. The published notice reads as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1962.

CADMIUM HELD IN NATIONAL STOCKPILE—PROPOSED DISPOSITION

Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98(b) e) notice is hereby given of a proposed disposition of approximately 2 million pounds of cadmium.

The Office of Emergency Planning has made a revised determination, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a(a)) that said cadmium is excess to stockpile needs. The revised determination was occasioned in part by a change in the mobilization planning period from 5 to 3 years.

Since the revised determination is not by reason of obsolescence of the cadmium for use in time of war, this proposed disposition is being referred to the Congress for its express approval, as required by section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

General Services Administration proposes to transfer said cadmium to other Government agencies, to offer the material for sale on a competitive basis, or otherwise to dispose of it in the best interest of the Government upon the express approval by the Congress of this proposed disposition but not earlier than 6 months after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. This notice has also been transmitted to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof.

The initial quantity to be offered for sale will not exceed 300,000 pounds. Subsequent offers will be scheduled at intervals of not less than 60 days.

This plan and the dates of disposition have been fixed with due regard to the protection of producers, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets as well as the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on disposal.

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Under section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a(a)) the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is charged with the responsibility of determining the strategic and critical materials to be stockpiled. Section 3(e) of the act empowers the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of any materials in the stockpile that are no longer needed. Such disposals may not be made until 6 months after the publication in the Federal Register and transmission of a notice of the proposed disposal to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House. If determination to dispose of certain materials is for reasons other than obsolescence of the material for use in time of war, express approval of the Congress is required before the disposal can be accomplished. If the proposed disposal is based on a determination that the material is obsolescent for use in time of war, express approval of the Congress is not required. For the purposes of these requirements the law provides that a determination is by reason of obsolescence if such determination is on account of (1) deterioration, (2) development or discovery of a new or better material or materials, or (3) no further usefulness for use in time of war.

Since the proposed disposal is not by reason of obsolescence, express approval of the Congress is required. This congressional approval could be granted in the form of a concurrent resolution. Because of favorable current market conditions this legislative proposal not only would grant congressional approval for the disposal but would permit the disposal to begin upon enactment of the bill instead of waiting until 6 months after October 20, 1962, the date of publication of the disposal notice in the Federal Register.

Information on disposal

The Army and Navy Munitions Board (a predecessor in function to the Office of Emergency Planning), placed cadmium on the list of strategic and critical materials to be stockpiled. Pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, the Army and Navy Munitions Board directed the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department (a predecessor in function to the General Services Administration) to make purchases of cadmium for the national stockpile, although a sizable quantity was obtained by surplus transfer from other agencies.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, revised the determination as to the quantity of cadmium to be stockpiled and authorized the disposal of the quantity of 2 million pounds of cadmium in excess of the revised stockpile objective. The revised determination was based in part on a change in the mobilization planning period from 5 to 3 years. The Office of Emergency Planning authorized General Services Administration, by letter dated July 2, 1962, to prepare this disposal plan which it later approved.

Cadmium is a soft, silver-white metal chiefly used in electroplating, pigments and chemicals, alloys, and storage batteries. No ore is mined solely as a source of cadmium, but it is obtained mainly as a byproduct from zinc, copper, and lead operations. The United States is the world's leading producer of cadmium. Other principal producing countries in the free world are Mexico, Canada, Belgium, Republic of Congo, Southwest Africa, and Japan.

The U.S. production of cadmium metal for 1961 was 9,943,000 pounds, and imports of cadmium contained in flue dust have averaged about 1,500,000 pounds annually in recent years. In 1961 the United States exported 702,000 pounds of cadmium. Consumption in the United States in 1961 was approximately 10,116,000 pounds. Estimated world production of cadmium in 1961 totaled approximately 20,800,000 pounds.

The quantity proposed for disposal is stockpile-grade cadmium metal in various shapes and sizes, packed in wooden containers, and stored indoors at several locations throughout the United States. The correct domestic price of cadmium is $1.85 to $2.10 per pound in ton lots. The average acquisition cost per pound of cadmium in the stockpile is $1.97.

In 1962 a tight supply situation developed with regard to this material and its scarcity increased the market price and created a favorable market for an early sale of this material. For these reasons, no substantial problem is present in relation to protecting the United States against avoidable loss or protecting producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The quantity offered for initial sale will not exceed approximately 300,000 pounds. Subsequent offerings will be scheduled at intervals of not less than 60 days. The amount and timing of the subsequent offerings will be determined, based on the evaluation of the results of the earlier sales and existing market conditions. Because the cadmium will be offered for sale in small lots, small business should be able to participate fully in the disposal sale.

Departmental recommendation

Printed below and hereby made a part of this report is a letter from the Administrator of General Services dated October 16, 1962, requesting congressional approval for the disposal of excess cadmium from the national stockpile.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately

2 million pounds of cadmium now held in the national stockpile. This notice is being published in the Federal Register and is forwarded to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)).

The Office of Emergency Planning has made a revised determination, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a (a)), that there is no longer any need for stockpiling said cadmium. The revised determination was made for the reason that said cadmium is excess to stockpile needs.

Section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act provides that no material constituting a part of the stockpile may be disposed of without the express approval of Congress, except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of the material for use in time of war. Since the revised determination in this case was not by reason of obsolescence, we request that the Congress approve the proposed disposition.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 66, H.R. 212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 212) to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the report on the bill (No. 68) be printed in the RECORD in explanation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Veterans' Administration today is authorized to pay not more than $250 to cover the burial and funeral expenses of a deceased war veteran, a veteran discharged from service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty, or a veteran in receipt of or entitled to receive disability compensation. Discharges must be under other than dishonorable conditions. Claims must be filed within 2 years after burial.

The subject bill would extend the time limitation for filing a claim for burial allowance in any case where a veteran's discharge has been corrected, after death, to one under conditions other than dishonorable to 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of the bill's enactment, whichever is later. The committee believes this bill is equitable and concurs in the favorable report of the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration advises there are no data available on which to predict an estimate of cost but it is believed relatively few cases will be affected and the cost will not be significant.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report of the Veterans' Administration follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to furnish the following comments in response to your request for a report by the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 212, 88th Congress, an act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable.

Under existing law (38 U.S.C. 902) the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay a sum not exceeding $250 to cover the burial and funeral expenses of a deceased war veteran, a veteran discharged from service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty, or a veteran in receipt of or entitled to receive disability compensation. It is required that a claim for this burial allowance be filed within 2 years after burial, with an additional year allowed from date of notification by the Veterans' Administration in which to submit necessary evidence.

H.R. 212 does not create a new class of persons eligible for the benefit, but is directed toward the situation where a discharge originally issued under conditions other than honorable is corrected by competent authority after his death—either upon his own application theretofore filed, or upon the application of his next of kin or legal representative. If the action of the correcting board or other authority is accomplished while a sufficient amount of the 2-year delimiting period remains for an application for burial allowance to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, no problem exists. However, if such action is delayed beyond the 2 years we are forced to deny the claim.

H.R. 212 would correct this situation by adjusting the time for filing a claim to provide that all persons will have an equal period of time to apply for the burial allowance, once the eligibility to receive it exists. Specifically, H.R. 212 would extend the time limits for filing a claim for the burial allowance in any case where a veteran's discharge has been corrected, after death, to one under conditions other than dishonorable, to 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of the bill's enactment, whichever is later.

In view of the fact that the principal purpose of granting a corrected discharge is to remedy an injustice and afford equitable relief the objective sought to be accomplished by the bill would seem to be justified and would be consistent in principle with other provisions of the laws we administer. For example, 38 U.S.C. 3010(1), provides that, under certain conditions, monthly benefits, such as compensation or pension, may be awarded retroactively to the date on which application was filed with the service department for correction of the discharge. We would favor the enactment of this bill. There is no data available upon which to predicate an estimate of the cost which would result from its enactment. However, it is believed that relatively few cases would be affected and that the cost would not be significant.

We were advised by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to a similar report on this bill to the chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that there was no objection from the standpoint of this administration's program to the presentation of the report to that committee.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

DEDUCTION FOR CHILD CARE EXPENSES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, H.R. 2085.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2085) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that portions of the report on the bill—No. 69—be printed in the RECORD in explanation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 2085, as amended, would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make the $600 child-care deduction available, on the same basis as for widows, to women who have been deserted by their husbands. However, for the woman to have this status she must have been deserted by her husband, not know his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, and must have applied to a court to compel him to pay support. Thus, such women would not be required to file a joint return with their husband in order to be eligible for the child-care deduction and the deduction would not be decreased $1 for every dollar of earnings above $4,500.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

Under present law (sec. 214) a deduction of up to $600 a year can be taken for expenses incurred by a woman or a widower for the care of a dependent son or daughter (or stepson or stepdaughter) under age 12 (and also for dependents who are physically or mentally incapable of caring for themselves) if the care is to enable the individual involved to be gainfully employed. However, for working wives who are married to obtain this deduction they must file a joint income tax return with their husbands. In this case the deduction allowable is reduced $1 for each dollar of income of the husband and wife in excess of $4,500. For purposes of this provision a woman is not considered as married if she is legally separated from her husband under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance.

This bill would amend present law to treat in the same manner as a widow, a woman who has been deserted by her husband. For this treatment to be available, however, she must not know of the husband's whereabouts nor have known of his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year. Also, she must have applied to a court of competent jurisdiction to compel him to pay support or otherwise comply with the law or a judicial order (as determined under regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate).

Your committee has reported this bill favorably because it believes that where women clearly have been deserted by their husbands, they should be eligible for any child-care-expenditure deduction in the same manner as a widow. Under present law they cannot obtain this deduction because of the requirement that they file a joint return with the husbands who deserted them. Moreover, even apart from this restriction, the deduction under present law would be of limited value, because it decreases if they earn more than $4,500 a year and disappears entirely if their earnings exceed $5,100 a year. No comparable restriction is imposed in the case of widows. Your committee has favorably reported this bill because it believes these women should be treated, for purposes of this deduction, in the same manner as widows.

This provision is to apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this bill.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report of the Treasury Department follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, March 12, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 2085, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

This bill would amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction for the expenses of child care to a wife who has been deserted by her husband whose whereabouts is unknown and has not been known at any time during the taxable year provided she has applied to a court of competent jurisdiction to compel the husband to pay support or otherwise comply wtih the law or a judicial order.

Under present section 214, a married woman is entitled to a deduction of up to $600 for the care of children under 12 and disabled dependents of any age, only if she files a joint income tax return with her husband. The deduction is reduced dollar-for-dollar to the extent the couple's combined adjusted gross income exceeds $4,500. Thus, a married woman who has been deserted by her husband and cannot locate him is deprived of the child-care deduction because she is unable to file a joint return. On the other hand, a single woman or a woman who has been divorced or is legally separated from her husband may claim such a deduction on her separate return.

A wife who has been deserted by her husband and left without financial support for her children is frequently in a more difficult financial situation than a woman who is divorced or legally separated from her husband because in the latter case, a court will generally require and enforce some form of support arrangement for dependent children before granting the decree of divorce or of legal separation. Since the child-care deduction was originally authorized to alleviate the burdens on families where the mother had to work in order to maintain minimum living standards and had to pay for child care while outside the home, it seems inequitable to deprive deserted wives of this form of assistance when they are in similar circumstances.

Accordingly, the Treasury is sympathetic to the policy underlying H.R. 2085 and, in his statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on the current tax program, the Secretary recommended the adoption of the amendment proposed in H.R. 2085. Because the Secretary has also recommended other liberalizing changes in section 214 of the Code which H.R. 2085 would amend, and testimony has been received which might cause the House committee to suggest further changes, you may wish to give thought to whether it would not be more appropriate to consider the instant amendment in the light of the overall proposals with respect to section 214.

Except for this suggestion, the Department has no reservation concerning H.R. 2085 and favors its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

TAX TREATMENT OF REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 68, H.R. 1597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

(c) Redeemable Ground Rent Defined.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term "redeemable ground rent" means only a ground rent with respect to which—

(1) there is a lease of land which is assignable by the lessee without the consent of the lessor and which (together with periods for which the lease may be renewed at the option of the lessee) is for a term in excess of 15 years,

(2) the leaseholder has a present or future right to terminate, and to acquire the entire interest of the lessor in the land, by payment of a determined or determinable amount, which right exists by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or privately created condition, and

(3) the lessor's interest in the land is primarily a security interest to protect the rental payments to which the lessor is entitled under the lease.

And, on page 4, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the report on the bill (Rept. No. 72) be printed in the RECORD at this point in explanation of the provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 1597, as amended, in effect deals with the tax treatment in Maryland of both the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this real property subject to the redeemable ground rent. For the home buyer the ground rent paid is treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, is deductible by him for tax purposes. The seller of the real property subject to the redeemable ground rent is treated as if he had sold the property subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent is taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and, therefore, is reflected in any gain (or loss) recognized to him. Under the bill, as amended, the deduction of the ground rent, as the equivalent of a mortgage interest payment, is available for 1962 and subsequent years. In the case of the seller of the property, however, the new treatment in general applies only in the case of transactions occurring after the date of enactment of the bill.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it favors the enactment of the bill as amended by your committee.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

In Maryland private homes have often been sold subject to so-called ground rents. A ground rent is an obligation assumed by the home buyer to pay a fixed amount per year on the property. Under Maryland law, 5 years after the creation of a ground rent any holder of the property may redeem the ground rent by paying an amount computed by capitalizing the rental payment at a 6-percent rate. From 1921 until the decision in the Welsh case (cited below) Treasury Department rules and regulations treated ground rents as mortgages in every respect. Accordingly, the annual rents were deductible as interest by the home buyer, and the seller of the home included the redemption price of the ground rent in his sale price in the same manner as the face amount of a purchase money mortgage.[1]

In 1956, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held in *Estate of Ralph W. Simmers* (231 F. 2d 909, affirming 23 T.C. 869) that a person retaining a Maryland ground rent is the actual owner of the property (i.e., the lessor) and, therefore, that a builder who sold houses subject to such rents would not have to include the capitalized value of these rents in his sales price to determine gain (or loss) in the manner in which mortgages are included. The same general principle was followed in *Welsh Homes, Inc.* v. *Commissioner* (32 T.C. 239, affirmed 279 F. 2d 391). The amount of gain not included in current income is somewhat different in the two cases although under both decisions additional gain would be taken into account on redemption of the ground rent.[2]

---

[1] The Treasury position is apparent from G.C.M. 2042; C.B. VI-2, 182 (1921); and I.T. 2679, C.B. XII-1 103 (1933).

[2] Assume a purchaser pays $12,000 for a home subject to an annual ground rent of $120. Capitalizing this at 6 percent indicates a value for the ground rent of $2,000. Thus, the total value of the property is $14,000. Assume the land cost $500 and the house $10,000, a total cost of $10,500. The

With these two decisions that the person retaining the ground rent was the owner of the property, the Treasury Department could no longer maintain its position that the payment of the ground rent was deductible interest payment rather than a nondeductible rental payment. Therefore, effective as of January 1, 1962, the Treasury Department changed its regulations to conform with the principles of the two court cases, both as to the home buyer and as to the seller.

Your committee believes, without regard to the formal legal theory involved, that the result obtained under the court decisions in practice is the wrong result. It sees no reason why the home buyers in Maryland should receive smaller deductions for tax purposes with respect to payments made on their homes than is true of taxpayers elsewhere with respect to similar payments made on their homes.

On the other hand, there also appears to be no justification in permitting the seller of the property in these cases to reduce the gain at the time of his sale below that which would be realized in other States merely by making use of the redeemable ground rent device available in Maryland, rather than a purchase money mortgage which generally would be used in most other States to achieve substantially the same results.

In view of these considerations, your committee's bill, as amended, restores the old rules and regulations of the Treasury Department. First, the code is amended to provide that annual or periodic rentals under a redeemable ground rent (except the amounts paid in redemption of this rent) are to be treated as interest paid on a mortgage indebtedness. Second, the special rules of the code dealing with gain or loss on the disposition of property are amended to treat a redeemable ground rent as a mortgage and to provide that real property held subject to liabilities under a ground rent is to be treated as being held subject to liabilities under a mortgage.

The bill provides different effective dates for the deduction of ground rents by home buyers and the determination of the price received by the seller of property. In addition, the bill also provides transition rules to deal with those situations where homes have been sold in earlier years.

First, for the homeowner, ground rents are to be deductible in the case of rents paid or accrued on or after January 1, 1962. This is the same date existing regulations denying such a deduction were to become effective (sec. 1.163-1(b) of the regulations). By making this change, Congress will be assuring the uninterrupted continuation of the allowance of ground rent as a deduction.

Second, the basis adjustments, made to treat the capitalized value of ground rents in the same manner as mortgages, in general are effective on the day after the date of enactment of this bill. After that date, regardless of when the property was acquired, both in determining the basis and sales price of property held subject to a ground rent, the capitalized value of the ground rent is to be taken into account in the same manner as a mortgage. Thus, the sales price would be increased by such an amount and the basis of the property would be increased by this amount if the property was transferred subject to a ground rental.

Third, rules are provided for the builder or other person who before the date of enactment of this section sold real property retaining a redeemable ground rent, for determining the basis of the redeemable ground rent itself when it, after the date of enactment, is sold or redeemed. If he took the redeemable ground rent into account for tax purposes in the past in determining his sales price for the real property, then there will be included in the basis of the ground rent in his hands this same amount in the case of a subsequent redemption or sale. If he did not in the past take the redeemable ground rent into account for tax purposes in determining the sales price of the property, then he may not take this value into account as part of the basis of the redeemable ground rent when it is sold or redeemed.

Your committee's amendments changed the bill, as passed by the House, so that it will add to the Internal Revenue Code a new section 1055(c) which will define a redeemable ground rent. Your committee feels that this definition will make the effect of the bill considerably clearer.

The "redeemable ground rents" which constitute the arrangements to which the term as used in the bill refers, are agreements in the form of freely assignable leases, as to which there is a statutory right to redeem upon payment of the capitalized value of the rentals reserved in the agreement at a rate not in excess of that fixed by statute. These leases are usually renewable and are for very long terms. In Maryland, in order to have a statutory right of redemption the term (including renewals) must be for at least 15 years and is frequently for 99 years. These arrangements are used primarily as vehicles in the financing of the purchase of real property. An essential characteristic is that in actuality the "tenant" has the equivalence of fee simple ownership in the land, and the "landlord" has only a security interest in the property to protect the rental payments to which he is entitled. The landlord does not have the usual liabilities of a landowner for taxes on the property, nor in tort. Upon ejectment of the "tenant" for nonpayment of the ground rent, the "tenant" has certain rights to redeem his property by curing his default within a limited period of time (similar to the remedy of a mortgagor with an equity of redemption).

The term "redeemable ground rent," as used in the bill, refers to an arrangement in the form of an assignable lease as to which a right to redeem upon payment of a determined or determinable amount exists by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or privately created condition. Thus, the bill does not alter the existing law applicable to a lease joined with an option to purchase. Accordingly, in any case in which the "tenant" has a right to extinguish the reversionary interest, which right was created by action of the landowner, this arrangement will be treated as a true lease or as a mortgage, as the case may be, in the same manner as if this bill had not been enacted. This will, of course, also be true even if the right to extinguish the reversionary interest was originally created by an earlier landlord for the benefit of a former "tenant."

Of course redeemable ground rents not of the type referred to by the bill, but which are still the substantial equivalent of mortgages bearing interest and to which the Simmers and Welsh Homes decisions do not apply, would continue to be treated in accordance with current Treasury practice. For example, there would be no change in the treatment of Pennsylvania redeemable ground rents created as separate charges at the same time as the owner of the real property conveyed a fee simple estate.

III. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Subsection (a) of the first section of the bill, as reported, amends section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for interest) to provide that the annual or periodic rental payments under a redeemable ground rent is to be treated as interest on an indebtedness secured by a mortgage. This does not apply to amounts paid in redemption of the ground rent.

Thus, it will be clear that a homeowner will be able to deduct rental payments as interest in the same manner as has been done from 1921 through 1961 under the Treasury practice. Also, ground rent payments will be treated as interest for all other purposes of the income tax. Thus, for example, it will be clear that ground rents are not to be treated as "rents" for purposes of the first sentence of section 543(a)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to personal holding company income). However, these payments will be treated as rents for purposes of that subsection to the same extent as ordinary mortgage interest is so treated in the special case described therein (interest payments on purchase money mortgages received by a corporation selling real property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business). Accordingly if a corporation is owned by two individuals and is not engaged in the building business, it is a personal holding company if 80 percent of its gross income is from ground rents. On the other hand, if a corporation is engaged in the building business and sells houses, reporting the gain from such sales as ordinary gain, the interest produced by the ground rents reserved on the sale of such houses is treated as rent income, so that even if 80 percent of its gross income is from this source, it is not a personal holding company.

Subsection (b) of the first section of the bill inserts a new section 1055, in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (old sec. 1055 being renumbered as sec. 1056). Subsection (a) of this new section provides that a redeemable ground rent is to be treated as being in the nature of a mortgage and that real property held subject to liabilities under a ground rent is to be treated as being held subject to a mortgage. Thus, under this section it will be clear that the transfer of property subject to a redeemable ground rent has the same effect as the transfer of property subject to a mortgage; that the acquisition of property subject to a redeemable ground rent is to be treated the same as the acquisition of property subject to a mortgage, and that the holding of property subject to a redeemable ground rent is to be treated in the same manner as the holding of property subject to a mortgage.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of new section 1055 provides that subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date of enactment of this section and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of new section 1055 provides that in determining the basis of real property held subject to a redeemable ground rent subsection (a) is to apply whether the real property was acquired before or after the enactment of this section. In other words, if a homeowner paid $10,000 in cash for a house subject to a ground rent redeemable for $2,000, his basis for the house is $12,000 whether he acquired

---

gain on the transaction under the two cases and under the bill is as follows:

	Cost or basis	Sale price	Gain
Bill	$10,500	$14,000	$3,500
Simmers case	10,000	12,000	2,000
Welsh case	9,000	12,000	3,000

The bill determines the gain as the difference between the total sales price and the total cost or basis. Under the Simmers case the gain is computed as the difference between the sales price and the cost or other basis of the house alone. Under the Welsh case the sales price is the same as in the Simmers case. However under the Welsh case the basis of the interest transferred bears the same ratio to the total basis of the house and land as the sales price bears to the sum of the redemption price of the ground rent plus such sales price.

it before or after the date of enactment of the bill. Similarly, if on the date of the enactment of the bill property is owned with a carryover basis (because of a tax-free transaction), the basis of the present owner's predecessor in interest is to be determined by treating a redeemable ground rent as a mortgage. Thus, for example, if in 1962 a corporation acquired a house subject to a redeemable ground rent in a transfer to which section 351 applied, the basis of the transferor of the property is to be determined by treating any redeemable ground rent to which it was subject in such transferor's hands as a mortgage.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of new section 1055 provides transitional rules for persons who reserved or created a ground rent on or before the date of enactment of the bill. Under these rules, a person who transferred the right to hold real property reserving a redeemable ground rent and who did not take the ground rent into account for income tax purposes at the time of the transfer, will not have any greater basis than his cost for such ground rent.

This may be illustrated by some simple examples. Assume in all cases that a builder purchased land for $500 and erected a house thereon for $10,000. Thereafter he sold the house for $12,000, reserving a ground rent redeemable for $2,000 ($120 a year)—

(1) In the first case, the builder reported a $2,000 gain on the sale of the house, treating the sale price as $12,000 and his cost as $10,000. Since the builder did not take the ground rent into account at all on the prior sale of property, his basis for the ground rent is not more than $500 (the cost of the land not offset against the sale price of the house.) Thus, if he sells the ground rent for $2,000, he has a gain of $1,500.

(2) In the second case, the builder reported a gain of $3,000 on the sale of the house, treating the sale price received by him as $12,000 but treating his cost allocable to the house and leasehold at 12,000/14,000ths of his total $10,500 cost, or $9,000. In the case of this builder, since he still has remaining $1,500 of unallocated cost, his basis for the ground rent is $1,500. Thus, if he sells it for $2,000, his gain is $500.

(3) In the third case, the builder reported $3,500 gain. He obtained this result by treating his receipts on the sale as $14,000 ($12,000 cash plus a ground rent redeemable for $2,000), and computing his costs as $10,000 for the house and $500 for the land. Since this builder took the entire amount of the ground rent into account in computing his gain, his basis for the ground rent is $2,000. Thus, if he sells the ground rent for $2,000, he has no gain and no loss on the transaction.

Subsection (c) of the new code section 1055 sets forth a definition of a redeemable ground rent. Under this definition, a redeemable ground rent is a ground rent payable under a lease assignable by the lessee without the consent of the lessor which (including possible renewal periods) is for a term in excess of 15 years. The definition also provides that the leaseholder must have a present or future right to acquire the entire interest of the lessor by payment of a determined or determinable amount and that this right must exist by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or any privately created condition. Finally, the definition provides that the lessor's interest must be primarily a security interest to protect the rental payments to which he is entitled.

Subsection (d) of the new code section 1055 adds a cross-reference to section 163(c) relating to treatment of rentals under redeemable ground rents as interest.

Subsection (c) of the first section of the bill adds to section 163 a cross-reference to the new section 1055.

Subsection (d) of the first section of the bill makes a conforming amendment to the table of sections for part IV of subchapter O of chapter 1.

Under section 2 of the bill, the amendments made by subsection (a) of the first section of the bill are to take effect as of January 1, 1962, and are to apply with respect to taxable years ending on or after such date. The amendments made by subsection (b) of the first section of the bill are to take effect on the day after the date of enactment of this bill and are to apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to note, with respect to this bill, that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] was much concerned and quite active in securing the committee's favorable report, and urging its acceptance. The Senator from Maryland is now in Mexico as a part of our official delegation to the Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico. I wanted to note for the Record his activity in connection with the bill just passed.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 65, Senate Resolution 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 56) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly recommended to the Judiciary Committee a request for $450,000, plus an estimated $25,000 to take care of the legislative salary increase of 7 percent, making a total of $475,000. This was calculated to take care of salaries and other expenses on the same basis as last year, and including the same number of employees on the payroll of the subcommittee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] had said to me that the minority desired and needed additional personnel consisting of two additional attorneys, one economist and two stenographers.

Their present personnel consists of three very able lawyers, of the senior range, and a secretary.

This increase in personnel for the minority would mean an additional expenditure for salaries of approximately $55,000 or $56,000 per year and bring the total amount of salaries for those assigned to the minority to approximately $110,000 per year.

I stated to Senators Dirksen and Hruska that I would be willing to provide from the $475,000 recommended by the subcommittee one additional employee for the minority which could be an attorney or an economist, as the minority preferred, but that we would not be able to do more than that unless extra funds were provided for that purpose. Since the minority did not move for the extra appropriation necessary for this purpose, the subcommittee's recommendation was limited to the $475,000 necessary to carry the payroll in the same amount as last year.

In the Judiciary Committee, discussion of the need of the minority for additional staff people led to a decision by the Judiciary Committee to increase the request from $475,000 to $535,000 in order to give additional assistance to the minority on the subcommittee. This additional personnel was to include two attorneys, one economist, and two stenographers. The amounts which I have stated were the amounts necessary for the operation of the subcommittee for 12 months.

In the Rules Committee the total amount approved was $443,250 for the 11 months remaining, after excluding funds made available to the subcommittee during February 1963. This amount approximates the amount recommended by the subcommittee to the Judiciary Committee of $475,000 for the 12-month period. Thus, as the resolution stands before the Senate at this time, the funds available to the subcommittee for this legislative year will be approximately the same as the funds were last year, plus the legislative increase in salaries of 7 percent. I want to make it clear now that as chairman of the subcommittee I must say to my colleagues constituting the minority of the subcommittee that it will not be my intention to reduce the present majority staff who are needed by the majority to carry on the program of the subcommittee in order to afford to the minority additional employees other than the one attorney or economist which I will undertake to make available, as I stated to Senator Dirksen, when the matter of this resolution was before the subcommittee, and when it was being discussed by the Judiciary Committee. I also made this fact clear in my statement to the Rules Committee.

I recognize that the subject matter with which this subcommittee deals is one involving complex law and difficult economic problems. I appreciate the need of any member of this subcommittee for expert assistance in performing the duties incumbent upon a member of this subcommittee. For that reason, since the minority considers additional assistance is needed, I am willing to support their effort to make the funds for that purpose available. I have, accordingly, agreed to sponsor, with the Senator from Illinois, an amendment increasing the amount, on an 11-month period, to $490,000, which will be an amount sufficient to employ the 5 additional personnel over a period of 11 months.

I wished to make my position clear and to state how the matter stood.

I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and myself, for the purpose of increasing the amount to $490,000 on an 11-month basis, beginning March 1, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$535,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$443,250".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I now ask that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois and myself be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered to the committee amendment, on page 3, line 8.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 17, immediately after the word *"Provided,"* it is proposed to strike out "that the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee", and to insert in lieu thereof "That from the amount authorized under the provisions of this resolution for the expenses of the committee, the amount of $94,500 on an eleven-month basis shall be available for temporary technical, clerical, and other assistants, economists, and consultants compensations determined by the Members of the Minority"; and on page 3, in line 8, to delete "$535,000", and in lieu thereof to insert "$490,000 on an eleven-month basis beginning March 1, 1963".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so that the record may be complete, I should state that when the subcommittee was first considering its budget, there was projected a figure of $475,000. I first moved that the item be cut by $100,000. That proposal did not prevail. Then the $475,000 budget was approved.

Along with my associates on the minority, we abstained from voting when this matter came to the full committee. We made the point that we are inadequately staffed on the minority side, and thought that something should be done about it forthwith. As a result of these deliberations, and in the course of them, we made the point that we should have an economist and we should have two additional counsel and two clerical employees, in addition to the counsel that we already had, for the minority members of the subcommittee.

It was agreed in the Judiciary Committee that this should be done. The chairman's letter sets it forth in the report, and in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration it is indicated that that committee had no intention of disturbing any agreement made in the full Judiciary Committee.

However, the amount was cut, and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said he could not release any of his present staff of 31 people, and that there would not be funds enough to take care of the minority needs.

I thought we made a very good case. In the first place, we looked at all the activities of the committee last year. I ask unanimous consent that this table and agenda now be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE RESOLUTION FOR FUNDS

I

A look at the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee activities report for year 1962, indicates that it concerned itself with:

	Witnesses	Days	Pages
1. 2. Drugs and patent interference	60	28	4,217
3. Civil demand legislation [1]	------	------	------
4. Railroad mergers	27	9	1,644
5. Packaging and labeling	41	15	1,104
6. Concentration [2]	------	------	------
7. Hearing aids	11	5	533
8. Steel	None	2	190
9. Space satellite communications	16	9	757
10. Price fixing in electrical industry	48	26	2,612
11. Strengthening antitrust penalties	9	3	218
12. Insurance (no hearings in 1962)	47	21	5,708
13. Foreign commerce [3]	------	------	------
Total	259	118	16,983

[1] Senate hearings and legislation completed in 1961.

[2] No hearings. Report prepared by Bureau of Census.

[3] No hearings. Several executive session discussions.

II

A look at the agenda for the 88th Congress submitted by the chairman indicates that the subcommittee probably pursued the following things:

1. Publishing of papers by leading antitrust experts—lawyers and economists, which was begun last year.
2. Publishing electric manufacturing industry reports which resulted from hearings during the past 2 years.
3. Subcommittee plans to keep abreast of legislation passed in drug field during past year.
4. Consideration of legislation in the field of professional team sports.
5. Continue to find legislative remedies in professional boxing.
6. Staff will look into complaints regarding the U.S. Olympic Committee.
7. Continue study of its overall concentration.
8. Looking into the number of practices in manufacture and sale of proprietary drugs and in the furnishing of certain types of services in the health field.
9. Packaging and labeling practices.
10. Continue its examination into the insurance industry.
11. Will continue to keep informed of developments in the steel industry and other basic elements, especially those with which vertical integration has become a serious problem.
12. Dangers to competition inherent in conglomerate integration.
13. Government procurement contracts, especially Defense Department and GSA contracts and to whom they go.
14. Another Defense problem dealing with concentration resulting from patents whose research is financed by the taxpayers.
15. Interrelation between antitrust and the emergence of the Common Market.
16. Another international problem (a) deterioration in our balance of payments; (b) high domestic industry concentration and possible restricted arrangements; (c) foreclosure of markets to smaller companies.
17. Mergers in several major branches of the transportation industry.
18. Such legislation as the President may recommend.
19. Subcommittee itself will look for ways to improve our antitrust laws.
20. If special and unforeseen circumstances arise which warrant subcommittee's attention to any particular industry or problem.

III

It appears that some of the subcomtee's activities invade the jurisdiction of other standing committees of the Senate, as for example:

1. The railroad merger moratorium bill, S. 3097, which has always been the province of the Senate Commerce Committee.
2. The space satellite communications, which was fully ventilated by the Senate Space Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee.
3. The packaging and labeling investigation to which the Senate Commerce Committee has jurisdiction and expressed interest.
4. Drugs, which normally is heard by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the patent provisions by the Senate Patent Subcommittee.
5. Insurance, which is subject to the jurisdiction of several Senate committees.
6. Common Market, which has been studied by the Joint Economic Committee for several years and by several other committees of Congress.

IV

The majority staff of the subcommittee totals 31 and consists of the following: Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., staff director; Horace L. Flurry, senior counsel; John M. Blair, chief economist; George E. Clifford, assistant counsel; S. Jerry Cohen, assistant counsel; Victor E. Ferrall, assistant counsel; Dorothy D. Goodwin, assistant counsel; Robert M. Hausman, assistant counsel; Charles W. Hughes, assistant counsel; Maurice C. Mackey, Jr., assistant counsel; Herman Schwartz, assistant counsel; Wilbur D. Sparks, assistant counsel; E. Winslow Turner, assistant counsel; Thomas C. Williams, assistant counsel; Lois E. Alexander, economist; E. Wayles Brown, Jr., economist; Irene Till Hamilton, economist; Walter S. Measday, economist; Raymond C. Cole, Jr., investigator; Paul S. Green, editorial director; Julian F. Granger, assistant editorial director; O. Marie Graffam, telephone operator; Kathryn M. Coulter, special assistant to staff director; Janice R. McKellar, executive secretary; Gladys E. Montier, clerk; Lucile Bryant, stenographer; Katherine F. Chaney, stenographer; Catherine M. McCarthy, stenographer; Arlone Read, stenographer; Jo Anne Youngblood, stenographer; Emily Zayyani, stenographer.

V

The minority staff consists of the following: Peter N. Chumbris, counsel; Ronald D. Raitt, counsel; James E. Bailey, counsel; Esther H. Esmond, secretary.

VI

The minority asks for the following additional staff members: One economist, two counsels, and two clerks at salaries to be fixed by the minority members of the subcommittee.

VII

Who does the minority represent? Popular vote 1960 Presidential election: Kennedy, 34,221,349; Nixon, 34,108,546.

In terms of people represented as expressed by their votes at the polls, the minority represents a tremendous segment of the population of the country and is, therefore, entitled to an adequate staff.

VIII

It should be noted that the majority members of the subcommittee have made arrangements to create a subcommittee within the subcommittee with specific members of the majority assigned to the special subcommittees, which permits the majority to be conducting three investigations consecutively, for example: Senator ESTES KEFAUVER is heading the Common Market hearings; Senator PHILIP A. HART, the packaging and labeling hearings; and Senator THOMAS J. DODD, the insurance hearings—all three running almost continuously during the months of March and April. The minority members and their limited staff cannot so readily divide themselves into three groups within a group.

Investigation by this subcommittee resulting in legislation where the whole case cannot be adequately made is like going into court and getting a judgment by default. What does such a condition do to business confidence in the country at the very time when the President through his fiscal program is trying to engender confidence and get the country moving again?

IX

We believe our request is fair and if not acceded to, the activity of the subcommittee should be sharply reduced or canceled altogether.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year we heard 259 witneses. We had 118 days of hearings. We took 16,983 pages of testimony. By reference to be incorporated, an additional 16,000 pages of testimony were taken in the prior session on the drug bill.

I pointed out also that on the new agenda for the present Congress, we are not only going to wander into the national field, but we are going to wander also into the international field. If we get any closer to the moon, probably some members of the committee will take a little trip to the moon to see whether the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and other acts are doing pretty well up there.

For the RECORD I recite that there will be published papers by leading antitrust experts and lawyers and economists. All of this began last year. There will be published electric manufacturing industry reports, which resulted from hearings during the past 2 years. The subcommittee also plans to keep abreast of legislation passed in the drug field during the past year. It will consider legislation in the field of professional team sports. It will continue to consider proposed legislation in the field of professional boxing.

Therefore, we will go into the steel industry, the insurance industry, the boxing industry, and the team sport business. Then we are going to look into complaints regarding the U.S. Olympic Committee. I do not know that that properly belonged before us, but I think it does, and it is on the agenda as outlined by the chairman.

Then we will continue the study of overall concentration. We will look into practices in the manufacture and sale of proprietary drugs, which we only touched heretofore, and into the furnishing of certain types of services in the health field.

A hearing is in progress at present on packaging and labeling. We shall continue to examine into the insurance industry.

Mr. President, we have reached the point now where the subcommittee breaks down into other subcommittees. We have any number of subcommittees in action. One subcommittee, a subcommittee on packaging and labeling, is very busy, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. Hearings on the insurance industry will soon begin under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

We shall examine into the Common Market, and there will be a trip abroad to see what the practices of the Common Market are. We are not only national; we are international.

I hope now that we can amend rule XXV, so that this committee can look into the space field and finally find something that is in orbit. I do not mind. All I want is enough help and enough staffing so that we can keep ahead of activities and be something more than the tail to the kite.

Now we are going to examine into the dangers to competition inherent in conglomerate integration. Mr. President, I will let you figure out what that means.

We shall examine into Government procurement contracts, especially Department of Defense and General Services Administration contracts, and to whom such contracts are awarded.

There is another Defense problem, this one dealing with concentration resulting from patents whose research is financed by the taxpayers.

We will examine into the interrelationship between the antitrust laws and the emergence of the Common Market.

Then there is still another international problem: deterioration in the balance of payments; high domestic industrial concentration and possible restricted arrangements, and foreclosure of markets to smaller companies.

We shall look into mergers in several major branches of the transportation industry and consider such legislation as the President may recommend.

The subcommittee itself will look for ways in which to improve the antitrust laws.

Then, if special and unforeseen circumstances arise, which warrant the subcommittee's attention to any particular industry, we shall examine into that subject as well.

Mr. President, that is a workload. If I did not have another thing to do—if I had no minority leadership chores, no work on the Committee on Finance, or anything else—this agenda would keep me busy 24 hours a day. Mr. President, we cannot pursue these important matters without an adequate minority staff.

The subcommittee's activities have also got into the work of other committees, as in the case of railroad mergers. There was also the communications satellite bill, which was fully ventilated by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. President, I have placed all this information in the RECORD, and I shall ask unanimous consent to have the names of the members of the majority staff of the subcommittee, which total 31, printed in the RECORD.

What we have asked is that we have nine persons—one economist, the necessary clerks, and the necessary counsel—to handle this business. I remind the Senate and I remind the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that we do not speak for a tiny minority, because in 1960, while there were 34,200,000 votes for President on the majority side, there were 34,108,000 Republican votes. So we are speaking for a considerable segment of the country, and we mean to do it as best we can.

We believe, therefore, that the only way in which we can properly do it is to have the necessary staff. That is why we have asked for it.

Much has been said in the press and in the columns about inadequate minority staffing. An attempt was undertaken to correct it in another body, but it failed by one vote. If we do not succeed now, so that, as against a majority staff of 31, we will have a minority staff of at least 9 persons of our own selection, then this fight will continue. I shall encourage the ranking minority members of every standing committee to make absolutely certain that they will have an adequate staff with which to discharge their responsibilities.

It has been said that from the money allowed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, we could have only one additional staff member in addition to the staff we now have.

That is not enough. Besides, no matter how much money was approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the agreement in the full Committee on the Judiciary was that the minority would have nine staff members. The Committee on Rules and Administration, in its own report, indicated that it was not the intention of that committee to disturb any agreement which was had in the full Committee on the Judiciary before that resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. If our distinguished chairman feels that he will be short of money, I shall support him on this amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. If it is a matter of another $40,000, very well; let us have it, and let us do a good job.

I have made the point on the Senate floor before that I think our legislative bodies too often practice harassment of business and industry in this country, and thus destroy and impair confidence at the very time when the President's fiscal program for tax reduction to consumers and producers, and the huge, astronomical deficit, are all designed to get the country moving again. I doubt whether we shall be able to do that if business and industry are constantly to be attacked, so as to diminish confidence, which is that one elusive ingredient without which such a program will never succeed.

So, as the majority from time to time develops its legislative proposals, we want to see what they look like. We want to take them apart and put them together again. We want to determine for ourselves whether we are against them, whether we want to modify them, or whether we want to support them. We cannot do that unless we have an adequate staff. Therefore, I hope that whether objection to this amendment is registered or not, the Senate will approve it, because we will continue to fight if what it proposes is not to be done.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I support the views expressed by the minority leader. For the past several years the minority has had a most difficult task because of the huge volume of material turned out by the members of the staff who are assigned to the majority. The variety, number, and complexity of the problems have already been touched upon by the minority leader. Our task is made quite difficult, when the presence of minority staff members is required at hearings being conducted simultaneously with intensive staff work on other subjects. It is impossible for the minority staff to perform their duties connected with other work of the subcommittee.

For example, hearings are now in progress on the so-called packaging and labeling bill. At the same time, preliminary investigations are being made in connection with the relationship of the antitrust laws to the Common Market. Obviously, when members of the minority staff are tied up in hearings which are actually being held, they are not in a position to devote their time to the studies and surveys which are necessary in other fields which are soon to be explored. There is only one remedy which can be applied, without regard to the total amount of money which ultimately will be allowed to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. That is to provide additional staff for the majority, a staff which can be employed and engaged within the amount of money which is actually allowed.

Whatever the amount of money is, there should be a more equitable representation of the minority, so we can discharge our responsibilities in the many fields which are gone into by the subcommittee.

It is said that is not possible, because the majority staff cannot be cut down in order to allow for additional staff members for the minority. But, Mr. President, there is a solution, namely, to reduce the workload of the committee. Far too often, in my judgment, there have been expeditions and forays into the jurisdiction of other committees, in violation of rule XXV, which relates to the reference of bills and other measures to committees. The prescription drug bill is one. If there is any measure which requires the attention of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is the prescription drug bill. Still others are the bills dealing with Government procurement, with its many side effects. Basically, procurement measures should not be referred to our committee; neither should patent measures be referred to it.

So I suggest that if there is not room enough to solve all the ills of the Nation's economy, perhaps we had better pare down a little and reduce the number of positions presently held by the majority staff members sufficiently to enlarge the minority staff so it can deal intelligently with the measures in the fields in which the committee works.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I support the statement made this afternoon by the minority leader.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the work of the committee is not easy. All members of the committee and all members of the staff have given it a great deal of time. Certainly our Nation is unusual in its free, competitive enterprise system. The antitrust laws are the regulators and the coordinators of that system. I know it is not popular to discuss those laws; but they are the greatest protection to business, both large and small, which our Nation has. Without them, our economy could not exist as it does.

It is a matter of great joy to me to find that the cartel system, under which the European nations have operated so long, and into which some of our corporations have been tied, much to the detriment of our economy, now is losing its strength. Today many of the nations of Europe are getting away from it, and embracing antitrust principles. That development has occurred, and is still occurring, in the Coal and Steel Community and in the Common Market countries. As a result, trade will become freer, and restrictions will be broken down, and it will become easier and more profitable for American businessmen to do business with the nations of Europe and with the Common Market. This is the wave of today. I am very glad that many European nations which have not antitrust laws have profited by our experience and are passing such laws or are planning to do so. Italy will do that. Australia is planning to enact antitrust laws; and the antitrust provisions of the Common Market, as set forth in the Rome Treaty, should be given every encouragement. In many ways, they are improvements over our antitrust laws. The freedom of trade and commerce and, therefore, the unity of the Western World have much to gain by having more nations provide good, workable antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should, instead of sometimes being condemned by businessmen, be applauded, because they are the protectors of what all our businesses want; namely, a free, competitive enterprise system.

Mr. President, I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment would be clearer if, on page 3, in line 8, the committee amendment to strike out "$535,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$443,250" were withdrawn. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that that committee amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMINICK in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to a point of inquiry: Is that the amendment which was cosponsored by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, it is not. The Parliamentarian has informed me that if this amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is withdrawn, the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Illinois and myself will take its place, and in that way the resolution will be clearer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to have the pending amendment read, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 17, immediately after the word "*Provided,*" it is proposed to strike out "that the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee", and to insert in lieu thereof "That from the amount authorized under the provisions of this resolution for the expenses of the committee, the amount of $94,500 on an eleven-month basis shall be available for temporary technical, clerical, and other asistants, economists, and consultants to be appointed by Members of the Minority of the committee, at compensations determined by the Members of the Minority"; and on page 3, in line 8, to delete "$535,000", and in lieu thereof to insert "$490,000 on an eleven-month basis beginning March 1, 1963".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the Chair state whether the amendment is subject to a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment is not subject to such a point of order, in that it is not new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am forced to oppose the amendment, for two different reasons. First, I shall direct my remarks to the portion of the amendment covered by section 2, which, if enacted at this time, would very clearly establish a precedent, in that it would earmark specific funds for the use of minority staff purposes. In the past, a precedent which has been considered by the Rules Committee and has been approved and acted on by it and by the Senate is the one which already is set forth in section 2; namely, "that the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

Mr. President, therefore I would be forced to oppose that provision of the amendment which would change the precedent which has been established in this respect, particularly in view of the fact that it has not been considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee which has reported out the resolution in regard to the presentation that has been made here with the amendment.

Second, I am forced to oppose the amendment as to the amount of money requested for the reason set forth in my statement of March 14 to the Senate, in which I pointed out:

> Naturally enough, money must be appropriated for each committee to permit the proper processing, studying, and reporting of proposed legislation referred according to jurisdiction.

However, as I stated on that occasion, I believe that if we are going to attempt to effect economies, we should start right here at home in our own body and try to exercise some reasonable restraint insofar as the money authorized for the conduct of the business of those committees is concerned.

I should like to point out that the subcommittee which we are now discussing has requested $450,000 on previous occasions. In 1962 the committee requested $450,000; in 1961, $450,000; 1960, $450,000; 1959, $425,000; 1958, $365,000; in 1957, $275,000.

Now we come to a total original request in the appropriation of $535,000, which is almost double the amount requested in 1957. I have checked with the Senate disbursing officer. He informed that, according to his records. 37 employees are employed by the subcommittee at the present time. That is exclusive of when actually employed's or those persons on loan. According to the committee report, the budget was based on 44 employees, including 2 when actually employed's. In other words, that provides a leeway of five employees over and above the amount presently employed by the committee which would be available, exclusive of the when actually employed's who are covered in the report at the present time.

I believe that the committee could reasonably accept a reduction in the amount requested, particularly since it has been a constantly increasing amount, as I have indicated, and also in view of the fact that when we compare the amount with the funds received by some of the other committees, the contrast is evident. For example, the Committee on Armed Services, which is a standing committee of the Senate by statute, may employ 10 staff members, including 4 professional staff members and 6 administrative members. On the basis of full employment for those authorized personnel, the budget would amount to $142,250. In addition, the standing committee can make certain other expenditures up to $10,000 a Congress.

If we were to assume that the important Committee on Armed Services of the Senate during 1963 spent its fully-authorized amount, plus the amount that it has requested for all of its subcommittees to operate during the current year, the total figure would come to only $332,250.

When we consider the operation of a committee of the stature of the Committee on Armed Services, with all of its subcommittees—a committee which exercises jurisdiction over the expenditure of almost $50 billion of the national budget—I submit that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee certainly can live within the amount of money that was recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is the sum of $443,250 for an 11-month period.

That figure was arrived at in the following manner: I proposed an amendment in the Committee on Rules and Administration relating to instances in which subcommittees had requested more than they had requested in the last previous year to pay the increase in salaries and the fringe benefits which were brought about by action of the Congress last year. My amendment would reduce those requests 10 percent. That is the amendment that was applied to the resolution—Senate Resolution 56—here before us today.

The matter of committee staff is a question for the subcommittee to resolve. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will resolve it in a fair and equitable manner between the majority and the minority.

If I remember correctly, I believe the record shows that the minority has five staff employees. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated to our committee that he would be able to give the minority one additional employee on the basis of the reduced appropriation which we have approved in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Again I say that the amendment is poor in two respects: First, it would establish a precedent insofar as fixing a specific amount for the use of the minority in carrying on the business of a subcommittee. Second, the amount approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, as shown in Senate Resolution 56 as amended, in the sum of $443,250 for an 11-month period, is an adequate appropriation. I would merely add that the 11-month authorization is more, proportionately, than the committee received last year and would provide the subcommittee with an adequate amount to pay all of its employees and take care of the additional requirements. As I have previously indicated, the subcommittee budget is based upon the employment of 44 people, including 2 WAE's. The disbursing officer informed me that presently only 37 people are employed on the committee staff.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Merely to keep the record straight, the minority has assigned to it currently not five but four employees. There are three counsel and one stenographer.

The work of the subcommittee is complex and voluminous. There are 37 employees, only four of whom are assigned to the minority. Would that not affect somewhat the Senator's judgment in respect to the question of whether or not fair treatment is extended to the minority?

Mr. CANNON. First, in response to the correction of the distinguished Senator, I am advised that four minority employees are specifically assigned to the subcommittee. But some of the presentations made before the Committee on Rules and Administration have indicated that, in many instances—and I am sure it would be true in this particular instance—employees are not employed by political party, but are employed by the distinguished chairman on the basis of their ability. I am sure that if the record were checked—and I do not know that it is necessary to check it—we would find that the minority certainly has very ample representation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not refer to the political affiliation of the employees. I refer to whether or not they are assigned to the minority to work under instructions of the minority members of the committee. Unless they are responsible to the members of the minority, they are not assigned to it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would be more than fair in seeing that the work of the subcommittee is performed irrespective of who requests it. It is not my understanding that the subcommittee's work is along party lines and that it is doing work for a particular party, but is rather doing work for the business of the subcommittee. I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if it is not a fact that he carries on the business of the subcommittee irrespective of party lines and of what the minority or majority may have employed?

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will yield further, I wish to assure him that the subcommittee is highly political. With respect to most bills it considers there is a sharp division, philosophically, as to whether the proposed investigation even should go forward, and, when bills are proposed, as to whether the bills should be considered favorably or otherwise. The division is not always along the lines of Democrats and Republicans, but certainly along the line of what are commonly called—I believe under a mistaken construction and application—liberal or conservative views.

The subcommittee is highly political. There is no concealing that fact. There is no way for the minority to have representation by calling on members of the majority committee staff, for help in marshaling facts, arguments, and statistics, in opposition to a bill which the majority wants. That simply does not work.

Mr. CANNON. I say to the distinguished Senator that if the facts did not sustain their position, I do not think it would help the minority members whether they had 5, or 10, or 20 people.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will yield further, the situation now is that for more than a year there has been an investigation and study into the Common Market antitrust laws. That has been done by the members of the majority staff. We shall, in due time, go into the matter of hearings.

We have not had, on the minority side, the opportunity to have the subject studied so that we will know what facts to look for, or what witnesses would support a given point of view so that we could have a fair and impartial hearing.

It seems to me that procedure is not fair. We cannot, as a minority, ask members of the majority staff to make a study and find out things which will not strictly conform to the thinking of the majority.

Mr. CANNON. Again I say to the distinguished Senator, I do not believe that staff members are assigned to represent particular views. I think they are assigned to carry out the duties of the subcommittee.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the entire staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee is directed to carry out the work of the subcommittee, irrespective of whether it may benefit one party or another? Is that not the situation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Generally that is true. The staff is assigned to try to get the facts, to obtain witnesses, and to carry out the work of the subcommittee. Of course, many members of the staff are stenographers, secretaries, clerks, and telephone girls.

I wish to say further that generally antitrust matters should not be partisan. For instance, the Common Market problem is not partisan in any way at all, that I can see.

I do not think that the drug bill, which the Senate finally passed last year, was a partisan matter; although I recognize that in the presentation of witnesses and evidence, and considering attitudes toward bills, there are times when there are very sharp conflicts as between some of the majority members and some of the minority members.

I think I should also say that it is true, as has been pointed out, that various members of the subcommittee have been carrying on different activities.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has been very busy studying, and has kept a great many staff members occupied, in connection with the labeling legislation and tax legislation, which is of importance.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] will start hearings soon in connection with certain aspects of the insurance industry.

Antitrust legislation is very technical and very time consuming, and a great deal of research is needed. I should like for the majority members to have an adequate staff, and I should like for the minority members to have the staffing and the representation that they feel they need. That is the reason I have joined with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in sponsoring the amendment.

That was the attitude of the full Committee on the Judiciary, I say to my friend from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the Senator from Tennessee, is it not a fact that all the committee staff members are available for use by either the majority or the minority, as the members see fit?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; they are available when they are called upon, although many times they are so busy working on some matter that they may not be immediately available.

The staff members are experts in regard to antitrust matters. I can understand why the minority members would like to have lawyers and economists to whom they can give direct assignments, to present their particular side of some antitrust problem.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the score of borrowing staff or referring matters, the Senator from Nebraska has in mind, for example, the problem in regard to the railroad merger bill. The chairman, and the majority want a bill which would freeze, under certain circumstances, railroad mergers as of December 31 of this year.

Here is a Member of the Senate from Nebraska who is opposed to that bill. How practical would it be, Mr. President, to ask a staff member whose loyalty runs to the chairman of the subcommittee to engage himself in working out a brief, arguments, and facts against the bill which the chairman of the subcommittee is advocating? How could a person on a staff serve two masters?

These are positions which are diametrically opposed to each other. One says "Yes" and one says "No."

The same was true with respect to the drug bill, when there was an effort to amend the patent laws of this country. Some of us took strenuous exception to that. How much confidence could I have in asking a member of the majority staff, who is beholden to the chairman of the subcommittee for his appointment and for his continued employment, to develop facts, figures, history and arguments in opposition to the position taken by the chairman of the subcommittee? I do not think that would be practical.

No member of a subcommittee staff should have to work for more than one master. He cannot do the work conscientiously in such a situation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I merely restate my position, that the matter of staff is a matter for the subcommittee to determine. I think that position has consistently been followed, except for the provision written into section 2 of the resolution as it was presented, providing for a minority representative.

It would be a mistake, in my opinion, for this body to attempt to fix a proportion as between staff members of the respective parties. If that were to be done, again I point out that according to the Senate Disbursing Office there are now only 37 employees, and the budget presented was based on 44 employees, which is a difference of 7. Of the 44 listed, 2 are WAE's, so there is plenty of room in the budget for additional staff people. That is a matter for the subcommittee to determine and not for the Senate to determine.

The Committee on Rules and Administration, which reported Senate Resolution 56, considered the matter of the total appropriation, of the total authorization, and saw fit to reduce it. Mr. President, I submit that that reduction is proper.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. May I direct the Senator's attention to page 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, in particular the fifth full paragraph, which reads:

> In amending Senate Resolution 56 to reduce the total expenditure authorization requested therein, it was not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to disturb any agreement relating to majority and minority pro rata representation on the staff of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monoply.

I suppose that language should be read in connection with the last two sentences on that page, the last sentence of which reads:

> As the attached budget indicates, the minority will be furnished with five lawyers, one economist, and two clerical assistants.

That was a decision of the entire Judiciary Committee. Was it not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to accommodate that agreement and settlement which was made in regard to the personnel?

Mr. CANNON. Not insofar as the last statement is concerned. The Senator from Nebraska was reading from a letter from the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee to the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly.

Mr. CANNON. The Rules Committee reduced that amount. It was based on the original $535,000 request, which the Rules Committee did not see fit to approve. The Rules Committee, however, did approve the language which the Senator read first—that it was not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to disturb any agreement relating to majority and minority prorata representation on the staff of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

That was the intention of the Rules Committee. It still is. That is the point I am making here. This is not a matter for the Judiciary Committee to determine. The Rules Committee did not see fit to change it, but it did reduce the amount requested and acted on that basis. That is the basis of Senate Resolution 56. That is the reason why I am opposing both parts of the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska would like to point out that 44 positions are authorized and yet it is felt there cannot be an accommodation to extend to the minority 5 additional employees to make an attempt to meet in part, at least, the 33 who remain on the staff representing the majority. It seems to me that, unless some effect is given to the language on page 2 which I first cited, the plain intent of the Rules and Administration Committee cannot be carried out, because we have been told by the chairman of the subcommittee that he does not intend to give us any more than one additional person to represent the minority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator will recall that I stated to the Rules Committee on both occasions that if the reduced amounts were agreed upon I would be able, out of the sums, to find a place for one senior attorney or economist, as they wished, but unless the increased amount were agreed to, it would not be possible to have five additional employees. That has been my statement in connection with this difficulty now.

That fact is made clear in the letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. Eastland], which appears at the bottom of page 2 of the report—that the reason for the additional amount was the additional five employees.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-objection, it is so ordered.

MARITIME COMMERCE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been keeping in close touch with the list of ships serving the Cuban trade, and from time to time I have placed in the Record a compiled list of the names of ships, the flag of registry, and the gross tonnage. These ships include only ships of free or neutral nations, whichever characterization we may wish to make with respect to them, but does not include the so-called bloc ships. By that I mean, of course, ships that come from the Soviet bloc, with the exception of those listed from Yugoslavia.

I have tried to keep the list up to date. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point, for the benefit of Senators and others who may be following this subject, a list of ships of the free world, but including Yugoslavian ships, which have called in Cuba during the period of January 31 to March 8, 1963, based upon information received from the Maritime Administration.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Name of Ship, Flag of Registry, and Gross Tonnage—20 Ships

Apollon, Greek, 9,744.
Baltyk, Polish, 6,984.
Bar, Yugoslavia, 7,233.
Bialystok, Polish, 7,173.
Cavat, Yugoslavia, 7,266.
King Theseus, Greek, 9,153.
Kongsgaard (tanker), Norwegian, 19,999.
Kyra Hariklia, Greek, 6,888.
London Independence, British (tanker), 22,643.
London Majesty, British (tanker), 12,132.
London Pride, British (tanker), 10,776.
Mastro-Stelios II, Greek, 7,282.
Ole Bratt, Norwegian, 5,252.
Overseas Explorer, British (tanker), 16,267.
Pantanassa, Greek, 7,131.
Piast, Polish, 3,184.
Polyclipper, Norwegian (tanker), 11,737.
Shienfoon, British, 7,127.
Stylianos N. Vlassopulos, Greek, 7,244.
Tulse Hill, British, 7,120.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is seen by this list that in this short period 20 ships called in Cuban ports. The British are far out in front in terms of total tonnage. During a 5½-week period from January 31 through March 8, these British ships have totaled 76,000 gross tons, including two ships in the 16,000 to 22,000-ton class.

Greece is the only other country whose combined tonnage was significant. These vessels in this period amounted to 47,442 gross tons.

The combined tanker tonnage of 93,555 tons shipped much needed petroleum products in vessels flying the British, Greek, and Norwegian flags.

A few days ago I placed in the Record the number of ships which came through the Panama Canal and stopped in Cuba. They include a very formidable list of ships which either have called in Communist China or were on their way back from Cuba to Communist China.

I have before me a news release, and probably if I had called attention to this matter over a period of weeks, it might have had some effect on the administration's hopes that the nations of the free world would join with us in this matter, particularly in relation to supplying Cuba with commodities when we have the quarantine in existence. Of course, our ships cannot call in Cuba. If they do, they cannot discharge and pick up cargo in the United States.

The Greek Government on March 16 issued an order, which I shall read. It is in the nature of a news release, but it covers the pertinent facts. It states:

> Royal Greek Embassy
> Press and Information Service,
> *Washington, D.C., March 16, 1963.*
>
> With reference to press reports from Athens the Royal Greek Embassy announces that a royal decree has been issued banning all vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports.
>
> Exception is only being made for ships under time charter contracted prior to the promulgation of the present decree.
>
> This measure has been taken by the Royal Hellenic Government in full cognizance of the impact on the interests of the Greek mercantile marine industry, already seriously affected by adverse conditions of the international shipping market.

I commend the Hellenic Government for taking this step. I am only hopeful, after reading the list of ships which have been calling in Cuba, that the action of the Hellenic Government might permeate some other governments which are a part of what we like to call the free nations of the world.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Richard H. Holton, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

Edgar F. Kaiser, of California, and sundry other persons, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of the Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392: Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver, O397818, to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment of Senate Resolution 56 to investigate the antitrust and monopoly laws.

REQUEST TO WITHHOLD ACTION ON CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have asked the leadership of the Senate to withhold action on the confirmation of the nominations of the officers and directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. until I shall have finished the preparation of the case, which I think is a very substantial one, against the propriety, advisability, and constitutionality of the Senate allowing itself to be entrapped into the operations of a purely private corporation organized for profit.

I shall raise three questions: First, the propriety of the Senate permitting itself to be used, to become ensnarled in the organization and in the subsequent operations of this private corporation.

Second, the constitutionality of the confirmation by the Senate of officers and directors of a purely private corporation. Section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution provides that the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, "officers of the United States."

Third, I shall raise the question of the legal effect upon the operation of the corporation of the confirmation of the nominations of its officers and directors by the Senate.

I respectfully publicly ask the leadership of the Senate to withhold action on the confirmation of these nominations for a reasonable time, until this case may be properly prepared and presented to the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] upon his request that the Senate withhold action on the confirmation of the nominations of officers to the Communications Satellite Corporation, and upon the study which he is making of the situation.

According to current news on the teletype in the cloakroom, the bylaws which the proposed Satellite Corporation officials have adopted will make it impossible for the general public to buy as much stock as the communications carriers will have. This further confirms the wisdom of the action taken by the Senator from Tennessee.

I have been advised by others that the Communications Satellite Corporation has already borrowed $5 million and has spent two-thirds of it for the employment of personnel, some of them at salaries in excess of $100,000 a year.

In my opinion, the important question before the Senate is the one raised by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who has pointed out that the Constitution provides that the President of the United States shall appoint the officers of the United States. I do not believe it was ever contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that the President should begin to appoint officers of private corporations organized for profit.

RESCINDMENT OF CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF BRIG. GEN. PAUL LEONARD KLEIVER TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation of the nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver to be a major general be vitiated and that the nomination be returned to the Executive Calendar. There had been a request to withhold action on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, and without objection, the request of the Senator from Minnesota is granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

CUBA DIPLOMATIC VICTORY WEAKENED BY ATTACKS AT HOME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the great American diplomatic victories of our time was achieved by the leadership of this administration last October and November in the confrontation between the United States and Soviet Russia over the presence of Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba.

It was not a confrontation between the United States and Cuba; it was a confrontation between the United States and Soviet Russia, in which the President of the United States paid no attention to Castro and never conferred with him. The President conferred solely with the leaders of Soviet Russia.

As a result of the American quarantine of Russian military movements into Cuba, a threefold diplomatic achievement was scored:

First. The Russian ships turned back and did not attempt to break the American blockade and quarantine.

Second. After first denying that there were nuclear missiles in Cuba, Khrushchev then admitted that there were such weapons there.

Third. Khrushchev then agreed to pull all of his nuclear missiles out of Cuba and take them back to Russia. He announced to the world that he was doing that. All of this was a complete about-face for Russia. The United States gained prestige in the eyes of the free world, and gave the Communist powers a lesson in Western Hemisphere solidarity and strength that they will not forget.

Each member of the Organization of American States voted to sustain the American quarantine. At the time of this crisis and confrontation in October and November 1963 I was in Argentina and Brazil as a Member of the U.S. congressional delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting, which was held in Brasilia. I saw the electric effect on Latin America of the firm American stand, of the Russian bluster, then of the Russian confession and promise of rectification. I talked with delegates from Brazil and many other Latin countries.

I saw the prestige of the United States grow in Latin America hour by hour, day by day, until that prestige reached a pinnacle in the eyes of our Latin American neighbors that it had probably never before reached. I think some of the effects of that victory are being reflected in the tumultuous welcome being given President Kennedy in Costa Rica this week.

This diplomatic victory, this achievement of Russian confession of nuclear arms in Cuba, and Russia's promise of doing better, was a diplomatic victory that the world and particularly our Latin American neighbors would not forget, unless we try to make them forget it by our domestic attacks on our own victory.

In fact, nobody has forgotten it except a few who seek to make political capital for American politicians out of power, at the expense of national prestige, strength, and well-being.

Some of the prime critics of the Democratic administration have sought to bury the October 1962 victory of the United States over the Communist powers under a deluge of scare words.

I do not think the American people are going to be scared out of the fruits of their diplomatic victory by politicians in blue shirts on TV.

But perhaps we should grow concerned about politicians who are trying to make political capital for themselves by going into a war dance every time a TV camera points at them. It seems that hardly anybody in political office goes into a war dance nowadays without having first put on a blue shirt for better television reproduction.

It is easier to put on a blue shirt and go before television and talk tough than to put on a helmet and go to war.

It may be that Cuba has stored weapons in caves. It is a matter for the persons responsible for our national security, the Defense Department, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, paratroops, intelligence agencies and the Central Intelligence Agency, to check and to be on guard against it.

But the possibility and the danger of weapons being stored in caves in Cuba ought to be kept in perspective. Which is more dangerous, a weapon stored in a cave, or a nuclear missile on a submarine just off our shores, or a nuclear missile in the Soviet Union with the range to strike American shores, or a set of nuclear weapons on Communist-owned ships, or a war-happy ruler in Communist China with weapons of unknown quantity and power?

The simple truth is that all are dangerous to us; and to single out a weapon in a Cuban cave for cause for special panic and fear in these times is about as sensible as to single out a new model Russian tank as a cause for panic and fear.

Mr. President, a generation of young Americans have lived all their lives with the knowledge that war can come at any time, that when it comes it will be rough on everybody, and that war dances out to be retained only as the Indian tribes have retained them; namely, mostly for show on patriotic holidays, to show the youngsters how things were in the old days.

Mr. President, the Washington Post published on Sunday, March 17, an article written by Philip L. Graham, president of the Post, captioned: "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph." The article is well written, and so is the headline. Mr. Philip Graham has indeed earned an accolade for his well-reasoned, hard-hitting, ably written article. The headline tells the story. I ask unanimous consent that this informative and thoughtful article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham, president, the Washington Post)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed inflex action. That was the President's peremptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba, it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas for his fine defense of the administration's Cuban policy. What he has said is eminently correct.

It occurs to me that it is high time that the carping critics of the administration's policy change their tune, and admit that, insofar as Cuba is concerned, our policy there has been a huge success.

I further agree with the Senator from Texas that the present course of firmness and quiet commonsense which President Kennedy is following with respect to Castro and Cuba and the administration's efforts to mobilize all the other American states to follow a policy of containment to prevent the spread of subversion, but not breaking our treaties and international law, are entitled to the support of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his kind words about me.

I could say no less than I have said, since at the time when this crisis developed, I was—as I have stated—one of the six Members of the Senate, together with six Members of the House of Representatives, in South America, as delegates to the Interparliamentary Union. At the time when the quarantine on Cuba was first proclaimed, those of us who were delegates were asked many questions. It will be recalled that among them was the question of whether Russia would attempt to break through the blockade. But then the ships from Russia turned away.

Then Russia admitted that she had borne false witness to the world about having nuclear missiles in Cuba; and then Khrushchev promised to pull them out of Cuba.

Some persons argue that Khrushchev did not pull all of them out of Cuba. They seek to obscure the greater victory—in that Khrushchev admitted that he was wrong, and promised to pull out of Cuba the missiles he had there. Khrushchev pledged to the people of the United States, to the people of the free world, and to all the world that he would pull those missiles out of Cuba. That was a diplomatic victory of great proportions, and it had an electrifying effect on all those who were assembled at that time at the meeting in Brasília.

I have lived all my life in Texas, and I lived for 3½ years at El Paso, on the border. In all that time I have seen many Latin Americans; but at no other time in my life have I seen the desire of the American people for an American diplomatic victory reach the peak which it reached at that time, in connection with Cuba.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 56) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has an amendment which may clarify this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who wishes to withdraw the amendment he has offered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to join in asking that the pending amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I now submit the following amendment: On page 3, in line 8, to strike out "$535,000", and in lieu thereof insert "$468,250".

This is a compromise figure which is arranged on the basis that the committee shall give us an economist in the range of $16,000; and, in addition thereto, the $25,000 will then be used, under direction of the minority, for the additional staff. We believe we can consummate it and can have a total of eight, instead of nine, as per our original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$535,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "$468,250".

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not wish to be bound by the number "8". The idea is that out of the regular appropriation the minority will get one other person in the economist class; and then I would follow the direction of the Senator from Illinois in connection with the $25,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is understood.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 56), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from march 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $468,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

NUCLEAR-TEST BAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me. I shall be as brief as possible.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] have both been speaking with great eloquence and fervor in behalf of the administration's position on a nuclear-test ban. I wish to join them in their remarks; I think both those Senators are absolutely correct.

At this time I wish to call attention to a very fine editorial, published in the Milwaukee Journal, which supports the position those Senators take.

In the editorial it is pointed out that—

> Any lull in negotiations can be used to good effect here at home. There is a special need to answer congressional critics who accuse treaty negotiators of going too far to accommodate the Russians. There is need to explain to the public why 7 on-site inspections are deemed sufficient now, instead of the 20 which were demanded a few years ago.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal calls for support of the administration's position and for recognition of the overwhelming importance of doing all we can to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union on a nuclear-test ban—and of course to do so in a practical and sensible way, defending our honor, at the same time.

I am very happy to have a chance to place this editorial in the RECORD at a time when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has been leading the fight, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who also has been taking a very active part in the fight, are on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TO PURSUE TEST BAN

Secretary of State Rusk makes clear that efforts to reach agreement with Soviet Russia on a treaty to end nuclear testing will not cease. He concedes that prospects are not bright at the moment.

Until Moscow gives evidence of being more reasonable, negotiations will have to mark time. At the most recent round of Geneva talks, the United States expressed readiness to accept as few as seven onsite inspections of suspicious underground disturbances in enforcement of a treaty. The Soviets clung to their demand for no more than three.

Any lull in negotiations can be used to good effect here at home. There is a special need to answer congressional critics who accuse treaty negotiators of going too far to accommodate the Russians. There is need to explain to the public why 7 onsite inspections are deemed sufficient now instead of the 20 which were demanded a few years ago.

A good start has been made in the letter of Adrian Fisher to Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, a leading critic, by President Kennedy at his press conference, and now by Secretary Rusk.

According to Fisher, the Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, we can safely reduce inspections because of improved detection techniques, and because we now know that there are only 40 percent as many earthquakes in the Soviet Union each year as we originally thought. The fewer earthquakes, the less chance there is of a secret underground nuclear test being mistaken for a natural disturbance. Fisher also pointed out that it would take a series of underground explosions, not a scattered few, to alter the nuclear balance of power.

The President emphasized this point at his press conference and also declared: "We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it."

It remained for Rusk to restate why efforts to achieve a treaty must go on.

"Unless we can find some way to bring a stop to this qualitative arms race," he warned, "the prospect is that there not only will be increasing billions of dollars applied to nuclear testing but the arms race will become increasingly unpredictable."

There is a further danger. The longer the world goes without curbing nuclear testing and the arms race the more nations will join the nuclear bomb club. Some 20 nations, it is estimated, now have the abilities to build a bomb of sorts. The more the nuclear power spreads, the greater the danger of the bomb being used.

There are measures of risk in any agreement between nations, and a test ban treaty would be only a step toward halting the arms race. But as Rusk pointed out, both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have recognized the danger of uncontrolled testing and declared it to be in the interest of America and all mankind to bring testing under control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his strong support on this question, and for bringing to our attention the editorial of the excellent newspaper in Milwaukee, the Milwaukee Journal. It is extremely helpful and reassuring. The fact is that the treaty which our Government is presenting in Geneva today is a more practical, exacting, and safeguarded treaty in terms of American national security interests than any treaty proposal presented at any time in preceding years. It has been worked out on the basis of scientific calculation and fact, as I tried to indicate in the Senate a few days ago, in a detailed and, I believe, a well-documented speech.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was, indeed. It was a superb speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration's proposal at Geneva represents very careful planning and thoughtful consideration of the difficult scientific problems that relate to the detection of earth movements as a result of nuclear blasts. I really believe that the treaty is in our national interest, and I feel, as the editorial states, that we must set the record straight back home so that it does not appear to the public or to the world that the loudest voices in America are opposing the beginnings of some arms control program among the nations of the earth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for putting into the RECORD the fine editorial of the Milwaukee Journal. As the Senator from Minnesota said in this speech, it is difficult indeed to get into print or into the newspapers the true story of the position of the United States in respect to a nuclear test-ban treaty. In his excellent speech to which the Senator from Wisconsin referred, my friend from Minnesota made it perfectly clear that all of the critics of the test-ban position of our Government got headlines and front-page stories. They appeared in newspapers all over the country. At that time when he made his speech, which was the ablest argument in support of the treaty which has yet been made, the Senator from Minnesota predicted it would hardly scratch a line of print in the press the next day. In fact, it did not. The speech got no play in the press anywhere that I saw. Certainly it did not appear in the metropolitan newspapers here or in my State. Yet this very morning, when a certain gentleman over in the other body who has been bitterly opposed to the test-ban negotiations and the possibility of a test-ban treaty, spoke his piece for the third or fourth time, it appeared in headlines: "Republicans Again Attack Test-Ban Treaty."

A picture accompanied the story. I am sure it is an inaccurate representation of the true facts. An enormous area inside of Russia was shown where it is alleged that it would be impossible for an underground nuclear explosion to be detected.

That story appeared prominently in the newspapers. But we do not get in the press a word reporting the sound position of the administration, as so ably set forth on the floor of the Senate in great detail and well documented by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator is absolutely correct in what he has said in reference to the discussion of this very vital issue. Apparently the only way we can get any comment on our position in the columns of the press is by an exchange of letters to the editor in the Washington Post. I do not believe that that is the way news ought to be generated. I think debate should take place in the Senate. Last week or 2 weeks ago we did have a discussion on this whole subject of a nuclear test ban.

Letters to the editor are one thing, but sincere discussion in the Senate on this question is another thing.

I point out that I saw the newspaper story this morning again in the Washington Post, accompanied by a big picture of a Member of the other body showing that there were approximately 2 million square miles in the heartland of Russia which could camouflage or mask nuclear blasts of an underground nature.

The map was drawn so poorly that the person who drew the map would have been flunked in an elementary course in geography at any country school.

More importantly, the facts upon which the map was predicated were incorrect. Anyone who knows enough to come in out of the rain would know that they are wrong. But there is constant repetition of this sheer nonsense—nonsense which, I may add, is rather dangerous. There are several ways to pollute the atmosphere. One way is by nuclear fallout. Another way is by sheer playing political nonsense. We have been witnessing some of that political nonsense. But it seems to get on the front page. I suggest that comics ought to be on the comic page and not on the front page. What has been going on in some of the present talk on nuclear test prohibition is sheer tragedy, and comedy, may I add—comedy in terms of the facts being misleading, and tragedy, and tragic indeed in terms of the consequences to the world.

I wish to thank both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Pennsylvania and, may I say, others in this body whose voices have been raised on the side of a sensible, safeguarded agreement relating to nuclear test prohibition, but those voices are seldom reported. All one needs to do is to say that the administration is selling out the security of our country and, bango, the one making the statement receives four columns across the front page or the inside page. Its appearance does not mean that the speaker has been factual. It means he is irresponsible, and irresponsibility has no place in these matters of the discussion of our national security.

I would add only that if the administration's proposal is so bad and so weakens our security, then why do not the Russians accept it? I thought they were out to give us the business. I thought they wanted to see us destroyed. I thought they wanted to overwhelm us. If the administration is presenting a proposal that is shot through with weakness and with serious limitations to our national security—if it is a proposal that would weaken the United States—I would have thought that Khrushchev himself would have come over to Geneva and have embraced it. Instead, the Russians say that it is too tough. They reject it out of hand. They will have nothing to do with it. The reason they will not have anything to do with it is that it is a safeguarded, sensible, scientifically designed treaty and proposal, and it is about time that the public understood it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I wish to say once again that I am very proud and happy to march behind him and support him on this issue as well as on many others.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado so that he may interrogate the Senator from Minnesota, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I shall be brief. As I understand, the Member of the other body to whom the Senator from Minnesota referred has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has been studying this question, hearing all the evidence, and presumably should be well informed in giving out the facts as he sees them. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct. The Member of the other body, for whom I will always speak with respect, is undoubtedly giving out the facts as he sees them. At one time I was a teacher. I had some students. When they took a test, they gave me back the facts as they saw them. At times I flunked them because their facts were wrong. The facts as we see them may not necessarily be the facts, but one's conception of the facts. Distinguished Members of the other body, as well as Members of this body equally distinguished, have their points of view as to the facts. There is such a thing as a fact and there is such a thing as a point of view. I repeat what I have said. Some of the statements that have been made in respect to the nuclear test ban treaty are not factual. They are opinions. Likewise, some of the statements that the Senator from Minnesota has made are opinions. As I said in the RECORD 2 weeks ago, at some points facts are no longer clear and well defined. Then we come to value judgments. But when we get to the factual matter, the facts are there. Beyond that it is a question-of-value judgment.

Mr. DOMINICK. The point I was trying to make is that the Senator from Minnesota, for whose opinion I have a high regard, referred to some with whom he did not agree as being irresponsible. I did not wish to have the RECORD show the opinion of a Member of the other body as being irresponsible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not intend to speak of my colleagues as being irresponsible. I wished to say that some of the statements I have read are irresponsible. Where those statements came from is a matter of research. It will not take long to find out where they came from. There have been some irresponsible statements. I do not wish to say that either political party has a monopoly upon irresponsibility. Both parties have spawned some, may I say, even on this issue.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senators.

ADMINISTRATION AGENCY TO WIN FASTER ACTION FROM REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, about 2 years ago—in December of 1960—Dean Landis, of Harvard Law School, made a report on the quasi-judicial agencies of our Government. It was a very constructive report in which he made a series of proposals as to what could be done to improve their operations. He pointed out in many ways how their operations sorely needed improvement.

For instance, there were delays in the administration of justice which were quite excessive—in some cases 1 year, and in some cases 2 years before decisions were handed down.

This morning's Wall Street Journal reported that the administration plans to seek a new agency to reform the regulatory groups. It is pointed out that this new agency would have an advisory role with relation to the 100-odd independent or semiautonomous commissions, boards, or agencies; to try to make constructive proposals—and to follow them up—to see to it that these agencies do a much better job in the future than they have done in the past.

Mr. President, in connection with this question, last January, shortly after the second anniversary of the Landis report, I wrote letters to the heads of several of these agencies, asking them what they had done to bring their agencies into line with the Landis recommendations. I wrote among others to William L. Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to Mr. Frank W. McCulloch, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; to Mr. Laurence K. Walrath, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and to others.

The replies I have received from these gentlemen indicate in each case that there has been substantial progress. For example, the Interstate Commerce Commission states that it had the greatest number of cases closed in its history, during the past year.

The Securities and Exchange Commission report a 100-percent increase in registration statements. It has not been able to make much progress as to handling them, and it still takes an inordinate length of time for that, but at least the Commission is keeping its head above water and is not running in the wrong direction or losing ground.

Mr. Frank McCulloch reports that the National Labor Relations Board has been making signal progress and that the time for handling many cases has been cut in half.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal, my letters to the Chairmen of the various agencies, and the answers I have received from the three Chairmen may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

I hope the Congress will give careful consideration to what seems to be a thoughtful, constructive, and very useful proposal by the administration. It is about time that we had some way of bringing order to these headless agencies which have proliferated so greatly and which have perfectly enormous economic power.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION SEEKS NEW AGENCY TO REFORM REGULATORY GROUPS—SPEEDIER ICC, NLRB DECISIONS ARE A GOAL, PROPOSALS MAY HAVE BIG IMPACT ON BUSINESS

(By Louis M. Kohlmeier)

WASHINGTON—President Kennedy, probably within the next few weeks, will ask Congress to put a head on the headless "fourth branch" of Government. Some long-hoped-for reforms could result.

The "fourth branch" is a highly informal assemblage comprising 100-odd independent or semiautonomous commissions, boards, and agencies. Many of them perform both judicial and administrative functions. They range from such potent business regulators as the Federal Trade and Interstate Commerce Commissions to the more obscure Indian Claims Commission.

The agencies' big shortcomings, as one administration official sees them, are "inordinate, costly delays" in decisions, lack of uniformity in procedures, and questions of fairness in their methods. So the administration aims to superimpose on the "fourth branch" a new Government echelon: A Presidentially appointed council of 11 members, atop a larger assembly of delegates from inside and outside Government. This superagency could recommend, though not order, reforms.

WIDESPREAD IMPACT

Some possible remedies that this new headquarters might push have already been worked up. The proposals could carry high significance for those who deal with "fourth branch" agencies, whether they're New York stockbrokers, Texas gas pipeline operators, California television broadcasters, or some larger object of Federal regulation.

For example: To reduce the months and even years it takes agencies to decide whether to allow cuts or increases in railroad, airline, pipeline, and other rates, a whole set of procedural reforms might be adopted. Parties to a case might be required to submit the bulk of their evidence, reduced to writing, early in the case. Rigid limits might be set on the time a hearing could run. Examiners who conduct hearings would get more authority to limit cross-examination of witnesses and insure continuous sessions, instead of "hearing by interludes."

A little-known "black list" that circulates among some agencies names companies that have been barred from receiving Federal contracts "without prior specification of reasons or opportunity to be heard," according to a White House-sponsored group that studies the agencies. A suggested solution would bar any blacklisting until an agency offered a contractor a hearing and handed down in writing its conclusions and reasons.

The Federal Communications Commission, which has been criticized for failure to explain its awards of television and radio station licenses, might be required to "fully publicize and subject to some form of public discussion" its criteria, particularly concerning broadcasters' programing.

COMMUNICATIONS CURB?

And each agency might be required to write its own code barring off-the-record communications between commissioners and outsiders hoping to influence some pending decision. Any agency official who received such a communication would be required to report it to a superior who'd make it public. The code might provide that a lawyer who attempted such back-door influence could be censured or even lose his right to practice before the agency; an applicant involved automatically could be denied the license or other privilege he sought.

These and other reform recommendations, now under study at the White House, may be sent to Congress shortly. Or they might be held back until the new superagency could be set up to review them.

The administration's decision to go to Congress with agency reform legislation came after White House aids saw a compilation of the time it still takes agencies after years of talk about "regulatory lag," to decide cases.

These facts and figures, put together during the past 2 years by a White House study group called the Administrative Conference of the United States, represent the first comprehensive survey of regulatory lag ever conducted, according to the Conference. During the fiscal year ended last June, it found that the Interstate Commerce Commission on average was taking 1½ years to decide a transportation rate case. An unfair labor charge rested 350 days on average with the National Labor Relations Board. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board needed 248 days to decide the average application to organize a new federally chartered savings and loan association. And the Civil Service Commission consumed an average of 350 days on proceedings under the Hatch Act, which restricts political activities of Federal employees.

Other evidence of snail-pace action abounds. The Atlantic Coast Line and Seaboard Air Line Railroads, which filed merger plans with the ICC in July 1960, still are awaiting a final yes or no. The other day the Civil Aeronautics Board finally concluded a proceeding ordered in 1954 on subsidy payments to Colonial Airlines, a company swallowed up 7 years ago in a merger with Eastern Air Lines.

What worries the administration most, one official suggests, is that regulatory delay may hold back the whole economy. Says he: "A year's unnecessary delay in a license to build a hydroelectric project or a gas pipeline can have effects all down the line, on constructing, the hiring of operating personnel, and ultimately consumers."

No one can pinpoint the total dollars-and-cents impact, but certainly big sums are involved. Natural gas pipeline companies have pending at the Federal Power Commission applications to construct some $914 million worth of new facilities; on average, it takes the Commission 9 months to a year to decide these cases. Pending for some 5 years at the FPC have been the bid of four private utilities to build a $190-million dam on the Snake River at the Idaho-Oregon border and the competing application of a group of public utility districts for a $369-million project.

Four big railroad merger plans dragging on before the ICC would produce estimated annual savings of $182 million, much of which probably would be invested in new facilities.

Any effort at reform must face the stubborn fact that the regulatory realm is both highly complex and politically tender.

Almost every one of the 100-odd agencies was set up under its own law to deal with a particular economic or other problem. So reform would require changes in a lot of laws. Moreover, because each of the agencies is independent or semiautonomous, there has been little cooperation even on improved procedures the agencies can set up themselves, and no general reform leadership has emerged from within the agencies.

Their independence has made the agencies balk at direct White House intervention. And they've frequently had congressional support in fending off the White House. The lawmakers, who had a major hand in creating many of the agencies, like to think of them as "arms of Congress." Because of these political considerations, Mr. Kennedy apparently has rejected an idea offered by an adviser early in his administration for a White House czar to oversee the agencies.

Instead, the White House has drafted bills to set up a superagency, closely following a recommendation of the administrative conference which studied the fourth branch. As chief executive officer, this agency would have a chairman appointed by the President. But because he'd be outside the White House and because his power would be limited, it's reasoned that he'd be something less than the czar once proposed.

The Chairman, with a rank roughly that of a Cabinet Under Secretary, would be spokesman for the superagency before congressional committees and in public forums. He'd preside over an 11-member council, also appointed by the President, that would function like a board of directors. But ultimate authority to recommend new laws and procedures would rest with an assembly of some 80 delegates, mainly from the agencies but including representatives from other Government branches, bar groups, and universities.

JANUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CARY,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: What progress has been made in putting into action the recommendations of Judge Landis' report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 with respect to your Commission?

My particular interest is in obtaining statistics on the Commission's current caseload, the backlog, the amount of time it now takes to dispose of cases, the Commission's current budget and whether or not this budget represents an increase or a decrease in relation to its budget for 1959.

Your cooperation in this respect will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

JANUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. FRANK W. MCCULLOCH,
Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: What progress has been made in putting into action the recommendations of Judge Landis' report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 with respect to your Board?

My particular interest is in obtaining statistics on the Board's current caseload, the backlog, the amount of time it now takes to dispose of cases, the Board's current budget, and whether or not this budget represents an increase or a decrease in relation to its budget for 1959.

Your cooperation in this respect will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

JANUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. LAURENCE K. WALRATH,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALRATH: What progress has been made in putting into action the recommendations of Judge Landis' report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 with respect to your Commission?

My particular interest is in obtaining statistics on the Commission's current caseload, the backlog, the amount of time it now takes to dispose of cases, the Commission's current budget and whether or not this budget represents an increase or a decrease in relation to its budget for 1959.

Your cooperation in this respect will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1963.
Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bill: This is in reply to your letter of January 11, 1963, which I acknowledged on the 18th, concerning the Landis report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 and the current statistical picture at the Board.

You may recall that Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 grew out of the Landis report's principal recommendation for the N.L.R.B. This plan, which would have enabled the Board to delegate to its trial examiners the power to make initial decisions in unfair labor practice cases, subject to a limited discretionary review by the Board, was defeated in the House, although favorable reports on it came from both the House and Senate Government Operations Committees.

We still believe in and endorse the principles of that plan. Its wisdom has been confirmed by our experience since May 15, 1961, with the delegation of decisionmaking in representation cases to our regional directors. As our timelag figures show, the delegation of authority in representation cases and our revised internal procedures have permitted the Board to issue decisions somewhat more promptly and to cope with the increased intake of unfair labor practice complaint cases which would have been impossible but for the delegation of representation cases.

Although the need for a plan 5 or similar plan is not as urgent today as it was in 1961, the rise in our caseload and the continuing, though now decreased, backlog may still make essential the eventual attainment of the objectives of plan 5 of 1961. Hence, legislative proposals, such as S. 1734 (with revisions as proposed by the Bureau of the Budget), which was introduced in the 87th Congress, or other proposed legislation that we hope will be introduced with the President's approval to carry out the administrative conference's recommendation 9, would be, if enacted, a substantial further help in meeting many of our current problems.

The basic administrative problem of the division of the agency between the Board and its independent General Counsel was discussed in some detail by Landis. He concluded that a return to the earlier system (pre-Taft-Hartley) would be preferable. But no one, least of all Mr. Landis, has considered this feasible, and no action has been proposed to effect this change.

While Landis stated that "inordinate delay and docket congestions" were not the NLRB's "pattern," he and we recognized that the time required for disposition of cases was too long. We have made signal progress on this matter, cutting the time for representation case decisions in the regions almost in half, to a median average of 40 days in July–December 1962, and reducing the contested complaint case median average to around 300 days. The enclosed tables give these figures more fully.

The case intake which the filing parties control, not the Board, and which averaged a little over 13,000 for the first 10 years under Taft-Hartley, has now virtually doubled, to about 26,000. The current and comparative intake of cases since 1958 may be seen from the attached table.

The numbers of contested cases on hand, our backlog. at the end of the last 5 fiscal years and as of December 30, 1962, are as follows:

	Complaint cases			Representation cases			Total
	Contested	Stipulated	Total	Contested	Stipulated	Total	
1958	190	9	199	220	2	222	421
1959	196	14	210	387	12	399	609
1960	312	18	330	516	6	522	852
1961	443	17	460	540	9	549	1,009
1962	305	18	323	150	15	165	488
Dec. 30, 1962	297	9	306	112	18	130	436

Our current budget (fiscal 1963) of $21,006,000 exceeds our 1959 budget of $13,256,600 by approximately $8 million. The growth in the Board's budget since 1958 is as follows:

1958	$9,749,000
1959	13,256,600
1960	15,280,000
1961	18,213,000
1962	19,989,000
1963	21,006,000
1964 (requested)	23,060,000

I know of your deep and consistent interest in economy, and I believe you know from my experience with Senator Douglas that I am trained in the same school. I want therefore to underline that in the 1¾ years for which I can account the Board and General Counsel have exercised the greatest care in their caseload estimates (and the actual figures have been amazingly close, thus far in excess of estimates), have pursued every means of securing greater efficiency, have increased the settlement averages significantly (avoiding litigation) and have budgeted for increased productivity in each succeeding year, despite staff turnover. I cannot do justice to these matters in a paragraph. But the figures alone do not tell our story.

If you have other questions about any of these subjects, or other aspects of the Agency's work, please let me know. I shall be glad to send you whatever information may be helpful.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

Frank W. McCulloch,
Chairman.

P.S.—Because of its broad scope, I shall enclose a copy of the General Counsel's 1962 report, which I think you will find interesting.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1963.
Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: This is in reply to your letter of January 11, 1963, about the action the Commission has taken in connection with the Landis Report on Regulatory Agencies, dated December 27, 1960.

The Landis report was but one of several reports and studies concerning this Commission which were released in the fall of 1960. Among others was a comprehensive organization and procedures survey conducted by the management consultant firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton. This report, authorized and paid for by the Bureau of the Budget, was received on November 9, 1960. Also at the request of the Commission, a committee of outstanding practitioners conducted an extensive survey of our operations and organization and submitted their findings and recommendations in October 1960.

On the basis of these studies and the critical self-analysis which they generated, extensive organizational and procedural changes have been made since January 1961. Stated briefly, changes were made which:

1. Strengthened the role of the Chairman.
2. Created the new office of Vice Chairman.
3. Eliminated the "reporting Commissioner" concept, relieving seven Commissioners of burdensome administrative responsibilities.
4. Reduced the number of divisions from four to three.
5. Delegated authority to the Vice Chairman to institute formal docket investigations arising out of the work of the seven regulatory bureaus.
6. Directed the seven regulatory bureaus to report to the Chairman through the Vice Chairman.
7. Adopted a procedure for assigning responsibility for important cases to individual Commissioners.
8. Limited the right of appeal to the entire Commission.
9. Established 12 new employee boards to act for the Commission in nonadversary proceedings.
10. Delegated greater authority to staff members.
11. On the basis of new legislation approved September 14, 1961, established three additional employee boards which are authorized to act for the Commission in deciding cases which involve the taking of testimony at public hearings or submission of evidence by affidavits.
12. Adopted a realinement of our field organization resulting in closer coordination of all field activities of the Commission.

With reference to your request for statistical data, please be advised that the Commission had 4,711 formal proceedings cases pending as of December 31, 1962. During fiscal year 1962, 7,588 formal cases were opened and 7,902 cases were closed. The 7,902 cases closed during fiscal year 1962 represents the greatest number of cases closed during any similar period and a figure 30 percent higher than 5 years ago. During fiscal year 1962, an average of 7.8 months was required to close a case, either on the basis of a decision on the merits or on the basis of an order discontinuing the proceeding prior to a decision. Those cases dismissed or discontinued prior to a decision required 3.6 months to close, those cases decided by an examiner's recommended report becoming effective required 6.8 months to close, and those cases decided by the Commission or an employee board required an average of 12.6 months to reach a decision.

The Commission's appropriation for fiscal year 1963 is $22,606,000, which amount is $3,858,200 higher than the $18,747,800 appropriated for fiscal year 1959. In 1959 the Commission's average level of employment was 2,268, for 1963 average employment is estimated at 2,426.

I appreciate the opportunity to supply you with this information. Should you desire further information, I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

Laurence K. Walrath,
Chairman.

Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1963.
Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: Since Chairman Cary is out of the city, I am further responding to your letter of January 11, 1963, in which you requested information regarding the progress that has been made by this Commission in effectuating recommendations contained in Mr. Landis' Report on Regulatory Agencies of December 1960. In addition, you requested statistics on the Commission's current caseload, backlog, the time required to dispose of cases and the Commission's current budget.

The discussions and recommendations contained in Mr. Landis' report applying to the Securities and Exchange Commission dealt mainly with four matters: (1) delay in the processing of registration statements; (2) the need for controls to be more widely extended as against investment advisers; (3) the need for delegation of certain of the Commission's functions; and (4) the holding of individual Commissioners responsible for the preparation of opinions. Significant steps have been taken in each of these areas which, it is believed, meet the criticisms expressed by Mr. Landis in his report.

1. Registration statements: During fiscal years 1959–62, the number of registration statements filed increased progressively—almost 100 percent increase from 1959 to 1962. The tremendous upsurge in filings, despite the additional personnel to examine these statements, caused a progressive increase in the number of registration statements pending on June 30 of the past 4 years. (See item 1 of exhibit I.)

In recent months, it has been possible to reduce substantially the time in process for many categories of registration statements and, in addition, gradually to reduce the number of pending statements. Neither of these aspects of the Commission's work is entirely within our control, since an issuer or underwriter or both may wish to defer the effective date of a pending registration statement because of market conditions or for other business reasons. As of June 30, 1962, our records showed 730 pending statements, a fairly high percentage of which had not been completely processed at that time. As of a recent date, there were approximately 350 pending, over two-thirds of which had been reviewed. We hope that as of the end of the current fiscal year, the number of cases then pending will approximate 180. Market conditions between now and the end of June will of course largely affect the validity of our estimate.

In August 1962, the Commission modified form S–8 to permit the use of that form for the registration of securities to be offered pursuant to restricted stock options. Form S–8 is less complex than form S–1, which ordinarily would have been the appropriate form for use in connection with such offerings.

2. Investment advisers: Regulation of investment advisers has been extended in several important respects. Amendments to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 which had been proposed by the Commission, were enacted into law in the closing days of the 86th Congress. Those amendments substantially increased the Commission's power with regard to the regulation of investment advisers. Pursuant to the authorization contained in those amendments, the Commission has adopted rules and taken other steps designed to make regulation of investment advisers more effective. The Commission has taken the following actions in this area:

(a) A new registration form indicating the new bases for disqualification from acting as an investment adviser which are now incorporated in the statute.

(b) Rule 206(4)–1 has been adopted by the Commission which has the effect of proscribing the use by investment advisers of certain specified types of advertising, and has instituted a program for the enforcement of the provisions of that rule.

(c) Rule 206(4)–2 has been promulgated which requires that clients' funds and securities held in the custody of an investment adviser be segregated, that clients be notified in writing of the place and manner in which their funds and securities will be maintained, that clients receive a report at least quarterly of transactions in their accounts and that all funds and securities of clients be verified at least once during each calendar year through examination by an independent public accountant.

(d) Rule 204–2 has been issued which requires investment advisers to maintain certain books and records, and has under consideration at the present time a proposed amendment to that rule which would require reports from persons who are associated with investment advisers and who engage in specified activities.

3. Delegations of authority: Pursuant to provisions of Public Law No. 87–592, the Commission has published a notice of proposal to adopt rules delegating certain of its functions and has received comments thereon. The comments which have been received are now being considered to determine what modification should be made in the proposed rules. It is anticipated that delegation rules will be adopted in the very near future.

4. Opinions: On January 16, 1961, shortly after the publication of Mr. Landis' report, the Commission adopted the practice of assigning to individual Commissioners the responsibility for opinions, except in cases which are of a routine nature and which may be disposed of by orders or short-form opinions, a practice that has been followed since that time.

As indicated in the attached exhibit I, the appropriation increase from fiscal 1959 to 1963 approximates $5.6 million. This increase is distributed generally as follows: $2.9 million for program increases, $1.7 million for pay increases and $1.0 million for the special study of the securities markets.

For the past 5 years, a total of about 600 positions have been added to the staff, of which approximately 400 were allocated to the investigations and enforcement program, and the registration statement and regulation A program. In addition, 65 were assigned to the special study of the securities markets. The balance or 135 positions were distributed to the several other programs administered by the Commission. In general, the progressive and substantial workload increases in major programs as shown in exhibit I exceeded the personnel allocations to these programs, thus resulting in mounting backlogs during the period 1959, through 1962. In 1963, it is anticipated that some of these backlogs will be reduced substantially.

Your request for statistics relating to pending cases is shown on pages 59 through 65 and 270 through 279 of the attached publication entitled "Statistical Data Relating to Administrative Proceedings Conducted by Federal Agencies."

Should you desire any additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Byron D. Woodside,
Commissioner.

EXHIBIT I—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Statement of principal workload items—Fiscal years 1959 to 1963

	Actual				Estimate 1963
	1959	1960	1961	1962	
Appropriation (in thousands)	[1] $7,705	$8,100	[2] $9,512	[3] $11,412	[4] $13,286
1. Examination of registration statements:					
Pending, beginning of year	145	252	335	515	730
Filed	1,226	1,628	1,830	2,307	1,550
Subtotal	1,371	1,880	2,165	2,822	2,280
Examined	1,119	1,545	1,650	2,092	2,100
Pending, end of year	252	335	515	730	180
2. Examination of other filings and applications	475	564	670	680	600
3. Preliminary proxy statements:					
Pending, beginning of year	35	122	50	45	35
Filed	2,024	2,133	2,228	2,381	2,600
Subtotal	2,059	2,255	2,278	2,426	2,635
Examined	1,937	2,205	2,233	2,391	2,600
Pending, end of year	122	50	45	35	35
4. Examination of regulation A filings:					
Pending, beginning of year	120	147	343	289	227
Filed	854	1,049	1,057	1,065	850
Subtotal	974	1,196	1,400	1,354	1,077
Examined	827	853	1,111	1,127	1,027
Pending, end of year	147	343	289	227	50

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT I—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—Continued

Statement of principal workload items—Fiscal years 1959 to 1963—Continued

	Actual				Estimate 1963
	1959	1960	1961	1962	
5. Regulation A suspension orders:					
Pending, beginning of year	$24	$29	$31	$28	$31
Instituted during year	87	77	54	52	65
Subtotal	111	106	85	80	96
Closed during year	82	75	57	49	56
Pending, end of year	29	31	28	31	40
6. Examination of annual and periodic reports (form 8, 9, and 10K):					
Pending, beginning of year	5,833	7,154	8,865	9,947	11,819
Filed	11,094	11,698	12,404	13,769	15,200
Total for disposition	16,927	18,852	21,269	23,716	27,019
Examined	9,773	9,987	11,322	11,897	20,219
Pending, end of year	7,154	8,865	9,947	11,819	6,800
7. Examination of other annual and periodic reports:					
Pending, beginning of year	2,649	3,207	3,653	2,410	3,158
Filed	43,528	43,015	44,978	47,598	50,000
Subtotal	46,177	46,222	48,631	50,008	53,158
Examined	42,970	42,569	46,221	46,850	50,758
Pending, end of year	3,207	3,653	2,410	3,158	2,400
8. Stop order proceedings and other administrative actions:					
Pending, beginning of year	49	64	68	60	71
Instituted	46	57	47	53	90
Total for completion	95	121	115	113	161
Closed	31	53	55	42	66
Pending, end of year	64	68	60	71	95
9. Investigations including administrative, civil, and criminal proceedings:					
Pending, beginning of year	937	977	960	1,126	985
Opened	523	519	567	510	615
Subtotal	1,460	1,496	1,527	1,636	1,600
Closed	483	536	401	651	660
Pending, end of year	977	960	1,126	985	940
(a) Administrative proceedings to deny or revoke registrations of brokers and dealers or to expel from NASD:					
Pending, beginning of year	50	98	115	124	162
Opened	111	94	77	95	120
Subtotal	161	192	192	219	282
Closed	63	77	68	57	125
Pending, end of year	98	115	124	162	157
(b) Administrative proceedings to deny or revoke registrations of investment advisers:					
Pending, beginning of year	(5)	1	7	4	11
Opened	(5)	6	------------	7	25
Subtotal	(5)	7	7	11	36
Closed	(5)	------------	3	------------	25
Pending, end of year	(5)	7	4	11	11
(c) Injunction actions:					
Pending, beginning of year	(5)	(5)	84	96	105
Filed	60	91	90	89	100
Subtotal	(5)	(5)	174	185	205
Disposed	(5)	(5)	78	80	105
Pending, end of year	(5)	(5)	96	105	100
(d) Criminal reference reports referred to the Department of Justice:					
Pending, beginning of year	(5)	(5)	102	100	130
Referred	48	53	42	64	55
Subtotal	(5)	(5)	144	164	185
Disposed	(5)	(5)	44	34	60
Pending, end of year	(5)	(5)	100	130	125
10. Number of broker dealers registered, end of year	4,907	5,288	5,500	5,870	6,100
(a) Applications for broker-dealer registration:					
Pending, beginning of year	60	87	61	126	81
Received	944	1,077	1,065	1,133	1,100
Subtotal	1,004	1,164	1,126	1,259	1,181
Processed	917	1,103	1,000	1,178	1,101
Pending, end of year	87	61	126	81	80
(b) Amendments to registration of brokers and dealers:					
Pending, beginning of year	244	120	31	160	982
Received	2,573	2,985	3,193	3,337	3,100
Subtotal	2,817	3,105	3,224	3,497	4,082
Processed	2,697	3,074	3,064	2,515	3,582
Pending, end of year	120	31	160	982	500
(c) Terminations	(5)	(5)	(5)	791	800
(d) Number of broker-dealer inspections	1,471	1,499	1,627	1,515	1,670

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT I—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—Continued

Statement of principal workload items—Fiscal years 1959 to 1963—Continued

	Actual				Estimate 1963
	1959	1960	1961	1962	
11. Number of investment advisers registered, end of year	$1,671	$1,867	$1,855	$1,836	$1,600
(a) Applications for registration of investment advisers:					
Pending, beginning of year	22	30	26	24	16
Received	278	305	313	315	315
Subtotal	300	335	339	339	331
Processed	270	309	315	323	310
Pending, end of year	30	26	24	16	21
(b) Amendments to registration of investment advisers:					
Pending, beginning of year	231	16	6	65	373
Received	730	813	764	699	600
Subtotal	961	829	770	764	973
Processed	945	823	705	391	673
Pending, end of year	16	6	65	373	300
(c) Terminations	(5)	(5)	(5)	338	546
(d) Number of Investment Adviser Inspections	----------	----------	8	149	200
12. Regulation of investment companies:					
(a) Applications reviewed for exemption of transactions with affiliates, status matters, and other proposals of investment companies:					
Pending, beginning of year	44	52	86	84	93
Filed during year	102	132	130	137	175
Subtotal	146	184	216	221	268
Applications reviewed during year	94	98	132	128	208
Pending, end of year	52	86	84	93	60
(b) Review of filings for compliance with regulatory provisions of the act:					
Pending, beginning of year	22	22	52	72	51
Filed during year	1,115	1,361	1,162	1,201	1,374
Subtotal	1,137	1,383	1,214	1,273	1,325
Reviewed during year	1,115	1,331	1,142	1,222	1,300
Pending, end of year	22	52	72	51	25
(c) Review of annual compliance reports:					
Pending, beginning of year	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Filed during year	----------	----------	----------	----------	767
Subtotal	----------	----------	----------	----------	767
Reviewed during year	----------	----------	----------	----------	567
Pending, end of year	----------	----------	----------	----------	200
13. Registered investment companies:					
(a) Number of registered investment companies:					
Number at beginning of year	453	512	570	663	727
Number of registrations during year	76	67	118	97	60
Subtotal	523	579	688	760	787
Number of registrations terminated during year	11	9	25	33	30
Number of registrations end of year	512	570	663	727	757
(b) Investment company inspections	14	27	56	52	90
14. Reorganization proceedings:					
(a) Review of reorganization proceedings filed in courts	88	83	111	94	110
(b) Reorganization proceedings in which the Commission participated during the fiscal year:					
Pending, beginning of year	35	45	45	48	61
Notices of appearances filed in courts during year	14	9	12	18	20
Subtotal	49	54	57	66	81
Proceedings closed during year	4	9	9	5	11
Pending, end of year	45	45	48	61	70

---

[1] Includes $605,000 for pay increases.

[2] Includes $605,000 for pay increases.

[3] Includes $412,500 for the special study of the securities markets.

[4] Includes an estimate of $486,000 for pay increases and $537,500 for the special study of the securities markets.

[5] Not available.

REPUBLICAN UPSIDE-DOWN APPROACH TO BUDGET CUTTING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have one other insertion to make in the RECORD, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will indulge me further.

Mr. President, we have seen an example of our good friends on the Republican side of the aisle increasing spending once again, and increasing expenditures by the Federal Government.

The distinguished minority leader led the fight for a $25,000 increase, as I understand it, in the budget for the Committee on the Judiciary. That is a small amount of money. However, I think it is another specific example of the fact that Republicans do have a tendency to increase spending.

In the House of Representatives the other day there was a more spectacular example. As Mr. Roscoe Drummond pointed out this morning, the Republicans to a very great extent were instrumental in producing a military appropriation bill which, together with committee action increasing the administration's military pay bill, exceeded the Kennedy request by $1.1 billion—$1.1 billion.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out, the Republicans seem to be going in exactly the opposite direction from the way in which they have been talking. They talk about cutting spending. They were going to cut $3 billion from defense. But in fact they are helping to increase the defense budget. So far it appears that they will vote for a bigger budget than the President himself requested.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out, this seems to be an upside-down approach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent column written by Mr. Drummond may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET CUTTERS—AN UPSIDE-DOWN APPROACH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Republicans are making a very odd beginning in their avowed crusade to cut the Federal budget. It is an upside-down approach—this cutting the budget by increasing it. It is not much of a way to go about it.

The first test vote in the House dealing with fiscal 1964 provided the Republicans with the opportunity to begin to do what they have proclaimed and pledged they would do.

The test found the majority of Republicans voting to add still more to the already record-high defense budget.

It helped to produce a military appropriation bill which, together with a committee action increasing the administration's military pay bill, exceeded the Kennedy request by $1.1 billion.

It elicited a barrage of Republican criticism as the best ally the economizers could possibly have at the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara.

That's the picture and unless you are wearing upside-down glasses, it looks like this:

In their first big opportunity to show that they meant it when they set a goal of $10 to $15 billion in budget-cutting, the Republicans not only took no action, they took reverse action—upped the spending.

The Republicans by their own votes are now further from their objective than when they started—and are moving in the opposite direction.

Instead of having to trim $3 billion from the defense budget, as the Republicans have been talking about doing, they now face the task—in part as a result of their own votes—of having to cut about $4 billion if they are to achieve their goal.

No wonder Representative KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, who votes economy as well as talks economy and who cast one firm ballot against the whole military authorization bill in protest over its size, had this to say after her fellow Republicans had increased it:

"How can we go out to our people, harassed taxpayers, and tell them that things have got to be cut, and then vote more than was requested?"

I suspect that this is a rhetorical, if tearful, question and that no answer is really needed. The only answer I could give is that the Republicans flunked their first economy test badly. If they hadn't cut the defense budget by a single penny, they would have only flunked by 100 percent. They did worse than that. They voted to add money to the budget; they voted to authorize more than was requested; they came up to the starting line of their economy race and took a big step backward. Unless the Republicans do have a secret formula by which appropriating more money will mean spending less, they simply talked out of one side of their mouths and voted out the other in their first economy test. Not a pretty sight.

Are the Republicans helping their cause by harassing Secretary McNamara? I doubt it.

The central criticism they bring against McNamara is that he is substituting civilian judgment for military judgment in making the final decisions of the budget and selection of weapons systems.

I do not say that the Secretary of Defense cannot err, but where does this argument take you? McNamara had to substitute civilian for military judgment in cutting $16 billion from the total military requests of the three services down to $52.5 billion. If he hadn't the Republicans would have to cut $20 billion instead of $4 billion to reach their goal.

If the Republicans in Congress are going to succeed in cutting $4 billion from the defense appropriations, they will also be substituting civilian for military judgment.

There is, however, one military command they could well ponder: "About face."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to place in the RECORD, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of this body—a new member, to be sure—the view that the effort to increase the appropriation of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate was purely a Republican maneuver. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] was only doing what he thought was proper in order to carry out an arrangement made with the minority leader and the other minority members of that committee, but the subcommittee today will have 44 employees, though prior to the increase it had 39 employees.

The subcommittee proposes to investigate a host of different matters, including a number which, in my opinion, would come more appropriately within the jurisdiction of other committees.

If we wish to cut our waste, this would have been a place to support the Senator from Nevada in his effort to cut the appropriation. The subcommittee has doubled its staff number since 1956, and there are among the employees a number of individuals who, I am informed, are of not much use to the Senator from Tennessee in his efforts to carry on his investigations of the operation of the monopoly and antitrust laws.

I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for raising this point on the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I take my seat, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will indulge me, I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, who, with his characteristic graciousness, has permitted me to make my insertions in the RECORD prior to his speech. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I merely wished to express my appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senator from Wisconsin for their expressions about the obvious power which they have attributed to the Republicans, both on the Committee on the Judiciary and in the Senate. It is quite unusual, when we are outnumbered 2 to 1 for the Republicans to be able to be so successful in endeavors to get proper staffing on committees. I think this is quite a compliment to the Republicans for their ability and prestige.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is, too, I say to my friend from Colorado, but this is the way they operate in this bipartisan coalition which I have called "the establishment." As a part of the contribution which the Republicans make to "the establishment," every now and then they are given four or five more employees on some subcommittee.

UNITED STATES AND UNITED NATIONS CONGO POLICIES: SUCCESSES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall speak on the United States and the United Nations Congo policies; their successes and their future opportunities.

Mr. President, in the early days of the session, harsh criticism of the administration's support of the United Nations' activities in the Congo was heard in this Chamber and read in certain journals.

> The United Nations has involved us in a terrible and expensive war in the Congo—a war of bald aggression.

One of our colleagues was heard to say. It was even said by another Senator that—

> The situation in the Congo is chaotic and menacing, and our Government is still pursuing an African policy which parallels Communist aims and objectives, which is inimical to the best interests of this country and of the so-called Dark Continent.

Another member was widely quoted as saying:

> It is an unspeakable tragedy * * * that the U.N. should be starting wars.

Mr. Luce's weekly journal of plutocratic opinion, Time, added fuel to the fire:

> The world is horrified witness to the spectacle of foreign soldiers, aided by the United States, seizing the towns and firing on native soldiers of the Congo. * * * The blazing guns and swooping planes of the United Nations hardly fitted the pacifying intent of its original Congo mandate.

At this time when President Kennedy's policies toward Cuba and a test ban are the objects of equally harsh criticism, I think it may be useful to attempt an objective review of the Congo situation to see why the critics, who were so vocal just a few weeks ago, are so very silent indeed today.

I submit that such a review indicates that the United Nations and the U.S. Government, which has consistently supported United Nations actions in the Congo, have scored a brilliant triumph.

Though perseverance, tact, wisdom, the United Nations has brought a real semblance of order out of the chaos existing in the Congo during the early days of its independence. As Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, stated recently, the Katanga secession has ended and "the phase of active military involvement by United Nations forces in the Congo is about over." Threats to destroy plant and equipment in Katanga and elsewhere have faded. The peaceful return of European residents has accelerated. Soviet technicians and military air and surface craft, once present in large numbers, have been withdrawn. A brave and moderate Congolese, Cyrille Adoula, is leading his country in peace and freedom in the difficult reconstruction and development tasks ahead.

I. RECENT HISTORY

The drive for Congolese independence got underway in earnest in December of

1958 with a call for an immediate end to Belgian rule at the Pan-African Conference in Ghana. Sporadic demonstration started in key cities throughout the Congo. In January 1959, serious riots occurred in Léopoldville and elsewhere, and by the end of the year, demands for independence could no longer be ignored.

In January 1960, King Baudouin invited representatives of the various Congolese parties and factions to a conference in Brussels. On January 27, Belgian and Congolese officials agreed that the Congo would become independent by mid-year. The conferees also agreed that the six Provinces of the Congo—Katanga, Léopoldville, Kivu, Kasai, Oriental, and Equator—would be integrated into a single independent government with a bicameral, freely elected parliament in Léopoldville. The parliament was charged with the responsibility for electing a national president, who would appoint a premier.

The first general elections were held in the Congo under Belgian control in May of 1960.

In Katanga Province, which was destined to play a crucial role in the months to follow, Moise Tshombe's party, the Conakat—the political arm of the Lunda and Bayeke tribes—won 91,116 votes. The opposing Balubaket party, representing the Baluba tribe, received 134,916 votes. Mr. Tshombe lost the provincial capital city of Elisabethville. Thus, Mr. Tshombe was defeated in his first and only election in his own province.

The Conakat Party and its allies, however, captured 27 seats in the Provincial Assembly of 60 seats. The Baluba Party won only 25 seats. Eight seats were never filled because of contests, so the Conakat formed the Provincial Government.

In due course and after some contest, the newly elected Parliament elected Joseph Kasavubu, President, and Patrice Lumumba was appointed Premier.

In June 30, 1960, 53 years of Belgian rule ended for the 14 million inhabitants of the Congo, including 120,000 European residents. A pitifully small handful of Congolese had received formal education. There were only about 30 Congolese university graduates in the country; almost no professional men or lawyers to enforce the law and carry out its administration. Fewer than 20,000 were attending academic secondary schools. A large number of tribes existed, speaking over 100 languages, and tribal loyalties claimed first allegiance with a large portion of the population.

Five days after independence, the 20,000-man Congolese Army mutinied. President Kasavubu and Premier Lumumba were unable to restore order. Belgium sent paratroopers in to protect Belgian citizens and property. Katanga Province thereupon declared its independence from the Central Government in Léopoldville.

On July 10, 1960, the Congolese leaders appealed to the United States and the United Nations to help restore order. President Eisenhower decided the proper course was to work through the United Nations.

On July 14, the Security Council approved a resolution, backed by the Eisenhower administration, authorizing the formation of a United Nations force to maintain order in the Congo and to effect the withdrawal of Belgian troops. The difficult process of building a 20,000-man U.N. Congo force began.

The situation in Katanga Province soon became critical. With only one-twentieth of the population of the Congo and occupying less than one-twelfth of the country's terrain, Katanga accounted, because of its mineral resources, for more than one-half of the country's revenues prior to independence. In turn, the great, Belgian-controlled mining complex, Union Miniere, paid about 80 percent of Katanga tax revenues.

Due to the harassment of the Balubas by Mr. Tshombe's government, the Baluba tribe representatives in the Provincial Assembly withdrew and Tshombe's party representatives, with less than a majority of the total seats, held a rump session and "ratified" Katanga's secession. Seventy thousand Baluba tribesmen subsequently sought refuge from Tshombe in U.N. refugee camps.

Note again that the secession of Katanga was a totally illegal act, not based on proper parliamentary law. It was carried out by a minority of the people of Katanga, who had rejected Mr. Tshombe's leadership in the one election which had been held in that province.

It is significant that, despite costly propaganda efforts in this country and elsewhere, Katanga was never recognized as an independent State by any country in the world.

I digress from my text to emphasize the costly propaganda campaign which was carried out by groups in the United States who supported Katanga secession. They tried to foster an anti-United Nations feeling throughout the country which is totally unjustified. For example, there is a television-movie program entitled "Katanga, the Untold Story," sponsored by the Dr. Ross Pet Food Co., featuring former Congressman Donald Jackson of California—sometimes erroneously identified with our able colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] who has absolutely nothing to do with it—the former being a well-known spokesman for Tshombe's secessionist movement.

At my request, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has given me samples of the mail which he has received expressing outrage at the activities of the United Nations, supported by the United States, in the Congo, basing their views on this totally false television and motion picture production.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has been assiduous in sending constituents who wrote him the true story of the Katanga situation. It is a shame that under our system of free press, free television, and free motion pictures—which I strongly support—such widely distorted versions of the facts should be given so much credence and should mislead so many members of the American press.

The tortuous series of events in the long history of the United Nations' efforts to restore order in the Congo since the summer of 1960 needs only passing reference: Mobutu's efforts to establish a military dictatorship in late 1960; Lumumba's kidnapping in February of 1961 and eventual death in Katanga in early 1961; Tshombe's increasing hostility to United Nations' activities and the repeated attacks on United Nations' personnel by his armed forces, led largely by white European mercenary soldiers; Tshombe's many talks with Central Government and United Nations' representatives and his persistent refusal to cooperate with the Léopoldville authorities.

In mid-September 1961, while on a trip to effect a cease-fire between United Nations' and Katangan troops, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, one of the world's foremost citizens, was killed in a plane crash near Ndola, Northern Rhodesia. The causes of the crash were never determined.

Late last December, events reached a climax when drunken Katangan soldiers subjected U.N. troops to repeated fire and shot down a U.N. helicopter near Elisabethville, brutally beat its crew and allowed an Indian lieutenant to bleed to death. Two days later, Katangan soldiers fired heavily on U.N. positions. The United Nations negotiated patiently for hours with Mr. Tshombe. The Katangan leader even visited the scene, admitted that the firing was coming from his own forces and said he would stop it. When it became obvious that Mr. Tshombe was powerless to control his own troops, the United Nations had no alternative but to defend itself and to carry out its mandate to maintain law and order and to insist upon freedom of movement to avoid further dangerous situations.

Those who portrayed the mercenary-led Katangan Army as an effective and highly motivated fighting force must have been sorely disappointed by the events that followed. The Katangan soldiers offered practically no resistance to the U.N. troops. In certain areas, the population demonstrated its pleasure at being rid of the Katangan gendarmeries and enthusiastically welcomed the U.N. troops. In the industrial city of Jadotville, the Africans hoisted the U.N. force commander to their shoulders and loudly proclaimed their relief over the end of 2 years of tension and warfare.

At long last, and only as a result of U.N. actions, Mr. Tshombe announced his readiness to implement Secretary General U Thant's plan for Congo unity. How much suffering would have been spared had Mr. Tshombe decided to do this when he first accepted the plan last September. The record clearly shows that every conceivable effort was made by both the Congolese and by the United Nations—to say nothing of major efforts by the U.S. Government including even a trip to Elisabethville by the third ranking man in the State Department, Under Secretary George McGhee—to reunite Katanga with the Congo by peaceful means.

Two essential points about the U.N. operation in the Congo are frequently forgotten. One is that the United Nations was invited into the Congo by the legitimately elected Government of that country, and it acted in Katanga with the full approval of the Congo's recognized Prime Minister and Chief of State. The other is that the U.N.'s actions were strictly in accord with its mandate from the Security Council. This mandate called upon the United Nations to maintain the territorial integrity and political independence of the Congo and to assist the Central Government in the restoration and maintenance of law and order. Until the Katanga secession was terminated, there was no hope for national development. The nation's limited resources in men had to be devoted exclusively to national reunification.

The allegation referred to earlier that our Congo policies have paralleled Communist aims and objectives is an irresponsible distortion of truth. The Soviet Union during the long period of the Congo crisis consistently opposed the U.N.'s operations there. It tried to remove the late Secretary General Hammarskjold when his efforts to restore order and unity began to succeed. It opposed the recognition by the United Nations of Kasavubu as Central Government President. It supplied military aid and technicians to assist Lumumba before Mobutu ordered all Soviet personnel out of the country in September of 1960.

When Lumumba was arrested, Moscow-oriented Vice Premier Gizenga, who had been appointed to his post by Lumumba, announced his succession to the premiership and seized the assets of the National Government in Stanleyville, the capital of Oriental Province. Gizenga's regime was immediately recognized as the legitimate head of the Congo by the Soviet Union. After prolonged, unsuccessful negotiations, the United Nations moved to assist soldiers loyal to the Central Congo Government in putting down Gizenga's insurrection. Gizenga was taken into custody and has been under detention ever since January of 1962, despite repeated protests by the Communists. The Soviet Union has refused and still refuses to contribute one ruble to support U.N. operations in the Congo.

In short, the U.N. and the U.S. policies in the Congo have been a striking success. The Soviet Union has received nothing for the large sums of money and the efforts of many of its personnel, which it has invested in the Congo. The Soviet Union is out of the Congo for all practical purposes, and credit for this goes to the policies of the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration and to the able administration of the United Nations and the dedicated members of its peace force.

II. CYRILLE ADOULA

Clearly an important turning point in the ultimate resolution of Congolese affairs was the formation of a coalition government in August of 1961 under the leadership of Cyrille Adoula as Prime Minister. Some of my colleagues will recall meeting Mr. Adoula during his good will tour of the United States in early 1962, when he met with the President and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Under Mr. Adoula, the Congo has made much forward progress. His government quashed the extremist leftwing rival regime established in Stanleyville by Antoine Gizenga and ended the secession of the diamond-rich South Kasai province. Mr. Adoula fought off the combined parliamentary efforts of Gizenga's supporters and those of Katanga Provincial President Moise Tshombe to overthrow the central government.

The Central Government under President Joseph Kasavubu and Prime Minister Adoula has acted in a statesmanlike manner toward Mr. Tshombe and has appointed former Prime Minister Joseph Ileo, a man known for his moderate, pro-Western views, to be minister to Katanga. I am confident that President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Adoula will continue to do everything possible to complete the reintegration of Katanga in a constructive and farsighted manner.

Just last month, Cyrille Adoula was attacked in this Chamber as at best a neutralist and perhaps very far to the left. In my view, this is a great unfairness to a man who has been a vital force for law and order, moderation and progress in his country; a man who has whipped both the Communist left and the plutocratic or Fascist right.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this place in my remarks excerpts from a statement by Mr. Adoula to the Parliament in Léopoldville in January of this year. Judge for yourselves whether these are the words of a dangerous extremist or a responsible leader of his people, aware of the virtues of freedom and private enterprise, and compassionate in victory:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> My dear compatriots, following this appeal for patriotism and constructive work, the situation requires me to explain to you the cause of our misfortune: South Katanga secession. For the first time since we acquired independence, all necessary conditions for reunification of Congo seem to have been found. You know the situation that exists today in South Katanga. We are happy to confirm that the U.N. operation has been carried out in accordance with the mission of that organization and with a concern for sparing as far as possible the civilian population, be they Congolese or foreign.
>
> We have spared no effort to arrive at an amicable solution. By its attitude the Central Government has proved to the world its good will and has thus unmasked the game of the secessionists. The process has been long and difficult because, contrary to international opinion, the Congolese public was aware of the spirit of the group in power in Elisabethville. Because it was aware, the Congolese public did not understand our conciliatory attitude, which they took to be weakness. We needed great courage and firmness to keep to this line of conduct and to persevere in our action, which today is beginning to bear fruit.
>
> I would like to take this occasion to define the conditions of the Government as to the return of South Katanga to the Republic of the Congo, so as to avoid speculation of certain people with respect to our intentions. The reintegration of South Katanga will not mean reprisals. On the contrary, we will be very happy finally to reunite the Congolese people and resolve the problem which has constituted a heavy mortgage on our future.
>
> These are not simple words: examples of South Kasai and Orientale Provinces, which have been reintegrated after having been in rebellion, bear witness to our conciliatory spirit and to our understanding of the true interests of our country.
>
> As you know, the President of the Republic has solemnly proclaimed amnesty for political infractions. In doing this he committed his personal honor and the honor of the Government he represents. For the Chief of State, for the Government, for all authorities, for each Congolese, the return of South Katanga to the Republic means an end to the atmosphere of uneasiness and insecurity.
>
> Reintegration of South Katanga will mean for each citizen of that province full enjoyment of civil rights throughout the Congolese Republic. Restrictions imposed on people by the Elisabethville authorities will be lifted and Katangans will have access to positions in the Central Government and to all posts of responsibility.
>
> As to the Katangan economy, I wish to make clear that the Central Government intends to respect its commitments to encourage and protect, there as elsewhere in the Republic, all private investment, both Congolese and foreign.
>
> As to foreign technicians, I wish to affirm that the Central Government appreciates the services they render to our country. We will make sure that their persons and their interests are preserved. So as to give them all possible guarantees, we intend to regularize their status through direct agreements with their countries of origin. I wish to reaffirm to them, in my position as chief of Government, and in the name of the Congolese people, that they will always be welcome in this country.
>
> To make more precise the intentions of the Central Government on the solution of the South Katanga problem, I wish to borrow the following quotation from Abraham Lincoln, who seeing civil war approaching its end, declared: "With malice toward none, but with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all Nations."
>
> My dear compatriots, I could not end this talk without thanking the United Nations and its Secretary General for their persevering efforts to help us restore the territorial integrity of our country.
>
> I also express my gratitude to all countries which have helped us, particularly in this phase in the life of our country.
>
> The support and comfort that African countries have brought to us, of which the latest example was the PAFMECSA meeting in Léopoldville, strengthen us in our faith in the future of our country, and in the future of African friendship.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit that these are the words of a man we can be proud to call our ally.

III. THE FUTURE

Much remains to be done. As the military phase has receded, the enormous backlog of economic and social problems of the Congo have come to the fore. Inflation has been rampant, and a black market flourishes. Food, formerly available in adequate supply, now has to be imported with costly foreign exchange. Half the work force has been unemployed for more than 2 years. Tribal warfare still takes its toll of human lives.

The bank vaults of the Katanga Banks have been found to be pretty well rifled, presumably by Tshombe or his followers. More than a billion Congolese francs have been located in two small banks in British Rhodesia, and some 300 million francs—about 1.5 million U.S. dollars—are believed to have been spirited away to Portuguese Angola. An unknown amount of foreign exchange accounts is missing, and the International Monetary Fund is attempting to trace its location. Substantial sums are suspected to have been hidden by Tshombe and his colleagues in numbered bank accounts in Switzerland.

But while the problems of the Congo loom large, so, too, do the opportunities. The Congo is one of the largest, wealthiest countries in all of Africa. It has common borders with nine other areas—some of which are newly independent; others which seem headed for a period of tension and strife. The Congo is a member of the Lagos-Monrovia group of countries and of the Pan African Freedom Movement for East, Central, and Southern Africa, and it has recently drawn closer to the Afro-Malagasy Union of 12 French-speaking nations. Thus, in many respects, the Congo is pivotal to many of the forces that will affect the future of Africa.

Clearly, U.N. forces will have to be retained at reduced levels for some time to help quell tribal disorders until local gendarmes can be trained in sufficient numbers to maintain order.

To help alleviate the critical shortage of trained Congolese needed to run the machinery of government, U.N. recruited personnel have helped operate essential services throughout the country since the summer of 1960.

International civil servants have stood behind the Congo administration to assist and to teach Congolese officials. Schools were manned by teachers recruited by the United Nations from all over the world. Economic and technical aid on a sizable scale has been provided by the United Nations and will have to be continued. Doctors of the World Health Organization have contributed much in medical work throughout the Congo since 1960.

Adoula flew to Belgium recently to arrange for a settlement of his government's holdings in the Belgian-run Katanga mining company. Belgium herself has sent some technicians to Léopoldville. Italy sent some officials there to look into a training program for the Congolese Air Force. And the European Common Market sent a team to the Congo to arrange a trading program of $60 to $80 million over the next 5 years.

The United States carried almost 50 percent of the U.N.'s military and economic expenses during the last 2½ years. The stated U.S. objective from the start has been the encouragement of a "free, stable, non-Communist government for the Congo as a whole." With this objective much closer at hand than before but still short of realization, a continuation of U.S. economic assistance will clearly be needed. The administration has made clear it will see that the United States does not pay more than its fair share of development costs.

Assistant Secretary of State for International Institution, Harlan Cleveland, upon his return in February from a fact-finding mission to the Congo, is reported to have met with Secretary-General U Thant and to have urged that the United Nations now undertake the role of coordinator for all economic aid to the Congo to prevent East-West competition. As visualized, the United Nations would provide a broad umbrella for aid from all countries, and even nations and groups not members of the United Nations, such as West Germany, and the Common Market, would be urged to make effective contributions.

I ask consent that a summary of the recommendations of the Congo planning group headed by Mr. Cleveland, identified as State Department press release 109, dated March 1, 1963, be inserted in the Record at this place in my remarks:

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of U.S. Recommendations for a Program of International Assistance to the Congo

The Congo is a paradox: staggering problems in the present, and impressive prospects in the future.

The United Nations has already made a very great contribution to the future. There is a large reservoir of good will toward the United States, the product of our general African policy, our support of the United Nations and the Central Government in Léopoldville, and our close working relations with other governments interested in the Congo's welfare in spite of policy differences from time to time. The Congo has maintained its independence despite efforts of subversion and secession. Such threats continue, but, on balance, the Congo is going the way of free choice and not coercion; we should not neglect the next necessary steps to help it stay on that course.

As it enters the nation-building phase of its young life, the Republic of the Congo appears to face three key obstacles to progress:

A political system which is in the developing stage and requires increased executive powers and the capability to discharge such responsibility;

A relatively expensive military establishment that does not yet function in full response to the country's needs;

A financial administration which collects too little revenue and does not yet have dependable budgetary controls.

More than external aid, success of a nation-building effort in the Congo depends on developing the administrative capacity to rehabilitate the national army, bring the fiscal system under control, and construct a political system featuring a strong executive. If these prerequisites can be met, the Congo should no longer require substantial outside aid in a few years' time, for its resources are great and its population relatively small.

II

The relevant portions of the U Thant plan for national reconciliation have been largely fulfilled and partly bypassed by the events of December 1962 and January 1963.

What is needed now is an agenda for nation-building in the Congo, including as one part the knotting of the loose ends of Katanga's reintegration.

One point of the U Thant plan which awaits further action is the constitution. But a new, Federal Constitution for the Congo will necessarily depend on the parliamentary situation. Meanwhile, a de facto federalism is actually developing in the Congo.

An executive amnesty for political crimes has already been announced for Tshombe and his colleagues;

The integration of the currency is well underway and can be speeded up;

Parts of the Katangan gendarmerie are being integrated by unit or individual applications to the ANC;

Katanga's "foreign affairs" establishment is to be formally disestablished; and

Arrangements to bring the Conakat Party into the Central Government are being considered.

III

One of the most critical tasks facing the Congo is to bring military expenditures under control and to raise the Congolese National Army (ANC) to a higher degree of efficiency and discipline. Plans already suggested for a multinational training program based on a reduced but more effective army, plus an adequate air and naval capability, offer excellent prospects if they can be put into effect.

Multinational assistance to the Congolese Government in the military field should be coordinated under an acceptable arrangement between the Congolese Government, the United Nations and the nations concerned. This will permit the establishment of a national military aid pattern allowing several countries to help. Our own assistance, if requested, would primarily take the form of logistics support.

A civic action survey is needed to help plan an economic development role for the ANC and to consider how discharged veterans might best be employed.

The Congolese Government's desire to assure its authority in Katanga against the day when the United Nations will be pulled out must be met.

The requirements of a training program for provincial and municipal police are being given urgent consideration. It is encouraging that offers of assistance have also been forthcoming for this task.

U.S. policy favors the most rapid possible phase-out of the ONUC force consistent with the increasing capability of the Congolese Government to maintain minimum levels of security and insure its national integrity. It would, however, be dangerous to phase-out the ONUC force so rapidly as to leave an "internal security gap" before the adequate national security forces are trained, for insecurity in the Congo would invite unacceptable foreign intervention.

IV

Domestic harmony in the Congo nation will crucially depend this year on the value of the money in which soldiers are paid and the provincial governments are financed. Just as you cannot do business without insuring internal security, you cannot have growth without sound money.

In spite of growing production and rising exports, the Congo suffers from severe inflation. The actual market value of Congolese currency is about one-fourth the legal rate.

A well-financed, well-coordinated and well-staffed stabilization program including effective budgetary procedures, spending controls, tax collection and differential exchange rates is required. Unless this is done, the Congo may be faced with runaway inflation. The additional requirement is to obtain enough external resources to maintain minimum levels of essential imports, finance necessary expatriate technicians, and service the external debt.

To move toward stabilization, the Congo will require:

A strong administration in the Ministry of Finance and provision for this purpose of a substantial number of foreign technicians to assist in the Ministry of Finance.

Husbanding of military expenditures.

A special effort to make the most effective use of the sums available for education.

Assurance through foreign aid of a minimum level of essential imports. This should help to meet the inflation problem.

Launching a public works program to reduce unemployment, rehabilitate the vital transportation network, and build constructive ties between the Central Government and provincial and local governments.

V

Other nations can do much, and we should encourage them to do more.

The Belgians already support 2,000 technicians, teachers, judges, and public administrators. They also will be continuing to make other payments, including the service on Congolese debts.

Belgian assistance in the financing of imports would be an important contribution, and we hope substantial assistance of this kind will be made available.

We expect that the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany will also wish to participate in assisting the Congo. The Economic Development Fund of the European Economic Community (EEC) may provide substantial assistance over the next few years.

A dozen other countries are potential small contributors to a plan for nation building in the Congo. The nation building effort can be particularly stimulated by contributions from non-European countries.

The United States should endeavor to:

Continue Public Law 480 food sales as required to assist the supply of food to the Congo.

Although some direct aid will be required to finance imports, we can aim at putting a rapidly increasing portion of this aid on a loan basis, in view of the basically strong potential of the Congolese economy. Loans will be especially appropriate for equipment and spare parts in the transportation sector.

Continue support of the United Nations Congo Fund but shift the emphasis to such priority sectors as public financing, and try to assure that other donors finance at least half of the Fund.

Secure adequate assurances about the spending of aid-generated local currencies available for economic development, public works and budget support, and its use in support of a vigorous stabilization strategy.

Continue a development grant program operated under the United Nations umbrella and reoriented to emphasize activities directly in support of stabilization and internal security objectives.

VI.

The presence in the Congo's future of several large contributors, and several additional smaller ones, requires the multilateral coordination of bilateral efforts, both in retraining the ANC and in stabilizing and developing the Congolese economy.

A competition of purely bilateral aid is not only inefficient but risks importing the cold war into the Congo. A creative combination of bilateral aid and multilateral coordination is what is needed to conduct an effective, well integrated program.

The United Nations should provide the Central Government with direct technical aid in the areas of greatest national importance—that is, in internal security matters, the control of foreign exchange, the coordination of external aid and the administration of the public finances.

We should help the United Nations to find additional high-level talent for these purposes.

The technical work done by specialized agency teams in education, health, food and agriculture, manpower training, meteorology, telecommunications and airport management is useful, and generally of good quality and high repute. The United Nations Secretariat should continue to take the responsibility for the supervision and the coordination of these activities in the field. But they should be increasingly funded after 1963 from the Special Fund, the expanded technical assistance program, or the specialized agencies' budgets themselves.

We understand it is the desire of the Government of the Congo that the United Nations should serve as general coordinator for all bilateral aid to the Congo's economic development. This role will involve:

(a) providing top personnel to help the Government of the Congo coordinate external aid from all sources for all purposes.

(b) reviewing each proposed bilateral program to make sure that it fits within a framework agreed between the Government of the Congo and the United Nations; and

(c) participating directly in decisions about the use of some important development aid, as is now the case in the allocation of local currency generated from Public Law 480 imports.

The contributors to the reconstruction task in the Congo should consult on the types of aid needed in assuring a rational and fair distribution of the assistance effort.

The question of the future financing of the United Nations peace-keeping activities in the Congo is being considered in the Committee of 21 and is not being treated in this paper.

It is our hope that the maximum number of countries will find it possible to assist the Republic of the Congo as it enters the important nation-building phase of its development.

IV. CONCLUSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the resolution of the Congo crisis represents a major success for American policy. Steadfast U.S. support of United Nations efforts to restore order and unity in the Congo, begun under President Eisenhower and carried out under President Kennedy, continues despite loud voices of dissent in this country and in the Congress.

U.S. policy has received widespread support throughout the free world, and has been praised by virtually all African leaders. The delegates to the last meeting of the Pan African Freedom Movement for East, Central, and Southern Africa, sent a message to President Kennedy expressing "appreciation for the enlightened Congo policy now pursued by your Government and also for assistance given to the Congo."

The United Nations has scored a most impressive achievement. Scorned as too weak to keep the peace by those who place their faith in national machines alone, criticized by the anti-internationalists who prefer to see the United States "go it alone" as in Teddy Roosevelt's days, the United Nations has succeeded, where we alone might well have failed or invited another big power conflict. The United Nations forces from 21 nations, including India, Ireland, Sweden, Ghana, Guinea, Tunisia, Morocco, and Ethiopia, who carried out the U.N. tasks in the Congo—and suffered 260 casualties—deserve our warm praise and thanks.

The tragedy is that the United Nations was not recognized from the first as the best source of stability in Katanga as elsewhere in the Congo. As the late Dag Hammarskjold said in one of his last statements to the Security Council of the United Nations:

> I believe, and many believe with me, that this Organization, in all its frailty, represents the sole approach which may give us a chance to reduce the risk that the constant frictions which characterize the life of our present day world will build up to a tension easily triggered in which we would all be engulfed.

Mrs. Marian McVitty, an able U.N. observer, in a recent newsletter summed up the U.N. efforts in the Congo in words that may well be used by an historian looking back on recent events there with greater perspective:

> The record will show that any U.N. mistakes were inadvertently made; that the United Nations was impartial, devoted and effective; that U.N. representatives were more mindful of the dignity of Congo officials than of credit they might claim for themselves or the organization; that U.N. individuals bore criticism from all sides although not one of them could expect to gain any personal advantage. The United Nations operation in the Congo is not finished, but it has accomplished much in a difficult situation. It bids fair to succeed in an experiment of great importance to the future of international undertakings to provide peace and security by maintaining order under law.

Those of us who support President Kennedy in his support of the United Nations and its efforts to secure a just and lasting peace for a free Congo nation can take real satisfaction in the progress of that country toward the achievement of its national aspirations and goals.

The success of our Congo policy is a triumph for freedom over the forces of communism, racism, and plutocratic fascism.

Mr. President, how nice it would be if the defense of the foreign policy in the Congo of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy could receive the same coverage in the press which the attack of its irresponsible critics has been given in the newspapers of the United States.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in accordance with the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, March 19, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 4: 11: *It is required of stewards that they be found faithful.*

O Thou God of might and of mercy, we thank Thee for the patience and perseverance of those who, in these troublous days, are taking hold of Thee with renewed faith and are determined never to let go.

Bestow Thy sustaining grace and courage upon all who are struggling desperately against the moods of doubt and despair which assail them when the victory for righteousness and justice appears very dark and gloomy.

Grant that our chosen leaders and representatives may continue to carry on faithfully, as good stewards, even when distrust and derision, scorn, and carping criticism seem to be rife among those whom they are seeking to serve.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate on March 20, 21, and 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

REAPPOINTMENT OF JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN

The clerk called House Joint Resolution 234, to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of John Nicholas Brown, of Providence, Rhode Island, on March 14, 1963, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

HISTORY OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement on the history of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Since the Private Calendar is being called today the first time during the 88th Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of, this calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all private bills are referred. Private bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, etc., as distinguished from public bills, which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only 5 were private laws. But, their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress (1885–87)—the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available—passed 1,031 private laws, as compared with 434 public laws. At the turn of the century, the 56th Congress (1899–1901) passed 1,498 private laws and 443 public laws—a better than 3-to-1 ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee of the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62d Congress (1911–13) changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause 6, which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932 and then adopted in its present form on March 27, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: (1) Those authorizing the payment of money for pensions, or (2) for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure, (3) those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream, or (4) those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and cold war flood of private immigration bills. The 82d Congress (1951–53) passed 1,023 private laws, as compared with 594 public laws. The 87th Congress (1961–63) passed 684 private laws and 885 public laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause 6, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesdays of each month. The consideration of Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection. Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matter so stricken out shall not again be included in an omnibus bill during the session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved into their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed severally.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the official objectors system the House has established to deal with our great volume of private bills.

The majority leader and minority leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar objectors during a Congress. The objectors have the responsibility of carefully studying all bills which are placed on the Private Calendar. When the Private Calendar is called, the objectors are on the floor ready to object to any private bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular private bill, he can get assistance from the objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. Those rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. The agreement is as follows:

"Reaffirming the policy initially adopted on June 3, 1958, the members of the majority and minority Private Calendar objectors committees have today agreed that during the 88th Congress they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of 7 calendar days, excluding the day the bills are reported and the day the Private Calendar is called.

"It is agreed that the majority and minority legislative clerks will not submit to the objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

"This policy will be strictly observed except during the closing days of each session when House rules are suspended."

The agreement was entered into by the majority objectors—the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill]—and the minority objectors—the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson].

I feel confident I speak for my colleague objectors when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance consideration to the private bills, by not asking us to depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

NATIONAL RICE WEEK

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is National Rice Week. Tomorrow, in commemoration of this event, the rice industry is sponsoring a free serving of a rice dish to all who dine in the restaurants and cafeterias in the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings. It is estimated that 6,000 persons will be able to have this delicacy on their luncheon plate. On behalf of the Congress, I want to thank the rice industry for this generosity and to salute this observance.

Too often we have experienced on this floor bitter and heated controversy over agricultural policy. Today, I want to tell you a brief story which I hope will reassure those who do not represent farm areas that progress is being made in solving the problems of agriculture.

Some years ago, the rice industry was faced with a critical surplus problem. They recognized that something had to be done and proceeded to do it with the help of legislation which the Congress saw fit to pass. At the moment, there is no surplus problem. A heartening example of how the rice industry has gone about in getting its industry stable has to do with Cuba. Prior to Castro, Cuba was the No. 1 dollar market for our rice exports. When it was recognized that Castro was a full-fledged and uncompromising Communist, the rice industry voluntarily wrote Cuba off as a market for its produce. This was a hard blow to take, but the industry wanted to play its part in cutting our economic ties with the Cuban dictator. To make up for this loss the rice industry, with remarkable determination and ingenuity, went out into the world markets and found customers for the rice previously sent to Cuba.

This is just but one of many examples that the industry has been putting forth in keeping its production in line with demand. It is a pleasure for me to pay tribute to them today for a job well done.

NAVY DEPARTMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have uncovered another case of Navy Department sleight of hand in regard to plans and blueprints for a certain piece of equipment which proves what I have been contending for the past 2 years, and that is that as long as we allow the military to act as its own judge, jury, prosecutor, defense attorney, and witness, we cannot hope to save any money on our massive military expenditure.

The case I am about to detail for you is typical of so many more. The Navy has rigged a procurement so that only one company will bid on it, but I hope, after my presentation here today and after the General Accounting Office looks into the matter, more competition will be induced. It certainly should be, and the middle-grade civil servants who arrange this sort of thing should be chastised severely.

Here is what has happened:

In January 1961 a contract—85111—was issued to Chu Associates, Cambridge, Mass., for development and production of 250 units of the AS-1018/URC(XMI) antenna. Since Chu was paid for development of the antenna, you would expect the Navy would ask for blueprints and plans, would you not?

In June of 1962, under terms of contract 87534, the Turbo Machine Co. was issued a contract for the same equipment. It produced 107 units at a cost of $541 each. Just a few days after this, the Navy negotiated another contract—again with Chu Associates—No. 87698—for another 121 units of the same equipment at a price of $970 each—almost twice what was paid Turbo Machine Co.

The waste in this is self-evident. There can be no question.

Now the Navy presently has another requirement for the same equipment under terms of request for proposal 26057. This bid closes April 9, 1963, and is for 261 units. In a special notice on the bid set, the Navy states that it does not know if any patents are involved. Such a statement is enough to frighten away many bidders, and that is apparently the intent of some middle-grade civil servant in the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, after paying for development of this antenna and after buying it from two different makers, I think you will agree the Navy should know if patents are involved. As a matter of fact, it should have those patent rights for itself because the taxpayers paid for the development of this item.

Unless the Navy is flushed from behind the woodpile, here is another procurement that will go to a favored company and another instance in which the taxpayer will be the fall guy. I have today asked the General Accounting Office to make a full investigation of this procurement and have also referred the matter to the Justice Department and the Secretary of Defense.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S SURPLUS GRAIN STOCKPILE CLAIM

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I challenged Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's flat claim that surplus grain stockpiles have been reduced over one billion bushels during his two years in office.

I used statistics from Mr. Freeman's own department to prove his claim was unfounded. The actual reduction was about one-half that claimed.

I am glad to report that Mr. Freeman now recognizes the error of his ways.

Tonight Mr. Freeman will address the National Farmers Union in New York City. In the official text of his speech, released early today by the Department of Agriculture, he is quoted as saying:

> By October, we expect to have 1.1 billion fewer bushels of grain in storage and under loan than we had 2 years ago.

Compare this with Mr. Freeman's flat claim on March 8—less than 2 weeks ago—to Americans for Democratic Action in Pittsburgh:

> We have already reduced our stockpiles of surpluses by 1,077 million bushels.

Mr. Freeman obviously now acknowledges that the billion-bushel reduction is not a fact. It is not an accomplishment. It is wishful thinking, a speculative guess on what may materialize by October.

SPECIAL FUND OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this Special Fund of the United Nations is a tremendous thing. It was not so tremendous back in the beginning in 1959, but since then the generous taxpayers of the United States have increased their contributions 300 percent until this year we except to put in perhaps $29 million.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD today two tables that provide an at-a-glance study of the scope of this Fund that has become a second foreign policy for the United States, and I want to point out a few of the highlights of these tables.

We find that since its beginning in May 1959, the Special Fund has undertaken 286 projects in 74 countries and territories. The total cost of Fund projects has been $588,784,716 of which the Special Fund has contributed $250,625,800. Beneficiary territories and nations have chipped in with $338,158,916.

The total contribution of the United States to the Special Fund is estimated by our State Department to be some $100,400,000 up to this point.

The first table shows that the three areas of the world benefiting the most from Fund projects are the Americas, Africa, and Asia, and the Far East.

There have been 83 projects in the Americas. Total cost is highest in Asia and the Far East at $175,077,371.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.—remember that agriculture grant to Red Cuba?—has administered far and away the most Special Fund projects with a total of 113. UNESCO is next with 48. The International Atomic Energy Agency trails with one project—that nuclear research project in Yugoslavia about which I have commented to the House in considerable detail.

The second table provides a quick view of the total number of and the costs of projects received by each individual country and territory. It shows that India, with 20 projects, has the most projects and the greatest total cost at $58,704,546.

We note that the United States has received no Special Fund aid.

The tables follow:

1. Projects approved by the Governing Council: Summary, May 1959 to January 1963

	Number of projects approved [1]	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
		Total	Special fund [2] earmarkings [3]	Government counterpart contribution [3]
Governing Council session:				
May 1959	13	31, 265, 287	9, 575, 500	21, 689, 787
December 1959	30	49, 187, 129	25, 237, 700	23, 949, 429
May 1960	30	58, 604, 600	22, 820, 600	35, 784, 000
December 1960	41	85, 388, 400	36, 233, 300	49, 155, 100
May 1961	41	74, 907, 500	33, 368, 300	41, 539, 200
January 1962	48	110, 520, 900	42, 814, 300	67, 706, 600
May 1962	41	82, 278, 600	36, 902, 600	45, 376, 000
January 1963	42	96, 632, 300	43, 673, 500	52, 958, 800
Total	286	588, 784, 716	250, 625, 800	338, 158, 916
Region:				
Africa	76	154, 058, 450	67, 463, 400	86, 595, 050
The Americas	83	155, 316, 095	72, 243, 900	83, 072, 195
Asia and the Far East	82	175, 077, 371	73, 806, 000	101, 271, 371
Europe	16	47, 821, 687	13, 211, 000	34, 610, 687
Middle East	28	52, 645, 113	30, 035, 500	32, 609, 613
Interregional	1	3, 866, 000	3, 866, 000	----------
Total	286	588, 784, 716	250, 625, 800	338, 158, 916
Category of project:				
Resource surveys	118	175, 097, 114	88, 077, 100	87, 020, 014
Technical education and training	107	270, 799, 589	102, 104, 900	168, 694, 689
Applied research	57	131, 335, 713	52, 146, 500	79, 189, 213
Economic development planning	4	11, 552, 300	8, 297, 300	3, 255, 000
Total	286	588, 784, 716	250, 625, 800	338, 158, 916
Executing agency:				
FAO	113	197, 652, 389	90, 824, 300	106, 828, 089
IAEA	1	1, 752, 400	546, 400	1, 206, 000
IBRD	14	17, 261, 200	10, 103, 700	7, 157, 500
ICAO	8	27, 616, 600	10, 397, 700	17, 218, 900
ILO	37	75, 188, 112	30, 521, 600	44, 666, 512
ITU	8	18, 789, 900	6, 479, 700	12, 310, 200
UNESCO	48	155, 531, 077	52, 059, 000	103, 472, 077
UN	46	77, 637, 575	43, 680, 800	33, 956, 775
WHO	4	7, 963, 300	2, 118, 400	5, 844, 900
WMO	7	9, 392, 163	3, 894, 200	5, 497, 963
Total	286	588, 784, 716	250, 625, 800	338, 158, 916

[1] Excludes 2 projects which had been canceled prior to commencement of execution.

[2] Revised earmarkings as of Jan. 31, 1963.

[3] The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing Council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

2. Total number and cost of projects by recipient country or region, May 1959 to January 1963

Country	Number of projects approved	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
		Total	Special fund earmarkings [1]	Government counterpart contribution [1]
Afghanistan	2	3, 338, 700	2, 363, 700	975, 000
Argentina	8	14, 180, 500	6, 238, 900	7, 941, 600
Bolivia	3	3, 451, 600	[2] 1, 993, 600	1, 458, 000
Brazil	5	9, 226, 400	4, 965, 200	4, 261, 200
Burma	5	9, 534, 800	4, 193, 800	5, 341, 000
Cambodia	1	2, 038, 500	947, 500	1, 091, 000
Cameroon	1	2, 692, 800	1, 174, 800	1, 518, 000
Ceylon	2	2, 396, 300	1, 053, 300	1, 343, 000
Chile	8	15, 415, 950	7, 525, 700	7, 890, 250
China	5	5, 925, 675	3, 361, 600	2, 564, 075
Colombia	9	14, 915, 450	6, 384, 900	8, 530, 550
Congo (Brazzaville)	2	3, 738, 900	1, 816, 900	1, 922, 000
Cuba	1	3, 035, 600	1, 157, 600	1, 878, 000
Cyprus	2	4, 879, 000	2, 127, 100	2, 751, 900
Ecuador	7	10, 824, 200	5, 159, 900	5, 664, 300
El Salvador	1	910, 800	348, 300	562, 500
Ethiopia	2	1, 979, 800	1, 362, 800	617, 000
Federation of Malaya	2	4, 133, 000	1, 421, 500	2, 711, 500
Gabon	1	2, 892, 000	2, 092, 000	800, 000
Ghana	5	7, 601, 500	3, 461, 500	4, 140, 000
Greece	4	5, 639, 300	2, 128, 300	3, 511, 000
Guatemala	2	2, 543, 700	1, 400, 700	1, 143, 000
Guinea	2	1, 944, 100	1, 273, 100	671, 000
Haiti	2	1, 724, 900	1, 004, 600	720, 300
Honduras	1	1, 002, 300	422, 300	580, 000
India	20	58, 704, 546	17, 391, 500	41, 313, 046
Indonesia	2	3, 481, 800	1, 548, 300	1, 933, 500
Iran	8	20, 271, 600	7, 705, 600	12, 566, 000
Iraq	5	11, 495, 800	3, 779, 800	7, 716, 000
Israel	6	7, 987, 313	2, 643, 200	5, 344, 113
Ivory Coast	1	3, 150, 400	1, 034, 800	2, 115, 600
Japan	1	1, 676, 800	702, 500	974, 300
Jordan	2	2, 026, 200	1, 318, 700	707, 500
Laos	1	1, 338, 900	583, 900	755, 000
Lebanon	6	13, 218, 700	5, 757, 700	7, 461, 000
Liberia	1	1, 756, 900	1, 006, 900	750, 000
Libya	2	4, 247, 550	1, 639, 600	2, 607, 950
Madagascar	1	2, 924, 200	1, 435, 200	1, 489, 000
Mali	2	5, 131, 900	2, 032, 900	3, 099, 000
Mexico	5	12, 955, 000	4, 789, 000	8, 166, 000
Morocco	6	16, 072, 200	5, 144, 200	10, 928, 000
Nepal	1	1, 199, 400	974, 400	225, 000
Netherlands: Surinam	1	1, 462, 000	770, 000	692, 000
Nicaragua	2	2, 384, 400	1, 590, 400	794, 000
Nigeria	10	26, 138, 200	10, 630, 300	15, 507, 900
Pakistan	9	25, 798, 450	11, 484, 000	14, 314, 450
Panama	1	509, 600	418, 600	91, 000
Paraguay	1	908, 900	543, 900	365, 000
Peru	9	13, 536, 955	[3] 6, 582, 700	6, 954, 255
Philippines	3	4, 733, 300	2, 428, 600	2, 304, 700
Poland	2	7, 968, 500	1, 837, 500	6, 131, 000
Republic of Korea	5	8, 344, 200	4, 112, 400	4, 231, 800
Republic of Vietnam	1	421, 400	268, 500	152, 900
Saudi Arabia	3	5, 886, 200	2, 077, 700	3, 808, 500
Senegal	4	9, 006, 000	3, 964, 100	5, 041, 900
Somalia	2	2, 093, 100	1, 523, 100	570, 000
Sudan	8	12, 090, 600	5, 321, 000	6, 769, 600
Syrian Arab Republic	6	12, 030, 900	4, 458, 400	7, 572, 500
Thailand	7	10, 682, 900	5, 497, 500	5, 185, 400
Togo	2	2, 756, 500	1, 973, 500	783, 000
Tunisia	5	11, 321, 800	4, 988, 800	6, 333, 000
Turkey	4	14, 637, 687	3, 889, 400	10, 748, 287
Uganda	2	5, 566, 000	1, 473, 000	4, 093, 000
United Arab Republic	11	21, 269, 000	8, 497, 900	12, 771, 100
United Kingdom:				
British Guiana	4	3, 246, 900	1, 762, 400	1, 484, 500
Colony of North Borneo	1	1, 559, 900	769, 900	790, 000
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	2	2, 482, 300	1, 341, 300	1, 141, 000
Kenya	3	5, 361, 800	3, 234, 800	2, 127, 000
Malta	1	1, 501, 200	601, 200	900, 000
Singapore	1	1, 449, 100	578, 100	871, 000
Upper Volta	1	1, 840, 900	1, 040, 900	800, 000
Uruguay	2	3, 868, 000	1, 975, 000	1, 893, 000
Venezuela	5	18, 031, 300	4, 780, 30.	13, 251, 000
Yugoslavia	3	13, 196, 000	2, 627, 500	10, 568, 500
Subtotal (74 countries and territories)	274	555, 688, 976	227, 910, 500	327, 778, 476
Regional and interregional projects:				
The Americas	6	21, 181, 640	12, 429, 900	8, 751, 740
Asia and the Far East	5	8, 048, 100	6, 419, 400	1, 628, 700
Interregional	1	3, 866, 000	3, 866, 000	----------
Subtotal	12	33, 095, 740	22, 715, 300	10, 380, 440
Total	286	588, 784, 716	250, 625, 800	338, 158, 916

[1] The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing Council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

[2] Includes residual earmarking of $1,000 to cover initial expenditures on a project which was subsequently canceled.

[3] Includes residual earmarking of $1,725 to cover initial expenditures on a project which was subsequently canceled.

A BILL TO ELIMINATE APPROPRIATIONS CEILING ON THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act states that aggregate appropriations for this vital Agency must not exceed $10 million. I am today introducing a bill to eliminate that ceiling, which if left standing means that not more than $10 million may be appropriated during the life of that Agency. Already, Mr. Speaker, about $8.3 million of the $10 million authorized has been appropriated.

It would be tragic and a waste of the valuable work already performed by the Agency if this ceiling is not removed. This leaves $1.7 million authorized but unappropriated, while the Agency requests $15 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963.

Tens of billions—more than $50 billion this year—are being spent in the quest for defense. Surely, activities aimed at an indispensable element in defense—the search for effective international arms control—should not be impaired by an outdated appropriations ceiling.

In connection with this, I wish to call attention to two observations—one by President Kennedy and the second by William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

President Kennedy in September 1961, appeared before the U.N. General Assembly to state:

> Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Mr. Foster at a symposium at Ann Arbor, Mich., last December stated:

> Nonetheless, we can not enjoy a real sense of security today. If the arms race continues, the hazards to our own security will become increasingly sharp.

These are concise statements, Mr. Speaker, which should bring home to us the urgency in permitting the Agency to continue its quest unhampered by an unrealistic appropriations level.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN, OF OREGON, ACCOMPANYING BILL TO PROVIDE CERTAIN DATA FROM MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THEIR SPOUSES, AND CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my March 11 speech on the floor of the House, I am introducing today a bill—the third in a projected series—to require from Members of Congress and their spouses annual statements of sources of income as well as transactions in real estate, commodities, and securities. The requirement also applies to employees of the Congress with an income at the annual rate of $12,500 or more.

CAPITAL GAINS FOR PULPWOOD AND TIMBER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina tree farmers have much more land in forest than all the other cropland combined including grassland. Our tree farmers realize more income annually from trees than any other single crop in South Carolina.

When pine trees are planted or when they just come up, as is common in the pine belt, it is usually a minimum of 12 to 15 years before any income can be realized; and this is in the form of pulpwood. It is usually a minimum of 25 to 30 years before pine timber can be harvested for lumber; and thereafter it can be selectively cut every 5, 10, or sometimes it is 20 years. This is true for pine and poplar, and for our hardwoods it requires many more extra years to mature. In the meantime, the farmer must pay taxes on his forest land, he must prevent fire, and in some cases he must do some thinning and pruning for which he receives no return whatever.

The small tree farmer cannot harvest a few trees annually for pulpwood or for timber. He must wait for a number of years until his trees reach such size or such volume that it will be economically feasible for someone with equipment and trucks to come in and buy his pulpwood and timber.

Many small farmers have invested heavily in pine trees in the hope that in 10, 15, or 20 years they could make a harvest with which to send their children or grandchildren to college. This is the only means thousands of our tree farmers in the Southland have to send their children to college.

The elimination of capital gains on pulpwood and timber production, as proposed by the tax program of the President, would be a severe and tragic blow to the tree farmers of South Carolina and to those of the entire South. This tax proposal, if adopted, would add greatly to the farm problem, particularly the already depressed family-size farmer who owns most of the pulp and timber land in the South.

Mr. Speaker, my people have been encouraged for 30 years to plant trees under our conservation program. They have been taught reforestation. They have been urged to set out trees to conserve water, and lately, millions of trees have been set out under the soil bank. As an example, my home county in 1919 planted more than 70,000 acres in cotton—last year only 2,200 acres. We have gone to pine trees, but trees simply cannot be harvested every year on our small farms. Therefore, I know of nothing which would set back agriculture in the whole Southland more than this proposal to eliminate capital gains.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the house and in the senate in South Carolina; and I have never served with more dignified, dedicated, and patriotic legislators.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to you and to this entire Congress for your earnest consideration the following, most timely, concurrent resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate and House of the State of South Carolina on March 6, 1963, opposing the elimination of capital gains on pulp and timber. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was offered by three of our most distinguished Senators, Senator John West, of Camden; Senator Henry B. Richardson, of Sumter; and Senator C. Claymon Grimes, Jr., of Georgetown.

Concurrent Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Reject That Portion of the Tax Program of the President of the United States Which Would Eliminate the Capital Gains on the Sale of Timber and Urging the Congressional Delegation From South Carolina To Oppose, With All the Strength at Their Disposal, the Passage of Such a Measure

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

Whereas the enacting into law the President's proposal will most certainly effect the economy of the State very adversely; and

Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have, through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; be it further

Resolved, That the members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS AND AREA TRAVEL BANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members of the House about a problem that I ran into in the case of one of my constituents in his relations with the U.S. Government.

The reason I asked for 30 minutes on the floor of the House during which to discuss this problem is that the underlying policies involved are very important ones. They should mean something, to the country as a whole, and they are indicative of attitudes of the Government that are in need of reorganization.

My constituent's name is George W. Martin, Jr. He lives in Manhattan. Mr. Martin had planned to leave on April 15 of this year for a 2-week cruise to the Greek islands with stops in various cities in Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and Albania. This particular cruise was arranged by an English organization entitled "Swan's Hellenic Cruises." The tour consists largely of a group of Englishmen and Europeans who are interested in Greek civilization. The cruise will be accompanied by British university professors who will provide lectures during the tour.

Each of the persons on this tour presumably is a person interested in Greek history, Greek civilization, and how Greek civilization relates to the modern age.

My constituent, Mr. Martin, is a distinguished author. His most recently published book is entitled "The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice," subtitle "A Homeric Fable." It is based on Greek mythology adapted to the present time.

Prior to this publication Mr. Martin was the author of a leading book on the opera and recently he has completed a manuscript on the Italian composer, Verdi.

On April 27 it is planned the ship will dock at Durres, Albania, in order to take a brief bus ride, as a group, to examine some of the most ancient and most interesting Greek ruins of the whole trip. The excursion does not involve any overnight stay in Albania nor at any time moving in anything less than a group.

After making arrangements for the trip Mr. Martin was advised by the British company that his American passport would not be valid for Albania; that he, Mr. Martin, will be relieved of the passport when the ship reaches Durres; and that if he should attempt to leave the ship the U.S. Government has given instructions that he is to be reported to the U.S. authorities.

Mr. Martin brought this to my attention and I took up the matter orally with the Department of State. I made the point that here was a group of British and European scholars and professors, all interested in Greek civilization, together taking a most interesting tour of the Greek isles, and yet when they stop at the port of Durres to see some of the greatest Greek ruins of all, Mr. Martin will be the only person on board the ship who will be required to stand at the gangplank, to surrender his passport and suffer the humiliation of being left behind because his government won't let him go.

I pointed out to the gentlemen in the State Department that I thought this was not only an embarrassment to my constituent but that it was an embarrassment as well to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject. As the House well knows the subject of the issuance of passports and area travel bans is in a state of confusion. Past procedures of the State Department in this area were struck down by the Supreme Court in three important cases, the Kent, Briehl and Dayton cases. So I immediately raised the question on what power and authority does the State Department rest its case. In addition, assuming authority exists, is the power reasonably exercised in any particular case.

The case of Mr. Martin has triggered off quite a discussion, I am pleased to say, at various levels in the Department of State. I will tell you how this particular tale came out in just a few moments. You will be interested to know what happened in the case of Mr. Martin.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, there has been a reluctance to come to grips with this whole problem of area travel bans. The Martin case has served the useful purpose of removing the subject from the back burner.

Subsequent to my conversations with the State Department I received a letter from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton on this subject dated February 28, 1963, which reads as follows:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I am writing in response to your oral request to me regarding existing restrictions on the travel of U.S. citizens to Albania.
>
> In order that you may more fully appreciate the Department's current policy in this matter, it may be useful if I relate briefly some of the background.
>
> The Department's policies with respect to travel limitations as established by previous administrations had not been reflected in any published regulations but were brought to public attention through the issuance of press releases.

This is the U.S. Government, I insert here parenthetically, standing on a power base of authority created only by press release.

> This unsatisfactory procedure has been under review at the direction of the Secretary in the Department with the object of achieving a more orderly procedure through published regulations of the Department. This includes a complete review of past policies, including the present limitation on travel to Albania. This review involves both form and substance and is expected to be completed in the near future.
>
> In the meantime, in order to be responsive to your immediate inquiry, I would call to your attention the fact that the Secretary of State has the statutory power to designate restricted geographical areas and to refuse to sanction the travel of U.S. citizens to that area (sec. 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1185).
>
> Application of this authority in the Secretary to restrict travel to Communist China was upheld in *Worthy* v. *Herter*, 106 App. D.C. 153, 270 F. 2d 905 (1959) certiorari denied 361 U.S. 918 (1959). The same considerations apply to the restriction of travel of citizens of the United States to Albania.
>
> On April 28, 1952, the Department of State limited the travel of U.S. citizens to Albania by invalidating all passports issued thereafter for such travel unless specifically endorsed under the authority of the Department to be valid for such travel. The decision to restrict travel to Albania was announced in a Department press release dated May 1, 1952. The limitations on the travel of U.S. citizens to Albania have not been lifted or removed.
>
> Passports are being specifically endorsed for travel to Albania when information furnished by the applicant shows that he meets the standards established by the Department as a condition for such endorsement and if there is no adverse information available which would bar such travel.
>
> The passports of persons wishing to travel to Albania are validated for such travel when there is a "legitimate business justification, reason of compelling interest, or when the refusal will result in considerable damage to the individual concerned." A request made for the purpose of visiting relatives or settling an estate is considered as falling within a "reason of compelling interest." Tourist travel to Albania is not being approved.
>
> The Department appreciates your interest in the problem of limitation upon travel and would be glad to receive any views which you may hold regarding this area of restricted travel of U.S. citizens.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

The provision of the Immigration and Naturalization Act that is referred to as the underlying basis for authority is 8 U.S.C. 1185, mentioned in Mr. Dutton's letter. But this provision in the Immigration and Naturalization Act is a provision pertaining only to wartime conditions or existence of a national emergency proclaimed as such by the President of the United States in an official proclamation, and even in this case the imposition of an area ban is a discretionary act on the part of the executive branch and not an act by any direction of the Congress.

One would suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there would be some commonsense attached to discretionary acts on the part of Government.

In this case the U.S. State Department was asking Mr. Martin to submit to embarrassment, and for what reason? In my view, if there were anything to be gained by the United States or its citizens it would be one thing. But there is nothing to be gained.

I do not accept the fact that this is done for the protection of responsible U.S. citizens such as Mr. Martin. This is often given as the reason. But the State Department let the cat out of the bag in its letter to me. In Mr. Dutton's letter to me he states that the State Department would make an exception for a U.S. citizen traveling in Albania where there is legitimate business justification or reason of compelling interests or that the refusal will result in considerable damage to the individual concerned. The letter goes on to state that a request made for the purpose of visiting relatives or settling an estate is considered as falling within a reasonable or compelling interest.

Now what a grand jumble of legal niceties this is. If it is safe for Joe Doakes to visit Albania because his Aunt Mary has left him a valuable set of library books on Greek mythology, and the will is being contested, why is it unsafe for a U.S. citizen who is a writer on Greek mythology to travel in a bus a few miles in from the coast in order to see preserved relics of ancient Greek history. If Charles Dickens were alive today, he would have found no greater example of legal humbug than this.

It will be said that Albania is a Communist state. Of course it is. It is under the domination of Moscow. But we permit our citizens to visit Moscow. If the Soviet Union or Albania will not permit our citizens to enter, that is another matter, but that is not the case in point.

But apart from the legal and other inconsistencies involved, it seems to me that the State Department has in the past been treading on some very fundamental rights. The right to travel, Mr. Speaker, which means the right to communicate is an important and sensitive right. The Supreme Court has stated it is a right subject to the due process protection. A rereading of the opinions of the Supreme Court in the three cases that I mentioned—Kent, Briehl, and Dayton—will suggest the dangers of resting such cases on a press release as authority for a very doubtful proposition to begin with.

I was very pleased that Mr. Dutton in his letter asked me for my views regarding this area of restricted travel for U.S. citizens. My views, Mr. Speaker, can be very simply stated. I doubt that the State Department has the power to withhold a passport in this particular case, and if the State Department does have the power, it is a discretionary power only and would have been very badly exercised in this case.

Now back to Mr. Martin. I want to extend a compliment to the State Department because, on review of the whole case, the Department found that it would serve no useful purpose whatever not to allow Mr. Martin to visit Durres with the others. That is a very sensible and sound conclusion, and I give the State Department good marks for having reached this conclusion in this case.

You may ask, Why am I taking the floor now to talk about this case and to bring it to public attention? I even run the risk of having some of my colleagues here, who may take a different view than I, making some complaint, raising some question suggesting that the State Department acted unwisely in the case of Mr. Martin. Why rock the boat? That is the very reason I am talking. It is time the boat was rocked. I am very interested in bringing this matter to public attention and in pushing the State Department into a resolution of the underlying question. This question has remained unresolved for some years. It has lain around unresolved with various aspects of the State Department going in quite different directions, and with all persons in the State Department quite aware that an entire area of U.S. policy has been grounded on the issuance of some press releases and not on proper regulations.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I just wanted to ascertain whether or not you are advocating the principle of uncontrolled travel by U.S. citizens, including Communists, to any Communist country, which includes Albania, which, as you know, is Communist controlled and also a country with which we do not have diplomatic relations.

Mr. LINDSAY. The short answer to the gentleman's question as stated and framed by him is, "No."

Now, to go on. The State Department cannot continue in this never-never land in which it finds itself at the present time. Proper regulations have to be issued, and those regulations must have due regard to a very fundamental right, which is the right to communicate, which means the right to travel.

A review of the regulations, further, should have in mind that there are due process rights and first amendment rights involved. The area ban is a very doubtful basis to begin with. I am not sure it serves any useful purpose. In any event I hope the Department will not operate out of fear or narrowmindedness. The issue is far too important.

BRITISH SHIPPING REPUTATION SUFFERS MAINLY FROM ONE TRADER

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, I disclosed on the floor of the House that an American citizen held substantial interest in British shipping concerns which may be held accountable for two-thirds of all current British shipping to Communist Cuba. Ironically, this same citizen has received some $32 million in U.S. Government-insured ship construction loans.

It has come to my attention that the British firm of Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., in which American citizen Manuel Kulukundis of New York owns 25 of 115 shares, has served as agent for 80 percent of the non-Communist tankers calling in Cuban ports since the beginning of 1963. Presumably these tankers are carrying vital petroleum cargoes from the Soviet Union—and we know that if Castro's oil supply was crimped, Cuba's economy would come to a screeching halt.

During the summer months of 1962, when the Soviets launched their full-scale buildup in Cuba, 12 of the 14 Kulukundis-controlled ships supplying the island of Cuba were tankers, and these ships carried cargoes vital to the Communists from ports inside the Soviet Union. Kulukundis' British affiliates signed a long-term oil shipping contract with the Soviets in 1960, the same year he received some $23 million in U.S. Government-insured loans.

Most British shipping firms have voluntarily suspended shipping to Cuba. It is unfortunate that one shipping syndicate is allowed to continue its aid to the Communists, thereby creating a blotch on the reputations of the responsible members of Britain's merchant fleet.

The International Chamber of Shipping, a worldwide association of the maritime industry, stated that it could not unilaterally ban free world shipping to Cuba because "it was not for the International Chamber of Shipping to usurp the responsibilities of governments." Just last Friday the Greek Government instituted a ban on further Greek shipping to Cuba. The government of Greece is to be commended for this action, and the American people give this positive affirmation of friendship their applause.

Hopefully, the responsible British shipping interests will urge their government to halt further British shipping to Cuba. The British shipping ministry could start with the British affiliates of American citizen Manuel Kulukundis.

Mr. Speaker, since January 1, 1963, there have been 10 ships affiliated with the Rethymnis & Kulukundis Agency in London which have called in U.S. ports. Dollars from profitable American cargoes have thus gone to further the operations of this shipping syndicate which chooses to do business with the Communists while enjoying the privileges of freedom.

I urge that Great Britain halt continued British shipping to Cuba, and that the United States close its ports to nations which allow further sea trade with Castro's Communist island.

EPILEPTIC CHILDREN

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill which I am introducing today, which deals with what is, in my opinion, one of the most sadly neglected segments of our population today—the 1,200,000 school-age children and adolescents in America who suffer from epilepsy.

The research and treatment data which has been gathered on this condition, chiefly by such organizations as the Epilepsy Foundation which has national headquarters in Washington, demonstrates conclusively that the overwhelming majority of the children and adolescents stricken with this disease are capable of taking full advantage of the scholastic opportunities offered by the public and private schools of America.

You will note that I said capable of so doing. The tragedy of the situation is that because of the fear and ignorance which shrouds this condition thousands of these youngsters are being denied the equal educational opportunity which is every American child's birthright. This fear and ignorance unfortunately permeates our public school system as well as other segments of our population.

The unfortunate fact is that many teachers, principals, and school officials of America are not aware of the advances which have been made in the understanding and treatment of epilepsy in recent years. Because of this, admissions policies and policies for dealing with epileptics within the schools have resulted in too many cases in the denial to epileptics of opportunities to realize the educational levels they could otherwise achieve.

This bill would help to overcome this problem. In a society where education is crucially important in preparation for employment and social adjustment, the Nation cannot afford to lose to neglect these present 1,200,000 Americans, and the many more thousands who will follow.

The child with epilepsy does not differ from any other child in the way he looks or behaves as a direct result of having epilepsy. But he is affected by the attitudes of his parents, teachers, and other members of his social environment.

Medical research has proved that most epileptics are not injured physiologically by seizures—the only possible damage is bodily injury resulting from a fall. So the principal effect is a psychosocial disturbance. Without these psychological and social effects, the child with epilepsy would be expected to live a completely normal life, receive his education in a completely normal way. But this psychosocial disturbance is a result of attitudes toward the epileptic child—the attitude of his parents, teachers, and schoolmates.

In a pamphlet published by the Epilepsy Foundation, Dr. Norris Haring writes of a recent survey of the attitudes of educators toward epileptic schoolchildren. A large percentage of these teachers, principals, and school administrators expressed fear. This feeling of fear ranged from fear that the child would harm himself or someone else during a seizure, to the fear of not knowing what to do in the case of a child having a seizure.

Dr. Haring notes that a large number of studies over the past 20 years have provided convincing evidence that changing public attitudes toward the child with epilepsy can best be accomplished by keeping the child in the public or private school and the design of a careful program of training educators on understanding epilepsy and knowing how to meet classroom problems arising from the condition.

The Education of Students With Epilepsy Act will be the first nationwide effort to help solve the most insidious problem facing one of our Nation's most valuable resources, the over 1 million capable, potentially productive schoolchildren, whose chief misfortune is their suffering from the misconceptions of those who are supposed to lead them to a rich and useful adulthood.

THE URGENT NEED FOR AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 of this year I introduced H.R. 4061, a bill to accelerate, extend, and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program. I did so because I feel air pollution control is a vitally important problem and one which demands our immediate action.

Of course, the problem of air pollution is not a new one. Indeed, as early as the first century men had begun to complain about the murky air which they breathed and to suspect that it was the cause of some of their physical ailments. Seneca wrote of the "heavy air of Rome and the stench of its smoky chimneys which when stirred poured forth whatever pestilent vapors and soot they held enclosed." Centuries later both Shakespeare and Milton noted this matter, Shakespeare calling the London air "a foul and pestilent congregation of vapors." So we see that both Imperial Rome and Elizabethan England were beset by the same problem which is confronting modern-day industrial America. It seems clear, however, that in our civilization air pollution is a greater menace to health than it has ever been before. Ancient Rome and Elizabethan England breathed air polluted by smoke and soot from fires used to heat homes. Today we in the United States breathe air that is polluted not only by the dirt and fumes from home furnaces, but also by automobile exhaust, industrial chemicals, and the residues from burning wastes as well as from the fuels necessary for generating power.

Unless we adopt stringent measures to control air pollution, this health hazard will most certainly assume even more gigantic proportions in the years ahead. There are several reasons for this. One is that our country is growing and at the same time is becoming increasingly urbanized. By 1970 our population will have reached the 220 million mark. Two-thirds of these people will live in cities covering less than 10 percent of our total land area. More people will require more cars, more factories, and more power for domestic and industrial purposes. Into air already hazy with smoke, soot, and chemical vapors will go more of the same.

Another factor to be considered is that our national economy is expanding. Between 1960 and 1970 the gross national product is expected to climb by 60 percent. This means, of course, an increase in commercial and industrial activities which will require more and more energy. It has been estimated that demand for power will nearly double in the next 20 years. Although some energy will be generated by water power and some by nuclear reactors, most of it will have to be provided by combustion of fuels with a corresponding increase in potential air pollution.

Yet another very significant aspect of the air pollution picture is the rising number of motor vehicles and the enormously increased fuel consumption and mileage recorded each year. By 1980 experts predict we will have 120 million vehicles on our highways—50 million more than at present. Moreover, the number of vehicle miles traveled will nearly double. In other words, 120 million cars, trucks, and buses will crowd the roads, each averaging 9,400 miles per year and emitting thousands of tons of combustion products into the air we breathe.

Now why am I concerned and why should you be concerned about air pollution? Why should we try to do something about it? Why not accept it as one of the prices that must be paid for progress by an urban, industrial, and mobile society? One reason is that air pollution costs us as much as $11 billion per year in damaged or destroyed crops, reduced meat and milk production, and depressed property values. Another reason, and to me a much more important one, is that air pollution is a real threat to the health of all our citizens. We have all seen the dramatic and frightening results of a heavy smog which envelops a city for days or weeks such as the one which settled over Britain this winter, bringing with it illness and even death for the weak and the elderly. Such episodes, fortunately, are not numerous; however, it is just this fact that leads to our apathy in regard to air pollution control. Because we do not see constant and striking evidence of the effects of air pollution, we relegate the subject of its control to the list of things we plan to do something about later—always later. Growing evidence as to the deleterious effects of long-term exposure to air pollution, however, is forcing us at last to examine this problem and to take action to conquer it.

Evidence is beginning to accumulate which points to air pollution as the cause of several diseases and an accelerating factor in the progress of a number of others. Air pollution has been linked to emphysema, a chronic lung disease in which there is a breakdown of lung tissue capable of carrying out oxygen transfer. As a result the victim experiences shortness of breath and is unable to bear even slight exertion. Various other respiratory conditions such as asthma and bronchitis are also aggravated by air pollution. Studies show that these conditions are more prevalent in urban areas than in rural areas where pollution is less severe and also that these conditions are alleviated when the patients are placed in an environment where chemical irritants are removed from the air by means of filters.

Lung cancer is significantly higher among urban dwellers than among rural groups, even when smoking habits are the same. Although the research is still incomplete, there is evidence linking lung cancer to air pollution, and it is known that a number of the pollutants found in community air supplies will produce cancer in experimental animals. Also under study is cancer of the stomach and esophagus since a considerable amount of the pollution in the air is swallowed.

Additional research is now in progress to establish the relationship between air pollution and heart disease. Although there are many contributing causes of heart disease, circumstantial evidence is strong that air pollution plays an important role.

Less tragic than heart disease or cancer but nevertheless inconvenient and uncomfortable is the common cold. And that too has now been linked to air pollution. Just this week the Public Health Service has issued a statement citing the studies of Dr. F. Curtis Dohan of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine as evidence that airborne sulfur compounds "trigger outbreaks of upper respiratory infections."

When we think of the tens of millions of workdays lost due to colds and chronic respiratory complaints as well as of the suffering and death that could be prevented, surely we must recognize the urgent necessity of finding and enforcing means of controlling air pollution.

I have long been deeply concerned about air pollution. I have voted for air pollution control bills when they have come before the House. I am proud to have been instrumental in the drawing up of a tristate compact by New York, Connecticut, and my home State, New Jersey, for air pollution study and control.

However, the time has come for more drastic action. The problem is of more than local significance; it affects every citizen. Moreover, the threat to our national health grows more ominous each month, each week, each day that we procrastinate. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 4061, a bill which provides for a national research program into the causes, effects, and methods of control of air pollution. My bill also authorizes the appropriation of $74 million over a 10-year period for grants for support of air pollution control. It calls for the encouragement of interstate cooperative activities and the adoption of uniform laws. It creates an air pollution advisory board in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, most important of all, provides the authority and machinery for enforcing air pollution control measures.

My bill, H.R. 4061, meets the requirements outlined by the President in his recent health message for necessary legislation in the field of air pollution control. It also embodies many of the recommendations of the Committee on Environmental Health Problems which submitted its report to the Surgeon General in November 1961. It is a strong bill and, I believe, a sound one. I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgency of this matter. There is much to do, and we have already delayed too long. Let us now move with all possible speed toward a solution of this problem. It is a difficult problem but one which must be solved—which can be solved by passage of this bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Conte, for 3 hours, on March 26, 1963.

Mr. Lindsay, for 1 hour, on Thursday next, vacating his special order for Wednesday, March 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan.

Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Patman.

Mr. Staebler.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Barry in three instances.

Mr. McLoskey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Udall.

Mr. Carey.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

567. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Glen Elder unit, Solomon division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

568. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87–27, 87th Congress, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 12. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4987. A bill to provide for the return to the United States of the remains of members of the Armed Forces who died after September 2, 1939, and whose remains are buried outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4988. A bill relating to the taxable status of sales prior to September 1, 1955, of tubes for use in the production of certain component parts of television receiving sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 4990. A bill to amend section 314(q) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased rate of compensation for arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H.R. 4991. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Commitee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4992. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4993. A bill to require Members of Congress, their spouses and certain other related persons, and all employees of the Congress to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in real estate, securities, and commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4994. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to require that imported woven labels must have woven into them the name of the country where woven; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the additions to the reserves for bad debts of certain agricultural and livestock credit corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4996. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4998. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4999. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 5000. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 5001. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5002. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 330. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee on February 6, 1963; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pursue an equitable fiscal policy for the purpose of preserving the economic freedom of the citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials of the Legislature of the State of Georgia memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to stating that in the interest of maintaining our second largest industry, forest products, that IRC 631-A should neither be tampered with nor repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject the proposal of the President of the United States to revise the income tax laws of this country by requiring those persons who itemize their deductions in their returns to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total income of their itemized deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Hugh A. Bruce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Konstantina D. Ioannou (Johnson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Bruno Neglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5007. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Joseph Artio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to the American Legion, on the Occasion of Its 44th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the fact that 44 years ago this month the American Legion came into existence at the so-called Paris caucus of March 1919.

That was, in my estimation, a singularly important event, Mr. Speaker, representing as it did the first major attempt of American veterans of World War I to quash the expansion of world communism—a baby tiger in the year 1919, that was to grow into the awesome beast which we confront today.

Had all Americans risen in like spirit, to meet the threat of communism in 1919, there would be no such problem confronting us at this moment as that represented by Russia, Red China, Cuba, and the rest of Communist society. Unfortunately, however, the Legion stood virtually alone, back in those days, in viewing with alarm the dramatic spread of Communist ideology. While others, in a manner befitting idiot children, spoke in terms of communism as a kind of interesting experiment, the newborn American Legion of 1919 was pouring forth its condemnation of Communist principles from the start.

This was the period, you will recall, when European veterans were returning home en masse to join the Socialist Party of that period, from which revolutionary efforts developed in Russia, Hungary, Germany, and many other countries, including even Canada. Moving in to eliminate the revolutionary spirit among American veterans, the American Legion reminded its followers of that for which they had fought: a set of principles standing forth far and above the feeble promises of socialism. In short time the Legion battle cry had carried the day among the great mass of American doughboys and there was not the slightest chance for socialism's spread within the United States—at least, not with the aid of American veterans, and not without their bitter opposition.

Notwithstanding all later contributions of the American Legion to the American way of life, none, in my opinion, exceeds in importance the very first step, by which the Legion aided and abetted the democratic cause at a dangerous and perilous time, and with remarkable effect.

We have every reason to hail the accomplishments of the American Legion at this time, and to wish its membership good health and a glorious future in the stirring days ahead.

Increase in Residual Oil Import Levels Not Viewed as Victory for Coal, Nor Is This Action a Loss for Venezuela Or East Coast Area of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 16, 1963, the Washington Post reported in its news columns an action by the Secretary of the Interior on March 15 wherein he issued an order in which maximum import levels for residual fuel oil to be used as fuel were announced at a new level of 575,000 barrels daily for the east coast—PAD District I—for the allocation period April 1, 1963 through March 31, 1964.

The Post's staff reporter, Julius Duscha, set the stage in his interpretative news article for an editorial in the same issue. The headline of the Duscha story was "Residual Oil Imports Get 9.6 Percent Increase." That staff reporter described the action in the first two paragraphs as follows:

> Domestic coal and oil producers won a significant victory yesterday when Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall authorized only a small increase in residual oil imports.
>
> The losers in the decision were Venezuela, which produces nearly all of the residual oil burned in the United States, and the users of the thick industrial fuel, most of whom are in New England.

Mr. Duscha then wrote in the next paragraph that—

> The White House and the Interior Department have been subject to intense political pressures both from the supporters and from the opponents of the controversial import control program.

In an editorial, the title of which was "Skidding on Oil," the Post expanded the Duscha line and attacked the residual oil import control program in general and the March 15 policy and quota pronouncement in particular.

It is my view that both Mr. Duscha and the writer of the opinion article, "Skidding on Oil," wrote prejudged accounts of the action. I have responded in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post.

It is my judgment that the news dispatch under the headline, "Eastern Import Quotas for Residual Fuel Oil Are Boosted by Agency," in the March 18, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal comes closer to being an accurate account, and I quote parts of that news story as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—The Interior Department, as expected, set maximum import levels for residual fuel oil on the east coast at about 575,000 barrels a day, beginning April 1. This is about 50,200 barrels a day more than currently authorized.

I inquire, Mr. President, where is the victory for domestic coal and oil producers claimed by Mr. Duscha in the Washington Post article? A daily increase of 50,200 barrels of residual oil imports is hardly a victory for coal and it certainly does not represent the loss for Venezuela that Mr. Duscha and the Post editorial imply.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to the following additional paragraph from the Wall Street Journal dispatch:

> There is pressure on one side from coal mining interests to tighten Government curbs on residual fuel oil imports, and pressure on the other side from industrial consumers to scrap the curbs. The Kennedy administration, in announcing the new allocations, in effect, ignored both sides and continued the present policy of setting the aggregate quota equal to the difference between estimated demand and domestic output.

That interpretation appears to me to be much more realistic than the news article and the editorial published in the March 16 issue of the Washington Post.

I have stated in a letter to the editor of the Post the personal view and official opinion that "the President, as our Chief of State, as our Commander in Chief, and as the Chief Executive—and he does wear all of these hats in this instance—has been attempting to perform the art of the possible through democratic compromise, and has not been trying to do the impossible—please everybody—as charged in the Post editorial."

And I stated further that because the policy seems not to be especially pleasing to anyone, "this is not necessarily an indictment of the administration; perhaps it has, on balance, done the best that it is possible to do in arriving at its solution to a problem on which there is such wide disagreement."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the March 16, 1963, Washington Post editorial, "Skidding on Oil," and my letter of March 18 to the editor of that paper in which I comment in considerable detail on the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1963]

SKIDDING ON OIL

Caught between the devil of domestic politics and the deep blue Caribbean Sea, the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy. It is seeking to please everybody. During the Eisenhower administration, this country unwisely began placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States. And what has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry.

A month ago, a top-level White House memorandum called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports. The outcry from coal producers and from the refining branch of the oil industry was prompt and predictable—and apparently the outcry was heard. As this newspaper forecast, the administration yesterday announced the smallest possible increase in residual quotas—50,000 barrels a day which would make the daily quota 567,000 barrels.

The figures are slippery, and by artful presentation it may be possible to argue that something is being done for the embattled democracy of Venezuela. But can it be seriously argued that the wafer-thin increase is in any sense meaningful? That was the phrase used by the White House memorandum—a phrase, be it noted, that was approved by every department involved except the Labor Department. Last year, without benefit of a White House report, residual quotas were increased by 56,000 barrels a day.

Let it be acknowledged that the dilemma is real. But this administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism. It surely might entail some difficulties with coal State Senators if a genuinely meaningful relaxation of residual oil imports were put into effect April 1. But then it would entail infinitely more difficulties if the regime of President Betancourt should be overwhelmed by the totalitarian enemies who find comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela.

WASHINGTON, *March 18, 1963.*

EDITOR,
The Washington Post.

SIR: Your editorial, "Skidding on Oil," in the Saturday, March 16, 1963, issue is representative of the type of advocacy of uncontrolled entry of foreign products into this country that tends to increase the ranks of both protectionist and isolationist blocs in the United States—especially in the interior States. And I write this as one who supported the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and most foreign aid and international policy legislation during my 19 years in the Congress. But I write also in the role of one who is becoming alarmed in seeing the ranks of employed American labor thinned by the impact of imports on certain domestic industries and markets.

In this connection, I suggest that the rush of the coal industry into manpower-displacing mechanization of mining came principally at the time of and as a consequence of the advent of uncontrolled imports of predatorially priced foreign residual oil. It was and continues to be a condition forced by growing foreign competition—a competition the Post apparently would have expanded and accelerated notwithstanding the economic consequences of driving domestic fuels industries out of more and more of the domestic markets.

Your editorial observes that the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy, namely, is seeking to please everybody. Without implying complete approval of the administration's residual oil policy, I cannot agree with this observation.

In representing a coal, oil, and gas producing State, I have been endeavoring to work for the appropriate and necessary interests of these important domestic industries, the health of which means so much to our local, State, and national economies and to our people. Accordingly, I have been a consistent and persistent participant in discussions, negotiations, and deliberations with a bearing on the development of international trade legislation and on the formulation of residual oil policies especially.

It is clear that there are differing views within the administration concerning the question of what should be this Government's policy on residual oil as a commodity and on importation of foreign residual oil in particular. But it is my personal and official opinion that the President, as our Chief of State, as our Commander in Chief, and as the Chief Executive—and he does wear all of these hats in this instance—has been attempting to perform the art of the possible through democratic compromise, and has not been trying to do the impossible, as charged in the Post editorial.

I feel that the President knows it is impossible to please or satisfy within the framework of a single policy the editors of the Post, the Venezuelan Government, the international oil companies involved in the refining and marketing of Venezuelan and Dutch Antilles petroleum products (including residuals), the east coast importers-marketers, and the domestic coal, oil, and gas economy interests—including the so-called coal State Senators to whom you refer.

The fact is, of course, that the residual oil import control program announced last Friday in the Post as a "coal victory" was not that at all. It is obvious that it was not pleasing in any degree to the Post's editors. Apparently it was not received with applause by either the Venezuelan Government or some of the international oil companies or by importers-marketers. But neither was it totally satisfactory to me or to colleagues allied in the effort to keep residual oil imports at tolerable and reasonable levels. Segments of the coal industry, in fact, have severely criticized the latest installment of the administration's residual oil import control plan.

It seems, therefore, that the editorial allegation that "the administration is seeking to please everybody" is one which does not square with the facts because no one especially seems to be pleased with the policy. This condition is not necessarily an indictment of the administration; perhaps it has, on balance, done the best that it is possible to do in arriving at its solution to a problem on which there is such wide disagreement on all facets.

I am disappointed that the announced residual oil control program lacks elements which are necessary to help bring about more stability for domestic fuels industries. But this does not alter my view that the President arbitrated the widely differing opinions on the controversial subject in what he doubtless construed to be the best interests of the combined and inseparable national security, national economy, and so-called hemisphere solidarity considerations which it is his duty to evaluate and protect.

Although I do differ with the administration on some details, I do not concur with the Post's editorial inference that there is nothing "meaningful" about "placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States."

It is amazing your newspaper should imply that the Government of the United States has little if any obligation to the interior States but seemingly does have a superior obligation to Venezuela and the industries of the eastern seaboard States.

After terming the restrictions on residual oil imports to be unwise, your editorial declared that the control program "has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers (and) has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry."

I challenge this assertion. The following is in rebuttal:

Residual oil sales in the Eastern United States alone are and have been for some time supporting approximately one-fourth of the total cost of the Venezuelan Government. This certainly is a real and very substantial yield for a country's waste product. And it is a considerable contribution for this one Venezuelan commodity to elicit from U.S. dollar-paying customers. Does this help our balance-of-payments deficit situation?

Furthermore, this foreign residual oil, derived and delivered cheaper on our east coast than most domestic residuals, is fast driving the domestic residuals out of not only the eastern fuel markets but, in fact, out of domestic production. Consequently, at the higher levels of imports authorized, foreign residual oil in increasing quantities has been and will be admitted to replace and displace domestic residuals. Certainly it cannot be said that this has been bad for Venezuela. The opposite is true. Venezuela has been helped while the domestic refineries have been forced to cut production or to extend the refinery processes to eliminate or vastly reduce residual yield.

As for the assertion that the residual oil import control program has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry, the mistake is in the increasing of the levels of residual oil import quotas so that more and more of this foreign waste product can be brought into our country at predatorily administered prices to compete with and to displace domestic fuels, especially coal. Without controls, foreign residual oil would virtually flood domestic coal out of eastern electric utility and heavy industry markets before such innovations as coal by unit trains at lower delivered prices and extra-high voltage, long-line transmission electricity can be delivered competitively from coalfield powerplants to the east coast, including New England.

Furthermore, the Government of the United States, for national security reasons, has no right to permit the strategically and economically important east coast to become almost totally dependent on an offshore product to supply its heat and energy requirements.

If the domestic coal industry of the interior United States is to be eliminated or domestic petroleum refinery production to be endangered, at least let these conditions be the result of domestic competition—not foreign. Energy from American coal helped build the vast utility and heavy industry complex of the east coast; the coal and domestic petroleum interests should not therefore be condemned for seeking to maintain a fair share of the fuels markets of the region.

If the east coast is going to turn more substantially outward and offshore for supply there doubtless will be an appropriate "interior America" response. This condition should be avoided in the interest of a strong and healthy United States of America. A condition of strength in the Nation's perimeter regions only and economic strangulation and sociological decline inland is unthinkable.

I am not suggesting that the east coast should reorient its supply lines totally inward or that it should be required to do so by Government decree. But I urge that there be closer cooperation between our coastal areas and the interior. Parenthetically, it is important to note that such overwhelming proportions of our country's vast defense spending have gravitated to the coastal States that this, too, is becoming a cause for real concern in interior U.S.A.

It is my belief that our President is so cognizant of these conditions that the administration's continuation of the residual oil import control program—rather than a scuttling of it by relaxation of controls as recommended by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning—is one of the necessary resulting actions.

Finally, I am in disagreement with your concluding statement which seeks to include the oil import quota program under the blanket indictment of "every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela." Admiration for the administration of President Betancourt—an admiration which I share with the editors of the Post—should not blind us from acknowledging the very generous trade policy maintained by the United States toward Venezuela.

Contrary to the implications of your statement, U.S. imports from Venezuela are more than double our exports to that country, and our purchases account for approximately 50 percent of all Venezuelan crude production and about 75 percent of that country's residual oil production. Nor does this tell the entire story; for Venezuela receives further benefit from U.S. trade in the rate of exchange of pegging the oil export rate at 3.05 bolivares per U.S. dollar in contrast to the rate for Venezuelan imports of 3.35 bolivares per dollar. The rapid progress toward economic recovery in Venezuela during the past year is perhaps the best evidence of the working of the so-called trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela. I rather doubt that there are many nations that would balk at this kind of discrimination—at this type of treatment.

For these reasons and those mentioned earlier, and notwithstanding my disagreement with some details of the residual oil policy and quota announcement, I believe the Post's editorial, "Skidding on Oil," does injustice both to the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. In establishing the oil import quota program, the previous administration rightfully acknowledged the relation between national security and the health of our domestic economy. In continuing the quota program the Kennedy administration has rightfully reaffirmed the importance of this relationship.

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

Let Supply and Demand Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, graphically pointed out the sharp decline in hog and cattle prices which has occurred in 90 days of the Kennedy-Freeman feed grain program.

To further dramatize the economical bind livestock producers now find themselves in, I should like to include in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which has just reached my desk.

This letter was in the form of a petition and included the signatures of 43 reputable, hardworking farmers who reside in the 19th Illinois District which I represent.

At the outset, this communication pointed out that as beef producers the writers of the petition were not interested in having the Government subsidize the beef industry nor guarantee a specific profit on feed cattle.

It was pointed out that to condone this type of practice would only bring about Government control and would weaken the overall agriculture structure.

In addition to the policy which has driven down corn prices through Government sales in order to get a good signup under this feed grain program, and is in a large measure responsible for the recent drop in prices, there is another factor which I believe needs proper investigation, and has added to our economic problems. I refer, of course, to the disproportionate drop in dressed beef prices in over-the-counter sales.

As pointed out in the letter received from my constituents, in December 1962, the average price of choice fat steers in Chicago was $30.50. Three months later, on February 25, 1963, the average price of the same type cattle was $24—a drop of 21 percent. During the same period beef sold over-the-counter in the local chainstores dropped 11 percent.

This severe decline in the price of fat cattle without a proportionate drop in dressed beef is a serious threat to the welfare of the economy. Comparable figures with respect to dressed pork would reflect similar discrepancies.

We cannot be both fish and fowl. If this administration is attempting to rig prices of feed grains then I respectfully suggest we go into the area of controlled labor costs and take practicable steps to investigate whether or not chainstores are exercising undue control over the dressed meat market.

I believe if the economics of supply and demand are allowed to work freely, without the threat or influence of monopolistic forces, be they from within or out of Government, then we shall have some hope of overcoming the present threat to our economy.

Closure of the Glen Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, closure of the left diversion tunnel of the Glen Canyon Dam restricting the flow of the Colorado River, which initiated the storage of water in Lake Powell, was accomplished March 13. Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy has issued instructions to commence storage immediately in order to take advantage of fortuitous circumstances which will permit earlier storage than was originally anticipated.

Commissioner Dominy has said:

> Storage in Lake Mead is near an alltime peak—not only from a cyclical standpoint but additionally for this time of year to meet lower basin water needs. We have been able to expedite work on the outlet gate at Glen Canyon Dam to effect immediate control. This combination of circumstances makes this the most favorable time we could possibly select to commence storage.

Commissioner Dominy added:

> We are indeed fortunate to be able to close the gates 30 days earlier than anticipated. In this year of likely reduced runoff, every day's storage will make a difference in the total operational program. It is fully expected that even with approximately 75 percent of normal runoff, as currently forecast from March 1 snow surveys, dead storage can be obtained within 10 to 12 months. This will insure meeting the power production scheduled at Glen Canyon Dam next year.
>
> The dam proper is now more than 90 percent completed with the highest block in the 710-foot dam now within 10 feet of crest elevation. About 300,000 cubic yards of concrete is needed to bring all of the blocks in the dam to crest height. Glen Canyon Dam will be "topped out" with placement of the last bucket of concrete sometime this summer.

L. F. Wylie, project construction engineer for Glen Canyon Dam, manipulated the hydraulic controls of the left tunnel high pressure gates. The controls are located in the gate chamber deep within the bedrock of the left abutment of the dam and directly above the gates in the left diversion tunnel. Access to the gate chamber is by way of galleries and shafts through the concrete of the dam and the rocks of the dam's abutment.

The filling of Lake Powell also heralds the beginning of boating and other recreation on this great manmade lake. By midsummer it is estimated that Lake Powell will be more than 150 miles long and reach a point above Hite, Utah. The new lake will exceed 65 square miles in area.

Temporary boat ramps and other facilities have been built by the National Park Service at the Wahweap Recreation Area located about 5 miles from Glen Canyon Dam. The rising waters of Lake Powell will reach these temporary ramps by June. Until that time, boats can be launched at Kane Creek, 20 miles from Wahweap Recreation Area. James Eden, superintendent for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, has pointed out that, as the water level gradually rises this summer, Lake Powell will offer unparalleled scenery to boaters who can explore the many side canyons which enter the Glen Canyon of the Colorado.

Millions of game fish will be planted in Lake Powell this spring, under a program planned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State Fish and Game Departments of Arizona and Utah. Opening of Lake Powell to fishing is planned for 1964.

Development of recreational facilities and the fish and wildlife program on Lake Powell is being accomplished under the provisions of section 8, Public Law 485, which authorized the Colorado River storage project with Glen Canyon Dam as the key feature.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently Westchester County was deeply saddened and left the poorer by the loss of a most illustrious and distinguished Methodist clergyman, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. Bishop Oxnam before his retirement in 1960 had a varied, long and rich career. Prior to his election as bishop in 1936, he was the president of DePauw University. In addition to being the Methodist bishop of the areas of Omaha, Boston, New York and Washington he was the president of the Federal Council of Churches from 1944 to 1946 and one of six presidents of the World Council of Churches from 1948 to 1954.

Bishop Oxnam was the exemplar of a dynamic combination of physical, intellectual and moral excellence. He was a former football player at the University of Southern California, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, before he went to pursue his theological studies at Boston University.

Upon his passing Bishop John Wesley Lord was quoted as saying:

> Bishop Oxnam was recognized by friend and foe alike as one of the "summit souls" with whom God on occasion blesses mankind.

We in Westchester share this sentiment and to his wife, the former Ruth Fisher, his sons and daughter and his eight grandchildren we send our deepest sympathy. Their loss and ours and the Nation's is very great.

President Speaks to Advertising Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an Associated Press dispatch containing excerpts of President Kennedy's recent remarks to the Advertising Council in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy—and the next several months may well be dominated by these topics. In the last 100 years, questions of economic policy have become as complex to the layman as questions of space and military technology. Free soil, free silver and free trade, for example, were basically easier to understand than the balance of payments, the tools of debt management and the application of countercyclical forces. Today every problem has several alternative solutions, and every answer raises several questions. I am more than ever convinced of the words once uttered by George Bernard Shaw: "If all economists were laid end to end, they still would not reach a conclusion."
>
> FAMILIAR QUESTIONS
>
> Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:
>
> 1. The limit on the national debt;
> 2. The size of the Federal budget and
> 3. The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.
>
> All three of these questions have faced the legislative and executive branches before—and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it. Economic history—specifically the history of 1957–60, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions would spell downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole.
>
> I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.
>
> HARSH RESULTS
>
> The Federal Government—and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole—decided in 1957 to keep the debt limited unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.
>
> —In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent.

In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

—In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output—it has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

—In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957, the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer primarily to budget and balance-of-payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

STRONG ECONOMY

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The six succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all time in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit at all.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after the mid-1957 decisions, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem the tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been estimated to be a surplus of $466 million.

REALISTIC CEILING

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden—as measured by its proportion of gross national product—steadily declining.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to the trend at all levels of government, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of the previous year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.

And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut, but for a program which will add only $2.7 billion to the next budget deficit. Certainly it is clear that, if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut.

So I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be remembered by us all—by those of us in the administration and the Congress, and those in this audience who are leaders of opinion in the business community.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote De Tocqueville in 1835, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterward repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years—if we can stick to the facts and cast out falsehoods and, above all, distinguish clearly between facts and falsehoods—then, surely, this great country can achieve the full fruits of greatness which today remain beyond our reach.

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter 1959 was operating at the level of a $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit—and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short- and long-term credit—long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

SAME DECISIONS

Now, in 1963, the Government is once again faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures:

"In the second half of 1957 the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

Farm Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in December 1962 I arranged for distribution of about 4,000 questionnaires to the farming counties of the Second Congressional District of Arizona. I believe that the results, now tabulated, may be of interest to our colleagues.

In the first instance I mailed this questionnaire to approximately 2,000 persons on my mailing list in Cochise, Pinal, and Yuma Counties—areas whose economy is heavily based on agriculture. In addition, I had the splendid cooperation of the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation and its fine director, Bill Davis. With the consent of the Federation boards in each of my five counties, the questionnaire was mailed to every Farm Bureau family. Additionally, the Yuma Daily Sun kindly consented to publish the questionnaire in its columns, urging readers to clip the questionnaire and send the answers directly to me.

Mr. Speaker, with this wide distribution I had hoped for a large cross-section of farmer opinion. The results, in number, were disappointing; there were only 195 returns. At first I was inclined to believe that this response indicated apathy among farmers. On closer examination—and after talking to numerous farmers who received the mailing—I am satisfied that this is not the case. I believe that Arizona farmers are vitally concerned about present farm legislation. They are, however, confused by their long experience with different and changing programs. They recognize that there are big deficiencies in our present programs, and they recognize that city dwellers, who far outnumber farmers, are unhappy about the cost. Yet they fear any sudden or drastic changes. Farmers, as a group, do not have any simple, clear-cut solutions to this massive crop of problems and inequities. I am inclined to believe that these feelings, rather than apathy, account for the small number of returns.

This conclusion is suggested by a Marana farmer who wrote a long, sincere, and constructive letter reporting on a meeting of his friends called specifically to discuss my questionnaire:

> I am sure you will not be surprised to learn that this group of only eight or so persons could not arrive at 100-percent agreement as to the program we would like to see enacted.

I have said that the returns were small in number, but I can report that they were very large in quality. The great majority of those who replied wrote separate additional letters, or extensive marginal comments, giving their detailed thoughts and suggestions. I have read each one of these, and I was impressed by the seriousness and good sense with which these Arizonians discussed problems of vital importance to their livelihood. The depth of these replies and the wide discussion touched off by the questionnaire have fully justified my efforts in this undertaking.

In tabulating the returns I had them divided into three categories:

First. Price support farmers—110 replies: This group included all those who indicated that they were participating this year in one or more price support programs. Many of the replies tabulated in this group were from farmers who also grow crops for free-market sale.

Second. Free-market farmers—60 replies: Counted here were active farmers cultivating citrus, alfalfa or other crops not subject to price support programs.

Third. Nonfarmers—25 replies: These were individuals not presently engaged in farming. Many of these are people who formerly engaged in agriculture, who work in farm-related businesses, or who had some special interest in farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulations themselves are worth careful examination, but I have noted the following highlights:

First. Present programs are not popular: Both farmers and nonfarmers in my district agree that the present programs are wrong and should be revised in some way. A Pinal County nonfarmer echoes the sentiment expressed by many who wrote comments on the questionnaire:

> Things are in such a mess that patchwork or piecemeal mending of the present programs can never work any real or lasting benefits. A completely new approach is needed.

Second. Free-market conditions are preferred: Almost 90 percent of the non-price-support farmers and 66 percent of the price-support farmers prefer that the Federal Government establish free-market conditions—either now or eventually. A small Cochise cotton farmer expressed a common feeling when he wrote:

> I have seen farmers become well-to-do while others could not make a living—all because of farm subsidy and restrictions. Free enterprise would help us no end.

Third. A transition to free enterprise farming is favored: While there is general agreement that free-market conditions should be established, a large majority do not want the Government to "quit agriculture" immediately. One price-support farmer wrote:

> In my own personal situation, if the cotton and feed grain programs were discontinued, I would be out of this type of farming fast. I would go broke.

The price-support farmers are especially opposed to any sudden change. What all the groups prefer is that free-market conditions be established by way of a transition period of 3 to 5 years during which there would be declining price supports, or some kind of transition payment. According to one farmer:

> By using a transition period and working toward free enterprise we might be able to adjust financial policies so that few, if any, farmers would be wiped out.

Fourth. Cotton policy disliked: With regard to Federal cotton policy—cotton is the chief agricultural product in my district—none of the nonfarm replies and only 4 percent of the free enterprise farmers favored the present programs. While 29 percent of the price-support farmers favored the present policy, more than 50 percent preferred that free-market conditions be established sooner or later. A high percentage—over 80 percent—of the nonfarmers and free-market farmers preferred a return to the free enterprise way of farming cotton. Only a small percentage of the respondents favored voluntary land retirement payments.

Fifth. Food-for-peace program is liked: Arizonians are very much in favor of the food-for-peace program. Over 86 percent of the returns gave favorable responses.

Sixth. Price-support farmers and free-market farmers differ: Price-support farmers are less anxious for the Federal Government to revise present agricultural policies than free-market farmers, yet each want free-enterprise conditions established eventually.

The price-support farmers—58 percent—favor the present cotton export subsidy, and the free-market farmers—89 percent—oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I recently published the results of a survey I made of constituent opinion on a wide range of legislative matters. Included in this questionnaire, which prompted more than 2,500 replies from all parts of my district, was the same question on farm legislation asked of farmers in this questionnaire. The results were as follows:

Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe Federal farm legislation should take?	Percent in favor
Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by two-thirds of farmers voting in referendum	21
Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate	13
Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free-market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc	66

While my poll of farmers is not a scientific cross section, it does give me a general idea of what Arizona farm people are thinking. The general attitude is that the present makeshift and piecemeal programs are inadequate and that something should be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, a small Cochise cotton farmer, who is also a cattle rancher, summed up the option of some southern Arizona farmers when he wrote me.

> I think that we should move to free enterprise farming as quickly as possible. I am one of those who is privileged to enjoy the freedom of a cow ranch. I can raise as much beef to sell as feed conditions and my own ability will allow. I can look my banker and the rest of the world in the face (as a rancher). As a farmer I lie, connive, and perjure myself to the local PMA board. I beg them for more cotton acreage and would steal some if it were possible. I bow to the most high in Washington and hang my head in shame. My farm is for sale.

This blunt opinion, of course, would be sharply disrupted by many who feel that bankruptcy for farmers and farm communities would quickly result from any drastic change.

It is hard to draw any positive conclusions from this interesting project, but I believe it was worthwhile. I want to thank especially all those who responded. I shall keep their opinions in mind in the months ahead.

The complete results of this poll follow:

Responses to the farm questionnaire

	Nonfarmer		Free-market farmer		Price-support farmer		All responses	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe the Federal Government should take?	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
A. Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by ⅔ of farmers voting in referendum	0	100	2	98	36	64	20	80
B. Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate	27	73	27	73	35	65	31	69
C. Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free-market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc	92	8	90	10	66	34	78	22
2. If Congress should decide to abolish acreage allotments and price supports for basic commodities, would you favor—								
A. An immediate change with no transition or phase-out period and no transition payments?	20	80	27	73	15	85	20	80
B. A transition period of 5 to 10 years, during which price supports would be gradually reduced to nothing?	28	72	24	76	45	55	36	64
C. The Udall plan for immediate elimination of acreage allotments and price supports, but with a 3- to 4-year period of declining cash transition payments based on a percentage of the price support payments paid during the last year of the present programs?	81	19	80	20	70	30	75	25
3. If free-market conditions were adopted for basic farm crops, would you favor—								
A. Marketing-order legislation providing that a two-thirds majority of producers could use Agriculture Department machinery to establish quotas so that production could be adjusted to the approximate level of demand?	14	86	31	69	50	50	39	61
B. Laws to permit USDA to make annual estimates of quantities which producers could market at fair prices, so that farmers could through voluntary action restrict production—without controls or price supports—to the approximate level of demand?	74	26	84	16	55	45	68	32

Responses to the farm questionnaire—Continued

	Nonfarmer		Free-market farmer		Price-support farmer		All responses	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
4. Do you favor or oppose the food-for-peace program under which surplus foodstuffs are used in our foreign aid program?	84	16	77	23	92	8	86	14
5. With regard to Federal programs for cotton, what is your thinking on these points:								
A. Should the present export subsidy be continued?	8	92	11	89	58	42	36	64
B. U.S. textile manufacturers often complain about the export subsidy, and are demanding some kind of import fee on cotton textile imports equivalent to the amount of export subsidy. Would you favor such an import fee?	50	50	45	55	61	39	59	41
C. At the present time, cotton farmers generally cannot transfer cotton allotments from one State to another. Which of these would be better?	*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*	
1. No transfers permitted	26		45		51		46	
2. Transfers allowed only in cases of real hardship	53		16		18		22	
3. Allotment transfers permitted without restrictions	21		39		31		32	
D. At the present time cotton allotments cannot be transferred from one county to another within a State. Which of these rules would be better?								
1. No transfers permitted	16		35		38		35	
2. Transfers permitted without restriction	31		35		47		41	
3. Hardship transfers only	53		30		15		24	
E. If we are to continue with price supports and acreage allotments, what should be the per-pound support price?	*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*	
Extra long staple	(1)		43		48		46	
Upland	(1)		25		28		27	
6. What legislation would be best for corn and other feed grains?	*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*	
A. Present temporary programs of price supports, based on voluntary acreage reductions	5		7		19		13	
B. A mandatory type program with price supports and acreage or bushel allotments if approved by two-thirds of the farmers voting	0		3		13		8	
C. Free-market conditions	95		90		68		79	

[1] Nonfarm responses were inconclusive.

	Percent in favor		
	Present programs	Voluntary land retirement payments but no supports or allotments	Free market
7. What kind of farm legislation would you favor for these crops?			
Cotton:			
Nonfarmer	0	19	81
Free-market farmer	4	12	84
Price-support farmer	29	21	50
All respondents	17	18	65
Wheat:			
Nonfarmer	0	23	76
Free-market farmer	2	13	85
Price-support farmer	20	20	60
All respondents	11	18	71
Dairy products:			
Nonfarmer	4	11	85
Free-market farmer	4	6	90
Price-support farmer	18	6	76
All respondents	10	7	83
Produce, vegetables, fruit, citrus:			
Nonfarmer	3	12	85
Free-market farmer	4	8	88
Price-support farmer	10	3	87
All respondents	7	6	87

SIZE OF THE FARMS

	Free-market farmers	Price-support farmers
Size of farms owned or operated by the respondents to this survey:	*Percent*	*Percent*
Small (0 to 300 acres)	66	40
Medium (300 to 700 acres)	16	21
Large (700 acres or more)	18	39

New Bill on Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of introducing today the administration's proposals to extend and improve the Area Redevelopment Act. This legislation was one of the first and most important bills passed under the Kennedy administration. Those of us who fought long and hard over the years to get this on the statute books are tremendously heartened by the progress made over the past 2 years.

The area redevelopment program has brought hope to hundreds of communities and rural areas which have suffered for years from heavy unemployment. Already some 800 areas, accounting for 78 percent of all eligible places, have submitted overall economic development plans analyzing the problems which face them and blueprinting the steps to be taken to restore prosperity and full employment. The agency has approved 700 individual projects which will create 34,000 jobs and help 18,000 worker-trainees. The benefits of this program, of course, go far beyond those directly involved by helping to stimulate the growth of the entire area and, in fact, helping to raise production and incomes nationally.

The bill I am introducing today is one of high priority. I am sure it will have the support of all of us who are concerned over the plight of the unemployed and the waste of national resources and manpower. I plan to hold hearings on the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency beginning April 1. In these hearings we will take testimony on every aspect of the problem and give careful consideration to every point of view. I am hopeful that we can bring the bill to the floor in the near future.

For the benefit of Members, I am inserting a section-by-section summary of the administration proposals contained in my bill.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963

GENERAL

The attached amendments would allow the Area Redevelopment Act more fully to meet the needs for which it was created through increased fund authorizations and flexibility. These amendments are based upon the experience of the Area Redevelopment Administration during the period May 1, 1961, through February 28, 1963, and are more fully described below:

Section 2. Declaration of purpose

* * * * *

Section 3. Amendments to section 6(b)

(A) Authorization To Increase the Total Amount of Industrial and Commercial Loans Outstanding

Section 6(b)(1)(A) of the Area Redevelopment Act now places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of loans and/or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for commercial or industrial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act. Section 6(b)(1)(B) places a similar limitation on the amount of loans or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for such projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act. It is the purpose of section 3(a) of the proposed amendments to raise the ceilings on the total amounts of loans outstanding under each of these sections from $100 million to $250 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed the Small Business Administration to execute loan agreements amounting to $20,431,335 in industrial and commercial loans for projects in 5(a) redevelopment areas and $17,711,442 for projects in 5(b) areas. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration has project applications in the total amount of $86,431,967 pending for projects in 5(a) areas and $118,510,788 pending for projects in 5(b) areas. Evidence indicates that loan activity will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of loan approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have approximately $425 million in loans outstanding under section 6 by June 30, 1965, if there were no statutory limitations. It is clear that the present ceilings imposed by section 6(b)(1) of the Area Redevelopment Act will be reached considerably before the act's termination on June 30, 1965, unless otherwise amended.

(B) Refining the Minimum 10-Percent Requirement

Section 6(b)(9)(B) requires at least 10 percent of the aggregate cost on an industrial or commercial project for which an Area Redevelopment Administration loan is sought, to be supplied by a public or semipublic body in the form of equity capital or as a subordinated loan with delayed repayment. The proposed amendment to this section would authorize the minimum 10-percent money to be repaid during the same time but at no faster rate than the financial assistance extended under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

American Redevelopment Administration has experienced great difficulty in obtaining the required 10-percent money in order to advance the economies of redevelopment areas. In fact, there is a direct relationship between the severity of the economic problem and the difficulty experienced by communities attempting to raise the required funds. The present proposal would not eliminate the 10-percent requirement but would make it possible for redevelopment areas to attract additional financial sources which are presently unable to participate in projects because of the statutory restrictions on repayment.

Section 4. Authorization to increase the total amount of loans for public facilities outstanding

Section 7(c) of the act places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of public facility loans which can be outstanding at any one time for public facilities under section 7. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the total amount authorized to be outstanding from $100 to $150 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed delegate agencies to execute loan agreements amounting to $24,777,200 in public facility loans for projects located in areas designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. Loan applications were pending in the amount of $13,178,525 for such projects. However, the pending applications figure does not include anticipated loans resulting from the denial of section 8 applications in whole or in part. Evidence again indicates that loan activity resulting from section 7 and 8 applications will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have more than $100 million in loans outstanding under section 7 by June 30, 1965, but for the present $100 million limitation.

Section 5. Authorization to increase the total amount which can be appropriated for grants for public facilities

Section 8(d) of the act authorizes $75 million to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants for public facilities under section 8. This amendment would increase the total amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose for the duration of the act from $75 to $175 million, and would enable it to remain available until expended when so specified in appropriation acts.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $35 million for public facility grants, together with the $40 million previously appropriated for fiscal year 1962, exhausts the authorization under the act for this purpose. As of February 28, 1963, applications for grants totaled $26,875,566. Obligations for 1964 are currently being estimated at $35 million, with a minimum 10-percent increase estimated for 1965. The requested increase in authorization to $175 million takes into account both the $75 million previously appropriated and the approximately $75 million currently projected, with some leeway for anticipated increases. If the statutory authorization is not increased, ARA's public facility grant program will go out of existence at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Section 6. Amendments to section 11

(A) Authorization To Increase the Annual Amounts which Can Be Appropriated for Technical Assistance

Section 11 of the act authorizes appropriations not to exceed $4.5 million annually to provide technical assistance useful in alleviating or preventing excessive unemployment or underemployment. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the annual amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose from $4.5 to $10 million.

Under its present authorization, the Area Redevelopment Administration as of February 28, 1963, had approved contracts in the amount of $1,651,000 for technical assistance. Applications for such assistance had been received in the total amount of $25,799,248. Of this total, approximately $11 million of these applications were received in fiscal year 1963. Currently, applications are arriving at a rate of $1 million per month. Experience has shown that this assistance is of great value, and it is anticipated that the rate of applications will continue to rise.

(B) Amendment To Make Explicit Discretionary Authority to Require Repayment of Technical Assistance

The additional language makes it clear that the Secretary has the authority to require repayment of funds advanced for technical assistance in appropriate cases.

Section 7. Procuring the services of experts and consultants under section 12(10)

This section governs the procurement and payment for services of experts and consultants hired temporarily by contract or appointment to assist the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the act. It limits temporary services to 6 months, omits mention of intermittent services, and limits the per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to $15. The proposed amendment would modify the provisions of this section in conformity with 5 United States Code 5a by authorizing the procurement of temporary services of experts or consultants up to 1 year instead of 6 months and providing for intermittent services, thereby explicitly assuring to ARA the authority customarily available to executive departments in this regard. It would also automatically conform the authorized per diem allowance to the current applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, which is now $16.

Section 8. Authorization for appropriated funds to remain available until expended and for depositing certain appropriations in the Area Redevelopment Fund

The proposed amendment to section 23 will provide for appropriations being made on a basis where funds may remain available until expended. In addition, funds appropriated for the purpose of making loans under sections 6 and 7 of the act are directed to be deposited in the Area Redevelopment Fund which is established by section 9(b) of the act. This amendment further provides for payments of interest to the Treasury on use of funds appropriated to the Area Redevelopment Fund.

Detroit Hosts 1968 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. I am extremely pleased that Detroit has been designated as the American city to bid for the 1968 Olympic Games. I congratulate the U.S. Olympic Committee for not letting the unsportsmanlike maneuvers of the Los Angeles committee upset the previous decision picking Detroit.

All of us owe a debt of thanks to the Detroit Olympic Committee, Mayor Cavanagh and other elected officials who have worked so hard to promote Detroit's selection. I also want to commend the gentleman from Michigan, Representative HAROLD RYAN, of Detroit, who was among the first to act after Los Angeles attempted its end run.

The action of the U.S. Olympic Committee reflects the vitality of the city of Detroit and the citizens of Michigan in making it perfectly clear that Detroit is ready and eager and able to do an outstanding job as host for the 1968 Olympics.

The Power of Prayer and Christian Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my 20th annual St. Patrick's Day address carried on Cleveland radio stations WERE and WDOK:

THE POWER OF PRAYER AND CHRISTIAN ACTION

St. Patrick's endowment to the Irish race and to all humanity is so rich and so vast that scholars and orators down through the centuries have been recording and relating his life and times with enthusiasm and without pause. It makes little difference that disagreement exists as to the time and place of his birth and death, or that documentary evidence is not now available to confirm all the good and great work of his lifetime. Among mortal men St. Patrick holds a unique place, untarnished by centuries of inquiry, undiminished by the doubts which attach to the legends of time, and unshaken by the eras of disbelief which have disturbed the tranquillity of Christendom over the past centuries. The spirit of St. Patrick lives on with the steady sureness of the rise and set of the sun, with the power of the rushing tides which move the seas and with the refreshment of life akin to the spring when so much of God's handiwork is again reborn.

The gifts of St. Patrick to all the human family live on with each generation, because they provide food for the human spirit. The nature of man is unchanging. It is the same today as it was in the days of St. Patrick. We in our times have seen that man lives not by bread alone, as we witness the evil outcomes of a belief that holds the animal desires and needs of man are all that matter. Those evil outcomes today pose a threat to the survival of the entire human family. Atheistic communism is but a part of that threat. Equally dangerous is the pernicious infection of materialism in Western society, with its false goals and symbols, with its cold detachment from responsibility for the common weal, with its disdain for those human concerns which mark Christian life and its preoccupation with personal gain above all else. The signs of this disintegrating process are many. But the spiritual power of Christianity, upon which Western society has been built, remains strong and restive beneath the thin veneer of contemporary life. We who believe must break through that artificial surface which has fallen upon our civilization. A spiritual rebirth of the Western world is sorely overdue.

Turning to the ways and means through which a spiritual rebirth of the Western World may be launched, we find no shortage of suggestions or remedies. There are no doubt many roads leading to that end. None is short and the one that is sure is marked with dangers, sacrifice, and commitment. That is the road Patrick traveled from his early youth, in his years of preparation to convert pagan Ireland to the cause of Christ, in his tireless mission among the Irish people until his happy death among men.

Two lessons from the life of our patron Saint demonstrate the spiritual power of Christianity. The first is the lesson of prayer and the second is the lesson of Christian action.

It will be recalled that Patrick, as a boy of 16 years, was captured and carried off to slavery in Ireland. Baptized a Christian before his capture, he found the real meaning of his faith during 6 years of captivity. While he ate the bitter bread of bondage in a foreign land, a profound spiritual change came over him. "The Lord," said Saint Patrick in his confessions "opened the sense of my unbelief." The love of God so fully consumed his soul that in a single day or night he would offer a hundred prayers—for strength and deliverance and for the conversion of his captors. He often thought about escape and he longed for his family. But the dangers of escape were many. He did not know the countryside or how to get to the sea. If his master recaptured him it might mean loss of his life. Along the way he could be captured by hostile forces and resold into slavery. A voice came to him in his sleep—"Behold thy ship is ready," heartening him to attempt the perils of escape to a port some 180 miles from his master's house. He escaped, avoided all dangers en route, and reached the port to find the ship of his dreams waiting and soon to sail. Applying for service on the ship, he was rebuffed. Patrick was not robust of body and the ship's crew was comprised of sea ruffians. Turning to depart he began to pray and before he had finished the ship's master had a change of heart and called out to him to come aboard. At sea, Patrick tried to convert the members of the crew. Before Patrick reached the safety of a monastery in Europe his trials and dangers were many and the power of prayer was many times demonstrated for him.

But Patrick sought much more than his personal safety. He had set as his goal the life of a missionary to spread the light of Christianity. This required intensive preparation, as Patrick was aware of the shortcomings of his early life, particularly his lack of scholarly training. In the course of his preparations under the tutelage of learned men, he dreamed of his experience in far away Ireland in which a man came to him bearing many letters, handing him one he opened it and it began "We pray thee, holy youth, to come and again walk amongst us as before." It was then that Patrick removed any doubts about his goal to convert the Irish people.

Patrick's wish to return to Ireland as a missionary was not quickly granted. After his ordination there appears to have been some doubts as to the wisdom of his wish as well as his adequacy to fulfill it. Palladius was the first bishop sent to Ireland by authority of Rome. His mission was to administer to the spiritual needs of the small Christian communities then existing in Ireland. There were many doubts held about efforts to convert the entire Irish race, some based upon the fierce character of most tribes, some upon insufficient knowledge about the customs of the people, and others upon the magnitude of the undertaking and the lack of missionaries for the task. Bishop Palladius died after 1 year of work in Ireland and the way was then opened for Patrick to fulfill his mission. Consecrated a bishop, he departed for Ireland with a small band of followers in the year 432. From then on until the death of Patrick, the many lessons of Christian action which he left us were performed on Irish soil.

Patrick, in his mission to the Irish people, maintained a happy balance between prayer and the good works of Christianity in action. He learned from his early youth that prayer and good works were inseparable, that one without the other could not work God's will on earth. Accounts of his missionary life are filled with events marking this happy combination.

Patrick prayed for strength, spiritual as well as physical, to carry on his work. He needed both in abundance as he traveled the hostile countryside, filled with the hardships and fraught with dangers from tribal chiefs and lesser kings and their followers.

Patrick prayed for courage to face the dangerous tests of his mission. To convert the Irish he had decided on the bold course of confronting the tribal chiefs and lesser kings with the message of Christianity. Patrick dared to accept the greatest risks as necessary to the success of his mission. His life was in the balance on many occasions, in the test with the Druids, in the exchange with the tribal magicians, and in his challenges to the superstitions and false idols of the pagan way of life.

Patrick prayed for wisdom to understand the strange ways of the many Irish tribes, to understand their customs, their legends, the background of their particular places of ceremonial worship, and their fierce spirit. His understanding of all these things made easier his mission of conversion and on occasion saved his life and the lives of his followers. By the use of reason and the sincerity of his good example, he changed ancient ways without offending those attached to them.

Patrick prayed for the gift of eloquence in bringing the message of Christ to a people set in their ways and not easy to convince. And his eloquence in support of the way, the truth, and the light was so great as to leave this blessing as a dominant trait of the sons and daughters of Ireland in every generation.

Patrick prayed for the virtue of patience and in his mission he was patient with all and everything except evil. Evil was the handiwork of the Devil and Patrick could have no patience with the Devil or any of his works. He did not believe in the peaceful coexistence of good and evil. How well he understood that one or the other must triumph. His victory was the triumph over evil.

Patrick prayed for fortitude to persevere in all trial and suffering, in times of temptation, in situations of seemingly hopeless odds, and in the loneliness that so often attended his role as shepherd of his flock. Fortitude and perseverance were strong in the works of Patrick. He could not be deterred from his mission. Setbacks were regarded as but a test for more important tests to come. Success was accepted as a sign that he must redouble his efforts.

It is accurate to conclude that Patrick prayed for the opportunity to prove himself a strong and unyielding soldier in the army of Christ. How else can we explain his readiness to give his life so that the teachings of Christ might be brought to the people of Ireland, living in what was then regarded as the most distant land of the known world? He never sought the easy way, but always the right way. He never held to the warmth and comfort of the hearth because his home was wherever his holy mission took him, always ready to carry the message of Christianity into the contest with pagan beliefs, customs, and traditions.

Patrick was more than a true and tried soldier in the army of Christ. His place in history as a bold and determined leader of men to a life of eternal happiness is assured. Patrick did not seek this reward. Fifteen centuries of Christendom have conferred it upon him. Patron saint of the Irish, St. Patrick is beloved and honored by all who believe that life does not end in this world and that the life of the spirit is eternal.

We have learned that the power of prayer can move mountains, light the darkest skies, calm the most violent storms, and heal the gravest wounds. But St. Patrick has taught us that prayer, accompanied by Christian action, in a spirit of total commitment, can change the world. And change the world we must, through a vigorous rebirth of Christian life.

Few of us can hope to emulate the life of St. Patrick in our journey through this world. But all of us can aspire to follow in his well marked journey those footsteps which come closest to our individual station in life, to our individual capacities, and to the opportunities which come to each and every one of us in our daily lives. The true Christian can not detach himself from responsibility for the common good. Christian life must be filled with a warm and human concern for the misfortunes and needs of our fellowmen. As we pass along the road of life we must be aware of those who fall by the wayside and whose cries for help are weak or timid. And like Simon of Cyrene we must be ready to share the burdens of others less fortunate. For this is the fulfillment of Christian life in the spirit of good St. Patrick which can change the world of our times.

Retardation: A Matter of National Interest Which Deserves Our Maximum Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, one of our major concerns in this session of Congress must be a program to help solve a major problem facing the country today. We all are becoming familiar with the great problems of the mentally retarded. We know that mental retardation continues as a major problem to this Nation, socially and economically. We know that while only 4 percent of the mentally retarded are confined to institutions, their care costs relatives and communities some $300 million annually. Additional amounts are required for the construction of facilities for custodial and educational purposes. These costs amount to an additional $1 billion per year or more. We know, Mr. Speaker, that about 3 percent of the population of this Nation are persons having significant difficulties in adapting adequately to their environment. Based on this figure of 3 percent, approximately 126,000 children born each year will be classified as mentally retarded. Of this group, 110,000 will suffer mild retardation which can, with special training and assistance, be reduced, enabling them to acquire limited job skills and achieve a certain independence in the community. The remaining children in the group classified as mentally retarded will range from severe retardation to moderate retardation, for which additional services are required. As a nation we were slow in recognizing the problem and attempts at a solution. However, since 1950, interest in the problem of mental retardation has grown very rapidly. Foundations, parents groups, professional groups, and members of legislative bodies have stimulated activity in this field when they became convinced of the urgent need for some solution to the problem. I feel it timely, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to emphasize the part taken by the Federal Government in this important work. I would like to review the activities of the administration in studying the problem, discovering its scope, and planning its solution.

I. THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST STATEMENT, OCTOBER 11, 1961

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the President's message of October 11, 1961, calling for a national plan in mental retardation. The President expressed a deep concern over the Nation's failure to act to solve the problems of the mentally retarded. He defined mental retardation as a "condition resulting from a basic abnormality of the human mind." He recognized mental retardation as a symptom of a disease, rather than a disease itself.

The President reviewed the scope of the problem indicating that "mental retardation is a serious personal matter to at least 1 out of every 12 people." He indicated that by 1970 "we will have at least 1 million more retarded persons than there are at present." After referring to the birth rate of mentally retarded children the President said:

> This is a national problem and it requires a national solution.

The President went on to indicate the financial hardships to the families of the mentally retarded and the emotional strain suffered by the retarded child in trying to cope with modern society. He stated that we must act nationally to alleviate the problems of them as mentally retarded. We owe it to them as individuals and to ourselves as a Nation.

The President indicated that the effort to help the mentally retarded at that time took six basic forms:

First. Diagnostic and clinical services for the retarded were being expanded.

Second. An increase in beds in residential institutions.

Third. An increase in the number of special education classes.

Fourth. Parent counseling was conducted by professional persons in the field.

Fifth. Child welfare agencies were attempting to meet some of the needs.

Sixth. Vocational centers to prepare the child for a useful life were established.

The President in his first statement went on to say that although the effort was being made along the foregoing lines, "the central problem remains unsolved, for the causes and treatment of mental retardation are largely untouched." He therefore called together a panel of outstanding professional people to prescribe a program of action. The activities of the panel were directed generally to "the adequacy of existing programs and the possibilities for greater utilization of current knowledge." More specifically the President instructed the panel to review and make recommendations with regard to—

First. The personnel required to do the job.

Second. The areas of concern that offer the best hope of success and the means necessary to encourage activity in the area.

Third. Present programs of treatment, education, and rehabilitation.

Fourth. Unity faction between Federal and State Governments and private resources.

II. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PANEL ON MENTAL RETARDATION, OCTOBER 1962

The President's Panel, chaired by Hon. Leonard W. Mayo, made its 194-page report to the President in October 1962. After introductory remarks on the nature and effects of mental retardation, the panel made eight recommendations which it discussed in the report:

1. Research in the causes of retardation and in methods of care, rehabilitation, and learning.
2. Preventative health measures including (a) a greatly strengthened program of maternal and infant care directed first at the centers of population where prematurity and the rate of damaged children are high; (b) protection against such known hazards to pregnancy as radiation and harmful drugs; and (c) extended diagnostic and screening services.
3. Strengthened educational programs generally and extended and enriched programs of special education in public and private schools closely coordinated with vocational guidance, vocational rehabilitation, and specific training and preparation for employment, education for the adult mentally retarded, and workshops geared to their needs.
4. More comprehensive and improved clinical and social services.
5. Improved methods and facilities for care, with emphasis on the home and the development of a wide range of local community facilities.
6. A new legal, as well as social, concept of the retarded, including protection of their rights, life guardianship provisions when needed, an enlightened attitude on the part of the law and the courts, and clarification of the theory of responsibility in criminal acts.
7. Helping overcome the serious problems of manpower as they affect the entire field of science and every type of service through extended programs of recruiting with fellowships, and increased opportunities for graduate students and those preparing for the professions to observe and learn at first hand about the phenomenon of retardation. Because there will never be a fully adequate supply of personnel in this field and for other cogent reasons, the panel has emphasized the need for more volunteers in health, recreation, and welfare activities, and for a Domestic Peace Corps to stimulate voluntary service.
8. Programs of education and information to increase public awareness of the problem of mental retardation.

III. THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

For the first time in our history the President sent a special message to Congress on the problems of mental retardation and mental illness. He suggested a threefold attack on these crucial problems:

First. Discover the cause and eradicate.

Second. Strengthen the skilled manpower and resources of knowledge necessary to sustain the attack.

Third. Strengthen the programs and facilities serving the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

With these objectives in mind the President suggested a new approach, "designed, in large measure, to use Federal resources to stimulate State, local and private action."

To prevent the increase of mental retardation, the President recommended a 5-year program to stimulate State and local activity to "plan, initiate and develop comprehensive maternity and child health care service programs" which would aid families unable to afford needed medical care. To further aid to reduce the effect of mental retardation, the President suggested doubling the existing $25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health, using a significant portion for the mentally retarded. I suggest that the Congress should promptly and fully support this recommendation. Further, the President emphasized the need for community facilities and services for the mentally retarded. The President suggested grants to be awarded to the States on a selective basis to give every State an opportunity to begin a well organized, comprehensive program to meet the needs of the mentally retarded. The President urged the granting of Federal funds for the construction of facilities for first, inpatient clinical units in which specialists on mental retardation would serve; second, outpatient clinics including facilities for special treatment; and third, "satellite" clinics in outlying cities for treatment of the mentally retarded.

Finally to promote research the President suggested "legislation to authorize the establishment of centers for research on human development including the training of scientific personnel."

The President urged action in his recommendations stating the intention to promote, "to the best of our ability and by all possible and appropriate means—the mental and physical health of all our citizens."

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed to the Congress a program responsive to the President's special message of February 5, 1963, and the Report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. The program will cost $204,723,000 for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $76,219,000 over the program for fiscal year 1963. Through the enactment of this program, expanded activities would be permitted by the Public Health Service through the National Institutes of Health; through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; through the Bureau of State Services; through the Children's Bureau; through the Office of Education and through the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. The emphasis in all of the foregoing units would be on research development with a view to studying the scope of the problem and possible solutions.

V. THE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of this distinguished body is concerned with the problem of mental retardation and is desirous of doing everything possible to solve what the President has correctly called a national problem. The maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendment of 1963, known as H.R. 3386, was introduced by my distinguished colleague, Representative WILBUR MILLS and on the Senate side by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. RIBICOFF (S. 1072). This bill proposes to accomplish the following:

First. Project grants to the States to pay for comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

Second. Project grants for comprehensive maternity care—including infant care after childbirth—for women in low-income groups among whom there is a high incidence of births of children who are mentally retarded. This would be a 5-year program of project grants in which the Federal share would be up to 75 percent. The program would be administered by the Children's Bureau, under a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

Third. An expansion of both the maternal and child health program, and the crippled children's program of the Children's Bureau from the current $25 million annually for each program to an ultimate $50 million annually after 7 years. Under the President's budget for fiscal 1964 at least $1 million would be used specifically for mental retardation activities in these two programs.

Fourth. A new research program of the Children's Bureau authorizing grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Of the recommended first year appropriations of $2.1 million, it is expected that about $500,000 will be used for research in the field of mental retardation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I recall at this time that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has introduced in the Senate bills to provide funds for the construction of mental retardation research centers and the construction of facilities for the care, treatment, and training of the mentally retarded—S. 755 and S. 756—and a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which would provide Federal assistance for service to the mentally retarded and others whose vocational rehabilitation potential is difficult to determine (S. 968).

Mr. Speaker, I say the action of the President in addressing himself to this problem early in his first term is commendable. The action taken at that time in appointing the panel of distinguished citizens resulted in a comprehensive study of the problem and recommendations which the President could use as a basis for the special message on this national problem. The bills now before this distinguished body which I have briefly reviewed indicate the beginning of Federal action to alleviate the problem. I look for continued action in this field, constant attention to this grave problem, and a day when this national problem will be measurably alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce legislation which will further treat with this subject. I have used as a basis the clear way of progress already made in an area once considered hopeless. I am indebted for suggestions to such groups as the Guild for Exceptional Children, from my own district who are doing much fine work in this field. I trust that Members of this House will support pending legislation and the bills I have briefly made reference to. For each Member knows that any delay on our part will result in increased suffering among what I have often called "our greatest asset"—the Nation's young and their dedicated and loving parents.

For those who wish to go into this subject in depth, I suggest the following publications:

"A Proposed Program for National Action To Combat Mental Retardation"—The President's Panel on Mental Retardation, October 1962.

"First National Report on Patients of Mental Health Clinics"—Anita K. Bahn, B.A.; and Vivian B. Norman, B.S.

"A Proposed Program To Combat Mental Retardation"—Rudolf P. Hornuth.

"Preparations of Mentally Retarded Youth for Gainful Employment"—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1959, No. 25.

"Research Relating to Mentally Retarded Children"—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960.

"The Mentally Retarded Child at Home"—Laura L. Dittmann, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleagues in saluting the action taken by the House in unanimously passing H.R. 274 on March 4, 1963. This resolution embodies the high esteem and respect which all Members have for Mr. Lewis Deschler who in his role as Parliamentarian, impartially advises the Speaker and other Members on the innumerable precedents and the intricate operation of this body's rules. For 35 years Mr. Deschler has rendered invaluable and inestimable service to many Speakers, Members and indeed to the whole Nation. All of us owe a true debt of gratitude to this gentleman, and I am delighted that the House has provided an opportunity for us to express it. The honest confidence we place in this able and learned gentleman is a key factor in contributing to the smooth and orderly function of this great legislative body. Mr. Speaker it is my fond hope that Mr. Deschler will serve us for many more years.

Frederick R. Kappel Receives Silver Quill Award of Nation's Specialized Business Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the recent 14th annual state of the Nation dinner of the Specialized Business Press of America, sponsored by National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park, February 7, 1963, in Washington, at which the chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Frederick R. Kappel, was presented the Silver Quill Award for 1962 by the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, for "distinguished service to the business community."

Many Members of the Congress joined industry and business leaders, Government officials and policymakers in our national life, at this notable event.

The excerpts follow:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Introductory Remarks by Master of Ceremonies Milton B. Kihlstrum, President, Miller Publishing Co., and Chairman of the Board, National Business Publications, Inc.

We come to the climax of our evening—the presentation of the Silver Quill Award of the Specialized Business Press. As always, there were many candidates considered—all outstanding; all deserving. However, none sparkled with such brilliance as that guiding genius behind Telstar who is here to receive our highest tribute.

We are also favored by the presence of another great man of universal respect—the Vice President of the United States—who was himself, last year, recipient of this award. The Specialized Business Press of America will always be honored, Mr. Johnson, by its association with your momentous endeavor. We are delighted to have you now present the Silver Quill Award for 1962.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson in Presenting the 1962 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications to Frederick R. Kappel

Mr. Kihlstrum, Mr. Schoenbrun, Mr. Kappel, distinguished guests at the head table, ladies and gentlemen—the dynamics of living are at an alltime peak. Time and distance are shrinking, as the marvels of the space age burst forth at an ever-increasing rate. We're in a race—a race for survival, a race for solutions to social problems, a race to the moon and beyond. This competition involves our way of life—involves our way of doing business, involves our way of maintaining leadership—maintaining it through freedom rather than maintaining it through force.

I suggest that there is more to the space race than those whose rockets are more reliable and those whose spacecrafts first attain their objectives. Those are important, of course, but, as I say, there is much more involved.

There is a contest between a democracy with private enterprise and a dictatorship without private enterprise. As the leaders of the former, we must continue to prove to ourselves and to the world that partnership between private business and free government is the superior way of getting things done.

The Silver Quill Award is peculiarly devoted to the field of business. It is granted by the Nation's business publishers to those whom they have selected as having performed outstanding service to business. But, we're living in a world where all of us—business and labor and agriculture or professionals—must operate in such a manner that what we do in our own field also serves the best interests of our country.

I have not come here this evening to lavish compliments on Frederick Kappel—the people in this audience have recounted his accomplishments so many times that words from an amateur are entirely superfluous. It is the tradition of the Silver Quill that the recipient of the previous year's award make the presentation and I am pleased that this tradition has selected me to pass it on to a most deserving, most distinguished, most competent and a greatly dedicated all-American, Fred Kappel.

Remarks of Frederick R. Kappel

This is an honor I deeply appreciate for several reasons. The first is that this occasion has come through the years to be such a meaningful event. What makes it so, of course, is all people who have gathered around. And, certainly, this gathering is a great tribute to the business publications of the country. We have only to look around this room to realize the importance attached to the business publishing function.

I can't help thinking, too, of the men who have been honored in previous years. It makes me very proud and also very humble to be associated with such a group. One of its most distinguished members, your guest of honor last year, just sat down a minute ago after saying more about me than I could recognize. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being so generous in overstating my case.

Another thing that pleases me especially is that this year's award really honors many people and not just me. I have been in the Bell System nearly 39 years. It doesn't take that long to realize that whatever credit we earn is the work of able and devoted men and women all through the business. And it doesn't lessen my personal appreciation, it only increases it, to be able to say—on their behalf as well as for myself—thank you for this recognition.

The story of Telstar is a perfect example of what I have just said. Hundreds and hundreds of people have done their absolute best to make this wonderful thing work. This best involves disciplined scientific imagination, great technical proficiency and the most demanding insistence on quality. But something more is needed, too. What is it that invigorates such effort? What fires people up and then pours on the coal?

I think it is the realization that there are great ends to be served and that every job well done contributes importantly to serving them. By great ends, I mean the mastery of space as a new medium for worldwide communications; the creation of a system which, along with ocean cables, will meet fast-growing human needs; the demonstration of continuing American leadership in extending and improving services that, hopefully, will help bring together the peoples of all nations.

As matters now stand, Telstar has provided basic assurance that satellite communications are indeed feasible and practical and that design and construction of commercial satellites, and ground stations to work with them, can now be approached pretty much as a straight engineering project. There is no scientific obstacle to designing a commercial system immediately and bringing it into being as soon as the satellites could be manufactured and put into orbit, say in 2 or 3 years.

I also mentioned ocean cables. Regarding them, I might say, too, that in a few years' time, their capabilities for handling all kinds of communications will surely equal those of satellites. It would be a great mistake to think that all the paths of progress are out in space.

The important thing of course is to make the best use of all the opportunities. The incorporators appointed by the President are working hard, as you know, to get the Space Communications Corp. started. Speaking for the Bell System, I will just say again that our wish and hope are to take an active, constructive part in this, and as soon as possible. We want to help build a strong, healthy enterprise that will be a great success.

Now the theme of this meeting tonight has been "The Challenge of Universal Communication." And it seems to me this takes us inevitably to the problems of communication in the broad sense—not just the kind I have been talking about, but the whole matter of communicating ideas and purposes of spreading and getting understanding. It is in this effort that the specialized business publications play their important part, not merely as reporters but as lively interpreters of the goals, the achievements, the significant thinking of American industry.

But how can we in business communicate better? And what do we want to communicate anyway?

Several thoughts occur to me. First, I think business simply must communicate more successfully than it has; that the economic growth we are all striving for depends first and foremost on the vitality and drive that is generated in the private sector of the economy—on stimulating and rousing the energies of private enterprise—on encouraging acceptance of risk and the enthusiastic, eager exercise of management skills.

I honestly don't believe the country can get where it wants to go in any other way. Without question these factors have been central to our progress so far. Yet we seem unable to communicate the very philosophy that the country has prospered by. We have watched millions of young people grow up with little or no understanding of the practical economics of business enterprise. We have let profit come to be a dirty word—or a mere technical term in professional economic lingo—while the absolute need for profitability has been clouded over and obscured.

Second, we have big problems in this country and we will not solve them if our aims are small. I said earlier that I thought the driving force behind Telstar was the realization of important ends to be served. If we in business want to instill confidence in others, if we want to inspire people to strive, then we must communicate a feeling of purpose, a feeling that what we are doing is deeply and truly important—important to the country and important to the future.

But we can never communicate this kind of feeling just by using words. I don't say words can be dispensed with. Basically, however, business—and Government, too, for that matter—communicates by how it works. This is age-old doctrine, I realize, but I still can't find a better one. The determination to produce quality, the utmost in value, whatever the product or service may be—this makes work important. This gives dignity to employees, character to the business, lasting substance to investment and satisfaction to consumers, with attendant public respect. Performance and only performance will largely communicate itself—with the help of words to be sure—but the business that puts on great performance will never need the dictionary to explain it.

As a third point, I think more businesses are learning that by the very act of stating their purposes, they greatly encourage their own effort to achieve them. This involves what I call giving hostages to performance. When you commit yourself to the public plainly, for all to read or hear—well, you are committed. You are out on a limb. You have to stand or fall, and that is a wonderful discipline.

Unhappily, most instances of climbing out on a limb now occur in disputes of various kinds and involve demands made on others. What I am speaking for here is that we make more demands on ourselves, and make them in public. The words we use to do this might even be the most important in all business communication.

Finally, just a word about communication and agreement. Some people I talk with seem to think these are two sides of the same coin. I don't think so at all. I agree that communicating means to listen as well as to talk, but the name of the game is not "Me, too." After all, one of the main purposes of communication is to make clear when you disagree, and why.

I make this rather obvious point because I hope the theme of this meeting will not carry any of us off into dreamland. We surely need, in this country, broad unity of purpose. But we shall never arrive at it by pretending to agree when we do not. We shall get there only by continuously testing and prodding each other—by a continuous dialog, as the intellectuals call it. And what I am saying here tonight comes down essentially to this:

First, business needs to do all it can to improve its part in the dialog; and second, the foundations for success in this effort must be, as they have always been, good purposes, good will, good faith, and good works.

To the national business publications I say again, for myself and equally for my associates in the Bell System—we are deeply grateful for this award. We shall try our best, with your valued and important help, to contribute usefully toward solving problems of communication, in every sense of the word.

Thank you very much.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. G. Willard Collins, evangelist, Church of Christ, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee because Thou hast revealed to man the meaning of love and sacrifice through the gift of Thy Son. Today we thank Thee for all the men and women who have worked with Thee to carve upon the soil of this land a fruitful nation and people. Our God, we pray that the Members who assemble in this House may recognize their power and responsibility as our leaders, and we ask for Thy guidance to them in this day's activities. May we believe enough to trust Thee; may we obey Thee that Thou might bless us; may we serve Thee and our neighbors that all men may know that we are Thy people. In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 19, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1089. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

"A REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA"

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa", submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REFERENDUM ON THE NEW WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the result of conversations which I had with several farmers who were in Washington this week on a tour sponsored by the Missouri Farm Bureau, I am led to believe that many of the farmers of this Nation are being given advice which is based upon a false assumption, and that if they follow this advice it can only result in irreparable damage to their own interests.

I am talking about the advice which some of these farmers have received from those who are recommending that they vote against the new wheat program which is scheduled to go into effect in 1964 if the referendum carries in the election, to be held in the late spring or early summer.

After I had explained to the group the importance of approving this new program, I pointed out that in the event two-thirds did not approve the program they would then revert to the basic law under which there would be maximum supports of 50 percent of parity only for those who planted within their base allotments. This, I said, would mean a support price of about $1.25 a bushel for those who restricted their plantings, but the market price would in all probability be less than a dollar a bushel, this estimate being made on the theory that without restrictions the overall planting would be increased with no limits on acreage.

Then, some of these farmers replied:

> If the referendum results in a vote against the program, then the Secretary of Agriculture will be forced to ask Congress to enact a new law, for he cannot afford to let the basic law go into effect, especially with an election year coming up in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to be an expert on agriculture, and I do not pretend to have the solution to the farm problem, but after 12 years of sitting on the House Committee on Agriculture, I think I have learned a few things. One of them is this, and I am willing to stake my reputation on this prediction. If this new wheat program is not approved by the two-thirds vote in the forthcoming referendum, you are going to see some mighty sick and disappointed farmers throughout this land of ours, and the most surprised bunch will be those who are banking on the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress—at least the House Committee on Agriculture—coming up with some alternative proposal to "pull their fat out of the fire."

If the referendum fails, I am predicting that you will see good wheat selling for less than a dollar a bushel in 1964, and the warehouses will be filled with loan wheat on which the farmer has received only $1.25 a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the reading of the following editorial, taken from the March 6, 1963, issue of the Des Moines Register:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register,
Mar. 6, 1963]

WHEAT FACT AND FANCY

The Farm Bureau is conducting a major drive to defeat the new wheat program which will go into effect in 1964 if two-thirds of the growers vote in favor of it in a referendum in June of this year. The bureau says the basic issue is "whether the farms of America are to be managed by farmers or by a Government bureaucracy." It says a favorable vote would "give a great boost" to the administration's efforts to expand "supply management" to other commodities, but a "no" vote would be interpreted as a sign farmers do not want additional compulsory supply management programs.

This view of the wheat referendum seems unduly apocalyptic.

If farmers vote for the program, they will not be committing themselves to it for all time to come, but only for the 1964 wheat crop. If the program proved in practice to be as bad as the Farm Bureau says it is, surely this would be apparent to farmers, and they could reject the program on the next vote. And Congress could change it. What farmers are voting for in the referendum is not a new direction for all farm programs, as the Farm Bureau says, but a trial of a new plan for wheat.

The Farm Bureau is sounding dire warnings about the wheat controls which Charles B. Shuman, president of the organization, says are the "tightest, most restrictive ever proposed for any farm crop." That is extreme language, and it is careless language. Many kinds of controls have been proposed since 1920. The wheat controls are no tighter than those which have been in effect for tobacco and cotton for years and are not as tight as the controls for sugar. The Farm Bureau consistently backs these programs.

If two-thirds of the farmers vote in favor of the program, every wheat grower will be required to comply with his acreage allotment. He can grow as much wheat as he is able to grow on the allotted acres, but he will receive the full support (about $2 a bushel) only on a number of bushels to be determined as his share of the national supply used for domestic food consumption plus a portion of exports.

There are no more "controls" on the farmer than in the case of any crop where mandatory acreage allotments are in effect, as they have been in wheat for years. The main difference in the new program is that the price support will be a two-price deal: The grain not eligible for the top price support (probably about one-seventh of production) will receive a lower support comparable to feed grain supports, about $1.25 a bushel. Growers also will get a land-retirement payment for acres taken out of wheat.

The Farm Bureau correctly says that this new program will result in some decline, probably small, in the total net income received by wheat growers (but not in average income, because the number of growers is dropping). The two-price support plan results in a lower blend price support for wheat.

But rejection of the new plan would mean a much larger drop in wheat income. Price supports for all wheat produced would drop to 50 percent of parity, about $1.25 a bushel.

It is hard to see how the Farm Bureau leaders can get so wrought up about "compulsion" and dictatorial controls which do not go into effect unless two-thirds of the producers vote to accept them. What the Government is saying is that, if two-thirds of the producers favor the controls, then everyone who chooses to grow wheat will have to go along. Every business has regulations, governmental or private.

It seems not unreasonable that the Government ask farmers to cooperate in limiting production if they want a guaranteed price for their product. If they don't want to comply with acreage allotments in return for a higher price, well, that settles that. But it isn't an issue of Government management of farms, nor is it setting the course of farm policy forevermore.

EARNED INCOME LIMIT FOR THOSE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would increase to $1,800 the annual amount of earned income a person may receive without having his social security benefits reduced.

My bill would liberalize present social security requirements that retirees under 72 must have $1 of social security benefits withheld for every $2 of earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 per annum, and $1 withheld for every $1 of earnings in excess of $1,700.

I am pleased to join Senator HUMPHREY, who has introduced an identical bill in the Senate, and other House Members in proposing this legislation which will give older citizens an opportunity to receive a more adequate income to meet the heavy costs of living.

This is the third major amendment to the Social Security Act which I have proposed so far this session of the Congress.

My other bills, H.R. 2107 and H.R. 2685, would increase minimum social security benefits from $40 to $50 per month and lower age requirements for full social security benefits to 60 years for both men and women.

These bills are designed to strengthen our economy at the base. They would put needed purchasing power into the hands of those who need it most. They would bring a measure of social justice to individuals and families and those 35 million of our fellow citizens—including many in the Sixth District of Pennsylvania which I am privileged to represent—who are denied the opportunity of a decent livelihood in the midst of great national surpluses and prosperity.

I hope that the amendments to the Social Security Act which I have introduced will be carefully considered and that they will be approved by this present Congress.

INTERPRETATION

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, last night's issue of the Washington Star carried a story by George Sherman, a staff writer, commenting on the recent visit of President Kennedy to Costa Rica. The article goes on in this manner:

> Both in private and public, U.S. officials are hailing Mr. Kennedy's meetings with the six Presidents of Central America and Panama as a major landmark in U.S. policy in the hemisphere.

In view of the testimony taken in the Moss committee in the last 3 or 4 days I think that most Members of Congress and certainly most taxpayers are going to have their tongue in their cheek and take a hard look at the final result. We have learned that "managed news" does not necessarily reflect what has actually taken place. But the point I want to make further is that apparently we are committed to another foreign aid program in Central America, because further down in the story it states that the prestige of the President was going to be thrown with full weight behind a new program which is described as a new Fund for Central American Economic Integration.

I would only conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that those of us who have cast an unpopular vote in our district for mutual security and foreign aid are finding it increasingly difficult to go along. We find another program that is announced for the first time, not in the United States, not requested from Congress, but perfunctorily announced from a place out of the country. I recall that the Alliance for Progress was announced first in Uruguay and we found out that U.S. credit was committed for $10 billion.

I think we have four programs already working in Central America and I certainly hope that this program will be screened very carefully by the House before any binding commitments are made.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY SPOKESMAN STATES INACCURATE TEST-BAN FACTS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on the Voice of America's "Press Conference, U.S.A.," broadcast worldwide on Tuesday, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's Deputy Director Adrian S. Fischer inaccurately charged the big 2½-million-square-mile hole for Soviet undetectable test ban cheating under the administration's new test-ban treaty proposals does not exist. The big hole was revealed Monday by the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing.

Mr. Fischer's statements to the world simply are not factual. If he had been on commercial radio selling health pills as phony as the big hole test-ban treaty proposal he would be landed on by the Federal Food and Drug Administration like a ton of bricks and charged with misleading advertising, failure to label deleterious ingredients, and peddling a product dangerous to public health and safety.

Fischer denies existence of the big hole by alleging signals equal to a 3-kiloton shot in alluvium—that is, a 3 bury signal—beyond a distance of 1,240 miles are larger than the size signal for distances 620 to 1,240 miles used by the conference committee to illustrate the big hole. Table 1 shows the situation for the 620 to 1,240 distance where the size of the seismic signal is 4 millimicrons. Table 2 shows the situation for distances beyond 1,240 miles where the size of the signals goes back up to about 10 millimicrons, their size at 480 miles or about 800 kilometers. What table 2 illustrates is that even if, with this larger size signal, there is a marginal detection capability, the signal still is not sufficiently larger in size than background microseismic noise to permit identification of a cheat test shot, or series of them, from among thousands of small earthquakes of similar size occurring annually in the U.S.S.R. Without this identification capability, the big hole still exists. Paint it black for the future U.S. national security.

Fischer complains that the 3 bury signal—that is, signal equivalent to a 3-kiloton shot in alluvium—used as a measuring yardstick in the conference committee's report do not establish the big hole because there is relatively little dry alluvium in the U.S.S.R. His argument is specious because the dry alluvium equivalent is merely an expression of measurement, a yardstick. Units on this yardstick are now called a "bury" to eliminate such confusion. There are many other geological formations in the U.S.S.R. which may have an equal or greater muffling effect on the seismic shock signal of cheat tests. Alternatively, the signal may be reduced below thresholds of detection and identification merely by conducting the tests in underground cavities which decouple the shock wave of the explosion from the surrounding earth and thereby produce seismic signals of meager size. The big hole still exists, despite Mr. Fischer's misleading reasoning. Paint it black for the future U.S. national security.

Fischer further asserts the big hole does not exist because a seismic observatory at Mould Bay, Canada, has detected shots less than 3 kilotons fired by the AEC in Nevada. Again his reasoning is specious because reputable seismologists tell us Mould Bay's peculiar capability is a rare accident of geography based on the relative locations of the Nevada shots and the Mould Bay instrument. Such rare accidents can never tell us where to locate a seismic detection station in similar juxtaposition to an underground cheat shot that has not even yet been planned, let alone located somewhere within the Soviet Union's 8½ million square miles of real estate. The big hole still exists. Paint it black for the future U.S. national security.

It is hoped that the factual tables accompanying these remarks will be noted by the Member of the other body who Tuesday made disparaging remarks in the RECORD about the big hole charges. The tables are based on factual statements of a responsible Defense Department seismologist. If the gentleman will examine these tables he will possess information I believe he did not have then. These plain scientific facts of physical life have a direct bearing on the responsible evaluation of treaty proposals in context of the ability to deter a determined and intelligent cheater. He should admit this.

TABLE 1.—*Actual size (in millimicrons) of 3-bury[1] seismic signal compared with size of signal required for detection, location, and identification of "suspicious" shots at 620 to 1,240 miles (1,000 to 2,000 kilometers) distance*

Microseismic background "noise" level	3-bury [1] signal	Signal size needed for detection and location	Signal size needed for identification
5	4	10	[2] 50
4	4	8	[2] 40
3	4	6	[2] 30
2	4	[3] 4	[2] 20
1	4	[3] 2	[2] 10

[1] A "bury" is a unit of seismic signal measurement. For example: 1 bury is the equivalent of a seismic signal created by a 1-kiloton explosion where the shot is fired in alluvium formation in direct contact with the soil, i.e., without decoupling: 2 bury is the same for a 2-kiloton explosion and so on: Explanation of the origin of this unit of measurement will be found in remarks by Representative HOSMER in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4767–4768.

[2] 3-bury signal useless for identifying it as a cheat test.

[3] 3-bury signal begins to show on seismograph for detection purposes.

NOTE.—Average microseismic background level is 10 to 20 millimicrons. Table shows only "very quiet" areas of 5 millimicrons and less. 2 times background required for detection and location. 10 to 20 times background required for identification.

TABLE 2.—*Actual size (in millimicrons) of 3-bury[1] seismic signal compared with size of signal required for detection, location, and identification of "suspicious" shots beyond 1,240 miles (2,000 kilometers) distance*

Microseismic background "noise" level	3-bury [1] signal	Signal size needed for detection and location	Signal size needed for identification
5	10	[2] 10	[3] 50
4	10	[2] 8	[3] 40
3 [4]	10	[2] 6	[3] 30
2 [4]	10	[2] 4	[3] 20
1 [4]	10	[2] 2	[5] 10

[1] A "bury" is a unit of seismic signal measurement. For example: 1 bury is the equivalent of a seismic signal created by a 1-kiloton explosion where the shot is fired in alluvium formation in direct contact with the soil, i.e., without decoupling; 2 bury is the same for a 2-kiloton explosion and so on. Explanation of the origin of this unit of measurement will be found in remarks by Representative HOSMER in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4767–4768.

[2] 3-bury signal begins to show on seismograph for detection purposes.

[3] 3-bury signal useless for purpose of identifying it as a cheat test.

[4] Reduction of background noise to these extremely low levels even by installation of highly sophisticated equipment is not assured.

[5] 3-bury signal barely enters threshold of identification.

NOTE.—Average microseismic background level is 10 to 20 millimicrons. Table shows only "very quiet" areas of 5 millimicrons and less. 2 times background required for detection and location. 10 to 20 times background required for identification.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT ON TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 18 I wrote the President respecting deficiencies of a nuclear test ban treaty his advisers state is under preparation for offer to the Soviets in the near future. The letter also discusses possible reasons for what I feel to be bad advice on the subject these advisers are giving him. I hope the President will be given the letter to read. It is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban.

The HONORABLE JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I sincerely hope this letter may reach your eyes because it contains information relating to the national security which I feel you may not otherwise receive.

Your Disarmament Agency people recently outlined to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy many of the provisions of a revised test ban treaty under preparation which they state soon will be offered the Soviets. This proposal contains a loophole through which the Soviets can move clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent, Communist world domination.

According to testimony of Government technical witnesses heard by the JCAE at the same hearings, the verification system to be proposed is inadequate to detect and identify underground test cheating at yields equivalent to "3 kilotons and below conducted in alluvium formations" if cheating is carried on at least 620 miles inside Soviet borders. According to my calculations, this leaves an area of at least 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R.—and probably twice that size—in which significant secret Soviet underground tests can be carried on wholly without fear of detection.

This undetectability results from the inherent inability of seismographs to detect and locate signals unless they are at least twice the size of the earth's normal microseismic background noises and their inherent inability to distinguish, that is, identify, suspicious events from earthquakes unless the signals are 10 to 20 times larger than background noise.

In short, natural background noise, which averages 10 to 20 millimicrons, affects seismographs just like static affects a radio receiver—the signal's are blotted out by the noise.

This is what happens:

Assume a quiet location for the seismograph, with background noise of only 5 millimicrons. This means the signal must be at least 10 millimicrons for detection and location and at least 50 millimicrons for identification. Yet, the signal from a 3-kiloton shot 620 miles distance will be only 4 millimicrons in size—far below levels required for verification of cheating.

Even assuming special instruments could reduce the background noise to an irreducible 1 millimicron minimum, where marginal detection and location capability would appear, still a 10 millimicron signal would be needed for identification, and the actual signal will be only 4 millimicrons.

It is to be noted that signals can be held to the 4 millimicron level either by limiting test yields to 3 kilotron in alluvium or equivalent soils or by conducting larger shots in underground cavities which "decouple" the shock waves from surrounding earth and reduce the signal to the undetectable level.

The foregoing all is a matter of public record in the JCAE's hearings. Also on the JCAE's public record is testimony as to what weapons development progress can be made in this big hole undetectable cheating area. It amounts to the entire spectrum of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons except an "unsubstantial fraction" of strategic weapons—these being superyield H-bombs the U.S.S.R. already has developed anyway.

If you offer the Soviets the treaty now being drafted it will mean an offer by the United States to forgo wholly all nuclear weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply trust a Communist promise not to continue nuclear weapons development when it can be done without fear of discovery.

This is exactly what your Disarmament Agency relates it is advising you to do on the grounds the risks of not doing so are greater than those of doing so. In effect, they say it is more risky for both sides to test in the open than it is for the Communist to be given the opportunity for cheat testing while we stop progress. This flies in the face of logic if we assume we distrust the Soviets enough to spend $50 billion a year on military defense.

The advice also flies in the face of logic if a treaty with a big hole in it is an ineffective treaty, and I do not see how it could be otherwise. Secret weapons testing of the magnitude possible would drastically affect the military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Further, if an ineffective treaty is concluded, it will surrender all opportunity to conclude an effective one. What happens then to the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere who see an effective treaty as one of the very few opportunities there is to achieve a less risky world?

There is no need to take my word, Mr. President, for the facts on undetectability and clandestine weapons development opportunities above related. Dr. Carl Romney, seismologist for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, can explain the inherent physical limitations on seismic detection imposed by background noise as he did to the JCAE. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's director of military applications, can define for you the wide spectrum of opportunity for undetectable weapons development, as he did to the JCAE. I urge you to confer with these men.

Why do I suggest bypassing your Disarmament Agency advisers for this information?

Simply because if they have not already put this matter to you, then you should no longer have confidence in their advice. With the hopes of mankind aroused for a reduction in the world's risks by an effective test ban treaty, they are not doing their jobs advising you to enter an ineffective one. They cannot safely be relied upon if they tell you to trade the reality of an effective risk reduction device for only an illusion of effectiveness, with the eventual prospect of a nuclear Pearl Harbor thrown in for good measure.

If their advice to you is so bad, why do they give it? These are patriotic men of integrity—what, you may ask, is my answer to that?

My answer, Mr. President, does not reflect on either the patriotism or the integrity of these men. They are hard working people, intensely anxious to succeed in their jobs. It is simply that success in their jobs can only be demonstrated by the conclusion of some agreement with the Soviets. They want a good agreement, not a bad one. But they want an agreement. I am certain that this factor leads them into subconscious miscalculations of the balance of risks which overemphasizes hopes for the verification system and underemphasizes practical difficulties with it.

Mr. Foster, who heads the agency, is a former business executive, his assistant is Mr. Fischer, a former lawyer. Both receive their advice on seismology from Dr. Long, a chemist. None have been on their jobs even for a period of 2 years. Your Committee of Principals which reviews the Disarmament Agency's advice is composed of three former business executives and four former college professors. This group too has only been on the job for about 2 years.

Look at it this way: At Cape Canaveral, where "all systems are go" it means the check out of many, many components of a missile have been made electronically and infallibly before the final light is green.

By contrast, at the Disarmament Agency all components of a test ban proposal are not checked out electronically and infallibly before you receive the green light. They are checked by human beings who must make many, many individual subjective judgments as to each component before giving you a red or green light on the overall treaty package. Each of these many, many judgments is subject to a subconscious intrusion of the desire for an agreement. Constant favorable resolution of small doubt by this means, a bit by bit, piece by piece, eventually add up to one big major miscalculation.

Such miscalculation, Mr. President, I sincerely feel has occurred. It has occurred substantially in the manner I have outlined. Both you and the Nation will be its innocent victims unless prompt steps are taken, steps which can only be taken by you.

So again, I urge you to talk directly with Dr. Romney and General Betts, or others of equal knowledge and ability, who are not subject to the subconscious pressures upon Mr. Foster and his associates.

I am certain what they tell you will substantiate the proposition that an effective test ban treaty—one which will in fact cause the Soviets to stop nuclear weapons development if we do—will require manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union as well as on free world soil.

Again, in closing, I reiterate the danger of missing the chance for an effective, risk reducing treaty by the proposal of an ineffective, risk increasing treaty.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

THE STORY OF A MAGAZINE ARTICLE FIX

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on the flimsiest possible evidence, a major national publication has sought in recent weeks to discredit southern football generally and athletic officials at the University of Alabama in particular.

In the Saturday Evening Post dated March 23, 1963, there is an article entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix" which, according to the editors of the magazine, is "shocking" and the biggest sports scandal since the 1919 World Series baseball games. The article makes charges against two men, athletic directors at their respective universities, Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts, University of Georgia.

The facts on which these charges have been based run from the ephemeral to the nonexistent. However, the facts do speak for themselves that the magazine article is "fixed" in such a way as to cause the readers to draw distorted conclusions. First, they accuse Butts and Bryant of conspiring and fixing the 1962 football game between the University of Georgia and the University of Alabama, which was played at Birmingham, saying in a prefatory note to the article:

> Before the University of Georgia played the University of Alabama last September 22, Wally Butts, the athletic director of Georgia, gave Paul "Bear" Bryant, head coach of Alabama, Georgia's plays, defensive patterns, all the significant secrets Georgia's football team possessed.

The basis of this charge was a telephone call allegedly overheard by a man who admittedly knows little about football.

This is not evidence you could go into court with, or even get very many people familiar with football to take seriously. Yet the Saturday Evening Post has seen fit to put Paul Bryant and Wally Butts on trial in the court of public opinion. They are being tried in a "fixed" article with the facts arrayed in an effort to present a case against two honored and respected men.

Some of the "shocking" revelations of Butts to Bryant in the alleged telephone conversation were that Georgia did not have a man who could quick kick, that the Georgia quarterback revealed whether he was going to pass or run by the way he held his feet, and that certain other players committed themselves in advance on particular plays. Butts is also supposed to have given away offensive and defensive plays. While all of this is very interesting, there is some question that in this day of intensive scouting of opposing teams and slow motion photography the coach of one of the top teams in the country and a man voted by his peers as coach of the year in 1961 would have to be leaked information such as that alluded to in the article. It is outrageous that such a charge should be made, on the strength of statements by a convicted bad check artist. Furthermore, Coach Bryant was never even contacted by the Post to ascertain the validity of the charges or to obtain his comments. This failure to contact the victim of the charges bespeaks malice and a callous disregard for truthful, objective reporting.

Coach Bryant, in a statewide television appearance before the people of Alabama, answered these absurd charges in this way:

> I have been accused in print of collusion or attempts at collusion with the athletic director of the University of Georgia to fix or rig the game we played with the University of Georgia last fall.
>
> Our boys won the game by a score of 35 to 0.
>
> I welcome this opportunity to tell the people of Alabama that these charges are false in every sense of the word. I want to take this time to deny them with every force at my command. Never in my life have I attempted to rig or fix any game either as a player or as a coach.
>
> In these charges there is a statement that I had information on the Georgia football team. Certainly we did. We have information on and about every team that we play. This is scouting and research and study, etc.
>
> The Saturday Evening Post charges that I obtained confidential, detailed plans that would affect the outcome of the game with Georgia.

> It is part of the business of coaching football and is the duty of my staff and me to know as much about an opposing team as is possible. We attempt to do this, and, ladies and gentlemen, that is what a coach does the other 9 months of the year when football season is over.
>
> We study films of other schools. They study our films. All college teams exchange coaching films. We study the movements of players, their abilities, their weaknesses, and their habits. We study the coaches and their techniques, the games that they have played with us previously, and the games they played with other teams.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it might be useful to mention at this point that last October, Coach Bryant was the subject of a previous defamatory article in the Saturday Evening Post and that he has filed a suit for libel against the magazine on the basis of the false and misleading material contained in that article. The charges brought against the University of Alabama coach in the earlier article are as defamatory as in the present one.

However, the Post is not content to defend the earlier article in a court of law—they have set out to wreck the career of a man. The present article, "The Story of a College Football Fix," constitutes their countersuit against Paul Bryant. By the skillful manipulation of facts with quotes, the article indicts two men when the facts will not uphold their contention that a "fix" was on. The only "fix" in this whole affair is the Post's article.

The alleged phone call was overheard and noted by a man who is highly questionable at the very least. First, why did he listen to a phone conversation that he was accidentally cut in on? Secondly, the Post intimates that Wally Butts' alleged motives were both personal and financial. The phone call listener is an insurance man who has had a little trouble about issuing bad checks. He was convicted on charges of issuing two bad checks, was fined and placed on probation for the offense. He admits in the article that he has always had trouble with his financial affairs. Motives? Considering the background of the accuser, his motives are the ones which should be called into question.

But motives are not the issue here. What is an issue is that the Saturday Evening Post has libeled and defamed two honored and respected men.

Mr. Speaker, Coach Paul Bryant is a man who has dedicated his life to the youth of our country and to college athletics. He has risen to pre-eminence in his field. For that reason he makes a good target for the irresponsible and the rumor mongers. The Saturday Evening Post has attempted to take from Paul Bryant what no man or magazine should ever be allowed to take from any man. They have tried to take his good name.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new departure for the Saturday Evening Post. Over the past several months, they have time and again resorted to sensationalism and mad-dog journalism. This magazine has published in each recent issue so-called "inside dope" stories that characterize some of the worst journalism in America. Articles like "Air Crashes: Growing Peril in the Skies"; "A Vote Against Motherhood"; "Birmingham: City of Fear"; and now this scurrilous piece of reporting on "The Story of a College Football Fix," raise serious questions about the future of the Post. In the last 3 years, the Post has lost $40 million in advertising revenues while almost every other national magazine has increased its advertising income. Figures from Advertising Age show that the Post advertising revenues were $105 million in 1960. In 1961, the figure dropped to $86.5 million and dropped more sharply in 1962 to $66.5 million.

It is tragic to see a magazine with an illustrious history like the Post, a magazine in which many people have formerly had confidence, resort to this type of yellow journalism in an effort to bolster sagging revenues. One naturally cannot evaluate the accuracy of every article published in a given magazine. If a person reads an article about a subject he does know something about, and that article is full of distortions and inaccuracies, then it raises serious questions in the reader's mind about the validity of other articles.

For me, their recent article about my home city of Birmingham was such an article. Now, this attack on a renowned football coach in an article skillfully designed to cause the readers to conclude his guilt, makes me wonder if the Saturday Evening Post may not fade away into the oblivion they have suggested for Coach Bryant. Confidence once lost is hard to regain. Recent articles in the Post have caused a loss of confidence and I will not be surprised if that magazine in the near future ceases publication like the Literary Digest of the 1930's.

One facet of the case of the Saturday Evening Post is that it points to the need for review of our libel laws and regulations for publications using the U.S. mails. As the postal regulations stand now, libelous matter is mailable as long as it is not on the outside wrapper of the magazine. No reference to "The Story of a College Football Fix" was made on the outside of the Saturday Evening Post.

By the time court cases covering the libel suits come to trial, the damage caused by these articles will already have been done no matter what the outcome of the suits. Moreover, the laws and penalties for libel are obviously no obstacle to a magazine that has lost $40 million in advertising revenues in a 2-year period. The Post, financially desperate and losing revenue in the tens of millions of dollars, can regard the threat of libel judgments with indifference.

Yet let the record show first, that the University of Alabama board of trustees has investigated the charges thoroughly and has issued a statement absolving Coach Bryant; second, that a lie detector test given Coach Bryant has established his innocence; third, that the Justice Department has looked into the case and dropped its investigation; and fourth, that the president of the University of Alabama, Dr. Frank A. Rose, has issued this statement:

> The rumors concerning Coach Bryant were brought to my attention 3 weeks ago. After careful and thorough investigation, including the most favorable results of a lie-detector test given by a man who is a former member of the FBI and lecturer at the Keeler Polygraph Institute in Chicago, administered at the request of Coach Bryant for Commissioner Bernie Moore and me, I have found no evidence of any kind that would implicate Coach Bryant in any way with rigging or fixing, or betting on football games.
>
> A real injustice has been done to the University of Alabama and Coach Bryant and I am delighted to be able to make this statement at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Alabama is my alma mater and it is for that reason that I rise to speak—for that reason and the fact that a fine man has been defamed by a shameless "reporter" and an irresponsible magazine. Their article has done its damage, the magazine has achieved its goal of sensationalism, and it has caused widespread comment, but all of these petty and shortsighted goals have been achieved at the fearful sacrifice of truth.

RICE AS THE STAFF OF LIFE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when you consider the world production and value of the 10 most important commodities and materials, rice is on the top of the list. More than one-half of the total world population looks to rice as the staff of life as it provides 80 percent of the food for more than 50 percent of all the people over the globe. There must be a reason for such a universal and wide acceptance of rice. It is one of the most versatile of all foods.

A well-balanced diet consists of four general classifications—the milk and dairy products, meats, fruits and vegetables, and cereals and bread. Rice is a part of two of these four great food groups, being classified in the fruit and vegetable and bread and cereal food groups. Rice works so well with all of these major classifications of foods. As main dishes it harmonizes with meats, fish, poultry, and seafood dishes. As for use in desserts, it combines with milk and dairy products as well as with eggs as an ingredient, along with sugar and starches. So rice is one of our most versatile foods which is adaptable to dishes for use in any season of the year and at every meal.

There are three principal kinds of rice—white milled rice, long, medium, and short grain, brown rice, and parboiled rice. There are many byproducts of rice, including rice flour, rice oil, rice hulls, rice polish, and rice bran.

White rice contains nutrients of the finest biological value, including protein, calcium, iron, carbohydrates, vitamins of the B complex, and a bit of fat. Rice is wholesome, economical, tasty, palatable, as well as nutritious. It is quite easy to prepare. Boiled rice is one of the most acceptable and widely severed rice dishes. For usual servings for a family of from four to six people here is all that is required in preparation: three cups of water with a teaspoon of salt placed in a cooking vessel. Bring to a boil. Pour in 1 cup of white rice, either long, medium, or short grain, or parboiled. Place cover on vessel, turn down to low heat, and cook for 22 minutes. It is ready to serve usually with butter or margarine. To make more flavorful, a couple of pats of margarine or butter may be added before cooking.

Some of the vast number of recipes which were made available by the Washton Embassies include: From the Embassy of Turkey; dolmas—stuffed vegetables; from the Embassy of Brazil: chicken soup with rice; from the Embassy of France: entrements au riz; from the Embassy of Indonesia: fried rice; from the Embassy of Cambodia: royal rice; from the Embassy of Germany: rice a la trautmannsdorff; from the Embassy of Iran: loobia polau; from the Embassy of Italy: rice croquettes; from the Embassy of Mexico: arroz a la Mexicana; from the Embassy of Saudi Arabia: rice with lamb and nuts; from the Embassy of Israel: Palestine rice plate; from the Embassy of Australia: creamed rice with apricot sauce; from the Embassy of the Philippines: royal rice cake; from the Embassy of Japan: rice is best as is.

My favorite rice recipe, rice with mushrooms, is as follows: One cup uncooked rice; one can consommé; one small can mushrooms; one-eighth pound butter or margarine. Melt margarine in skillet. Add rice and fry until it pops or swells. Put rice in a baking dish and add the consommé and mushrooms. Cook 45 minutes in oven at 350 degrees.

Thanks to Mrs. John Cooper, West Memphis, for first introducing me to this.

The Rice Council for Market Development sponsors two major yearly rice events: National Rice Week March 17 through 23, and the October Rice Harvest Festival. It is comprised of rice growers, mills, and all segments of the rice industry in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. The council is a voluntary organization devoted to the promotion of rice at home and abroad.

The rice industry is most appreciative of the fine cooperation accorded it by Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, who operates Capitol restaurants and cafeterias, together with Mr. Kermit Cowan, who is superintendent of the House Restaurant and Cafeteria, and Mr. Robert S. Sonntag who is in charge of the Senate facilities, in serving rice to all of its patrons on Wednesday, March 20, 1963. Green rice was enjoyed by several hundred Members of the Senate, House of Representatives, press news media, Capitol Hill employees and visitors.

The work of the rice council in promotion of rice in foreign markets could not be accomplished without the cooperation and work of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Rice Export Development Association. The Department of Agriculture has been most helpful to the industry in the administration of Public Law 480 consistently since its passage in 1955.

U.N. CORRECTS PROJECT: CANCELLATION BETTER SOLUTION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform our colleagues that the United Nations has agreed to correct a Special Fund project which has been the cause of concern in this House.

I am glad to see the U.N. admit a mistake and correct it. Now, I hope they will admit that this whole project is a mistake and cancel it. The project would provide radioactive isotopes to a Communist bloc nation—that is not the sort of thing Americans should be helping provide for Communists. At the very least American financial support—a planned $218,560—should be withdrawn.

The project to which I refer is that for nuclear research in Yugoslavia about which I first advised this House February 25, in the early stages of my investigation, into the foreign aid funds of the United Nations—a large measure of which American taxpayers provide.

The Special Fund of the U.N. has agreed to revise and correct the authorization for this $1.7 million project. The House will recall that the Special Fund—40 percent financed by American taxpayers—will contribute $546,400 to this project.

In a restricted U.N. document the project is called an agriculture research project. But, in fact, the proposed authorization clearly provided for research in agriculture, and also for a Federal center for general nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia.

I carried an objection about that authorization to the United Nations and to the U.S. Department of State, after I had advised the House of my concern. Today, I can report that I have been informed by Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton and by U.N. Special Fund Managing Director Paul G. Hoffman, that the final contract for this project will provide clearly and specifically that the nuclear research may pertain only to agriculture.

However, I trust that the House will note that radioactive isotopes, once provided for this project, might be used for many purposes other than agricultural research. And, the United Nations very limited checking system on its projects makes it unlikely that it, or the United States, would ever know what the isotopes actually were used for. For instance, isotopes can be used to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, to test and measure metals, and in connection with biological and chemical warfare.

The American delegation to the U.N. and our State Department fell sound asleep on this job and would have allowed this project to have been agreed to, complete with a loophole, so that Communist Yugoslavia could have gained knowledge in a nuclear research center using U.N. aid subsidized 40 percent by American taxpayers.

Luckily, congressional inquiry stirred the bureaucrats from that snooze and dream fantasy of one-worldism, and I trust they will stay awake from now on to veto this project; and to check upon just where U.S. contributions to the U.N.'s ballooning foreign aid program go. I can only wonder how loudly they were snoring when the Fund approved that $1.2 million to aid Red Cuban agriculture—to say nothing of the 11 other U.N. aid projects approved for Cuba.

Ambassador Stevenson of our U.N. delegation agreed with me that the original Yugoslav project authorization could conceivably be misinterpreted. Mr. Hoffman said he felt the original provision was somewhat ambiguous.

Secretary Dutton, acting for the Secretary of State, informed me that the State Department—belatedly—understands my concern about the language of the original authorization. An officer of that Department informed the United Nations that the authorization was incorrect.

I hope the State Department understands equally well my opposition to the nuclear research project, in toto—corrected or uncorrected. Radioactive isotopes are critical items in this atomic age. Americans never should provide them or finance the purchase of them for a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the Record pertinent portions of the correspondence documenting the U.N.'s project correction:

Representative Hall to Mr. Paul Hoffman,
February 21, 1963

Dear Mr. Hoffman: I would like to ask you for clarification of the intentions of the Special Fund and the International Atomic Energy Agency in connection with a project approved but not yet started entitled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture" in Yugoslavia.

I find in studying the Special Fund pamphlets on this project that it calls for a "Federal center for nuclear research and training and for the application of nuclear research to the field of agriculture. That would indicate that the Federal center is a separate facility from the agriculture research. I would appreciate receiving detailed comments about this.

Durward G. Hall,
Member of Congress.

Representative Hall to Secretary of State Rusk, U.N. Ambassador Stevenson, Mr. Paul Hoffman, February 25, 1963

Mr. ———: A matter of serious concern has come to my attention in connection with a United Nations' project under the Special Fund. The project is in Yugoslavia and is entitled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture."

May I call your attention to the "restricted" publication of the Special Fund dated March 22, 1962, and covering the recommendations of the Fund's managing director for approval of the nuclear research project.

In paragraph 5 of the publication under the subheading "III—The Project" I find the first sentence which states:

"The request calls for a Federal center for nuclear research and training and for the application of nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture."

My concern arises from the construction of that sentence detailing the aims and goals of the project. As the sentence reads it authorizes development in two directions (1) to solve problems in agriculture and (2) to provide for a nuclear research and training center.

Durward G. Hall,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Paul Hoffman to Representative Hall, March 4, 1963

My Dear Mr. Hall: I acknowledge receipt of your letters of February 21 and 25, 1963, relating to the Special Fund project in Yugoslavia entitled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture."

I wish to offer the following comments in reply to your inquiry:

1. From paragraph 2 of the Governing Council document dated March 22, 1962, and referred to by your letters, you will see that the Yugoslav Government already operates an Institute for Application of Nuclear Research in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Sciences at Zemun and that institutions applying nuclear research methods are found also at four other locations in the country.

2. Through provision of international experts, equipment and fellowships for studying abroad, the Special Fund is assisting in upgrading and expanding the Institute at Zemun, as detailed in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of the mentioned document. The Federal center mentioned in line 1 of paragraph 5 is synonymous with the Institute at Zemun mentioned in paragraph 2.

3. The phrasing of the first sentence of paragraph 5 quoted by your letter of February 25 is admittedly somewhat ambiguous. The essence of the sentence is that the request calls for a Federal center which will apply nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture.

Paul Hoffman.

Representative Hall to Mr. Hoffman, March 7, 1963

Dear Mr. Hoffman: Thank you for your letter of March 4, providing me with information about the operation of your Special Fund and answering my specific questions. It is of great value to me and to the Congress to receive cooperation from international civil servants in our consideration of the Special Fund during this time when it is being questioned in the United States and in the Congress.

With regard to paragraphs 2 and 3 of your letter may I ask if any action has been taken by your office to set straight the ambiguity that you and I both see in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of the Special Fund document mentioned as it concerns the Federal center for nuclear research. If not, might I suggest that you issue a specific directive clearing up this loophole officially by proclaiming that the Federal center is indeed synonymous with the Institute at Zemun and providing that under no circumstances is the Special Fund project to involve any nuclear research other than that involved with plant and animal agricultural research. It seems to me that action by you would clear the air and eliminate the problem.

Durward G. Hall,
Member of Congress.

Ambassador Stevenson to Representative Hall, March 8, 1963

Dear Congressman Hall: I was glad to have your views on the United Nations' Special Fund for Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture project in Yugoslavia. As a result, I have undertaken some special homework on my own and am now in a position to share a few thoughts with you.

This particular project, like 289 others currently being implemented under U.N. Special Fund auspices, was first approved by the Governing Council. This Government took an active role in the establishment of the Special Fund some years ago and, as a member of the Governing Council, the U.S. representative devotes considerable attention to each recommendation of the Managing Director. This was particularly true with respect to the Yugoslav project to which you refer.

Following a thorough review by the Governing Council, the plan was approved in May 1962. The International Atomic Energy Agency was asked to serve as executing authority. Incidentally, the Italian representative was particularly praiseworthy of Yugoslav efforts in this field and encouraged adoption of the project.

While I agree that the purpose as stated in paragraph 5 of the Special Fund document you mentioned in your letter could conceivably be misinterpreted, subparagraphs a, b, and c are, in my mind, crystal clear. You will note that following the opening statement:

"The request calls for a Federal center for nuclear research and training and for the application of nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture."

The document specifies:

"The Institution will deal with the following major subjects:

"(a) Soil fertility and plant nutrition, including methods for laboratory assessment of the phosphorous status of the soil and methods of application of phosphorous fertilizers; studies of leaching of plant nutrients; study of soil moisture in connection with irrigation; grafting work in orchard and grape cultures; and studies on the absorption of plant nutrients by plants from the soil and on their movements and accumulation within the plant;

"(b) plant breeding, using irradiation as a supplement to conventional breeding methods, in order to produce mutants of agricultural crops and forest trees; and

"(c) animal husbandry, including protein nutrition studies of poultry and thyroid activity as a guide in nutrition studies of beef cattle."

Adlai E. Stevenson.

Representative Hall to Ambassador Stevenson, March 12, 1963

Dear Mr. Ambassador: Thank you for your letter of March 8 providing me with information about the Special Fund and the particular Yugoslav project with which I expressed concern.

Since you agree that paragraph 5 of the U.N. document we discussed "could conceivably be misinterpreted," may I ask if any action has been taken by your office to set straight the ambiguity that you and I both see. I agree with you that the later subparagraphs are clear, but these subparagraphs do not change the major premise to which you and I object.

Since the major concern of the Congress appears to be the relative lack of postappropriation checking on how the Special Fund spends money provided chiefly by American taxpayers, I feel it would serve a useful purpose for the American delegation to initiate a clarification of the paragraph in question proclaiming that the Federal center is indeed synonymous with the Institute at Zemun and providing specifically and in clear English that under no circumstances is the Special Fund project to include any nuclear research other than that involved with plant and animal agricultural research. Clarification will hurt nobody and will ease the way of the Special Fund when this Congress reaches the question of foreign aid appropriations.

Durward G. Hall,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Paul Hoffman to Representative Hall, March 13, 1963

Dear Congressman Hall: Thank you for your letter of March 7 which awaited my return to New York today.

With regard to its second paragraph, I should like to inform you that the plan of operation for the Yugoslav project is about to be signed by the Yugoslav Government, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Special Fund. I can assure you that this tripartite contract for the implementation of the project will not contain the ambiguity which appears in paragraph 5 of Special Fund document SF/R.5/Add.40. It will, on the other hand, conform to the correct description of the purpose and activities of the project as set forth elsewhere in the rest of that document.

Paul Hoffman.

Assistant Secretary of State Dutton to Representative Hall, March 13, 1963

Dear Congressman Hall: I want to thank you for your letter of February 25, 1963, concerning the United Nations Special Fund project in Yugoslavia covering nuclear research and training in agriculture which has been referred to me for reply.

I note your inquiry concerning the precise meaning of paragraph 5 of the Special Fund document covering this project. An officer of the Department has spoken with Mr. Clinton Rehling, assistant to Mr. Paul Hoffman of the Special Fund, who has informed him that the language in paragraph 5 is incorrect and that in the publication of the final project agreement the present incorrect language will be appropriately modified. The first sentence of paragraph 5 will then read:

"The request calls for a Federal center for nuclear research and training in agriculture and for the application of nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture."

I can well understand your concern about the language as it stands in the original document and appreciate your inquiry which will lead to its being more accurately expressed in the final project agreement.

Frederick G. Dutton,
(For the Secretary of State).

TAX CREDITS FOR ADDITIONAL WORKERS HIRED BY EMPLOYERS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which can contribute greatly to the solution of our rising unemployment through the traditional American system of free enterprise. The bill which I am presenting would encourage private employment by providing tax credits for additional workers hired by those employers who conduct our trades and businesses. The measure, which was suggested in an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune several weeks ago, has been advanced by Mr. R. Edwin Moore, chairman of the Bell & Gossett Co., a typical American business developed through the opportunities afforded by our free system. This measure would give the employer credit for each added worker over the average number of employees on the payroll during the previous 3 years. And—in the case of a 100-percent increase, the employer would be entitled to a 1-percent reduction in his corporate tax rate. This incentive would continue until a maximum of 10-percent reduction in corporate tax rate had been achieved.

This measure would encourage greater employment in private industry and would add to the incentives so necessary to stimulate our economic growth and progress. Not only is there incentive for the employer, but for the individual who seeks gainful employment and brings personal skills and talents to the labor market in return for a fair wage and the satisfaction of knowing he is earning his way. There is incentive here for the men and women to whom private employment is the American way of life and who are reluctant to participate in a "made work" program which threatens to destroy our economy and reduce this once proud Nation to a welfare state.

This is not a gimmick nor a device to be taken lightly. Rather, it is a practical and workable method of helping to resolve a national problem in a manner consistent with our American system. It avoids the theories and schemes and the alien philosophies which appear to motivate some so-called economists who have captured the ear of our President. This is a practical businessman's solution. It deserves the fullest consideration in the very serious efforts with which we are engaged—those of demonstrating the adaptability of our free enterprise system to meet the needs of our expanding population in a rapidly changing economy.

U.S. LOAN TO BRAZIL

Mr. **HARSHA**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HARSHA**. Mr. Speaker, Brazil and our State Department are now wrapping up a U.S. loan which may range up to $200 million. Negotiations started under a bit of a pall when it was announced from Rio that Finance Minister Dantas was coming here to get the money so Brazil could build a trade program with Russia.

At interviews here, Mr. Dantas further admitted that the money would be used to develop trade with Russia. Then the Brazilian Embassy issued a statement denying any such purpose and claimed that Mr. Dantas misunderstood the question.

The Brazilian Embassy further stated:

> Any forthcoming American credits to Brazil will be used exclusively to finance the importation of U.S. goods and services and for repayment of commitments to U.S. creditors.

If this is so, then there is no need to deliver the money to Brazil, the United States should retain it and make the payments direct to the American creditors; but if the money is delivered to Brazil, it will find its way into the Communist trade program.

One could no more keep this money separate and aloof from such Red negotiations than one could pour a glass of cream from off the top of a bottle of homogenized milk.

The American Ambassador to Brazil, Lincoln Gordon, testified before the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee that the Government of Brazil was infiltrated with Communists. The State Department, seeing congressional opposition to the Soviet trade loan building up, issued a statement that must appear ludicrous to the rest of the world. It said that Communist infiltration of the Brazilian Government is not sufficient "to have a substantial influence on Brazilian Government policy."

Yet, 3 members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, 2 others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secretary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger.

If the loan is to be used to further Brazil-Red trade, it should not be made regardless of the pleas that Brazil's economy is in poor condition. If the money is to be delivered to the Brazilian Government, the loan should not be made because it will find its way into the program to promote Communist trade.

ARE FEDERAL SUBSIDIES ABUSED?

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FOREMAN**. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today about the need for Federal Government subsidies to assist us in our various responsibilities—education, transportation, medical care, urban renewal, and others—that should be taken care of on the local level. We see, read, and hear much about dollars in the form of Federal aid, but I am fearful that we do not understand that with Federal aid we also get Federal control and regulation.

This continually growing bureaucratic control and regimentation of our lives is the greatest single enemy today against our freedom as individuals. We need to awaken again the spirit in America that individual freedom, incentive and the desire to be free are the building blocks upon which was founded the greatest country ever known in the history of mankind.

We have freedom, which sometimes we tend to take for granted, having had it so long we are not really conscious of what it is. While we have the courage and will to die for freedom, we sometimes wonder if we have the guts to live for freedom.

It is particularly refreshing to me to see those seemingly few dedicated individuals today who are living and working and fighting to preserve this precious inheritance. My friend, Mr. Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board of the First National Bank in Dallas, Tex., is one such individual. A living example and dynamic exponent of the free-enterprise system, Ben Wooten travels thousands of miles each year speaking to Americans about their precious heritage, their freedom and their responsibilities.

We had the honor and privilege of having this free enterprise spokesman visit our west Texas area this month to speak at the annual chamber of commerce banquet in Pecos, Tex. I commend Ben Wooten for the very excellent, nonpartisan, thought-provoking message he delivered.

I would like, unanimous consent, to include Mr. Ben Wooten's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE WILL TO BE ECONOMICALLY FREE

(By Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board, First National Bank in Dallas, annual chamber of commerce banquet, Pecos, Tex., Tuesday, March 12, 1963)

Anyone is honored by an invitation to talk to this outstanding group. If I were able to coin beautiful and expressive phrases at will, I could better tell you of my gratitude for being with you this evening. My mind wanders down memory lane and dwells upon my most precious possessions—friends. Friendships have been likened unto the homing ships that touch our evening shores; unto the flowers fair that sweeten the desert air; unto the stars that slip out at night and give us light after the sun has gone away.

There is a poem I like very much:

"It is always a joy in life to find,
  At every turn of the road,
A strong arm of the comrade kind,
  To help me onward with my load.

"And since I have no gold to give,
  'Tis love must make amends,
It is my prayer that while I live,
  God shall make me worthy of my friends."

I trust that God shall make me worthy of my friends in Pecos.

My subject is an abiding one, namely, "The Will To Be Economically Free." I have no apologies for the seriousness of my talk and it is completely nonpartisan.

In the din of battle with accompanying stresses and strains, men do not falter in pushing the fray even to death in order that freedom survives. Yet, history tells us again and again that in order to keep freedom, we must daily live it, embrace it economically as well as guard it militarily.

With Kipling, let us pray:

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far flung battle lines,
Beneath whose awful hands we hold,
Dominion over palm and pine.
Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

We must not forget that the economic fallacy of continuously spending more than we collect will ultimately do for us what it has done for every people in history—namely, financial destruction and poverty. A broke United States would truly be a world tragedy. We must not forget that nations, like individuals, are financially broke when their liabilities exceed their assets. This is a simple financial and economic fact easily understood—one that cannot be circumvented.

Robert Louis Stevenson once said: "Soon or late everybody sits down to his banquet of consequences." Regardless of the amount of wealth possessed by our Nation, if we continue in our annual deficits and unbalanced payments, we will finally come to the banquet of consequences that result from further depreciation of the dollar. We, of course, will spend whether at a deficit or not any amount necessary to defend our country, but certainly, until the great danger is past, we should not adopt any new give-away plans abroad or at home.

Back in the year 1932, one of the presidential candidates said along with other things that, if elected, his party would support laws establishing a minimum wage, unemployment insurance, medical care, a 30-hour week and improved workmen's compensation. He further stated that his party would support spending $5 billion annually for relief and another $5 billion for public works. He favored Federal aid to agriculture and socialization of power. His party wanted steep increases in income and inheritance taxes and a tax on the interest of Government securities. He also asked Federal aid for homeowners who had mortgage problems. This platform was offered the American people by the presidential candidate of the Socialist Party. He did not win the office of president but his platform cast before it the shadow of coming events. It is not my purpose today to discuss the merits of any individual plank in the Socialist candidate's program; however, we must, in the light of present-day policies and laws, admit that in the main his socialistic ideas have prevailed in the United States.

I once read an article by a young man who said: "I favor private enterprise because I am poor. I would never be happy to be a mere cog in the wheel. I could never be happy were every choice concerning my life made by someone else. I would rather be poor and live under the freedom and opportunities that private enterprise offers than to be rich and live in a penthouse on Manhattan Island under the restrictions of national socialism."

Like the young man who favored private enterprise, let us remember that economic freedom is a personal thing, a precious thing to be valued much greater than subsistence security. There is no economic reason whatever for us to surrender the mastery of our individual fate to the state. We have the highest living standard in the world under our unique American system, and we should never tamper with success. Every American should keep in mind that if he becomes a ward of the state, he will no longer be a free man.

Woodrow Wilson said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Judge Louis D. Brandeis said: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect our liberties when the government's purposes are beneficient."

Benjamin Franklin said: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither safety nor liberty."

During the past 5 or 6 years especially, we have heard a great deal and witnessed the followthrough of at least one philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, namely, "You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred." We do not quarrel with this statement; however, we direct attention to other admonitions of Mr. Lincoln just as important, just as vital and deserving of as much attention as the one quoted above. We regret that these admonitions appear to be ignored by a large segment of our people in authority. Mr. Lincoln gave us nine essential economic "cannots" all worthy of our deep concern. They are as follows:

"(1) You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

"(2) You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

"(3) You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

"(4) You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"(5) You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"(6) You cannot help little men by tearing down big men.

"(7) You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

"(8) You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves.

"(9) You cannot build character and courage by taking away men's initiative and independence."

In effect, these great Americans—Messrs. Wilson, Brandeis, Franklin, and Lincoln—say that the socialist state makes beggars out of proud men, cowards of strong men, and serfs of freemen. The socialist state ultimately brings inflation through the deficit door and continued spiraling inflation always produces restrictions on personal liberties.

Inflation has long been the greatest destroyer of freedom in the world. Deficit financing is inflationary. When the value of a nation's money is lost, some kind of dictatorship usually takes hold in order to avoid complete chaos. We would be reminded that since 1946 the value of the dollar has gone down 21½ cents.

We may well ask what can you and I do about it. The antidote is a renewed faith in God, in ourselves, in the American tradition, and the principles under which we have reached the highest living standards of any people ever on earth. Let us emphasize thrift, courage, personal independence, a willingness to live for individual economic freedom, and support officeseekers that are dedicated in purpose and deed to the tenets of Americanism. Under drastic inflation the American people would suffer more intensely than the people of any other nation in history in that 90 percent of all the life insurance in the world is written in the United States. The security we have provided through insurance loses the exact amount as the dollar in circulation.

John Milton once said: "Awake, arise, or be forever fallen." This admonition was given 275 years ago, but it is applicable today to every American, so let's resolve that our individual freedoms shall not be further whittled away. We are firmly of the opinion that in the afternoon of life when the gold of the sunset has been driven away by the gray of the twilight, there will be more dignity, joy and comfort in living off what we have created for ourselves than in wondering for whom to vote in order to keep a socialistic stipend from being cut. Liberty is more precious than any governmental handout or subsidy.

We are reminded that Ella Wheeler Wilcox once wrote:

> "One ship drives east, another west,
> With the self-same gale that blows;
> 'Tis the set of the sail, and not the gale,
> That determines the way we go."

It is certainly time for us to reexamine the setting of our economic sails and steer our financial ship of state into the harbor of a sound dollar and there permanently drop anchor.

An author whose name I do not know once wrote:

> "Isn't it strange that princes and kings,
> And clowns that caper in sawdust rings,
> And common folk like you and me,
> Are builders of eternity.
>
> "To each is given a book of rules,
> A shapeless mass, a bag of tools,
> And each must make 'ere life has flown
> A stumbling block or a stepping stone."

We know the rules of individual freedom and we have the tools to maintain and promote it. Let's resolve that we shall be stepping stones along the pathway of freedom and humbly pray that we shall have the will, the courage, and the determination to bear the personal economic risks of freedom and thus keep America what it is today—the most blessed place this side of Heaven.

LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, we were expressing concern over a rash of violent crime in the District of Columbia. In the ensuing months, that rash has become a virulent fever. It is in a critical stage. I am not one who believes that crime can be prevented, or even abated, solely by rigid police methods. But law enforcement is an important and essential factor in securing the peace and guaranteeing the safety of citizens as they go about upon their lawful occasions. The Congress must not neglect to provide the legislative tools for law enforcement.

On March 15, 1963, the practice of investigative arrest in the District of Columbia was terminated by administrative order. I did not condone the practice and do not mourn it. Every reasonable man must be concerned, however, with the legal void created when the suspension of investigative arrest was not coordinated with the substitution of some constitutional alternative.

In fairness to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, it is generally known that they did seasonably prepare a recommendation for authorizing judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes. The Commissioners draft has not been offered as a bill, allegedly because it is the subject of an extended constitutional debate in some pigeonhole in the Justice Department.

With all deference to the able lawyers in the Justice Department, I would submit to the House that there are some Members here who are capable of considering constitutional issues. If there is to be a debate on this subject, let it be open, let it be free, and above all, let it begin.

I have, therefore, today introduced the draft legislation on this subject. It has been neither ratified by the Bureau of the Budget nor confirmed by the Justice

Department. To be candid, I have not had an opportunity to research the constitutional history of this procedure and I cannot personally vouch for every word in this bill. I am offering it as a basis of discussion to encourage prompt action. The people of the Nation's Capital look to us for protection. We must act now to provide it.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have as of this date sent the following letter to the Secretary of State:

March 21, 1963.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I have called to the attention of the Congress, and to your agency, previously, my remarks in the Congressional Record of Thursday, March 14, and Monday, March 18, evidencing my concern over the existing open door of subversion through the Cuban Embassy and Cubana Airlines in Mexico City, which facilitates the visitation of not only Latin American but U.S. citizens as well to Cuba.

By the State Department's own announcement of January 16, 1961, such travel by U.S. citizens is in violation of the U.S. law, punishable by penalty of $5,000 or 5 years in jail, or both.

It is quite obvious that a number of persons visiting Cuba by this route are engaging in subversive activities and rendering services to the Castro Communist government, which appears obvious for two reasons, the first being that Cuban Embassy approval, thus Castro government approval, is necessary and, secondly, some of those known to have visited Cuba since the State Department announcement have known Communist backgrounds.

This open door to subversion in this hemisphere obviously must be closed and I am therefore asking that a strong protest be made to the Mexican Government, urging that government to withhold flight permission from any and all U.S. citizens who attempt, contrary to U.S. laws, to secure passage to Cuba and to demand that the Cuban Government stop issuing visas to those citizens and that all other Latin American governments be encouraged to make a similar demand of Mexico.

I am requesting that unified action by all the Latin American countries in this respect be taken up by the State Department through the Organization of American States, believing that a strongly worded protest from that Organization and from a number of Latin American nations and the United States could result in closing this open door to subversion.

I am further recommending that the State Department consider, in the event the Mexican Government does not heed this protest, that Alliance for Progress funds be withheld from Mexico until this necessary action is taken.

I am further requesting that the State Department, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, seek immediate prosecution of persons known to have violated the law, title 8, United States Code, section 1185, particularly in view of the fact that some of these persons who have visited Cuba since January 16, 1961, are known to have Communist backgrounds and others have openly and notoriously evidenced their recent visitations to Cuba in the Worker and the Peoples World, Communist front newspapers. Public statements emanating from the State Department to the effect that prosecution is difficult would seem to be without substance in view of the notoriety some of these Cuban travelers are providing themselves.

I would be delighted to discuss this matter with you or your representative at your convenience and to make available to you such information as I have. I also suggest that the House Un-American Activities Committee has a copy of the list of some 73 U.S. citizens who, in the short period of 4 months, illegally visited Cuba through this open door of subversion through Mexico, the list of which I turned over to the committee and I am sure the committee would make it available to your Department. I have already asked that this list be made available to the Justice Department.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

William C. Cramer,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously set forth in the Record some 73 U.S. citizens who have gone to Cuba despite the fact it is illegal.

BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat has a well-deserved reputation as one of the fairest, most forthright newspapers in the country. In its lead editorial of March 6, the Globe focuses a clear and timely light on the subject of "Bipartisan Opposition," noting that:

> The fact is, antagonism for the sterile policy Mr. Kennedy improvises at Cuba is itself bipartisan. Responsible Members of Congress are Americans first, party members second. If they fear an administration shuffling into critical national hazard, they have an obligation to oppose policy.

Bipartisan Opposition

Administration spokesmen, even the President by his attitude, are blaming Republican politics for the bristling worry in Congress and the wide public disenchantment over Kennedy policy in Cuba.

But far more than that is at the root of national anxiety about our acute fumbling at Cuba.

Many Democrats have joined GOP Members of Congress in opposition, at least in open criticism, of New Frontier ploys in the Castro-Soviet issue.

The deep concern transcends politics. It is a rising fear that the country, under Mr. Kennedy's vacillating tactics and endless temporizing, nurtures in Cuba the military and subversive seeds of Communist takeover throughout Latin America—eventually a bloodless Moscow triumph in the Western Hemisphere.

The lament is heard in Washington that politics should end at the water's edge; bipartisan backing ought to rally behind the President's Cuba policy—no matter apparently what it is. Closed ranks will always be true in time of war. It is neither wise nor realistic under present conditions.

The fact is antagonism for the sterile policy Mr. Kennedy improvises at Cuba is itself bipartisan. Responsible Members of Congress are Americans first, party members second. If they fear an administration shuffling into critical national hazard, they have an obligation to oppose policy.

This is precisely what has been happening on Capitol Hill. The back-and-fill conduct of the New Frontier at the time of the abortive Cuban blockade—and subsequent hand-sitting as Russia builds its Castro redoubt for a spread of subversion, sabotage and Red revolution through Central and South America—have evoked sincere and urgent warnings from both sides of the aisle in Congress.

Naturally, Republican leaders have led one contingent of opposition to the Cuba involvement. Senator Keating of New York has been the chief Jeremiah over the Red Cuban buildup. So right and so ahead of administration information has he proved he has seemed Delphic. Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, has been articulate over failure to come to grips with the Cuba problem. Senator Hickenlooper, of Iowa, wants a full-dress review.

Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, pertinently demands baring of secret communications between the White House and Khrushchev, to see if a deal was made to vacate European bases in return for removal of Moscow big missiles from Cuba.

But many Democrats have shown frank criticism and dismay over administration helplessness or accommodation at Cuba. Such comment has been voiced by Senators Stennis, Lausche, Thurmond, and Holland. House Speaker McCormack tersely called the attack on an American shrimp boat an act of aggression. Senator Russell, of Georgia, urged a policy of hot pursuit, in which he was joined by ultraliberal Congressman Claude Pepper, of Florida.

Four investigations of the Cuba policy are underway in Congress. A probe of the Soviet buildup has been undertaken by Senator Stennis. Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, is launching a probe into pro-Castro activities in the United States. Representative Selden, of Alabama, has his Foreign Affairs Subcommittee looking into Cuba subversion in Latin America. Liberal Senator Frank Church, of Idaho, is inquiring into the administration's failure to halt U.N. aid to Castro.

All these committee heads, of course, are Democrats.

There is bipartisan opposition to Kennedy Cuban policies, which have so far been largely impotent and promise no improvement.

It is overt misrepresentation to impute the Cuba policy critiques to partisan politics.

When the President stiffens his policy, more accurately develops an intelligent policy for the Cuban issue, he will get all the bipartisan support he wants. Unless he starts to do something about Cuba, bipartisan opposition will continue—and mount.

OLD FRIENDS IN COSTA RICA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House an editorial from the Richmond News Leader dated Tuesday, March 19, 1963, entitled "Old Friends in Costa Rica," which contains some rather revealing information concerning leftwing and Communist activities in Central and South America.

As the record shows, I have on a number of occasions, based upon established facts, asked that a careful evaluation of President Romulo Betancourt's previous affiliations be made by the United States, as well as, in light of those past facts, that careful consideration be given to all present evidences that perhaps all is not as well in Venezuela under the Betancourt regime as appears on the surface.

This editorial also brings into interesting focus the activities of a number of the radical left leaders in Central and South America for closer examination.

I also include an editorial by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star on March 16, 1963, entitled "Our Image Is Anti-Communist, But Washington Buffets Conservatives Around the World, Observer Says." This editorial of coincidental actions which have had the effect of toppling or making less stable the governments of conservatives throughout the rest of the world, is an interesting corollary to the Richmond News Leader editorial which indicates the New Frontier's results are similar in Latin America, whether intentional or otherwise.

The editorial points out that President Betancourt, of Venezuela, formed, and was honorary president of, the IADF, the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, in 1950 and that the first conference of this ultra leftwing organization was attended by Jose Figureres, Haya de la Torre, Muñoz-Marín, Victor Andrade, and others, and in the late 1950's Betancourt and Figueres were joined by Fidel Castro. The three of them formed the "Pact of Caracas" and by 1958 the Betancourt junta had toppled the Government of Venezuela. "Less than a month after Betancourt's election in December of 1958, Castro was in power in Cuba."

A second conference of the IADF was held in 1960 in Caracas and was attended by a delegation of eight from Cuba, together with other leftist leaders, including Cheddi Jagan.

Further consideration should be given to the ultraliberals who have taken over in other countries, including the Presidents of Mexico, the Dominican Republic, British Guinea, and Brazil, and the efforts of Betancourt to assist in the election of his good friend and ultraliberal who opposed the present President of Chile. The pattern is becoming rather obvious and I think it is time for the people of the United States to realize what is happening throughout the world, the result of the new pattern being that the conservatives in governments throughout the world are having a difficult time and are being replaced in many instances.

I submit the following two editorials for the attention of the House:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Mar. 19, 1963]

Old Friends in Costa Rica

As President Kennedy begins talks in Costa Rica today, American warships ride uneasily off the coast and security arrangements on land are as tight as those in Caracas when the President made his Venezuelan tour in 1961. The reason is that Manuel Mora Valverde, head of the Costa Rican Communist Party and brother-in-law to Romulo Betancourt, has announced in advance that the Communists will not take the responsibility for any disaster. The six Central American countries at the San Jose Conference are scared of Castro; and those who are crying the loudest for action are those who brought Castro to power and were still praising him in 1961.

Mr. Kennedy is at San Jose to boost the prestige of the year-old Socialist regime of Francisco Orlich, figurehead for the party of Jose Figueres. The relative stability of Costa Rica is due to the sound economic development attracted by the previous conservative regime of Mario Echandi. Echandi was the first Latin American to be elected in U.N.-supervised elections; a real anti-Communist, he tolerated training camps in Costa Rica for the 1961 Cuban invasion at a time when Figueres and his friends were still praising Castro.

Venezuela's Betancourt is of course not at the conference, although his exposed position on the Caribbean makes him vulnerable. But Betancourt has always worked closely with his fellow-revolutionary Figueres. In the late fifties, the two of them found a third friend whose views seemed identical to theirs. This congenial man was Fidel Castro. The three of them formed the ironically named "Pact of Caracas" (where the hated Jiminez held sway); and by 1958 the Betancourt junta had toppled the government of Venezuela. Less than a month after Betancourt's election in December of 1958, Castro was in power in Cuba.

By January 1959, Figueres began to doubt Castro's reliability. The former U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica, Whiting Willauer, has testified that Figueres had helped Castro with arms and ammunition. "You and your liberal group of Betancourt, Muñoz Marín, and others, of course, put this man into power, or at least supported him very strongly," Willauer told Figueres one day over lunch; "I feel that the chances are very strong that he will be dominated by communism, if he is not already a Communist." Figueres said he was "worried," and would consult with his friends at Betancourt's inauguration in February. But still Figueres went to Havana in March at Castro's invitation; he was insulted, ignored, and had the microphone ripped away from him in the middle of his congratulatory speech.

Yet, as late as 1961, members of the Figueres-Betancourt group were still praising the Cuban revolution and boasting of the support they had given. An interesting publication of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom gives the whole story. The founder and honorary president of the IADF is Betancourt himself, who organized the group in 1950 while he was an exile in Havana. The first conference was a rollcall of the leading revolutionaries of South America: Figueres, Haya de la Torre, Muñoz Marín, Victor Andrade, and other names better known to Latins.

The first purpose of the IADF was to return Betancourt to power; and when that was accomplished in 1958, the occasion was celebrated, according to the official account, with "a dinner which proved one of the most dramatic and symbolic moments of IADF history."

Thus by 1960 the IADF was able to hold its second conference in Caracas, with Betancourt as host. There were no qualms about admitting a delegation of eight from the worker's Cuba or British Guiana's Cheddi Jagan. The Secretary General presented a report on the IADF's interventions in the Western Hemisphere, a report climaxed by a proud account of support for the Cuban revolution (see below).

Special awards were announced for Figueres, Muñoz Marin, Adolf Berle, and Herbert L. Matthews, of the New York Times (the last-named for "consistent articles clarifying the democratic struggle"). The report concluded by admitting that "the IADF organized literally hundreds of meetings, seminars, roundtable discussions, mass public meetings, luncheons, and dinners. We held numerous significant off-the-record meetings which had deep influence in many cases, in changing the attitudes of key personalities, and creating a climate of understanding, through private discussions of hemisphere problems."

All of this was published a year later, in 1961, when Castro's course had been unmistakably confirmed. Early in November 1961 Venezuela severed relations with Cuba in preparation for Mr. Kennedy's visit a few days later. An ill wind from Cuba began to fan the Marxist flames Betancourt and Figueres themselves had set. "I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be one until the day I die," said Castro on December 2. Castro is not dead, and his old friends in Costa Rica are very much alive. We hope they will examine their failure to detect that Marxist-Leninism before the shooting started.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Mar. 19, 1963]

Betancourt Praises Cuban Revolution

(In 1961, just a few months before Venezuela severed relations with Cuba, Romulo Betancourt's Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom published the following account of its considerable support for the Cuban revolution. At the time of publication, the names listed in the last paragraph were still part of the Cuban regime. Editorial comment above.—Editor.)

Cuba's liberation from the dictatorship of Batista concerned us since the coup d'etat in 1952 when we began collecting materials; we made the first protest against Batista's betrayal of the scheduled elections.

From that date throughout the 5 years of the anti-Batista struggle, we constantly made public protests, arranged interviews for the leaders in exile with the press, facilitated the possibilities of journalists in reaching and seeing the revolutionary forces in Cuba; protesting in the United States the shipment of arms to Batista.

In the United States, IADE, for the 5 years of the anti-Batista struggle, continuously identified itself with the fighters for liberation; the secretary-general, as well as other members of our U.S. committee, talked before literally hundreds of meetings, explaining the aims of the struggle, and the brutalities against which they were fighting.

We assisted the spokesman for the revolutionary forces in the United States as elsewhere; we arranged press conferences for Dr. Urrutia, Dr. Llerena, Dr. Agramonte, and Dr. Chibas. We met in Mexico and elsewhere with Dr. Aureliano Sanchez Arango and others. We gave our constant encouragement and help to the hosts of Cuban patriots in New York, who gave so generously of their limited substance toward the liberation fight.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 16, 1963]

Our Image Is Anti-Communist—But Washington Buffets Conservatives Around the World, Observer Says

(By Constantine Brown)

Shortly before this reporer left Rome for a brief visit to Washington, he asked a Roman newspaperman what he believed was President Kennedy's image in Italy.

The reply was, "The Communists and leftists will always hate President Kennedy. But in the last year or so he has disappointed the right-of-center people. However, there are still those who look upon him as the man who will save the world—and naturally Italy—from communism."

This recalled a recent dinner conversation in Rome. The signora on my right asked, "Why does President Kennedy give such warm support to Premier Fanfani? Fanfani has brought a left government to Italy."

I replied that the Kennedy New Frontier was itself a "progressive" Government in the belief that this policy would further its goal for coexistence and world peace, and naturally it tends to support leftist governments. The signora's surprise on learning this caused her to say, "But then we are lost. Italy—the whole world is—if America is not determined to destroy communism."

The above conversations came to mind when recently Senator HUMPHREY delayed the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee of Outerbridge Horsey as Ambassador to Czechoslovakia.

The reason, he said, was that Mr. Horsey had offended "some of the more liberal element" of the State Department when he was minister counselor in Rome and paid little special attention to the "leftist elements" in Italian politics.

It has been known for some time that members of our foreign service as well as those serving in the State Department in Washington must be exceptionally careful with whom they associate if they expect promotions. This has been so for the last 5 or 6 years and has been accentuated in the last 2 years.

In Rome Mr. Horsey was known for his independence in associating with those on both sides of the fence in the belief that this was the best way of obtaining a complete picture of Italian politics. But Senator HUMPHREY's questioning of this sort of independence is serving as a warning to every member of the State Department at home and abroad.

The questioning of the Horsey appointment also brings clearly into view the basic foreign policy of the administration: that is, warm approval for leftist governments and frowns and sometimes hostility for those right of center. If one reviews the policies of the New Frontier over the last 2 years it becomes obvious that this was its intention from the beginning. To name a few instances in Laos we did not support the conservative element, but rather encouraged forcefully a neutral government with a "broad base." That is a government composed of conservative center and Communist elements.

We actually used a blackjack against the conservative Katangan leader Tshombe, preventing Katanga by force from being autonomous. Only recently we offended the Portuguese Salazar government when Assistant Secretary of State Mennen Williams stated that the United States favored self-determination of the Portuguese territory of Angola.

In Europe, Washington has frequently needled the conservative German Government. We scolded Ambassador Grewe and caused his recall. President Kennedy gave a dressing down to Ambassador Grewe's successor and we have established a lobby in Bonn against the Paris-Bonn treaty. The dislike for President de Gaulle in Washington is well known because of his policy of a Europe of the Fatherlands.

We have offended Canada's conservative Diefenbaker government, causing its overthrow. And although our relations with Britain are still cordial, President Kennedy greatly weakened the Macmillan Conservative government when he pulled the Skybolt rug from under it at Nassau.

All this, of course, is well known among political observers, but the rank and file of citizens around the world still look upon the U.S. Government as determinedly anti-Communist. Perhaps this is so because of the vast sums we spend on economic and military aid, and the great publicity given to our plans to strengthen the NATO. Abroad, our goal for peaceful coexistence seems to get lost in the shuffle.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the special order I have for today be vacated, and that it be moved to Thursday next, March 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE CRIME SITUATION IN WASHINGTON

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] has just stated he has introduced or is going to introduce a bill dealing with the crime situation in the District of Columbia. I do not know what his bill provides, but if it strikes at this problem of increased crime in Washington, even if it does so only a little bit, I want to commend him for it.

The crime situation in Washington has not only become deplorable and disgusting, but it is absolutely frightening. Almost every morning when I pick up my paper I read about a horrifying crime committed on the streets or in someone's home in Washington.

Just recently I saw where an 11-time loser, a man who had been convicted of a felony 11 times in his life, was again arrested for armed robbery. The leniency with which the criminals are treated in the District of Columbia has become an open invitation for every exconvict in the United States to converge on the Capital of this Nation. The District of Columbia has become a teeming anthill of ex-cons and hoodlums, and I certainly hope that something can be done for stricter law enforcement, more rigid prosecution, longer, sterner sentences by our judiciary; and, if necessary, I would like to see a real habitual criminal act in the District of Columbia to stop this sort of crime wave.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear what the legislative program is for the rest of the week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have no further legislative business for this week except one resolution which will be called up. We are not ready yet to announce the legislative program for next week.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be any legislation next week?

Mr. ALBERT. We are hoping that there will be some legislation next week. If the gentleman will assist us in getting the members of the Committee on Rules on his side to report rules, there will be legislation next week.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman's party has a 2-to-1 majority on the Committee on Rules, and I doubt that he needs my help under those circumstances.

Mr. ALBERT. May I advise the gentleman that one of the members on the Committee on Rules on this side of the House is in the hospital.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa cannot do very much about that.

Mr. ALBERT. Neither can the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. At long last it has come to pass. Again we see the poor old Committee on Rules being blamed for the alleged failure to do their work as they should. Now, if I recall correctly, along about the 9th of January this year some of our more brilliant leaders packed the Committee on Rules so that the leadership and the administration could do just as they pleased in connection with all activities in this august body. Now we come to the floor here today without a legislative program, and the poor old Committee on Rules is responsible for the fact that we do not have any legislation. Really, I feel that somebody ought to be just a bit sorry for the Committee on Rules and have a little sympathy in their hearts for the members of the committee who are serving time without assistance from either the administration or the leadership.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, no one is blaming the Committee on Rules. I was merely asking what the gentleman from Iowa might do with some of the gentleman's friends who serve on that committee, because we had hoped that we would get a rule on a certain bill. However, I would like further to state to the gentleman from Iowa that I appreciate the gentleman's concern. The gentleman is always a very, very conscientious Member of the House and he continually makes sure that the proprieties of the House are observed. The gentleman is quick to make sure that every member conscientiously pursues his duties. But does not the gentleman from Iowa realize also that during the first session of every Congress the matter of organizing and considering legislation by committees is one that takes considerable time? The gentleman would not be one who would want the committees of the House hastily to consider legislation before it was reported to the floor. The gentleman would not want that, because the gentleman is very conscientious in the attention that he gives to the details of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will find, as I know he has already done, that all of the committees in the House are busy considering important legislation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman that we will program legislation just as fast as it can be expeditiously reported and ready for action on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I cannot recall in my years around here—some 14 years—a session getting the late start of this one. Spring has already arrived. This is almost the last of March and still the dawdling goes on.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I think if the gentleman will check back to the 83d Congress the gentleman will find that there was not very much legislation before Easter.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to have to do a little specific research with respect to past sessions.

Mr. ALBERT. I recommend that to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder what makes the gentleman from Iowa, or the gentleman from Oklahoma, for that matter, feel that the gentleman from Iowa would have any more influence with the Committee on Rules which is controlled not by the minority party, but by the majority party by a 2 to 1 voting margin, than you would have with the full membership of the House which is also controlled by the majority party.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I always yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] obviously does not have as much confidence in the gentleman from Iowa as the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am just inquiring what influence you might have. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa has not had too much influence this morning thus far in this matter.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I might supplement what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has said. The Committee on Rules, in its wisdom, did reserve judgment on a certain bill by a 7-to-7 vote, but I might also say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that there was a proposal pending before the Committee on Rules having to do with backdoor spending. If the gentleman could get us one more vote, we could have had that scheduled for next week and I think it would have made a very comfortable legislative program for at least 1 day.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his suggestion.

I would like to state further—I have made one request and I am about to make another—that committees be permitted to sit this afternoon. I have been making those requests for the committees day in and day out. I would advise the gentleman that the committees have been busy. They have been sitting morning and afternoon, and I am sure that when the fruits of their efforts are forthcoming, we will have the cooperation of the gentleman from Iowa in putting these bills through the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I only hope that we can arrive at some week soon when the House can do some business.

Mr. Speaker, with that I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Calendar Wednesday rule program may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RECENT SURVEY OF WESTERN EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the press reported last week an alleged leak of a recent survey of Western European public opinion. Because the results of this survey have produced considerable comment, I have made an investigation into the circumstances. I am satisfied that there was no intentional leak of this confidential document which was supposed to have remained classified for 2 years; and I am also satisfied that the public release and discussion of the survey at this time would be useful because the results have great significance for our foreign policy.

There has been considerable concern, not only among Members of Congress but also in the press that the prestige of the United States may have been adversely affected by recent events in Western Europe.

In France, for example, General de Gaulle's attitude toward the Nassau pact, his policies which suggest some degree of political and economic isolation for Europe, and his insistence upon an independent nuclear force, all have made it appear that the people of France may have suddenly become disenchanted with their close association with the United States and U.S. policy.

One might conclude that President Kennedy's unwavering support of those great principles which have been the foundation of our relations with Europe for many years may have set back the United States in the eyes of French opinion. The survey indicates that this is by no means the case.

In February 1960 only 28 percent of Frenchmen interviewed approved of our foreign policy and 23 percent disapproved. In February of this year the percentage of Frenchmen approving had increased to 46 percent against 24 percent who continued to disapprove.

It is also important to note that 2 years ago most Frenchmen believed that we were not doing all we should to prevent World War III and that our actions did not match our words. Today the majority of Frenchmen believe that the reverse is true.

The survey results in Great Britain are just as startling. Contrary to what some have been saying and thinking, the recent Skybolt controversy has not caused a wave of anti-American feeling. In the past 2 years the confidence of the British people in our ability to lead the free world has risen from 35 to 54 percent; and today 59 percent of them regard our recent actions in international affairs favorably, as against only 48 percent 2 years ago.

The attitude of the British people toward neutralism has also shifted significantly in the 2-year period. In May of 1960, 46 percent of the people interviewed in Great Britain believed that their Government should not take sides in the cold war, while 42 percent believed that Great Britain should side with the United States. Today 52 percent want to align themselves with us, and only 38 percent prefer the neutral role.

And finally, nearly two Britons out of three now believe that our country is doing what it should do to prevent a third world war. In 1960 the majority interviewed felt we were not.

In West Germany public opinion has reached a new high in favor of the

United States and its foreign policy objectives. Seventy-seven percent of Germans have confidence in our leadership as against 57 percent in 1960. Seventy percent believe that we have the will to translate our words into deeds, as compared to 45 percent in 1960. More than two-thirds of the Germans interviewed approve of our foreign policy and peacemaking efforts today, while less than half approved them in 1960.

I think we can draw a lesson from the reports of opinion in these three Western European countries. The prestige of the United States, it seems to me, does not vary with the daily ups and downs of diplomatic exchanges. Rather it depends on the qualities of firmness and consistency in our leadership of the free world toward goals which are universally approved and which are responsive to the desires of freemen.

I think the President can take considerable pride in the results of this survey, for they demonstrate clearly that if the major lines of our foreign policy are forcefully and constantly expressed, and if we follow up with consistent actions taken with calmness and without hysteria, the message of the United States will be understood and approved in the free world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not clear as to the source of this survey. Can the gentleman tell me the source of this survey? Who made the survey?

Mr. ALBERT. It is the survey with respect to which there was an alleged leak of confidential information.

Mr. GROSS. Who conducted the survey?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman knows as much as I about who conducted it.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know; I will tell the gentleman honestly I do not know.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not know any more about the names of the individuals who conducted it than does the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what agency or department of Government conducted it? Was it the USIA?

Mr. ALBERT. I assume that it was conducted under the direction of the USIA but I have not discussed this matter with the USIA and I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if this is the same survey which the USIA refused to give a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs only a couple of weeks ago?

Mr. ALBERT. I am unable to advise the gentleman as to that. The information to which I have referred, having been compromised by having been published in the press in part at least, could not now be considered confidential in my opinion.

A TWO-WAY SAVINGS PLAN FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, an article in this morning's Washington Post discloses very concisely how this Congress can effect a multimillion dollar saving in the Federal budget and at the same time inject a note of equitable treatment for the Nation's coal industry. I am going to ask that the item, "Lilienthal Asks Halt in Atomic Power Plans," be inserted in the Congressional Record this very day, and I hope that a copy of the complete speech referred to will soon be available for this purpose.

David Lilienthal, the first chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, once believed that, through a reasonable amount of research, electric power could be generated by the atom at great savings over conventional fuels. He now feels that enough Federal funds have been fed into the research program, energy from the atom is not needed at this time, and that industry can and will put fissionable materials to use in electric power generation when and if needed.

Mr. Lilienthal is to be congratulated for this forthright stand. We, who represent coal areas are especially grateful, inasmuch as the Atomic Energy Commission has been planning to dole out millions of dollars to private utilities to stimulate the civilian atomic power program and thus deprive coal from getting a fair share of the increasing business of its best customer.

Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1956, the Honorable Cleveland M. Bailey of West Virginia inserted in the Record an article which I had prepared for Public Utilities Fortnightly in regard to the subsidization of atomic generating stations. To give emphasis to Mr. Lilienthal's current appraisal and to demonstrate what few changes have taken place in this field over the past 7 years, I ask at this time for unanimous consent to reprint in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the full magazine article, with the introductory remarks by Mr. Bailey. The Washington Post article will then follow, and I urge my colleagues to note all of this material carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not ask for further space at this time, but I should like to refer to other newspaper articles that have appeared in Washington newspapers during the past week with respect to the search for a building site for the U.S. Patent Office. There has been talk of its locating in areas removed from downtown Washington, including the Annapolis-Baltimore area. In view of the grave need for reducing Government spending, the executive department can quickly solve the Patent Office space problem by making room for it at the Atomic Energy Commission headquarters in Germantown, Md.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, that the AEC be put on notice that this Congress is going to slash its appropriations to the extent that personnel engaged in the civilian atomic power program will be relieved of their duties immediately. Once this order is complied with, there will be more than enough space for the Patent Office at Germantown. In effect, Congress will be bringing about a dual savings: by reducing AEC expenditures and making a new Government building unnecessary.

Lest this premise sound harsh, Mr. Speaker, be assured that the cutback in personnel at the AEC can be accomplished without undue hardship to anyone. In an organization the size of this Government, there are jobs opening every day in other departments. Many of them should never be filled because they are unnecessary; still there will be hiring, and the other departments of the bureaucracy will be able to absorb some of the AEC people. Private industry will want some of the scientists and engineers. In any event, it is the business of Congress to force the executive department to operate as efficiently as possible, and here is the place where we definitely must begin to tighten the purse strings.

Perhaps the job of clearing out unnecessary personnel at AEC could be superintended by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, who also questions the advisability of going forward with the AEC's civilian research program.

The articles follow:

Atomic Waste: Financial and Otherwise—Speech of Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey, of West Virginia, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. Bailey. Mr. Speaker, under special permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record an article entitled "The Basic Danger in the A-Power Program," which was written for Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor]. In that it points up some questionable spending of the taxpayers' money by a Government agency, I feel that the article merits the attention of every Member of the House and Senate.

Congressman Saylor has stated, in effect, that the Atomic Energy Commission's rapacious penchant for developing atom-powered electric plants has led to extravagant expenditures for which justification is sought through the use of distorted figures on coal reserves.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of these remarks let me make it clear that the prospects of using the atom to make electricity and for other peacetime chores is a welcome thought. We are cheered at the U.S. Navy's success in using the atom as a fuel for powering submarines. We look with relish to the improvement of agricultural crop yields through the application of radiation from radioisotopes. We hope that someday a jigger of uranium will be all that is needed to move our automobiles for hundreds of thousands of miles. And we will be grateful if research and science ultimately enable us to light and heat our homes through fissionable materials at as small a cost as we have been led to believe will be possible. But I protest the idea that an endless stream of funds from the Federal Treasury should be channeled through the Atomic Energy Commission to conduct a myriad of experiments in an effort to make these dreams come true.

As representative of the Nation's largest coal-producing State, I particularly resent the AEC's implication that atomic powerplants must be constructed at all costs because there will not be an adequate supply of conventional fuels to meet demand. We recognize that electric-generating capacity is steadily being increased; it is estimated that in another 20 years 350 million tons of coal per year will be required by the electric utilities alone. A current advertisement published by the First National City Bank of New York predicts that the figure may reach 500 million tons by 1975. Well, West Virginia can guarantee to provide its share of that load, plus its other commitments for both industrial and domestic use, for at least another two centuries.

Yes, annual coal production can be doubled over present output and there will still be enough mineable reserves to last for at least 200 years. If that sounds like such a short time as to be cause for alarm, let me remind you that two centuries would take you back 20 years before this great Republic was born. In 1756 Benjamin Franklin, whose memory we honor this week, still had more than three decades of his life to go. Young Charles Cornwallis, who later surrendered at Yorktown to end the fighting in the Revolutionary War, was commissioned an ensign in the British Army. Maria Antoinette and Louis XVI were still babes-in-arms and Napoleon Boneparte was not yet born. There was no talk of atomic piles at that time; in fact Alessandro Volta was still too young to have developed Volta's pile, which was to become the first real battery capable of delivering a steady current of electricity.

So you see a lot can happen in 200 years; in fact, there is a good chance that the atom as a source of power for electric power will become obsolete even before those supplies of coal in West Virginia are exhausted. For the record, let me also point out that there will be a lot more coal in America's reserve stockpile even after West Virginia's share is gone. In addition to the 50 billion tons in my home State, there are at least 1,162 billion tons of coal elsewhere in the United States. Members of Congress should keep these figures in mind when they are told that the Atomic Energy Commission must be given more millions of dollars to hurry up the job of developing reactors that will compete with coal and other conventional fuels.

Another factor which cannot be overlooked in the program for peacetime application of nuclear power is the risk element. Thus far the insurance companies have found it impractical to underwrite the hazards, and the Federal Government apparently will soon be asked to accept this responsibility as a necessary expense.

I contend that if the operation of a nuclear powerplant, as well as the disposal of radioactive wastes resulting therefrom, constitutes such a tremendous hazard to the welfare of the people, then Members of Congress had better stop and decide whether the Government should be willing to stimulate the growth of the hazard by accepting such a responsibility. Congress is first obliged to demand concrete information that will enable us to determine whether the need for setting up atomic powerplants at this time is worth taking such chances, and whether the tremendous outlays for nuclear power and the perils to which our people may be exposed will be compensated for by savings in the cost of power.

Before such questions can be answered, we need additional information which has not yet been made public. The dangers that would come with the disposition of radioactive wastes, and attendant hazards that go with the operation of a nuclear powerplant, appear to be of such tremendous magnitude that the Members of Congress cannot blindly stimulate further the creation of such jeopardy without breaching the trust imposed by the American people.

Not long ago a scientist warned that the disposal of atomic waste might inflict serious damage on the minds and the bodies of future generations. Another scientist, a sanitary engineer for the Atomic Energy Commission, recently made a speech in which he admitted that, as the atomic power industry grows, the problems of sufficiently diluting atomic wastes to make the air and water safe for human beings could be fabulous. He said that if one-third of the electric power which this country expects to produce in 1980 were to be supplied through atomic energy, the amount of water required to dilute the poisonous byproducts to safe levels would be equivalent to the flow of 12,600 Mississippi Rivers.

I cannot vouch for the authenticity of these statements, but I do know that the man who tried to tell the world about the serious effects of atomic radiation was quickly hushed up by the people who want to rush the reactor program through without first taking heed of the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the conditions which must be studied carefully when the request for the Atomic Energy Commission budget is taken into consideration. In view of the fact that U.S. coal reserves will last us hundreds of years longer than AEC spokesmen have been saying, I question the soundness of placing almost $2 billion at the disposal of the crowd which is so quick to dispose of coal's potentialities. For the further elucidation of Congress, I believe that the AEC could be most helpful if it would make available complete data on how much of its total expenditures are actually being spent on the electric power phase of the program. These statistics would include information on how many persons were sent to the atoms-for-peace session at Geneva at taxpayers' expense and how many others are traveling all over this country and the rest of the globe working on a project that no one is sure will be practical.

You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that I do not for one minute object to the appropriation of funds for the continuance of the defense aspects of the nuclear program. We will give our scientists and engineers what they need to develop the necessary weapons to protect our shores and our homes, but I think that the time has arrived when we should check closely to find out just how much of the rest of the work is necessary and feasible, and how much of it is the dream of that coterie of spenders who insist upon discounting the coal industry and its potential. West Virginians who have been put out of work by maneuverings of free trade theorists and other stargazers want to know how much of the money which we pay in taxes is being used to develop another means of encroaching upon our markets.

I commend Congressman SAYLOR's article to your reading.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

"[From Public Utilities Fortnightly of Jan. 19, 1956]

"THE BASIC DANGER IN THE 'A' POWER PROGRAM

"(By the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania)

"(This author warns against expecting too much and too soon in the way of atomic power. It could be just as disastrous as too little and too late—if the American taxpayer has to pay the bill for a pig in a poke.)

"For an industry traditionally disdainful of Government supports and subsidies, the electric utilities today appear to be treading on dangerous right of way. The perilous path originates at the disbursing office of the Atomic Energy Commission and moves along the course carefully designed by advocates of public power.

"Of a certainty, the Atomic Energy Commission—in its headlong drive to set up the atom as a producer of electricity—has made it difficult for private companies to refuse its generous subventions; perhaps, however, the time has come for beneficiaries in the utility field to make it distinctly clear that further grants—whether in the form of finished reactors, guaranties, or writeoffs—are unwanted, unwelcome, and unacceptable.

"The desirability of encouraging research and development leading to the production of electricity at reasonable costs through the medium of fissionable materials is not in question. There is definitely a place for the atom as an added fuel, particularly in areas where conventional fuels are not readily available. Development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide electrical energy for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The atom should be put to work in whatever peacetime roles it is capable of assuming in our competitive economy, but not at the risk of enabling the Federal Government to encroach further into the realm of private business.

"House-to-house salesmen often use gifts as a guise for getting a foot in the door. The Government also employs this technique most effectively. It entered the electric power business on a broad scale through a backdoor entrance by using agricultural development in the Tennessee Valley as a part of the opening wedge. By the same token, bureaucracy's continued investments in the power-by-atom program might give the Government a foothold on private property that would ultimately bring a demand for full title. Meanwhile the A program may be placing all supporters of the free enterprise system in an embarrassing position, for the so-called participating projects are creating a made-to-order and more-than-valid issue for public power protagonists.

"The recent history of AEC's participation in the development of atomic energy for commercial purposes would imply that (1) the Federal Treasury has such an abundance of funds as to preclude the necessity for careful and economic expenditures, and (2) the welfare of the Nation depends upon the ability of the Government and/or the utilities to generate power through the use of fissionable material.

"The fallacy of the first premise is evident to everyone save possibly those Government officials behind the go-for-broke program. Assumption No. 2 has been given such widespread publication that the principal arguments of the program's promoters need to be exposed if the AEC spending spree is to be effectively restrained.

"The obvious strategy of the program has been to attempt to convince the general public that diminishing resources of conventional fuels make it necessary for the rapid development of electric-generating plants powered by the atom. Voluminous statistical reports have been prepared in whatever way is deemed necessary to strengthen this impression. Few have any basis in fact, and all such allegations can automatically be refuted by a reference to authentic tables on coal reserves.

"Oil and natural-gas reserves, are undeniably being depleted at an increasing rate and eventually will be exhausted. Natural gas is admittedly a short-term fuel. The necessity for conserving it has prompted the Federal Power Commission, on occasion, to refuse applications for the use of natural gas under industrial boilers in areas where coal is available.

"The end of our oil reserves, on the other hand, is not in sight at the present time, although it is highly possible that the country will begin to feel a pinch before the end of the century. When this scarcity develops, America's fuel industries will be prepared for it. Atomic energy cannot replace the higher uses of petroleum, but synthetic fuel plants can provide both gas and oil when they are no longer available in Nature's storehouse. The raw material to be used in the production of synthetic fuels will be oil shale or coal—both of which occur in generous quantities within America's soil.

"All indications point to coal's carrying a progressively increasing portion of the energy load in the years ahead. The continued upturn in the use of electrical and mechanical energy will spiral demand for coal from the present 400 million to 500 million tons per annum to the billion-ton mark before the year 2000. Even at this rate of production, however, there is enough coal within the borders of the United States to last for more than a thousand years.

"Specifically, recoverable coal reserves are in excess of 1.2 trillion tons. Pennsylvania, which has produced about one-third of all the coal used in this country since 1850, still contains some 30 billion tons of mineable deposits. These estimates are based on studies of the U.S. Geological Survey, an agency which apparently has not been consulted by the AEC officials who have set out to portray coal as a short-life fuel.

"The other misconception being publicized in the all-out campaign to continue using taxpayers' money in attempts to expedite creation of an atom-powered electric utility industry is being developed around the cost factor. In the past year there have been numerous news stories based on promises by AEC spokesmen that the atom will eventually generate cheap electric power. Presumably, this objective will be reached if a kilowatt-hour of electricity can be produced in a range somewhere between 4 and 7 mills.

"To the average reader, that statement may sound most attractive. The fact is, however, that conventional fuels have long been producing electricity at a cost of less than 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. Modern steam plants within close proximity of coal mines are producing 3-mill electricity at the present time. Even in remote areas, where freight rates boost the delivered cost of coal to twice the cost at the mine, electricity is generated for less than 7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"The Government's failure to disseminate actual cost information in regard to the peacetime nuclear program makes it almost impossible to determine how many billions of dollars will have to be turned over to the AEC before the atom will produce electric power at a reasonable cost. When construction began on the atomic powerplant at Shippingport, Pa., in September 1954, the AEC—which is building the reactor—was extremely vague about the cost factor. Finally, 15 months and a great many millions of dollars later, a Commission spokesman was cornered at a press conference and admitted that electricity from the Shippingport plant is expected to cost 52 mills per kilowatt-hour—at least 10 times the cost of electric power generated with conventional fuels.

"The AEC's propensity for keeping expenses in the darkroom while the artist's conception of nuclear powerplants is projected to the public in glowing terms could eventually strike a damaging blow at the private utility industry. Sooner or later the public power sodality will reveal figures disclosing the total amount invested by the AEC in developing atomic electricity, then ask this question:

" 'Since the Federal Government has contributed such an enormous sum toward making nuclear power stations possible, is there any reason why the taxpayer should permit public utilities to profit from this undertaking?'

"To obviate such a possibility, the general public should demand dissemination of actual cost information except where publication would be inimical to the national security.

"The assumption that nuclear power from presently contemplated reactors may eventually become competitive with electricity from conventional plants disregards the progress in coal utilization. In other words, the nuclear power planners are assuming that atomic-generated electricity will challenge coal pricewise if capital and operating costs of nuclear reactors are reduced as hoped for and—meanwhile—coal technology stands still.

"In 1920 it required an average of 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. By 1930 the figure was down to 1.60; in 1940 it was 1.34 and in 1950 it was 1.19. Early in 1955 the average dropped below 1 pound of coal per kilowatt-hour. Some of the modern plants are far below that average. These figures, unlike those pertaining to power costs in atomic electric plants, are not hypothetical. They are based on established records and are in the files of the Federal Power Commission.

"In spite of continuing progress, the present utilization efficiency of coal in the steam plant is only about 38 percent. Obviously, there is still a great deal of room for progress. It is not inconceivable, if research underway bears fruit, that when and if nuclear power reaches the point where it can be producing 7-mill electricity, the efficiency of coal utilization will have doubled over its present rate. Philip Sporn, president of the American Gas & Electric Co., explains it this way:

" 'It needs to be kept in mind, too, in judging whether and to what extent nuclear plants will be built in the future in place of new conventional plants, that the nuclear development will always be competing with a constantly improved—that is to say, more efficient—conventional alternative.'

"Another factor which the backers of this new application of atomic power find convenient to withhold from publication is the relative cost of fuels in the overall operating budget of a public utility system. It is therefore not generally realized that only 16 percent of the total cost involved in generating power and bringing it to the consumers is chargeable to fuels. Thus, even if it were possible to find a way to generate electricity through a self-perpetuating fuel that could be obtained absolutely free, it would still be impossible to reduce a $6 electric bill by more than $1.

"Under the circumstances, it would appear that U.S. consumers are already receiving inexpensive electricity and that, since the promised cheap power from the atom is still confined to the province of theory, there is no justification for the vast expenditures being made under the auspices of the AEC research on the commercial application of nuclear materials.

"There is no denying that if the Government is going to subsidize construction of reactors and other necessary facilities; if the Government is going to undertake to insure property and personnel against damage that could be inflicted in the event of an accident in an atomic plant; if the Government is going to underwrite commercial operations against losses incurred in developmental programs; if the Government is going to supply atomic fuel at less than the full cost thereof; if the Government is going to subsidize atomic fuel processing and disposal of atomic waste—then there is a basis for the assertion that the atom may soon become a principal source of electric power. In all likelihood, electricity at TVA rates can be made available to consumers in various areas of the country if the Federal Government is willing to pour sufficient funds into the atomic energy program.

"Public power groups want to make Federal funds available to whatever extent is necessary to produce their brand of cheap electricity. They are urging more AEC help to private firms for the construction of atom power reactors. They want research and development aid on more liberal terms, and they want the AEC to bear the cost of fuel elements for small reactors. And while the Nation's private insurance industry is attempting to determine the most feasible methods of providing indemnity to cover damages that would result from an accident in an atomic electric plant, the public power enthusiasts would have the Government assume the insurance burden regardless of costs involved. What we who oppose unnecessary expansion of the public power program must realize is that each such subsidy provides bureaucratic forces with a further opportunity to claim a vested interest in the electric power industry; to believe otherwise is to underestimate the intent of public power supporters.

"Those who would socialize the whole power industry find the atom's potential in the generation of electricity a very convenient steppingstone, particularly since the Government fostered basic research and has exercised strict control over succeeding developments. The new atomic energy law, enacted in 1954, tended to lessen the Government's monopolistic grasp on the atom, but it retained Federal control over private development in the nuclear fission field. The revised law has been described thusly by Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), himself a renowned engineer:

" 'If anyone claims that the new Atomic Energy Act turns over to private industry a bonanza in the form of already solved technical and economic problems and an assured profit, either he does not know the facts or he is an arrant demagog. Any private investment in commercial atomic power generation in the near future will have to be inspired more by public service motives than by any reasonable expectation of substantial profit.'

"Atomic energy is novel, and its advertised possibilities in industrial application have wide public appeal. It arouses the curiosity, heightens the imagination. It is another source of heat with a new and special technology, yet on close examination we discover that it has no immediate advantages which should impel us to expedite its advent into the power field by investing billions of hard-to-get tax dollars.

"Practical businessmen and industrialists will welcome the opportunity to put this new source of power to work. Yet they foresee no immediate need for it. The electric-utility industry is proceeding with an unprecedented expansion program in steam-electric stations. Some of the companies, while not discounting the theory that in a decade or so hence it may be profitable to invest in full-scale atomic-energy plants in certain areas of the country, are erecting steam-generating stations in coal-producing regions at greater distances from consuming communities than has heretofore been considered economically feasible. At the present time 340,000 volts are transmitted by generating stations; utility experts believe that eventually it will be possible to operate 500,000-volt wires, thereby decreasing line losses and permitting transmission over greater distances. Under such circumstances, more and more generating stations would be located at the mine mouth, thus reducing costs and further discouraging the entry of competitive sources of power, except in remote sections of the country.

"Left to their own resources and ingenuity, the electric utilities will develop atom plants soon enough. Meanwhile the industry will supply all the power that is required without any help from the Federal Government. This point was stipulated very succinctly in one sentence of Adm. Ben Moreell's analysis of the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power: 'Technically and financially there is no present prospective need for Federal power activities.'

"Federal encroachment in the power-making business has already gone entirely too far. Neither the general public nor the electric-utility companies can afford to permit the Government to proceed with some of its elaborate plans for participation in the atomic-energy projects that belong in the private-industry classification. By allowing the Government to come into the tent so long as it has the price of admission, electric utilities might learn too late that they have made it possible for the bureaucrats to take over the center ring."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

LILIENTHAL ASKS HALT IN ATOMIC POWER PLANS

(By Howard Simons)

A call by David Lilienthal for the Government to abandon its support of atomic power development and to reduce substantially its support of basic atomic research has prompted a congressional committee to ask the Atomic Energy Commission to answer its critic.

Lilienthal, the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, challenged the AEC last month in a series of lectures at Princeton University. The theme of his lectures was that "the facts of the world of 1963 are in conflict with the way in which we think and deal with the atom, we should jettison and junk those outmoded ideas."

Lilienthal urged the Government to put "the atom into the mainstream of men's affairs" and not keep it artificially separate and apart, as Lilienthal views the present role of the atom in U.S. activities. To do this, Lilienthal suggested that the AEC, itself, might need drastic modification.

What aroused the interest of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy even more than these comments were Lilienthal's suggestions about continued Government support for civilian nuclear power and basic science as it relates to the atom.

The Joint Committee has championed Government support of both these programs.

As regards atomic power development, Lilienthal suggested the following as premises for 1963:

Energy from the atom is not now needed for civilian purposes.

At the time and place where it is needed it will be forthcoming without governmental prodding. If there is a real need it will be met by the utility and manufacturing industries, as it has been with the automobile, the diesel engine, the telephone, and so on, in response to proved economic need.

There is now no urgent fuel or power crisis and no prospect of one in the foreseeable future; when such a shortage develops, it will be taken care of by the atom if that is then the best alternative.

Moreover, said Lilienthal, who resigned as Chairman of the AEC on February 15, 1950, the Government "should stop trying to force feed atomic energy."

Throw away the present discredited timetable. Don't abandon the hope for competitive power, he advised, but deal with it realistically.

The same approach, Lilienthal argued, should apply to the atom in basic science, in medicine and agriculture and industry. Funds and scientific manpower should be freed for other starved areas of research and development, such as biochemistry.

In effect, Lilienthal was saying just the opposite of what the AEC had reported to President Kennedy in November 1962, and what AEC officials told the Joint Committee in late February.

This was essentially that nuclear energy can and should make a vital contribution toward meeting the Nation's long-term energy requirements and that the proper role for the Government is to develop and to demonstrate the technology that will lead to a self-sustaining and growing nuclear power industry.

In short, where Lilienthal wants the AEC to get out of the nuclear power business, the AEC not only wants to remain in the atomic power business, but to increase its support of the Nation's nuclear power efforts.

Citing such variances between the AEC and Lilienthal, the Joint Committee, in an unpublished letter, has asked the AEC for its comments. The Joint Committee further asked the AEC to make its views of Lilienthal's views known before the resumption of its annual hearings on the state of the Nation's atomic energy industry.

These hearings, continuing those held in February, will begin on April 2 and will be devoted largely to non-Government witnesses.

ON COMMEMORATIONS AND SPECIAL OBSERVANCES AND ON THE ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL COIN TO COMMEMORATE THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a recent revelation that disturbs me greatly. I refer to Secret Service proposals for this fiscal year that would increase Vice President JOHNSON's personal protection staff to approximately 36 men, or 34 more than any other Vice President in history. Since the days of the Honorable Vice President Barkley, it has been traditional to have two agents protect the Vice President. Before making a number of specific points, and filling in my colleagues on the background, I would like to say that the proposals are both preposterous and presumptuous.

Even more alarming, Mr. Speaker, is that 19 agents would be taken directly from the field at a time when counterfeiting, for example, is at an alltime peak. Justification of this fantastic personal staff for Mr. JOHNSON is, I suggest, absolutely impossible. There is not a single individual in this House who could say to me that this is a sensible proposal. It suggests everything unwise, unreasonable, and unnatural.

And I might direct my next comment to the Vice President himself, a man in whom I have the greatest respect and one who was a great majority leader of the other body. He comes from the State, Mr. Speaker, that has its would-be tradition wrapped in praise of its tough frontier spirit—the land of the six-shooter and so many other things. This sedate House, Mr. Speaker has heard Texan after Texan extoll the great virtues of independence almost beyond the point of toleration. Yet we have listened, Mr. Speaker, and we have accepted this in the best tradition of our national life.

But now we are confronted with a very serious matter. The Chief of the Secret Service, Mr. James T. Rowley, is authorized to provide this protection of the Vice President. To go back a bit, after the Blair House shooting of 1950, the election of coverage has been up to the Vice President himself, by request.

The law, Public Law 87–829, passed on October 15, 1962, states that the Secret Service is authorized to protect the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year. This is something that we here would agree to. What I cannot understand is that previous protection by request never amounted to more than two individuals except while the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission.

I can well understand and appreciate the dangers incumbent upon the Vice President when he goes abroad. No one would doubt this. However, I cannot quite rationalize how the Congress in its right senses could justify this tremendous expansion at a time when the lives of a number of public officials in town are in greater potential danger than is the life of the Vice President. I do not mean to play "cloak and dagger" in this situation, but certain Justices of the Supreme Court and U.S. Senators are much more controversial. I do not have to name names here. I simply do not feel the Vice President is in any great danger. I am strongly in favor of the maximum protection for the President, but some armies do not have 35 guards trained with the efficiency and expertise of the Secret Service.

Unlike the feast at Cana, where the best wine was served last, I have saved the worst news for my conclusion.

The cost for the 35 Johnson agents would amount to over $261,000 and the 1 clerk over $4,000. There would be an additional expense of over $20,000 for personal benefits and over $37,000 for overtime pay. This does not include travel expenses which total $390,000 for both the President and Vice President, an increase of $165,000. Without travel the cost to the taxpayers per year will be $322,000.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, the whole issue here is exceedingly unwise. We are being asked to take men from strategic positions within the Secret Service for protection that has never before been necessary. Is it now analogous that the Secretary of State would also demand the same amount of protection? We could be establishing a precedent here that would cost thousands of dollars. I want to reiterate my claim that I have nothing personal against the Vice President in this matter, but simply with the precedent involved. I believe firmly in the rightness of my cause and I intend to pursue it. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, do you not think we should start protecting the poor overburdened taxpayers?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for bringing out these facts. But, I think an even more dangerous precedent was set 2 years ago, which I brought out on the floor of the House at that time, and that is the fact that about $1 million is being spent annually for a private FBI investigative force for the Attorney General to be used at his sole discretion and direction for the first time in the history of this country, outside of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI itself. Recently there was published for the first time that I had seen it in print—in Newsweek—this fact that some 54 private investigators, under the direct supervision and control solely of the Attorney General, exist. I understand that number is closer to 100, and last year a substantial increase over the previous year was asked for and granted. And, I think that this expenditure of funds for this private, separate, exclusive investigative force, solely under the control of the Attorney General, outside of the FBI, is a matter that this Congress should give serious consideration to, in that I know of nowhere that this force and its functions are authorized or their duties prescribed by law or proper authorizing legislation. Therefore, the serious question is raised as to what authority did Congress in the first place have to appropriate funds and to establish this force without proper authorizing legislation proscribing, prescribing, and ascribing the duties of these people that should have come out of the Committee on the Judiciary on which I serve. I favor adequate personnel to investigate organized crime, but I think Congress should have authorized such a unit and set out its duties or should have added to the FBI force already authorized.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Florida. Of course, we will have an opportunity to vote on this particular item when the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill comes to the floor before the Easter vacation, and I hope my colleagues will support me to strike out all of the agents except two, which is all the other Vice Presidents have had; one or two, but two was the maximum that any Vice President ever had.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on the speech he just delivered on this important matter and endorse what he said and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First of all, I am interested to learn that we are going to have one appropriation bill before Easter. I was not aware that we were going to do any business at all before the Easter recess. But, let me have those figures again. My hearing is not very good this morning. Did I understand that there are going to be 37 new agents?

Mr. CONTE. Thirty-five Johnson agents and one clerk. Of course, besides those you will have supervisors and assistant supervisors on down the line.

Mr. GROSS. How many have past Vice Presidents had?

Mr. CONTE. The most any Vice President had since Barkley was two.

Mr. GROSS. Why has this sudden danger to the life of this brave Texan developed?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad you brought up that question. For, when this law went through the House, it was estimated that at best it would not cost over $100,000 for these additional agents. That law merely authorized protection for the Vice President. So, I asked the Chief of the Secret Service, a very able man, "Prior to this law it was by request of the Vice President; is that correct?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Did JOHNSON ask for protection last year?" He said, "Yes." I said, "How many men did you give him?" He said, "Two." So I said, "Why give him 35 now? Because there is a law on the books?"

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that 37 or 35, whichever it is, will be enough, or should we turn out a platoon of marines to trail him around day by day, hour by hour, and evening by evening?

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Let me ask my friend from Massachusetts this question. Did the Vice President request these agents himself?

Mr. CONTE. He did request last year and received two.

Mr. BASS. I mean, did he request this increase?

Mr. CONTE. Now, I think I made it clear here that I am not directing my remarks to the Vice President.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, when he presented his budget to the Congress or to the President, and the administration in turn presented it to the Congress, requested 35 men on behalf of the Chief of the Secret Service.

Mr. BASS. Could it be that the Chief of the Secret Service knows much more about this situation than I and perhaps even than the gentleman from Massachusetts, and feels that in his great wisdom and experience that it would take 35 men to carry out the wishes of the Congress when we stated we would provide the Vice President protection?

Mr. CONTE. First let us get the record straight. I certainly do not want to assume here that I am an authority on this. I think Mr. Rowley is doing a fine job. He is an authority. However, it does not take much commonsense to rationalize that in the past when the Vice President requested protection, he was given two. Why, all of a sudden, has that figure jumped up to 35? I cannot understand this.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman cannot tell me that Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, who possesses great secrets, is not in as much grave danger as the Vice President. The gentleman cannot tell me that Chief Justice Warren, who is a controversial figure in certain parts of the country, does not require the same amount of protection as does the Vice President. The gentleman cannot tell me that Senators like the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Senator GOLDWATER, and other controversial Senators in the U.S. Senate do not require the same type of protection.

I am all for protecting the Vice President. I think he is a fine man. I am willing to give him two men, but I cannot see why he needs 35. What are they going to do with these 35 men?

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I cannot yield further at this point. I yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a 3-minute statement originally out of the 40 minutes of time that I had taken to talk about something a lot more important than this.

However, since so much of my time has been taken already, I will have to continue making this brilliant statement that I have prepared, which is much more pertinent and valuable to the Congress and to the world than this matter now being discussed.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I have a 15-minute special order during which I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, if we can pursue this item a little bit further. This is a very important issue.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I only want to say this: I do not know how many agents it takes to protect the Vice President of the United States. However, I want the RECORD to show that the Vice President did not personally request this.

Mr. CONTE. As far as I know, the request came from the Secretary of the Treasury; who requested these men to him, I do not know.

Mr. BASS. He did not personally request a given number of agents to protect him. But let me say this: I refer to the statement I made just a few moments ago on the floor of the House to the effect that if something is not done to relieve the crime-wave situation in Washington, D.C., I can visualize the time when I personally would want 35 people around me to protect my life and the life of my wife, and to protect the life and the life of the wife of the gentleman from Iowa, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman is absolutely right. I would like to take those 35 men and put them here in the District of Columbia to protect the citizens of this area. I think it would be of greater value.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York for 1 minute.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the distinguished gentleman from Iowa to yield for one purpose only. I was on the floor of the House and listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] about the leak of a group of popularity polls taken abroad. I would like to suggest that one of the things which is wrong with our foreign policy at the present time is that it is foreign policy by popularity polls. If the administration would try to do more of what is right and courageous instead of worrying about what a group of pollsters say, we would be in much better shape in the world today. I think it is unfortunate that this pollster business had to be elevated to such a high level here on the floor today by a distinguished Member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] the majority leader, who is a spokesman for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact we spent so much time on it indicates that there is too much concern about what is popular and not enough concern over what is right. If the administration would care more about substance than it does about public relations, we would have a more solid foreign policy today.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue this debate, but I have something very important to discuss and I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been yielding all over the place. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan can get time as much as he wants. I think I have been very generous. I think the gentleman is unfair in suggesting with this motion and kind of inference with the point that he is making. However, I shall yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has made a point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I simply make the observation that this is a continuation of the same blockheaded foreign policy that was displayed by previous administrations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] made the point that foreign policy was being conducted by popularity poll. It seems to me that I recall that we have had a number of criticisms of the administration on the floor of this body and in the other body for the past 3 or 4 or 5 weeks, because it was charged that the administration proceeded with our foreign policy operations even though they did not satisfy Mr. Diefenbaker, even though they did not satisfy Mr. de Gaulle, and even though they did not satisfy Mr. Tshombe. It does seem to me that the distinguished gentleman from New York might want to consult with other members of his party and decide whether they are criticizing the administration because it is supposed to be conducting foreign policy by popularity poll or because it is supposed to be conducting foreign policy in spite of the wishes of our allies. It does seem clear that the only subject on which the Members on the other side of the aisle can agree is that no matter what the Kennedy administration does, it is wrong.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, maybe we can set this policy question to rest. I recall during the last election this was quite a subject. So we discussed the matter with the head of the USIA when he came before our subcommittee for appropriations and we tried to get him to tell us what the policy picture was going to be under this administration. At that time they decided they were not going to conduct any polls because they were not of any value anyway, because they did not really get to the depth of the question and really did not settle anything. So I think this whole policy question ought to be well buried, because I do not think it has any relevant importance. I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], on the subject.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, with regard to foreign policy and polls and the administration's foreign policy, I think it is a travesty that we dropped the ball when we had a chance to make a touchdown at the Costa Rica Conference. Most of those countries were willing and anxious to have drafted a strong, firm, long-range, planned program to get rid of Castro and communism in Cuba and the subversive results and aftereffects in this hemisphere. I think it is a shame that at the time when we had a real opportunity to work with countries, many of which have actually been invaded by Castro marauders during 1961, and with many of the Presidents of those countries asking for a firm policy, that are largely for a planned program that they could follow, that the Organization of American States could consider on the recommendation of the Central American States—I think it is a shame that we dropped the ball when we could have made a telling touchdown in Costa Rica by providing a long-range, firm program to eventually get rid of Castro and communism in Cuba and in this hemisphere.

I do not know what the polls would show in Latin America after this visit, but I would say our prestige is much lower than it would have been if the United States had provided the firm leadership that we should have at Costa Rica instead of announcing in advance our intentions not to try to carve out a stiff, meaningful program. I call attention to my remarks of Monday, March 18, pages 4425–4430 of the Congressional Record.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before I launch on my prepared remarks, I want to say in response to the observations made by the majority leader when he stated that committees were hard at work in the Congress and that soon we will get some legislation. If the committees are not any harder at work than the great committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Public Works, then we are not working very hard. There is a lot of important business before that committee. One of the subcommittees, the subcommittee on investigating the interstate highway building program, has not even called together the members of that committee. The members on the minority side do not know what the plans are, what they intend to do, what or where they are investigating, and what the problems are in many areas. We do not know much about it because we do not have an adequate staff to do anything about it.

Last year, I think it was in July, I wrote the chairman of the subcommittee a letter after I had counseled with him about an idea about stepping up the activity and the effectiveness of this committee. He said he thought it was a good one. "Write me a letter and we will take it up." I wrote him a letter and he has not even answered. So I reiterate, I believe the committees are not busy if they are not any busier than the Committee on Public Works of which I am a member.

So much for that.

Very briefly, then, on foreign policy. As the House knows, I have been one of those who believe in presenting a united front on the foreign policy question to the Congress, and that we ought to have a bipartisan foreign policy. But I have been here long enough to know that we have made a lot of mistakes with our foreign programs; in fact, I think the trouble with this whole matter in the foreign area is that we have no discernible, understandable foreign policy. It is for this reason that I have suggested from time to time to the State Department and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the issuing of a statement on foreign policy that reflects the true intentions of our country.

I am reminded that just as England needed a Magna Carta in her period of crisis in early history and as we needed a Declaration of Independence in 1776, so somebody needs to issue a policy statement that makes some sense on the foreign front and that will be understood both by the American people and freedom-loving people everywhere. Then we will not have to worry about prestige polls and the other things we have discussed here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks; also, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling] be allowed to revise and extend his remarks at the close of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition in America that we commemorate significant events, important developments and occasions that have emphasized and carried forward the great ideals authored, enacted into law, fought for, and sacrificed for in our history. It is fitting and proper that we do this. These commemorations serve to remind us of the great ideals and ideas that moved us forward in the right direction on the moving vehicle we call freedom. It has been said that in understanding the past we can open the future. With these commemorations we have strengthened our system in many ways.

Because our forebears understood this and I believe felt more keenly than we do the importance for a rich heritage they wisely formed a pattern of proper observances and built memorials to our Nation's great all over this land we call America. We have a fine collection of these here in the District of Columbia where the millions who come to visit can, while they are here, catch something of the spirit that burned in the hearts of the torchbearers of freedom.

We build libraries everywhere with the aid of foundation money and with tax money where the books that reveal our literature, our art, and our dramatic history can be stored, used, and read by the population in order to better understand our system of popular government and to help give the advantages that came from a free society.

The world's largest and most valuable of these libraries is, very logically, here in Washington.

Archives buildings are found in all of the States and principal cities to house the valuable original documents that signaled our birth such as the Declaration of Independence and the document which carried out its objective—the Constitution—both housed here in our own Archives Building at great cost to the taxpayer who willingly and gladly assumes this responsibility.

Monuments built to the memory of the great in our heritage can be found in every State of the Union. They are also built at the scene of sacrificial action for the preservation and advancement of liberty, there to be a reminder to us and to posterity of those who toiled, who fought and who sacrificed in the struggles that have brought us to this point in our history.

The Congress of the United States, I believe, has shown great wisdom in providing for programs and projects to accent our history by leaving reminders in all of our national parks where it is appropriate and convenient to do so.

There are so many, many areas one could point to where a most significant and appropriate memorial has been constructed and reconstructed. Among the most meaningful and appropriate is the Independence Hall area in Philadelphia—a project that is carried out in cooperation with the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania. This project reminds us of the great things that can happen through the cooperative effort of elected representatives of the people.

The National Park Service, responding to congressional action, has also featured contributions by individuals in our heritage. Most important of the people who have received this kind of attention is a man whom I have dubbed the most American American—Abraham Lincoln. In cooperation with Kentucky and the citizens around Hodgenville they have restored the Lincoln birthplace area. Everywhere where Lincoln has lived is marked and is made available for the people to see.

One of the most outstanding in his early life is the Pidgeon Creek area in Indiana where last year a Nancy Hanks Park was dedicated in tribute to the mother of this great American and in appreciation of the contribution the great State of Indiana has made toward the shaping of Lincoln's destiny.

The State of Illinois has restored New Salem so that it looks just like it did when Lincoln lived there. The Lincoln tomb where Lincoln lies buried with his wife and three children is another great tribute made possible by the Government. The city of Springfield and the State of Illinois are now planning to restore a large section of the downtown area so that it will be reminiscent of the kind of community in which Lincoln lived and served as a legislator and a lawyer.

The city of New York wisely has kept the Cooper Union Building where Lincoln made that famous speech ending, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

In the city of Washington we have built a memorial to Lincoln which is neither tomb nor temple but something of both; a most magnificent structure and appropriate tribute to Lincoln. It draws more people to it than any comparable memorial anywhere else in the world.

Volumes could be written about the other tributes to this great man in bust, in statue, in picture, in books, and on our postage stamps. Why, you ask?

Again I suggest that the reasons are reflected in the some 6,000 books that have been written, all of them in part or in whole dealing with what Lincoln said, what he did, and what he was. What he said throughout his lifetime revealed the heart and soul of this man. It proves his burning desire to know what was right and then to say what was right in such a way that people could understand it. Then, with an unbounded faith in those ideals that gave us freedom he directed the forces spiritually and politically in the tragic and challenging period and we find now that what emerged then was an America more nearly like that envisioned by our forefathers than even the most avid abolitionist believed possible.

In this 100th anniversay and commemoration period of that time, the Civil War, we emphasize not the conflict but the tragedy, that at frightful cost enriched and made clear the American tradition. The phrase, "Conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," acquired a magnificent meaning during and since the war for all of us and for all time. With the result that our Nation under God was unified and made strong beyond any power again to separate and divide. What has emerged now is the last great hope of an imperiled mankind. The fragment of history that we show so humbly today may furnish an insight into the tumult, the bitterness, that in the end cleared the air for the triumph forever of the American genius for justice and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania with its Civil War Centennial Commission assisting and the people of Gettysburg with the Lincoln fellowship there have, through the years, commemorated the anniversary of the Gettysburg Address. To that community, on the 19th of November, they have drawn national leaders, Governors, Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet members, historians, and poets like Sandburg and each time, with these programs, these people have enriched the American heritage there by recalling, reviewing, reappraising, and placing in proper perspective for us what was said there and the things we need to be reminded of that this situation recalls. For this I believe every American should be thankful.

Mr. Speaker, no greater expression of our appreciation could be shown for the sacrifice that was made for freedom, and which, through a combination of circumstances, was so eloquently called to our attention by Lincoln on that important day 100 years ago next November, than the passage of H.R. 1611 introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE GOODLING, the Representative of that district, calling for the issuance of a 50 cent piece to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore would like to give my support to H.R. 1611 and review if I may a little history in connection with this address that might be worthwhile for us to think about as we consider this very appropriate tribute to a man, to an occasion and through both to our philosophy of government of, by and for the people.

I will begin by reminding you that 100 years ago two armies met near the little town of Gettysburg, in southern Pennsylvania. The details of the titanic battle that followed have been well covered in numerous books, so that it is not necessary, even if it were possible, to recount them here. The battle raged for 3 days, July 1–3, 1963. Thousands laid down their lives in sacrifice and other thousands were wounded, captured, or missing. We who are so far removed from that awful conflict can hardly imagine the heroism and hope, the tragedy and despair of the men who fought there.

In the end, Lee withdrew across the Potomac. The high-water mark of the Confederacy had been reached. The contest was not ended, but Lee was never again at the head of an army of equal strength, and never again did he set his columns in motion and enter into a conflict with such high hopes. The battles of Cold Harbor, the Wilderness, and Spottsylvania were still to be fought, and Sherman was yet to make his historic march to the sea. But after the failure of Pickett's charge on July 3, Appomattox was inevitable.

Gettysburg was decisive not only in the American Civil War; it was decisive also in man's long struggle for popular government.

Following the battle the heroic dead were hastily buried in shallow graves, many of them unmarked. This condition was highly unsatisfactory, and Mr. David Wills, a resident of Gettysburg, who was a true-hearted patriot and a man of great executive ability, took the lead in correcting it. On July 24, 1863, he wrote to Governor Curtin, submitting a plan for a cemetery in which the remains of the dead heroes could be reinterred and properly marked. With the approval of Governor Curtin and the cooperation of the Governors of other States, land was purchased and the cemetery grounds plotted and laid out. Plans were made for consecrating the cemetery with appropriate ceremonies and the Honorable Edward Everett of Massachusetts was selected as the orator for the occasion. In deference to his wishes the ceremonies were postponed until November 19.

The invitation to President Lincoln to speak at Gettysburg was an afterthought. On November 2 Mr. Wills wrote to the President informing him:

> These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose, by appropriate ceremonies, on Thursday, the 19th instant. Hon. Edward Everett will deliver the oration. I am authorized by the Governors of the different States to invite you to be present and participate in these ceremonies, which will doubtless be very imposing and solemnly impressive. It is the desire that after the oration, you, as Chief Executive of the Nation, formally set apart these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks. We hope you will be able to be present to perform this last solemn act to the soldier-dead on this battlefield.

President Lincoln needed no urging. His heart was full of gratitude for what had been so gloriously accomplished at Gettysburg. He determined to find time in the midst of a busy schedule to participate in the dedicatory ceremonies.

The original plans proposed that the train carrying the Presidential party should leave Washington at 6 a.m., arriving at Gettysburg at noon. On the return trip, the train was to leave Gettysburg at 6 p.m. and arrive in Washington at midnight. Lincoln was not satisfied. He wrote on the note from Stanton the following endorsement:

> I do not like the arrangement. I do not wish to so go that by the slightest accident we fail entirely; and, at the best, the whole to be a mere breathless running of the gauntlet.

In deference to the President's objection, an alternate arrangement was made providing that the train should leave Washington at noon on November 18 instead of at 6 a.m. on November 19.

Almost innumerable books and magazine articles have professed to tell the true story of Lincoln's notable address. It has been asserted that he wrote it on the train between Washington and Gettysburg; that he wrote it at the Wills' residence the night before its delivery; and that he wrote it in full before leaving Washington. There are five copies, still extant, in Lincoln's own handwriting. The first page of the first draft is on a sheet of "Executive Mansion" letter paper. Except for the first sheet, the first draft is written in pencil on the wide-lined paper that he habitually used for public documents, similar to that which he used for the writing of his second inaugural address. William E. Barton, in his excellent work, "Lincoln at Gettysburg," says:

> Whether Lincoln had wholly completed his first draft before he left Washington, we are not sure; if he had, he was not satisfied with the way it ended. He certainly did not write the address or any large part of it on the train. At Judge Wills' house that evening he read over the first draft of his speech, and was not pleased with the way it ended. His second sheet, whatever he had on it, he presumably destroyed. About 9 o'clock the following morning, Lincoln rose from the breakfast table in the Wills house and went to his room. There, not very long afterward, John G. Nicolay found him rewriting his address. For this rewriting he used the same kind of paper which he had used for the pencilled first draft of his second page. From the new draft, written wholly in ink, and without erasure, on two pages of the wide-lined paper, Lincoln delivered his address that day. This second draft is virtually a fair copy of the first draft.

The dedicatory program opened with a dirge by the Birgfield band of Philadelphia, followed by a prayer by the Reverend Thomas H. Stockton, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. The effort was eloquent although somewhat lengthy, but it was the embodiment of the spirit of patriotism and victory rather than of the spirit of humility and devotion.

A selection by the Marine band followed, after which letters of regret from Gen. George G. Meade, Gen. Winfield Scott, and others, were read.

It was noon when Mr. Everett arose and spoke the opening words of his oration:

> Standing beneath this serene sky, overlooking these broad fields now reposing from the labors of the waning year, the mighty Alleghenies towering before us, the graves of our brethren beneath our feet, it is with hesitation that I raise my poor voice to break the eloquent silence of God and nature.

His oration, which had been prepared with care, was delivered with effectiveness. It was nearly 2 o'clock when he closed with the prophecy that "down to the latest period of recorded time, in the glorious annals of our common country there will be no brighter page than that which relates the Battles of Gettysburg."

Everett's oration was followed by a hymn composed for the occasion by B. B. French, of Washington, and sung by the Baltimore Glee Club. The second stanza reflected the spirit of the occasion and set the tone of thousands of Memorial Day ceremonies in the decades to come:

> "Here let them rest;
> And summer's heat and winter's cold
> Shall grow and freeze above this mold,
> A thousand years shall pass away,
> A nation still shall mourn this day,
> Which now is blest."

The crowd was silent when Lincoln rose to speak, following the hymn, but the address was so short that the people had hardly adjusted themselves to its spirit when he ceased. It is reported that as he took his seat there was silence for a moment, then some scattered applause.

The Gettysburg address was not received with universal acclaim. The simple remarks were given scant attention by the big dailies. The opposition press, as might be expected, treated the address with indifference or even with scorn. The Springfield (Mass.) Republican was almost alone in its immediate recognition of the immortal words. The following day, the Republican labeled it "a perfect gem, deep in feeling, compact in thought and expression."

It is true that greatness in a speech, like greatness in other events, is often recognized only when seen through the haze of time. As the curious but sympathetic multitude saw a sad-faced man sink down in his chair, how little they realized that the sentences they had been privileged to hear would take their place among the great works of literature. Prof. H. C. Holloway, who was present that day, says in his reminiscences:

> Indeed, so great was the speech that no one at the time comprehended it fully. No eulogistic utterances in regard to it can do it justice. As the ages go by it will lose none of its luster. We had heard very much more that day than we dreamed of.

Yet, even then, the brief address elicited commendation from one who was certainly a qualified judge. Edward Everett spoke with the voice of prophecy when he said:

> Mr. President, your speech will be remembered long after mine is forgotten.

The following day he wrote to Lincoln a letter in which he expressed his great admiration for the address, and said:

> I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near to the central idea of the occasion in my 2 hours as you did in 2 minutes.

Notwithstanding the importance of the battle itself, and in spite of Lincoln's assertion that "the world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here," it is the address that has kept alive the memory of the battle. The Gettysburg address has become a part of our American heritage and of the heritage of freedom-loving people throughout the world. It stands in the very first rank of American state papers, surpassed only by the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights. It is the object of H.R. 1611 to commemorate the anniversary of the delivery of this historic address, a purpose in which I heartily and sincerely concur.

In one version of the address the closing clause reads, "and that this Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth;" in its final form, however, this clause was changed to read, "and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." This change gave it universal application and demonstrated that Lincoln's thoughts and hopes swept far beyond the borders of America and embraced the whole of humanity.

In the Gettysburg Address, delivered in the midst of a long and bloody war, we find no trace of an appeal to the baser passions. It was an occasion on which exultation or vindictiveness might naturally have found a place in wounded hearts. Such sentiments were not entirely absent from the program and from the applause which the expression of those sentiments evoked. Even the chaplain's prayer was not wholly free from a spirit of boasting and bitterness. But no suggestion of rejoicing or revenge is found in Lincoln's words. Emerson says:

> Lincoln's heart was as large as the world, but in it there was no room for the memory of a wrong.

His thought rose above the passing passions of the hour and dwelt on great and abiding truths.

Today, the forces of communism press everywhere against the frontiers of the free world. In international affairs we pass from one crisis to another. In his article entitled "The Last Best Hope of Earth," Carl Haverlin says:

> In this battle for sheer survival, the ideas of Abraham Lincoln and the power that has been generated by what he was, what he accomplished, and what he stood for are, in my opinion, among the most potent weapons that the free world can wield. Since so many of the globe's inhabitants are have-nots, the figure of Abraham Lincoln gains added strength because of his own insignificant beginnings, and his lifelong dedication to the dignity of man. Wherever one looks, whether at home or abroad, there are many examples of this imprint today.

Elsewhere in the same article, Mr. Haverlin writes:

> But I am sure that in the balances of men's minds—whether they be men of Ghana and black, or men of India and brown, or men of China and yellow, or whether pigmented like ourselves and thus in a world sense in the minority—the existence of Abraham Lincoln and the body of people who supported him weighs in those balances more heavily in our national interest than we can realize.

This bill provides that the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparation for such coinage. I mention this point only in passing. I do not desire to emphasize it because I feel that the project would be a worthwhile one even if the expense were substantial.

Mr. Speaker, the United States can have no finer image in the eyes of the world than the one supplied by the Gettysburg Address. The issuing of this commemorative coin is, in a sense, an affirmation of our faith in the ideals of Lincoln and in the sentiments that he expressed in the Gettysburg Address. It is a rededication to the great task remaining before us. It is an indication, before the whole world, that we are willing to stand up and be counted. It is a renewal of his high resolve, and ours, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. Speaker, some will argue against this proposition because of precedent. Let me say that while a new precedent may be established with the issuance of this special 50-cent piece to commemorate the Gettysburg Address, it is not new to have a special issue of the 50-cent piece.

This Congress, in its wisdom, did just that to help Iowa commemorate the 100th anniversary of its coming into the Union. This was good public policy and it served the public interest because it did call attention to a great and important event in our history—and I say parenthetically that Congress never did a finer thing when they gave the people of Iowa the opportunity and privilege of having more self-government. This has added both to the welfare of the people there and to the Nation and it has enriched our culture. This issuance encouraged the people of Iowa to reflect on the contribution that they have made to their heritage and to renew their pledges to the great ideals summed up pretty well in the Iowa motto that says "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain."

But Mr. Speaker, if this is establishing a new precedent it is a good one just like the setting of other precedents have been throughout history.

I do not know the details of the impression that they would have on this coin but I imagine there would be a quote from the Gettysburg Address itself if not the complete address. This they tell me is possible. Possibly they would use just the last part which reads:

> That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

If just those ringing, meaningful words could be called to the attention of our people daily and to the attention of all who would have occasion to use our currency, they would be reminded each time of our system which gives freedom for the people. It is clear from this statement, too, that what is referred to here for the people is meant for all the people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that this can be done almost without cost to the Government and the further fact that it can and will do so much good for freedom, let us join hands in the passage of this legislation and in every way we can to aid and abet those in Pennsylvania and Gettysburg to adequately commemorate this great occasion, this magnificent speech, and this great ideal that was exemplified so eloquently and impressively 100 years ago next November 19.

This does involve history, a great interest of mine. For those, and there may be some, who believe that history is dead, dull, and finished, let me suggest what a great historian has said and that is:

> The events of the past are but the earlier acts in a drama that is still going on—that what happens tomorrow is only the shadow of an action taken today, the echo of a thought conceived yesterday. Understanding the ideas created and nourished by great minds through all our centuries can give contemporary man a new capacity for judgment and vision—a capacity which will clarify and illuminate his life, as a citizen and as a man.

I suggest in addition, that the deeper we look into our own history, the further we can look forward with confidence in the great ideals that were reflected in the life and action of Abraham Lincoln who, in my opinion, stood so tall among us that day when he gave us the 267 words we find in the Gettysburg Address. They need to be remembered forever, they need to be commemorated in such a way that the impact of what was there said will be made more manifest, more meaningful, to more people everywhere.

A COIN SHOULD BE MINTED TO COMMEMORATE THE CENTENARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, 5 score if you will, come November 19, thousands of Americans gathered at Gettysburg to witness ceremonies held to dedicate a portion of a great battlefield of the American Civil War as a national cemetery. What transpired on that day has made the name of Gettysburg known and cherished wherever in this world men love freedom.

On that occasion, the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, was asked to make a "few appropriate remarks." Confining his remarks to less than 300 words is an indication he complied with the first request. The President did not live to learn how appropriate his words actually were. Their real significance is attested by their lasting fame. They have been revered throughout the world as the sublime Gettysburg Address. A grateful posterity has taken what he said as the creed for all who love liberty. Freedom and sacrifice then as now, are inseparable.

It would appear fitting and proper that a coin should be stricken to commemorate the centenary of what is probably the most meaningful and lasting address, one which acquires deeper significance with each passing year. It has become an American heritage and stands as a beacon light for the entire world. Like the man who uttered it, its fame does not end at waters edge. Wherever there is written and spoken language, Lincoln and his immortal passages are known.

There is no more fitting and finer tribute to the Gettysburg Address than that of Lord Curzon, in an address delivered at Cambridge University, November 6, 1931. The following is a part of that speech:

> It is an amazingly comprehensive and forceful presentation of the principles for which the war then was waging. It joined the local to the national, the occasional to the permanent, it went straight at a declaration of the purpose which animated the soul of Abraham Lincoln, and for which the men buried at Gettysburg had given their lives. Above all, it was a declaration of America's fundamental principles.

When Mr. Lincoln went to Gettysburg he must have had some supernatural power to look beyond his immediate audience. Democracy was on trial and this had to be shown to the world. There is evidence that the phrase a "few appropriate remarks" gave him considerable concern and weighed heavily upon him and caused him to give serious consideration to what he should say.

The President reached Gettysburg in the afternoon of November 18, carrying with him at least part of his address. It was completed in the home of Judge Wills where he was a guest.

The ceremonies on the 19th were solemn and impressive. There was appropriate music, the recital of a dirge written for the occasion by Benjamin B. French, the U.S. Commissioner of Public Buildings and what was to be the main address of the day. This was delivered by the foremost orator of the time, Hon. Edward Everett, of Massachusetts. For 2 hours he expounded in his graceful polished phrases which had gained him his standing as the Nation's greatest orator.

This then was the situation as the tall man arose. So brief were his dedicatory remarks the audience had barely settled before he had finished. It was probably a disappointed audience, it having expected more. It was not until it appeared in print that its true beauty became apparent. As stated, the President was looking beyond the Gettysburg audience. Here he summed up the one fundamental principle of American Government—political equality. He portrayed briefly all fields where men have contended and died for human liberty and for government which would assure to all the rights and opportunities of life. Lincoln showed the country the Civil War was waged to test democracy and that his and future generations must dedicate themselves to the unfinished tasks. One hundred years later much remains unfinished.

Few men have the ability to say so much in so few words. The real significance of the Gettysburg Address can be summed up in one word—simplicity.

Gettysburg was the turning point in the war. It was decisive in the Civil War, but was also decisive in the world struggle for popular government, one that would recognize all who would become Americans, one which believed in the brotherhood of man.

A coin should be minted for Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. The words are as relevant today as they were one century ago. An unknown minister said:

> Lincoln's Gettysburg speech was a coin dropped from the mine of the Anglo-Saxon language.

The precedent has been established. A coin was minted to commemorate the 75th anniversary in 1938. Within the last few days this House did what had never been done in the history of the country. It established a precedent by making a distinguished gentleman an honorary citizen of the United States.

It does appear fitting and proper that a coin should be minted to commemorate the centennial of what is truly a landmark in history and will live as long as the spoken language. This event should be properly remembered, for contrary to what Mr. Lincoln suggested, the world did note and remember what he said there.

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all concerned about the continuing controversy reported daily in the press on the subject of the congressional inquiry into the TFX award recently made by the Department of Defense. I participated in the discussions on this subject on the floor on March 4. At that time my interest centered around the appeal of one of the two major participants to the Congress after having lost the competition primarily because of failure to adhere to the ground rules prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The losing company really designed two airplanes rather than one as prescribed in the ground rules. A number of the other participants, major aircraft companies, which had previously been eliminated could easily have duplicated the proposal of the losing company had they, too, failed to adhere to the ground rules.

That the ground rules were feasible can be readily demonstrated. The tactical plane currently in major production for the Air Force is produced in an aircraft plant adjacent to my district. It was designed and built by the Navy for the Navy mission. Afterward this plane was found to be the best plane for the Air Force tactical mission as well. I am greatly disturbed that the example of this plane has apparently escaped the notice of the inquiry and the press.

Subsequent to my remarks on the floor on March 4 the press has taken a much more balanced view of the whole matter. One of the articles that has done much to clear up the uncertainties is an article by John G. Norris published in the Washington Post on March 18. After very capably reviewing all facets of the matter, Mr. Norris points out that no one seriously suggests that politics entered into Mr. McNamara's decision. He very knowledgeably sums the situation up as follows:

> In the last analysis, it comes down to a question of judgment. And as McNamara pointed out, he is the man charged by law with making such highly important judgments. Right or wrong, most people feel that it will turn out to have been an honest judgment.

During my membership for some years on the House Armed Services Committee we have been urged repeatedly to pass legislation giving the Secretary of Defense adequate authority over the military. These recommendations cautioned us on the danger of the military-industrial threat to our way of life and have come from people at high levels who have borne high responsibility and from both political parties. In the instance of Mr. McNamara we have the capable man that we have all sought who is attempting to do the job that we in the Congress have outlined by our legislation. The columnist, Mr. William S. White, has adequately addressed himself to this aspect of the matter in the Evening Star of March 18 in which he says:

> Congress clamored for years for a Secretary who would knock heads together at the Pentagon.

If Mr. McNamara is seriously embarrassed by the congressional inquiry, perhaps subsequent weaker Secretaries of Defense will be tempted to view problems in terms of what powerful Member of Congress from what powerful congressional committee is interested in the problem rather than the merits of the matter at hand. Let me quote Mr. White:

> Somebody will be hurt; and this is a pity. But if the principal victim is Mr. McNamara, it will be a very bad thing, indeed.

I commend to you for your earnest consideration both articles as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 18, 1963]

MISJUDGING MCNAMARA SEEN AS BOEING'S ERROR

(By John G. Norris)

Boeing lost the $6.5 billion TFX warplane order, it now seems clear, not as the result of political influence, but because it did not realize who was boss at the Pentagon.

In repeated proposals, the Seattle aircraft company offered the Air Force and Navy higher combat performance than its rival, General Dynamics—made possible only by building what are essentially two separate planes—instead of meeting Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's demand for one all-purpose craft that may save $1 billion.

HOW BOEING LOST OUT

After 22 months, General Dynamics finally came up with what is essentially a single fighter plane design acceptable to both services' military chiefs even though its performance will be less than Boeing offered.

Boeing apparently based its hopes of winning on: (1) a bid that was about $100 million less than its rival's, and (2) a conviction that McNamara finally would yield to the military view that air combat performance was all important.

Instead, he rejected Boeing's bid as unrealistically low, declaring some of its proposed design innovations to attain higher performance were technically risky.

General Dynamics and its affiliate, Grumman Aircraft, received the award to build essentially similar versions of one fighter, on the ground that the one-plane approach and more conventional design promised to deliver a satisfactory plane sooner and cheaper.

M'NAMARA FACES QUIZ

In essence, McNamara's position is that the expected $1 billion savings outweighed the extra performance Boeing offered.

Whether McNamara is right remains to be seen. When he goes before the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee this week for questioning on the detailed brief he submitted to it Wednesday, McNamara must:

Convince the public that Boeing greatly underestimated the cost of developing the complex TFX fighter and that the Government would have had to bail out the company had it been given the order even though its proposal was a fixed-price bid. Pentagon officials say he not only will present detailed data on where Boeing was low but will give official estimates of what the cost actually would have been.

Uphold his contention that Boeing's inexperience in building fighters—whereas General Dynamics and Grumman are veterans in the field—is a valid argument against it. Opponents insist that Boeing's record in making bombers is excellent and that fighter production techniques are not too different.

Explain away the errors discovered in some Pentagon evaluations of the rival bids and some charges of "unusual procedures" employed in the evaluation that have been brought out before the Senate subcommittee. McNamara did not touch on these in his "brief" last week, but aids insist they are of minor importance.

Convince Congress that his estimate of a billion-dollar saving in having one plane instead of two is realizable. The Secretary is relying not only on economics in development costs, but those in production, operation, maintenance, and spare parts inventories once in service.

The importance of this central point of McNamara's case has been challenged. Some contend that the differences between the Air Force and Navy versions of the Boeing proposal—compared to these in the successful bid—were less marked and vital than claimed.

Show that the added performance offered by Boeing was marginal compared to the marked advantages that introduction of the General Dynamics-Grumman plane will bring when the TFX is introduced to Air Force squadrons and Navy aircraft carriers in the late 1960's.

NEW TYPE OF WING

The new plane, to be known as the F-111, employs a radically new variable sweep wing than can be pulled back for high speed—1,700 miles an hour—or pushed forward for "loitering" over combat areas and landing on short, rough fields. This innovation also will give the craft much improved performance at both low and high altitudes and in cross-ocean ferrying range. It is designed for use in both conventional and nuclear warfare.

Congressional testimony so far has brought out that the original specifications set by McNamara in 1961 for the all-purpose plane had to be watered down because bidders could not satisfy the differing Air Force and Navy needs without building what amounted to two airplanes.

McNamara's opponents say that because of this and the final decision favoring General Dynamics instead of Boeing, the Air Force and Navy will get poorer planes than if the aircraft industry had been allowed to push for two top performance aircraft.

DELAYS IN PAST PRACTICE

In the past, the practice generally has been to try to build the best combat plane possible within the state of the art of aeronautical science. This has often led to delays in eliminating bugs and getting them into service on schedule—a point made by McNamara against the Boeing design.

Many believe, however, that if time shows McNamara to have been wrong, it will be because he overruled the military and insisted on his moneysaving all-purpose airplane.

No one now seems to be seriously suggesting that politics entered into his decision. When General Dynamics won the coveted order last fall, some people's eyebrows were raised. The company will develop and build the TFX at its Fort Worth plant in Democratic Texas, while Boeing would have done the work at its Wichita plant in Republican Kansas.

GROUNDLESS INNUENDOS

Washington wiseacres promptly dubbed the TFX—which stands for tactical fighter experimental—the L.B.J.—short for LYNDON B. JOHNSON. But after extensive airing of the controversy these innuendos seem completely groundless.

It is too early to say definitely who is right and who is wrong in the complex controversy. McNamara made a strong case in his statement filed with the Senate subcommittee last week. The evidence before Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN's investigating group so far indicates there may be a strong case against it.

In the last analysis, it comes down to a question of judgment. And as McNamara pointed out, he is the man charged by law with making such highly important judgments. Right or wrong, most people feel that it will turn out to have been an honest judgment.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1963]

MCNAMARA'S BIGGEST TEST—STRONGEST MEMBER OF KENNEDY'S CABINET FACES STRONGEST MEN OF CONGRESS

(By William S. White)

Irresistible force and immovable object are meeting in a great and melancholy contest now drawn taut between the strongest member of the Cabinet, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, and the strongest men of Congress.

Somebody will be hurt; and this is a pity. But if the principal victim is Mr. McNamara, it will be a very bad thing, indeed.

For the real issues lying between the devoted Robert McNamara and the equally devoted men of Congress are infinitely bigger than even the chief present symbol of their dispute, the multibillion-dollar contract now being investigated in the Senate.

Aptly enough, this inquiry is being conducted by one of the best groups in Congress, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. His panel is doggedly examining why Secretary McNamara let a contract for the all-purpose TFX warplane to General Dynamics Corp. rather than to the rival Boeing Co., which had offered what seemed on its face to be a lower bid.

With equal doggedness, Mr. McNamara is defending that decision on the ground that, taking everything into consideration, it was his judgment that General Dynamics could do the job in the least time, at the least risk, with the best result in weaponry and, in the end, also at the least cost.

The rights and wrongs, in sheer terms of immediate dollars and cents, are quite beyond any independent evaluation by this columnist and may forever be. For by their very nature such vast outlays by the Pentagon include such immense and varied factors as to make any outside judgment as difficult to grasp as a wavering moonbeam flitting across the ceiling of a shuttered room at midnight.

Other and more important things, however, can be said with complete confidence. Involved here is a challenge to Secretary McNamara's ultimate civilian control over the Pentagon by uniformed officers with pipelines to Congress who beyond question are far less interested in economy than he is. Their professional interest, and rightly so, is in having all the arms they want of the kind they prefer, period.

His interest must be in procuring the best arms available; but with due regard to economy, to unified general military policy and to many other considerations which do not overly concern the uniformed military fellows.

And involved—though not in the McClellan committee itself as a whole—is a determined movement in Congress to reduce the authority of this civilian head of the Pentagon and to increase that of the generals and admirals.

There is no "conspiracy" between the men in uniform and the men in Congress. But there is undoubtedly some working purpose to cut Secretary McNamara down to size.

At last, the whole question comes to this: Is civilian authority to be supreme, or is it to be abridged in the clearly well-intentioned but profoundly dangerous notion that, in these days of cold war, the generals and admirals really know best?

It is a hard question superficially, but to those who have read the Constitution it has only one answer. The Secretary of Defense must remain the Secretary of Defense. If he falls into fatal error, it will be necessary to get another man. But neither Congress nor the generals-admirals can run the Pentagon—or should.

All the same, there is tragedy here. The men in Congress who are striking at Secretary McNamara are acting from the highest motives. And the man they are striking at has been regarded up to now by these very men of Congress as the best Secretary of Defense in history, tough and nonpolitical.

Congress clamored for years for a Secretary who would knock heads together at the Pentagon. Congress has got him now—and is not so happy with the choice as it was before.

SHOULD THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TOLERATE NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE LAW?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, should the Congress of the United States tolerate noncompliance with the law? The answer is certainly "no" but it should be a more emphatic "no" when it comes to this body or its Members. Certainly if we are to require obedience to the laws which we enact to regulate the diverse affairs of our fellow men, we should zealously endeavor to live within both the spirit and the letter of the law when it directly relates to us and to this august body.

On March 12, 1963, on pages 4017–4019, I outlined a situation which exists regarding the reporting of counterpart funds under title 22, section 1754 of the United States Code. This law clearly requires the reporting and full disclosure of the counterpart funds expended by Congress. Section (b) of this statutory requirement says, in part:

> (b) *Provided,* That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member

> and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

The report which was filed for the Committee on Education and Labor in the March 11, 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 3967–3968, clearly was not in accordance with the requirements of this law. I pointed out these areas of noncompliance in my March 12 address to this body.

It is interesting to see the impasse regarding this noncompliance with our own statutory mandate. As a Member of Congress, I have used every means available to find out the full story on these funds expended by our committee, but everywhere it is a dead end. I am well aware of the fact that the Attorney General does not give opinions to Members of Congress but I nonetheless wrote to him and asked if he had any responsibility to enforce title 22, section 1754. This is the reply I received:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, March 18, 1963.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: This is with reference to your letter to the Attorney General of March 13, 1963, regarding the responsibility placed upon Members of Congress by the reporting requirements of 22 U.S.C. 1754(b).

We very much regret that the Attorney General is unable to furnish you with an opinion on the matter. The law limits him to giving legal advice to the President and the heads of the executive departments. See 5 U.S.C. 303, 304. Beginning with Attorney General Wirt, it has been the traditional position of Attorneys General that legal opinions should not be rendered either to Congress, its committees or its Members. (See e.g., 1 Op. A.G. 335; 2 id. 499; 36 id. 532.)

We are, however, desirous of assisting you as far as possible, and therefore offer the following as an unofficial comment. The statute in question authorizes local currencies owned by the United States to be made available to certain committees of Congress for their local currency expenses, and provides that each member or employee of any such committee shall make an itemized expenditure report to the chairman of the committee. It is further provided that the chairman of a House committee shall forward a consolidated expenditure report to the House Committee on House Administration and the chairman of a Senate committee shall forward such a report to the Senate Appropriations Committee. The section does not contain any penal sanction for failure to comply with its provisions, and we are not aware of any. We assume that noncompliance is a matter for the chairman of the committee involved or for each House of Congress itself in an appropriate case. I invite your attention to the Conference Report on the Mutual Security Act of 1958 (H. Rept. No. 2038, 85th Cong., 2d sess.), the relevant portions of which appear at 1958 U.S. Code Congressional and Administration News 2805–06.

Sincerely,

NORBERT A. SCHLEI,
Assistant Attorney General.

I also wrote to the State Department after a telephone conversation with Mr. John Leahy of that Department. Mr. Leahy was most courteous but felt it was not within his authority to release to me the figures on counterpart moneys expended by the Committee on Education and Labor. The letter I directed to Secretary Rusk elicited the following reply:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 18, 1963.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASHBROOK: I am replying to your letter of March 11 requesting statistics on counterpart funds expended by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Present procedures for the disbursement and accounting of local currencies owned by the United States were established in 1953 after consultation with Congress and provide for annual reports to be made in detail to the chairman of the congressional committee authorizing the use of those funds. This is done on the basis of the relevant act of Congress (sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959) which states that local currencies "shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties * * *."

A detailed report is annually provided by the Department to each committee covering all funds drawn by its members and staff pursuant to letter of authorization from the committee chairman. Since the sole authority for the use of the local currency resides with the legislative branch and the funds are for the use of its members and staff in carrying out their duties, it has been concluded by both the executive and legislative branches for a number of years that information concerning congressional use of the money should be obtained from Congress rather than the State Department. I respectfully urge that the proper place to which your inquiry concerning the Education and Labor Committee should be directed is appropriate officials in Congress and submit that this is strictly pursuant to the long evident intent of Congress on these matters.

For an agency of the executive branch to undertake unilaterally to change established procedures primarily concerning the Congress would obviously not be proper. Also, as a matter of basic policy, the separation of the executive and legislative branches of Government militates that Members of Congress be accountable through their respective Houses concerning these funds. For it to be otherwise would, in effect, have the Department police Members of Congress.

The Department submitted on February 28 to the Committee on Education and Labor a full report on the disbursement of local currencies for its members and staff pursuant to letters of authorization from the committee chairman. This was done on the same basis as in past years. The report included the amount of local currency obtained by its members, the date the money was furnished, the country where it was provided, the equivalent U.S. dollar value, and whether for transportation, as an advance, or other purpose specified by the Members of Congress.

I regret that I cannot provide the specific information which you request.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

You will note that the Department "submitted on February 28 to the Committee on Education and Labor a full report on the disbursement of local currencies for its members and staff pursuant to letters of authorization from the committee chairman." I have therefore directed the following letter to the chairman of our committee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN POWELL: As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I am interested, as I am certain you are, in making sure that our committee complies with the law. It is apparent to me on the face of the report which you filed with the Committee on House Administration concerning the expenditure of so-called counterpart funds that this report is not in compliance with title 22, section 1754, United States Code.

Possibly this is a clerical error on the part of one of our committee staff members. At any rate, the error should be rectified. The State Department informs me that on February 28, 1963, they furnished you with a full report on the counterpart funds expended by our committee. Unless you consider this report as a matter which is private to you and not available to the members of the committee, I would like to receive a copy of it.

At any rate, I hope every effort will be made to correct this report so we will comply with the law.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Representative to Congress.

This is a most interesting situation, as I have stated before. The Committee on House Administration says that it is not their responsibility to check into the expenditure of these funds. I am sure that they are right. On the other hand, the only department which knows the full story, the State Department, will not tell and the Attorney General's Office is not interested. Now, if our chairman will not tell me, how will we ever know the true picture of these moneys expended? Possibly some Members feel that the expenditure of these funds should be treated like a private little game preserve for chairmen of the various committees, but I am sure that the taxpaying public does not agree with this contention.

In checking the history of this provision, we once again see what happens in a Senate-House conference where the House recedes from its position. The mutual security bill of the House of Representatives, H.R. 12181, 85th Congress, had provided for a substantial modification and reorganization of the accounting procedures of the House of Representatives which would have brought about a more thorough disclosure of the counterpart funds used by Members of Congress. In the language of Senate Report No. 1627, which accompanied the conference report, the conferees stated that:

> The House conferees * * * accepted the simpler language of the Senate amendment, since it appeared to attain their desired objectives.

It is now evident that this provision has not accomplished the desired objective.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION"—CHAPTERS I AND II, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD chapters I and II of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation" by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution.

CHAPTER I

At all times and ages, some people felt the urge to turn back the wheel of time. Mostly, this urge degenerates into innocent "reactionary" talk; but sometimes the talk affects policy and delays reform. Since 1945, when the first atomic bombs were exploded, the urge to go back to the "good old days" of World War I and World War II (which cost upward of 100 million casualties, worldwide) has become overpowering in many, and has resulted in a foreign policy out of Pandora's Box. But these nuclear age reactionaries are posing a threat far worse than mere slowdown of technical progress; they are playing into the hands of the Communist revolutionaries, and thus endanger both peace and survival.

In the late 1940's some nuclear physicists, hoping that the invention of atomic weapons could be undone or neutralized, proposed a ban on testing. It was assumed that, given adequate detection equipment, any nuclear explosion anywhere on the globe could be detected without difficulty. Consequently, cheating would be impossible and a test ban would be self-enforcing. As a result, the development of nuclear weapons would be delayed or stopped, and the specter of nuclear holocaust eliminated.

Geneva, 1958: Science turns political

In 1958, American, British, and Soviet scientists met in Geneva to determine the nature, performance characteristics, and size of an international detection system which would be needed to control compliance with a test ban. The theory was that the inspection system should be constructed according to the findings of objective scientists, i.e. a reliable detection system was to be the prerequisite for a political test ban agreement, the system was to possess as much reliability as the scientists were able to build into it, and the political compact was to insure the construction and operation of the detection system, substantially as the scientists recommended it.

The findings of the first Geneva scientific conference reflected many concessions by American scientists to Russian scientists. Russian negotiators were setting forth arguments inspired by political decisions, and some of them were not very familiar with the problems under discussion. American negotiators were interpreting scientific facts as loosely as possible in order to ensure that the negotiations not be broken off prematurely. It turned out later that much of the information on which the initial Geneva recommendations had been based, was invalid. The conferees had taken the "easy way out" by disregarding such outstanding questions as the technology of cheating, or even the feasibility of underground and space testing. Subsequent scientific conferences had to be called to cover some of the gaps, but to this day such crucial questions as techniques of evasion still remain to be discussed, and great uncertainty about the requisite number and performance capabilities of control stations persists. For example, the number of control stations recommended at Geneva implicitly assumed that the test violator would cheat on or under terra firma but not at sea.

Careful study of the various Geneva documents shows that even in theory it is quite impossible to build a dependable detection system. In the political reality, only more or less phony detection systems are practical. Nevertheless, the test ban negotiations were continued and the unduly optimistic Geneva recommendations were watered down step by step. During the past few years test ban negotiations have centered around inspection and control systems which would provide only uncertain protection. Great trust is placed in unmanned so-called "black boxes" which a dictatorial state should not find too difficult to tamper with. But even the number of these black boxes has been reduced to below the bare minimum—obviously it is easiest to tamper with the smallest black box system.

Thus, the terms "detection," "identification," "inspection," and "control" have become mere symbols, and no longer refer to substantive hardware systems. The strategy of the test ban proponents has been to bring about a treaty in which lip service is paid to the need for inspection, for example, but in which provisions are made only for a pro forma inspection system. Shadowboxing of this sort is necessary to obtain the required public support.

Naive and biased test ban advisers

Many American policymakers have been sympathetic to test ban proposals for reasons not directly connected with American military security. Some have held that by pushing the test ban negotiation, the "image" of the United States would gain, notably in the underdeveloped areas. These proponents are forgetting entirely that a country which fritters away its basic strength and which is susceptible to being fooled by its opponent, is bound to lose prestige. Others hoped that the emplacement of a worldwide inspection system would open up presently closed societies—entirely forgetting that no dictatorial regime would acquiesce in a test ban if it involves the demise of the dictatorship, and overlooking the fact that a few inspectors digging a few holes in isolated mountain wastelands hardly can have political impact.

Unfortunately, many American decisions on test ban negotiations resulted in part from misinformation which was fed to decisionmakers and from a personnel policy through which test ban advocates were placed at focal positions throughout the Government, while their critics were silenced or removed.

Many of the U.S. scientists who presently are advocating for a test ban agreement, in 1949 were arguing against ICBM's and hydrogen bombs. Some of these people were then arguing that the United States did not need fusion devices and that if it did develop hydrogen weapons, the Soviets would be put in a position to copy the technology—yet at the time these arguments were set forth, the Soviets already were busy working on fusion weapons of their own design. If the advice of these experts had been followed, the Soviets would have gained a monopoly in ICBM systems with highly effective warheads and might have been in a position, sometime during the 1950's, to defeat the United States with little risk to their own survival.

Most of the American nuclear scientists who presently favor the test ban as a device to stop the arms race, to avoid nuclear holocaust, and to obtain mutual accommodation between the United States and the Soviet Union have not taken the trouble to study communism, its objectives and action patterns. They have not familiarized themselves with Soviet strategy. They have no understanding of how the test ban, or rather the Communist protest ban propaganda, fits into the strategy of the Kremlin. Some assume naively that the Soviets are interested in the test ban as a step to securing world peace as we understand this term in the United States. These people would be highly surprised to learn that in Communist "Aesopian" semantics, the expression "lasting peace" is synonymous with "fully established worldwide Communist dictatorship after the elimination of all actual and potential forces of opposition and resistance."

It should be pointed out that some of the scientists favoring a test ban very often have been wrong in their scientific estimates. In particular, many have a record of denying feasibility of certain technical developments which later proved entirely feasible. The history of the H-bomb, among others, gives ample illustrations of this point. In other words, scientific interpretations have been bent to conform to political desires.

Soviet test ban strategy: Weapons superiority

The test ban was advertised as a "first step" to a broader agreement with the Soviets. It was argued that since both the Soviets and ourselves are interested in avoiding nuclear destruction, the test ban would satisfy an identical mutual interest, consequently, it would be feasible despite the cold war. Unfortunately, the assumption of a common mutual interest in strategy is fallacious. True, the Soviets don't want to be blown up, just as we don't want to succumb in a nuclear exchange. But the Soviets do not have the slightest interest in the survival of the United States or even the American people. They are interested in their own survival and victory, and in our destruction. Similarly, they are not interested in slowing down the technological race. Their interest is to slow down the technological progress of American weapon systems.

A relative slowdown of American nuclear progress was precisely what the Soviets achieved through the first unpoliced weapons moratorium. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on March 3, 1962, stated that the Soviet test series of 1961—by which the Soviets broke the de facto moratorium which had existed since October 31, 1958—made it "mandatory for the United States to examine our present and projected capabilities very closely" emphasizing that weapons systems development "is a dynamic technology similar to many industrial technologies," Mr. McNamara reassured Americans that as of March 1962, "The weapons in the arsenal of the free world are adequate to meet the strategic objectives of the present." However, he added the warning that "every effort must be made to insure" that these weapons "do not in fact become obsolete in their relationship to capabilities of a potential enemy."

In discussing the Soviet test series of 1961, Mr. McNamara characterized it as an "extensive weapons development effort." The implications of continuing the moratorium on atmospheric testing by the United States would be very grave indeed: "It would only be a matter of time before the present powerful U.S. nuclear strategic advantages would begin to diminish in relation to Soviet force capabilities and might ultimately shift in favor of the U.S.S.R." The United States, therefore, was forced "to recognize the extreme importance of the so-called 'technological momentum' as applied to this aspect of national defense." In other words, nuclear technology is progressing very fast, and American security policies must be based on a sober recognition of this central fact.

President Kennedy, in his address of March 2, 1962, indicated that the Soviet tests of 1961 "reflected a highly sophisticated technology, the trial of novel designs and techniques, and some substantial gains in weaponry." The President emphasized that the Soviet test series had as a "primary purpose * * * the development of warheads which weigh very little compared to the destructive efficiency of their thermonuclear yield," thus implying that the Soviets succeeded in increasing nuclear efficiency in terms of the yield-to-weight ratio. The increase of nuclear efficiency is one of the most significant factors governing weapons design. Not surprisingly, therefore, the President disclosed "in all candor that further Soviet series, in the absence of further Western progress, could well provide the Soviet Union with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggressive designs. Were we to stand still while the Soviets surpassed us, or even appear to surpass us, the free world's ability to deter, to survive and to respond to an all-out attack would be seriously weakened."

The President added that the United States "cannot make similar strides without testing in the atmosphere as well as underground" and that "in many areas of nuclear weapons research we have reached the point where our progress is stifled without experiments in every environment."

The President added another discouraging observation: as of March 1962, the Soviets had tested 30 high yield devices, while the United States had tested only 20 devices in the megaton range. It should be added that the United States never tested devices of a yield as high as those tested by the Soviets. Furthermore, as a result of the 1962 Soviet test series, during which they exploded at least 11 megaton shots, including two of about 30 megatons, the relative Soviet advantages over the United States in the high yield area should have increased further—unless we assume that we are smarter than our opponents and obtain better results through half the number of tests.

The 1961 tests provided the Soviets, as President Kennedy pointed out, "with a mass of data and experience on which, over the next 2 or 3 years, they can base significant analyses, experiments, and extrapolations, preparing for the next test series which would confirm and advance their findings." Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on March 2, 1962, reiterated this same point: "Should the Soviets build upon their last series of tests with another series, the free world could be in great danger."

It so happens that the Soviets, during 1962, indeed conducted an additional, very extensive series of tests. According to U.S. announcements there were at least 34 shots. As soon as they concluded this second test series, they promptly made a "concession" to restart the test ban negotiations in earnest.

Political pressures devalue U.S. tests

It is true that the United States also tested during 1962, but as appears from Secretary McNamara's statement of March 3, 1962, as well as from many other statements and indications, the American tests were put under stringent operational limitations. There is a great difference in a test series designed to gain a maximum of scientific data and another in which many of the research requirements are subordinated to political apprehensions leading to inflexibility in scheduling events to sharp curtailments of yield.

One of the objectives of American testing was stated succinctly by Secretary McNamara: "Since the actual high altitude physical environment cannot be duplicated below ground, it was recognized that on the basis of technical developments in nuclear weaponry, the United States under the present conditions has no alternative but to proceed with an atmospheric test program." In this connection President Kennedy referred to Soviet high altitude nuclear explosions—"in one case over 100 miles high"—explaining that our opponents were seeking information on the effects of nuclear blasts on radar and communications and that this sort of testing constituted an important step in the development of an antimissile defense system. On the basis of these disclosures, it should have been expected that the U.S. high altitude tests would be pressed with vigor. But as soon as our high altitude tests ran into a number of technical difficulties and propaganda headwinds, the effort apparently was greatly scaled down.

With one known exception, the Soviet test shots were all atmospheric, whereas the majority of ours were underground In my judgment, much of the criticism of underground testing is ill-considered but it is true that certain tests must be conducted in other media. Hence an underground testing program, if it is to produce satisfactory results, must be larger in scope than an equivalent atmospheric program.

The plan was, as Mr. Kennedy announced last March, that "we will be conducting far fewer tests than the Soviets." Actually we attempted during 1962 about 103 shots—41 atmospheric, 2 underwater, 55 underground, 2 joint United States-United Kingdom underground, and 3 at high altitude, of which 2 were failures—but apparently less than a handful were genuinely high-yield tests. If the two Soviet test series of 1961 and 1962 are compared with our tests since the rupture of the moratorium, it appears that the Soviets detonated about 90 devices, including 25 of high yield, while the United States shot about 115 devices, with an absolute minimum of explosions in the megaton range.

Naturally, the number of Soviet tests as announced by USAEC must be considered to be a minimum figure: AEC may have missed a few shots, and it may not have announced all it knew; in particular, their figures do not include more than one Soviet underground shot. In the absence of a detailed analysis, one might infer (perhaps quite wrongly) that in general, progress in both countries probably was about even. However, with a high degree of confidence one could conclude that the Soviets now enjoy a lead in the capability of designing high-yield weapons.

To control the amount of radioactivity released during test series by testing underground, is neither unwise nor undesirable. The simple fact, however, is that the significance of tests with no holds barred is considerably higher than of those tests where one of the main intentions is just to go through the motions, and to advance physics rather than weaponry. I do not know whether the Soviets or we progressed farther during 1962, but to judge from the manner in which the two test series were conducted, the Soviets should have achieved substantially greater improvements in their relative strategic position.

Who now has nuclear superiority?

The possibility that there might now be in process a reversal in the strategic balance of power was spelled out with great clarity by Adm. Chester C. Ward on February 8, 1963, in his statement to the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing. He asserted that the Soviet weight-to-yield ratio which before 1961 had been about twice ours, by 1963 had leap-frogged over our capability. Irrespective of what the exact figures are, our previous lead, it is generally agreed, has diminished and may be disappearing. The Soviet weight-to-yield improvement apparently was particularly impressive in the large and superyield categories. Admiral Ward deduces from this fact that the Soviet stockpile of 1961 which was estimated at 20,000 megatons, in theory, could be reworked without addition of any new nuclear materials, into a stockpile of far larger dimensions. It is well to observe that a stockpile, to be militarily effective, must be deliverable. But it is also important to realize that the Soviets, through their test ban strategy, are attempting a reversal in the global nuclear power contest. They are aiming at superior nuclear efficiency, and through a technological quantum jump, at a vast enlargement of their weapons stockpile, as expressed in terms of megatons.

It is most discouraging, to say the least, that prior to ordering the temporary cessation of underground tests on January 26, 1963, neither the President, nor the Secretary of Defense, nor the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, felt a need to report to the Nation about the nuclear events of the past year. They did not disclose any information, let alone exact data, as to whether, as a result of the recent American tests, our lead which had become narrower by the end of 1961, again had been increased in American favor. If our advances had been spectacular, perhaps a temporary and very short suspension of our tests would have little meaning, even though the President stated in March 1962: "The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban * * * as long as * * * a new uninspected moratorium or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret."

The United States, on January 20, 1963, had again discontinued testing at a moment when the Soviets had done all the testing they planned to do and needed the time to digest the information. That this decision was based upon another misreading of Soviet intentions appeared speedily and on February 1, 1963, resumption of testing was ordered. But complicated programs cannot be turned off and on like water without falling to pieces. Nuclear security is not an area for playing a diplomatic cat-and-mouse game.

CHAPTER II

The test ban: a Soviet strategy for unilaterally disarming the West

There is a widespread assumption throughout the United States, and particularly among scientists, that the Soviet Union presently pursues a policy of "peaceful coexistence" and that this term means to the Soviets an attitude of live-and-let-live with the United States. Even if this is the correct interpretation, it does not follow that a test ban is desirable. The present policies of the Kremlin cannot be considered to be permanent. Technology continues to advance and requires constant endeavor.

"Peaceful coexistence"

But this wishful interpretation of peaceful coexistence is quite inaccurate. In his speech of January 6, 1961, for example, Khrushchev stated that peaceful coexistence, among other things "helps * * * the forces struggling for socialism, and in capitalist countries it facilitates the activities of Communist parties * * * it helps the national liberation movement to gain successes." Peaceful coexistence, according to the very architect of that strategy, "implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas." It is "a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena." "Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle * * * the coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism."

Khrushchev summed up the essence of his current strategy as follows: "The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace."

The Communist magazine National Affairs Monthly (February 1955) made the point very explicit by saying: "peaceful coexistence does not take away from the right of the peoples to change their governments * * * but presupposes this right. The idea that peaceful coexistence must include the maintenance of the status quo is imperialist propaganda."

"Sincere" disarmament

Another widespread illusion is that the Soviets want disarmament "sincerely." The Communists are indeed very sincere about desiring U.S. disarmament but they don't have the slightest intention of disarming themselves. It is patently unfair to accuse the Communists of insincerity in these matters because they did state what they want very clearly. Insincerity, by contrast, must be ascribed to those Americans who deliberately ignore the Communist message.

The Communist doctrine on war and disarmament has been entirely consistent since the times of Marx and Engels. For the Soviet Union the doctrine was laid down explicitly by Lenin. For example, in 1916, Lenin stated: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap." In 1917, he said: "We are no pacifists * * * we have always declared that it would be stupid if the revolutionary proletariat promised not to wage revolutionary wars which might become indispensable in the interest of socialism."

In 1928, the resolutions of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International disclosed: "The aim of the Soviet proposals (for general and complete disarmament submitted in November 1927) is * * * to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulates that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism."

In the same vein, Khrushchev, during the 20th party congress in 1956, made this interesting "dialectic" statement: "Putting into effect a policy of peace our party considers it to be its most important duty to strengthen untiringly the gallant and glory-covered armed forces of the Soviet state—our army, navy, and air force; equip them with the latest technology * * *."

On October 20, 1960, Khrushchev spoke about the need to "force" the capitalist countries to come to an agreement on disarmament. Similarly, at a meeting of representatives of 81 Communist parties, in December 1960, the directive was laid down that "an active determined struggle" had to be waged to "force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament."

In his speech of January 6, 1961, Khrushchev quoted Lenin to the effect that it was necessary to establish "contacts with those circles of the bourgeoisie who gravitate toward pacifism." A Russo-German military dictionary published in 1962 by the Military Academy of Communist East Germany defined liberal pacifism as "impotent peace sentimentality" which serves to bemuse the masses. It adds: "The Communists have never been pacifists" but "fight against unjust wars and support, with all means, just wars." The current world peace movement, the dictionary avers, is different from "pacifism" in that it conducts an "active offensive struggle against the danger of war. The best elements among the pacifists support the world peace movement. Imperialist agents are attempting to carry pacifism into the Socialist countries * * * to weaken their defensive power. Therefore pacifism is fought energetically in the Socialist countries."

On January 6, 1961, Khrushchev made points which should be remembered by every American: "The struggle for disarmament * * * is an effective struggle against imperialism." This struggle is also "an active struggle against imperialism" but above all, it is an active struggle "for restricting its military potentialities."

In the very next sentence, after he explained that the purpose of the Communist disarmament policy is to weaken the military power of the United States (this is a translation into English of Khrushchev's "Aesopian" version that disarmament is an active struggle to restrict the military potentialities of imperialism), he insisted that "peoples must do everything to achieve the prohibition and destruction of atomic weapons." The achievement of both a nuclear test ban and the cessation of production of nuclear materials have been assigned as a high priority objective to the Communist world movement since 1956. Can a Communist objective really be in U.S. interest? Did they err in assuming the test ban agitation serves their purposes? Or are we wrong in thinking it helps our cause?

Perhaps the clearest statement was made by Khrushchev to the World Congress on General Disarmament and Peace on July 10, 1962: "The struggle for general disarmament facilitates the struggle for national independence. For their part the successes of the national liberation movements strengthen the cause of peace, contribute to strengthening the struggle for disarmament. Disarmament means disarmament of the forces of war, the liquidation of militarism." The meaning of the last sentence is again that the U.S. should be disarmed but not the U.S.S.R.

"Just" war

In his recent book on military strategy, marshal of the Soviet Union, V. D. Sokolovsky specifically argued that the invention of nuclear weapons in no way changed the character of war. He opposed the contention that nuclear war was unthinkable and that war no longer could be considered as the continuation of politics by forceful means. According to the Sokolovsky book, war remains an instrument of politics, a concept which, incidentally, coincides closely with Mao Tse-tung's dictum: "Whether shields and spears are used as in ancient times, or modern weapons, the objective of warfare remains the same."

In brief, as V. Cherpakov, a representative of the Soviet Ministry of National Defense expressed it in 1954, "Communists link the cause of peace with the cause of victory of the proletarian revolution." Lenin originally defined the purpose of Soviet disarmament policy as being to disarm the bourgeoisie and arm the proletariat. Khrushchev, in January 1961, phrased it slightly differently: "The slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism."

These statements must be read with the understanding that the Soviets firmly adhere to the doctrine of "just war," i.e., of wars fought to overthrow "oppressing classes," are legitimate and may have to be fought. The above quoted dictionary states that a "distinction of the character of war according to its conduct (offensive or defensive war) is false." It also avers that "just wars" occur particularly frequently in our modern era and clarifies the key point: if it were to come to a war between "imperialism" and the "socialist camp," this war would end "inevitably with the victory of socialism and the complete liquidation of imperialism. It would be the last war in history, on the part of socialism the most just, and on the part of imperialism the most unjust of all wars."

In October 1962, the World Marxist Review, the theoretical organ of world communism, wrote that "general disarmament does not mean disarming the peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence * * * disarmed, the imperialists would be powerless to prevent the people from attaining freedom. Disarmament primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly developed countries," i.e., the United States.

It should be emphasized that these quotes are just a sample and could be multiplied virtually ad infinitum. The wishful notion that the Soviets have abandoned all intentions to go to war against the United States just cannot be supported by any dependable evidence.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION"—CHAPTERS III AND IV, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD, chapters III and IV of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation" by Stefan T. Possony, of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER III

The test ban: A Soviet strategy for military superiority

At this stage of the game, the Soviet Union is not yet in a position to carry through its plans for world conquest or, to put it differently, to complete the world revolution. The ultimate victory of communism necessitates the elimination of the United States as a military power, preferably through surrender but through nuclear war if otherwise unattainable.

Surrender cannot possibly be achieved unless and until the Soviet Union acquires a vast qualitative and quantitative preponderance in nuclear firepower, means of delivery and defensive weapons. Nuclear war cannot possibly be waged, let alone won, by the Soviet Union against the United States unless the Soviet forces are militarily vastly superior and in particular capable of inflicting heavy initial destruction on, or even crippling U.S. retaliatory forces by means of a nuclear surprise attack, as well as fending off and absorbing any strikes by residual American capabilities.

To achieve a posture where, by one means or the other, the Soviets can impose their will on the United States and the rest of the world, they must yet accomplish considerable advances in nuclear weapons systems. Marshal Sokolovsky's book is permeated by the twin ideas that modern conflict is nuclear in character and that it is necessary for the Soviets to win the technological race. He emphasized that the "appearance of qualitatively new types of weapons and war materiel and their rapid introduction into the armed forces" is a distinguishing feature of modern war and concluded that "the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries must be prepared, above all, to wage war under the conditions of massive use of atomic weapons by both belligerent parties."

In connection with U.S. reluctance to share nuclear weapons with our allies and our inclination rather to risk the destruction of NATO than the "proliferation" of nuclear weapons, note Sokolovsky's reference to the "other Socialist countries." This passage seems to indicate that the Soviets may be willing to "share" their nuclear weapons with at least some of their satellites. The Russo-German military dictionary also dealt with this problem and stated, somewhat ambiguously, that the U.S.S.R. is compelled "to produce the most modern nuclear arms and to equip with those weapons the Socialist armed forces for the defense of the Socialist camp."

According to Sokolovsky, nuclear weapons which achieve "incomparably better results than ordinary means of destruction * * * can be used for the solution of problems on every scale: strategic, operational, and tactical." His conclusion is: "The correct and profoundly scientific solution of all the theoretical and practical questions related to the preparation and waging of just such a war (nuclear war) must be regarded as the main task of the theory of military strategy and strategic leadership."

There are, of course, numerous statements indicating that Soviet scientists are fully alive to the potentialities of rapidly advancing nuclear technology, including statements showing their awareness of revolutionary new approaches like neutron bombs and even particle annihilation. Soviet awareness of the feasibility and utility of neutron bombs dates back to 1952. V. S. Yemilyanov, member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, a strong influence within the Soviet nuclear program, and director of Glavatom, the Soviet AEC, between 1960 and 1962, suggested in Izvestiya on August 31, 1961, that if it were feasible to bring about particle annihilation, for example by "uniting the proton and the antiproton" and thus transforming the particle mass completely into radiation, the highest release of energy would be accomplished, "approximately a thousand times greater than through thermonuclear fusion." There is no point in viewing this particular theoretical statement with alarm. The quote is given merely to illustrate the direction of Soviet thinking, not to suggest that the Soviets are presently embarked upon a program of particle annihilation. By contrast, there is every reason to assume that they are busy developing the neutron bomb.

The Soviets are indeed sincere in pushing the test ban—as a stratagem to slow down American technological progress, nuclear and nonnuclear, in order to facilitate the winning of the technological race by the Soviets. It is inevitable that a decline in the rate of nuclear progress will affect the design of all delivery and defense systems.

It is true that as compared with the first round of the test moratorium, a simple verbal commitment no longer seems acceptable to the United States. This point was stressed by the President last spring. Consequently, to slow down American nuclear programs again, Khrushchev may be prepared to make a slight concession in the hope of achieving a second moratorium round. The Soviets intimated that they would allow three—or perhaps only two?—inspections and the installation of detection equipment at three points selected by the Soviets themselves. In 1958, Soviet and Western scientists envisaged a quota of 27 inspections and 21 monitoring stations. It is a foregone conclusion that an inspection system acceptable to the Soviets will be in no position to inspect anything of importance, let alone verify that no clandestine testing is taking place.

A careful reading of Khrushchev's communications to President Kennedy leaves some doubt as to what the Soviet Union is ready to "give." In his letter of January 7, 1963, he stated: "We believe and we continue to believe now that, in general, inspection is not necessary and if we give our consent to an annual quota or two or three inspections this is done solely for the purpose of removing the remaining differences for the sake of reaching agreement." However, in his letter of December 19, 1962, Khrushchev referred to "Ambassador Dean's statement, the United States would also be prepared to work out measures which would rule out any possibility of carrying on espionage under the cover of these inspection trips including such measures as the use of Soviet planes piloted by Soviet crews for transportation of inspectors to the sites, screening of windows in the planes, prohibition to carry photocameras, etc."

And again in his second letter, Khrushchev wrote: "Of course, in carrying out onsite inspection there can be circumstances when in the area designated for inspection there will be some object of defense importance. Naturally, in such a case it will be necessary to take appropriate measures which would exclude a possibility to cause damage to the interests of security of the state on the territory of which inspection is carried out."

Assuming that the verification of a cheat explosion would damage the "interests of security" of the U.S.S.R., it would appear that the inspectors will not be allowed entry to the places were evasions have occurred and can be confirmed.

Whether or not the Soviets will, for a long period of time, cheat, for example underground, or at a time of their choosing resume atmospheric tests openly, is conjectural. The point which in terms of international law is of overriding significance is this: The Soviet Constitution specifically authorizes the Government of the Soviet Union to abrogate any international agreement or treaty at any time unilaterally (art. 49-0).

CHAPTER IV

The test ban: an American strategy for military inferiority

In times past, some American scientists have argued that, in the advance of nuclear weapons, a sort of a plateau was reached. In terms of nuclear efficiency, not too many additional improvements could be expected; moreover all, or practically all, bright design ideas which would be useful for weapons uses, already had been proposed. The possibility of further discovery and progress was not denied but the significance of such progress for U.S. security was questioned. Sometimes it was intimated that U.S. security would be served better if further progress were inhibited. Such ideas were propagated many years ago and set forth with considerable conviction during 1958. Undoubtedly, these same notions are repeated today, despite the fact that events disproved these expectations.

Even a cursory reading of technological history will show that basic inventions (like electricity or electronics) do not run their course within a 20-year timespan; the development curve of nuclear physics hardly will have a unique shape of its own, nor be the shortest of all major inventions.

If a scientist does not foresee possibilities of future developments, his contentions are in the nature of statements on his own limitations but cannot be considered as predictions of things to come.

Other scientists argued that the yield of nuclear weapons in the American arsenal has reached an upper limit of practical usefulness. This type of argument depends on many assumptions, few of which ever are made explicit. Surely, as the putative opponent hardens his installations to secure them against nuclear attack, yields must be increased to keep pace with such hardening. Yield requirements also depend, among other factors, on accuracy and on the strategy adopted. For example, a strategy designed to knock out cities can do with relatively low yields but a counterforce strategy, as announced by Mr. McNamara, needs rather hefty yields.

It is, of course, true that yields and numbers may be "traded off" against each other; and it may even be preferable to launch against a target 10 missiles with 10-megaton warheads each, instead of 1 missile with a 100-megaton warhead. But according to this arithmetic 10-megaton warheads and 10 missiles would be required. Naturally, we have no program to augment the number of our missiles to the enormous quantities needed to maintain an effective firepower balance, and even if this were the plan, we could not afford the cost. In addition, we are mostly buying missiles with warheads in the low megaton range. Perhaps one 100-megaton missile does not equal fifty 2-megaton missiles, but what is the ratio according to the administration? On a straight firepower basis, 2,000 Minutemen and Polaris with yields augmented through testing would be the equivalent of eighty 50-megaton Soviet missiles. In such a confrontation, we would be far more seriously deterred by fallout dangers than our opponent.

It is true that the overall cost of the superyield missile would be much higher, perhaps twice or three times as high as the cost of smaller missiles. Hardening, in particular, would call for very heavy expenditures. The Soviets, however, could dispense with hardening their large missiles, because presumably they would use them for a first strike, while we are obligated to keeping our missiles for retaliatory operations. The superyield missile also possesses the advantage of a very high single shot kill probability.

Against these reasons favoring increases in yield, the argument is customarily being made that increased accuracy would achieve the same result as the augmentation of yield. In other words, a bull's-eye with a 1-megaton missile may be more effective than a miss by 1 mile with a 100-megaton missile. Actually, for a 1-megaton missile to achieve the same kill effectiveness as a 100-megaton missile, its accuracy must be almost five times greater. For all practical purposes, this would mean that an intercontinental missile requires a CEP of around 1,000 feet. Accuracies of this order of magnitude are extremely hard to attain and they may require gear which would reduce the payload of the missile, in addition to greatly increasing its cost. It is generally admitted that improvements in accuracy above a CEP of 3,000-4,000 feet follow an asymptotic curve.

Thus, it is technologically far easier and economically far cheaper to improve the effectiveness of missiles by increasing yields, rather than by trying "shoot for the moon" in accuracy. If, in addition, accuracy should improve according to a normal growth curve, the effectiveness of a superyield weapon would be enhanced as a bonus.

It should be added that a superyield weapon, in a sense, anticipates the first generation of anti-missile missiles: the superyield weapon can be exploded at a very high altitude and still cause a great deal of damage. The small yield missile must be detonated at a far lower height over the target. If antimissiles force the height of burst upwards—the incoming missile would be set to explode before it is intercepted—the effect of the explosion would be negligible.

In any event, the Soviet Union clearly has embarked on a course of maximizing the yields of its warheads and bombs. Whether or not this is desirable, it is incumbent upon the United States to acquire the technological know-how and the equipments which would allow our forces to use yields at least as effective as the opponent. The "escalation" to our detriment from a lower to a higher level of nuclear violence, can be prevented only if U.S. yield and overall firepower capabilities exceed those of the U.S.S.R. The implied message of Khrushchev's speech of January 16, 1963 is this: a thermonuclear showdown with the United States is infeasible so long as ways have not been found to reduce substantially the amount of deliverable firepower held by the United States. Is it our intent to help Khrushchev solve the most crucial task confronting his strategy of world revolution?

Many scientists have argued the desirability of slowing down technological progress. There is indeed no doubt that if technology could be decelerated, weapon systems would obsolesce much more slowly and military expenditures could be reduced.

Unfortunately, technology is in the nature of an impersonal force. Hence it can be influenced only in a very limited fashion. Certainly, it is feasible deliberately to slow down one's own technology, for example by starving R. & D. budgets and stopping experimental physics in the form of a unilateral test ban. But such a unilateral decision does not necessarily influence the rate of technological progress in the Soviet Union. In fact, the European states, formerly the leaders in weapons technology, have slowed down almost to a standstill, but their security was not helped by this forbearance. They would have bet their independence if the United States had stepped out of the technological contest, too.

If we decelerate American technology now, the main result will be that the Soviet Union will achieve technological superiority which it can and will use to destroy the United States. Let us not forget that the Soviets operate in line with a command issued by Khrushchev as recently as January 16, 1963 at Berlin: "The duty of Communists at the helm of state power is to do everything possible to insure that our strength will grow."

It would be definitely to American advantage if, for example, Soviet advances in nuclear efficiency could be stopped. But if we were to enter into a test ban now—and assuming the test ban would work as expected by its proponents—we would be stabilizing a military situation which is most unfavorable for our strategy of not striking the first blow. The present technological situation favors aggression and renders defensive warfare almost unmanageable. Actually, if a test ban were consummated, we would only be making this situation worse by allowing the Soviets, through clandestine testing, to acquire strategic missiles and bombs with a higher effectiveness than our own. Whether Soviet knowledge of the effect of high altitude explosions facilitates their planning for a surprise attack or not, our lack of warheads most suitable for anti-ICBM weapons and the relative inefficiency, and cost, of our current tactical nuclear weapons would facilitate Soviet attack against the United States and Europe.

To put it differently: nuclear technology presently has produced the most potent offensive weapon systems of history. This brutal fact certainly does not stabilize the international situation. If, against the trends of the past two decades, we want to stabilize international life, we must be able to reduce the relative advantages of aggression. Hence it would not be to our benefit to decelerate or stop nuclear technological progress before some balance between the offense and the defense has been reestablished. By interfering with U.S. technological progress now, we facilitate a Soviet strategy of agression and expose ourselves to the danger of military defeat. Let us not forget that in his Berlin speech of January 16, 1963, Khrushchev reiterated one of the oldest points in Communist conflict doctrine, viz that "especially in countries which have suffered defeat, a favorable situation arises for the victory of the working class."

As we analyze official U.S. statements on recent Soviet test series, it appears that these were designed to improve existing nuclear technology. Their progress in the yield-to-weight ratio has given the Soviets two additional options and thereby that increased flexibility to which we pay lipservice: they can increase the yield of their individual weapons, both missile warheads and bombs, and they are able to utilize their improved nuclear efficiency, if they so desire, to reduce the size of their missiles, while preserving very significant yields. Since in addition, the Soviets have been using their recent tests to improve their antimissile capabilities, it is apparent that they are making considerable strides in augmenting the threat they are holding out against the United States. The United States, in turn, is in dire need of increasing the explosive strength of practically all its missiles, and it too has requirements for antimissile defense.

All this, however, has been, and still is in the nature of evolutionary improvements in existing technologies. To forgo technical progress which still can be achieved would be a far greater strategic sacrifice for the United States than for the Soviet Union, simply because we are operating, by and large, under a second strike nonaggressive strategy. But the crucial issue of the test ban revolves around a problem which is far more basic than a matter of mere evolutionary improvement. In the present period the issue is not whether we want to assure continued technological progress in abstracto, nor whether we can afford to stop experimental tests undertaken for the purpose of chance discovery. The specific question which is the guts of the test ban decision, is whether or not the United States should develop so-called neutron bombs and pure fusion weapons.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION" CHAPTERS V AND VI, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD chapters V and VI of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER V

The test ban and the neutron bomb

For years, a great deal of misinformation has been propagated about the neutron technology. It is remarkable, to say the least, that opponents of the neutron development—and they are more or less the same people who opposed the H-bomb and otherwise have excelled by "cautious advice"—have been very vociferous, whereas the scientists with firsthand knowledge on the subject have been unable to speak out or even to correct false and falsified information.

It has been suggested, for example, that the neutron bomb could not be perfected for nearly half a century; that even if the scientific problem could be licked, no useful weapons that would be light and compact enough for practical use could be developed; that, even if a weapon were available, it would have barely any military use; and that it would be very easy to achieve protection against neutron weapons.

It is patently impossible to state with finality when a weapon development will be completed, and to predict exact design and performance characteristics, before the weapon has been tested, developed, and perfected. The optimist is not always right, and the pessimist not always wrong. It is nevertheless incredible that supposedly responsible people are setting forth arguments for which there is no basis in fact. This observer, for one, has gained the conviction that many of these evaluations of future weapons do not reflect professional knowledge and judgment but rather emanate from political considerations, notably from wishful thinking on how the conflict with the Soviets could be settled.

It is remarkable that, despite the fact that a debate on the neutron bomb has been going on for some time, the Government has not seen fit to publish basic information on the subject.[1] Thus, as of 1963 we have presented to the American people less information regarding it than Soviet scientists presented as of 1958 to the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva. The fundamental design idea of the neutron bomb was explained by the Russian physicist L. A. Artsimovich, who also disclosed that the Soviets apparently were interested in this technology as early as 1952. Here is his explanation:

"A pulsed thermonuclear reaction may also be possible under conditions when a high temperature is reached during the compression and implosion produced by a charge of conventional explosives (such as TNT or something more powerful) surrounding a capsule of deuterium or a mixture of deuterium and tritium."

In simple terms: an atomic bomb is a device by which an explosion is achieved through the fission of uranium, plutonium or perhaps thorium; the hydrogen bomb is a device by which an explosion is obtained through the fusion of hydrogen, brought about initially through a fission explosion; a neutron bomb is a device by which an explosion is accomplished through the fusion of the heavy isotopes of hydrogen, namely deuterium and tritium. If the fusion of the heavy hydrogen isotopes is achieved without initial fission, but by nonnuclear means we would have an all-fusion weapon.

The term "neutron bomb" refers to the fact that unlike fission and fission-fusion bombs, which produce mostly heat and blast, the energy released from the fusion of the heavy hydrogen isotopes will be largely in the form of neutrons. A Soviet colonel by name of M. Pavlov has given more exact data:

"In the reaction of the nuclear fission of uranium or plutonium, the neutron flow comprises about 1 percent of the total weight of the nuclear charge. The kinetic energy of the neutrons accounts for only 3 percent of the total energy of the explosion. * * * In a thermonuclear bomb * * * as much as 20 to 33 percent of the total weight of the nuclear charge is used in the creation of a neutron flow and a considerable part of the energy of the nuclear explosion is accounted for by the kinetic energy of the neutrons."

The neutron weapon is therefore different in kind from other nuclear weapons, not only because it has an entirely different ratio between heat, blast, and radiation, but also becaus it differs in the nature of the radiation and in the penetrating power of the released neutrons.

The neutron weapon kills people and except in the area of immediate impact, does not destroy equipment, installations or housing. Another characteristic of this weapon is that on a yield-by-yield basis, its effectiveness against personnel extends over a greater radius than that of other nuclear weapons. Hence the yields needed to incapacitate targets can be reduced, in practically all cases by one order of magnitude or better.

In addition, the weapon does not result in uncontrolled fallout which, it is generally agreed, would be the main cause of the ultimate cost of nuclear war. More specifically, it would cause very little genetic damage and it would result in a low disability rate, i.e. most of those casualties who escape death would have a full recovery.

---

[1] An American blackout of the discussion on space flight preceded the surprise ascent of sputnik in 1957.

The neutron weapon would allow conducting operations with great accuracy, making it possible to reduce the losses among the civilian population. The most basic cause of military destructiveness and the long duration of military conflicts always has been that in order to kill enemy troops, the surrounding territory had to be flattened, and weapons and logistics had to be destroyed. With the neutron weapon, much of this traditional requirement for destruction can be ignored. To destroy a company in a ditch, it will no longer be necessary to destroy an entire village; and to stop production in a factory, it will no longer be unavoidable to flatten an entire town.

It is true that protection against the neutron weapon can be developed; protection is always forthcoming ultimately. For the time being, however, the neutron bomb will have the upper hand over protective materials and measures that would be available on a battlefield. It is interesting to note that some of those who argue that defense against A and H-weapons is impossible, view the chances of protection against N-weapons very optimistically. Protection against neutrons is harder to come by, even in a normal fallout shelter.

The fact that through the accurate employment of neutron bombs casualties can be more or less restricted to the military force and that industries and cities may escape being smashed up, naturally would allow faster and more effective reconstruction after the war.

Mr. William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated that "pure fusion weapons would not be of great advantage to us because they would constitute primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already large stockpile of nuclear weapons." The above listing of some of the characteristics of the neutron bomb would indicate that a neutron device would be considerably more than just a "cheaper substitute" for existing weapons, but would be a new weapon with entirely new use patterns and effects. It should not be forgotten that this weapon would have features which, to the extent that any weapon can be "attractive," would be considerably more attractive from the humane point of view than existing fission and fusion weapons.

It is no minor matter by any means whether weapons are cheaper or more expensive. Perhaps it is true that cost reduction (if this were the only advantage to be gained from the neutron device) would be of marginal utility for our strategic systems. But this would certainly not be the case of our tactical weapons requirements, let alone of the requirements for air and missile defense which, if the statistics of past wars are any guide, will be very large. To turn this around: if we could combine in our missile defenses accuracy with large numbers we would possess so strong a defensive position that a Soviet first-strike strategy may become impractical. What is so wrong about this?

Moreover, the question of cheapness has a great bearing on the effectiveness of the NATO alliance. The United States should not be surprised to discover that our allies are getting somewhat restless when we base our technological policies on this sort of reasoning. What may be a minor economic advantage for us may mean the political survival of many of our friends as independent nations. It should be obvious that all-fusion weapons are economically far closer within the reach of Western Europe than fission and fission-fusion weapons, that they are well suited for European conditions, and that they would really improve the defense of Europe. If this is true, then it also is obvious that decisions on neutron weapons should not be made unilaterally by the United States.

The military significance of the neutron bomb has been deprecated by comments to the effect that it would have only tactical applicability and that we already are well provided for with tactical weapons. Disregarding the fact that the neutron device probably will be particularly effective in antimissile defense, it is surely incorrect to state that the tactical nuclear weapons we now have are adequate in numbers and performance. With the present technology which is ruled by the requirement of the "critical mass," low-yield weapons are extremely costly and can be achieved only through the deliberate prevention of a higher yield for a given amount of fissile material, i.e., a low yield is achieved by willfully reducing efficiency. Cost price of present nuclear weapons is largely independent of yield; a lower yield and a higher yield weapon come at about the same price.

But let us assume our present tactical arsenal were adequate and let us even assume that there were enough tactical weapons to equip, in case of war, our allies and fight on for a while. The full utilization of our present weapons, even if we restrict ourselves to relatively low yields, would create considerable havoc in densely populated areas. I do not think that a weapon which inflicts unnecessary casualties on friendly or even hostile populations is very desirable, nor does it help to further good relations among allies. I can only marvel at the strange logic of those who, in the name of humanism, oppose the development of a weapon like the neutron bomb.

But let us for a moment suppose that the Soviets have neutron weapons and we do not, and let us suppose that the Soviets are attacking Western Europe. An enemy in possession of neutron technology would have no trouble appearing on the battlefield with 10 or a 100 times more tactical weapons than we would have available. These weapons would come in a greater variety of yield but most of them within the lower spectrum of yields, and the cost of each weapon would be proportionate to the yield. The owner of the neutron weapon thus would possess vast numerical superiority and greater tactical versatility, and his armed forces would be far less vulnerable than those of his opponent. In addition, the use of neutron devices by the Soviets would make a great deal of sense because it would allow them to conquer Europe pretty much intact.

Our first encounter with a Soviet force unilaterally equipped with neutron weapons probably would lead to a rather catastrophic defeat because our troops would suffer from tactical and technological surprise. If we want to recoup and resist, we would have no other choice but escalate the conflict. If we started with conventional weapons only, we probably would be compelled to use weapons in the 10 to 100 kiloton range, and if we started with tactical atomic weapons, we might have to decide to move into the full strategic exchange. In the words of Professor Dyson, "any country which renounces for itself the development of nuclear weapons, without certain knowledge that its adherents have done the same is likely to find itself in the position of the Polish Army in 1939, fighting tanks with horses." The hapless Poles had little choice in the matter, but we are picking a strategy of inferiority deliberately.

It is a grave mistake to think that the neutron bomb has no applicability to strategic warfare. Neutron weapons are perfectly adaptable to strategic and massive operations. They would allow both a very effective "selective bombing" campaign in the style of World War II (but with a firepower suitable to a conflict in the present technological era), and they could also be used for "city busting" and a genocidal strategy. The point is that the present hydrogen technology precludes the selective bombing approach and forces everybody else into a strategy of across-the-board destruction. The neutron technology, by contrast, would increase our flexibility and greatly reduce the probability of a holocaust conflict. There would be more and better options.

It would make sense for the Soviets, in an aggressive war against the United States, to use superyield devices as counterforce weapons to knock out our retaliatory capabilities, and to follow up the disarming strike with selective attacks with neutron weapons against segments of our population. The main advantage for the Soviets of this strategy would be that while the United States is knocked out, the American industrial plants would remain intact and be available to the victor. At the same time, a neutron strategy on the continent would allow the seizure of the European industrial plant. Thus, the Communists would avoid a Pyrrhic victory. Even if Soviet industry were smashed by our residual retaliation, the Communists, despite nuclear war, would be in possession of the wherewithal needed to rule the world. Hence, it is to be expected that the Soviets will make every effort to equip themselves with the neutron weapon. We cannot, for that matter, be sure they are not yet in possession of a neutron capability.

This argument can be spun out endlessly but it seems self-evident that the new technology opens vast new horizons and for the nation which does not possess these weapons, poses enormous dangers of technological surprise. However, one of the most interesting aspects of this development is that the new nuclear technology does not continue the trend toward greater destructiveness and greater human loss. In fact, it reverses this trend and does so not by a futile program trying to go back to the weapons of McKinley and the troglodytes, but by moving forward with the clock of history.

It is, of course, easy to argue that the neutron technology should be resisted because it would make war again more manageable and hence more "thinkable." But responsible statesmen cannot operate with sophistry of this type. They must assume that, under certain circumstances, their best efforts to preserve peace will fail and that if a war has to be fought, it is preferable to fight it with highly effective weapons which allow to keep down the cost of human suffering and material damage, instead of with weapons which are far more destructive than necessary but not necessarily more effective than weapons which could be used instead. Flexibility is one of our announced strategic goals—here is a way to achieve this objective.

If the United States were to sign a test ban treaty, it would ipso facto renounce the development of the neutron bomb. As matters stand today, our neutron development proceeds at a pace slower than necessary or prudent. In view of the fact that the Soviets have known about the neutron bomb design principles for at least 11 years, this development should be accelerated to the maximum extent possible. But if we were to sign the test ban, we also would institute a so-called control system which, according to the most liberal interpretations of the treaty's present stipulations, would be entirely ineffective in preventing the Soviets from developing the neutron weapon through clandestine testing.

CHAPTER VI

The test ban: A cheater's paradise

In addition to many overriding strategical considerations militating against the test ban, the proposed control scheme will founder on numerous technical and practical difficulties. To begin with, there is no definition of the term "testing" and "test."

An international agreement on a subject which remains undefined can only lead to trouble.

During the past moratorium, the United States operated most of the time under the most restrictive possible definition of testing. We could have been entitled, within the spirit of gentlemanly behavior, to adopt a sensible definition. But as soon as we engage in a venture we consider "progressive" we lose, temporarily, all sense of proportion. This is a bit of national psychology which has great bearing on the problem.

There is no doubt that the Soviets did adopt an entirely different definition—one which allows them maximal freedom of action—and they would again operate under the most permissive definition. Unless this particular confusion were straightened out, a test ban agreement would work to the detriment of the United States, even if the Soviets did not cheat and just continued their nuclear "experiments" up to the yield which, in their judgment, constitutes the borderline between a "test" and an "experiment."

There is not much argument that nuclear explosions in the open atmosphere can be detected with standard equipment. It usually is overlooked, however, that the probability of detection varies with several factors, including yield and altitude of the shot, the amount of radioactivity thrown out, topographical conditions of the area, distance from the test equipment, etc.

While it would be imprudent for a violator to carry out high yield tests in the open atmosphere, a good possibility exists that relatively low yield tests of clean weapons may go undetected and that effective concealment techniques may be developed for some types of shots. Furthermore, tests undertaken in remote areas, such as oceans in the southern hemisphere, though they may be "detected" in a fashion, probably would provide only ambiguous instrument readings.

With respect to space shots, the launching of a space vehicle may or may not be detected. This depends, among other things, on intelligence capabilities: no provisos for this type of detection would be included in a test ban agreement. Depending on altitude, the explosion may or may not be discovered by optical and electromagnetic gear. A detection system in space might conceivably scoop up or record the presence of radioactive debris. Yet this detection of radioactivity could be made known to observers on the earth only by telemetry which is ambiguous evidence; or else the space vehicle must be recoverable.

To put it mildly, the capability to detect space shots at present is strictly circumscribed. Though we are planning to make five shots to install a space detection system, such a system does not exist now and may never exist. Space is very large and the probability of detection obviously depends on the distance of the control vehicle from the explosion, the yield of that explosion, and environmental conditions. The would-be violator would know the exact characteristics of the control orbits and hence would be able to plan his shots with a view toward minimum detectability. In any event, the effectiveness of a satellite system would have to be tested out experimentally before we can place any figure of reliability upon it—but this presupposes several nuclear space shots which would be outlawed by the test ban.

It is generally admitted that the detection of underground shots is most difficult and in many ways a matter of chance. Recently, the Government has issued much publicity advertising alleged progress in the technology for detecting underground explosions. There is no reason to doubt that such progress has been made although it is strange that the Government has exercised strong censorship to prevent dissenting voices from being heard. Moreover, the releases were couched in vague language.

But just as the art of detection is making progress, so the art of cheating could make progress, too, and undoubtedly is making such progress in the U.S.S.R. The technologies of detection and concealment are in a see-saw race, with the latter still enjoying a very considerable lead. Whoever concentrates more brains, efforts and resources on this problem, whether the detector or the violator will gain an advantage. Without going into any details, let it be stated that if the would-be violator has a good knowledge of the performance characteristics of the detection system, he always will possess a superior capability to conceal clandestine tests.

Depending on definitions of testing, there may be arguments on whether very low yield explosions are really tests or just experiments. It may be possible to accommodate significant explosions in metal containers and certainly it is feasible to combine the techniques of container testing with those of underground testing. Whether the violator will go to any lengths to insure secrecy for such experiments is debatable, but it is apparent that laboratory experimentation up to the high fractional kiloton level can be conducted undetected quite easily.

It is true, on the other hand, that the very existence of a detection system would force the violator to forego certain types of tests and to place restrictions on others. This may or may not be a handicap to him, but it is to be presumed that if a test ban were to last for 10 or more years, the main result would be that the technology of the violator would be deflected into directions different from those which would be followed in the absence of a detection system. To make this point more specific: a test ban would virtually assure that the Soviets will develop neutron weapons.

Verification is more difficult and in some ways more important than detection. Yet it is rarely discussed. Verification is that portion of a test ban arrangement through which an accusation of violation is proved or disproved. For example, the American detection system would be alerted, by instrument readings, to a possible underground shot in the Soviet Union. Thereupon inspectors would be sent to the probable place of the explosion, where they would "inspect," dig for radioactive samples and other evidence, and ultimately find the radioactive debris. Through this radioactive corpus delicti it would be "verified" that the Soviet Union, indeed, had violated the agreement. If by contrast, no radioactive sample is found, the accusation must be dismissed.

However, lack of incontestable evidence by no means constitutes proof that no violation has taken place. Should the detection system receive indicators of suspect events and should the inspectorate fail to uncover verificatory evidence, there would be a great deal of confusion and apprehension which could lead easily to an international crisis.

The verification of shots in the atmosphere over land usually is deemed to be simple. But is it? Disregarding the fact that vast tracts of land may not be accessible to the inspectors (e.g. China), the verification of an explosion probably can be prevented without too much trouble. The nuclear test device may have been dropped from an airplane, and not be exploded from installations on the ground. It may have been shot in by missile from a distant launch point and exploded over a "proving ground," which is nothing but a set of measurement instruments. The measurement equipment can be withdrawn, within a few hours, by trucks and helicopters. Moreover, the shot need not leave any residual radioactivity.

If after such a carefully planned event the inspectors arrive on the scene, perhaps after 2 or 3 days which would be early, they might find a single depression on the ground. This depression hardly would constitute evidence, even if it could be proved that it did not exist 1 week earlier. But there may be no depression at all.

If the device was missile-fired, inspection of the launch site—provided it is identified—might indeed indicate that it has a store of nuclear weapons. But so what? Any missile site must be provided with warheads. For that matter, the inspectors would not be allowed even close to the missile base and they certainly would not be allowed to inspect its books and installations. The violator also may claim that the missile was fired from a foreign base and that the shot actually constituted an act of aggression. There is no limit to this sort of skulduggery.

Take, for example, atmospheric shots fired by submarines at sea. Suppose a Soviet submarine fires a test device in the South Atlantic and suppose that within 3 or 4 days enough evidence, including radioactive air samples, is available suggesting that an explosion did occur. Suppose that the exact location of the explosion can be determined. If the inspectors were to go to the place of the explosion, it would be impossible for them to find any evidence: they would find the ocean in the same shape as an ocean is always found. But the radioactivity, if any, would have been long dispersed. To catch the violator it would be necessary to discover the submarine and force it to surface, which is an impractical proposition. It seems unnecessary to spin out this case further: verification of overwater shots indeed is far from certain.

Currently there is no feasible method of verifying explosions in space. If the Soviets were to launch a space vehicle and explode a nuclear device, at not too great a distance, the United States might gain a good notion of what was going on. But we would not possess the type of evidence which "would stand up in court," assuming that we could make public use of the evidence we have. Hence, we would be reluctant to move, just as during the Cuban crisis, Washington did not move before there was clear photographic evidence of the presence of Soviet missiles.

With respect to the verification of underground shots, the situation is that in order to get at the radioactive debris caused by an underground nuclear explosion, the location of the presumed event must be pinpointed with extraordinary accuracy. Once the inspectors are in place, it would be necessary to start digging through an area of tens or even hundreds of square miles. All kinds of fascinating calculations can be made to determine the probable number of man-days required for digging and drilling until the debris is actually discovered. However, unless telltale clues of test preparation are discovered, it is clear that the discovery of the debris is clearly a matter of chance and a very small one at that. Naturally, an inspectoral team may discover all sorts of circumstantial evidence confirming the indicators received from the detection system. But such sort of ambiguous evidence simply does not constitute valid verification.

Actually, it would be relatively simple to "discover" all kinds of "evidence" which are not there. As soon as there were some evidence on Soviet cheating, we can rest assured that they would find "evidence" of U.S. cheating. The violator has at his disposal numerous political tactics to vitiate any attempt at verification, and it can be predicted safely, on the basis of past United States and Soviet performances, that after one or two tries, inspection will fade out of business.

Undoubtedly, if indicators multiply, suggesting continuous cheating, the most cooperative signatories to the test ban will be forced to react. Theoretically, they can decide upon "sanctions" but in practice they have few alternatives but to resume testing themselves. Since their reaction will be sluggish and since furthermore the violator will have made allowance in his plans that he might be found out, he will have arranged things in such a manner that he maximizes his time advantages.

If the cheating starts at a moment when the cheater and the noncheater enjoy technological parity, the violator, without too much trouble, may gain a lead of 2 to 3 years. If this advance were achieved during a period when, for one reason or the other, war is ruled out, the violator would have gained only a temporary advantage. However, the violator may be preparing for aggression and may have readied his weapon systems in such a way that he can rapidly incorporate the most up-to-date nuclear devices. If then he restricts his tests to the proofing of radical designs, he can arm his delivery means with the types of warheads which the tests showed to be most successful. Ingenuity and careful planning should go a long way toward rendering the violation of the test ban militarily productive.

The effectiveness of the test ban stratagem can be seen more clearly if we assume that concealment techniques have advanced to such a point that clandestine underground testing will, in fact, not be detected, let alone verified. If after a long series of clandestine shots, the violator openly abrogates the test ban treaty by full-yield atmospheric proof tests, and at the same time checks the reliability of his existing weapon systems, he may be able to secure nuclear preponderance and insure maximum effectiveness of his first strike.

Intelligently employed, the test ban stratagem of conceal and surprise could prove to be decisive for the outcome of the war, or even for success of the ultimatum: "Surrender or die."

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION"—CHAPTERS VII AND VIII, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD chapters VII and VIII of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER VII

The test ban treaty: Manifold problems of verification

A signatory to a test ban, if he decides to cheat, will try to commit a perfect crime. It will be recalled that a large percentage of murders go unpunished because the murderer is not identified or apprehended. Even if tried, murderers are not always convicted and they often benefit from loopholes in the law and thus escape a penalty which would fit the crime. In addition, many deaths which go into the books as accidents, heart attacks or suicide actually are homicides.

Perhaps it is pertinent, in this connection, to recall that the true nature of the death of Pavl Bang-Jensen, the U.N. official from Denmark who was in charge of the files concerned with the Hungarian uprising of 1956, never has been fully clarified. Was it suicide or was it murder dressed up as suicide?

In any event, many murders remain unpunished because the average police detective does not reach the standards set by fiction writers like Conan Doyle and Erle Stanley Gardner; because there often is lack of personnel and laboratory resources to investigate evidence thoroughly and completely; and because indicators of foul play often escape physicians and coroners engaged in rapid routine examinations. There is no perfect crime but many crimes remain unpunished because enforcement agencies are inadequate and overworked. The key to detection is a strong incentive to detect, perseverance, and even creativity in interpreting indicators. If these ingredients are lacking in a test ban inspectorate, cheating would be easy.

The detection of clandestine nuclear explosions is primarily entrusted to scientific instruments, including unattended "black boxes." Presumably these instruments provide "objective" data which can be easily read and interpreted; thus, human frailties seem to be excluded.

If the violator is clumsy, then the instrument readings, in all likelihood, would disclose the transgression. But if he is skillful, these readings could be very ambiguous. Contrary to what laymen may think, even seemingly unambiguous instrument readings can give rise to protracted debates and often interpretations are affected by a priori theories.

In the end, debates about the meaning of detection data would be decided by the conviction of those within the detection bureaucracy who possess the greatest power and whose function it is to coordinate different views. This situation, incidentally, may work in two directions: it may facilitate cheating or it may lead to a major international crisis in all those cases where the coordinators are convinced, rightly or wrongly, that despite lack of verificatory evidence cheating is taking place.

Inspectors who are sent into the field to investigate a presumed violation will find indicators and evidence according to their observational talents and their eagerness either to find or to overlook. Naturally, their effectiveness also may be reduced by "red herring" indicators conveniently planted by the evader, as well as by any number of diversionary techniques. Conversely, the inspectors of some countries would find it relatively easy to act as provocateurs.

As year-in-year-out inspections do not produce any results, the inspectors will lose enthusiasm for the job and the numbers of inspectors may be cut. After all, if everybody is honest, a small police force is adequate. Presumably, only few technically qualified personnel will apply for positions within the inspectorate.[1] If genuine professionals are assigned to the job, the situation may be different but there are not too many of those available in the first place. It would be very imprudent to assume that the Communists cannot influence any of the inspectors or plant their own agents (with American or British nationality) within the inspectorate.

Even an otherwise effective intelligence service is not immune against deterioration or wishful thinking. During the last moratorium there was an argument about whether the Soviets were cheating by means of underground testing.

Honest men were entitled to differ in their conclusions on this point. But whether or not the Soviets were cheating before resuming open testing in 1961, there was no great eagerness to find out. On the contrary, suggestions that this problem better be investigated were frowned upon; and some of those who got busy with the task and unearthed suggestive indicators were ridiculed.

Much of this negative attitude was derived from an assumption that it would make no sense for the Soviets to cheat. Some of the more naive "true believers" even asserted the Soviets would abide by the moratorium lest they risk the censure of public opinion. Bureaucracies are not likely to push causes against the predilections of the upper echelons, and intelligence bureaucracies are no exception. This sort of thing is highly irrational and ultimately backfires. Nevertheless, chances are that within a democracy, the reaction time against test ban violations will be exceedingly slow.

Incidentally, it is noteworthy that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced on February 2, 1962, that the Soviets had fired an underground shot; some time later, the Soviets confirmed, in an offhand manner that, indeed, they had carried out a single underground explosion. It is, of course, wildly improbable that the Soviets never checked on underground test technology. They are known to possess very good information on the phenomenology of underground shots, and disclosed themselves that they fired a considerable number of subterranean HE explosions. If they did not experiment with underground nuclear explosions, someone should be fired in the Soviet Union for dereliction of duty.

Their disclosure about the one and only shot may be interpreted as an attempt to convince us that our capabilities for detecting underground shots are perfectly adequate. This little incident illustrates Soviet mastery of deception techniques, as well as, unfortunately, an American reluctance to recognize the fact that the Soviets are employing deception as a standard operating procedure.

CHAPTER VIII

The test ban: Range of nondetectable cheating

It is generally agreed that underground testing is the most promising method of evading a test ban agreement. Mr. William C. Foster in his statement to the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing belittled the feasibility of clandestine underground testing. He argued that since seismic signals which occur from explosions of the same size vary, an evader could not be sure of evading seismic detection. He also alleged that "big hole" decoupling is time consuming and expensive. In addition, the excavation of the large cavity might be detected and an underground test might unexpectedly produce a visible surface crater which may be found.

Undoubtedly, these possibilities exist but only on condition that the would-be evader of a test ban is clumsy, does not plan his cheating properly, or does not bother to spend too much money and effort on hiding the clandestine shots because he is not worried about the ambiguous indicators that might result from a poorly concealed clandestine program.

Some of our underground tests have unexpectedly led to venting and to some minor changes in the configuration of the mountains over the test sites. On the basis of our experience, the chances that there would be an unexpected large visible surface crater is certainly not better than 1 in 10. That such a change in the landscape would be detected, presumably by intelligence, is a little farfetched but let us assume that there is a probability of one in five. The combined probability that such a crater would occur and that it would be detected is then 1 in 50. This means that there is a chance of 1 such an occurrence per 2 test series of 25 shots each. However, this is merely the chance that intelligence might discover the crater, by no means to be confused with detection of a shot by instruments, let alone with verification through ground inspection.

---

[1] Mr. Foster explained that a "surprise abrogation by the Soviets" of a test ban treaty "might leave us as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test." He stated that the Government will make it "a matter of national policy to maintain readiness to test"; scientists would continue nuclear weapons research and "our weapons laboratories should function effectively." This is wishful thinking because the most creative scientists would have no incentive to stay with a dead-end program; at best, our laboratories would decline in quality.

The argument that big hole decoupling is time consuming is irrelevant. The test ban negotiation has been going on for 5 years already, hence there was adequate time to produce any number of big holes. The argument that the creation of a big hole is expensive is equally irrelevant, since cost is meaningful in terms of what a price buys. If a test ban immobilizes the technological progress of the United States and allows the Soviet Union, through cheating, to achieve nuclear supremacy, the expenditure for a few big holes would be trivial.

It is perhaps true that a large excavation project might be discovered during the construction phase, but such a possibility would be anticipated by the evader. There are any number of techniques through which discovery even of a large earth-moving job can be prevented, some of them very simple and inexpensive. The observation might be added that during the construction phase no suspect seismic signals would be received from the particular area: testing has not started yet. But in the absence of specific suspicions attached to a specific area, the excavation would be discovered only by chance. Even in this case the excavation may be explained away through a cover project.

But this criticism of big hole decoupling overlooks the fact that adequate decoupling can be achieved in natural caves as well as in mines; and that it is not always necessary to produce a very big hole: depending on the yield of the test as well as on the decoupling factor which is desired, the size of the hole can be increased or decreased. There are other decoupling techniques which either may be substituted for the big hole or used in combination with it. In the latter case, the decoupling factor may be increased for any given size of the cavity.

It is true that explosions of the same size produce variable signals. Some of these are due to variations in the geological environment and presumably can be anticipated through proper analysis. Other variations are caused, among other factors, by weather and temperature changes. There are a few unpredictable elements. However, these variations occur within limits: a 1-kiloton shot will not unexpectedly result in a 100-kiloton signal. Hence this danger can be easily guarded against through a prudent choice of yields and decoupling techniques.

Mr. Foster asserted that the "number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions" originally was overestimated. He added that our ability to distinguish between earthquakes and explosions has been improving steadily.

But what is an improvement? Mr. Foster indicated that so far we are able to distinguish only over half of the seismic events. Actually, he chose careful language by saying that over half of the earth tremors give indications of being earthquakes on the basis of such seismic criteria as first earth motion. He did not say that the distinction could be made with finality from seismic criteria, he merely talked about indications. He added that somewhat less than another third of the seismic events were ruled out by nonseismic criteria; that is, by a number of judgments entirely divorced from instrument readings. These judgments may be right or wrong, but even if they are excellent they have no bearing on the effectiveness of scientific detection. Hence the seismic system produces reasonable indications on about half of the events.

However, even according to Mr. Foster's statistics, about 15 percent of the seismic events remain in the dubious category, that is, they could be earthquakes or explosions. Significantly, Mr. Foster left it to the reader to figure out the magnitude of this residue for himself. It may be presumed that if we concern ourselves only with large seismic events, this residual number may not be too large. But since the decoupling technique exists, we really must be concerned with very small seismic events whose number, especially during periods of high seismic activity, is very considerable. The fact that fewer earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion have been observed than was expected, is not very meaningful.

In the absence of exact figures, we will grant, for argument's sake, that the difference between expectation and observation is significant. But seismic activity varies in intensity. When we talk about an annual number of earthquakes in a given region, we are talking about a statistical average. It is obvious that in a period of low seismic activity, the number of suspect events will be smaller than in a period of high activity. Our present statistical evidence is based on too short a timespan to allow a firm assessment of what the true average may be. Furthermore, this type of argument again disregards the decoupling technique: the number of small earth tremors is quite large, and the signals from low-energy events are most ambiguous. Hence, if these events must be taken into consideration, the challenge remains considerable, even if the number of easy-to-identify, high-energy events has declined. Mr. Foster's argument would be valid if we assume that the Soviets are stupid enough to cheat by means of tamped shots. It loses much of its force if we assume that the Soviets are more clever than USACDA seems to give them credit for.

What, then, is the capability of seismic detection? Mr. Foster disclosed these facts: "None of the seismic systems proposed by the United States from 1959 on would be capable of detecting with any certainty any explosion of 3 kilotons or less, if they occurred in alluvium. Moreover, artificial decoupling might permit considerably larger yield explosions without detection."

Now let us go back to the perfect crime and let us assume that the Soviets plan their crime to consist in the clandestine decoupled testing of neutron devices. We assume that the detection system would be capable of detecting explosions of 1 kiloton (instead of 3) and that the decoupling factor is 100 (instead of about 300). In this case a test explosion of 1 kiloton would provide a signal of the equivalent of 10 tons which is clearly not detectable and which is two orders of magnitude below the threshold of detection. Yet in view of the effects radius of a neutron bomb, a 1-kiloton device is easily the equivalent of 10-kiloton fission bomb.

Theoretically, if we want to keep the signal down to the 1-kiloton level and if the decoupling factor were 300, a 300-kiloton device could be tested, but for the purposes of the neutron program such a large shot would be entirely unnecessary.

If we assume that the neutron test program could be managed to full satisfaction, with shots up to 10 kilotons (in addition to which there would be a requirement for much HE testing), and if we furthermore assume that the decoupling factor would not be larger than 100, the expected maximum strength of the seismic signals would not exceed the equivalent of 100 tons. This would be an insurance factor of 10:1 if the system were capable to detect down to the 1-kiloton level and of 30:1 if it had only a 3-kiloton capability.

An insurance factor of this magnitude should easily accommodate the various hazards which could occur, e.g., signal strength variations.

Incidentally, the signals produced from neutron devices may be much less than those from fission and fission-fusion weapons and telltale radioactivity would be vastly less. Hence much of what we now assert about detection capabilities will not be correct if the system were to operate against a neutron test program.

But we have not yet reached the crucial point: Earlier treaty drafts stipulated that inspection would apply only to signals of a strength of 4.75 or larger, on the earthquake scale, i.e., to tamped shots of 20 kilotons or higher. If the signals remain below this intensity, we would, according to these early drafts, not be entitled to inspect. The area below this magic figure of 4.75 or 20 kilotons was placed under the regime of a gentlemen's agreement: we would have taken the Soviet's word of honor that they are not testing.

In other words, in order for us to be entitled to inspect and to have a chance to verify evasion, the Soviets would have to shoot at about 20 kilotons without decoupling or 2 megatons or more, with decoupling. Shots of such magnitudes are entirely unnecessary in the neutron program.

The lower threshold of 4.75 was eliminated from current draft treaties: theoretically we would be free to inspect any signal which we consider suspect. In reality, of course, the threshold had been suggested because of many practical considerations, including the ambiguity and frequency of the weaker signals. For all practical purposes, inspection will continue to apply mainly to the larger signals, although it may be granted that absence of a precise lower threshold figure would allow greater flexibility.

But the point is still this: A large percentage of neutron tests could be carried out on the fractional kiloton level and would not even require decoupling. The few larger tests which might be necessary would require only moderate decoupling. The program can be concealed, even with larger yields, below the threshold of actual detection—provided decoupling and possibly additional camouflage, concealment and deception techniques are utilized. These facts dispose of Mr. Foster's point that though single tests "might sometimes escape detection by seismic means a test series would be far more difficult to hide. Yet, little progress can ordinarily be made with individual, isolated tests." There is no need whatever for the Soviets to restrict themselves to isolated shots.

The conclusion is clear: a systematic, full-fledged neutron test program can be carried out in its entirety by clandestine underground explosions. It is not excluded that our detection system would produce indicators and that through intelligence, we might become suspicious of what was going on. Yet we could not prove the violation and we would have no legal justification in cancelling the treaty. The test ban thus would be an excellent cover for the neutron program. In this case the perfect crime seems to have a high degree of feasibility.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION" CHAPTERS IX, X, XI, AND XII, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include at this point in the

RECORD chapters IX, X, XI, and XII, of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER IX

The test ban: The need for weapons systems tests, new weapons systems and peacetime nuclear explosives

The discussion on the test ban usually centers on the implicit assumption that a continuation of tests is necessary only to insure technological progress. Whether or not technological and design experimentation is the most important aspect of testing, the fact remains that additional types of testing are mandatory for the security of the Nation.

Few people realize that though we are entrusting our security to ICBM's, we never have tested a full assembly of such a missile, i.e., we have not launched an ICBM together with its warhead, nor destroyed a target with an ICBM-launched warhead. There is no particular reason to assume that our ICBM's won't function when the dire moment arrives, but the fate of the Nation is far too serious a matter to be entrusted to mere, albeit persuasive, assumptions.

Similarly, much can be achieved in testing weapons like anti-ICBM's without nuclear warheads. But at one point it will become necessary to test the whole assembly. Indeed, we might be well advised to launch an anti-ICBM together with its warhead, in order to determine whether or not we are developing our anti-ICBM's the hard way. The President intimated that the Soviets had been conducting such tests. It is quite probable that through nuclear tests we could accelerate our anti-ICBM work—and what could be more desirable for the physical security of our Nation.

Some experts argue that from time to time a weapon, for example, an ICBM in its silo, or a bomb in the bay of a B-52, must be shot off in order to determine readiness and reliability. After all, we are checking on all other aspects of our readiness posture—is the business end of a weapon not its most important part? Before World War II our torpedoes were not tested but were assumed to be battle ready. We found out in combat, very much to our chagrin, surprise, and detriment, that many of those torpedoes proved to be duds. We could very easily lose a war if we did not continuously check on the reliability of our weapons.

Secretary McNamara already has been quoted with reference to the need of determining the effects of high altitude explosions on radars and communications, as well as possibly on antiballistic defense designs. We have fired a few high altitude shots but a little reflection will show that the phenomenology of such explosions must vary with yield and altitude of the detonations. Yet we tested only up to certain yield limits and we restricted ourselves to few selected altitudes. In other words, much needs still to be learned about the effects of nuclear explosions in the upper atmosphere and in near space.

Furthermore, we need considerably more knowledge about the effects of nuclear weapons on material, equipment, artifacts, vegetation, etc., notably we should test out shelter designs and the effectiveness of the hardened missile silos. The ability of our hardened sites to withstand nuclear blasts presently can be only estimated. Granted that these estimates reflect the best available professional judgment. However, this judgment is derived from extrapolations and is quite hazardous with respect to blasts of very high yields.

If the effectiveness of hardening were presently underrated, we would be spending too much money; at the same time we could assume that our hardened missiles are far less vulnerable than postulated in our defense planning. If, by contrast, the effects of hardening were overrated, our missile force would be at greater jeopardy than we have calculated, especially if the enemy were in possession of reliable data on our sites. This is a subject where guesswork should be entirely taboo.

From the technological point of view, testing is needed to increase our nuclear efficiencies in order, for example, to provide smaller missiles like Minuteman and Polaris with far greater yields than they presently possess. Secretary McNamara recently testified about Soviet hardening and suggested that it may be increasingly difficult for us to attack Soviet missile sites. Surely, it is self-evident that as hardening increases, yields must grow. But the boosting of yields must be accomplished within the constraint that the size of delivery vehicles must be reduced; this is a formidable challenge which cannot be met by occasional shots. Apparently we are unwilling to face up to this problem.

The Soviets presumably are staking much of their fortune on big yields. Conversely, they may use their nuclear efficiency to employ ever smaller ICBM's without losing firepower. In fact, if they want to attack the United States effectively, they need small—and cheap—ICBM's, perhaps several thousands of them. In terms of fission-fusion technology, the warheads of these missiles must have the maximum yield that can be packed into the nose cone. This is not all they need, but let us suppose the Soviets beat us in the race for nuclear efficiency; in this case, given numerical equality or even superiority on our part, they would be able, in addition to optimizing their posture for surprise attack, to exceed, force by force, the punch of our light as well as our heavy ICBM's.

Perhaps it is pertinent in this context to remember that Khrushchev withdrew his missiles from Cuba because, as he admitted by implication himself, the United States was capable of delivering far more firepower on the Soviet Union than the U.S.S.R. was capable of visiting on America. This firepower was vested, almost exclusively, in our SAC and fleet bombers, while the firepower of our long-range missiles hardly exceeded 5 percent of the total. Since firepower obviously is not the only factor that must be considered, this statistic is in no manner an objection to missiles. Yet the requirement for heavy firepower remains. The elimination of bomber aircraft whether justified from the aeronautical point of view or not, calls for more than a mere substitution of delivery vehicles: it also is necessary to prevent a precipitous decline in firepower.

To illustrate this point just a little further: assume our present SAC bombers average a firepower of 15 megatons per plane and assume that 15 percent of the planes would be able to execute 2 missions: This would give 1,600-odd SAC bombers the capability to deliver approximately 28,000 megatons of destruction. If this firepower were to be carried in 2-megaton missiles, about 14,000 light ICBM's would be necessary and even if we were to decide on 10-megaton missiles, we would need 2,800 heavy ICBM's. These are infeasible numbers which demonstrate the impracticability of an all-missile strategic force. These figures prove also that nuclear efficiency must be boosted considerably in order to insure that tomorrow's missile, in terms of firepower, will be a weapon that, at least in some missions, will be reasonably equivalent to today's bomber.

To return to other weapons requirements: We need clean weapons to be able to fight tactical wars effectively in densely populated areas—a clean technology is almost a prerequisite to holding the NATO alliance together. We also need optimal weapons for ground-to-air and antiballistic missiles; for a variety of reasons, including cleanliness, all-fusion warheads may fit the bill best. Tactical weapons must be of a high order of nuclear efficiency and will be required in large numbers. Hence to keep overall costs down, they must be small and cheap. The development of devices which in addition to being clean also are effective and economical is a tall order.

By contrast, if the Soviets were to show up with all-fusion devices, notably in antimissile and tactical weapons, and we would be stuck with the old technology—in addition to which we might have kept low or even cut down the number of such weapons in battle order—we might find ourselves in a very critical situation.

In the age of the Polaris submarine it is almost unbelievable that the Soviets would forgo developing nuclear missile and torpedo warheads, as well as bombs and possibly depth charges to satisfy the ASW requirement. We, too, must have nuclear tests to develop effective antisubmarine weapons, including some weapons with a relatively large lethal radius.

In addition, we need tests for weapons which would be peculiarly effective within the framework of our military tasks in Europe. For example, in order to facilitate the holding of forward positions on the ground, we should develop nuclear land mines. Nuclear sea mines would have their uses in defending positions like offshore islands and landing beaches. We may need nuclear explosives to destroy installations from which our forces have to retreat.

Very small nuclear weapons may help stay-behind forces to defend themselves for long periods and they may give immense strength to resistance movements in occupied countries.

It is all very well to worry about escalation of limited wars and to argue, with considerable propagandistic exaggeration, that even the use of a 0.1 kiloton device against, for example, secret police headquarters in a recently conquered country, would unleash a global thermonuclear war at the 10 to 100-megaton level, i.e., cause escalation by an order of magnitude of 100,000 to 1 million on a single shot basis, however, the contingencies of war are unpredictable. To prepare weapons for certain uses does not mean that such weapons will be used, but that they can be used if they are needed. The chances are that escalation will be prevented most effectively if a whole spectrum of nuclear weapons were available. If we allow the enemy to become superior in the tactical nuclear field, we either will be losing limited local wars or to stave off defeat, will be compelled to escalate by our own initiative. Moreover, the absence of adequate tactical nuclear capabilities invites local aggression.

Despite wishful thinking about the exclusively civilian uses of space, sooner or later space will become a decisive military medium. Hence there exists the requirement for developing types of weapons and firepower which are effective in the vacuum above the atmosphere. It is apparent that neutron devices would be particularly useful in the space medium.

Testing also has a bearing on space propulsion. It is generally agreed that the Orion project—which is designed to use small nuclear "bombs" to propel a space vehicle—would allow the lifting of maximal payloads into orbit and permit the deepest penetration into the solar system. Of all propulsion systems it would provide for the most effective utilization of space. However, so far it seems impractical, because of radioactivity, to launch an Orion assembly from the ground; unfortunately, by using Orion propulsion only from orbit, much of the system's utility would be lost. An all-fusion technology would eliminate the radioactivity and thereby open the road to getting really important payloads into space.

Should the Soviets decide to move into space as a decisive military medium, they may employ Orion techniques even before they are able to eliminate the radioactivity. Actual Orion shots, in all likelihood, would be detected but the testing of the propulsion unit may be done on test stands which, by their very construction, could provide a great deal of decoupling. The required yields would be small in comparison with weapons. On balance it is likely, for various practical reasons, that the Soviets would base their Orion propulsion on all-fusion devices. By the same token, a requirement for effective space utilization might induce them to develop the all-fusion technology on a high priority basis.

As usual, the skeptics find it difficult to visualize the possible advantages of this new technology. But skepticism always opposes any new approach. Many decades of experience in weapons planning should have taught us to distrust the emotional opposition of scientists who are only superficially familiar with the new concept. Security would be served better if we were to rely more heavily on the cautious optimism of those scientists who really have explored the new possibility and found it attractive. The brutal twin facts which we cannot circumvent are that space utilization requires maximum energy releases and that nuclear explosions are the method through which maximum energy releases can be produced—and produced most cheaply.

In earlier years, some people hoped that radioactive substances could be used for military purposes. These expectations, so far, have been disappointed and perhaps radiological warfare remains impractical. Nevertheless, if radiological weapons could be perfected they would offer some possibilities of humane warfare. For example, a factory could be made inoperative by covering it with radioactive substances of suitable half-lives; if so, it would not be necessary to destroy the installation and in the process kill the working crews and the population living within the vicinity of ground zero. This sort of denial weapon also would make it unnecessary in case of retreat, to carry out scorched earth destructions; hence postwar recovery would be facilitated. Surely, the prospect of fighting war with less casualties than was heretofore possible merits some attention.

The aforementioned Russo-German military dictionary talks about radioactive weapons (boyevyye radioaktivnyye veshchestva) as though they do exist in the Communist arsenal, and states that radioactivity can be propagated in the form of powders, liquids, and smokes delivered from rockets, aerial bombs, artillery shells, and mines. It is added that radioactive substances can be used in combination with gas warfare. Is this another capability which we abandon unilaterally to the enemy?

Finally, there is the possibility of using nuclear explosions for industrial and civilian purposes, as envisaged in the Plowshare program. While this program has been continuing, it is allowed only a very low momentum and its vast potentialities are still unconvincing to those skeptics who are skeptical on a priori grounds and because they sense that Plowshare invalidates the basic concept of the test ban.

But the United States, who is over its neck in foreign aid, can ill afford to forgo modern technology in operations abroad (or at home, for that matter). For example, if a second Panama Canal were built by nuclear explosions rather than by conventional methods of earth moving, something like $8 billion could be saved, according to one estimate. Surely, this sort of money could be used to transform the economy of the Caribbean area. Instead of commenting further on the potentials of Plowshare, I refer to the book by Dr. Ralph Sanders of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, where the possible impacts of this technology on our security and economy are spelled out, with the exception of the possible developments in the chemical industry.

Plowshare explosions may be required for the building of stations on the moon. It is indeed self-evident that to establish anything like a useful environment on the moon, or later on some planets, a great deal of "earth" moving will be required. Hence we would have to transport vast amounts of energy into space, which would be impossible unless we can package the energy into minimum weights. Again, the nuclear explosive—of the all-fusion variety—provides the solution.

These various requirements do not necessarily have to be satisfied within the next few years. But ultimately they will have to be met. Hence it is not surprising that the United States, as appears from Mr. Foster's statement, envisages the possibility of a sudden cancellation of a test-ban treaty by the Soviets. In other words, we do not anticipate a permanent but merely a temporary test ban. This anticipation would be justified even if we assumed that the Soviets would like to stick to the ban, simply because some of these requirements will catch up with us. Peace may descend on this earth (which unfortunately is not very likely) but to maintain it in the face of rising populations and expectations as well as of raw material shortages, the utilization of Plowshare techniques will become mandatory; hence the all-fusion techniques must be developed. Lord Curzon once said in the House of Commons: "I do not exclude the intelligent anticipation of facts even before they occur."

In any event, the administration has not provided answers to these questions: if the test ban, by its very nature, can be only temporary, why try to achieve it in the first place? But even if a temporary ban would make sense, why shoot for it now? And why try to apply a test ban to the development of neutron and all-fusion devices when tests of such devices cannot be policed at all and when furthermore such tests would not produce significant fallout?

When the United States went into its first moratorium, it was generally assumed that our test organizations and crews would be kept together so that testing could be resumed almost instantly. It turned out that while we were able to conduct underground tests a few weeks after the Soviets broke the moratorium, almost 9 months were required to get ready for atmospheric testing. Now, it is promised again that if there were another moratorium or even a full-fledged ban, our test capabilities would be kept intact and on an instant readiness basis. These promises are unrealistic unless the American political behavior pattern changes. Even if the budgets were available—and in reality they won't be—the best talents would leave our weapons laboratories and test organizations, and perhaps the recruitment of younger physicists would become difficult. The Soviet Union which controls its scientific manpower does not suffer from a similar handicap. Hence a test ban would be disadvantageous to ourselves even if the Soviets were to observe it for the time being. At one point or the other, the test ban, which can only be temporary in nature, will come to a close, be it through detection of cheating, through cancellation, or through the action of nonsignatory states. On the day of expiration of the agreement, the Soviets would be in a far stronger position to resume operations than the United States.

CHAPTER X

The test ban: The jaws of the trap

According to a recent argument, the difficulties of policing a test ban were exaggerated by those who emphasized the potentialities of underground testing. It is alleged that the scientists who warned about the feasibility of cheating in underground test sites contradicted themselves when, after the resumption of testing by the United States, they called for atmospheric tests and voiced their discontent with our own underground testing program. This, it is argued, proves that underground testing gives only marginal results. Therefore, if a test ban does nothing else but force a would-be violator into ineffective testing, it would serve its purpose.

As so many arguments which have been produced ad hoc in the test ban debate, this particular line of reasoning is superficial, illogical, and to a large extent demagogic.

No one has ever claimed that underground testing can do all the jobs required in an effective testing program. By definition such matters as the phenomenology of high-altitude and deepwater shots and the vulnerability of ground equipments may have to be determined through atmospheric tests. This also holds true for the proof testing of high-yield battle order weapons, and finally for strictly technological testing at high yields.

In comparison with atmospheric testing, underground technological testing has several advantages (e.g., independence from weather and wind, and avoidance of fallout), but it also has a number of disadvantages. There are limitation on instrumentation, possibly modifications of effects, and vexatious restrictions on yield. If the underground tests were to be kept secret, yield limitations might be considerable, or else very large test sites must be constructed. Very large weapons, of course, never could be tested underground at their full yield.

During 1961 and 1962, therefore, when our test organization was hamstrung by many political limitations and when it was working feverishly against the danger that a new moratorium may be proclaimed, insistence on atmospheric tests was justified. But it is also noteworthy that the AEC, which at first evinced dissatisfaction with underground testing, on the basis of its experience during 1962, changed its mind and now considers underground testing favorably. Obviously, underground testing is an art and skills can be improved through learning.

This concrete situation has very little relevance for evaluating the potentialities of a stratagem aiming at a test ban and its evasion.

The trick the Soviets are trying to perform is to negotiate a test ban which would allow us the shadow of an inspection system and provide the Soviet Union with the substance of an effective clandestine testing capability.

Depending on how much inspection they would have to concede, clandestine test series can always be constructed in such a way that they will forever remain below the threshold of discovery and verification.

The frequent changes in Soviet policy, their unwillingness to grant even platonic concessions and the resultant postponement of the day when the United States will fall into the self-made test ban trap can be explained best by assuming that the Soviets have not yet decided how far they should go toward marrying American shadow to Soviet substance. Perhaps they do not feel they have yet reached the stage where adequate further progress can be insured by an exclusively underground program of several years duration. Once they have the super-yields they want and once they accomplish an anti-ICBM warhead, they may be ready for a clandestine underground program—at that moment American disarmament apostles, for a short while, may find that their prophecies on Soviet intentions are coming true.

Of course, the question is not whether underground and space testing is superior to atmospheric testing (which, for many cases, clearly, it is not), but whether clandestine testing allows more significant and rapid advances in weapons design than no testing at all, which equally clearly, it does, especially if the main challenge is to develop neutron devices.

Even if it were, on balance, not very probable that underground and space cheating alone would give sufficient results to allow the would-be aggressor to forgo other tests entirely, it can be argued that atmospheric test actually can be dispensed with for a protracted period, especially during periods when the other chief signatory of the ban does not test at all.

Obviously, a secret test program, even if it were restricted in scope, will in due time allow numerous improvements in weapons design, with the result that the balance of nuclear power gradually would shift to the violator.

Whether such a shift would occur with slow or rapid speed and how soon it might make a significant strategic difference, depends on many variable and unpredictable factors, including the ability of the violator to hit on unforeseen techniques through which the control system could be further degraded.

But even granting that testing would lead the violator only to a certain point. Assume he has achieved a new design but assume also that he feels he cannot just scale up but must test at full yield. In this case, he could risk a space shot, which may not be much of a risk after all. He also might produce a very deep and large underground cavity—in fact he may have used earlier underground shots to dig such a mammoth hole—and test the full yield underground. The rationale would not be that such a test would necessarily remain undiscovered but rather that the risk of detection is small, that attempts at verification will remain fruitless, and that more time will be gained in this fashion than by an open violation in the style of 1961.

The test ban danger can be understood most clearly if we do not overemphasize the question of whether shots can be detected and verified, but analyze the problem within the framework of a technological race in time. The Soviets may not be chiefly concerned about the danger of discovery. Their chief problem, as I see it, is to gain time advantages over the United States. It is only in this context that they must prevent premature discovery.

Naturally, time planning for the test program is part of their overall strategic time planning. Assume they estimate, after 8 years of cautious clandestine testing, that they probably gained the technical advantages they were seeking; assume that they decide to go to war after 2 more years. Since probably a fairly large number of atmospheric tests at full yield would be required to check the overall reliability of their battle order weapons, they should resume atmospheric testing on D-day minus 1 year. Even if the United States resumed testing within the year, the Soviets could have reaped great strategic benefits. Naturally, the proof tests may show that the weapons function less well than had been anticipated, in which case the stratagem may have failed in part. The odds are, however, that while yield predictions and the like may not be entirely accurate, serious and noncorrectable failures will not occur.

CHAPTER XI

The test ban: its strain on free world alliances

In all this pressure for the test ban, the United States has shown willingness, or so it seems to many outside observers, to subordinate the interests of the NATO alliance to the chimera of a Soviet-American test ban. If such a ban were concluded, it would amount to a quasi-alliance between the two hostile superpowers, especially if it were accompanied by a proviso that the nuclear club would remain closed to new applicants. The implications of such an agreement would be far reaching. Even in the present phase when the agreement is merely being discussed, the alliance has been weakening politically and militarily, and Europe has remained disarmed in terms of a future war. In the end, if the test ban were to stick, it would constitute a reorientation of the entire foreign policy of the United States. The effect of this policy would be, whether this is the intent or not, to divide the globe into an American and a Soviet orbit—until the day when the Soviets will see fit to grasp for it all.

Naturally, the proviso against the enlargement of the nuclear club cannot be enforced unless we or the Soviets, or both, were to threaten and even attack nations acquiring nuclear capabilities. Yet the Soviets hardly could afford to attack China. Khrushchev's recently commented: "When we will throw the last shovelful of dirt on the grave of capitalism, we will do it with China." In view of this attitude, it is very plausible to expect that the Chinese, once they get around to testing under moratorium conditions, actually would be acting as proxies for the Soviets. Similarly, the United States cannot prevent the French from pursuing their atomic program, and we have announced—and reiterated—that we won't interfere.

In this connection it is to be noted that the Soviets repeatedly stated they would stick to the principle that for each Western shot, they would fire a shot of their own. Hence, so long as the French continue their tests, the Soviets, irrespective of what they sign with the United States, will not consider that they are obligated in any manner by the discontinuance of American testing.

The incongruity of our policy can also be seen from the fact that we only recently offered to France Polaris missiles without warheads or submarines. This offer, which was refused, for good and sound reasons, was predicated on the assumption that the French would develop their own atomic warheads for that missile. It is fantastic to expect that the Polaris missile which has been in service for 2 years, will remain so desirable that still in 1970 it should be introduced into the French arsenal, i.e., at a time when the Soviets may be in the second generation of their antimissiles. Certainly, Polaris would be the wrong missile if by 1970 neutron technology were mastered, and missile as well as submarine could be reduced in size. By offering just one element of an entire weapon system, we are ignoring the main lesson in arms design since 1940: Weapons must be designed as systems; hence if we want the French and the British to have a nuclear submarine force, we had better get together and negotiate about the system in toto.

The French have yet to prove mastery of fusion techniques and surely a fission warhead on Polaris makes no sense at all. Irrespective of whether it is sound to expect that the French can have a truly effective Polaris warhead by 1970, if the United States were to enter into a test ban, we would expect the French not to engage in any tests. How then could the French acquire the warhead for the missile which we are offering to them? Would we not feel compelled to withhold the missile if they did not adhere to the moratorium—and to withhold it also if they did observe the moratorium, because they could not use the missile?

Truly, the United States has been maneuvering itself into an untenable position. While we have been chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of a test ban designed to initiate a series of arms control or disarmament agreements, or failing in this most illusory objective, to pursue a strategy of nuclear stalemate rather than deterrence, we have not even attempted to make some real progress for the benefit of mankind. The whole agitation about the test ban came about because of fears that fallout would endanger human health. It might have been feasible to conclude an international agreement for the control of the amounts of radioactivity released into the air every year. Such an agreement could be patterned, for example, after the international whaling convention or provisions for the control of epidemics. Perhaps the Soviets would have been unwilling to forgo their stratagem and substitute a beneficial measure. But the pursuit of a useful public health convention, instead of a strategic boomerang, would conform both to American security interests and to its traditional concern for human welfare.

It is distressing that the United States has gradually been slipping into a policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament, on the one hand, and illusions and duplicity on the other. Major strategic decisions in a democracy should be based upon a proper democratic debate. Instead, secret diplomacy abounds, the Government manipulates the news and abuses security provisions by withholding information to which the American public is entitled, especially since the pertinent information is known to the Soviets. The absence of regular reports on the nuclear race bespeaks a fear that the American people may become apprehensive of Soviet nuclear advances and consequently demand the initiation of a serious and continuous American test program.

A democracy cannot function without an effective opposition. It would seem as though in many vital security areas, but especially in the nuclear field, there has been a de facto suspension of the democratic procedure within the United States.

The voice of those who oppose the folly of the test ban has been stifled effectively and it remains to be seen whether this particular intra-American iron curtain can be pierced before the security of the United States is permanently imperilled. In a democracy the opposition is expected to be loyal. But it is a vital element of its loyalty to the Nation that the opposition must fulfill its functions of opposing false policies, even at the price of a loss in popularity. An opposition which keeps silent throws away its chances and forfeits the future of the Nation.

CHAPTER XII

The test ban: an American retreat from supremacy

The test ban is one important step in the many unilateral measures which the United States has been taking toward unilateral nuclear disarmament. The Soviets have carried out more tests at high yields than we have, and when they announced that they would use 100 megaton devices in their weapons, we stuck to bombs and warheads of far lesser firepower. We are reducing the total megatonnage of our strategic delivery system. If we allow a firepower gap to develop according to present trends, we would simply make the Soviets a present of the greatest blackmail potential ever possessed by an aggressor.

We are holding back with the development of warheads of optimal usefulness in anti-ICBM's. It is utterly incomprehensible that Disarmament Agency Chief William C. Foster lists as an advantage of the test ban that "the development of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides." There can be no advantage in such a slowdown for a second-strike power. International stability would be enhanced through a better balance between offensive and defensive weapon systems. Mr. Foster's statement, however, discloses the true attitude of the administration to antimissile defense: they just don't want it.

There has been a recent downgrading of the utility of low-yield tactical weapons and a great eagerness to strengthen the conventional firepower of the ground forces rather than their nuclear capability. We are more afraid of rash acts by our own troops than of enemy aggression and have put our nuclear weapons under so many controls that it will be a miracle, should aggression eventuate, if they can be used before the storage and launch sites have been hit. To top all this, we are relying on weapon systems which were never fully tested and whose reliability is not checked at regular intervals.

It is apparent that by contrast, the Soviet Union is trying to maximize its nuclear capabilities for all weapon systems useful in a modern war.

The solid strategic result, so far, of 5 years of unpoliced test moratorium, test-ban negotiation, and somewhat desultory U.S. testing has been that the Soviets caught up and possibly overtook us in the yield of strategic weapons as well as in high-yield nuclear efficiencies. Presumably, to judge from Mr. Foster's statement, we still enjoy advantages in smaller and tactical weapons—but this seems to be irrelevant in view of the fact that the administration plans to stop production of tactical weapons and makes every effort to downgrade the utility of these weapons, be it even at the price of further undermining NATO.

Hence we don't really need a second test-ban round to help the enemy because we are conceding the tactical weapons to the Soviets anyway. But the second round, in all likelihood, would provide the Soviets with a monopoly in neutron weapons. In any event, a test ban which by definition cannot be used to police tests on neutron weapons and which would be observed unilaterally by the United States because we don't want to develop the neutron technology, would provide the Soviet Union with an optimal condition to achieve military supremacy.

Has Khrushchev forsaken nuclear war? Perhaps, but for how long? How long will he stay in power? He anticipates that as a result of his peaceful coexistence strategy, major crises will develop. What he plans to do when a crisis occurs was stated by him in blunt language on January 16, 1963: "If a revolutionary situation has arisen, the working class, led by its vanguard, must utilize this situation for seizing power * * *. The people have the right to use the most decisive means including armed struggle, in the interest of the victory of socialism."

Impregnable Troy fell to a primitive ruse. The test ban is a highly sophisticated stratagem, but it is really based on an elementary point of observation: Americans are so highly susceptible to high-sounding propaganda that they can be persuaded to commit political suicide. The trick is to disarm us and make us die by an infinite number of small steps. The test-ban stratagem is the most effective psychological warfare campaign of the century, a real breakthrough in the art of psychological warfare, just as radar, the fission bomb, the missile, and sputnik constituted technological breakthroughs. But of all these breakthroughs, the test ban has the optimal cost-to-effect ratio.

Shall we be extinguished because we are listening to Kipling's prophets "of the utterly absurd, of the patently impossible and vain?" Odysseus knew how to behave when he encountered the Sirens; we are eager to be charmed by their sweet songs. "Around them the bodies of their victims lie in heaps."

APPLICATION OF POWER REVENUES FROM RECLAMATION PROJECTS FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Government makes a profit on a Government-owned business, those profits rightfully belong to the people of the United States. With this in mind, I am introducing a bill that would provide for the application of power revenues from reclamation projects to the reduction of the public debt.

What my bill means is that revenues derived from reclamation projects will first be used to repay the costs of such projects, but once the project is on a paying basis, additional profits would be transferred to the General Treasury and would be applied only for the reduction of the public debt of the United States.

We all recognize the value of necessary reclamation power projects, but we should also recognize that profits from such projects belong to the taxpayers. Instead of turning such profits back into the Treasury, as was originally intended, they have been used in the past to support irrigation projects that not only cannot pay their own way but even add to the already staggering surpluses of agricultural products in this country. Some do not even benefit the power customers served by the original project.

Using these power profits for unsound irrigation projects is a direct form of subsidy, paid for by the American people. The figures are juggled, however, to make it appear that they cost us nothing. My bill would put an end to this reshuffling and dealing off the bottom of the deck. The cards would then be on the table, face up, for all to see.

This bill would not only work to reduce the national debt, but would amount to a wiser expenditure of these moneys than is now being done through questionable irrigation projects. These projects would then have to stand on their own merits instead of sneaking in behind the skirts of public power profits.

The worst part of all is that these irrigation projects put new acres into production raising the same crops that we pay other sections of the country not to raise. These farms are not even capable of paying back the interest-free money they are using to get into production.

Using these power profits to reduce the national debt would be the first step taken in that direction for some time. Our Government ran $6.3 billion in the red last year, expects to run another $8 or $9 billion in the hole during the fiscal year ending June 30, and anticipates a deficit of at least $11.9 billion next year if current budget requests are approved.

If this is the case, Congress may be asked to up the debt limit to $320 billion after this June 30 to meet the spending requirements for fiscal 1964. The debt limit was $285 billion in 1961, which means we are on the threshold of increasing it by the whopping total of $35 billion in just 3 years.

If reclamation power profits had been returned to the Treasury under the terms of my bill in the past, our public debt would now be around $4 billion less than it is. This may seem insignificant in these days of $100 billion budgets, but at least it is a first step toward a goal of fiscal sanity.

My bill has three major purposes, to reduce our impossible national debt, to eliminate a practice that results in increased farm surpluses at taxpayer expense, and to make wiser use of these moneys at a time when the fiscal strain is big enough to begin with.

HOW STRONG IS THE DOLLAR?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1963, I made a statement on the floor entitled "How Strong Is the Dollar?" This statement called attention to one facet of our balance-of-payments problem.

On March 13, 1963, I read into the Record, page 4106, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, "Ignorance or Intent?" This article demonstrated the close relationship between our balance of payments and the administration's budget handling.

Calling attention to the need for maintaining confidence in the U.S. dollar, the Wall Street Journal advocated reduced Federal spending as the best way of stimulating healthy economic development.

On March 19, 1963, the distinguished minority leader of the Senate issued the following statement:

Statement by Senator Dirksen, March 19, 1963

The Kennedy administration's highly questionable proposal to increase the national debt so that the Federal Government can spend more while the people pay less in taxes offers so many dangers to our economy that it is difficult to list them.

Certainly one of the greatest dangers is further inflation which means rising prices. The American people, who saw their money cheapened by nearly 50 percent under the Truman administration, understand this danger and it is one of the reasons they doubt the wisdom of President Kennedy's proposal to increase spending while cutting taxes.

But there is a much less understood danger—the threat the President's program presents to an already bad economic problem, the flow of gold from this country to foreign lands.

In 1962, the United States paid to foreign creditors $2.2 billion more than it received in the balance of payments and it is already estimated our deficit position will be equally bad this year. As a result of the 1962 payments, our shrinking gold holdings were reduced $911 million, meaning our foreign creditors demanded gold instead of accepting our dollars more than 40 percent of the time.

It is a fact of economic life that the demand for gold by foreign holders of dollars will step up sharply if the Kennedy program should result in additional inflation. Foreign economists and financiers recognize the inflation potential in the proposed Kennedy deficit and just their fear of it could produce increased difficulties in our flow of gold problem.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership, feel it imperative to point out that higher prices which inevitably follow inflation could only mean less export of American goods and more export of gold to pay for the increased imports of goods made by cheaper foreign labor. Instead of helping solve unemployment, Mr. Kennedy's planned deficit very conceivably could increase unemployment and worsen our gold position to boot.

The creation of jobs is our No. 1 problem and we believe any tax-and-spend program which weakens confidence is likely to worsen rather than solve the problem.

The Senator from Illinois has done a commendable job in linking our balance-of-payments problem to the planned budget deficit proposed by this administration.

Until a year ago, balance of payments was a subject with which Americans were largely unconcerned. In the last 2 years foreign creditors have been demanding gold instead of accepting our dollars. If this situation continues, balance of payments may become as well known as Mickey Mantle's batting average.

W. A. SHEAFFER PEN CO.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the golden anniversary of one of my State's major industrial enterprises—a company whose name in the short span of 50 years has become known to many millions of people throughout the free world.

I refer to the W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., incorporated in 1913 in Fort Madison, Iowa, by the inventor of the lever-fill fountain pen, and now directed by the two grandsons of the founder.

When W. A. Sheaffer began production of writing instruments a half-century ago with a staff of six employees, his "factory" was a 12- by 14-foot room in the back of his small jewelry store on the main street of this southeast Iowa community.

Today, in the same city, Sheaffer Pen Co.'s three modern plants cover an area of several blocks and contribute substantially to the economy of the area by employing more than 1,400 of Fort Madison's 15,000 citizens.

In addition, there are hundreds more employed in Sheaffer facilities in Canada, Australia, South America, and Europe—evidence of the opportunities for growth and expansion under the American free enterprise system.

I am proud of the accomplishments of this Iowa firm that for 50 years has adhered unswervingly to the philosophy of its founder: build quality products, charge a fair price for them, and sell them with pride. In the years ahead I am sure that Sheaffer management and employees will have as their goal even greater service to the fundamental area of personal communication as a force for international understanding and well-being.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last year I had extensive correspondence with the Reverend Stanley Stuber of Jefferson City, Mo., and the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] regarding the use of information provided by the committee from its public files. This exchange originated when I received a letter from Dr. Stuber calling for the abolition of the committee because of certain "abuses" of which he, and others, contend the committee have been guilty.

In following up on his complaints, which centered around the publication by certain individuals and groups in Missouri of committee material concerning him, I believe some important questions of procedure were raised. This correspondence appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 3, pages 3776–3779, volume 108, part 13, pages 18279–18282, and volume 108, part 14, pages 19503–19505.

A further instance has been brought to my attention by Dr. Stuber of the use of committee materials dealing with him. Once again, I believe that this subject is of such importance to the Congress and the country in evaluating the work of the committee that I am placing the correspondence dealing with it in the RECORD.

First is a letter which I received from Dr. Stuber enclosing a copy of a memorandum circulated by the Reverend Alfred Thornton of the Bible Baptist Church of Jefferson City to all members of the Missouri State Legislature. My reply follows:

MISSOURI COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 28, 1963.
The Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: Enclosed is another documentation of how the listings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities are being used to smear Americans who may believe in the National Council of Churches and the United Nations.

You will note that the Reverend Mr. Thornton claims that he received the listings from Chairman WALTER and that this information is directly from the official records in Washington.

This is very serious business, since this document was sent to all the members of the house and senate of the Missouri Legislature.

I certainly hope that you will find time to follow up on this matter, and discover some way of keeping the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from the hands of those who want to use the great influence of a congressional committee for their own personal purposes of smearing those with whom they do not agree.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY I. STUBER,
Executive Director.

BIBLE BAPTIST CHURCH,
Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR LAWMAKER: A copy of this letter is being put in the hands of all senators and representatives of our State legislature. It concerns the Reverend Dr. Stanley I. Stuber of Jefferson City.

Dr. Stuber is executive secretary of the Missouri Council of Churches with headquarters here in the capital city. You will be hearing from this man for he will be using his position as head of a large council of churches to influence certain legislation. Please notice very carefully the following information about Dr. Stuber.

I have a personal letter from the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Chairman of Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. WALTER enclosed the following data.

"1. In 1950 and 1951 Dr. Stanley I. Stuber sponsored the National Committee To Repeal the McCarran Act. (The Internal Security Subcommittee said that this organization was subversive.)

"2. Dr. Stuber was secretary-treasurer of the Inter-Church Committee of The American Russian Institute. (That organization was listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee, and Internal Security Subcommittee.)

"3. Dr. Stuber was connected with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. (This organization was declared subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities, Attorney General of the United States, Internal Security Subcommittee, and Subversive Activities Control Board.)

"4. Dr. Stuber was a sponsor of The Call for a National Emergency Conference. (That organization was declared subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities.)

"5. Dr. Stuber was a sponsor of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom. (This organization was declared subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, Committee on Un-American Activities.)"

In recent weeks Dr. Stuber has been reported in the local newspapers as opposing the House Un-American Activities Committee making known publicly the names of persons found to belong to Communist-front organizations, and that he and his Council of Churches would officially favor legislation to abolish the death penalty in Missouri.

Dr. Stuber will probably deny this report—he has already in the past, but I remind you this information is directly from the official records in Washington. If you should like a photostatic copy of this report from Washington I will be happy to provide you with one. If for any reason you should want to contact me further, my telephone numbers are Jefferson City 635–1970 or 635–1097.

By the way, the above report on Dr. Stuber is only fragmentary. There are other men in Missouri who know more on him than I do. Their names and addresses are available for you.

With every good wish, I am
Yours sincerely,
REV. ALFRED O. THORNTON,
Pastor.

FEBRUARY 5, 1963.
STANLEY I. STUBER, Th. M., D.D.,
Executive Director, Missouri Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR DR. STUBER: I wish to acknowledge your letter of January 28, 1963. It is obvious to me that the Reverend Thornton is referring back to the incident which I checked into where Congressman WALTER released the unevaluated material in the committee's files under the caveat the committee employs. I do not condone what was done and I have endeavored to persuade the House Un-American Activities Committee not to permit this kind of thing to happen.

On the other hand, it is quite obvious that Reverend Thornton is misusing this material as he does not call attention to the caveat of the House Un-American Activities Committee which accompanies this material. Quite the contrary, Reverend Thornton seeks to create innuendoes the other way. This is a matter of Reverend Thornton's actions, however, not the House Un-American Activities Committee. It does demonstrate, however, the point you sought to make of the manner in which House Un-American Activities Committee material can be misused when placed in the hands of certain people.

I still find it strange, however, that you do not have your explanation of your association with these various groups adjudged to be subversive firmly placed in the House Un-American Activities Committee files. The House Un-American Activities Committee points out that they have asked you for this statement several times and have assured you that this becomes just as much a part of the files as the derogatory material.

I have no knowledge of any new incident of the House Un-American Activities Committee releasing unevaluated material to a member of the public, or even to another Congressman, who then made it available.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

Next is a letter which I received from the Missouri Convention of American Baptists, written in an attempt to clarify the situation and put Reverend Thornton's memorandum into proper perspective. Again my response follows:

Missouri Convention of
American Baptists,
Columbia, Mo., February 4, 1963.

Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
Webster Groves, Mo.

Dear Mr. Curtis: I have reason to believe that you have received a communication from the Reverend Alfred O. Thornton, pastor of the Bible Baptist Church, Jefferson City, Mo., which seeks to cast suspicion on the patriotism of the Reverend Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, executive director and Ecumenical Minister of the Missouri Council of Churches.

I am privileged to serve as the official representative of the American Baptist Convention in Missouri and Dr. Stuber is an ordained minister of this denomination. It is in this capacity that I am writing to call your attention to two things:

1. I have in my files photostatic copies of letters from the staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and from one of the members of the committee, stating that there has never been a hearing nor an investigation of Dr. Stuber and that he has never been identified as a member of the Communist Party.

2. The statement regarding the practice of the House Committee on Un-American Activities making public the content of their files is a reference to and consistent with a resolution adopted by the Greater Council of the American Baptist Convention and submitted in writing to Members of the Congress by the American Baptist Convention.

I have taken the liberty of writing because I believe that Mr. Thornton, through misinformation which has come to his hands, has possibly cast one of American Baptists' respected leaders in an unfavorable light.

I shall be pleased to discuss this further with you if you should care to request it.

Respectfully,

James Havens,
Executive Secretary.

February 19, 1963.

Mr. James Havens,
Executive Secretary, Missouri Convention of American Baptists, Columbia, Mo.

Dear Mr. Havens: Thank you for sending me a copy of the letter you are sending to people who may have received communications from Rev. Alfred Thornton, pastor of the Bible Baptist Church of Jefferson City, in respect to Rev. Dr. Stanley Stuber.

I think this goes a long way toward putting this matter in the proper light. This is a way much preferable to that of castigating the Congress and its committees, as was done in the unfortunate statement to which you make reference in point two of your letter.

The phrase "unevaluated and limited" information should be used in place of the word "misinformation" contained in the next to the last paragraph of your letter. The House Un-American Activities Committee did not give out misinformation, as Dr. Stuber himself acknowledges, only unevaluated and limited information, which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

A copy of my reply to Mr. Havens was directed to the attention of Reverend Thornton. He took issue with my contention that his "Dear Lawmakers" memorandum drew or suggested "unwarranted conclusions" and asked for an explanation of my statement. Here, I feel, is the crux of the matter; in this can be found the responsibilities of the various interested parties to safeguard the personal reputations of those about whom the committee has material in its public files.

In its form for providing requested information from its public files on specific individuals and groups, the committee prints a caveat stating that the information which follows is not evaluated and contains only material which has been received by the committee, not results of any investigation by it. It goes on to say that the information set forth is "not, per se, an indication that this individual is subversive, unless specifically stated."

This caveat is as much a part of the committee's information as the material which follows it. Yet, there are those, like Reverend Thornton in the case at hand, who republish this material, often edited and always leaving out the explanatory caveat. We can hold open for discussion whether there should be files of the committee open to the public and whether the committee should cooperate with those interested in this material to the extent of reproducing it and sending it on request. A case could be made either way on this, and should be made.

Nevertheless, the committee in responding to requests for information of this nature takes the very commendable precaution of making sure the caveat noted above goes with it. Then we come to the responsibility of those who receive and republish the material from the committee. If they follow the procedures which Reverend Thornton has, they ignore their responsibility to the people who are subjects of the committee files and to the people to whom their reports are sent. If their purpose is to smear, they can use the edited committee file material, just as they can any other half-truth, and make what appears to be a damning case. To turn back for a moment to the basic issue which brought me into correspondence with Dr. Stuber, is this adequate reason for abolishing the committee? Clearly not. It may indicate a need for a better procedure on the part of the committee to prevent abuses by other people outside of the Congress, but it cannot impute the motives of those on the outside to the committee.

The letter of Reverend Thornton asking for a clarification of my statement and my response follows.

Bible Baptist Church,
Jefferson City, Mo., February 23, 1963.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Curtis: Thank you for sending me a copy of your recent letter to Mr. James Havens, executive secretary, Missouri Convention of American Baptists.

In the last paragraph of your letter to Mr. Havens you say, "The House Un-American Activities Committee did not give out misinformation, as Dr. Stuber himself acknowledges, only unevaluated and limited information, which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions."

I would appreciate very much your explaining simply what you meant by the last clause of that paragraph, quote: "which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions." I am completely in the dark as to what you meant by that and since I am directly involved I assure you of my sincere desire for an explanation.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Alfred O. Thornton.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

Rev. Alfred O. Thornton,
Pastor, Bible Baptist Church,
Jefferson City, Mo.

Dear Dr. Thornton: I am happy to comply with your request that I explain what I meant by the last clause of the paragraph you refer to in my letter to Mr. James Havens: "which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions."

Your "Dear Lawmaker" letter addressed to all Missouri State legislators stated, "Please notice very carefully the following information about Dr. Stuber.

"I have a personal letter from the Honorable Francis E. Walter, chairman of Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Walter enclosed the following data:"

This data was typed on the standard form employed by the House Un-American Activities Committee which has a printed caveat preceding the information set out. This caveat reads as follows:

"This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee. The fact that the committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated."

You did not print this caveat in your letter or in any way warn the people you were writing to that this was unevaluated material and that deductions should not be drawn from it that a person is or was subversive.

As a matter of fact, you edited the material from the House Un-American Activities Committee files.

Item 1. The House Un-American Activities Committee files state that the Daily Worker "reported" Dr. Stuber to be a sponsor of the Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act and a circular and petition of this committee listed him as among "prominent

Americans" who urged the repeal of the McCarran Act.

Your letter states baldly that Dr. Stuber sponsored this national committee. This is drawing an unwarranted conclusion. I remind you the sole authority for drawing the conclusion is the Daily Worker, which, according to my standards, and I suspect yours, is a very unreliable authority.

Item 2. The House Un-American Activities Committee file merely says that a letterhead, received in 1949, listed Dr. Stuber as secretary-treasurer of the Inter-Church Committee of the American-Russian Institute.

You draw the unwarranted conclusion that "Dr. Stuber was the secretary-treasurer * * *." A letterhead at most is some evidence of this fact, not conclusive proof. Furthermore, you very neatly have edited out of the House Un-American Activities Committee report references to dates, except in your item 1, dealing with the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act—and there you put in the years in which the Daily Worker and the committee said Dr. Stuber was active in this but failed to note that the earliest citation of this committee as subversive was in 1956. Dates become very important in evaluating membership in organizations. An organization can start out perfectly sound and be subverted at a later date. It is for this reason that the House Un-American Activities Committee files give the date when the organization under question was declared subversive and by which governmental agency. In this instance, the Inter-Church Committee of the American-Russian Institute, the dates were 1949, 1952, and 1956. There is no statement as to when the letterhead might have been printed. The House Un-American Activities Committee statement is limited and quite clear, "the letterhead was received in 1949."

Item 3. The files state the Daily Worker reported in 1947 that Dr. Stuber was among many signers of a statement sponsored by the organization in question. Two pamphlets of the organization said Dr. Stuber was among the signers of a statement and appeal sponsored by it. You draw the unwarranted conclusion that "Dr. Stuber was connected with" the organization. This is an indication of some connection, but not proof of it. The dates of the statements are not listed so we have no way of knowing whether they were issued before or after the organization in question was found to be subversive.

Item 4. The files state that the call for a National Emergency Conference May 13, 14, 1939, "named Dr. Stuber as a sponsor." You draw the unwarranted conclusion that he was a sponsor. Maybe he was, but this is only an indication he was. The organization was not declared subversive until 1946 and 1949.

Item 5. The file states that Dr. Stuber's name was on a letterhead (no date) of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom which was declared subversive in 1946 and 1949. The date of the Spanish Civil War suggests that the letterhead, whatever it signifies, probably was printed about 10 years earlier. You draw the unwarranted conclusion that "he was a sponsor."

I have pointed out specifically where you have drawn unwarranted conclusions. Let me now point out where you suggest unwarranted conclusions. Your final paragraph is as follows: "By the way the above report on Dr. Stuber is only fragmentary. There are other men in Missouri who know more on him than I do." Now what do you mean "know more on him" unless you are suggesting that all the secondhand, quoted out of context, rephrased material you have previously set out is something "on him," that is, against him.

What indeed is the entire purpose of your letter if it is not to draw and suggest unwarranted conclusions about Dr. Stuber?

Now let me conclude by saying this. I have no brief for Dr. Stuber. I don't believe I have ever met him, although I may be in error on this. I am at considerable odds with him on many important matters including his actions and attitudes toward the House Un-American Activities Committee, which I believe is doing a very difficult task under very trying circumstances with a reasonable record of fairness. I have criticized and still criticize the House Un-American Activities Committee for certain specific things, but I try to make my criticism constructive and I am also guided by the thought that I may be the one in error.

I believe that freedom of thought and the freedom to express one's thoughts is very basic to our way of life. It is because the Communist ideology would deprive our people of these freedoms—and our other important freedoms as well—that I am so strongly opposed to communism. However, we must not in combating communism and its attempt to infiltrate our society (and this threat is not a figment of the imagination) sacrifice the very freedoms we are fighting to protect. The end cannot justify these self-defeating means.

I am satisfied that if we are careful and fair we can combat communism effectively. Communism thrives on unfairness, excesses and carelessness with the truth; it withers in the light of honest debate and true seeking after facts. I do not believe the material which you circulated has helped in the fight against communism.

With best wishes,

Yours very truly,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

There is a final level of responsibility which I feel deserves mention in this area. It is the responsibility of men like Dr. Stuber, leaders in their communities, to those who look to them for guidance. I am placing a letter which I have written to Dr. Stuber below, but I should like to point up its major thrust. As a preface to my letter is a letter which Dr. Stuber has written to the committee, in response to their invitation and request, stating his comments on the listings which the committee has dealing with him in its public files. I am pleased that Dr. Stuber has done this and, I might note, committee procedure is that this statement will be made part of the file of material on Dr. Stuber and will be with the file material to those who request such material.

In joining, supporting, or lending his name—if indeed he did—to the various organizations which are mentioned in the committee's files, Dr. Stuber placed the prestige of his person and his office behind these organizations. Because of this prestige which Dr. Stuber has, it is incumbent upon him, just as it is incumbent upon every Member of this body, to use care in giving support to groups which seek it. His giving support is not a private thing; it is an act which the recipient organization will publicize and upon which those who respect Dr. Stuber and have faith in him can rely. He owes it to the public to make the full extent of his connections an open matter—if he does support a cause, he should be glad to say why and, if the cause has been found subversive, to explain why he feels he can still cooperate with it in the best interests of the country or, on the other hand, announce that he no longer gives it his support. Just as Reverend Thornton has failed in his responsibility, Dr. Stuber, too, has helped create what I believe is a very unfortunate situation.

FEBRUARY 21, 1963.

The Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: At your suggestion I am making the following statement to be used in connection with the public file dealing with my name: "Dr. Stuber Not Connected With Communism."

In view of the above listing I want to state that it is entirely misleading and has absolutely false implications. I have never been a member of any Communist or Communist-front organization. Neither have I paid membership dues to any such organizations nor attended any of their meetings. All during my public ministry I have been opposed to communism and to other totalitarian groups. What I have said and done have been inspired by Christian convictions and have had no connection with communism. As an American citizen, believing in our Bill of Rights, I feel that it is not un-American to speak out boldly for what I believe to be Christian principles. I am perfectly willing to be judged by my Christian position. I am unwilling to be associated to any degree with communism.

The Reverend Dr. STANLEY I. STUBER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1963.

STANLEY I. STUBER, Th.M., D.D.,
Executive Director, Missouri Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR DR. STUBER: In reviewing your recent letter to Chairman FRANCIS WALTER of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the statement which you have prepared for inclusion in the public file of material dealing with you, I felt compelled to write further carrying on our exchange on this matter.

I am very happy that you have chosen to accept the invitation of the committee to give this statement. I regret that you did not do so earlier. You have attained, and I am sure earned, a position of great respect in your community—a community which, I might say, extends far beyond the bounds of Jefferson City and the State of Missouri. Many people look to you for leadership and respect the opinions which you express.

With this prestige which you enjoy goes a duty to those who rely upon you. I feel I have the same duty. I cannot give my support to an organization without knowing that with it I lend whatever prestige my name carries to the organization as well. My support for an organization, and yours, is not a private thing; it thrusts this relationship out into the public eye, with all of the personal satisfaction and problems which this implies.

With the relationship public, the duty attaches to one who has lent his prestige to an organization to assure that the reliance placed in him is not misdirected in support of the organization. The duty can be met by letting those who rely upon you know the details of your connection with the organization and, if you disagree with the organization, your duty compels that you do whatever you can to make this disagreement known.

The content of your statement to the committee should reassure everyone of your beliefs. It does nothing to meet your duty to those who rely upon you to bring to light your connection, if any, with the organization with which your name is linked in the committee public files.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

AREA JOB RETRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 18, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] inserted in the Congressional Record a statement in which he discussed the operation of the Area Redevelopment Administration's job retraining program in Hagerstown, Md.

The net effect of the gentleman's statement was to absolve the agencies involved of any responsibility for a situation in which Federal funds were used in this program to train workers, directly and indirectly, for the benefit of a company, Mack Trucks, Inc., which relocated one of its plants from Plainfield, N.J., to Hagerstown, Md.

I must respectfully take exception to the gentleman's conclusion.

The gentleman's statement in the Record, Mr. Speaker, was generally factual—so far as it went. Not only did he omit some pertinent considerations, however, but he also placed an interpretation on the situation which I believe runs directly at variance with the facts he concedes.

He concedes that Mack Trucks, Inc., is a runaway plant, that its removal from Plainfield, N.J., to Hagerstown, Md., was a clear case of a relocation of industry; that the Area Redevelopment Act contains a clear bar against using Federal funds for a relocating industry; that an application was filed for Federal funds under the Area Redevelopment Act to set up a program for retaining workers as machine tool operators at the Mack plant in Hagerstown; that, even though this specific application was denied, three different programs for training machine tool operators were established in the immediate area; and that a total of about 60 or more workers retrained in these programs with Federal funds were employed by Mack Trucks.

In one very important respect, however, the gentleman's recital of the facts is, I believe, incorrect. He states that "as soon as this situation"—the direct referral of 15 graduates of the first retraining program to the Mack Co.—"came to the attention of officials in Washington, the Hagerstown Employment Service Office was reminded of the bar against aiding relocating industries, and no future references were made to Mack."

According to my information, Mr. Speaker, at no time during this period did officials in Washington remind the Employment Service Office of this prohibition. The Courier-News of Plainfield, N.J., which first revealed the situation on March 7, following an extensive, firsthand investigation in Hagerstown and Washington, quoted the director of the Maryland Office of Employment Security in Hagerstown as stating that he does not recall anyone ever telling him to stop referring people to Mack.

If this were the whole story, Mr. Speaker, it would represent a clear violation of the spirit and specific provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, whether intentional or a result of poor administration. These additional facts, however, which the gentleman from Maryland ignores, makes the violation even more obvious.

The Federally subsidized retraining programs were established in Hagerstown and vicinity in full knowledge of the fact that Mack was the area's biggest employer and the source of the largest demand for machine tool operators.

Those who established the program knew, too, that the demand for machine tool operators by other employers was a direct result of Mack's policy of "pirating" skilled employees from these other employers through the promise of higher wages.

Therefore, those who established the retraining programs had every reason to know that most of the demand for machine tool operators was created, directly and indirectly, by a relocating industry, and that the principal purpose of the retraining programs, financed by Federal funds, was to meet the demand created by this relocating industry, Mack.

Not counting those workers undergoing retraining who went to work for employers other than Mack, because Mack had previously raided those employers, the direct cost to taxpayers of retraining the 60 or so workers employed by Mack totaled $50,000.

Part of this $50,000 of tax receipts was paid by the 2,000 or more former employees of Mack in Plainfield, N.J., who lost their jobs when Mack moved to Hagerstown. Therefore, those who became unemployed by virtue of a runaway plant were forced to help support the training of workers to take their places in this same runaway plant.

It is this fundamental injustice, Mr. Speaker, that led Congress to write a forceful antipiracy provision in the Area Redevelopment Act. The Mack experience suggests this provision is either being administered inadequately or is incapable of enforcement.

The gentleman from Maryland seems to imply that the law cannot properly be enforced. He dismisses as an "inadvertance" the fact that workers were trained for employment in a relocated plant. He writes off as "a fact of life" the inevitability that other retrained workers, not specifically referred to the relocated plant, will eventually go to work for the relocated plant in answer to widely advertised employment opportunities for workers retrained as machine tool operators. And he further defends the use of a federally subsidized retraining program to supply workers to industries which have lost employees to the relocated plant.

If this is a proper interpretation of the manner in which the Area Redevelopment Act should be administered, or if the act is in fact being so administered, I feel certain the news will come as something of a shock to many Members of Congress who voted in favor of the act. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which considered the legislation and reported it favorably, I can say with some assurance that this was not the understanding at the time the act was approved. On the contrary, no other provision of the act received more extended and careful consideration than the antipiracy clause. Everything possible was done to make this provision airtight, to guarantee that Federal assistance would not be used in any way to aid, abet, or encourage the relocation of plants from an industrially developed area to a labor surplus area, or to otherwise benefit such plants. I do not believe the Area Redevelopment Act could have been passed if there had been any reasonable doubt that the administration shared this understanding and was prepared to administer the act accordingly.

The reasonableness of a strict interpretation of the antipiracy provision is, I believe, self-evident. First, it would be the grossest kind of injustice to require displaced workers, who are also taxpayers, to help finance a tax-supported program providing benefits to the company which caused his unemployment by relocating its plant. Second, it is obviously uneconomic for a Federal-aid program to function in such a way that it benefits the act of exchanging unemployment, and this is clearly the effect of relocating existing industrial plants. The new employment created by the new plant is often more than matched by the unemployment caused by closing the existing plant. While private companies have a right, of course, to relocate their facilities, they have no right—either in reason or law—to expect the Federal Government to provide assistance of any kind in connection with the relocation. The purpose of the distressed area program is to help create new job opportunities by encouraging establishment of new and expanded industrial facilities, not by relocating plants already in existence.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully but vigorously disagree with our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles], with respect to the responsibility for permitting Federal funds to be used to benefit the Mack Co.'s relocated plant. The assistance the Mack Co. received was both direct and indirect. It was substantial. It was provided knowingly in a situation in which the Mack Co. was both the chief cause of the Federal-aid project and its principal beneficiary. And it was provided in violation of a specific provision of law.

Under these circumstances, accountability cannot be waived. Whether it is the Area Redevelopment Administration or the Department of Labor, someone is responsible for permitting Federal funds to be used to assist a relocated plant. Congress has an obligation to look into the situation thoroughly and determine whether such violations of the antipiracy provision of the Area Redevelopment Act can be prevented or whether this provision cannot be enforced adequately.

I have discussed this matter, Mr. Speaker, with several of my colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee, including the chairman of the committee. I have written to the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor asking them to investigate and provide us with a full report. The Secretary of Commerce has assured me it will be looked into carefully and a full report furnished in the near future. I have not yet heard from the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure our colleagues, especially those who represent industrial areas as I do, will agree that this situation is extremely serious.

If the Area Redevelopment Act is not being administered in accordance with the spirit of the law and the clear intent of Congress, then we must take appropriate steps to insist on proper administration. If the antipiracy provision of the act is ambiguous or inadequate in any way, then Congress ought to tighten it up. If the antipiracy provision cannot be enforced as Congress intended, or if the act cannot be so administered as to prevent the use of Federal funds to aid relocated plants, then I believe the entire act should be repealed or drastically revised and a fresh start made to find a more workable way of aiding distressed areas.

Otherwise, we shall be permitting, indeed encouraging, the Area Redevelopment program to be used as a lure to companies interested in relocating their plants when they can get something for nothing. The people we represent, many of whom are potential victims of such piracy, would not be likely to agree that this is a proper use of Federal funds.

FREEMAN'S POLICY FIGURES ON WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been confronted during the past 2 years by the paper curtain—the New Frontier-style barrier through which only officially slanted news is permitted to come to public view.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has its own paper curtain, and this is particularly true of the deceptive propaganda being fed to farmers about the wheat referendum.

Officials of the Department, from Secretary Freeman down to county ASC office managers, are declaring that the referendum is a choice between $2 wheat and $1 wheat.

This is false and grossly misleading. It is made for an obvious reason: It plays on the price-depression fears of farmers. But neither the $2 figure nor the $1 figure is accurate.

Price is only one of several important considerations in the referendum. But considering price only, the choice is not between $2 wheat and $1 wheat. It is between wheat at about $1.85 the first year and, under the worst circumstances, $1.25 wheat if the referendum fails.

Where the $1 figure originated is anybody's guess. It did not come from anything in the lawbooks. If the referendum fails—and if Congress should fail to pass new legislation—wheat would be supported at 50 percent of parity. This means price support at $1.25 a bushel. Of course, no one seriously suggests that Congress would fail to act if the referendum fails.

Consider the facts. Mr. CARL ALBERT, majority leader of the House, represents a major wheatgrowing area. Would he block new legislation if farmers vote down the certificate scheme. Of course not. Indeed he would be in the front ranks hustling to get a new bill passed.

With the 1964 election just around the corner, is President Kennedy apt to put the clamps on voters who grow wheat just because they turned down the bill to establish mandatory acre-and-bushel controls? He is not about to, and all the threats to the contrary will be smothered in wide smiles once the referendum tally is counted.

Does a car salesman refuse to deal with a customer just because he will not buy one particular model? Of course not. He is back quicklike with another one—probably the same day.

That is why I say that only under the worst circumstances wheat would be supported at $1.25 if the referendum fails. Those circumstances just will not come to be, particularly with a politically sensitive President in the White House.

Now, the promise of $2 wheat if the referendum carries. Probably the least understood portion of the proposal is that if a farmer stays within his allotment he gets a certificate for only a portion of the production. The portion is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of the national quota. Secretary Freeman has indicated farmers staying within their allotments would get a 70-cent certificate for between 80 and 85 percent of their normal production. Note the word normal.

This means the farmer would average about $1.85 per bushel—not $2—since he would sell the balance of his production—some 15 to 20 percent—under the $1.30 per bushel support level.

If the farmer heaps on the fertilizer and gets a bigger-than-normal yield, the extra yield would go under the $1.30 support too, and thus the average per bushel would drop below $1.85.

The new legislation would give the Secretary vast discretionary authority.

Suppose the wheat harvest is good in 1964, and stockpiles rise. Under the new legislation the Secretary would have the authority—and the responsibility, for that matter—to cut back the bushelage quota still more. It is anybody's guess what the per bushel average price for wheat might then be in 1965 and beyond.

The new legislation provides that wheat used for food at home and such portion of wheat exports as the Secretary determines, would be supported at between 65 and 90 percent of parity. The Secretary is directed to consider eight factors in making this determination.

Previous legislation provided a minimum price support at 75 percent of parity for all wheat produced within the allotment.

Now wheat not accompanied by certificates would be supported at a still lower level than 65 percent of parity, again to be determined by the Secretary. He has announced that wheat not accompanied by certificates on farms that stay within their allotments will be supported at $1.30 a bushel, or a shade over 50 percent of parity.

Under the law the Secretary could have gone much lower and related the price support to feed grains. This lower support would be possible, of course, after 1964. Budget troubles might force such action.

All the erroneous talk about $2 versus $1 wheat obscures other dangerous features of the new legislation.

For example. No payment for diverted acres after 1965, and payment at the Secretary's option in 1965.

Let me explain. Under the new legislation the old 55-million-acre minimum national allotment would be eliminated. In its place would be a billion-bushel minimum marketing quota. This quota, on a bushel and acre basis would be divided among wheat farmers.

As technology improves, this could mean sharp acreage cuts in years beyond 1964. As yields go up, allotments and quotas go down.

You might assume that as acreage allotments are cut, farmers will be paid for the diverted acres. Payments are authorized only for 1964 and 1965. After 1965, no payments are authorized. Secretary Freeman has already announced that farmers will receive a diversion payment for 1964 on a 10-percent mandatory cut at 30 percent of the normal yield. In 1965 he may make it substantially lower or eliminate it altogether. Here again budget problems may govern policy.

Here is something even more serious, a strange new penalty never before applied in commodity programs. The new legislation provides that after 1965 the diverted acreage must go into conserving or certain special crop uses, but no payment is authorized for this diversion. If the farmer fails to place this acreage in conserving uses, he becomes ineligible for price supports or certificates and is subject to high marketing-quota penalties. All this, even though he stays within his wheat allotment.

As I said, this is something new: truly a straitjacket within a straitjacket.

This is a good time for the wheat farmers of America, and particularly those in my home State of Illinois, to stop, look, and listen.

Somehow they must pierce the paper curtain and get the facts—before it is too late.

BRAZIL THREATENS TO QUIT TAKING OUR MONEY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if we are not careful we will make some of the foreign countries so mad they will quit taking our money.

This occurred to me when I read in the March 18 Evening Star this Associated Press story, the first three paragraphs of which are reprinted here:

> BRASILIA, March 18.—President Joao Goulart has reacted angrily to U.S. assertions that Communists had infiltrated his government. A big new obstacle arose to harmonious relations between the two countries.
>
> Mr. Goulart demanded that President Kennedy personally clarify the charges made by the State Department in a published statement to the House Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.
>
> The President issued an order to his finance minister, Francisco San Tiago Dantas, to suspend his negotiations in Washington for more U.S. aid. Informed sources said, however, that Foreign Minister Hermes Lima persuaded Mr. Goulart to withdraw the order.

Mr. Goulart was really going to get even with us, was he not? The moral of it: if we want our foreign aid program to keep going full blast, we had better quit complaining about such incidentals as Communist infiltration in the countries on the receiving end.

COLLEGIATE NURSING EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure I am introducing today authorizes a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for college training in the nursing field. The legislation is designed to help alleviate the pressing need for more and better trained nurses which exists in our Nation today.

This need is reflected in the present shortage of public health nurses, industrial nurses, and school nurses, as well as in the chronic shortage of nurses to staff hospitals and nursing homes. If we are to properly provide for the long-range nursing needs of this country, the time for action is now.

The Collegiate Nursing Education Act of 1963 has three main parts:

The first section provides matching grants for nursing school construction and specifies that no school could receive more than $500,000 in the 5-year period.

The second section authorizes funds for teaching assistance and states that no institution can receive over $25,000.

The third section makes scholarships available to both entering students and to graduate nurses with a 3-year hospital diploma.

I am pleased to advise the House that the Rhode Island State Nurses' Association and other nursing organizations are solidly behind this measure.

Nursing is a great vocation which seeks to serve those who cannot serve themselves. In order to close the gap which exists between the supply of qualified nurses and the demand for them, and to further upgrade the nursing profession, I urge enactment of the Collegiate Nursing Act of 1963 at this session of Congress.

A COGENT ANALYSIS OF THE PATENT PROBLEM

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, an important aspect of the present scale of economic growth in the United States arises from our need to see that we make the best possible use of the inventions which are developed in laboratories across the country. This is a complex problem, relating to the way we disseminate the results of technical and scientific research and the way in which we encourage the best brains and the best talent to apply itself to solutions of difficult technical problems.

An element of this problem is the handling of patents in such a way as to stimulate the progress of science and the useful arts. This area has provoked a great deal of discussion in recent years as some who are fearful of monopoly in any form have challenged the patent system, even though the Congress has established legislation to be invoked whenever antitrust situations appear.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions in the last Congress and a member of its predecessor, I have had occasion to study this controversy at some length. The House, on one occasion, has indicated its belief that a flexible patent policy with regard to inventions under the Space Act should be adopted by passing legislation which so stated and, on a second occasion, the Committee on Science and Astronautics overwhelmingly recommended such a statement.

There is no question that the Space Act should be amended to speed and improve our national space program and to give the Administrator of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration more flexibility with which to carry out his congressional mandate to use the full resources of the United States in achieving his goals. This will require legislative action.

The conflict in patent policies and theories has been brought to the attention of the President on a number of occasions and, in the early months of the present administration, there was a major attempt to urge Executive action which would take this policy out of the hands of the Congress. Wisely, the President recognized the complexity of this problem, and indicated at a press conference last year, in response to questions, that he would submit any proposal for a solution to the Congress.

Considerable study was given this question by the executive branch. Much of the study centered in the Office of Science and Technology, which is headed by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and which has very grave responsibilities in the shaping of science policy for the Nation. The Office is a staff arm of the President to advise and assist him in these matters.

Dr. Wiesner testified on March 14 at a hearing of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee which has held hearings on patent policies within the Federal Government. Dr. Wiesner discussed the complexities of this problem, and I found his remarks most significant and useful. I believe they should be given wider distribution and should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress, who should gave an interest in what he had to say.

In essence, Dr. Wiesner's statement sets forth a philosophy which evaluates the importance of the patent issue to the future of research and development and its relation to our national goals. From this, he draws certain guidelines for any real solution to this difficult problem. I was especially pleased to note that it concurs generally with the principles developed by our subcommittee last year.

Thus it seems apparent that, after extensive study of the question of the ownership of patents developed by industry in whole or in part with Federal research funds, Dr. Wiesner and his associates have arrived at most of the same conclusions which our committee recommended last year and which we reported to the House as House Resolution 12812 on August 12, 1962.

It is clear from Dr. Wiesner's testimony that he has found a definite need for flexibility in approaching the matter and that there are many instances in which title to inventions should remain with private enterprise as well as some in which title should become the property of the Federal Government. Dr. Wiesner emphasized that the Government should always retain a royalty free irrevocable license on these inventions for use by the Government. I believe it is implicit in his testimony that, for the most part, such license is sufficient protection of the public interest except in cases where the Government has been the chief instigator and financer of the inventions in question.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the views expressed by Dr. Wiesner show that the administration has looked into this question carefully and identified the equities which must be protected. I believe they also show clearly the need for a change in the present Space Act if we are to obtain the equity and flexibility toward which Dr. Wiesner is striving—and toward which we on this committee have been working for a number of years.

As things now stand, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 so restricts administrative procedures that NASA cannot deal with industry on a completely equitable basis. Where NASA is now compelled to demand ownership of inventions developed by contractors during the course of their research, subject only to possible waiver, the change which we have recommended would leave this matter to the discretion of the administrator who may choose that course which is in the best interests of the United States.

Evidence submitted to our committee overwhelmingly supported a change to provide much needed flexibility and thereby speed and improve our space program. Facts show that the rigid nature of the present law has resulted in a paucity of truly meaningful scientific disclosures to come thus far from NASA's research and development program. It is my hope that this matter can be rectified during the present Congress, after which the extreme partisans on this patent question may find themselves able to converge on a common meeting ground.

I am submitting Dr. Wiesner's remarks for publication in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF JEROME B. WIESNER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, BEFORE THE MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, MARCH 14, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to discuss policies concerning patents resulting from federally financed research and development.

Some months ago my office undertook an examination of the patent practices of the Federal agencies with respect to the allocation of patent rights under their contracts with private organizations. We examined the need for Government-wide uniformity of patent practices; explored the rationale behind current practices; and looked into the feasibility of developing a set of common criteria that would guide agency judgment in the handling of patent rights.

I am not speaking as an expert on patent law or on the intricacies of patent procedures in the several agencies. Rather, I am presenting observations from the vantage point of the Office of Science and Technology which is a staff arm of the President to advise and assist him in the coordination of science and technology functions. I am concerned with patent policy from the standpoint of its effects on the conduct of research and development and on the contributions of research to national objectives. Since the office of Science and Technology does not conduct research and development, I am not here to state or defend a particular policy position. We have analyzed this complex and tangled situation from a neutral corner and have conscientiously attempted to assess what the public interest requires, taking into consideration the many relevant factors, both public and private.

There are as many different patent policies and practices within Government as there are agencies engaged in research and development. In the course of our inquiry, we worked with some 20 different departments and agencies and found their attitudes in this matter full cooperative and constructive. Some of their practices are required by legislation; others have been developed through experience over the past 20 or more years. Each agency feels that its own policies are consistent with the public interest and its own mission. The present diversity of policy is due in part to the differing objectives of the Federal agencies and in part reflects differences in the principal industries with which they do business. Some like Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare support research of a type that might normally be tackled by nongovernmental research organizations were there sufficient private resources and motivation. Others like the Department of Defense engage in research and development where the occasional civilian byproducts are incidental to the main object of developing new hardware for governmental purposes. Some fields, such as atomic energy, have largely been developed at public expense. In certain areas of military and space technology, the Government agencies are drawing on extensive industrial experience and know-how developed at both public and private expense.

There can be little disagreement as to the national needs that Government patent policy should serve: the need for maximum creativity and inventiveness in solving scientific and engineering problems; the need to attract the Nation's most competent scientists and engineers and technical management teams to Government research and development tasks; the need for expeditious development and civilian use of any resulting inventions which are practicable for civilian use; and the need to promote healthy competition in industry.

Despite general agreement as to the objectives of Government patent policy, there are divergent views as to the extent patent incentives are required to accomplish these objectives where the work is financed by the Government. I would like to explore this in more detail; there is need for much better public understanding of the issues involved.

Unquestionably, the Government should acquire at least an irrevocable nonexclusive royalty free license with respect to all inventions made in the course of any contract of any Government agency. The questions that have been raised relate to the commercial exploitation of patents. Under what circumstances should the Government take title to inventions made under Government contracts? What are the circumstances where the public interest would be served by leaving exclusive rights with the contractor?

We can delineate several categories of research and development activity carried out for the Government in which a strong case can be made that it would be contrary to the public interest to permit the contractor to acquire exclusive patent rights under the contract. These are categories of scientific and technical work where the widespread availability of the results would be better served through publication and complete freedom of use; where the retention of exclusive rights by the contractor might unfairly put him in a dominant or preferred position. I have in mind the following situations:

First, where a principal purpose of the contract is to create products or processes which are intended to be used in the civilian economy, or which are otherwise intended to be available for use by the general public at home or abroad. Similarly, where the use of the product is required by governmental regulations, the Government should acquire the principal or exclusive rights.

Second, where a principal purpose of the contract is for exploration into fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare, such as the development of a new drug, a medical instrument, or an agricultural chemical.

Third, where the contract is in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the Government, or where the Government has been the principal developer of the field. In these situations, the Federal Government should acquire the principal rights where the acquisition of exclusive rights by the contractor at the time of contracting might confer on him a preferred or dominant position.

Fourth, where the services of the contractor are for the operation of a Government-owned research or production facility; or where the contractor is hired to coordinate and direct the work of others. In this situation the acquisition of exclusive rights by the contractor would be inconsistent with the purposes of the contract.

There are other circumstances in which a strong case can be made that would permit the contractor to retain exclusive rights for nongovernmental purposes. Such circumstances must clearly arise in the situation where the work is in an area where the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position and has demonstrated technical competence indicated by know-how, experience, and patent position. For example, consider the case of a pump manufacturer who has, over a period of years, invested considerable private resources in the development of new techniques for pumping fluids. In the course of research and development for the Federal Government in developing a pump for liquid fueled rockets, the contractor draws on his extensive background and know-how. Does the possibility that the improvement in the pump may have potential for commercial uses require the Government to obtain title to patents on the improvement?

We are familiar with the points made within and outside of the Government on both sides of this question.

On the one hand it has been advocated that since the Government pays for the research, it should own all the rights; that retention of exclusive rights by the large contractors would undesirably restrain competition and could lead to undesirable economic concentration; that the contractor receives exclusive patent rights without taking financial risks in the research; that the patent incentive is not needed to attract the most competent industries to Government work; that the contractor would be in position to exploit the invention at unreasonable charges or could withhold it from commercial use; that the patent incentive might result in withholding of information until patent applications are filed.

It has been just as vigorously alleged that in these circumstances there is greater likelihood of public availability of the invention if exclusive rights are left in the contractor as an incentive to encourage substantial private investment in product development, production, and establishing a market; that companies with independent investments in know-how and patent position will be reluctant to contract with the Government or to draw upon this background if their inventions were to be made available to competitors; that fewer, not more, contractors would perform important Government work; that there are likely to be fewer inventions reported as such under contracts where the protections and incentives of the patent system for public disclosure of the invention will not be available; that making inventions available for public use destroys the incentives of a privately owned patent; that the Government would be acquiring more rights than it needs for carrying out governmental functions.

The balance of wisdom between these two positions is difficult to reach. There is some validity to points on both sides. Some of them rest on conflicting assumptions. Some go beyond the narrow question of invention under Government contracts and seem to go to the philosophical foundations of the American patent system. I believe that many of the arguments advanced have weak factual foundation, and overgeneralize the actual situation. There is regrettably little fact on which to formulate policy in this difficult area of public administration.

I do not believe that the commercial value of patent rights arising under Government contracts in the past has been such either to support concerns about unjust enrichment or economic concentration, or to lend substantial force to claims that such rights provide an important incentive to attracting industrial firms to undertake federally sponsored research and development. The survey of defense contractors conducted by the

Patents Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary revealed quite limited commercial exploitation. The importance of patent incentives will vary from industry to industry and may also depend on the size of contractor. In the electronics industry with which I have had firsthand experience, the ownership of patent rights can be an important nutrient for the establishment and growth of small companies, and the lack of such rights poses a serious hazard. I know of several instances in which a small company struggled for years to establish a new product only to have a large company then come along and take advantage of the market when it became attractive. Patent protection in such instances would be most important. Therefore, in considering the allocation of patent rights under Government contracts, appropriate weight must be given to the views and unpredictable response of the large number of subcontractors on which the vitality of our military and space program heavily rests.

It has been the practice in some of the Government agencies to accord exclusive rights to contractors in the last-mentioned situation after the invention has been identified; that is, where the contractor has a nongovernmental commercial position, and where the commercial use of the invention is incidental to the primary object of the contract and is not of a type that would fall in one of the four public-interest categories previously described.

The Department of Defense feels strongly among other things that the performance of its mission requires the ability to assure the contractor at the time of contracting that he will retain commercial rights to his ideas, in order to assure the unrestrained participation by the most competent elements of American industry in the defense programs. There is concern that such unrestrained participation cannot be achieved without giving heavy weight to the contractor's commercial position and past investment in the field of his specialization in according exclusive patent rights. It is impossible, of course, to prove this contention short of trial by experience, although the views of many industrial firms large and small in support of the defense position are well known. Whether or not one agrees with the concern, it is real. There are grounds for caution lest a change in longstanding defense policy to insist that all rights to such inventions be retained by the Government in all cases result in research and development of lesser quality, of greater costs, or of longer times required to produce the desired results. A middle ground might be found to give particular weight at the time of contracting to the contractor's commercial position and his prior investment. The central question is not primarily whether experienced contractors could be found to accept more restrictive patent clauses. It is whether the terms of the contract will encourage the contractor to apply his full technical background and experience to the Government work. These considerations also apply to contracts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The national interest requires greater uniformity between DOD and NASA patent practices since they are drawing on the services of the same sector of industrial research and development competence.

Despite the wide apparent variations in agency practices at the present time and the fact that there has been a difference of view within the Congress, within the administration, and between industry and Government for well over 15 years, I feel that a reasonable basis for framing a governmentwide patent policy can be found. It seems important for the Government to move in the direction of a more consistent policy that will eliminate the unhealthy confusion and instabilities that attend the present situation. Such a policy should provide for the Government to retain title in the range of circumstances that I listed earlier; but it is necessary to recognize that, because of the problems of the type that concern the Department of Defense and NASA, any policy, to be realistic, should enable industry to retain exclusive rights in certain circumstances. As I have already indicated, the nature of the work involved, the commercial background of the contractor, and the extent to which the contractor would be expected to work the invention in the public interest would be significant factors in permitting contractors to retain exclusive commercial rights. Of course, where agencies now feel it necessary to acquire greater rights for the Government, such requirements should continue.

I think that any concern regarding such exclusive rights might be further alleviated if a further step were taken to assure the protection of the public interest. I have in mind the possibility that whenever the principal rights remain in the contractor, the Government would reserve the right to require the granting of a license on a nonexclusive royalty free basis unless the contractor or his licensee has taken effective steps within a limited period, as for example 3 years, after a patent issues on the invention to bring the invention to the point of practical application, or unless he has made the invention available for licensing royalty free or on reasonable terms. This would preserve the patent protection for a reasonable period in this time of rapid technological advance, and increase the incentives for expeditious commercialization and public use of new inventions while eliminating the possibility that commercial use of such inventions could be suppressed.

A Government policy along the foregoing lines could be adopted on a trial basis. At the same time I would urge the marshaling of facts by the Government agencies with respect to the development, reporting, and use of inventions made under Government contracts in order to provide a sounder basis for the formulation of future policy. Through my office and the Federal Council for Science and Technology, I would propose to develop by mutual consultation and coordination with the agencies a common approach to the implementation and further development of policy in this area, consistent with existing statutes.

I hope that various interests of the Federal agencies in stimulating and promoting the making and utilization of inventions under research and development contracts can converge in a common objective to serve all of the elements of our society and reinforce the partnership between Government and industry in accomplishing the many jobs required in the national interest.

NEED FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a resolution proposing the establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations, known as House Resolution 211, was submitted to the 87th Congress, first session, more than 2 years ago. The fact that it has not moved a step forward and had to be resubmitted to this Congress as House Resolution 14, is directly attributable to the State Department's opposition. Secretary Dean Rusk, in his famous letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], dated August 22, 1961, mentioned two arguments against such a committee:

> (1) The establishment of such a committee might be taken as a pretext for actions by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the present crisis over Berlin;
>
> (2) The U.S. Government's position would be weakened by any action which places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical state—

Meaning the Soviet Union, which hardly may be termed an historical state since it was established but 40 years ago. But to continue quoting Mr. Rusk, he also would oppose any action that "confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union."

However, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention lately that the State Department is using a third argument to defeat the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations. I quote from a letter, dated February 16, 1962, and signed by Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State:

> The creation of a specialized committee to operate in one sector of our foreign relations, without responsibility in the broader area of foreign affairs problems, would ignore the fact that our efforts on behalf of the captive nations can only be effective if they are made within the context of the overall Soviet threat as well as of our national interests and capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, the spokesman for the State Department in this case committed a basic error. Congressional committees are not established to operate in any sector of the executive branch of Government. Mr. Dutton's fear of competition is groundless. The congressional committees are established to conduct studies and investigations of matters properly coming before the Congress and make recommendations thereon. Congress examines such recommendations against a much broader background of its responsibilities than those of the State Department, and either accepts, modifies, or rejects the recommendations.

But what the State Department really wants is to preclude any congressional committee from exercising its constitutional duty of investigation within the sacred preserves of the Department. Taking the captive nations as an example, the State Department would like to deal with their problem the way it sees fit.

The Assistant Secretary of State makes no mistake about it. He says:

> We will continue our efforts on behalf of the captive nations, and we are confident that the established bodies responsible for these matters are able and determined to give them the full attention which they merit.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must stand corrected on one point. The State Department, as indicated in Mr. Dutton's letter, condescendingly agreed that "the

House Foreign Affairs Committee was taking a special interest in the question of the captive nations within the broader framework of the responsibilities of that committee."

The recognition would be too good if it were true. It is not. I understand the State Department has vetoed the establishment of a Subcommittee on Captive Nations under the Foreign Affairs Committee. Such a measure was recommended in the committee's "Report on Hearings on Captive European Nations," dated October 26, 1962. Evidently, the Foreign Affairs Committee was taking too much interest in the captive nations. Too much, that is, to the State Department's liking.

Mr. Speaker, do I hear the State Department tell us, "Hands off the captive nations," and are we going to take its dictates lying down? I hope we are not.

TAXES

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify on March 6 before the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the revision of our tax structure.

The following is the text of my statement and the questions and answers which were asked concerning it:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to comment on the President's proposal to revise our tax structure.

In dealing with legislation as important as this and covering as wide an area, it is unlikely that we will find many people who will agree with every facet of the President's recommendations. I assure you that I do not envy the tremendous burden which you must assume in performing the task of bringing out a bill that will be acceptable to a majority of Members of the House. I do trust that my comments will prove helpful and not further confuse an already complicated problem.

In the interests of time I will not discuss the general principles underlying these tax recommendations but will address myself to specific parts thereof. I would like, however, to make this one general statement, to wit, the enactment of the bulk of the President's recommendations should redound to the benefit of the entire economy of our country and more particularly to the benefit of the small businessman and to the lower income groups.

I address myself first to the matter of treatment of itemized deductions from personal income.

The proposed new treatment of these deductions by limiting them to that in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income is in my opinion the wrong way to tackle this problem. This would hit hardest at the lower income groups whose deductions while small dollarwise are most meaningful to them. There certainly will be no incentive to anyone to meet their civic and charitable obligations by saying to them that they can get no tax deduction or credit until after they have paid 5 percent of their income. It works an even greater hardship to say to them that the first 3, 4, or 5 percent of their gross income which they actually expend for medical expenses is not deductible. I could never understand the theory by which only the excess over these percentages was deductible.

The recommendation as to minor casualty losses so as to exclude all deductions up to 4 percent of the taxpayer's income would merely create another incentive to cheat. This is analogous to insurance policies which provide that the first $25 or $50 of loss is not payable by the insurance company. Insurance carriers will tell you that this results in most people getting bills for double the amount of the loss in order to cover the excludable portion thereof. The same thing will undoubtedly occur if this provision should be enacted. The Internal Revenue Service couldn't find a force large enough to investigate and check upon those items. It would undoubtedly cost the Government many times more to unsuccessfully attempt to collect the taxes for these deductions than the deductions themselves would aggregate.

Any attempt to remove the exemption from interest on mortgages and the real estate taxes on homeowners' properties would be nothing less than a breach of faith by our Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The small landowners are the most precious part of a State." For years our Government has been urging our citizens to become homeowners. The latest statistics show that almost 60 percent of our families own their own homes today. One of the greatest incentives to the acquisition of homes was the fact repeatedly stressed that interest on mortgages and real estate taxes were deductions from gross income for tax purposes. I urge that we do not change that exclusion.

Another recommendation that I oppose is the repeal of the $50 and 4 percent deduction on dividend income. This exemption was to have been a first step toward the elimination of the unfair and inequitable double taxation on earnings.

In considering what should be done with this recommendation I urge that this committee do not consider how much tax can be received by our Government but rather, do we have a right to tax earnings twice? Once the earnings of a corporation have been taxed, the net amount belongs to the stockholders and, while there might be some logic in taxing a corporation for failure to pay those earnings as dividends to the stockholders, we cannot justify taxing those identical earnings a second time when they are distributed to the owners therof.

With reference to capital gains, I urge that you will decrease the net revenue payable to the Government on capital gains by extending the period from 6 months to 1 year in order to qualify for a long-term capital gain. It is my opinion that the capital gains taxes payable to the Government would increase two or three times if instead of increasing the period we decreased it to 3 or 4 months. By decreasing the period to 3 or 4 months these capital assets would turn over that much more frequently and each time they were sold there would be a capital gains tax paid.

I heartily endorse the recommendation to tax as earnings and not as capital gains the moneys realized on stock options. But I suggest that that tax be payable not on earnings in connection with stock options granted after enactment of the law but on all earnings received after the enactment of the law, regardless of when the stock option was granted. The proposed changes of the rate of taxation will apply to all earnings thereafter received and any change in the tax structure should equally be made to apply to all earnings thereafter received regardless of when and where contracted for.

The President has recommended an additional tax credit of $300 for all people age 65 or over regardless of the source of their income. This credit is to replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit. Our senior citizens are greatly in need of tax relief since the annuities which they receive are usually not enough to live on. I believe that the Committee should consider the exemption from Federal income tax of annuities received by individuals age 65 and over. As a partial step in this direction I have introduced H.R. 4182, which would exempt amounts up to $2,400 in annuities, pensions, or requirement benefits paid by local, State, or Federal governments.

I strongly urge that as recommended in H.R. 4182 all annuities paid by State, local, and Federal governments be exempt from Federal income tax.

I recommend that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 525, to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction from Federal income tax for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, should be included in any new tax bill enacted.

I also urge the inclusion of the provisions of my bill, H.R. 530, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business by permitting individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small businesses to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1963, and to increase the surtax exemption; to provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings; to liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans; to provide an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate and to provide family-sized farmers an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care and marketing of farm products, and to provide family-sized farms the same exemption.

I believe that these last two items will greatly stimulate small business.

Thank you for your time and attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr MULTER, the committee appreciates you presenting your views to it. Any questions?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, it is a source of constant marvel to me, the scope and depth of my distinguished colleague's activities and this morning is another example of it.

I would, however, like to ask you a question with reference to your proposal concerning stock options. You used in your formal statement the word, "earnings." What did you mean by that?

Mr. MULTER. Stock options, as granted today, are in lieu of additional salaries or compensation to officers and employees of companies. I am not talking about the stock option that would be given to the run-of-the-mill employee where he is actually buying the stock and paying for it on the installment plan, but I am talking about the alleged incentive that big business gives to employees and officers, usually, in the top, higher echelon, to buy stock at less than market value at some future time.

The usual procedure is to offer the stock option at anywhere from 80 to 90 percent of the current market value at the time of the issuance or granting of the option which will be exercised at some future time when the stock is selling at a price two or three times the market value at the time of granting the option.

This, in my opinion, is earnings. It is compensation, and should be taxed as such when the profit is received on the sale of that stock.

In other words, I am granted this option to buy at 85 percent of market value and 2 years from today I exercise that option and buy the stock at 85 percent of today's market value but sell it at twice that price. The difference between what I pay then and what I get for it on resale at that time is earnings to me.

Mr. KEOGH. I see.

You mean earnings to the holder of the option. Is it your recommendation that the difference between the sale price and the option price should be taxed to him as ordinary income in the year received?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir; that is what I am suggesting.

Mr. KEOGH. You are, in effect, disagreeing with the proposal of the Treasury Department in that area that the individual be given the 5-year averaging?

Mr. MULTER. I am in agreement with the averaging provision. I would not pay the full tax in the one year if the provision for averaging is enacted as part of the law. I think that is a very essential part of the tax recommendation.

Mr. KEOGH. My reaction to your statement as you delivered it was you were placing a greater burden on the individual who exercises the stock option than even the Treasury and the President have proposed in the message and testimony?

Mr. MULTER. You had a right to draw that conclusion from my statement standing alone without further explanation.

Mr. KEOGH. You referred to the bill, H.R. 4184, and indicated, at least gave me the impression, you were increasing the retirement income credit to the recipients of public retirement systems, local, State, and Federal. Is that the purpose of the bill?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, would you accord the same treatment to those who receive retirement annuities from private pension plans?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. The point is, the income that has been used to buy those annuities whether privately or from Government by deposits or withholdings in a Government pension system, has been income to the payer in the first instance on which he paid the tax.

Mr. KEOGH. Not for the share of the employing agencies that the Government contributes and in the case of the Federal retirement system not for the difference between the percentage contributed and the benefits that the Congress have voted the Federal employees which represents to those individuals a virtual tax free gift, not of 52-cent dollars like in the corporate plans but of tax dollars?

Mr. MULTER. You are quite right. To that extent, my plan would be a subsidy to that pension or annuity. But I say we must do it because these pensions and annuities have been bought on the basis of what they were worth many years ago and for persons getting $2,400 pensions today they can hardly live on it. When they originally sought to buy that pension or annuity, it was enough in those days. Today it is not.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, with the personal exemptions and with the retirement income credit accorded those individuals under existing law, in my opinion the tax burden of an annuity of $2,400 a year is not very heavy.

Mr. MULTER. It hits hardest the single person, the widow or widower, who gets the smaller exemption.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, there are sociologists who will argue that perhaps they should bear a greater burden.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions? We thank you, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

VICIOUS ATTACK ON COACH PAUL BRYANT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of the University of Alabama, I condemn the vicious and irresponsible March 23 Saturday Evening Post attack on Coach Paul Bryant.

The charges contained in the Post article are little short of ludicrous. Those of us who know Paul Bryant and his devotion to the best interests of the University of Alabama and collegiate athletics generally are amazed and shocked that any magazine could sink to this low level of journalistic irresponsibility.

The Saturday Evening Post article is replete with half-truths and vicious innuendo, based on the flimsiest of testimony. That the magazine published this material without so much as contacting Coach Bryant tells us a great deal about the Saturday Evening Post's type of reporting.

Dr. Frank Rose, president of the University of Alabama, and the university board of trustees early this week responded to the Post's attack by expressing complete confidence in Paul Bryant. These expressions of confidence followed an investigation of the charges made by the magazine article, and I believe they reflect the feeling of the people of Alabama regarding this unwarranted attack.

DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, President Kennedy began a 3-day visit to San José, Costa Rica, for the purpose of meeting with the Presidents of Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. It was my privilege to attend this meeting at the invitation of the President along with my colleague from the House of Representatives, the gentleman from California, Representative MAILLIARD, Republican; and with Senators FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas; Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; and Senator HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa.

As a member of the bipartisan congressional group at the San José meeting and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I was especially concerned with the need for action to curb the Communist subversive threat in Central America.

The final Declaration of Central America issued by the heads of state in attendance calls for an April meeting of the ministers of government "to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda, and funds from that country."

The declaration also states that the April meeting is to take specific action toward increasing air and sea surveillance and interception of any Cuban Communist movement of money, propaganda, material, or arms to any area of Central America.

These points closely follow the recommendations made by the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs in its recent report dealing with subversive activities and traffic.

Should this implementing action follow in April, an important step will have been taken toward reducing the Castro Communist subversive threat to the hemisphere.

In addition to the proposed April meeting, the declaration contains pledges on the part of both the United States and participating Central American governments designed to further the creation of a Central American Economic Community.

As press reports have indicated, the President and his party were enthusiastically received in San José. Despite unprecedented Communist propaganda aimed at undermining inter-American confidence in our leadership, it was most encouraging to find in Central America obvious and sincere friendship for the President and the people of the United States.

PROTECTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS IS IMPORTANT, TOO

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a news item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, together with other members of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have been gratified at the decision of our able chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, to proceed at once with hearings by the full committee concerning the impact of international trade upon the American small business community. This is a most important matter, one that holds deep implications for the prosperity of not only small businesses, but, indeed, for all of America.

Much has been said about the opportunities offered the small businessmen of the Nation by increasing their markets in foreign lands. As trade is a two-way street, the opportunities also exist for smaller firms through the importation of foreign goods.

An example of this has been the use of imported steel wire rod by several hundred small processing and fabricating firms. Steel wire rods have been in short supply domestically. Prices charged for wire rods have, in some instances, been higher than those charged by the steel mills for mesh wire fabricated from the rods, according to charges filed with the Federal Trade Commission. Further, there have been allegations by some small businessmen that prices on wire rod have been kept high while finished product prices were slashed for the express purpose of squeezing out these small, independent firms.

Many of the steel mills of the Nation are engaged in dual distribution of a great number of products. As an example, they manufacture wire rod, which they sell to small processors. In addition, they also fabricate the same products made by these processors and sell them in direct competition with the products of their customers.

A news item from the March 19 issue of the Wall Street Journal indicates that the Treasury Department has recently ruled that these wire rods are being imported at cutrate prices in violation of the U.S. antidumping law, the matter has been referred to the Tariff Commission for decision as to whether U.S. steelmakers are being harmed. I submit that of at least equal importance is the question of whether the banning of these imports would not do irreparable damage to the small businesses presently purchasing the imported rods. Particularly so, since it appears that these small firms cannot afford to purchase domestically produced rods, regardless of whether the importing continues or not.

This is the kind of question upon which much light can be shed by the hearings recently announced by Representative EVINS.

It seems to me that, as a condition precedent to the banning of further imports of steel wire rods at present prices as sought by our domestic steel mills, the question of the price squeeze tactics apparently being used by the domestic steel industry to the detriment of independent small businesses must be fully resolved. To this end, it is my intent to fully investigate this matter as part of the hearings on dual distribution which will be held by the Subcommittee on Distribution next month. If our domestic steel mills are guilty of the tactics with which they have been charged, it is clear that the banning of these imports could serve only to snuff out a number of small business concerns.

Chairman EVINS will, I am sure, at the hearing on foreign trade by the full committee, fully investigate all aspects of the tariff problem involved here. As an adjunct to this, my subcommittee will attempt to determine what impact upon small business the dual distribution of products manufactured from wire rod, such as mesh wire, is having upon the small businesses manufacturing these products.

I insert the news item, mentioned above, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 19, 1963]

The Treasury Department upheld the complaint of U.S. steel mills that hot-rolled carbon steel wire rods are being imported from Belgium at cutrate prices in violation of the U.S. antidumping law.

The Treasury referred the case to the Tariff Commission, which must decide whether the imports are injuring U.S. steelmakers. If it decides they are, the Tariff Commission is empowered to boost customs levies to bring the imports in line with domestic goods.

A controversy has long been simmering between U.S. producers of wire rods and domestic users who have been buying the product from foreign mills. These users insist the steel industry's effort to reduce the wire-rod imports, if successful, could put some of the fabricators out of business.

TO CONSIDER OTHER COMPLAINTS

Under the antidumping law, the Tariff Commission has 3 months to decide the Belgian rod case. Treasury officials said they hope to use the time to rule on other sections of the complaint involving steel rods imported from West Germany, France, Luxembourg, and Japan.

Six U.S. steel mills participated in the original charge against wire-rod imports. They were Bethlehem Steel Corp., Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., Armco Steel Corp., and Detroit Steel Corp. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Corp. joined later.

In their complaint, filed last September, the companies alleged that Belgian rods were being sold in the United States at from $24.95 to $25.85 a ton below the indicated value in the Belgian market.

WELL BELOW EUROPEAN LEVEL

The Treasury, in ruling that the Belgian prices had violated the antidumping law, computed a weighted average price for steel rods sold in Belgium and made a similar computation for the price paid by importers in the United States.

The average import price, a Treasury official said, was well below the European level. The official added, however, that Department rules forbid publication of the price figures used in the comparison.

An official of one of the U.S. mills that participated in the complaint said of the Treasury ruling, "We're glad to have some results, but we had hopes that the European countries would be considered together rather than separately." He said the Common Market mills operate as a single entity, through the European Coal and Steel Community, and joint consideration would have eased the investigation. Members of the Common Market, in addition to Belgium, are West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

Other sources, however, observed that U.S. mills had pushed for joint treatment by the Tariff Commission because it would have been easier for the mills to prove injury from the combined imports of all foreign nations, instead of one by one.

The impact of wire rod imports has been significant. According to industry data, foreign producers sold 645,000 tons of the product in this country last year, up from 451,000 tons in 1961 and only 54,000 tons in 1957. The imported volume in 1962 accounted for 39 percent of the U.S. wire rod market.

The Treasury estimated the value of wire rods imported from Belgium last year at $1.8 million.

Imported rods have sold for as little as $95 a ton in recent months. Prices, however, have moved to $105 to $115 a ton, still well below the U.S.-made price of generally $140 to $145 a ton.

IMPORTERS SEE DISMISSAL

Despite the price differential, U.S. importers of the foreign-made goods insist there is no violation of the antidumping law. Declared Ernest Wimpfheimer, president of the American Institute for Imported Steel, a New York trade group representing importers:

"We think that the dumping charge has no merit and the sooner we have a chance to present the evidence the sooner we can get a determination and dismiss the complaint. There is every reason to assume that this case will be dismissed by the Tariff Commission with a findings of no injury to the American steel industry."

U.S. fabricators said they have been buying the imported rods because they can't afford the higher priced domestic goods. Many contend that even if U.S. mills are able to force higher prices on imports, this won't mean more business for domestic steel makers. The fabricators said they still won't be able to afford the U.S. rods.

Nearly 300 small companies process wire rods into such products as wire staples, chain link fence and nuts and bolts, and a large percentage of them use imported steel. Some said they would try to pass higher import prices along to customers, but most insisted the market wouldn't stand this and that it would mean a sharp pinch on profit.

Some users of wire rods and drawn wire have even charged that U.S. mills have refused to cut the price of rods or wire, but have slashed prices on some finished wire products in recent years to put a squeeze on these smaller companies with which they compete for wire product business. One Texas maker of wire mesh used to reinforce concrete said it has filed complaints with the Federal Trade Commission and the Texas attorney general that U.S. mills charge more for wire used to make the mesh than they do for the finished mesh itself.

An attorney for makers and importers of European steel said some wire-rod users plan to testifiy at any Tariff Commission hearing that U.S. mills are squeezing these customers by selling wire products at a relatively small markup over the rod prices, or even at the same prices. The counsel also said he plans to offer evidence aimed at showing U.S. mills are pricing their wire rods more than $50 a ton above the cost of making them.

OTHER DUMPING CHARGES

A Midwest maker of chain-link fence and wire mesh used to reinforce concrete for such uses as garage floors, delivers the mesh to customers at Grand Island, Nebr., for a price equal to 8 cents a pound. The company currently pays about 6 cents a pound for Japanese wire rods, giving it a 2-cent spread to prepare the rods, draw the wire, fabricate the mesh and ship it to Grand Island.

But this concern said it would have to pay 7½ cents a pound for domestic rods, and freight charges to Grand Island alone would be more than that half-cent spread. If imported rods climbed another $10 a ton, or a half-cent a pound, "we'd just have to throw reinforcing mesh in mothballs," a company official said.

An eastern rod user said it would have to pay nearly $145 a ton for domestic rods, but sells its wire product for an average of only $150 a ton and has operating and overhead costs of more than $30 a ton. The company currently pays about $105 a ton for foreign wire rods and said that if the price got up to around $115, "we'd have a difficult time keeping our head above water."

An eastern make of wire for items from paper clips to fasteners for aircraft construction had a loss of nearly $100,000 last year. The company buys 30 percent of its wire rods from abroad and says a $10-a-ton increase in rod prices would add $60,000 annually to its costs. "An increase of $10 a ton over the present level of foreign rod prices would put a certain number of people into a marginal situation, and a $20 rise—if it lasted for long—would have better than 50 percent of the people who are using imported rods operating at a loss," a Florida maker of drawn wire and reinforcing mesh said.

WOULDN'T SWING TO U.S. RODS

U.S. steel mills in the past 6 months also have filed antidumping complaints against European and Japanese producers of standard pipe, Japanese makers of hot-rolled sheet, and Canadian producers of reinforcing bars.

Many wire-rod customers insist higher foreign rod prices wouldn't swing them to domestic rods, which would still be too high in price unless U.S. mills abandon their policy of not cutting rod prices to meet import competition.

The eastern company that buys 30 percent of its rods from abroad said that as foreign-rod prices rise, "the saving on the 30 percent we buy is less effective. We could not afford to do other than buy a larger percentage from abroad to keep our average cost of supply down." Many rod users contend the antidumping drive seems so pointless that U.S. mills must be waging it for some reason such as attempting to create a general hostility toward imported steel.

OUTCOME IN DOUBT

Domestic steel mills that make wire rods say they don't know what the final outcome of their antidumping drive will be. But some feel that if import prices are boosted a bit, and they can count on these prices staying there, then the U.S. mills will be able to trim their own prices enough to win back some business. "Until the antidumping law is enforced, it's impossible for the domestic mills to know what we are going to do to get this business back. We have got to decide where we stand first," one major producer said.

Steel mills deny any effort to put a squeeze on their wire rod customers. A few insist they have at times offered price concessions on rods. And while most mills concede they haven't tried to bring the price of rods down to meet import prices, they insist these prices are far too low to attempt to compete with them and they have no assurance they wouldn't go still lower if they did make the try.

Some steel sales officials said they have met price reductions on many fabricated wire products but not on wire rods because there seemed more justification for adjustment on fabricated wire products. Less drastic cuts were needed on the fabricated products and a greater profit margin was available to play with, they said. "Unlike rods," said one official, "you have a chance to be competitive with the going price on mesh."

Mills don't deny they have, in past years, been unable to provide all their customers with desired wire rod tonnages because of short supply. One steel executive says, however: "I wish we were short today—I'll take all the orders we can get."

And while wire rod users are unhappy about the steel industry's antidumping drive, they aren't necessarily opposed to the principle of dumping charges. One Eastern wire mesh maker has filed charges with the Customs Bureau that Belgian and French wire mesh producers have dumped their product in this country. The concern says the Bureau threw out the Belgian case, but hasn't ruled on the French case.

A PLEA FOR CORRECTION OF AN UNFAIR POLICY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record a copy of a letter which I have written to Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. It brings to light a most unfair situation which cries out for correction:

March 20, 1963.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I want to call to your attention a situation which I believe merits your careful consideration. Admiring your performance in office as I do and realizing how overburdened you are with work, I hesitate to add to your workload. However, I feel impelled to write to you because of a policy which I feel to be unjust and definitely detrimental to servicemen's morale.

The policy to which I refer is one under which servicemen are required to reimburse the Government for damage to Government property which was caused in the line of duty. As I understand it, these charges are assessed even though the damages are not caused through any willfulness or recklessness. Within the past week, two such cases involving constituents have been called to my attention.

In the first case, a private on duty who while driving a jeep became involved in an accident, has been required to pay damages of $276 which are being deducted from his monthly paychecks. I might add that the serviceman claims that he did not have a driver's license when he entered the service, but was taught to drive while in the Army.

The second case, although even more glaring, is obviously the result of some type of administrative error. In that case, a young serviceman was a passenger on a vehicle which was in an accident in Germany. This resulted in his sustaining a depressed skull fracture lacerating the brain. He now has practically no vision in his right eye and severe neurological disturbances which I need not specify here.

The serviceman was discharged from service and granted a 70-percent total disability rating. Shortly thereafter he received a letter advising him that he was "pecuniarily liable to the United States of America in the amount of $1,619.86 to cover the damage to the truck." Since the serviceman was merely a passenger in the truck at the time of the accident, the assessment of damages against him was obviously an administrative error, but my point is that it is unfair to assess such damages even against the driver if the accident was not due to negligence of a wanton or willful type.

Servicemen cannot control their assignments and should not, therefore, be held accountable for damage to equipment upon which they are ordered to work.

I do not question the need for economy in the armed services, but surely in view of the huge amounts expended by the military, there must be a better starting place than these charges to our servicemen which can cause severe hardships to the men and their families.

Sincerely,

Charles S. Joelson,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN WORKING WOMEN

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, there are almost 25 million women in the work force of our Nation. There are 3 million American families who depend almost entirely on the earnings of a woman. There is scarcely a major American industry which does not depend in some measure on the skill, training, intelligence, and efficiency of its feminine employees.

The American woman has traveled far from the era when she was considered the property of her husband, only slightly more valuable than his cattle. However, there are still areas where—through ignorance, prejudice, or crass-profit interests—she is denied fair treatment. Women who work find that time after time the choicest jobs go to men no better and sometimes less qualified than themselves. In case after case, men doing the same work, with the same skills, and the same qualifications receive higher pay. National differentials range from 42 percent among salesworkers to 68 percent among clerical workers.

I think we all agree that women are entitled to their full rights as American citizens. Failure to guarantee these rights works hardships not only on the women themselves, but on the families they support. It unnecessarily and unreasonably lessens purchasing power at a time when increased buying is a needed stimulus to our economy. It prevents the full utilization of workers' skills thereby adversely affecting production, as well as morale.

I believe that we need every national asset functioning to its fullest extent. We cannot afford the waste produced by this discrimination against our working women. In line with this, I am introducing an equal pay bill similar to the measure introduced by Representative Edith Green to help remedy the situation by prohibiting discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers involved directly in interstate or foreign commerce. It sets up procedures for complaints, investigations, and, where violations are found, enforcement. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to act to correct violations by informal, or if this fails, legal means.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Conte, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Price, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Whitener, for 1 hour, on March 25.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 2 hours, on March 28.

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes, on Monday, March 25, 1963.

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 1 hour on Tuesday, March 26, and Wednesday, March 27, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana, for 30 minutes, on Monday, March 25, 1963.

Mr. Alger, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 3, and 1 hour on Monday, April 8, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Hosmer in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Findley.

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Ashbrook.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Marsh) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Hemphill.

Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Boggs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

569. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting an additional amendment to the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. district courts, which was ordered printed as House Document No. 48 of the 88th Congress (H. Doc. No. 48, pt. 2); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

570. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled "A Plan for Strengthening Utilization Research and Development," pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 415, 87th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

571. A letter from the chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for 1962, which represents their 53d year, pursuant to a Federal charter granted on June 15, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

572. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Dixie project, Utah, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

573. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River project, Arizona, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

574. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life to study the changing scope of rural America, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

575. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a purposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act" (68 Stat. 666, as amended); to the Committee on Agriculture.

576. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal year 1963, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

577. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 605 of Public Law 87-554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

578. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on borrowing authority for December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

579. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

580. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

581. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

582. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

583. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1988. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 844. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 845. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2635. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25 year lease limitations; with amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator Allen J. Ellender; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 5009. A bill to provide a uniform rate of duty for portable container locks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5010. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 5011. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehoood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5012. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5013. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5014. A bill to provide for the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service rendered by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5015. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5016. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to authorize educational institutions to be reimbursed for facilities furnished for Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5017. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 5018. A bill to protect postal patrons from obnoxious and offensive mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5019. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 5020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of commutation fares paid by an individual in traveling to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5021. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5022. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5023. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5024. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 5025. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5026. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 5027. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5028. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5029. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5030. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5031. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 5032. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5033. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which beneficiaries are no longer subject to restrictions on outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5034. A bill to amend section 218(d) (6) (C) so as to require that coverage by the old-age and survivors' disability and insurance program in States permitted to divide retirement systems for State and local employees shall cover a majority of the members of such a retirement system at the time the agreement therefor is entered into; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 5035. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 5036. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5037. A bill to control the human intake of agricultural commodities containing radioactive substances, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (by request):

H.R. 5038. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to postage rates on certain educational kits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5040. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5041. A bill to provide for the application of power revenues from reclamation projects to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5042. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 5043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for employers who hire additional employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5044. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 5045. A bill to authorize a grant for carrying out a project of construction for the expansion of the facilities of the Washington Hospital Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5046. A bill to authorize judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5047. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5048. A bill to amend section 207 of the National Housing Act to eliminate the provision presently limiting mortgages thereunder to the cost of the physical improvements involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 5049. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that, in the case of gasoline used in vehicles furnishing taxicab service, 2 cents of the 4-cent Federal gasoline tax shall be rebated to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5051. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5052. A bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 5053. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5054. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5055. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5057. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800, the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5058. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5059. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring William Sidney Porter who wrote under the name "O. Henry"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5060. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5061. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5062. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 5063. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 5064. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Kentucky among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5065. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 5066. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 5067. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5068. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 5069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at certain public and private institutions of higher education and high schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.J. Res. 331. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 333. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 338. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation respecting the ringing of bells in celebration of the anniversary of Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 341. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 342. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed throughout the United States by the ringing of bells, requesting the President to issue a proclamation to this effect, and calling on civic and other community leaders to encourage public participation in such observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 296. Resolution to print as a House document, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Memorial of the Alabama Legislature, known as Senate Joint Resolution 9, which deplores the exodus of continent-based textile plants to Puerto Rico to take advantage of income tax regulations indigenous only there and jeopardizing the healthy future of statewide textile and other industries and demands an equalization of income taxes between the island and continental United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Branko Cule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5071. A bill for the relief of the Norvell Bros. Painting & Decorating Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Rinella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5073. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Lawrence Nestor against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Valdo Santoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Renzo Giretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5076. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Sun Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice D'Errico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stojanka Frankovich and her son, Zvonimir Frankovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5081. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Herminia C. Balagot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5083. A bill for the relief of John Stewart Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Ilia Vasil Karakostas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Georgious Sopassakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5086. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stellario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5087. A bill for the relief of Fotini Selitsanou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5088. A bill for the relief of Dimitrious Lintzeri, his wife, Panagniota G. Lintzeri, and his minor children, Dina Lintzeri and Andrew Lintzeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5089. A bill to grant, posthumously to the late Gen. Robert E. Lee of Virginia, restoration of full rights of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5090. A bill to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the grade of General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Shi Young Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5093. A bill for the relief of Rigas Giokas and his wife, Vangelya Giokas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Yasuko Sugiura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Malcolm W. Bayley and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

71. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harlan Savage, president, La Habra Democratic Club, La Habra, Calif., relating to the establishment of a Scientific Constitutional Monetary System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

Thursday, March 21, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, amid all life's changing scenes, make us conscious of Thy overshadowing presence. Thou art the love that will not let us go, the love that followeth us all the way.

We touch the hem of Thy garment in the human love which hallows our own lives and sanctifies our homes—love which, at its best, bears witness to Thee and the divine love which alone is the balm able to cure the hurt of the world.

In the midst of crushing cares, relentless demands, and tormenting fears which the Nation's problems bring, may the quieting peace of Thy presence restore our jaded souls. Give truth to our words, sincerity to our hearts, and courage to our deeds in these times that are testing as by fire the treasure bequeathed to us. So may we in our day make patriotism beautiful with loyalty and dedication to this free land of our love and prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 19, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator Allen J. Ellender.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Establishment of a Commission on Rural Life

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Rural Life to study the changing scope of rural America, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees and Ex-Servicemen," for the fiscal year 1963, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Department of the Army Contracts for Military Construction Awarded Without Formal Advertisement

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, dated December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Removal of Percentage Limitations on Retirement of Enlisted Men of the Coast Guard

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Backlog of Pending Applications and Hearing Cases in the Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of U.S. Information Agency

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Contracts Negotiated for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River Project, Arizona

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River project, Arizona (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on the Dixie Project, Utah

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Dixie project, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Glen Elder Unit, Solomon Division, Missouri River Basin Project, Kansas

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Glen Elder Unit, Solomon Division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment to Rules of Civil Procedure for U.S. District Courts

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, an amendment to the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. District Courts, adopted March 18, 1963 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Issuance of Certificates of Citizenship in the Canal Zone

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Petitions To Classify Status of Certain Aliens for First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions to classify the status of certain aliens for first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Boy Scouts of America

A letter from the chief Scout executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 12

"A joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and to the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is reported some high placed officials have endorsed the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury to disallow capital gains tax treatment under the provisions of current IRC 631–A (formerly 117K) on privately owned timber subsequently processed or manufactured by the same owner into lumber or other forest products; and

"Whereas IRC 631–A has had the effect in Idaho of encouraging the growth of privately owned forests such as tree farms; despite the risk and hazard of fire, insects, disease and the payment of ad valorem taxes on both land and trees for a period of up to 100 years with the forest crop of trees being the only growing crop on which ad valorem tax is paid each year. Logs and lumber from the tree crop are again assessed as personal property and tax paid on the assessed value on the second Monday in January of each year thereafter; and

"Whereas most operators have deemed it essential to possess a reserve of privately owned timber to insure the continuity of economic units and stable employment rather than depend on public sources of timber with the indefinite and vascillating policies of the latter, and

"Whereas the American lumber industry is, and has been, adversely affected by constantly increasing imports, mostly from Canada. The imports from the latter amounted to 17 percent of 1962 U.S. production, which was 14 percent more than for 1961; and which Government is aiding and assisting its industry in the promotion of the exploitation of foreign markets, and

"Whereas the blowdown as the result of a windstorm in 1962 of some 10 billion feet of timber on the Pacific Coast will add to already existing competitive problems, and

"Whereas an investor who purchases forest, fruit or nut trees for resale would not be deprived of capital gains tax treatment whereas the timber-owning, job-furnishing operator would not be accorded similar treatment, and

"Whereas the repeal of IRC 631–A would force an incentive for a policy of "cut out and get out," which were the common practices of early day lumbermen in the northern tier of States at the beginning of the 20th century; now, with progressive, enlightened sustained yield forest practices in effect on private ownership, the proposed tax change would leave no other alternative than a return to the regressive policy of 50 years ago of "cut out and get out", and would: (1) Destroy the incentive for maintaining intensified forest yield management with a goal of perpetual sustained yield of a timber crop; (2) have a devastating effect on county, school, and municipal tax valuations for necessary tax revenue in counties having substantial private ownership; (3) after allowing the denuded land to go for taxes and reverting to public ownership, there would be no tax revenue, as the Government does not pay taxes. Or only many years in the future when the 25-percent return from Federal forest sales might be available on reforested land, would Idaho counties receive any return of tax revenue; (4) create such a situation profitwise that it would be impractical, if not impossible, for timber-owning companies to stay in business; and

"Whereas the "cut out and get out" policy would have a depressing effect on the market value of publicly owned timber as well as disrupting the orderly disposal of the annual growth; and

"Whereas privately owned forest owners have neither received nor requested subsidies, or price supports from public sources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and the house of representatives concurring*, That the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America are hereby respectfully petitioned that in the interest of maintaining our second largest industry—forest products—that IRC 631–A should neither be tampered with nor repealed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President, Vice President, and Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 2

"A memorial urging the Congress of the United States to pursue an equitable fiscal policy for the purpose of preserving the economic freedom of the citizens of the United States of America

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas the economic freedom of each of the citizens of the United States is in peril because of the fiscal policy being followed; and

"Whereas a primary element of freedom for each citizen is fiscal stability; and

"Whereas during the past decade the Government of the United States has been pursuing a fiscal policy which is endangering the fiscal stability of each citizen of the United States.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States set a firm fiscal policy which will guarantee to each citizen economic freedom.

"2. The Secretary of State of Arizona is directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

"Approved by the Governor March 11, 1963."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 206

"A resolution urging the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Georgia congressional delegation to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber; and for other purposes

"Whereas forest land comprises 25,772,200 acres, 69 percent of the total land area of the State; and

"Whereas 23,931,100 acres are in private ownership and constitute 93 percent of the total forest land; and

"Whereas these forest lands are providing approximately a gross return of $1 billion to the State's economy through forest industries; and

"Whereas forest industry represents the third largest dollar volume of industry and supports 200,000 or more persons annually; and

"Whereas Georgia has led the Nation in reforestation for many years, having converted almost 700,000 acres from cropland to trees under the soilbank program in recent years; and

"Whereas investments are made for long periods of time during which they are continuously subject to many hazards, such as fire, insects, disease, and market fluctuations; and

"Whereas the State and Federal Governments have encouraged forestland owners to develop previously unproductive lands for timber products; and

"Whereas Georgia leads the Nation in the number of acres under the tree farm program; and

"Whereas an incentive must exist to encourage the production of crops that must be produced over two or more decades before any substantial financial return is realized; and

"Whereas the capital gains tax treatment on long-term timber gains recognizes these various factors; and

"Whereas this type of tax treatment has been effective in stimulating private forest owners to adopt management plans and programs to produce timber to meet the national needs; and

"Whereas private forest land is in a wide variety of ownerships with 197,000 owners in Georgia; and

"Whereas the repeal of capital gains taxation will materially reduce the ability of private individuals and industry to continue reforestation and will accelerate the cutting of present timber growth; and

"Whereas forestry has made its greatest advances during the last 20 years as the result of stimulus of capital gains: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, that the Governor of the State of Georgia and all members of the Georgia congressional delegation are urged to do everything in their power to maintain the present capital gains tax treatment regarding the cutting or disposal of timber; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Georgia and to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

"GLENN W. ELLARD,
"Clerk."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION L—PEMBILIER DAM AND RESERVOIR

"Concurrent resolution endorsing and supporting the construction of the proposed Pembilier dam and reservoir project and commending the agencies participating in its investigation and planning

"Whereas the proposed Pembilier dam and reservoir on the Pembina River, near Walhalla, N. Dak., is progressing to the point where a report thereon by the investigating agencies of both Canada and the United States can be expected before another session of the legislature; and

"Whereas the surveys, investigations and studies so far made all indicate economic feasibility, that the construction thereof would insure control of flooding on the Pembina River, adequate municipal and industrial water supplies for several communities in both countries, also supplemental water for potential irrigable areas, and for other beneficial purposes; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has devoted much time and study to this proposal and has individually and collectively toured the Pembina River basin and inspected the various sites and areas involved in the proposed project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein; That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby reaffirms its wholehearted endorsement and support of the Pembilier dam and reservoir project aforesaid, commends the International Joint Commission and all the agencies of both Canada and the United States participating in the important investigative and planning activities for their faithful and conscientious devotion to their task and trusts that the definite report thereon will become available sometime during the next fiscal year; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies hereof be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States; Secretary of the Department of State; President of the U.S. Senate; Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; District Engineer, St. Paul Office of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Chairmen of the Canadian and United States Sections, International Joint Commission; Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress; and the Governor of North Dakota.

"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION X—EROSION CONTROL AND BANK STABILIZATION, MISSOURI RIVER, N. DAK.

"Concurrent resolution urging early completion of spot bank stabilization and erosion control adjacent to the Missouri River

"Whereas the Garrison Reservoir was constructed to provide, and has provided, substantial benefits to the entire Missouri River basin for municipal and industrial water supplies, sewage dilution, flood control, navigation, irrigation, power generation, and other beneficial uses; and

"Whereas that reach of the Missouri River between the Garrison Reservoir and the Oahe Reservoir constitutes an unprotected portion of the river extremely vulnerable to erosion from erratic water releases; and

"Whereas since the construction of the Garrison Dam, without supplementary erosion control or bank stabilization structures, the clear water being released from the Garrison Reservoir is eroding approximately 500 acres yearly of valuable bottom land from the banks of this stream; and

"Whereas future releases will increase the loss to 800 acres or more annually; and

"Whereas specific areas constituting several thousand acres of land are threatened by erosion should the erratic pattern of water released from Garrison Reservoir be continued; and

"Whereas the problem appears to be the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the U.S. Congress is respectfully urged to direct the Corps of Engineers to forthwith undertake emergency measures to prevent this impending irreparable loss through construction of spot revetment works between the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs in consultation with the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission so corrective stabilization will be applied to the areas imperiled; and be it further

"Resolved, That sufficient copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation for their own use and for appropriate distribution to congressional committees, officials, Representatives and Senators.

"STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD F. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"FRANK A. WENSTROM,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request):

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., and Karlson Development Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1156. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Curtis when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1157. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 1159. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1161. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1162. A bill for the relief of Ginseppe Stracquadanio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1163. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Miss Katina J. Nakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1165. A bill for the relief of Dr. Florencio A. Hipona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1166. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development in furtherance of the purposes of the act of May 16, 1910 (36 Stat. 369; 30 U.S.C. 1, 3, 5, and 7), as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felicite A. Clignett; and

S. 1168. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request):

S. 1169. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McIntyre, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1170. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Morse, Mr. Hart, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1171. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special issue of bonds in order to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States, through the purchase of such bonds, to participate in the financing of peace-keeping activities of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM IN EACH COUNTRY

Mr. COOPER submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) to express the sense of Congress that the President appoint a committee to evaluate our foreign aid program in each country and report its finding to the President and Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Cooper, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Scott), submitted a resolution (S. Res. 116) to establish a Select Committee on Consumers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED INCOME-TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties.

In an article published last August in the New York Times magazine, I dealt with the rising costs of running for office, and argued for several reforms to relieve candidates and political parties from the necessity of relying too much on large contributors—which in practice generally means either big business or big labor—for the money needed to finance political campaigns. In the article, I wrote:

> Campaign costs have simply grown too big for the average candidate to cope with. Political elections have been subject to the same rising costs that have affected all our lives in recent decades. This has been aggravated by the rapid growth in population requiring more and more voters to be reached, and by the introduction and expansion of television, which is not only expensive but essential as a campaign medium.

Later in the article, I pointed out:

> Congressional candidates have employed many methods for raising campaign funds in small amounts from the public at large. Yet most of them have proved unproductive. Door-to-door solicitations have been tried, but seldom have they yielded substantial returns. Any number of candidates have sought to raise money with return-mail appeals, usually with the most disappointing results.
>
> As a consequence of such experiences, most congressional candidates have been left with no alternative but to depend upon the large contributor for their campaign money.

Mr. President, as one remedy for this situation, I proposed to the tax laws an amendment to furnish an inducement to the small contributor, the individual citizen of modest means. I suggested that each taxpayer, in computing his taxable income for the year, ought to be allowed to deduct up to $100 for contributions made to either the candidates or the political party of his choice. I said that—

> Our tax laws should be designed to encourage more people to support, with their dollars as well as with their votes, the whole of the election process, for this is the lifeblood of a free society.

The bill I now introduce would accomplish this result. The fact that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] joins me in sponsoring the bill demonstrates that the proposal enjoys both Republican and Democratic support. For this purpose, we have created a liberal-conservative axis, spanning the width of the Senate and the width of the political spectrum. We share a common concern that present trends have brought about an excessive polarization in our politics, and we believe this bill would be a constructive step toward proliferating the financial base of costly campaigns. The bill would furnish to the individual taxpayer an incentive to contribute a modest amount, either in support of the political party of his choice, or of a candidate he favors, and thus would tend to free those who hold high public office, and those who aspire to it, from undue reliance upon a few large contributors.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record, and that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1152) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties, introduced by Mr. Church (for himself and Mr. Goldwater), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The article presented by Mr. Church is as follows:

Campaign Money—How Much? From Whom?

(By Senator Frank Church)

Washington.—A prominent citizen of my State announced his candidacy for Governor by declaring he was not a politician but a businessman. "The word 'politician' is a nasty word," he was quoted as saying.

Now, Idaho usually enjoys clean government and there is no question that the Government of the United States is untainted by the kind of pervasive corruption which plagues so many other governments in the world. Why, then, should "politician" still be regarded as a nasty word?

The ambassador of an Asian country asked me this very question just a few weeks ago. Ironically, the country he represents is nearly engulfed by graft. Yet, he said, "In my country, as in most others I have known, public service is thought to be the highest calling. To become a member of the parliament is the noblest ambition a man can hold."

If we don't accord the same prestige to Members of Congress, it is not because we fail to hold our politicians to strict account. Anyone entering Congress from private life becomes at once aware of the higher standard of behavior expected of him.

Indeed, we are so accustomed to having our politicians tread the straight and narrow that the occasional scandal in public life will produce far more indignation than any comparable scandal elsewhere. A few deep freezers discredited the entire Truman administration; the gift of an oriental rug and a vicuna coat not only drove Sherman Adams from the White House, but shook public confidence in the administration of Dwight Eisenhower for months afterward. The affair of Billie Sol Estes has rocked the New Frontier as no other single episode.

This could be true only in a country where the people expect, and usually get, honest performance in public office. In short, it isn't corruption in Congress that puts the taint upon the term "politician." It isn't what we do in Congress but how we get into Congress that accounts for the lingering suspicion in the public mind.

Campaign costs have simply grown too big for the average candidate to cope with. Political elections have been subject to the same rising costs that have affected all our lives in recent decades. This has been aggravated by the rapid growth in population requiring more and more voters to be reached, and by the introduction and expansion of television, which is not only expensive but essential as a campaign medium.

The recent announcement that some network TV shows will be shortened by 5 minutes to allow senatorial, gubernatorial, and other local candidates time for paid political broadcasts during this general election campaign is encouraging news. Prime evening time is usually difficult to buy except in 15- and 30-minute segments. Similar time was afforded presidential candidates in 1956 and 1960, but this is the first breakthrough for local candidates; it should help.

Laws forbid candidates to spend more than the barest minimum of their own funds, but most candidates could not begin to afford the whole cost, even if it were permitted. Therefore, contributions must be sought, and the question at once arises: How much, and from whom?

To help furnish an answer to this question, President Kennedy appointed a special Commission on Campaign Costs, composed of a group of distinguished citizens experienced in raising money for either the Democratic or Republican Party, together with several nationally recognized academic authorities on the subject. They spent months studying the problem, and the President has now submitted their recommendations to Congress.

Unfortunately, the commission confined itself to the financing of presidential campaigns. Congressional contests were ignored, though clearly they constitute the more urgent problem. Of course, presidential campaigns are immensely expensive, but it is much more difficult for congressional candidates to raise the money they need, and they are far more vulnerable to pressures from special-interests groups.

In an effort to escape these pressures, congressional candidates have employed many methods for raising campaign funds in small amounts from the public at large. Yet most of them have proved unproductive. Door-to-door solicitations have been tried, but seldom have they yielded substantial returns. Any number of candidates have sought to raise money with return-mail appeals, usually with the most disappointing results.

Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, Republican, of Ohio, is said to have run a newspaper ad during a campaign which read: "BILL AYRES Needs Your Help." In the ad, AYRES requested $1 contributions. In a single newspaper, the ad cost $200. Total returns attributed to the ad amounted to $51.

As a consequence of such experiences, most congressional candidates have been left with no alternative but to depend upon the large contributor for their campaign money. I recall a Congressman once telling me that his entire campaign had been financed by not more than 20 contributors. "They were the only ones on my side who could afford sizable donations," he said.

As a candidate for reelection to the Senate this year, I am acutely aware of how badly we need to reform the methods for raising money to finance campaigns for Congress. And I know we shall never achieve these reforms until the public acquires a better understanding of the problems we face.

Congressional campaign costs vary greatly from State to State. A House candidate running in 1 of New York City's 19 districts would find telecasting prohibitively expensive and wasteful, since it would reach millions of people who are not involved in his election. A candidate for the single House seat representing the State of Nevada not only must make use of television to reach his constituents, but is compelled to do so on what amounts to a network basis.

A Senate candidate in a State like Idaho may hope to meet personally a very high proportion of the voters, while a candidate for the Senate in a State like California wouldn't even try. I have heard of Senate campaigns in which upward of a million dollars was spent by each side. My own successful campaign for election to the Senate in 1956 cost barely more than $40,000—and my Republican opponent's just over twice that amount.

But the problem for the Idaho candidate can still be more difficult than for a candidate in California. Hundred-dollar-a-plate dinners are not uncommon in States with large metropolitan centers. Yet my friends felt that they were aiming very high when they scheduled a $12.50-a-plate fundraising dinner in my honor in Boise a few months ago.

People in the smaller States either do not have or are not accustomed to giving the amounts of money necessary for modern campaigning. The inevitable consequence is that candidates on both sides are compelled to accept help from outside their own State. This circumstance is not well understood by many of the voters in these States, and there is often bitter criticism of big contributions which cross State lines.

Seldom is the big contributor, whether in or outside the State, so brash as to offer a campaign contribution to a Congressman or Senator at a time, or in a manner, which tends to link the money to a pending bill. But occasionally this happens. A classic example occurred in 1956, when the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill was under consideration by the Senate.

The late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota was up for reelection, and it was thought that he was inclined to support the bill, which would have exempted independent natural gas producers from Federal utility rate control. Then, on February 3, Case strode out onto the Senate floor to announce he would vote against the bill—because improper influence had been exerted on him to vote for it, in the form of a $2,500 cash donation which he had refused.

On February 7, a Senate select committee was established to investigate the incident. During the committee's hearings on the contribution, John M. Neff, a lawyer representing the Superior Oil Co. of California and Texas, was identified as the immediate donor. Later testimony, however, revealed that the money was from the personal funds of Howard B. Keck, president of the Superior Oil Co. The Senate committee's report, released 2 months later, said that "the objective of the individuals who initiated and carried out this chain of events was to influence by political contribution the vote of a Member of Congress."

Fortunately, cash bribes are about extinct as a method of attempting to influence votes in the U.S. Congress. Yet the problem of exerting influence through heavy, though legitimate, campaign contributions still remains unsolved. The late Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon once wrote:

"If MAURINE (Mrs. NEUBERGER, then an Oregon State legislator and now her husband's successor in the Senate) or I ever would take $100 in cash behind the locked door of a hotel room to cast our vote for or against a specific legislative bill, we would be guilty of receiving a bribe. But if, at the next election, we accept not $100 in cash but $1,000 in a check from the same donor, it is all perfectly legal, providing the check is made out to the Neuberger-for-election committee."

I don't hold that the large campaign contribution necessarily clamps a manacle upon either a candidate or an elected official. The candidate, of course, must scrupulously refuse any contribution tendered for a commitment which would restrict his freedom of action if elected; the elected official must make his convictions and his conscience the final arbiters of his vote. I believe that nearly all the Members of Congress—Senators and Representatives alike—do their utmost to live up to these standards.

Still, given the infirmities of human nature, there is always the danger that a certain bias, favorable to the big contributor, will weigh upon the judgment of even the most objective legislator. For this reason, and because so general a dependence upon the big contributor erodes public confidence in the "politician"—and thus weakens popular respect for the very processes of representative government—there is a real and immediate need for changes in the methods of financing our election campaigns.

I would suggest as the minimum required, the following:

1. Let the television stations in each State set aside, as a public service, a reasonable amount of free time to be equally divided between the two parties during the general election campaign.

If local stations would offer this time on a voluntary basis, as the national networks did for the two presidential candidates in 1960, it would work a significant reduction in the high cost of campaigns and help candidates for major State and congressional offices to free themselves from undue reliance upon big contributors.

2. Let the tax laws be revised to furnish an inducement to the small contributor, the individual citizen of modest means. Each taxpayer, in computing his taxable income for the year, ought to be allowed to deduct up to $100 for contributions made to either the candidates or the political party of his choice.

Our tax laws should be designed to encourage more people to support, with their dollars as well as with their votes, the whole of the election process, for this is the lifeblood of a free society.

3. Let us gather public support behind those methods for raising campaign funds which draw from the many and not from the few. The fund-raising banquet, if the price of the tickets is within the reach of the average voter, is one method. The citizens' committee openly soliciting at large is another.

In this connection permit me a personal reference. During my first campaign for the Senate in 1956, I lacked the money for more than the very minimum of television time, and so I spent 9 months on the road, with my wife at the wheel of the car, going from store to store, from farm to farm, from house to house, knocking on doors in order to meet the people personally.

A thick, protective callus formed between my right thumb and forefinger from shaking hands, which led one pundit to comment: "FRANK CHURCH is the only lawyer in Idaho with a callus—on his hand."

But despite rigorous efforts to cut costs, and although I engaged no advertising agency, wrote my own copy, and depended solely upon the services of volunteer workers, it soon became evident that I couldn't begin to finance my campaign on the offerings of small contributors. I discovered what every candidate for Congress learns, that big contributions are essential.

The largest contributor to my campaign was the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a nonpartisan citizens' action group which undertakes to raise money for selected congressional races. One of the purposes of the committee is to increase the number of small contributions to campaigns, thus broadening and diversifying the sources of political funds and consequently relieving candidates of the pressure to answer to specific interests.

The money donated to me was raised principally through a series of advertisements bearing the caption, "A Clean Politics Appeal," calling for personal contributions from the readers of such newspapers as the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and such periodicals as the Reporter, Commonweal, and the Saturday Review.

The money came in $1, $5, $20 amounts. To this day, I do not know the identity of the individual contributors. Moreover, neither then nor since has any member of the committee ever asked me to vote a given way on any issue.

It is true that the National Committee for an Effective Congress usually supports liberal candidates, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. I think it would be desirable for a comparable committee to be organized for the purpose of giving a similar type of support to conservative candidates.

These three proposals, when taken together, would help materially to reduce the importance of the big contributor in our political campaigns.

Honesty in government, in the last analysis, will always depend upon the integrity of the men who hold public office. But if we can shift to the people at large the responsibility they should bear for financing our political campaigns, then far more public confidence in our representative form of government will result, the public service will recapture that prestige to which it is entitled, and the institutions of free government will be strengthened throughout the land.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state on the floor of the Senate my pleasure in joining with the distinguished Senator from Idaho in presenting a long overdue bill. Several Congresses ago I served on a Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying and Campaign Expenses. During that time it became very obvious that some approach like the one now proposed should be made and would have to be made if we in politics would be able in the future to meet the rising costs of campaigns. I am very glad that the Senator from Idaho has introduced his bill. I suggest that he might allow it to be held at the table for a day or two, because I feel, since we are all plagued with the same curse, that all Senators, both the Republicans and Democrats, might wish to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be very happy to do so. Other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, have offered different versions of the bill in the past. There is widespread interest in the subject on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for the remainder of the week in order that other Senators who may wish to add their names as cosponsors may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Idaho on his bill. I shall look it over, and most likely I shall associate myself with it.

I could not help but note that the distinguished Senator from Arizona had announced that he was a candidate for reelection. I am becoming a little concerned about this bipartisan play this morning. I trust that what we have heard is not an announcement of a new "Union" ticket under new financial auspices. But if it is, may I say that it could not involve two more worthy gentlemen.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. If I have any time remaining, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I request 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to state that last year the subcommittee held extensive hearings on a bill in the nature of the one proposed, and recommended to the Senate the passage of a measure very similar to that covered by the bill introduced by the Senator from Idaho. Unfortunately, the bill was subject to a point of order in that it did not originate in the House. An identical bill was introduced in the House, but the House failed to take action on it. I am sure that the sense of this body was in favor of a bill of the nature of the one that the Senator has introduced. I feel sure that if the House would see fit to act on a similar type of bill, the Senate would have no difficulty in passing such a measure.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I hope the committee will give favorable consideration to the bill this year.

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to yield if I can secure some additional time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall see that the Senator has his 3 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the $100 deduction allowed each taxpayer be in addition to the $12 billion deficit we already face?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Naturally, if we deny the general fund moneys, it would be included in any deficit. But I believe the proposal would work a much better purpose on moral grounds. For that reason I can support the measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wished to be sure whether a further diminution of revenue would be contemplated.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Any time that we disallow money to the Federal Treasury, our deficit problems are increased. However, I think in the Senate we could correct that if we could get the other side to work very closely with us.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS THEREUNDER

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and myself, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

This bill, which is part of the President's legislative program, extends the existing law, which expires June 30, 1964, for 3 years to June 30, 1967.

The bill provides for extension of the appropriation authority for the 3 additional fiscal years at an annual level of $75 million. This extension is considered essential to satisfy the firmly projected needs of the national airport system. The urgency of these needs is indicated by the fact that applications are now pending for improvements at 540 airports during fiscal 1964 which would cost a total of approximately $150 million, and these applications must be considered on the basis of the existing $75 million per year funding. In fiscal 1962, eligible project requests totaled $149,782,000, and in fiscal 1963 these applications totaled $140,114,000.

Since its inception in 1947, the act authorizing Federal grants to local communities for the construction and improvements of airports on a matching fund basis has provided funds for 5,372 separate projects leading to improvements at 1,762 airports. Through January 1 of this year, Federal funds totaling $721,861,000 have been granted for these purposes. Sponsoring communities have expended $748,866,000 in this period of tremendous growth in our civil aviation industry.

Throughout the history of this program the emphasis has been on safety, for it has been through the improvement of runways, runway lighting, and other nagivational and terminal facilities that the use of the airplane has developed into a routine necessity for many millions of our citizens.

Fully 50 percent of the users of our airport and airways facilities are military aircraft. The airport improvements made possible under this legislation have therefore been of vital significance to our military aviation capabilities.

The rapid expansion of air transport needs and requirements could justify an increase in this program to permit matching grants totaling $100 million a year. However, the realities of the present overall budget situation, and particularly our national defense needs, rule out such an increase at this time. A larger and larger percentage of our people are relying each year on air transportation. From 1957 to 1961 the total flight time of our general aviation fleet increased from 10,738,000 hours per year to 12,650,000 hours. The explosive development of our air transport industry in the past decade has been possible to a large extent through this program. In 1952, 27½ million persons bought airline tickets in the United States. Last year this figure had more than doubled to 61,700,000. In 1952, at 141 control towers then in operation a total of 15,814,000 landings and takeoffs were recorded. Ten years later, with 270 towers operating, landings and takeoffs had nearly doubled to 28,200,000.

In 1952, this country had 52,670 licensed aircraft. On January 1 of this year 85,669 aircraft were using the airports of this country. This steady and ever-increasing growth of our air transport fleet will continue.

Without question, this program must be continued and must be efficiently and expeditiously administered to meet the additional air traffic demands throughout the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Dependable and evermore rapid transportation is essential to our economic security. Our national security also requires the development of these transportation facilities.

The grants provided by this act have been, and will continue to be, the basis for increasing the accessibility of air travel and air transport in both urban and rural regions of the country. The act establishes criteria enabling the development of our huge metropolitan air traffic centers as well as the establishment of profitable and usable airports of more modest size within the financial means of smaller communities.

I would like to cite now the principal features of the existing law and set forth a number of proposed changes incorporated in this bill.

First. The existing law expires June 30, 1964. Proposed change extends act for 3 years, expiring June 30, 1967.

Second. Existing law authorizes a total of $225 million available at rate of $75 million annually. No change.

Third. Existing law provides special $7 million annual set-aside for general aviation to relieve congestion at high-density airports. No change.

Fourth. Existing law disallows Federal contribution for items not directly related to safety, that is, terminal buildings, and so forth. No change.

Fifth. Existing law allows 75 percent contribution for certain landing aids, that is, in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and so forth. No change.

Sixth. Existing law provides for apportionment to States—under area population formula—75 percent with 25 percent placed in discretionary fund. Proposed change: Apportionment to States would be decreased to 50 percent and amount placed in discretionary fund increased to 50 percent.

Seventh. Existing law provides an annual amount available to Hawaii of $731,618—$131,618 under State apportionment plus $600,000 special set-aside. Under existing law the amount annually available to Puerto Rico is $600,000 and to the Virgin Islands $300,000. Proposed change: It would eliminate the $600,000 set aside for Hawaii, treating Hawaii as any other State. It would treat Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands equally, each entitled to $450,000 annually. These proposed changes must be reviewed very carefully to make sure that international air traffic needs are not neglected.

Eighth. Existing law permits 50 percent Federal contribution for planning costs, provided grant agreement for a specific project is entered into. Proposed change: Adds new provision for advanced planning grants up to 66⅔ percent of total estimated planning cost.

Ninth. Under existing law funds allocated to any State under the apportionment formula which are not obligated within 2 fiscal years revert to the discretionary fund. Proposed change: Reduces from 2 years to 1 year the time such funds will revert to discretionary funds. This was proposed under the previous act but met with strong objections from airport operators who claimed that 1 year did not allow adequate lead time to arrange for planning, financing, and so forth.

The bill has a new provision requiring that as a condition to any grant the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including the enactment of zoning laws, has been made to restrict the use of land adjacent to the affected airport so as to make it compatible with the operation of the airport. This requirement for such assurances can in future years insure greater safety in the operation of aircraft and great comfort and livability in areas adjacent to major airports. The Agency recognizes that proper zoning by airport sponsors is not always possible. This is especially true where multiple jurisdiction is involved. At the same time, corrective zoning is impossible in many already developed areas. Therefore, it proposes to require assurances with respect to land uses only where feasible under the circumstances.

I question personally the proposal reducing the percentage of funds to be apportioned among the States. At the present time, 75 percent of available funds are apportioned among the States on an area population basis. This bill would decrease this apportionment to 50 percent and place 50 percent in the discretionary fund. The present act provides that 25 percent of the money be placed in the discretionary fund. I am convinced the present allocation formula has proven efficient and effective. Because of much greater traffic density in heavily populated areas, the construction dollar benefits more citizens. Local financing certainly is more easily accomplished in populous transportation centers.

I am sure also that amendments will be carefully considered to eliminate the proposed redistribution to the discretionary fund of all apportioned funds unobligated at the expiration of 1 year rather than at the end of 2 years as now provided. The present provision provides local communities with crucial leadtime in the development of airport projects. It permits the phasing of construction at the cost economical and efficient time schedule with the certainty that Federal funds will be available over a longer period.

One of the most progressive features of this proposal would authorize advance planning grants up to 66⅔ percent of the estimated planning costs, thus encouraging more adequate planning by local sponsors in advance of the preparation and submission of requests. The existing Federal Airport Act authorizes Federal reimbursement of 50 percent of certain planning costs incurred in connection with a specific project. Because Federal financial participation occurs only after the project for which the planning was undertaken is approved, we have found that communities are reluctant to undertake extensive airport planning. However, only through careful advance planning can we be certain that construction on the airport proceeds in the most economic and orderly manner. We believe the additional funds expended for planning at this predevelopment stage will be fully offset by a reduction in future construction costs.

Careful, cautious, but quick planning for future airport needs was never more important than it is today. The phenomenal growth of our aviation industry means that each month more and more planes will be landing and taking off from our airports, and more and more people will be crowding through our terminals. The economic growth of communities throughout the Nation depends upon the extension of this program. It has been an outstanding success in the past and holds the promise of even greater benefits for the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days so that the Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended:

(1) by striking out the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(2) by inserting the words "(except advance planning for which specific grants have been made)" immediately after the word "specifications" in the present paragraph (6);

(3) by striking out the subsection heading "Airport Classifications" and all of subsection (b).

SEC. 2. Section 4(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1103(a)) is amended by inserting "and advance planning therefor", immediately following the word "development".

SEC. 3. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR ADVANCE PLANNING AND PROJECTS

"(d)(1) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in the several States, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $201,300,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph $67,100,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. All funds appropriated for these and prior fiscal years shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(2) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $2,700,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of the amounts appropriated, $900,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. All funds appropriated for these and prior fiscal years shall continue to be so available until expended. Of each such amounts appropriated during the fiscal years enumerated herein 50 per centum shall be available for Puerto Rico and 50 per centum shall be available for the Virgin Islands. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section prior to fiscal year 1965 shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph in effect on January 1, 1963."

"(3) For the purpose of developing, in the several States, airports, the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having high density of traffic serving other segments of aviation, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act for such purpose, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $21,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph $7,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. All funds appropriated for these and prior fiscal years shall continue to be so available until expended."

SEC. 4(a) Section 6(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "75 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum";

(2) by striking out "and the fiscal year immediately following" in the second sentence;

(3) by inserting "for advance planning or" immediately following the word "grants" in the second sentence;

(4) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: ": *Provided,* That any funds authorized to be obligated prior to fiscal year 1965 shall be apportioned in accordance with the provisions of this subsection in effect January 1, 1963."

(b) Section 6(b)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(1)) is amended:

(1) by striking out "Twenty-five per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "Fifty per centum";

(2) by inserting immediately before the period the following: ": *Provided,* That any funds authorized to be obligated prior to fiscal year 1965 shall be placed in the discretionary fund in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph and subsection 6(c) in effect January 1, 1963."

(c) Section 6(b)(2) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(2)) is amended:

(1) by inserting "advance planning grants or" between the words "for" and "such" in the first sentence; and

(2) by inserting "advance planning or" before "projects" in the second sentence.

(d) Section 6(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(c)) is amended:

(1) by inserting "advance planning and" immediately preceding "projects";

(2) by striking out "two fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year".

SEC. 5. Section 7 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1106) is amended:

(1) by inserting in the section heading "Advance Planning And" immediately preceding "Projects";

(2) by inserting "advance planning and" immediately preceding "projects" where that word first appears in the text.

SEC. 6. The Act is amended by adding a new Section 8 to read as follows:

"ADVANCE PLANNING GRANTS"

"For the purpose of developing airport layout plans and plans directly related to eligible construction projects, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to sponsors, based upon approved advance planning proposals, for not more than 66⅔ per centum of the estimated planning cost. For the purposes of this section, "airport layout plan" means a plan for an airport showing boundaries and proposed additions to all areas owned or controlled by the sponsor for airport purposes, the location and nature of existing and proposed airport facilities and structures, and the location on the airport of existing and proposed nonaviation areas and improvements thereon."

SEC. 7(a) Section 9(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(a)) is amended by:

(1) inserting "Advance Planning Proposals And" immediately preceding "Projects" in the title to section 9.

(2) by inserting "an advance planning proposal or" immediately following "Administrator" where that word first appears in the first sentence.

(b) Section 9(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(b)) is amended by striking out "submission of a project" and inserting "submission of an advance planning proposal or a project".

(c) Section 9(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(c)) is amended by striking out "submission of a project" and inserting "submission of an advance planning proposal or a project".

(d) Section 9(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(d)) is amended by striking out "that the project will contribute" and inserting "that the project is not inconsistent with existing plans for the development of the area in which the airport is located and will contribute".

SEC. 8(a) Section 10(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved project under this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs".

(b) Section 10(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended by striking out "(1), and the maximum United States share under subsection (a)(2),".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out the parentheses and all words within the parentheses and inserting ", not to exceed 75 per centum,".

SEC. 9. Section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1110) is amended:

(a) by adding a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"Appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent feasible, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including landing and takeoff of aircraft".

(b) by renumbering the present paragraphs (4) through (8) as (5) through (9), respectively.

SEC. 10. Section 12 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1111) is amended:

(1) by changing the first sentence to read as follows:

"Upon approving an advance planning proposal or a project application, the Administrator, on behalf of the United States, shall transmit to the sponsor or sponsors of the advance planning proposal or project application an offer to pay the United States share of the planning costs or allowable project costs."

(2) by striking out "of the project" where it appears at the end of the third sentence:

(3) by changing the fifth sentence to read as follows:

"Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the costs which have been or may be incurred."

SEC. 11. Section 14 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1113) is amended:

(1) by inserting "advance planning costs or" immediately preceding "allowable" in the second sentence;

(2) by striking out "of the project" where it appears in the second and third sentences;

(3) by inserting "advance planning or" immediately preceding the term "airport development" wherever it appears.

(4) by inserting "plan or" immediately preceding the word "development" where it appears the second time in the fourth sentence.

INCREASED USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a bill to carry out the recommendations of the Welsh report on agriculture. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1156) to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes, introduced by Mr. Curtis, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that a few years ago the Congress passed a proposal of mine which called upon President Eisenhower to appoint a bipartisan Commission to find new industrial uses for the products of our farms. This five-man Commission was headed by Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, of Omaha. The Commission secured the voluntary services of some 200 leaders in agriculture, chemistry, engineering, industry, and research.

These experts were divided up into a number of task force groups. They performed their services without compensation and many of them even declined to submit a bill for their travel expenses. The Commission reported in general that the problem of farm surpluses could be solved by finding new uses for the products that we can produce on the farm.

The program recommended by the Welsh Commission was divided into three parts. These parts were: research, trial commercialization, and pilot testing.

The bill I am introducing today is similar to S. 714 which was introduced in the last Congress, with one important addition.

This addition consists of a new section which calls upon the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with municipalities and others in research on the problems of air pollution, through the use of alcohol made from farm crops as a component of motor fuel. This should be of interest to all of our great cities.

For instance, a well-qualified source expresses the opinion that a reduction in the level of unburned hydrocarbons through the use of alcohol-gasoline blends could have an immediate effect on the Los Angeles smog problem. This authority contends that such a blend of motor fuel could reduce the unburned hydrocarbon emission approximately 50 percent. There is a reasonable possibility that after such a plan had been followed for a few years, accompanied by additional research, it could bring about even greater benefits.

After preparing the bill and these remarks, there came to my desk an article published in the Omaha Herald of March 18, 1963. It was published on the front page of that newspaper. It is entitled "Smog-Free Fuel Could Cut Grain—Two Headaches Solved at Once." The article was written by Bob Considine and bears the dateline of New York. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in full at this time in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SMOG-FREE FUEL COULD CUT GRAIN—TWO HEADACHES SOLVED AT ONCE

(By Bob Considine)

New York.—The Southwest Research Institute of San Antonio, Tex., has produced a remedy calculated to do something constructive, simultaneously, about the Nation's colossal grain surplus and Greater Los Angeles smog.

Here's the pitch:

Turn the mountains of Government-owned wheat into alcohol, dump some of it in the oceans of gasoline burned in cars every day, and presto. Smog-producing exhaust gases will be reduced by as much as 60 percent.

So will the burden on the back of the American taxpayer, who not only buys the subsidized grain but foots the $1 million a day rent bills to store it and other surpluses.

GRAIN, SMOG GROWS

The grain stocks grow larger each day, and the smog gets thicker not only over Los Angeles but over an increasing number of cities.

These two apparently unrelated headaches have long been the concern of Nebraska grain dealer J. Leroy Welsh, who headed President Eisenhower's commission to find industrial uses of surplus grain.

He persuaded the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and Inspection to turn the problem over to the remarkable San Antonio research outfit.

The research team began with a discouraging hurdle: Alcohol has long been used as a car fuel, notably in racing cars, but the cost has been commercially prohibitive.

HURDLE CLEARED

The researchers cleared the hurdle by getting more out of the alcohol they made from wheat. Mixed with high-test gas to the degree of 25 percent, the blended fuel was just as efficient as high-test gas at average car speeds, and almost as efficient at low and high speeds.

Remarkable differences showed up in the reduction of exhaust gases. Early findings indicate that the use of this in the Los Angeles Smog Control District would reduce the unburned hydrocarbon emission approximately 50 percent.

In the course of its study, Southwest Research Institute wizards devised a new concept in auto motors, one that will increase compression and efficiency by as much as 50 percent—and, not incidentally, make better use of an alcohol-gasoline fuel if that comes about.

ONE FOR THE ROAD

Major car companies are seeking rights to mass-produce the motor.

"Give your gasoline one for the road," is the slogan at the research center.

"The entire wheat surplus could be wiped out in less than a year if the fuel people accept this program," the institute's bright young president, Dr. Martin Goland, said.

"It is also quite conceivable that farmers would in the future be urged to raise more wheat, and other grains that can be reduced to alcohol, instead of being subsidized not to plant.

LOT OF PRESSURE

"We could unload the heavy burdens of subsidy and storage. As for the big fuel companies, they've been under a lot of pressure to do something about their role in smog. They should regard this development with enthusiasm."

Unless something is done to devour the mounting grain surplus we'll all be up to our hips in it. Every time the Government in effect bribes a farmer to take X number of acres out of production, another section of government, Federal or State, broadcasts new ways and means of coaxing the earth to yield greater gains.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it has long been my hope that alcohol produced from grain could be used as a part of our motor fuel. Farmers buy a great deal of gasoline and tractor fuel. Certainly they should be allowed to produce their own fuel. The number of cars in the country is constantly increasing and likewise the motor fuel market is increasing. European countries have blended alcohol into their gasoline up to 25 percent. Were we to blend alcohol into our gasoline to the extent of 10 percent, it would require more than 1 billion bushels of grain a year. In other words, that one use alone could go a long way toward solving the grain surplus problem.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its report, based on the work of the agricultural research service at Peoria, Ill., said on June 9, 1954:

> Because of extensive practical experience in the use of alcohol-gasoline blends in foreign countries and laboratory and road studies made in this country, it is evident that the use of alcohol as a fuel for internal combustion engines is practical from the technological standpoint.

However, we face a very definite obstacle in regard to this. It is an economic fact that gasoline can be produced cheaper than alcohol. Consequently, no one selling gasoline is going to turn to a blended alcohol. In peacetime, under our free American system, we cannot compel that to be done by law.

I am thoroughly convinced that a broad program of research will lower the cost of producing alcohol from farm products. At the present time, when we make alcohol out of farm products, we have a protein residue that is a very valuable food for animals, however, with improved methods brought about by research and trial commercialization, it is believed that the alcohol can be extracted, and the protein residue will be a fine human food. Its value will then be many times greater than its value for livestock food. The alcohol will become more or less a byproduct and can be sold at a price that will enable it to compete with gasoline for a part of the motor fuel market. So, while a portion of the motor fuel market is not the farmer's at this time, it is not an impossibility that one day it will be.

A number of leaders in the petroleum industry are not adverse to these efforts. They realize that the farmers are purchasers of their products. Oil companies are taxpayers too and should be interested in farm program costs. They realize that farm prosperity means a great deal to the prosperity of our country. Furthermore, the same companies will be selling the motor fuel at all the filling stations in the country, regardless of the components of that fuel. They are not going to lose the business.

Incidentally, it is my objective and that of the Welsh Commission that the Government enter into the field of research, trial commercialization, and pilot testing with limited subsidies, but that the results be turned over to private enterprise. We do not advocate a program of Government-owned plants and Government manufacturing of products from the farm or from any other source.

Our surpluses are primarily starches. From starch we make alcohol, and from alcohol we can make rubber, plastics, and a thousand and one things that are now being made from other materials.

We are not limited by any means to motor fuel and rubber and like products. There are literally hundreds of possibilities of making industrial uses of agricultural products. These include solvents, surface coatings, medicines, chemicals, building materials, containers, utensils, electronic components, fibers, films, explosives, adhesives, lubricants, insecticides, waxes, drilling muds, paints, varnishes, and even paving materials.

Practically all of the research that has been carried on in behalf of agriculture has had to do with increased production. This is necessary and wise because it lowers costs. We have failed to carry on an adequate program to find new markets and new uses. In fact, it is believed that only about one-sixteenth of 1 percent of the gross sales of agriculture has been used on research to find new uses of agricultural products.

By contrast, industry is currently investing about $11 billion a year in research. The result is a constant flow of new and improved products. These new products—the result of modern research—have provided the foundation for new industries, new consumer demand, more jobs and more business. This research by industry is continuous, systematic, and intensive. I find no fault with it. I merely point out that a similar research program should be carried on in behalf of agriculture.

Because research has gone on in industry and it has been lacking in agriculture, the farmers of America have lost many of the markets they previously had. For instance, linseed oil has been replaced as a component of paint to a large extent. Were we using the same amount of linseed oil per gallon of paint as we did back in the thirties, the farmers could plant an additional 1 million acres of flax.

Half of the market for natural fibers, including cotton, wool, and silk, has been taken over by synthetic fibers. Two-thirds of the shoes now are made partly or wholly of leather substitutes. Soap made from natural fats has lost out to detergents. In the last 10 or 12 years, the use of detergents per person has increased from 1 pound to 15 pounds per year, while the use of soap has decreased from 23 pounds to 8 pounds a year.

Perhaps one of the most discussed problems over the country is the heavy traffic and the difficulty of finding a parking place. This indicates that the United States is using a great amount of rubber, although there are many, many uses for rubber besides that which is used by the automobile industry. A small portion of this rubber is natural rubber, but most of it is synthetic rubber. If only part of this synthetic rubber market would be supplied with synthetic rubber made from alcohol made from grain, it would take hundreds of millions of bushels a year. This was done during World War II under the rubber czar, Mr. William Jeffers. As the program progressed the cost lowered materially, again pointing up the need for trial commercialization and pilot testing to make these proposals economically feasible.

Research should be carried on to find the additional uses for the 55 million tons of legumes produced annually in the United States. One of the task force groups of the Welsh Commission made an estimate of the untapped possibilities in this field. This estimate included a billion dollars worth of protein, carotene worth $2¾ billion, vitamin E worth $2 billion, vitamin K worth $115 million, xanthophyll worth $12½ billion, and chlorophyll worth $19 billion. These figures sound a bit fantastic, but they show that these materials in our legumes are waiting to be used and developed for medicinal and other nonfood uses.

Another task force, working on potatoes, reported:

> The potato industry is confident that a materially enlarged research and development program would so expand the market that surpluses would disappear and it might even be necessary to increase production.

Likewise, the task force on sugar had this to say:

> The sugar industry is confident that these industrial uses will be developed, to the extent perhaps of utilizing an extra million tons of sugar by 1965 and 2 million tons by 1975. This would add more than 10 percent to the projected 1965 demand and more than 16 percent to the projected demand for 1975. Sugar is an inexpensive, exceptionally pure, and chemically very reactive material, adaptable for many large-scale industrial applications. Present industrial use is small, but a dozen years of research have turned up some highly promising leads.

Not all of the new uses that are economically possible of our farm crops are confined to crops already being raised. The Welsh Commission had a task group on new crops. It is estimated that about 250,000 plants are on the earth that have been identified. We have only domesticated around 150. There remain about 249,850 plants that should have our attention because they can supply many things needed in our economy.

A new type of bamboo can be produced in the South, especially in areas that have had to cut down their cotton acreage, which would be very valuable in preventing a paper shortage in this country. It is estimated that this could take a million acres.

Due to research already carried on, safflower is now an important crop in Nebraska. In addition to its food value it is being sold to manufacturers for alkyd resins, enamels, varnishes, and high-quality paint.

Instead of our resorting to abaca and sisal to supply our cordage and rope, we should develop the sansevieris, a commonly used house plant known as a snake plant. This promises a market for possibly a hundred thousand acres.

Our economy could use 200,000 acres of kenaf to make fiber for post office twine, carpet yarn, camouflage, and burlap instead of using imported jute.

Wax is now in demand in industry. We ought to be producing 150,000 acres of Simmondsia from which a needed high quality wax can be produced.

We import our tannins used in the production of leather. This tannin could be supplied from canaigre and we could perhaps use a hundred thousand acres of that crop.

Mr. President, it is entirely possible that if a broad program of research and trial commercialization can be undertaken, many of these things I have mentioned can be developed. It is also possible that some of them will not prove practical, but in this process of research we will develop many things that I have not mentioned or that were not even thought of by the fine individuals who worked on the Welsh Commission report.

The important problems facing our Nation have been solved, if they have been solved, by education, research and trial and error endeavors. It is my opinion that it will be along this line that progress comes to American agriculture. It will not come through political answers or a negative approach of reducing the number of acres that a farmer can farm. A reduction of acres has not provided the answer. We have not yet scratched the surface in increased productivity.

In developing such a program for agriculture there is a definite part to be played by government. Individual farmers, unlike a great corporation extending from coast to coast, cannot do their own research. This must be done by government. It must be research for the purpose of finding new uses and new markets.

The program that I advocate and that is advocated by the Welsh Commission falls into three parts. First, is research. That is most important, but it must not end there. Research merely for the shelf, for someone to read years later, if ever, does not provide the answer.

In the second place, the Government must sponsor a program of trial commercialization and pilot testing. The Government should take the ideas developed in our laboratories and try them out as pilot operations sponsored by the Government and on a contract basis handled by private enterprise.

Thirdly, it calls for a program of limited subsidies on a test pilot basis to both farmers and industry, to get the program started. Farmers cannot be expected to plant one of the untried 250,000 plants existing on the earth if they have no hope for a market. Industry likewise cannot build factories to use the products of the farm until they know that the crop is available, that it will afford a product the American public wants, and they can produce it economically. Consequently, on a trial basis, on a pilot testing basis, the Government should finance such a program. I would be willing to reduce other parts of the agricultural budget to finance this program.

The results of all this research, trial commercialization and pilot testing, which will have been supported by limited subsidies, will then be turned over to all segments of our economy which are non-Government, to the end that it will be used by private enterprise, and that competition will prevail.

To further this program the Government should forthwith cause the Commodity Credit Corporation to make surpluses available to Government laboratories, private laboratories, universities and private businesses for research purposes without cost.

The Government should be authorized to enter into contracts to furnish, at low price, surplus agricultural products over a period of 5 or 10 years to any business to manufacture new industrial products. The present subsidy now being paid for exports should be extended to domestic concerns which would put the surpluses to new uses which are for other than human or animal consumption. Such a business should by contract be assured of their supply of raw materials over a period of years so they could depend on it.

A program of industrial uses when it becomes a reality, or any other farm program, cannot succeed if the United States is flooded with agricultural imports from other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD at this point Legislative Resolution 25 passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska. The resolution points out the injury suffered by our farmers and ranchers from the increased imports of livestock and meat and meat products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 25

Whereas this legislature wishes to focus the attention of the Nation and the Federal Government upon the probability that the rising volume of imports of mutton, pork, beef, and veal into the United States has been a factor in contributing to the serious decline of livestock prices; and

Whereas the imports of beef and veal, product weight, for the 11-month period of January through November of 1962, totaled 884 million pounds, which volume was equal to 9 percent of the U.S. production of beef and veal during this same period and represented a 39-percent increase from the 635 million pounds of beef and veal imported during the same period in 1961; and

Whereas the imports of pork for the first 9-month period of 1962, totaled 151,464,000 million pounds, which volume was 22 percent greater than during the same period in 1961. Pigskin imports during the first three quarters of the year 1962 were up 150 percent; and

Whereas imports of all red meats during the first three quarters of 1962 were up 36 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:

1. That the Nebraska Legislature hereby petitions the executive branch of the Federal Government, the Senators and Congressmen from Nebraska to exercise their authority immediately under the powers and privileges granted in Public Law 87-794, and to further consider the wisdom of flexible quota of imports to balance the consumptive need, in relation to U.S. domestic production.

2. That action be taken immediately because the situation is unusually serious and requires correction at the earliest possible moment.

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced, if promptly enacted, would relieve the present situation and would, without a doubt, increase the price of cattle and hogs and sheep to our farmers and feeders. Our big increase in imports has occurred in the last few years. This bill which I have introduced, S. 1126, would place an additional 25 percent ad valorem duty on all imports of livestock, meat and meat products which were in excess of the level of imports for the calendar year 1957.

Mr. President, when the administration presented its trade bill to Congress last year, I voted against the measure. It was unwise. The damage it will do to agriculture was foreseeable.

During the course of the consideration of the trade bill, a number of amendments were offered which would have been beneficial to agriculture. They were all opposed by the administration forces and all defeated. I offered an amendment which would have directed our negotiators to hold down our annual imports of agricultural products to the 1957 level and to maintain our annual exports at not less than the 1957 level. That amendment, like the others, was opposed on the Senate floor by administration forces and defeated. We are now suffering the consequences.

The European Common Market is a good thing for Europe. It will bring political unity. It is a private enterprise operation and it will give to the European countries a strength which will be a bulwark against communism.

The trade policy of this administration in respect to the European Common Market has been totally unrealistic and unsound. Administration sources presented the Common Market to the people of the United States as a free trade movement. The fact is, it is a protectionist movement. The Common Market seeks to abolish trade barriers between the member nations in Europe, but establishes protection around the outer rim of the Common Market countries. It is their intention to produce for themselves all of the agricultural products and other products they possibly can. The Common Market of Europe aims to do for Europe what the Constitution of the United States did for our States in 1787. Barriers were then abolished between the several States, but a tariff policy was adopted for the entire United States. That policy developed a strong economy for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks my individual views as printed in the report of the Committee on Finance when the Kennedy trade bill was before the Senate.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS, ON H.R. 11970

This measure goes far beyond the existing trade agreements program and I do not favor its enactment in its present form.

The European Common Market is a very desirable entity. It will lead to greater unity among the nations of Europe; it will elevate their economies and strengthen their political ties. It is a fortress against international communism and our national policy should be to encourage and to cooperate with the Common Market. The bill presented by the committee will not, in my opinion, be mutually advantageous to the United States and to the European nations. Both need each other and whatever weakens the United States weakens Europe.

Under the trade agreements program existing for more than a quarter of a century the Congress has delegated its constitutional powers to levy, modify, and repeal taxes, and its powers to regulate portions of our commerce to the executive. In the past there have been certain limitations in this delegation of power. In most recent years the Congress has provided for safeguards such as the peril point and escape clause procedures. The measure before us departs from all these previous concepts.

Our reciprocal trade program of the past is not free of criticism. The United States has allowed foreign countries to impose many nontariff barriers against us such as quotas, embargos, import licenses, unreasonable inspection, variable import fees, currency manipulations, and other harassments. In the past the Congress has authorized the President, in his negotiations, to lower tariffs by 50 percent. Under the successive acts passed, the United States has bargained away 80 percent of its tariffs and bargaining power. The result is not praiseworthy. The average U.S. tariff on dutiable goods at present is 11 percent while the average for other major industrial nations is 14 percent. Many important examples are in greater contrast—for instance, the tariff on European cars sold in the United States is 6½ percent and the tariff on American cars, under EEC proposals will soon be 22½ percent. Many other unfair situations can be cited especially in connection with our agricultural products. Candy is a widely consumed item and is made entirely from agricultural products. We permit candy to come in from Switzerland, France, Germany, or England under a tariff of 14 percent. American-made candy shipped to many of these nations faces a tariff of 30 percent. The farmers want to trade with the Common Market countries. We are the world's most efficient and lowest cost producers of agricultural products. Under the variable duties now in effect within the Common Market countries, the products of American farmers face a tariff in the Common Market countries, as of August 1, 1962, at least six times as high as corresponding tariffs on identical items imported from the Common Market into the United States. In addition to the inequality of tariffs facing the United States, we meet continually countless instances of the imposition of nontariff barriers mentioned above.

It is my belief trade negotiations can be carried on that would be mutually advantageous to the United States and to other countries. It must be a two-way street. The only safeguards remaining in the bill before us are ineffective. Discretionary power is given to the President, without limitation, to raise tariffs, to any level or to impose any other trade restriction. These provisions are not guidelines for negotiation. They will be applied, if at all, after the fact. They will subject the President to innumerable requests and pressures from deserving industries at home and will create ill will for the United States within foreign countries if they are ever applied.

The bill before us eliminates the peril-point procedure. No longer will the Tariff Commission, after it has made its studies, advise the President before the negotiations at what point injury might occur. This measure abandons the policy of economically sound increased trade and proceeds upon an admission that negotiations will be consummated to the injury of segments of our economy. The escape clause is shorn of effectiveness in existing law.

The powers delegated to the President are vastly greater than the powers heretofore delegated. He may, through negotiation, lower all tariffs from their present level, a level lower than almost any other country, by an average of 50 percent. An additional list of commodities is subject to being lowered more than 50 percent—in fact down to zero. The President is specifically authorized to negotiate away all tariffs now less than a 5-percent ad valorem equivalent. In these two latter categories of additional power will rest many of our agricultural products.

Prior acts had, as their goal, an expansion of trade and an increase of jobs. This measure substitutes a Government-managed economy for the United States and for foreign countries with shocking disregard for business and employment results. The bill sets up a superunemployment compensation system in addition to individual programs of our 50 States. It is another major step toward federalizing our unemployment systems. The bill permits workers or management to seek a finding that they are injured by imports. A worker so found to be unemployed by the reason of imports will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks at approximately 65 percent of his salary. This will amount to almost twice the average rate of unemployment compensation paid by our States. He will receive these benefits for 52 weeks, a longer period than is provided by most State unemployment compensation systems.

If this Federal unemployment compensation system becomes the law it will bring about many inequalities and many instances of unfairness. A person whose unemployment is caused by the Executive granting concessions to destroy his job will draw a higher rate of unemployment compensation, for a longer period, than his neighbor who is secondarily unemployed because his employment was based upon goods or services provided to the business which closed because of imports. Attention is called to the testimony in the hearings of longtime, well-qualified administrators of State unemployment compensation systems who testified against this provision of the bill.

This measure is defective in its unprecedented and far-reaching delegation of power. It is lacking in that it fails to provide guidelines before agreements are entered into with foreign nations to protect the United States from arbitrary barriers or to protect the U.S. domestic market from excessive and uneconomic imports. The measure should be materially revised or delayed until January when such revision could be made.

Carl T. Curtis,
U.S. Senator.

BASIC SALARY OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES FOR RETIREMENT PURPOSES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit Federal employees to have withheld from their pay for retirement purposes their appropriate share of compensation for overtime, night, holiday, and similar work.

Under the present Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, only basic salary is subject to the 6½-percent payroll deduction, which is then transferred to the civil service retirement fund. The definition of basic salary in the current law does not permit credit for work in excess of the normal 40-hour tour of duty.

The objective of the legislation is to expand the statutory definition to include the various types of pay enumerated above for retirement purposes.

Over the years of an employee's career, this could mean a slightly higher annuity based upon the additional contributions he makes resulting from work in these categories.

The individual who is required to spend hours over and above the normal work cycle or who must perform service on a less desirable shift is certainly performing work, just as he would under normal circumstances. Yet, under existing law, he may not add the value of his work to his retirement account.

Fundamentally, a staff retirement program is designed to permit employees to cease working after the required years of service and at the required age with a reasonable expectation of continuing income to maintain them during the later years of life. This bill is simply an extension of that principle to allow workers to acquire retirement credit for certain periods of works upon payment of their normal share of the retirement cost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1157) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPEAL OF SECTION 13A OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in 1958, believing that the railroads then were on the verge of bankruptcy, Congress enacted an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act along with a package of other measures intended to provide emergency help to what was then regarded as a sick industry. This legislation was known as the Transportation Act of 1958 and most of its provisions were, I believe, warranted as measures intended to bring about more equitable treatment of the railroads, even though we now are aware that the railroads were nowhere nearly as sick in 1958 as they had led many of us to believe.

One provision of this legislation, however, has been the subject of strong controversy ever since its enactment. I refer to that strange provision of law which became section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. This section, according to its legislative history, was intended to provide a means by which the railroads could circumvent State agencies which the railroads claimed has been treating them unfairly by denying them permission to discontinue passenger trains for which there was no longer a need. This law has now been in effect for more than 4 years and during that time more than 220 trains have been completely discontinued and 51 additional trains have been partially discontinued as a result of this statute. It would seem that 4 years is certainly long enough for any railroad which may have been unfairly treated by the State agencies to have taken advantage of this enactment and to get rid of any unprofitable trains it may have been unfairly compelled to continue.

I am therefore, today, introducing a bill which would repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. This measure would return to the States and to the railroad commissions the authority over passenger train discontinuances which they had always exercised prior to the 1958 amendment. It is my belief that the State railroad commissions, which are most familiar with the needs for service in a given area, are the most logical agencies to determine whether or not the public convenience and necessity requires continued passenger train operations. I believe that action to repeal section 13a is essential at this session of Congress if the public is not to be denied passenger train service which it still requires. The provisions of section 13a, to my mind, are unique in the legislative history of our country in that, in effect, they give to the railroads themselves as a public utility the right to regulate themselves insofar as passenger train operations are involved. In fact, this law has frequently been criticized for its lack of adequate protection of the public interest.

Among the ways by which section 13a clearly ignores the public interest are the following:

First. It permits the railroads to discontinue passenger train service by the mere posting of a notice unless the Interstate Commerce Commission decides that it should act on the notice and hold a hearing. Such action is entirely discretionary with the Commission.

Second. The public is denied the right to appeal a passenger train discontinuance to the courts, but the right of such an appeal is preserved for the railroads whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission orders them to continue a train. Lopsided justice is no justice at all.

Third. Discontinuances of passenger trains are permitted to take place without any requirement for the holding of a public hearing.

Fourth. Railroads are permitted to discontinue interstate passenger train operation without being required to justify such action.

Fifth. If the Interstate Commerce Commission does decide to hold a hearing, the law requires the public to prove that the continued operation of the interstate passenger train will not be an undue burden on the railroad, although the public can only secure such proof from material which only the railroads can supply.

Sixth. The law permits the railroads to withhold from opponents of proposed discontinuances all material needed to prove undue financial burden until the day of the hearing, if one is held.

Section 13a thus places a completely unrealistic and unfair restriction upon efforts by the public and even the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep a passenger train in operation. One of the provisions most damaging to the public interest is that which authorizes automatic discontinuance of interstate passenger trains unless the Interstate Commerce Commission renders a final decision within 4 months of the original discontinuance date. This unreasonable time limit clearly denies the public adequate time to prepare its opposition to the discontinuance.

There is much evidence that many railroads have used section 13a deliberately to downgrade passenger train service in order to eliminate trains. The present law permits the ICC only to look at the facts—or alleged facts—which the carrier decides to disclose in the application submitted and it is not permitted to examine the motives of the carrier in seeking to abandon trains. The Commission is limited to determining, solely on the basis of the evidence before it, whether the public convenience and necessity requires the continuance of the train and whether that continued operation will be an undue burden on the railroad. Thus, under the present law, the Commission is required to permit the discontinuance of a train on which the service has deliberately been deteriorated.

Many of the State laws, which were made ineffective by section 13a, on the other hand, permit the State commissions to require continued service on specific schedules and with specific equipment, and this authority thus can prevent deliberate destruction and reduction of service. Section 13a, however, has left the Interstate Commerce Commission powerless to set minimum service standards.

The need for repeal of section 13a has been repeatedly pointed to by the State railroad commissioners. Regularly at the annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the delegates have voted to adopt a resolution calling for repeal of this legislation.

In conclusion, I submit the following tabular summary, compiled as of February 7, 1963, of section 13a cases which have arisen since the Transportation Act of 1958 was enacted:

	13a(1)	13a(2)	Total
Number of applications	86	26	112
Number of trains involved	316	142	458
Number of trains discontinued	188	41	229
Number of trains partially discontinued [1]	51	0	51
Number of trains completely or partially discontinued	239	41	280
Number of trains ordered to keep operating [2]	41	67	108
Number of trains where case was dismissed or withdrawn	24	27	51
Number of trains involved in cases still pending	12	3	15

[1] A partially discontinued train would be one that was ordered to operate during only a portion of the year—such as holiday seasons—one where service was cut during several days of the week, etc.

[2] Most of the orders stipulating that a train must keep operating were for the usual 1-year moratorium, allowing a new application after 1 year. Thus, the same "trains" will appear in the figures more than once. Therefore, since a case-by-case rather than train-by-train method is used for record purposes, the figures are not completely additive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be published in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1161) to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act is repealed.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963.

Two years ago it was my privilege to be the chief sponsor of S. 1, the area redevelopment legislation which was finally enacted into law on May 1, 1961. In the short period of time that has elapsed, the Area Redevelopment Administration has made tremendous strides in assisting in the rejuvenation of many local economies that had suffered from persistent economic distress. In less than 24 months, the agency has designated eligible for assistance under the terms of the act 996 local areas and 51 Indian reservations in 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa; received 792 overall economic development programs from 792 areas and 42 Indian reservations in 48 States; approved the overall economic development plans of 700 areas and 36 Indian reservations; approved 724 projects in 47 States, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico, which will create approximately 35,000 direct jobs and countless more new jobs through the indirect effects of increasing economic growth and prosperity in these areas; and approved 345 training and subsistence programs to assist over 18,000 previously unemployed in developing new skills for new jobs.

More specifically, the Area Development Administration has approved 139 industrial loans at a total cost of approximately $42 million; 78 public facility projects totaling approximately $25 million in the form of loans and almost $17 million in the form of grants. At the same time, the agency has approved 162 technical assistance projects at a total cost of $5.4 million.

However, the task of the Area Redevelopment Administration is far from completed. Therefore, the administration has proposed legislation to extend and improve the Area Redevelopment Act, which I am introducing today.

Basically, the bill would—

First. Increase the authorization for industrial and commercial loans from $100 million to $250 million for industrial or commercial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act—so-called urban areas.

Second. Increase the authorization for industrial and commercial loans from $100 million to $250 million for industrial or commercial projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act—so-called rural areas.

Third. Increase the authorization for public facility loans from $100 to $150 million.

Fourth. Increase the authorization for public facility grants from $75 to $175 million.

Fifth. Permit the required 10-percent local contribution for industrial or commercial projects if it is in the form of a loan to be repaid concurrently with financial assistance extended by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Sixth. Increase the authorization for technical assistance from $4.5 to $10 million.

I hope that the Senate will be able to act quickly on this request of the administration for amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act. The Secretary of Commerce, in his letter of transmittal to the President of the Senate, has ably stated the case for this legislation. Secretary Hodges said:

> The Area Redevelopment Act embodies the primary legislative authorization for attacking the problem of unemployment and underemployment in those areas of the Nation which are suffering the greatest economic adversity. The problems of these pockets of distress—and the measures which are appropriate to their economic revitalization—are distinct and in addition to the economic challenges which face the Nation as a whole. Impressive strides have been made under the area redevelopment program. A continuation of this essential work is dependent upon additional appropriation authorizations. Also, experience in administration has indicated the need of certain modifications to more effectively attain the objectives of the act.
>
> I commend this proposed legislation to you as being in the greatest national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a detailed analysis of the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

GENERAL

The attached amendments would allow the Area Redevelopment Act more fully to meet the needs for which it was created through increased fund authorizations and flexibility. These amendments are based upon the experience of the Area Redevelopment Administration during the period May 1, 1961, through February 28, 1963, and are more fully described below.

Section 2: Declaration of purpose.

Section 3: Amendments to section 6(b).

(a) Authorization to increase the total amount of industrial and commercial loans outstanding: Section 6(b)(1)(A) of the Area Redevelopment Act now places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of loans and/or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for commercial or industrial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act. Section 6(b)(1)(B) places a similar limitation on the amount of loans or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for such projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act. It is the purpose of section 3(a) of the proposed amendments to raise the ceilings on the total amounts of loans outstanding under each of these sections from $100 to $250 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed the Small Business Administration to execute loan agreements amounting to $20,431,335 in industrial and commercial loans for projects in 5(a) redevelopment areas and $17,711,442 for projects in 5(b) areas. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration has project applications in the total amount of $86,431,967 pending for projects in 5(a) areas and $118,510,788 pending for projects in 5(b) areas. Evidence indicates that loan activity will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of loan approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have approximately $425 million in loans outstanding under section 6 by June 30, 1965, if there were no statutory limitations. It is clear that the present ceilings imposed by section 6(b)(1) of the Area Redevelopment Act will be reached considerably before the act's termination on June 30, 1965, unless otherwise amended.

(b) Refining the minimum 10 percent requirement: Section 6(b)(9)(B) requires at least 10 percent of the aggregate cost of an industrial or commercial project for which an ARA loan is sought, to be supplied by a public or semipublic body in the form of equity capital or as a subordinated loan with delayed repayment. The proposed amendment to this section would authorize the minimum 10 percent money to be repaid during the same time but at no faster rate than the financial assistance extended under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

ARA has experienced great difficulty in obtaining the required 10-percent money in order to advance the economies of redevelopment areas. In fact, there is a direct relationship between the severity of the economic problem and the difficulty experienced by communities attempting to raise the required funds. The present proposal would not eliminate the 10-percent requirement but would make it possible for redevelopment areas to attract additional financial sources which are presently unable to participate in projects because of the statutory restrictions on repayment.

Section 4, authorization to increase the total amount of loans for public facilities outstanding: Section 7(c) of the act places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of public facility loans which can be outstanding at any one time for public facilities under section 7. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the total amount authorized to be outstanding from $100 to $150 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration has instructed delegate agencies to execute loan agreements amounting to $24,777,200 in public facility loans for projects located in areas designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. Loan applications were pending in the amount of $13,178,525 for such projects. However, the pending applications figure does not include anticipated loans resulting from the denial of section 8 applications in whole or in part. Evidence again indicates that loan activity resulting from sections 7 and 8 applications will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have more than $100 million in loans outstanding under section 7 by June 30, 1965, but for the present $100 million limitation.

Section 5. authorization to increase the total amount which can be appropriated for grants for public facilities: Section 8(d) of the act authorizes $75 million to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants for public facilities under section 8. This amendment would increase the total amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose for the duration of the act from $75 to $175 million, and would enable it to remain available until expended when so specified in appropriation acts.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $35 million for public facility grants, together with the $40 million previously appropriated for fiscal year 1962, exhausts the authorization under the act for this purpose. As of February 28, 1963, applications for grants totaled $26,875,566. Obligations for 1964 are currently being estimated at $35 million, with a minimum 10-percent increase estimated for 1965. The requested increase in authorization to $175 million takes into account both the $75 million previously appropriated and the approximately $75 million currently projected, with some leeway for anticipated increases. If the statutory authorization is not increased, ARA's public facility grant program will go out of existence at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Section 6, amendments to section 11:

(a) Authorization to increase the annual amounts which can be appropriated for technical assistance: Section 11 of the act authorizes appropriations not to exceed $4.5 million annually to provide technical assistance useful in alleviating or preventing excessive unemployment or underemployment. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the annual amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose from $4.5 to $10 million.

Under its present authorization, the Area Redevelopment Administration as of February 28, 1963, had approved contracts in the amount of $1,651,000 for technical assistance. Applications for such assistance had been received in the total amount of $25,799,248. Of this total, approximately $11 million of these applications were received in fiscal year 1963. Currently, applications are arriving at a rate of $1 million per month. Experience has shown that this assistance is of great value, and it it anticipated that the rate of applications will continue to rise.

(b) Amendment to make explicit discretionary authority to require repayment of technical assistance: The additional language makes it clear that the Secretary has the authority to require repayment of funds advanced for technical assistance in appropriate cases.

Section 7, procuring the services of experts and consultants under section 12(10): This section governs the procurement and payment for services of experts and consultants hired temporarily by contract or appointment to assist the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the act. It limits temporary services to 6 months, omits mention of intermittent services, and limits the per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to $15. The proposed amendment would modify the provisions of this section in conformity with 5 U.S.C. 5a by authorizing the procurement of temporary services of experts or consultants up to 1 year instead of 6 months and providing for intermittent services, thereby explicitly assuring to ARA the authority customarily available to executive departments in this regard. It would also automatically conform the authorized per diem allowance to the current applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, which is now $16.

Section 8, authorization for appropriated funds to remain available until expended and for depositing certain appropriations in the area redevelopment fund: The proposed amendment to section 23 will provide for appropriations being made on a basis where funds may remain available until expended. In addition, funds appropriated for the purpose of making loans under sections 6 and 7 of the act are directed to be deposited in the area redevelopment fund which is established by section 9(b) of the act. This amendment further provides for payments of interest to the Treasury on use of funds appropriated to the area redevelopment fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill entitled "Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963," introduced today by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be held at the desk until next Wednesday for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the decline of the mining industry in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and elsewhere in the United States. I have been counseling with experts at various colleges and universities, including the Michigan College of Mining and Technology, as well as in the Bureau of Mines and the Area Redevelopment Administration. Indeed, as far back as June 22, 1961, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the subject at my request.

From these explorations it is evident that the single most helpful avenue to pursue to help this industry and the people who want to work in it is through research. We have outstanding technical ability in the United States and especially in Michigan, but funds are in very short supply.

It appears logical for this research to be under the administration of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior. And, it appears equally logical and desirable for the Bureau of Mines to be authorized to utilize professional skills, not available in sufficient quantity in its staff, from other sources by contract or grant. This procedure would permit the Nation to step up its attack on the sticky problems standing in the way of maximum resource utilization. Unfortunately, however, I find the Bureau of Mines is not presently authorized by law to make grants or contract for research of the type I have in mind.

The bill I am now introducing would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with and make grants for the conduct of research and development programs of the Bureau of Mines. This proposed legislation, if enacted, will enable the Bureau to draw on large supplies of scientific and engineering talents and technologic resources to supplement and complement the Bureau's own scientific establishment. Thus augmented the Bureau of Mines will better provide for the Nation's expanding needs for minerals and for the welfare of the people engaged in obtaining mineral commodities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development in furtherance of the purposes of the act of May 16, 1910 (36 Stat. 369; 30 U.S.C. 1, 3, 5, and 7), as amended and supplemented, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AFFIDAVITS OF BIAS OR PREJUDICE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code. The measure is identical to S. 2478, which was reported favorably with amendments and passed the Senate on October 3, 1962. Unfortunately, it did not reach the House in time for consideration by that body last session.

The bill makes a significant, but not sweeping, change in the procedure for passing on affidavits of bias or prejudice in the Federal court. Under the present law, when a party to an action files an affidavit of personal bias or prejudice against the judge before whom a matter is pending that judge may determine whether it is sufficient to warrant disqualification from further consideration of the case.

The indelicate nature of the situation alone suggests that the judge against whom the affidavit is filed should not pass on its sufficiency. The proposed amendment to section 144 accomplishes this purpose by requiring that its disposition be placed in the hands of another judge. The bill also changes the time when such an affidavit may be filed to reflect the current court practices in setting down cases for trial.

In its midwinter meeting last month, the Judicial Conference of the United States reaffirmed its support of the measure. Because the bill is highly desirable, it is my hope that it will receive the early consideration and approval of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1168) to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code, introduced by Mr. Hruska, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended so as to read:

"Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding.

"The affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists, and shall be filed not less than thirty days before the trial or hearing of the proceeding, or good cause shall be shown for failure to file it within such time. An order shall then be entered directing that an authenticated copy of the affidavit shall be forthwith certified to the chief judge for the circuit in which such proceeding is pending, and said chief judge, or any judge designated by him, shall determine whether the affidavit is timely and sufficient. A party may file only one such affidavit in any case. It shall be accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record stating that it is made in good faith."

UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations a bill to authorize a special Treasury issue of United Nations peace bonds designed to give the American people an opportunity for the first time to demonstrate in a tangible, effective manner their support for the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations.

Senators Humphrey, Morse, Hart, Young of Ohio, Douglas, and Williams of New Jersey have consented to join me as cosponsors of this measure.

The bill would direct the Treasury to make available for public purchase for a 2-year period a special $50 million issue of peace bonds for use by the President in support of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. Notification and approval of Congress would be required for all expenditures. The bonds would yield the same rate of interest as U.S. savings bonds when held to maturity 25 years from date of issue, and, like savings bonds, they would be redeemable according to a preassigned schedule of values. They would be sold on a discount basis in small denominations of $25 to $1,000, and no person would be allowed to hold more than $10,000 of bonds at any one time.

Many Members of Congress seem to be under the impression that most of the U.N. financial problems were taken care of last year by the enactment of legislation authorizing U.S. matching purchases of up to $100 million of United Nations bonds. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

Due primarily to continuing, highly successful peacekeeping operations in the Congo, the Middle East and elsewhere, the U.N. deficit, which stood at $72.4 million last December 31, is expected to increase to $126 million by June 30 even if no new peacekeeping assignments are undertaken. This latter estimate takes into account all receipts expected from the U.N. bond sales, which are not expected to exceed much more than $150 million in all, although $200 million were authorized, and, as of March 1, $126 million actually sold.

Congo expenses have already dropped somewhat from the $10 million per month cost averaged last year, and it is hoped that they will drop to $5 million per month by the middle of this year, but they cannot drop much further in the immediate future because of heavy reconstruction, development, and technical assistance obligations. Middle East expenses continue at about $1.6 million a month.

The World Court advisory holding last summer that emergency U.N. costs of the Congo and Middle East forces constitute a legal obligation of all members was approved by resolution on a vote of 76 to 17 in the General Assembly last December. To date, however, this action has not had an appreciable effect on cutting members' arrears, although it is hoped that it will have such an effect in the future when members are threatened with automatic loss of voting powers under Charter Article 19 when 2 years' arrearages accumulate. The Soviet Union will reach this stage in January of 1964 unless it makes new payments.

A 21-nation working party was formed at the last U.N. session to study future financing of the United Nations. This group will report to a special session of the Assembly in mid-May, but no miracles are expected. The U.S. position at the meetings of the group has been that our Government will not pay more than 32.08 percent of the cost of peacekeeping operations in the future—the same share as we pay of the regular assessments. Indeed there is reported to be a healthy consensus at the United Nations against any one nation assuming a larger share of U.N. support than the United States has been shouldering, although the wisdom of the rigid, percentage cutoff is questionable. We spend more than the total current deficit of the United Nations daily for defense—or every 4 months for chewing gum.

Clearly the United Nations must find new and reliable sources of funds if its effectiveness is to be maintained or increased. The people of this country and other countries should be given the opportunity to supplement the support given to U.N. activities by their governments.

Legally the United Nations belong to its member governments, and the latter have been jealous not to dilute their control over the organization by authorizing individuals to have an equity in the United Nations. If the United Nations fails, however, the loss in terms of increased tensions and risks of war will be borne equally by the governments and the peoples of the world.

All popular opinion polls show that support for the United Nations in this country and elsewhere is broad and deep.

A Gallup poll early in 1962 showed that 83 percent of the people think it very important that the United States make the U.N. a success. A poll I took in Pennsylvania at the same time showed that an overwhelming 87 percent of those responding favored U.S. efforts to strengthen the United Nations. The millions who have listened or watched anxiously the U.N.'s deliberations during severe international crises in recent years know of the vital role the organization has played in providing a forum for venting national emotions and in actually supplying the means of establishing or maintaining the peace in trouble spots around the globe. The U.N.'s efforts for peace are acceptable frequently where no nation or group of nations, no matter how well intentioned, could prevent war by unilateral threats of action.

I think the popular subscription to "peace bonds" in the United States would surprise the cynics who tend to deprecate the U.N. and the antiinternationalists who think the United States should always go it alone.

In the last Congress when I introduced a like measure, a number of influential nongovernmental organizations, foreign policy, and labor groups in particular, testified in support of the proposal at a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee in July. State Department and Treasury officials appeared in support of it, although a basic misunderstanding developed as to the authority of the President to use the funds realized from the bond sales over and beyond amounts otherwise authorized and appropriated for U.N. support activities or merely to displace such appropriations.

I have amended the bill, first, to make clear that the moneys made available to the President from the bond sales shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any other amounts appropriated for U.N. support purposes, and expendable only after Congress has been notified and had opportunity to disapprove planned expenditures; second, to provide peace bond holders with a return equal to the going rate of interest on U.S. savings bonds, which happens to be 3¾ percent at present, rather than 2 percent as suggested earlier; third, to limit the period of issue to 2 years and the total face amounts to $25 million per year; and fourth, to specify use of the funds to support special peacekeeping operations of the United Nations rather than general U.N. activities. I am hopeful that the amended bill will again receive administration approval and be enacted by the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1171) to authorize the issuance of a special issue of bonds in order to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States, through the purchase of such bonds, to participate in the financing of peacekeeping activities of the United Nations, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to create a Select Committee on Consumers in the Senate, analogous to the existing Select Committee on Small Business. The bill is cosponsored by Senators Cooper, Keating, Prouty, and Scott.

This means of aiding the interests of consumers has been a constant cause of mine since I have been in the Congress. The measure I am introducing today is identical to those I proposed in the 86th and 87th Congresses.

In July, 1962, President Kennedy appointed a Consumers' Advisory Council, somewhat along the lines of a promise he made during the 1960 campaign. At that time I placed in the Record a New York Times editorial stating that the appointment of the advisory committee while laudable could express only a pro forma interest in consumer problems. Only a committee in each House of Congress could represent significantly the fact that ours is a consumers' economy. Legislation handled by a variety of standing committees affects the interests of consumers in, for example, consumer frauds, quality, prices and productivity. Yet there is no single forum in which the consumers' interest in all such legislation can be adequately taken into consideration in a comprehensive way, just as the Small Business Committee represents comprehensively the problems of the small business community.

Nothing has come to my attention since the creation of the advisory committee to change my view that a congressional committee is vitally needed. I strongly urge the administration to take the same view and support this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 116) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Consumers (referred to hereinafter as the "committee") consisting of seventeen Members of the Senate, of whom eleven shall be members of the majority party and six shall be members of the minority party. Members and the chairman thereof shall be selected as soon as may be practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution, and at the beginning of each Congress commencing thereafter, in the same manner as members and chairmen of standing committees of the Senate are selected. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(b) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate, and from time to time may establish such subcommittees thereof as it may determine to be required for the performance of its duties. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that such committee or subcommittee may fix a lesser number thereof as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(c) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and investigation with respect to—

(1) the nature and extent of economic problems of consumers within the United States;

(2) the extent to which authority heretofore conferred by law upon executive, administrative, and regulatory agencies of the United States provides effective means for the solution of consumers' problems; and

(3) the nature of any additional legislative or other measures necessary or desirable for the solution of such problems.

(b) The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendations for any additional legislative or other measures which it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the solution of economic problems of consumers.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (3) require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; and (6) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency and may employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency, as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

Sec. 4. Until an appropriation is made for the payment of the expenses of the committee, such expenses, in an amount not to exceed $———, may be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure to broaden the legislative authority of the Select Committee on Small Business.

I also ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the resolution the name of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] may be added to the list of those Senators who are cosponsoring the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Excerpts from address by Senator McClellan, delivered at Tulsa, Okla., on March 8, 1963, before the Arkansas Basin Development Association.

SOVIET TECHNOLOGY ANALYZED IN RECENT STUDY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the West German embargo on the sale of large-bore steel piping to the Soviet Union is an encouraging sign of a more realistic free world attitude toward trade with the Communist bloc. For many years the Sino-Soviet bloc has been able to procure from the West vital machinery and equipment needed to build up Communist military and economic strength. According to press reports, the Department of State fully backed the West German ban on the sale of this steel pipe, after it was classified as strategic by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. President, I applaud this action by the Department of State, and I hope this is an omen of a firm U.S. policy on this subject, and that whatever steps are necessary will be taken to make certain that all our allies stand behind the decision of the Federal Republic.

One of the real difficulties in coordinating Western efforts against the Soviet economic offensive was pinpointed in a Washington Post editorial published yesterday. The editorial reads in part as follows:

> What is at fault here is a situation which makes NATO's export controls a matter of ad hoc political maneuver instead of common constant policy. COCOM, the existing NATO mechanism, provides only for voluntary adherence to a thin list of banned goods, while the United States applies strict legislative controls to a thick list. Thus an item like pipeline is strategic and banned on this side of the Atlantic but—despite the NATO action of last November—available for export at a given country's discretion on the other side. A common NATO policy on exports to the Communist bloc is clearly needed.

The action of the West German Government this week evidenced its good faith in wanting to form such a common policy; and we must make every effort to get the same cooperation from our other NATO allies.

Coming in the wake of a barrage of vicious slanders by the Soviet radio and press, the determined position of the German Government deserves commendation. Soviet attacks on the German Government have been growing in intensity since Chancellor Adenauer's original move, 3 months ago, banning sales of steel pipe to the Soviet Union.

It is particularly appropriate today, when former Foreign Minister Von Brentano is visiting the United States, to express the approval of the American people of the ban which has been maintained by the Federal Republic.

International communism has made all too clear its objective of world conquest. On more than one occasion, Khrushchev has threatened our annihilation and burial.

Since our conflict with communism is economic as well as political, we have nothing to gain in this struggle by helping the Reds build up their economy by filling gaps in their technology. It is ridiculous, and perhaps suicidal, for the United States or any of its allies to contribute in any way to the building of Soviet military or industrial strength. I do not know of any businessman who would consider it sound practice to help his competitor put him out of business.

A new trade agreement signed between France and the Soviet Union, which is to run through 1965, represents a trade increase of up to 15 percent over that under the previous trade pact. Among the items which France will supply to the Soviet Union are machinery for chemical, paper, pulp, electronic, and food industries, machine tools, pipe, nickel, and other goods. In return, the Soviet Union will supply France with anthracite coal, oil, manganese, and other commodities.

This is only one of a number of agreements signed during the past 3 years between the Soviets and our allies. Statistics show that the trade between Great Britain, Italy, and West Germany, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, has been steadily growing since 1956. Among the goods which our allies are shipping to the Soviet Union are items of definite strategic importance.

It is obvious that the arrangements we have made with our allies to control the flow of strategic goods to the Soviet Union have not been completely effective.

It is suggested in some quarters that the United States should scrap or relax restrictions on trade with the Communist bloc; first, because our allies are not cooperating; and, second, because Soviet technological advances have equipped the Communist bloc with everything we have.

It is certainly true that our allies have not fully cooperated; and it is not a secret that the greatest offender has been Great Britain, whose former President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Peter Thorneycroft, currently her Secretary of Defense, as far back as October 1953, advocated the lifting of the ban on the shipment of strategic materials to countries in the Soviet bloc.

But certainly it is not true that the Soviet bloc no longer requires, in order to achieve its various goals, advanced machinery and technology from the free world. The Soviet Union is in dire need in many industrial areas of advanced equipment and engineering know-how; and reports that the Soviet Union today is self-sufficient in terms of her industrial needs are refuted by the Soviets themselves.

A recent study entitled "Quality Control and Reliability in the U.S.S.R.," by Mr. Joseph A. Gwyer, senior research analyst in the Library of Congress, prepared as background material for his lectures before the various sections of the American Society for Quality Control, reviews pertinent data on the subject contained in Soviet technical and scientific publications reaching this country. His findings, based on statements of personnel representing a cross-section of the Soviet technological community, as well as top political leaders of the Soviet Union, are startling in the degree to which they expose the substandard quality of both industrial and consumer goods mass-produced in the Soviet bloc.

In his answer to those who have judged Soviet progress on the basis of their successful ventures into outer space, Mr. Gwyer has this to say:

> Such feats are less attributable to the volume and quality of industrial output than to the ability of a ruthless totalitarian system to allocate by decree its best brains and almost unlimited material resources to the solution of a problem which is given the highest priority by the leaders of the system. * * * These Soviet spectaculars were, in fact, attained through crash programs conducted at the expense of research and development that does not contribute directly or indirectly to the military effort.

Mr. Gwyer points out that the Soviet's mass-produced nonmilitary goods are definitely not of a high quality. Disclosures that 3 out of 10 Soviet tractors, 6 out of 10 automobiles, 1 out of 4 pieces of construction machinery, and 1 out of every 3 metal-cutting machine tools are systematically idle because of the substandard quality of parts and assemblies are definite evidence that the Soviet emphasis on quantity, rather than on quality, of goods produced, is having a detrimental effect on the entire economic structure of the Soviet Union. A similar situation exists with respect to diesel engines, electric motors and generators, chemical processing equipment, compressors, gages, measuring equipment, testing equipment, as well as spare parts for all of these; and also on batteries, spark plugs, tires, agricultural implements, telephones, television and radio receivers, refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, light bulbs, and similar equipment. According to calculations by Soviet specialists, this substandard production costs the Soviet Union fantastic amounts of money yearly. In 1958, these losses amounted to between $16.5 and $22 billion—150 to 200 billion rubles, old currency. Mr. Gwyer cites a knowledgeable Soviet engineer as saying that the situation is so bad that "a number of establishments and scientific-technical organizations do not know the actual precision, reliability, service life, and resistance to wear of most important types of equipment manufactured by the Soviets."

The inability of the Soviets to solve these problems was also the subject of Khrushchev's tirade before the Central Committee of the Communist Party on November 19, 1962. His remarks included references to the effect that the Soviets should "utilize that which the capitalists have—that which is rational and economically advantageous."

He even pointed to "western efficiency through competition" citing the experience of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler in solving their production problems.

In summing up his study, Mr. Gwyer states that the Soviets do have the necessary theoretical knowledge of the problem, but that they have not bridged the gap between theory and practice. He writes:

> The difficulties of translating the theory into practice stem basically from organizational problems, lack of trained personnel, obsolescence of manufacturing equipment and above all, the reluctance of the state to substitute quality for quantity as the prevailing consideration in mapping its expansion goals.

Any review of East-West trade makes it evident that Soviet purchases of equipment from the West are as quite selective, indicating that most of it will be used for either military or semimilitary purposes. Machine tools, instrumentation, and electronics are given a high priority, and consumer goods receive a very low priority. The Soviets are doing their best to build up their industrial power with the free world's help, and our NATO allies have cooperated in a shocking degree in this scheme.

I hope we shall wake up to these Soviet economic tactics before it is too late. In the present state of world affairs, it is senseless to talk about scrapping controls and expanding trade with the Communist bloc. The free world's technological superiority could be a powerful weapon in combating international communism; but, to date, our advantages have been largely forfeited by a lack of coordination and cooperation. I hope that studies such as that made by Mr. Gwyer will help promote a keener understanding of the opportunities for the West in an economic counteroffensive against the Communist bloc.

CAUTION REQUIRED IN SALE OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, steps have been taken in recent weeks by the Department of Justice to sell the Government's holdings in the General Aniline & Film Corp., and to turn over to private enterprise the ownership and management of the company. In my judgment this company and its employees can achieve, under private ownership, levels of growth and prosperity which could not be reached under continued Government control. This view is shared by virtually every labor, management, and civic organization interested in the welfare of this giant industry and its thousands of employees. For this reason, the plan to sell the company to private enterprise generally has been welcomed.

Concern has been expressed, however, with regard to the conditions under which the company will be sold. A recent letter to me from the president of the International Association of Machinists, Mr. A. J. Hayes, emphasizes the importance of insuring "that the company will be maintained as a wholly integrated corporation continuing to function at all the locations and plants now in existence."

A resolution adopted by the American Shareholders Committee of the General Aniline & Film Corp., also emphasizes the necessity of continued operation of the company as "a wholly integrated functioning unit."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from New York, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, these communications reflect a sentiment which is shared by all of us who have been interested in promoting the interests of the General Aniline & Film Corp., its employees, and the communities in which it operates. It would be a grave mistake for this company to be sold to any small clique, for dismemberment or relocation; and every possible safeguard against such an eventuality should be provided in the sales arrangements worked out by the Department of Justice. I strongly endorse the suggestion of both the International Association of Machinists and the minority shareholders committee that the best way to promote the future of this corporation as a strong, independent enterprise is to provide for the widest possible distribution to the public of its stock.

This matter is of tremendous importance, not only to the areas in which this corporation operates, but also to the general public. The corporation is a valuable Government asset, and it should be sold in a manner which will be of maximum benefit to the economy. This will not be the case if it falls into the hands of any group more interested in exploiting the corporation's stored up resources than in promoting its future prospects. While I have no reason to doubt the good faith of the Department of Justice, this matter deserves the closest scrutiny by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hayes' letter and the American shareholders resolution be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

[IAM Letter, Mar. 12. 1963]

Re: General Aniline & Film Corp.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: It has come to the attention of the International Association of Machinists that the Attorney General of the United States has authorized the formation of a committee to formulate procedures for the sale of the Government-held stock of the above subject corporation. I am sure that you are aware that our organization represents a considerable number of the employees of this corporation, and it is our desire to insure the employees that the company will be maintained as a wholly integrated corporation continuing to function at all the locations and plants now in existence.

In that it is our desire to continue the integrated operation, we are opposed to the sale of any shares of this corporation to any large company that could be considered as a competitor, and whose only purpose in purchasing the stock would be to eliminate competition and thereby close or remove one or a number of the plants which would, of course, result in unemployment to our members.

In our opinion the best interests of all parties concerned would be the sale of the Government-controlled shares to a large group of American underwriters for a wise and thorough distribution of the stock to individuals rather than to the competitors of this corporation. In order to achieve this objective we would suggest that the Justice Department prohibit competitor corporations from bidding and also purchasing the shares that will be sold and distributed by the Attorney General.

Very truly yours,
A. J. HAYES,
International President.

RESOLUTION

At a meeting of the American Shareholders Committee of General Aniline & Film Corp., held on the 8th day of March 1963, the following resolution was proposed, seconded and unanimously passed:

"*Resolved,* That it is a matter of vital concern to our country, shareholders of the company, its employees and management to preserve and continue the company as a wholly integrated functioning unit; and be it

"*Resolved,* That the American Shareholders are unalterably opposed to a sale of the vested shares to General Aniline & Film Corp.'s competitors or any other industrial combine which may seek to dismember our company and destroy competition, causing the closing or removal of plants, widespread unemployment and irretrievable loss to the shareholders; and be it

"*Resolved,* That the interest of all will be best served by a sale of the vested shares to a large group of American underwriters for a wide and wholesome distribution of the stock to American citizens only.

"In order to achieve this objective, the American Shareholders Committee urges the Justice Department to draw up a list of companies which will be prohibited from bidding and gaining control of the vested shares.

"There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

"HAROLD RAPPE,
"Secretary."

WHAT GOES ON—DESTRUCTION OF BOMBERS?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, because of this administration's deliberate attempt to manage the news, some confusion has arisen over a question I asked on March 9 during a speech at North Aurora, Ill. I wish to clear it up now. During my speech, Mr. President, I asked this question:

> Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B–47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there would then be a gigantic bonfire in which all of these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?

I went on to explain that this question had not been dreamed up; that I had heard on good authority that the administration was considering plans for such a pool with the Russians to destroy weapons.

Mr. President, I want to say now that my question was answered twice. Once by officials of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency who denied the existence of such a plan. The second answer came from Secretary of State Dean Rusk in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11. Secretary Rusk not only admitted that the bomber-burning plan had been discussed in the Disarmament Agency and with other Government departments and with leaders in Congress, but he also offered the opinion that the news stories of the Disarmament Agency's denial were erroneous.

Now, Mr. President, it has been 10 days since Secretary Rusk attempted to set the record straight. Presumably he knows what he is talking about. And if he is right, then either the Disarmament Agency is guilty of crass dishonesty in its dealings with the press or the reporters who wrote the stories about the Disarmament Agency's denial are guilty of completely misunderstanding what the Agency was talking about.

In any event, I have not seen any statement from the Disarmament Agency which has attempted to clear up the impression that came from that Agency and which was distributed throughout the United States to the effect that no such bomber-burning plan was ever under consideration. And I doubt if we shall ever see the truth from this source. I believe that this Agency deliberately set about creating the impression that Senator GOLDWATER was talking through his hat when he asked about the plan to destroy bombers in a joint disarmament display with the Soviet Union. Fortunately for the American people—who, I submit, have a right to know about any and all crazy disarmament plans that are being hatched within this Government—Secretary Rusk told the unvarnished truth. He answered questions put to him by the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] in a way which gives the lie to Disarmament Agency assertions that it was puzzled at my question and that I might have been confusing the bomber-burning plan with a portion of the general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva. They were not any more confused than was Secretary Rusk. They knew and he knew precisely what I was talking about. They knew I was talking about a plan that they were actively pushing within the Government of the United States. The only difference is that the Disarmament Agency, in talking with reporters for publication, failed to tell the truth and admit that they knew what I was talking about. Secretary Rusk acknowledged that he did and suggested that reporters covering the Disarmament Agency were at fault.

Mr. President, I seriously doubt if any reporters wrote stories about a denial that was not made. But I do not doubt that the issuance of deliberately false and misleading information—and then blaming the conclusions stemming from that information on reporters—may be the newest brand of news management practiced on the New Frontier to hide some of its secret activities.

And I say this is a disgraceful state of affairs. If any agency of the Government can deliberately create false information about a question raised in all good faith by a Member of the U.S. Senate, who is ever going to trust anything that agency says again? There is one thing the bright young men along the New Frontier better start learning about news management. When it is practiced in any degree and when the operation is exposed for phony, the result is a loss of confidence on the part of the American people in their own Government. This is a high price for any administration to pay for what has come to be recognized in recent months as standard operating procedure in the New Frontier. But it is the price of dishonesty in the handling of the people's affairs.

Now, Mr. President, just so there will not be any misunderstanding, I want to emphasize that Secretary Rusk, in his Senate testimony, made it very clear that this Government had not made any proposal, formal or otherwise, to the Russians on the bomber-burning plan. To quote him exactly in a reply he made to Committee Chairman Fulbright—and these are his words:

> The idea is being studied. The idea is being considered. But no proposals have been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this connection, I want to make it equally as clear that I did not ask in the question I propounded whether a proposal had been made to the Russians. I simply asked if it were true that there are plans "in the making." And I believe it is extremely clear now that such a plan was in the making in the Disarmament Agency. But why could we not have the truth right from the beginning? What goes on in this mysterious new agency we created? Are they ashamed to acknowledge what kind of projects are under discussion? I can only say if this idea to destroy bombers is any sample, I can understand why they are reluctant for the American people to know what they are up to.

During his testimony on this subject, Mr. President, Secretary Rusk said the bomber plan was only one of a great many possible steps in the disarmament field which is under consideration. I believe it is appropriate to ask what other steps are under active study in the Disarmament Agency. These are matters which I believe directly affect the safety of the American people and the security of the Nation. They should be brought out into the light of day where the American people can see what they are and where they might lead us as a nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Secretary Rusk's testimony on the bomber plan before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reprinted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Chairman. I have one other thing. The chairman, in his usual and inimitable way, made the point much better than I could possibly make it. I do not see why you necessarily must look forward to a continuation of this procedure in this and other cases. It seems to me you ought to be able to arrange for negotiations to be private, of course, making whatever you arrive at, if you ever do arrive at one, public.

They are quite different things.

Now, as to this question that is again in the morning paper, I believe, about the destruction of bombers, is there any relation to this disarmament business?

Secretary Rusk. Well, it has no direct relation with the nuclear test-ban discussion.

The Chairman. Not nuclear but disarmament?

Secretary Rusk. I think that story was incorrect, Senator. There has been discussion in the Disarmament Agency of a great many possible steps in the disarmament field.

The Chairman. I am not particularly interested in the substance of the other, and, as I say, this whole thing is becoming political in its nature.

This contest between who is telling the truth—I do not care whether you destroy these obsolete bombers or not, but it seems to me it ought to be possible to have whether you are or whether you are not understood, without there being implications of deception and untruths about it.

We have destroyed thousands, or hundreds, at least, of bombers in my State after World War II that were old fashioned. We are beginning to, what is it they call it, decommission these 47's now, I understand. I have heard that with one of the bases in my State, they are substituting 52's or some other number, anyway.

In any case, I see it in the paper as a matter of controversy. Can this not be cleared up or can you clear it up this morning?

Secretary Rusk. This is a point that has been discussed inside the Disarmament Agency and with the departments as one possible step which might at some stage be seriously considered. There has been no proposal made on this to other governments or to the Soviet Union on such a step.

Now, one of the elements in this sort of an idea, that you destroy mutually certain of your obsolescent weapons, is to be sure to limit the extent which weapons which are highly sophisticated, but which become obsolete as between, say, the Soviet Union and the NATO powers, do not find themselves spread all over the world and become a part of theo ther arms races that are going on in different parts of the world, and do not feed out into a lot of countries which would find them a burden and would stimulate the dangers elsewhere.

But, here, again, is a problem. We are concerned with a lot of things in the Disarmament Agency, looking at them as possibilities. We reject a lot of them; we put others up for further study. But, with reference to your earlier remark about negotiations, Senator, it is very difficult to have these things prematurely out for public debate before one even knows whether it will be well to negotiate them.

So that clarification on a point of this sort is not simple. The idea is being studied. The idea is being considered. But no proposals have been made.

The Chairman. I personally do not think much of the idea one way or the other, but I do not like to see these controversies develop which have political overtones, because, regardless of our difficulties in getting along with Russia, we do not need to tear ourselves apart internally as between the two parties over something of this kind, which, I am frank to say, I do not think is particularly significant.

And, lastly, I will just end by saying that my real suspicion about this disarmament is that this is diverting your attention and the attention of the whole Government from those areas which might lend themselves to improving our relations with our present enemies, and I doubt if this is and does contribute very much. But it is preoccupied with—you have created a whole agency for this particular activity. Nobody is very optimistic about getting anywhere. A lot doubt, even if you made an agreement, that you would achieve very much, whereas the other areas of relationships that are connected with trade, with definite human relations, which are fundamental, rather than the symptom, that you neglect by fixing your attention so strongly upon this aspect of our problem.

For whatever it is worth, there are some people who feel this very strongly.

Secretary Rusk. I think, sir, that public attention has been drawn very strongly to the nuclear test ban discussion and to the whole disarmament problem, but I do not think that means that the other problems are being neglected inside Government, to that extent.

I think, also, it is fair to say——

The Chairman. Well, for example, you are very concerned about this, but, at the same time, last year, this Government reimposed, did not reimpose—I mean it took away the most-favored-nation clause for two countries which are important in this area.

So, with one hand, you are very concerned about this, as you say, because of its peace overtones. On the other hand, we go out of our way to create worse relations with the people who are involved. We seem very inconsistent.

Secretary Rusk. Senator, my views on the most-favored nations, actually, with respect to Poland and Yugoslavia have been stated repeatedly to the Congress. I was, myself, very regretful to have that action occur. I think it has not been in our public interest to have it occur.

The Chairman. Well, it did occur, anyway.

Secretary Rusk. But I think on the disarmament point, sir, here is a place where there could be a genuine common interest between ourselves and the Soviet Union to try to move ahead, if we can.

As late as this so-called electoral speech the other day, about a week or 10 days ago, Mr. Khrushchev pointed once more to the great burden that this arms race imposes upon the Soviet Government in the allocation of its resources as between arms, on the one side, and consumer and other goods on the other.

Now, leaving aside ideological considerations, for the moment, I think an outsider would say that here is one field in which there is some basis of continuing common interest between these two groups of nations. They both have great unfinished business which calls for resources, and the arms race makes it more difficult for them to turn to that unfinished business, so that we have felt that as one of the points at which we might engage a genuine interest, that the disarmament idea, the disarmament possibility was one that ought to be thoroughly explored.

The Chairman. I do not mean to disengage complete. I think it is overemphasized, is all I meant. I think it is given more attention than it really deserves. I think it ought to be continued, and, if there is anything to it, why, take advantage of it.

But you certainly ought not to get the idea that this is the one and only way you can make progress toward peace.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Humphrey. Senator Carlson?

Senator Carlson. Mr. Secretary, I just want to follow along with what our chairman, Mr. Fulbright, mentioned in regard to this article that appeared in the paper this morning. I want to be sure that I understand you correctly. This article states that: "U.S. disarmament officials denied yesterday that any plan had been shaped for the reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union."

Do I understand your answer to our chairman was that you had been considering this?

Secretary Rusk. Yes.

Senator Carlson. And it was part of your program?

Secretary Rusk. But I believe the reported denial itself was a misunderstanding of what the Disarmament Agency official has said.

Senator Carlson. I am glad to get that clarification, because, as the chairman has well stated, that is one of the problems that we have up here on the Hill.

Senator Morse. Will the Senator yield for a clarification?

Senator Carlson. I certainly will.

Senator Morse. I do not think the record is clear now at all, since this last response of the Secretary. I understood the Secretary to say, and he can check me, that there had been no negotiations with the Soviets or anyone else in regard to the destruction of any bombers, but that there had been discussions within our own Government as to possible programs for the demolishing of obsolete equipment including bombers. Now, if that is the statement, the record ought to show.

Secretary Rusk. That is right.

Senator Morse. Is that your position?

Secretary Rusk. That is correct.

Senator Carlson. I wanted to clear it up because this quote in the paper this morning says that there had been no discussion, at least for reciprocal burning. Now, the Secretary says there has at least been discussion within the Agency here in Washington in regard to this; is this correct?

Secretary Rusk. That is correct, sir.

And I added the point that I think the reporter misunderstood what the official in the Agency said, because the official did not deny that there had been discussion.

Senator Carlson. I wanted the record to be clear on this, because I want to state categorically that there have been representatives of the disarmament representatives up on the Hill.

Secretary Rusk. That is correct. This has been discussed with leaders of the Congress as one of the possible steps that we might want to take.

Senator Carlson. That clears that up, I hope.

Senator Aiken. May I ask, Mr. Chairman: Does that mean that we will agree to destroy our antiquated equipment rather than selling it to the so-called developing nations? Would that not be a good agreement for Russia and the United States to make?

Secretary Rusk. Senator, I mentioned this earlier because one of the curious things about the disarmament discussions——

Senator Aiken. I am for it——

Secretary Rusk (continuing). Has been that it tends to concentrate on the arms as between the Soviet Union and the United States without regard to the other arms races going on in other parts of the world.

At the time the General Assembly was voting for disarmament, 70 nations were asking for military assistance.

Senator Aiken. That is right.

Secretary Rusk. We do not want to see weapons, burdensome weapons, of this sort move out into general supply in competition around the world, because they are expensive, burdensome, and, in many situations, could increase the dangers.

Senator Aiken. I think that would be a profitable subject for discussion, and one which, perhaps, might prove more fruitful than the test ban treaty, and more immediate, perhaps.

STATES RIGHTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when asked by a local friend what the recently adjourned Constitutional Convention had accomplished, Benjamin Franklin replied that they had given them "a republic, if you can keep it."

That Republic was to be founded upon a written Constitution, under which would be created a Union of sovereign States. The keystone of the arch of that Union was the rights of those sovereign States and the people thereof. Although fully embodied in the Constitution, the rights of the States were explicitly spelled out in the 10th amendment. The greatest of all Chief Justices, John Marshall, said of the 10th amendment:

> No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and compounding the American people into one common mass.

From that time, until 1937, the Supreme Court honored that construction of the Constitution. In that year, the Supreme Court repealed the 10th amendment so far as constitutional restraint on the spending powers of Congress are concerned. And, in the next 25 years the Supreme Court reversed nearly 50 percent more of its previous decisions than during the first 146 years of its existence. In addition to reversing previous decisions on the meaning of the 10th and 14th amendments, the Supreme Court has, in effect, held that it can strike down any State law it pleases.

Last Tuesday, in the case of Fay against Noia, the Court struck another serious blow at the rights of the States, when it denied the right of a State to enforce its own judicial procedures in criminal cases.

> The rights of the States to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures, consistent with the 14th amendment, have long been recognized as essential to the concept of a healthy federalism. Those rights are today attenuated if not obliterated in the name of a victory for the struggle for personal liberty. But the Constitution comprehends another struggle of equal importance and places upon our shoulders the burden of maintaining it—the struggle for law and order. I regret that the Court does not often recognize that each defeat in that struggle chips away inexorably at the base of that very personal liberty which it seeks to protect. One is reminded of the exclamation of Pyrrhus: "One more such victory * * * and we are utterly undone."

Mr. President, those are not my words—predicting the destruction of our Republic unless we stem the current trend to destroy the rights of the States. That solemn warning was issued by a distinguished member of our Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Clark, when he concurred in the dissenting views of Justices Harlan and Stewart in the Fay case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this time, excepts from the dissenting opinions of Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Harlan.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mr. Justice Clark (dissenting): "I agree fully with and join the opinion of my Brother Harlan. Beyond question the Federal courts until today have had no power to release a prisoner in respondent Noia's predicament, there being no basis for such power in either the Constitution or the statute. But the Court today in releasing Noia makes an "abrupt break" not only with the Constitution and the statute but also with its past decisions, disrupting the delicate balance of federalism so foremost in the minds of the Founding Fathers and so uniquely important in the field of law enforcement. The short of it is that Noia's incarceration rests entirely on an adequate and independent State ground—namely, that he knowingly failed to perfect any appeal from his conviction of murder. While it may be that the Court's 'decision today swings open no prison gates,' the Court must admit in all candor that it effectively swings closed the doors of justice in the face of the State, since it certainly cannot prove its case 20 years after the fact. In view of this unfortunate turn of events, it appears important that we canvass the consequences of today's action on State law enforcement.
>
> "First, there can be no question but that a rash of new applications from State prisoners will pour into the Federal courts, and 98 percent of them will be frivolous, if history is any guide.[1] This influx will necessarily have an adverse effect upon the disposition of meritorious applications, for, as my Brother Jackson said, they will "be buried in a flood of worthless ones. He who must search a haystack for a needle is likely

---

[1] In the 12-year period from 1946 to 1957 the petitioners were successful in 1.4% of the cases. H.R. Rep. No. 548, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. 37.

to end up with the attitude that the needle is not worth the search." *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U.S. 443, 537 (1953) (concurring opinion). In fact, the courts are already swamped with applications which cannot, because of sheer numbers, be given more than cursory attention.[2]

"Second, the effective administration of criminal justice in State courts receives a staggering blow. Habeas corpus is in effect substituted for appeal, seriously disturbing the orderly disposition of State prosecutions and jeopardizing the finality of State convictions in disregard of the States' comprehensive procedural safeguards which, until today, have been respected by the Federal courts. Essential to the administration of justice is the prompt enforcement of judicial decrees. After today State judgments will be relegated to a judicial limbo, subject to Federal collateral attack—as here—a score of years later despite a defendant's willful failure to appeal.

"The rights of the States to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures, consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment, have long been recognized as essential to the concept of a healthy federalism. Those rights are today attenuated if not obliterated in the name of a victory for the 'struggle for personal liberty.' But the Constitution comprehends another struggle of equal importance and places upon our shoulders the burden of maintaining it—the struggle for law and order. I regret that the Court does not often recognize that each defeat in that struggle chips away inexorably at the base of that very personal liberty which it seeks to protect. One is reminded of the exclamation of Pyrrhus: 'One more such victory * * * and we are utterly undone.'"

* * * * *

Mr. Justice Harlan, whom Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Stewart join (dissenting): "This decision, both in its abrupt break with the past and in its consequences for the future, is one of the most disquieting that the Court has rendered in a long time."

* * * * *

"I dissent from the Court's opinion and judgment for the reason that the Federal courts have no power, statutory, or constitutional, to release the respondent Noia from State detention. This is because his custody by New York does not violate any Federal right, since it is pursuant to a conviction whose validity rests upon an adequate and independent State ground which the Federal courts are required to respect.

"A full exposition of the matter is necessary, and I believe it will justify the statement that in what it does today the Court has turned its back on history and struck a heavy blow at the foundations of our Federal system.

I. DEPARTURE FROM HISTORY

"The history of Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction, I believe, leaves no doubt that today's decision constitutes a square rejection of long-accepted principles governing the nature and scope of the Great Writ.[3]

"Habeas corpus *ad subjiciendum* is today, as it has always been, a fundamental safeguard against unlawful custody. The importance of this prerogative writ, requiring the body of a person restrained of liberty to be brought before the court so that the lawfulness of the restraint may be determined, was recognized in the Constitution,[4] and the first Judiciary Act gave the Federal courts authority to issue the writ "agreeable to the principles and usages of law."[5] Although the wording of earlier statutory provisions has been changed, the basic question before the court to which the writ is addressed has always been the same: in the language of the present statute, on the books since 1867, is the detention complained of "in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States"? *Supra*, p. 1.

Detention can occur in many contexts, and in each the scope of judicial inquiry will differ.

* * * * *

"The question before us is the circumstances under which that custody may be held to be inconsistent with the commands of the Federal Constitution. What does history show?

"1. Pre-1915 period: The formative stage of the development of habeas corpus jurisdiction may be said to have ended in 1915, the year in which *Frank* v. *Mangum*, 237 U.S. 309, was decided. During this period the Federal courts, on applications for habeas corpus complaining of detention pursuant to a judgment of conviction and sentence, purported to examine only the jurisdiction of the sentencing tribunal. In the leading case of *Ex parte Watkins*, 3 Pet. 193, the Court stated:

"'An imprisonment under a judgment cannot be unlawful unless that judgment be an absolute nullity; and it is not a nullity if the Court has general jurisdiction of the subject, although it should be erroneous' (3 Pet., at 203).

* * * * *

"The concept of jurisdiction, however, was subjected to considerable strain during this period, and the strain was not lessened by the fact that until the latter part of the last century, Federal criminal convictions were not generally reviewable by the Supreme Court.[6] The expansion of the definition of jurisdiction occurred primarily in two classes of cases: (1) those in which the conviction was for violation of an allegedly unconstitutional statute, and (2) those in which the Court viewed the detention as based on some claimed illegality in the sentence imposed, as distinguished from the judgment of conviction. An example of the former is *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371.

* * * * *

"It was also during this period that Congress, in 1867, first made habeas corpus available by statute to prisoners held under state authority. Act of February 5, 1867, c. 28, § 1, 14 Stat. 385. In this 1867 Act the Court now seems to find justification for today's decision, relying on the statement of one of its proponents that the bill was "coextensive with all the powers that can be conferred" on the courts and judges of the United States. Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 4151. But neither the statute itself, its legislative history, nor its subsequent interpretation lends any support to the view that habeas corpus jurisdiction since 1867 has been exercisable whether or not the state detention complained of rested on decision of a federal question.

* * * * *

"In dealing with applications by state prisoners the Court developed the doctrine of exhaustion of state remedies, a doctrine now embodied in 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U.S. 241.

* * * * *

"In subsequent decisions, the court continued to insist that state remedies be exhausted, even when the applicant alleged a lack of jurisdiction in state authorities which, if true, would have enabled the federal court to act on the application immediately.

* * * * *

"There can be no doubt of the limited scope of habeas corpus during this formative period, and of the consistent efforts to confine the writ to questions of jurisdiction. But the cardinal point for present purposes is that in no case was it held, or even suggested, that habeas corpus would be available to consider any claims by a prisoner held pursuant to a state court judgment whose validity rested on an adequate nonfederal ground. Indeed, so long as the writ was confined to claims by state prisoners that the State was constitutionally precluded from exercising its jurisdiction in the particular case, it is difficult to conceive of a decision to detain in such cases resting on an adequate state ground. Even when the concept of jurisdiction was expanded, as in *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371, and other decisions, the matters open on habeas were still limited to those which were believed to have deprived the sentencing court of all competence to act, and which therefore could always be raised on collateral attack. It is for this reason that the Royall line of 'exhaustion' cases, relied on so heavily by the Court, has no real bearing on the problem before us. For those cases dealt only with the discretion of the court to take action which, if the allegations of lack of state jurisdiction were upheld, it would have had power to take either before or after state consideration. The issue here, on the other hand, is one of power, and wholly different considerations are involved.

* * * * *

"2. 1915–1953 period.—The next stage of development may be described as beginning in 1915, with *Frank* v. *Mangum*, 237 U.S. 309, and ending in 1953 with *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U.S. 443. In *Frank*, the prisoner had claimed before the state courts that the proceedings in which he had been convicted for murder had been dominated by a mob, and the State Supreme Court, after consideration not only of the record but of extensive affidavits, had concluded that mob domination had not been established. Frank then sought federal habeas, and this Court affirmed the denial of relief. But in doing so the Court recognized that Frank's allegation of mob domination raised a constitutional question which he was entitled to have considered by a competent tribunal uncoerced by popular pressures. Such 'corrective process' had been afforded by the State Supreme Court, however, and since Frank had received 'notice, and a hearing, or an opportunity to be heard' on his constitutional claims (237 U.S., at 326), his detention was not in violation of federal law and habeas corpus would not lie.

"It is clear that a new dimension was added to habeas corpus in this case, for in addition to questions previously thought of as 'jurisdictional,' the federal courts were now to consider whether the applicant had

---

[2] The increase in number of habeas corpus applications filed in Federal district courts by State prisoners is illustrated by the following figures:

1941	127
1945	536
1950	560
1955	660
1960	872
1961	906
1962	1, 232

(1962 and 1959 annual reports, Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, pp. 23 and 109, respectively.)

[3] For a broad range of views, see the analytical discussions of the development of Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction in Hart, Foreword, 73 Harv. L. Rev. 84; Reitz, Federal Habeas Corpus: Impact of an Abortive State Proceeding, 74 Harv. L. Rev. 1315; Brennan, Federal Habeas Corpus and State Prisoners: An Exercise in Federalism, 7 Utah L. Rev. 423; and Bator, Finality in Criminal Law and Federal Habeas Corpus for State Prisoners, 76 Harv. L. Rev. 441.

[4] U.S. Const., Art. I, § 9, cl. 2.

[5] Section 14 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, c. 20, 1 Stat. 73, 81, 82.

[6] The statutory development relating to review of criminal cases by the Supreme Court is discussed in Bator, supra, note 1, at 473, n. 75.

been given an adequate opportunity to raise his constitutional claims before the state courts. And if no such opportunity had been afforded in the state courts, the federal claim would be heard on its merits. The Court thus rejected the views expressed in *Andrews* v. *Swartz, supra,* by holding, in effect, that a constitutional claim could be heard on habeas if the State's refusal to give it proper consideration rested on an inadequate state ground. But habeas would not lie to reconsider constitutional questions that had been fairly determined. And a fortiori it would not lie to consider a question when the state court's refusal to do so rested on an adequate and independent state ground.

* * * * *

"Subsequent decisions involving state prisoners continued to indicate that the controlling question on federal habeas—apart from matters going to lack of state jurisdiction in light of federal law—was whether or not the State had afforded adequate opportunity to raise the federal claim. If not, the federal claim could be considered on its merits.

* * * * *

"A development paralleling that in *Frank* v. *Mangum* took place during this period with regard to federal prisoners. The writ remained unavailable to consider questions that were or could have been raised in the original proceedings, or on direct appeal, see *Sunal* v. *Large,* 332 U.S. 174, but it was employed to permit consideration of constitutional questions that could not otherwise have been adequately presented to the courts.

* * * * *

"To recapitulate, then, prior to *Brown* v. *Allen,* habeas corpus would not lie for a prisoner who was in custody pursuant to a state judgment of conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction if he had been given an adequate opportunity to obtain full and fair consideration of his federal claim in the state courts. Clearly, under this approach, a detention was not in violation of federal law if the validity of the state conviction on which that detention was based rested on an adequate nonfederal ground.

"3. Post-1953, *Brown* v. *Allen,* period: In 1953, this Court rendered its landmark decisions in *Brown* v. *Allen,* 344 U.S. 443, and *Daniels* v. *Allen,* reported therewith, 344 U.S., at 482–487. Both cases involved applications for federal habeas corpus by prisoners who were awaiting execution pursuant to state convictions. In both cases, the constitutional contentions made were that the trial court had erred in ruling confessions admissible and in overruling motions to quash the indictment on the basis of alleged discrimination in the selection of jurors.

"In *Brown,* these contentions had been presented to the highest court of the State, on direct appeal from the conviction, and had been rejected by that court on the merits, *State* v. *Brown,* 233 N.C. 202, 63 S.E. 2d 99, after which this Court had denied certiorari, 341 U.S. 943. At this point, the Court held, Brown was entitled to full reconsideration of these constitutional claims, with a hearing if appropriate, in an application to a Federal District Court for habeas corpus.

"It is manifest that this decision substantially expanded the scope of inquiry on an application for federal habeas corpus. *Frank* v. *Mangum* and *Moore* v. *Dempsey* had denied that the federal courts in habeas corpus sat to determine whether errors of law, even constitutional law, had been made in the original trial and appellate proceedings. Under the decision in *Brown,* if a petitioner could show that the validity of a state decision to detain rested on a determination of a constitutional claim, and if he alleged that determination to be erroneous, the Federal court had the right and the duty to satisfy itself of the correctness of the state decision.

"But what if the validity of the state decision to detain rested not on the determination of a federal claim but rather on an adequate nonfederal ground which would have barred direct review by this Court? That was the question in Daniels. The attorney for the petitioners in that case had failed to mail the appeal papers on the last day for filing, and although he delivered them by hand the next day, the State Supreme Court refused to entertain the appeal, ruling that it had not been filed on time. This ruling, this Court held, barred federal habeas corpus consideration of the claims that the state appellate court had refused to consider. Language in Mr. Justice Reed's opinion for the Court appeared to support the result alternatively in terms of waiver,[7] failure to exhaust state remedies,[8] and the existence of an adequate state ground.[9] But while the explanation may have been ambiguous, the result was clear: habeas corpus would not lie for a prisoner who was detained pursuant to a state judgment which, in the view of the majority in Daniels, rested on a reasonable application of the State's own procedural requirements. Moreover, the issue was plainly viewed as one of authority, not of discretion. 344 U.S., at 485.

* * * * *

"This brings us to the present case. There can, I think, be no doubt that today's holding—that federal habeas will lie despite the existence of an adequate and independent nonfederal ground for the judgment pursuant to which the applicant is detained—is wholly unprecedented. Indeed, it constitutes a direct rejection of authority that is squarely to the contrary. That the result now reached is a novel one does not, of course, mean that it is necessarily incorrect or unwise. But a decision which finds virtually no support in more than a century of this Court's experience should certainly be subject to the most careful scrutiny.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL BARRIER

"The true significance of today's decision can perhaps best be laid bare in terms of a hypothetical case presenting questions of the powers of this Court on direct review, and of a Federal District Court on habeas corpus.

* * * * *

"What is the reason for the rule that an adequate and independent state ground of decision bars Supreme Court review of that decision—a rule which, of course, is as applicable to procedural as to substantive grounds? In *Murdock* v. *Memphis,* 20 Wall. 590, 632–636, it was concluded that under the governing statute (i) the Court did not have jurisdiction, on review of a state decision, to examine and decide 'questions not of a federal character,' id., at 633, and (ii) an erroneous decision of a federal question by a state court could not warrant reversal if there were: 'any other matter or issue adjudged by the State court, which is sufficiently broad to maintain the judgment of that court, notwithstanding the error in deciding the issue raised by the Federal question.' (Id., at 636.)

"But as the Court in *Murdock* so strongly implied, and as emphasized in subsequent decisions, the adequate state ground rule has roots far deeper than the statutes governing our jurisdiction, and rests on fundamentals that touch this Court's habeas corpus jurisdiction equally with its direct reviewing power. An examination of the alternatives that might conceivably be followed will, I submit, confirm that the rule is one of constitutional dimensions going to the heart of the division of judicial powers in a federal system.

"One alternative to the present rule would be for the Court to review and decide any federal questions in the case, even if the determination of nonfederal questions were adequate to sustain the judgment below, and then to send the case back to the state court for further consideration. But it needs no extended analysis to demonstrate that such action would exceed this Court's powers under article III. As stated in *Herb* v. *Pitcairn,* 324 U.S. 117, 126:

"'[O]ur power is to correct wrong judgments, not to revise opinions. We are not permitted to render an advisory opinion, and if the same judgment would be rendered by the state court after we corrected its views of Federal laws, our review could amount to nothing more than an advisory opinion.'

"Another alternative, which would avoid the problem of advisory opinions, would be to take the entire case and to review on the merits the state court's decision of every question in it.

* * * * *

"Determination of the adequacy and independence of the state ground, I submit, marks the constitutional limit of our power in this sphere. The reason why this is so was perhaps most articulately expressed in a different but closely related context by Mr. Justice Field in his opinion in *Baltimore & O. R. Co.* v. *Baugh,* 149 U.S. 368, 401. He stated, in a passage quoted with approval by the Court in the historic decision in *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins,* 304 U.S. 64, 78–79:

"'The Constitution of the United States * * * recognizes and preserves the autonomy and independence of the States—independence in their legislative and independence in their judicial departments. Supervision over either the legislative or the judicial action of the States is in no case permissible except as to matters by the Constitution specifically authorized or delegated to the United States. Any interference with either, except as thus permitted, is an invasion of the authority of the State and, to that extent, a denial of its independence.'

"For this Court to go beyond the adequacy of the state ground and to review and determine the correctness of that ground on its merits would, * * * be to assume full control over a State's procedures for the administration of its own criminal justice. This is and must be beyond our power if the federal system is to exist in substance as well as form. The right of the State to regulate its own procedures governing the conduct of litigants in its courts, and its interest in supervision of those procedures, stand on the same constitutional plane as its right and interest in framing "substantive" laws governing other aspects of the conduct of those within its borders.

There is still a third possible course this Court might follow if it were to reject the adequate state ground rule.

* * * * *

"This Court might grant certiorari, 'ignore' the state ground of decision, decide the federal question and, instead of merely remanding the case, issue a writ requiring the petitioner's release from custody. By this simple device, the Court, it might be argued, would avoid problems of advisory opinions while at the same time refraining from consideration of questions of State law.

---

[7] See 344 U.S., at 486. See also Mr. Justice Frankfurter's separate opinion, 344 U.S., at 488, 503.

[8] "A failure to use a state's available remedy, in the absence of some interference or incapacity * * * bars federal habeas corpus. The statute requires that the applicant exhaust available remedies. To show that the time has passed for appeal is not enough to empower the Federal District Court to issue the writ." 344 U.S., at 487.

[9] "[W]here the state action was based on an adequate state ground, no further examination is required unless no state remedy for the deprivation of federal constitutional rights ever existed." 344 U.S., at 458.

"In short, the constitutional infirmities of such a disposition by this Court are the same as those inherent in review of the state question on its merits. The vice, however, is greater because the Court would, in actuality, be invalidating a state rule without even purporting to consider it.

"2. On habeas corpus: The adequate state ground doctrine thus finds its source in basic constitutional principles, and the question before us is whether this is as true in a collateral attack in habeas corpus as on direct review. * * * Is that federal court constitutionally more free than the Supreme Court on direct review to 'ignore' the adequate state ground, proceed to the Federal question, and order the prisoner's release?

"The answer must be that it is not.

* * * * *

The Court exceeds its constitutional power if in fact the state ground relied upon to sustain the judgment of conviction is an adequate one. See infra. The effect of the approach adopted by the Court is, indeed, to do away with the adequate state ground rule entirely in every state case, involving a federal question, in which detention follows from a judgment.

"III. ATTEMPTED PALLIATIVES

"Apparently on the basis of a doctrine analogous to that of 'unclean hands,' the Court states that a federal judge, in his discretion, may deny relief on habeas corpus to one who has understandingly and knowingly refused to avail himself of state procedures. But such a test, if it is meant to constitute a limitation on interference with state administration of criminal justice, falls far short of the mark. In fact, as explained and applied in this case, it amounts to no limitation at all.

* * * * *

"Looked at from any angle, the concept of waiver which the Court has created must be found wanting. Of gravest importance, it carries this Court into a sphere in which it has no proper place in the context of the federal system. The true limitations on our constitutional power are those inherent in the rule requiring that a judgment resting on an adequate state ground must be respected.

"IV. ADEQUACY OF THE STATE GROUND HERE INVOLVED

"It is the adequacy, or fairness, of the state ground that should be the controlling question in this case.[10] This controlling question the Court does not discuss.

"New York asserts that a claim of the kind involved here must be raised on timely appeal if it is to be preserved, and contends that in permitting an appeal it has provided a reasonable opportunity for the claim to be made. * * * In other words, the State claims that it may constitutionally detain a man pursuant to a judgment of conviction, regardless of any error that may have led to that conviction, if the relevant facts were reasonably available and an appeal was not taken.

"Under the circumstances here—particularly the fact that Noia was represented by counsel whose competence is not challenged—is this a reasonable ground for barring collateral assertion of the federal claim? Certainly the State has a vital interest in requiring that appeals be taken on the basis of facts known at the time, since the first assertion of a claim many years later might otherwise require release long after it was feasible to hold a new trial.

* * * * *

"Moreover, we should be slow to reject—as an invalid barrier to the raising of a federal right—a state determination that one forum rather than another must be resorted to for the assertion of that right. A far more rigid restriction of federal forums was upheld in *Yakus* v. *United States,* 321 U.S. 414. In that case, the Court sustained a federal statute permitting an attack on the validity of an administrative price regulation to be made only on timely review of the administrative order, and precluding the defense of invalidity in a later criminal prosecution for violation of the regulation. What the Court there said bears repetition here:

" 'No procedural principle is more familiar to this Court than that a constitutional right may be forfeited in criminal as well as civil cases by the failure to make timely assertion of the right before a tribunal having jurisdiction to determine it' (321 U.S., at 44)."

THE DEFICIT IN THE INTERNATIONAL ACCOUNTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the deficit in the international accounts of the United States is a matter of grave and continuing concern to the Congress. It is a problem which is seldom brought into focus in as analytical, objective and concise a manner as has recently been done by Leland James Pritchard, professor of economics and business administration at the University of Kansas.

Professor Pritchard has a long career in the study of economics and is a person highly respected by his colleagues in both the academic and business world. His analysis of the present balance of payments problem and possible solutions is of immediate interest to all concerned, primarily because of his conclusion that the present situation in which we find ourselves is not the reponsibility of the private sector of our economy but rather finds its explanation in "the vast volume of unilateral transfers—payments—made by the Federal Government to finance foreign military and economic aid."

Because I believe that the Members of Congress will find Professor Pritchard's analysis enlightening and useful, I request unanimous consent that this article, as it appeared in the Lawrence Journal World of March 18, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS: THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

With the exception of 1957, there has been a deficit in the international accounts of the United States for every year since 1950. The cumulative total of this deficit now exceeds $23 billion. This is the proximate source of our balance-of-payment problem. The problem arises from the fact that the accumulated deficits jeopardize the future gold convertibility of the dollar.

At the end of 1949 our monetary gold stocks were in excess of $24 billion while net foreign short-term claims against these stocks came to about $7 billion. Now we find the situation reversed with nearly $22 billion of foreign demand claims outstanding against our gold, and a gold stock which has shrunk to less than $16 billion. It is no exaggeration to say that the United States is only technically solvent.

If the dollar is to remain a reserve currency, which is tantamount to saying: if the United States is to remain a leader of the Western bloc, the convertibility of the dollar must remain credible—the dollar must continue to be "as good as gold."

An understanding, and acceptance, of these statements will be facilitated if we define our terms and explain some of the more salient relationships involved in balance-of-payment analysis.

The so-called balance of payments represent the aggregate volume of payments made to foreigners in a given period, and the aggregate volume of receipts from foreigners in the same period.

Types of transactions which give rise to receipts (from our standpoint) include: Exports of merchandise, services rendered to foreigners, the collection of interest, dividends, rents, and royalties from foreigners, the sale of securities to foreigners, etc.

Conversely, transactions which give rise to payments include: Imports, expenditures of U.S. tourists abroad, payments for the use of foreign-owned ships, the payment of insurance premiums to foreign-owned companies, the purchase of foreign securities, the payment of interest dividends, rents, and royalties to foreigners, etc.

In contradistinction to the balance of payments of individuals, cities, and even States, the balance of payments of the United States—and of every other nation having its own money system—always balances. Payments always equal receipts; debits equal credits. The balance of payments always balances because there can be no net transfer of bank deposits. The fact that payments can be, and are, made by using hand-to-hand currency in no way invalidates this economic law, since national regulations tend to restrict net transfers of hand-to-hand currency to inconsequential magnitudes.

Where international transactions are largely negotiated by private individuals and business firms on their own initiative, rather than through State agencies, it would only be by sheer coincidence that the payments transactions entered into in a given period came to an equality with the receipts transactions for that period. To the extent that equality is not achieved, some type or types of payments (or receipts) are necessary to fill the gap; for, as noted, the balance of payments always balances.

The stopgap payments (or receipts) involve changes in monetary gold stocks and/or net foreign short-term dollar claims. Insofar as these claims are against us they are in the form of demand and time deposits and Treasury bills. A country is said to have a deficit in its balance of payments when an export of gold is not offset by a decrease in foreign-owned short-term claims; or conversely, when an increase in foreign-owned short-term claims is not offset by gold imports.

With $22 billion of short-term claims (in effect international clearing balances) against less than $16 billion of gold, $12 billion of which is pledged (via the gold certificate) as collateral for the note and deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, the U.S. dollar could even now be dethroned if the foreign holders of these claims chose to exercise any considerable volume of their options. And they do have the option. The gold and short-term dollar holdings of foreign countries (excluding the Eastern bloc) are now in excess of $43 billion, nearly $30 billion of which is held by Western Europe. Even on the basis of an enlarged volume of world trade this represents an excess of dollar liquidity for Western Europe. Even were the Reserve authorities to suspend the gold certificate requirement or Congress to abolish this redundant provision altogether (proposed by H.R. 642, introduced into Congress January 9, 1963), the future of the dollar as a reserve currency would remain uncertain.

---

[10] In view of the concession by the State, I assume in this discussion that Noia's confession was coerced. A confession, of course, may be coerced and yet still be a wholly reliable admission of guilt. See *Rogers* v. *Richmond,* 365 U.S. 534. Whether or not Noia was guilty of the crime of felony murder, and whether the evidence of his guilt was accurate and substantial, are matters irrelevant to the question of coercion and also irrelevant here.

How has the once almighty dollar been brought into such jeopardy? An examination of the components of our balance of payments will provide the answer. In dissecting the balance of payments we are justified in placing complementary transactions in juxtaposition; that is, receipts from exports are matched against payments for imports; receipts from services rendered foreigners are matched against payments for services rendered to us by foreigners; and capital items (interest, dividends, purchases, and sales of securities, etc.) involving receipts are offset against capital items involving payments.

For the period of our chronic deficits (since 1950) receipts from merchandise exports have amounted to $206.5 billion; payments for imports, $163.7 billion or an excess of receipts of $42.8 billion. Receipts from services total $43 billion while payments for services come to $51.3 billion or an excess of payments on service accounts of $8.3 billion. Capital account receipts during this period total $35.7 billion, payments on capital accounts, $38.5 billion or an excess of payments of $2.8 billion. Summating all of these nongovernmental transactions we find receipts equal to $285.2 billion, payments equal to $253.5 billion, leaving an excess of receipts on nongovernmental account of $31.7 billion. Obviously the private sector is not responsible for our chronic deficits. The explanation is to be found in the vast volume of unilateral transfers (payments) made by the Federal Government to finance foreign military and economic aid.

During the postwar period (fiscal years 1946–62) these outlays, on a net basis, amounted to $89.9 billion, and to $66.7 billion since 1950. The largess of the Federal Government in dispensing free dollars to foreigners has been on such a vast scale it has washed out the $31.7 billion of dollar credits accumulated by the private sector during the past 13 years and has brought about a cumulative deficit in our balance of payments in excess of $23 billion.

The obvious solution to our balance-of-payments difficulties is to reduce foreign aid. This solution is rarely suggested because of the widespread tendency in this country to regard military expenditures both at home and abroad as sancrosanct and therefore inviolate. In lieu of reducing foreign aid it has been suggested that we devalue the dollar, increase exports, and even curtail imports and foreign investment by U.S. nationals.

To meet the situation through a devaluation of the dollar, or a suspension of the convertibility of the dollar would eliminate the dollar as a reserve currency. It would destroy confidence in the country and definitely eliminate the United States as a leader of the Western bloc. Furthermore, devaluation would provide only temporary relief even if other nations did not devalue by compensatory amounts. Devaluation would not change the underlying causes of the imbalance and deficits would resume as domestic prices rose in response to the devaluation.

An endeavor to reduce the deficits through greater import restrictions or through curtailment of U.S. oversea investment would be self-defeating and contrary to our professed intentions of fostering a free world. Furthermore, capital outflows can only be moderately affected through a restrictive domestic monetary policy, and we can ill afford the higher interest rates required by such a policy. Such punitive rates would further dampen down an already sluggish economy. Direct controls must be eschewed because of their totalitarian nature.

Some expansion of exports, however, is possible. This can be achieved by providing more tie-ins of exports to our foreign aid, and by changing our selection of foreign aid beneficiaries. Under the Marshall plan aid went mostly to Western Europe and gave rise to a concomitant volume of exports: tractors from International Harvester, generators from General Electric, etc. Now our aid is mostly to governments located in east and southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. Too often these governments are controlled by military strong men, wastrels and plain incompetents (these designations are not necessarily mutually exclusive); men who have difficulty distinguishing their private purse from the public treasury; who have little interest in, or aptitude for, the economic development of their countries; who lack the support of the mass of their peoples and who regard their offices as temporary sojourns for their private enrichment. For these and other reasons they prefer an anonymous Zurich bank account to spending balances allocated to them in the Chase-Manhattan Bank on machinery, equipment, and supplies that would assist in the habilitation of their national economies. So great has this dissipation of funds been that the United States has had to obtain loans from Switzerland, Italy, and West Germany to arrest the outflow of gold. Central bank and treasury loans from these countries now amount to $500 million.

In addition to obtaining loans to support the dollar, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve have entered into reciprocal currency "swap" agreements amounting to $1.1 billion with 10 foreign central banks and the Bank for International Settlements. Neither the Treasury nor the Federal Reserve has any illusions that such devices provide a substitute for policy actions to correct basic imbalances in our balance of payments. Such arrangements can only provide temporary stability to the dollar and discourage speculative forays against the dollar. All such loan and stabilization arrangements are mere palliatives. They can do no more than temporarily slow down the denudation of our gold stocks.

In some instances we could actually increase our exports by decreasing foreign aid, for, as any Yankee trader should know, it makes little sense to buy something if it can be obtained free.

Improvement in our export position could also result from spending more on research and development of civilian products, and by holding prices down, our goods would remain competitive on both a quality and a price basis. But the gains to be achieved here can easily be overestimated; for we are not suffering from declining exports. Our exports have not only increased markedly, approximately doubling in value in the 1950–62 period, but their value, as a proportion of total world trade, has not diminished.

Because the deficit in our balance-of-payments was about $2.2 billion in 1962 compared to $2.4 billion in 1961 and $3.9 billion in 1960, some believe the problem can be solved without a drastic cut in foreign military and economic aid. Those who hold to this view seem to overlook the fact that a part of the decline in the deficit is due to the payment ahead of schedule of debt service charges by West Germany and France, as well as to increased military procurement in this country and an actual reduction in oversea military personnel expenditures. And they seem far too sanguine about the possibility of expanding exports.

The maintenance of personnel overseas, a number now exceeding 600,000 not counting dependents, constitutes the principal drain on the dollar since their maintenance necessitates a multi-billion conversion of dollars into local currencies. A lesser drain derives from the rental of oversea military bases and the many other costs associated with their maintenance. On the other hand, a Polaris submarine roaming the Atlantic provides no foreign exchange problem—unless it is based abroad.

We are increasingly told that a curtailment of our foreign Military Establishment or a reduction in foreign economic aid will open the floodgates and communism will inundate the world, or, at least, would produce a loss of confidence in the United States as a leader of the free world.

Even if one subscribes to the questionable belief that our extensive oversea military bases have contained communism, the fact is that the situation has deteriorated until we have no choice except to curtail those types of foreign military and economic aid which create a drain on the dollar.

If we do not, the dollar will cease to be a convertible currency, will cease to be a reserve currency, and the United States will be forced into a high degree of economic isolation. We shall then discover that, irrespective of the number of bombers and missiles we have, we are no longer the leader of the free world; indeed, we will be held responsible (and rightly so) for scuttling a goodly share of it.

MEANINGFUL TAX RELIEF

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an editorial in the March 14 issue of the Rocky Mountain News has cut like a breath of fresh air across the administration's arguments for a tax cut with continually mounting Federal deficits.

The editorial, entitled "What's Wrong in the United States?" draws a conclusion that should be mounted on a plaque over the desk of each tax debator—the simple truth that the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

To the administration's advocates of the Keynesian theory of massive Federal spending as the solution to all our economic ills, I recommend for reading the Rocky Mountain news article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG IN THE UNITED STATES?

You look over the list of domestic economic troubles as noted by President Kennedy at his press conferences. There isn't one of them that a healthy tax cut wouldn't cure or at least help substantially.

And the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

The basic problem is as simple as that, though the solution is difficult in the present political atmosphere.

Relief from the extortionate load of Government spending would generate energy from top to bottom. It would give people something to work for.

To hear the talk as to lack of opportunity for youth you would think there were just so many jobs until the Government passed a law to create some more. You wonder how youngsters ever got a job in the past. This same frightened scramble to divide up poverty held back recovery from the great depression and now dominates discussion of automation.

Jobs generate jobs. Wages and profits create the demand for goods, which puts more and more people to work—unless the chain is broken by bungling Government intervention or expropriation of the fruits of industry.

Talk about our crop of "war babies" growing up and needing jobs. They are relatively few in numbers compared to the millions of refugees from communism who streamed into demoralized West Germany after the war. Work was found for all of them and West Germany actually has a labor shortage. Automation did it—along with the sane, old-fashioned fiscal policies which balanced budgets, made the mark one of the soundest currencies in history and produced the feeling of confidence in the future which comes with a rising living standard.

On the other extreme are such countries as Argentina. There is a land potentially as rich as ours—demoralized by massive governmental bungling and an inflated currency.

Argentina's trouble is our trouble, though we are not nearly so far gone and had more fat in the form of capital to eat up.

The complacent tendency in Washington to cut taxes while letting the spending run simply is a plan to eat up some more of the capital which makes jobs. By inciting more inflation it will nullify any tax cut. By breeding fear of an unsound currency it will discourage enterprise and we will have more unemployment, not less.

The prosperity of Western Europe dates from the time when it scorned the advice of our frightened liberals, hardened their currencies and started paying their bills with cash. We now owe them money in form of balance of payments. Our Government now is buying these currencies in great quantities to protect the once almighty dollar.

More vocal politicans and economists in the United States are in the grip of an economic obsession that we can borrow ourselves rich. This brand of mass insanity has run its course in Europe but still afflicts a great deal of the world including the underdeveloped countries, all of which somehow managed to eat for centuries without our help, or maybe in spite of it.

None of these new nations has a chance until it discovers that only work creates wealth and that capital accumulations must be protected if their people are to have the tools which make work productive.

Under present policies, they are frightening away capital faster than it can be poured down the ratholes thus created, through foreign aid from the U.S. Treasury.

We see two main sources of hope. One is the amazing resiliency of the U.S. economy which has survived and even progressed during a generation which has expropriated half its profits and sterilized them in wasteful Government schemes. The other is mounting impatience with the whole red-ink business, out through the country.

When the people finally sense what has been happening to them and vote their indignation, the politicians will sober up and find a way. If the country—and particularly the unemployed—are to be spared deepening troubles, that had better be soon.

ARMED FORCES CHESS TOURNAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 3 years ago I announced to the Senate the opening of the first annual Armed Forces Chess Tournament sponsored by the American Chess Foundation. I wish to once again bring this highly commendable program to the attention of my colleagues upon the successful completion of the third servicewide chess tournament last October.

The American Chess Foundation conceived the idea of annual all-service tournaments as part of its continuing program of encouraging the playing of chess as a national sport and pastime for young and old. I fully support this objective. Chess represents a useful auxiliary to our national goal of creating a strongly intellectual atmosphere in the schools, on the job, and at home. Chess is one of the most ancient and honorable of intellectual pastimes—it is the indoor sport par excellence not only in the West but in the Orient. It is played with equal satisfaction by the international chess master or the rank amateur.

Chess on the tournament level presents the kind of rigorous intellectual challenge that should be encouraged in the United States. That our young men in the military have accepted this challenge with such enthusiasm is most encouraging. The Department of Defense should be commended for its support of the foundation's program. Similar commendation is due the United Service Organizations and member agencies for their willingness to provide essential facilities and assist in the planning of the program. And finally, those young Americans who disciplined themselves during their limited leisure hours for the rigors of tournament play should be especially congratulated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the 1962 Armed Forces Chess Tournament taken from the Army Information Digest be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY GAINS TOP HONORS IN ARMED FORCES CHESS TOURNEY

It was check and checkmate for two Army players who moved their forces across the boards to take first and second place in the 1962 Armed Forces chess tournament held in October at the Lafayette Square USO Club in Washington, D.C. As a result, the Army holds the Thomas Emery Armed Forces chess championship trophy for a year.

Sp4c. Roy D. Mallett, of the 51st Infantry, 4th Armored Division, Germany, became the new chess champion of the military services by virtue of seven wins and two draws. Runnerup was Pvt. Harry Mayer of Special Troops, Fort Knox, Ky., with a score of six wins, two draws, and one loss. The Army also was represented in the field of 10 finalists by another competitor, Sp4c Laszlo Incze, from Fort Richardson, Alaska.

Other finalists included three entries from the Navy, three from the Air Force, and one from the Marine Corps. In addition to the Emery Cup, silver cups were presented to the first three winners and silver plaques to the seven other finalists.

The 1962 tournament is the third in a program sponsored by the American Chess Foundation with cooperation of the Department of Defense, U.S. Chess Federation, USO, and the Adjutant General's Office. It was initiated with a grant from Thomas Emery, of New York, Marine Corps veteran of World War I and internationally recognized chess master, who stresses the game's unmatched value in mental discipline and strategic planning.

At the posttourney awards dinner, Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education and Manpower Resources, cited the relevance of chess to the strategic problems of our times—to counterinsurgency, guerrilla actions, and resolution of the cold war: "The chess player understands, as we all must understand, that there may be tactical advantages to retreats in seeking victory. He understands the most important factor of all—that a pawn is not something to be taken lightly, for the least of the powers cannot only get in the way but can actually bring about the downfall of figures more powerful."

SUPPORT FOR THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 432, the Clean Air Act of 1963, introduced by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], is the most comprehensive proposal on the subject of air pollution control ever put before the Congress.

The bill faces squarely the fact that while the control of air pollution is primarily a State and local responsibility, there is a corresponding Federal responsibility to provide leadership, technical know-how, and financial encouragement on a national basis to combat this national problem.

We cannot continue to go at this problem on a piecemeal basis. A national effort is essential, and a well-grounded 10-year program of research, technical assistance, and enforcement, as provided in S. 432, will give us the tools needed for the job. It is a privilege to join with the junior Senator from Connecticut in his comprehensive attack on what truly should be described as a life-or-death domestic problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several recent press reports from Minnesota dealing with air pollution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Dec. 9, 1962]

AIR POLLUTION CHIEF FEARFUL OF UCLA SMOG

Malcolm McLouth, Minneapolis chief air pollution control engineer, today wrote to S. Smith Griswold, his Los Angeles, Calif., counterpart, expressing concern about what the smog might do to the Minnesota football team, which is to play in the Rose Bowl January 1.

Here is the text of the McLouth letter:

"The problem of the exact chemical analysis of Los Angeles-type smog is again a matter of concern for us in Minnesota.

"Last year a toxic substance called U. of W. was responsible for an unfortunate first half in the Rose Bowl. It was not until the second half that our scientists had devised a counter reagent but by then it was too late.

"In recent technical journals in the sports section, I have noted that a new substance called UCLA has been found in increasing quantities in airwaves in Los Angeles. Could you rush me a complete chemical and physical analysis of this new medium so that we may devise a counter reagent that will immunize our players from UCLA poisoning?"

(The University of Washington defeated Minnesota 17–7 in the Rose Bowl last January 1. Minnesota plays the University of California at Los Angeles in the Rose Bowl January 1.)

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Oct. 10, 1961]

PIPING OFF BUS FUMES

To the EDITOR:

I noted in a September 21 letter a suggestion that buses be forced to eliminate their odor nuisance by extending the exhaust pipe to the roof. This is not a new approach as a law was proposed by the Minneapolis City Council in 1955 that would have made this mandatory. This proposal was subsequently defeated when several disadvantages were pointed out.

Madison, Wis., did pass such an ordinance but it was later repealed after a short and unsuccessful trial run. Included in the disadvantages are the spewing of water and carbon particles on pedestrians near bus stops, the increased back pressure on the engine creating more objectionable fumes, and the heat and fire hazard created by the extended pipe.

MALCOLM E. MCLOUTH,
Chief Air Pollution Control Engineer.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune]

PROTECTING THE AIR FROM MOTOR POLLUTION

California is testing a variety of exhaust control devices for automobiles. These are said to remove from 60 to 80 percent of smog-producing chemical byproducts. Crankcase devices, now being installed voluntarily on new cars sold in California, are believed to remove about 20 percent of these irritants. Eventually these will be required on every car registered in California. Better air by 1966 is promised.

Smog has forced California to face this problem. Other States don't have the combination of conditions to make smog from exhaust very often, but their people deserve the purest air possible. It seems likely that all motor vehicles will have such protective devices before many years have gone by.

As the population increases, particularly in some areas, and we all use various modern mechanisms and discoveries so freely, other problems will surely bother us. Noise is one. So is the appearance of quantities of almost indestructible detergent bubbles in many drain and sewage disposal systems.

Human beings need clean air and water for a happy existence. We must be ready to pay for these with various precautions, some of them not even imagined as yet.

[From the Willmar (Minn.) Tribune, Mar. 7, 1962]

AIR POLLUTION CONTROVERSY

(By O. B. Auguston)

This evening there will be, what looms up, as a very interesting meeting of the city council when the air pollution ordinance is supposed to get its third reading. The meeting place of the council and in order to accommodate the expected crowd, has been changed from the council chambers to the city auditorium. Apparently the council will hear both pros and cons, favor and opposition, to this proposed ordinance. And we imagine the city fathers are striven between the two camps of thought. All of this controversial subject stems from the feather plant incident wherein we find a large segment of our city protesting odors which have been coming from this particular plant. And, as we have maintained before, those people have had just cause. We too believe in clean air and we should surely try to keep our air as clean and pure as possible. And surely as we have stated before, our citizens have a right to champion clean air as they often do for clean pure water. This right of our citizens should never be forgotten in this entire controversy. We live in an area of town not affected but if we were living in the area really concerned we would kick like steers with the rest of those folks. The point at issue seems to be the extent to which the proposed ordinance goes in trying to meet the problem of air pollution. Those who are seeking to encourage local industry fear that too drastic an ordinance will discourage plants from locating here, providing more employment and more payroll which our city needs. They too have a point if we are to build our city which has seen some of its payrolls decline. So one sees two forces arrayed and opposing each other and one wonders if in this matter, like most questions of this nature, there is not some middle road of compromise. An ordinance that will be strong enough to avert instances like the feather plant odors which we have found quite extreme and still not so drastic that it would become an extreme discouragement for most any kind of industry to locate in our city. We want a clean city and with as clean air as possible. At the same time we surely do not wish to establish a reputation as a city which does not want industry. Somewhere in the middle of these two schools of thought may be found a happy medium that would be acceptable to both the citizens of the community and industry or those who would promote more industry. The air pollution we have had in our city has been declared a nuisance and one only has to live in that part of town most seriously affected to so designate it. At the same time in our fervor for such an extreme case of air pollution we do not exactly want to burn down the house to catch the rats. Perhaps out of the meeting tonight will come some solution of this controversial issue. Surely we may need some sort of an ordinance that will avoid repetitions of the gravity of the feather plant nuisance odors and this perhaps can be arrived at without too severe provisions that could needlessly hurt us industrywise.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer-Press, Dec. 10, 1961]

CITIES SPEND MORE AND MORE FOR PURE AIR

(By Richard A. Williams)

The expression "free as the air we breathe" rapidly is going out of date.

Cities are spending more and more money to eliminate or curb the pollution which industries, homes, and automobiles pour into the air every day.

How great is the problem? Atomic fallout has received an enormous amount of publicity, but one State public health official said he is more concerned about the pollution in the air at the intersection of Seventh and Robert on a busy shopping day than he is about the fallout from atomic tests.

And he has good reason to be concerned because there is statistical evidence that air pollution contributes to lung cancer, heart disease, and other illnesses such as the bronchitis which is so prevalent in London, England.

In the Twin Cities, the most immediately noticeable effect has been irritation of the eyes. How unhealthy this is will depend upon your point of view; nevertheless, it is uncomfortable and could be the forerunner of more serious ailments.

George Rascka, associate chief of the radiation and occupational health section of the State department of health, says there are three main sources of air pollution in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

The pollution can be attributed in roughly equal amounts to industrial, home, and automobile wastes, he said. This isn't true in other areas. In London, for instance, coal smoke predominates while in Los Angeles, where much has been done to clean up industrially, about 60 percent of the trouble is attributed to automobiles.

And home activities shouldn't be discounted. An illustration of the effect backyard activities can have on the air is the smoke haze that hangs over the city during leaf-burning time in the fall. Rascka predicts the time will come when people won't even be allowed to burn trash in their backyards.

In fact, the burning of trash and garbage at public dumps may be eliminated by the use of sanitary landfill types of disposal or through community-type incinerators.

These new methods of home waste will call for the expenditure of public funds. Industry already is being required to take steps to eliminate its stack wastes.

Now, in Los Angeles, the city officials are thinking in terms of exhaust suppressors for automobiles. These would be an expense to the owners of the vehicles.

With the St. Paul-Minneapolis metropolitan area growing the way it is, the problem is going to become more troublesome with the passage of time. There is no doubt that before the problem is licked, the air the citizens breathe no longer will be free.

But the price the citizens will pay for a breath of fresh air in the future can be reduced materially by some relatively inexpensive preventative measures now.

ADEQUATE STAFF FOR MINORITY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Tuesday last the Senate was presented with the highly important matter of providing funds for the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. In the course of the discussion, I offered an amendment to increase by $25,000 the amount to be expended by that committee for its work during the present Congress and the present calendar year. That amendment was the result of a compromise and a general discussion which was had with all parties in interest.

My very distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] took occasion to remark that this was "a Republican maneuver"; and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] was impelled to remark that this was an "upside down approach to budget cutting."

I cannot leave the permanent RECORD stand in that fashion. First, I point out that I tried to cut the amount by $100,000 in the subcommittee, and it was voted down by a party vote. Second, it was agreed in the full committee that the minority should have additional staff. Third, it was agreed in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and inserted in its report, that no agreement contrived in the full committee should be impaired or modified by any reduction that might have been allowed by the Rules Committee.

All of these matters were disclosed before that time, and it just seems to me that where there is a passion for truth and fact, the whole bundle should be set forth, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read, not merely here in Washington, but in all sections of the country. It is a permanent RECORD. It is used by youngsters when they debate in high school and college. It goes to nearly all the libraries of the country. Since these debates appear in the body of the RECORD, it occurs to me that we ought to be pretty careful to set out the whole package, so all the facts are readily available and so readers do not have to skim through the whole RECORD.

It makes me a little curious and makes me wonder whether the New Frontier is going to have a new one-way street. To be logical about it, I suppose they should try to deny us all our staff, give us nobody, give us no weapons, give us no instrumentality with which to do our duty, and then let the pilloring and the harassment of the business confraternity of the country go forward full tilt. Then we would have an open door and they could do anything they would like to contrive.

When we look at the 1960 election returns, it will be noted how close the Republicans came to winning the presidency. The minority party spoke for nearly half of the people of the country, who saw fit to vote the Republican ticket. They are entitled to be heard.

The only way they can be heard in this body is through their elected Senators. The only way those Senators can properly and adequately do their duty and discharge their responsibility is to have more personnel.

I was going to ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], if he were here, what he would think if the University of Wisconsin football team trotted out on the field with 2 players and the California team in the Rose Bowl trotted out with 11 players. Someone would say, "What kind of a business is this? Is this the way to run a railroad?" [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The record shows that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] has 31 on his team and it shows we have 4. That is a very considerable disparity when the minority attempts to properly do its duty.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] mentioned Roscoe Drummond, celebrated columnist, in connection with budget cutting. I am glad he did. If I remember correctly, Roscoe Drummond wrote one column last year on the question of staffing, and he castigated not only those on the other side, but me and others, for failure to do something about it. I am glad to use Mr. Drummond as a witness in the case.

So, having made his case, we caused a study to be made by the Legislative Reference Service, and I expect at an early date I shall be conferring with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished acting majority leader on the question of staff adequacy.

But I do not like to be pilloried on the floor and let it be made to appear that the minority leader has reversed course simply because he gets a few dollars out of the contingency fund. Before all of this amount can be spent, we want to get a little of it for adequate staffing.

I have only one more thing to say. There appeared in the Washington Star some weeks ago a cartoon of me by a distinguished cartoonist, Jim Berryman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The cartoon depicted a table on which was a whole series of cutting tools for use by the minority leader when he starts out to cut the budget.

I wrote Mr. Berryman a note, "Jim, send me the original, but when you do, I want you to take the dent out of the meat ax and sharpen it with a grindstone, because I do not like to deal with dull tools." [Laughter.]

I am going to be determined that on this floor an appropriate, accurate record is made; and if it is not made I am going to get out the broadax and put it on the grindstone and then there is going to be some business.

So I say to the Senator that I am sure it was an inadvertence when he said what he did about trying to get a little money for additional Republican staff members, so that we can adequately and efficiently pursue Mr. Kefauver in whatever the agenda of the subcommittee is. That is little to ask, especially now that the Antitrust Subcommittee has taken on international attributes. The subcommittee is going to Brussels before Easter. They are going to talk with the Common Market. They are going to Paris. I am not going with them. I have business here, and I will send no minority staff man, either. All we want is people to help us do the work.

If we ever get around to the time where there is a constituency on the moon, and they are violating the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act, that trip I might take sometime. However, when I do I want to be sure that we have had all the necessary staff work done so we can come back from that great stellar orb in the firmament and give the Senate a proper report.

Therefore, I was just going to put this all into one package. This staff problem has been besetting the Senate for a long time. We have been inadequately staffed. We have had 40 as against 3. We asked for five. In a way, I am sorry that we compromised. Instead of getting five, we will get four. That is awfully meager. I am willing, like Lazarus, to take whatever drops from the table, if they drop just enough for us to do our job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield. However, I must ask for additional time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I only wish that this same point had been made by my good friend 10 years ago, in 1953, when the committees had Republican majorities. I am one of those who like to see these inequities remedied, no matter how late, or how long we waited for a change. However, I wish to say to my good friend from Illinois that if he wants to take that trip to the moon, I believe we can get an even bigger appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will not go unless the Senator from Minnesota goes also.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Further, I should like to say to him that he makes such a great contribution to our deliberations and is so jovial and makes such good sense that I hope he will decide not to go to the moon, because if he and I get together, I am sure we can agree on sending someone else. I am sure we can agree on someone else.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as always, I am completely overwhelmed by the oratory of my good friend from Illinois, and his crushing and logical argument leaves me breathless for reply. His defense of minority rights in the Senate makes me recall his strong stand on the antifilibuster resolution only a short time ago.

I am quite in accord with him that there ought to be more minority staff members on all the committees. I hope that he will join with me and, I hope we will be joined by the Senator from Nebraska, whom I see on the floor now, in bringing out that resolution, for a complete investigation of all the rules and customs and manners of the Senate, including minority staffing of the committees. I for one shall be glad to support him in seeing to it that the somewhat underprivileged minority of the Senate should have an adequate number of coaches, so that when the time comes for them to stand for reelection and perhaps try to capture some of the seats on this side of the aisle, no one will be able to say that they do not know the score.

Therefore, I commend the Senator for his defense of the minority. I point out only that in connection with this particular subcommittee we are discussing, I was of the view that the subcommittee was already badly overstaffed. I had no objection whatever to the staffing being adjusted so that the minority would have appropriate representation, and I commend the Senator from Illinois for coming to the floor and speaking again on this matter. I only say, in defense of the Senator from Wisconsin, who is not here, that he was talking primarily, not about the minority staffing in the Senate, but that the honorable, able, wonderful, and historic party to which my friend from Illinois belongs, having marched up the hill in defense of cutting the budget, had turned around, like the troops of the King of France, and has increased the defense budget by over $1 billion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am absolutely overwhelmed by this burst of charity coming from the distinguished Senator from——

Mr. CLARK. Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Pennsylvania. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin did take occasion to point out that it was the minority leader who was asking for $25,000.

Mr. CLARK. However, he was talking mostly——

Mr. DIRKSEN. He mentioned the minority leader in the Record. The fact is, he came to my desk after the Committee on Rules and Administration had taken action, and he said to me, "We cannot even give you one; not even one."

Mr. CLARK. That was not the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it was the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK. Whose name has just come into this discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Therefore, entreaties and supplications and importunities, and everything else we tried were of no avail, and we had to bring it out here on the floor of the Senate and fight it out here. I was glad to do it.

I do not like to see thousands of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD go out all over the country, and have it appear that the minority leader was reversing his position with respect to economy in the Federal budget. What we are trying to do is get enough people to help us, so that the ax might cut even deeper.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to inform the Senate that the State of Nevada on Tuesday of this week, March 19, ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to the States last year.

This brings to 23 the number of States which have ratified this important amendment, which would eliminate the prerequisite that a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting in a Federal election.

I am informed that the Assembly of the Nevada Legislature ratified the amendment on Tuesday by a vote of 34 to 0. The Nevada Senate approved its resolution ratifying the amendment a month before on February 19, by a vote of 14 to 0. The action of the Nevada Assembly completes ratification of the amendment.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. Each of the Senators cosponsored and supported my resolution vigorously to passage in the 87th Congress, and lent his effective assistance this year in bringing the matter to the attention of his State legislature, with the most gratifying result which I have announced today.

In addition to this good news, Mr. President, the legislatures which at present are in session in many of the other States are considering this matter at this time. Among them, either the house or the senate of the legislatures in five States has ratified the amendment. Those States are Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin.

I express my appreciation to the Senators representing each of those States for the splendid progress made thus far. I hope that we soon shall hear that each of these States has completed ratification of the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Florida. It was a real pleasure to work with him on this measure. The unanimity in the Nevada Senate, as shown by the vote of 14 to 0, and the vote in the Nevada Assembly, of 34 to 0, likewise unanimous, indicate that the feeling of the people of Nevada is similar to or exactly the same as that of the Senator from Florida. He is to be commended for the fight he has been making.

I hope that the amendment will soon be reaching the end of the trail and that its final ratification will be consummated in the very near future.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the gracious comment of the Senator from Nevada. I do not believe that the action of the Legislature of Nevada, as shown by the results just reported, would have been possible without the very helpful work which was done by both the distinguished Senators from Nevada, through their aggressive and continuing support of the amendment.

NEWSPAPER STRIKES IN CLEVELAND AND NEW YORK

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in my native city of Cleveland, which has a metropolitan population of approximately 1,800,000, the 2 major newspapers have not been published since November 29, 1962, because of a labor-management dispute existing between the publishers of the newspapers on the one side and 11 labor unions on the other.

In Metropolitan New York having a population of 12 million, the 8 major newspapers have been out of circulation since December 7, 1962, because of a labor dispute with the International Typographical Union.

Obviously, the owners of these newspapers as well as the workers and the general public have been seriously and adversely affected by these work stoppages. The evidences of what is going on indicate that the prospects of a discontinuance of these strikes in New York and Cleveland are practically nil. Neither the publishers nor the labor unions are prepared to yield. They are supposedly of equal strength—the one insisting upon the surrender of the other.

While this fight to the death is going on, other business enterprises and workers, and the general public, as well, are being adversely affected. The problem has reached proportions so great that the President of the United States felt obliged to make a statement in connection with the controversy. He stated that the union was "attempting to impose a settlement which could shut down several newspapers in New York and throw thousands out of work."

It is assumed that the President's statement was motivated by his knowledge that some of the New York newspapers, even before they were closed down by the strike, had severe financial problems. The eight publishers of New York and the two publishers of the Cleveland newspapers have insisted that they cannot meet the demands of the unions with any hope of survival.

The unions, on the other hand, reject the positions taken by the publishers. They contend that the publishers can meet the demands for increased pay, reformed working conditions, and for improved terms in employment security.

Recently, I read a statement attributed to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, to the effect that collective bargaining in the United States is breaking down because neither management nor labor occupies a position of weakness requiring the one to yield to the other because of exhaustion. I disagree most violently with the implications contained in the alleged statements of Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, that in our economy in labor-management disputes, the weak should yield and the strong should survive. That type of philosophy means that might is right and that ethics have no place in labor-management disputes.

If labor strikes are to be decided in our country on the basis of which of the two has the greatest economic and political power, then our democracy is doomed. I am unwilling to subscribe to that type of thinking.

Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that a strong conviction exists in some quarters that the strikes of the typographical unions against the newspapers of New York City are tied in with the strike against the two newspapers in Cleveland in my own State of Ohio. I would, therefore, strongly urge that the Government Operations Committee of the Senate, headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], take a look at these two strike situations for the purpose of finding the answers to the following questions:

Are the two strikes tied together in any way?

Is the settlement of the Cleveland strike dependent upon the settlement of the New York City strike?

Is there an understanding among the unions involved that the picketing must continue until a settlement is reached with respect to all of the claims of all of the unions?

Is there an understanding between the New York publishers and the Cleveland publishers that no settlement shall be accepted by one or more of the publishers unless the same settlement is entered into by the unions with all of the publishers involved in the strike?

Mr. President, it is my view that the principal object of such an investigation should be the gathering of all the facts needed to serve as the basis for a legislative program which would accomplish the following goals:

An effective enforcement of the freedoms intended by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States to be enjoyed by both the managers of business and industry and the working people of the Nation;

The prohibition and elimination of conspiratorial combinations fixing prices and illegitimate commercial practices, or practices otherwise creating monopolies at the expense of the general public;

The enactment of provisions that will insure to the workers, to the publisher, the businessman, and to the public generally, the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights without impairment because of improper combinations amounting to monopolies.

Mr. President, since I dictated this memorandum and had it typed, I read in the newspapers, this morning, that Mr. Bridges, of the Longshoremen's Union on the west coast, said that if the recommendation made for the settlement of the Longshoremen's strike had not been accepted, he would have acted to paralyze shipping on the west coast. In that event, the east coast, the west coast, and the gulf coast would have been imperiled and shipping on all those coasts would have been shut down because of the combination of activities of labor leaders in those three areas of the country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the December 3, 1962, issue of Steel Magazine contained on page 18 an article which reported, among other things, the award by the Department of the Interior to a foreign bidder of a contract, in the amount of $3,200,000 for eight pump turbines. The lowest bid from a domestic bidder was $3,481,000. The difference would thus appear to be a matter of $281,000; and some persons might conclude that the Department of the Interior has saved the taxpayers this sum. But has it? This is a vital question.

There has recently come to my attention an analysis of this transaction which shows that, instead of a saving to the taxpayers of this Nation, the awarding of the contract to the foreign bidder may well result in a loss of more than $1.5 million.

The analysis was prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers; and it certainly offers something to think about. I ask unanimous consent that portions of the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On the basis that the domestic bidder would have realized 10 percent profit before Federal income taxes and that this increment of earning would have been taxed at the rate of 52 percent, the tax thereon would have amounted to $181,012.

Payment of the net earning in the amount of $167,088 to the domestic bidder's stockholders might be deferred in part or all, but it would ultimately go to the stockholders and on the basis of an average tax rate of 25 percent their tax thereon would have amounted to $41,772.

On the basis that the domestic bidder's direct labor and salary costs would have been 30 percent of his bid price and that his employees would have been taxed at an average rate of 20 percent, their collective tax thereon would have amounted to $208,860.

On the basis that the domestic bidder's direct material costs would have been 30 percent of his bid price and that his suppliers likewise would have averaged 10 percent profit before taxes and would have been taxed at the rate of 52 percent, the tax thereon would have amounted to $54,303.60.

With 30 percent of the domestic bidder's price remaining for overhead expenses, which for the most part include services, supplies, replacements, etc., and with the suppliers thereon making an average of 10 percent profit with a tax rate of 52 percent, the tax thereon would have amounted to $54,303.60.

Thus, for an implied saving of $281,000 by placing this contract with a foreign bidder instead of the lowest domestic bidder, the Government stands to lose $540,251.20 in taxes just from the domestic bidder, his stockholders, his employees and his direct suppliers. If consideration is extended to indirect stockholders or owners, indirect employees and indirect suppliers, the tax loss to the Government could conceivably be two or three times the amount of $540,251.

The $3,200,000 to be paid to the foreign bidder will, of course, further deplete this Nation's gold reserves which are already approaching a sad state.

With our Nation's high unemployment and attendant high unemployment taxes to support the unemployed, together with high welfare costs for those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, it is inconceivable that the Government would place this contract with a foreign bidder under any circumstances.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it should be noted that the analysis dealt largely with the dollar cost, in terms of the loss of tax revenue, to the Federal Government. Even more important, to my mind, is the need, where possible, to provide job opportunities for our unemployed. Here was a clear opportunity for the Federal Government to give private industry an opportunity to prosper and expand, and thereby to provide much-needed jobs for American workers, instead of further distributing American taxpayers' funds to foreign countries, at the expense of our own citizens. The Department failed to recognize the opportunity; and the cost of Government continues to climb. This is not the only example of this mistaken evaluation of bids. Similar matters have been called to public attention in connection with Department of Defense contracts for steel and other equipment. In the evaluation of bids of this type, such opportunities for American private industry and such job opportunities for our unemployed should be taken more fully into consideration.

BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND SIX EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of participating in a ceremony at which the Postmaster General signed the first bargaining agreement with six employee organizations representing the Nation's half-million postal employees. In scope, it is the largest agreement of its kind in our history.

The occasion was of great historic importance to these loyal Federal employees, and it marked a milestone for the Post Office Department in employee relations, this agreement—made official yesterday—will be good for the Federal Government and good for the employees. Not only will the provisions benefit both sides, but also this contract marks a great stride forward in the President's new labor-management program, by giving official recognition to our Federal employee organizations. I join with those who hope and believe that through this agreement we may see the dawn of a new era in the Federal service.

For many years, I have sponsored employee-recognition legislation to bring about an enlightened program such as this one. I am very much pleased that the President has moved ahead through his Executive authority in this field.

I congratulate the Post Office Department on its work in putting into effect the President's program. Much credit is due Postmaster General J. Edward Day for his untiring efforts and friendly cooperation. Credit is also due the Department of Labor for the fine pioneering work it did in establishing the ground rules for this agreement. I congratulate also my many friends—both leaders and rank-and-file members—in the employee organizations. They have worked long and hard to achieve the recognition accorded them yesterday. I rejoice that their efforts are now being rewarded.

SECRETARY McNAMARA AND THE TFX

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, because of the confusion that has been generated by the Senate committee's investigation of the TFX contract, I wish to have printed in the Record today's article by Walter Lippmann, as published in the Washington Post.

In the article it seems to me that Mr. Lippmann has put in clear context the major issue before the Congress in this matter; namely, the right of the Secretary of Defense to be the final arbiter over the vast defense appropriations. The issue has been confused by the running newspaper stories. In this article Mr. Lippmann clearly stated the case for the one basic design for Air Force and Navy fighter aircraft and the reason why vast economies can be made by this concentration.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

McNamara and the TFX

(By Walter Lippmann)

After swimming around for a while in the sea of technical detail of the TFX argument, I emerged dripping with facts and wondering, since there is so much that I do not understand, whether there is anything which I am entitled to write about. However, while I have nothing to say about the use of titanium, of thrust reversers in supersonic flight, or even about high inlet ducts in the propulsion system, there is, I think, a simple and important question at the heart of the argument between Secretary McNamara and his critics.

There are, as I see it, no villains involved, and there is not a shred of evidence to show that the contract went to the General Dynamics Corporation because the Vice President is from Texas, or that Senator Jackson has been doing anything improper because the Boeing Co. is from the State of Washington. The crux of the argument is not technical, military, or political, but economic. From the beginning Secretary McNamara's conception has been governed by his intention to keep the defense budget, which is already enormous, from becoming uncontrollably larger.

In order to keep military spending within some limit, it is necessary to sacrifice perfectionism in the choice of weapons. If money did not matter, each of the three military services could be allowed to build for itself the most perfect specialized tactical fighter. But since money does matter, the Defense Department has to forgo demanding the best weapons that unlimited money could buy and to content itself with the less perfect weapons that will do the military job. Secretary McNamara's friction with the uniformed hierarchy stems from his commitment to the basic proposition that if military spending is not to run wild, the weapons chosen have to be fully adequate but less than perfect.

Thus, Secretary McNamara has, as Mr. Reston reminded us the other day, canceled the nuclear powered airplane and the Skybolt missile, he has opposed the all-out development of the RS–70, and has given up two or three other very expensive projects which, in his judgment, are not necessary military weapons but military luxuries. In the same way of thinking he has been insisting that for the new supersonic tactical planes, which both the Navy and the Air Force need, every effort should be made to develop one tactical fighter plane that can be adapted to the needs of each service.

The whole controversy turns on this. The General Dynamics proposal is very much nearer to being one plane for both Navy and Air Force than is the Boeing proposal. According to Secretary McNamara, the Boeing proposal is in fact for two much more specialized fighter planes. The General Dynamics proposal is for "an air-frame design that has a very high degree of identical structure for the Navy and the Air Force versions," whereas in the two Boeing versions "less than half of the structural components of the wings, fuselage, and tail were the same."

To illustrate how wasteful is overspecialization, Secretary McNamara tells us that the Navy now has a large number of aircraft out of operation for lack of spare parts while the Air Force has a $2.2 billion inventory of spare parts that are "already obsolete and practically worthless."

The judgments which Secretary McNamara is making in the choice of these very expensive weapons are judgments which somebody has to make. Congress has the right and the power to hold him accountable for them. Congress is not qualified and it hasn't the time to make those judgments itself. Congress also has the opportunity to review the Secretary's decisions. For these new complicated weapons systems take years to develop.

But the kind of judgment which Mr. McNamara is making is the kind of judgment the Secretary of Defense is meant to make. That is one of the main reasons why his office was created. We know from experience that it has not always been easy to find a Secretary of Defense who was competent to do that. In Secretary McNamara the country has a Secretary of Defense who in his training, in his practical experience, and in his technical knowledge of production, is remarkably, perhaps uniquely, qualified to pass judgment on a problem like that of the TFX.

NELLE WYRICK LEWIS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, early this year, one of Oklahoma's most distinguished women passed away. Mrs. Nelle Wyrick Lewis, who became one of Oklahoma's first women lawyers, first woman marshal of the State supreme court, and chief law clerk of the same court, passed away in Washington on January 15 of this year.

Mrs. Lewis was the wife of Gen. William C. Lewis, and the mother of Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr. Her husband served Oklahoma in many capacities—as U.S. district attorney, as State senator, and as an outstanding military leader in two World Wars. Her son has, since 1949, served as administrative assistant to Senator Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine. He, too, holds a general's commission in the Reserves. Because of Mrs. Lewis' achievements and because of her great courage, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record the eloquent tribute to her which her son, William C. Lewis, Jr., has written in her memory.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nelle Wyrick Lewis, January 24, 1892–January 15, 1963, Arlington National Cemetery

Because we feel that those who have been so thoughtful in their expressions of sympathy and condolences would be interested in certain facts of the life of Nelle Wyrick Lewis, whose internal beauty equaled her external beauty—and more important, because of how her experiences can possibly give hope to others—this is sent to you.

She was a remarkable woman of outstanding professional achievements. She did not attend college until her son was 6 years old. At that time (accompanied by her son), she returned to her native State of Tennessee and attended Cumberland Law University at Lebanon and from which she received her bachelor of laws degree. The motivation came during the time her husband was in the military service in World War I.

But before she completed her studies, received her law degree and passed the Oklahoma bar examination, World War I had long before ended. And instead of entering the practice of law at that time with her husband, she accepted appointment as marshal of the supreme court of the State of Oklahoma. She was the first woman to ever hold the position of marshal of a State supreme court. Subsequent to this, she became the chief law clerk of the Oklahoma Supreme Court. In this position, her principal responsibility was to supervise the drafting of legal opinions rendered by the members of the court. She wrote many of the original drafts herself—and had the distinction of being rated by two successive chief justices as the "best brief lawyer in the State of Oklahoma."

When the family moved to Duncan, Okla., she formed the law partnership of Lewis & Lewis with her husband—and after several years she retired from full practice but did not become inactive. A great source of pride to her was an event in 1939, when, upon the motion of her husband, she and her son were admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. On that occasion, the then Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes observed that such was a historic first for the Court—the first time that an entire family where there was one child or more had participated in an admission ceremony before the Court.

She used to speak of this in connection with another distinction of which she was proud—that she "was the only woman whose husband and son were Generals in the Air Force Reserve."

What was practically unknown about her was that she was a woman of great political acumen—and that it was she who provided the backbone and impetus to the penny-postcard organization campaign for the successful candidacy of another great woman, Margaret Chase Smith, for U.S. Senator in 1948. For the organization of that campaign was built upon the financial shoestring of a penny-postcard followthrough to the thousands, who signed the primary papers of Margaret Chase Smith.

As outstanding as these achievements are, they do not reflect the true greatness of Nelle Wyrick Lewis—and the potential value of her life to others. These were accomplishments of happiness. Yet, she did far more in accomplishments marked with discouragement and saddened by tragedy in her health.

If the latter accomplishments could be summed up in one word, that word would be "comeback." In normal terms, "comeback" signifies the unusual and rare recovery from failure, loss or defeat.

But Nelle Wyrick Lewis made so many unbelievable comebacks that ultimately those comebacks were regarded by her, and the members of her family, as routine and normal—and certainly not rare. In fact, at the time she did finally pass away both she and her family were confident that she would make another one of those remarkable comebacks to which they had become accustomed.

She lived 29 years beyond the first time that doctors said she would die. That first gloomy prediction was back in 1934 when she and her husband were in an automobile accident and in which she suffered a fractured skull and three broken vertebrae and other serious injuries. Her doctors said that she would not live through the night. She suffered through a long and difficult year, but she came back with full recovery.

Next she suffered illness with her mouth and there was serious suspicion that she had cancer of the tongue. But she came back on that and ultimately the condition cleared up.

Her next illness was colitis, which her doctor said she would have the rest of her life. But, in time, she came back on that and recovered fully from it.

Her next illness was anemia. But again, in time, she made a comeback on that and with full recovery.

In 1950 in Waterville, Maine, she had her first heart attack. This was to be the first one on which she would make unbelievable recoveries.

In March 1952 she suffered a series of strokes and the doctors at George Washington University Hospital gave her only 6 hours to 6 months to live. Again in July 1952 she suffered a second series of strokes and was given no more than 6 months to live. Her paralysis was practically complete as she could not talk, she could not move her limbs, and her vision was blurred, as was her memory.

Some cells of her mid-brain were destroyed by the strokes—the cells which controlled her basic reflexes. Ironically, her brain cells that controlled the more advanced mental processes were not damaged. This made the situation all the more difficult for her for while her intelligence continued as bright as ever, she was unable to express thoughts because she could not talk, could not see clearly and could not even make signs because of the paralysis of her limbs.

But again, she made a remarkable and unbelievable comeback—for she taught the remaining unimpaired cells of her mid-brain to do the work that the dead cells had done before. It was a long and difficult battle but she won—and her comeback and recovery was so complete that she regained her sight to the extent of wearing glasses only for reading, of walking with a cane only to steady her, and regaining her speech fully.

In fact, on the very night that she finally passed away she was answering the telephone with the vibrance and bell-tone clarity that many people earlier had characterized as the "best telephone voice they ever heard."

She suffered the unbelievable number of some 2 dozen heart attacks. Repeatedly her doctor said that she could not survive during these attacks. On January 2, 1961, when she fought for 6 hours, her doctor requested authority for an autopsy from her family. Between May 1962 and January 1963, she had 12 heart attacks of the magnitude requiring hospitalization. In early December when she was at the hospital as a result of the ninth of these 12 attacks, her doctor told her family that she would never leave the hospital. Yet, she not only recovered from that attack sufficiently enough to return home—and to enjoy a full Christmas at home—but she similarly recovered from two subsequent attacks.

She would recover so well and so quickly from the attacks that as few as only two or three days hospitalization would be required. Indicative of her confidence and courage was the fact that when her husband and son took her to the hospital in these attack times—her son driving and her husband administering oxygen on the way—she would caution them against getting nervous. As she left the house on her last attack, her confidence and courage was shown when she said she wanted her small transistor radio to take to the hospital with her.

In spite of all this physical adversity, she lived a full and happy life—for she never really was an invalid simply because she just didn't permit herself to be.

This remarkable medical history of Nelle Wyrick Lewis is given not just as a tribute to her—but also to demonstrate what courage can accomplish—and to give courage to those who may have lost hope—to show what can be accomplished even in the face of physical adversity.

Its objective is to encourage afflicted persons—and their families so endeared to them—to make adjustments—to live their lives with as much happiness, optimism and faith as they can—and to resist the understandable despondency that can paralyze the lives of such persons and their families.

For if Nelle Wyrick Lewis had let such despondency capture her and her family, she would never have enjoyed the tall and stately green spruce and fir trees, the beautiful white birches, and the ocean at her home in Cundys Harbor, Maine—she would never have enjoyed the beautiful Maryland spring with its myriad of multicolored blossoms of the dogwood, redbud, apple, peach, and cherry trees; and the azaleas, forsythia and mock orange plants; the cardinals, bluebirds, robins, mockingbirds, and even quail; and the chipmunk, squirrels and rabbits that she watched through the picture window from her comfortable rocking chair at the home of her son—she would never have enjoyed the miracles of television that kept her active mind abreast of the public and political affairs, in which she had such a keen interest.

Repeatedly she counseled that if you believed in something strongly enough and set your heart on achieving it enough, you would realize your dreams. She practiced, and literally lived, what she counseled, in spite of physical adversity, until her remarkable heart finally went to sleep.

Yes, she was "quite a girl"—even if we do say so.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S JOE FOSS FEATURED IN AIR PROGRESS MAGAZINE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most dramatic chapters in World War II is the story of South Dakota's Congressional Medal of Honor winner, Joe Foss. Foss, who later served as the Governor of my State, was the first American fighter pilot of World War II to equal Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's World War I score of 26 enemy planes shot down.

Now serving as the commissioner of the new American Football League with headquarters in Dallas, Tex., Joe Foss continues to hold our admiration for his brilliant work as a Marine pilot in World War II. Air Progress magazine in the April–May 1963 issue features a dramatic account of Mr. Foss' achievements. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPT. JOSEPH J. FOSS

Congressional Medal of Honor winner Capt. Joseph Jacob Foss was the first American fighter pilot of World War II to equal Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's World War I victory score of 26 victories. Foss, a U.S. Marine flier, registered all his victories in the short period of 3 months—during which time he was suffering from malaria. Although the majority of the Marine ace's victims flew the technically and numerically superior Mitsubishi Zero, Joe Foss and his men turned the tide in the violent air fighting over the steaming jungles and shark-infested sea.

Foss was born April 17, 1915, in a small white farmhouse a few miles east of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. His parents of Norwegian and Scotch-Irish descent were simple living, hard-working farmers. As a boy, Joe roamed the countryside trapping wild animals for extra money. His dad, a superb marksman with a rifle, taught Joe all that he knew about guns. When Joe was a senior in high school, his father was killed and the responsibility of running the farm fell on the young man's shoulders.

Joe wanted a college education and he entered Augustana College in Sioux Falls in 1934, but he found it difficult to run the farm and study, too, so he left college after his freshman year. Then a dry season descended upon the area and the crops failed. Determined to get a college degree, Foss entered Sioux Falls College the following year and worked as the college janitor to support himself and his family. He was a member of the football and track teams and also did some boxing during his sophomore year. He sold 20 acres of farmland plus his car, and worked in his spare time in order to pay for his junior and senior college years which were spent at the University of South Dakota. He was graduated in 1940.

The future ace's first airplane ride occurred in 1934; by 1937 he had learned to fly in a Taylorcraft. Whenever he had a few dollars, Joe Foss would rent a plane at the local airport. He took ground school training at Rickenbacker Field near Sioux City. In February 1940, with $5 in his pocket, the airminded youth hitchhiked to Minneapolis to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps. Second Lieutenant Joseph Foss won his wings in March 1941, and was made an instructor. On January 1, 1942, Foss was sent to photo school at Pensacola and then was posted in San Diego with a reconnaissance squadron. When he requested fighter duty, he was told that his 27 years made him too old. But repeated requests finally bore fruit and Lieutenant Foss was made executive officer of Marine Fighting Squadron 121 at Camp Kearney, Calif., August 1, 1942. Eight days later he married his childhood sweetheart, June Shakstad. By September 1, 1942, Capt. Joe Foss and VMF-121 were on their way to the South Pacific.

The squadron was equipped with six-gun Grumman Wildcats. Sixteen planes were on active duty. Foss led eight of these while the squadron leader led the remainder. The men liked Foss and called him "Old Foos." Flying from Henderson Field on Guadalcanal he shot down his first Zero on October 13, 1942. The Japanese pilot had surprised the Wildcat from 6 o'clock high, but his shots missed. As the Zero sped by, Foss fired and the Mitsubishi exploded. Then three more Jap fighters attacked the isolated flier. Their lethal fire put holes in his wings and destroyed the Grumman's oil system, causing the engine to overheat and freeze up. With the Zeros still attacking, Foss made a deadstick landing back at his field unharmed. This fracas taught Foss a lesson—after this he kept a sharp lookout in all directions at all times. In fact, he soon earned the nickname of "Swivel Neck Joe."

Marine Fighting Squadron 121 was kept busy escorting torpedo planes and dive bombers, strafing Japanese supply areas, and intercepting enemy bombers. During the afternoon of October 23, Captain Foss took off on his second flight of the day to intercept a formation of 16 Japanese bombers with Zero escort. As 5 Zeros dived to the attack and Joe turned his flight toward them he spotted 20 more Mitsubishi fighters joining the melee. As he dived to gain speed, Foss fired at a Zero tailing a Wildcat and the enemy plane exploded with a blinding flash. A split second later he followed another Zero into a loop and destroyed it while both were inverted at the top of the maneuver. Coming out of the loop, Foss fired at a third Japanese fighter which crashed into the sea. The Marine flier's fourth victory for the day was another Zero sent down in flames.

Joe Foss' ability to score so rapidly is attributed to the fact that he was a superb marksman. The enemy appeared doomed once he pressed the firing button. The flight leader, in many cases, had to break away from a dogfight because of plane damage, shortage of fuel or ammunition. To conserve the latter, Foss often used only four of his six guns, alternating to conserve ammunition.

His victories mounted quickly. On October 25, Joe Foss shot down five Japanese aircraft. Five of his Wildcats were attacked by six Zeros that morning and "Old Foos" quickly rode the tail of one attacker, firing at long range. As its pilot bailed out the Mitsubishi disintegrated. Before the pieces had fluttered into the sea, Foss was slamming .50-caliber bullets into the belly of the second Zero and sent this crashing into the sea also.

That afternoon his third Zero of the day blew up after a short burst. Its engine almost smashed into the captain's wing man. During the confusion another Zero dived on the ace but the Jap's aim was poor. As the enemy plane sped by, Foss sent it down out of control. When the pilots returned to the field almost out of fuel and ammunition, throttled back for landing, more Zeros attacked and shot down one of the unsuspecting marines. With two Zeros on his tail, Joe climbed into a cloud and quickly turned in a complete circle. When the trio emerged the Wildcat was behind the Japanese. With his last few rounds of ammunition, Foss racked up his 5th victory of the day, his 16th of the war.

After dispatching two reconnaissance float planes and a Zero on November 7, Captain Foss became separated from his flight. As he headed for home he was forced to fly through violent rain squalls which drove him far off course. When his engine began smoking and then stopped, Foss put the Wildcat into a long glide and dead-sticked to a belly landing in the water. The rough landing split the fuselage and the fighter sank almost immediately with the startled pilot trapped inside his flooded cockpit. Five, ten, twenty, thirty feet beneath the shark-infested waters until, at last, Joe Foss managed to break free and shot to the surface. The ace used chlorine capsules to keep the sharks away as the twilight turned to darkness.

After hours in the water, Joe heard the sound of a canoe and muffled voices, but he remained silent as the searchers circled about since the occupants could have been Japanese or unfriendly natives. Upon hearing a few English words, Foss finally cried out and was hauled aboard by a local white planter and helpful natives. He was taken to a mission on a deserted island and was well cared for until the U.S. Navy picked him up with a PBY Catalina flying boat. When Foss returned to Guadalcanal he loaded his Wildcat with razor blades, chewing gum, tobacco, cigarettes and magazines, and dropped all this in a sack over the mission in thanks for their kindness to him.

Adm. W. F. "Bull" Halsey presented Captain Foss with the Distinguished Flying Cross on November 9, 1942. The captain's flight outfit became known as "Joe's Flying Circus" and collected 72 victories during the time that Foss was in command.

Soon after the Distinguished Flying Cross presentation Captain Foss became severely ill while flying; by the time he landed he could hardly sit up. With a fever of 104 degrees, there was no question but that Joe had a bad case of malaria. On November 19, he was flown to New Calendonia in a C-47. During his illness Foss lost 37 pounds. By November 30, the ace was in Sydney, Australia, on sick leave and it was here that he met two other famous aces of World War II—"Bluey" Truscott and "Killer" Caldwell.

One month later Joe Foss was back on Guadalcanal and on January 15, 1943, he was in a very tough dogfight over New Georgia, during which he shot down 3 more Zeros which brought his "destroyed" total to 26.

Eleven days later he was ordered back to the States. Although he stopped at Espertu Santo until February 17 to regain some of his strength, during the trip home he again became ill with malaria and was just about given up for dead on several occasions. But he shook it off and as the leading ace of the U.S. Armed Forces landed on the West Coast on April 19, 1943, and was given a hero's welcome. He was cheered, made speeches, conferred with the top brass on tactics and equipment.

Foss was ordered to the White House where, on May 18, 1943, President Roosevelt presented him with the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award the United States has to offer. In view of his extensive and successful battle experience the Armed Forces valued his ideas on air fighting and Joe became a tactical advisor to the U.S. Marine Corps.

Promoted to the rank of major, the ace agitated for more action and was placed in command of a marine squadron flying Vought F4U Corsairs. After training at Santa Barbara, the unit was in the South Pacific by March 1944. On many occasions Joe Foss flew with Col. Charles Lindbergh who was a technical representative of the Vought-Sikorsky Co.

After the War in 1946, Foss started a flying service with one airplane. Within 3 years, the outfit had 14 planes and 12 employees. Joe resigned his commission in the Marine Corps to become a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. He then organized the South Dakota Air National Guard and became its commander and then chief of staff. He entered politics and was elected State representative from Minnehaha County in 1948 and 2 years later ran unsuccessfully for the governorship of South Dakota.

Foss returned to active duty with his Air National Guard in 1951 during the Korean conflict, but could not obtain a combat assignment due to an Air Force ruling which prohibits Medal of Honor winners from accepting frontline duties. The colonel went to Washington to seek a waiver of this ruling and even offered to give back his medal but he was politely refused. This was a man who really wanted to fight for his country.

In 1953, Foss was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in the South Dakota National Guard. The following year he was elected Governor. He is now the commissioner of the new American Football League with headquarters in Dallas, Tex.

Joe Foss will always be remembered as being typical of the handful of U.S. pilots who fought our Nation's enemies under the most adverse conditions and, with determination and skill, stopped the Japanese advance during one of the darkest periods in this country's history.

SENATOR BURDICK MAKES IMPORTANT AGRICULTURAL ADDRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Senator Burdick, of North Dakota, was a featured speaker at the Farmers Union Central Exchange banquet in St. Paul on March 6. On that occasion he delivered one of the most thoughtful and provocative addresses on the agricultural problems of today which I have yet seen. The Senator, who is known as one of the Nation's most distinguished authorities on agricultural problems, concentrated his remarks on the forthcoming wheat referendum. He asserted that this spring's wheat referendum is the "single most important event in agriculture this year."

I hope that the Members of the Congress will read Senator Burdick's address and that what he has to say will be taken very seriously not only by his colleagues in the Congress, but by farmers who will be participating in this spring's wheat referendum.

I ask unanimous consent that this superb address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR QUENTIN N. BURDICK AT FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE BANQUET, MARCH 6, 1963

I consider it a real pleasure and a distinct honor to appear before the representatives of a great cooperative. Your institution has placed in the hands of farmers from my State of North Dakota and the great area of the Midwest tools with which to gain a better life on the farm. Great credit is due you for your part in the fight to retain and keep traditional rural America as a place for American families—a place where churches, schools and communities can exist and serve. The stress of economic forces has been difficult in the past. Your fathers and my father, Usher L. Burdick, served in the cause of the American farmer then. We must do it now. We must do it for the national interest and the national economy. Today we face a period of great crisis—a period of great decision, which will affect the economy of that vast area of the midwest extending from the Canadian border down the Missouri-Mississippi Valley.

The single most important event in agriculture this year will be the national wheat referendum.

The economic stakes in the referendum are tremendous. The choice wheat farmers make will be final and conclusive.

If two-thirds of the voting farmers approve, then the two-price wheat certificate program for 1964 will go into effect and farmers will be assured of a high level of wheat income with very little reduction in acres. The program also makes possible the orderly disposal of our surplus stocks of wheat which—unless reduced—threatens the whole price structure of our wheat markets.

On the other hand, if one-third plus one of the voting farmers reject the program, then I hesitate to predict the chaos and the disaster that will result—not only for wheat farmers but all of agriculture.

Most of the farmers served by this great regional cooperative—Farmers Union Central Exchange—grow wheat as a major cash crop. This is particularly true of those of you who live in Montana, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and western Minnesota. There is not one among you who hasn't been deeply concerned in recent years with the increasing gravity of the wheat problem. Under the previous administration—under Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, in case you have forgotten—surplus stocks of wheat were permitted to pile up year after year for 7 consecutive years—until we had well over a billion bushels in our Government inventory.

That's the problem we inherited when the present administration took over in 1961.

It's not easy—and it's not pleasant—to remedy a chronic problem of such magnitude. It's not easy or pleasant for an administration nor for Congress charged with the responsibility of finding a workable solution—and certainly it is not easy or pleasant for the farmers who have the problem on their backs.

But this administration and the Democratic 87th Congress did not duck the problem—we did not run away from it and pretend the problem wasn't there.

As all of you know, we immediately took positive measures—and we did it against the bitterest, most obstructionist kind of partisan opposition.

Early in 1961 Secretary Freeman stepped up our wheat shipments abroad—both in dollar cash sales and through an expanded food-for-peace program. By 1962 we were shipping more than 700 million bushels of wheat abroad—that's more wheat than we use for all purposes here at home in 1 year.

In the closing days of the 87th Congress—against solid Republican opposition in both Houses of Congress—we passed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 which included the 1964 wheat program.

It was our judgment then—as it is now—that a two-price wheat certificate program is constructive, realistic, and workable legislation. There really is nothing now in the program. The two-price idea has been carefully considered by some of the best farm statesmen in Congress for many years. The two-price plan was written into the 1956 farm act but was vetoed by President Eisenhower for an entirely different reason. The certificate idea has been proposed and discussed by competent and thoughtful people in agriculture for over 30 years. The program assures the wheat grower $2 a bushel for 80 percent or more of his quota and around $1.40 for the balance.

The program is designed to reduce our surplus stocks of wheat to 600 million bushels within 4 years—this is an amount considered necessary for national security.

In addition the 1964 program further supplements the wheat growers' income by offering diversion payments for land taken out of wheat. These payments are at a rate of 30 percent of parity times normal average yield for the 10-percent mandatory cut in acreage and 50 percent of parity times normal average yield for additional acres.

The end result is that wheat growers will have a national wheat income equal to 1962, even with slightly reduced acres. The program is designed to bring in a wheat income of from $2.3 to $2.4 billion which I think is a very favorable level of income compared to other segments of agriculture.

Anyway you want to look at it—the issue—the only issue—in the national wheat referendum this year is economic. It is not a political test of strength—though some would like to have you think so. It is not a conflict of ideologies—though some would have you believe it is. It is not a test of a farmer's loyalty to one farm organization or another. It is simply a matter of dollars and cents—nothing more.

Do you want more wheat income or less? Do you want to reduce surpluses or add to them? Do you want order and stability in the market place or do you want chaos and disaster? Do you want $2 wheat or do you want 90 cent wheat?

I think the great national debate now going on about the 1964 wheat program is healthy. I wouldn't want it any other way. But in this instance, the tactics and public statements being made by the opposition point up how desperate they are—how intellectually bankrupt they are. The opposition has made us more concerned, more knowledgeable about the program, and more determined that the 1964 wheat program should be approved in this year's referendum.

It might be well to spend a few moments to sift the fiction from the facts.

Claims are being made that wheat farmers have nothing to lose if they vote down the program because—they say—Congress is patiently waiting at their beck and call to write another wheat program—a better program, mind you—as soon as the referendum is over.

I don't think many farmers will be hoodwinked. At least, I hope not.

There is absolutely no basis to believe or hope that Congress can or would pass another wheat program if farmers turn down this one in the referendum.

In the first place, Congress is in no mood to do it. The truth is, Congress is sick and tired of the wheat problem. The 87th Congress passed the program and now if farmers turn it down, the only logical interpretation Congress can make is that farmers don't want any program.

I'm not the only one who says this and believes this.

Here is what President Kennedy said on the subject in his farm message to Congress on January 31 of this year: "Net farm income at the end of 1962 was $1.8 billion a year more than it was in 1960 * * * The increase in farm income has generated added business for rural industries and farm communities, putting millions of dollars in Main Street cash registers and adding at least 200,000 jobs to the national economy * * * The successes of these principles have been made possible by a series of congressional and executive actions undertaken in the last 2 years * * * The success of these principles also calls for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum to be held under the permanent legislation enacted by the Congress last year. If two-thirds of the wheat producers vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by that law, the present income of our wheat farms will be protected and the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced. Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. I do not believe that anyone who clearly understands the choice would prefer a return to the depression conditions that preceded the initiation of price supports a generation ago. New legislation for wheat is neither necessary nor feasible this year."

Senator Ellender, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, had this to say—and I quote: "In my humble judgment it would be calamitous to the wheat farmers of the Nation if a negative vote is cast because Congress cannot and should not take action to further deal with the wheat problem for this year."

Congressman Frank Thompson of New Jersey, I think accurately reflects the attitude of nonfarm Congressmen when he said, "If wheat farmers don't want a program which has scant support from the people in my district, neither do I."

There are 435 Members in the House of Representatives. Since the reapportionment resulting from the 1960 census, there are only 131 seats from farm districts—out of the 435. The attitude of Congressman Frank Thompson, and other city Congressmen like him is important, since they represent the urban majority in the House. I knew Frank Thompson when I was a Member of the House in the 86th Congress, and we could generally rely upon his vote for farm legislation. Because he came from a nonfarm district, he cast some very difficult votes—very unpopular votes among his constituents. When he says "if the wheat farmers don't want a program which has scant support from the people in my district, neither do I," I am certain that is what he and others like him will do. So don't rely upon any hope that a better wheat bill, or any wheat bill will be passed this year.

It is being said during this referendum campaign that if the 1964 wheat program is approved in the referendum, then government will be running the farms and not the farmers.

It is interesting to note, the opposition who is making this ridiculous claim, are the very same people who come back to Congress year after year and ask for renewal of almost identical programs for rice, tobacco, cotton, wool, and sugar. I say that if farm programs are right and necessary for these major crops—they are equally necessary for wheat—and with no more danger of government interference or controls. And I may point out, that if farmers want stabilized prices and supports, then there is no alternative but to comply with quotas. There is no other way. And the Department of Agriculture neither can nor wants control of the Nation's farms—and it never will.

Regulation and management does not mean loss of freedom or independence. Management of production in line with demand has been practiced and used by almost every other segment of our economy except agriculture. And I think it is about time farmers be given a chance to employ the same production and market techniques that have long been enjoyed by oil companies—the steel and auto industries—to mention just a few.

The claim is being made that the price of wheat would never go below $1.35 or $1.40 a bushel if the program is voted out in the referendum.

Even if this were true—which it isn't—that price level of $1.40 would be a disaster level for 90 percent of the wheat farmers in the Nation.

The facts are, wheat would probably go down to less than a dollar a bushel. I'll tell you why.

If there is no program for 1964, wheat farmers in the desperate and lonely effort to maintain gross income, would plant at least 65 million acres—that's a conservative estimate.

On that 65 million acres, farmers would harvest something like 1.5 billion bushels—that is 300 to 400 million bushels more than we could possibly use at home and ship abroad.

You pile that 400 million bushels on top of the present surplus stocks of a billion bushels and what do you think will happen to the price of wheat? The bottom would drop out and you'd be lucky to get 90 cents.

This would be bad enough if only wheat farmers got hurt—and thousands upon thousands would. But dollar wheat would wreck the feed grain market and it would wreck the livestock market. Cheap feed means cheap hogs—cheap cattle—cheap poultry—cheap eggs—cheap milk and cheap butter.

Knock out the 1964 wheat program and you would start a chain action that will knock down farmers in other areas of agriculture like bowling pins.

The claim is made that major wheat States in the Great Plains have lost acres to Eastern States and Southern States. This is absolutely untrue.

In fact, all major wheat States in this area have maintained their historical percentage of the national wheat allotment or have gained sizable increases in acreage at the expense of other States.

It has been claimed that the wheat grown in the Great Plains is superior wheat and is not the cause of our surpluses.

It is true that hard winter and hard spring wheat are superior in breadbaking qualities. But it is the soft wheats that are in most demand for ready-mix pastries and cakes and cookies. The biggest bulk of wheat in surplus is grown right in the Great Plains area. This is a fact we must face—as unpleasant as it may be. We cannot run from it—we cannot sweep the surplus under the rug and forget about it.

The opposition says "vote down this program and we'll get you a better one."

Well, nobody that I know has seen such a program. All we know is what they tell us. First, apparently, they want a massive land retirement program—a super soil bank. It would be tremendously costly, in terms of payments, to retire 65 million acres—and in terms of dried-up towns and closed-up businesses and of people seeking work in cities—it would be sheer disaster.

Secondly, they say wheat would then be sold at cash market prices and these prices would be sufficient—in time—because the production of wheat would be in line with demand.

The facts are, before all this would happen—before the price of wheat on the open market got up to a high stable level—there would be precious few family wheat farmers left. The sheer attrition of dollar wheat would see to that.

My friends, I have lived among you long enough to know that none of you are falling for these claims. The stakes in the referendum are great. The choice you will make is final and irrevocable. There will be no second chance. I urge you to consider your decision thoughtfully—based on facts. These facts are available to you—at your local ASC offices—from your local cooperative—at your county agent's office—at your land grant colleges. All major organizations, cooperatives and commodity groups directly concerned with wheat and feed grain—with one exception—are urging farmers to approve the 1964 wheat program.

But you must remember—the opposition needs only one vote to your two votes to defeat it. So it takes more than good attitude—it takes your vote.

It will take the dedication and determination of the type of men who built the Central Exchange.

Again I wish to say that it has been a great pleasure to be with you this evening. May I extend to your board of directors, your manager and to you, best wishes in your deliberations here in convention, and in all your operations at home.

SOUTH DAKOTA FARM YOUTH'S VIEWS ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most sincere and effective statements concerning the problems confronting our farm families that has come to my attention in recent months is a letter I received from a young high school senior in White Lake, S. Dak., Mr. Larry Vissia.

Larry is an honor student and a delegate to Boy's State with a most promising future. Yet, limitations beyond his control have made it virtually impossible for his family to operate their farm successfully. He has indicated that he would be pleased to have his letter placed in the Congressional Record.

I ask unanimous consent that Larry's letter be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 2, 1963.

Dear Senator McGovern: Excuse me for bothering you like this because I know you receive many letters and you are very busy with your job.

I am a senior in White Lake High School and this spring I will graduate hoping to go onto college. As you know White Lake is a small town with farming as its life blood, but what is going to happen to this small town if the present trend keeps up? Every year thousands of farmers in South Dakota and across the Nation are leaving hoping to go to the city to try to find employment. Let me give you an example:

In 1956 a man with five boys had to give up farming because the landlord of this farm sold it to another person who put it in the soil bank. This person who bought it was rich; he had several sections of land already and he did not need it. The farmer, who was set off the farm lost all his livestock and machinery to pay off a mortgage. He tried to start farming again, but there were no farms available. Why? Because these farms are in the soil bank and the large farms are buying out the small farmer. Where are all the small farmers going? To the city because they have no other alternative. Now to get back to this farmer. He is now a construction worker and a farm laborer. He works in the summer and has to draw unemployment in the winter. He wants still to get back on the farm, but he cannot because of the prices on pigs and cattle, and the price of feed. The price of hogs now is 15 cents and you have to pay 79 cents per pound at the grocery store. It costs you about $25,000 to start farming now and in order to get a loan you have to have a certain size farm and certain qualifications. This farmer I am talking about is 57 years old. How is he to get back on the farm at his age. Every day I have to look at his and his wife's down-hearted faces because they can't. You see they are my parents.

I received honor grades in school and last year I was a Boy's Stater. I have to make a choice now whether to go on to college or to stay home and help my parents get back on a farm. But how in the world am I going to do this? I am only a 17-year-old boy. Something has to be done about the situation of the farmer, and I hope that you will try to ease the situation.

I love and respect my parents very much and I want to do my best to please them. What should I do in this type of situation? I know my parents want me to stay and help them, but still they want me to go to college, too.

I have always admired you since I shook hands with you at Fish Lake last fall. I would very much like to have your opinion on this. Could this be just between you and me? Thank you very much for listening to this.

Respectfully yours,

LARRY VISSIA.

NATIONAL RICE WEEK

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, most Americans tend to think of Texas as a beautiful land with vast herds of cattle, numerous oil wells, great cities, pretty girls, a wonderful climate, and unlimited opportunity for the young at heart. And all this is true.

However, Texas has much more than this. The State produces, as a rule, more rice than is produced in any of the other States of the Union. I say as a rule, for occasionally we allow one of the other States to come in first. We do this to keep them from getting an inferiority complex.

But I rise today not to say a few kind words about Texas, for all the world knows we are a modest people, but to say a word about the domestic rice industry's program of self-help.

As my colleagues know, the week of March 17 through 23 is National Rice Week. Capitol cafeterias and restaurants on Wednesday of this week featured free servings of rice with the compliments of growers, millers, and Members of Congress from the rice-producing States.

The rice industry has undertaken an extensive campaign of advertising this month in an effort to boost their sales. Advertising of rice is being done by private brand distributors and the Rice Council, a national organization of the rice industry for promoting domestic consumption. The council is supported by voluntary contributions from all rice growers and millers.

Mr. President, I offer my congratulations to those rice growers and millers who are doing what they can, on their own initiative, to increase the sales of their products.

And I urge my colleagues to partake of rice when they have the opportunity—Texas rice if at all possible.

PROFIT IN RECLAMATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Central Valley project is a blue chip investment. That is proven by the 1962 annual report for this great and growing reclamation project in California which shows that at its 25th anniversary it is financially solvent in high degree.

Last year the Central Valley project earned a net profit of $8,131,000 which was turned in to the U.S. Treasury. This net income, mind you, was over and above operation and maintenance expenditures, over and above provision for replacement and depreciation, and over and above interest paid on the power investment and the municipal water investment.

The new report just issued by the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the Central Valley project's 1962 gross income from irrigation repayment, power sales, municipal and industrial water sales totaled $17,865,000. The liabilities that I mentioned, including interest, totaled $9,734,000. The net for the year was $8,131,000.

Let me comment further about that interest item. We generally think of reclamation projects as being interest-free. Of course it is the irrigation costs that are interest-free. In the case of the Central Valley project, which observed its 25th birthday last October, it has now piled up accrued interest on its power and municipal water supply investments of more than $25 million.

In addition, in the same period, it has returned to the Treasury net operating income of $106 million. And in 25 years the value of its crop returns to the farmers it serves has reached a total of $2,300 million.

Mr. President, I think that is a pretty good financial record. One fundamental reason why it is so good, so far as repayment is concerned, is that on the Central Valley project we held on to the electric power as an integral part of the project. Proceeds from the publicly built, publicly owned, publicly operated power facilities account for 77 percent of the operating revenue of the Central Valley project to date. Irrigation repayment has accounted for about 20 percent; municipal and industrial water sales 3 percent. Obviously, power is the paying partner.

I said the Central Valley project is a growing project. The Trinity River division, which will add more power revenue, is just getting into operation. The San Luis division, authorized 3 years ago, is now under construction. The new Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal unit is proposed for authorization by this Congress as another badly needed and likewise highly feasible addition to the project. I expect to request hearings on S. 351, my Auburn-Folsom bill, as soon as the Bureau of Reclamation's new engineering report on the unit reaches the Congress.

Mr. President, I am proud of the Central Valley project and the multiple benefits it has conferred on the people of California. I am proud of its sound repayment record. I am proud to have been the author or coauthor of every addition to the project since the initial authorization in 1937. The entire Congress can rightly share this pride which, I am sure, will be enhanced by the new Auburn-Folsom unit proposed in S. 351.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOR 1962

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress I had the honor and the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, of which I remain a member. In that capacity, I gained new insight into the importance of the Library of Congress not only to the parent body but to the Nation. We have reason to be proud of our Library—the National Library of the United States—and the imagination and competence with which it is administered by Dr. L. Quincy Mumford and his able staff.

In his annual report to Congress for the fiscal year 1962, which was recently published, Dr. Mumford gives an account of his stewardship, pointing out, among other things, that 22 percent of the funds appropriated to the Library for fiscal 1962 were returned to the Treasury in the form of income. I believe that his report warrants our careful attention. Consequently, I would like to summarize it for the RECORD.

In the report Dr. Mumford examines—

First, the role of the Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States and the need for a commission on the Nation's library problems;

Second, the Library's efforts toward automating the information systems of research libraries in general but particularly that of the Library of Congress—one of the first Government agencies to mechanize its business operations;

Third, the present status in the Library's desperate need for space;

Fourth, the resounding success of the Library's Public Law 480 program to acquire and catalog foreign publications for 22 American libraries;

Fifth, the growth of the Library's collections by nearly 700,000 items to a total of nearly 42 million—in circumstances that dictate comprehensive collections to serve national needs but selective acquisition;

Sixth, the Library's many-faceted cataloging and classification programs to control research materials—among them a publication called the biggest bargain of the year;

Seventh, an impressive array of new or expanded reference services to Congress, Government, and the public—especially scientists—as outlined below;

Eighth, varied national and international activities in cultural fields in which the Library has long been active because of its unusual collections—in music, poetry and literature, and fine prints;

Ninth, a staggering increase again in the sale of printed cards, the deposit of $2,792,099 in the U.S. Treasury from the sale of cards and technical publications, and the success of an experiment with card distribution; and

Tenth, the highest number of copyright registrations in history, fees of $1,043,588 (which funds are deposited in the Treasury) for registrations and other services of the Copyright Office, and issuance of a report on revision of the U.S. copyright law.

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY

In its continuing appraisal of its role and obligations, the Library of Congress had an opportunity in fiscal 1962 to review in depth certain basic assumptions about it in relation to a memorandum prepared by Douglas W. Bryant of Harvard University Library for Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of the Joint Committee on the Library, for the purpose of constructive discussion. That objective, Dr. Mumford reports, was realized, and both the memorandum and an accompanying report on it by Dr. Mumford are published as an appendix to the Librarian's annual report.

Questions were raised in the Bryant memorandum with respect to the place of the Library of Congress in the Federal Government, its formal designation as the National Library of the United States, and a change in name to reflect such designation. Dr. Mumford points out that "the Library of Congress is in fact the national library of the United States" and that "the Congress, the Nation, and other countries fully recognize this role." He believes that Congress, moreover, "is willing to support not only this concept but programs in keeping with it." He notes that a change of name would "throw away the symbol of prestige and influence that years of leadership on both the national and international scenes have built," and that, although favoring formal recognition of the Library as the National Library, he would prefer to retain its name and its place in the legislative branch, and that "more than a century and a half of history cannot be abrogated."

Dr. Mumford reports also on his recommendation for a high-level permanent commission, created by Congress and appointed by the President, to consider the constantly developing and changing library problems of the Nation—whether at the Federal, State, or local level and whether in school, university, or public libraries—if the American library world is to meet the challenges created by the Nation's educational and research needs.

AUTOMATION SURVEY

After several years of study by members of the Library staff, the Library of Congress obtained in 1961 a $100,000 grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., for a survey in depth of the possibilities of automating the information system in the Library of Congress in particular and in research libraries in general. A team of experts engaged shortly before the beginning of fiscal 1962 completed its study after the fiscal year had closed, and a final report is expected in the spring of 1963.

Meanwhile, Dr. Mumford reports on supporting studies and on efforts to share experience with other libraries, and he adds:

> There is good reason to believe that the answer to the basic question—Is automation of the information system in a large research library * * * technically feasible?—will be in the affirmative. But solutions must be found for the whole range of problems involved in the task.

In addition to that survey, the Library also has underway a study of using a small-scale computer in its business operations, which were among the first in the Government to be mechanized.

SPACE PROBLEMS

Long-sought suitable space to provide partial relief for the Library's overcrowded conditions until a third building can be built was at least found late in fiscal 1962; 80,000 square feet of space with adequate weight-bearing capacity for heavy library materials and cardstock will be made available late in 1963 or early in 1964 in the Naval Weapons Plant, for the renovation of which Congress has provided a supplemental appropriation.

Plans for a third Library building were radically altered by the proposal for a Madison Memorial to be built south of the Library and to contain space for Library collections; since such space would provide for only about 24 percent of the Library's projected needs for 25 years but would permit scaling down the size of the third building, plans for a smaller third building were drawn by the Architect of the Capitol in fiscal 1962.

Dr. Mumford also reports on adjustments made within the present two buildings to create usable space, but little or nothing more can be done there. He concludes his introduction to his annual report that "in a third building there is hope."

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM

The first year of the Library's program to acquire foreign research materials under Public Law 480, as amended, was a resounding success in the 3 countries to which the program is limited and for the 22 American libraries that received the publications. From India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic some 400,000 publications were shipped to the Library of Congress and to 21 other research libraries by the close of fiscal 1962, after only a few months of actual operation. The participating libraries are contributing to the cost of operating the program and have also combined to finance cataloging programs for the materials received.

THE COLLECTIONS OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Since a research library must grow if it is to serve its users, and since the National Library must have comprehensive collections, 664,313 items were added to the permanent collections in fiscal 1962. That number—about a quarter of a million fewer than usual—resulted from a highly selective acquisitions program. Simultaneously, surplus and deteriorated materials were "weeded out" where possible, and newspapers which have been microfilmed were removed from the collections. The total collections now number more than 41,879,900 items and include more than 12,534,000 books and pamphlets, 17,989,000 manuscripts, 3,088,000 photographic negatives, prints, and slides, 2,684,000 maps, 2,110,000 volumes and pieces of music, 587,000 fine prints and reproductions, 592,000 volumes in raised type, 481,000 containers of "talking books," 160,000 bound volumes of newspapers, 76,000 reels of microfilmed newspapers, 147,000 other reels and strips of microfilm, 150,000 microprint cards, 53,000 microcards, 68,000 reels of motion pictures, 120,000 phonograph records, and 1,033,000 broadsides, posters, and other materials.

CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION

A major characteristic of a national library is an active program for bringing under control materials for research not only in its own collections but in those of other institutions so that library users may exploit them. The many-faceted efforts of the Library of Congress in this field began more than half a century ago, and the current status of many such projects is discussed in the pages of the annual report.

But the most interesting for fiscal 1962 is a 6-pound, 1,100-page catalog published at no expense to the Government, "The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections." Compiled and produced by the Library of Congress through a grant from the Council on Library Resources, this initial volume represents this country's first success in bringing bibliographic control to the tremendous numbers of manuscripts that are scattered throughout the land in thousands and thousands of collections. At $9.75, it is described by Dr. Mumford as "one of the biggest bargains of the year for research institutions."

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICES

The account of the Library's increased reference services in their many aspects is a formidable story in itself—without regard to the initiation of new services. Among them, in brief, fiscal 1962 saw—

First, a new high in research and reference work for Congress in response to 142,400 inquiries, 99,400 of which were answered by the Legislative Reference Service and 43,000 by the Law Library and the Reference Department—(for the Legislative Reference Service, the 99,400 inquiries represented an 18-percent increase;

Second, the loan of more than 2 million items within the reading rooms and 217,000 on interlibrary loan;

Third, an increase of 12 percent in readers using the national books-for-the-blind program and an 11-percent increase in circulation of such books, to which 562 new titles were added in multiple copies; and

Fourth, an extensive list of publications prepared and issued by the Library to guide scholars to materials on subjects of vital importance to the Nation.

Fiscal 1962 also saw the success of a service initiated by the Library shortly before the year began—a scientific and technical literature-searching service, available to industry on a fee basis. In this same field, there is such a multiplicity of resources for information that the Library in 1962 made plans to set up also, through a grant from the National Science Foundation, a National Referral Center for Science and Technology. This national clearinghouse will identify and keep a record of the proliferating sources of information, wherever located, and will tell inquirers where to go for the answers to their queries in the field of science and technology. This Center became operational on March 4, 1963.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

A brief review of the Library's cultural activities of the last four decades is included in the annual report, in addition to current programs. There is also a report on the Library's program of lending materials for exhibition in this country and abroad, with emphasis on its traveling exhibits of fine prints and on reactions to them.

INCOME-PRODUCING OPERATIONS

For fiscal 1962, Congress appropriated to the Library of Congress $17,193,700. Other funds are available to the Library from gifts, grants, and transfers. Annually, two income-producing operations in the Library return moneys to the U.S. Treasury, and in fiscal 1962 their combined returns to the Treasury represented more than 22 percent of the Library's appropriations for the same period. When the sale of printed catalog cards and technical publications boomed again to a new high in fiscal 1962, the card division deposited in the Treasury a total of $2,792,099 from this service that is so useful to other libraries and scholars. In the Copyright Office, registrations passed the quarter-million mark for the first time in history—254,776—and fees for these and other services brought in $1,043,588.

Other operations of the card division included an experiment to distribute sets of printed cards to wholesale bookdealers and publishers to accompany books purchased by libraries. More than 4,880,000 cards were sold thus. Total cards sold numbered 42,386,314—compared with 35,678,496 the year before.

Among Copyright Office activities were the preparation and publication of a comprehensive "Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law," which summarizes the present law and presents specific recommendations for a new statute. Wide discussion of it has been held and comments collected and analyzed by the Copyright Office.

CHICAGO OUTLOOK FORUM SUPPORTS CONSUMER TAX CUT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the light of the popular view that the financial community almost unanimously believes that the emphasis of a tax reduction should be on stimulating investment and not consumer demand, I should like to insert into the RECORD a clipping from the March 7 issue of the Journal of Commerce indicating an opposite opinion expressed by four prominent Chicago bankers.

At the monthly outlook forum sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Mr. Tilford Gaines, vice president, First National Bank of Chicago; Mr. Arnold C. Schumacher, vice president, Chicago Title and Trust Co.; and Mr. Herbert E. Neil, Jr., econcmist, Harris Trust & Savings Bank, all agreed that a tax cut should be aimed at stimulating consumer spending rather than corporate investment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 7, 1963, edition of the Journal of Commerce, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMISTS CONTEND CONSUMER SPENDING SEEN GOAL OF TAX CUT

(By Murray Harding)

CHICAGO, March 6.—A tax cut should be aimed at stimulating consumer spending rather than corporate investment, agreed three economists at the monthly economic outlook forum sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

A fourth pointed out that investment had been strongly prodded already by the 7-percent investment tax credit and new depreciation guidelines established last year.

FAVOR SHOT IN ARM

Favoring a shot in the arm for consumer spending was Tilford Gaines, vice president, First National Bank of Chicago; Arnold C. Schumacher, vice president, Chicago Title & Trust Co.; and Herbert E. Neil, Jr., economist, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

The increase in capital spending by businesses in 1963, put at 3 percent by a McGraw Hill survey, had been somewhat underestimated, declared George Cloos, senior economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. The increase was 9 percent in 1962, and he predicted it would be in the same range this year despite a stuttering start caused partly by the dock strike.

A 12-percent decline had been forecast for railroad spending in the survey but more recent soundings indicated a 20-percent increase, he noted. Similarly, steel, petroleum, and auto company spending were all running ahead of the McGraw Hill estimate.

The tax credit and depreciation guidelines had a more invigorating effect than anticipated, he said. The Treasury thought that less than half the $4.7 billion added depreciation would be, resulting in a revenue loss to the Government of only a little more than $1 billion.

Actually, said Mr. Cloos, businesses were likely to take the full amount possible for 1962, and the total might run higher than the Treasury figured it could. Deferral made no particular sense, he explained, since money taken down was worth more now than in the future, even disregarding inflation, because of the interest it could earn.

If fully utilized, the credit and depreciation revisions would have the same effect as a cut in the corporate tax rate from 52 percent to 45 percent; either would cost the Treasury about $3.5 billion of the $50 billion annual corporate tax bill, he said.

RECORD SIGHTED

Using the Treasury's estimates of possible tax savings and projecting a modest increase in profits this year, Mr. Cloos said that corporate cash generation could approach a record $40 billion. He defines cash generation as the amount a company has left after taxes and pays out for dividends and depreciation reserve. The existing mark of $35 billion was set last year; the highest figure prior to 1960 was $31 billion.

Many firms, increasingly confident about the outlook, have indicated the extra cash will be used for added capital spending, he said.

Mr. Cloos took no position on how a tax cut should be oriented, but argued that no matter which was stimulated, consumer spending or capital investment, the other would be favorably affected.

"They work on each other and I think both will be higher in 1963," he said.

"The No. 1 problem is reaching a level of reasonably full employment," said Mr. Gaines, "A tax reduction directed at increasing the national growth rate though greater capital investment could have the effect of stimulating growth at a given level of underemployment."

It was not true, he stressed, that faster economic growth would automatically increase employment, nor that employment could not be expanded without an increased rate of economic growth.

Confusion arose because of the aggregate indexes, like gross national product, used to measure growth, he said. Productivity should be rated by the labor input per unit of output, and manufacturing productivity, which theoretically would be stimulated most by added investment, was already the fastest growing segment of the economy.

Over the last 5 years, production of goods had increased 17 percent while manufacturing employment was cut back 2½ percent. In the same span, consumer spending for goods had tailed off.

SHIFT IN EMPLOYMENT

He noted that employment was shifting from industrial to service industries, like utilities, transportation, communication and financial institutions, where the rate of growth was slower, and suggested this might be the reason the economy appeared to be marking time.

Mr. Schumacher remarked that the stimulator effect of service industries, long a "stepchild" to economists, was underestimated. They were buyers of equipment products, as well as increasingly substantial employers.

"We have moved through a capital goods cycle and are beyond it now," he declared. Rather than investment incentives, "we need stimulation of middle income consumers."

Mr. Neil agreed with Mr. Gaines that a tax cut should be used to spur consumer buying in an effort "to push the economy back up to full utilization."

HOW TO CONSPIRE TO FIX PRICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How To Conspire To Fix Prices," which is a reprint from the Harvard Business Review of March–April 1963.

This article is a humorous reflection in an ironic tone on the lessons to be learned from the now famous price-fixing cases in the electrical equipment industry. Although written with considerable humor, it describes realistically the modern-day price-fixing conspiracies which were so typified by the electrical price-fixing cases. It indicates not only the folly of such conspiracies under the law but also when considered from the

viewpoint of the businessman without regard for the law. I believe it will be informative and interesting reading on the subject of price fixing in violation of our antitrust laws.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How To Conspire To Fix Prices

(By John Q. Lawyer)

(Editor's Note.—It has been a firm policy of Harvard Business Review to identify authors of all articles and letters, but in this instance we are making an exception, and calling attention to it by the use of a name that is obviously a pseudonym. We do so in the belief that because of the author's involvement as an attorney in a number of pending cases, the use of his actual name might be both unethical and prejudicial.)

Now that the smoke has lifted from the price-fixing conspiracy rubble of the electrical-equipment industry, boardrooms across the Nation will be submerged in pipe-sucking reflection on the lessons to be learned from it. Surely a most striking aspect of this antitrust fiasco is that so many capable executives could make such a botch of the relatively simple job of running a tidy conspiracy. Many basic rules of successful conspiring were sadly neglected.

GETTING STARTED

The fundamental rule of conspiring is:

Rule 1: Do not overlook the fact that the purpose of a price-fixing conspiracy is to make more money than you would have made if you had not conspired in the first place.

A most disturbing aspect of the electrical-equipment debacle was that several conspirators simply did not believe that they (and their companies) could make more money fixing prices than competing. As one $100,000-per-year executive explained it:

"These conspiracies had been going on for decades. [Actually, they apparently date back to the old 60–40 agreement between General Electric and Westinghouse, made in 1896.] They were virtually an industry tradition. I was convinced that I could make a hell of a lot more money without going to the meetings. By getting my sales up, I could cut costs so low that I would clean the board. But suppose this didn't work out. Suppose there was a recession or something which I couldn't possibly foresee. If things went badly for my division, everyone would say that I had refused to be reasonable, that I had been the cause of the fall in prices and profits—and I would get it in the neck.

"But, if I played along and did what my predecessors had been doing for years and profits went dry, I would get sympathy instead of condemnation. Everyone would say that I was doing my best in a depressed market—and my job would not be jeopardized.

"I couldn't afford to take the chance of not going to the meetings and playing the game."

This kind of thinking is what game theorists lovingly refer to as "playing the minimax solution." By this they mean making the best of a bad situation. What the corporate strategist does not do is try to make the biggest profits possible for his company and win the biggest incentive bonus for himself. Rather, he seeks to maximize the chance of not losing.

This is, of course, sound strategy. But it is not sound conspiracy. While a minimax player remains in good stead with top management in the short run, he is likely to end up in jail in the long run; and that is not good for anyone's job rating.

From the company's point of view, such a situation is bad business. If bigger profits can be made by competing than by conspiring, it behooves top management to stamp out the meetings. Conspirators may be reluctant to give them up. They have to worry not only about profits, but also about keeping their jobs. Getting the message across to them will be a tough job. But tough as it may be, top management's next rule of successful conspiring is clear:

Rule 2: Don't wink at a conspiracy unless it is a moneymaking proposition.

This sounds obvious, but it is not. Figuring out whether a conspiracy will be profitable is a tricky business. Too often, top management is guilty of accepting tradition without question. Therefore, its first operating rule should be:

Operating rule 2a: Get your economists and market analysts busy. Do not continue a profitless conspiracy. And, if you are not now conspiring, do not overlook this potentially profitable marketing technique.

An effective conspiracy permits a group of corporations to set their collective price just as though they were one company, i.e., a monopoly. If, however, you are already top dog in your industry by virtue of your lower costs and if your greater efficiency makes it possible for you to squeeze out of the market any competitor you want, then think twice before conspiring. By going along with your less efficient coconspirators, you may be siphoning off to them some of your profit potential.

But if you are one of the high-cost companies in the industry, beware. The more efficient companies may discover their mistake after the conspiracy is under way and then stab you in the back. The general rule is:

General rule 2b: Price-fixing works best where no one conspirator has a substantial cost advantage over his coconspirators.

Suppose that you and your market analysis team have thought it through carefully and are convinced that price conspiracy is what your profit picture calls for. You are, however, faced with a reluctant competitor. How can you persuade him to join? (If it happens that the reluctant dragon is also much more efficient than you are, you will need some sure tool for keeping him in line, once you get the conspiracy rolling. The mere threat on your part to "cop out" is not enough. Such a threat is a two-edged sword.) There is an answer to this problem:

Rule 3: Threaten a reluctant conspirator with antitrust action in order to bring him into the fold.

This basic rule seems anomalous. But it is not, as these cases show:

Case 1: If the doubting Thomas already has 61 percent of the market, your job is easy. Say to him, in an offhand way (preferably in an informal atmosphere, such as the country club or a hospitality room): "Tom, I notice you already have 61 percent of the market. If you get much bigger, you'll have Loevinger on your back."

This should do the trick. But if it does not, see that Tom's company does get bigger. Suppose you usually get 9 percent of the market. For the next couple of months, make it a point to let Tom get all the business you usually get. That will give him 70 percent of the market and will surely attract the attention of the Antitrust Division, particularly if accompanied by a well-timed news item or poison-pen letter. While a costly gambit, if your economists have done their job, you will know to the penny whether it is worth it.

An attractive feature of this approach is that you can do it all by yourself even if you are a relatively small part of the industry. Of course, if you can get your fellow would-be conspirators to help out, a faster, better job can be done with less cost to you personally.

Case 2: Suppose, however, Tom does not have 61 percent of the market. He only has 33 percent of the market which, as is well known, "is not enough."[1] If Tom is, in fact, much more efficient than any of his competitors but, being canny about antitrust, prefers to let sleeping dogs lie and not drive them all out of business, you still have the problem licked. Simply say (under the same circumstances as in case 1): "Tom, you old deceiver [smile] you are too much for me and the rest of the fellows. We can't compete with those low costs of yours." Then, proceed not to for a couple of months.

The only additional difficulty you will encounter in case 2 is that it will take more than one would-be conspirator to get Tom's market share up to 70 percent.

Case 3: The real test comes when Tom's company is just as (or more) inefficient as every other company in the industry and when he accounts for only a small part of the market. This is a relatively unlikely situation because, odds on, under such circumstances Tom will want in as badly as you do.

If Tom is too stubborn to see reason, you will simply have to bluff it through in the manner described in cases 1 and 2 and hope for the best. If he is really hopelessly inefficient, you may want to consider the possibility of driving him out of business as quietly as possible. This latter course is not without risks.

ALTERNATIVES TO CONSIDER

Even though you have decided that it would be profitable to give up competing, it does not logically follow that you must conspire. Other, less exotic, avenues of noncompetition should first be explored:

Rule 4: Before conspiring, be sure that follow-the-leaderism and conscious parallelism are not in the cards. They are much less dangerous and work every bit as well.

Follow-the-leaderism is a terrific way of not competing. It works especially well when your industry makes a large variety of shelf items. And it has the enormous advantage of not being illegal—at least, not very.

Further, it is very economical. It involves no traveling expenses. All companies (except one) can give up printing price books. The larger the number of items and the more frequent price changes, the bigger the savings on this important item.

Annoying details of covering your tracks are eliminated. You simply announce (publicly) that from now on you will follow Amalgamated's prices; throw away your salesmen's out-of-date pricebooks and you are ready to begin not competing. There is no risk of suspicion or mistrust between you and your fellow noncompetitors because nobody is trusting anybody.

An appealing feature of follow-the-leaderism is the delightful incantation which goes along with it:

Incantation rule 4a: A successful leader-follower constantly repeats the incantation, "A like price is a competitive price, a like price is a competitive price, a like price is * * *."

Anyone with a modicum of economic sophistication knows that there is only one price in a perfectly competitive market. (Of course, this is also true in a perfect monopoly, and probably true in a perfect oligopoly. Further, it is probably correct that no such thing exists as "perfect competition," "perfect monopoly," or "perfect oligopoly." But these sorts of hypersophisticated statements rarely get stated.) A neat variation on this theme is to argue as follows:

"An equal price is a competitive price. If the prices of various sellers on a given product are different, the purchaser has no choice. He must buy from the lowest price seller—or risk looking like a nut. But if the prices are the same, the purchaser can shop around and buy from whomever he wishes. His consumer's sovereignty is restored."

---

[1] See *United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America,* 148 F. 2d 416, 424 (2d Cir. 1945)

Once follow-the-leaderism is firmly entrenched in your industry, worries about cutthroat competition and being priced out of the market are ended. One cannot ask more than this, even from a conspiracy.

A really important advantage of follow-the-leaderism is that it permits the leader to set his prices as if he is the only seller, i.e., a monopolist. This is so because he knows that only one price will prevail in the market—the one that he sets. This is a good break for him, and he undoubtedly will be gratified about the situation even if he had no part in its creation. And since your prices will be the same as his, his monopoly advantages will rub off on you.

The mood of cooperation which follow-the-leaderism creates has much to recommend it. By escaping the nagging irritations of having to set your own prices, by avoiding worry about being undercut, and so forth, you free yourself to devote your management talents to industrial statesmanship. This, in turn, will give a resounding boost to your corporate image.

The only drawback with follow-the-leaderism is that if you quit following, the leader may decide to take you to task for destroying the industry's spirit of cooperation. But you run this risk with other pricing policies, too, so you have not lost anything by trying:

Operating rule 4b: Conscious parallelism may be illegal, but it is certainly not as illegal as conspiring. Moreover, it is hard to prove.

Conscious parallelism is legally elusive for two reasons: (1) No lawyer is exactly certain what it is; (2) lawyers seem to have great difficulty distinguishing it from cutthroat competition.

These factors pose no deterrence for the businessman. For him, effective conscious parallelism is simply a matter of:

Operating subrule 4b(1): Get to know your competitors.

Operating subrule 4b(2): Develop effective lines of interfirm communication.

Getting to know your competitors is as easy as it is pleasant. Go to conventions, trade association meetings, business seminars, and other get-togethers. Buy drinks for your competitors, play golf and bridge with them, meet their wives and families. In time you will develop the bedrock understanding of your competitors' psychology on which successful conscious parallelism is based. You will find that you can put your feet upon your desk and know exactly what "Old George" over at Amalgamated is thinking—often before "Old George" thinks it.

This specialized aptitude is not only useful for escaping the rigors of cutthroatism, which often results from inaccurately gaging what competitors will do, but can also be helpfully combined with follow-the-leaderism to avoid costly miscalculations, particularly in situations of fluctuating price or demand conditions. In addition, if you decide you must conspire, your predictive talents will be an effective bulwark against misunderstanding, which is the nemesis of a successful conspiracy.

Not enough attention has been given to one ingenious interfirm communications channel—a reliable, time-tested aid to not competing:

Operating sub-subrule 4b(2a). Get in the habit of announcing policy and price changes in the press.

The ability to second-guess your fellow parallelers is all very well. But there can be no slipups if you all read about changes in policy or prices in the newspapers before they happen. Do not keep the industry (and the Nation) in the dark. To do so invites unnecessary confusion and distrust. If the industry knows the exact amount of any planned price change, it will have no difficulty in meeting it to the penny. The risk of one or more parallelers inadvertently setting a price below or above their coparallelers and the embarrassing scramble to get back in line are avoided.

But a word of warning is in order. Only announce planned changes. Public announcement of a fait accompli may have disastrous side effects.

TIDY PROCEDURE

An executive should now be in a position to make a well-informed decision as to whether a price-fixing conspiracy is for him. If the answer is "Yes," the following rules must be adhered to scrupulously:

Rule 5: Do not have more active conspirators than necessary; do not have working-level meetings if not absolutely necessary; and do not include personnel any farther down the hierarchical ladder than is 100 percent necessary.

This rule would seem to go without saying. Yet, astonishingly, it was repeatedly violated in the electrical conspiracies. For example, without intending anything personal, to have an assistant department sales manager attending meetings in a multibillion-dollar conspiracy is preposterous. Hence:

Rule 6: Do not take notes; do not leave papers, work sheets, scratch pads, and the like lying around in hotel rooms and other meeting places; do not register under your real name; do not travel with your coconspirators in public transportation to or from meetings; do not make conspiratorial telephone calls from your office (particularly if your efficient secretary keeps a log); in other words, do not keep records of any kind.

The men in the electrical conspiracies did a little better here than on rule 5, but not well enough. Discipline fell apart particularly badly in the written-records and the registering-under-real-names departments. Admittedly, a modern executive has an almost paranoiac desire to get things in writing. But the desire must be resisted. If you feel yourself weakening, bear in mind:

Operating rule 6a: If it cannot be done without writing it down, do not do it.

Operating rule 6b: If you feel you must have something in writing, you are temperamentally unsuited to conspiring.

The most common problem encountered by otherwise competent executives is that using aliases, burning scratch pads, and the like gives them what one described as "a sort of Harry Bridges feeling." This feeling is psychologically repellent to some managers. However, experience has shown that such repulsion can be overcome. Indeed, deeper within the psychological makeup of most executives is a secret enjoyment and appreciation of counterespionage techniques. Hence:

Operating rule 6c: Learn to take pride in a scratch pad well burned or an alias well rendered.

By so doing, bonus psychic rewards will be reaped from a properly managed conspiracy. Accordingly:

Rule 7: Do not meet in hotel rooms if you can avoid doing so.

This rule is difficult to explain rationally. The fact is that Department of Justice and congressional committee investigators are particularly fond of sniffing around hotels. And, though it repels the modern mind, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that hotel rooms are jinxed—at least insofar as price-fixing conspiracies are concerned. And:

Rule 8: Avoid complicated schemes.

Nothing titillates the curiosity of a Federal investigator more than a complicated scheme such as "phase of the moon." He responds like a jigsaw puzzle addict with a 10,000 interlocking-piece picture of the Bay of Biscayne on a rainy Sunday afternoon. Simple agreements such as, "You take 50 percent of the market, George, and I'll take 25 percent," are more prosaic—but every bit as effective, if not more so. And they are much less exciting to would-be trustbusters.

So much for the "thou shalt nots." What about the affirmative techniques of efficient price fixing, which are much more stimulating for the conspirophile? This brings us to:

Rule 9: Have some reason for meeting besides fixing prices.

It does not matter what the reason is. A convention, vacation, golf, meal, drinks—all are fine. As one conspirator explained it, "I don't know what the devil lawyers talk about after dinner, but businessmen talk about business, and business means prices." This has a strong ring of plausibility. You can hardly send a man to jail for discussing prices over a cup of coffee. Therefore:

Rule 10: Gripe a lot, especially about prices.

Successful price fixers invariably sandwich into their business day endless hours of griping about depressed prices, rising labor costs, and so forth. An expert conspirator can disguise a complicated agreement so thoroughly that it is indistinguishable from a grumbling complaint.

Mastery of the griping technique leads the aspiring conspirator naturally and easily to two grand rules:

Rule 11: Develop a jargon.

Rule 12: Send up "trial balloons."

These two rules, taken in tandem, form the ultimate in sophisticated conspiring. They are perhaps best illustrated by an example: Imagine a meeting. A 3-hour presentation by the group's economist of charts, bar graphs, and economic analysis has just been completed. (Nothing blurs tracks like 3 hours of economic analysis.) Conversation ensues:

"George Leader. 'Fellows, we must do something about prices. They're really bad.'

"Chorus. 'Old George has something there, all right; damned if they aren't. It's all Hoffa's fault.'

"George Leader. 'If we could get prices up a little bit, say 2.79 cents per pound, I think we could hold the line.' ['Holding the line' is a favorite phrase of almost all successful conspirators. It is classic, artful, price-fixing jargon.]

"Chorus. 'Yes, yes, we must hold the line. Damned if Old George hasn't got something there. Sure would be grand if we could get prices up 2.79 cents per pound.'

"George Leader. 'If someone would send up a trial balloon [rule 12], I'm sure everyone would follow.'

"Chorus. 'That's right; if only someone would run it up the flagpole, everyone would salute.'

"George Leader. 'Boys, I'm sure that someone is bound to run it up the flagpole in the next 11 or 13 days—or so.' [At this point, George fixes Frank Follower with a menacing stare.]

"Frank Follower. 'I certainly wouldn't be surprised [warm smile] if someone did just that in the next 11 to 13 days—or so.' [The meeting breaks up with cheering and huzzahs as everyone drains his drink and departs.]"

This type of meeting is price-fixing at its very best and its moral is clear:

Rule 13: Remember that the line between overt price collusion and mere discussion of a common problem is fine indeed.

When the conspiracy is functioning smoothly, it is time to think about maximizing efficiency. Bearing in mind that the reason the conspiracy was organized in the first place was to make more profits (rule 1), you will find that these questions must sooner or later arise: How much profit will our conspiracy make for us? Who will get what share?

The answer to the first is simple. It will depend on the skill of the group in setting its pricing policy. The fact that the conspirators are in a position to price as though they were one company leads to the next maxim:

Rule 14: It is advisable to have at least one member in the conspiracy who has monopoly experience.

Conspiracies most often fail before they are started. Of those which are launched, the most common cause of failure is dissension amongst the conspirators over the question of who gets how much of the swag. This leads us to a key rule:

Rule 15: Do not be greedy.

Typically, difficulties occur when one conspirator feels that another is getting "more than his share." But it does not matter how much more you get if you are better off than you would have been had you not conspired. To conspire harmoniously:

Operating rule 15a: The share of each individual conspirator relative to the shares of any or all of his coconspirators must be, by mutual consent, treated as irrelevant.

If this rule is not followed, bickering, hostility, and ultimate collapse of the conspiracy will result. Accordingly, the following philosophy should be uniformly pursued by all conspirators, to the exclusion of any other philosophy:

Operating rule 15b. If you are getting more than you would have gotten, stay in; if you are not, get out.

So much for sharing the spoils. Another common source of quibbling in otherwise effective conspiracies is the question of who will get which bid. This aggravating problem of musical chairs has been the downfall of many excellent conspiracies.

A highly efficient answer, sometimes known as the "Fellner solution," is recommended. It can be stated as follows:

Optional rule 16: Do not overlook the possibility of dividing up sales revenues at the end of a prearranged conspiracy accounting period, irrespective of who actually made the sales.

Here is how this method works: During a conspiracy accounting period, say, 3 months, make a rough attempt to keep to the prearranged market shares of each conspirator in the allocation of bids. But do not worry if the market shares and the bids actually obtained get slightly out of line. At the end of the 3-month period, have an accounting with conspirators who have exceeded their market share—paying rebates to those who have not.

Strict adherence to the Fellner solution will eliminate a great deal of intraconspiracy tension. It has, unfortunately, one modest drawback: it poses some tricky difficulties for each conspiring company's accounting department. These are, however, largely a matter of aesthetics. Experience with the Fellner solution suggests that, in fact, such a challenge brings out the artist in most accountants. Any accountant worth his salt will find pleasure and satisfaction in untangling the rebates, and then carefully retangling them in his T-accounts and profit and loss statement.

A good optional course to follow is:

Operating optional rule 16a: Have at least one member in the conspiracy who has accounting experience.

Another obstacle commonly encountered is the competitor who, through unenlightenment, inadvertence, or plain unpleasantness refuses to conspire. In such a case, stern measures are required:

Rule 17: Have an adequate contingency fund for educating (or eliminating) mavericks.

Many avenues for effective employment of the conspiracy contingency fund—to which all members have contributed on a pro rata basis—are available. Most commonly, such funds are used to subsidize the member who is forced to compete with the maverick. Another popular tactic is to elect one member to compete with the maverick, giving him appropriate subsidization from the contingency fund. Designation may also be done in a kind of Russian roulette style, rotating member by member as each bid arises, with the understanding that when the maverick strikes, the member with that bid number will do the job of breaking him in—or just breaking him. But do not forget:

Important operating rule 17a: Avoid giving the appearance of selling below cost. It antagonizes the Federal Trade Commission.

What are the proper areas for price conspiracy? Philosophically speaking, it is inescapably true that:

Philosophical rule 18: Conspiracies work best on shelf items, but are least necessary. They work worst on special-order items, but are most needed in these areas.

As one frustrated conspirator put it, referring to the electrical fracas, "It's damned hard to conspire about a $17 million turbogenerator. It's a lot easier when you are selling watt-hour meters or something like that." Why is this so? First, price books are not generally available for items made to specification. When they are, they are not reliable. Secondly, follow-the-leaderism and conscious parallelism are easily created for stock items and can be effectively combined with a well-organized conspiracy. Thirdly, the artful conspiratorial techniques that are outlined in rules 10 to 12 are not readily applicable to specially designed products. More specificity is needed.

The slightest change from standard "specs" clogs the wheels of conspiracy. It forces conspirators to wrestle with bidding problems in great detail. This, in turn, leads to more meetings, more scratch pads, more notes, and more telephone calls (violating rule 6). It necessitates more conspirators, some of whom may have to be drawn from the lower operating levels of the member companies (violating rule 5). It may even require "working meetings," and this is absolutely incompatible with a smoothly functioning conspiracy. Perhaps worst of all, it opens up myriad opportunities for bickering, dickering, and nit-picking.

I have no ready answer to this problem. American industry appears inescapably skewered on the horns of a dilemma. Caution should be the watchword of would-be conspirators selling special-order items. Hence:

Operating rule 18a: If you sell special-order items, do not allow your enthusiasm to conspire to get out of hand.

PROBLEM OF APPREHENSION

The possibility of apprehension is, of course, an important element in the decisional thinking of conspirators and would-be conspirators. The rational conspirator not only weighs this possibility in his initial decision to enter a conspiracy, but engages in a a continuous process of reevaluation during the conspiracy's duration. A reliable rule to observe is:

Rule 19: When the heat is on, get out.

Extensively applied in both economic and noneconomic conspiracies, rule 19 has stood the test of time. A conspirator cannot find a more reliable benchmark.

Rules 5 through 12, as well as operating rules 6a and 6b—if scrupulously observed—have a salutory impact on the apprehension potential of a conspiracy. Another rule, frequently recommended by old-school conspirators, is that solid citizens are less likely to end up in the jug than unsolid citizens. This has not proved reliable in recent years. The better rule now appears to be:

Rule 20: Do not worry about being a good citizen and a respected member of the community. It will not help you.

Certain Members of Congress and of the administration are notorious for the dim view with which they regard identical prices. They are joined by an uncomfortably large majority of economists in the belief that "strict price uniformity outside the organized exchanges is * * * conclusive proof of collusion in a world like ours where supply and demand are constantly changing."[2] This situation has led to a popular rule among conspirators, to wit: Steer clear of identical prices at all costs.

In the above-quoted standard text, "The Theory of Price," George J. Stigler advises that "the best policy of concealment for collusive oligopolists at the present time is to purchase a table of random numbers and quote agreed prices subject to a small random addition or subtraction."[3]

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice attorneys' dogged refusal to be deceived by "phase of the moon" conspiring techniques suggests that they, too, have discovered Stigler's sound advice. Another better rule is, therefore, apparent:

Rule 21: Do not worry about avoiding identity of price. This will not solve your problem.

There are, no doubt, many useful and original rules for conspiring which have not been discussed here. It is only commonsense that a would-be conspirator should:

Rule 22: Get the advice of an experienced conspirator.

CONCLUSION

Sooner or later, however, after all the expert conspirators have been consulted, the neophyte will have to make up his own mind. To conspire or not to conspire; that is the question.

The rules outlined above, if scrupulously followed, will make this an easy decision. For the mathematically inclined, would-be conspirator, the following, more precise formulation would be a useful guideline:

$$r_c > c_o^f + c_o^p + a \cdot c_a^f + a \cdot c_a^p$$

This rule states that a price-fixing conspiracy should be entered when (and only when) the returns from conspiring (r_c) exceed the operating costs to the firm of conspiring (c_o^f), plus the personal operating costs to the conspirator (c_o^p), plus the anticipated costs to the firm of apprehension (c_a^f), discounted by a factor reflecting the likelihood of apprehension (a), plus the personal apprehension costs to the conspirator (c_a^p), similarly discounted.

In using this handy formula, beware of negative personal apprehension costs ($-c_a^p$). One case dramatically illustrates this problem:

Prior to his apprehension in the electrical industry cases, a middle-management executive was earning a salary of $47,000 per year and commuted to work each morning in 30 minutes. When apprehended, he was dismissed from this seemingly lucrative position, but fortunately was able to secure new employment. His salary is now $70,000 per year, and he commutes to work in 20 minutes.

However, the wealth of data made available to students of conspiracy by the electrical-equipment cases strongly suggests that such negative apprehension costs are the exception rather than the rule. It seems appropriate, therefore, to conclude with a moral:

Moral: Even price fixers who do not get caught may not benefit by conspiring.

TAX REDUCTION PROGRAM DESCRIBED IN UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE TO CHICAGO AUDIENCE BY ASSISTANT TREASURY SECRETARY SURREY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 18, 1963, Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, spoke before the Union League Club of Chicago on the proposed tax cut.

---

[2] George J. Stigler, "The Theory of Price" (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1952), p. 240.

[3] Ibid., p. 240.

Mr. Surrey brought out some pertinent and interesting facts in his remarks which I think are worthy of the attention of the Members of this body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE STANLEY S. SURREY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 18, 1963

Today, after 25 months of recovery from the last recession, although gross national product, personal income, and retail sales are at record levels, our economy is still operating far below where it could be—and moving at a rate of growth that will leave us far short of where we could be in the years ahead.

The gap between our economic accomplishment and our economic potential has persisted for 5 years. That gap at present represents $30 to $40 billion in total output, $18 to $20 billion in wages and salaries, and $7 to $8 billion in business profits. It is also reflected in an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and our persistent large budget deficits, which have totaled $30 billion in the last 6 fiscal years.

Our failure to move ahead more rapidly leaves our economy all the more vulnerable to the damaging effects of another recession. The best way to avoid a recession or to moderate its effects is to make a sustained effort to accelerate growth—which will increase employment, output, income, business profits, and tax revenues.

To do nothing at this time would be to gamble with our economic security and with our hope for a better tomorrow. I believe nearly all of us recognize this, and that there is a general consensus today on the need to accelerate our economic growth. The consensus goes even further. It has become increasingly clear that a major contributing factor to our inability to achieve greater economic activity lies in our tax system.

For our high tax rates—forged in the necessity of war and maintained during the inflationary period of high postwar demand—have in recent years become a major deterrent to economic expansion. Their role, with the changing character of our economy, has shifted from that of holding down inflation to one of holding down growth.

These high rates operate to repress economic activity, with the result that tax revenues are reduced. The recent persistent large budget deficits reflect the inability of a lagging economy to produce enough tax revenue to meet the demands of national security, space exploration, and an expanding population.

Our repressive tax rates simply soak up too many dollars that would otherwise increase consumer spending, or finance new business investment, or provide added incentives to both individuals and businesses to produce more, earn more, and invest more. High tax rates are serious restraints on private incentives, and they unduly reduce the profitability of private enterprise. By weakening consumer demand they sap one of the strongest forces influencing business investment—the prospect of profit through expanding markets.

Here also, therefore, the discussion of recent weeks has shown a remarkable consensus—that income taxes must be reduced. But there are some who believe this reduction should wait until Federal expenditures are greatly reduced.

Some believe a cutback of at least $4 to $5 billion is required—such as would be involved in holding total expenditures at the 1963 level—while others believe far greater cuts should be made before we can proceed with tax reduction. But imposing such rigid conditions on tax reduction is far more likely to make tax reduction impossible or to substantially reduce the benefits of a tax cut to the economy. We must not let the agreement we have finally achieved for revision of our tax structure be destroyed by an unwillingness to be realistic about our present expenditures.

This administration has already shown that it recognizes the need to hold expenditures down. This year, with the exception of space, defense, and interest costs, President Kennedy's 1964 budget actually shows a reduction in total expenditures. This was achieved despite the fact that over the past 9 years this sector of the budget has increased by an average of 7.5 percent a year.

The many billions that would have to be cut from the budget to achieve the large absolute expenditure reductions that some would require as a condition to tax reduction must presumably come at least in part from defense and space programs. Our country's defense requirements and its place in the frontier of space exploration simply do not permit large reductions in these areas.

Apart from the damage to vital programs that would result from large expenditure cuts, a sharp cutback in Government spending could well result in an economic downturn which would shortly reduce revenues to the point where deficits might actually increase.

A sensible program of expenditure control—not rigid or impossible conditions of large expenditure reductions—will permit us to proceed with the tax revision we all agree is needed. But no one should believe that this course means a resignation to continued deficits.

The best way to balance the budget is first to balance the economy. This requires significant tax rate reduction that will add to incentives to work and invest, to purchasing power, and to the flow of investment funds. The increased economic activity generated by such a rate reduction will, within a few years, even at the new lower tax rates, bring in more tax revenue than we would have had otherwise. Thus the renewed vitality in the private sector, fed by new investment, new demand, and new incentives, would provide increasing tax revenue which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget. The entire increase in revenues which we foresee as a benefit of tax reduction will not be spent by Government. A portion of it will be used to reduce the deficit. President Kennedy made that clear in his budget message when he stated:

"As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit. Although it will be necessary to increase certain expenditures, we shall continue, and indeed intensify our effort to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs."

The point I want to make is that you can work toward balancing the budget far more effectively, far more constructively, far more safely, by means of a responsible, balanced tax program combined with firm and rational expenditure control than you can by attempting massive and immediate spending cuts.

The first course demonstrates faith in the latent vitality of our free market economy. It indicates a belief that our economy can move ahead, wipe out the temporary additional deficit from the tax cuts, and through an accelerated rate of economic growth move on toward full employment and a balanced budget. The other course could, if put into effect in the current economic climate, produce results of the kind its supporters most want to avoid.

It is clear, then, that our country is not moving ahead as fast as it can and must. It is clear that the restraints of the income tax structure are a major cause of our economic lag and that revision of the tax structure is therefore an imperative task. There is also increasing recognition that despite our present deficit the path to a balanced budget is through a tax reduction in a climate of expenditure control. The final, hard step remains—to reach agreement on the details of the tax revision. This revision must provide maximum benefit to the economy at a minimum of budgetary cost, and do so in a manner that is fair to all taxpayers. The tax program the President has proposed fully meets these requirements.

The chief revision in the President's program—its No. 1 reform—is a very large reduction in the rates of the income tax. The individual rate scale at the completion of the program would be reduced from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a lower range of from 14 to 65 percent—with rates throughout the scale 20 to 30 percent lower than today. The corporate normal tax rate would be 22 percent for the first $25,000 of profit—27 percent less than the present 30-percent rate. This is the only rate that concerns 80 percent of our corporations. The maximum corporate rate would drop from 52 to 47 percent.

These are sweeping rate changes that significantly pull down the rates of tax. An individual concerned with his marginal rate of tax—what will the Government take as its share of the added dollar he earns through a risky investment or increased personal effort—will find the Government taking 20 to 30 percent less than it does today. On the corporate side, after-tax profitability on new investment under the combination of the 1962 program, with its investment tax credit and depreciation reform, and the proposed rate reduction, is increased by almost 30 percent.

The cost of the rate reductions in the President's program comes to $13.7 billion—over $11 billion for individuals and over $2.6 billion for corporations. Yet this much revenue must be involved if the rate reductions are to be as significant and effective as the President has recommended. Anything less simply means a lesser rate reduction. Thus, a rate reduction involving, say, $7.5 billion for individuals is, of course, a rate reduction—but will not yield a rate scale from 14 to 65 percent. Somewhere in that scale—at the bottom, at the top, in the middle, or all along—the rates will have to be significantly higher than those proposed by the President. The barriers to private incentives and higher demand simply would not come down as far as the President has recommended.

The President has, in addition, recommended several reforms—all of which involve a revenue cost—to alleviate certain hardships under the tax structure which rate reduction alone cannot eliminate. One reform creates a minimum standard deduction to help low-income families, particularly those with many dependents. This proposal for a minimum standard deduction achieves the effect of an increase in personal exemptions, strongly urged by many in our society, at a revenue cost of only $310 million, by focusing that loss directly in the area of hardship. Another reform would benefit and treat more fairly taxpayers over 65, particularly those who are still working. Other changes would benefit taxpayers whose employment requires them to move to a new community, taxpayers who must provide care for their children in order to work, and people whose incomes fluctuate sharply from year to year. One reform, designed to promote civilian research and technology, benefits business directly by providing for the immediate writeoff of equipment used in research and development. Surely the need for these changes is evident.

The rate reductions, plus these structural reforms or changes, involve a revenue cost of nearly $14.5 billion. Together, they represent a program of significant and effective rate reduction complemented by relief of obvious tax hardships and a needed incentive to civilian technology and increased productivity. Programs which involve a lesser revenue cost than $14.5 billion for these purposes must mean less significant rate reductions and the elimination of some or all of the hardship-relieving and growth-inducing reforms. They must involve less incentive to private initiative and activity. In terms, therefore, of rate reduction and incentive, in terms of hardship relief and increased growth, they are "second-best" programs. They cannot, of necessity, be as effective as the program proposed by President Kennedy.

But $14.5 billion is a large revenue cost. Our Federal budget is in a deficit position, brought on by necessary increases in defense, space and public debt interest expenditures and by a failure of the economy to operate at full potential—the very failure the tax program is designed to meet. Firm Presidential expenditure control—which has even lowered remaining budget expenditures from the 1963 level—has kept the budget deficit to $9.2 billion, apart from the tax program. Under these conditions the most appropriate course is to seek an overall tax program that permits us to achieve in a fiscally responsible way the full rate reduction and hardship relief afforded by the $14.5 billion figure—rather than to seek a "second best" rate reduction or to incur a greater increase in the deficit than is required.

The tax program permits the accomplishment of the benefits of the $14.5 billion proposals in a fiscally responsible way through two measures: One, it spaces the rate reductions in three steps, starting in 1963 and ending January 1, 1965, and two, it obtains through other structural changes and reforms, which would commence in 1964, $4.1 billion in direct revenue gains and $1.5 billion in increased budgetary receipts, or a total of $5.6 billion. The result is a net budgetary cost of $8.8 billion for the total program when completed, before account is taken of the increase in revenues resulting from economic expansion induced by the program itself.

These revenue-raising structural changes or reforms are in three groups. The first group comprises seven changes affecting individuals and totaling $3 billion, the principal ones involving a 5 percent floor under itemized deductions, the elimination of the $50 dividend exclusion and 4-percent dividend credit, and the elimination of the present tax exclusion for sick pay. These three changes would yield $2.9 billion.

The second group contains several changes primarily involving corporations, which would increase tax revenue $320 million. One would involve the allowance of only a single surtax exemption to multicorporate structures, coupled with elimination of the penalty taxes on consolidated income taxes. Another would improve tax rules affecting natural resources. Still another would put larger corporations—the 15,000 corporations with tax liabilities over $100,000—on a current-payment tax basis over a 5-year transition period, involving no increase in tax liabilities but increasing budgetary receipts by $1.5 billion in each of the 5 years. The third group involves an interrelated set of changes in the capital gains area which would yield a $750 million increase in revenue resulting from increased turnover and mobility of capital.

These revenue-raising structural reforms, while contributing to the fiscal responsibility of the overall program, are in themselves needed improvements in the tax structure. They eliminate special provisions—which now permit unfair escape from tax—and thereby increase the equity of the income tax structure. They substitute the economic marketplace for the tax avoidance device as the governing factor in the allocation of investment resources. They broaden the tax base, without harm to existing incentives, such as those involved in charitable giving or home ownership, and foster private initiative through the lower marginal tax rate they permit.

These structural adjustments, involving a change in the computation of taxable income, are in a sense made only once. The rate reductions will far more than offset these adjustments so that from the very start of the program almost all taxpayers obtain a significant net reduction in tax liabilities—the average is 18 percent.

As taxpayers subsequently increase their incomes—through wage or salary increases, increased investment, increased dividends, increased business activity—the increase in income will be subject to the far lower rate scale involved in the program. It is this year-in, year-out effect of the large rate cuts—made possible, especially in the middle and upper brackets, by the revenue-raising reforms—that will provide the basic change in the impact of the tax structure on incentives and the economy.

The large amount of revenue devoted to rate reduction will provide both increased incentives to private investment and initiative and an increase in consumer purchasing power. While some may stress increased investment incentives as the more important of the two and others may favor increased spending power, the real lesson of recent years is that both have a necessary contribution to make to our economic health.

The increase in spending power will help to absorb existing unused capacity and provide a more favorable climate in which the investment incentives of lower rates, the investment credit, and depreciation revision will operate, enabling us to move more rapidly toward full employment. The investment incentives, exerting a constantly more powerful effect as the economy moves upward, will then contribute to a continued acceleration of our rate of growth.

We should not and need not rely upon only one of those two forces for our economic advance. That is the reason for the large amount of revenue devoted to rate reductions in the President's program. A significantly lesser amount could make us choose between the forces of demand and investment. Here we find either no unanimity as to the line of choice or an unwillingness on the part of those who urge a lesser amount to face up to the task of making the choice.

In sum, the President's program is a balanced program. It is balanced in terms of time, neither attempting to do everything at once with the consequent risk of inflation and possible damage to our balance of payments, nor delaying action in the vain hope that the economy would somehow move by itself to a level which would lead to balanced budgets. It is balanced in terms of equity, with the benefits fairly distributed among all income groups of taxpayers and to corporations as well. It is balanced in terms of achieving maximum economic impact with a minimum budgetary cost, both because of the staging over 3 years and the offsetting effect of certain reforms. It is important to keep in mind that this economic impact is far greater and more immediate than the staging might indicate. By July of next year, for instance, close to $6 billion in additional spending power will have been poured back into the economy. Before 1964 is out, the tax program will have increased net after-tax income of business and individuals by more than $10 billion. In addition, income and spending will be still further increased as the economy expands in response to the stimulus provided by the tax program. Finally, the tax program is balanced because it includes both incentives to investment and an increase in demand.

The Ways and Means Committee is now engaged in its consideration of the proposed tax program—the stage where, through public hearings and otherwise, various groups seek to pull the tax revision this way or that way closer to one extreme or the other. It is the stage when those who are affected by a recommendation to change a particular provision seek to justify the present situation or to alter the recommendation.

This is the final, hard stage of tax revision—where the general consensus on the goal of greater economic activity, on the repressive effect of the tax system, on the need for tax revision and net tax reduction leaves off and the disputes over the shape of the tax revision commence.

Here clearly no general consensus on final details has yet been reached. Thus the testimony before the committee indicates a wide spectrum of opinion as to which groups should receive the tax cuts. If, for instance, the rate reductions recommended by the AFL–CIO and the NAM were both accepted by the Congress, the total revenue cost involved would be $24 billion. Necessarily, in this context of competing tax plans the proponents of each plan will criticize the President's program—but each with a different criticism. High-income taxpayers look at the larger percentage reductions in tax liabilities going to low- and middle-income taxpayers and feel that those groups are getting too much. They say some of the reforms remove the otherwise almost uniform changes in the rates. Low- and middle-income taxpayers look at the larger dollar reductions and the larger percentage increases in after-tax incomes going to high-income groups and feel that the upper-income taxpayers are getting too much. They may argue that the proposed rate scale of 14 to 65 percent is not as progressive as the present scale running from 20 to 91 percent. In reality, much of this criticism is really testimony to the basic fairness of the overall program.

Certainly improvements and helpful changes will occur as the work of the committee proceeds toward resolving conflicting views and writing the actual legislation. But those who are trying to pull the program this way or that way, or to pull out this or that part, should not lose sight of the main goal.

The goal is to move the economy closer to full employment by raising our rate of economic growth. This can best be achieved by removing the repressive effects of our income tax structure on the economy. To accomplish this result will mean far more to all taxpayers before this decade is out than will the dollars that the program will put in their pockets in 1963, or 1964, or 1965.

For the interaction of increased incentives to produce and invest, both corporate and individual, together with the increased funds available for consumer spending and for investment will create an upward spiral—not of wages and prices but of economic activity and accelerating growth—which will permit us to achieve our goal of a full employment economy.

The President's program proposes to reach this goal through a major tax rate reduction, combined with some reforms that remove hardships and some that raise revenue through broadening the tax base and eliminating special provisions. Only in this way can sufficiently large rate reductions be achieved in a fair way, without undue budgetary strain.

This is no time for half measures or attempted short cuts. There is an urgent need for action on the matter of taxes—action that is basic and lasting. The President's program is a balanced, fair and effective response to this critical need.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MICHIGAN, EDITORIAL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Ann Arbor News recently published an editorial giving a thoughtful presentation on the pending bills before the Congress to establish a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan.

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee will begin hearings on the bill, S. 792, which Senator McNamara and I have introduced, later this month.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Ann Arbor News be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hart's Park Bill Better

Senator Philip A. Hart says there are no important differences except size in the proposals for a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park which he and Representative Robert P. Griffin, Republican, of Traverse City, have introduced this year. This appears to be true, but it is an important difference.

Hart's bill calls for a 77,000-acre park, including the lake a short distance inland from the dunes. Griffin wants a park of only 37,000 acres, which would include North Manitou Island but stop short of the inland lakes.

There is still room for compromise on acreage, in the direction of a somewhat smaller area than Hart proposes. But those who are lauding Griffin's small park plan as the ultimate in protection of individual rights, and are calling Hart's bill socialistic, are failing to take account of all the relevant facts.

Except in the eyes of those who just don't believe in national parks there no longer seems to be a significant difference in the provisions for protecting local property owners proposed by Hart and Griffin.

Both bills have provisions forbidding the Federal Government to condemn private homes. Both would give the Department of the Interior first option on private property within the park boundaries when it did go on the market, with price-setting provisions similar to those which have proven acceptable at Cape Cod National Seashore.

Hart's bill would bring property around the inland lakes, just east of the dunes, under these property protection provisions. Griffin's bill would draw the park boundary west of these lake properties. It would be better to have these properties stabilized by zoning codes, as provided in Hart's bill, than to have them on the edge of the park, where commercialism would probably run rampant as visits by tourists to the new park increased.

Any land speculator who has ever attacked a township zoning code in court knows that such codes would not protect the inland lake properties, once a park was estabished along the lines suggested by Griffin.

Griffin has proposed including North Manitou Island in the dunes park, for the sake of additional shoreline. But this island is a privately operated hunting preserve, heavily stocked with deer and very short on scenery.

It is not the business of the Interior Department to operate hunting preserves. If the Department chose to include North Manitou inside the park—which is unlikely—it would have to find a way to greatly reduce and control the deer population in order to make the island usable for camping and visits by tourists. But the lack of trees and scenery would make it pointless for the Government to get into such a project.

Despite these differences, the important thing is that the idea of a Sleeping Bear National Park has bipartisan support this year, meaning that it should be possible to pass a bill for which both parties can take some of the credit.

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND THE WORLD OF TODAY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Alexandria Library Co. in recent years has invited nationally known scholars and creative writers to speak on some aspects of the life, history, or culture of Virginia, or of the other Southern States, in order to remind the present generation of the great part which the South has played in creating and molding this Nation.

On March 14, 1963, the Alexandria Library Co. invited to give its annual lecture Mr. John Dos Passos, author and writer in residence at the University of Virginia. Mr. Dos Passos spoke on the topic, "Thomas Jefferson and the World of Today."

In order to give this informative and important speech the circulation which it justly deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thomas Jefferson and the World of Today

Only 137 years, merely the span of a couple of long lifetimes, have gone by since Jefferson died at Monticello and, on the same Independence Day 1826, his old friend and political opponent, John Adams, died at Braintree, near Boston, whispering, so the old tradition has it: "Thomas Jefferson still survives." Both men lived to see the first half century of the Republic they had helped found. They lived to see the United States spread from the eastern seaboard to the Rocky Mountains. They lived to see the beginnings of the age of steam and of the industrial revolution. They lived to see their experiment in government strike roots and become an established nation.

Their ideas of how men should be governed took somewhat divergent paths during their long lives. Jefferson believed in government by the people by universal suffrage; Adams felt that popular democracy must be held in check by representation of the rich and well educated, and that both powers should be balanced by a strong Executive. Though they saw plenty of dangers ahead both Jefferson and Adams were able to turn their faces to the wall in their last hour happy in the assurance that the work they had done was good.

Looking back on them from the viewpoint of the mid-20th century we can see that the political attitudes of the radicals and conservatives among the men who founded this Republic were really much closer together than they seemed at that time.

When Gouverneur Morris, who was a conservative, and cynical about human capabilities for self-government, wrote to George Washington describing politics as "that divine science that has for its object the happiness of mankind," he meant the same thing by the word "happiness" that the radical idealist Jefferson meant when he drafted the Declaration of Independence. They both were thinking of the right of every man—which they considered his inalienable birthright—to live his life as he chose so long as he didn't interfere with his neighbor. They differed as to what kind of government would best preserve this right, which they agreed was based on the freedom of speech and assembly, and of the press; and on freedom to own property and to handle your property according to what seemed to be your best advantage.

Essentially the happiness they were thinking of was a moral happiness. Whether they were Deists or Congregationalists they were still too close to the old Protestant religion of salvation as a private, individual, and personal experience (the Quakers' light within) to confuse moral and spiritual happiness with affluence in material things. They believed in material well being, but as a basis for the godly life. Adams would have called it that. Jefferson and Gouverneur Morris would probably have called it the philosophic life, but essentially they would have meant the same thing.

These 137 years have seen such a transformation in American society that the aspirations of Jefferson and Adams and Washington and Gouverneur Morris and Hamilton and the rest sometimes seem to us as far away as the aspirations of Confucius. I think they are more cogent than we realize.

Of course, when I was a boy everybody told me that the dominant stamp on the American Government was Hamilton's. For many years I hope and prayed that Jefferson's tradition, with its emphasis on personal rights and decentralized administration, would prevail. Today any dispassionate appraisal of the development of this country since Franklin Roosevelt's first administration will lead to the conclusion that American institutions have evolved in a way which neither Jefferson nor John Adams nor Hamilton could have imagined.

Mass production techniques have spread physical well-being throughout the social heap, with results directly contrary to the forecasts of early 19th century economists, who from Jefferson to Marx could see only evil in the factory system. A second unforeseen byproduct has been the development of an all-encompassing and possibly stifling bureaucracy of the sort which in ancient times took something like 300 years to mature to the point where it stifled the Roman Empire.

The wise old village elders John Adams had his trust in hardly came to the fore.

Hamilton's money men, even when they attained undisputed power in the period after the Civil War, failed to produce the sort of stable ruling class on the model of the English gentry that Hamilton dreamed about.

Whatever really conservative business tradition there was in this country abdicated about the time of the panic of 1929.

The independent farmer, whom Jefferson hoped would be the cornerstone of civil liberties, has been losing ground ever since the failure of La Follette's progressivism.

Jefferson never believed the 18th century Englishman's political axiom that the rich and wellborn are politically more gifted than the poor. In August of the busy year of 1776 he wrote one of his personal friends (who was also a political opponent) Edmund Pendleton, the conservative Virginia lawyer from Caroline County, speaking of the property qualifications for voting which Pendleton wanted in the projected Virginia constitution, "You have lived longer than I have and perhaps may have formed a different judgment on better grounds; but my observations do not enable me to say I think integrity the characteristic of wealth. In general I think the decisions of the people in a body will be more honest and more disinterested than those of wealthy men."

The years I think have more or less borne Jefferson out. The various vested interests have had their fling and have vanished from the scene. The southern slaveowners almost brought the Nation to total disaster. Whenever the American capitalists who took over next messed in politics they proved themselves shortsighted and inept. Now we are governed by mass appeals and pressure groups. Occasionally I'm afraid that we'll have to admit that "the decisions of the people in a body" have taken forms that Jefferson would neither have considered "honest" or "disinterested." Up to now the record of popular democracy has not been too bad, but the danger looms that as a result of the voters' abdication of sovereignty, a regimenting and bureaucratic Federal Government will take on powers which would have been unthinkable to Thomas Jefferson or any of the founders in their most despairing nightmares.

Politicians have to deal with the present as they see it. Our practical politicians have in their hearts, though many of them wouldn't admit it even in private, lost respect for the brainwashed masses whose votes they woo. Dealing with the mass organizations of leviathan labor and leviathan business too many of them have come to the opinion, which is beginning to be made vocal by the phrasemakers from the colleges, that the ideals and practical precepts of men like Jefferson and Adams and Hamilton are under modern conditions nugatory and void; or else merely useful for the adornment of political speeches, like the red, white, and blue bunting around the speakers' stand.

To me, on the contrary, the challenge of the times to individual liberty and individual initiative makes the thought and the practice of the men who founded this Republic more to the point, than ever.

The organization of society has changed in a century and a half, but the nature of man has not changed. A man can no more be trusted with unlimited power over his fellows today than he could in the days when the authors of the Constitution labored so hard to curb his instincts for evil.

Politics in the great sense—Gouverneur Morris's divine science—which men like Jefferson and Adams thought of as the art of influencing their neighbors for their own good, was based on a knowledge of basic factors in human behavior which haven't changed since the beginnings of recorded history.

The United States must stand or fall by the success of self-government.

If there should grow up in this country a generation of men and women who felt that the most important thing in life was to save the United States from destruction and their own liberties along with their country's, they would find in the records of the founders of the Republic a storehouse of the skills and mental attitudes they would need in their work.

They would find they needed a formula by which to apply the basic libertarian ideas as directly to modern institutionalized society as Jefferson and his friends applied them to the everyday world they knew. The formula will never be found by denying the premises on which the Government was founded.

Lord knows for the last 30 years we have done enough talking about democracy in this country. Maybe the reason why the talk doesn't turn into useful action is because the terms don't apply exactly enough in our lives as we live them. Something of that sort may help to explain our failure of nerve and failure of will as a nation upon the international scene at the moment of victory at the end of the Second World War. It is this failure which continues to threaten terrible consequences for our lives and our children's lives and for our hope of setting up some kind of civilization fit for a man to live in.

Let's have a look at what life was like in America at the end of the 18th century.

Speaking in general terms peoples' lives were assembled in two kinds of social organization. There was the New England type town where social standing depended on a combination of godliness with that possession of this world's goods which was thought of as the outward expression of divine favor. The New England town developed a paradoxical combination of social stratification with political democracy. At Harvard College students were listed according to their social standing instead of according to their scholastic ability, but that doesn't mean that literacy wasn't highly regarded by the Bostonians. The New Englanders were people of the book. Their towns were socially small oligarchies but their government was town meeting where in spite of stratification every man wellborn or lowborn had his say. This was the society which produced the Adamses.

Then there was the plantation society, where men were rated according to the acreage of their lands. The plantation society produced George Mason and George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and the rest. In the Virginia county governments, as in rural England, the landowners were the law.

Both of these systems were subject to the stimulus of the ebb and flow of the new settlements to the westward, where skill and courage and the push necessary for survival were the most admired qualities. The educated men, the men of book learning, of all these differing communities were steeped in the spirit of noblesse oblige which was the good side of the arrogance and selfseeking of the British ruling gentry.

The thing the Americans—townsmen, fishermen, and sailors of the New England seaports; planters and merchants from the Chesapeake; hunters and furtraders from the Ohio—had in common was that they thoroughly understood the society they lived in. The technology was simple. From the time of Confucius or Abraham to the time of the American Revolution the basic operations by which men sowed crops for food and produced clothing and shelter had changed remarkably little. The tools had improved, but production was still based on the skill of the hand and the arm and the eye.

The family was everywhere the productive unit, as it was the social unit. The work of apprentices, indentured servants, Negro slaves on the smaller plantations in the South, all meshed into the framework of a man and his wife and his sons and daughters coping with life as a group.

Any tolerably bright individual knew from personal experience how wheeled carriages and sailing ships worked, understood the processes of agriculture and manufacturing, the use of money and the techniques of buying and selling on the marketplace. Much more important, they all knew by direct personal experience how the different kinds of people worked who made up their society.

They took human cussedness for granted.

None of them had many illusions about how men behaved. A radical idealist like Jefferson allowed for the self-interest (real or imagined) of the average voter or the vanity and ambition and greed of the officeholder as much as a cynical conservative like Gouverneur Morris. They were practical people in the sense that many of our politicians today are impractical people. They checked their high-sounding oratory with real events they saw happening around them.

The difference between radicals and conservatives was that they applied their knowledge according to different theories. Jefferson thought that enlightened by universal education under self-government, the people would improve themselves indefinitely. Like his Scottish contemporary Adam Smith he had almost pathetic faith in the workings of enlightened self-interest.

Both parties understood the old Adam as well as any of the more desperate demagogs we have with us today. They allowed for the old Adam's selfseeking, for his shortsightedness, his timidity, his only intermittent public spirit. The difference was that the statesmen of the early republic used that knowledge in the service of great aims. Using men as they found them, they managed, out of their debates and their bitter political struggles to set up the system of balancing powers which made possible the exuberant growth of the United States.

Jefferson led the radical wing which was in favor of more popular rule rather than less. At the same time he thought of universal suffrage always within the frame of decentralized administration.

In a letter he wrote a few days before his death refusing, on account of the state of his health, an invitation to spend that very Fourth of July which was going to be his last with a group of admirers in Washington City, he spoke happily of the blessings and security of self-government and "the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion," and rephrased the basic conviction of his life with characteristic vehemence: "The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

It is one of the ironies of history, that the Communist zealots whose dogma provides them with boots and spurs to ride the mass of mankind legitimately by the grace of Karl Marx, justify themselves by the same political phraseology which the men of Jefferson's day hoped would make forever impossible the oppression of the many by the few.

The detractors of the American people naturally make a great play of our faults and our vices, but it's for our virtues that they really hate us. King George of England hated us in Jefferson's day because we had the nerve to challenge the right of a small group of privileged Englishmen to determine the destinies of their kinsmen overseas. The social engineers in the Kremlin and of Mao's imperial court in Peiping hate us because the success of our comparatively free economy, in spreading the benefits of mass production through all levels of society, challenges the Marxist dogma on which they base their dictatorship.

We must not forget that the commonest practice of mankind is that a few shall impose authority and the majority shall submit to it. Watch any bunch of children playing during a school recess. It's the habit of individual liberty which is the exception.

The remaining liberties we enjoy today, freedom to express our ideas if we have any, freedom to jump in a car and drive any place we want to on the highway and indeed to leave our own country if we have a mind to, freedom (so long as we are at peace with the union) to choose the trade or profession we want to make our living by, were won, we must never forget, by the struggles and pains of generations of English-speaking people who somehow had resistance to authority in their blood. What the generation of 1776 did was to organize those traditions into a new system.

When the British troops marched out of Yorktown to surrender to Washington's army, one of their bands played a tune called "The World Turned Upside Down." In the long run we have managed to make the promise of that tune come true. Underdog has come mighty near to becoming top dog.

I think we may add on the credit side of the ledger, that there has never been a society where so many men and women have shared a fellow feeling for so many other men and women. With every change in economic organization new class lines and stratifications have appeared, but they've hardly outlasted a generation or two. The old saying about three generations from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves has turned out profoundly true. Compared to the rest of mankind, we've come nearest to producing a classless society. Ask any recent immigrant. Nine times out of ten he'll tell you that what struck him first in the United States was that feeling of the world being turned upside down.

Right from the beginning the wise men have said that Jefferson's ideas wouldn't work. Washington in his last years, and John Adams and the whole Federalist Party thought majority rule through universal suffrage would be disastrous. Their reasoning was the basis of the lamentations of the school of Brooks Adams and Henry Adams at the beginning of this century. In fact I think it is safe to say that since the earliest days only a small minority have really, in the privacy of their own consciences, believed that American democracy would truly in the last analysis succeed.

The point of view of the learned and well born was admirably put forward in a letter the English historian Macauley wrote in 1857 to H. N. Randall when he was putting the finishing touches on his biography of Jefferson.

"You are surprised to learn," Macauley wrote Randall, "I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I never in Parliament, in conversation or even on the hustings—a place where it is the fashion to court the populace—uttered a word indicating the opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty or civilization or both.

"You think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World; and while that is the case the Jeffersonian policy may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity." (You'll recognize the theory of the last frontier which has long been popular among certain historians.) "But the time will come," Macauley went on, "when New England will be as thickly populated as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams. Hundreds and thousands of artisans will be sometimes out of work.

Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have millions, while another cannot get a full meal. The day will come when, in the State of New York a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose the legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, a strict observance of public faith. On the other side is a demagogue ranting about tyranny or capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest people are in want of necessities. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for bread?

"I seriously apprehend that you will in some such season of adversity as I have described do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act, like people in a year of scarcity who devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year not one of scarcity but of absolute distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stay you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said, when society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and your Huns and Vandals will have engendered within your own country by your own institutions.

"Thinking this, of course I cannot reckon Jefferson among the benefactors of mankind."

You'll recognize in this letter of Macaulay's an early statement of the underlying theme of Ortega y Gasset's "Revolt of the Masses," which is still I think the clearest expression in modern terms of the dangers of the cult of the lowest common denominator.

If there should grow up in this continent a generation of men and women ready to give up their lives to defending the last strongholds of the practice of individual liberty, their first duty would be to prove, by word and deed, that Macaulay and Ortega y Gasset were wrong. The imperative need of our time is to prove to ourselves first, and to the rest of the world after, that the methods of self-government can cope with the human problems of industrial society.

Don't let anybody tell you that Macaulay wasn't a great historian, because he was. His practical experience in Parliament gave him a particularly sharp insight into political behavior, but he had no way of foreseeing the new factors which have come into the picture. One is the immense increase in productivity. Another is the mass market which resulted from high wages.

Macaulay had no way of knowing that the American industrialist and the American farmer would be producing within a hundred years such a profusion of goods that the problems facing our political economy would be those of surplus rather than scarcity. Whenever we get a breathing space from the waste of war, we start to pile up such mountains of wheat and corn, such rivers of crude oil, such avalanches of automobiles, washing machines, hedge clippers, of everything you can think of, that the economy gets the blind staggers.

Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal revolution had all the earmarks of the sort of uprising Macaulay looked forward to with so much dread. We had our hundreds and thousands of artisans out of work. We had our mutinous and discontented labor.

"Spend spend spend. Tax tax tax. Elect elect elect" was the watchword. The sufferers marched to the polls and elected and reelected Franklin Roosevelt who sure ranted plenty about the tyranny of capitalists and bankers. The rich were despoiled through the income tax. The poor were to a certain extent subsidized. But the end result, instead of the Republic's being laid waste by the barbarians from below, was that everybody got richer. If the New Deal demagogues, ranting, as Macaulay put it, about the tyranny of capitalists, were able to produce such a successful readjustment of the economy, majority rule must have more resources than he imagined.

The trouble is that every good thing has its bad side. In Jefferson's day the average man could understand how the world he lived in worked. Today our industrial world has become so cut up into specialized departments and vocabularies, and has become so hard to understand and to see as a whole that most people won't even try. Even people of first-rate intelligence, at work in various segregated segments of our economy tend to get so walled up in the particular work they are doing that they never look outside of it. We have forgotten that citizens have duties as well as rights. Along with the benefits of the New Deal revolution came an apathetic complacency toward the general good and the neglect of inventive and original thought about sociology and politics. It is possible that future historians will discover that at the moment of its greatest material success the American Republic was brought to destruction because its people ran out of ideas.

Future historians may puzzle over the fact that just at the moment when American society was proving how versatile it was and how adaptable to changing conditions, so many well-educated young men should throw overboard the theories and practices which had brought the American system into being and turn back to the socialist dogmas of a century ago which would seem to have been discredited by the dreadful history of the Soviet Union since the time of Lenin's revolution. The subject is confused by the prevalence of a sort of totalitarian doubletalk, by which the vocabulary of self-government is used to mean something quite different; but the fact remains that a great many Americans are finding it harder and harder to apply the words and phrases that fitted the agrarian society Jefferson and Madison lived in to the pyramidal structure of today's industry.

Man is an institution-building animal. Every new process for the production of food and goods or their distribution changes the shape of the lives of the men and women who take part in it. Careers have to be molded to fit each new process. People's lives become intertwined in complicated structures of vested interests. With every change adaptations are demanded. Adaptation is slow and difficult and painful. The symptoms of insufficient adaptation are maladjustment, frustration, and finally, apathy. The social structure that has grown up around the present type of industrial production has developed so fast that we haven't had time to adapt to it. In this new environment we are finding it hard, perhaps harder than we realize, to operate the institutions which the English-speaking people built up through centuries of resistance to authority. The challenge which has to be met by all Americans alive today, if their lives are not going to end in ruin and defeat, is the adaptation of free institutions to a rapidly changing industrial society.

The men who founded this Republic gave their lives to the study of how to regulate the interaction between some men's instinct to boss and take advantage of their fellow men, and the freemans' instinctive resistance to authority. They called that interaction self-government. If we are to learn to adapt self-government to the needs of an institutionalized society (the alternative is the type of universal servitude we see in its extremest form of Chinese communism) we are going to need to study the skills and aptitudes of the statesmen who so successfully fitted the old Adam of their time into a government of laws rather than of men.

It was Jefferson's sarcastic young friend from Orange County, little James Madison, who set down in the oftenquoted No. 51 of the Federalist the basic hardheaded rule which, for all these men, radical and conservative alike, became the cornerstone of their political theory: "In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this; you must first enable the Government to control the governed and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

Jefferson phrased and rephrased the doctrine many times. When he was Minister to France, during the period when the Constitution was being argued in Philadelphia, he wrote a letter to his old friend Edward Carrington.

This was the same Colonel Carrington who was such a great lover of liberty that an amusing story was told of him. St. John's Church in Richmond was so crowded when Patrick Henry made his most famous oration that many of the delegates couldn't get in. Among those hanging by their eyelashes to the outside framing of the open windows was this Colonel Carrington. When Henry ended his speech with "Give me liberty or give me death" Carrington turned to his friends who were also dangling from the window ledges and begged them to see to it that when he died he should be buried on this spot where he had experienced his life's greatest moment. His tomb is still there to prove it.

Jefferson in Europe had been enjoying the music, the architecture, the light wines and the landscape, the society of attractive and entertaining women, the skillful gardening of the English and the politeness of the French, but he had been horrified to find himself living in a social system in which, as he put it in words he quoted from Voltaire, every man was either the hammer or the anvil.

"I am convinced," he wrote Carrington while trying to explain his general principles of government, "that those societies (as the Indians) which live without government, enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness than those who live under the European governments. Among the former public opinion is in the place of law, and restrains morals as powerfully as laws ever did anywhere. Among the latter under the pretext of governing, they have divided their nations into two classes, wolves and sheep. I do not exaggerate. This is a true picture of Europe."

What Jefferson was saying in his characteristically extreme way was that there was a universal law in human affairs by which any group which achieved power over their fellows, whether you called them representatives, commissars, bureaucrats, or monarchs and their courts, would exploit them to the limit of their capacity.

The Marxists of Lenin's day truly thought that if they threw out the businessmen exploitation would stop. What happened was that the bureaucrats became a new and more ferocious exploiting class. The realities of the Soviet Union have disproved Karl Marx. Jefferson and his friends thoroughly understood that any dominant group whatsoever, if you gave them a chance, would exploit the people under their charge, leaving them, so Jefferson put it, the way beekeepers do with bees, just enough of their product to give them strength to keep on working.

"Cherish therefore," Jefferson went on to Carrington, "the spirit of our people, and keep alive their attention. Do not be too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them. Once they become inattentive to public affairs, you and I, and Congress and assemblies, judges and Governors, shall all become wolves. It seems to be the law of our general nature, in spite of individual exceptions, and experience declares that man is the only animal that devours his own kind; for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe and to the general prey of the rich on the poor."

Later in his life, in a letter to Dr. Cooper, looking back on the England he'd seen in the beginnings of the industrial revolution, Jefferson described the stratifications of English society as scathingly as Karl Marx did several decades later. He explained that the people were divided into an aristocracy of wealth, a laboring class, and a pauper class. "The aristocracy, which have the laws and government in their hands, have so managed them as to reduce the third description below the means of supporting life, even by labor; and to force the second, whether employed in agriculture, or the arts" (by arts he meant handicraft and machine production) "to the maximum of labor which the construction of the human body can endure, and to the minimum of food and of the meanest kind, which will preserve it in life * * * To obtain food enough and clothing, not only their whole strength must be unremittingly exerted, but with the utmost dexterity they can only keep their ground * * * Hence the industry and manual dexterity of their journeymen and daylaborers and the science of their master workmen"—I'm skipping a little—"keep them in the foremost ranks of competition with other nations: and the less dextrous individuals * * * furnish materials for armies and navies to defend their country, exercise piracy on the ocean, and carry conflagration, plunder, and devastation on the shores of all those who endeavor to withstand their aggressions."

Jefferson was writing in the full bitterness of the War of 1812. He was writing about the rising British empire (which we now look back on with some nostalgia facing as we do the advance of another and much more brutal conqueror), but it is amusing how aptly his description fits the social stratification which has developed in the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The sentences that follow might be quoted from an editorial on the suppressed revolt in Hungary. "A society thus constituted possesses certainly the means of defense, but what does it defend? the pauperism of the lowest class, the abject depression of the laboring, and the luxury, the riot, the domination and the vicious happiness of the aristocracy." (For aristocracy read bureaucracy.) "In their hands the paupers are used as tools to maintain their own wretchedness, and to keep down the laboring portion by shooting them whenever the desperation produced by the cravings of their stomachs drives them into riots. Such is the happiness of scientific England." And such we might add is the happiness of every nation in recorded history, where the power to govern has outrun the power of the governed to resist infringements on their liberty.

The profound emotional basis of Jefferson's belief in popular government was that he instinctively saw society with the eye of the underdog. In letters written at various times in his life you come across remarks about how important he felt it was, especially when he was holding public office, to break down the barriers which inevitably grew up between an officeholder and the general mass of his fellow citizens. Often he'd travel on his trips back and forth between Monticello and the seat of government in the miserable jouncing carts that were the public stages of the time, instead of in his own carriage, just for that purpose.

Now what would my imaginary generation of men and women, who would be ready to give up their whole lives to save these United States and the liberties they stand for, learn from this argument, as they followed it through the letters and statements of the statesmen and the acrimonious journalism of the day?

The first thing that would strike them would be, I think, that all these men loved the United States better than their own lives. In spite of their bitter political conflict at the time of Adams' presidency and Jefferson's leadership of the republican party, Jefferson and John Adams died friends. In spite of all his differences with Hamilton, Jefferson set up a bust of him in the hall at Monticello. In spite of Hamilton's scorn of Jefferson and his theories, he threw the votes he controlled in Congress to Jefferson in the election of 1801, because he thought it was his patriotic duty to do so.

These men of the first generation of leadership were ready, at the last ditch, to sacrifice their own feelings and even their own convictions to the country's good. They were able to stand aside enough from their own political passions to see the country's good as separate from their own aims. The United States constituted the ruling passion of their lives.

A recent example of this grand tradition was the magnificent way Senator TAFT, after he lost the Republican nomination, threw all the fading energy of the last days of his life into helping General Eisenhower win the presidency, and then into trying to help him deserve it once he'd won it. Compare this with Stalin's assassination of Trotsky or the struggles for power in the Soviet Union that followed Stalin's death and you'll understand how much we have to defend.

That year of 1776 which launched the United States was a year of gruelling work for Jefferson. It's amazing how much work people can get into a short period if they have to. When Jefferson walked up the stairs to his parlor in bricklayer Graaf's new house during those hot June days in Philadelphia to set down at his traveling desk the first rough draft of the Declaration of Independence his mind was still busy with his plans for the new constitution of his home State, where the old House of Burgesses had turned itself into a constitutional convention.

He had been trying to get himself recalled to Williamsburg so that he could take part in the crucial committee work. He was smarting under the suspicion that the Virginia conservatives were keeping him in Philadelphia because they were afraid of his radical influence in Williamsburg. There was a geographical cleavage in Virginia between the conservative tidewater landowners and the radical young man from the pioneer counties of the west. Jefferson, although Albermarle had been settled territory since his father's day, usually sided with the westerners. He felt that the work of the Virginia convention was a great deal more important for the future than the mere drafting of a state paper for Congress. The new State governments were, as he put it "the whole object of the present controversy; for should a bad government be instituted for us in future it had been as well to have accepted at first the bad one offered us from beyond the water without the risk and expense of the contest."

He'd already sent his notes as to what kind of government he thought was good to his friends in Williamsburg.

He wanted every citizen to be a property owner and every property owner to have a vote. He wanted to abolish the English custom of entail on the eldest son so that properties would be broken up at each generation by being divided among a number of heirs. He was willing to have incomes further leveled by a tax on surplus earnings. He wanted complete religious liberty, with church and state quite separate, freedom of discussion and of the press, and the gradual abolition of slavery. In the end this became the scheme along which the country developed.

All these victories for the human spirit, which our fathers took for granted have been called in question in our lifetimes.

It turned out that Virginia adopted George Mason's constitution (of course George Mason wanted a great many of the same things) but Jefferson had another chance to set the pattern for the new social order which would come out of the Revolution when he was chosen later that same fall, along with his old lawteacher George Wythe, and fastidious George Mason, and Edmund Pendleton, and one of the Lees, to take on the tremendous job of revising, modernizing, and clarifying the entire code of English law as it applied to Virginia. A challenge for Lycurgus.

A few days after George Washington wound up his retreat through the Jerseys by whipping the Hessians at Trenton the committee met in the wintry little village of Fredericksburg up at the falls of the Rappahannock. Jefferson took home enough work from that meeting to kill a mule. "A great rubber off of dust," John Adams called him. It was in the course of this work that he worded his great statute on religious liberty, and his bill, which unfortunately turned out to be ahead of its time, to set up a free public school system in Virginia.

These country gentlemen who settled down quietly to work up a new code of laws for their country certainly had their nerve with them. They had declared war on the richest nation in the world. They were part of a scattered confederation of ill-organized settlements on the edge of an undiscovered continent between the hostile Indians and the roaring ocean. Some of their chief cities were occupied by the enemy. Their coast was blockaded by the world's most powerful fleet. The last summer's expedition to try to rally the Canadians to their cause had proved an expensive failure. Their only properly organized army, after continuous retreats, had managed one very small victory.

Nothing daunted they set to work to draw the plans for governing the nation that was yet to be.

You can catch something of the ardor of those days from the letters and documents printed in the first two volumes of the Princeton edition of Jefferson's complete papers. If there should appear this race of men and women I've been trying to imagine, hellbent on saving this Republic and the practice of personal liberty, that's where I should advise them to start their education in the art of statesmanship.

From reading the thoughts and doings of the men who found themselves in positions of leadership in this difficult season of wartime defeats they would perhaps contract the conviction that men of shrewdness and honesty and willpower can in the face of every kind of difficulty reshape a society as they live in it from day to day.

They might pick up some of the affection for the practical machinery of self-government that these men had. They might learn from them a national patriotism hot enough to cut through class lines and group pressures and local interests. They would learn that being an American is an urgent business.

The first thing it took to sit down at Fredericksburg in the winter of 1777 and start to work on a new code of laws was courage. Courage is just as contagious as cowardice. From an enthusiastic study of the daily work of the architects of this Nation, we can catch some of the feeling they had of being masters of their destiny.

Our weakness so far in the endless yelling match with the Communists and in our arguments with our allies is that the people who represent the United States seem hardly convinced at the bottom of their hearts that it is from our kind of liberty under our kind of self-government that the new and radical and adventurous methods of conducting human affairs will develop. Our public men have forgotten the passion for freedom which should be our weapon and our defense.

The Communists have often had the better of the argument during the last 20 dishonorable years—the most disheartening years in our history—because they are thoroughly convinced that they can remake the world. They have proved that they can too; the trouble is that they are remaking it in the wrong direction.

Don't we perhaps need to go to school again to the Americans who, only four or five generations ago did remake the world? They turned it upside down and remade it in the right direction. They can teach us to get our courage back. The moment we can prove to ourselves that we are masters of our destiny at home, we will maybe start to win the worldwide battle too.

HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL AT PANGUITCH, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a most interesting and, for me, nostalgic article about the high school basketball team at Panguitch, Utah, written by John Underwood, appears in the March 4 issue of Sports Illustrated. Because the experiences of this little town and its people are rather typical of small American towns everywhere, I am asking that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Panguitch is in the southern part of my State and lies in an arid plateau area, where the earning of a livelihood is still difficult and where our people must pit their energies against a sometimes hostile environment. Yet, from this little town and the other little towns of America, have come the leaders of our Nation and here has grown the culture of America. This article is about a basketball team. Most of these boys, perhaps all of them, will go on to college and perhaps few, or none, of them will return to Panguitch, but this will always be their home and their heritage.

As a footnote to the article, I would like to add that Panguitch won the consolation championship of the class B—small student body—high schools of the State of Utah on March 16, 1963. This means that the team lost its game on the first night of the tournament and won every game thereafter.

I can visualize that tournament because my father, James E. Moss, was one of the founders of high school basketball in Utah and was known affectionately throughout the State as the father of high school athletics. From my earliest childhood, I attended basketball tournaments and other athletic contests with my father. This is the first year that he has not attended the high school basketball tournament since it was founded in Utah—because he passed on last September.

I ask unanimous consent that the Panguitch article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONLY GAME IN PANGUITCH, UTAH—THOSE BOBCATS CAN'T BE BEAT

The only thing that stood between Donald Ortman and basketball was his terrible modesty. Lank, limby and obviously cut for the game, Don Ortman would gladly play for Panguitch High, he told the coach in 1936, but not if it meant taking off his long pants. The coach, equally inflexible, could not agree ("Long pants?" he shrieked. "Out there on the court? Long pants?"), and Panguitch, Utah had to wait until Don's son Wally grew up before it could fully appreciate the Ortman family.

Nowadays, unabashed by the sight of his bare legs, Wally Ortman wears the conventional blue-and-white briefs of the undefeated Panguitch team and receives vast quantities of Panguitchian appreciation. This includes being a principal conversation topic on U.S. Highway 89 (Main Street) and at the Latter-day Saints Social Hall and around the corner at Daly's pool and billiard retreat. Rhyming couplets are composed by adoring teenage girls: "The score goes up, that player, golly. He's real neat, his name is Wally." His younger brothers, Kenny and Dennis, bask in his prominence and beg him to teach them to back dribble. They consider the time golden when Wally gets with them at the make-do court in the vacant corral across the road. His girl, Barbara, has promised to retrieve the ring and picture she gave to another boy after the Panguitch coach, Bob Davis, a purist, got the team to swear off girls for the season.

Wally's gray-haired mother is still his most devoted fan. She recounts Panguitch basketball lore—like the time the "sore losers" from Marysvale set fire to a neighbor's car—while she struggles with the heavy batter for Wally's favorite boiled-raisin cake or punctiliously launders his uniform. Sometimes she cries to herself as she watches him disappear up the gravel road, walking, bag in hand, to the Panguitch gym on game nights. "It's sad for parents, the way time flies," she says. "We're content and we stay. Where can we go now? But when the children get out of school, they always go. There's nothing here to keep them."

Panguitch, Utah, is a blinking amber light at a dogleg on U.S. 89, 170 miles southwest of the nearest big town, Provo, and roughly along what Salt Lake City sensationalists imagine to be the beeline taken by itinerant bank robbers and high rollers heading west for Las Vegas. A brush with such glamorous villains was suspected in Panguitch last winter when the drugstore was robbed, but other than that, Panguitch doesn't qualify as much of a sin town. The local Garfield County News reported some time ago that when a woman in nearby Escalante called to report a robbery, the sheriff (since retired) instructed her to please get the name and address of the crook and he'd be over to make the arrest.

Panguitch (Ute Indian for "big fish") squats in a water-scarce trough between the Parowan Range on the west and the Panguitch Plateau, a branch of the Wasatch Mountains, on the east. Deer are plentiful in the hills, and no self-respecting Panguitch boy will go a season without getting his buck; venison is, therefore, staple fare in Panguitch. The area is 6,560 feet above a sea most Panguitchians have never seen, and is crisscrossed with irrigation ditches partly filled with snow at this time of year. It is a gray land studded with cottonwood, ponderosa pine and native fir, but mostly there is sagebrush, uninspiring, mile after mile. The beauty is in the mountains, where there are vivid streaks of red beneath peaks that seem to have been confected with Reddi-Wip.

Because of the water shortage the population of Panguitch—1,435—has remained almost constant since the turn of the century. The people are interested in outsiders ("I have never seen a Negro," said the mother of one of the basketball players) and inquisitive about their tastes, yet they are at a loss to explain the red in their own mountains. The State's largest sawmill is at Panguitch, and there are alfalfa farms and small cattle ranches that vie for the water, but the lifeblood of the community is a million dollars' worth of tourists and hunters each year. There are 13 modern motels and 9 gas stations to snare the traveler within the town limits. In summer the principal attraction is Bryce Canyon, a sort of Grand Canyon in miniature 25 miles to the southeast (Grand Canyon itself is only 175 miles south). The hunters come by the hundreds in the fall. The sign outside town discriminates only against "peddlers and hawkers" (licenses required) and "noisy mufflers and cutouts." Panguitch cafe food is hearty and the hospitality is, too, despite regiments of big-city parking meters. (This winter a second-string Panguitch High basketball player called Whips is famous for his fancy dribbling and fakes between and around the meters.)

The town's religious preference is Mormon, by 95 percent—which makes it a challenge for a visitor to achieve a social cup of coffee. The town's passion is basketball, and it is a challenge for anybody to talk about anything else. Bill Coltrine, a high school sportswriter for the Salt Lake City Tribune, stopped in Panguitch while vacationing last summer and was assailed by a delegation of townspeople eager to stuff him with details on the great team Coach Bob Davis was going to have. "But friends, this is July," protested Coltrine. "Nobody talks basketball in July."

"We do," chorused the delegates.

The Panguitch team had won its 16th straight and appeared well on its way to the State class B championship when Photographer Rich Clarkson and I checked into the New Western Motel down the street from the school the other day. We had driven the 71 miles from Cedar City, the nearest airport town. "You'll find people in this part of the country are very friendly," said the proprietor of the New Western, a native named Clarence Cameron. "Now, you'll be in rooms 15 and 16. But before you unpack, let me tell you about our basketball team. They've won 16 straight. Could be better than that 1957 bunch that won the State championship. And that was an exciting team. Never knew what they were going to do.

"Anyway, this could be the best we've ever had. They're fine boys, too, all of them. Joe Riggs is our little guard. We call him the Little General. Smart, very sensitive kid. His father runs the AG market in town. Just built a new house. Brent Turek is the big boy who scores so many points. His dad works for the State parks. Good job. Wally Ortman's dad has had a lot of bad luck. Been very sick. Wally's a great shooter. Lou Tibbs' dad is a rancher and a State legislator. Ned Richards' dad is the postmaster. They're big boys. Seem to get bigger every year. But listen. Let Bob Davis tell you about how they got to be the first five in the first place. Quite a scandal. Took a lot of courage on Bob's part."

Mrs. Cameron passed out dishes of peanut butter fudge ("It's my specialty") and said it wasn't unusual of a game night for Mr. Cameron to run back and forth from the motel to the gym, puffing and puffing, to get progressive accounts of the scoring. "We play Bryce Valley tonight," she said, "but there's not a seat to be had. The gym is sold out for the year. All 250 seats."

"We're getting a brand-new gym next year," said the proprietor. "Blueprints are already in. It'll cost $380,000 and will seat 2,300 people, which is 2,000 more than it'll seat now and 1,000 more than we've got people. But we're aiming to bring in the Region 9 tournament.

"Basketball," he said, "is really it in this town. Look around you at all the nets and goals in the backyards. There's as many backboards as there are TV antennas. In some places there was a basketball goal before there was indoor plumbing. Some of them still don't have indoor plumbing."

"Actually, there's no other diversion in the winter," said another Panguitch man. "Except the movie house and the pool hall. And the movie screen has a big slice in it where a kid threw a piece of cardboard. The slice always shows up on the hero's nose. And as for the pool hall, that's no place for a youngster."

"The pool hall is the blight of the community. Always has been," said a third man. "The idle brain is the devil's workshop."

Down the street there was only a handful of cars in front of the high school though it was 2 o'clock. This, it was explained, was because only a handful of Panguitch High School kids could afford cars. The bright yellow-and-silver Chevrolet, souped up to 250 horsepower, belonged to Dr. Sims Duggins' son Rodney. The Studebaker with the bongo drums in the back belonged to the marshal's son, and it was given to him because his father didn't want him flitting around in the patrol car.

There were sheep and cows in the yard across the street from the school. (Panguitch zoning restrictions, said the hotel proprietor, maybe aren't what they ought to be.) The school is a compact, two-story, buff-brick building built to last in 1937. It is right next door to the older Panguitch Junior High, which is condemned but still in use. Standing on the steps out front, one can feel the throb of the physical education students pounding around in the gym upstairs, can smell the pastry being burned in the home economics oven and can hear, from somewhere, a struggling cornet soloist playing "The Nutcracker Suite," or is it "Bye Bye Blues"?

Enrollment at Panguitch is 110, of which 64 are boys. The principal, Clifford LeFevre, a bright, middle-aged man, says he gave up ranching to return to education, and this explained the huge hide of a Hereford steer that covered one wall of his tiny office. He has a staff of only 13 and therefore requires double duty from some faculty members. In addition to his own job, LeFevre teaches biology and speech; Wrestling Coach Allen Smith is also the music teacher and directs the 30-piece band; and Basketball Coach Davis instructs in math and makes a stab at trigonometry. Davis will be qualified in chemistry as soon as he completes the biweekly course at Cedar City. Teachers get nothing extra for coaching, so Davis, father of five, with a sixth due in June (his annual salary is $4,750), works summers at the slaughterhouse in Kanab and is always on call when somebody in Panguitch needs a pig butchered or some linoleum laid. "Bob can do just about anything he sets his mind to," says Principal LeFevre.

Coach Davis is a tall, curly-haired, handsome man of 32 with a crank-and-go voice and a knowledge of basketball gleaned mostly from books ("I didn't play when I was at Brigham Young, you see"). Sitting in Principal LeFevre's office, he talked about the intricacies of his offense and how he had decided to use a double post this year. Then he was asked about the basketball scandal he'd cleared up, and about his moratorium on dating. How did a coach cope with such explosive issues?

"A couple of years ago," he said soberly, "I discovered some of the boys on the team—all of the first five, in fact—were smoking and drinking. I passed on a warning and let it ride, hoping they'd see the light. Well, there was this party. Cigarettes and beer. A couple of the boys joined in only because they knew if I found out and was going to do anything I'd have to go against them all. That's what I did. I made a clean sweep, and the next thing you know we're starting a bunch of sophomores—Brent and Wally and Joe and Lou. It was tough going for a while. I don't imagine I was too popular a fellow down at the pool hall. But it was a blessing in disguise. This team found itself. You'll see tonight. And I didn't have to worry about them. They made their own training rules and they abide by them. They're good boys."

Did they honest and truly give up girls on their own?

"Well, not exactly," said Davis, clearing his throat. "But rules are rules. Even now I have to get after them for standing around the halls mooning. There'll be plenty of time for that after the State tournament."

Principal LeFevre and his visitors stepped out into the hall. Basketball star Turek, tall and blond, and basketball star Riggs, short and brunet, were lounging by the locker of Cheerleader Melanie McEwen, soft and dreamy. "See what Coach means?" said LeFevre. On the bulletin board there was a huge chart divided into 40 squares. The first few squares had been crossed off with bold black strokes. "Countdown Calendar," read the title, and LeFevre explained that the girls had put up the poster as a reminder of that day of salvation when the ball boys, as they are called in Panguitch, would be freed from Davis' clutches. "Happy Days Are Here Again" said the caption under the last square.

As part of the general displeasure with the rules, Sophomore Sandra Crofts had written a poem (English Teacher Irene McEwen, Melanie's lovely mother, is very strong on poetry). The poem was called "Ball Season," and it portrayed the grim life of the boyless world of Panguitch girls and the girlless world of basketball players. "In bed every night, right at 10," Sandra had written sagely. "Being on the team is like being locked in a pen." She went on to say that all a girl does every day is go home to mother, and predicted that soon the girls will be dousing their hair with Brylcreem for something to run their fingers through.

The Panguitch gym was filled to popping for the game with Bryce Valley. In a front row seat Hot Rodney Duggins, the doctor's son, pointed out that on both sides the fans were sticking out onto the playing court. This was all right, he said, because it made it impossible for a Panguitch player to go out of bounds. Rodney's father leaned over to say that in days past, when crowds were not so orderly, the corners of the playing floor would actually round off with people.

The Panguitch junior varsity players won the preliminary game as the key decisions by the two officials, both Panguitch High faculty members, consistently went in their favor. "Think they're prejudiced?" said Rodney, winking wildly. Dr. Duggins said that this was, after all, just the preliminary, but he remembered a Panguitch varsity game in Marysvale when the timekeeper kept the clock between his knees, hidden from view, and the last 17 seconds took half an hour. "Then there was the referee who gave the opposition the ball while Panguitch was out getting a drink of water. The other team scored," said Dr. Duggins, "and one of our lady fans fainted on the spot." By this time the preliminary game was over and Official Maloy Dodds came over to join the conversation. When he was playing for Panguitch, he said, the ladies of Escalante used to line the street outside after a game and throw their high-heeled shoes at the Panguitch players.

The varsity game began, and Dr. Duggins noted with pride that he had delivered every boy on the starting team. "The starting teams of both schools," he added. Melanie McEwen and her cheerleaders soon had the metal-roofed Panguitch gym, the exact acoustical equivalent of a rural mailbox, rocking with repetition: "Baskets! Baskets! Baskets, boys! You make the baskets, we'll make the noise!" The boys responded, after a slow start, and soon were making baskets as fast as Melanie's group could suggest them.

Still, Bryce Valley, which had won only once previously, clung to the lead. It was sacrilege, said a Panguitch father. Coach Davis called for time. "Posing," he said to the Bobcats. "You saw a photographer out there, and you started posing." He sat back down. "Slow starts, slow starts," he muttered. "Times like this we couldn't throw the ball into the Great Salt Lake." Lou Tibbs slumped beside him, momentarily relieved of his job at forward. "Have you ever seen a worse basketball player than me?" he asked. "I think I probably have," said Coach Davis absently.

The tide, inexorable as it always is for the better, taller team, began to change. Joe

Riggs made six straight points, and Brent Turek and Wally Ortman seemed to get every rebound. Six, eight, ten, twenty ahead. The Bobcats piled it on.

They were every bit up their credits. The 6-foot-3, 180-pound Turek played with exceptional basketball sense, timing, and touch. His rebounding was superb. Wally Ortman's back dribble evoked many a long ah, and little Joe Riggs—inspired, his mother said afterward when the parents got together on the floor—scored 16 points on long one-hand shots. "Unh-unh, unh-unh, those Bobcats can't be beat," cheered the cheerleaders. Bryce Valley became Panguitch's 17th victim, 71 to 48, and the State tournament was just five games away.

"Now what do we do?" I asked Hot Rodney as the crowd filed out. It was barely 10 o'clock.

"Nothing to do," said Rodney despairingly. "Unless"—he brightened—"unless you want to ride up and down Main Street a couple times."

The next day, training rules notwithstanding, there remained the question of whether little Joe Riggs or big Brent Turek was in the lead with the beautiful Melanie. Between classes, Mrs. McEwen discussed this, but first she brought out a bundle of papers, the classroom compositions of Joe Riggs. One was entitled "Marriage Before Education?" and in it Joe wrote: "To a teenager of a small country town who has any foresight into the problems of the near future, the bonds of matrimony is a dread."

"Look at the others," said Mrs. McEwen. There was a poem, "Panguitch," in which Joe vowed to stay in his hometown "forever," and a thesis on the multiple horrors of opiate analgesics. They were well written. On one of them, Mrs. McEwen had scribbled, "You're such a swell guy."

"This is a smart, sensitive boy," she said. "But, most important, he realizes there's more to this world—and should be more to Panguitch—than basketball. Oh, they know how I feel," she went on, eyes flashing, "I'm still as much a fan as anybody. Go to all the games. But I'm also the oldest teacher here. My husband has done well in the motel business and we have been many places and seen many things. We're going to Hawaii next month and we're going to send Melanie to Paris to school if she wants to go. What I'm driving at is this: as a teacher, I want a great deal more for these kids, these very fine, wonderful kids, than just a score and a winning streak." Her voice had been rising. She stopped.

"Now," she continued quietly, "Melanie was named after that fine young woman in 'Gone With the Wind,' the one with such high character. I'm pleased to say Melanie has lived up to the image. And as for her love life, that's pretty much her own business."

Brent Turek, the third corner of the triangle, lives in Hatch, a village of 198 people, 16 miles south of Panguitch. In "My Story," a composition for Mrs. McEwen, Brent depicted himself as being initially amazed by how fast the crowd was at Panguitch High and how dumb he must have seemed. The night after the Bryce Valley game Mrs. Turek, a large, friendly, pink-faced woman, served a dinner of venison, rice, pear salad with strips of cheese, great slices of homemade bread baked in a wood-burning stove and milk. "I'm really very sorry," she said, "but there's no coffee." She said they didn't get much company in Hatch, and coffee-drinking strangers are rare. "It was funny last fall," she said. "Two bandits were supposed to be on the loose and the man on the radio said to lock your doors. Nobody in Hatch owns a lock."

It was suggested to Brent that he obviously had a talent for basketball and would surely get a scholarship offer. But what of the fair Melanie?

"Oh, gee, she's Joe's girl now, I guess," said Brent modestly. "I'm no heart smasher. Besides, girls are plenty destructive. 'Come on, come on, you don't have to be in training all the time,' that's what they say. Not Melanie, mind you, but some of them.

"Say, listen, I'd like to tell you a few things about the Mormon religion. I won't try to convert you or anything, but you'd be surprised how important it is in our lives and how much we help each other. It's a good feeling to be in touch with people. Tonight I'm going up to the Little Ranch to give them the monthly lesson. As a priest—you get to be a priest when you're 16—I'm supposed to give a lesson to two families a month. Come along and see."

The Little Ranch was another 5 miles south and apparently had fared poorly in the last 100 years. A simple unfrosted light bulb illuminated the tiny living room. There were pictures of old people on the walls, and a frayed Indian blanket covered the sofa. Mrs. Little, a painfully thin bright-eyed woman of 77, sat rocking in a misshapen black chair, her fur-lined boots unbuckled after a long day. As Brent gave the lesson—"Honor thy father and thy mother"—she nodded approvingly, interrupting on occasion to test him with a question.

When the lesson was over she said, "He's a fine boy, isn't he? And a fine Mormon. And isn't that a fine basketball team he's on? Undefeated, you know."

U.S.S. "UTAH"—UNMARKED GRAVE OF A MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a timely and touching article, entitled "U.S.S. *Utah*—Unmarked Grave of a Medal of Honor Winner," appeared in the Navy Times of March 27, 1963. This article points out that one of the Navy heroes who lies entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah* in Pearl Harbor holds the highest military honor which this country can give, the Congressional Medal of Honor. Pending before the Senate of the United States is S. 703, which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to fly the colors of the United States above the U.S.S. *Utah*, which is the grave of 54 men who died at Pearl Harbor.

In my opinion, it is a mark of ingratitude that this Nation has so long neglected these men. Thirty-six other Members of this body agree with me, because they have joined as cosponsors of S. 703. Additional Senators are still calling into my office and asking to be placed on the bill as cosponsors. I recommend for the reading of all the Senate and for all others who see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this very timely article by Bill Kreh, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.S. "UTAH"—UNMARKED GRAVE OF A MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

(By Bill Kreh)

Pearl Harbor was in flames. Hoarse klaxon horns were sounding general quarters through the bark of 5-inchers and the chatter of machineguns.

The ex-battleship U.S.S. *Utah*, moored northwest of Ford Island, shuddered at her berth as she took a torpedo hit from an attacking Japanese plane. A second hit came seconds later. She started to list rapidly.

The order came:

"Abandon ship over starboard side."

On deck, a ruddy-faced, brown-haired chief watertender named Peter Tomich pushed his way back through the men who were scrambling to get over the side. He headed for the nearest hatch.

"Gotta get below to my men and my boilers or they'll blow to hell," he shouted to an officer as he pushed him aside.

Pete Tomich disappeared down the hatch that December Sunday morning. He got his men out of the engine room and secured his boilers.

Then he refused to leave his post as the mortally wounded *Utah* rolled over in the water.

Chief Tomich is still at his post within the scorched hulk of the *Utah* that lies awash off Ford Island. He and 53 other *Utah* men never made it out of the ship on Pearl Harbor Day. They've been there since—their final resting place marked only by a small bronze plaque on the *Utah's* exposed side.

Tomich's devotion to duty and heroism didn't go unnoticed. He was awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously on March 4, 1942, by President Franklin Roosevelt—one of 15 Navy men to win the Nation's highest decoration at Pearl Harbor.

The fact that a Medal of Honor winner is among the 54 entombed *Utah* sailors was brought to attention by the officer who was skipper of the *Utah* at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack—Capt. James M. Steele, U.S. Navy Retired. He wrote to Senator FRANK MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, who is spearheading the combined campaign of Navy Times and Parade magazine to have a flag flown over the *Utah's* hulk.

"I think Chief Tomich knew he didn't have a chance of coming out alive when he went back down to his boilers," Captain Steele told Navy Times. "He deserved that medal."

The ex-U.S.S. *Utah* skipper says he believes the Japanese knew well the training value of the *Utah* to the fleet and considered her a worthy target. Captain Steele's views run counter to others' speculation that the *Utah*, which had been used as a target ship, was mistaken for an aircraft carrier by the enemy because of her stripped deck.

Captain Steele revealed that the *Utah*, besides being a target ship, had also been used as a test vessel for antiaircraft training.

"Far from being unarmed," he wrote Senator Moss, "the vessel had the most advanced antiaircraft guns in our Navy on board, some of which had not yet been installed on any of our major combatant ships."

The retired captain also made another point clear. "On December 7, 1941, the U.S.S. *Utah* was in full commission in the U.S. Navy," he wrote.

In the past, the Navy has maintained it could not, under present regulations, fly a flag on the half-submerged *Utah* because she was not in commission at the time she was sunk. Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth has told Senator Moss that the Navy would erect a flagpole and fly a flag over the *Utah* if Congress told it to and provided the money. A bill to do this—S. 703—has been introduced by Moss and is cosponsored by 36 other Senators.

The Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, composed of 12,000 members, has just put its support behind the bill.

In his letter to Moss, Captain Steele told how the *Utah* survivors used the ship's service funds of more than $1,000 to pay for the erection of a bronze plaque in the State Capitol Building at Salt Lake City in memory of their shipmates. The plaque was dedicated in 1945. It is the only place where the names of the entombed *Utah* men are inscribed.

Here, too, is where Peter Tomich's Medal of Honor is displayed—a medal which has gone unclaimed for 20 years by next-of-kin of a hero whose background is shrouded in mystery.

There's probably less known about Peter Tomich than about any other winner of the Medal of Honor in recent years. Records show he was born in Austria on June 3, 1893. He enlisted in the Navy at Newark, N.J., on January 23, 1919, and was naturalized the following October in Charlotte, N.C.

When he enlisted, he spelled his name "Tonich," but by 1922 had substituted an "m" for the "n." He never married and always gave as his next of kin, a cousin, John Tomich, 363 Brown Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

When he was killed at Pearl Harbor, the Navy's telegram to John Tomich was returned marked "address unknown." So was the letter notifying his cousin of his winning the Medal of Honor.

A check showed there was no such address in Los Angeles, nor was there any record of a John Tomich.

Exhaustive efforts were made by the Navy and the Red Cross to find some kin of Chief Tomich. An article in a national news magazine brought forth some clue to his background but no tangible leads on relatives.

One Navy officer wrote that he'd known Tomich for many years. He gave some insight into the type of man who would go back down to his boilers and certain doom in a sinking ship.

"Boilers were his life and steam was in his blood," the officer told the Navy. "He always knew the speed the ship was expected to make because he taught himself to read the signal flags—and he was always where he could read them."

"He knew his job and he knew his limitations. He was a wise and simple man * * * had no other interest in life but his boilers and his ship.

"One of the many stories about him is worth retelling. The destroyer squadron commander was a demanding soul who would ask the impossible and then want to know why it was not done expeditiously.

"One afternoon the speed was increased rapidly to full power. The steam pressure fell and some smoke was made. A little excitement ensued but when it was all over Tomich commented in his Slavic accent: 'He rings up 30 knots from stop and yells no smoke. I like to tell him that he is gottam lucky to be moving at all'."

No kin were found to claim his Medal of Honor and for nearly a year it remained filed away in the Navy Department.

In 1948, the Navy decided to name a new destroyer escort after the Pearl Harbor hero. The prospective skipper asked the Navy for the medal to be displayed in the ship. For 3 years the medal stayed with the U.S.S. *Tomich* (DE-242).

When the ship was put in mothballs in 1946, Tomich's medal was returned to the Navy. The Governor of Utah, at the suggestion of ex-*Utah* Skipper Captain Steele, asked the Navy to display it alongside the *Utah* memorial plaque in Salt Lake City. The Navy agreed, with the provision that it would be returned should a next of kin show up after all these years or if the Navy ever names another ship after Tomich.

There's a final ironic note to the Peter Tomich story. In 1936, he asked for transfer to either the destroyer *Perkins* or *Cushing*. His request was not granted—the billets for chief watertender aboard both these ships were already filled.

A few weeks later, his orders came through. They transferred him to the U.S.S. *Utah*.

It's been his home—and grave—ever since.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GALE W. McGEE, OF WYOMING, BEFORE 13TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this Nation's relationships with the United Nations have long been a subject of long and heated debate. Unfortunately, too many people are more eager to debate than they are to consider the issues at stake. For they often criticize the United Nations for doing or not doing things that organization was never designed to do.

In the interest of a realistic look at this subject and a better understanding of the role of the United Nations in our foreign policy, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a speech made recently at the 13th Annual Conference of National Organizations by my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

This speech not only puts the issues in proper perspective but also provides a real challenge for Americans who would destroy a valuable organization to further their own selfish ends.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] has demonstrated, once again, his insight into the problems we face today. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Part We Have To Play

(Address by the Honorable Gale W. McGee before the 13th annual Conference of National Organizations, called by the American Association for the United Nations, March 12, 1963, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

The United Nations is today facing its most critical test in the realm of public opinion. The critical nature of this test stems from two factors—first: After a decade and a half of operations, the world dream which emerged from World War II has now been taken for granted. Second, the practical application of the operations of the U.N. has run into the many frustrations that inevitably accompany the quest for practical, political solutions to theoretical problems. In fact, we may even now be paying the price for overselling the U.N. in its adoption as a cure-all for many things.

A national attitude of taking a working U.N. for granted, however, has created a new opening for the perpetual enemies of international understanding to mobilize a new assault on the operations located on the banks of the East River in New York. The mail in my office, as I'm sure in every Senator's office, daily records a litany of hate preached by the executive secretaries of a collection of right-wing organizations. These tirades are launched from a pre-Columbian world that is still flat rather than round. The cliches of hatred are routinely regurgitated by lackeys strategically located in the home districts of all Congressmen. That the attack marshals untruth and resorts to distortion should not distract from its impact upon the misinformed or uninformed mind where it can prey on ignorance and indifference. Hitler himself taught us the deadly effectiveness of the big lie. These enemies in our midst even now not only have perfected the Hitlerian techniques, they have added their own embellishments to get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States.

What this means is that you and I have to spend less time talking to each other and more time out on the front lines in the marketplace spiking the falsehoods and promoting the truth.

Typical of these is contained in a letter I received only last week from New York which inquires, "Mr. Congressman, how can we uphold the U.N. which every layman knows supersedes the Constitution of the United States? The United States has become but a tool of the Communists." The truth of the matter, of course, is that the Communists charge exactly the opposite; namely, that the U.N. is a tool of the United States. The events in Korea and in the Congo sometimes seem to lend credence to this latter charge where in both instances we decided that it was a fundamental security interest of the United States to stop the Communist Chinese from crossing the 38th parallel on one hand and from preventing the Russians from moving into central Africa on the other. In each instance, we persuaded the U.N. to endorse these responsibilities.

Or take the point raised in this letter recently received from Casper in my own State. "When are we going to withdraw from the Communist-dominated U.N. and expel the whole stinking mess from our shores?" With all of the assertions that the U.N. is a Red tool, it remains strange indeed how violently the Communists themselves oppose it and how strenuously they seek to disrupt its activity. We ought to weigh well Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's reminder that in the U.N. the free world has not lost a single vote to the Communists.

Unfortunately, the facts don't get in the way of the U.N. haters. They will continue the attack—as one did only this morning when he wrote, "I am sorry to read that you are such a champion of the dying U.N. It is a Communist, Jew-dominated Zeus god, glasshouse in New York. I hope the voters of Wyoming catch up with you on this question."

And from California, "Can't you explain to me why communism has spread so rapidly since we joined the U.N.?" This man needs to be reminded of some elementary facts of international life. One is that, so far, communism has gone nowhere in the world and stayed as an idea. It has remained only where shored up by bayonets. Even more significantly, of the 46 newly independent nations born since World War II, not a single one of them has adopted communism as its way of life.

Basic to eliminating misunderstanding about the U.N. is that we make it abundantly clear what it is not. This should then leave us with our base of operations for what it is and can do. First of all, it is not a private American club. It is truly, as its name describes, a world organization. Second, it is not an anti-Communist league. In all truth, as one woman from Illinois wrote, "I suspect there may be some Communists in that U.N. thing in New York." In fact, she ought to understand that there are also Buddhists, Presbyterians, and a wide assortment of other species currently at loose in the world. Third, the U.N. was not originally conceived as a peace-enforcing agency. It was created to talk peace, and even to make it possible but not to carry it out.

Once we accept those fundamentals, it is possible then to cast the U.N. in its proper international perspective of this moment.

(a) In keeping with that perspective, we have to see the United Nations as one of several strings to our own survival bow. The United Nations no more determines U.S. foreign policy than does NATO, or the OAS, or SEATO. The pot of international politics is continually boiling. Where it spills over may vary from crisis to crisis. How we succeed in turning down the fire may be as variable as the tongues of the flames themselves.

For example, the most critical international tension point is Berlin. Yet Berlin does not lend itself to United Nations action nearly as effectively as it does to NATO action. Emotionally, Cuba is our hottest current question. It does not lend itself to United Nations action because the U.N. is not an anti-Communist group. The OAS, however, is more appropriately tailored for this hemisphere problem. Or in Vietnam, where no other existing agency has seemed capable of acting, unilateral activity on the part of the United States has been required. Finally, in special instances, like the Israeli-Arab question, or the Congo, the U.N. itself is peculiarly better suited to cope with those areas. What this means is that there can be no pat formula or single solution to all crises. The nature of each threat has to be assessed against the capabilities of the several reservoirs of power available to us, whether this be NATO in Berlin, OAS in Cuba, the U.N. in the Near East, or the USA alone in Southeast Asia. It permits us a flexibility and a set of alternatives for resisting the encroachments of Soviet imperialism—or anybody else's for that matter.

(b) The emergence of neutralism and national sovereignty within the U.N. constitute a new and great defense against international predators. For some, this fact alone would seem to be a reversal of international goals. Beginning with World War I, students of international policy preached the evil of national sovereignty as a cause of war. With the appearance of many new nations since the last war, however, the importance of each new country standing on its own feet and jealously guarding its independent status has come to be recognized. Irrespective of choosing up sides, or even of which side, national independence for Togo, or Indonesia, or Venezuela is a far more certain deterrent to the erosions of international communism than short-range pacts and treaties. In the United Nations independence has been dignified and upgraded. The extent to which it continues to do so can only enhance the capacities of the new states for resisting threats from the outside.

(c) Here in the United States it behooves us to avoid the pitfall of fixed percentage ceilings on our contributions to the U.N. Mindful as we must be of the disproportionate share of those burdens which we have been carrying, we, nonetheless, must be quick to weigh the consequences of the alternative. To be specific, in fixing our own percentage of contributions, we forfeit to the other side the initiative for destroying the U.N. By cutting off our contributions at whatever level arbitrarily, we leave open to the Soviets the decision simply not to pay up their share and thus destroy the U.N. I do not believe we ought to be maneuvered into that kind of bind.

(d) Keeping the U.N. in perspective requires that we continually examine its operations as a changing force. On the anvil of experience there have been hammered out new concepts of U.N. capacities. The resolution for peace during the Korean crisis is a case in point. By transferring the weight of power from the Security Council to the General Assembly, the act likewise alters the relationship of our own national interests to that body. What was then regarded as a brilliant tactical victory for the United States has left in its wake some new headaches connected with our own veto power.

Also, the role of the United Nations which the exigencies of the Congo crisis have spelled out in recent years has materially altered the peace-enforcing role of this international body. These two illustrations are sufficient to remind us that it would be folly to look upon the U.N. with fixed concepts or as a static institution. *Unless or until it responds* to the forces of change and our attitudes toward it react the same way, those same changing forces will tear it apart. History teaches us nothing if not the inevitability of change.

If reason and wisdom are to prevail and the opportunity for a free interchange of ideas and alternatives, individual citizens—not statesmen and diplomats—are going to have to be willing to go to bat again for the cause of the United Nations. If we're going to the luxury of a division of opinion in plotting a direction for human affairs, it is necessary that we spike now these insidious rumors and deliberate misrepresentations of the issues at stake in today's world. This cannot be fought in the chambers of the United Nations; this cannot be dealt with in releases from the Department of State; this cannot be resolved in the Halls of Congress. This must be settled first of all on Main Street.

1. The next time you hear at your bridge club, or at Rotary, or at your coffee break some of the allegations referred to earlier in these remarks, do not avoid nailing them then and there. Too many of those of us who believe have been tempted to avoid controversy rather than to accept responsibility for correcting untruth.

2. Write a letter to your editor. Recent studies are conclusive that letters to the editor, particularly in our smalltown newspapers, have become an effective instrument for reaching the public mind. The hate mongers are busy perfecting this technique. It is time we fight back in kind.

3. Get on your local radio station. Get your organization to buy time, if necessary, to reply to the charges of the McIntyres, Billy Hargises, the Paul Harveys, and the Dan Smoots. It is not a question of denying the enemies of the U.N. an opportunity to be heard but rather whether we should forfeit the field to them through indifference. The U.N. and the cause of world peace do not speak for themselves; they have to be spoken for. Peace does not just happen; it has to be sought and its cause waged as vigorously as we wage war.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, does that conclude the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Is there additional morning business?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there additional morning business? *If not, morning business is closed.*

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the interest of the good name of as able a public servant as we have had in the years I have worked in the legislative and executive branches of this Government, I will discuss briefly today a subject which recently has been the source of a great deal of publicity.

I refer to the current Senate investigation of the award by the Department of Defense of the so-called TFX contract to the General Dynamics Corp., instead of the Boeing Co.; and more specifically, to an article in the Washington Evening Star of March 20, entitled: "Gilpatric Relationship Probed in TFX Award—Senators Find Pentagon Official Was in Contract Winner's Law Firm."

A great many people already know of *the extraordinary qualifications for his* present position that are contained in the career of Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric.

In that he is one of the Nation's most prominent lawyers, it was only natural that he came to know well the managements of major companies in the aircraft and other industries, including both Boeing and General Dynamics. It is of interest that at various times he has done legal work for both these corporations; and as a result he became a friend of both William Allen, president of Boeing, and Frank Pace, then Secretary of the Army, later head of General Dynamics-Convair.

After returning in 1953 to his law firm, Cravath, Swaine & Moore, in which he was a senior partner, Mr. Gilpatric followed scrupulously the policy of never representing any member of the defense industry in matters having to do with the Defense Establishment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I conclude my statement before yielding to the able Senator from Nebraska, unless he prefers I yield at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Before the Senator goes into other questions, I should like the distinguished Senator from Missouri to yield on the question of the law firm to which he has referred. If he does not wish to do so at this time, I shall wait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would appreciate it if my friend would wait. Otherwise I must yield, of course, to other Senators.

Occasionally, however, Mr. Gilpatric did serve as an adviser on other matters for such concerns as Boeing and Convair.

For example, during 1957 and 1958, Mr. Gilpatric was asked by the Boeing Co. to assist in preparing its case against the Renegotiation Board in the U.S. Court of Claims; and in 1958 he appeared as a witness for Boeing in that proceeding, testifying as to Boeing's performance in the production of B-47 bombers on the basis of his knowledge of that program during the time he was with the Air Force in the years 1951–53.

Mr. Gilpatric also served as adviser to General Dynamics Corp. during 1959 and 1960 in connection with the acquisition *of a business that was not connected* with the aircraft industry.

Since formed in the early part of the 19th century, Secretary Gilpatric's law firm has represented many American corporations, both large and small, which have done business with the U.S. Military Establishment. Among the firm's clients are such companies as Bethlehem Steel, Newport News Shipbuilding, Westinghouse Electric, International Business Machine, Minneapolis-Honeywell, Fairchild Camera & Instrument, Perkin-Elmer Corp., Studebaker, Olin Mathieson Chemical.

Almost always the legal work done for such concerns by the Cravath firm does *not include advice and assistance to* them in connection with the sale to the Government of military equipment. In the case of General Dynamics, for example, his firm advises on certain corporate and financial matters; but has *nothing to do with any military pro*curement activities of that corporation or its divisions, such as Canadair, Convair, and Electric Boat.

But to be sure he would have no conflict of interest, when Mr. Gilpatric entered Government service in 1951, and again in 1961, he withdrew from his firm and had no connection with it during the entire period of his Government service.

In addition, his prior firm association, as well as the nature of its legal work, were made a matter of public record each time he was confirmed unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and later by the Senate itself.

With such a record of accomplishment, it is saddening to feel constrained to rise in defense of such a public servant.

Actually, this defense also constitutes a defense of scores of others who have come into Government from private life; and also citizens who, we can only hope, will in the future be willing to make the same type and character of sacrifice in undertaking Government service as has been characteristic of the career of Roswell Gilpatric.

Let us look for a minute at past history with respect to the careers of his predecessors.

Since its inception, this Nation has had in all over 100 military Secretaries; that is, Secretaries of War, Navy, Army, Air Force, and Defense.

Over two-thirds of these public servants have had a professional background, mostly the legal profession.

Amonk the latter have been such Secretaries of War as Elihu Root, Newton D. Baker, Henry L. Stimson, Louis Johnson, and Kenneth Royall.

There have also been a number of military Secretaries chosen from the investment banking profession, such as James Forrestal, Robert Lovett, and Thomas Gates.

Coming as they often have from large legal or banking firms, professional men of this type have usually had associations with broad sectors of American business, including those elements which serve the Defense Establishment.

It is a fact that it would be well nigh impossible to select a man for a Defense secretaryship from either a large law firm or banking firm who had not had some previous connection with a client doing business with the Military Establishment.

The question then may be asked: Does this state of affairs give rise to a conflict-of-interest problem comparable to that in the case of an individual who comes to the Defense Department from a corporation doing business with the military? In the latter case, however, any "conflict of interest" has been avoided by having the appointee, as a condition to acceptance of his office, divest himself of any financial interest or other connection with the business he is leaving to enter Government service.

In the case of professional men accepting Presidential appointments in the Defense Department, it has been considered proper to require that the individuals sever their relationships with their firms, afer a disclosure of the nature of the business carried on by such firms.

Thus, in the case of Secretary Gilpatric, when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Armed Services for the hearing on his confirmation on January 17, 1961, he made the following statement prior to the committee's approval of his nomination:

> Now, I did not submit to the committee any financial statement, because, I am sorry to say, I do not own beneficially any securities in any corporation.
>
> In that respect I, unhappily, do not have a conflict-of-interest problem.
>
> I do, however, want to explain to the committee my situation with respect to my law firm, because I have been a member for 20 years, except for the time I was in Government, of a firm that has served many large companies, small companies, that have done business with the Defense Department.
>
> Before I take office, if I am confirmed, I will retire, of course, from that firm, and I will have no financial or other interest in it, except that I will be paid sums of money that will represent my interest in work that was done before I left the firm; not large sums of money, but sums that represent the unbilled and uncollected work of the firm for past periods.
>
> But, I repeat, I will have no interest whatsoever in the future business of the firm, and I will sever my connection with it.

If these steps—namely, withdrawal from his law firm and disclosure of the fact that the firm's clients include companies doing business with the Defense Department—do not meet any conflicts of interest problem, no professional man with the extraordinary background of Mr. Gilpatric could ever qualify for appointment to a statutory position in the Department of Defense.

In this respect, Gilpatric's position is no different whatever from that of many of his distinguished predecessors, including his own former partner, John J. McCloy, who left the Cravath firm in 1939, to become Assistant Secretary of War under Secretary Stimson.

The latter, considered one of the greatest of all Secretaries, also came from a large New York law firm, one which numbered among its clients many concerns doing business with the Defense Department.

So much for Roswell Gilpatric, who, after these widely published stories implying, if not asserting, a conflict of interest, can receive little reward for his long and distinguished public career beyond the inner gratification which is the right of any man who knows he has served his country well.

Now as to other aspects of this TFX award.

Let me say first what I am sure all my colleagues know, namely: in no sense are these remarks to be considered any criticism of any member of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee on Investigations. There is no one in the Senate for whom I have greater respect and affection than I do for its chairman, the senior Senator from Arkansas. I served with him for many years on this committee, and know firsthand of his paramount desire to be fair and just at all times. I have the same high respect and regard for the ranking member of his committee, the very able Senator from Washington.

With that premise, and because of my growing apprehension as to what these hearings could well be doing to the true defense posture of the United States, I take the liberty of presenting a few additional thoughts.

As one who, in 1946, was assigned by the Secretary of War the task of monitoring with the Congress the original National Defense Act of 1947; and who has participated, in some fashion, in the subsequent changes in this act of 1949, 1953, and most important, 1958, I well remember that, each time the question of the structure of the organization of the Department of Defense came up for review, invariably the investigation made by the Congress resulted in this body concluding that the Secretary of Defense needed more authority to properly conduct the operations of his office; and as a result, many of the original restraints on his authority have been removed.

At this point the record should show that, as of now, and as the result of a law passed by the Congress, the Secretary of Defense has "direction, authority, and control" over the conduct of our Military Establishment.

The statute clearly spells out this authority. Therefore why this formal, continued, and intense scrutiny of his decision, which decision followed the recommendations of three of his four chief civilian heads—Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric, Secretary of the Navy Korth, and Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert—the fourth, the Secretary of the Army, was not connected with the matter.

But regardless of what the Service Secretaries thought, or any member of the military, the Secretary of Defense was the only person who could make the decision in this case; because the decision involved the assignment of the development of a weapon system to one service, the Air Force, for operational use by two services, the Air Force and the Navy.

The National Security Act vests the responsibility for this type of decision directly in the Secretary of Defense. Moreover, it is the Secretary of Defense who recommends to the President and the Congress the budget for the Department. Only he can make a decision having budgetary implications in excess of $6 billion.

If this is true, even if a mistake in judgment has been made—and I do not believe any such mistake was made—the right of decision was clearly that of the Secretary of Defense.

That is the law, and anybody who opposes that position opposes the law.

There is another aspect of this matter which worries me even more, however.

Some of us have differed with the present Secretary of Defense on matters of judgment—on at least one occasion that has been true of myself. Differences in matters of judgment, however, and a formal effort to reverse a major policy decision on the grounds the Secretary has exceeded his authority, are two entirely different subjects.

If every time a disgruntled contractor, or a party in interest with a disgruntled contractor, does not obtain a contract on which the contractor has bid, a congressional investigation is thereupon requested, then much, if not most, of the time of those responsible for our defense policies—in this most critical world of today—must be taken up in justifying an administrative decision.

It is not paradoxical that the company involved, Boeing, has received more business from the Department of Defense than any airplane company in the history of the United States.

In the 11 years, 1951 to 1961 inclusive, Boeing received from the U.S. Government $11,818,900,000.

From that business, Boeing earned a net profit of $907,700,000.

And that is not all. In addition to this tremendous amount of defense business, during these 11 years Boeing obtained $1,346,400,000 of commercial business. On this latter business they earned some $90 million.

This commercial business, on which they also profited, was primarily a fallout from their military work. Much of their outstanding success, commercially, has been the 707 series of airliners, a fallout from the B-52 bomber—as the leader in the Senate in the field of domestic aviation, my able colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], well knows, along with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

In addition, they have the Minuteman program, and the Dyna-Soar, and have just received an order from the space agency, NASA, for some half a billion dollars.

Now let me turn to another aspect of the problem.

Of equal importance is what the continuation of this investigation could do to the security of the country; to our capacity to resist the obviously growing danger of Communist aggressions, from all over the world.

Anyone with experience in the military knows it is vital, under our system, that there be a proper relationship of mutual trust and respect between those who devote their lives to a military career, and those appointed under the statute to be the civilian leaders of the military.

One of the basic principles of our Government is civilian control over the military; but that control, whether real or apparent, means little or nothing from the standpoint of adequate defense unless there is mutual respect on both sides.

From many sources one hears that these hearings are now breaking down the normal mutual trust and respect between the military and its civilian leadership; and those of us in this body who have had some military experience know that morale is a priceless asset in case military action is ever forced upon us.

If these four able and dedicated Americans cannot be permitted to handle these defense problems in accordance with the law, how can we ever obtain those civilian leaders with proper experience and background, especially when recognizing the great personal sacrifices involved for them?

Despite the eminence of these civilian heads in their own communities, and in the Nation as a whole, they are now being held up to public criticism and censure because they exercised their right of judgment, under the law.

It goes further. People in my State are now asking me if lack of integrity is involved in this award.

If men who give up what these men have given up in order to serve their country in peacetime, run the risk of not only having their judgment but also their integrity attacked, what chance will there be to continue to obtain the talent vital to the security of our Nation?

I have read the statement of the Secretary of Defense; and, based on his position, I believe he made the correct decision, not only from the standpoint of the Military Establishment, in which I have had some experience, but also from the standpoint of the American taxpayer.

Even if he and his principal associates did not, however, make the correct decision, it was still their right, under the law this Congress passed; and that fact cannot be overemphasized.

In closing, Mr. President, may I say with greatest respect to all those involved, that I believe each day this attack on our civilian leaders of the Defense Establishment continues, the morale of the Armed Forces is further lowered; and such a result can only be detrimental to the security of the United States.

Therefore because of all the reasons previously mentioned and especially because of the obvious necessity for us to cope with current Communist aggression, I would hope whatever the decision, that decision be reached expeditiously and these hearings be concluded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my beloved colleague the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Missouri was not criticizing the committee for its investigation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right. I am not criticizing the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand it is the view of the distinguished Senator from Missouri that this investigation should not continue?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. Let me say to the distinguished chairman I believe it should be continued. I hope it can be concluded as expeditiously as possible, because I believe it is detrimental to our security, since in my opinion it is reducing the morale of the Armed Forces. The able chairman of the committee and I agree on most things, and I know he wants me to express my opinion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he thinks it would be well, under all the circumstances and the apprehensions that have been expressed, for the Senate simply to adopt a resolution directing that the hearings be ended and that no further proceedings be held thereunder.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. Any such action would be implied criticism of the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas. He knows of my devotion to him. We have differences of opinion in some matters with respect to this particular case. But I hope he will continue with his investigation. He is fair and just.

I hope, as soon as the chairman interrogates the man who, under the law, had the right to make the decision, the committee will find this decision was proper.

May I add that one of the mistakes in the Department of Defense—and many have been made—is that it felt it would be better for the Secretary of Defense to postpone his appearance. I have heard this from both sides. So if there has been any delay in calling the Secretary of Defense, it had nothing to do with the chairman. He offered to accede to the wishes of the Secretary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not want to take the time of the Senate. I want to go back to the hearings. I am trying to expedite them. If my friend will yield to me for this one observation, he speaks of the military being under attack and the Defense Department being under attack. I hope it has not come to the point that if the Congress, or an arm of the Senate, under its duty as spelled out in the law, undertakes to perform that duty and inquires how that decision was arrived at, what was taken into account, whether or not the other bid or offer was valid, as good, or better—such inquiry will be characterized as an attack. If so, the Senate has authorized that attack. I do not believe it comes properly within that context.

I have done a great deal of investigating as a representative of this body. I have tried to be fair. I appreciate the Senator's having just said that I offered to let Secretary McNamara appear first and put his case before the committee and the country before any other testimony was heard. Immediately when he felt he ought to, he had his opportunity. He is offering it this afternoon and, further, implementing a statement he sent to the committee, which the committee received when he was not able to appear earlier. I think the committee is carrying out its mandate.

If it is not, the Senate can control it. It can pass a resolution and tell the committee to cease and desist in this inquiry. If it will do that, it will relieve the chairman, and I am sure other members of the committee, from a very heavy responsibility. If we make mistakes, people have a right to criticize us. If I do something that is wrong, let them criticize me. I am willing to do the best I can. I welcome criticism when I make mistakes. I do not believe that all criticism is malicious. I do not regard it that way. I welcome constructive criticism. I do believe that this committee is either carrying out the will of the Senate, and serving as an arm of the Senate, and performing a duty that it is under mandate to perform, or it is beyond its jurisdiction, and it has launched out on something in which the Senate is not interested and in which the country is not interested. If we are doing that, the Senate has a responsibility to act and to pass a resolution directing that the committee desist from further proceedings.

That is all I want to say, Mr. President. Until the Senate does that, I shall do my duty as I see it, and that is to proceed with the hearings. I shall certainly proceed with them expeditiously.

Right before me, in the newspaper, I read of complaints about witnesses being mistreated. This committee is meeting at night in order to expedite the hearings. It is interrogating witnesses at night in order to expedite the business of the committee. I am going to stand by the committee until it can be shown that we are doing something wrong. I will stand behind the staff until it can be shown that they are doing something wrong. One member of the staff has served the committee for 16 years. He served under the present Attorney General. He is one of the top men. I do not believe that he has any such characteristics as he is being criticized for. The other member of the staff who is under criticism here is on loan from the General Accounting Office. He is a humble fellow. I never heard him raise his voice or saw him do anything improper in his work for the committee.

We might just as well get down to these things right here on the floor. If the Senate does not have confidence in the committee, it should withdraw its authority. This is not a pleasant thing. I get no pleasure out of doing hard work.

The Senator speaks about the country and about what is happening.

I say to the Senator that there is enough of a question raised here that the matter ought to be cleared up, and that the country wants it cleared up, in my judgment. I will do the best I can. I say that when all the facts are in, the record will justify the committee's being sustained in the action it has taken. If we do not get all the facts, we will get other reports which will do a great deal of harm. It is like the reports that are made to members of the press but with the admonition, "You cannot quote me. You must not say where this comes from." Yet it comes from the Pentagon. When I want to criticize anyone, or cast aspersions against anyone in Government, I never resort to going under cover or hiding behind that kind of stratagem.

Let us hope that there is nothing wrong in all this, and that at most it is a case of bad judgment or a difference of opinion. Let us hope that is all there is to it. In the meantime, I will carry out the will of the Senate. That is all I want to say.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will be glad to yield, but first let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I am grateful for his remarks. I join him in feeling that these background press conferences are dangerous. They have been going on for some time, ever since 1946 at least, when I first went to the Pentagon. They are held in order to help the press get all the story.

I am worried about the fact the Deputy Secretary of Defense said this morning that statements attributed to him by some members of the press—and he emphasized there were only some members—were at variance with what he had said.

In all my experience in government I have never known a man of higher character, or greater ability, than Roswell Gilpatric. That is one of the chief reasons I am making these remarks today. I also have complete respect and confidence in the distinguished chairman of the committee.

But I do believe, because of the turn of events, all this is affecting the morale of the Armed Forces. I am grateful to him for saying that he will conduct these hearings as expeditiously as possible. In my statement today there is no implication or criticism that he has not done so.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In urging that the hearings proceed expeditiously and that they be ended soon, does the Senator suggest that they be ended before all the facts are in?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, I do not.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have had some experience in the aviation industry. As long as the Senator has raised this point, I believe it is possible that I know as much about the aviation industry as most Members of the Senate. This is a technical discussion. It involves wing structure, overall performance. These are always very difficult problems to analyze in detail. Therefore, what we are doing is criticizing the judgment of the Secretary of Defense. The able Senator from Nebraska is a lawyer. What I am saying is that, even if the Secretary of Defense has made a mistake—and I have studied the record, and based on my experience I do not believe he has, but even if he has made a mistake, we, the Congress, passed a law, the National Security Act of 1947, which we further amended in 1958, and that law gives him the right to make that mistake. I do not say he did. I do not believe he did.

I say to the Senator from Nebraska, who represents a great State, the center of our Strategic Air Force, that the basis of our Military Establishment under the Constitution is civilian control. I would be a little nervous if the Secretary had gone against all his civilian advisers when he made this decision. But he did not do so. Every one of his leading civilian advisers involved in this decision recommended, without any reservation of any kind, that he make the decision which he did make.

I might add that the military board, in its final presentation to civilian authority, said that either one of these airplanes could do the job for which it was designed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator does not believe the hearing should be ended until all the facts are in. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I answered that question before when the Senator raised it; of course not.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the distinguished Senator from Missouri read the classified hearings?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know what classified hearings the Senator is referring to. Through the courtesy and fairness of the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, the members of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee were not only invited to attend the hearings, but were allowed to ask questions of the witnesses. I have attended as many hearings as I could, and read as much of the proceedings as I could. I also have an expert aeronautical engineer on my staff, who has studied the hearings. I have interrogated witnesses before the committee. Let me assure the Senator from Nebraska that I have done my best to understand the subject.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I have noticed him at the hearings. I wish he could be there all the time. Before I came to the floor today I inquired of the chief clerk of the committee if anyone had withdrawn copies of the hearings to read. I was informed that not one Senator has asked for them. I inquired of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, this morning, if any person other than the people connected with the Department of Defense had received classified copies of the hearings. He said that to his knowledge they had not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was there when that was said.

Mr. CURTIS. I noticed what the Senator said about the employment of the law firm. He read some material similar to the statement made by Mr. Gilpatric this morning, which was that in 1957 and 1958, Mr. Gilpatric performed legal services for Boeing. Also, Mr. Gilpatric's statement said that in 1959 and 1960, while he was a member of that firm, he performed services for General Dynamics.

It is also true—and I might ask the Senator if he is aware of it—that upon my cross-examination of Mr. Gilpatric, we found that there had been no employment by Boeing since 1938——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Since 1958.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, 1958, almost 5 years ago; and upon cross examination, Mr. Gilpatric told us that the firm now—in 1963—is employed by General Dynamics.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What is the point?

Mr. CURTIS. It was employed in 1962 and 1961.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So what?

Mr. CURTIS. His statement referred only to 1959 and 1960.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator imply that Mr. Gilpatric's statement was disingenuous; that he was trying to conceal facts? What is the purpose of the interrogation of the Senator?

Mr. CURTIS. The purpose of the interrogation is to point out that as of this hour the firm is employed by General Dynamics and has been since 1959; and that the current employment by General Dynamics was brought about by the effort of Mr. Gilpatric while he was in the firm.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to check the record carefully. I heard what the distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense stated this morning. He is one of the ablest and most patriotic men I have ever known. He was Under Secretary of the Air Force when the Secretary of the Army was Mr. Frank Pace. He also told the Senator from Nebraska, as he did the rest of us, that the founder of General Dynamics was previously a member of the law firm of Cravath, and that therefore he obviously had absolutely nothing to do with originating the relationships. The fact is that General Dynamics Corp., due in part to the success of the Boeing Co., lost more money, to the best of my knowledge, than any company ever lost on a program in the history of the free world. That is sad but true and is partly attributed to the superiority of the 707 and the 727 to other planned commercial aircraft.

Nevertheless, if the Senator from Nebraska feels that inasmuch as the former Secretary of the Army, an able and patriotic public servant who was previously Director of the Bureau of the Budget, had an opportunity to learn of the vision, ability, and skill of the Under Secretary of the Air Force of that time, and who later went back to practice law in New York—if the Senator from Nebraska feels that the former Secretary of the Army later, in private business, on his own, trying to make money for his company, made a mistake either in ethics, propriety, or intelligence, when he requested the current distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense, who was then in private practice, to help him with his problem, as great a problem as any I know of in the history of private business in this country, I cannot agree.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Missouri believe that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] would proceed with an investigation because Boeing or any other company was, as the Senator has stated, "a disgruntled bidder"?

Mr. SYMINGTON. A few minutes ago I gave my opinion on that to the Senator from Arkansas. He is one of the closest friends I have in the Senate or anywhere else, a dedicated and devoted patriot. I do not in any way criticize the establishment of these hearings; nor in turn would he ever suggest to me that I could not come on the floor of the Senate and tell him, with great respect, what I felt was going on as a result of the hearings. In any case, I fully support the hearings.

All I said was, first, that I deeply regretted the implied press attacks made against one of the ablest and most patriotic men I have ever known in Government, and second, I hoped that, inasmuch as this subject is boiling over and a subject of discussion in hundreds of military establishments all over the world, they could be concluded as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator did refer to these hearings, and stated that Boeing was a "disgruntled bidder." Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to suggest that this investigation is being carried on because the Boeing Co. was a disappointed or "disgruntled bidder"?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Presumably, this investigation is being carried on because someone objected to this award not being made to the Boeing Co. Inasmuch as my able friend from Nebraska is a member of the committee, he probably knows more about that than I.

Mr. CURTIS. I should say, in response to that statement, that many military people, civilians who are not connected with either company, competent aeronautical engineers, and others, are greatly disturbed over the decision that was made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a former Assistant Secretary of War and former Secretary, I am not surprised that some of the military in uniform object to some decisions made by those civilians who, under our Constitution and the statute, have the right of decision.

Mr. CURTIS. Still, I cannot reconcile the position of the distinguished Senator from Missouri by citing all the millions of dollars of business which Boeing has received as a reason why this investigation should not go on.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I never cited that as a reason why the investigation should not continue.

Mr. CURTIS. What was the purpose of reciting the business that Boeing received? What does that show?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it shows that the Boeing Co. in the past had been treated fairly; that the Boeing Co. at present, with the Minuteman, is being treated fairly; and that the Boeing Co. in the future, if the Dyna-Soar goes into production, as I hope it will, will have been treated fairly.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure the Senator from Missouri will agree that the amount of business which a company has is certainly not a relevant basis for the consideration of the decision whether an award of a contract should be made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, it is not. The only reason I mentioned it was that I have heard people felt the Boeing Co. was treated unfairly. All I can say is that the Boeing Co. has obtained nearly $11 billion in business in the last 11 years, and I think that would show it has not been treated unfairly.

When Skybolt was cancelled, the Boeing Co. received a heavy addition to their already heavy Minuteman schedule.

I hope the Senator from Washington will join with me—and I am sure he does—in the hope Dyna-Soar will continue.

I have also learned recently that NASA has given Boeing a half-billion-dollar space order.

Mr. JACKSON. I suggest that that statement is not relevant to anything which the committee is considering. If we are to say that a company which has a good business record is to be discounted in the consideration of Government contracts, if we say that the awarding of a contract is not to be decided on the merits, that is a sad day. But since the Senator has raised this question, I ask him, Who is the largest holder of defense contracts today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Over the last 11 years——

Mr. JACKSON. That is not the question. Who is the largest holder of defense contracts, excluding this TFX contract?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know. If the Senator from Washington knows, I hope he will tell us.

Mr. JACKSON. It is General Dynamics. I did not want to bring this up. I do not see why the Senator wishes to inject irrelevant questions into the particular hearing we are considering. The committee is trying to decide this question on the merits, simply to get the facts. If there is any real criticism, the Senator, who is of course an invited member of the committee can ask questions. To my knowledge, he has not attended the hearings all the time. Probably he could not have done so.

But I would suggest that those complaints be directed in the committee, where he has a chance to ask the questions and to get the information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think the Senator from Washington was on the floor to hear all my statement, else he would better understand my position and my respect for him.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sorry that I came in a little late.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I understand. With all due respect to my friend, the Senator from Washington, who knows how fond I am of him, and how much I respect him, I still will say what I believe.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course the Senator from Missouri can say what he wants to say. But let me ask whether he condones the attacks made by an unknown accuser against the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and myself.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. Before the Senator from Washington entered the Chamber, I expressed my opinion about the unfortunate aspects of these anonymous statements. I would never condone an attack on the Senator from Washington, because in my judgment he is one of the most able Members of the Senate, one who knows as much as any Senator about the functioning of the executive and legislative branches.

However, I do not appreciate the attacks made on a long-time friend of mine, whom perhaps I had something to do with persuading to return to Government service. I think he is as honorable as any Member of this body.

Mr. JACKSON. I have not made any attacks on him; but he did make an attack on me, and it was made from an anonymous platform. I do not mind attacks on me, but I should like to know who my accuser is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I listened to the Secretary's statement this morning. It is my understanding of the record—of course the record will speak for itself—that Mr. Gilpatric said he did not attack the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I shall not go into that matter now; the record will be made available to the press, and the record will speak for itself.

But I think it unfortunate to have such a development occur, when it could have been avoided by the Pentagon. On the very day when these news stories came out, the Pentagon had an opportunity to repudiate them; but the Pentagon did not do so until representatives of the Pentagon were required to come before the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if I were in the position of the very able Senator from Washington, I would feel incensed about this matter, especially after the publication of some of the articles he showed to me. The last thing I would want to do would be to criticize him.

As I said before he came to the floor, these background press conferences have been going on in the Pentagon ever since I came here—1945, 18 years ago. That is done in an effort to help the press with their problem of getting the truth to the people—all truth which will not help a possible enemy.

I feel that one good coming from these hearings is the indication that perhaps these press conferences should be abolished. Based on the testimony of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, at least someone in that group did not carry out what the Secretary of Defense called the ground rules.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Missouri is concerned with the reputations of people. Does he not think that, in fairness, he should also criticize high officials in the Pentagon who make such statements? I do not refer to statements about the background of defense problems, as such; but they should not make personal attacks, such as those which appeared in the press, attacking the integrity or the character of the chairman of the committee [Mr. McClellan] or of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course I agree that should not occur.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course it should not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to speak only briefly.

First, I desire to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who surely is highly regarded by all the Members of this body, as are also the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]. I believe it fair to say that what disturbed the Senator from Missouri was the making of charges and countercharges which did not provide any information on the issue into which the committee itself seeks to probe. I believe it can well be stated now that the Senator from Missouri has not proposed that the hearings not be conducted. To the contrary, in the course of his cross-examination by the chairman of the committee, the Senator said the hearings should be conducted.

I wish to say that the chairman of the committee is working day and night, as we know; and any Senator who has served at any time on that committee knows that its chairmanship is handled with great intelligence, honor, and integrity.

I say most respectfully to my colleagues that it would be well if we could subdue the kind of personal invective which seems to be developing, because that has nothing to do with the issue.

Let me state that before the Senator from Washington entered the Chamber, the Senator from Missouri pointed out, several times, that the anonymous statements which came from the Pentagon were uncalled for. Furthermore, as was pointed out by the Senator from Arkansas, the complaint made against the committee staff is without merit and is uncalled for, and every Senator resents it.

This is the important point which we need to develop. This is what the Senator from Missouri has said very well.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The important point which we need to develop is that the civilian authorities had a right to make the judgment. They may have made an incorrect judgment; that point is yet to be determined. But the law gives them this responsibility, and the civilian authorities should be respected in the position they take under the law, even if the committee itself arrives at a determination that bad judgment was exercised.

What the Senator from Missouri is rightly worried about is that a person of the character of Mr. Gilpatric would be smeared by innuendoes going back and forth in connection with a law firm with which he has been associated. I am not a lawyer; but Members of the Senate who have been associated with law firms certainly should be able to return to those firms after their Government service is terminated. Certainly if one serves in the Department of Defense at a salary of $22,000 or $25,000, and if he lives in Washington, D.C., he had better have another job to return to—either that, or be prepared to find himself heavily in debt.

It is also difficult for a Senator to live here on the salary he receives.

I believe the Senator from Missouri is making a plea that this investigation be allowed to go on without interruption and without personal invectives. I believe he is also making a plea to stand by the statute law of the country—namely, that in connection with interservice and interagency disputes, the Department of Defense and its Secretary have authority to make the final determination. What is wrong with that?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the assistant majority leader, who is a member of the committee. What he has said certainly should be done. But if, every day, we are to be confronted with anonymous statements coming from the Pentagon or with statements which, when we ask about them, those in the Pentagon admit had no basis of fact, but apparently were issued in an effort to influence the committee in some way or to deter it from doing its duty, I will not know how to proceed.

All that we in the committee want is to obtain the facts which attended the making of the award; that is all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think now the Pentagon has issued some mismanaged news.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Part of it was concealed news. I think the authors of these statements should be made known.

I thank the Senator from Missouri. I know of his patriotic service to the country and of his desire to protect our interests. All we want is to have the committee protected. If Senators do not favor that, they can say so.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I support the Senator from Arkansas. I would be the last who would want to indulge in personal invective in connection with such a matter.

I have the highest regard for the senior Senator from Missouri. Over the years he and I have worked together on these questions. I do say that we have a duty in the committee to make an honest judicial review. Unfortunately, all of this trouble really started across the river when the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Information and Public Affairs, Mr. Sylvester, cut loose with a shotgun charge against every member of the committee but one, alleging self-interest. The incident occurred on one weekend, and was handled on a managed platform basis. The following weekend we received a charge on an anonymous basis against the chairman and against myself.

I think that is rather sad. If there are smears, it is clear where they started. I think the time has come that when a question is to be raised about any individual or issue, it should be done out in the open and in the proper way. I am sure that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri, feels that way. At least most of this controversy could be avoided.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was a very poor job of public relations. The Senator knows I feel that way since I told him before. I agree on that point without reservation.

Mr. JACKSON. I have known Mr. Gilpatric for many, many years. He served in the Department of the Air Force, I believe as Under Secretary, from 1951 to 1953. I am sure he would desire that this matter be handled in the same fair and just way.

I merely hope and trust that the developments that have occurred will be avoided in the future insofar as personal invective is concerned. We do have a responsibility to review the acts of civilians as well as the military. Civilians can be wrong; the military can be wrong. But I must say that while the Secretary of Defense has the final say-so on the question involved, I do believe that the American people have a right to know whether his judgment was sound. We should know, not whether he was fallible, as we all are, but whether there really was an abuse of his authority. That statement applies to the military as well as to the civilians. That is what we are trying to do, and there is no other desire.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As far as abuse of authority is concerned, I cannot agree.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not possible for a civilian to abuse his authority?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The military said that both of those companies could do the job. The question was one of commonness, a decision between the Air Force, Navy, Defense, and the civilian heads.

As I understand under the law, in the matter of procurement, the civilian leader of the Pentagon, the Secretary of Defense, has the right to make the decision. In this case he followed the unanimous recommendation of his civilian leaders. If he was wrong—and I believe that is the only point on which the able Senator from Washington and I differ—at least he, McNamara, did what he believed was right under the law from his standpoint.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not say that he abused his authority.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thought the Senator felt he did.

Mr. JACKSON. I said that we have a right to investigate and determine whether he abused his authority. I do not think the fact that he is acting under a statute which gives him final authority means that we cannot question the judgment that went into the use of that authority. Surely if we reached that point, it would be civilian dictatorship, and I do not believe the Senator wished to leave that impression.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to see any form of dictatorship. As a result of some unfortunate experiences, in which I had a participating part, we passed a law which gave the Secretary of Defense the authority to use his judgment to make the final decision in a matter of this character.

I want to associate myself with respect to the integrity of Mr. McNamara in the same way that I have Mr. Gilpatric. He may have made a mistake, but he did what he thought was right. And he followed the recommendations of many of his assistants in the doing of it. I am sorry this action is not approved by everyone, but in any case he had the right under the law to do what he did. That is my major point.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not attacking the integrity of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, or the integrity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense. I am maintaining—and surely I cannot believe my friend disagrees with this statement—that we have the right to investigate to determine whether there has been an abuse of discretion by the Secretary of Defense. Surely he does not believe that we do not have that right or authority.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree we have the authority. I only regret the matter of the integrity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense has been in the press; and inasmuch as I believe these hearings are now affecting the morale of the armed services, I felt it obligatory for me to present respectfully my position. I know that my friend from Washington, with whom I have worked for so many years, would grant me that privilege.

Mr. JACKSON. I fully agree, but at the same time two Senators—the senior Senator from Arkansas and the junior Senator from Washington—were involved in the question, too. I share the high regard of the Senator from Missouri for people who are endeavoring to serve in a very difficult spot in the Department of Defense. But surely we have the right to conduct a judicial type of inquiry such as the chairman of the committee is endeavoring to do. That is all I have to say.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. He has been very patient. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has a very wide acquaintance among military personnel and civilians who are interested in and are familiar with our defense program. Does the Senator state that the decision that was made did not adversely affect morale?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My answer to that is that some of the people in the military feel the decision was correct. Others feel the decision was wrong. I would illustrate my answer: During World War II, before I came into the Government, it was my job to put armament on airplanes, in this country and in England. Airplanes were first designed without any guns. As a result, they had magnificent performance. The only trouble was nobody would fight them until guns were put on, so the performance was always reduced when guns were added. When that happened, the people in the armament division were pleased, but flying people were often displeased.

We will always have disagreements in the military, not only with relation to types of decisions by the Secretary of Defense like those to which we are referring—and I say this with great respect for the military—but also because the military often do not like the exercise of civilian control.

Mr. CURTIS. My question was not whether there was disagreement. My question was whether or not the disagreement had hurt morale. There is great evidence that it did.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the Senator is correct. Some people in the military feel very deeply about this matter. They thought a mistake had been made. It was their right to feel that way. There are also people in the military who felt a mistake had not been made. As I see it, since we had in the past such disagreements—the famous B-36 hearings, when the Secretary of Defense could not cork the bottle with decision—that was one of the reasons why, in 1958, we gave direction, authority, and control to the Secretary; so when such differences arose between various segments of the military, or between the military and the civilians, the Secretary could say, "This is it"—just as would the head of any other business, using stockholders' money, would arrive at a decision.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has discussed the activities of our committee primarily in two sections. One was a defense of the integrity of Deputy Under Secretary Gilpatric. In the other section he commented upon some of the activities of the committee and its investigation of the situation here. So that we may proceed, I should like to make a couple of comments in each area. I ask unanimous consent that I may make the comments not in the form of a question, and then let the Senator from Missouri rejoin me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to yield first for a question by the able Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MUNDT. That is all right.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Could we finish our colloquy?

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to have the Senator from Missouri in the Chamber when I make my statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I assure my friend I shall be in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will yield to me before he concludes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the statement made by my distinguished colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, as well as the colloquy which he has had with my friend the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], who is one the most distinguished committee chairmen the Senate has ever had.

By voicing, as he has, in such a fair and dispassionate way, many of the details involved, which help to add knowledge with respect to the magnitude of the question and the problem involved, and by outlining the authority which Congress has seen fit to transfer to one man in order to obtain a joint service operation when that is necessary, I feel that the senior Senator from Missouri has rendered a genuine service. The subject has been handled, I think, in a most dispassionate way.

I should like to join the Senator from Missouri. I express not only my confidence in him, in the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and in the other Members of this body, but also my confidence in those fine men who have been the pride of this administration. I speak of the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric.

If anyone wishes to call whatever this "dead cat" that has been thrown in, in some way, a conflict of interest, I merely say that the only way we could avoid that situation would be by not having competent men handling the problem. We should have competent men handling it. We could, of course, perhaps find some lawyer in New York City who does not have any clients, who does not have any practice, who does not have any experience in industrial operations. It seems to me that that would go far beyond the bounds of propriety.

The committee is not guilty of anything. It has been construed by the press that because a man is a partner in a New York firm and because one of its clients is perhaps a very small portion of the package of business, and is a successful bidder, that something irregular is involved. Such a situation, however, does not make anybody a crook or a conspirator. It merely means that the man is a member of a firm, from which firm he resigned and to which firm he has not belonged for the past 2½ years.

We would do a great disservice, it seems to me, if we need competent men to handle a business running $52 billion a year, if we were supercritical of them in the press, or if there were intimations that they have committed some wrong.

I think that Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric are two of the finest men I have ever seen in Government. They are dedicated men. If they have made a mistake, they are, of course, subject to criticism. Certainly, the Senator from Missouri and I and every other Member of the Senate knows that if a mistake was made it was not a mistake of integrity but a mistake, perhaps, in understanding all of the ramifications involved.

I for one think this project is a good concept. There will be billions of dollars saved if we can have one common plane which can be modified slightly to serve both the Navy and the Air Force. This is an approach through which real economy can develop. The Senator from Missouri knows, as I know, that the bid by the low bidder for whatever is involved in the initial prototype is a mere fraction of what will be involved in the total.

By this bid this company has won the right for the follow-on, if a large quantity of these planes is later to be purchased.

I think this was a deal which was very carefully studied. I, for one, join in expressing my vote of confidence for the able men who run the Department of Defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank my able colleague the senior Senator from Oklahoma. He has said, in a very few words what it took me many more words to say this afternoon.

There is one point I should like to make for my friend from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I in no way criticized either the handling of the contract or the conduct of the committee. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota was in the Chamber when I started my remarks. I said that I hoped the hearings would be ended as soon as possible.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have read the Senator's statement in its entirety. On that basis I desire to question the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS rose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he concludes?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then I shall yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator for his most mature, well-mannered, and excellent remarks, delivered without rancor and without controversy.

Last week I took the floor of the Senate to defend the Secretary of Defense. I am happy to see that the Senator from Missouri, who is far better qualified than I in this area, is also defending the President's Secretary of Defense. I hope that others who belong to the President's party will feel the same way about the matter.

I wonder if the Senator has had occasion to see, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, the very interesting article written by Walter Lippmann entitled "McNamara and the TFX"?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did see it. After having read it, I was especially gratified to note the appropriate compliment paid to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I find myself in complete agreement with the statements made not only by the Senator from Missouri, but also by Mr. Lippmann in his column. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA AND THE TFX

(By Walter Lippmann)

After swimming around for a while in the sea of technical detail of the TFX argument, I emerged dripping with facts and wondering, since there is so much that I do not understand, whether there is anything which I am entitled to write about. However, while I have nothing to say about the use of titanium, of thrust reversers in supersonic flight, or even about high inlet ducts in the propulsion system, there is, I think, a simple and important question at the heart of the argument between Secretary McNamara and his critics.

There are, as I see it, no villains involved, and there is not a shred of evidence to show that the contract went to the General Dynamics Corp. because the Vice President is from Texas, or that Senator JACKSON has been doing anything improper because the Boeing Co. is from the State of Washington. The crux of the argument is not technical, military, or political but economic. From the beginning Secretary McNamara's conception has been governed by his intention to keep the Defense budget, which is already enormous, from becoming uncontrollably larger.

In order to keep military spending within some limit, it is necessary to sacrifice perfectionism in the choice of weapons. If money did not matter, each of the three military services could be allowed to build for itself the most perfect specialized tactical fighter. But since money does matter, the Defense Department has to forgo demanding the best weapons that unlimited money could buy and to content itself with the less perfect weapons that will do the military job. Secretary McNamara's friction with the uniformed hierarchy stems from his commitment to the basic proposition that if military spending is not to run wild, the weapons chosen have to be fully adequate but less than perfect.

Thus Secretary McNamara has, as Mr. Reston reminded us the other day, canceled the nuclear powered airplane and the Skybolt missile, he has opposed the all-out development of the RS–70, and has given up two or three other very expensive projects which, in his judgment, are not necessary military weapons but military luxuries. In the same way of thinking he has been insisting that for the new supersonic tactical planes, which both the Navy and the Air Force need, every effort should be made to develop one tactical fighter plane that can be adapted to the needs of each service.

The whole controversy turns on this. The General Dynamics proposal is very much nearer to being one plane for both Navy and Air Force than is the Boeing proposal. According to Secretary McNamara, the Boeing proposal is in fact for two much more specialized fighter planes. The General Dynamics proposal is for "an airframe design that has a very high degree of identical structure for the Navy and the Air Force versions" whereas in the two Boeing versions "less than half of the structural components of the wings, fuselage and tail were the same."

To illustrate how wasteful is overspecialization, Secretary McNamara tells us that the Navy now has a large number of aircraft out of operation for lack of spare parts while the Air Force has a $2.2 billion inventory of spare parts that are "already obsolete and practically worthless."

The judgments which Secretary McNamara is making in the choice of these very expensive weapons are judgments which somebody has to make. Congress has the right and the power to hold him accountable for them. Congress is not qualified and it hasn't the time to make those judgments itself. Congress also has the opportunity to review the Secretary's decisions. For these new complicated weapons systems take years to develop.

But the kind of judgment which Mr. McNamara is making is the kind of judgment the Secretary of Defense is meant to make. That is one of the main reasons why his office was created. We know from experience that it has not always been easy to find a Secretary of Defense who was competent to do that. In Secretary McNamara the country has a Secretary of Defense who in his training, in his practical experience, and in his technical knowledge of production, is remarkably, perhaps uniquely, qualified to pass judgment on a problem like that of the TFX.

Mr. JACKSON rose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to do so, I should like to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. I wondered whether I could clarify this somewhat.

Is there any reason why we should not criticize officials in this Administration because we happen to be members of the same political party.

Mr. CLARK. That is the privilege the Senator from Washington has, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. JACKSON. I have a good record in the Senate of supporting this administration. That does not mean that we are not at liberty to criticize acts by members of the administration.

Is that the position the Senator from Pennsylvania takes?

Mr. CLARK. I say again what I said a moment ago; the Senator from Washington is quite within his rights.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. CLARK. My position is that the Senator from Washington is quite within his rights.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, no matter how wrong someone in this administration may be, we are not to criticize him because he is within the administration?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has put words in my mouth which I did not speak. I have a high regard for the Senator from Washington. I am not trying to criticize him.

Mr. JACKSON. I am trying to find out the Senator's position.

Mr. CLARK. I have stated my position. I am in accord with the President. I am in accord with Mr. Lippmann.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I thank the Senator for waiting.

I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will be kind enough to permit me to yield to the Senator, because he did seek the floor first.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have only one comment to make on the first portion of the remarks by the distinguished Senator, in which he defended the integrity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric.

I have no disposition to quarrel with his defense in that connection whatsoever. As a matter of fact, until this morning, when it was initiated by Mr. Gilpatric, I think there was no testimony before our committee in any way criticizing him for a conflict of interest or any other matter.

I cannot refrain, however, from expressing the wish that the distinguished Senator from Missouri might have been as considerate and as restrained with respect to possible conflicts of interest when he was questioning the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey, because that was a similar situation.

The question of conflict of interest is a very difficult one, Mr. President. I served on a Senate committee, with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] as the chairman, when the committee made a complete study of the conflict-of-interest problem. We thought we could come up with some suggestions or recommendations for eliminating it. It is very difficult to find people with satisfactory qualifications who are not connected with various corporations, banks, or law firms.

I remember the unhappy situation which involved Mr. Harold Talbott, who I believe at one time was Secretary of the Air Force, and who I thought was a dedicated and fine public servant.

An uproar developed all across the country out of an investigation which showed that he had written a letter at one time on somebody else's stationery, and President Eisenhower promptly asked for his resignation.

I point out in this connection that I do not know any foolproof law which we could set up for any screening process. I am sure that there are people who can go in and out of law firms and back to public service, and in and out of corporations and back to public service, and never let their associations in any way influence their judgement.

I am sure it has been done in the past. I am sure it can be done now and that it can be done in the future. I am equally sure, however, that in the past, perhaps now, and it will certainly be true sometime in the future, we are going to find individuals whose judgments are colored by previous or existing associations. But I point out that the so-called conflict-of-interest issue involving Mr. Gilpatric was not initiated by the committee, but developed out of a newspaper story and was brought into the committee room on that basis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, with respect to the news story, the Senator can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe I read a story in which it was stated that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota stated the conflict-of-interest matter would be investigated; and when it was suggested to him that it might include Secretary Gilpatric, he said that was correct. That was before Secretary Gilpatric testified this morning.

Mr. MUNDT. May I comment on that statement? The Senator from South Dakota was asked by the press whether or not the conflict-of-interest aspects would be investigated. I said of course; in any investigation one would go into those matters. But at that time I did not know of Mr. Gilpatric's connection with the law firm and its relations with General Dynamics and did not have him in mind at all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With respect to Mr. Talbott, Mr. Talbott was a dear friend of mine. I did my best to defend him; in fact when the problem came before the committee of the Senator from Arkansas, I discussed with the chairman the problems in connection with that investigation and received his approval to advise and consult with Mr. Talbott, even though I was on the committee. This he granted me and this I did.

Mr. MUNDT. I recall the contributions of the Senator from Missouri with regard to that question. I appreciate the contributions of the Senator in the hearings. Would the Senator like to comment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me yield first to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the danger that has been laid before the Senate is that the talk about conflict of interest casts a shadow on a man like Roswell Gilpatric. I repeat, these are rather serious charges—even innuendoes. It seems to me we have an obligation, in light of the sacrifices we ask of people to serve in these sensitive positions, not to cross their countenance or path with such shadows. Secretary Gilpatric and Secretary McNamara are men of unusual competence and ability. They have been recognized as such in the professional and business areas. I do not know of anything either one of them has done which would indicate that it represented an unethical practice or in any way involved a conflict of interest.

I do think these officials are obviously subject to criticism or interrogation. It cannot be said that because a man is a civilian official he is immune from investigation or inquiry. However, I think a disservice may have been done, and has been done, by the indication that there may be a conflict of interest. Lawyers have their problems about it, as do others.

When one is in a law firm, and in order to get into the Government he resigns his position from the law firm, unless he gets a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court, there is always the possibility that he is going back to the law firm. If that situation exists, a great disservice is done to a lawyer, from his professional point of view as well as from his personal point of view, when a conflict of interest is indicated, particularly when lawyers have represented many clients.

I think the Senator from Missouri was trying to point out in a very dispassionate way that this gentleman did serve his country with distinction. He had many clients and he has represented people in different areas of the aviation industry. That is the real reason for being disturbed over the assertion or innuendo that there was a conflict of interest.

I join with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] when he said that he knows of no two men in this Government who have had a finer record in both private and public life than Secretary McNamara and Secretary Roswell Gilpatric. Why Secretary McNamara was willing to give up a fine post in private industry and come here and take over the huge, intricate mechanism called the Defense Department and the Pentagon is something that is almost beyond my comprehension. But he has done an admirable job. He is a man of decision. That is why he was in private industry. He did not wiggle and wobble, but went to the job and did what he had to do.

The same goes for Roswell Gilpatric. He has had years of service. Whether he made a good judgment or a bad judgement is subject to individual view. That question will be determined by the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota. He always says better what others have tried to say. I am glad to yield again to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who, of course, has not been at the hearings, that there have been no charges nor innuendoes emanating from the committee concerning Mr. Gilpatric or any other individual in the Pentagon. The whole question of discussing the background of individuals is a prerequisite to making a good investigation. I would want to have no part of an investigation which stated as its purpose that we were not going to investigate the background of people, but simply the charges. We have made no charges. None have been made.

I pointed out earlier that Secretary Gilpatric ran into the same kind of difficulties, because of his background, that

George Humphrey and Harold Talbott encountered because of their backgrounds. I remember the Senator from Missouri rose and made a spirited defense of Harold Talbott, and in the end, because of derogatory statements growing out of charges of conflict of interest, the Government was deprived of the services of a very able public servant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I said that one of the purposes of the debate, if we can do anything today, is to set the record straight. So far as those who are interested is concerned—and the Senator from South Dakota is on the committee, and I am not—we can make clear that the so-called conflict-of-interest assertion which has found its way into print can be set straight by the statement that there is no known evidence that there exists any conflict of interest.

Mr. MUNDT. We cannot decide the issues of the investigation, here on the Senate floor today but as of 20 minutes of 3 o'clock today, which is the correct current time by the Senate clock, I can say there is no evidence I know of that would cast a blight on Mr. Gilpatric.

On the other matter, it seems to me the Senator from Missouri was proceeding on an improper basis in his efforts to try to induce the committee to close its hearings as rapidly as it can, and in questioning what the committee was actually trying to do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is putting words in my mouth.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me quote the words from the mouth of the Senator from Missouri, then:

> The right of decision was clearly that of the Secretary of Defense. That is the law; and anybody who opposes that position opposes the law.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator said again:

> Differences in matters of judgment, however, and a formal effort to reverse a major policy decision on the grounds the Secretary has exceeded his authority, are two entirely different subjects.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Which implies the committee is attacking the problem on that basis. We are not. I have never heard in committee any question that the Secretary of Defense has the right to overrule the decisions of the military.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. MUNDT. The whole question is whether, in the exercise of that right, he utilized sound and justifiable judgment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the Senator agrees with me. I hope he will postpone judgment on Secretary Gilpatric.

Mr. MUNDT. I have said, and I repeat, that as of 20 minutes to 3 I have heard no evidence that there is any conflict of interest, and I have formed no judgment with regard to Secretary Gilpatric.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to have the Senator take that position on the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is proceeding on the wrong basis when he assumes that that is what the committee is trying to do, namely, to attack the right of the Secretary of Defense to make decisions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri has a right, in a talk, to say what he wants the Senate to know. When the Senator from South Dakota says that I am criticizing the committee, he is reading into my remarks something that is not correct. I went out of my way to state that I am not criticizing the committee. I am emphasing three main points. The first is that whether this decision, this exercise of judgment, was right or wrong, under the law the Secretary of Defense has the right to do it.

Second, in my opinion the continuation of these hearings over many weeks—I believe the Senator from South Dakota said they might run through the spring——

Mr. MUNDT. It is spring now. So I suppose that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator knows what I am getting at. He probably knows better than I what the press referred to.

Based on my experience, I believe all this is hurting the morale of the Armed Forces of the United States, and therefore I hope the hearings will be conducted as expeditiously as possible, and I am confident that the chairman feels this way.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe I can say for the chairman that no one has ever conducted hearings more expeditiously than he has. He told us the first time that we had a hearing, and before any minority member of the committee learned about the TFX controversy, and when we voted unanimously to proceed with the investigation, that he thought the hearings would last 4 or 5 days. I said facetiously at that time that I thought it might take that many weeks. I am convinced that the chairman will not terminate the hearings until we have had all the facts presented. We have heard, so far, only three of the major witnesses. We have heard, actually, only from John Stack, a world-wide renowned aeronautical engineer; from Col. Charles Gayle, the TFX system project officer at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; and from George Spangenberg, the Navy Department's chief aeronautical engineer. From the Pentagon we have heard only from members of the Evaluation Board. Except for an affidavit from the Secretary of Defense which was presented to the committee in his absence.

Still to be heard from in the investigation are a number of four-star admirals and generals, including the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis LeMay. We have not yet heard from him. We have not yet heard from the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Anderson. We have not yet heard from the management and the technical people of either Boeing or General Dynamics. Of course the Senator may urge, if he wishes, that we fold up the hearings, but I believe that——

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is misquoting me. I did not say that I urged the hearings be folded up. I said they should be conducted expeditiously.

Mr. MUNDT. I will read what the Senator has said:

> I would hope whatever the decision, that decision be reached expeditiously and these hearings be concluded.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct, concluded after being handled expeditiously.

Mr. MUNDT. To me that means folded up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It means expedited.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. We agree that it should be done expeditiously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator agree that the hearings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible, provided the facts are obtained?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Then we are in agreement on this point.

Mr. MUNDT. We are not in agreement with what the Senator has said. I read again what the Senator has said:

> Therefore, because of all the reasons previously mentioned and especially because of the obvious necessity for us to cope with current Communist aggression, I would hope whatever the decision, that the decision be reached expeditiously and these hearings be concluded.

I do not go along with believing the hearings should be concluded. I say we are proceeding expeditiously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. One of the reasons for putting that statement in my remarks today was based on a comment which the Senator is supposed to have made to the press that it looked to him as though the hearings would run for months.

Mr. MUNDT. If I was quoted as saying that, I was misquoted. I did not say it would take months.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD at this point part of the press report which referred to the statement made in this connection by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. That is perfectly all right with me.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McNamara, Aid Called Tomorrow for Questioning

(By Cecil Holland)

* * * * *

Meanwhile, Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said he was sure the subcommittee would look into the financial connections and interests of all those who participated in the decision to award the contract to General Dynamics.

Besides Mr. McNamara these included Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert and Navy Secretary Fred Korth. The civilian Secretaries overruled a unanimous recommendation of military experts that Boeing be granted the $6.5 billion contract.

Senator MUNDT made the statement in commenting on reports that Mr. Gilpatric, before joining the Defense Department, was connected with a New York law firm that has represented General Dynamics in some matters. According to the testimony received by the subcommittee, Mr. Gilpatric participated in the contract award decision, although Mr. McNamara said he assumes full responsibility for the award.

> Senator MUNDT also indicated that the subcommittee would look into the role of Mr. Korth in the decision. Before becoming Secretary of the Navy last year, Mr. Korth was a prominent Fort Worth banker.
>
> However, the Senator said he doubted that the subcommittee would question Mr. Gilpatric on his law firm connections until a later time.
>
> LONG PROBE SEEN
>
> Senator MUNDT said the investigation probably will last much longer than the subcommittee had anticipated.
>
> "We are getting into fields we never anticipated," the Senator said. "This conflict-of-interest thing was never in our minds until events and the reading of newspapers put it there."

* * * * *

Mr. MUNDT. Now I wish to read this statement from the Senator's speech, because it raises an implication as to what we are trying to do. I am sure that the Senator does it out of good motivation. However, it puts an entirely different focus on the hearings. I read:

> Some of us have differed with the present Secretary of Defense on matters of judgment—on at least one occasion that has been true of myself. Differences in matters of judgment, however, and a formal effort to reverse a major policy decision on the grounds the Secretary has exceeded his authority, are two entirely different matters.

I say categorically, first, there has been no effort on the part of our committee to reverse a decision for any reason. We have raised no question as to whether the Secretary of Defense has exceeded his authority. Why attribute that to us?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that the purpose of the hearings is to see that this contract does not go to General Dynamics. That would be a reversal.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no such purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator has a right to his opinion. I have a right to mine.

Mr. MUNDT. We have never been told, and we have never assumed, that the purpose was to take it away from anyone.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure the Senator would not say that these hearings are being conducted for no purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. May I tell the Senator that purpose? We are trying to determine whether, rightly or wrongly, they gave it to the company which could produce an acceptable plane at the cheaper price. Secondly, we are trying to determine if they gave it to the company which could produce a plane which provides, at the present stage of the art, the best possible plane available from American producers. I am more concerned as to whether we are getting in this TFX plane, a plane which measures up to the capabilities of American industry to provide a plane of maximum performance, than I am as to whether or not we paid $100 million or $500 million too much for it, because, if in fact, a better plane is available than the one for which we have contracted, we have virtually squandered the whole $5 billion. I am sure that the former Secretary of the Air Force, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, will agree that we need the best possible plane, not one that is second best. That is what we are trying to determine.

Proceeding with the Senator's statement, I am, like the Senator from Washington, a little perplexed as to this recital of the financial integrity and engineering ability of the Boeing Co. The Senator failed to put in a similar review of the financial success of General Dynamics. I suppose that will be available to the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; the Senator is incorrect. In debate I volunteered the fact that in recent years General Dynamics lost more money than any other corporation in the history of the free enterprise system.

Mr. MUNDT. At all events, the Senator realizes that he is in dispute with Mr. McNamara in this connection, because——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would like to have the Senator from South Dakota guide me with respect to where I am in dispute with the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator will let me finish the sentence, I will be glad to provide some guidance.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yielded to the Senator from South Dakota for a short statement. He has been proceeding now for 15 minutes. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been on his feet for not less than a half hour. I am glad to yield to the Senator, so that he can explain anything he wants to explain.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Missouri has been on his feet a while himself. The Senator from Missouri is in dispute with the civilian officials in the Pentagon, who say that one reason why they believe the contract should have gone to General Dynamics is that on the basis of experience Boeing has had some criticism about the correctness of some of its estimates. It would seem to me that a company which has done so well in the past might be inclined to do well in the future, as against a company which, the Senator now says, has lost more money than any other company ever lost in American history. I did not know that.

I have one more comment to make in connection with the Senator's talk. This arose out of the basis on which our investigation is being held. Perhaps I can save time by inserting in the RECORD the facts which are sanitized, publicized, uncensored, and made available to the public, so by studying this RECORD all citizens will have the data needed to help them formulate their own judgment concerning the kind of evidence which our committee has been considering, as against that which has been imputed to us.

I have an unclassified table showing the operational comparisons of the two TFX proposals, the one by General Dynamics, the other by Boeing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Operational comparison of 2 TFX proposals—General Dynamics versus Boeing as evaluated by U.S. Air Force

[Only subcommittee selected items are shown]

	General Dynamics	Boeing
Cost factors:		
Contractor's proposal (millions) [1]	$5,455.5	$5,364.2.
Air Force program estimate (millions)	$7,083.2	$6,983.0.
Air Force program estimate adjusted figure	$5,803.0	$5,387.5.
Performance comparisons:		
1. Ferry range (nautical miles)	X	X plus 1,100 miles.
2. Reaction time at minus 65° F. (minutes)	2 times X	X.
3. Landing distance over 50-foot obstacle (feet)	X plus 590 feet	X.
4. Deceleration device	Dive brakes and spoilers	Thrust reverser.
5. Air Force estimate of Navy weight (pounds)	X plus 2,208 pounds	X.
6. Air Force estimate of Navy mission A (loiter time in hours)	X	X plus 30 minutes.
7. Air Force estimate of Navy mission B (loiter time in minutes).	X	5½ times X.
8. Aircraft carrier spotting [2]	X plus 5	X.
9. Avoidance of foreign object damage	Deflectors	High scoops.
10. Area intercept mission (radius in nautical miles) [1]	X	X plus 177 miles.
11. Ordnance carrying capability (pounds of demolition bombs):		
Wings out	X	X plus 69 percent.
Wings in	X	X plus 11 percent.
Contractor's proposed ordnance loading: [1]		
12. Nuclear bombs	X	X plus 50 percent.
13. Air-to-ground missile	X	X plus 50 percent.
14. Demolition bomb	X	X plus 105 percent.
15. Cluster dispenser	X	X plus 180 percent.
16. Fire bomb	X	X plus 250 percent.
17. Land mine	X	X plus 70 percent.
18. Rocket launcher	X	X plus 44 percent.
19. Air-to-air missile	X	X plus 100 percent.
20. General Dynamics superior on supersonic speed		
21. Boeing superior on subsonic speed		
22. Commonality of parts, General Dynamics is superior		

[1] Contractor data.

[2] Navy evaluation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I point out and emphasize, for the guidance of those who read, that this information is with respect to the present stage of the investigation, with many competent witnesses yet to be heard, and with the Secretary of Defense now in the hearing room waiting and ready to testify. On the basis of the evidence now before the committee—which is available at this time—there are 22 different performance criteria listed, comparing the performance of the two TFX planes. On only three of them is the preference given to

General Dynamics, as against the preference given on about 16 or 17 to Boeing.

It is evidence of this type, Mr. President, that the committee has been receiving and considering and which perplexes and puzzles us as to the reasons the Pentagon insisted upon the more expensive plane with the poorer performance evaluations.

On some comparisons there is apparently equal ability. There are some comparisons as to which there is a reasonable argument, such as the relative merits of dive brakes and spoilers as against thrust reverser. With respect to the deceleration device, General Dynamics uses dive brakes and spoilers, while Boeing proposes thrust reversers.

Finally, with regard to the attacks made upon our committee, I am happy that the Senator from Missouri joins with the rest of us in regretting the kind of attack which comes from the Pentagon upon the integrity of the chairman and the rest of the members of the committee. The Senator from Missouri has himself served on committees which have been under attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. He recognizes that such attacks are somewhat distasteful.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I had the honor to serve with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on such a committee not too many years ago.

Mr. MUNDT. Every one of us was constantly under attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In that connection, my experience on investigating committees of Congress dates back to the time when I served on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, under the chairmanship of Martin Dies. For some strange reason, I have been assigned to investigating committees from that time until now and have the perhaps doubtful distinction of having served more years on congressional investigating committees than any other Member in the history of Congress.

I must say that in all my experience, except for this, the most exciting experience was as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, under Martin Dies, when that committee was investigating the allegations of communism in the Government, and almost everyone in the administration was attacking our committee. At no time since then have I seen a congressional committee subjected to as determined a drumfire attack from a Government Department as has occurred from the Pentagon on the McClellan committee in the instant case.

People will read in the Washington Evening Star tonight, for example, under the banner headline "Air Force Hits TFX Probe Tactics," still another item indicative of the extremes to which the Pentagon will go. Let me read from the article:

> The report, prepared by an Air Force officer for internal Air Force use, says the questioning was so rough that one man "collapsed from nervous exhaustion and reoccurring ulcer" and that two others "showed signs of deep fatigue."

As I said in the committee room today, the military personnel of the country, including emphatically members of the Air Force, have demonstrated a stamina, a fighting capacity, and a capacity to serve which, it seems to me, negatives any suggestion of their being any validity in the suggestion that Air Force officers are collapsing all over the place because Jerome S. Adlerman has asked them some pertinent questions. I cannot conceive of any questions he could ask which would be so rough that the fighting heart of the Air Force was going to faint away, because our American airmen have well earned their reputation as gladiators. It illustrates the hyperbole involved, the extremes to which some go in attacking this committee in almost an hysterical manner—certainly in an unrealistic one.

I hope that if nothing else grows out of the colloquy on the floor today, a cease-fire order will be issued from the Pentagon or from places higher up in Washington to get off the backs of the committee, and let us proceed in an orderly and objective fashion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be very brief, because I know that the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Pennsylvania have been waiting to speak.

First, as to Under Secretary Gilpatric, he is a New York lawyer. I have known him for many years. I understand very well the problems of lawyers in large firms who retire from those firms to enter government service. It is our objective to get the best men at the salaries allowed, and we will jeopardize getting them if we impugn their motives. I say this advisedly. I do not question Under Secretary Gilpatric or any member of the committee, whatever may have been Mr. Gilpatric's connection with the law firm, or our connection—and that includes my own—in the interest of getting the maximum amount of business for our States. It is a fact that one of the parties involved is Grumman, which has important manufacturing interests in my State. I question as little the bona fides of Mr. Gilpatric as I do of my own, in my own field, to rise above any such considerations in a matter so critically important to the defense and security of America as is this contract which we are discussing, and the end result which it will mean to the security of our Nation.

I join with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in calling for a standstill, a freeze, upon all of the recriminations, back and forth, which have only sought to divert the distinguished chairman of our committee. I have been a lawyer in the trial courts for almost 30 years. I will testify to the fairness, decency, and lack of intimidation with which he is conducting the hearing. The answer is to get on with it.

But certainly a man like Mr. Gilpatric is entitled from me, a fellow lawyer from New York, perhaps above anybody else, to an absolutely clean bill of health in this matter, as he is, in my judgment, from the Senator from Washington or any other member of the committee, notwithstanding any very ill-advised comments made off the cuff or off the top of his head by anybody from the Pentagon.

I am delighted to join with all Senators in nailing that and laying it at rest.

Second, it is my judgment that what we are seeking to determine—and I am sorry that I differ with the Senator from South Dakota in the objective of this hearing—is to determine whether there has been an abuse of discretion. I was delighted to hear the Senator from Washington say that very thing. The question of whether he made a mistake in judgment or not is a matter of basic policy within the constitutional prerogative of the civilian head of the Department of Defense. If I were convinced, to the bottom of my being, that Secretary McNamara made a mistake in judgment, that there was not an abuse of discretion due to some outside influence, or whatever other errant consideration there was in coming to such a finding, I think it is extremely important to air this matter.

I do not believe the 21 or 22 criteria now set forth in the Record—and I think the Senator from South Dakota was quite right to use whatever he could in that regard, without investigation—represents the whole basis on which the decision will have to be made. We also have to decide if there were requirements far above the specifications required of those airplanes. In other words, if we are dealing with specifications beyond the specifications set up by the Department, then we are dealing in an area which other considerations, like those of common use between the Army and the Air Force, become particularly pertinent and important to the decision of the Secretary.

So, unless we find an abuse of discretion, this matter must remain exactly as it is, whatever we report, but the report of this committee will have a material effect on the whole matter.

Finally, and most important, we must consider the morale of the Armed Forces. Probably the single most important question in the whole discussion relates to the morale of the Armed Forces. I have served, the Senator from Missouri has served, almost every Senator involved has served in the Armed Forces, and we know that men will have to fly this plane, whether it is the one which Secretary McNamara picked or the one that was rejected, insofar as Boeing is concerned. Men will have to fly the plane, and the morale of the Air Force is critically important. I think we have a job—and this is collective to all of us—to establish, absolutely and firmly, the morale of the Armed Forces. If we should decide that this contract is to be awarded on the basis of a superior civilian decision, then it is our job also to rally behind the decision the full moral support of the Armed Forces. I think a grave danger exists. It is a fact that military officers are testifying the other way, and that their testimony is being kept from the public. Furthermore, more of that may occur.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is our duty to see to it that the facts are made known, and that, when this matter is concluded, we, ourselves, shall have acted to fortify the Armed Forces of the United States.

As a member of the committee headed by the gifted Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I thank the Senator from Missouri for his contribution to our consideration of this matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Let me say that I had the privilege of serving as Assistant Secretary of War for Air and Secretary of the Air Force at the time contracts were awarded for the construction of the B-47 and the B-52, perhaps the greatest airplane ever flown. I approved those contracts after study, but have not approached this matter from that point of view. Furthermore, I did not and do not wish to become involved in a technical discussion this afternoon.

Next, Mr. President, let me say that I agree thoroughly with the Senator from New York, who served in the military as a distinguished officer during the last World War, that the morale of the Armed Forces is being adversely affected by these hearings. Anyone who reads the sad and unfortunate article appearing this afternoon in the newspapers and that has been referred to knows that such an article is bound to affect adversely the proper intertwining of the civilian and military in our system.

Next, Mr. President, I refer to the Secretary of Defense. I think highly of him, and know he has the right, under the law, to have direction, authority, and control in connection with this decision, and he has made the decision to the best of his ability. He may have erred in arriving at his judgment, but I am sure he felt he did the correct thing and I happen to agree with him.

Finally, Mr. President, let me present that I have been around this Capital for many years—indirectly, for more than 40 years; and directly, in Government service for some 18 years. The more I see of life, the more important I think it is to try to have justice done, especially to one's friends. I am sure no member of the committee on the Senate had anything to do with the unfortunate stories about Mr. Gilpatric. I know of no one in Government who ever served more ably than he has. My statement today is made primarily because of the attacks against him that have appeared in the press. Whenever a friend of mine in whom I believe, and who is serving the Government to the best of his ability, is unfairly attacked in the press, I intend to take the floor to defend him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I share the sentiments which have been expressed in regard to expediting the hearings.

This morning we undertook to hear Secretary McNamara. At his request, we scheduled his appearance. In the meantime, we could not ascertain the source of the derogatory statements which issued from the Pentagon under an injunction not to reveal the author of the statements. So, as the first witness today, we had Mr. Gilpatric, the Deputy Secretary, who finally acknowledged that he had held the press conference; and I am told by the press that that is where the members of the press got the information.

Furthermore, that delayed us and prevented us from hearing the Secretary. But while we were holding the hearing this morning on the complaint, and were trying to ascertain the source of the derogatory news article which went out last Sunday, another one came out, right in our teeth. I hold in my hand today's Washington Star, and the principal headline reads as follows: "Air Force Hits TFX Probe Tactics—Abuse Charged Against Staff of McCLELLAN."

Mr. President, if they want the hearings expedited—and let me say that already, in two instances, they, themselves, have retracted their statements; they did so this morning, when they said they did not mean any such thing—I do not know what they will say about this new article; but I state to the Senate that it is not true.

Senators speak of defending their friends; but I do not believe that the three staff members mentioned in the article are at all of the character described in the article. One of them has served the Government for 16 years; and for approximately 8 years of that time, I believe, he served under the distinguished Attorney General.

Mr. President, such tactics cannot be defended. If Senators are going to defend their friends, I shall defend the distinguished staff members who must do work which often is not pleasant.

If the hearing is being delayed and if there is a lack of expedition, the fault lies with those who are trying to obstruct it and interrupt it. So far as I know, that is not coming from the legislative branch. It is coming from the Pentagon; and when I make that statement, Mr. President, I am not hiding behind anonymity. I make that statement. This morning I made it in the committee; and now I make it again, here on the floor of the Senate.

At this time I must leave the Senate Chamber, to attend the committee hearing, where the Secretary is waiting. I ask my colleagues who serve with me on the committee to join me now in attending that hearing. Let us go there now and hear the Secretary as long as we can.

I have another appointment this afternoon, and I shall have to adjourn this hearing early. But I ask the Senators who serve on the committee to go with me to the committee hearing, and let us give the Secretary an hour of the time of the committee, and thus expedite the matter.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Arkansas, "Godspeed."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal said here today about the purpose of the investigation conducted by the McClellan committee on the awarding of the TFX contract. The award, of course, involved, in the end, two companies, one the General Dynamics Co., and the other the Boeing Co. of my home town, Seattle.

Although the contract itself, so far as the Boeing Co. is concerned, was mainly concerned geographically with the Wichita, Kans., division of the Boeing Co., the Senator from Washington, my colleague [Mr. JACKSON] and I, of course, have a deep interest in the matter. We are, first of all, very proud of the record of the Boeing Co. in the field of defense, commercial airplanes, and other pioneering efforts which the company has engaged in over the years. We are also proud of the fine engineering staff which has been assembled by the company over many, many years. It has been called by Defense officials on many occasions, the finest engineering staff, particularly in the aerodynamic field, in the United States, if not the world.

So we have had an interest in this matter, as would any two Senators representing the State of Washington, the home base of the Boeing Co.

We, of course, knew that Boeing Co. and General Dynamics were the two companies being considered, some months prior to the time the award was finally made. As such, we were hopeful the Boeing Co. would be awarded the contract, because we were confident they could do the job demanded by the Defense Department, and had an adequate staff in engineering, a work pool, to do the job. And second, we were the representatives from the home area of the company. We, of course, did not at any time think that the contract should be given to any company which would not be in the best interest of the country and produce the best possible airplane in this important field at the lowest cost.

The contract was awarded, and this investigation is going on. I joined with my colleague when the question was asked as to who started this investigation. It was started by people who had some doubts about whether or not the award was made in the best interest of the country and if it was the type of plane that was really wanted.

Also I joined with my colleague from Washington in the hope, too, that the committee would take a look at this award to see exactly what happened and to determine, as the Senator from South Dakota said today, whether or not we were going to end up with the best possible defense vehicle. At no time did the junior Senator from Washington or I, directly or indirectly, try to influence anyone in the Pentagon or anywhere else in the Government regarding the award. We were hopeful the contract would be given solely on its merit and solely on the basic criterion of who could produce the best type of plane the Defense Department said it wanted for this country.

I believe my colleague [Mr. JACKSON] stated he called once or twice regarding the status of this particular contract; and I think I did on one or two occasions. By "status" we meant when they expected to give the award and how far it had proceeded along through the evaluation boards and the different studies. That is all.

I must say for the RECORD that no one in the Boeing Co. and no Boeing official ever suggested to any of us that we should do anything political about this contract; and I am sure this statement applies to the delegation in the House who represent the Seattle area, and I am sure this is true also for that section of the country represented by the Senators from Kansas, or the Representatives from the Wichita area, where the Wichita division is located.

The Boeing officials, in discussing the matter with me, said they wanted absolutely no politics involved in it at all. We discussed it in a general way. They wanted the matter decided on the merits. They were so sure of their own ability to be able to stack up on the merits on this particular plane that they almost leaned over backward.

A great deal has been said in the past few days that there has been some interest on the part of the Senators in regard to this contract, particularly with respect to Senators who serve on the committee. I believe at one time the Deputy Secretary of Defense, on a television broadcast, mentioned that two powerful Senators from the State of Washington were involved. He referred to me and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is a member of the McClellan committee.

I wanted the record to be clear that the Boeing officials and anyone cognizant with this matter had pinned their hopes on this being decided on the bare merits of the ability of the Boeing Co. to produce the kind of plane that the Defense people said was needed in the interest of this country.

We know, of course, what it means to bid on contracts. Sometimes a bid is difficult to make, and very often it does not necessarily mean that the low bidder will perform his contract in a way that it will cost the Government exactly what was bid, or vice versa. That is because on a matter of this kind there are thousands of engineering changes. That necessitates many changes in the contract.

They felt that they could do this job and do it well. They spent a great deal of time and effort on it in their engineering department. They wanted the award to be made in the highest possible sense, fairly and in the best interests of defense, lacking of politics.

I do not know what the committee will come up with. Their inquiry is a perfectly proper one. It is to find out, not the right of the Secretary of Defense to make the decision, but how the decision was made, and whether in the end the country is going to get what he and the rest of his people think they should have of this plane.

I reserve judgment on this matter until the committee makes its findings.

I have received many letters from my constituency at home and from others, asking what we are doing about this. A great deal stems from the fact that the Pentagon itself has released certain portions of its testimony to the press. Other portions have been held in executive session. Therefore, it is difficult to get all of the facts and to put them together. When the committee finally concludes its work and makes a report, only then will the case be clearly stated. We, of course, are looking anxiously toward that report.

Mention was made today about the morale of the military. We better, also, consider the morale of the country. When so much of the taxpayers' money is being spent for a weapon, the people want to be sure not only that we are getting our money's worth, but also that they are getting the best possible product. If awards are made contrary to this or with political influence, therefore, their morale and faith in government would be shaken.

Many of the people who have written to me from my home State of Washington, particularly from the Seattle area, have been very fair in their comments. I should like to read an excerpt from one letter as typical:

> I have, with intent interest, followed the investigation of the TFX contract. It is quite true that I am a resident of Seattle and, therefore, have an interest in the growth of the Boeing Co. However, this letter is not motivated by such regional loyalty. I am quite sure I would feel the same if, under the circumstances, Douglas or Lockheed Aircraft Co. were involved.
>
> It is extremely disturbing to think that the U.S. Government will not accept the principles of the competitive bidding system which is, as you know, one of the mainstays of the free enterprise system in America.
>
> And, when any firm submits a bid that is superior in design and lower in price and has that bid rejected for what appears to be political reasons, I think the consequences can be disastrous and will most certainly result in the future loss of confidence in our Government.

This citizen's morale is just as important as the military.

I do not say what the writer suggests, that there were political reasons involved in this award. I do not know. I am sure the committee will continue expeditiously to get all the facts, and come to a conclusion on this. However, I believe this letter is typical, because the general tenor of what has been released so far and of all the stories relating to this contract certainly justify any private citizen feeling what this writer states.

If that is the case, I know the committee will not only discover it but will pass upon whether the award was rightly made or that there was an abuse of discretion.

Here is another letter. The writer says, in part:

> The fact that Boeing lost the contract is important, but it is not as important as the question of why and when in the military affairs of this country such things could happen as we read in the reports.

All this involves the morale of the people. Up to date they have been wondering whether there is something here that is not right. This must be resolved for the morale of everyone.

Some newspaper articles have been confusing to us. I quote from one. The headline states: "Solon Charges Favoritism in Plane Contract." I read from it the following:

> Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, said today he will expect the Secretaries of Defense and Air Force to explain what he termed "unusual" steps in the award of the TFX warplane contract.

Actually, the Senator from Arkansas did not charge favoritism. He used the word "unusual." But this is what the public is getting from the release of fragmentary parts of the testimony by the Pentagon. No wonder the Senator from Arkansas uses the word "unusual."

I have a legitimate interest in this matter. It has been most objective. The Boeing Co., of course, naturally was disappointed, as were we, because they felt they could do the job on this particular project better than anyone else.

Mention was also made today of the amount of money which Boeing has received over the years and of the profit it has made on both commercial and military contracts. I am sure the figures which have been given are correct. They might seem to be a little large. But I remind the Senate that Boeing Aircraft Co., pioneered in this field long before any of the rest of the companies ever existed or had a name. So it is only natural that Boeing should have received many contracts, dating back to the early days of the Boeing Aircraft Co. They developed a know-how. Boeing has not received any more military contracts than have been justified by their know-how and ability to do the job, and the fact that they submitted engineering estimates and lower bids was because of their faith in this know-how. Secondly, they could do the job on time.

The RECORD ought to show also, looking back upon a 10-year period, that four or five companies, including Boeing, Lockheed, North American, Douglas, and perhaps others, have shared fairly equally in the awarding of defense contracts.

It was somewhat ironical today, as I listened to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] make his speech, to recall that when he was Secretary of the Air Force he was involved in the move of a part of the Boeing Aircraft Co. to Wichita, Kans. Naturally, I opposed that transfer; I thought Boeing should stay in Seattle. I thought the concept of moving plants inland at that time for defense reasons was a little farfetched. He was helpful on this.

A part of the difficulty here is that the Wichita plant is available to do the kind of job the Department of Defense said it wanted to have done under the TFX contract. So Boeing's earnings should be placed in context.

I think the discussion today was wholesome. I could place in the RECORD numerous telegrams and letters, all suggesting that political reasons are involved in the awarding of this particular contract, and implicating many persons, including persons in Texas, and persons high in the Government. I repeat I do not know whether there was any political influence in awarding the contract or not. I know there was none from our end, so far as Boeing is concerned. I know that for certain. If there was any influence used from the other end, so far as the other company is concerned, I am sure that the committee will find out about it.

The fact is that the public is commencing to think because of the fragmentary news releases, that political influence must have been used. So it behooves us to back up the committee in its continuance of the investigation—expeditiously, surely, but principally to get all the facts involved, and not to stop until it has all the facts.

I think that not only is the purpose of the investigation well taken, but also the committee should examine into every possible angle of the subject, so that the American people may know what is taking place.

My colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has been made the target of some attacks. When I say that I do not know what took place on the other end, I am speaking from my own personal knowledge that, so far as he and I are concerned, no attempt was made and no attempt was suggested by anyone—the Boeing officials, ourselves, or anyone else—to exert any political influence at our end. Senator JACKSON has been attacked twice, I believe, in the last week. I wish to read into the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pentagon's Attack on JACKSON," published in the Seattle Times of March 18, 1963. The editorial relates to the first attack:

> Washington's Senator JACKSON has been made the target of a vicious, underhanded attack of the type being employed too frequently in the National Capital.
>
> We refer to a United Press International news dispatch over the weekend quoting Defense Department officials, who "insisted on anonymity" as charging that JACKSON helped initiate the TFX fighter-bomber investigation to "further his political fortunes."
>
> These anonymous officials in the Pentagon declared further that JACKSON asked for the inquiry by Senator MCCLELLAN's committee to make it "look as if he had done his duty to his constituents" because the contract was not awarded to the Boeing Co. The innuendo was that JACKSON was motivated to build himself for reelection in 1964.

Mr. President, I should like to intrude my own statement that the constituents of Senator JACKSON and myself are the Boeing officials, the people who run the company; but the jobs probably or mainly would be at the Wichita division. So what has been said must be placed in that light, too. Since the Pentagon has suggested that two powerful Senators were involved in this question, I think that point should be referred to. I continue to read from the editorial, with which I wholeheartedly agree:

> The charges are absurd. In our view JACKSON has little to worry about in the 1964 election. And at the time the TFX investigation was begun there was no perceptible sentiment in the Seattle community that the decision to award the contract to General Dynamics was not in the best interests of the Nation.
>
> Boeing, of course, raised no question—either directly or indirectly.

I suggest that had they raised any question, Senator JACKSON would have been the first to be contacted. But no question was raised. I continue to read:

> The community sentiment, it seemed to the Times, was to the effect that the contract had gone to General Dynamics for justifiable reasons best known to the Pentagon and the decision should be accepted here without protest. That, incidentally, was the attitude of this newspaper.

Mr. President, I can say that that is true also. So much stress has been placed on awarding contracts on the merits that it would have been impossible for anyone in the community—this newspaper, Senator JACKSON, or myself—to believe that they had not been awarded on their merits, and solely on their merits. The editorial continues:

> As we watched the situation develop underlying suspicions in the National Capital—as reflected by news magazines—began raising questions as to whether politics had not been a motivating factor in the selection of the Texas firm.

I think the Seattle Times has put its finger on the real fact, namely, that there were so many articles written about this matter, not wholly in the newspapers or over the wire services, but articles appearing mainly in news magazines. I myself read several of them. They intimated some of the things which I have placed in the RECORD today, and surely enough to have caused any responsible Senate committee to think that there was something basic on which to proceed in this particular case. The Seattle Times puts its finger on the point when it says:

> As we watched the situation develop, underlying suspicions in the National Capital—as reflected by news magazines—began raising questions as to whether politics had not been a motivating factor in the selection of the Texas firm.
>
> It was only after the McClellan committee began getting into the details of the contract award that there arose local concern that perhaps the Pentagon had selected the "second best plane at the highest price."

I interrupt my reading of the editorial to say that, surely, the committee had not only the right—if that was the conclusion of news magazines, of the Seattle Times, and of some of the people from whom I have received letters—but also the duty and responsibility, to determine whether the Pentagon has selected the second best plane at the highest price.

I read further from the editorial:

> This, it should be noted, was quite a little while after the time specified by the anonymous Pentagon spokesmen that JACKSON was supposed to have declared that the McClellan committee should "take a little, brief look" to further JACKSON's political fortunes. JACKSON has denied that he made any such overtures.

Of course, no one believes more than I do that that is entirely true.

I read further from the editorial:

> The emphasis of this editorial, however, does not deal with the TFX investigation itself. It is to condemn the practice of the Pentagon, as well as other agencies of the National Government, to accuse and hide behind anonymity.
>
> If the accusers of Senator JACKSON were of good conscience in the matter, they would not have hidden behind anonymity. They would have permitted their names to be used. The Senator, as anyone else, is entitled to know who his accusers are and to have them face him. Frankly, we don't care for the type of journalism that permits such anonymity.
>
> We suspect that the Pentagon will rue the day its spokesmen stooped to the low level of accuse and hide. They have been using as a defensive tactic the smear technique in endeavors to discredit the McClellan committee. This will be resented deeply throughout Congress, where MCCLELLAN and JACKSON are held in the highest esteem as responsible Members of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Then the editorial states—and this is my primary point, which surely is quite pertinent, following the Senate debate earlier today:

> It is Congress' duty to probe the TFX contract award and one may be certain that the arrogant attitude of the civilian experts in the Pentagon—from Secretary McNamara on down—will not deter the committee.

Mr. President, I make these points, not only to reaffirm the interest of my colleague [Mr. JACKSON] and myself in the affairs of this company, which has its home office in our State, and not only to reaffirm our concern with what is in the best interests of the country, but also in hopes that the committee will do what has been suggested here today by many Senators; namely, get at this matter and ascertain exactly what happened, not only because of its importance, but also because the faith of the people of the United States in their Government is involved. I do not want to see the morale of the people of the country shaken, any more than we would wish to see the morale of the members of the Armed Forces shaken.

I hope this will be done expeditiously. I hope every facet of the award will be explored, so that the public will know exactly what happened.

Mr. President, certainly the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] at the opening of the committee inquiry into the TFX contract award should result in keeping the attention of the entire country directed toward the hearing his investigations subcommittee is holding. As the Senator from Arkansas has reported, a top-ranking military evaluation team repeatedly and unanimously recommended that the contract be awarded the Boeing Co., but—and this is a most alarming fact—that decision was overruled each time by civilians in the Pentagon.

Mr. President, it is clear that the findings made thus far by the Senator from Arkansas and his subcommittee demonstrate that it is necessary that further inquiry be made into the procedures being employed in selecting the weapons on which our country and all the rest of the free world must depend. We must ascertain whether the recommendations made by professional military officers are being subordinated to the recommendations made by a group of young "experts" in the Pentagon. We must also ascertain why—as indicated by the findings of the subcommittee—a less expensive and more effective fighter-bomber proposed by the Boeing Co. was rejected, in favor of a more expensive and less effective one, proposed by another company. We must also ascertain whether regional politics is playing any part in the matter of the selection of weapons.

Mr. President, certainly this issue surpasses by far any local concern over the size of the payrolls in connection with the operations of the Boeing Co. This matter involves the defenses of the free world.

All of us hope most sincerely that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will press his subcommittee inquiry until he can satisfy himself and the entire country that neither political considerations nor any other improper considerations are affecting the national safety.

If the Pentagon made an honest mistake it is not too late to correct it—if not for the total award, at least for the bulk of it in the interests of getting for us the best at the lowest cost.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I had hoped to get the floor earlier this afternoon, while the subject of the TFX contract was under discussion, but so many Senators had great pearls to leave with the Senate that it was impossible for me to obtain recognition at that time.

I should like to leave this suggestion with the Senate. Last week I read in the press that we loaned to Indonesia the sum of $17 million, and that at the same time Indonesia bought three jet planes from Convair—which is to say General Dynamics—for the sum of $20 million.

While the Senate is in the process of investigating contracts, particularly as they relate to relationships of various people in the Government, I hope that this particular item also, which came up almost coincidentally with the TFX matter, can be explored to ascertain what relationship there is, if any, to the loan to Indonesia and the almost identical price-range purchase by Indonesia of the three jet planes from General Dynamics.

I know that the hour is late, and the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair) desires to leave shortly. I merely wish that the expressions of fellowship for the members of the Department of Defense, which were stated this afternoon, had been thought of many times during the Eisenhower administration.

I do not wish to accuse Mr. Gilpatric of anything. I think that such accusations have to be proved. So far as I am concerned, until they are proved, Mr. Gilpatric is as pure as the driven snow. I only wish it had been possible to engender in the hearts of Senators on the other side of the aisle the same sympathetic gleam of consideration and concern for the lives and professions of people as was raised this afternoon, because it was needed many times.

The problem comes back to one point. I will say this now, and I will say it again when we Republicans are in the majority, which will be in a couple of years. It is not possible to secure people who amount to anything unless they have achieved some success in their lives. No matter who they are, if people are to be selected to perform important service in the Government, it is necessary that they be people who have done something worthwhile. They should have done something of consequence or have had important positions either with business, a profession, in the field of education, in the field of religion, or perhaps in allied fields.

I hope the members of the committee will read these words and will examine into the matter of the sale of jet planes to Indonesia.

SECRETARY McNAMARA'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN STRENGTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak primarily on the TFX situation; I think it has been handled superbly by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. But I do feel that the criticism which has been rising in general against the Secretary of Defense should be answered; and I intend to do so briefly.

ARMED FORCES MANAGEMENT APPRAISES M'NAMARA

Recently an editorial was published in the Armed Forces Management magazine. It was written by the editor of that magazine, Mr. C. W. Borklund. I read from the editorial:

> We find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.
>
> Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "The Trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.
>
> Part of the complainers' difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere below the top level.
>
> It is hardly surprising then that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.
>
> Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.
>
> This ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:
>
> 1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason, said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."
>
> 2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.
>
> Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.

Mr. President, I think the editorial is an extremely statesmanlike one; and I believe it deserves our careful attention. It comes from a competent, authoritative, and expert publication. We as U.S. Senators have an obligation to view this problem overall. We must recognize—as the editorial states so well—that we are in a rapidly changing technology. We are living in a time when each of the services would like to have a great deal more hardware. The Secretary of Defense has cut by approximately $13 billion or $14 billion the requests of the armed services. Of course, under those circumstances, the Secretary of Defense will make enemies. His task is an extremely difficult one. How difficult was shown by the proceedings in the House of Representatives the other day. There, after a great deal of debate about trimming the defense budget, after argument by members of the Republican Party that they felt that the defense budget could be cut by $3 billion, instead of voting to reduce the McNamara budget, the House voted to increase it by over $1 billion, and a majority of the Republican Members of the House voted to support that increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial which was published in the Armed Forces Management magazine printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS HORRENDOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By C. W. Borklund)

Packs of nasty little academic debates have been scurrying around military circles, and even beyond, recently over a tongue-twisting polysyllabic mouthful called the trend to centralization of decisionmaking authority in the Pentagon.

While we sympathize with the subjective reasons for this fretting, we find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.

Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "The Trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.

Part of the complainers' difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere below the top level. Properly, but unfortunately for their peace of mind, the nature of the challenge and of the resources we have to meet it can be evaluated best only from Defense Secretary McNamara's office—and this would be so, incidentally, whether he or someone else was warming the chair.

On top of that, the cause of good personnel relations is boosted little when the job itself is such that a new Secretary, whether he wants to or not, must operate not unlike, interestingly enough, Boston Celtics basketball coach Red Auerbach. Said Auerbach recently, describing why his ball club has for years been so successful, "They (the team) must adjust to me. I don't have to adjust to them."

It is hardly surprising then, that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.

Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.

Significantly, much of the chatter has cropped up at budget hearing time on Capitol Hill. Thus, Pentagon veterans write about 20 percent of the talk off to "gamesmanship," that grand old military art of setting the proper congressional stage for stating why a particular program should be given by the legislators better than it got from its own military review.

> Not that the Secretary's Office is executing its decisions these days with unchallengeable excellence. Its sledgehammer implementation in some very detailed areas has caused considerable consternation; discouraged all but the most courageous crusaders from responding to a key McNamara philosophy (printed in AFM 2 years ago) that he expected "prompt decisions from Defense personnel who accepted responsibility and did not seek excessive advice."
>
> But translating philosophy into procedure in as complex a setup as Defense takes quite awhile. Until McNamara closes the large-sized information gap which exists, particularly at the working military level, over who is supposed to do what and why, he will probably have to continue to make many decisions on details. (The fact that they haven't bogged him down so far is a break for the rest of the organization.)
>
> However, this understandable lag in awareness has been twisted around lately by some incomprehensible thought process into a set of qualifying credentials for criticizing McNamara. Even more ridiculous: he's being charged, basically, not with incompetence but with having the audacity to do what the law says he's supposed to do—run the Defense Department.
>
> If you inspect the record, it is clear that most, if not all, the barbs being thrown at McNamara accuse him of doing today what a Defense Secretary was being chastised for not doing just 3 years ago.
>
> Understandably, observers who don't have their emotions all jangled up in this debate are considerably confused by the flip-flop nature of the protagonists' new viewpoint, find few facts to support it and know many facts that don't.
>
> For instance, this ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:
>
> 1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason, said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."
>
> 2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.
>
> Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.
>
> To nurture understanding (which in final analysis is the only real problem) will require the highest kind of statesmanship. But we can hardly expect much progress when reasonable, responsible people are tangled instead in a distracting separatist argument full of high-flown theorizing and ghostly managerial abstractions which have no fact-supported substance except in their own minds.

WASHINGTON STAR COMMENDS M'NAMARA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star, recently commenting on Robert McNamara, had the following to say:

> The real point is, however, that someone must be willing to do the homework, to take the responsibility and to assume the personal risks of decisionmaking in the Defense Department. This is what Mr. McNamara has been doing, and we do not believe that Congress, the President, or anyone else is in a position to do it for him. If the Secretary is strong willed and hard boiled, these qualities are essential in his job.

Mr. President, that is a fine editorial from the Star. It touches on the fact that all the qualities for which the Secretary of Defense has been criticized—that he is cold, calculating, operates like a calculating machine, and is unemotional—are exactly the qualities we need in a Secretary of Defense. We need one who is able to make his decisions based on the facts and based on a careful evaluation which is objective and fair. That is actually what the Secretary has done.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pentagon Boss Man

> When Robert S. McNamara first came to the Pentagon 2 years ago to be briefed on his new job, the outgoing Secretary, Thomas S. Gates, suggested he study a new Air Force report on the legal powers of the Secretary of Defense. The theme of the study was that Congress in 1958 had voted vast but unexplored authority to the Secretary—authority that Mr. Gates was just beginning to understand and to exercise.
>
> Mr. McNamara found in that report one of the solutions to the problem that had plagued previous Secretaries and had deeply disturbed Congress and the public—the problem of forcing four services to agree on a minimum essential national defense.
>
> Ever since he was sworn in Mr. McNamara has used the full legal powers of his office. He has consolidated functions common to all of the services; he has plunged into the details of Defense Department problems; he has asked the services embarrassing questions about imbalances and inconsistencies in the force structures and has insisted on clear, fast answers to his questions; he has introduced new management techniques to meet military objectives more cheaply, and he has made the tough decisions required by his job.
>
> Some Congressmen are criticizing him today, largely on the score of not leaving the decisions up to military men. They do not say Mr. McNamara has failed to consult the military men, for the record of congressional hearings show he has done this exhaustively. The conclusion is that the Congressmen can only be asking that the military men make more decisions—or, more likely, argue more and procrastinate more.
>
> We like Mr. McNamara's approach. Other approaches have been tried, and they did not work. There was the spectacle, for instance, of former Secretary of Defense McElroy begging Congress to "hold our feet to the fire" and force the Pentagon to choose between the Bomarc and Hercules missiles.
>
> If Congress wants to return to the old days, then Congress must change the law to take power of decision away from the Secretary of Defense. We think that Congress, upon reflection, will not want to do this. For someone must make the decisions, and they are tough to make. We hope that Mr. McNamara will come up with the right answers, and we think, certainly on the whole, that he has been right. The real point is, however, that someone must be willing to do the homework, to take the responsibility and to assume the personal risks of decisionmaking in the Defense Department. This is what Mr. McNamara has been doing, and we do not believe that Congress, the President, or anyone else, is in a position to do it for him. If the Secretary is strong willed and hard boiled, these qualities are essential in his job.

WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS EVALUATES M'NAMARA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a recent editorial the Washington Daily News also commented in the same way. The Washington Daily News said:

> In the current controversy between Defense Secretary McNamara and Congress over the TFX fighter plane contract, it may be a good idea to recall the chief reason Congress unified the Armed Forces back in 1947 and set up a single Secretary of Defense:
>
> To wipe out obvious costly duplication among the services and thus save the taxpayers billions of dollars.
>
> And ever since passage of unification, Congress has been reinforcing the idea by giving the Defense Secretary more power.
>
> Now the country has in Mr. McNamara a Defense Secretary with both the statutory backing and the personal ability to enforce unification as never before.

Obviously a man of that force and with his authority is bound to make enemies. In the past it has been indicated that we can judge a strong man's ability when he is in a position of authority by the weight of criticism leveled at him. That is true in the case of Mr. McNamara. He is assuming the responsibility for making tough decisions. He is making them. In doing so, of course, he is incurring predictable and understandable criticism.

He is also serving the national interest and serving it mighty well. Imagine what a perfectly enormous defense budget we would have if Mr. McNamara merely accepted the recommendations of the armed services. Instead of a $52-billion defense budget, we would have a $65-billion defense budget. While some people might argue that Congress could then proceed to cut it, I doubt that it would. If Mr. McNamara had not made the cut he did, I believe that a $65-billion defense budget might very well be passed by Congress. Then our deficit would really be perfectly enormous.

The service that Secretary of Defense McNamara has performed in his hard and difficult task should be appreciated by our taxpayers, because it is a great service to them as well as to all of us citizens. Mr. McNamara has not only succeeded in achieving economies in our Defense Establishment, but also in the process he has given us the strongest Army, Navy, and Air Force that we have had in our history by far, and probably a more decisive edge over the Soviet Union than we have had in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "McNamara and the TFX," published in the Washington Daily News of recent date, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

McNamara and the TFX

> In the current controversy between Defense Secretary McNamara and Congress over the TFX fighter plane contract, it may be a good idea to recall the chief reason Congress unified the Armed Forces back in 1947 and set up a single Secretary of Defense:
>
> To wipe out obvious costly duplication among the services and thus save the taxpayers billions of dollars.

And ever since passage of unification, Congress has been reinforcing the idea by giving the Defense Secretary more power.

Now the country has in Mr. McNamara a Defense Secretary with both the statutory backing and the personal ability to enforce unification as never before.

So when both the Army and Navy demonstrated a need for a supersonic fighter plane, Mr. McNamara demanded a single craft which would meet the differing requirements of both services. He estimated that if such a plane could be designed it would save the taxpayers a billion dollars.

With as much as $6 billion involved in developing and producing this plane, the race for the contract naturally was hot. In time, the field was narrowed to two—Boeing and General Dynamics-Grumman.

Boeing went into the judging finals with a design most pleasing to the services themselves—a design which varied enough for Air Force and Navy functions for Mr. McNamara to hold that the company, in effect, was proposing two different airplanes from a structures point of view.

General Dynamics followed the boss' orders more explicitly, producing a design of much greater "commonality" for both services and which would have greater interchange of parts. Mr. McNamara, supported by the Air Force and Navy Secretaries, calmly overruled the military and awarded what will be the first of a series of huge contracts to General Dynamics—despite Boeing's somewhat lower bid.

Mr. McNamara's argument for a single plane is persuasive. As for Boeing's lower bid, he points out with much justification that original bids on such huge weapons systems have meant little in the past because actual costs have commonly increased from 300 to 500 percent over estimated costs.

WALL STREET JOURNAL APPROVES M'NAMARA STRENGTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to another editorial on the same subject which appeared in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal. The Wall Street Journal comments:

> Now whatever the merits of the arguments over any of these specific decisions and plans, it seems to us it ought to be possible to keep a couple of basic points clear.
>
> One is that civilian control of the Defense Department is a principle long since agreed upon for the soundest of reasons. If Mr. McNamara is applying it more vigorously than others have, that is hardly a good excuse for military dismay; officers so supersensitive reflect only on themselves.
>
> A further point: It is not necessarily so that military men are the most impartial judges of weapons—particularly new design concepts like the TFX intended for use by more than one service. Nor are they always the most prudent purchasers of weapons.
>
> Experience has shown that responsible officers do develop vested interests in particular weapons systems, interests which may impede the development of advanced weapons essential for future defense needs.

The editorial concludes:

> For our part, we wish he had been able to do more, particularly in keeping costs from soaring as they have the past couple of years. But at least he is making a needed effort to impose control on an institution made almost uncontrollable by its built-in rivalries, its encrustation of traditions, its proclivity for committee creation and empire building and, above all, its sheer size and the vast sums at its disposal.

It is very hard for any mere mortal to envision the perfectly fantastic size of the Defense Department budget, the enormous amount at their disposal—$50,000 million—$50 billion.

For any Defense Secretary to have the kind of competent, effective control over the Defense Establishment which Mr. McNamara has developed is a great service, when that man has the kind of values and the kind of judgment that Mr. McNamara has. I think he has served this country mighty well.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Grappling With an Octopus," published in the Wall Street Journal on March 21, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Grappling With an Octopus

Many men have had many ideas about how to run the Department of Defense—what its strategic plans should be, how much money it should spend, how to make it more efficient. But they would all be compelled to agree that the Pentagon is a sprawling octopus which practically defies coherent management.

Secretary McNamara's current troubles stem largely from the fact that he is indeed trying to get hold of this octopus that more passive men would let lie. He is accused of setting up a "McNamara monarchy" of civilians which, among other alleged evils, is said to be having bad effect on military morale. He is charged with asserting, by implication at least, too much independence of Congress. And so the military-political fur keeps flying.

For what they are worth, the charges appear true enough. The famous TFX fighter-bomber case shows the move toward a greater civilian centralization of the Defense Establishment, with some downgrading of the role of the individual services and of the military men as decisionmakers. It also shows the concern of Congress, where Mr. McNamara is scheduled to testify on the matter today.

The Secretary and his civilian advisers awarded the TFX development, which may provide some $6.5 billion in eventual orders, to General Dynamics and Grumman even though the military advisers thought Boeing had the better design; Mr. McNamara believes they paid too little attention to other considerations.

What's more, he is thinking of putting still greater responsibility for both evaluating and procuring weapons in civilian rather than military hands. In his view there is too much inefficiency and waste in present practices.

Now whatever the merits of the arguments over any of these specific decisions and plans, it seems to us it ought to be possible to keep a couple of basic points clear.

One is that civilian control of the Defense Department is a principle long since agreed upon for the soundest of reasons. If Mr. McNamara is applying it more vigorously than others have, that is hardly a good excuse for military dismay; officers so supersensitive reflect only on themselves.

A further point: It is not necessarily so that military men are the most impartial judges of weapons—particularly new design concepts like the TFX intended for use by more than one service. Nor are they always the most prudent purchasers of weapons.

Experience has shown that responsible officers do develop vested interests in particular weapons systems, interests which may impede the development of advanced weapons essential for future defense needs. Also that they may develop vested interests in particular contractors, not with sinister intent but often just out of familiarity with their operations. Civilian experts might do better for the Nation in many cases.

As for Congress, its defense responsibilities are obviously enormous and it is certainly entitled to question anything it wants. Yet if it pushes its inquiries to the point of the harassment and niggling interference, it is not helping the defense effort. Congress cannot run the Pentagon day by day; that is what the Secretary has been delegated to do. As Mr. McNamara himself asks, if he is not to knock heads together for the sake of efficiency and curbing military extravagance, who is going to do it?

For our part, we wish he had been able to do more, particularly in keeping costs from soaring as they have the past couple of years. But at least he is making a needed effort to impose control on an institution made almost uncontrollable by its built-in rivalries, its encrustation of traditions, its proclivity for committee creation and empire building—and, above all, its sheer size and the vast sums at its disposal.

The whole Government would deserve more respect if other officials in other departments were equally interested in tackling the bureaucratic octopus.

TIME FOR CASE RESOLUTION TO PREVENT CONGRESSIONAL PRESSURE FOR CONTRACT PREFERENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on a related subject, Marquis Childs recently wrote a column in the Washington Post in which he briefly discussed the TFX controversy. In the column, Mr. Childs pointed out that the controversy underlined how very constructive is the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. I am honored to be a cosponsor of the Case proposal, which would provide for a continuing congressional investigation of defense contracts, particularly seeing that no political influence from the Congress was involved. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] has made an excellent proposal. The controversy over the TFX in the Senate today underlines how valuable the Case proposal would be.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post also be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arms Race Seen Infecting Politics

(By Marquis Childs)

The noisy quarrel, which is essentially between two giant contractors and their congressional backers, over the TFX plane contract points up the ever-growing entanglement of huge defense spending with the politics of who gets what.

The Senate subcommittee investigating the $6.5 billion contract has taken after Secretary of Defense McNamara on the ground that he gave the contract to General Dynamics even though Boeing entered a lower bid. McNamara's answer is that economies to be achieved through developing a single plane for both the Air Force and the Navy determined the award. A resolute man, he shows no signs of reversing his decision.

The Defense Department has responded by saying, in effect, that you can hardly expect an unbiased finding when Senators with a direct stake in the outcome sit on the investigating committee. The accusing finger is pointed at Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, for whom the Boeing plant in Seattle and its payroll must be a major consideration.

But it is possible that Jackson, with his wide and continuing interest in national security, would welcome a way out of the pressures that inevitably bear down on a Senator with important defense industry in his State. If he can deliver for a particular industry back home he may at the same time be doing a disservice to the Nation.

That is why the Senate, instead of indulging in the quarrel currently going on, would do well to give serious consideration to the proposals of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican of New Jersey. CASE put in bills the other day calling for complete public disclosure of all communications whether written or oral and from Members of Congress and anyone in the executive branch seeking to influence the awarding of a contract. He would also require full and prompt disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract is granted.

Of the $60 billion a year in defense and space contracts an estimated 65 percent are negotiated without competitive bidding. This is a wide-open invitation to pull and push. While by most accounts McNamara has done a remarkable job of standing up to these pressures, it is too great a burden to put on one man.

CASE, in introducing his proposals, cited examples of the "I can do more for you" theme that is more and more resorted to. He quoted speeches by President Kennedy in last year's election in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, claiming a marked increase in Government contracts for those States under his administration, with the President urging election of Democratic Governors to continue this collaboration.

The Defense Department has fallen into the habit of allowing Senators and Representatives to announce important defense contracts in their States and districts. That tends to create the impression they are responsible for obtaining this prize. In most instances the impression is false but there is rivalry for the local headlines that come out of such an announcement.

Senator CASE has a third proposal. That is to establish a joint Senate-House committee to review defense and space contracts, with special attention to negotiated contracts. It would be made up of a Democrat and a Republican each named from the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, Senate and House Government Operations and Senate and House Space Committees.

It would bear a family resemblance to the Committee on the Conduct of the War which Harry S. Truman so ably directed in World War II.

That any of the Case proposals will be adopted seems unlikely even though five other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bills. The joint committee on contracts cuts across too many privileges and prerogatives which present committee chairmen cling to.

With each succeeding election, so long as defense budgets run at $55 or $60 billion, the game of contract promise and grab will become more deeply entrenched in the political system. As this system prevails any meaningful disarmament is bound to become more difficult. Each Member of Congress will have a stake in keeping the home plant going. This has already been demonstrated in areas where aircraft contracts have been cut back as missiles have begun to dominate.

In his farewell address President Eisenhower spoke solemn words of warning about the growing influence of what he called the military-industrial complex. Today it might better be called the military-industrial-political complex.

DEPRESSED CONDITIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, "approximately 285 million years ago Pennsylvania was in worse shape than it is today."

Mr. President, that observation appeared recently in a Philadelphia business review.

In those dim and dismal days of the early Paleozoic Era, Pennsylvania was a bleak place, a vast swamp swarming with reptiles; dominated by the most primitive concept of survival by the fittest.

Pennsylvania has come far since then. It is the "Keystone State" of our great Nation. Its importance was pointed out with unusual clarity by Governor Scranton in a recent address to our State legislature. The Governor said:

> What say we Pennsylvanians to America?
>
> We say this:
>
> As you are our Nation, we are your heartland.
>
> You rolled across the prairies in our Conestoga wagons; you roared across a continent on our rails of steel.
>
> With our textiles, we clothed you.
>
> With our coal, we warmed you.
>
> With the rich produce of our soil, we nourished your bodies; with our genius, we nourished your minds.
>
> We gave Ben Franklin a home, Andrew Carnegie a furnace; Charles Schwab an opportunity, and John Mitchell a cause.
>
> In our largest city, your freedom was born, your Constitution came to life there. Your Union was preserved with mingeld blood on the fields of Gettysburg.
>
> A Massachusetts man, Henry Adams, once wrote that Pennsylvania both managed and paid for every war in which the United States had been engaged. And he was right. We built the Nation's war machine with the same skill as we manned her peacetime workbench.
>
> We lit up your sky with the rich red fire of our forges; we lit up your hearts with the high promise of our vision of the American dream.
>
> We built your machinery; we made it hum and sing.
>
> We are Pennsylvanians; ours is the Keystone State.

Yes, Mr. President, we have come a long way since the Paleozoic era; but we have our difficulties—some very serious.

In that time long ago they had no unemployment problems; they had no people. There was no concern over great industries working at partial capacity; there were no industries. There was no controversy over Government contracts: there were no governments.

So, although things are better in Pennsylvania than they were 285 million years ago, still, things are not particularly good. Our unemployment has for many years been excessively high, frequently double the national average; and it stays grievously high.

Governor Scranton is now instituting positive programs, to get our people back to work; but he has barely had time to start. Furthermore, the influence and operations of the Federal Government play an increasingly important role in the economics of all of our States. Government purchasing practices, both at home and abroad, have an enormous impact on industrial growth and employment levels.

Hopes were high in Pennsylvania after the 1960 presidential election. The winning candidate had campaigned in our State many times, and promised much. Under his leadership there was to be no return to the Paleozoic era but, rather, a forward march into a majestic and even greater future. He had shown an understanding of our related business, economic and unemployment problems, and, he had shown a desire to help.

Let me recall some of his words to Pennsylvanians:

> I pledge that a new administration will move at once to put our people back to work. The policy of full employment—which the Democratic Party wrote into law in 1945—will be taken out of the ash can where the Republicans have thrown it and made once more a primary objective of national economic policy.—Sharon, Pa., October 15, 1960.
>
> The Democratic Party today has set forth many goals for the future of America * * * a goal whose attainment is basic to all our other programs is the goal of full employment.—Levittown, Pa., October 30, 1960.
>
> Let us take our abundance out of storage at home and put it to work. Let us give our money and our workers and our factories fulltime jobs. Let us have more new jobs and more new buying power. Let us start building again.—Philadelphia, Pa., October 1960.
>
> Let us take our great productive capacity—our money and our men and women and our machines and our factories—out of storage.—Brookville, Pa., October 1960.

We all remember such stirring words of promise and hope. We all remember that incessant theme of "I am going to get this country moving again." But, after more than 2 years, what have been the results? What do we find today?

Well, I can say that things are still better in Pennsylvania than they were in the Paleozoic era. But 57 of our 67 counties are classified as persistent or substantial labor surplus areas. In late 1960, 37 of our counties were so classified.

So in getting the country moving forward, we have had at least 20 Pennsylvania counties moving steadily backward.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has observed that "the existence of labor surplus areas depresses the commerce of the entire Nation."

Unemployment in Pennsylvania is 9.3 percent. That means that 1 out of every 12 Pennsylvanians is unemployed.

The Labor Department's group F category, which lists areas with the very highest unemployment percentages, shows only three areas. Two are in Puerto Rico. The third is Johnstown, Pa., with 15.6 percent unemployed. In Wilkes-Barre the figure is 14.1 percent. In Scranton it is 13.5 percent. In Pittsburgh 11.1 percent are out of work. In Altoona it is 14.1 percent. In Erie, the figure is 9.9 percent. Even in Philadelphia the figure, at 7.6 percent, is well over the national average.

Depressed areas are tragic places. You should walk some of their streets. You can see it in the hunger, the hopelessness in the faces of children, as well as their job-seeking elders. We hear much of terrible conditions in underdeveloped lands. Well, these areas in our own great country are not underdeveloped, but it can be said they are underhelped.

I am sure that if Pennsylvania could get under a foreign aid program, conditions would improve drastically, and I imagine if we were a foreign nation which was particularly threatening to the United States, we could probably double the amount of Federal help in short order. However, unfortunately for Pennsylvania, it is close to Washington in everything except help.

Past the multitude of human tragedies, of human waste, which this situation represents, though, there are other important aspects requiring consideration.

Pennsylvania is a basic, a vital industry State. As Governor Scranton has so eloquently pointed out, Pennsylvania's industries, resources, and ingenuity have played a decisive role in America's historic rise to world prestige and power.

Yet, as one outstanding example of our dilemma, our steel industry—without which the U.S. economy and defense effort would collapse—is operating at little over half capacity. This is occurring at a time when the Government continues to buy steel abroad.

Our coal industry is characterized by chronic unemployment—yet, again, we find the Federal Government frequently buying abroad.

I am not opposed to foreign purchasing if it is necessary, and does not contribute to keeping our industries down, and unemployment up. This is now too often the case. Foreign purchasing also contributes directly to our present balance-of-payments difficulties, about which the administration voices such great concern. Dollars go abroad which could and should be kept at home; dollars which might serve as wages for our unemployed, investment capital for our businessmen.

One positive action the Government could take to help us to help ourselves would be issuance of a new Executive order to implement the Buy American Act. I have long advocated this, and though I have had some success in specific instances in Pennsylvania, the overall picture is still one of procrastination, indecision, and inaction on the part of the Federal executive department.

Last July, my intervention resulted in an award to an American rather than a West German, steel company for 2,400 tons of carbon steel. I was gratified by the administration's cooperative attitude in that instance. The Government was also buying coal and coke abroad for our military installations in Europe last year. I am again happy to report that my pleas, and those of others, in behalf of the coal industry and the miners resulted in the purchase of 400,000 tons of coal from Pennsylvania mines.

But the results of such interventions are not always so salutary.

Recently, the Defense Department awarded a contract to reconstruct two naval vessels, to a west coast shipbuilding firm, which intends to subcontract most of the new construction to Japan. Defense Secretary McNamara informed me that it was impossible to consider the bid of Pennsylvania's Sunshipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. under the present Executive order implementing the Buy American Act.

As they now stand, the criteria and guidelines of the Buy American Act are not geared to a period in which we must simultaneously cope with heavy involvement abroad, and large-scale unemployment and lagging industry at home.

So, on August 23 of last year, I forwarded a series of recommendations, made by the American Iron and Steel Institute, on the Government's foreign steel purchases, to Mr. David Bell, the then Director of the Bureau of the Budget. One of the institute's recommendations was for a new Executive order to implement the Buy American Act.

In my covering letter to Mr. Bell, I pointed out that:

> I endorse these recommendations because I believe that if present foreign steel purchases by the U.S. Government continue at the present rate they could jeopardize the jobs of thousands of steelworkers and may be a threat to one of the most important defense industries in the Nation.
>
> It has been estimated that every ton of steel purchased from foreign sources with U.S. Government funds means up to 2 days less work for an American steelworker.

In mid-September I was notified that a Cabinet Committee, chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury has been established to consider changes in procurement policies.

On November 1, the United Steel Workers of America informed me that they were supporting efforts for a new Executive order on the Buy American Act. As I had had no word of any disposition having been made of my recommendations, I wired the President on November 2.

Promptly on December 3, I received a letter from Mr. Bell which stated that a study was being carried out on Federal purchases of foreign materials, and that it would be completed and presented to the President in the near future.

This study is apparently continuing. And so is unemployment.

The recommendations which I submitted to the Budget Bureau proposed that all purchases of $10,000 and less, and all purchases above that figure where the domestic cost over the foreign cost is 50 percent or less should be made from domestic sources; all cases where the domestic cost is more than 50 percent larger than the foreign cost should be referred to the head of the procurement agency; and for an end product to be considered of American origin, 80 percent of its components should be of such origin. This could be embodied in a new Executive order, but the administration's silence continues.

The question of a new Executive order on the Buy American Act is now in the hands of the executive department. There is little more that we in Congress can do than hope that the President will see the urgency of this crisis in employment and act promptly.

However, I cannot remain idle while more than 9 percent of the workers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are seeking jobs which do not exist.

I propose a direct legislative attack on this problem.

Today the U.S. Government purchases goods and services that represent about 10 percent of our gross national product. I would like to see those dollars—one out of 10 in our economy—go to work for our unemployed.

I am now drafting legislation to give businesses in economically depressed areas a percentage advantage when they bid on Government contracts.

This legislation would authorize the Secretary of Labor to set up classifications for areas, depending on their relative rates of unemployment. Then, companies in those areas would receive a 2 to 12 percent price advantage when bidding on Government contracts.

The percentage would depend on where the work actually would be performed. When work was to be done in several areas, the percentage would be adjusted accordingly.

In terms of my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for instance, when the Government wants to buy coal, a company in Scranton—where 13.5 percent of the people are unemployed—would get a 10 or 12 percent advantage over a company in an area of relative prosperity.

A similar advantage would apply to railroad ties when they come from Johnstown, where there are more than 15 percent of the people out of work, to steel when it comes from Altoona where 14 percent of the people are unemployed, and so forth. I have used Pennsylvania illustrations, but of course these figures would be applicable to any area in the United States which qualified under the percentage computations to be made by the Secretary of Labor.

When contracts were negotiated, rather than let by competitive bidding, my bill would require that these advantages be computed into the weighted factors in such contracts.

My proposal does not require the Government to buy from any one area, regardless of the unemployment, because it is obvious that each area is not equipped to provide all the goods and services required by the Government. But it does seek to turn some of the contracts toward areas which are able to meet the production requirements but need a price advantage to equalize the competitive advantage now enjoyed by companies from more prosperous areas.

This bill is designed to assist all areas suffering from economically depressed conditions, but obviously my principal concern is with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I am concerned, even saddened, that Pennsylvania, with its wealth of skilled manpower, its almost unique industrial capacity—not to speak of potential—and 7 percent of our population—far too many of them unemployed—received in the last fiscal year a mere 3.8 percent of total Federal military and research and development contracts. During the period since 1960, when Federal expenditures on such contracts rose over 20 percent, Pennsylvania contracts increased only one-half of 1 percent.

So, Pennsylvania, which pays over 10 percent of our Nation's taxes, is being left behind. Yet, research and development, for example, lies at the very heart of an expanding future, a future which does not include depressed areas.

Moreover, there has been a noticeable trend toward withdrawal of military installations from our State. Six Army Ordnance departments have, for example, been closed. I am looking into a report that the Optical Glass Division of the Middletown Air Force Depot is to be moved to another State. There are others.

Although this trend may be justifiable from defense or other standpoints, it still works to aggravate Pennsylvania's unemployment problem. It points up another facet of the Federal Government's impact on our State.

Though their interest in revision of Government purchasing policies has not been readily apparent, the administration has been acting, or attempting to act, in ways which their thinkers and theorists believe will solve unemployment throughout the country. They know, and we know that it is a national problem—Pennsylvania just seems to get the worst of so many national problems.

One of the administration's articles of faith seems to be a belief in the magic of deficit spending—the idea that debt-based artificial stimulants to our economy hold some strange cure-all power. They have even started planning deficits. With most of us, in our daily lives, debt is enough of a problem without deliberately planning more of the same.

Though deficit spending may furnish a short-term stimulus to the economy, it must be recognized that it also causes more inflation at a time when the cost of living is at an all-time high, and rising. Furthermore, continuing deficits increase the interest on our national debts, thus, ultimately increasing taxes, and weakening our Government's credit. This policy will not solve our unemployment problems now any more than it did in the 1930's.

The interest on our $300 billion debt—soon to be increased—amounts to $9 billion a year. This is increased at the rate of $30 million with each added billion of debt. And, most dollars borrowed by the Federal Government are new dollars, which automatically cheapen all those already in existence.

I know that some people consider these deficit spending dangers of which I have been speaking, to be a myth, old copybook maxims; the cliches of our forebears. Thus, the new economists justify modern follies by sneering at ancient truths. To them I would further point out: Deficit spending is not going to reopen closed coal mines. It will only increase the prices of the miners food and clothing. Nor is deficit spending going to reopen closed plants and railroad yards. It will only succeed in cutting the buying capacity of those who have little enough as it is.

No, I am not for deficit spending, and those that are might well recall some line by Rudyard Kipling:

> Then the gods of the market tumbled,
> And their smooth-tongued wizards withdrew,
> And the hearts of the meanest were humbled,
> And began to believe it was true
> That all is not gold that glitters
> And 2 and 2 make 4—
> And the gods of the copybook headings
> Limped up to explain it once more.

The fundamental point is that regardless of the degree of stimulation which may or may not be furnished the economy by deficit spending, it does not get to the root of the problem. It merely delays the day of solution, or collapse. I want action which will help us get to the root of the problem, action which will get our people back to work for good.

There are the public works programs, of course, the youth conservation programs, all the rest. Though one may see merit in some of these programs, they fail to apply to the root causes, basic curatives. They propose surface solutions which merely delay the day when someone will have to limp up and "explain it once more."

Further, if we are going to take people off the streets, we should certainly try to help them to keep themselves off the street when we are through with them, perhaps through aid to vocational and technical training—a subject which I plan to discuss in detail at a later date.

In his address to the legislature, Governor Scranton pointed out that "the next half dozen years are going to be critical ones for establishing the growth patterns of American industry." One vital element will be location of the job-producing research and development firms. The Governor is now offering proposals which will enhance Pennsylvania's appeal to these firms. He has stated:

> Presently Pennsylvania has the same rate structure as the Federal Government for determining depreciation allowances. This should be changed to allow manufacturing and research and development companies erecting new or enlarged plants to claim a depreciation allowance on the new facility of one and a half times that now allowed.
>
> Obviously, this will make Pennsylvania an attractive place for industry to begin or to expand.
>
> Another change we should make in our tax laws is called for because the new types of research and development industries are sure to bring jobs and prosperity.
>
> Presently we exempt corporations dealing in manufacturing or processing from capital stock and franchise taxes. We should extend this exemption to cover firms dealing in research and development.

In addition to these and other proposals, a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Washington office has been established under the direction of former Representative James Van Zandt. Its mission will be to coordinate the overlapping interests of Federal and State Government, to cut through some of the complexities which so frequently prevent the right contract coming together with the right company, and to more effectively present the picture of a Pennsylvania which has much to offer.

So, we are moving to help ourselves, but with few signs from the Federal administration of workable, job-creating programs, and solid meaningful progress toward real solutions.

In fiscal year 1962, only 29.5 percent of total military prime contracts awarded went to areas of substantial unemployment.

Though approximately half of the dollars received by large companies are paid out in the form of subcontracts to other companies, it is of interest to note that some 85 percent of reported receipts of military contractors for both prime and subcontract work go to 100 defense contracting firms. Thus, many are obviously passing contracts back and forth between themselves. In a great many instances this may be necessary, even imperative, but I doubt that this overall trend contributes to strengthening our grassroots industry.

These figures indicate that the so-called set-aside policies for small business and surplus labor areas have not been overly successful. And, Government procurement regulations provide that "in no case will price differentials be paid for the purpose of carrying out this policy." The General Accounting Office has interpreted this to mean that practices of negotiating contracts with labor surplus firms which would meet the lowest price offered by any other bidder on a designated procurement might be continued, but that no such contract could be awarded at a price in excess of the lowest available.

It is my hope that many of my colleagues will join with me in sponsoring legislation which help us to realistically meet this problem. I would also hope to work in close cooperation with the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. The national unemployment rate has, after all, just climbed to 6.1 percent—if it keeps on, it may soon catch up with our rate in Pennsylvania.

There has been much talk in recent years about these problems, but I seriously doubt that anyone can talk us into more jobs. Nor can they spend us into real solutions. We in Pennsylvania have heard a lot about programs. What we prefer is progress. There are no calories in statistics, no nourishment in sympathy.

It is a time for action, for a concerted attack on this tragic and basic infection which daily gnaws away at the very cornerstone—the keystone—of our great, and in so many ways, materially blessed society.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very brief.

Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the words of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. He is performing a great service in spotlighting the problems created by chronic and continued unemployment. The persistence in our so-called affluent society of areas of high unemployment, of low per capita income, and of unsatisfactory career opportunities is one of the greatest challenges that our Nation faces today. Although I have not had an opportunity to study his recommendations carefully, the Senator's discussion should, undoubtedly, stimulate interest and concern in the role that can be played by the Federal Government to alleviate conditions that are in many ways the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, as of February, 1963, there were 19 areas of substantial unemployment within the State of New York. They include Erie and Niagara Counties, with the city of Buffalo, second largest city in the State. They include Herkeimer and Oneida Counties, with the cities of Utica and Rome. They also include Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Catskill, Cobleskill, Elmira, Geneva-Canandaigua, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Medina-Albion, Newburg-Middletown-Beacon, Ogedensburg - Massena - Malone, Plattsburgh, Ticonderoga, Watertown, and Wellsville.

What can be done to bring more jobs to these cities and rural areas? What can be done to train the unemployed now living in these areas to perform work that, undoubtedly, needs to be done in other fields?

In my judgment, there is no one answer. Vocational retraining, if undertaken intelligently and on a sufficiently broad scale, can help in certain instances. Appropriate public works projects can provide immediate employment and over the long run can create the factors that encourage economic development and growth. Tax reduction has a role to play both in encouraging corporations to expand and create new jobs and in returning to the individuals funds that can flow out into the economy. Export expansion can also bring new jobs to areas of unemployment, if combined with vigorous resistance against protectionist tendencies developing in other countries. In short, Mr. President, we must explore a number of areas and methods in order to meet the heart-rending challenge of unemployment, of men laid off from their lifetime work, of women forced to take low-wage jobs where there is no work for men, of youngsters coming out of school without the complex skills necessary to find a place in our modern society. No problem is more serious in our society today. No problem deserves our attention more urgently. The answer does not necessarily lie in a proliferation of hastily concocted Federal programs but rather in a thorough analysis of the basic need and in an overall fiscal policy that will provide the national growth we need. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on discussing this very pressing problem here today.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York very much. I appreciate his comments. During the time we have been here I have always known that we shared the same concern about a problem relating to which many of us feel something more should be done, and it certainly must be done, to meet the problem of unemployment than we have so far managed. I thank the Senator.

PUBLICATION OF USIA OPINION SURVEY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the controversy over news reports of the findings of recent U.S. Information Agency surveys of public opinion in Western Europe has tended to obscure the findings themselves.

There is no good reason to believe that portions of this report were leaked to the press, as has been suggested by critics. None of the critics can give any good reason—political, or partisan, or personal—as to why this information might have been given out at this season, or, on the contrary, why it should be withheld. The portion of the report which has been publicized certainly contains no information which proves detrimental to the national interest, nor is there any good reason to believe that its release is having any significant effect upon our foreign policy or the political strength of either of the political parties in the United States.

The survey results reflect a high level of prestige. The substance of the survey report is this: Contrary to allegations which have been made by some Members of Congress and some members of the press, U.S. prestige in Western Europe is extremely high. The reaction to our foreign policy and programs by the citizens of our closest allies is generally very favorable. The people of Europe express confidence in American policies and in our willingness to support our words with action. They understand our efforts for peace; they share our world objectives; and they have a high esteem for the United States. Far from embracing a position of "third force" neutrality, the people of Western Europe continue to identify their national interests with those of the United States.

Concern has been expressed that the discussions relating to the substitution of the Polaris submarine for the Skybolt missile caused marked resentment against the United States in Great Britain. However, in February of 1963, 59 percent of the people in Great Britain expressed a favorable impression of our Government's recent conduct of international affairs, whereas only 14 percent had an unfavorable impression. In 1960, the results showed 48 percent favorable and 18 percent unfavorable. Since 1960, the number of British citizens expressing confidence in U.S. leadership has risen from 35 to 54 percent. In May of 1960, 42 percent of those interviewed thought that Great Brintain should ally itself with the United States and 46 percent thought that Great Britain should remain neutral. Today that trend has been reversed, and 52 percent prefer alliance with the United States and 38 percent prefer neutrality. In May of 1960, a majority of those interviewed in Great Britain felt that the United States was not doing all it should to prevent war. Today our efforts for peace are endorsed by a majority of nearly two to one.

In West Germany, confidence in American leadership stands at a record 77 percent—compared to 57 percent in 1960. Seventy percent of the German citizens interviewed expressed confidence in U.S. willingness to support its policies with necessary action, compared to 45 percent in 1960. Sixty-five percent approve of our foreign policy in general and 76 percent approve of our efforts toward peace in particular. In 1960, the comparable figures were 48 percent and 44 percent. Public opinion in West Germany expressed a decided preference for association with the United States as opposed to neutrality, and a highly favorable opinion of this country and its objectives.

The results of the survey in France have a special interest because of the widespread speculation about the consequences of France's rejection of Great Britain's application for membership in the European Common Market and the rejection of the U.S. offer of a multilateral deterrent force. These actions did not drastically alter the basic political, military, and economic problems of the Atlantic community nor of the Common Market countries, but the resulting controversy and the exaggerated response in some quarters might have been expected to result in adverse French reaction.

The published results of the USIA survey, however, indicate greater approval of U.S. foreign policy by the people of France than at any time since the surveys were initiated in 1956. Forty-six percent of the French citizens interviewed expressed approval of U.S. foreign policy in February of this year, compared to 24 percent with an unfavorable opinion. In February 1960, only 28 percent expressed approval, while 23 percent expressed disapproval. General approval of U.S. policies is higher today among the people of France than it was last summer, and it is substantially greater than it was 3 years ago. A majority of those expressing an opinion now feels that the United States is exerting responsible leadership in the common effort to achieve and maintain order and peace in the world.

The results of the poll are an inadequate guide to policy. These results are an answer to those who arbitrarily, on the basis of a kind of private inspiration, charge that we are losing prestige in European countries. They reflect clearly the confidence of Europeans in the President as a leader in world affairs and are evidence of better understanding among Europeans of our Government's response to international challenges. I have serious doubts as to whether the USIA should be taking polls on potentially confidential matters.

The controversy and confusion resulting from this incident suggests another reason for establishing a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Foreign Information and Intelligence. Continuing supervision over the foreign information and intelligence activities of the U.S. Government help to prevent pointless and unworthy political controversy.

ALASKA'S DEFENSES ARE INADEQUATE—THE RUSSIAN FLYERS PROVED IT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the so-called defenses of Alaska are not adequate. They never have been. The invasion of Alaska's airspace by two Russian planes demonstrated that fact.

Beginning about 15 years ago, the United States began to build, at great cost, bases around the world to contain the potential aggression of Soviet Russia.

At that time I stated—publicly—my belief that many of these bases were built, figuratively speaking, on quicksand. I warned that rampant nationalism, Communist subversion, or other factors would cause the governments of these nations to request that our bases be withdrawn.

It has happened. In other cases where we have not been compelled to scrap an investment of many millions of dollars, the United States has been blackmailed into paying more rent for the land on which these bases are located or paying through the nose with vastly increased economic aid. That happened in Spain. It happened in Libya, where, in addition to an initial retainer payment of $7,500,000, the United States agreed to pay $4 million a year. When that agreement expired, the Libyan Government insisted on raising the ante to $10 million a year. The United States yielded, although in addition to these fantastic payments, the presence of these bases with their substantial employment of local labor, payment of local rents, and purchases of local products constitute a great economic bonanza for that underdeveloped country. Likewise, we are granting substantial economic aid to Libya, running into many milions of dollars.

Even in presumably friendly countries our military tenure is uncertain.

There is no danger of our losing any of our military strength in the 49th State, except as by our own unwisdom we fail to install it or keep it there. The Alaska delegation in Congress protested in vain, 4 years ago, when the Air Force suddenly reversed its policy of strengthening the air materiel in Alaska and abandoned Ladd Field, near Fairbanks, the first airbase to be established in Alaska 25 years ago and the northernmost base on the continent. Alaskans considered it folly then and do now.

No area—as Billy Mitchell pointed out in his last public appearance in 1935 before the House Committee on Military Affairs—is strategically more important. It lies within naked eye view of Soviet Siberia. It fronts on the new air crossways of the world, the Arctic Ocean. It is, needless to say, inhabited by a militantly patriotic population of American citizens. It holds the key to the defense—and offense—of the North American Continent and thereby of the heart of the free world.

But it is as true today as when Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold, the five-star General who commanded the Air Force during World War II, wrote it in his book: "Global Mission" 15 years ago:

> Through to this day Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves.

Alaska is the logical place for missiles. There are none there, and when Lt. Gen. Frank Armstrong, the commander in chief in Alaska from 1957 to 1962, who had, a decade earlier, been stationed there as its air commander—a great and capable officer with 2 years more of service in view—recommended missiles for Alaska, he was promptly called to Washington and his retirement ordered by Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis Le May—a deplorable action in my view and that of virtually all Alaskans.

The Anchorage Daily Times has just published an excellent editorial on the State of Alaska's defenses entitled: "Alaska Wide Open to Soviet Tourists."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Alaska Wide Open To Soviet Tourists

Two Soviet planes have now demonstrated the glaring defense weaknesses that Alaskans have been citing for years.

The Russians flew over western Alaska last week like tourists out for a sightseeing excursion. They flew slow and they flew low.

The only capability the Alaska defenses showed was the ineffective measure of watching a blip on a radar screen.

Fighter planes sent to intercept the intruders did not even get close enough to see them. They could not have hit them with gunfire had they wanted to.

The Russians apparently continued their sightseeing trip unconcerned by blips and the interceptors.

This military response by the United States to an incursion over our land is a marked contrast to the response of the Russians in 1955 when they shot down a U.S. Navy plane 40 miles southwest of St. Lawrence Island.

The Russians went out over international waters and downed a U.S. plane that was not violating any law. But the United States could not even look at the Russians when they intruded.

The incident points up the fact that the United States has left this gateway to America undefended. The billion-dollar warning systems for invading aircraft and ballistic missiles can sound alarms but the military capability to respond is no more than a gesture.

The warning systems in Alaska are the most important defense investment here. Radar stations stand like a picket fence from the Aleutians along the western coast to the Arctic Ocean shores.

The Soviet incursion shows that the warning systems are vulnerable to sneak attack at any time. The Russians could knock them out while their "tourists" are out for a joyride.

A few well-placed sorties in slow planes could hit each White Alice communications station. Word of whatever happened after that would be a long time getting to military headquarters.

Simultaneously with a strike at the warning and communications systems, the Russians could capture Fairbanks and Anchorage military establishments with a few paratroopers. And Alaska would be theirs until the United States marshaled enough strength to recapture it by force.

Perhaps the Pentagon can read what the Russians say with their reconnaissance planes better than what is said by Alaskans.

The incident proved that the handful of fighter interceptors assigned to Alaska are inadequate to do an effective job. The interceptors are too far away and are too few to protect the important radar installations and the communications system.

There should be more fighters assigned to Alaska. They should be deployed so that every strategic point on the coastline of Alaska can be protected. And they should be in sufficient numbers to provide capability for an effective response in many places simultaneously.

The best place to stop the Russians is beyond the shores of Alaska, not inland. The most economical defense is one that insures retention of Alaska in American hands, not one that will require a costly, bloody war to recapture it.

Mr. GRUENING. Governor Egan has just written a vigorous letter to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the State of Alaska's defenses or lack of them. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of Alaska,
Office of the Governor,
Juneau, March 19, 1963.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: The U.S. State Department's formal protest to Soviet Russia against the overflight of an area of southwest Alaska by two Soviet reconnaissance aircraft on March 14, vividly points up a situation which could result in catastrophe for our Nation unless remedied at the earliest possible time.

One news item quoted Washington, D.C., sources as stating that the Soviet planes had penetrated U.S. airspace to a depth of 30 miles. Yet, the first press release from Washington, D.C., indicated the planes were tracked going out of Kuskokwim Bay, one of them passing over Nunivak Island, and the other plane passing over Nelson Island. A 200-mile arc drawn on the map using the central area of Kuskokwim Bay as the beginning point, passes through St. Lawrence Island at an area approximately 15 miles back from St. Lawrence's most easterly point.

The question most commonly asked in Alaska following news of the overflight is: Just what does the United States consider to be U.S. airspace for defense purposes?

There would have been a lesser alarm in the minds of Americans if the flights had passed over the area of Wales in the northwest Seward Peninsula area. It is only a short distance from that point across Bering Strait to the easternmost point of Siberia, and it is always possible for a plane to get off its course and violate U.S. airspace.

The shock of learning of the extremely deep Soviet penetration into the southwest area, is another matter altogether. Those planes had to have been flying and flying and flying to reach the Kuskokwim Bay area. Thus, it is extremely clear that something must be done at the earliest possible moment to bulwark Alaska's defenses.

The occurrence of this flight and its penetration over the Alaska mainland was not surprising to anyone of even passing familiarity with the woeful inadequacy of U.S. Air Force capability to maintain surveillance over Alaska's long and sparsely populated coastline.

On numerous occasions in recent years, I and other Alaskans have protested vigorously the inadequacy of U.S. military installations in our State. This weakness, which exists both as to offensive and defensive forces, has also been cited repeatedly by some of our Nation's top military authorities.

Despite our pleas, those in policymaking positions in our military establishment have chosen to ignore the all too obvious need to enhance Alaska's military capabilities. That such a situation has been permitted to continue defies both logic and reason.

Contrast, for example, the continuing indifference to Alaska's military deficiencies to the national furor and the urgent concentration of military forces in Florida which followed disclosure of the presence of a comparative handful of Russian missiles and technicians in Cuba.

This comparison is not made for purposes of criticizing the military buildup undertaken as a result of the Cuban situation. Such action was essential and the prompt response to the challenge which it posed is to be commended. I ask only that comparable recognition be given to counteract the far more serious and continuing danger posed by the situation along Alaska's unguarded coastline.

The March 14 incident protested by the State Department points up vividly the inadequacy of Air Force capability in Alaska for either reconnaissance or defense. It gives renewed emphasis to the need for the establishment of medium range ballistic missile launching sites capable of neutralizing Russian strength known to exist in Siberia.

Forces now available in Alaska for reconnaissance or aircraft interception are too few in number and too far removed from the Alaska coast to be meaningful.

There is an immediate and urgent need for additional fighter plane bases along the entire coast of western Alaska, particularly along the northwest Alaska coastline.

I strongly urge your prompt and favorable reassessment of our Nation's present ineffective military policy in Alaska to the end that these obvious needs may be met during the coming construction season.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

HAROLD F. COFFEY, FREE ENTERPRISER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on December 11, 1962, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, an organization chartered in the State of New York, made its annual awards for outstanding free enterprise achievements to eight men and two women.

One of the recipients of the award was a long-time personal friend, Harold F. Coffey, a most enlightened industrialist from North Carolina.

On behalf of myself and my colleague the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], I ask unanimous consent that certain items from the Evening Capital, of Annapolis, Md., of December 11, 1962, and the citation which accompanied the award to Harold F. Coffey, and a sketch of Harold F. Coffey which appeared in the Davidson College Bulletin for January 1963 be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Dec. 11, 1962]

FREE ENTERPRISE AWARDS ASSOCIATION PRESENTS THEM—TWO WOMEN, EIGHT MEN RECEIVE TOP RECOGNITION FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE AS HEADS OF BUSINESSES

NEW YORK, N.Y., December 11—American Success Story Awards for 1962 were presented today by the Free Enterprise Awards Association to two women and eight men as examples of the success possible under America's free enterprise democracy.

The recipients rose from the ranks to own or head giant industries. They started as a reporter, a farmer, a teacher, a laborer, a Russian immigrant, a woman "stogie" roller and other jobs.

All praised the American democratic system and its freedoms for making their success possible.

Presentation of Free Enterprise Awards Association's 11th annual awards were made at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel by Free Enterprise Awards Association awards chairman, Talbot T. Speer, who rose to own a Maryland newspaper chain, one of America's oldest papers, the 235-year-old Maryland Gazette and the Baltimore Business Forms, Inc.

Speer read the citations which stated that the recipients had "* * * won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice and ethics, symbolizing the success possible under our free enterprise system."

He cited them for their dedicated work in civic, religious and philanthropic causes and contributions to their fields.

Speer declared that the Berlin wall was a 25-mile monument attesting to the failure of Russia's despotic system and pointed out that the recipients' success stories were proof by comparison, that the American democratic system was best and that it gave spiritual and material success to all.

"The only walls we build are for homes and industries, to raise our highest standard of living still higher" added Speer.

He warned that the Berlin wall and the Cuban crisis prove that "the totalitarian ideologies would desperately use any inhuman means to wipe out democratic nations" and he urged all people who wish to maintain their liberty to "join the conflict between human dignity and slavery."

The Free Enterprise Awards Association was chartered by New York State in 1952 and approved by the Supreme Court. With leaders in all fields, it carries out its charter duties, "to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American free enterprise democracy" through morale defense projects to bolster the faith of all people in the American democratic system.

The award participants, selected from various trades and areas to show the awards of success possible in large and small communities in America, were:

Walter J. Tuohy, president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., and subsidaries, of Cleveland, Ohio.

John D. MacArthur, owner of the Bankers Life & Casualty Co., of Chicago, Ill.

J. Donovan Forney, founder-owner of Forney Industries, Inc., of Fort Collins, Colo.

Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, president of the William L. Bonnell Co., of Newnan, Ga.

Lilburn S. Barksdale, owner of the Barksdale Valves Co., of Los Angeles, Calif.

Mrs. Zella Ritz-Woller, president of the King Bee Manufacturing Co., of Bellwood, Ill.

Dudley D. Sherman, president of the National Chemical & Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill.

Harold F. Coffey, president of the Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co., of Lenoir, N.C.

Dr. Charles D. Bradley, president, founder and owner of the Bradley Semiconductor Corp., of New Haven, Conn.

James R. Riley, president of Suburban Motor Freight, Inc., of Columbus, Ohio.

Here's what the recipients said about the free enterprise system which made their successes possible:

Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway: "A company's success, as does a nation's, depends on the loyalty and dedication of its people. Teamwork, sharing of problems, and freedom of opinion, assures the success of any endeavor. Just as despotism in government or business crushes the human spirit, so does democracy bring out the dignity of the individual—the best in citizen or worker."

John D. MacArthur, president, Bankers Life & Casualty Co.: "In our democracy any person can reach for the rainbow. Don't stop if you come up with a fistful of air. If you stop trying you start dying."

J. Donovan Forney, owner, Forney Industries, Inc.: "In our free enterprise democracy workers have the best working conditions, benefits, and own shares in industries. Yet, don't be too 'chicken' to go into business for yourself or you might end up with nothing to crow about. Faith in God, your Nation, and your ability will bring peace and success."

Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, president, the William Bonnell Co.: "Free enterprise is the only economic system that gives each of us the right to be what we want to be, including the right a woman has to make business or homemaking her career."

Mrs. Zella Ritz-Woller, president, King Bee Manufacturing Co.: "America gives equal opportunity to men and women. Success in a man's world is not always through pleasing his palate. Give him a good product and you will succeed. If men can make ladies dresses why can't a woman make safety lighting and products for truckdrivers?"

Dudley D. Sherman, president, National Chemical & Manufacturing Co.: "I am just one of the thousands of Russian and other immigrants who achieved success and freedom in America. Our success is a tribute to America's free enterprise democracy and proof that it works for all."

Harold F. Coffey, president, Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co.: "In our democracy you are free to build your own business. You can make it last forever—like the work of the old masters, if you put beauty, durability, and craftsmanship into any product you make."

Dr. Charles D. Bradley, president, Bradley Semiconductor Corp.: "America's free enterprise gives incentive to original research. Anyone is free to develop new and better products and enrich himself and his fellow men. Our competitive system insures success for better 'traps.'"

James Ralph Riley, president, Suburban Motor Freight, Inc.: "Success in America's democracy is assured if you give unselfish service to your customers and your community. Help improve the areas you serve and you will prosper in material and spiritual values."

Lilburn S. Barksdale, president, Barksdale Valves: "In our democracy one can achieve personal and business fulfillment if he couples determination to suceed with personal integrity in his dealings with employees and customers and has a sincere desire to be of service to his fellow men."

[From the Evening Capital, Annapolis (Md.), December 11, 1962]

CONGRATULATIONS TO RECIPIENTS OF THESE WELL-EARNED AWARDS

Congratulations to the two women and eight men whose outstanding records of business and civic service have won them today's richly deserved American Success Story Awards.

The presentation of the awards by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., to these 10 persons who rose from humble jobs to become owners and heads of giant industries demonstrates how all may find and earn opportunity in this land of freedom and democracy through their own ability, hard work and study.

The awards, which were presented by Talbot T. Speer, chairman-president of Baltimore Business Forms, Inc. and president-publisher of the Capital-Gazette Press, Inc. of Annapolis, Md., constitute stories of success won by men and women who started careers "on their own" and rose to positions of eminence in the business world.

Their stories are outstanding examples of what can be achieved under democracy, where freedom of choice and ability, based on the foundation of a belief in God and in the dignity of man prevails.

They did not have to function under a system that places itself above the dignity of man as an individual, or have to please party agents or leaders, to obtain success.

Their judges were not party functionaries but the free people of this Nation. The services or products of the business in which they are engaged had to appeal to the mass of consumers, whose favorable reaction determined success or failure. In other words, they were freemen and had to please other free men and women in order to attain success.

The American Success Story Awards are a perfect answer to any who criticize our democratic system.

Russia's Nikita Khrushchev would do well to take a lesson from this and give it deep thought. It would give him a better understanding of the democratic system, which he criticizes and tries to tear down, and also of the power and strength of the United States and other free people.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association deserves high praise for pointing out to the world the proof of the value of our free enterprise system.

CITATION

Harold F. Coffey, 64, resident 480 West Harper Avenue, Lenoir, N.C. President, Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co., Union Mirror Co., NuWoods, Inc., Furniture Manufacturers, Inc., Lenoir, N.C. Director, Charlotte Branch of North Carolina National Bank, Carolina Northwestern Ry., Fidelity Bankers Life Insurance Corp., others. Was farm boy. From age 9 helped father build business and learned every step in producing furniture. From small shop employing 50 people, Kent-Coffey, under Harold Coffey's expert direction, is now a leading producer of bedroom and other furniture with 13 acres of roofed plant area employing hundreds of craftsmen with multimillion dollars in sales through nationwide showrooms and thousands of dealer stores in United States, Canada and worldwide. Cited for his contributions to and leadership in the furniture industry and his dedicated work as director and member of many civic and charitable organizations.

[From the Davidson College Bulletin, January 1963]

SUCCESS STORY: HAROLD F. COFFEY, 1920

Harold F. Coffey, 1920, of Lenoir, is one of eight winners of the 1962 American Success Story Awards, presented annually by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, an organization with the purpose of promoting incentive and championing the cause of the American democratic system.

The association said the citation for Mr. Coffey, president of the Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co., is for contributions to the furniture industry and his work as director and member of many local, State, and national civic and charitable organizations.

This busy man is also president of the Union Mirror Co., Furniture Manufacturers, Inc., and Nu-Woods, Inc. (the latter organized in 1961), all of Lenoir. He is vice president of the Southern Furniture Manufacturers' Association, High Point, and is a director of the National Veneer Co. and the Blue Ridge Development Corp., both of Lenoir; the Fidelity Bankers Life Insurance Co., Richmond; the Carolina Motor Club, Charlotte, and the Charlotte branch of the North Carolina National Bank; the Furniture Factories' Marketing Association of the South; the Carolina & Northwestern Railway, Washington, D.C.; and the Southern Furniture Exposition Building, Inc., High Point.

Mr. Coffey serves as an associate member of the American Institute of Management, New York City; as a member of the Advisory Board of Manufacturers for the New York Furniture Exchange, New York City; as a member of the Board of Governors of the American Furniture Mart (a former chairman of the board), Chicago, and of the Dallas Trade Mart, Dallas, Tex.; and as a member and former president of the North Carolina Industrial Council. He is a life member of Oasis Shrine Temple and served as Potentate in 1942.

His club affiliations include the Lenoir Moose Club, Lenoir Gold Club, Lenoir Country Club; the Commerce Club of Atlanta; the Blowing Rock Country Club; the Lake Hickory Country Club and the Foothills Shrine Club of Hickory; the Charlotte Country Club, the Charlotte City Club, and the Red Fez Club of Charlotte; the Ponte Vedra Club of Ponte Vedra, Fla.; the Circus Saints and Sinners Club of Miami, Fla.; the Chicago Athletic Association and the Furniture Club of America, Chicago; and the Marco Polo Club of New York City.

His political appointments have covered a long period of service. In the first year of Gov. William B. Umstead's administration, he was appointed a member of the North Carolina State Ports Authority and continued in that position until Governor Umstead's death and for the next 2 years of that administration when Luther Hodges was Governor. During the 1920's, he served for several years on the Lenoir City Council. And early in 1962, he was appointed a member of the Governor's Commission on Educational Television. It is not surprising that, due to other pressing duties, he recently resigned from that post.

This Davidsonian is listed in "Who's Who in America," "Who's Who in Commerce and Industry," and in "Who's Who in the South and Southwest."

This success story, which Mr. Coffey attributes to breaks and hard work, began as an office clerk in the concern which was founded by his father. This was about 1917–18 when he left Davidson to enlist in service for World War I but was rejected because of flat feet.

Or perhaps it goes back to 1907, when he was 9, and he began working in his father's factory for 3 cents an hour (no child labor laws then). From 3:30 to 6 p.m. each day after school he learned to operate the machines—the lathes, the sanders, the bandsaws. There were 50 employees of the company then receiving a dollar a day in wages. The Kent-Coffey Co. today has 500 to 1,000 employees and sales are in the multimillions of dollars.

By the time he was 22 he was vice president, and on his father's death in 1943 he became president. He is a Democrat, a Presbyterian, and member of Pi Kappa Phi social fraternity. In 1923 he married Miss Annie Neely, of Rock Hill. They have no children.

TRUTH IN CREDIT NEEDS DRAMATIZED IN SMALL CLAIMS COURT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] of the truth in credit bill. Recently the Washington Daily News disclosed that the need for the truth in credit bill is becoming more evident every day. In 1960, when the small claims branch in Washington had a jurisdiction limited to $50, there were about 12,500 cases. Last year with the jurisdiction upped to $150 there were 28,000 cases. The testimony is that 90 percent involve suits by firms or collection agencies against individuals for unpaid bills.

The fact is that with our present enormously expanding credit system, people have no idea how much interest they are paying. The facts are that they are being exploited, and they should have the right to know what true interest rate they are paying. That is what the Douglas bill provides. It is an excellent bill. I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will report it out and that the Senate will act favorably upon it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Easy Credit Brings Thousands to Claims Court," by Rice Odell, published in the Washington Daily News on March 15, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASY CREDIT BRINGS THOUSANDS TO CLAIMS COURT

(By Rice Odell)

Every day a constant, nagging battle is waged in the District between angry merchants and angry customers.

The scene of the battle is the small claims branch of the Court of General Sessions, a relatively obscure courtroom tucked away in the courthouse at Fourth and E Streets NW.

The merchants whose lawyers come there are angry because, after extending easy credit on purchases, they find themselves unable to collect the bills.

Some collection agencies complain that government employees, in making credit purchases, often take advantage of the fact that their wages cannot be garnisheed.

The customers who come to court (in far fewer numbers) are even more angered by a feeling they have been cheated—perhaps because they succumbed to high pressure, or what they bought was not delivered, or was not what they ordered, or they were unable to get a down payment back when the sale didn't go through, or the price was raised without explanation.

This is the extent of the easy credit problem as reflected in small claims cases only:

In 1960, when the small claims branch had a jurisdiction limited to $50, there were about 12,500 cases.

Last year (the first full year after the jurisdiction was raised to $150), there were 28,216 cases.

Of the cases which come into court, according to Chief Deputy Clerk Charles P. Henry, Jr., "at least 90 percent" involve suits by firms or collection agencies against individuals for unpaid bills.

Last Tuesday, for example, there were 153 cases on the court's calendar, of which 139 involved such suits.

It seems safe to estimate that there is at least $2 million worth of unpaid debts brought into that court alone in a year, and possibly much more.

In most of the cases called in small claims branch, the defendant doesn't show up, and judgment is automatically entered for the merchant suing.

On one end of the scale are the firms which have made honest and forthright sales and are victimized by the cheats who have no intention of paying their bills. On the other are the men and women who didn't realize what deep financial water they were getting in, to whom the missing money leads to serious arguments at home, perhaps a family breakup, and even a start in crime to recover the sorely needed money.

It may sound farfetched but it has happened many times, and with tragic consequences.

This, of course, has no reference to the large majority of firms which do not hand out credit without some feeling of responsibility, or to collection agencies which decline business from such firms.

UNEMPLOYMENT A SERIOUS LONG-RANGE PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, unfortunately there has been much too little discussion or consideration of the very fine manpower report issued by the President recently. The long-term unemployment problem is more serious than the short-term problem, but it is getting far less attention. One of the reasons that I opposed the proposed tax cut is that it is aimed to correct a long-term situation with a short-term cure.

Recently the Washington Post commented on the manpower and unemployment report made by the President of the United States. The highlights set forth in the editorial are an excellent way to get a brief résumé of what the report contains. One of the things that impressed me most is that whereas in 1960 we had some 2.6 million Americans becoming 18 years of age, in 1965—only 3 years from now—we shall have 3.8 million Americans becoming 18 years of age, which is the average age at which they enter the labor force. We will have a perfectly enormous job in the future providing the kind of employment which those people will require. It will take a great deal more training and a great deal more emphasis on education, especially vocational education, than the Congress or the American people have contemplated.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1963]

MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT

President Kennedy's first manpower report, submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, is a sobering document which should convince even the most casual reader that unemployment, the Nation's most pressing economic problem, is not susceptible of quick and easy solutions.

Since 1947 some 10 million new jobs have been created, bringing the volume of employment to an alltime record of 67.8 million in 1962. Nevertheless, employment opportunities have failed to keep pace with the rapidly growing labor force, and since 1958 the average rate of unemployment has been well in excess of 5.5 percent. There are now 4.9 million jobless persons who comprise 6.1 percent of the labor force, and unless the present trend is sharply reversed, the problem will become more acute. According to the President's calculations:

"The net growth of the labor force in the sixties is expected to be about 13 million, more than 50 percent greater than in the fifties.

"Unless the growth of new job opportunities is also accelerated, unemployment totals will rise. If in the next 5 years we provide new employment at the pace of the last 5, by 1967 unemployment will come to over 5½ million, or more than 7 percent of the 1967 labor force."

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, some of the more salient factors are readily discernible. Labor has been displaced by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity. Since 1947, output per manhour in private industry has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in manhours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947. Employment in the manufacturing sector has been declining since 1956, and the introduction of labor-saving technology has doubtless affected employment even in those sectors of the economy which have been growing most rapidly.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 percent—will lack high school diplomas. Unless the gap between the requirements demanded by the new technology and the educational attainment of those entering the labor force can be narrowed, widespread unemployment among young people is likely to persist.

The difficulties created by rapid technological change can be substantially mitigated by fiscal and monetary policies designed to accelerate the overall rate of economic growth. But their elimination will require a massive program for the retraining of displaced workers and a nationwide effort to lower the high school dropout rate. While a promising start was made with the passage of the Manpower Development Act which will provide for the training of some 400,000 people over a 3-year period, it is only the beginning of what will prove to be a very long campaign.

EXCELLENT REUSS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague in the House, Representative HENRY REUSS, has submitted a concurrent resolution which would urge our country to call an international conference for the purpose of launching a worldwide wildlife conservation program. Mr. REUSS has been a great friend of conservation. He has excellent judgment in that field. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Washington Post supporting the Reuss resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALL OF THE WILD

One of the most disheartening spectacles arising from the spread of civilization is the steady and relentless extermination of entire species of wildlife. Some 200 species of birds and animals have already been wiped out and nearly 250 more are in present jeopardy. The problem exists everywhere, but is especially acute in Africa. The quest for ivory and pelts, for trophies and supposed aphrodisiacs (a quality attributed to powdered rhinoceros horn), has threatened vast herds of antelopes, zebras, elephants, rhinos, and hippos with reduction to the point of peril.

All this has been brought to the attention of Congress by Representative HENRY REUSS, who has introduced a concurrent resolution that would urge this country to call an international conference for the purpose of launching a worldwide wildlife conservation program. Here is an instance where an ounce of prevention is surely needed—especially since no question of vast costs is involved. What is needed, as Mr. REUSS points out, is legislative protection for wildlife and training in wildlife management—both objectives eminently within the grasp of reason.

If the world is to avert the day when only man and his domesticated animals occupy the globe, some form of concerted action is needed. An International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) has existed since 1948, but it has only a paltry budget (reportedly about $90,000 a year) and the only large and prosperous member-nation is West Germany. The World Wildlife Fund is another concerned organization that has used limited resources for conservation. The WWF estimates that $1.5 million a year is needed to save the most seriously threatened species.

Mr. REUSS proposes that local currencies accumulating abroad under food-for-peace programs be made available for wildlife conservation work. Certainly this seems a legitimate use of counterpart funds. The earth will be a barren place if modern Noahs fail to create an ark for the vanishing and colorful creatures of the wild.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT BY HOARD'S DAIRYMAN ON PROPOSED CLASS 1 MILK PRICING SYSTEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this afternoon we concluded hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on dairy legislation, and particularly on the three bills—one introduced by the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER], one by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and one by me—which would provide for a class 1 pricing system.

Hoard's Dairyman, a very fine publication printed at Fort Atkinson, Wis., edited by the Hoards, carries an editorial in the March 25, 1963, issue supporting the class 1 principle and the class 1 bills in general. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which sets forth the case for our bills, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMESTIC DUMPING: A 13-BILLION-POUND TARGET

Dairymen producing manufacturing milk have asked how they would benefit from the use of class I bases in Federal milk marketing orders. It is our conviction that they stand to benefit materially. At least 20 billion pounds of manufacturing milk are being produced in Federal order markets. Compare this, if you will, to Government purchases of about 10.8 billion pounds last year.

We all recognize that some manufacturing milk must be produced with Federal order grade A milk because a reserve is needed to supply the variations in the market. Certainly, there is no need for anything like 20 billion pounds. A liberal reserve would be no more than 7 billion pounds. This leaves a real surplus of Federal order manufacturing milk of at least 13 billion pounds. Here is the target at which class I base proposals are directed.

Our basic point, however, is that such milk is "subsidized" milk. It is produced at a fictitious price because the consumer of class I or bottled milk underwrites the cost of its production. If the class I price is $5 per hundredweight and the class II or manufacturing price is $3 per hundredweight, and the milk is evenly divided in its utilization in the market, then the blend or uniform price to the dairyman is $4. The farmer produces in response to the $4 price, not the $3 price.

But the surplus milk is thrown onto the national manufacturing milk market in the form of butter, powder, and cheese in competition with the products of the manufacturing milk producer. We believe a lot of this milk would not be produced if class I bases were used. In that event, manufacturing milk dairymen would benefit from a much improved supply-demand situation. If farmers in Federal order markets wanted to produce manufacturing milk for the manufacturing price, that would be their privilege and the manufacturing milk producer should not complain. He has every justification for vigorous protest now.

We have offered the opinion, from time to time, that without the dumping of manufacturing milk on the national market from Federal milk orders the free, open-market farm price of manufacturing milk could very well be in the area of $3.40 per hundredweight or even higher. Frankly, we cannot support this guesstimate by well-documented data. It wasn't too long ago, however, that manufacturing milk price was this high—well above the old support level of $3.25.

A change in direction in Federal order markets, we conclude, would redound to the advantage of both Federal order producers and manufacturing milk producers. Higher utilization of class I in the order markets would mean a higher average price to those dairymen. Less manufacturing milk being dumped on the market would be a direct benefit to all other dairy farmers.

MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION ANSWERS TO CLASS I MILK PRICE PLAN QUESTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milk Producers Federation submitted to the committee the answers to the standard questions asked about the proposal we have made. I think that in extremely simple language they have answered each of the questions extremely well.

This is such a fine and thoughtful job that it should be brought to the attention of all Senators, because I earnestly hope we shall have an opportunity to act on the bill in the near future, so I ask unanimous consent that the series of questions and answers may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. What are the objectives of this plan?

The principal objectives are to (a) eliminate a basic defect of blend pricing which provides milk producers a price higher than the lowest class price for manufacturing milk in excess of the market's normal supply requirements for fluid milk products, (b) permit individual producers to produce in line with market requirements for fluid milk products without having their prices reduced by present surplus or increased production of other producers, (c) provide individual producers an opportunity to increase net income, and (d) reduce the national dairy surplus and the cost to taxpayers of the dairy support price program.

2. Is this plan production control?

No. It does not limit any producer to any maximum quantity of milk he is allowed to produce or sell. It does not place any physical limitations on the number of cows he may keep. It does not limit in any way any factor of production or sale of milk. It allows producers supplying a given market, at their own request, to receive a price for base milk related to the class I price, and a lower price related to manufacturing milk value for any milk in excess of base sold, instead of a single blended price for all milk.

3. How can this plan be expected to reduce the dairy surplus?

Reduction of the national dairy surplus is one of the principal objectives of the dairymen's class I base plan. The plan can be expected to accomplish this in a number of ways:

(a) By reducing the incentive to produce surplus milk under the Federal order program. Approximately half of the milk produced in the country is marketed under Federal milk orders. Under some of these orders there is now a high degree of surplus. Under others there is only a moderate amount. Under still others there is no surplus. The base plan would allow each market to establish surplus reducing incentive in line with the degree of surplus existing in each respective market—be it a lot or a little. Several Federal order markets now have a surplus of 10 to 25 percent or more and have blended prices of $4 per hundredweight or more and a surplus class price of approximately $3. The base plan would discourage production of surplus by reducing the price paid for surplus production from $4 or more per hundredweight to about $3.

(b) By relieving producers of the pressure they are now under to continually produce more milk, hence, more surplus, as the only available means of maintaining the size of their milk checks to keep up with increasing production costs. The single blend price system we have now penalizes a producer who might try to keep production in line with his share of the class I market. The penalty is in the form of a lower blended price caused by the increased surplus production of other producers. His only recourse is to engage in a surplus production race with his neighbor. The base plan, by treating each producer as an individual relative to his production and his market, frees each producer from this penalty and the incentive to produce unneeded surplus milk. The result should be a reduction in surplus.

(c) By using the order to build into the market price structure incentives to adjust supply in line with class I demand. This is done by a number of interrelated factors, all of which aim in the general direction of supply-demand balance. Such incentives should operate toward a reduction of the Nation's dairy surplus.

4. What effect will base plans have on the cost of the national dairy support program?

Since the dairymen's class I base plan provides voluntary incentives to reduce production, it should reduce the surplus and in this way should reduce the cost of the support program. Such plan should result in reduced expenditures by the Congress.

5. What will this plan cost to administer?

The Federal Order Administrator's offices are set up and functioning. Many of them are already administering seasonal base plans. Administration of Federal milk orders has been competent and efficient since its inception. It is supported by the industry at no cost to the taxpayer as will be this program.

6. How does this plan avoid being a trade barrier?

First we must clarify the term "trade barrier." On the production side of the dairy industry the class I price for milk in any given milk market is never high enough to permit dairy farmers in every other part of the country to compete. This is because milk's natural characteristics result in high cost of transportation, thereby giving a natural advantage to dairy farmers nearby a given market. This is why class I prices decrease with distance from the market center and why class I prices vary among markets.

Reflection of natural characteristics of production and marketing through geographic variations in milk prices does not constitute a trade barrier. The dairymen's class I base plan is not a trade barrier. Only if a base plan in a particular order contained features which kept out milk from other supply areas to preserve an artificially high class I price or an artificially low surplus price would it be a trade barrier within the meaning of section 8c(5)(G) of the act, and such an effect is not intended.

7. Does the plan require any changes in language or interpretation of class I pricing standards of the act (Sec. 8c 18)?

Language—no; interpretation—yes. The pricing standards are as follows:

"The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish * * * shall, * * * reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates * * * insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest * * * (and) thereafter, as the Secretary, finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices."

The dairymen's class I base plan is designed to improve the application of supply-demand pricing now provided in the act. The phrase "other economic conditions" in the present standard makes it sufficiently broad to be properly applied to the base plan without change in language.

Certain changes in interpretation of the present standard from its past application to single blend pricing would be necessary. For example, the pricing standard has been interpreted to require automatic supply-demand adjustors in class I pricing formulas. The base plans provide incentives and opportunities to individual dairy farmers which are designed to improve upon this application of supply-demand pricing. For this reason, if a base plan is introduced, the necessity of retaining the supply-demand factor in the orders, presented class I price formula needs to be reevaluated.

With the task of obtaining a supply-demand balance in the order given over to some extent to the base plan, the general level of the class I price can reflect other objectives such as an equitable income goal for producers, changes in production costs, and costs of available alternative supplies of milk from other supply areas, all of which may properly be considered encompassed in the phrase in the present pricing standard, "* * * other economic conditions * * *."

The various incentives among producers set in motion by a base plan particularly with respect to the market's milk supply, necessitate reinterpretation of the class I pricing standards of the act because supply-demand forces under the order will be influenced in a different manner than under present operations. For this reason they must be taken into account in a proper determination of what the class I price should be in conjunction with a base plan.

8. Does the plan require any changes in pricing milk used for manufacturing under Federal orders?

No. Under the plan milk marketed in excess of fluid milk requirements will be priced on the same basis as under the current orders. The lowest use class price must be at a level at which milk will be accepted for processing, and in line with nationwide values of manufactured dairy products. This class price in Federal orders now reflects national competitive forces affecting the supply of milk of dairy farmers delivered to manufacturing plants not regulated by Federal orders and the consumer demand for dairy products (butter, cheese, ice cream, evaporated milk, etc.) including the level of the price support program. To the extent that the base plan becomes an inducement to producers to market less excess milk, thereby reducing the national dairy surplus, there might be some impact on prices in the manufacturing milk market. This in turn automatically would be reflected in the class price under orders. This effect would be indirect. No amendments to surplus class price formulas should be required as a result of the base plan.

9. What effect would this plan have on the dairy price support level?

In orders where the plan is adopted bases will be related to market requirements for fluid milk products, and the undesirable effects of blend pricing eliminated. The result should be a closer alinement of market supplies with market requirements. The plan does not provide for positive reduction in total supplies; but with closer adjustment to market requirements on a market-by-market basis, the pressure to reduce support prices will be relieved.

10. How would bases be applied?

There are a number of different ways that bases could be applied. One way would be to establish for each producer under an order a base expressed in pounds per day or per pooling period. These bases would be predicated upon deliveries during a prior representative period, adjusted to reflect the total fluid milk utilization of milk allocated to producers, plus a reasonable necessary reserve. These bases then could be projected 1 year in advance from a specified beginning date, which would be the first day of a given month. Then each month the market administrator would compute, as separate totals, all base milk and all milk in excess of base delivered to handlers by all producers under the order. He would first assign milk used in the lowest class to excess milk, and compute a blend price for base milk consisting of the weighted average class use value of the remaining milk in the pool. Each producer would be entitled to this base price for his base milk, and the manufacturing milk price for any excess.

Another way would be to have the plan optional in the sense that producers under a given order who so wished could request bases for their share of class I without other producers being required to have bases. Those who applied would have the market's class I milk assigned to their base first, and milk in the lowest price class assigned to their excess first. They would then be entitled to the class I price for base milk and the lowest class price for their excess. For producers who did not apply for bases a single blended price would be computed from the remaining class uses of milk remaining unassigned to base or excess.

For orders where the plan is applied by requiring all producers to have a base, these bills allow for the inclusion within base of a reserve above actual sales of fluid milk products to cover the day to day and weekend variations in sales. This is expressed as a percentage above monthly average of sales. The percentage of reserve considered necessary is variously estimated among markets at between 10 and 25 percent of actual sales in the month of lowest production seasonally. The reserve milk is actually used for manufacturing in the lowest price for lack of a market in a higher priced class. The price for base milk where reserves are thus included in base will reflect some milk at the manufacturing price class ranging from the defined percentage of reserve in the shortest production month to higher proportions in the flush season to the extent of the seasonal range in the particular market.

The pooling procedure must also allow for the eventuality of all producers together delivering less base milk than the volume of class I sales, but with some individual producers delivering some excess.

11. What is the base period?

The "representative period" for determining bases should be a period preceding the date that the plan starts, ending as close to the start of the plan as possible. It may include all or portions of more than 1 year. Each market need not have the same base period years nor the same length of period. Factors which should guide the Secretary in his selection of the period for a given market should include local customs regarding any current base plan, desires of producers affected, past trends in market supply, abnormal conditions, shifts in supply sources, availability of data, etc. The computations necessarily require time which can be provided only by some lag between the base period and the time of application of bases.

12. How are bases determined and changed?

The bill provides for making "due allowance" for "abnormal conditions" and "hardship cases."

These terms are meant to apply to the base period. If a producer's "total deliveries" in the base period were low due to an abnormal condition, he might be entitled to an adjustment in his base to offset the effect of the abnormal condition.

The allocation concept also includes the opportunity to adjust all bases periodically in line with changes in sales of the products on which the initial base allocations were made.

Another way that a given plan might allow all bases to be changed periodically (such as annually) would be the use of a 2-, 3-, 4-, or 5-year moving or "rolling" average base according to deliveries or a new base every year in the case of a 1-year base plan. In this way a producer's increase (or decrease) in deliveries each year would have an effect on his next year's base to the extent of 100, 50, 33⅓, 25, or 20 percent of the change depending on whether the base period is 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years long. If this type of automatic adjustment were allowed, it would also be necessary to refigure every year the percentage of total market deliveries to normal supply requirements and apply this percentage to prevent automatic base adjustment from getting the sum total of the market's bases out of line with normal supply requirements.

Another way that an individual producer could change the size of his base would be to obtain part or all of the base of another producer.

In summary the bill would provide for bases to be changed in a number of ways depending on the circumstances of individual producers and market conditions, with considerable flexibility allowed on each market to provide for changes to best meet its needs.

13. How does a new producer obtain a base?

The bill specifies that the sales allocation (base) must make "due allowance" for "new producers including new producers thereafter entering a market." This means that the plan must provide some means for new producers to obtain a base. This is one of the safeguards provided which would prevent any base plan under this bill from becoming a trade barrier. The particular procedure for granting bases to new producers would depend on the particular local market situation, as developed in the required hearing. A number of different methods of accommodating new producers could be used, and should be allowed consideration, such as:

(a) A small percentage of the total market's base to be set aside out of which new producers could be granted bases according to some prescribed performance rules.

(b) A new producer to be allowed average market value (or some specified percentage thereof) for a period equal to the base period, after which he is given a base according to his deliveries.

(c) New producers allowed to earn a base according to deliveries but required to take the excess price while earning a base.

(d) New producers allowed to obtain bases from other producers. In the case of limited transfer bases, new producers could enter the market by earning bases. The method would be provided under the order by requiring shipments for a period, for example, of 3 years to earn a full base. Under this situation, a portion of the increase in class I sales or the bases of retiring producers could be set aside for allocation to new producers. In the event the plan allowed for unlimited transfer of bases, new producers could enter the market by purchasing bases of producers who may retire or desire to reduce their production. In no event would new producers receive more favorable treatment than old producers.

14. To what extent would bases be transferable among producers?

The bills specify no particular degree of transferability. All past experience with any type of base plan, for whatever purpose, and whether privately operated or under Government auspices, indicates a need for some degree of transferability. The tighter the base in terms of limitation of opportunity for adjustments, the greater the need for freedom of transferability and vice versa.

This is for the purpose of preventing a "tight" base plan from freezing producers to their production at some point in time in such a way that they are hampered from making future shifts in resource allocation to improve efficiency.

There is a need for limiting transfer of base to milk producers to avoid the abuse of their being acquired and hoarded for coercive purposes by anybody, particularly persons who are not milk producers.

On this detail of a base plan, as in any other described above, there is need for flexibility among orders. Bases may or may not be negotiable, depending upon the rules adopted for the particular market. If, for example, farmers supplying a particular market favored unlimited transfer of bases, such an arrangement could be established. If, on the other hand, farmers supplying a market favored restricting the transfer of bases, such arrangement could also be established. Transfer of bases then might be limited to transfer from one person to another on the same farm, or to allow a tenant farmer who had earned a base to take his base to another farm.

15. To what extent would bases be transferable among markets?

Base allocations are claims upon the class I returns from a market to the producer milk delivered in that market. Ownership of a base on a particular market is of no value unless the holder delivers milk to that market. Individual producer bases are determined by deliveries of such producer during a predetermined representative period. The terms of each of the individual orders could recognize deliveries of producers transferring between markets.

If producers shifted from a market, with or without bases, to another market with bases, then they would be entitled to bases computed in the same manner as used for assigning bases to the original producers on that market.

If producers moved from a base market to a market with no base, their bases would have no value in the new market.

16. In what way would a base plan affect intermarket movements of milk?

Base plans are not intended to encourage either more or less intermarket movements of milk. Intermarket class prices relationships, rules for pool participation and type of pool are the features of orders, along with the natural characteristics of milk production and marketing, which determine intermarket movements of milk. Since base plans are to be applied only to the producer milk under an order, any inshipments of other milk would not be affected by the base plan. Shifts of producers from one market to another would be affected by whatever rules the base plan provided for allowing new producers in a given order to obtain base, as explained in the answer to the question concerning transferability of bases.

17. Does the plan provide any maximum or minimum on individual bases?

No. The average size of producers varies among Federal order markets from less than 500 pounds of milk per day in some areas of highly diversified farming to more than 13,000 pounds per day in other markets where dairying is characterized by a few large feedlot type of milking herds. Because of these wide variations in production conditions, any base ceiling to be prescribed by the law would have to be so high as to be meaningless or else it would work a hardship and discriminate against the normal pattern of family farms in some areas. If any performance standard with respect to base sizes is needed, it could be considered in the hearing for a base plan for a given market.

18. What effect would this plan have on other farm crops or livestock products?

The effect of this plan on other farm crops or livestock products would be limited to the release of production resources from dairying to the extent that dairymen adjusted production to meet market requirements.

19. What would be the effect of this plan on producers of manufacturing grade milk?

The plan's purpose is to eliminate the payment of any part of the money derived from class I sales for surplus milk delivered by order producers in excess of market requirements. In effect, it says to manufacturing milk producers, "You may still have to compete with producers under Federal orders, but you have the assurance that those producers will be receiving the manufacturing price for their surplus milk."

20. What effect can the plan be expected to have on negotiated marketwide premiums?

If the surplus in a market is reduced, the incentive for premium prices may be lessened.

21. Can the plan work satisfactorily in one market without being in effect in all other markets?

Yes, but producers who adopt this program and reduce production to meet market requirements may require some assurance, by way of order provisions, that the results of their efforts will not be undermined or eroded by contrary actions of other handlers or groups of producers outside the program, including other Government programs.

22. What advantage does this plan have over national dairy supply management proposals involving allotments, bases, or quotas?

Base plans as features of Federal orders would have the advantage of being tailored much more closely to local market conditions and customs. Great variation exists among markets in the degree of surplus, all the way from some which have no surplus above normal reserve requirements to some with as much as 40 percent of such surplus. It would be most difficult if not impossible to fit any single national adjustment program to the varying conditions which exist among markets. The base plan has the further advantage of being introduced on a market-by-market basis with much better chance of approval by local referendum.

23. What would be the effect of this plan on fluid milk markets which are not regulated under Federal or State controls?

(a) The rules for the movement of milk from plants in unregulated areas are established under other order provisions, allocation, pool plant qualification, etc. The base plan would place no added burden on such movement.

(b) For producers in currently unregulated markets who wished to become producers in an order market having a base plan, the acquisition of a base by purchase or performance would be a requisite.

(c) All markets, regulated or not, feel the effects of national surpluses. To the extent that the plan removes some of the pressure for increased production, all markets will benefit.

HIGH COSTS CRUSHING AMERICAN DAIRY FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the National Farmers Organization requested the Doane Agricultural Service to make a study of the cost of producing milk in Missouri, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and a number of other States.

Mr. President, this is a very competent and capable service. The study was made, and it indicated how high is the cost, as well as the fact that farmers throughout these areas are in fact losing a great deal of money at present prices. This emphasizes, therefore, how very important is the need for some kind of dairy action of the kind we are considering.

I ask unanimous consent that the table relating to comparative costs may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative cost of producing milk in selected States assuming a 30-cow herd using a pasture system and producing 232,290 pounds 3.5-percent-fat-corrected milk (average 7,743 pounds), July 1

Item	Missouri	Kentucky	Illinois	Indiana	Ohio	Michigan	Wisconsin	Minnesota	Iowa	South Dakota	Nebraska	Kansas	Idaho
Labor, total amount	$2,088	$1,310	$2,214	$2,050	$2,050	$2,211	$2,285	$2,515	$2,585	$2,419	$2,511	$2,448	$2,670
Feed cost:													
Hay	976	1,109	953	1,089	1,163	1,082	877	1,024	840	832	840	790	1,606
Concentrate	2,299	2,568	2,874	2,606	2,836	2,376	2,184	2,261	2,759	2,491	2,606	2,299	2,759
Pasture, 20 cents per head per day	1,260	1,320	1,260	1,200	1,200	1,080	1,020	1,020	1,140	1,080	1,140	1,260	900
Cow replacement, 15 percent	1,026	999	1,080	1,242	1,134	1,296	1,242	1,215	1,215	1,242	1,134	1,161	1,107
Death loss, 3 percent	205	200	216	248	227	259	248	243	243	248	227	232	221
Artificial insemination	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210
Veterinary and medicine	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Utilities	150	150	160	160	160	170	170	180	170	180	160	160	170
Gas and oil	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	220	210	200	210
Supplies	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125
Miscellaneous	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Hauling milk, 35 cents per hundredweight	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813
Taxes, 1 percent of present value	298	248	514	418	373	328	277	342	423	324	415	339	459
Repairs, 4 percent of present value	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767
Insurance, $7 per $1,000 value	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
Depreciation	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838
Management allowance, 1 percent	298	248	514	418	373	328	277	342	423	324	415	339	459
Return on investment, 5 percent	1,490	1,240	2,570	2,090	1,865	1,640	1,385	1,710	2,115	1,620	2,075	1,695	2,295
Less:													
Calf sales	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288
Manure credit	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300
Total cost	13,763	13,071	16,034	15,200	15,060	14,449	13,644	14,531	15,592	14,459	15,212	14,402	16,335
Cost per hundredweight	5.92	5.62	6.90	6.54	6.48	6.22	5.87	6.25	6.71	6.22	6.55	6.20	7.03
Same as above except drylot rather than pasture system:													
Labor	2,262	1,421	2,398	2,218	2,218	2,422	2,499	2,751	2,836	2,650	2,754	2,611	2,956
Feed cost:													
Hay	2,310	2,805	2,255	2,420	2,585	2,145	1,650	1,925	1,760	1,650	1,760	1,870	2,805
Concentrate	2,299	2,568	2,874	2,606	2,836	2,376	2,184	2,261	2,759	2,491	2,606	2,299	2,759
Cow replacement	1,232	1,199	1,296	1,490	1,361	1,555	1,490	1,458	1,458	1,490	1,361	1,393	1,329
Death loss	205	200	216	248	227	259	248	243	243	248	227	232	221
Artificial insemination	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210
Veterinary and medicine	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180
Utilities	160	160	170	170	170	180	180	190	180	190	170	170	180
Gas and oil	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	110	105	100	105
Supplies	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150
Miscellaneous	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Hauling milk	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813
Taxes, 1 percent of investment	268	268	281	289	282	290	283	282	287	279	274	276	273
Repairs, 4 percent	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774
Insurance	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Depreciation	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898
Management allowance, 1 percent	268	268	281	289	282	290	283	282	287	279	274	276	273
Return on investment, 5 percent	1,340	1,340	1,405	1,445	1,410	1,450	1,415	1,410	1,435	1,395	1,370	1,370	1,365
Less:													
Calf sales	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288
Manure credit	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300
Total cost	14,081	13,961	14,913	14,907	15,108	14,704	13,969	14,539	14,982	14,419	14,538	14,234	15,901
Cost per hundredweight	6.06	6.01	6.42	6.42	6.50	6.33	6.01	6.26	6.45	6.21	6.26	6.13	6.84

Source: Prepared December 1962 for National Farmers Organization (NFO) by Doane Agricultural Service, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW AND EVALUATE THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF NATIONS RECEIVING ECONOMIC AID FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it may lie upon the desk until April 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), submitted by Mr. COOPER, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States has been engaged since World War II in programs of economic aid to other countries; and

Whereas an essential purpose of the United States in carrying out these programs has been to assist free countries in developing as quickly and effectively as possible, to the end that such countries may be able to raise the living standards of their peoples, achieve economic stability, and maintain and strengthen free institutions; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated approximately 66 billion dollars to the fulfillment of these objectives; and

Whereas the Congress does not have available to it the necessary information to enable it to evaluate the effectiveness of the aid extended by the United States to specific countries: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should appoint as quickly as possible a committee for each country receiving economic aid from the United States, composed of at least five members, including representatives of the public, to review and evaluate the development program of such country and to report to the President and to the Congress not later than January 1, 1964, their findings with respect to the following—

(1) Whether the recipient country (a) has a practical national development program which affords a reasonable expectation that the objectives of such program will be attained, taking into consideration the human and natural resources and capabilities of the country, (b) is providing the maximum amount of self-help within its capabilities, and (c) has adopted the fiscal, administrative, and social reforms necessary to the success of such program;

(2) whether the specific projects to which United States aid is allocated will contribute materially to the fulfillment of the primary needs of the recipient country's development program, and to the purpose of the United States to assist in raising the standards of living of the people of the country; and

(3) such other matters as, in their opinion, will be useful to the Congress in its consideration of legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for financing foreign-aid programs for 1965 and subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of Congress that such committees should be appointed first to review the development programs for the following countries, which have received approximately one-third of the assistance extended by the United States under foreign-aid programs: Korea, India, Japan, China, Greece, Vietnam, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Philippines, and Iran; and that legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for carrying out these programs for fiscal year 1965 and subsequent fiscal years should not be enacted until the Congress has received and considered the reports referred to in this resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, early this year the President of the United States appointed a distinguished Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, to study the foreign aid program. I am sure the work of that Committee—because it is made up of such distinguished and able men—will be of great value to the administration in the formulation of its assistance program, as well as to the Congress, and in informing the people of the United States of the effectiveness of our foreign aid program. It is my understanding that the Committee will make its first report within a short time, and that it will be followed by others.

Of course, I do not know what the Committee will recommend. But I am convinced that the only way the administration, the Congress, and the people of this country can know whether our foreign aid program is effective and economical is to assess the program in each country which is receiving foreign assistance.

Last year, when the Senate was considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, I offered a similar proposal, in the form of an amendment to the bill, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint small committees to assess our foreign aid program in each country receiving aid, and to report their findings to the President and to the Congress. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, but it was stricken in the House-Senate conference.

Today I am offering a concurrent resolution similar in purpose. It is my hope that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the administration, and the distinguished committee which the President has appointed, will give thought to the proposals which the concurrent resolution expresses.

In substance, my suggestion is small committees made up of perhaps five members, appointed by the President, assess in depth our foreign aid program in each country.

I know that when one mentions the word committee, the thought of a superficial examination comes to mind. This is not correct. The purpose of the resolution is that the committees would make an assessment and study in depth of the program in each country. They would determine whether the plan for development which each country has formulated is one which is suited to the needs of the country and its resources, and whether it has a reasonable chance of success.

Second, it would determine if the projects to which we give assistance are ones which are adequately related, and contribute substantially, to the development plan of the country.

Another purpose of the resolution is to find out if the countries we assist are exerting maximum self-help, and whether they are instituting necessary fiscal, administrative, and social reforms.

I believe that if this effort is not made we will see rising discontent and disaffection in Congress and throughout the country with the foreign aid program, and a rising danger that the program may not survive. I speak in this regard as one who has supported foreign aid, and believes in its value.

Later, next week, I expect to discuss the subject again and to give in greater detail my reasons for advancing this resolution.

The resolution has precedence. The Senate adopted my similar resolution last year; and in 1959, then Senator Kennedy and I submitted a resolution—which was adopted by the Congress—which provided for a special study of the foreign assistance program in India and in Pakistan. The study was made. If an effective study can be made in two countries, it can be made in all of the countries to which we give assistance.

A question was raised last year about the cost of such studies. Of course this would cost a considerable sum of money, but it would be miniscule in comparison to the $4 billion or more we are being asked to appropriate this year. Moreover, the studies could be paid for out of the foreign assistance funds appropriated for each country.

Another objection was made that perhaps we could not find men from private life who would be willing to undertake such work. I would want to see two prominent and able men from outside the Government appointed to serve on each such committee, with others added if the President decided to enlarge the committee beyond five. In addition, each committee should have at least three members of the administration familiar with our foreign assistance program. In my judgment the separate studies would require probably 4 to 6 months, perhaps less for some countries, to make the detailed study and evaluation of the program in each country.

Commencing with countries such as Korea, India, Japan, Nationalist China, Greece, South Vietnam, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, the Philippines, and Iran, we could perhaps do the study in one-half of the countries in 1 year. That would require, say, 80 or 100 men from private life. If we cannot find 80 or 100 men from private life who would be willing to do this important work, our country is in very bad shape indeed.

The purpose of our foreign aid program, as I conceive it, is to assist the developing free countries of the world in their economic and social development in raising the standards of living of their people, and thus to help them maintain and strengthen free institutions and democratic values.

If our aid is not being effectively used, we will fail, or at least fall short of the objectives of our country and of the countries we assist.

So I submit the resolution today, and I have asked that it lie on the desk until April 1. I expect to consult with other Senators about it. Later, next week, I shall elaborate in more detail on my reasons for submitting the resolution.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Monday next at 12 noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a remarkable address which was delivered yesterday by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. The address was delivered at the First Inter-American Defense College graduation at Fort McNair. The speech was heard by many Central and South American ambassadors and distinguished representatives of those countries in both civilian and military life. It was received enthusiastically. In fact, I have been told today that many of the embassies of the South American and Central American countries have asked for copies of the speech, including the tape recording that was made of it.

The Vice President not only gave a challenging message relating to the need for solidarity and the cooperation among the members of the American states, but presented some good, hard, factual material concerning our relationships with all the countries of this hemisphere, including Cuba.

I call to the attention of the Senate particularly the facts the Vice President outlined relating to Cuba.

First. He said in Cuba, under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent.

Second. In Cuba, as elsewhere, communism has demonstrated again its inability to meet the food requirements of the people. Food consumption has declined 15 percent under Castro.

Third. Sugar production, the lifeblood of Cuba's economy traditionally, has consistently declined each year under the Communist regime, and the 1963 crop will be the smallest since the end of World War II.

Fourth. The Cuban economy has already cost the Soviet Union more than $1 billion.

Fifth. It is of significance to Americans in each republic of this hemisphere that since communism seized control of Cuba, nearly a quarter million people have fled from Cuba.

These are the facts, as the Vice President cited them. I am sure when my colleagues in the Senate study this speech, they will find it to be one of the most thought provoking and one of the most ably documented speeches on U.S. policy relating to Latin American countries that has been delivered to date.

I compliment the Vice President and thank him for this splendid presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, FIRST INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE COLLEGE GRADUATION, FORT MCNAIR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This is a proud occasion for all the Americas—and all Americans. Only a year ago the Inter-American Defense Board observed its 20th anniversary by meeting with President Kennedy to discuss the concept of the Inter-American Defense College. The college was an improved plan then—but still on paper. Today the first class of the college meets for graduation.

It is fitting that the emphasis of the college emphasizes more than the study of military affairs alone. As the charter of this institution spells out, economic, political, and social factors—as well as military—"constitute essential components of inter-American defense."

The Republics of this hemisphere share the common purpose of safeguarding peace, independence and well-being of all men who bear the name of Americans. But that purpose cannot be accomplished by arms alone. To preserve peace, to maintain independence, and to further the well-being of all our people, we must achieve political, economic and social stability under responsive and responsible democratic institutions.

That is the purpose of the Alliance for Progress. That is the purpose of the deliberations underway today in Central America. That is—and will continue to be—the purpose of our expanding efforts to achieve greater unity and more effective cooperation among the free nations of this New World.

At this moment, the most urgent problem in our hemisphere is the existence of communism in Cuba. Our mutual objective is to end that Communist regime in Cuba. We cannot be really content until communism is gone from Cuba and gone from this hemisphere.

The united action last October of the Organization of American States made indelibly clear that the Americas will not acquiesce to the establishment of Communist arms in the Western Hemisphere.

Equally, we shall not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil.

We are mutually determined that the Cuban people shall have opportunity to choose their own government, freely and without oppression.

If the naked attempt of the Soviet Union to transform Cuba into a military threat to the hemisphere required realism of us all, no less realism is required of us in meeting the broader threat to our security which is presented by the presence of poverty, privation, illiteracy, disease, and injustice anywhere among our Republics.

The basic problem of security in our hemisphere is not Cuba, not Castro, not communism. The most impressive lesson learned from Cuba is that communism is not the answer to the need of this hemisphere. Cuba is clearly proving to be for the Communists a showcase of failure—not a show window of success. Where West Berlin stands behind the Iron Curtain as a conspicuous example of the superiority of freedom, Cuba today exists within the community of free American Republics as an even more glaring example of Communist failure in and for the New World.

We must not overlook—we must not minimize—the significance and importance of these facts:

1. In Cuba, under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent.

2. In Cuba, as elsewhere, communism has demonstrated again its inability to meet the food requirements of the people. Food consumption has declined 15 percent under Castro. For the past 1 year, foodstuffs have been rationed. Clothing was added to the ration list last month.

3. Sugar production, the lifeblood of Cuba's economy traditionally, has consistently declined each year under the Communist regime and the 1963 crop will be the smallest since the end of World War II.

4. The Cuban economy has already cost the Soviet Union more than $1 billion. We estimate that Cuba currently is costing the Soviets $1 million per day. Yet even this support has been unable to arrest the deterioration and decline of the Cuban economy.

5. Finally, it is of significance to Americans in each Republic of this hemisphere that since communism seized control of Cuba, nearly a quarter million people have fled from Cuba. The United States has issued authorizations to another 300,000 Cubans to enter this country if they are permitted to leave their island prison. I might add that we have received nearly 600,000 individual Cuban requests for visa waivers.

To recite these facts is to recite a story of failure—the failure of communism in this hemisphere. That failure is inherent in the Communist system itself. But we must not overlook the fact that this failure is also a result of the unity and cooperation of free nations acting together through nonmilitary means to accelerate and precipitate that failure.

While some argue that the application of selective controls are not enough, it is well for us to examine the results of our efforts in this regard.

1. In 1962, free world trade with Cuba was less than $90 million—only one-tenth the precommunism level. That trade will be even lower this year.

2. Total trade between Cuba and all of Latin America last year was only $12 million and will virtually disappear this year. I would emphasize that a large portion of the free world's limited 1962 trade with Cuba was food. None of it was in arms. None of it was strategic goods. None of Cuba's oil came from or is coming from free world sources.

3. Contrary to some beliefs, free world countries are cooperating closely in these efforts. Free world shipping to Cuban ports is now one-tenth what it was before October. Where in January 1962 128 free world ships put in at Cuban ports, in January of this year only 12 free world ships carried cargoes to Cuba.

4. Increasingly effective political isolation of the Communist regime in Cuba has been achieved on a hemispheric basis. Fourteen Latin American countries have broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. Last October complete hemispheric solidarity on the Cuban issue was achieved for the first time with the unanimous vote in support of the quarantine. In many student and labor elections in the hemisphere during the past 2 years there have been significant gains for the democratic forces and a significant decline in the appeal and influence of Castro communism.

5. Members of the OAS are now taking vigorous steps to deal with the threat of Cuban subversion of democratic institutions throughout the hemisphere.

More could be mentioned. These measures make the point, however, that both the will and the capacity of American Republics to unite in common purpose is maturing responsibility—and this offers all of us solid and tangible encouragement to believe that we can achieve and maintain the unity essential to meet and master the long-standing and continuing problems of our hemisphere.

If Cuba offers to Americans, North and South, convincing proof that communism does not hold the answer to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere, we must not fail to look at the other side of the coin. Communism's failure merely underscores for us freedom's responsibilities. The needs of this hemisphere are needs of the people. Those needs must be met—and we must meet them under freedom.

The presence of Communist forces in Cuba is testimony to the ultimate failure of communism in this hemisphere. Those forces are there because communism cannot—in either the New World or the Old World—dare to permit the people to exercise the rights of representative democracy.

The high purpose of the Alliance for Progress is to make real for all the peoples of the Americas a democratic alternative to the doctrine and dogma and defaults of totalitarianism—in all its forms.

The ultimate goal of the Alliance for Progress is to serve the people of this hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is for people—it was designed to solve human problems, to help people to live better and more productive, more dignified and satisfactory lives. Through the Alliance, we are trying to make accessible for every citizen of this hemisphere the opportunity to satisfy men's basic needs for home, land, work, and schooling in an environment of freedom and health and opportunity.

The real story of the Alliance for Progress is not the present story of its difficulties but, rather, the long-range story of its absolute necessity. All alliances, all effective confederations, all successful unifications among freemen have begun uncertainly. Unity itself is more difficult to achieve than are the works which flow from unity. But unity of purpose is the special genius of this hemisphere and we can be confident that this genius will find its finest hour in the 10 years of common purpose of our efforts through the Alliance for Progress.

Building new industries and new roads, laying new rails, and modernizing old agricultures are difficult labors. Even so, it is easier and quicker to do these things than to produce a people with an economy capable of fully utilizing such works. Under the Alliance for Progress, we are trying to do both. Long, hard years may lie ahead. But those years of effort and progress will be neither so long nor so hard as the years of inertia and inaction which lie forever behind us.

In the work that we must do as Americans, the military of the American Republics will be filling a creative and constructive role of the first magnitude. Under the civic action program, we began last year actively encouraging Latin American armed forces to expand their participation in public works, in improving agriculture, transportation and communications, health, sanitation, and other such lasting contributions to economic and social development. Such work has been performed as a matter of standard practice over the years by armed forces in a number of our Republics, such as Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, and Chile. In Peru and Bolivia, this country has supported engineer construction units through our military assistance program—and we are now actively planning expansion of this program in other countries of the hemisphere.

Because we live in a hemisphere where peace has found a home, we can realistically look forward to utilizing our military forces for the full realization of the promise of peace. This is a pioneering concept—a new departure in the affairs of man. It is a new departure of which all members of the military of our Republics can be especially proud to take an active and creative part.

All of our achievements in hemispheric unity—whether military or nonmilitary in character—aim toward the common purpose of realizing the fruits of peace. We must not be deterred from this goal. We must maintain the strength, efficiency, and alertness of our military forces. We must be sure of our state of preparedness, as we must be swift in our response to danger. But the presence of military challenges must not mislead us to believe that the solution of our problems in this hemisphere is a military solution alone—or even foremost.

Today, as throughout the modern history of the Western Hemisphere, our guard must be constant and strong against subversion of our democratic institutions and integrity. But we can well recall the words of a great free world leader—not of our hemisphere—Winston Churchill, who said: "The first victory we have to win is to avoid a battle; the second, if we cannot avoid it, to win it."

Against the dangers which face us, we must bring the response of responsible freemen to bear—the response of greater unity, constant cooperation, continuing joint purpose. There can be no peace in the hemisphere unless there is peace in the world and there will be no peace in the world if we are irresponsible as peacekeepers in the hemisphere. Our purpose is peace—with honor. But we shall not allow our honor to be compromised, our freedom to be jeopardized, and our opportunity to be defaulted.

ASSISTANCE IN PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons on behalf of myself, Senator MORSE, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator McINTYRE, and Senator NEUBERGER. I ask that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1170) to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in his message on the aging, President Kennedy painted a full portrait of the sorry plight in which many of our older citizens find themselves. He drew attention, in particular, to the very special problems of shelter faced by those who are past their middle sixties.

One-fourth do not have households of their own, but live in the homes of relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent live in substandard housing lacking a private bath, toilet, or hot running water, or which is otherwise dilapidated or deficient. And many others live in housing unsafe or unsuitable for elderly people.

The President further pointed out that almost half of those over 65 and living alone receive $1,000 or less a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than $1,000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their home, of less than $5,000.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Elderly Housing of the Special Committee on the Aging, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, held extensive hearings on the shelter problems of the elderly. Out of those hearings came important legislation but it was introduced too late in the session for action.

Mr. President, the subcommittee's findings coincided precisely with those of the President. Many of our older people with very limited income live in rental housing which falls far short of any reasonable standard of health or safety. Nearly 40 percent of those who live in rental housing are in quarters classified as substandard and yet they are frequently charged exorbitant rents.

It is true, of course, that over the years Congress has enacted a variety of measures designed to ease the shelter problems of the elderly. Within the higher income brackets these programs have been generally successful in meeting a vital need. But they fail to meet the requirements of most single older persons and those couples who can afford to pay only $40 or so per month.

Under the public housing program, for example, approximately 120,000 persons 65 and over now have been provided shelter—just under 80,000 families. But over 2 million elderly persons have incomes low enough to qualify for this kind of housing.

Under section 202 of the Housing Act, long-term loans may be made to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, or public bodies which sponsor rental or cooperative housing for older people. Fund authorizations for this program currently are far below the applications. This has occurred despite difficulty in finding sponsors to undertake these projects in specific communities. Such an undertaking requires a high level of expertise—in many communities most available in the local housing authority. Unfortunately, however, such authorities are presently excluded from participation in the program.

The subcommittee found that rental housing stimulated by section 231 of the Housing Act, which insures lenders against losses on mortgages used for construction or rehabilitation of rental accommodations for older persons, has been largely in so-called retirement communities in the sunshine States of Arizona, California, and Florida. Comparatively little use of the program is found in the more populous States.

The FHA loan program for moderate income housing, enacted in 1961, is greatly impaired by its limitation to family units. Just about a quarter of the older population lives alone or with nonrelatives. A large proportion is, of course, widowed. In the Housing Act of 1956, Congress made single men and women over 65 eligible for public housing. This program should be similarly improved.

The regular FHA mortgage program encourages homeownership by those over 65, but, unfortunately, those with the financial means to avail themselves of the program comprise an extremely small minority among our older citizens.

With 5 million ill-housed senior citizens in the country it is a grave disappointment to find that only 100,000 units of elderly housing have been built in the last 6 years under all these existing Federal programs.

There are those who argue that this is a problem best left to the private market to resolve. Indeed, they espouse a "rollback" in Federal expenditures for housing.

They put forward their arguments with added vehemence in a year when a tax cut has been recommended.

Well, how well has the construction industry done in meeting this challenge?

True, it has performed well in providing quality housing for millions of Americans since World War II. But virtually all of this has been suburban housing for younger and comparatively well-to-do families.

The three-bedroom house, often on two floors with a large lot and no convenient transportation, is hardly the kind of place for an elderly couple in its retirement years. Such a couple or an individual wants quarters convenient for its own purposes, not child rearing—quarters relatively small, convenient to public transportation, stores, health services and recreation, possibly including special safety features.

This is not the kind of housing the building industry has been interested in providing. Not, that is, without outside incentives.

And those incentives, by and large, must come from Government.

This leads to the crux of the problem. If we assume that only 20 percent of the 5 million who need better housing would want to live in the kind of quarters being erected under the Federal programs, a very radical assumption indeed—in other words, if we assume that 80 percent can be satisfactorily housed by the private economy in hand-me-down family housing or converted hotels and roominghouses—we still need to provide something like 1 million units through the Federal programs. At $10,000 to $12,000 a unit, which is our current experience, an investment of $10 to $12 billion is required.

These figures are perhaps speculative. But they are clearly frightening. The 20-percent estimate is arbitrary, but it seems conservative. Two years ago I had the opportunity to look at specialized housing for the elderly in Sweden and Denmark, both of which have far more such housing than does the United States in relation to population. Their experience would bear out the suggestion that if we had specialized housing for the elderly for 9 percent of our elderly households—in other words, 20 percent of those needing housing—such housing would be readily occupied by people who would find their new homes far preferable to their present ones.

Thus, while we cannot say with confidence what the ultimate need is, we can say with total confidence that it is far greater than the supply of specialized housing that now exists. The subcommittee has urged intensive research to find answers to the questions of how much such housing is needed, and what the characteristics of such housing should be.

As a phase of this research, we urge community-by-community surveys, and we propose that Federal assistance to urban planning under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, be extended to cover these surveys. The official planning body and the community wide council of social agencies, under our recommendation, would collaborate in organizing a survey in a given community. They would find out with some degree of exactness the actual living conditions of senior citizens in the community, the extent of their need for better housing, and the kind of housing they would like to have.

Do the old people want to live in multiunit buildings with other old people, or do they want to be scattered throughout the community in neighborhoods with younger families? Do they want to live downtown, or on the edge of town, or somewhere in between? How do they feel about high-rise buildings? How many can prepare their own meals, and how many need the service of a central kitchen or dining hall?

We know that the answers to these questions will be that some old people prefer one pattern of living, and some prefer another. Some can live independently; the degree of dependence of the others varies widely. But the important thing is to determine, in each community, the approximate numbers who want and need one or another kind of accommodation and then to develop the plans, and select the sites, that will be suitable to that community. Those making the surveys in each community would have the benefit of the experience of other communities and the best available knowledge on the subject, made available to them by the central research staff in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The undertaking would be closely coordinated with urban renewal activity.

Now, how about the money problem in this year of the tax cut? Obviously, any adequate housing program for the elderly or any other group will cost a great deal of money. Only through Federal assistance can rentals be brought down within the range of "ability to pay" for those living on small pensions and other retirement income. The subcommittee urged that the Federal programs be expanded as rapidly as the demand develops in the communities throughout the country.

Whether the result will be a demand for $10 or $12 billion worth of projects, or somewhat more or less, is not clear—and for that reason this particular bill suggests no amount. But what is clear is that the demand will be of a totally new order of magnitude compared to that of the existing programs.

It is equally clear that this kind of money can never be squeezed out of the Federal budget. Of the three Federal programs, only the public housing program involves a subsidy from the taxpayers. Yet, ironically, it is the only one of the three that does not suffer severely from budget limitations. Under this program, the capital cost of a project is spread over 40 years of Federal budgets and the immediate impact of a new project on the current year's budget is consequently not great.

The section 202 direct loan program and the section 231 FHA insurance program, on the other hand, involve no subsidy. Under section 202, the Federal Government lends the money at a rate sufficiently high to cover its own cost of borrowing plus a margin to cover administrative costs and provide a reserve against possible losses. Under section 231, the Federal Government, through FNMA, purchases mortgages with appropriate funds, but the interest rates are sufficient to cover the cost of FNMA's borrowing from the Treasury.

Yet, in both cases, the total amount of the loan or the mortgage, as the case may be, is carried in the budget as an expenditure during the year in which it is made. If we were to set out to build 100,000 units under these programs, therefore, it would require at least $1 billion from the budget. This would provide only 2 percent of the 5 million who need better housing. Yet our budget limitations are so tight that it is not easy to see how this kind of money—much less 10 times that amount—could be provided in any reasonably short period of time.

Thus, the anomalies of our budget practices make it far easier to finance 10,000 units of nonsubsdized private housing under the direct loan or mortgage insurance programs which pay their own way. That is because one of them is in the budget and the other one is not.

Accordingly, our subcommittee stressed the urgency of developing either a new method of financing, or a new method of budget presentation. This bill embodies the latter approach. It does it very simply—by directing that only the ultimate estimated net loss, if any, from the loan and mortgage purchase progams be treated as an expenditure in the budget. Since there has been and will be no ultimate net loss at all, these programs would simply be excluded from the expenditures column. The Congress would still control the magnitude of the programs, of course, by limiting the borrowing authority of the responsible agencies. And the operations of the programs would, of course, be shown in the budget documents, but much as trust fund operations are shown—outside and separate from the administrative budget.

This proposal may sound novel, but it is not. It merely applies, to a single program, the principle of capital budgeting which many of us have long advocated.

Every State, every city, every county, every private business, and every foreign country whose budgeting practices have been examined by our own experts, I believe, separates recoverable investments from outright expenditures. A city government may borrow in the tens of millions for capital expenditures, but it is regarded as fiscally sound if its operating budget, including amortization of its bonds, is balanced. The same is true of county and State governments. No private business would lump together its payrolls and its loans in a single column called expenditures; a loan is offset by an entry in the income column reflecting the value of the obligation created by the loan. Yet the Federal Government, if it lends $10 million, ignores the fact of an equal increase in the total of debt owed to the Government. Does a bank treat a loan just as if the money were given away? Of course not. Then why should the Federal Government, when it performs the functions of a bank, treat its loans in that manner?

There is no other jurisdiction, public or private, on the face of the earth that keeps its books in the ridiculous way the Federal Government does.

This is what the President of the United States referred to in his commencement address at Yale University last year, when he complained that the Federal budget "cannot tell a loan from a straight expenditure" and "cannot distinguish between operating expenditures and long-term investments."

Perhaps someday, with the leadership of the President, we will shift our budget as a whole over to a new system of presentation. But I am tired of waiting. I think we should begin by applying the principles of capital budgeting to a single program, housing for the elderly. It is an urgent program. It is one with an enormous potential for increasing human happiness. It is one which helps people who are least able to help themselves, helps them to satisfy what may be the most important single yearning in their lives—for a decent place in which to live. And it is a program which can go nowhere, which cannot really get off the ground, without a change in budget practices.

I submit that here is the place to begin. Let us try the principle of capital budgeting in this one program. We can consider the principle separately and later for other programs which may have an equally valid claim. But if we wait for a complete recasting of the Federal budget before we apply the principle anywhere, we will certainly wait for years—if not forever. And, meanwhile, old men and women will continue to live in unsafe, rundown, unsanitary, unsuitable housing instead of in the bright, new attractive quarters which can be theirs if the Federal programs now underway can be expanded to meet the demand which will come from the communities of America.

There are other provisions in the bill—to facilitate the provision of housing for the elderly in urban renewal areas, to ease the impact of renewal on elderly people, to broaden participation in both the direct-loan program and the nursing-home programs, and otherwise make our efforts more effective. Instead of elaborating on these points, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Record, at this point in my remarks, a summary of conclusions and recommendations from the report of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

(1) A national problem: Housing for the elderly is a national problem of great magnitude, which the Nation has only begun to recognize and come to grips with. And the problem will grow as the number of elderly persons grows—from 17 million over 65 in 1960 to 24.5 million in 1980.

(2) Magnitude of the need: While the supply of housing is inadequate for all age groups—as indicated by the estimated 11 million substandard units still in use—a higher proportion of elderly than of any other age group live in substandard dwellings because their income is least. About 5 million households among the 11 million containing elderly persons, or 45 percent, need to be better housed.

(3) Need for specially designed housing: Even among elderly persons living in "standard" housing, many are ill-housed because units designed for families may be unsuitable for the special needs of elderly persons, especially those most advanced in age. They need housing especially designed for older persons. Such housing units should be suitable in size for single individuals or couples, easy to maintain, economical in cost, convenient to community activities and services, and incorporating certain design features which reduce the hazards to older people whose physical mobility is reduced. Housing properly designed for older people enables them to maintain independent households longer than is possible otherwise.

(4) Need for range of choice: Individual retired people differ widely in their housing needs and desires. Specially designed housing should, therefore, offer a range of choice, adjusting to the requirements of the older person rather than requiring him to make the adjustments to a style of living he may find objectionable.

(5) Expansion of Federal programs: In view of the severely limited incomes of most persons over 65, substantial improvement in the living conditions of the Nation's elderly depends heavily on Federal assistance to provide specially designed housing at reduced costs. Present Federal programs—FHA insurance, direct Federal loans, and special public housing units—are well conceived, and for those relatively few persons whom they serve, they are of great benefit. But compared with the magnitude of the need, they have barely scratched the surface—producing a few thousand units when the need is in the millions. If the Nation is to succeed in providing decent shelter for all its older citizens, it must undertake an effort on a scale far greater than is now underway.

(6) Financing of Federal programs: Such an effort can hardly be undertaken as long as all of these Federal programs depend on appropriated funds which are included as budget expenditures. The FHA and VA programs which have been instrumental in the vast expansion of suburbia since World War II have succeeded only because their insurance and guarantee operations were outside the budget. The direct loan and loan insurance programs for the elderly involve no cost to the taxpayer, and no net increase in the Federal debt. In the case of the direct loan program, all the Government does is pass on to the borrower the comparatively low interest rates which the Government is able to obtain. The mortgage insurance program makes private financing more readily available by insuring lenders against loss. Yet through the technicalities of budget presentation these transactions are treated the same as other governmental expenditures which involve 100 percent subsidy. Either a new method of financing housing for the elderly must be found which will bring down interest rates without requiring the use of appropriated funds, or the methods of budget presentation must be changed so that repayable loans are not lumped in with outright expenditures.

(7) Nursing homes: Progress in meeting the need for good nursing home accommodations has been retarded by the exclusion of nonprofit nursing homes from FHA insurance aid now given to proprietary nursing homes.

(8) Research: In order that housing for the elderly may be properly planned, much more knowledge is needed. Research should be of two kinds—general studies aimed at learning more about the effects of various housing arrangements on older persons and evaluating the varied projects which have been undertaken; and community-by-community studies of the shortcomings of housing for the elderly and the particular needs and desires for improved shelter expressed by the elderly themselves in each locality.

(9) Community organization and leadership: Even if the limits could be removed from Federal assistance, few communities are prepared to take advantage of such assistance and proceed rapidly with the design and construction of specialized housing for the elderly. This is due not only to the absence of data, referred to above, but to the absence of community organizations prepared and competent to assume leadership. The country needs more specialists in the field of housing for the elderly, and communities need to mobilize the resources of all organizations, both public and private, which can contribute to leadership and planning.

(10) Community planning: Based on the results of both general and local research, each community should develop a plan for housing its own elderly which will enable those who are ill-housed to move into suitable dwellings and offering a range of choice within the limits of what the elderly can afford. This plan should be an element of, and consistent with, the community's comprehensive physical plan.

(11) Urban renewal: Urban renewal has worked particular hardships on elderly persons, both because they are heavily concentrated in renewal areas and because as a group they are less adaptable and hence suffer more from sudden and enforced change in their living arrangements. Every possible step should be taken to soften the impact of urban renewal on older people.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee offers the following recommendations, which are developed in more detail in the remainder of this report, and requests their consideration by the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(1) Expansion of Federal programs: Federal assistance under existing programs for housing for the elderly—FHA insurance, direct loans, and special public housing units—should be expanded as rapidly as communities are prepared to take advantage of these aids. The authorization for the direct loan program should be increased immediately, since applications exceed total funds now authorized.

(2) Financing of Federal programs: To make the needed expansion of Federal assistance possible, a new method of financing those programs which involve no subsidy—the insurance and loan programs—should be devised to remove their dependence on appropriated funds, or methods of budget presentation should be revised so that these transactions, which involve no ultimate expenditure, are not classified as outright expenditures.

(3) Community organization and leadership: In order that all of a community's

resources may be mobilized to deal with the housing problems of its elderly citizens, the restriction on participation by local housing authorities in the direct loan program should be modified.

(4) Nursing homes: Nonprofit as well as proprietary nursing homes should be made eligible to participate in the FHA mortgage insurance program.

(5) Research: The Housing and Home Finance Agency should undertake a major research program to obtain far better data than now exists on the housing needs of the elderly and the effect on older persons of various housing arrangements.

(6) Community planning: Federal assistance to community planning should be expanded to provide aid for surveys of the housing needs of the elderly in each locality and the development of comprehensive community plans.

(7) Urban renewal: In order to ease the impact of urban redevelopment on housing for the elderly, the following steps should be considered:

(a) Amend provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 relative to local noncash grants in aid to permit local public agencies to make sites available for development of cooperative and nonprofit sponsors of housing for the elderly and to credit the value of such sites to the project as a local noncash grant.

(b) Authorize the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages for the rehabilitation of the residence of an elderly homeowner on terms which do not require full amortization of the loan. Such mortgages could require payment of interest only or interest plus a part of the principal with the balance becoming due upon the sale, devolution, or other transfer of the property.

(c) Authorize rent subsidies for limited periods to enable persons displaced by urban renewal or other Federal programs to obtain decent housing, the subsidies to be included as part of the project cost.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY ACT OF 1962

NEED FOR THE SECTION	EFFECT OF THE SECTION
Section 2. Home improvement loans under section 220(h) of the National Housing Act	
Many elderly persons and couples own their own homes, and are able to live comfortably on very small retirement incomes because they are homeowners and do not have to make rent or mortgage payments. But this independence can come abruptly to an end if their homes are in areas designated for rehabilitation and they are required to make major alterations or improvements to meet the housing standards of the neighborhood. It is becoming an increasingly acute problem that elderly homeowners in rehabilitation areas cannot take advantage of even the liberal mortgage insurance provisions which now are available and have no alternative but to move out of their deteriorated homes.	This section would permit the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans for elderly homeowners, the terms of which provide that all, or any unamortized part, of the principal becomes due upon the death of the owner or sale or other transfer of the property. Loans insured under this subsection would carry an amortization schedule which the lender and the borrower agree can be met with the elderly borrower's income; with the possibility, in the case of very low income persons, of the payment of interest only with the entire principal amount becoming due upon the next transfer of the property.
Section 3. Repair and rehabilitation under section 221 of the National Housing Act	
	Section 3 would extend the benefits of the same type of rehabilitation loan as contemplated in section 2 to elderly persons occupying housing which requires rehabilitation to make it suitable for their use after having been displaced from an urban renewal area.
Section 4. Eligibility for occupancy of single elderly persons in moderate income housing	
Section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act provides for a below-market interest rate for certain types of sponsors to provide moderate income housing. The present language makes this financing aid available for developers of family units with the result that widowed and single elderly individuals are excluded from occupancy of this housing.	The amendment made by this section would simply permit housing to be constructed under this provision for single elderly persons, as well as families. This is in the nature of a technical amendment to existing law, but one which should have considerable impact on the amount of new housing available to elderly persons.
Section 5. Mortgage insurance for nonprofit nursing homes	
Section 232 of the National Housing Act as now written discriminates against a major group of the providers of this specialized type of housing. Section 232, which was enacted in 1959, has proved effective in facilitating the financing of the private profitmaking nursing homes. But the many nonprofit groups, including the thousands of nonprofit hospitals which might add such facilities, are at a great disadvantage since they must raise their funds through private subscription or seek to borrow them without the benefit of mortgage insurance.	The amendment made by section 5 would extend the authority of the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages for nonprofit groups to construct nursing home facilities. Mortgages could be up to 100 percent of the project cost with the same limitations now applicable to proprietary nursing home mortgages, or for the amount of the non-Federal share of Hill-Burton approved projects. The extension of mortgage insurance to nonprofit nursing homes does not in any way substitute for, or infringe upon that part of the Hill-Burton program which is devoted to nursing homes, but simply offers an aid to the financing through private channels of the sponsor's share of the project cost.

Section 6. Community planning to meet the housing needs of the elderly

This section is directed toward helping communities to make full and proper use of Federal programs, as well as the other resources available to them to provide housing for their older citizens. Among the greatest lacks in this field is the paucity of information at the community level on the housing problems and needs of the elderly and how steps to meet these needs might be integrated with the total development plan of the community.

Section 6 would amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, which provides grants on a matching basis for long-range urban planning, to authorize such grants to competent community planning agencies for surveys of the actual needs and problems of their older citizens.

Section 7. Eligibility of public housing agencies for direct loans for housing for the elderly

It is important, if we are to meet the tremendous needs of our elderly people for appropriate housing, that all of the knowledge and skill available in each community be able to play its proper role. The direct loan program established under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, specifically excludes local housing authorities from participation, the program being primarily directed to stimulating and making possible the provision of housing by nonprofit and cooperative groups.

It has been found, however, that in many communities, and especially in the smaller communities, there simply is no nonprofit group with the necessary experience, resources, and permanence to undertake such projects.

This section would modify the eligibility provisions of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, to provide that in communities where a demonstrable need exists for housing of the type built under this program, the local housing authority may be considered an eligible sponsor if no otherwise eligible group exists to meet this need.

Section 8. Relocation of elderly persons from urban renewal areas

It has been found that the elderly tend to be concentrated in the older sections of cities and are disproportionately represented in areas subject to renewal. The present requirements imposed by the urban renewal program for relocation of persons in project areas do not now protect the interests of the elderly residents as well as they do those of the working population and, in fact, do not require any special consideration of the elderly being relocated.

There is a serious shortage in most areas of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for relocation of very low income people. This problem is especially acute with respect to the elderly because they are less able to adapt to inadequacies in housing and because their incomes generally are among the lowest. Many proposals have been made for tapping the private housing market through supplementation of the rent paying ability of elderly persons being relocated. Although this approach obviously is fraught with many serious problems, the need for relief from the shortage of decent housing for relocation, especially of elderly persons, is so great that careful study is warranted.

Section 8(a) would amend section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that the special needs and physical limitations of the elderly be provided for in relocation plans submitted to the Urban Renewal Administration.

Subsection (b) defines "elderly families" and "elderly persons" for purposes of this section.

Subsection (c) calls for a study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the need for and feasibility of a rent supplementation program as an aid in proper relocation of the elderly from urban renewal areas. The results of the study are to be reported to the Congress.

Section 9. Property in urban renewal areas to be used for elderly persons housing

The possibilities for the reuse of cleared land in urban renewal areas for housing and related facilities for the elderly have not even been approached by renewal projects to date. In fact, it has been found that potential sponsors of low and moderate cost housing for the elderly have had great difficulty in obtaining sites in urban renewal areas because of the high cost of land and the competition of economically higher alternative uses.

An amendment to present programs is needed to help make possible through urban renewal the continued residence of elderly people in the areas of the city where they have lived, but in greatly improved physical surroundings.

This section authorizes the Urban Renewal Administration to add to the Federal share of the capital grant the difference between the amount of a local public agency receives for land used for housing for the elderly constructed by nonprofit or public agencies and the amount which would have been received from a developer who would devote the site to its highest alternative use. The section provides safeguards to assure that this authority and additional subsidy are used only to create complete developments with the facilities and services in addition to housing necessary for independent living by older people.

Section 10. Budget treatment of certain capital, recoverable and investment expenditures

The need for better housing for the Nation's elderly amounts to millions of units. This need simply cannot be met without the assistance of the Federal Government.

When this assistance is in the form of direct loans or FNMA mortgage purchases, it involves no subsidy by the taxpayers. It is inaccurate and misleading for such loans and purchases to be shown in the Federal budget as expenditures rather than as investments which will be repaid in full.

Section 10 would provide that only estimated net losses to the Government from mortgages purchased by FNMA under section 231 of the National Housing Act, as amended, and loans made under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, will be shown as expenditures in the President's budget.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I note in the Presiding Officer's chair the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the chairman of the Special Committee on Problems of the Aging. I wish to pay this public tribute to him for the assistance he gave the subcommittee of which I am the chairman in preparing this report and hearing the testimony. I wish to thank him again for his support in having the report of the subcommittee approved by the full committee, and to point out publicly what a magnificent public service the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has rendered over the years in studying and then in bringing to the floor of the Senate legislation to improve the lot of our senior citizens who are so badly in need of that kind of compassion which senior citizens get in almost every civilized country in the world except our own.

HOUSING FOR PEOPLE IN THE MIDDLE-INCOME BRACKETS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not mean to imply in my preceding remarks that the only housing problems in America today are those of the elderly. Far from it.

Even in the middle-income brackets, the homebuilding industry has tended to concentrate its efforts among the families which are better off financially.

We are producing fewer homes per year than a decade ago, despite a housing market going unmet, a large number of unemployed who are seeking work, and a building industry with a sizable unused capacity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of a valuable document entitled "Report on Middle-Income Housing," prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we will produce this year in the neighborhood of 1,400,000 housing units. Yet we should be building more than 2 million.

How big is the need in specific terms?

Last year, I requested the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to prepare a report on the extent to which various income groups in typical American cities could afford moderately priced new homes.

In response to this request Administrator Weaver has provided information on construction costs, housing expenses, income groups served and income groups not served by the homebuilding industry in some representative cities. These data have not been available previously and constitute an important new set of facts for the Congress to consider.

This study reveals what has long been suspected by housing economists, that the present product of the homebuilding industry is within the reach of only one-third to one-half of American families. The other half to two-thirds of our families cannot typically afford to purchase even the most modest home. Further, the study reveals that there are wide differences in both capital and operating costs of comparable homes in the cities selected for study. There is a marked tendency for the homebuilding industry to concentrate upon the construction of luxury-class homes as opposed to the minimum-price house. Thus, even where the industry might serve somewhat lower income groups it apparently tends not to do so in many cities, thus further curtailing the housing market.

I say this without assigning blame, for the industry is obviously pursuing a course of action intended to maximize profit and, indeed, must do so.

In addition, I have little question that the regulations of local government, and possibly some Federal aid programs, tend to induce the industry to produce somewhat higher quality and higher priced homes than minimum prices alone would suggest.

The study reveals wide variations between cities in the income groups served by the building industry. In some metropolitan areas as many as half of all families can apparently afford the typical minimum-priced product of the industry, at least when located on the cheapest available suburban land. This study does not treat of the difficult problems of providing some new housing, particularly rental housing, for moderate-income families who prefer to live in central cities. In the city of Philadelphia this is an especially difficult problem—one which arises in most of the major cities of the country.

The study also calculates the effects which different financial terms would have on the proportions of families able to afford new modest homes. These calculations reveal that the extension of terms comparable to those now available in the program of housing for the aged, or in the so-called 221(d)(3) program of renewal housing, could increase the proportion of families in the housing market by 50 percent. In almost every one of the cities studied, the extension of such credit terms would bring half to nearly two-thirds of our families within reach of a new home. I wonder how long the American housing economy can tolerate a situation in which more than one-half of the market is unserved. It seems to me that this is a crucial area wherein government can assist the building industry to achieve broader service to the American people as other industries are accustomed to doing.

It is my conviction that this study demonstrates the need for a new permanent program of credit aid for families in the moderate and lower income groups now excluded from the market. Such a program should make it possible for the average American family to buy or rent a new home. Even more desirable would be a program which would extend the same right to every American family which had a steady income and was prepared to assume the responsibilities of homeownership. I believe that it is our objective to provide incentives to enable the building industry to broaden its market to do this job. Further, such program would provide a needed bolstering of our national economy through largely private investment and business.

I do not hold, of course, that credit alone can do the required job. We need to provide incentives for the industry to build lower priced homes, incentives for potential customers to spend more on housing and less on frills, and incentives for local governments to remove any impediments which they may have put in the way of low-cost production. But these are features of a program which might well be tied to Federal credit aids designed for moderate and lower income families.

Mr. President, in the year ahead we will be reviewing the experimental programs adopted in 1961 and will be considering the features which are required in a permanent program to enlarge housing production and meet a broader segment of our housing needs. The study which the Housing Agency made for me provides valuable data on the extent of our present deficiencies and on some of the means for overcoming them.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT ON MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

The problems of providing an adequate supply of housing for middle and lower income families have attracted the attention of Congress in almost every year for the last 30 years. The enactment of each piece of basic housing legislation, the Home Loan Bank Act in 1933, the National Housing Act in 1934, the U.S. Housing Act in 1937, the Housing Act of 1949, and the Housing Act of 1961 was motivated by desire to make home ownership and decent rental housing available to families who could not otherwise obtain adequate housing, as well as by the desire to provide opportunities for expanding employment and investment in the homebuilding industry.

During the last decade, the Congress has steadily expanded earlier programs in an attempt to solve these same problems more adequately. The progressive reduction of downpayment requirements and the extension of amortization periods for loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration were attempts to move in this direction. As early as 1950, a bill, S. 2246, introduced by Senator SPARKMAN would have established a new Federal mortgage corporation for cooperative and nonprofit housing for families otherwise unable to afford new homes. This principle was recognized in the Housing Act of 1961 which authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association together with the Federal Housing Administration to engage in an experimental program of mortgage insurance and loans directed specifically to middle income families.

Despite the extensive programs already enacted by Congress, it has been charged that the homebuilding industry as presently constituted and with present Government aids is unable to provide new housing for more than the upper 30 to 40 percent of the income groups of American families. If this is the case, then the homebuilding industry service to the American public is more narrowly limited and its market more narrowly circumscribed than that of other industries. This obviously has important implications, both for the housing conditions of middle and lower income families and for employment and investment in one of our major industries.

Of course, it is not necessary for all American families to be able to purchase or rent new homes. At any time most of our families are living in homes which are at least 10 years old. The partly depreciated stock of used housing is our major housing resource and most always accommodates the vast majority of families. In the Housing Acts of 1954 through 1961, the Congress enacted important legislation to help preserve and improve that existing stock.

If the housing market worked better it would provide a large volume of new housing for middle and higher income families. As these housing units aged, they would depreciate in value and decline in price or rent through what is called the filtration process, until eventually they became available at sufficiently low prices and rents in sufficiently good condition and in large enough quantities to meet the needs of other families of lower income at prices and rents within the means of those families. Unfortunately, this filtration process has never worked perfectly, as is evident from the fact that significant fractions of our population still live in substandard housing and that in many cities there is still a shortage of standard older homes and apartments at prices or rents within reach of moderate income families. If the market processes are to be made more effective, a larger volume of new construction must be produced each year so that there will be a larger stock of housing and lower prices for housing in the future. As long as the building industry serves only an upper income minority of the population, however, the volume of new construction is too limited to achieve the necessary amount of filtration. Historically this appears to have been the case.

This point may be simply illustrated. If homes are produced only for people in the top 30 percent of the income distribution and homes filter down through a decile of the income distribution in, for example, 10 years, it would take 40 years after completion before any of the housing units would reach the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution. Few of the units would then still be of acceptable standards. On the other hand, if new units were produced that were within reach of people in the top 60 percent of the income distribution, it would take only 10 years for some of these units to filter down to the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution, and the units would still be of acceptable standards.

The production of new housing units available to lower income groups would also enlarge the market for new units and lead to an increased annual production rate. The accelerated increase in the housing stock would add pressures for a hastened filtration process that would help cut short the economic life of the millions of substandard units that are still occupied at present.

The mobility of families, increases in population, changes in locational preferences, changes in the distribution of income, neighborhood obsolescence rates, withdrawals from the stock and other factors also influence the filtration rate, of course, but these forces are probably less direct than the proportion of families in the new home market.

Unfortunately, our understanding of these market facts has been severely limited in the past. In the absence of complete data on housing market processes and with inadequate research funds, we have had to infer even major facts about the market and have been unable to proceed on the basis of sound factual data. The recent census studies on components of change in the housing supply, and statistics now being gathered on new home sales and prices, will undoubtedly help to provide a sound scientific foundation for the development of programs for the home building indusrty which will enable it to expand its markets and serve American families more fully. The tables submitted below by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and developed from data in the files of the Federal Housing Administration is an important contribution to this understanding. It will unquestionably assist the Congress, the American people, and the home building industry in their joint efforts to provide more and better housing and to provide enlarged opportunities for employment and investment in housing.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON THE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING MARKET

The accompanying report presents statistics which are helpful in considering the financial aids needed in developing sales and rental housing programs for middle-income families.

The data presented are based upon the estimated construction cost and estimated monthly housing expenses for a basic single-family home built for sale in each of 10 geographically distributed metropolitan areas in the United States. Similar data are also presented on the estimated construction cost and estimated monthly rent for a basic rental unit in a walk-up type project in each of the same 10 metropolitan areas. Utilizing these basic data, interest rates and amortization periods were varied to determine the extent to which such changes in mortgage terms would reduce monthly housing expenses or monthly rentals, and in turn the number or percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient, based upon an assumed 20 percent of income for housing expenses or rents, to afford the lower monthly housing expenses or rents.

An important qualification should be noted in interpreting the figures presented in this report. The estimated number or percentage of families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 to afford the housing expenses estimated were predicated upon the assumption of sales housing program for middle-income families. Similarly, the number or percentage of families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 to afford the rentals estimated were predicated upon the assumption of a rental housing program for middle-income families. If it is assumed, however, that both a sales housing program and a rental housing program were to be adopted, the estimates for a sales housing program could not be added to those for a rental housing program. For a combined sales and rental housing program, the number or percentage of families who would have had sufficient income to afford either to purchase the basic sales housing unit or rent the basic rental unit would tend to approximate the higher of the estimates for either the rental or sales housing program.

It should be noted also that substantial variation among cities can be expected in the extent to which sales or rental housing would be used, since local preferences for sales versus rental housing vary considerably.

SALES HOUSING

Minimum cost homes assumed

The accompanying tables show the costs required for the construction of a minimum standard, single detached home in the lowest price class meeting FHA standards in 10 geographically distributed metropolitan areas. The housing data were prepared from information in the files of the Federal Housing Administration and the income distributions are from census reports. It should be noted, first, that construction costs vary widely from metropolitan area to metropolitan area. In high cost areas such as Boston, Mass., and Newark, N.J., the minimum cost house is estimated by FHA to require $14,500, including costs of land. These costs are for a very small house of less than 1,000 square feet, with three bedrooms, meeting FHA local mortgage insurance standards and mortgage ceilings. The lowest construction cost for a comparable house is found in Phoenix, Ariz., where it would cost $11,000. Other metropolitan areas range between these extremes.

Incomes required by purchasers

The minimum incomes required to purchase this modest home under present circumstances, with current interest rates, and the 30-year financing now available in many of the areas in the sample are shown in table 1. This income will be from $7,800 in Newark, N.J., the highest cost area, to $5,200 in Atlanta, Ga., one of the lower cost areas. The other metropolitan areas in the sample, range between these extremes.

Families having required incomes

Table 2 shows the percentage of all normal families who have an income this high. In the Houston, Tex., metropolitan area, 58 percent of the families have the income required to purchase minimum standard homes. On the other hand, only 37.8 percent of the families in Boston, Mass., metropolitan area, have an income high enough to permit them to purchase the FHA minimum homes in that community. These percentages assume that the housing expense-to-income ratio is that found by FHA experience to be typical of families in these income groups. If, on the other hand, it is assumed that housing expense-to-income ratio should not exceed 20 percent of income, then only 50 percent of the families in the Houston metropolitan area have incomes sufficient to permit them to purchase the FHA minimum home and only 33.8 percent of the Boston metropolitan area families have such incomes. These figures clearly indicate that even under the most favorable circumstances the home industry can rarely serve as much as 50 percent of American families and more typically is serving between 35 and 45 percent of such families. As the report indicates, these are median or average figures. Many families can spend more of their income on housing than the tables assume, others much less.

Variation in monthly housing cost

It should be noted that just as construction costs vary from community to community, so also do the costs of homeownership. Appendix tables 1-A through 1-J show the components of these costs of homeownership. The costs of mortgage interest and principal payments are assumed to be at the same interest rates, but vary with the capital costs of the dwelling in the several communities. FHA mortgage insurance premium rates are of course, standard. Other housing expenses, including the costs of heat, light and maintenance vary both with the costs of the dwelling and with climatic and other circumstances. These tend to be higher in the northern metropolitan areas and lower in souther metropolitan areas. On the other hand, there is a very wide variation in local real estate taxes which range from $26 per month in the highest cost community in the sample to as low as $4.94 per month in the lowest cost community. While the tables do not show what is received for these tax payments, the FHA reports them as typical of taxes on this type of home in each of the communities.

It is quite evident that local taxing practices and local service standards must vary widely and that some essential costs of local government are not revealed by the estimated tax payments. It seems reasonable to assume that the average American family purchasing a typical three-bedroom house has two children, both of whom would be in school in the years following home purchase. The costs of educating a child in reasonably managed public school systems will vary from as little as $200 per year per child, in school systems having the lowest possible standards, to as much as $1,000 per year per child in communities having very high standards. Where the home is paying only $60 per year in taxes it must be obvious that sales or other local or State taxes are supporting large parts of the cost of education. In addition, a substantial fraction of other costs of police, fire, streets and highways, recreation, health and other services must come from other taxes or these services are being provided at levels substantially below those which are common in most American communities. Thus, the tax payment component in housing cost may often conceal substantially higher nonproperty taxes which must be paid by the resident to provide essential services for housing. In more than half of the communities in the sample, real property taxes are less than a typical payment of approximately $20 per month, which is scarcely sufficient to support general government services plus a share of educational costs in most American communities.

Variations in median income

Appendix table 2 shows the distribution of income in the sample cities in 1959. It will be noted that median income ranges from a high of over $7,000 to a low of just over $5,000. Thus, the median income family in the highest income community can be as much as 40 percent above the median income in the lowest income community. There are comparable variations in the distribution of income among the several income classes as shown in Appendix table 2. This table also shows the cumulative percentage distribution of incomes in the sample cities. It will be noted that the percentage of families having an income less than $6,000 per year ranges from 37 percent to over 60 percent.

Proportion of families actually purchasing FHA homes

Appendix tables 3 and 4 show the distribution by income of families actually purchasing FHA insured homes during 1959 and 1960 under section 203 of the National Housing Act. These proportions obviously vary with the incomes of the families in each metropolitan area, the costs and prices of the homes produced by the building industry in each area and variations of cost of home ownership previously discussed. Appendix table 3 thus indicates that from 31 percent to as little as 3.4 percent of FHA home purchasers in 1959 had such incomes of less than $6,000. Comparable figures are presented in appendix table 4 for 1960.

When these income distributions of families actually purchasing FHA homes are compared with minimum incomes required for purchasers of a minimum standard house, it is interesting to note that in three northern cities from 31 to 49 percent of actual FHA purchasers had less than the minimum income required to purchase the minimum standard home. Put it another way, 69 to 51 percent of purchasing families did have adequate incomes to purchase the minimum standard home. By contrast, among the southern cities only 13 to 16 percent of FHA home purchasers had incomes less than those required for the minimum standard home as revealed by the tables.

Price classes of homes produced under FHA mortgage insurance

Appendix table 5 shows the appraised value of homes actually produced under FHA programs in the year 1959. This table reveals that a majority of the homes produced are valued at more than the minimum price assumed by the tables. Indeed, in the high cost area of the Boston metropolitan area, only 6.3 percent of all homes produced under FHA insurance were priced below $14,000 and in a lower cost metropolitan area of Mobile, Ala., only 6.6 percent of all FHA insured homes were produced at prices below $12,000.

Thus, the tables reveal startling disparities in the performance of the housing market in different metropolitan areas. Some cities like Indianapolis, Ind., are characterized by moderate building and housing costs and relatively high incomes. Here the building industry is in a position to serve about half of the potential market under ideal circumstances. Other metropolitan areas which have low costs, but low incomes, find the industry able to serve less than 20 percent of the potential market. It is interesting to note that, as measured by these ratios, some higher income, higher cost northern cities seem to have a better potential performance record than some lower income, lower cost southern and western cities. In eight of the metropolitan areas, the homebuilding industry is apparently serving less than 20 percent of its potential market, but in the other two areas, this percentage is 31.1 percent and 52.5 percent of the potential market.

These calculations, of course, ignore the proportion of families who are actually in the housing market, since in any one year less than 10 percent of the families will normally purchase a home. It is obvious that well over half of all families are not potentially in the market in any real sense in any year. If data were available on the income distribution of these families it would probably become evident that the proportion of the potential market actually served by the homebuilding industry was substantially less than that indicated by the tables. It might be reasonable to infer that the proportion in the market would be half or less than that shown in the tables. If adjustments were to be made for the extraordinary low tax areas, to take account of other taxes paid by homeowners in other ways, the proportion in the market would, of course, be further reduced.

Effects of financing charges on homeownership

Each of the tables to which reference has been made above also contains a series of columns showing the family incomes and the proportion of the families which would be served by progressive reductions in interest rate from 5¼ to 2 percent and extension of amortization period to 40 years. Tables 1 and 2 bring out very sharply the potential enlargement in the housing market which would result if such favorable terms were made available to families in moderate and low-income classes. Thus, under present financing terms of 5¼-percent interest rate and a 30-year amortization period, only 37.8 percent of Boston metropolitan area families would have had incomes in 1959 which would have permitted them to buy the minimum standard FHA home. Under the most liberal financing terms assumed—2-percent interest rate and 40-year amortization period—this proportion could almost be doubled to 61.7 percent. If it is assumed that a 20-percent ratio between housing expense and family income is a desirable objective, then the percentage of the families in the housing market in the Boston metropolitan area would have been raised from 33.8 to 57.6 percent by the variation in the terms described. Similarly, in the southern metropolitan area of Mobile, Ala., an estimated 39.4 percent of families would have been within income classes in 1959 which could have afforded a minimum standard house under present financing terms; 61.6 percent would have been brought into the housing market by the indicated change of terms. Since, as already has been noted, these are theoretical rather than actual proportions, the proportional increase in the market might be substantially higher than that indicated by the tables, if the homebuilding industry could be persuaded to produce a higher proportion of low-cost homes in such communities.

The following table shows the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated housing expenses for the basic house, assuming housing expenses equal to 20 percent of income, 100-percent mortgage financing for 40 years and interest rates ranging from 4 to 2 percent; as compared with present rather generally available financing terms of 5¼-percent interest and a 30-year amortization period:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Percentage of families with sufficient incomes in 1959			
	Under present terms of 5¼ percent, 30 years	Under terms of—		
		4 percent, 40 years	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:				
Boston, Mass	33.8	45.6	51.8	57.6
Newark, N.J	39.3	50.4	56.1	61.5
North Central:				
Indianapolis, Ind	36.8	49.0	55.0	60.6
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	41.2	56.0	63.0	69.3
Topeka, Kans	34.7	47.0	53.3	59.3
South:				
Atlanta, Ga	49.2	59.5	63.9	68.0
Houston, Tex	50.8	61.1	65.3	69.2
Mobile, Ala	39.4	51.6	56.8	61.6
West:				
Phoenix, Ariz	43.7	53.0	57.7	62.0
Portland, Oreg	38.2	50.1	55.7	61.1

The figures presented in the table above should not be interpreted to mean that all the families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 would have been eligible under a middle-income program. In any middle-income program which provides unusual financial aids, such as below market interest rates and extended loan maturities, it would be advisable not only to limit the sales price of the house, but also to limit in some way the eligible purchasers of the homes to those most in need. The latter might be done by establishing maximum income limits. Preference might well be given to families displaced by renewal. No public purpose would be served if the homes to be provided under a program intended for middle-income families would be made available to families whose incomes are considered adequate to purchase standard homes under presently available financing terms.

The more meaningful figures, however, would be the number or percentage of additional families who have sufficient incomes to afford to purchase the basic home under the particular financing plan adopted, but who would not have sufficient income to afford to purchase the basic house under the present best available financing terms of 5¼ percent interest and a 30-year amortization period. The following table presenting figures to illustrate this were derived from the previous table, and are based upon the distribution of family incomes for 1959:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Additional percentage of families who would have had sufficient incomes in 1959, under the terms indicated, but with insufficient incomes under 5¼ percent, 30-year financing		
	4 percent, 40 years	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:			
Boston, Mass	11.8	18.0	23.8
Newark, N.J	11.1	16.8	22.2
North Central:			
Indianapolis, Ind	12.2	18.2	23.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	14.8	21.8	28.1
Topeka, Kans	12.3	18.6	24.6
South:			
Atlanta, Ga	10.3	14.7	18.8
Houston, Tex	10.3	14.5	18.4
Mobile, Ala	12.2	17.4	22.2
West:			
Phoenix, Ariz	9.3	14.0	18.3
Portland, Oreg	11.9	17.5	22.9

The above figures indicate, for example, that if the interest rate was reduced from 5¼ percent to 3 percent, and the amortization period extended from 30 years to 40 years, the reduction in estimated monthly housing expenses would have reduced the income needed to purchase the basic house so that an additional 18 percent of the families in the Boston metropolitan area would have had sufficient incomes in 1959 to purchase the basic house. Comparable figures for the other nine metropolitan areas indicate a range of 14 percent to 21.8 percent as the additional families who would have had sufficient incomes in 1959.

On the same basis, if the interest rate was reduced from 5¼ percent to 2 percent and the amortization period extended from 30 years to 40 years, the percentage of additional families who would have had sufficient income to purchase the basic house would have ranged from 18.3 to 28.1 percent in the 10 metropolitan areas included in the report.

These percentages of additional families are based upon the assumption that all of the additional families would become eligible for a middle-income program which would be based upon any one of the particular terms indicated. This would mean that the maximum income limit would be established just below the income needed to purchase the basic house under presently available financing terms, and the minimum income would be the income equal to five times the estimated monthly housing expenses for the basic house under the particular financing terms adopted. It will be noted, however, that practically all the families to be housed under such a program would have estimated housing expenses equal to less than 20 percent of income. On the other hand, mortgage terms could be tailored to meet the housing needs of families, to avoid this.

A middle-income housing program might be designed to provide for only the lower income part of the additional families. This could be done by reducing the maximum income described above, but making no change in the minimum income limit.

Another approach to a middle-income program might be to reduce the maximum income limit to the income level needed on a five times estimated housing expense basis under the particular financing terms adopted, and permit any family with an income below this income level to purchase the house if it so desired.

PRICE DISTRIBUTIONS OF HOMES ACTUALLY PRODUCED

Table 3 shows the actual distribution by price class in 1959 of homes built in three of the selected metropolitan areas during the period 1950–59. Since this was a period of steadily rising costs with very sharp cost increases during the first part of the decade, the median value of homes produced is actually substantially lower than it would be if comparable data were available for homes built in the years 1959 or 1960. Despite this fact, it should be noted that more than 81 percent of all the homes produced in the Boston area and over three-fourths of the homes produced in Atlanta or Minneapolis-St. Paul area had market values which exceeded the construction cost assumed for the minimum standard house cost.

SOME QUALIFICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

These data present for the first time authoritative evidence on the actual performance of the home building industry under the most important and the most effective of the Government's programs of aid to housing. The data present no evidence, however, on housing in central cities as opposed to suburban areas where lower land costs are found. Many American families prefer or must have close-in locations on higher cost land in order to preserve their access to places of employment.

The tables do not take account of the important variable of family savings. A proportion of home buyers make substantial down payments and thus reduce their current out-of-pocket housing expense. Doubtless, this will continue to be true in the future, though the proportion of low-income families with substantial savings is quite small. Nor do the tables deal with other family expenses which limit the ability of the family to purchase a home. Extra-large families, those who are required by employment locations to have two cars, those who have serious or prolonged illness in a family, or who care for parents or grandparents may often be unable to afford the ratio of housing expense to income assumed by the tables or found in actual FHA practice.

RENTAL HOUSING

The statistics on rental housing presented in the report which follows are similar to those for sales housing described in the first section of this summary, and cover the same 10 metropolitan areas.

The statistics on rental housing are predicated upon estimates of construction costs and monthly rentals, prepared by the Federal Housing Administration, for a basic two-bedroom rental unit in a walkup type structure. Inasmuch as a standard rental unit was used as a basis of comparison, these figures reflect the local cost differences which exist among the 10 metropolitan areas included in the report. Table 4 shows incomes of families now served by the 221(d) (3) program, and under other possible terms. Table 5 shows the proportion of all families with these incomes. Appendix tables 2 and 7A–J show the cost and income figures used for each metropolitan area.

The basic facts revealed by these statistics relate to (1) the extent to which reductions in the mortgage interest rate will reduce the monthly payment required for principal and interest, and in turn, the reduction possible in the monthly rent of the basic unit because of this; (2) the extent to which the family income needed could be lowered because of this reduced rent; (3) the proportion of the families in each of the 10 metropolitan areas whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit under the various financing terms indicated; and (4) the additional proportion of the families whose 1959 incomes would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit under the various financing terms indicated, but would not have had sufficient incomes to pay the estimated rent under present market interest rate financing terms. It is assumed in deriving these statistics relating to rental housing that the family income needed would be five times the estimated rent, or in other words that rent would be equal to 20 percent of income.

These basic facts are summarized in the statistics for each of the 10 metropolitan areas which are presented in the 2 following tables. The first table shows the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit, assuming 100 percent mortgage financing is provided for a 40-year term, at interest rates ranging from 5¼ percent down to 2 percent.

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Percentage of families with sufficient incomes in 1959				
	Under present terms of 5¼ percent, 40 years	Under terms of—			
		4 percent, 40 years	3⅛ percent, 40 years [1]	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass	35.3	42.7	47.8	48.6	54.5
Newark, N.J	31.8	38.0	42.3	43.1	48.2
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind	35.9	43.4	48.6	49.4	55.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	23.3	29.0	33.5	34.2	39.8
Topeka, Kans	25.1	31.6	36.1	36.8	42.7
South:					
Atlanta, Ga	46.5	53.2	57.7	58.3	62.8
Houston, Tex	44.5	51.3	55.9	56.6	61.4
Mobile, Ala	37.8	45.4	50.5	51.3	56.5
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz	28.8	34.7	38.8	39.5	44.5
Portland, Oreg	31.2	39.3	45.2	46.1	52.7

[1] These estimates for 3⅛ percent, 40-year financing differ somewhat from similar estimates based upon FHA income limits established under FHA sec. 221(d)(3) which also provides for 3⅛ percent, 40-year financing. The 2 main reasons for these differences are that in establishing maximum income limits (1) FHA adjusted the census income data for underreporting of income, whereas in preparing the above estimates no such adjustment was made, and (2) where the annual income limits based on a 5-times-annual-rent basis, exceeded the median income for an area, FHA reduced the maximum amount of mortgage insurable so that the resultant lower rent would be consistent with the median income; no similar adjustment was made in preparing the above estimates. For detailed figures, see tables 4 and 5 in the attached report.

The figures in above table show a considerable variation among the metropolitan areas covered in the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit under the financing terms of a 5¼-percent interest rate and a term of 40 years. The percentages range from 23.3 percent in Minneapolis-St. Paul to 46.5 percent in Atlanta, Ga., and the percentages are higher for the three metropolitan areas in the South than in the metropolitan areas covered in other sections of the country.

The figures also show that if financing at reduced interest rates is provided, a substantially increased percentage of families would have had sufficient incomes in 1959 to pay the lower rent for the basic rental unit made possible because of lower interest rate financing. With financing at a 2-percent interest rate, for example, the percentage of families with sufficient incomes in 1959 to pay the reduced rent would have ranged from 39.8 percent in Minneapolis-St. Paul to 62.8 percent in Atlanta, Ga.

The figures presented above should not be interpreted to mean that all of the families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 would have been eligible under a middle-income program. In any middle-income program which would involve unusual financial aids, such as below-market interest rates, it would be advisable not only to limit the rents to be charged and thereby channel the reduction in debt service resulting from the lower interest rate financing into lower rentals, but also to limit in some way the tenants to be made eligible to rent the units under the program. The latter might be done by establishing maximum income limits, so that the units to be provided would be made available only to the families most in need. No public purpose would be served if the rental units to be provided under a program intended for middle-income families would be made available to families whose incomes are considered adequate to pay rentals predicated upon project financing at market interest rates.

The more meaningful figures, however, would be the number of additional families who have sufficient incomes to afford the estimated rent for the basic unit under a reduced interest rate financing plan, but who would not have sufficient income to afford the estimated rent for the basic unit under the present 5¼-percent interest rate financing plan. The following table presenting figures to illustrate this was derived from the previous table and is based upon the distribution of family incomes for 1959:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Additional percentage of families who would have had sufficient income in 1959, under the terms indicated, but with insufficient incomes under 5¼ percent, 40-year financing.			
	4 percent, 40 years	3⅛ percent, 40 years [1]	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:				
Boston, Mass	7.4	12.5	13.3	19.2
Newark, N.J	6.2	10.5	11.3	16.4
North Central:				
Indianapolis, Ind	7.5	12.7	13.5	19.4
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	5.7	10.2	10.9	16.5
Topeka, Kans	6.5	11.0	11.7	17.6
South:				
Atlanta, Ga	6.7	11.2	11.8	16.3
Houston, Tex	6.8	11.4	12.1	16.9
Mobile, Ala	7.6	12 7	13.5	18.7
West:				
Phoenix, Ariz	5.9	10.0	10.7	15.7
Portland, Oreg	8.1	14.0	14.9	21.5

[1] See the footnote to the preceding table for an explanation of why these estimates differ somewhat from similar figures for FHA sec. 221(d)(3).

The above figures indicate, for example, that if the interest rate is reduced from 5¼ percent to 3 percent with no change in the 40-year amortization period, 13.3 percent of the families in the Boston metropolitan area would have been in the income classes between the lowest income level which could afford the rent for the basic unit under the present 5¼-percent interest rate financing plan and the income level of families who could afford the rent under the 3-percent interest rate financing plan, assuming annual income equal to 5 times annual rent. In other words, if a middle-income program with 3-percent interest rate financing was so designed as to make all the families in this income gap eligible, an additional 13.3 percent of the families in the Boston metropolitan area would have been eligible incomewise, according to family income figures for 1959.

On the same basis, a reduction in the interest rate from 5¼ to 4 percent would have made eligible, from an income viewpoint, an additional 6 to 8 percent of the families in the 10 areas covered. Similarly, a reduction in interest rate from 5¼ to 3 percent would have added 11 to 15 percent of the families; and a reduction from 5¼ to 2 percent would have added 16 to 22 percent of the families.

These percentages of additional families are based upon the assumption that all the families whose incomes fell in the income gap would become eligible for a middle-income program. However, a middle-income program might be designed to provide for only part of these families. This could be done by reducing the upper income limit of this income gap.

A second approach to a middle-income program might be to establish the maximum income at five times estimated rent under a particular financing plan but permit families with incomes below this maximum income level to be eligible.

A third approach might be to establish the maximum income at a level somewhat higher than the indicated income required on a five-times-rent basis under a particular financing plan, but provided that the rent to be paid by such higher income families would be 20 percent of their income. This would have the effect of increasing the rent to be paid by such families who are admitted to a middle-income project. Also, some families with incomes less than the indicated income limit could be admitted to the project, but they would also pay rent equal to 20 percent of their income. This would have the effect of reducing the rent for such families with lower income who are admitted to the project. This approach would necessitate a finely balanced selection of tenants in a project according to their incomes, in order to assure that the total rental income to be collected in a project would be adequate to maintain the financial soundness of the project. Additionally, of course, the program might be designed to permit rent increases as incomes rose so that rents would remain at a constant proportion of family incomes, and the interest paid on the mortgage would increase toward market rates.

RENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF UNITS ACTUALLY PRODUCED

Table 6 of the accompanying report shows the actual distribution by gross rent in 1959 of the renter-occupied units in 1959 which were built during the period 1950–59 in three of the selected metropolitan areas included in the report. Since this was a period of steadily rising construction costs and operating expenses, the median gross rent of rental units is actually substantially lower than it would be if comparable figures were available for rental units built in 1959 or 1960. Despite this fact, it should be noted that from 85 to 90 percent of the rental units produced in the Boston, Atlanta, or Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan areas had gross rents which exceeded the estimated rent for the minimum standard unit assumed.

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

These tables are indicative of the inability of the homebuilding industry to reach the very wide market among all American families which has traditionally characterized other American industries. The data compiled by the Housing and Home Finance Agency constitute an important contribution to our understanding of the functioning of the housing market under present circumstances and with present programs with Government assistance. Unquestionably, the Congress is interested in these facts, in an effort to improve the performance of both Government programs of assistance and of the homebuilding industry, just as it has almost continually for the last 30 years. Without commenting upon the feasibility of any of the many approaches toward the broadening of the housing market which have been proposed in recent years, some broad conclusions from this study are quite evident.

1. The market for housing is a peculiarly local one, because of the wide variations which now exist in construction costs, in other costs of homeownership, and in the distribution in family incomes. It seems apparent that what is high income in some areas is low income in others, that what is high cost in some areas is low cost in other areas. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that no program with arbitrary cost or income limits can serve the needs of all American communities and that a much greater degree of flexibility in such limits will be required by any program directed specifically to serve the housing needs of middle and lower income families. This principle has been recognized in past housing legislation but seems particularly important in connection with the kinds of programs that might become necessary in order to widen the market for housing to a larger proportion of all American families.

2. The tables also clearly indicate that the proportion of the American families who are able to afford modest new homes could be substantially increased by further liberalization of home financing terms. Indeed, the proportion of families potentially in the market might in many communities be doubled if loan terms were available comparable to those now authorized in some other nonhousing Government loan programs. The present programs for loans for housing for the aged and the program of submarket interest rates conducted by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration under section 221 (d)(3) of the Housing Act of 1961 are examples of congressional recognition that special needs exist which may necessitate terms not required by the vast majority of American families. The extent to which such terms should be made available, the controls required to prevent such favorable terms from becoming competitive with conventional, private lending, or with FHA and VA insured and guaranteed mortgages are not treated by this study and remain for further analysis and discussion. The extent to which favorable loan terms might be made available utilizing existing lending institutions and practices are illustrative of other problems not treated by the current study. A letter of transmittal from the Housing Administrator to Senator CLARK discusses some of these problems, however.

3. It is also evident that the price and rent distributions of homes produced by the building industry are an important variable in the industry's service to American families in middle and lower income groups. The study reveals wide variation in the distribution of houses produced as between high priced and relatively lower priced homes, and in rents of new rental units. Thus, it is quite evident that mere liberalization of credit terms will not produce the maximum possible benefit to middle and lower income families unless such liberalization can be coupled with incentives for builders to produce significant proportions of homes and rental property at the lowest possible price and rental classes. In future studies on the subject, it would unquestionably be desirable to examine the incentives which now lead the building industry to produce such high proportions of such high-priced homes in higher price brackets in some communities, and to ignore the potentially larger market for lower priced homes. Since it must be presumed that the industry responds to what is most profitable, and since all programs of aid to housing are operated on voluntary basis and depend on the cooperation of local enterprise, present and future programs must be scrutinized carefully to assure that they provide appropriate incentives to the building industry to produce homes in the lower price classes where the need is apparently the greatest.

4. The regulatory and tax effects of local government are relatively unexplored influences in the housing market which are suggested by this study. The share of local government cost carried by taxes on housing varies widely in the 10 metropolitan areas included in this report. Indeed the range exceeds 500 percent. Further, this study does not bring out the extent to which local regulations may impose added costs on home ownership or operation or added construction costs of the building industry. Unquestionably there are communities in which excessively high standards of building codes, zoning, local street requirement and the like serve to limit the market for housing and produce incentives in the building industry to produce only the highest price housing. These impacts on the housing market should also be studied and considered in any comprehensive attempt to enable the building industry to serve a broader market.

5. Finally, except under liberal term loans with no interest and with indefinite amortization periods, it is obvious that there will remain a significant proportion of American families who cannot afford new houses without extraordinary aid or subsidy. The needs of many such families, indeed of most of them, could be served by a better functioning of the market for used homes, if the market for new housing could be enlarged sufficiently so as to permit the filtration process to work more expeditiously and more broadly. Some families will doubtless continue to require low-rent public housing, especially among very low income groups, those without stable employment, those with health or other problems which impair their ability to assume responsibilities for home ownership or to rent decent privately provided accommodations.

The present study makes a significant contribution to the enlargement of the understanding of the housing market. There follow the factual study prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and a copy of a letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK dealing with some policy problems in the middle- and lower-income housing field.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1962.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: This is in reply to your letter of December 29, 1961, in which you requested our assistance and advice to clarify middle-income housing issues which are likely to be before the Congress during 1962 and later years.

In that letter you requested certain factual data and some suggestions regarding policies which might better serve the needs of middle-income families and the housing industry. The factual data you requested with respect to sales housing are presented in the enclosed statement and the policy suggestions are presented below. The factual data you requested on rental housing are in process of preparation and will be provided soon. The unavoidable delay in providing the rental data is regretted, but it was necessary to request additional information from FHA insuring offices and also to analyze the operating statements of rental housing projects in order to develop the detailed basic local data needed for the analyses you desired.

The factual data presented in the enclosed statement are predicated upon comparative figures among selected areas for a basic house for sale. The data being prepared on rental housing will also be predicated upon a basic unit for rent. It is our feeling that unless comparable units are used, the analysis by areas would reflect differences in housing quality which would distort comparisons among areas as to what a middle-income program might accomplish.

The enclosed factual statement presents comparative figures showing the percentage of families in each of 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas, whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to purchase the basic house under the assumptions indicated in your letter. The data are for 1959 since the latest census figures on family incomes for individual areas are for that year. For sales housing, separate figures are shown assuming: Interest rates of 5¼ percent, 4 percent, 3 percent, and 2 percent; amortization periods of 30, 35, and 40 years; and housing expense in relation to income at the average for homeowners having FHA-insured loans as computed herein, and at a uniform 20 percent for all areas, as you requested. These data are summarized in table 2 of the enclosed statement.

Your attention is directed to a number of qualifications to the use of these figures which are presented in the enclosed statement. The statement also includes a detailed explanation of how the figures were derived.

I would like to comment now on the policy suggestions you requested for middle-income housing. With respect to policies which might be adopted to assure that any program of middle-income housing would be channeled to the most economical or efficiently built housing available in the private market for new housing in the area, I might submit the following for your consideration.

1. The experience with the so-called below-market interest rate FHA program (FHA sec. 221(d)(3)) indicates that this may be a desirable approach to consider. In initiating this program, each FHA insuring office estimated the construction cost of a basic, livable, rental unit of non-extravagant character and size, which could be built and rented in the local area. Estimates were then prepared for each area of the maximum income limits for families of various sizes who would be eligible to rent such units at rents approved by FHA. Subsequent changes in rents would also have to be approved by FHA. This approach would assure that the new rental units in an area would be of the lowest feasible construction costs, that the rents charged would reflect the financing terms made available, and that the families

moving into the new units would have incomes at or below the prescribed income level for the area.

If we attempted to use this same approach for sales housing, however, we would be faced with the problem of controlling the sales price to the initial purchaser, as well as possible resale by him to make a quick profit. This would be necessary because a house with the more favorable middle-income financing terms would command a better price in the market. However, any attempt to limit sales prices, and thereby keep the houses in the middle-income stream, would result in onerous controls which no one wants and which are difficult to police. One possibility might be a permanent-type cooperative of single-family homes, wherein transfers of homes would be appropriately controlled by the cooperative.

2. In order to induce the building industry to design and produce the most economic units within the construction cost limitations prescribed, an architectural-engineering design competition could be sponsored. The most economical and acceptable designs resulting could be used by a local sponsor as a basis for competitive bidding to contract for the production of a designated number of units. Also, it would be advantageous to a building to utilize these designs in building units for sale or rent since financing under the program would be assured, and marketability of units largely assured because the financing terms would provide below market housing expenses or rents. The proposals providing the best prospects for cost reductions or better value for the housing dollar, could be accorded a priority in processing and thus have first claim on the funds to be made available under the middle-income program.

You also requested suggestions with respect to policies needed to assure that a middle-income housing program would in fact not be in competition with other new or existing housing. It is our considered judgment that there is no practical way of preventing new construction under a middle-income program in an area from competing with conventionally financed new construction in low-priced brackets. However, the volume of conventionally financed new construction of desirable standards and location in an area which would be in the same price or rental brackets as a middle-income program in that area would most likely be quite small.

A middle-income program in an area would also compete with existing units in the area, whether financed conventionally, or with regular FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed mortgages. If the volume of such new housing in an area was large enough, it would tend to weaken sales prices and rents of existing units. On the other hand, the supply of existing acceptable middle-income housing is generally so tight that some new middle-income housing would be a desirable addition to the supply. As the program expanded, however, it would be necessary to study the local housing market carefully in order to prevent the development of an undue adverse effect upon existing housing.

I am hopeful that the factual data and policy suggestions presented herein will be helpful to you and other Members of the Congress in considering middle-income housing proposals.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

FACTUAL DATA FOR SALES-TYPE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

The factual data requested for sales-type housing are presented herein for 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas of varying sizes and geographical distribution. The selection of these areas was limited somewhat, since the data from the Population and Housing Census of 1960, presenting statistics on family incomes for 1959, were not available for some of the larger standard metropolitan areas at the time that work was started in obtaining the related FHA data that were needed.

The SMSA's for which data are presented herein and their population in 1960 are as follows:

Northeast:	
Boston, Mass	2,589,301
Newark, N.J	1,689,420
North Central:	
Indianapolis, Ind	697,567
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,482,030
Topeka, Kans	141,286
South:	
Atlanta, Ga	1,017,188
Houston, Tex	1,243,158
Mobile, Ala	314,301
West:	
Phoenix, Ariz	663,510
Portland, Oreg	821,897

FHA DATA

Appendix tables 1–A to 1–J, comprising a similar table for each of the above standard metropolitan statistical areas, present estimated monthly housing expenses data for sales-type housing. Separate estimates are presented, assuming financing available at interest rates of 5¼ percent, 4 percent, 3 percent and 2 percent, and also for amortization terms of 30, 35, and 40 years.

Before considering the specific figures presented in these appendix tables, it is necessary to explain how the figures were obtained and what qualifications should be placed upon their use. The comments which follow are keyed into each of the lines shown on appendix tables 1–A to 1–J.

(a) Estimated cost (including land):

The figures on construction costs, including land, presented in these tables are estimates for constructing a basically comparable one-story, three-bedroom house of 929 square feet.

The construction cost estimates were prepared by local FHA insuring offices to reflect local costs, and were used to establish the mortgage ceilings for various areas, under section 221(d)(2). Some minor variations in the specified house were permitted in order to conform to local practices, and heating installations were estimated on the basis of local practices.

These construction cost estimates have the unique advantage, therefore, of showing comparative costs, including land, of a comparable house in each of the 10 selected areas. This approach is preferred over the use of average appraised value under section 203 in each of the selected areas, since the latter would reflect differences in quality of houses built among these areas and thereby distort comparisons for acceptable housing under a middle-income housing program.

The estimated construction cost, including land, for this basically comparable house varied among the areas covered as follows:

Northeast:	
Boston, Mass	$14,500
Newark, N.J	14,500
North Central:	
Indianapolis, Ind	14,000
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	14,000
Topeka, Kans	13,000
South:	
Atlanta, Ga	11,500
Houston, Tex	12,000
Mobile, Ala	12,000
West:	
Phoenix, Ariz	$11,000
Portland, Oreg	12,000

(b) Mortgage amount:

The maximum mortgage amounts presented in appendix-tables 1–A to 1–J, which are the same as the estimated cost, are the maximum mortgages permitted for the locality under present regulations for section 221(d)(2). The minimum downpayment of $200 for displaced families or 3 percent of investment required for other families are thus presumed to be equal to the prepaid expenses or closing costs which are not in the property costs.

To the extent that property replacement costs (or initial expenses which are not in the property costs) can be held below these figures for individual properties, estimates of housing expense and of the income needed to purchase would be proportionately reduced. We have no basis for stating what reductions in housing costs below the maximum mortgage amounts authorized for section 221(d)(3) might be attained with FHA minimum standards.

Operations under this program in the next year or two may give partial answers to this question. A range of costs down to 15 or 20 percent below permitted maximums in individual localities might not be an unreasonable expectation.

(c) Interest and principal: Monthly mortgage payments to interest and principal, presented in appendix tables 1–A to 1–J, are level annuity payments for the repayment terms and interest rates indicated on the mortgage amounts specified.

(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium insurance (first year): The mortgage insurance premium indicated in the average monthly amount for the first year premium charge, based on a one-half of 1 percent annual rate. This monthly amount will decline slightly for each subsequent year, since it would be recomputed each year on the basis of the reduced outstanding balance of the mortgage.

(e) Real estate taxes: The monthly amounts shown for real estate taxes were computed by deriving an average tax rate for all FHA section 203 mortgages insured in 1961 on new homes within the housing market area of the city specified, and applying this tax rate to the replacement costs indicated. Actual charges for the assumed property would vary according to specific property assessments, tax rates for minor civil divisions where construction occurs, and the incidence of homestead exemptions, if any.

(f) Other housing expense:

Other housing expense includes charges for heating and utilities, hazard insurance, and expenses for maintenance and repairs. They were estimated on the basis of experience for all FHA section 203 mortgages insured in 1961 on new homes within the housing market area of the city specified, and by applying a pro rata estimate for a property of the replacement cost specified. For detailed figures on each of the areas, refer to footnote 6 on the page attached to appendix table 1–J.

It will be noted that the estimated real estate taxes and other housing expenses referred to above are based upon the FHA experience for 1961. Estimates based on FHA experience for 1959 would have been only slightly lower. For example, the monthly payment for real estate taxes for all new homes in the $13,000 value class on which FHA-insured mortgages under section 203 in the United States was $13.76 in 1959 and $14.20 in 1961. Similarly, other housing expenses for heating and utilities and for maintenance and repair were $24.50 in 1959 and $24.72 in 1961.

(g) Total monthly housing expense: The total was obtained by adding items (e) through (f) for each column, in each of appendix tables 1–A to 1–J.

(h) Estimated annual income needed by purchaser, based on FHA experience:

The two lines of estimates in appendix tables 1–A to 1–J under the caption "Estimated Annual Income Needed by Purchasers," indicate the annual income of families who can afford to pay the estimated monthly housing expenses indicated, under the assumptions specified.

The first line of estimates for an area is based upon the FHA national ratio of housing expense-to-income for that income group which purchased new homes in the same value class as the replacement cost of the basic house in that area. This approach was necessary since housing expense-to-income ratios by income classes are not available for individual areas.

In computing these estimated ratios, current family income, rather than effective family income, was used since current family income is more nearly comparable to the Bureau of Census definition of income. FHA processing of loan applications, however, is based upon effective family incomes. It will be noted also, that the ratios are based upon 1961 experience. However, comparable ratios for 1959 would have differed only slightly. The average housing expense-to-effective income ratio for the United States was 20.5 percent in 1959, as compared with 20.8 percent in 1961.

The annual income figure appearing in a particular column was derived by multiplying the estimated monthly housing expense figure appearing in that column by 12, and dividing the result thus obtained by the FHA ratio of housing expense to income. For example, in appendix table 1–A for Boston, the figure of $7,802 appearing in the column captioned "5¼ Percent Interest Rate and 30-Year Amortization," was derived by multiplying total monthly housing expense of $137.19 by 12, and dividing the result by 21.1 percent, the FHA ratio of housing expense to income.

It should be specifically noted that, in practice, a wide range of incomes above and below the computed income specified will be represented among the purchasers of a particular home value, reflecting both choice on the part of the purchasers and the relative burdens of other demands upon family income. Representative experience suggests about 70 percent of the families might be within a range 25 percent above and 25 percent below the computed median of family incomes of purchasers of a moderate price home.

(i) Estimated annual income needed by purchasers, based upon a 20-percent housing expense-to-income ratio:

The annual income figures appearing on line (i) were derived in the same manner as those on line (h); except that a uniform 20 percent of income was assumed for housing expense in each of the areas covered, an alternative assumption requested in Senator CLARK's letter.

The estimated annual incomes needed by purchasers, derived as explained above, were taken from appendix tables 1–A to 1–J and are summarized in table 1.

CENSUS DATA ON FAMILY INCOME

Appendix table 2 presents, for each of the standard metropolitan statistical areas covered, family income figures for 1959 taken from the 1960 census. Unrelated individuals occupying dwelling units are excluded from these figures. The family income figures are the latest available for individual metropolitan areas or cities.

There evidently is some underreporting of family income in these census figures, although the extent of such underreporting is uncertain. The following explanation by the Bureau of the Census is quoted in support of this point:

"The schedule entries for income are frequently based not on records but on memory, and this factor probably produced underestimates, because the tendency is to forget minor or irregular sources of income. Other errors of reporting are due to misunderstanding of the income questions or to misrepresentation.

"A possible source of understatement in the income figures was the assumption in the editing process that no income other than earnings was received by a person who reported the receipt of either wage or salary income or self-employment income but failed to report on the receipt of other money income. This procedure was adopted in order to make better use of the information obtained.

"The income tables for families and unrelated individuals include in the lowest income group (under $1,000) those that were classified as having no 1959 income, as defined in the census. Many of these were living on income in kind, savings, or gifts, or were newly created families or unrelated individuals, or were families in which the sole breadwinner had recently died or left the household. However, many of the families and unrelated individuals who reported no income probably had some money income which was not recorded in the census.

(Source: P. XXV, U.S. Census of Population, District of Columbia, PC(1) 10C. A similar explanation will appear in each of the other census publications in this series.)

PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES SUFFICIENT TO PURCHASE THE BASIC NEW HOUSE

Table 2 presents for each standard metropolitan statistical area covered, estimates of the percent of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to purchase the basic house described previously, under financing assumed at the indicated interest rates and amortization periods. Separate estimates are also presented assuming housing expense as a percent of income based upon FHA experience as described previously, and at a uniform 20 percent.

The estimates were derived for each area by computing the percent of families from the census data on income (appendix table 2) whose incomes would have been equal to or in excess of the income needed to purchase the basic house under the assumed financing terms and ratios of housing expense to income, as summarized in table 1. Where the income needed for purchase fell within a census income class, the division was estimated by assuming that the number of families in the census income class was evenly distributed within that income class.

The figures in table 2 show, for example, that in the Boston standard metropolitan statistical area in 1959, 37.8 percent of the families had incomes sufficient to purchase the basic house, assuming 100 percent financing at 5¼ percent, a 30-year mortgage, and the average FHA ratio of housing expense to income as previously described. At the other extreme of the terms presented, the comparable figure for the same area would be 61.7 percent of the families, assuming interest rates of 2 percent and a 40-year mortgage. If a housing expense-to-income ratio of 20 percent was assumed, the comparable percentages would be 33.8 and 57.6.

There are several qualifications to these figures which should be noted. One is that the census income figures, as stated previously, are underreported, and to the extent that they are underreported, the percentages of families with sufficient incomes to purchase the basic house would be understated.

A second qualification is that, as stated previously, there actually is a wide range of income above and below the computed average income among the purchasers of a house of a given value.

A third qualification is that the figures do not specifically measure housing market potential, since many of the families which have sufficient incomes to purchase may not be in the market if they are presently adequately housed, and many who seek new quarters may desire rental rather than sales units.

CENSUS DATA ON NEW UNITS CONSTRUCTED, 1950–59

The data in table 3 are presented for informational purposes, since they shed some light on the range of market values of new units added to the housing supply through new construction during the period 1950–59.

These figures show the market values reported as of December 1959, for owner-occupied one-family nonfarm units constructed during 1950–59. While these figures do not reflect market values as of the time the new units were initially sold, nevertheless, they provide some general guides on the market value classes in which new housing was concentrated as a result of market influences upon new housing production and subsequent value changes during the decade.

These statistics are taken from the Census of Housing, 1960, Components of Inventory Change. Separate data are to be published for 18 standard metropolitan statistical areas, among which are the three areas covered in this report. Data for these three areas are presented in table 3, which shows, for the one-family nonfarm homes which were constructed during 1950 to 1959 and were owner-occupied in December 1959, the market value at the end of the decade, as reported by the homeowner.

ADDITIONAL DATA ON FHA-INSURED HOME LOANS

Appendix tables 3 to 6 present additional information on FHA-insured mortgages on new one-family homes for each of the areas covered. These data are useful in indicating the income and property value classes served under FHA section 203 mortgage insuring operations.

Appendix table 3 shows the percentage distribution by family current income of purchasers of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in 1959. It will be noted that the class intervals for which these 1959 data are available differ markedly for those of the census. Since the class intervals for the 1960 FHA data are more nearly comparable with those of the census, we have also provided the FHA income data for 1960 in appendix table 4. It will be noted that the FHA income data in these tables are for family current income which is more nearly comparable to the census definition of family income. FHA uses effective income for processing loan applications for insurance. Here again we should caution, as we have previously, that the census figures understate family incomes.

Appendix tables 5 and 6 present percentage distributions by property value of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in 1959 and 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated annual incomes needed in selected SMSA's by purchasers of the basic 1-family house, assuming financing terms and housing expense ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING FHA SEC. 203 AVERAGE RATIOS OF HOUSING EXPENSE TO INCOME FOR INCOME GROUPS WHO PURCHASED HOMES OF THE COST SPECIFIED [1]

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	$7,802	$7,539	$7,358	$7,183	$6,895	$6,690	$6,721	$6,417	$6,194	$6,291	$5,979	$5,741
Newark, N.J	7,847	7,584	7,402	7,227	6,939	6,734	6,765	6,461	6,238	6,336	6,023	5,785
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	7,349	7,097	6,923	6,756	6,481	6,285	6,314	6,024	5,811	5,904	5,604	5,377
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	7,083	6,831	6,657	6,490	6,215	6,019	6,048	5,758	5,545	5,638	5,339	5,111
Topeka, Kans	6,591	6,364	6,208	6,056	5,808	5,631	5,658	5,394	5,202	5,287	5,016	4,810
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	5,229	5,032	4,896	4,764	5,449	4,394	4,418	4,190	4,022	4,096	3,861	3,682
Houston, Tex	5,304	5,117	4,988	4,863	4,658	4,512	4,534	4,318	4,159	4,229	4,006	3,837
Mobile, Ala	5,408	5,200	5,057	4,919	4,691	4,529	4,554	4,314	4,138	4,214	3,968	3,779
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	5,818	5,631	5,502	5,377	5,172	5,027	5,049	4,832	4,675	4,743	4,521	4,351
Portland, Oreg	6,610	6,402	6,258	6,121	5,893	5,731	5,756	5,515	5,339	5,416	5,169	4,981
ASSUMING HOUSING EXPENSE EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME												
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	$8,231	$7,954	$7,763	$7,578	$7,274	$7,058	$7,091	$6,770	$6,535	$6,637	$6,308	$6,056
Newark, N.J	8,278	8,001	7,810	7,625	7,321	7,105	7,138	6,817	6,581	6,684	6,355	6,103
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	7,826	7,558	7,373	7,195	6,902	6,693	6,725	6,415	6,188	6,287	5,969	5,726
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	7,543	7,275	7,090	6,912	6,619	6,410	6,442	6,132	5,905	6,004	5,686	5,443
Topeka, Kans	7,217	6,959	6,797	6,632	6,359	6,166	6,195	5,907	5,696	5,789	5,493	5,267
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	5,831	5,611	5,459	5,312	5,072	4,900	4,926	4,672	4,485	4,567	4,305	4,106
Houston, Tex	5,966	5,756	5,611	5,471	5,840	5,077	5,101	4,858	4,679	4,757	4,507	4,316
Mobile, Ala	5,976	5,746	5,558	5,435	5,184	5,005	5,032	4,766	4,572	4,657	4,384	4,176
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	6,545	6,335	6,190	6,049	5,819	5,655	5,680	5,436	5,258	5,336	5,086	4,895
Portland, Oreg	7,304	7,074	6,916	6,763	6,512	6,332	6,360	6,094	5,900	5,984	5,712	5,504

[1] The ratio used in each area was derived by estimating, on the basis of FHA sec. 203 mortgages on new homes insured by FHA in 1961 in the United States, the ratio for those income groups who purchased new homes averaging the replacement cost specified (see appendix tables 1-A to 1-J) for that area.

NOTE.—For details on how these figures were derived, refer to appendix tables 1-A to 1-J.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated percentage of families in selected SMSA's whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to purchase the basic 1-family house, assuming financing terms and housing expense-to-income ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING FHA SEC. 203 AVERAGE RATIOS OF HOUSING EXPENSE TO INCOME FOR INCOME GROUPS WHO PURCHASED HOMES OF THE COST SPECIFIED [1]

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	37.8	40.5	42.4	44.3	47.5	49.9	49.6	53.2	55.9	54.7	58.5	61.7
Newark, N.J	43.2	45.7	47.5	49.2	52.1	54.4	54.1	57.2	60.0	58.9	62.4	65.2
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	41.7	44.3	46.3	48.2	51.5	53.8	53.5	57.0	59.6	58.4	62.1	65.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	46.7	50.1	52.5	54.9	58.7	61.5	61.1	65.0	68.0	66.7	70.7	73.8
Topeka, Kans	41.8	44.6	46.5	48.3	51.7	54.2	53.8	57.5	60.2	59.0	62.8	65.3
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	55.9	58.1	59.6	61.0	63.2	64.9	64.6	67.0	68.8	68.0	73.3	78.8
Houston, Tex	58.5	60.6	62.1	63.4	65.6	67.1	66.9	69.1	70.8	70.1	72.4	77.0
Mobile, Ala	46.5	49.1	51.0	52.6	55.4	57.3	57.0	60.0	62.0	61.1	64.8	71.7
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	51.0	53.2	54.7	56.3	58.7	60.5	60.2	62.7	64.4	63.6	66.1	68.0
Portland, Oreg	46.5	49.2	51.0	52.8	55.8	58.0	57.7	61.0	63.3	62.2	65.6	68.1
ASSUMING HOUSING EXPENSE EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME												
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	33.8	36.2	38.2	40.2	43.4	45.6	45.3	49.0	51.8	50.6	54.5	57.6
Newark, N.J	39.3	41.6	43.5	45.3	48.3	50.4	50.1	53.5	56.1	55.0	58.7	61.5
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	36.8	39.6	41.5	43.3	46.5	49.0	48.6	52.3	55.0	53.8	57.6	60.6
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	41.2	44.4	46.7	49.0	53.1	56.0	55.5	60.0	63.0	61.7	66.0	69.3
Topeka, Kans	34.7	37.4	39.3	41.3	44.6	47.0	46.6	50.3	53.3	52.0	56.1	59.3
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	49.2	51.6	53.3	55.0	57.7	59.5	59.3	62.0	63.9	63.0	65.8	68.0
Houston, Tex	50.8	53.2	55.0	56.5	59.2	61.1	60.8	63.5	65.3	64.5	67.2	69.2
Mobile, Ala	39.4	42.3	44.6	46.2	49.3	51.6	51.3	54.5	56.8	55.8	59.1	61.6
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	43.7	45.0	46.6	48.2	51.0	53.0	52.6	55.5	57.7	56.8	59.8	62.0
Portland, Oreg	38.2	40.7	42.5	44.5	47.8	50.1	49.7	53.2	55.7	54.6	58.2	61.1

[1] The ratio used in each area was derived by estimating, on the basis of the FHA sec. 203 mortgages on new homes insured by FHA in 1961 in the United States, the ratio for those income groups who purchased new homes averaging the replacement cost specified (see appendix tables 1-A to 1-J) for that area.

TABLE 3.—*Market value in December 1959 of owner-occupied 1-family nonfarm homes which were constructed during 1950–59, for designated standard metropolitan statistical areas*

Total and value [1]	Boston, Mass.	Atlanta, Ga.	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.
Total number of homes	75,660	79,307	91,556
Percent of total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Value of home:			
Less than $5,000	----------	1.6	.3
$5,000 to $7,400	----------	3.4	----------
$7,500 to $9,900	.7	6.1	----------
$10,000 to $12,400	3.8	19.5	7.2
$12,500 to $14,900	17.1	18.6	25.3
$15,000 to $17,400	22.7	16.3	29.5
$17,500 to $19,900	14.7	10.4	14.6
$20,000 to $24,900	20.8	11.9	14.7
$25,000 to $34,900	9.7	8.5	6.7
$35,000 or more	10.6	3.5	1.6
Median value	$18,500	$15,100	$16,500

[1] Market value as reported by the homeowner.

NOTE.—Percentages may not add to 100 precisely due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, HC(4)—pt. 1A.

FACTUAL DATA ON RENTAL-TYPE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

The factual data requested for rental-type housing are presented herein for 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas of varying size and geographic distribution. These are the same 10 areas for which sales housing data were submitted in our previous correspondence.

The estimates of families who could afford the rent for the basic rental unit, as presented herein, were based upon the assumption of a middle income rental housing program. The estimates of families who could afford to purchase the basic sales unit, as submitted in our previous correspondence, were based upon the assumption of a middle income sales housing program. If it is assumed, however, that both a rental housing program and a sales housing program were to be adopted, the estimates for the rental program could not, of course, be added to the estimates for the sales program. For a combined rental and sales program, the percentage of families who could afford either to purchase the basic sales unit or rent the basic rental unit would tend to approximate the higher of the estimates for either the rental or sales housing programs. It should also be noted that substantial variation among cities can be expected in the extent to which sales or rental housing would be used, since local preferences for sales versus rental housing vary considerably.

FHA RENTAL DATA

Appendix tables 7–A to 7–J, comprising a similar table for each of the above standard metropolitan statistical areas, present estimated monthly rental data. Separate estimates are presented, assuming financing available at interest rates of 5¼ percent, 4 percent, 3⅛ percent, and 2 percent, and for an amortization period of 40 years.

Before considering the specific figures presented in these appendix tables, it is necessary to explain how the figures were estimated and what qualifications should be placed upon their use. It was necessary to rely upon estimates rather than actual section 221(d)(3) projects since there is little specific experience available at this time with completed projects under this section. The explanations which follow are keyed into each of the lines shown on appendix tables 7-A to 7-J.

(*a*) Estimated cost per room (including land):

The figures on construction costs per room, including land, presented in these tables are estimates for constructing a comparable two-bedroom rental unit in a walkup-type structure. The estimates were used to help establish maximum income limits for various areas under FHA section 221(d)(3).

Each FHA insuring office prepared estimates, based upon local costs, of the cost of construction, including land, of the basic unit or a basically comparable unit where some minor variations were necessary to conform to local practices.

The rental for each unit was then estimated, in Washington headquarters, on the basis of standard assumptions as to operating expenses, debt service, taxes, etc. Also, the estimated income, for three- or four-person occupancy, needed to pay this rental was estimated on the basis that the rent would be 20 percent of income. For a locality where the income so estimated was less than the median income reported by the Bureau of the Census (after adjustment by FHA for underreporting), the maximum permissible mortgage was authorized for the construction cost amount estimated. However, for a locality where the estimated income was higher than the adjusted median income of the Bureau of the Census, the maximum permissible mortgage was reduced proportionally and the construction cost also was reduced accordingly. As a result of this type of change, the construction cost was reduced for 6 of the 10 areas, but the amount of reduction was only $50 to $150, and in one case $250 per room.

Thus, the construction costs estimates presented in these tables are primarily for the same basic unit, with exceptions mostly of a minor nature. These construction cost estimates have the unique advantage, therefore, of showing comparative costs, including land, of a comparable rental unit in each of the 10 selected areas. While there is no firm basis for predicting what, if any, economies below these costs might be attained locally, experience, with actual construction under section 221(d)(3) might well demonstrate within the next few years that lower costs than those estimated herein are feasible. To the extent that lower costs are achieved, attainable rentals will be proportionately lower than those in the attached estimates.

The estimated construction costs, including land, for the basically comparable rental unit varied among the 10 areas covered as follows:

	Estimated construction costs	
	Per room	Per unit [1]
Northeast:		
Boston, Mass	$2,400	$13,800
Newark, N.J	2,600	14,950
North Central:		
Indianapolis, Ind	2,400	13,800
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	2,500	14,375
Topeka, Kans	2,400	13,800
South:		
Atlanta, Ga	2,050	11,788
Houston, Tex	2,050	11,788
Mobile, Ala	2,100	12,075
West:		
Phoenix, Ariz	2,150	12,363
Portland, Oreg	2,500	14,375

[1] Assuming 5.75 rooms for a typical 2-bedroom apartment by FHA room count, consisting of living room, dining room (or equivalent), kitchen, 2 bedrooms, 1 bathroom, and foyer or porch.

(b) Mortgage amount per room: The mortgage amounts presented, which are the same as the estimated costs described above, are the maximum permissible amounts for the basic unit, assuming the mortgagor is an eligible public body or agency, a cooperative, or a private nonprofit corporation or association. For other types of mortgagors, the maximum mortgage amounts would be 90 percent of the construction costs indicated.

(c) Interest and principal per month per room: Represents the level monthly payment of interest plus principal for a 40-year repayment period, at the interest rate and for the mortgage amount stated.

(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium per month per room: The FHA mortgage insurance premium is omitted, in keeping with FHA established policy for section 221(d)(3) projects.

(e), (f), and (h) Real estate taxes, hazard insurance, and replacement reserves per month per room.

The locality estimates for real estate taxes, hazard insurance premiums, other operating expenses, and replacement reserves, are each based upon actual expenses reported for section 207 projects built in the respective localities in the mid-1950's. Since there is no standardization of these projects and no ascertainable relative relationship of these projects to the section 221(d)(3) standard project assumed, the individual expense estimates might be biased in the direction of being excessive. Some restraint on this bias has been exercised by the arbitrary exclusion of projects with typically high rentals, or of reports with individual charges which differed sharply from other reporting local projects.

The estimated real estate taxes for section 207 projects in an area, derived as explained above, were expressed as a percentage of the replacement cost and this percentage was applied to the replacement cost for the basic unit for that locality. A similar procedure was used to estimate hazard insurance premiums and replacement reserves.

(g) Other operating expenses per month per room: Average per unit other operating expenses were estimated for each locality as explained in the first paragraph of the above section, and then adjusted to a per room basis, assuming 5.75 rooms per unit.

(i) Vacancy allowance per month per room: Calculated at 7 percent of total monthly rent, which is typically used in FHA processing of section 221(d)(3) proposals. Occasionally a smaller vacancy allowance might be justified.

(j) Total monthly rent per room: Represents the sum of lines (c) through (i). These estimates do not include tenant's electricity or telephone, and, in some cases, cooking gas.

(k) Estimated monthly rent per unit: Represents item in line (j) multiplied by 5.75, on the assumption that a typical two-bedroom apartment contains 5.75 rooms by FHA room count. This consists of a living room, dining room (or equivalent), kitchen, two bedrooms, one bathroom, and foyer or porch.

(l) FHA maximum income limits under section 221(d)(3) for families of three and four persons: The FHA maximum income limit for a locality was determined as explained in (a) above, under the caption "Estimated Cost Per Room, Including Land."

(m) Estimated median family income: Estimates for each locality are based upon census data, adjusted by FHA for estimated underreporting of income.

(n) Estimated income required to pay the two-bedroom monthly rent:

Estimates for each locality are based upon the assumption of the 20-percent rent-income ratio for the rental shown for the typical two-bedroom unit.

It will be noted that the FHA maximum income limits under section 221(d)(3) for families of three or four persons (line l) often differ from the estimated median income (line m) and the income required to pay the two-bedroom rent (line n) where 3⅛-percent financing is assumed. The reasons for these differences are:

(aa) The FHA maximum income limits were based upon a ratio of five times rent, wherein part of the rent was estimated by using standard or uniform assumptions as to real estate taxes, operating costs, hazard insurance and replacement reserves. In preparing the rent estimates contained herein, these individual expenses were estimated on the basis of reports of section 207 operating projects in the particular area, as was explained under the section headed "(c), (f) and (h)," and section (g) above. The principal differences occurred in the estimates for real estate taxes, other operating costs, and the ratio of operating costs to rent.

To the extent that the estimates of rent differ, the FHA maximum income (line l) would differ from the "Income required to pay two-bedroom monthly rent" (line n), since both estimates of income assume 20 percent of income for rent.

(bb) The upper limit on the FHA maximum income for an area (line l) is the Bureau of the Census median income, after adjustment by FHA for underreporting, for that area. In other words, in those areas where the FHA estimate of income needed to pay the rent for the basic unit under section 221(d)(3) was greater than the census adjusted median income, the census adjusted median income was adopted as the FHA maximum income, and the permissible construction cost and mortgage amount was reduced accordingly. Thus, in these areas, the FHA maximum income (line l) would be the same as "Estimated median family income (line m), but might be either greater or less than the "Income required to pay two-bedroom monthly rent" (line n), since the latter is computed independently on the basis of the rental estimates described above.

(cc) The FHA maximum-income limit for an area (line l) is often less than the census adjusted median income for that area. Since the income necessary to pay the rent, on a five-times-rent basis, often was less than the census adjusted median income, no public purposes would be served in such areas by permitting families with higher incomes—that is, as high as the census adjusted median income—to occupy the rental units under the program.

Summary figures for each of the 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas are presented in table 4, which shows the FHA maximum income limits under section 221(d)(3) for families of three or four persons and the estimated annual incomes required to pay the two-bedroom rent. These figures are taken from lines (l) and (n) of appendix tables 7–A to 7–J.

CENSUS DATA ON FAMILY INCOME

Appendix table 2 presents, for each of the standard metropolitan statistical areas covered, family income figures for 1959 taken from the 1960 census. Unrelated individuals occupying dwelling units are excluded from these figures.

There evidently is some underreporting of family income in these census figures. The following explanation by the Bureau of the Census is quoted in support of this point:

"The schedule entries for income are frequently based not on records but on memory, and this factor probably produced underestimates, because the tendency is to forget minor or irregular sources of income. Other errors of reporting are due to misunderstanding of the income questions or to misrepresentation.

"A possible source of understatement in the income figures was the assumption in the editing process that no income other than earnings was received by a person who reported the receipt of either wage or salary income or self-employment income but failed to report on the receipt of other money income. This procedure was adopted in order to make better use of the information obtained.

"The income tables for families and unrelated individuals include in the lowest income group (under $1,000) those that were classified as having no 1959 income, as defined in the census. Many of these were living on income "in kind," savings, or gifts, or were newly created families or unrelated individuals, or were families in which the sole breadwinner had recently died or left the household. However, many of the families and unrelated individuals who reported no income probably had some money income which was not recorded in the census. (Source: P. XXV, U.S. Census of Population, District of Columbia, PC(1) 10C. A similar explanation will appear in each of the other census publications in this series.)"

The figures presented in appendix table 2 are those as reported in the 1960 census, and are therefore not adjusted for underreporting.

PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES SUFFICIENT TO RENT THE BASIC UNIT

Table 5 presents for each standard metropolitan statistical area covered, estimates of the percentage of families whose annual incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the rent for the basic unit described previously. Separate estimates are presented assuming FHA maximum annual income limits under FHA section 221(d)(3) for families of three or four persons, and also assuming annual income limits based upon rent equal to 20 percent of income wherein the computed rent reflects payment of interest and principal on a 40-year mortgage at interest rates of 5¼, 4, 3⅛, 3, and 2 percent.

The estimates were derived for each area by computing the percent of families from the census data on incomes (appendix table 2) whose incomes would have been equal to or in excess of (a) the FHA maximum income under section 221(d)(3) as presented in the top part of the table, and (b) the income needed to pay the rent for the basic unit under the assumed financing terms and a 20-percent, rent-to-income ratio as presented in the lower part of the table. In preparing these estimates, when the income needed to pay the rent fell within a census income class, the division was estimated by assuming that the number of families in the census income class was evenly distributed within that income class.

There are several qualifications to those figures which should be noted. One is that the census income figures, as stated previously, are underreported, and to the extent that they are underreported, the percentages of families with sufficient incomes to pay the rent for the basic unit would be understated.

A second qualification is that in contrast to a uniform 20-percent, rent-to-income ratio, census figures relating rent to income show a wide range in the ratios of rent-to-income among, as well as within, income groups.

A third qualification is that the figures do not specifically measure housing market potential, since many of the families who have sufficient incomes to pay the rent required for the basic unit may not be in the market if they are presently adequately housed, and many who seek new quarters may desire to purchase sales units rather than rent.

CENSUS DATA ON NEW RENTAL UNITS CONSTRUCTED, 1950–59

The data in table 6 are presented for informational purposes since they shed some light on the range of gross monthly rentals for new rental units added to the housing supply through new construction during the period 1950–59.

These figures show the gross monthly rent as of December 1959, for renter-occupied nonfarm units constructed during 1950–59. While these figures do not reflect gross rents as of the time the new rental rents were initially rented, nevertheless, they provide some general guides on the gross monthly rental classes in which new building was concentrated as a result of market and other influences upon new housing production and subsequent rental changes during the decade.

These statistics are taken from the Census of Housing, 1960, Components of Inventory Change. Separate data are to be published for 18 standard metropolitan statistical areas, among which are three areas covered in this report. Data for these three areas are presented in table 6.

Gross monthly rent is defined by census to include the cost of utilities—water, electricity, and gas—and fuels, such as wood, coal and oil. Low-rent public housing units constructed during 1950–59 are included in the lower end of the gross monthly rental distribution, but are not identified as such in these figures of the Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 4.—*Estimated annual incomes needed in selected SMSA's by renters of a basic walkup type of rental unit, assuming 100-percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and rent-to-income ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING RENT EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass	--------	--------	7,000	--------	--------
Newark, N.J	--------	--------	7,550	--------	--------
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	--------	6,900	--------	--------
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	--------	7,300	--------	--------
Topeka, Kans	--------	--------	6,900	--------	--------
South:					
Atlanta, Ga	--------	--------	6,000	--------	--------
Houston, Tex	--------	--------	5,900	--------	--------
Mobile, Ala	--------	--------	6,050	--------	--------
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	--------	6,300	--------	--------
Portland, Oreg	--------	--------	7,300	--------	--------

ASSUMING FHA MAXIMUM INCOME LIMITS UNDER SEC. 221(d)(3) FOR FAMILIES OF 3 OR 4 PERSONS[1]

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass	8,056	7,335	6,869	6,800	6,310
Newark, N.J	9,215	8,435	7,935	7,856	7,328
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind	7,915	7,190	6,724	6,655	6,165
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	9,477	8,725	8,242	8,170	7,659
Topeka, Kans	8,273	7,549	7,087	7,014	6,524
South:					
Atlanta, Ga	6,082	5,468	5,072	5,013	4,592
Houston, Tex	6,541	5,924	5,527	5,468	5,047
Mobile, Ala	6,127	5,500	5,092	5,030	4,599
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz	7,945	7,300	6,886	6,821	6,379
Portland, Oreg	7,949	7,197	6,714	6,641	6,131

[1] Data are not available on rent-to-income ratios for FHA multifamily rental housing programs other than sec. 221(d)(3).

Source: Appendix tables 7–A to 7–J. These appendix tables also present data on the construction cost, mortgage amount, estimated monthly rental, and a description of the basic rental unit.

TABLE 5.—*Estimated percentage of families in selected SMSA's whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the rent for the basic walkup type of rental unit, assuming 100-percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and rent-to-income ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING FHA MAXIMUM INCOME LIMITS UNDER SEC. 221(d)(3) FOR FAMILIES OF 3 OR 4 PERSONS

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass	--------	--------	46.2	--------	--------
Newark, N.J	--------	--------	46.1	--------	--------
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	--------	46.5	--------	--------
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	--------	44.2	--------	--------
Topeka, Kans	--------	--------	38.1	--------	--------
South:					
Atlanta, Ga	--------	--------	47.3	--------	--------
Houston, Tex	--------	--------	51.6	--------	--------
Mobile, Ala	--------	--------	38.6	--------	--------
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	--------	45.4	--------	--------
Portland, Oreg	--------	--------	38.2	--------	--------

ASSUMING RENT EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass	35.3	42.7	47.8	48.6	54.5
Newark, N.J	31.8	38.0	42.3	43.1	48.2
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind	35.9	43.4	48.6	49.4	55.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	23.3	29.0	33.5	34.2	39.8
Topeka, Kans	25.1	31.6	36.1	36.8	42.7
South:					
Atlanta, Ga	46.5	53.2	57.7	58.3	62.8
Houston, Tex	44.5	51.3	55.9	56.6	61.4
Mobile, Ala	37.8	45.4	50.5	51.3	56.5
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz	28.8	34.7	38.8	39.5	44.5
Portland, Oreg	31.2	39.3	45.2	46.1	52.7

Source: Derived by computing the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 (appendix table 2) equaled or exceeded the incomes required to pay the rent for the basic rental unit (table 4).

TABLE 6.—*Gross monthly rent in December 1959 of the renter-occupied nonfarm units which were constructed during 1950–59, for designated standard metropolitan statistical areas*

Gross monthly rent [1]	Boston, Mass.	Atlanta, Ga.	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.
Total number of units reporting	17,230	30,562	19,157
Percent of total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Gross monthly rent:			
Less than $40	3.6	12.7	2.4
$40 to $59	29.6	20.9	1.4
$60 to $79	25.5	35.1	6.0
$80 to $99	19.9	15.8	8.9
$100 to $119	6.0	6.9	44.4
$120 to $149	8.0	5.7	21.1
$150 to $199	3.4	2.3	9.1
$200 or more	4.2	.6	6.8
Median gross rent	$73	$69	$114
Median contract rent [2]	$67	$61	$107

[1] Gross rent includes cost of utilities—water, electricity or gas, and fuels such as wood, coal, and oil. Low-rent public housing units constructed during 1950 to 1959 are included in the lower end of the gross monthly rental distribution, but are not identified as such in these figures of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Contract rent is the monthly rent agreed upon regardless of any furnishings, utilities, or services that may be included.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, HC(4)—pt. 1A.

INDEX OF APPENDIX TABLES

Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic one-family owner-occupied new home:

Appendix table 1–A: Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–B: Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–C: Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–D: Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–E: Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–F: Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–G: Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–H: Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–I: Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–J: Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 2: Family income distribution of families in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959.

Appendix table 3: Percentage distribution by family current annual income of purchasers of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959.

Appendix table 4: Percentage distribution by family current annual income of purchasers of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1960.

Appendix table 5: Percentage distribution by property value of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1959.

Appendix table 6: Percentage distribution by property value of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1960.

Estimated monthly rent assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit:

Appendix table 7–A: Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–B: Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–C: Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–D: Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–E: Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–F: Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–G: Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–H: Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–I: Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–J: Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area.

APPENDIX TABLE 1–A.—*Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 yea-s	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$80.19	$75.55	$72.36	$69.31	$64.24	$60.61	$61.19	$55.83	$51.91	$53.65	$48.14	$43.94
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	6.00	6.02	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Real estate taxes [5]	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27
Other housing expense [6]	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73
Total monthly housing expense	137.19	132.57	129.38	126.30	121.24	117.63	118.18	112.83	108.91	110.62	105.13	100.94
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.1 [7]	$7,802	$7,539	$7,358	$7,183	$6,895	$6,690	$6,721	$6,417	$6,194	$6,291	$5,979	$5,741
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	8,231	7,954	7,763	7,578	7,274	7,058	7,091	6,770	6,535	6,637	6,308	6,056

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

Appendix Table 1–B.—*Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$80.19	$75.55	$72.36	$69.31	$64.24	$60.61	$61.19	$55.83	$51.91	$53.65	$48.14	$43.94
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	6.00	6.02	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.00	5.97	5.99	6.00
Real estate taxes [5]	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31
Other housing expense [6]	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47
Total monthly housing expense	137.97	133.35	130.16	127.08	122.02	118.41	118.96	113.61	109.69	111.40	105.91	101.72
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.1 [7]	$7,847	$7,584	$7,402	$7,227	$6,939	$6,734	$6,765	$6,461	$6,238	$6,336	$6,023	$5,785
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	8,278	8,001	7,810	7,625	7,321	7,105	7,138	6,817	6,581	6,684	6,355	6,103

Note.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

Appendix Table 1–C.—*Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$77.42	$72.94	$69.86	$66.32	$62.02	$58.52	$59.08	$53.90	$50.12	$51.80	$46.48	$42.42
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	5.80	5.81	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.80	5.77	5.78	5.80
Real estate taxes [5]	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67
Other housing expense [6]	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55
Total monthly housing expense	130.44	125.97	122.89	119.92	115.04	111.55	112.08	106.92	103.14	104.79	99.48	95.44
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.3 [7]	$7,349	$7,097	$6,923	$6,756	$6,481	$6,285	$6,314	$6,024	$5,811	$5,904	$5,604	$5,377
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,826	7,558	7,373	7,195	6,902	6,693	6,725	6,415	6,188	6,287	5,969	5,726

Note.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

Appendix Table 1–D.—*Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$77.42	$72.94	$69.86	$66.92	$62.02	$58.52	$59.08	$53.90	$50.12	$51.80	$46.48	$42.42
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	5.80	5.81	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.80	5.77	5.78	5.80
Real estate taxes [5]	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01
Other housing expense [6]	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49
Total monthly housing expense	125.72	121.25	118.17	115.20	110.32	106.83	107.36	102.20	98.42	100.07	94.76	90.72
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.3 [7]	$7,083	$6,831	$6,657	$6,490	$6,215	$6,019	$6,048	$5,758	$5,545	$5,638	$5,339	$5,111
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,548	7,275	7,090	6,912	6,619	6,410	6,442	6,132	5,905	6,004	5,686	5,443

Note.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

Appendix Table 1–E.—*Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$71.89	$67.73	$64.87	$62.14	$57.59	$54.34	$54.86	$50.05	$46.54	$48.10	$43.16	$39.39
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	5.38	5.40	5.40	5.37	5.38	5.40	5.37	5.38	5.38	5.36	5.37	5.38
Real estate taxes [5]	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37
Other housing expense [6]	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65
Total monthly housing expense	120.29	118.15	113.29	110.53	105.99	102.76	103.25	98.45	94.94	96.48	91.55	87.79
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.9 [7]	$6,591	$6,364	$6,208	$6,056	$5,808	$5,631	$5,658	$5,394	$5,202	$5,287	$5,016	$4,810
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,217	6,969	6,797	6,632	6,359	6,186	6,195	5,907	5,696	5,789	5,493	5,267

Note.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1–F.—*Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$63.60	$59.92	$57.39	$54.97	$50.95	$48.07	$48.53	$44.28	$41.17	$42.55	$38.18	$34.85
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.78	4.77	4.77	4.76	4.76	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.76	4.74	4.75	4.76
Real estate taxes [5]	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60
Other housing expense [6]	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22
Total monthly housing expense	97.18	93.51	90.98	88.54	84.53	81.66	82.10	77.86	74.75	76.11	71.75	68.43
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.3 [7]	$5,229	$5,032	$4,896	$4,764	$4,549	$4,394	$4,418	$4,190	$4,022	$4,096	$3,861	$3,682
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	5,831	5,611	5,459	5,312	5,072	4,900	4,926	4,672	4,485	4,567	4,305	4,106

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1–G.—*Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$60.83	$57.31	$54.89	$52.58	$48.73	$45.98	$46.42	$42.35	$39.38	$40.70	$36.52	$33.33
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.55	4.57	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.55	4.53	4.54	4.55
Real estate taxes [5]	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77
Other housing expense [6]	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29
Total monthly housing expense	99.44	95.94	93.52	91.18	87.34	84.61	85.02	80.96	77.99	79.29	75.12	71.94
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.5 [7]	$5,304	$5,117	$4,988	$4,863	$4,658	$4,512	$4,534	$4,318	$4,159	$4,229	$4,006	$3,837
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	5,966	5,756	5,611	5,471	5,240	5,077	5,101	4,858	4,679	4,757	4,507	4,316

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1–H.—*Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family, owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$66.36	$62.52	$59.88	$57.36	$53.16	$50.16	$50.64	$46.20	$42.96	$44.40	$39.84	$36.36
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.97	4.98	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.97	4.94	4.96	4.97
Real estate taxes [5]	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94
Other housing expense [6]	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33
Total monthly housing expense	99.60	95.77	93.13	90.59	86.40	83.41	83.87	79.44	76.20	77.61	73.07	69.60
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.1 [7]	$5,408	$5,200	$5,057	$4,919	$4,691	$4,529	$4,554	$4,314	$4,138	$4,214	$3,968	$3,779
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	5,976	5,746	5,588	5,435	5,184	5,005	5,032	4,766	4,572	4,657	4,384	4,176

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1–I.—*Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$60.83	$57.31	$54.89	$52.58	$48.73	$45.98	$46.42	$42.35	$39.38	$40.70	$36.52	$33.33
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.55	4.57	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.55	4.53	4.54	4.55
Real estate taxes [5]	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15
Other housing expense [6]	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55
Total monthly housing expense	109.08	105.58	103.16	100.82	96.98	94.25	94.66	90.60	87.63	88.93	84.76	81.58
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.5 [7]	$5,818	$5,631	$5,502	$5,377	$5,172	$5,027	$5,049	$4,832	$4,674	$4,743	$4,521	$4,351
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	6,545	6,335	6,190	6,049	5,819	5,655	5,680	5,436	5,258	5,336	5,086	4,895

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-J.—*Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home*[1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land).[1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$66.36	$62.52	$59.88	$57.36	$53.16	$50.16	$50.64	$46.20	$42.96	$44.40	$39.84	$36.36
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.97	4.98	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.97	4.94	4.96	4.97
Real estate taxes [5]	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45
Other housing expense [6]	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95
Total monthly housing expense	121.73	117.90	115.26	112.72	108.53	105.54	106.00	101.57	98.33	99.74	95.20	91.73
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.1 [7]	$6,610	$6,402	$6,258	$6,121	$5,893	$5,731	$5,756	$5,515	$5,339	$5,416	$5,169	$4,981
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,304	7,074	6,916	6,763	6,512	6,332	6,360	6,094	5,900	5,984	5,712	5,504

[1] The basic house of 3 bedrooms was used in establishing the maximum mortgage ceiling needed for various areas under FHA sec. 221(d)(2). Each FHA insuring office prepared estimates, based upon local costs, of the cost of construction, including land, of this house, or of a basically comparable house where some minor variations were necessary in order to conform to local practices.

[2] This is the computed maximum mortgage amount which would be permissible under sec. 221(d)(2).

[3] This monthly amount would remain constant throughout the life of the mortgage.

[4] This monthly amount would decline slightly each year the outstanding balance of the mortgage is reduced.

[5] Represents 1/12 of the estimated real estate taxes.

[6] Includes the following estimated monthly amounts:

	Other housing expense	For maintenance and repair	For heating and utilities [a]	Miscellaneous expenses [b]
Atlanta, Ga	$20.22	$5.92	$11.20	$3.11
Boston, Mass	24.73	5.05	15.70	3.99
Houston, Tex	22.29	7.21	11.57	3.51
Indianapolis, Ind	36.55	8.28	24.13	4.13
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	25.49	3.70	17.72	4.06
Mobile, Ala	23.33	6.30	13.62	3.42
Newark, N.J	27.47	5.59	19.31	2.57
Phoenix, Ariz	23.55	6.82	13.88	2.86
Portland, Oreg	31.95	7.44	21.59	2.92
Topeka, Kans	26.65	6.84	14.22	5.59

[a] Excluding telephones.

[b] Mainly hazard insurance premiums.

[7] The number of sec. 221 cases were too few to compute a meaningful average, consequently the ratio used was based upon all sec. 203 mortgages on new 1-family homes insured in the United States in 1961. In computing this ratio, total current income, rather than total effective income, was used.

APPENDIX TABLE 2.—*Family income distribution of families in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959*

NUMBER OF FAMILIES

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Family incomes [1] of—										
	Median income	Total	Less than $4,000	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 to $8,999	$9,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass	6,687	640,526	116,418	64,861	86,156	76,842	67,392	53,207	39,380	90,769	45,501
Newark, N.J	7,149	443,681	74,132	39,088	52,493	49,640	43,484	37,135	30,300	74,688	42,721
North Central:											
Indianapolis, Ind	6,609	178,446	36,240	17,911	22,175	21,194	18,449	15,260	11,179	25,432	10,606
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	6,840	364,127	58,046	31,803	49,394	50,981	43,705	33,721	24.461	49,896	22,120
Topeka, Kans	5,931	36,369	9,067	4,366	5,104	4,408	3,539	2,697	1,925	3,858	1,405
South:											
Atlanta, Ga	5,758	255,983	79,302	26,968	28,670	25,555	21,641	17,065	13,313	29,349	14,120
Houston, Tex	6,040	316,194	86,906	33,296	36,490	34,710	29,559	22,580	17,059	37,692	17,902
Mobile, Ala	5,132	73,993	26,837	8,929	9,289	7,650	5,574	4,167	2,898	6,499	2,150
West:											
Phoenix, Ariz	5,896	162,697	45,857	17,810	19,740	18,255	14,975	11,598	8,251	17,560	8,651
Portland, Oreg	6,340	215,196	47,446	21,664	29,046	27,782	23,199	17,672	12,696	25,464	10,227

See footnote at end of table.

APPENDIX TABLE 2.—*Family income distribution of families in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959*—Continued

PERCENT OF TOTAL FAMILIES

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total	Family incomes [1] of— Less than $4,000	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 to $8,999	$9,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass	--------	100	18.1	10.0	13.5	12.0	10.5	8.3	6.1	14.2	7.1
Newark, N.J	--------	100	16.7	8.8	11.8	11.2	9.8	8.4	6.8	16.8	9.7
North Central:											
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	100	20.3	10.0	12.4	11.9	10.3	8.6	6.3	14.3	5.9
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	100	15.9	8.7	13.6	14.0	12.0	9.3	6.7	13.7	6.0
Topeka, Kans	--------	100	24.9	12.0	14.0	12.1	9.7	7.4	5.3	10.6	3.8
South:											
Atlanta, Ga	--------	100	31.0	10.5	11.2	10.0	8.4	6.7	5.2	11.5	5.5
Houston, Tex	--------	100	27.5	10.5	11.5	11.0	9.3	7.1	5.4	12.0	5.6
Mobile, Ala	--------	100	36.3	12.0	12.5	10.3	7.5	5.6	3.9	8.8	3.0
West:											
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	100	28.2	11.0	12.1	11.2	9.2	7.1	5.1	10.8	5.3
Portland, Oreg	--------	100	22.4	10.1	13.5	12.9	10.7	8.2	5.8	11.8	4.6

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total	Less than $4,000	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 to $8,999	$9,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass	--------	--------	18.1	28.1	41.6	53.6	64.1	72.4	78.5	92.7	100
Newark, N.J	--------	--------	16.7	25.5	37.3	48.5	58.3	66.7	73.5	90.3	100
North Central:											
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	--------	20.3	30.3	42.7	54.6	64.9	73.5	79.8	94.1	100
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	--------	15.9	24.6	38.2	52.2	64.2	73.5	80.2	93.9	100
Topeka, Kans	--------	--------	24.9	36.9	50.9	63.0	72.7	80.1	85.4	96.0	100
South:											
Atlanta, Ga	--------	--------	31.0	41.5	52.7	62.7	71.1	77.8	83.0	94.5	100
Houston, Tex	--------	--------	27.5	38.0	49.5	60.5	69.8	76.9	82.3	94.3	100
Mobile, Ala	--------	--------	36.3	48.3	60.8	71.1	78.6	84.2	88.1	96.9	100
West:											
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	--------	28.2	39.2	51.3	62.5	71.7	78.8	83.9	94.7	100
Portland, Oreg	--------	--------	22.4	32.5	46.0	58.9	69.6	77.8	83.6	95.4	100

[1] Incomes of unrelated individuals occupying dwelling units are not included in the figures above.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population and Housing, Series PHC(1), Census Tracts.

APPENDIX TABLE 3.—*Percentage distribution by family current*[1] *annual income of purchasers of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1959*

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total		Family current incomes of—								
		Number	Percent	Less than $3,600	$3,600–$4,799	$4,800–$5,999	$6,000–$7,199	$7,200–$8,399	$8,400–$9,599	$9,600–$11,999	$12,000–$14,399	$14,400 or more
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	$7,933	339	100.0	--------	--------	7.5	25.2	28.3	17.0	14.5	5.6	1.9
Newark, N.J	8,871	143	100.0	--------	--------	5.6	21.2	15.5	19.7	29.6	7.0	1.4
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	7,498	1,454	100.0	0.2	5.2	19.0	21.0	18.6	16.8	13.4	3.0	2.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	6,762	1,679	100.0	.1	4.8	26.9	28.7	18.9	11.0	7.7	1.3	.6
Topeka, Kans	8,143	86	100.0	--------	--------	3.4	27.6	24.2	20.7	20.7	3.4	--------
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	7,616	1,834	100.0	.4	3.6	15.0	23.1	22.9	15.9	13.9	3.3	1.9
Houston, Tex	7,298	2,124	100.0	--------	2.7	19.5	26.0	21.8	13.6	11.2	3.6	1.6
Mobile, Ala	7,844	550	100.0	--------	1.7	11.4	24.5	23.2	17.3	13.9	6.7	1.3
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	8,040	6,050	100.0	.1	2.8	12.1	21.1	19.9	14.7	16.2	7.5	5.6
Portland, Oreg	7,818	874	100.0	--------	2.5	13.7	24.2	18.7	20.1	15.0	3.6	2.2
				Cumulative percentages								
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	7.5	32.7	61.0	78.0	92.5	98.1	100.0
Newark, N.J	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	5.6	26.8	42.3	62.0	91.6	98.6	100.0
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	--------	--------	0.2	5.4	24.4	45.4	64.0	80.8	94.2	97.2	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	--------	--------	.1	4.9	31.8	60.5	79.4	90.4	98.1	99.4	100.0
Topeka, Kans	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.4	31.0	55.2	75.9	96.6	100.0	--------
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	--------	--------	--------	.4	4.0	19.0	42.1	65.0	80.9	94.8	98.1	100.0
Houston, Tex	--------	--------	--------	--------	2.7	22.2	48.2	70.0	83.6	94.8	98.4	100.0
Mobile, Ala	--------	--------	--------	--------	1.7	13.1	37.6	60.8	78.1	92.0	98.7	100.0
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	--------	--------	.1	2.9	15.0	36.1	56.0	70.7	86.9	94.4	100.0
Portland, Oreg	--------	--------	--------	--------	2.5	16.2	40.4	59.1	79.2	94.2	97.8	100.0

[1] Represents the sum of all amounts received by the principal mortgagor or the comortgagor(s) from any source, as reported on the application, adjusted to conform to any available verifications. This includes occupational income and income from commissions, fees, bonuses, business, corporations or partnerships, investments or other supplemental sources. These figures are more nearly comparable to census family income data than are the FHA figures on effective income.

NOTE.—Data for income classes comparable to those for 1960 (app. table 4) are not available for 1959.

Source: FHA Homes, 1959, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 84–M.

APPENDIX TABLE 4.—*Percentage distribution by family current[1] annual income of purchasers of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1960*

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total		Family current incomes of—									
		Number	Percent	Less than $4,000	$4,000-$4,999	$5,000-$5,999	$6,000-$6,999	$7,000-$7,999	$8,000-$8,999	$9,000-$9,999	$10,000-$11,999	$12,000-$14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:													
Boston, Mass	$8,773	247	100.0	--------	0.9	3.6	14.0	21.1	13.4	23.0	13.3	8.3	2.4
Newark, N.J.[2]	--------	58	100.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
North Central:													
Indianapolis, Ind	8,012	1,142	100.0	0.3	4.1	11.6	18.0	15.9	13.5	16.2	12.9	5.9	1.6
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	6,991	1,409	100.0	.1	5.3	21.0	23.8	16.8	13.2	9.8	6.9	2.3	.8
Topeka, Kans	7,698	142	100.0	--------	3.0	11.7	19.6	22.6	17.6	9.9	12.1	3.5	--------
South:													
Atlanta, Ga	7,987	1,523	100.0	.1	3.1	9.7	18.2	19.1	16.2	16.2	12.9	3.7	.8
Houston, Tex	7,751	1,795	100.0	.1	4.8	11.9	19.9	17.8	14.6	12.2	10.7	6.7	1.3
Mobile, Ala	8,157	378	100.0	--------	4.4	11.9	18.2	12.9	16.6	18.6	11.5	4.9	1.0
West:													
Phoenix, Ariz	8,456	6,164	100.0	.6	3.6	9.3	14.4	15.6	14.3	12.4	14.4	8.7	6.7
Portland, Oreg	8,187	742	100.0	--------	.4	10.1	16.7	19.4	18.2	14.7	11.7	6.5	2.3
				Cumulative percentages									
Northeast:													
Boston, Mass	--------	--------	--------	--------	0.9	4.5	18.5	39.6	53.0	76.0	89.3	97.6	100.0
Newark, N.J.[2]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
North Central:													
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	--------	--------	0.3	4.4	16.0	34.0	49.9	63.4	79.6	92.5	98.4	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	--------	--------	.1	5.4	26.4	50.2	67.0	80.2	90.0	96.9	99.2	100.0
Topeka, Kans	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.0	14.7	34.3	56.9	74.5	84.4	96.5	100.0	--------
South:													
Atlanta, Ga	--------	--------	--------	.1	3.2	12.9	31.1	50.2	66.4	82.6	95.5	99.2	100.0
Houston, Tex	--------	--------	--------	.1	4.9	16.8	36.7	54.5	69.1	81.3	92.0	98.7	100.0
Mobile, Ala	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.4	16.3	34.5	47.4	64.0	82.6	94.1	99.0	100.0
West:													
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	--------	--------	.6	4.2	13.5	27.9	43.5	57.8	70.2	84.6	93.3	100.0
Portland, Oreg	--------	--------	--------	--------	.4	10.5	27.2	46.6	64.8	79.5	91.2	97.7	100.0

[1] Represents the sum of all amounts received by the principal mortgagor or the comortgagor(s) from any source, as reported on the application, adjusted to conform to any available verifications. This includes occupational income and income from commissions, fees, bonuses, business, corporations or partnerships, investments or other supplemental sources. These figures are more nearly comparable to census family income data than are the FHA figures on effective income.

[2] Sample considered too small for tabulation.

Source: FHA Homes, 1960, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 85-M.

APPENDIX TABLE 5.—*Percentage distribution by property value of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1959*

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Total		FHA appraised values of—							
	Number	Percent	Less than $8,000	$8,000-$9,999	$10,000-$11,999	$12,000-$13,999	$14,000-$15,999	$16,000-$17,999	$18,000-$19,999	$20,000 or more
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass	339	100.0	--------	--------	0.6	5.7	35.8	32.7	15.1	10.1
Newark, N.J	143	100.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	36.6	25.4	5.6	32.4
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind	1,454	100.0	--------	0.4	15.4	36.7	23.3	10.4	8.5	5.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,679	100.0	--------	--------	3.2	27.9	38.5	19.5	7.8	3.1
Topeka, Kans	86	100.0	--------	--------	--------	11.1	33.3	33.3	16.7	5.6
South:										
Atlanta, Ga	1,834	100.0	--------	1.7	11.9	32.0	26.9	15.0	7.0	5.5
Houston, Tex	2,124	100.0	--------	2.9	22.4	24.7	24.9	17.4	5.4	2.3
Mobile, Ala	550	100.0	--------	--------	6.6	23.0	33.3	18.1	6.2	12.8
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz	6,050	100.0	0.3	7.1	25.1	30.6	21.3	6.8	2.3	6.5
Portland, Oreg	874	100.0	--------	.3	17.1	39.7	25.5	11.3	3.7	2.4
			Cumulative percentages							
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass	--------	--------	--------	--------	0.6	6.3	42.1	74.8	89.9	100.0
Newark, N.J	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	36.6	62.0	67.6	100.0
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind	--------	--------	--------	0.4	15.8	52.5	75.8	86.2	94.7	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.2	31.1	69.6	89.1	96.9	100.0
Topeka, Kans	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	11.5	44.4	77.7	94.4	100.0
South:										
Atlanta, Ga	--------	--------	--------	1.7	13.6	45.6	72.5	87.5	94.5	100.0
Houston, Tex	--------	--------	--------	2.9	25.3	50.0	74.9	92.3	97.7	100.0
Mobile, Ala	--------	--------	--------	--------	6.6	29.6	62.9	81.0	87.2	100.0
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz	--------	--------	0.3	7.4	32.5	63.1	84.4	91.2	93.5	100.0
Portland, Oreg	--------	--------	--------	.3	17.4	57.1	82.6	93.9	97.6	100.0

Source: FHA Homes, 1959, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 43-M.

APPENDIX TABLE 6.—*Percentage distribution by property value of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1960*

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Total		FHA appraised values of—							
	Number	Percent	Less than $8,000	$8,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $11,999	$12,000 to $13,999	$14,000 to $15,999	$16,000 to $17,999	$18,000 to $19,999	$20,000 or more
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	247	100.0	0.6	----------	----------	5.0	28.5	33.5	18.4	14.0
Newark, N.J.[1]	58	100.0	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind.	1,142	100.0	----------	.2	12.5	30.2	26.0	22.6	6.5	2.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,409	100.0	----------	----------	.6	24.5	38.5	23.4	6.2	6.8
Topeka, Kans.	142	100.0	----------	1.2	12.8	39.5	28.5	12.7	2.9	2.4
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	1,523	100.0	----------	.6	8.1	24.7	33.8	20.6	8.8	3.4
Houston, Tex.	1,795	100.0	----------	4.0	19.7	19.8	25.9	19.1	9.5	2.0
Mobile, Ala.	378	100.0	----------	.6	5.2	22.3	29.1	21.8	8.2	12.8
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz.	6,164	100.0	----------	5.8	21.9	27.3	24.6	12.1	3.4	4.9
Portland, Oreg.	742	100.0	----------	.3	14.1	27.2	32.0	18.9	6.1	1.4
			Cumulative percentages							
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	----------	----------	0.6	0.6	0.6	5.6	34.1	67.6	86.0	100.0
Newark, N.J.[1]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind.	----------	----------	----------	.2	12.7	42.9	68.9	91.5	98.0	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	----------	----------	----------	----------	.6	25.1	63.6	87.0	93.2	100.0
Topeka, Kans.	----------	----------	----------	1.2	14.0	53.5	82.0	94.7	97.6	100.0
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	----------	----------	----------	.6	8.7	33.4	67.2	87.8	96.6	100.0
Houston, Tex.	----------	----------	----------	4.0	23.7	43.5	69.4	88.5	98.0	100.0
Mobile, Ala.	----------	----------	----------	.6	5.8	28.1	57.2	79.0	87.2	100.0
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz.	----------	----------	----------	5.8	27.7	55.0	79.6	91.7	95.1	100.0
Portland, Oreg.	----------	----------	----------	.3	14.4	41.6	73.6	92.5	98.6	100.0

[1] Sample considered too small for tabulation.

Source: FHA Homes, 1960, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 41-M.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-A.—*Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	11.98	10.03	8.78	8.59	7.27
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.38	.38	.38	.38	.38
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.56	.56	.56	.56	.56
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.63	1.49	1.39	1.38	1.28
(j) Total monthly rent	23.35	21.26	19.91	19.71	18.29
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	134.26	122.25	114.48	113.33	105.17
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d) (3): families of 3 and 4 persons [9]	----------	----------	7,000.00	----------	----------
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00
(n) Income required to pay 2 bedroom monthly rent [11]	8,055.60	7,335.00	6,868.80	6,799.80	6,310.20

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-B.—*Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,600.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,600.00	2,600.00	2,600.00	2,600.00	2,600.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	12.97	10.87	9.52	9.31	7.88
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	5.42	5.42	5.42	5.42	5.42
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.35	.35	.35	.35	.35
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	5.41	5.41	5.41	5.41	5.41
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.69	.69	.69	.69	.69
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.87	1.71	1.61	1.59	1.49
(j) Total monthly rent	26.71	24.45	23.00	22.77	21.24
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	153.58	140.59	132.25	130.93	122.13
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]	----------	----------	7,550.00	----------	----------
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	7,550.00	7,550.00	7,550.00	7,550.00	7,550.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	9,214.80	8,435.40	7,935.00	7,855.80	7,327.80

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–C.—*Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	11.98	10.03	8.78	8.59	7.27
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.66	.66	.66	.66	.66
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.86	.86	.86	.86	.86
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.61	1.46	1.36	1.35	1.25
(j) Total monthly rent	22.94	20.84	19.49	19.29	17.87
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	131.91	119.83	112.07	110.92	102.75
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,900.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	7,914.60	7,189.80	6,724.20	6,655.20	6,165.00

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–D.—*Minneapolis, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100-percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	12.48	10.45	9.15	8.95	7.58
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	5.19	5.19	5.19	5.19	5.19
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.92	.92	.92	.92	.92
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.92	1.77	1.67	1.66	1.55
(j) Total monthly rent	27.47	25.29	23.89	23.68	22.20
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	157.95	145.42	137.37	136.16	127.65
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			7,300.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	9,477.00	8,725.20	8,242.20	8,169.60	7,659.00

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–E.—*Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	11.98	10.03	8.78	8.59	7.27
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.60
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	3.86	3.86	3.86	3.86	3.86
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.52	.52	.52	.52	.52
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.68	1.53	1.44	1.42	1.32
(j) Total monthly rent	23.98	21.88	20.54	20.33	18.91
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	137.89	125.81	118.11	116.90	108.73
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,900.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	8,273.40	7,548.60	7,086.60	7,014.00	6,523.80

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–F.—*Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.23	8.57	7.50	7.34	6.21
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.36	.36	.36	.36	.36
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.79	.79	.79	.79	.79
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.23	1.11	1.03	1.02	.93
(j) Total monthly rent	17.63	15.85	14.70	14.53	13.31
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	101.37	91.14	84.53	83.55	76.53
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,000.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	6,082.20	5,468.40	5,071.80	5,013.00	4,591.80

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–G.—*Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050 00	2,050.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.23	8.57	7.50	7.34	6.12
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	2.39	2.39	2.39	2.39	2.39
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.51	.51	.51	.51	.51
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.16	4.16	4.16	4.16	4.16
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.34	.34	.34	.34	.34
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.33	1.20	1.12	1.11	1.02
(j) Total monthly rent	18.96	17.17	16.02	15.85	14.63
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	109.02	98.73	92.12	91.14	84.12
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]	--------	--------	5,900.00	--------	--------
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	6,541.20	5,923.80	5,527.20	5,468.40	5,047.20

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–H.—*Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,100.00	$2,100.00	$2,100.00	$2,100.00	$2,100.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,100.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.48	8.78	7.69	7.52	6.36
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.51	.51	.51	.51	.51
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.74
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.56	.56	.56	.56	.56
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.24	1.12	1.03	1.02	.93
(j) Total monthly rent	17.76	15.94	14.76	14.58	13.33
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	102.12	91.66	84.87	83.84	76.65
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]	--------	--------	6,050.00	--------	--------
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,050.00	6,050.00	6,050.00	6,050.00	6,050.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	6,127.20	5,499.60	5,092.20	5,030.40	4,599.00

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–I.—*Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,150.00	$2,150.00	$2,150.00	$2,150.00	$2,150.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,150.00	2,150.00	2,150.00	2,150.00	2,150.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.73	8.99	7.87	7.70	6.51
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	4.48	4.48	4.48	4.48	4.48
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.45	.45	.45	.45	.45
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.61	1.48	1.40	1.38	1.29
(j) Total monthly rent	23.03	21.16	19.96	19.77	18.49
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	132.42	121.67	114.77	113.68	106.32
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]	--------	--------	6,300.00	--------	--------
(m) Established median family income [10]	6,300.00	6,300.00	6,300.00	6,300.00	6,300.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	7,945.20	7,300.20	6,886.20	6,820.80	6,379.20

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–J.—*Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	12.48	10.45	9.15	8.95	7.58
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.36	4.36	4.36	4.36	4.36
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.61	1.46	1.36	1.35	1.24
(j) Total monthly rent	23.04	20.86	19.46	19.25	17.77
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	132.48	119.95	111.90	110.69	102.18
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]	--------	--------	7,300.00	--------	--------
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	7,948.80	7,197.00	6,714.00	6,641.40	6,130.80

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX TABLES 7–A TO 7–J

[1] Not including tenants' electricity or telephone and, in some cases, cooking gas.

[2] This basic 2-bedroom rental unit in a walkup-type structure was used to help establish maximum income limits for various areas under FHA sec. 221(d)(3). Each FHA insuring office prepared estimates, based upon local costs, of the cost of construction, including land, of this basic unit, or a basically comparable unit where some minor variations were necessary to conform to local practices. For localities in which the requisite income for 3- or 4-person occupancy of such a unit (calculated with rentals of 20 percent of income) does not exceed the estimated median income in that locality. maximum permissible mortgages are authorized for this cost amount. If the median income estimate is lower, maximum permissible mortgage amounts are reduced proportionately from the cost estimate.

[3] Estimated cost, including land, is assumed to be the maximum mortgage amount permitted for each locality under sec. 221(d)(3) for projects sponsored by nonprofit, cooperative, and public agency sponsors. Maximum mortgage amounts were established at the lower amount of (1) estimated cost for a characteristic moderate rental 2-bedroom unit in a walkup project or (2) the estimated mortgage amount for a 2-bedroom unit which could be amortized over a 40-year period at 3⅛ percent interest and standard assumptions of taxes, operating costs, vacancy allowances, etc., with 20 percent rental payments by median income families.

[4] Level annuity monthly payments for a 40-year repayment period at the interest rate shown. Mortgage insurance premium omitted, in keeping with FHA established policy for sec. 221(d)(3).

[5] Computed as a percent of replacement cost. Real estate figures include certain other taxes (FICA, excise, etc.), which total not over 10 percent of the stated figures. Ratios reflect average experience of post-Korean crisis sec. 207 projects with a few years of operating experience reported in the last half of 1950's. (See attached schedule.)

[6] Average of per unit operating costs (adjusted to a per room basis at 5¾ rooms per unit) for post-Korean crisis sec. 207 projects having a few years' operating experience in the last half of 1950's, after eliminating project averages which were substantially higher than other project averages. (See attached schedule.)

[7] Calculated at 7 percent, which is typically used in FHA processing of sec. 221(d)(3) proposals. Occasionally a smaller vacancy assumption might be justified.

[8] Assuming typical 2-bedroom apartment equals 5.75 rooms by FHA room count, consisting of living room, dining room (or equivalent), kitchen, 2 bedrooms, 1 bathroom, and foyer or porch.

[9] Maximum income permitted by FHA for 3- and 4-person families eligible for admission to sec. 221(d)(3) projects in the localities specified.

[10] Based on census data, adjusted for estimated underreporting.

[11] Assuming a 20-percent rent-income ratio for the rental shown for a typical 2-bedroom unit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **CLARK.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES BY WOMEN MEMBERS OF IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. **HICKENLOOPER.** Mr. President, annually the women members of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation send to Washington a delegation representative of the farm bureau women of Iowa. This practice has been followed for a number of years. These women are outstanding in civic activities, in contributions to public affairs, and in agricultural promotional activities in the various counties.

This year their meeting was held in Washington on Tuesday, March 12. At a banquet which took place at the culmination of the meeting, four of the women delivered short speeches on various phases of subjects which appealed to them. The speeches were not written for them and given to them for repetition at a banquet. They wrote their own speeches and delivered them. I was so much impressed by the sound philosophy contained in the speeches that I asked for copies of them to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the basic, independent philosophy of the people who built the West, and which is perpetuated in the philosophy which these women have expressed, could be given wider currency and circulation.

Mr. President, I recommend a reading of these addresses as statements encouraging and stimulating the American philosophy of independence, self-reliance, and determination. The statements they made are representative not only of their philosophy, but also of the philosophy of countless others in our area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, first, to have printed as a part of my remarks the address entitled "Fiscal Responsibility of the Federal Government," which was delivered by Mrs. Jessie Zellmer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I am Jessie Zellmer, I was born on a farm near the Missouri River bottom 29 years ago. If you figure back that far you know that my childhood was marked by depression, drought, and on the bottom land a few miles from the Missouri, always spring floods whether it rained or not. I hated the long hours and hard work that showed on my parents face, so I wasn't unhappy when we left the farm when I was about 10 years old and moved to town. Dad still farmed. He said, "As long as I can farm I am a free man." It took me a long time to figure out what he meant. Nevertheless, I vowed that when I grew up I would never marry a farmer. Well, I met a tall handsome fellow about a year before I graduated from high school. He let me know that all he ever wanted to do was farm. I married him a few weeks after I graduated and a few weeks after that he left me and his dreams of a farm to help Uncle Sam during the Korean War.

When he returned, he helped his dad on the farm for awhile, then worked in Sioux City for about a year. He was always looking for the farm. We found it in Woodbury County, a few miles east of Sioux City. Our home is on a hilltop, and on a clear day I can see South Dakota and Nebraska and the flash of the sun on cars traveling near the Missouri River.

Our farm is 150 acres of rolling hills and valleys, quite different from the bottomland of my childhood. My husband, his father, and his brother exchange help and equipment and between the three of them, work about 550 acres. We raise hogs and fatten cattle. I have a flock of chickens. The chickens and a few cows and a garden that we irrigated, fed us for the first years we farmed as they were the driest years I can remember. In a way, these dry years were a godsend, because of them, my husband had the time to teach and show me things I would probably never bothered to find out for myself. You see, if I had ever learned anything about farming in my youth, I had forgotten almost every bit of it. I have learned to love the farm now and I would not be happy anyplace else.

We were very happy when our first daughter was born on the 4th of July 1956. She brought an end to the drought complete with hailstones as big as baseballs. That year, we became interested in Farm Bureau. It was also the first sign of an upswing in our farming operation, because, with the advent of rain our land yielded beyond my wildest dreams.

Two years later we had another daughter. Where our eldest is serious, dark, and studious, our youngest is a bright little blond bombshell.

The girls and the farm are our present and our future, because what we have in material wealth and what we believe in will effect the children now and in the years to come. Eventually we hope to have a larger farming operation. In the meantime we feel we must be alert and improve what we have in every way possible.

In our business the most important single item is finance. Money to buy more land, cattle, hogs, feed, and what have you. In this respect, credit is a very useful tool, but is also one that can easily become the master rather than the servant. We believe the same standards of fiscal responsibility hold true both for individuals and our Federal Government. Suppose your family took in $8,590 and you spent $9,370. You'd be in debt $780. And, suppose that 7 times in the last 10 years you have ended up in the red. Now you owe a little over $30,000. Suppose in the coming years, you are likely to become anywhere from $600 to $1,200 behind. Then you ask your banker for more credit to get your business going again. He might lend it to you if you use it to make more money, but he'd be pretty tough about using it for better living.

Well, just add seven zeros to the figures I've just mentioned and you have the picture of the financial health of the U.S. Government.

As a family, our concern is deficit spending at home and on the Federal, State, and local level. It almost seems that deficit financing has become a way of life both for families and for the Federal Government. In fact, our national fiscal policy for the past several years has convinced millions of American people that saving for the future is undesirable and a poor business practice.

The theory is that the Government monetary and fiscal policy should be designed to stabilize the economy. According to the theory, the Government should spend more than it receives when unemployment is high and make payments on the national debt when the country is prosperous. The idea may be fine, but it just doesn't work that way.

The national debt has increased in 24 out of the last 30 years. When recession threatens, Government spending is considered necessary. We are assured that the budget will balance again as soon as the stimulating effects of the increased spending is felt. When we are prosperous the economists and planners cite rapid growth and prosperity and find new ways to spend still more money. They point out that the rate of growth will bring the budget into balance in just a few years so why be concerned? Therefore, we have deficits either way. This policy has to be inflationary. If deficit spending is not inflationary, why do we collect taxes at all? The Federal Government has never quite exhausted its borrowing powers, if it should, it can always resort to the printing presses for more money. If financing the Government entirely by borrowing and printing money would be inflationary, then partial deficit financing is inflationary. Continuous inflation adds up to a considerable amount over a period of years—3 percent a year for 10 years is 30 percent.

The unbalanced budget cheapens the purchasing power of the dollar. The worker may end up with more paper money but it buys less. So inflation is a form of tax. Whatever the Government spends and does not collect, it must obtain by taking a small piece of each dollar in circulation. This burden falls heaviest on people with fixed investments and relatively fixed incomes such as our old people and widows. This is a cruel byproduct of inflation. It also adds to the cost-price squeeze which farmers find themselves. For example, between 1946 and 1958 farm prices rose little if any while the price of milk to the consumer increased 47 percent, the price of gasoline has gone up 50 percent, automobiles 140 percent, college tuition 235 percent. The housewife pays 173 percent more for coffee and the contractor 200 percent more for lumber.

Economists often point out 1 year or part of 2 or 3 years and prove statistically that no inflation has occurred. This is misleading. Inflationary pressures are like the steam in a tea kettle. They build up considerably without showing, but eventually pressure is so great that the lid comes off, because something has to give.

The things I've said are familiar to you I'm sure. I believe, however, Iowa can be proud of the record of its Senators and Representatives in their attempt to reduce Government spending. Our Iowa congressional delegation as individual Congressmen have constantly demanded more responsible thinking in Federal Government programs. Our Congressmen have introduced bills to eliminate nepotism, congressional junkets, and many bills of long-range significance. My family is extremely appreciative for this responsible attitude taken by our Congressmen and ask that it be continued.

Like the President, we believe that income taxes should be reduced, because they may be stifling economic growth. However, we do not feel that this can be done unless Federal expenditures are reduced, too.

I'm sure no intelligent person could examine the Federal budget without concluding that huge reductions could be made in defense, foreign aid, and domestic programs without impairing any program vital to our welfare and security. We would like to see expenditures reduced at least $10 billion and taxes an equal amount.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Anderson once said, "If we ever reach the point where people believe that to speculate is safe, but to save is to gamble—then we are indeed in trouble."

In this the Iowa Farmer agrees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, next, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the speech entitled "Foreign Affairs and Peace," delivered by Mrs. Bryon Falk.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND PEACE

It is my privilege as a member of the Farm Bureau organization to be here this evening, participating in a program so constructed that we may come to know each other in a much better way, to acquaint ourselves with this great capital of ours, to so pack away jewels for our box of memories, jewels that we may share with others.

We are from Iowa, that State that ranks so high in literacy, so very important in this fast-changing world of ours today our golden age folks have an amazing depth of knowledge in current affairs.

Iowa ranks high in many things. Figures are available to indicate this ranking. The greatly enlarged photos in the foyer of the State Farm Bureau Building in Des Moines attest to the beauty of our State.

I am from Page County, in the southwestern part of Iowa, one of the border counties so prominent in our State legislation discussions. We are proud of Page County. We have many "firsts." First in the U.S. Soil Conservation Service with the State experimental farm still in operation. Our 4–H beginnings were of the first in the Nation. The little Goldenrod Schoolhouse where Jesse Field Shambaugh, as a teacher, encouraged the boys to bring samples of corn to be judged. This dear person is known nationally as author of "The Country Girl Creed." Her beginnings with 4–H was the forerunner of our present 4–H. It was in 1959 that our Page County boys and girls visited in Canada, the first of such exchangee programs. In 1960, we had a boy and girl from Canada in our home. In 1961, our son went to Tennessee, and last summer a 4–H boy from Tennessee visited in our home. These young people have a deeper appreciation of farming processes from the thousand-acre wheat fields of Saskatchewan to the 2-acre tobacco farms of Tennessee, and with our northern and southern visitors we proudly viewed our corn lands of Iowa. Of interest to them in particular were the corn shellers and the cattle feeding operations.

Page County has at Shenandoah the two largest nurseries in the world, the offices of the largest seed and nursery retail stores in the world. Visitors from all over the United States view the all-American trials. Our geographical location at the end of the Wisconsin drift gives us a fertile soil for our part in filling the huge market basket.

My husband, Bryon Falk, and I live 2½ miles east of Essex, on my husband's home place. The abstract of which has never carried a mortgage or loan, hardly two pages in length, literally from Iowa or Waubonsie tribes to the U.S. Government, railroad, Iowa, and to our family. We also own and operate 160 acres, 2 miles to the east of us. We were of the generation that stayed home and cared for the folks and were a bit older than most when we married in 1939. We bought our farm and moved there in 1941, losing everything but the house by fire one hot July noon in 1942. We rebuilt only to have a tornado move in June 1, 1949, and take the two complete sets of improvements—houses and buildings. We lost about $75,000 in buildings, hogs and all, but we were safe with our children. We did not rebuild, for in the face of two disasters, we felt the debt too large to assume. We moved then to our present home, thankful in our hearts for God's great goodness to us. We have diversified farming, corn, beans, hogs, and home-raised cattle. We are not big farmers in any sense of the word, but we love the life of the farm. We are very active in church and community affairs. We firmly believe in our schools and in advanced education. Our daughter is a sophomore in college, majoring in physical education and minoring in home economics; the latter a direct result of 8 years active in 4–H. She serves now on a national level with Girl Scout summer programing. She loves the farm and can lend a hand in weeding beans or haying, if necessary. Our son is a senior in high school, very active in all affairs; holding offices of responsibility in county 4–H and district church youth. He has been accepted for college in the fall and as so many young people of today, is not quite sure what the future holds for him. While not planning at the present to farm, he feels sure that in 5 years, we will have farm plans in line.

We weathered together the ravages of fire, the devastating tornado, which only served to temper us for trying times ahead. Our family interests constantly change and widen. Economically, need we say more with two to be in college a total of 8 years and then more years as needed. Politically, we keep an awareness of situation by use of all media possible. We are avid readers of papers and magazines. We try to follow the work of our Senators and Representatives. Too often, though, we back home have a tendency to criticize before we know your position. We are happy with your firm convictions of what you feel is right with no fence riding.

My husband and I feel that the key to financial structure is confidence and gentlemen, we gave you that confidence when we cast the ballot. There is so much yet to learn.

We have been Farm Bureau members for over 20 years and I am happy here to say our Page County of 1,178 was net plus. Our district meeting for National Policy Committees met just 10 days ago and again I was proud to be a member of Farm Bureau. To have heard these discussions from the grassroots would have interested you. We realize it is from small acorns that great oaks grow. An example: several years ago a buzz session in the northeast corner of Griswold Hall in Page County—a justifiable complaint from a Farm Bureau woman as to the unfairness in the location of mailboxes in the county. Result? County to district to State and, yes, some of our Page County women were in Washington when that law went into effect.

Our Farm Bureau woman's theme for the year is "free in 1963." This is truly an American advantage and means so very much. In the summer of 1958, I visited in homes in nine foreign countries in Europe. I have shown slides to over 12,000 people. I was a guest in a Netherlands home through a member of ACWW (Associated Country Women of the World), an organization doing so much to prove an effective means of promoting understanding and goodwill throughout the world and helping people to help themselves. We hope these women of other countries may study their programs as we—our ABC's of Farm Bureau actions, beliefs, concerns, cultural, healthful, and responsible living. We are concerned not only with our own country, but with others. One of our chief concerns is for the betterment of international relations and peace. Do you know what it is to be a foreigner? You are a foreigner when you leave the shores of this country. How wonderful and a God-given bless to return. We speak of peace. Just what will bring about this peace? Maybe it will take the women to help do the job. In my own mind and from observations made while over there, we must first conquer the misunderstanding of language and the money problem. Picture to yourself a Norwegian woman about to buy a hat for $8 of her Norwegian money, and an American woman steps up and buys it with one of our American dollars. We must understand each other.

The American Farm Bureau is endeavoring to foster understanding among the farm people of the world as a means of furthering international good will. I want to assure you that Iowa farm women are not "peace at any price" advocates. We reject this concept as both futile and fatal. We recommend careful analysis of world problems and an attitude of international good will. A sincere dedication to the welfare and preservation of the human race, a concern for our Nation and our citizens here at home. We believe the implementation of this policy may call for more firmness in international leadership, less catering to neutrals and enemies, and fewer idle slogans and impractical theories.

We hope it will be possible to continue a high level of international trade. Agriculture has an important stake in foreign markets. We must not set our price supports so high as to discourage foreign trade. We believe the United States should better demonstrate to the world the advantages of our capitalistic system. To do so, we must encourage private investment and stimulate private trade. We must do at home as we encourage other countries to do. We favor continued support of United Nations. We should encourage the United Nations to become an effective implement for the attainment of the world peace with freedom and honor. The United Nations can be of value toward this end. It should be careful that it does not become imperialistic of itself or a super state. We believe membership and the right to vote should be limited to those nations that have paid their dues in full. We do not favor giving the United Nations U.S. money to be used in economic development. We should administer these programs ourselves.

We Farm Bureau women have the necessary and vital interest in peace, the needed compassion for the human race, and at the same time the practicality and courage to be an asset in making the vital decisions and taking actions necessary for the preservation of peace and survival.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, third, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the address delivered by Mrs. J. S. Van Wert, entitled "What Farm Program?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FARM PROGRAM?

I'm Mrs. J. S. Van Wert, of Franklin County. I live on a 40-acre farm 5 miles northeast of Hampton, Iowa.

As a child I grew up on a farm near Worthington, Minn. My parents both came from Sweden with no more than clothes to wear and a determination to establish a good Christian home in a land of free enterprise. My dad was one of the first settlers, having purchased our farm from the railroad for $9 per acre. My parents were hard workers and conservative. I was fortunate that they encouraged me and helped me through Iowa State University.

There I met my husband. This was during the depression. He had worked all of his way through the university and even supplemented his family's grocery basket. We were married after I taught 1 year to get some experience and incidentally pay a college debt. He was the county agent in Butler County at the time. That was when we struggled to maintain more than the minimum 200 Farm Bureau members in order to get the appropriation to continue the extension program and assure us of a job.

We purchased our first 40 acres later, the place where we now live. As land became available around us and we could make a downpayment, we added on.

After 5 years in extension work, we moved onto the farm. It was a big decision to make, to leave a salary job and enter more deeply into the competitive free enterprise system. We were happy that we made the choice however, as it was a wonderful place to rear our four children.

My husband was one who loved to be challenged and surely farming provided many such opportunities. Besides challenges, there were always elements of weather—too much rain, too little rain (which was a greater obstacle on our sandy soil), new worms, new weeds, new bugs, and unscheduled freezes. But we thank God for our blessings which outweighed the adversities.

General farming wasn't enough for us as my husband saw a service to agriculture in developing hybrid seed corn and hybrid hogs. We were pioneers in both, so, often we were the laughing stock of the community—what scrubby-looking corn were those inbred plots. One of our first hybrid-boar purchasers said, "I better keep him shut up for fear my neighbors shoot him for a rat."

Our children all helped in our farming ventures. As soon as they were old enough, they had their own livestock projects. We always felt that work helped develop their character. And when we all worked, as well as played together, we had greater fellowship.

This was a big help when my husband was suddenly killed in an auto accident in 1954. We stayed on the farm and managed the affairs the best we could. The boys finished their projects and went to college, both graduating in animal science.

The older son is now in extension work in Indiana while the other one is working for Swifts in St. Louis. My two girls enjoyed the duties on the farm too, but now the older one is a sophomore at the university, and the younger one will start there this summer.

Presently my older son thinks he would like to come back to the farm. History repeats itself in more ways than one, but I feel that this would be a greater jump for him than it was for us. It costs much more to start farming today.

He and I are concerned about farm prices and farm income. Gross income is not keeping up with the rising costs of machinery and other things we buy. Consequently, the squeeze is tightening. The January statistics showed that farm prices went up 1 percent but the prices of things purchased by us went up 2 percent. Would you advise a young man to start farming under these conditions?

My son knows that he will have to be very efficient and manage well. But one of the greatest concerns is what kind of farm program will we have? Will he be free to choose his type of farming or will the Government tell him what and how much to grow and perhaps eventually when to sell, as in England?

We believe a well-planned Government program can be of help to farmers and also be of value to consumers. At least, it can help us out of the situation we find ourselves today.

We would like to see a sound farm program planned for several years ahead—not keyed to each election and used as a political football.

Farm prices in the future will be determined either by the market or by the Government. Although the market method is not perfect, we believe it is better than Government price fixing. Government programs can be of assistance without destroying the market. This type of program would best serve the interests of farmers and is essential to the continuation of private enterprise.

President Kennedy has said: "The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decisionmaker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed. We regard the preservation and strengthening of the free market as a cardinal objective of this or any administration."

I agree with this viewpoint and would like to see farm programs adapted to this concept. However, it seems all departments are not in line with the President's statement.

For example, I was quite concerned by Secretary Freeman's announcement to stabilize corn prices for the southeastern area of the United States. Supports must be floors only with the price having opportunity to bounce upward from the floor. When prices ride on the floor, they will not be completely satisfactory, but in other years, may be high enough to make the average more acceptable. For example, soybeans have ranged from the old support price of $1.85 a bushel to as high as $3 in the last 5 years. I believe corn might at the moment be running well above the floor price, if we had our Government stocks isolated. Cotton is an example of having the floor too high and delivering the market to synthetic substitutes. I am informed that the use of these substitutes for cotton has increased 26 percent since the price support was raised 2 years ago.

Specifically, I think a helpful program could be simple. (1) It should isolate Government surpluses so that they cannot be used to depress markets. (2) It should provide floor-type price supports for staple commodities. These floors should be a protection against being forced to dump on the market at harvest time or the necessity of accepting unnecessarily low prices. However, they cannot be so high as to encourage unneeded production, the use of synthetics, cause us to lose our foreign markets, or to become a ceiling as well as a floor.

A long-term land retirement program may be necessary to adjust land resources. I believe this is all the control that is necessary for corn, soybean, and livestock. Corn consumpton has increased from 2.7 billion bushels in 1955 to 4 billion bushels in 1961. Soybean usage has increased similarly. Red meat consumption is encouraging. The midwest farm horizon has some bright spots—if we can avoid solving the wheat problem at our expense—avoid price fixing. It would certainly be a serious threat to our future if livestock were to be subjected to either price supports or quotas.

In summary, I would like to see a farm income. It need not be expensive nor in any way conflict with the long-term interests of the consumer. It can help us financially today and encourage our youth to continue efficient food production in the future.

My son is willing to work hard if he comes back to the farm, but he must be able to enjoy a moderate net income to justify the terrific capital investment he must make to start farming. He doesn't want Government handouts, but a healthy economy in which to operate freely so that his income is fair and proportionate to his efforts and his investment.

This concludes our panel to help you know your Iowa farm neighbor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, fourth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the speech entitled "Survival of Private Enterprise and Freedom," delivered by Mrs. Lloyd Moir.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVIVAL OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND FREEDOM

I am Mrs. Lloyd Moir, and my husband and I live on our own farm 5 miles south of Orange City, Iowa, in Sioux County. Sioux County is in the northwest corner of Iowa. It is a Dutch community, and an excellent farming area. While we are not Dutch, we truly have enjoyed the warm hospitality and friendships. We joined Farm Bureau in 1939, because we wanted to and because we believe in Farm Bureau philosophy.

Lloyd and I were born and raised in town and moved to the farm in 1939. While it wasn't the best year to go farming, we have been forever grateful. It surely gives us a better perspective on life—to have lived in town and on the farm.

We have four children, Peggy Jeanne, Lloyd, John, and Suzanne—three are married, and we have six grandchildren. All have attended Iowa State University and John is a sophomore student there now, majoring in electrical engineering. He interrupted his freshman year to get his service time taken care of and served 4 years in the Air Force. Lloyd is a captain in the Air Force, a jet copilot, and stationed at Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex. We have always been the kind of family that likes to read, work, and play together.

It is my concern for these our children and other young people, and our continued freedoms that prompted me to select the title "Survival of Private Enterprise and Freedoms."

Freedom of enterprise means only the right to choose an occupation, but does not necessarily guarantee success to the individual in his chosen field of work—that is up to him. This freedom, however, does not extend to antisocial activities such as to steal, to commit burglary, to organize murder for profit, and others of this nature.

Freedom to choose and to use one's own judgment in the conduct of our life and our business, permits mistakes to grow on as the old adage says, and it encourages progress and success. As humans, there are bound to be some failures in some of our ventures, but they are localized. One of the advantages in a competitive private enterprise is that penalties for failure are levied against those who fail, only. My grandfather used to say "We learn more by mistakes than by the things we do successfully." As individuals, with self-responsibility, we can try again, but under government controls and government price fixing, a whole society is penalized and one can lose that personal initiative of wanting to try again, and some may be lulled into a false sense of security.

Our system of government depends upon private property, freedom of enterprise, the price system, competition and the motivating factors of individual initiative and self interest to stimulate production and economic development. To trample on anyone of these, and cause the loss of this personal initiative would result in the gradual deterioration of our great Nation. We surely do not want this to happen—it would be a direct affront to the men and women who settled in this country, fought for its freedoms and drew up our Constitution.

My husband and I are very concerned about the survival of private enterprise and freedom. We consider the rapid and continued growth of Federal Government and authority vested in Washington to be a threat. I do want to emphasize that we do not consider this to be a partisan issue. The size of the Federal Government has increased alarmingly under both Democrat and Republican administrations. Big government and big budgets mean less money and less decisions for the people themselves. In many ways, big government means little people.

Some will argue that there is nothing to be concerned about in a democracy. They contend that people have the opportunity to reverse this at any time and consequently there need be no concern. This is true, if the citizens recognize the danger in time. But world history is filled with the stories of democracies that have fallen—and become dictatorships because the people themselves asked far too much from government—or at least protested too late. Democracies do not usually fall before the onslaught of evil people. In fact, the change from democracy to a dictatorship is often so gradual that even the dictator does not recognize when it occurs. History indicates that most dictatorships were benevolent dictators with the very best of intentions in the beginning. At times it seems we are losing sight of the basic principle our Founding Fathers had in mind—the leader of a democracy is not the source of power, he only directs it. Power itself must continue to be invested in the people. If power is given to an individual or group, it will eventually be used and it will eventually be abused.

The Government's hand in labor disputes has become increasingly evident. It was never more so than during the recent longshoremen's strike. The Government finally appointed a fact-finding committee. This committee came up with a recommendation which was between labor's demands and management's offer—but leaning toward labor. Labor and management were then told they could accept this or legislation would be enacted to end their right to free bargaining. Is this the pattern for the future? I do not pretend to have the answer, but I question the amount of private enterprise—or freedom involved in the Government deciding all future disputes on wages and working conditions.

The steel episode was a shocking one and possibly an eye opener for millions of citizens who are unaware of the mounting powers of Federal Government. It is not my intention to defend the steel companies—it may be that they did not live up to the spirit of the agreement signed between them and Steelworkers Union. Be that as it may, liberty and private enterprise is threatened when any individual or group of individuals can insist that industry reduce prices or be subject to antitrust prosecution and loss of Government contracts. If the steel companies were guilty of monopoly activities after they raised prices, they were guilty before and should have been prosecuted regardless. In my opinion, the most urgent need is not more laws, but revision or repeal of bad laws now on the books.

Then we have the medical care plan under social security that is being considered. The features about it of concern to us is that it is compulsory—again under government—and that it really doesn't solve the problem. Under this system, we would be handing out benefits to many elder citizens who don't need them, inadequate benefits to some, and none at all to others. While it is our Christian duty to care for the aged, I do feel the law we have and our rapidly growing private medical-insurance will be of more benefit. The cost of this one item can be a real burden on our young people's income and I think it is about time we think of them and the young people to come after them.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently announced that he had taken action to fix corn prices for 11 or 12 States in the Southeastern part of the United States. Now it is a well known fact that the Secretary has within his authority the ability to cause commodity futures to go up or down the full legal limit merely by an announcement or inference of future plans of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has been charged by the Congress with conducting a referendum of wheat producers to decide whether they want the certificate plan. The Secretary has said that he will use the full force of his Department to secure a favorable vote from wheat producers. Should the Department be both a referee and a participant? Is this a completely free society? We are all Iowans and I am sure familiar with the "Cow Pool," and its failure. This isn't being said in a gloating manner, but it is reassurance that the family farm is farming at its best. A family with its own money invested will plan, work and fight harder to survive and prosper than hired help will ever do for a manager.

I have heard the expression said by my own neighbors, "I prefer security." That is fine, providing it is the right kind of security—the kind we have earned ourselves that enables us to raise our families, take care of our old age, our medical expenses, and a depression (if that should happen). However, these few were thinking of the kind of security they felt came from the Government. Freedom isn't a gift—we must work for it. We must see beyond ourselves, beyond our homes and families, and each one must work for it—the laborer, the wife, the employer and our public officials. Whenever government assumes responsibility for the security, welfare, and prosperity of citizens, the cost of Government naturally continues to rise and we as citizens may be primarily to blame, as we clamor for more legislation and place more power in the hands of the executive.

I am happy to say that every poll of farmers I've seen shows that farmers want less—not more Government. I certainly do not have the answers, but perhaps be a little more reluctant to delegate powers. In closing, I want to say that I recognize the need and necessity of many Government functions and programs. We, as a family, blame ourselves and other citizens as much as we blame public officials. We hope that farm women—all farm people—all citizens will make it a point to become better informed and take more interest in Government, and rededicate themselves to the one principal that safeguards all others in our lives—freedom—both economical and political. I think of the story of the little boy whose father brought home a gift to him after one of his trips. It was a little world globe. The boy held it in his arms all day and looked at it and admired it and even took it to bed with him that night. When his father came to tuck him in he was sound asleep with the globe clutched in his arms. He carefully removed it and naturally awakened his son, who looked up at him and said, "Daddy, what are you doing with my world?" And this is truly something to think about. What are we doing with our children's world? Thank you.

CONDITION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I noted with interest reports in the press that members of the House Education and Labor Committee had visited several District schools on March 11. Particularly interesting were their expletives used to describe the lamentable conditions of Hine Junior High School.

"Horrible Hine" was visited by one of my staff members in February, and his report to me contained information that fully confirms results of the recent inspection tour undertaken by the Members of the other body.

First, a survey of District of Columbia public schools conducted in 1949 granted Hine only 262 out of a possible 1,000 points. It was judged then as "of such quality as to definitely eliminate consideration of it for rehabilitation or continuance in use." Remember, Mr. President, that this evaluation of Hine was made 14 years ago. The lighting in Hine is so old and so insufficient as to unquestionably hazard the eyesight of those trying to read or study by it.

Hine is made up of three buildings. Their age has been discussed repeatedly, but of greater significance is the fact that the three buildings are merged in such a haphazard manner that communication between them is difficult. If there were a fire, as there was in 1959, removing the children from the building safely would be a perilous task at best. The fire hazards in the building are further heightened by the wooden floors and wainscoating in the halls and stairwells.

The building is an unquestioned firetrap.

The toilet facilities are grossly inadequate. There is only one toilet for boys and one for girls in the entire complex.

The third floor of one of the older buildings that comprise Hine, burned in 1959, thus fulfilling the dire predictions of the fire marshals who had ruled it unsafe in 1949. The debris and trash from the conflagration are still lying around in the burned out section.

There is only one electrical outlet in the home economics classroom area, thus necessitating the concentration of all electrical equipment at one side of the room, It is a strange sight indeed to see 12 or 15 sewing machines grouped in a semicircle in one section of a large room, joined by a maze of electrical cords, extensions, and plugs—strange, and potentially dangerous.

In brief, in the words of Dr. Bolden, the principal of Hine, "There is not a single area in which our school is adequate."

In spite of the foregoing, it should be noted to their credit that the staff's morale is high, and that the discipline maintained is surprisingly good.

Last year, when Dr. Hansen, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, supplied the reasons for continuing to use Hine, Dr. Hansen said:

> Hine's situation is really a tragedy in terms of school plant, but nevertheless there is seating capacity there for students. Making the hard choice between classrooms for children who otherwise would be put on part time and classrooms which are available for children even though they are inadequate would force us to choose the first.

It took great courage for Dr. Hansen to make that statement. But I believe his judgment on the matter is quite sound. The tragedy of the situation is that Hine was not torn down 20 years ago and replaced with a totally new structure. The Superintendent of Schools should not be called upon to make judgments between two such unacceptable alternatives.

Recently, Dr. Hansen presented to the Board of Education a report entitled "Our Schools and Their Prospects." The report outlines the present state of the District school system, and spells out what must be done to bring the physical plant up to acceptable standards. The present situation is so poor as to be practically beyond recall, without immediate improvement in the budgetary support given to the District schools.

I am confident that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress will give this report the full attention and study it deserves. I intend to do whatever I can to see that its basic recommendations are carried out.

If we reject the recommendations contained in "Our Schools and Their Prospects," let us do so honestly, and without deluding ourselves in the process. Let us frankly admit that our District schools are rapidly becoming mere way stations between the streets, the reformatories, and the penitentiaries. If we are willing to accept this policy for District schools, perhaps we might just as well begin cutting the existing budgetary requests.

On the other hand, if we decide to provide more adequate facilities, let us look at the problem in its fullest dimensions and courageously accept our responsibilities.

I know the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is deeply concerned about these conditions, in his capacity as chairman of the District Appropriations Subcommittee. He has advocated increased expenditures for the District schools, and has consistently demonstrated a keen determination to bring about a more adequate building and salary program. He certainly will have the full support of the Senator from Minnesota, who is honored to serve with him as a member of the District Appropriations Subcommittee.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENTS OF THE CENTRAL AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on President Kennedy's trip, this week, to Costa Rica, to meet with the Presidents of the six Central American Republics. This is, indeed, a notable event. It is one more indication that the Kennedy administration considers Latin America to be one of the most critical areas in the world. The personal visit of our President is a true reflection of the importance which our country places on the Alliance for Progress. It is hard to overestimate the importance of a Presidential visit to the long-neglected Central American Republics; and already the press reports informing us of the overwhelmingly enthusiastic reception the President received indicate that our Central American neighbors fully appreciate the significance of the visit.

I was sure the President would receive that kind of warm and enthusiastic welcome. In my visits to Central America and South America, I found that President Kennedy is exceedingly popular and highly respected.

The Declaration of Central America, issued by the Presidents of the Central American countries, along with the President of Panama and the President of the United States, is a remarkable document, and in the years ahead will rank as one of the basic documents of the Alliance for Progress. In this document the Presidents of the seven countries addressed themselves to two key problems facing the Central American area: First, the problem of Central American economic integration, and second, the problem of the threat to the internal security of the Central American countries from Castro-Communist subversion.

In my report, on the Alliance for Progress that was issued last week, it was my privilege to discuss these matters at some length.

Today I will note only one or two highlights contained in the Declaration of Central America. First, I am happy to note the expressed determination of the seven Presidents to accelerate programs aimed at achieving the economic integration of the area, and that the United States has indicated a willingness to make a substantial contribution to a special fund to promote regional integration. I take particular pleasure in noting that this proposal is similar to one contained in my report on the Alliance for Progress. I am also encouraged that the President of the United States indicated our willingness to make available substantial assistance to implement a regional plan for economic and social development, when such a plan is completed by the Central American countries. In all of these actions, our Government is once again making unmistakably clear our support of the regional integration movement in Central America.

On the question of resisting Communist subversion in Central America, it is encouraging to note that the Declaration of Central America places high priority on early action by members of the OAS to restrict movement of materiel, propaganda and funds, as well as arms and trained saboteurs, to and from Cuba. To achieve this aim, the Central American countries and the United States will cooperate in joint programs for additional air and sea surveillance to cut down on the movement of men and materiel from Cuba, and will work out a system of exchanging intelligence information on the movement of people, money, propaganda, and arms between Cuba and Central American countries.

Third, I am happy to note that the Presidents took note of the plight of the Cuban people, and expressed their sympathy for them. In my report last week I stated:

> At the same time it is important that throughout Cuba and all Latin America it be clearly understood that we want the Castro-Communist tyranny to be replaced with the best of governments, that we will not tolerate a rightwing dictatorship. A Cuban government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reforms will have the firm support of the United States.

It is heartening to note that the Presidents of the Central American countries and the President of the United States share this view. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an article reporting on the meetings in Costa Rica.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

COSTA RICA CROWD HAILS KENNEDY—PLEDGE TO CONTAIN CUBA COMMUNISM IS WILDLY CHEERED

(By Dan Kurzman, Staff Reporter)

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA, March 18.—This usually sleepy Caribbean capital went wild today as virtually the whole population turned out to welcome President Kennedy in a frenzied reception that surprised even the optimistic observers.

The crowds that greeted Mr. Kennedy were estimated at more than 250,000. After a tumultuous greeting along the 3-mile route from the airport to the Presidential Palace, Mr. Kennedy last night addressed the Presidents of the six Central American Republics in San José's ornate National Theater.

WALL OF DETERMINATION

"We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty," he said after hearing speeches by the other conference participants.

In opening his 3-day meeting with the Presidents of the six Middle-American nations he vowed "fierce and unyielding resistance" to the spread of "foreign tyranny" in the Western Hemisphere.

"The Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuba nation into its despotic empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of continental America," Mr. Kennedy said.

"At the Organization of American States, at this meeting and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion."

ALLIANCE STRESSED

A major portion of the President's speech was devoted to the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Kennedy pledged continued U.S. aid toward the developing Central American Economic Community and congratulated the assembled nations on their long-range economic vision. All except Panama have joined in a move toward economic integration.

"We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities," he said. "To this end, we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, strong educational facilities and better utilization of resources."

From the moment the President and his party left the airport, where he was greeted by his host, President Francisco J. Orlich of Costa Rica, the waiting throngs were an explosive mass of emotion. The President's car was swallowed up in a sea of screaming people waving United States and Central American flags, and it was impossible to see him, or the car, even from several feet behind.

Dozens of youths climbed aboard the press buses that followed and stamped on the roof. Others reached into the windows to shake the hands of reporters who were reminded of the tumultuous welcome given President Eisenhower in New Delhi 4 years ago.

Smiling women in summery print dresses held up their children to see the procession. Many people made the V-sign with their fingers.

"This is one of the most important days in Latin American history," one Costa Rican official said.

It was apparent that the spirit of mutual partnership in which the Alliance for Progress was spawning was at last showing signs of blossoming. The Central American people were known to be friendly to the United States, and their hospitality was anticipated. But today's demonstration appeared to indicate more than friendliness. It seemed to reflect a sense of genuine kinship.

The tremendous welcome given Mr. Kennedy augurs well for the 3-day Presidential conference that started today. There is hope here that the wild enthusiasm will give the Alliance for Progress a significant shot in the arm, at least in Central America.

And it seemed to give more meaning to President Orlich's welcoming remark that the results of the Conference may affect all Latin America as well as the rest of the world.

In a brief reply at the airport, Mr. Kennedy said:

"I come here today not only with Members of Congress and the Secretary of State but as the representative of 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be free and an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century," he said.

American officials here are stressing that economic integration under the Alliance will be the main topic of conversation, and that the issue of subversion will be secondary.

The meeting is regarded as a means of putting some teeth into a statement made by President Kennedy at a recent news conference that the social and economic improvement of the Latin nations was the most important hemisphere problem.

Measures to be taken to reduce Castro-Communist subversion, it appears, will be discussed more for political purposes than as a topic of overwhelming importance. The Presidents of the six isthmus nations represented—Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama—actually seem more interested in discussing subversion than do the others.

This is attributed by diplomatic observers partly to an honest fear of Castro-Communist activity, partly to efforts to take the minds of the people off explosive domestic problems, and partly to a desire to please what is believed to be a large segment of American popular and congressional opinion.

It is expected that the final communique will recommend that antisubversion measures be taken by the participating nations individually, particularly in regard to restrictions on travel to and from Cuba.

The United States is likely to set the stage, however, for an impressive offer of economic aid after the conference to facilitate the advancement of the Central American Common Market and other measures for economic integration, which is considered necessary for the area's advancement under the Alliance and the containment of communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first article tells of the warm and enthusiastic reception which the President of the United States received when he arrived at San José. The article is entitled "Costa Rica Crowd Hails Kennedy." The article states, in part:

This usually sleepy Caribbean capital went wild today as virtually the whole population turned out to welcome President Kennedy in a frenzied reception that surprised even the most optimistic observers.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of President Kennedy's speech, delivered in San José on March 18, for the opening of his conference with the presidents of the Central American Republics; also a news article entitled "Anti-Castro Plan Set Up at San José"; also the official text of the Declaration of Central America; and also the text of President Kennedy's speech at Costa Rica University

There being no objection, the addresses, the article, and the declaration were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

TEXT OF KENNEDY SPEECH AT SAN JOSÉ CONFERENCE

In 1825 a son of El Salvador and a citizen of Central America, Antonio Jose Canas, first minister accredited by the United Provinces of Central America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay.

He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which he said the struggling new nations of this hemisphere "might consider upon and adopt best plan for defending states of new world from foreign aggression and * * * raise them to that elevation of wealth and power which from their resources they may attain."

Today, 108 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals—preservation of our independence, extension of freedom and elevation of welfare of our citizens to a level as high as "from our resources" we can attain.

And today I, too, have come from the United States at the invitation of Central America, which, with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed a dream and creation of Bolivar and Canas and Jose Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—a dream which became the inter-American system, and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful and most enduring system of international order in the history of all the world.

UNMATCHED RECORD

We can say this without exaggeration, because every effort to reimpose despotisms of the old world on the people of the new has been ultimately beaten back, because within this system 20 republics have attained full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations—and because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members.

There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principle of nonintervention and peaceful resolution of disputes has been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world would this be true.

We have not attained this strength by trying merely to protect what was already won, to preserve gains of the past to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled.

Instead it has survived, prospered and grown despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has itself been an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity.

UNIQUE EFFORT

As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspirations has swept across our shores the inter-American system has been able to translate these ideas and aspirations into working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration and this is why it has endured and will endure in future.

In the first three centuries of our history seeds of Western civilization and culture were here planted. In the next century we established an inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule.

This freedom has often been challenged—as it is challenged today in Cuba. But with help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented Spanish reconquest in 1866, men such as Costa Rica's Juan Rafael Mora, who helped drive out William Walker—with such help we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past as we will ultimately triumph over aggressors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation the inter-American system worked to establish politically the equality and national dignity of all its members to extend political democracy and to strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another.

Those goals have been largely met. Equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced, machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands and it will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

NEW CHALLENGES

Now, in our own time the inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges and it is again demonstrating capacity for change which has always given it strength. Foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and challenges are more difficult, more complex and more burdensome.

For today we are faced not merely with protection of new nations, but with remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies but with the destruction of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity, but with the preservation of human dignity. To meet this enormous challenge peoples of the Americas have fashioned an Alianza.

The Alliance for Progress is a system in which all American states have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move toward goals of Alianza. You have made enormous strides toward creation of the Central American economic community of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created, a Central American Bank has been established, and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields.

I congratulate you on your effort to reestablish a historic unity to meet new needs and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that effort.

REFORM CITED

In addition, you have begun to formulate long-range economic development plans essential to the success of Alianza. In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the charter of Punta Del Este and demanded by your people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1961 under programs supported by the United States as its contribution to the Alliance, almost 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in nations represented here today, almost a million new books have been distributed, and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more to children hungry for learning.

More remains to be done. Some 7,600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under Alianza programs in these nations, but far more remains to be built.

Six thousand new teachers have been trained as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health, and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slum dwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under Alianza, and almost $250 million of external resources has been committed in support of the Alliance in Central America and Panama to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet basic needs of people for improved health, education, and housing.

COFFEE AGREEMENT

Finally a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. And we are also willing to move ahead on agreements stabilizing prices of other commodities so that your future prosperity will not depend on often destructive fluctuation of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see with our own eyes how Alianza enters into lives of the citizens of Costa Rica, providing them with new homes in which they and their families could find decent shelter for the first time.

We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities and better utilization of resources.

Yet we cannot be satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to common good, unless the young and educated are given opportunity to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our Alianza will fail and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

CUBA UNDER COMMUNISM

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to new imperialism more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any this hemisphere has known.

Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuban nation into its despotic empire and it now seeks to extend its rule to shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered the American hemisphere is not fertile ground for foreign tyranny and any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will not easily yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting and whenever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion.

I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty.

In 1822, Bolivar, father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit, and in arms this continent * * * must raise its eyes * * * to peer into centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to full the blessings that heaven bestows on this earth and recalling in their hearts protectors and liberators of our day."

My friends and colleagues: today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in arms. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward to future centuries, knowing that our descendants also will gratefully recall in their hearts "protectors and liberators" of our day.

Anti-Castro Plan Set Up At San José—Seven Presidents Agree on Aid for Central America

(By Morris W. Rosenberg)

San José, Costa Rica, March 19.—The United States and six middle American nations vowed tonight to halt Castro Communist subversion with ships and planes if necessary and combat the threat of Soviet imperialism via Cuba with a massive assault on economic and social ills.

President Kennedy and the Latin chiefs of state wound up the second day of their San José meeting with a 2,000-word "Declaration of Central America" that raised no threat of armed intervention in Cuba but affirmed their "conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations."

They emphasized that in the meantime they would not suffer the Castro regime's efforts to subvert the six nations.

The declaration disclosed arrangements for special U.S. cooperation in additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters to block any Cuban attempts to smuggle agents, guns, and propaganda into Central America.

RESTRICTIONS PLANNED

In addition, the Presidents of Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras summoned a meeting of Interior Ministers for early April to "put into immediate effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda, and funds from that country."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in response to questions at a news briefing, would not rule out a possibility that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy would represent the United States at the meeting. It probably would be held in Managua, Nicaragua.

Rusk said President Kennedy gave the six Latin Presidents "the full story" of U.S. military commitments in the Cuban crisis. Citing measures to isolate the Castro regime, Rusk said "about the only thing not being done (by the United States) is shooting at Cuba."

After their second closed-door meeting of the day, the seven Presidents sat in a box in Costa Rica's ornate National Theater while Foreign Minister Daniel Odubur of Costa Rica read the declaration from the stage at a formal meeting of the Foreign Ministers.

Most of the statement was devoted to plans for economic development of the middle American nations, and Mr. Kennedy pledged what was called a substantial initial American contribution to a new fund to finance regional development projects. No figure was given, but Central American leaders spoke earlier of the need for $200 million.

It was emphasized, however, that money was not enough to turn back the threat of communism.

"In order to carry out their programs for social and economic betterment," it said, "it is essential to reinforce the measures to meet subversive aggression originating in focal points of Communist agitation which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America."

As for Cuba, the seven Presidents declared they "have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again and that its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination."

As the most effective means of combating Communist agitation and social discontent in the area, the declaration emphasized that Panama and the Central American States will join with renewed vigor in implementing the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

Between conference sessions earlier today, Mr. Kennedy visited a suburban housing project under construction as a joint United States-Costa Rican effort and said such projects will further the goals of democracy in this hemisphere.

These goals, he said, "call for ever-increasing standards of living which can liberate each individual for the full use of his capacities in the pursuit of a better life."

Today's sessions fell on the Feast Day of St. Joseph, Patron Saint of Costa Rica. This Roman Catholic holiday is a national holiday here and Mr. Kennedy observed it by attending special services at the San José Cathedral.

President Francisco J. Orlich of Costa Rica, his host, was seated at the place of honor in front of the altar and President Kennedy in a special chair nearby.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

Official Text of Declaration of Central America

The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples and are aware such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social, and administrative structure within the framework of principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States in San José to review difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America are convinced the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration and, bearing in mind extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

To accelerate the establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central American Common Market—to formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for various sectors of the economy.

To establish a monetary union and common fiscal monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration.

To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities.

To complete soonest possible reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the Act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este, especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration and social welfare.

To take the above measures with a view to achieving creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationship with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

The Central American Presidents affirm the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the isthmian Republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments already have taken measures to coordinate national plans so their execution will aid, rather than impede, achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program.

It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development will be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct an economic feasibility survey relative to this program of regional development.

The Presidents of Central America reaffirmed their hope the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement and the President of Panama declares his government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares his government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole, with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate association of his country with the program.

The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American republics to move as rapidly as possible toward integration of the economies of their countries and their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans will be monetary, fiscal, economy and social policies. It is a great step forward in achievement of this objective as well as toward achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his Government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America and the development plan being prepared by Panama.

U.S. CONTRIBUTION

To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by regional organizations.

For the longer term he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with procedures established in the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other free world resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector and declare their intention of taking necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept normal responsibilities compatible with development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purpose of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation.

BETTER LIVING STANDARD

Currently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income. Furthermore, they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare.

The Presidents also agree that opportunities should be given to the people of Central America to build and purchase their homes. There exist in Central America national savings and loan institutions which have been assisted under Alliance for Progress, and others are about to be created. In order to give further support for these national efforts the Presidents of Central America suggest that a regional home loan department which would be a secondary source of home mortgage funds should be created as a division within the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, and the President of the United States agrees to offer technical and financial assistance to it.

The isthmian Presidents indicate that Central American institutions should be strengthened as much as possible to enable them to play a major role in training personnel who will be needed to put into effect plans for integration of the isthmus. The large part of the responsibility for training will devolve on the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA). Recognizing, moreover, that trained manpower at all levels is needed for economic development, they agree to a proposal of the President of the United States to establish a multimillion-dollar scholarship fund for vocational training in agriculture and in industry for young people of outstanding ability who cannot afford normal expenses of such training, to which the United States will offer substantial financial assistance.

IMPORTANCE OF COFFEE

The Presidents note the primary role of coffee in the economies of Central America and the importance of an international coffee agreement for achievement of stable and remunerative prices.

They reiterate the intention of their governments to fully support the agreement so that it will serve as an effective instrument to improve the earnings of exporting countries from coffee and to promote their economic development.

Other primary commodity problems exist and the isthmian Presidents will hand to President Kennedy studies on these problems.

President Kennedy agrees he will have them reviewed immediately on his return to Washington.

The Presidents, notwithstanding the fact that present conditions are favorable to undertake a solution of economic and social problems of the isthmus through joint action of countries of area, believe that all of them are faced with an extremely provoked political problem which by its very nature can imperil the exercise of representative democracy and normal development of plans in which their respective governments are engaged to attain as rapidly as possible the highest levels of economic and social justice and to bring to full realization plans for Central American integration. Consequently the Presidents declare that in order to carry out their program for social and economic betterment it is essential to reinforce measures to meet subversive aggression originating in focal points of Communist agitation, which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America.

The Presidents note that the Council of Organization of American States is actively engaged in maintaining vigilance over continued intervention of the Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere as requested by the eighth meeting of consultation of foreign ministers. They express special interest in early completion by the Council of OAS of studies on Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere and particularly in early action by the Council on recommendations to the governments for counteracting those activities in these areas.

MEETING CALLED

The Presidents agree that the Ministers of Government of the seven countries should meet early in April to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict movement of their nations to and from Cuba and the flow of material propaganda and funds from that country.

This meeting will take action among other things to secure stricter travel and passport controls, including appropriate limitations in passports and other travel documents on travel to Cuba. Cooperative arrangements among not only the countries meeting here but also among the OAS members will have to be sought.

To restrict more effectively not only these movements for subversive purposes of people but also to prevent insofar as possible introduction of money, propaganda, materials, and arms arrangements for additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters will be worked out with special cooperation from the United States.

In addition to these measures a more rapid and complete exchange of intelligence information on movement of people, propaganda, money, and arms between Cuba and our countries is to be developed by a meeting of ministers.

SYMPATHY FOR CUBANS

The Presidents voice their deep sympathy for the people of Cuba and reaffirm their conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations. The Presidents recall how in 1959 the Cuban people were fired with hope of a purely Cuban revolution that was to bring them freedom and social justice, honest government, and free elections, fair sharing of goods, opportunities for all, more schools and jobs, better health and housing, and constructive land reforms, not collectivization of land. In sum a progressive republic which, in the words of Marti, would be "con todos y para todos." The Presidents declare that they have no doubt that a genuine Cuban revolution will live again, that its betrayers will fall into shadows of history and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in a common undertaking to secure for each individual liberty, dignity, and well being, which are the objectives of all free societies.

Finally the Presidents solemnly reaffirm their adherence to the principles established by treaty of reciprocal assistance of the Rio de Janeiro Charter of the OAS, in the act of Bogotá and in the charter of Punta del Este.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21 1963]

TEXT OF KENNEDY'S SPEECH AT COSTA RICA UNIVERSITY

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington where I am lectured to by professors to come to Costa Rica where I can talk to students.

In 1834 it was written of your city that "the people of San José (are) persuaded that knowledge produces all good and dispels all evil, that from it come good laws, good customs, good government, and that in short it is the soul of all happiness."

This great university is proof of that judgment, for from behind its walls have come much of the knowledge, the skill and the learning that have made Costa Rica one of the most enlightened and progressive democracies in the world—a principal source of good laws, good customs and a good government. Although I am not sure that your university courses can take credit for the beautiful women for which your country is also famous, they are well represented here today. I think therefore it is appropriate that the first speech by any United States President to a student audience in Latin America should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy, and I am honored that you have invited me here.

For the past 3 days seven Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with great questions which confront this hemisphere. On the answers to these questions depends the preservation of our liberties, the extension of democracy and the welfare and dignity of our people. But behind all the efforts of this week, behind the communiques and declarations, elaborate programs and the ambitious projects, lengthy speeches and formal proclamations, behind all this there has been one fundamental and essential assumption. And that is the assumption that you students—and young people of Latin America—are prepared to take up the great cause of liberty and welfare on which we are embarked.

More than half the population of Latin America is in your age group or younger. Without your effort and sacrifice and leadership, the plans and hopes of today's leaders for tomorrow's hemisphere will be doomed to failure. But with your help we can and will succeed.

This is an awesome task and a great opportunity. For we—you and I—are embarked together on a great adventure, the greatest perhaps since an Italian mariner first set sail for the west and touched on this old land. To you has been given the task of demonstrating that free men can conquer ancient enemies of poverty, hunger and ignorance—of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it—of bringing hope to those who search for hope—and of extending liberty to those who lack it. This is an immense task. It is filled with difficulties and dangers, hardships and hazards. But you have also been given an opportunity to shape history and serve man which has come to few generations of men.

RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY

And what Franklin Roosevelt said to the people of the United States I can say now here to you: This generation of Americans—your generation of Americans—has a rendezvous with destiny.

I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous. For I can remember my own country when it was quite different from the country we know today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now. And at that time only 1 out of every 10 American farms was electrified—half the farmers of our Southland were tenants and sharecroppers—thousands of families in the Tennessee River Valley had cash incomes of less than $100 a year—and all this was in addition to a great depression which had thrown 12 million people out of work, 10 times the population of your country and almost the population of all Central America. This was the United States of my own university days.

Then under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt we carried through a great New Deal. One program after another brought an end to tenancy, helped farmers win title to their own land, brought electricity to the countryside, transformed the poverty-stricken Tennessee Valley into a thriving industrial and agricultural area, and demonstrated to every man the immense power of an affirmative free government—the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to the idea of individual liberty.

I tell you this story not out of any sense of complacency or satisfaction that the job in my country is done. For we in the United States still have much unfinished work—to improve our housing and cities, our economy, our education and equal opportunities for all our citizens. That fight is still going forward.

But the New Deal does illustrate the transformation which a single energetic generation can make in the life of a country. And it is also an illustration of the capacity of free men to achieve a profound peaceful revolution on behalf of economic progress and social justice.

It is perhaps difficult for you to think of the United States as a revolutionary country—a country which has carried out many basic and sweeping social changes during its short history. But my country like all the countries of the Americas is the possessor of a profound revolutionary tradition which has helped shape the modern world. For it was in Philadelphia in 1776 and in Guatemala in 1821 that the American nations became the first to strike against colonial rule. And today in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, newly emerging nations are still struggling to perfect national independence and the freedom from foreign domination which we were first to achieve.

TRIBUTE TO FREE MEN

This history is an answer to those who claim that free people lack the drive and flexibility to remold the societies in which they live. The history of the Americas—the history of your own country in the last 20 years—is a tribute to the capacity of free men to call upon the deepest reservoirs of human mind and spirit. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, subtle and difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of the challenge. We are prepared to follow that path which advances man's welfare without destroying his dignity. And we know that lessons of our past promise success for our future.

Our goals for the future of this hemisphere—the challenge we have issued to you and to your compatriots throughout the Americas—is contained in the Alianza para el Progreso. Within the framework of this Alianza are contained four basic principles of American society which it will be your task to build.

First of these is the right of each nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation or coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of its people. Within our inter-American system we will accept no new empires and no domination of one nation by another.

Second is the right of each individual citizen to political freedom and individual liberty—the right to speak his view, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him and to reject it when it no longer serves the good of the nation. We have taken great strides toward achievement of this right in the last two decades but the job is not yet finished and it will not be finished until every American lives under freedom

Third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless and education for those who are today denied the right to learn. It may often mean that ancient institutions which serve merely to perpetuate the privileges of a fortunate few will be ended. It means that rich and poor alike must bear a fair share of the burden of national development. It will not be easy to achieve social justice but the experience of my own nation has been that once it is achieved it leads inevitably to a richer and fuller life for all.

The fourth principle of the Alianza is the right of every nation to pursue a course of rapid economic progress which modern knowledge and technology have made possible. We of the United States who have been fortunate in our own development have committed vast resources to assist those who have been less fortunate. And Latin American nations themselves have pledged to mobilize their own resources and energies to carry forward the task of development. This task is not easy either. To break centuries-old bonds of hunger and poverty and ignorance will require sacrifice and unending toil. But we are determined to pursue this road.

These are principles of our Alianza para el Progreso whose ultimate fulfillment is in your hands. They will not be attained by speeches or documents but by work and sacrifice, courage and endurance, on the part of millions of individuals throughout this hemisphere.

I speak to you as men and women pursuing the highest calling of a free society. A distinguished leader of my own country, Thomas Jefferson, once warned us that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free * * * it expects what never was and never will be, that no other foundation than education can be devised for preservation of freedom and happiness."

That is why you who are fortunate enough to be attending this school have also assumed a great obligation along with that opportunity. A distinguished rector of your university—for whom this campus is named—Dr. Ordigo Facio—wrote that "liberty is not a thing but a way of life which needs to constantly grow, to expand, to become stronger, if it is to live—for her to stop is to surrender—to become rigid is to lose the breath of life."

In your hands, my friends, have been placed tools of knowledge and skill which can make liberty grow and flourish.

Now I return to the United States. I return with the renewed confidence that I have seen here at this university those whose efforts will insure that the hopes and labors of my generation of Americans shall not have been in vain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I particularly call to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarkable address delivered by President Kennedy to the young people at the University of Costa Rica.

Frequently we hear it said that university students in such countries are not very friendly to American visitors. On the other hand, I have never found that to be the case when, as a Senator, I have visited these countries. In my visits, I have found the university students to be very friendly, very active, very inquisitive, and sometimes quite probing with their questions. But they are always willing to listen and always willing to learn.

President Kennedy thrilled the students there, and I am sure he set an excellent example for the Presidents of other great countries. In his address, President Kennedy cited the history of the United States as an example of the revolutionary, progressive spirit which should grip a people who are seeking a better life.

Mr. President, earlier in these remarks I mentioned that last week I had released a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress," based upon two trips to South and Central America. I now ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts from this report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From release of Mar. 16, 1963]

SELECTED EXCERPTS: REPORT ON ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

In terms of where it was a year ago, the Alianza para el Progreso has taken a giant leap forward. In terms of where it has yet to go, it has taken only a short faltering step.

In reviewing the Alliance today, there are solid grounds for encouragement—and serious grounds for concern. The Alliance has begun to gather momentum; the question is whether it can maintain and increase this momentum sufficiently to overcome the obstacles it now faces and those which loom in the near future.

Latin America needs a new deal. And the United States needs to understand that the changes we are calling for in Latin America—the reforms that we are demanding—will bring in their wake political, economic, and social developments which may not be readily understood or even acceptable to the United States. We are asking for a peaceful democratic revolution. We ought to understand that such a development is unique in history, particularly in areas where oppression, exploitation, poverty, and discrimination have been an established pattern for many generations. Such a democratic revolution, if it can be accomplished, may bring into power democratic governments that are left of center. In other words, liberal, progressive, and even radical political parties will be in the ascendancy and in power. We should be prepared to see a good deal of disorder, temporary confusion, and political disarray as the reforms and changes come about.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ALLIANCE

The Alliance is not just another U.S. aid program, but rather a cooperative endeavor by 19 Latin American countries and the United States to enjoy more fully the cultural, spiritual, and material riches available in the 20th century, and to put these within the reach of full populations rather than only a select few. Its origins and its operation spring from both the northern and the southern half of the hemisphere.

Now that the Alliance is in operation, it is readily acknowledged that the actions of Latin American countries themselves in achieving the goals of the Alliance are far more important than those of the United States.

It is silly to think that a program of the magnitude of the Alianza para el Progreso can be carried out without making any mistakes. Indeed, the effort to do so is the biggest mistake of all. The most sterile box score is the one that reads, "no runs, no hits, no errors." A team can survive a few errors if it gets some runs; but no matter how flawless its play, it will surely lose without runs. The Alianza has made a few hits; it has managed to get some men on base. But it badly needs some runs, and it ought to be prepared to take a few chances to get them.

For 2 years now, the emphasis (in the aid program) has been on long-range development—on economic growth and social progress. With some exceptions, and oversimplifying the matter somewhat, the United States has been trying to run a development program with a machine designed for a technical assistance program.

We speak of Latin America, but at best it is only a phrase that represents a broad generalization and roughly identifies a geographical area. Actually, Latin America is made up of individual nation states, all with their own history, background, and culture, and all very different. Therefore, we must face the fact that each country requires special and separate consideration. There is no general program that can be applied universally.

Whatever we do in Latin America we need to remember that Brazil is the key to success or failure. Brazil is the big country, and if the Alliance for Progress fails in Brazil and if our relationships with Brazil deteriorate to the point of noncooperation or emotional hostility, then whatever we seek to do in the Western Hemisphere will be endangered. It should be recognized that the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress in either Chile or Argentina will have far-reaching consequences in the hemisphere.

The experience of the past 2 years indicates that a basic mistake made was not in switching from technical assistance to economic development but in attempting to apply the new economic development formula universally. U.S. officials have attempted to apply it to Venezuela, Chile, and Mexico—with good reason—but also to Honduras, Paraguay, Ecuador, and Guatemala—which are at an entirely different stage in their development. The latter countries at the present time need further technical assistance before any economic development program can ever succeed.

Economic aid to be effective must be used where there is competence in management, skilled workers, and modern business know-how. Capital without the trained people is but a palliative. It yields little or no development. At best, it gives only temporary relief. The U.S. aid program and those of other aid institutions participating in the Alliance must be prepared to gear aid programs to the development level of the various countries in Latin America, not just to those of the more advanced countries. This will require a different balance of technical assistance and capital aid in the Central American countries than in the advanced countries of the southern cone such as Argentina and Chile.

Another factor in administration, closely related to the second is that at the same time that this process of change from technical assistance to economic development was occurring, the administrative machinery in Washington was becoming even more complex, which is to say more cumbersome and less capable of making decisions, even wrong decisions. One expects some administrative confusion in launching a new program, but much of this is plainly inexcusable, especially in a government which thinks it is good enough to include projects in public administration among some of its technical assistance programs abroad. I for one have never received an adequate answer to the question, "Why does it take a year to decide whether to build a housing project in the Dominican Republic, and then another year to actually build it?" Something is wrong here. If there are not sufficient loan officers or engineers available to review and appraise proposals, more should be hired—and if the law does not permit this it should be changed. If legislation is required, Congress should be informed accordingly.

Since 1948 there have been 10 administrators of the foreign aid program. The location of the agency has changed almost as frequently as the administrators. Sheer movement of physical facilities all over the city has created chaos and destroyed morale. Movement of files, desks, and partitions has been enough to leave officials in a state of permanent bewilderment. Under two administrations (1953–63) the foreign aid program has been the best example of administrative bungling in the Federal Government. In actual handling of the aid program, both have operated under the assumption that the program is temporary even while claiming to recognize that it is permanent.

Possibly the greatest single factor in weakening the morale of the aid agency is the succession of 1-year appointees as administrator. It is to be hoped that the appointment by President Kennedy of an experienced administrator, known to have the President's confidence will mean the end of the senseless pattern in which 1-year men are expected to do a 10 year-job. The knowledge by upper echelon officials that the policy directives they must implement will not be changed every year will do much to improve their morale and that of their subordinates. The knowledge that the AID Administrator enjoys the complete confidence of the President will do even more.

To implement successfully such a program requires experienced professionals who will remain in the program over a long period of time. We have learned over the past decade that you cannot tackle 30-year problems with 5-year plans using 1-year money. We must learn that the job cannot be done with 2-year personnel—who leave the program 6 months after they have really learned their job. One must not only recruit good men at both the higher and lower levels but must hold them. The Foreign Service has succeeded in this. The foreign aid program has not.

THE ROLE OF AID

Who makes the key decisions on aid matters for Latin America? Where are they made? On the political side in the State Department the locus of decision making has been fairly clear since the spring of 1962. This unfortunately, is not true on the foreign aid side. When the Alliance was first announced, it was suggested that U.S. programs under it be directed from the White House. This was considered but rejected in view of the formidable obstacles that would result in coordinating them with the State Department. The Alliance aid program was placed with the rest of the foreign aid program in the State Department. Yet it often appeared that the Alliance program was in the State Department and key decisions were made in the White House. If those responsible for the direction of the Alliance aid program are to stand a chance of success, they must have the authority commensurate with their responsibilities. Effective orderly administration of the Alliance program is impossible if designated Alliance officials cannot make final decisions.

The morale of AID personnel in Washington dealing with Latin America is suffering. In some of the missions abroad it is even worse. There is no more urgent task for the Washington headquarters of AID than to give a sense of confidence and firm policy direction to officials in the field. A good way to start would be to delegate more authority to AID mission chiefs and to ambassadors. If the Administration feels a man cannot be trusted, it ought to replace him with a man it feels can be trusted. But it ought not to give men responsibility without authority.

Since mission directors are the representatives of the U.S. Government in the field, it is essential that they understand the thinking of their Washington superiors and enjoy their confidence. This understanding and confidence will ordinarily be gained through regular consultations in Washington, during which directors meet individually with the AID Administrator and the Director of the Latin American region. Ready access to one's superiors in Washington is essential. I am encouraged to hear that the new AID Administrator places a high priority on regular meetings with aid mission directors.

THE COST OF THE ALLIANCE

There are at least three striking differences which should be noted between those three successful programs (point four, food for peace, and Peace Corps) and the economic and military aid programs. All three of these involve the outlay of comparatively small amounts of American dollars. All three have an immediate impact upon the recipient country. All three benefit the common people, rather than the elite group. Because they benefit the common people, they have been gratefully received.

Both military and economic aid are expensive—they involve expenditure of large sums of money. In both cases, the impact of the aid is usually delayed. There is a long time span between the agreement to support the building of a dam, an airport, or an industrial plant and the realization of the goal. In both cases, the immediate benefits are often enjoyed to a disproportionate extent by a small minority of the population—by the military, by contractors, businessmen, and high government officials. There is a pressing need for those types of immediate impact projects which will at least partially satisfy popular demand while long-range projects are being developed. Such programs in education, health, and housing can yield quick politically valuable results.

As the Alliance for Progress develops and more and more countries qualify for the above combination of aid programs, the total aid required may substantially increase. The United States must be prepared to face this prospect. For example, if the plans currently being discussed in Brazil to mobilize the resources of that great country to meet pressing economic and social problems are carried through, the United States should be prepared to render the massive assistance required—assistance which would undoubtedly be on a scale similar to that now available to India.

We should prepare to face the fact that the prospect of increasing our aid program in Latin America may require a careful reevaluation of our assistance to other parts of the world.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The importance of rural development can hardly be overstated. Over half of the countries of Latin America continue to spend sizable amounts of precious foreign exchange reserves to import food to feed their populations. This occurs in countries that are primarily agricultural. For the common man in most of Latin America, the key to a higher standard of living in the near future is still an increase in agricultural productivity. In this field the United States has a record of proven performance. We abound in technical expertise in the field of agriculture and the key to success appears to be our ability to secure the widespread adoption of known and proven techniques.

A successful agricultural program will require not only support of programs aimed at providing supervised credit, seed and fertilizer, machinery, land drainage, but will require continued technical assistance on a large scale. In the United States this massive dissemination of technical know-how was achieved through the agricultural extension system of county agents. Until some Latin American equivalent of this is realized, it is doubtful this can be done even through cooperatives. The choice in Latin America is between cooperatives and collectivism. Cooperatives provide an opportunity to pool resources and technical expertise.

LABOR

Throughout the Central American area, as well as Mexico and Venezuela, progress during the past year has been made in the field of labor. Mexico is a good example. Through our labor information officers assigned to USIA, we are now reaching the trade union movement in Mexico. One reason why we are now being effective is because we are using experienced union men. Five of the nine labor information officers now serving in Mexico City have a union background. These men have earned the confidence of Mexican labor leaders and now are beginning to make an impact in a labor milieu long dominated by Marxist-oriented groups. Some progress can also be noted in the training of Latin American labor leaders in this country. Through the American Institute for Free Labor Development, hundreds of labor leaders are now being brought to the United States for training. This is an excellent program, but can handle only a small fraction of the total number of leaders eligible. Much more needs to be done in this crucial area.

IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I found in my discussions in Latin American countries and I find in my discussions with businessmen here in this country much agreement with the U.S. Coordinator's conclusion: Two years after the Alliance was launched, Latin Americans have come a long way in learning the truth—the fact that the Alliance will succeed only if it accords a large role to a vigorous system of modern private enterprise. They have come a long way in facing the fact that of the $20 billion that will be required from abroad for investment under the Alliance program, $3 billion must come from the United States in private investments. Many now recognize, if they did not when the Alliance was launched in 1961, that the larger share of the investment capital needed for the Alliance must come from private sources, both domestic and foreign.

The pattern for business success in Latin America has already been established—right here in the United States. The U.S. businessman has a record of unparalleled success in adapting to a changing environment, in combining profitable business ventures with farsighted social welfare programs. In adapting to the changing environment of Latin American countries, American business must follow the same practices implemented here at home: support of education, training of nationals for responsible supervisory and managerial positions; sharing of profits, bona fide collective bargaining; opening up stock ownership to the people of the country. In Brazil a prominent and successful businessman told me that American business must expand its stock ownership to more and more Brazilians. He said, "Either get naturalized or be nationalized. Become a part of us instead of using us." His analysis may be prejudiced but it seems to represent the attitude of Latin Americans, rich or poor.

To promote new large scale foreign private investment, some system of international insurance may be needed to guarantee new investments. No individual government can supply all the capital needed. But the U.S. Government, working with European and Latin American governments, could devise a system to guarantee capital lent by private banks to private businesses interested in investing in manufacturing enterprises in Latin American countries. This would follow the procedure now in effect for the housing investment guarantee program under section 224 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1961.

Another essential means of strengthening the private sector is through expansion of trade. The private sector of Latin American economies cannot be strengthened unless markets are available for exports, both commodities and manufactured products. The immediate need is to expand trade between Latin American countries—which is now only 10 percent of their total trade.

One possible way of increasing this intercountry trade would be through the establishment of an export credit system modeled on the U.S. Export-Import Bank. Such a system might be worked out through OAS members, possibly administered through institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and/or through the Central American Bank.

THE BATTLE OF ATTITUDES

Even more important than equipping people with the skills needed in a developing economy is exposing both youth and adults to the values and traditions of a free society. This in turn will require that special attention be given to the institutions and media that shape the minds of the men who shape the society—specifically to the university professors, the teachers, to the textbook writers and publishers, to the writers, journalists, and news media personnel. A good example of progress in this area is the textbook program supported by AID in Central America. For the first time, first and second grade children will have modern textbooks published, not by Marxist-oriented presses shipped in from Eastern Europe, but by pro-Western groups and competent educators. This program could profitably be repeated in over half the countries of the continent.

Strange and alien as it may sound to North American ears, the key to controlling a university in many Latin American capitals is control of the student government. For years, Communists have had free run of universities—have had no competition. The vast majority of students and professors are non-Communists. But through organization Communists have dominated the university scene. It is now being proven that they can be beaten through counterorganization. Marxist influence in the national universities in Chile, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic is now on the decline because the Christian Democratic student organization backed by other pro-Western groups, have organized and have won the student elections, thereby gaining control of the student government. In these instances, democratic oriented groups have matched the leftwing groups in zeal, in organization and in perseverance—all of which are required to win the intellectual struggle being waged in the universities of Central and South America.

We in the United States are beginning to learn what the Communists have learned long ago—that resources invested in wooing and training the future leaders of society, in all fields, will pay high dividends. But our investment is still a pittance, considering the magnitude of the challenge. I for one have never heard a convincing explanation of why we have not launched a massive program to bring Latin American students and potential leaders to the United States for training and schooling. By massive, I mean 10,000 per year. The cost would be less than that of one modest highway loan, and the benefit for U.S. foreign policy could not be compared.

INFILTRATION OF JOURNALISM

On my trip to the Caribbean area in 1962, I was favorably impressed with improvements in the work of the U.S. Information Agency; its activities seem to have a better sense of proportion and of priority. The Voice of America broadcasts are better, but not yet as good as they ought to be, especially as regards to signal strength. Service to local broadcasters has been effectively strengthened.

In the daily press of many Latin American cities, however, the portrayal of the United States as the "Yanqui imperialist" is continued—or at least goes unchallenged. It is a well-established fact that journalists, and radio and TV commentators are regularly trained in Havana and Moscow and carefully placed in positions in the communications world. The journalist profession has been heavily infiltrated by Marxist trained writers and it is notorious that some large U.S. business firms regularly advertise in the Communist daily that is found in many capital cities.

HELP FROM THE CHURCH

One of the most hopeful signs in Latin America in recent years is the renaissance of the Catholic Church and a new awakening on the part of the church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent. The farsighted social and economic philosophy of Pope John's recent social encyclical Mater et Magistra is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been promoted to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals. Efforts are now being pursued to extend the programs in education and health in which the church has long been involved to the mass of the people. An excellent indication of the change taking place in the church in Latin America is found in the pastoral letter on "Social Reform and Common Good" issued in November 1962 by the 24 Roman Catholic bishops of Chile. The pastoral letter scathingly criticized existing social and economic abuses, deplored the inequality in distribution of incomes, and called on the government to extend and speed up its reforms and its social welfare programs. Offering its own example, the church in Chile is now redistributing most of its own lands to local peasants.

Closely related to the new orientation developing in the church is the growth of the Christian democratic movement in Chile, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Argentina, and Panama. Although currently electorally strong in only two countries, Chile and Venezuela, these strongly reformist pro-Western parties have growing strength in university and labor circles. Such leaders as Eduardo Frei and Radomiro Tomic, in Chile, and Ralfael Caldera, in Venezuela, can be expected to play an increasingly significant role in providing leadership for progressive democratic forces in Latin America.

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

One of the most promising movements toward economic and political integration is taking place today in Central America. The progress of the six small Central American Republics to achieve economic and political integration is especially gratifying in view of the minimal progress made by the countries of South America in achieving integration through the Latin American free trade area. President Kennedy's trip to San Jose in mid-March to confer with the Presidents of the six Republics is a grand gesture of the support we are giving to the integration movement.

In order to deal with Central America as a unit, the United States has established an AID mission known as ROCAP (Regional Office Central America and Panama) with headquarters in Guatemala.

ROCAP is only a few months old, and its precise relationship to the U.S. country missions and to Washington has not yet taken form, but its general role is clear: It is to use the AID program as a means of encouraging the Central American economic integration movement. Similarly, the basic role of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration is clear: It is to use credit as an instrument of encouraging the movement. ROCAP has able leadership, it has the strong support of the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, it has been well received by Central American leaders. In the allocation of U.S. funds under the Alliance for Progress program, this regional mission should receive high priority.

As it is our policy to promote integration in Central America, U.S. diplomats and AID officials assigned to Central American countries will be expected to endorse and promote this aim. If the regional mission, the regional bank and the Common Market are the instruments chosen to achieve this goal, then U.S. officials should support them.

I believe the time has come for another dramatic gesture by the United States—this time to accelerate the efforts now being made to achieve economic and social development in Central America. I propose that the United States offer to make available immediately up to $50 million toward the establishment of a Regional Integration Trust Fund to be administered by the Central American Bank. Because of the preference of some countries for bilateral aid, the decision on whether to accept the offer would be made by the governments of the participating countries. It should be discussed at the meeting of presidents next week in San Jose, Costa Rica. The purpose of the fund would be to initiate new projects and accelerate those now underway that contribute most directly toward economic and political integration.

The following discussion of the Cuban issue reflects the conversations held with numbers of Latin American leaders in the Caribbean and in South America. It should be recognized, of course, that differences exist among Latin leaders on this question.

THE THREAT OF TERRORISM

In the case of Latin America today, there is an immediate problem which must be distinguished from the long-range economic and social problems which the Alliance is designed to solve. This is the problem of the external Communist threat from Cuba, backed by the Soviet Union and China. Cuba by itself is not a military threat to the United States, but Cuba as an extension of Soviet military power is a threat to our security. The Cuban threat to Latin America however is not mythological but real. In the immediate sense, it is not economic, but primarily political, propagandistic and paramilitary. The threat arises from the fact that Castro's Cuba, backed by the Soviet Union and China, has become a forward base for the subversion of the hemisphere. It is now a base for indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans, including training in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. The threat is magnified by the fact that the aroused peoples of Latin America are pressuring their governments to meet basic social and economic problems that have gone unsolved for centuries.

This systematic attempt to subvert democratic governments in Latin America is best seen in the case of Venezuela. Venezuela is today the No. 1 immediate target of Castro-Communist subversion because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding there. It is the immediate target because the subversion of Venezuela with its huge resources of oil and iron would provide a springboard for the penetration of the entire South American continent. It could convert the Caribbean into a Communist sea. The United States has now made it clear that these attacks on Venezuela will not be permitted to succeed. They will be repelled—regardless of cost. Venezuela has top priority for U.S. support. From Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence and terror in Venezuela. It is no surprise that of the 1,500 persons from Latin America trained in Cuba in 1962, the largest number have been Venezuelans.

Venezuela has withstood attacks from the radical right and Communist conspirators because its democratic government has been capable of defending itself against armed attack from within and because its action programs in economic and social betterment command popular allegiance. It is obvious to the Betancourt government and to the United States that to cope with such attacks, economic aid alone is not sufficiently effective. Meeting the threat requires measures which are primarily paramilitary, political and propagandistic. All of these programs are designed to provide a shield of security behind which the Alliance for Progress can develop. They are essential to repulse the immediate threat to the stability and internal security that are necessary if the long-term Alliance for Progress economic programs are to succeed.

In considering the Communist problem in relation to the Alliance for Progress, we must therefore always bear in mind the distinction between the two salient Communist threats in the Western Hemisphere: (1) the appeal of the Communist economic model as a solution to the economic needs of impoverished people; (2) the attempt of a Communist regime (i.e., Cuba) and Communist groups within Latin American countries to subvert non-Communist governments through armed attack, internal terror and sabotage and propaganda.

The economic threat cannot be met by military solutions—but rather by effective mobilization of resources and accomplishment of reforms by local governments, combined with U.S. help in the form of foreign aid loans, Food for Peace, the Peace Corps and technical assistance. The subversion and terrorism problem requires specific political and internal security measures. Violence and subversion in Latin America cannot be defeated by relying wholly on the elimination of hunger, poverty and disease.

A POLICY ON CUBA

The United States has made it clear that our policy is to eliminate Castroism. The Cuban satellite will never be permitted to gain the status of an Eastern European satellite. Here the commitment itself is more important than the particular means and methods chosen to implement the commitment.

At the same time, it is important that throughout Cuba and all Latin America it is clearly understood that we want the Castro-Communist tyranny to be replaced with a progressive government, that we will not tolerate a rightwing dictatorship. A Cuban Government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reform will have the firm support of the United States, just as the progressive government of Venezuela does today.

We must emphasize again and again that the United States is dedicated to the welfare of the Cuban people. Although our Government has placed high priority in getting this message to the Cubans themselves (and was particularly successful at the time of the Cuban crisis in October 1962) a good share of the American public has been so preoccupied with the Castro military threat that it has given too little thought to consideration of a program for post-Castro Cuba. Our goal must be a free Cuba participating in the Alliance for Progress working for economic progress, better health, housing, and education—as well as political liberty.

Latin Americans are acutely aware of being under attack. They sometimes express the feeling that North Americans are mesmerized by Cuba as a military threat, whereas they feel the real war with communism goes on year after year at every level of activity. They are as concerned about the young Brazilian who returns from the Soviet Union, Cuba, or China to enter the journalistic profession as they are about the young Peruvian who comes back trained for guerrilla warfare in the Andes.

In describing the degree of infiltration of Communist-trained opinionmakers into the press, radio, TV and other areas of Latin American life, a perceptive Brazilian concluded that over the past decade the Latin American Republics had already received the billionth bullet in the Communist assault.

Our Latin American friends rightly remind us that the Communist problem existed in Latin America long before Castro came to power in Cuba. The Communist Party has been operating in Latin America for decades, and the threat of communism has been growing because the shocking economic and social problems in so many of these countries have gone unsolved.

Even if Castro and communism should be removed from Cuba, this would not eliminate from the Western Hemisphere the problems of Communist terror, subversion and psychological warfare, nor solve the terrible economic and social ills that plague vast areas of Central and South America. We must keep in mind that Cuba, however important, is only a part of the total problem; part of the total challenge we face in Latin America.

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed in meeting the staggering problems of poverty, illiteracy, maldistribution of wealth, and economic stagnation in vast areas in Latin America, we must administer and support the Alliance with the same sense of urgency that presently motivates our thinking about Cuba.

We are obliged to take note of the differing attitudes toward Cuba among Latin American countries. The governments of the countries on the South American cone, plus Brazil and Mexico, will continue to be under strong pressure from well-organized groups to oppose firm measures against Castro. Most Latin American leaders in the Caribbean area, on the other hand, will firmly support a strong policy although differing sharply on tactics. In my conversations with leaders of the Caribbean countries, I was repeatedly told that Castro had lost much of the popular appeal that he may once have had, and that public opinion regards his government as a dangerous menace to be eliminated, rather than as a model to be copied. But they look to the United States for leadership. I am hopeful that the guidelines of a common policy with respect to the Cuban problem will be agreed to in San Jose at the meeting of the Presidents.

In implementing such a common policy toward Communist-Castro Cuba, we must recognize that our leaders require wide latitude in choosing means, tactics, and timing. The national interest is not served by emotional and flamboyant public speeches, but rather by cooperative planning, cold reckoning, and persistent action to solve the Cuban problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues particularly to the contents of this report on the organizational structure of the AID administration and the problems which exist in the administration of our Alliance for Progress program. I have called for the same sense of urgency in carrying out this program that we have in our concern over Cuba.

We ought to recognize that whether or not the Communists ever gained a foothold in Cuba, the social and economic problems of South and Central America would be with us. The problems we face today result from years of neglect, years of tyranny, despotism, and aristocracy. Therefore, we are now trying to do in a very few years what should have been underway for decades. Also I have pointed out in the report the importance of our private investments and private enterprise in the Latin American area. I believe that some of the observations on the economic integration movement in Central America are worthy of our thoughtful consideration.

The Central American Republics have possibly done more than any other area in the world, save Western Europe, to develop a program of economic integration and of a common market. They have made great progress. They have competent, experienced, intelligent leaders who are doing their very best to bring about a more stable, just, and progressive society in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, on the same subject matter, I also wish to invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "Castro: Time Waster for Latin Conference," which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, of Tuesday, March 19. It relates to the report by Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, on her recent trip into the Latin American area. Representative GRIFFITHS traveled in Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras during December of this past year.

Her report made a very favorable impact upon Members of the House and upon those persons who were privileged to receive it. I commend Representative GRIFFITHS on the very fine report of her study mission and journey. I commend the Detroit Free Press for the thoughtful and constructive editorial that relates to this report and to all the problems that we face in Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO A TIME WASTER FOR LATIN CONFERENCE

Telling the Central American nations to forget about Castro for the moment and concentrate on their own problems, as President Kennedy did yesterday, is like telling junior to quit tattling on sister and clean up his own room.

Junior may not like it, but mother knows best.

Without running the real risk of war, there is not much the United States or the Central American nations can do about communism within Cuba right now. The President is doing about as well as anyone can expect.

The real question, which the President wants to deal with, is how to keep communism and Castroism from spreading throughout Latin America. In the Central American nations, he has a good starting place.

As Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS reported after her December trip to the area, these six nations—Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras—are largely ignored in the rest of the world. They are, in varying degrees, desperately poor, and their main export crop, coffee, has suffered a 30- to 40-percent price drop.

Some of the nations, in fact, are so poor that they can hardly afford the temporary drop in tax revenue that a sensible tax reform program would bring. Instead, to get working cash, they have to rely on a jerry-built program of high excise taxes on such things as cablegrams and slaughtering licenses.

In Panama, rural roads are so bad, she said, that it takes a farmer longer to get his goods the 7 miles to market than it did for John Glenn to circle the earth. In Honduras, there are no roads in the eastern half of the country, and even the Inter-American Highway is far from the economic center. Instead of being able to use Alliance for Progress funds for developing industries, the money must go first for roads.

In addition, we have long ignored the Central American nations in favor first of Europe, then Asia, and then South America. Since 1939, during the era of the good neighbor policy, U.S. disbursements to Central America, partly in loans already repaid, have come to only $14.10 per person, or 56 cents a year.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS found that these nations need to do major work on improving their higher education programs, both in the caliber of the work and the role of the universities. Five of the six nations, excluding Panama, have begun to pool their graduate level studies, but this is only a beginning.

A further problem facing these countries—and us—is the simple problem of how to give or lend our money. When we get into aid programs, we do not dip a toe, but plunge head first.

There are, for example, six agencies in the tiny country of Costa Rica borrowing or begging from six different U.S. agencies.

Add on the international lending agencies and the United Nations, and there are 15 channels of U.S. assistance, many working without knowing what the others are doing, and some even working at cross-purposes.

It is no wonder that much of our money is wasted, while the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

To begin on these problems is as much as the Presidents of the six nations, plus Mr. Kennedy, can do in the short and formal time alloted to the San Jose meeting.

It is all well and good that the six Latin Presidents want a declaration of opposition to Castro. But the conference would be a waste if their time is spent discussing how to get rid of him.

Their most effective way, as President Kennedy said, is to solve their own problems, so that the seeds of Castro's communism cannot find fertile soil in Central America.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND BRAZIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since we are speaking on matters relating to South and Central America, I should like to take the State Department to task for just a moment for what I consider to be a rather amateurish, unprecedented and, I believe, unwarranted handling of very difficult and sensitive relationships between our country and Brazil.

I cannot imagine how this situation developed. To say that the Government of Brazil was being infiltrated by Communists, and to say so in the public press, does little to help our efforts to improve our relationships in Latin America.

There is a time and a place for making statements of that kind if we believe them and if we have evidence to support them. If other so-called friendly governments were to make that kind of charge about our country, we would be very much disturbed, and rightly so. It is not a good idea for the officials of one country to inject themselves into the internal politics of another country, publicly at least. We had ways of doing this through our embassies and our diplomatic missions. But, as many of the newspapers in our country have noted, there was little to be gained and much to be lost by the rather crude and abrupt public comments upon the situation in Brazil. The Brazilian Republic has many problems. As a fellow member of the OAS we have every right to be concerned about those problems. If Brazil should fall by the wayside or should fall into the lap of the Castroites and Communists, the Alliance for Progress would surely fail. Not only that, but the security of our hemisphere would be seriously jeopardized.

There are many men in the Government of Brazil today—and I know some of them—who are as deeply dedicated to the principles of freedom and democracy as is anyone in our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of recent days be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dealing With Brazil

Whatever the chill wind from Paris, there is at least one rift in this country's historic alliances that can and should be promptly repaired. Few countries in the world have been older friends and allies than Brazil, the giant Republic of South America, which, more than any other, may determine the success of the Alliance for Progress. For more than 2 years there has been static in United States-Brazilian relations, a melancholy outbreak of petty vexations in which an insistence on being right on small things has obscured larger common goals.

Fortunately, with the visit of Francisco Clementino San Tiago Dantas, Brazil's powerful Minister of Finance, there is at hand an opportunity for a fresh start. Mr. Dantas, a pragmatic liberal leftist of formidable gifts, brings an important distinction to his mission. He represents an administration that has the power (and hopefully) the will to govern. Last January, the voters gave President Goulart the full executive powers that had been withheld from him 2 years before when he succeeded the erratic Janio Quadros.

The overriding hope in this country is that Mr. Goulart will use this power to cope responsibly with the single most pressing economic problem in Brazil—uncontrolled inflation. Though Brazil has had a dramatic rate of economic growth, fiscal insolvency has eaten away at the fruits of development. Everyone acknowledges this. To his credit, President Goulart has begun the task of reform. Brazil's anti-inflation program calls for a 35-percent cut in public expenditures, an elimination of subsidies for fuel and wheat, credit ceilings on Bank of Brazil loans to private firms, an internal price freeze on coffee and wage limitations for governement employees.

In the past months, Brazil has received ample and unsolicited criticism in the United States for its failure to set its house in order. What Brazil now needs is support and encouragement in carrying out an anti-inflation program that is long overdue. Specifically, Mr. Dantas is seeking to reschedule debt payments and release $84 million in aid money held up by the United States pending a genuine counterattack on inflation.

But what Brazil also needs is an affirmative attitude in the United States based on an understanding of life and politics in a swiftly changing country. Brazil is not a banana Republic and is on the threshold of great power status. It is foolish to expect Brazil to see eye-to-eye on the details of foreign policy, yet the amount of noise aroused by dissent on specifics has tended to obscure solidarity on fundamentals. When the Cuban crisis shook the world last October, there was no question of where Brazil stood.

As elsewhere in Latin America, there is an exotic spectrum of left-wing politics in Brazil. There are men like Mr. Dantas who describe themselves as liberal leftists. There are nationalists who want free enterprise at home but anti-American policy abroad. There are Moscow Communists and Castro Communists, and some of these, as our Ambassador, Lincoln Gordon, accurately reported, are in the government.

But no responsible U.S. official, emphatically including Mr. Gordon, would describe the government of Brazil as pro-Communist. The places of power are held by non-Communists, leaders whose influence will grow if Brazil prospers. It is this vigorous center, speaking for a burgeoning middle class, that should get more attention than the fanatic fringe. By dealing justly and generously with Brazil, by remembering that the overall terms of trade have tipped to Brazil's disadvantage, and by viewing Brazil in continental perspective, the United States can now give new strength to a faltering partnership.

SEISMIC CALCULATIONS SUPPORT U.S. TEST-BAN PROPOSAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had hoped that I might present for the Record of the Senate earlier today some observations on recent statements that have been made by Members of Congress, as well as other citizens, concerning the U.S. proposals at the nuclear test-ban conference in Geneva.

I should like to comment today on the seismic calculations that support the U.S. test-ban proposals.

It has been alleged that there is a big hole in our present proposals for a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union. I would like to point out a few rather substantial holes in this unwarranted attack on the administration's proposals for an effective and safeguarded halt to the further testing of nuclear weapons.

The opponents of the U.S. proposal now assert that underground nuclear explosions below 3 kilotons carried out more than 620 miles inside the borders of the Soviet Union could not be detected by the U.S.-operated network of control posts, which would be located around the periphery of the Soviet Union but outside its borders. In order to create this so-called big hole or zone of undetectability, three assumptions have been made, none of which stands up under close analysis.

My colleagues will recall that about 3 days ago a map appeared in one of the local newspapers, showing a picture of the Soviet Union and an area within the center of the Soviet Union called the zone of undetectability, or the big hole in the proposals of the United States at Geneva.

The map was not drawn very well. As I said earlier, it was a poor example of map drawing. The geographical aspects were even more unlikely and inadequate.

As I said, there were three assumptions which had been made, none which stands up under close analysis.

First, it is assumed that our detection capability necessarily decreased as the distance of the detection station from the location of the clandestine test increased. This assumption is not based on scientific fact.

The truth is that our capabilities to detect underground nuclear explosions at long range are frequently better than our capabilities to detect the same explosions at shorter ranges. This is due to the characteristics of the seismic waves which are generated by an underground nuclear explosion and the manner in which these waves pass from the point of detonation through the earth's crust or mantle to the detection station. For example, detection capability actually increases from about 2,000 to 3,000 miles. As a matter of fact, two relatively simple seismic stations located 2,000 and 2,500 miles away from our Nevada test site detected most of the 3-kiloton underground shots which have occurred in the dry desert dirt at the site. Improved equipment at these two stations would certainly have permitted detection of even smaller explosions.

These significant discoveries as well as overall improvements in our long-range detection capabilities have been the result of the continuing research effort in the field of the seismology of nuclear explosions—an effort which has been carried on by the Department of Defense since 1959.

The second assumption upon which the "big hole" argument is based is that the explosions of 3 kilotons or less would occur in a type of dry sandy soil known as alluvium. The proponents of this theory seem to recognize that tests in harder rock would increase the size of the seismic signals generated by the explosion, and therefore increase its detectability. This Soviet Union, however, contains precious little of the required type of soil to muffle the 3-kiloton tests. In fact, according to a U.S. Geological Survey map, no dry alluvium beds are to be found more than 620 miles inside the Soviet Union, which, according to the theory, would be the distance required to be outside the range of detectability. The two relatively small areas where soil of this alluvium type is shown to exist are both within 500 miles of the southern border of the Soviet Union.

Moreover, testing in this dry, loose soil creates many more hazards of external detection than does testing in other more substantial types of rock. In order to prevent a large cavity clearly visible on the earth's surface, tests in alluvium must be carried out at considerable depths. However, it is rare to find any dry sandy soil very far below the earth's surface—in the U.S.S.R. or anywhere else. The horns of this dilemma seem to punch quite a hole in the "big hole" argument, which its proponents have carefully chosen to omit from discussion.

In fact, I think it would have been much better if the proponents of the "big hole" argument had gone to our geologists. We know a good deal about it.

The third assumption on which the U.S. proposals have been challenged is that the long-range detection system would have a fixed detection threshold of 3 kilotons below which nuclear explosions could not be detected. This is not the case. The detection threshold varies from station to station, and, for each station, from day to day. It depends on the way the station is constructed, on the structure of the earth between the station and the explosion, and on the amount of background noise at the time of the explosion. A potential violator could not possibly know the threshold at each of the 100 or more detection stations located all around the world at the instant of the explosion. He could therefore never be able to be sure that even a small clandestine explosion would go undetected.

This should suffice to collapse the "big hole." But its proponents have also made rather broad claims about what can be done in the alleged big hole—that is, nuclear testing that might escape detection under a nuclear test-ban treaty. It is claimed that all tactical nuclear weapons and a substantial fraction of strategic nuclear weapons can be developed without detection. This assessment runs directly counter to the unanimous opinion of some of the best qualified people to judge. I am referring to the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of State; and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; in addition to Mr. William Foster, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and their scientists. On March 11, in a public hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Rusk stated, in answer to my question, that these individuals had unanimously recommended to the President the adoption of our latest test-ban proposals. Therefore, it is the unanimous and considered judgment of those who have primary responsibility in this field that our nuclear test-ban proposals would promote our national security. I will return to this question in a subsequent portion of my remarks. It is a very important one.

Granted there are risks that certain small and carefully concealed nuclear tests might escape detection. But any conceivable advances in weaponry resulting from these tests could not significantly affect the strategic military balance between ourselves and the Soviet Union, a balance which, according to the President's top national security advisers, presently runs in our favor.

That is not my judgment. That is the judgment of the most competent scientists and military weaponry men we have.

Those who assert that there is a "big hole" in our test ban proposals have made a number of other misstatements of fact and errors in judgment in reaching their conclusion. For example, whereas they emphasize the problem of "background noise" caused by all kinds of natural phenomena as placing restrictions on our ability to detect seismic disturbances, they totally ignore the significant improvements that have been made in our ability to deal with this problem through finding quiet locations for seismic stations, placing seismic instruments in arrays, and perhaps locating some in deep holes—not big holes.

When our latest proposals for a nuclear test ban and the verification system associated with it are examined in their totality, it becomes clear that the President and his advisers have proposed an effective and safeguarded treaty which would be in our national interest. In fact, it is a much better treaty ban than that proposed 2 or 3 years ago. I might add, that was a treaty which did not run into the same kind of sharp, partisan criticism this treaty is now facing. On the other hand, the "big hole" shrinks to its real size when it is tested against what we have actually proposed in the light of our substantial detection capabilities.

Frankly, I am puzzled why these irresponsible, misleading, and mischievous criticisms are being heard now, when the U.S. position is stronger than ever before. Why were they not made under the previous administration, which proposed a treaty below a threshold of approximately 20 kilotons? This was our position between 1958 and 1961—it was proposed, offered, supported and adopted by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. But now the opposition is quibbling over tests with a yield of 3 kilotons or less. To my way of thinking there is no comparison between the potential military significance of a test of 20 kilotons and one of 3 kilotons.

What is really going on? Does the "big hole" theory represent a concern for genuine scientific truth, or as seems more likely, is it simply a device to undercut a nuclear test ban regardless of the cost in terms of scientific veracity and probability?

Mr. President, up to this point I have tried to avoid injecting personalities into the dispute. I have tried to present a factual case without reference, except in very general terms, to the individuals who, in all good faith, have objected to the current test ban proposals of the United States. This morning, however, I obtained a copy of a letter from the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, a Representative from California, to the President of the United States. The gentleman implores the President to accept certain very dubious scientific claims with a view to dumping the carefully worked out test ban proposals which he, the President, has already approved. Over and beyond that, Mr. HOSMER literally asks the President to disregard the advice of three principal officers of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as the advice of some of his top Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officials. Now that the gentleman from California has injected personalities into the controversy, I have no choice but to meet him on his own ground and to demonstrate where he is both misinformed and the victim of his own bias against an effective test-ban treaty.

The Republican spokesman asserts that three top officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—Director William Foster, Deputy Director Adrian Fisher, and the highly respected scientist, Dr. Franklin A. Long—are so anxious to "succeed" in their jobs by concluding a test-ban agreement with the Soviet Union, that they are the victims of "subconscious miscalculations of the balance of risks." He attacks their qualifications for the responsible posts in which they have all been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. In less detail, but with far-reaching implications, he denigrates the President's "Committee of Principals," which advises him on disarmament and test ban matters. In so doing, the Republican spokesman is casting aspersions on the qualifications and judgment of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and several others. Many of these responsible public servants were Republicans—and I imagine they are still of that political persuasion—before accepting the invitation to serve the President of the United States.

But I want to deal specifically with the points raised against three of the top officers of the ACDA. These men, all appointed by President Kennedy and confirmed by the Senate, are Director William C. Foster, Deputy Director Adrian S. Fisher, and Assistant Director for Science and Technology Franklin A. Long.

The Republican spokesman believes he is better qualified to evaluate the advantages and risks of a test-ban agreement than these men are. Let us examine their records.

Mr. Foster—a Republican—has served under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. He came to Washington from private industry in 1941 to help out for a few weeks in the war effort. He stayed for the duration of the war. He held key positions in the War Department and was responsible for millions of dollars in weapons procurement. After the war he served as Under Secretary of Commerce, head of the Marshall Plan, and Deputy Secretary of Defense. President Eisenhower appointed him to the Gaither Committee and to be Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 1958 Geneva Surprise Attack Conference. He also served as executive vice president of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. and chairman of the board of the Aerospace Corp. In 1961 John J. McCloy—I may add, another good Republican—then the President's advisor on disarmament, asked him to join his staff as a special consultant. When Congress created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, President Kennedy, on the same day that he signed the bill, asked Foster to be its director.

This is the man whom the Republican spokesman attempts to dismiss as a "former business executive."

I submit this man has had quite a record in terms of national security and in terms of protecting the vital interests of this Nation.

Adrian Fisher also has a long record of public service. In the early forties he served in the State Department and in the War Department. He was awarded the Legion of Merit for his service as a B-29 navigator with the 20th Air Force. He was appointed Solicitor of the Department of Commerce in 1947, General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission in 1948, and Legal Adviser to the State Department in 1949. He has served as a member of the U.S. Panel on Permanent Court Arbitration, a member of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, chief reporter for the American Law Institute's Restatement of Foreign Relations Law of the United States, trustee of the Institute of Advanced International Studies, and member of the advisory committee of the mathematics department of Princeton University.

This is the man the Republican spokesman attempts to dismiss as "a former lawyer."

Dr. Franklin H. Long, in addition to his long service as a professor of chemistry and head of the Department of Chemistry at Cornell, has a long record of Government service. He became a consultant to the National Defense Research Committee, Office of Scientific Research and Development, in 1941. Later in World War II, from 1943 to 1945, he engaged in explosives research pursuant to a Government contract. Beginning in 1946, he served as consultant to the AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratories, and in 1947 he was named a member of the board of trustees of Associated Universities, which operates Brookhaven for the AEC. In the fifties and sixties he served as a consultant to the Army's Ballistics Research Laboratory at Aberdeen, as a member of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, as Chairman of the Chemistry Advisory Committee of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, as a member of the Navy's Solid Propellant Advisory Committee, as a consultant to the Defense Department's Scientific Advisory Committee, and as a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

This is the man the Republican spokesman seeks to dismiss as just a "chemist."

Mr. President, if these men are to be "bypassed"—and I use the word which appears in the published text of Mr. HOSMER's letter to President Kennedy—who is left to be trusted? According to the gentleman from California, the President should rely on Dr. Carl Romney, seismologist for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, and on Gen. A. W. Betts, Director of Military Applications for the Atomic Energy Commission.

These are distinguished gentlemen, exceedingly able scientists, and their testimony should be considered with the greatest concern and respect, because they are considered among the best men in their field. Without minimizing the qualifications of these men in the slightest degree, the Senator from Minnesota is not convinced that their judgment should outweigh that of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the AEC—not to speak of the leading officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—when it comes to a political calculation based on the best available scientific evidence and demonstrated U.S. detection capability.

Here again we have a situation in which a policy decision has to be made, and that policy decision must be made by policy officers. The law of the land sets up the program known as a Committee of Principals. That committee represents high level officials of the Government. They are directed, by law, to advise the President of the United States on these difficult, complex, and sensitive matters of nuclear test proposals. The President meets with the committee, which consists of the Director of the Central Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Those men have their technical advisers, the best this country can offer, and these men have unanimously recommended to the President of the United States the proposals presented at Geneva. Those proposals undoubtedly have shortcomings. Any proposal would. But the question is whether the risks we take with those proposals are greater or less than the continued unlimited nuclear arms race in which we now find ourselves.

I believe that the men making the proposals have more information about this question than I have, or the gentleman from California. Therefore, I rest my case on the many years of study which have been made by the leading scientists in this area and the policy officers to whom I have referred.

I ask unanimous consent that further information which sheds light on various aspects of this problem be printed at this point in the RECORD. I call attention, for example, to the critique of the scientific assertions of Representative CRAIG HOSMER in his letter of March 18, to President John F. Kennedy, which was prepared by representatives of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; also a copy of a letter from Representative HOSMER to the President of the United States, which was sent to me; and an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Concession and Alteration."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITIQUE OF THE SCIENTIFIC ASSERTIONS OF REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG HOSMER IN HIS LETTER OF MARCH 18 TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

The Representative from California [Mr. HOSMER] argues that a signal of 10 millimicrons strength is necessary to overcome background noise which at a quiet location may be 5 millimicrons. He ignores the fact that several American stations have average background noise levels of only 1 millimicron. He ignores the fact that a 5-millimicron background level can be reduced to 1 millimicron by using arrays of seismographs or placing one seismograph down a deep hole. Even a natural background level of 1 millimicron is not "irreducible" as HOSMER contends.

HOSMER's mistaken calculations throw his whole computation into a cocked hat. If a 1-millimicron average background level can be achieved, a 2-millimicron signal is sufficient for detection. HOSMER's own table shows a 4-millimicron signal over 600 miles from a 3-kiloton shot muffled by dry desert dirt. If he had continued the figures in his table to greater distances instead of stopping arbitrarily at 620 miles, he would have found that a 10-millimicron signal could be obtained at about 1,200 miles, and that the signal remained above the 2-millimicron level for hundreds of miles after that.

STATEMENT IN REPLY TO CONTENTION THAT A "BIG HOLE" EXISTS IN OUR PROPOSED TEST BAN VERIFICATION SYSTEM

The opponents of a test ban treaty have again resorted to the well-known technique of answering careful, reasoned, and factual arguments with a misleading but eye-catching slogan. This time the slogan is that a "big hole" exists in the proposed test ban treaty draft.

No "big hole" exists

The "big hole" contention is based on three assumptions, each of which is wholly inaccurate.

1. The first assumption is that small tests could not be detected by stations more than 620 miles away. Since the U.S. proposal is to rely on stations outside the Soviet Union to detect tests inside, the opponents contend that tests carried out within about 2½ million square miles in the center of the Soviet Union more than 620 miles from its border would be immune from detection.

The fact is that detection at distances greater than 620 miles is frequently better than that at 620 miles. Indeed, a 1961 study made by two scientists from the AEC's Livermore Laboratory and one from the Rand Corp. shows that the signal from a 1-kiloton shot in soft rock (tuff) at about 1,200 miles is over twice as high as the signal is at 620 miles. At either distance, the signal was strong enough for detection. A graph showing conclusions from this study has been given to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Another graph submitted to the Joint Committee by Defense Department Scientist Jack P. Ruina shows that while detection capability decreases from about 1,000 to 2,000 miles, it increases again from 2,000 to 3,000 miles. Throughout the range from about 600 to 6,000 miles, a modern multielement detection station would have a high probability of detecting nuclear explosions down to 1 or 2 kilotons in soft rock (tuff). As a matter of fact, two relatively simple seismic stations located 2,000 and 2,500 miles from our Nevada test site detected most of the shots equivalent to about 1 kiloton in soft rock. Improved equipment at these two stations would have permitted detection of even smaller explosions.

The falsity of the opponents first assumption alone destroys their "big hole" contentions.

2. The second assumption on which the "big hole" is based is that the central part of the Soviet Union contains areas of dry desert dirt (alluvium) which would muffle nuclear explosions. According to a U.S. Geological Survey map shown at the Joint Committee hearings, it is unlikely that dry alluvial beds of the requisite depth are to be found more than 620 miles inside the Soviet Union. The two relatively small areas

where soil of this type appears to exist are both within 500 miles of the Soviet border.

The falsity of this second assumption is also alone sufficient to destroy the "big hole" argument.

3. The third assumption on which the "big hole" contention is based is that the long-range detection system would have a fixed detection threshold of 3 kilotons below which nuclear explosions could not be detected. This is not the case. The detection threshold varies from station to station, and, for each station, from day to day. It depends on the way the station is constructed, on the structure of the earth between the station and the explosion, and on the amount of background noise at the instant of the explosion. A potential violator could not possibly know the threshold at each of the hundred or more detection stations located all around the world at the instant of the explosion. He could therefore never be sure that even a small clandestine explosion would go undetected.

The falsity of this assumption is also sufficient in and of itself to destroy the "big hole."

PROPOSED ONSITE INSPECTION PROVISIONS WOULD INCREASE RISKS OF CHEATING NOT DECREASE THEM

The opponents of a test-ban treaty contend that there are some 400 earthquakes each year in the Soviet Union which would have to be distinguished from clandestine nuclear explosions; that Soviet "military areas" would be totally excluded from inspection; that inspection parties would be limited to only 14 people of whom not more than 10 may be American or British; and that the administration's proposals would not deter cheating. These contentions are incorrect.

1. There are some 170 shallow continental earthquakes in the Soviet Union each year equivalent in size to about a 2-kiloton explosion in soft rock (tuff). By various methods other than onsite inspection, this number could be reduced to about 30 which would be relatively more questionable than the others. Seven annual onsite inspections would be provided.

In 1960 and 1961, when the United States was proposing 20, and then 12 to 20 onsite inspections each year, our Government estimated that there would be 600 earthquakes of this size each year in the Soviet Union. Of these, about 70, which were large enough to be subject to inspection under the treaty draft, would not have been identified as earthquakes or explosions without onsite inspection, according to estimates submitted to the Geneva test ban conference.

During this same period, inspection of earth tremors equivalent in size to about 19 kilotons in soft rock would not have been permitted by the treaty drafts. An uninspected moratorium on such tests was then contemplated while research was conducted to determine how to detect and identify them. The United States does not presently propose any uninspected moratorium. Any detected and located earth tremor which we regarded as suspicious could be inspected within the quota.

The present U.S. proposals would provide as great a deterrent as before against clandestine tests above 19 kilotons and a far greater deterrent against those below.

2. "Military areas" would not be excluded from inspection. However, we would clearly not wish Soviet teams to inspect the Pentagon or a missile installation. Therefore, the U.S. proposal would exclude sensitive defense buildings or similar military installations with the proviso that abuse of this provision by the Soviets would justify our withdrawal from the treaty.

3. Fourteen key members of an inspection team sent to the Soviet Union would be designated by the United States and the United Kingdom. The team would contain six or more individuals from the staff of the international control organization, but the leader of the team would be American or British. This is a strengthening of earlier proposals.

The earth tremors in the Soviet Union which would be inspected by this team would be selected and located by American and British scientists from data supplied by stations which they chose. This is also a strengthening of earlier proposals.

TESTS WHICH MIGHT ESCAPE DETECTION WOULD NOT ALTER MILITARY BALANCE

The opponents of a test ban argue that a broad range of militarily significant tests could be conducted without risk of getting caught.

The administration believes that a potential violator could never conduct a significant series without risk of getting caught either by seismic detection or intelligence means. It is true that the smaller the test and the greater the effort at concealment, the greater will be the difficulties of detection. However, this is the risk with any test ban treaty because no detection system can be made entirely cheat proof.

This problem has been carefully studied by the President, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other interested agencies in both this and other preceding administrations. Both administrations came to the conclusions that the risks of cheating were outweighed by the advantages of a test ban treaty. It is the unanimous view of the President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that our present proposals are in the national interest despite risk of cheating.

It is the view of this administration that, for the developments which could make a substantial change in the military balance in a way unfavorable to the United States, underground testing of a kind which might evade detection would be unsatisfactory. The most significant improvements in weight-yield ratios have probably already been made. Pure fusion weapons which might be developed either in the laboratory or with very small tests would be of lesser advantage to us than to the Soviet Union because such weapons would constitute for us primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already larger stockpile of fission weapons. Hence, any inhibitions on the development of pure fusion weapons would appear to be to our net advantage. Moreover, we have already made significant advances in the direction of tactical weapons with a smaller fission as compared with thermonuclear and fusion components. For these and the reasons set forth below, there is general agreement within the executive branch that a test ban of the kind now contemplated would be in the interest of the United States. There has been a strong consensus in favor of a nuclear test ban since 1958 and earlier.

ADVANTAGES OF A TEST-BAN TREATY

No statement in reply to the opponents of a test ban would be complete without describing the advantages of a test ban to the United States, something which the opponents wholly ignore.

The advantages are as follows:

First, the President and his key advisers in the national security area believe that a treaty of the kind we are proposing would preserve for a longer period our present nuclear advantages.

With continued unlimited testing by both the United States and the U.S.S.R., there would be further increases by both in the efficiency of weapons of higher yield. Our advantage in small weight, high yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would certainly increase their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would probably be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. It is in the nature of the nuclear weapons race that unlimited testing on both sides would tend to produce equality.

With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. Our advantage in smaller weapons would last for a longer period. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unknown by both sides. The development of missile defense systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period. In fact, if President Eisenhower's repeated efforts to secure a test-ban treaty from 1958 to 1961 had been successful, we would probably be in a better position than we are today.

Secondly, a nuclear test ban would constitute a significant first step in achieving control over the further spread of nuclear weapons. A test ban would by no means solve the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons. But it would place the principal nuclear powers in a position to come to grips with the problem more effectively, and in a position from which further steps in the same direction could be taken more easily than at present.

If a nuclear test-ban treaty were concluded, it would be to the interests of both sides to seek to obtain as broad participation as possible among present and potential nuclear powers. The difficulties of obtaining the adherence of France and Communist China to the treaty cannot be underestimated. However, there are a number of other countries likely to develop nuclear weapons in the absence of a test ban adhered to by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. With unlimited testing, the incentives to other powers to secure nuclear weapons are greatly increased. With a treaty and relatively broad participation, our ability to persuade other nations to accede should be substantially increased.

A third advantage of a nuclear test ban treaty is the effect it would have in eliminating radioactive fallout. The extent of the danger to ourselves and future generations from fallout has been the subject of a good deal of controversy and the question has not been completely answered. However, there is general agreement in the scientific community that any increase in the general level of radioactivity is harmful to some degree. Moreover, the danger of radioactive fallout is a significant political issue in many countries of the world, and is a source of real concern to many people in the United States.

A final advantage is that a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a first step in the direction of bringing the arms race under control. It would at the same time constitute an opportunity for the United States to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that some reciprocal control in our relations does not necessarily mean less security for the Soviet Union. It would give both sides experience with inspection and permit us to appraise their cooperation, and in the light of that appraisal, to estimate the cooperation which we might receive in the verification of broader agreements. It could lead to the development of a basis for confidence in other agreements.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I sincerely hope this letter may reach your eyes because it contains information relating to the national security which I feel you may not otherwise receive.

Your Disarmament Agency people recently outlined to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy many of the provisions of a revised test ban treaty under preparation which they state soon will be offered the Soviets. This proposal contains a loophole through which the Soviets can move clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent Communist world domination.

According to testimony of Government technical witnesses heard by the JCAE at the same hearings, the verification system to be proposed is inadequate to detect and identify underground test cheating at yields equivalent to 3 kilotons and below conducted in alluvium formations if cheating is carried on at least 620 miles inside Soviet borders. According to my calculations, this leaves an area of at least 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R.—and probably twice that size—in which significant secret Soviet underground tests can be carried on wholly without fear of detection.

This undetectability results from the inherent inability of seismographs to detect and locate signals unless they are at least twice the size of the earth's normal microseismic background noises and their inherent inability to distinguish, i.e., identify, suspicious events from earthquakes unless the signals are 10 to 20 times larger than background noise.

In short, natural background noise, which averages 10 to 20 millimicrons, affects seismographs just like static affects a radio receiver—the signals are blotted out by the noise.

This is what happens:

Assume a quiet location for the seismograph, with background noise of only 5 millimicrons. This means the signal must be at least 10 millimicrons for detection and location and at least 50 millimicrons for identification. Yet, the signal from a 3 kiloton shot 620 miles distance will be only 4 millimicrons in size—far below levels required for verification of cheating.

Even assuming special instruments could reduce the background noise to an irreducible 1 millimicron minimum—where marginal detection and location capability would appear, still a 10 millimicron signal would be needed for identification, and the actual signal will be only 4 millimicrons.

It is to be noted that signals can be held to the 4 millimicron level either by limiting test yields to 3 kilotons in alluvium or equivalent soils or by conducting larger shots in underground cavities which "decouple" the shock waves from surrounding earth and reduce the signal to the undetectable level.

The foregoing all is a matter of public record in the JCAE's hearings. Also on the JCAE's public record is testimony as to what weapons development progress can be made in this big hole undetectable cheating area. It amounts to the entire spectrum of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons except an "unsubstantial fraction" of strategic weapons—these being superyield H-bombs the U.S.S.R. already has developed anyway.

If you offer the Soviets the treaty now being drafted it will mean an offer by the United States to forego wholly all nuclear weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply to trust a Communist promise not to continue nuclear weapons development when it can be done without fear of discovery.

This is exactly what your Disarmament Agency relates it is advising you to do on the grounds the risks of not doing so are greater than those of doing so. In effect, they say it is more risky for both sides to test in the open than it is for the Communists to be given the opportunity for cheat testing while we stop progress. This flies in the face of logic if we assume we distrust the Soviets enough to spend $50 billion a year on military defense.

The advice also flies in the face of logic if a treaty with a big hole in it is an ineffective treaty, and I do not see how it could be otherwise. Secret weapons testing of the magnitude possible would drastically affect the military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Further, if an ineffective treaty is concluded, it will surrender all opportunity to conclude an effective one. What happens then to the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere who see an effective treaty as one of the very few opportunities there is to achieve a less risky world?

There is no need to take my word, Mr. President, for the facts on undetectability and clandestine weapons development opportunities above related. Dr. Carl Romney, seismologist for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, can explain the inherent physical limitations on seismic detection imposed by background noise as he did to the JCAE. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's Director of Military Applications, can define for you the wide spectrum of opportunity for undetectable weapons development, as he did to the JCAE. I urge you to confer with these men.

Why do I suggest bypassing your Disarmament Agency advisers for this information?

Simply because if they have not already put this matter to you, then you should no longer have confidence in their advice. With the hopes of mankind aroused for a reduction in the world's risks by an effective test-ban treaty, they are not doing their jobs advising you to enter an ineffective one. They cannot safely be relied upon if they tell you to trade the reality of an effective risk reduction device for only an illusion of effectiveness, with the eventual prospect of a nuclear Pearl Harbor thrown in for good measure.

If their advice to you is so bad, why do they give it? These are patriotic men of integrity—what, you may ask, is my answer to that?

My answer, Mr. President, does not reflect on either the patriotism or the integrity of these men. They are hard working people, intensely anxious to succeed in their jobs. It is simply that success in their jobs can only be demonstrated by the conclusion of some agreement with the Soviets. They want a good agreement, not a bad one. But they want an agreement. I am certain that this factor leads them into subconscious miscalculations of the balance of risks which overemphasizes hopes for the verification system and underemphasizes practical difficulties with it.

Mr. Foster, who heads the agency, is a former business executive, his assistant is Mr. Fischer, a former lawyer. Both receive their advice on seismology from Dr. Long, a chemist. None have been on their jobs even for a period of 2 years. Your committee of principals which reviews the Disarmament Agency's advice is composed of three former business executives and four former college professors. This group too has only been on the job for about 2 years.

Look at it this way: At Cape Canaveral, when "all systems are go" it means the check out of many, many components of a missile have been made electronically and infallibly before the final light is green.

By contrast, at the Disarmament Agency all components of a test-ban proposal are not checked out electronically and infallibly before you receive the green light. They are checked by human beings who must make many, many individual subjective judgments as to each component before giving you a red or green light on the overall treaty package. Each of these many, many judgments is subject to a subconscious intrusion of the desire for an agreement. Constant favorable resolution of small doubts by this means, bit by bit, piece by piece, eventually add up to one big major miscalculation.

Such miscalculation, Mr. President, I sincerely feel has occurred. It has occurred substantially in the manner I have outlined. Both you and the Nation will be its innocent victims unless prompt steps are taken—steps which can only be taken by you.

So again, I urge you to talk directly with Dr. Romney and General Betts, or others of equal knowledge and ability, who are not subject to the subconscious pressures upon Mr. Foster and his associates.

I am certain what they tell you will substantiate the proposition that an effective test ban treaty—one which will in fact cause the Soviets to stop nuclear weapons development if we do—will require manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union as well as on free world soil.

Again, in closing, I reiterate the danger of missing the chance for an effective, risk reducing treaty by the proposal of an ineffective, risk increasing treaty.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER.

CONCESSION AND ALTERATION

The English language is so swiftly, subtly and silently changed by the environment in which it exists that it is sometimes necessary to use the swiftest photography to catch a word in flight from an old to a new meaning.

Such a metamorphosis seems to be overtaking the words "concession" and "alteration" as they concern negotiations for a test-ban agreement. The word "concession" hitherto has meant a "yielding" or "conceding" or "surrendering." But in the vernacular of this controversy, the word "concession" suddenly has become synonymous with "change" or "alteration" whether the change or alteration demands a reduction in American demands or even an increase in American demands.

Those who criticize recent changes in the U.S. proposals were not conspicuously the advocates of the earlier American proposals when they were made. But suddenly, the offers of last year have become the basis of national security and any change from them is endowed with peril to the Republic. Whether the U.S. amendments stiffen or relax previous offers, in the language of the day's debate, they are all "concessions."

The semantic objective of the Arms Control Agency must be the development of a word which, in English, has the connotations of virtue and which is synonymous with "tough," "hard," "stiffening," and "unyielding" and which, in translation into Russian, means "surrender," "softening," "yielding" and "conceding." Armed with such a vocabulary, it should be possible to get a test-ban treaty approved by both countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NATIONAL STANDARD FOR EDUCATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have had my attention called to an article which appeared, in the newspapers this week, I believe, written by Admiral Rickover, on the subject of education. As everyone knows, the admiral over the years has shown a great interest in this field, and many times has had a very thoughtful approach to the fulfillment of the goal that I believe every American has a right to look for with respect to our educational institutions, and that is, chiefly, an improvement in education at all levels.

In the 4 years that I served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have many times called the attention of the Senate to the fact that our primary and secondary institutions of learning are not availing themselves of the quality of education which they can produce, and that this, as much as anything else, is responsible for the state of education of which so many people, including educators, complain.

Admiral Rickover reiterates a suggestion he made earlier to help speed educational progress through the establishment of a National Standards Committee. The Committee would be composed of prominent persons devoted, as he puts it, to the ideal of an American education second to none.

I was particularly interested in this article because the recommendations parallel to a considerable degree title I of S. 181, a bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], which I was pleased to cosponsor. Title I of S. 181 calls for the establishment of a National Scholarship Board consisting of 13 members, to be appointed by the President, whose duty would be to administer the scholarship program.

It appears to me that when hearings are held on the bill it would be worthwhile to consider the possibility of delegating additional responsibility to this Board, somewhat along the lines advocated by Admiral Rickover. I say "somewhat along the lines" because I am not fully in accord with the views he expresses in the article. However, I believe they are challenging enough that they should be very carefully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Education.

I invite particular attention to these words of Admiral Rickover:

> Now, the word "standard" has many connotations. I use it in the sense that comes first to mind: A specific requirement or level of excellence deemed worthy of esteem or reward.

I do not say that I would wish to see any such committee have control over the educational system of this country. I believe implicitly that the educational system should be controlled at the local level, and nowhere else. However, it seems to me that a committee which would set up standards which were acceptable and which were recognized standards, as to grade school graduates and high school graduates and college graduates, would be a step forward in our educational system.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICKOVER URGES EDUCATORS TO SET NATIONAL STANDARD

(By Adm. Hyman Rickover)

(NOTE.—Admiral Rickover, one of the most outspoken men of the times, is unhappy about the state of American education. Here he bluntly states what he thinks is wrong with education and educators, and what he thinks ought to be done.)

American education just isn't good enough.

That statement is true whether we look at it from the point of view of the kind of educated youth we need in our complex society, or from the point of view of our competitive position in education vis-a-vis other advanced nations.

Every American wants the best for our children. In education, the best we can give them is the chance to stretch their minds and reach the highest goal their intellect can encompass. They do not get this chance in "progressive" schools and permissive homes.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE

What, then, is to be done to improve American education?

Well, local communities and State governments have the power to increase the amount of classroom instruction per school year. We have the shortest school day and school year among leading nations.

They could eliminate from the curriculums everything that can be learned elsewhere. We are the only advanced country where precious school hours are wasted teaching children how to make fudge, twirl batons, drive cars, budget income, handle the telephone, catch fish, and similar trivia that any reasonably normal person picks up on his own or learns at home.

NEED NATIONAL STANDARD

Most important of all, they could improve teacher qualifications, bringing them up to the level existing abroad.

All this is important, but I am convinced we cannot put through a really effective reform program unless we set up a national scholastic standard.

Now the word "standard" has many connotations. I use it in the sense that comes first to mind: a specific requirement or level of excellence deemed worthy of esteem or reward.

Last May, in a hearing on English education before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON asked me by what means I thought Congress might help speed educational progress.

I suggested that a National Standards Committee be created. This would be a small committee, composed of men of national stature and eminence—trustworthy, intelligent, scholarly and devoted to the ideal of an American education second to none.

The committee would have two tasks:

First, it would act as an educational watchtower, announcing danger when it saw it approaching. It would keep under continuous scrutiny, and periodically report on, the state of American education. Does it meet the needs of our times? Is it competitive with education in countries of similar levels of culture and technology?

We need a disinterested agency to tell us the unvarnished truth about the true state of American education.

Second, the committee would formulate a national scholastic standard on the basis of its findings; a standard which would make us internationally competitive and which also respond to our specific domestic needs. The committee would do this by means of examinations set at different ability levels. No one would have to take them, but those who passed would receive national accreditation.

INTERFERENCE RULED OUT

The committee would in no way interfere with established institutions now granting degrees or diplomas. It would simply set up a higher standard, offer it to anyone who wished to meet it, and certify those who had successfully done so.

Such a committee would help prevent complacency and illusions of superiority and thus save us from the kind of painful shocks that sputnik and other evidence of Russian scientific proficiency have given us in the past few years.

Let me make it crystal clear that nothing in my proposal would violate the constitutional separation of power between Federal and State Governments, nor go counter to our tradition of control of schools by the local community.

A SERVICE ONLY

I envisage the rendering of a service, not regulation in any way, shape or manner.

The committee might provide one set of examinations at the level appropriate for a high school graduate who aspires to enter a first-rate college, and another set at the level of students who may wish to prepare for a semiprofessional or technician's job not requiring a bachelor degree but still requiring a good high school education.

There could be still another set of graduates of various types of colleges, especially those bound for the teaching profession.

I stress again that no one would need to take these examinations; but those who did pass them successfully would obtain national certification, perhaps the notation "N.S."—National Scholar—stamped on their regular diplomas or degrees.

SAVINGS ENVISAGED

There are many occasions where admissions officers of higher educational institutions, or prospective employers, have a valid reason for wanting to know what an applicant's scholastic qualifications actually are. Think how much time and money would be saved if the diploma were clearly to indicate this.

I do not share the pride our educationists take in the fact that we are the only leading nation with a school system that does not challenge its children to meet a national scholastic standard in order to receive academic awards.

I do not agree with them that children must not be judged, that each child has a right to equal education and equal status.

I do not believe that, as one superintendent of schools put it, "straight thinking and democratically minded school administrators will hand out the same diploma, regardless of the variation of high school courses and the range of scholastic achievement that are presented by the graduates as evidence of accomplishment."

DIFFERS WITH EDUCATIONISTS

Nor do I share educationist concern that children who do not measure up to a standard will suffer pain and lose face.

All of life is a series of tests. Young people will be better able to take these tests in their stride if at an early age they begin to learn that everything worthwhile requires great effort but that the satisfaction derived from attaining a standard makes effort worthwhile.

Given the wide differences of aptitude with which we are born and which we do not know how to alter, is it not good for young children to discover that some goals are beyond their capacities, that they cannot win all the tests?

Is it not better to know one's limitations, as well as one's capacities; not to live in delusions which life sooner or later will rudely shatter?

FRANK S. HOAG

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President it is with a great sense of sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American and a true pioneer in the publishing field for my State of Colorado.

On Saturday, March 16 at 7:50 p.m., after a full and rewarding life of 91 years, Mr. Frank S. Hoag passed away at the Parkview Episcopal Hospital in his home city and my original home city, Pueblo, Colo.

Until just prior to the death of his beloved wife, Mrs. Louise Hillebrand Hoag, on February 12 of this year, Mr. Hoag, despite his advanced years, remained mentally and physically alert and actively engaged as president of the Star-Journal Publishing Corp. in Pueblo.

Mr. Hoag was one of the newspaper pioneers of my State, having been actively engaged there in his profession since 1901. He was an outstanding civic leader and lay leader in his church. Only last month, Mr. Hoag received the Service to Mankind Award from the Pueblo Sertoma Club. He was one of the Nation's oldest Rotarians and a past president of the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce. His newspapers had long battled for improved conditions in the city he loved, and in his State. He and his papers were also one of the leading supporters for a measure which only last year he was able to see reach a successful culmination by action of the Congress—the Frying Pan-Arkansas project.

In the short space of time available to me here, it would be impossible to enumerate all of the accomplishments of this truly great and respected Coloradan—but, I should like it known here that Mrs. Allott and I, along with many thousands of others in my State, have felt, since last Saturday, a deep sense of personal loss with the death of Mr. Hoag. Additionally, a sense of nostalgia has prevailed, with the passing of an era—an era of journalistic greats—of which Mr. Hoag was surely one of the greatest.

I ask unanimous consent to have read into the Record immediately following my remarks, the Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Denver Post on Sunday, March 17, reporting on the passing of Mr. Hoag.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FRANK S. HOAG DIES IN PUEBLO—PUBLISHER 91

PUEBLO, COLO.—Frank Stephen Hoag, 91, president of the Star-Journal Publishing Corp. here, died at Parkview Episcopal Hospital at 7:50 p.m. Saturday.

An erect and energetic man, Hoag was active until the last few weeks of his life. He entered the hospital February 6.

His wife, the former Louise M. Allebrand, died at the same hospital February 12 after a long illness. They were married October 3, 1895, in McKeesport, Pa., and celebrated their 67th wedding anniversary last fall.

Hoag was born September 23, 1871, in Minerva, Ohio, of Quaker parents whose strict religious views provided a guiding influence throughout his life.

As a boy he supplemented the family income by trapping muskrats and raising bees. His father owned a country store and young *Hoag learned to bargain with the customers.*

After attending elementary and commercial schools he became a stenographer for the Iron City Tool Works in Pittsburgh, Pa. Later he became a bookkeeper for the Philadelphia Record.

The family moved to Colorado in 1901 because of Mrs. Hoag's health. After a short time with a lumber company in Colorado Springs, Hoag became associated with the Colorado Springs Gazette.

A short time later he moved to Pueblo to become an advertising solicitor for the recently merged Evening Star and Pueblo Journal.

The new company was owned by John F. Vail, head of the light and power company; Alva B. Adams, later a U.S. Senator; James B. Orman, a former Governor; Thomas Kelly, I. C. Porterfield, J. W. Finland, J. A. Black, Hume Lewis, and Samuel D. Trimble, later a district judge.

Hoag became discouraged because he felt the new owners of the paper did not take sufficient interest in the editorial content and returned to Colorado Springs where he remained for 2½ years.

BACK TO PUEBLO

Stockholders later persuaded Hoag to return to Pueblo to become general manager. He did, with the understanding that he could purchase the paper if he became financially able.

Hoag bought the Star-Journal in 1908. In 1933, he acquired the Pueblo Chieftain, the second oldest newspaper in Colorado.

Last month Hoag received the Service to Mankind Award from the Pueblo Sertoma Club.

He was president of the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce, a past president of the Rotary Club here, and one of the Nation's oldest Rotarians.

He was a cofounder of the Rocky Mountain Council of Boy Scouts, founding president of the Pueblo Knife and Fork Club, and president of Pueblo Manufacturers and Jobbers.

His newspapers long battled for improved conditions in the city and were among the forces behind the Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion project.

CIVIL SERVICE

From 1919 to 1930 he was a member of the board of corrections which administered the State hospital here, penitentiary in Canon City, and reformatory in Buena Vista.

Hoag is survived by a son, Frank S. Hoag, Jr., publisher of the Star-Journal and Chieftain; two daughters, Mrs. John W. Rawlings and Mrs. Frank E. Evans, Sr., both of Pueblo; five grandchildren, Robert H. Rawlings and Frank E. Evans, Jr., both of Pueblo; Col. John W. Rawlings and Mrs. Walter G. Farr, both of Washington, D.C.; and Mrs. Richard Nelson, who is with her husband in Pakistan; and 16 great-grandchildren.

Services will be at 3:30 p.m., Monday, at the First Presbyterian Church in Pueblo. Burial services at Rozelawn Cemetery will be private.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to one other matter very briefly, apropos of the recent remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota who now occupies the Presiding Officer's chair [Mr. Humphrey].

I for one admit I am no authority on disarmament. I will have to say that I really cannot recognize any great authorities on the subject of disarmament in the Senate at this time, either.

However, I should like to say this about *the criticism which has been made of* the distinguished gentleman from California, Representative Craig Hosmer. I know that he has performed outstanding service in the House. He is a Republican. I know that he works very hard at his job of being a Representative, as I have found in personal relationships with him when I have had reason to come in contact with him through my work in the Senate.

I have always found him to be very well informed on any subject on which he was speaking.

However, I believe that this matter goes to another little point, and I wish to say one thing relative to the comment made by the Senator from Minnesota, our distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. Humphrey], and that is, that I believe Mr. Hosmer had a legitimate right to do what he has done. Aside from everything else, if this is the way he feels, it is his duty, representing his constituents, to write this letter to the President, even if he is a hundred percent wrong. I do not believe he is a hundred percent wrong. After looking at the performance of this administration in the field of foreign affairs for the last 2 years, anyone has a right to look at any proposal made by it along the lines of disarmament or otherwise with a somewhat jaundiced and at least a critical eye from the standpoint of whether we are making true progress in this field.

I, too, am concerned about disarmament. I had the privilege last fall, as a delegate to the United Nations—a subject upon which I intend to speak at some length later, but not this evening—to spend a great deal of time with our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, and with others also, including our Ambassador to the disarmament conference.

I am not certain that we are pursuing the right course. If Mr. Hosmer does nothing else than to interject a note of caution at this point, the purpose will have been served, because we cannot become so enamored of the subject of disarmament itself, desirable as that is, as to make so many concessions that our public safety will be endangered.

Perhaps the President feels that the present proposals are satisfactory. Perhaps Mr. Foster, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Long feel that these proposals are all right. I simply add that I believe Mr. Hosmer is completely correct in raising the question, because there are a great many of us who are wondering whether, in our desire to reach a disarmament agreement, we may not go too far. I hope we do not.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if there is no other business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 25, 1963, *at 12 o'clock meridian.*

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of Tunisia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, the Republic of Tunisia celebrated the seventh anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba; and His Excellency, the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Habib Bourguiba, Jr.

The granting of complete independence by the French on March 20, 1956, was but an intermediate step in the political growth of the Tunisian state. Since 1881 when they had been forced to live under a French protectorate, Tunisians had gradually and steadfastly fought for their sovereign rights and liberty. With the formation of national parties in the 1920's, the political energy of the people became canalized and the national movement was accelerated. French rule was first challenged actively during the month of April 1938, when serious clashes occurred between French soldiers and the nationalist-led Tunisian populace. These riots caused the French to clamp down strongly on any political activity.

It was not until June 3, 1955, that the French authorities, pressured by internal disorders and by the nations of the world through the United Nations, bowed to the inevitable and ceded their powers of internal rule to the Tunisians, keeping only foreign affairs and defense matters under their control. A year of peaceful negotiations led finally to complete sovereignty for the Tunisian state.

The first obstacle which the Neo-Destour Party, the major political organization in Tunisia, had to overcome was an archaic government, both foreign and obsolete, headed by an unpopular hereditary ruler, the Bey. This party, guided by the competent Habib Bourguiba, was able, in 1 year, not only to depose the Bey and establish a republic, but also to promulgate a constitution whereby the rights of the people, freedom of religion, and equality of all citizens are guaranteed. This was the culmination of political growth and freedom for which the Tunisians had long hoped and fought.

The new Republic was immediately beset with many serious problems which had to be met and overcome; chief among them were exploitation of natural resources, insufficient housing, and unemployment. Because of political cohesion through the Neo-Destour Party, the Government made rapid gains. Children's villages were established to take care of the orphans and those small children who were forced to work for a living. Foreign investments, so important for the growth of a country, were guaranteed by public law. Attention was focused on mineral development and water resources—a 35,000 acre tract of irrigated land was opened for cultivation. And recently construction was begun on an oil refinery to supply fuel for local consumption, thus eliminating costly fuel imports.

Since our troops first fought to liberate Tunisia from the Axis Powers, the United States has proved itself to be a generous friend. Through foreign aid, we are helping the Government build electric power stations, enlarge port facilities, and extend airports to accommodate jet service for tourists who wish to see famous Roman and Carthaginian antiquities. When Mr. Bourguiba visited Washington in May 1961, the President promised further assistance for more noteworthy and necessary development projects. As one writer commented:

> This decision by the American Government to make of Tunisia a pilot project for long-term investment came as a clear recognition of the commendable progress the country (Tunisia) has made in every respect.
>
> (Lorna Hahn, "Tunisia: Pragmatism and Progress," the Middle East Journal, winter 1962, p. 28.)

Thus it is with pride that we in the United States salute our sister Republic, Tunisia, on its Independence Day anniversary and wish the people of the country continued success.

Communists Use United Nations To Promote Their Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, more and more we are learning of the double standard which has existed at the United Nations. Americans have clung to a hope through the past 17 years that this organization would help bring about world peace but increasingly we find evidence to indicate that we are being taken for a sucker in many of its efforts. This sad fact has come from the fact that in no sense is this organization a united nations. Working within the framework of this world organization is the hard-core Communist bloc which is not even remotely united in the same beliefs and aspirations which motivate American policy or interest.

A long series of instances including almost 100 Soviet vetoes which have blocked most constructive action can be recounted down to the happenings of the past month. After diligent inquiry, I believe I have received the only copy on Capitol Hill of the fraudulent 106-page booklet published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, which is an insult not only to America but to commonsense. In the foreword, UNESCO indicated its duplicity in referring to "race discrimination" in the United States in the factual sense while semantically mentioning "a concise statement of the constitutional position of the non-Russian populations of the U.S.S.R. and an account of their economic and social condition at the present time." Note there is no reference to discrimination. This report, UNESCO concludes "will be found most useful." As a tool of Communist progaganda, I would say, yes, but as an objective treatment of the situation in the U.S.S.R. today, absolutely not.

Written by two Russian professors, S. L. Ronin and I. P. Tsamerian, the first 8 lines are a dead giveaway. They piously state:

> The purpose of this publication is to acquaint the public with one of the major social triumphs of our day, namely, the way in which the problem of nationalities has been solved in the Soviet Union. It is, in fact, the story of the successful establishment of full equality of rights between races and nationalities in the U.S.S.R.

The booklet states the Communist line of economic determinism. All problems relate to the economic. There is no morality, just the economic. On page 11, the two Reds state:

> Thus in czarist Russia, the inequalities between national elements, and the oppression of national minorities and colonial peoples, were consequences of a reactionary social system based on czarist absolutism, capitalism, and landlordism.

The Russians had their dirty capitalism but overthrew it. The line is then propounded throughout the book that only communism will answer this situation which is prevalent where neofascism and western colonialism breed discrimination. The writers observe:

> Only the revolution of October 1917, which overthrew this regime and instituted the Soviet system, enabled the peoples of Russia to achieve genuine equality of rights and freedom of development. * * * It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression.

Just consider a few more of the quotes from this fantastic booklet which parrots the Communist Party line:

> Another well-known object lesson is the immense progress achieved by the great Chinese people in all economic and cultural fields since it freed itself from colonial domination, overthrew the reactionary regime, and established the rule of the people (p. 10).
>
> The Soviet Union is a brotherhood of free and equal peoples comprising 15 sovereign Soviet Republics in voluntary association on a footing of complete equality. Under the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., each of these Republics retains the right to secede from the union. Each of them embodies the collective will of its people and can decide its own future in entire freedom (p. 13).
>
> Socialist internationalism, fraternal union with equality of rights, steadfast friendship, and mutual aid, such are the true foundations of the sovereignty of the Union Republics (p. 13).

> Soviet citizens of all nationalities are working enthusiastically to build a Communist society. For that purpose it is essential to consolidate peace throughout the world. The Soviet Government is resolutely and firmly pursuing a policy of peace between the peoples and upholds the principle of peaceful coexistence between nations with different social systems (p. 15).
>
> The Soviet Union Constitution of 1936, which marks the triumph of socialism and the full flowering of Socialist democracy, sets out and confirms in the most definite and absolute fashion the principle of equality of rights for all nationalities and all races on the juridical plane (p. 28).
>
> The principle of national and racial equality of citizens of the U.S.S.R. is fully applied in the electoral sphere. All citizens have equal electoral rights and are equally eligible for election to all organs of the state—from the village Soviet to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (p. 29).
>
> The multinational Soviet state, grouping the equal peoples of Russia in a single state in a manner unprecedented in history, was a mighty achievement of the October revolution which thus solved a highly complex problem (p. 33).

The lies are even more blatant when mention is made to the Baltic and Ukrainian affiliations with the U.S.S.R. It is well remembered how the many millions of Ukrainians were liquidated and yet the UNESCO booklet contains this mention on page 41:

> It was likewise thanks to the conditions created by the Soviet Socialist regime and the multinational Soviet State that the Ukrainian people were unified for the first time in history in a national Soviet State.

As to the Baltic States, the report notes:

> In 1940, the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia), which voluntarily joined the Union (p. 37).

One lie after another is propounded in this United Nations organization booklet. The writers say that the central feature of the new government in the U.S.S.R. "was the assertion of the peoples' right to self-determination, including the right of secession and self-government." Few American apologists of communism will even go that far. Can anyone believe that the right of secession exists in Russia? Could Hungary secede? The "cornerstone" of this wonderful system in Russia, the professors venture, was the solemn proclamation of Lenin in 1917 when he said:

"Your beliefs, your traditions, and your national cultural institutions are henceforth declared free and inviolable. Organize your national life in complete freedom and without hindrance; it is your right."

What about the millions of White Russians, Georgians, and Ukrainians who were liquidated—not purged as is popularly stated but murdered? What about religion in Russia today?

This is not an isolated case. It is happening all of the time. The more obvious cases like the U.N. Special Fund expenditure of $1,157,000 in Cuba for an agricultural aid project receives great press but the day-to-day operations which are just as one sided in all too many instances, go unnoticed.

I have followed UNESCO particularly close because of my interest in education. This same double standard was obvious in their 1960 discourse on discrimination throughout the world. The October 1960 edition of their magazine UNESCO Courier depicts the Little Rock situation, and so forth, but not one word about discrimination in the Soviet Union where entire peoples are enslaved.

When questioned on this, the Director General of UNESCO wrote that the Soviet Union denies that minorities are persecuted in the U.S.S.R. and, therefore, nothing was said or could be said about it. On the other hand, the Courier only presented what American officials readily admit to exist within our country. A neat double standard, do you not think?

It is in light of this terrible double standard that we should start taking a second look at many of the programs of the United Nations. As long as we play by the rules of decent and civilized people we will be hamstrung. The Soviets use the veto, every cunning and deceit to promote their ends. I do not want us to change our high-principled ways but there is no need to be stupid either. Emotional cliches in behalf of the United Nations will not change the fact that the 17-year history shows a definite pattern of Soviet subversions which are working against our interests and the interests of all of the peoples of the world. The publication, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." is a good example of this. What makes it worse, the U.S. taxpayers are paying a great share of the cost of these efforts. Efforts are now being made by our Government to have the United Nations supervise our disarmament despite the fact that a Communist now heads up and, in fact, has always headed up the U.N. Military Secretariat which would supervise the world police force. One of these days we are going to wake up and ask, "Why did not someone tell us about all of this?"

"Bury": A New Unit of Measurement Appears in the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a new unit of measurement appeared for the first time anywhere in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The new measurement unit is "bury."

It is found in the proceedings of the House entitled "Disarmament Agency Spokesman States Inaccurate Test-Ban Facts," and two accompanying tables.

Heretofore in evaluation of capabilities of seismic detection systems to check on possible underground test ban treaty cheating, seismic signals equivalent to those produced by an underground shot of 1, 2, 3, or more kilotons fired in alluvium soil formations have been used as a yardstick.

This yardstick has been used simply because the United States has fired underground shots in Nevada alluvium soil from which fairly accurate seismic signal readings have been obtained. Equivalent signals may be produced in other soft geologic formations. The equivalents also may be produced in harder formation by firing a shot of larger kiloton yield in a cavity which decouples the explosive force from the surrounding earth thereby reducing the seismic shock signal to that created by a smaller kiloton yield device which is not decoupled by a cavity.

I have adopted "bury" as the unit of measurement for this signal equivalent for shots fired in alluvium. Thus, "1 bury" is the seismic signal equivalent of a 1-kiloton shot in alluvium; "2 bury" is the seismic signal equivalent of a 2-kiloton shot, and so forth.

This unit measurement has been adopted because of the widespread confusion being created in the evaluation of capabilities of the seismic verification system in a new test ban treaty draft soon to be offered to the Soviets by the Kennedy administration according to its Disarmament Agency spokesmen.

In this connection, it was demonstrated in a recent report of the GOP conference's nuclear testing committee based on testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that cheat shots at "3 bury" and less, that is, 3 kiloton equivalents or less, can be kept from detection by the administration's verification system. The Soviets need only fire the shot underground anywhere in an area of approximately 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R. The testimony also revealed that almost the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of interest to the military, including the neutron bomb, could be developed clandestinely in this big hole of undetectability. Soviet cheating in this way could lead to Communist nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent, Communist world domination.

In fact, that is why the name "bury" was selected for this measurement unit. It seemed particularly appropriate in the context of Premier Khrushchev's threat: "We will bury you."

Public statements by persons who have not done their homework on recent testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy illustrate this confusion between the yardstick and the actual formations in which cheat test shots can be fired.

For example, Deputy Disarmament Administrator Adrian Fischer contends there is not much alluvium in the Soviet Union, and reasons therefore, that the Soviets would not have much chance to cheat without being detected. Inasmuch as he surely would not want to mislead anyone as to the deficiencies in detection, identification, and location of cheat shots under a test-ban treaty, one must conclude he simply does not understand that undetectable seismic signals can be manufactured in soils other than alluvium or by firing in underground cavities. Use of the bury should clean this matter up.

Another victim of apparent confusion in this matter seems to be a vocal Member of the other body. The gentleman was moved recently to term as "irresponsible," "misleading" and "mischievous" the GOP's revelation of the big hole in the interior of the Soviet Union open for cheat testing toward Communist nuclear weapons superiority.

In the same statement to newsmen, the gentleman also asked, "If our proposals are as poor as HOSMER says they are, as full of loopholes as he says, why don't the Russians accept them?"

Perhaps that gentleman has forgotten that just a short time ago he, himself, gave the answer to that question in another of his recent interviews by the press. As I recall it, his statement was to the effect that the Russians are planning another series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere this year. They would, of course, stall accepting a treaty until they get them out of the way.

Also Russians well know the oriental bargaining technique of never accepting an agreement until the last possible concession is euchred out of the victim by sharp bargaining practices. U.S. negotiators certainly have given no reason for the Kremlin to assume that the long string of U.S. test ban concessions is anywhere near its end.

Message to Hibernian Society of Baltimore From President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as is customary, the Hiberian Society of Baltimore left no stone unturned to make their St. Patrick's Day celebration last Saturday one of the biggest and best the city has seen for a long time. Approximately a thousand members and guests were in attendance, including all the members of the Maryland congressional delegation.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, not only the dean of the Maryland delegation in the House, but obviously Irish, was honored by the society by being selected to toast the President. Incidentally, several years ago President Kennedy was the guest speaker at the annual dinner. Following the toast, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], read the following message which was sent to the group by the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

It has been said, by an Irishman I am sure, that the whole world is Irish on the 17th of March. Perhaps not the whole world, but it is indeed true and worth noting well that the joyful observance of St. Patrick's Day is now fully as much an American as an Irish tradition.

It is no simple matter to fix in words the teeming and contrary past, far less the bounding future of the Gael. Effort, even some guile, is required to sort out the truth from the facts. But certainly the celebration of St. Patrick's Day is centuries old in America. It began before the Revolution; it has never ceased; may it never do so. It has taken root among us because it is an occasion dedicated to freedom; to national freedom and religious freedom, and to the great St. Patrick.

There was never a better cause. We stand in the mighty succession of those who first proclaimed it, and those who brought it to fulfillment in our land. It is our cause to defend and ours to advance. In that conviction, I send you the greetings of this day.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Cuban Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a newsletter from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., from our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. The letter is as follows:

CUBAN PROBLEM

(By Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina)

Overshadowing all other problems facing the Congress is the needling and dangerous problem of Cuba. In a very short time, Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba has become a great funnel for world communism to pour in on the Western Hemisphere. Castro and Cuba do not just represent an island of Communist activity but a dynamite key which could blast us into world war if treated carelessly.

In view of this situation, it is my opinion that any public official making statements concerning the Cuban situation should do so only with care and when he is armed with facts. Officials of Government, whether they are elected like myself or appointed as they are in the State and Defense Departments, must realize that when they speak to the people of the United States and the world, they have the ability to inflame and excite or to calm and subdue.

REPUBLICANS RESPONSIBLE

The Kennedy administration inherited the Cuban mess from the previous Republican administration and the very ones who are now attacking the administration for its policy in Cuba, were a part and parcel of the Eisenhower administration which helped to put Castro in office. It was back in 1957 that I conducted an investigation into Communist activity in Latin and Central America. In my published report I warned the Republican State Department and President Eisenhower that unless we took affirmative action in the Caribbean area as well as in other points in Latin America to lead these people away from communism, that world communism would gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Those who now criticize President Kennedy, at that time laughed off my report and continued to ignore Latin America.

Later, when Castro's revolt was progressing in Cuba, the State Department under Eisenhower, together with his own executive orders, halted the shipment of arms and supplies necessary to protect the Cuban Government against the Rebel Castro. The Republican administration closed its eyes at shipments of American arms and other help to Castro's Communist guerrillas in the mountains of Cuba.

NAIVE STATE DEPARTMENT

Castro had hardly reached Havana to claim his new office of Dictator when the State Department rushed in blindly to recognize the new regime without even so much as asking a question. During all this time, I had pointed out in the Senate by speeches and press releases, Castro was surrounded by a brother and a number of key friends who had been trained by Russians in guerrilla warfare tactics and who had been schooled in communism. Long before the first Russian saw Cuban soil, the Eisenhower administration could have acted out of a just cause when our properties were seized and our citizens jailed and some even shot to death. This was the time to act.

The leadership in the Republican Party which now criticizes Kennedy for his policies toward Cuba, conveniently forgot the mess they made and handed to President Kennedy when he took office. The time to preserve the Monroe Doctrine should have been when it was being torn up and not wait until now when the Russians are holding the pieces.

NOT POLITICAL ISSUE

Any politician who harps on the Cuban situation to make it a political issue is doing his nation a great disservice. Those who cry invasion without just provocation should accompany their remarks with an estimation of how many Americans will die as a result. We are not cowards but neither do we wish to be foolhardy. So I urge every citizen to weigh carefully the charges and countercharges that may come as a result of major and lesser crises coming from the Cuban situation. We must rid Cuba of communism, but the means we use to achieve this end can be the difference between peace and war.

Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call the Members attention to a most worthwhile project being advanced by the citizens of one of the communities in my congressional district.

On July 4, the residents of Mount Morris, Ill., will commemorate the birth of our great nation with an old-fashioned patriotic celebration. The highlight of which will be ringing of every bell in the city at the same time. It is hoped that this resounding simultaneous peal will ring out loud and clear the theme of the celebration—Let Freedom Ring—thus vividly reminding the community of the reason why the holiday is celebrated.

Since the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia typifies the Nation's heritage of freedom, it has been suggested that the ringing of the Nation's freedom bell be carried coast to coast by the national communication media, immediately to be followed by the ringing of every available bell in every community across the country. At this time of grave national concern a return to the traditional theme of the Fourth of July—flying the flag and ringing the bells—is needed. Thus I strongly urge the Members to impress upon every American the importance of this project and the need for their participation in this nationwide symbolic rededication to the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. Charles Himes, Jr., chairman of the Mount Morris Family Festival Committee, as well as the many other Mount Morris citizens who are working diligently to make this affair a success are to be commended for this concerted attempt to refresh our memories as to the true meaning of the Fourth of July.

United Fruit Co. Cited for Part in Cuban Prisoner Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the very fine letters of congratulations written by the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, and Gen. Alfred Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross, to Mr. Thomas Sunderland, president of the United Fruit Co., for that company's humanitarian service in providing one of its ships for the shipment of supplies to Cuba in connection with the prisoner exchange program, and for the return of some 750 Cuban refugees to our country.

The United Fruit Co. certainly is to be commended for this unselfish service to the Cuban Families Committee; the ship, SS *Santo Cerro* and her crew were most welcome in this humanitarian project, and this act of generosity will always be remembered among the finest ones in our Nation's history.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letters from the Attorney General and from General Gruenther to Mr. Sunderland in the RECORD, along with Mr. Sunderland's gracious reply to General Gruenther.

The letters follow:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1963.
Mr. T. E. SUNDERLAND,
President, United Fruit Co.
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. SUNDERLAND: The recent return of the Cuban prisoners to their families has been a source of satisfaction to all of us. Your company is to be commended for its willingness to help the American Red Cross and the Cuban Families Committee in this outstanding humanitarian project, and I hope you will accept my sincerest congratulations.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.
Mr. THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND,
President, United Fruit Co.,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. SUNDERLAND: The American Red Cross is most grateful to the United Fruit Co., for the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* for the shipment of supplies to Cuba in connection with the prisoner exchange program, and for bringing 750 Cuban refugees to Port Everglades on the return voyage.

Several of our Red Cross personnel had an opportunity to work with officials of your company and with personnel aboard the *Santo Cerro*. The cooperation was perfect at all times.

I was especially impressed by the warm attitude of the crew toward the refugees on the return voyage. I am sure this created a most favorable impression of their new home.

Thus far three ships and several planes have carried supplies to Cuba totaling approximately $28 million. Twenty-nine hundred refugees have been transported to Port Everglades. A fourth ship is scheduled to sail from Baltimore within a few days.

It is clear that we shall be in the shipping business for at least 2 more months. Please pray that we do not have any natural disasters in the United States during that period. Our key disaster experts are heavily engaged in the Cuban program.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., March 12, 1963.
Gen. ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President, the American National Red Cross,
National Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL GRUENTHER: Thank you for your letter of February 20 concerning our donation of the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* and its crew in connection with the prisoner exchange program. We appreciate your very generous comments, particularly with respect to the attitude and action of our personnel.

Our personnel enjoyed working on this project, especially as it was concerned with the people of Latin America with whom we have enjoyed such a long relationship. Although the Cuban exchange program is a controversial matter, we could not permit this to stand in the way of the humanitarian aspect of the exchange. It was this latter aspect which was a major factor in our company decision to contribute over a quarter-million dollars in addition to the use of the ship and its crew.

I am certain you join in our hope that the day will come when Cuba will again be governed by the democratic, freedom-loving Cubans.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND.

Thirty-five Years a Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding members of the legal profession in the Midwest is Marks P. Alexander, who recently retired after 35 years' public service. Federal Judge Omer Poos describes Mr. Alexander's knowledge of criminal law this way:

> I think he knows more about it than any other man in the United States.

Mr. Alexander recently observed his 76th birthday and is recovering from surgery. He is retiring as assistant U.S. attorney for southern Illinois.

It is noteworthy that every U.S. attorney who has taken office since 1927 has asked Mr. Alexander to remain on the staff.

Address By Senator McClellan Before Arkansas Basin Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on March 8 at Tulsa, Okla., the Arkansas Basin Development Association held its annual meeting. We were fortunate in having as our guest speaker the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U.S. Senator from Arkansas. I cannot recall attending a meeting where the crowd was more enthusiastic or accepted more completely the views of a speaker.

I had the honor of being master of ceremonies at that meeting; and it is a distinct pleasure and honor for me to submit, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the remarks of our distinguished colleague, who made such a profound impression upon those who were present to hear him.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address by the senior Senator from Arkansas printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN, THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MARCH 8, 1963

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure to be your guest on this occasion and to have the privilege of addressing this splendid audience of fellow citizens of the Arkansas River Basin.

Your presence here this evening impressively demonstrates again your support of, your enthusiasm for, and your dedication to, the accomplishment of the comprehensive water resource development program of this valley, to the construction of which our Federal Government is now, I think, irrevocably committed.

The large attendance at this meeting and the ardor and buoyancy of spirit prevailing here, significantly indicate that you are generally satisfied with the progress made and the momentum that we have achieved in carrying this project forward. We have, I am sure, every right and good reason to be pleased and gratified.

We have long since passed the conception, visionary and planning periods, and the authorization action that necessarily precede all construction programs of magnitude that are sponsored and financed by the Federal Government.

Our Arkansas River Basin program has now reached the stage where it is so thoroughly and finally planned, so firmly and positively directed, and so completely activated and energized that we now not only know where and how it is going, but we also know when it will get there. As presently scheduled, we will reach our goal in 1970.

To that end I can assure you that all members of your congressional delegations will not only be alert to and will oppose any proposal or action that would hinder, delay, or interfere with that happening; but we will also actively support adequate appropriations to expedite further construction and make certain the job is completed by that time.

The distance we have traveled to reach the milestone of the present has, at times, been rugged and difficult. In earlier stages of our journey, we encountered delays and hindrances that were vexing and disappointing. Some of them, of course, were unavoidable.

However, faith, vigilance, perseverance, and hard work on the part of your organization, other auxiliary groups, and your Representatives in Congress have succeeded in moving the project from the early stages of hope and uncertainty to the present state of advancement and progress that assures success and the full attainment of our ultimate goal.

When measured by the dollar yardstick, this basin project is now about one-fourth completed. We are probably further along, however, than the dollar figures would indicate. With the closure of the big upstream dams and of Dardenelle on the main stem, and with the progress that has been made on bank stabilization work, we have already gained substantial control over the river's bad habits—silting, wandering, bank destruction, and irregular flow and flooding.

The size of the total task in which we are engaged in this valley is hard to comprehend. It is immense. Over the period of the next 7 or 8 years, nearly $1 billion will be poured into this basin in the form of contracts, wages, and materials by the Federal Government. Some of the material used, will be bought outside the basin, but much of it and most of the labor are being procured right here in the area.

More than 100 million cubic yards of earth will have to be dredged from the channels. Another 100 million yards will be piled into earth embankments. More than 600 million pounds of steel, 8 million barrels of cement, and 8 million tons of rock and aggregate will have to be put into place.

In addition, some 1,700 miles of highway, railway, and utility lines will have to be moved and relocated.

Within the next 10 years, State, county, and municipal governments, along with private enterprise, are expected to spend at least another billion dollars for the improvements necessary to make adjustments to the changes taking place and in the opportunity investments that this great resource development invites and provides.

Income and employment generated by such large scale construction is bound to provide an economic surge of unprecedented dimensions in this basin—one that is sure to carry forward until the project is completed. After completion, and when the Government's construction income has dwindled off, no doubt there will be a slack period of time—maybe a few years—before the full impact of new industrial development is felt.

State and local governments and business should be aware of this problem and make plans accordingly for that transition period. To the extent, of course, that industrial development can be accelerated, this situation can be met or at least greatly alleviated. We must keep on, and never cease planning for more expansion, more growth, and more building as our valley changes and future needs develop. For it is when we look beyond the construction period, that we foresee in the decades ahead, great, almost revolutionary, changes in our lives.

Much has already been written and said about the glowing future of the Arkansas River Basin. I will not attempt to match crystal balls with anyone, but I would suggest that we recall many demonstrated facts as revealed and experienced by other river basins that have had similar programs. I shall only mention one as an illustration.

In 1920 the tonnage carried on the Ohio River was only about 10 million tons. By 1929, when the Corps of Engineers had completed the first canalization program on the Ohio, that tonnage had more than doubled. It had increased to almost 50 million tons by 1950, and now it is in excess of 80 million tons.

There can be no doubt that water resource development has tremendously accelerated economic growth and progress in the Ohio River Basin. That development is credited with being an important reason for the investment of about $13 billion in industrial facilities in that valley during the 1950's.

As I have indicated, the Ohio River is not an isolated instance. Comparable statistics could be recited for the Illinois River, the upper Mississippi, and the Tennessee Valley.

Our late lamented and beloved Senator Kerr, to whom we are indebted more than to any other man for progress on the Arkansas Basin program, recently estimated that if the Arkansas Valley matches the achievements of the Tennessee Valley (and there is no real reason why it shouldn't), this development program should bring $20 billion in personal income into this region within the next 20 years. He felt that in view of its superior resources, the Arkansas Basin should far outstrip the achievements of the Tennessee. I share that view.

The more we look at this region, the more we must wonder that so many of its opportunities have remained neglected and untapped for so long.

A disadvantageous freight rate structure, which placed us in a poor position to compete for industrial development; the unreliability of our river with its unstable course and irregular flow; the relative sparseness of population; and the limited markets available to this region—all these have handicapped us in the past.

But these handicaps are being overcome. Navigation on the Arkansas will give us the low-cost transportation we need to open our coal resources and attract industries. And, as people move out of the increasingly congested eastern section of the country to seek open spaces and opportunities farther west, we may expect the population growth of our States to be greatly accelerated.

Then, at long last, we will be able to capitalize on the great blessings that nature has given us. We can utilize to the fullest one of the largest supplies of uncommitted water to be found in the United States—water which modern industry seeks with increasing eagerness to cool its machines, to drive its turbines, and to incorporate into its manufacturing processes.

Thus, industry can make maximum use of our huge wealth in basic energy fuels—gas, oil, and coal. Moreover, our many other mineral resources would also be turned into wealth. The Arkansas-White-Red Basin contains 65 commercial minerals, including 30 of the 38 important minerals that our country is now importing from abroad. Among these 65 minerals are sulphur, coal, salt, glass sands, ceramic clay, building stone, lead, zinc, and petroleum with its vast implications for the development of petrochemical industries.

Along with industry, other forms of enterprise will benefit. Fertilizer and farm machinery, building materials, steel and cement will come to our communities at lower cost; and many of our agricultural and other domestic products can likewise be shipped and marketed more cheaply.

To proclaim the Arkansas River Basin to be the land of opportunity, both as of now and for tomorrow, is no idle boast, no overstatement, nor is it an exaggeration. Instead, that assertion is based on fact and simply declares that which is true.

This claim of opportunity that we can proudly make today for this river valley and for our respective States amounts to only a modest appraisal and a very conservative evaluation of the great worth of the magnificent multipurpose development now in progress and the tremendous wealth and benefits that are destined to flow therefrom.

Reference to our area as a land of opportunity is not a mere attempt to coin or to make use of the phrase for any propaganda value that it may have, but rather to describe adequately and appropriately a pleasant and impressive reality.

This comprehensive development program on the Arkansas River is one of the largest ever undertaken by our Government, as an overall project, under the direction of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army.

In many respects its potentials transcend and surpass those of any other water resource development system in our Nation. It is truly one of the most dramatic and progressive programs for the conservation and development of water resources ever authorized and embarked upon by the Federal Government.

The completion and operation of these vast improvements will open up new vistas of prospects and possibilities for the expansion and growth of agriculture and industry, far beyond anything that was contemplated when the project was first envisioned or when it was finally justified and authorized.

What we have here is not just a local or area development standing alone or apart and isolated from other national interests. It is not a development whose benefits are restricted and confined to the immediate community or to the geographic section in which the improvements are being made. It is, and will be, a vital integral part of the overall structure of America's might and power.

New products and increased production emanating and resulting from this great venture will tremendously strengthen our economy, reinforce our national defense establishment, and further promote and enhance progress and general prosperity throughout the Nation.

Every dollar being expended on this program is an investment in these things—in the future of our country. All the cost incurred in the building of this system of improvements properly comes within the category of national investments rather than in the column of Federal expenditures. In the course of time—and much sooner than we may have estimated—these funds now being appropriated for this purpose will all be recovered into the Federal treasury. It will pay for itself many times over, by reason of the enlargement of the tax resources which this development will generate.

Thus, we are transforming what has heretofore been a significant, but dormant, economic potential into a future dynamic national asset. What we are building here is another powerful pillar of strength of such quality and endurance that the march of time for generations to come cannot efface or weaken. The years of progress that lie ahead can only augment and accentuate its force and influence upon our national image and stature.

By doing this—by making large investments of public funds—we also enrich the heritage of future generations.

In my judgment, some of the fiscal policies our Government is pursuing are unsound. In some other fields, I believe, it is unwisely making excessive and unnecessary expenditures—expenditures that are improvidently swelling our national indebtedness and further encumbering the estate that we are leaving to those who will follow us.

I definitely oppose that course and policy. But, in the vast development and conservation that we are making in our vital water resources—for every dollar we are prudently spending for this purpose—we are adding substantially to the wealth of their heritage.

We should also keep in mind another and vital area of compelling interest in which enormous expenditures are necessary and currently being made—that is in the field of science and technology. Some $15 billion annually is now being spent by Government and private sources for research and development. Research and development, in fact, has itself become a major industry in this country, one of the largest—one of the fastest growing.

We must therefore anticipate and prepare for the future by looking understandingly at what is happening today—what is emerging from the present. It is clear, and becoming more and more so every day, that the economic pattern of the future is emerging around science and technology. It is emerging through the difficult process of creative thought and innovation. We see this all around us everywhere.

The principal elements of this developing economic change are threefold. They are the scientists and their research facilities; the management and financial resources capable of bringing research to an economic outcome; and the educational, business, and political leadership capable of creating the proper setting for these scientific and technological forces.

Research and development have definitely become one of the few determinative influences in the ebb and flow of industrial location. This is a positive factor that we should not lose sight of. Again, I think, circumstances greatly favor us, and opportunity is knocking at our door.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has built five major installations to the south and east of us. They are Cape Canaveral; the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala.; the Michoud plant in Louisiana (where the Saturn rockets will be assembled); the giant test facility now being built in Mississippi; and the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston, Tex. (the home of the astronauts).

These installations are permanent—they are here to stay. They are fundamental to the creation, the assembly, the manning, and the launching of this Nation's largest rockets. These plants may, in time, be supplanted, but they will not be duplicated. They are a part of our economic landscape for many, many years to come.

It is of significant advantage that our great river basin leads directly into this whole gigantic space complex. It would seem, therefore, that we have done our river work in good time. We should seek to take full advantage of this magnificent opportunity to manufacture here in our area many of the components for missiles and spaceships and to carry on other vital work related to these installations.

It is not enough, however, for us to look down the river and see those things that might be of value to us. We must bring our great potential to life and find ways and means to make it an efficient part and parcel of this vital new space system. We must make this a major effort. Just as we have worked over the years to build the base from which we can now draw out the physical potential of this great river basin, so should we now work to achieve the full fruits and benefits of the opportunities this river development program has opened up to us.

We should pursue with unrelenting vigilance the opportunities that we have to develop those industries and those services that are now coming within our reach. This will be no easy task. It may well be more difficult than our work has been thus far, but it is most challenging, and success in the effort will surely be abundantly rewarded.

In conclusion, may I say, that the wonderful progress we have made in our river basin program is a tremendous tribute to the unity, vigor, and indefatigable persistence with which the people of this basin, and particularly your organizations, have supported the program throughout the years. The unified presentations made to the congressional Appropriations Committees each year by the Tri-State Committee representing Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and speaking for them with one strong voice, have been truly impressive and effective. The unity of your respective organizations and their working together have brought home to the people of this region a broad understanding of the importance of this development program and rallied their support behind it.

I congratulate you, and may I urge that you continue to labor harmoniously together in further seeking to bring into full fruition the magnificent and dynamic possibilities of future progress and prosperity that are now available to us.

The Nuclear Test Ban: An Appraisal of Mr. Foster's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, submitted a statement on the nuclear test ban issue to the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing. It is to be found at page 1641 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1963. Of the many statements submitted to the committee, Mr. Foster's contribution is perhaps the most significant, since it almost certainly must represent the official views of the administration of the subject.

In what follows, a critical appraisal will be made of Mr. Foster's statement. Admittedly the test ban issue contains a number of vital factors which are not amenable to scientific or even logical analysis. These factors relate to the great political issues which enfold the problem and there is little doubt but that they are the truly determining factors in the final judgment which one makes on the matter. As such it is only natural that the test ban issue should be a highly controversial one, as all important political issues are apt to be. However, in the overall assessment of the problem it is crucial that those scientific and military factors which are subject to reasonable analysis be understood and clearly expressed by those who attempt to arrive at judgment decisions. Rather than challenge Mr. Foster's statement in those areas which pertain to political judgments, this appraisal will mainly be restricted to an examination of those arguments which include technical and military considerations.

Section I of Mr. Foster's statement is headed by the contention that "a test ban treaty is in our national interests." To support this contention the following remarks pertaining to nuclear weapons development are made:

> Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be a further increase by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be more toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R.
>
> With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The developments of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period.

Implicit in these remarks are two basic assumptions: First, our current knowledge of Soviet nuclear weapons technology is sufficiently accurate to permit an assessment of the relative nuclear capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and, second, a test ban treaty would not permit significant progress to be made by unverified clandestine testing.

It should be understood that our knowledge of Soviet nuclear weapons is based far more upon speculation than upon cold hard facts. Edward Teller has described our process of evaluation as akin to trying to determine a neighbor's cooking by means of sniffing the smoke from his kitchen. Evaluation of this kind must of necessity be highly narcissistic, in that we must guess the Soviet technology by assuming that it is essentially the same as ours. To put it mildly, such methods are bound to be highly inaccurate and subject to human interpretation. As a result our evaluation process is really a result of human compromise rather than an exact analysis.

Dr. Hans Bethe, who is the Chairman of the evaluation panel which assesses the Soviet tests, reported early last year that the Soviet tests in 1961 had produced very substantial gains in multimegaton warhead technology, especially in the 1- to 5-megaton category and indicated that the yield-to-weight ratios they had achieved would permit them to attain hardened missile capabilities similar to our own. Such remarks as these hardly conform to the statement by Mr. Foster that we hold an advantage in small-weight high-yield weapons. If there is indeed a difference between Bethe's interpretations and those of Mr. Foster, it should be explained to a concerned public.

Incidentally, Mr. Foster chooses to ignore the relative position of the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the very high yield range, that is, tons of megatons. One wonders whether this is because he attaches no military significance to this range or whether, perhaps, he believes the Soviets now lead us in this area.

The lower the yield which the Soviets elect to test, the more difficult it is for our diagnostic system to analyze the debris from the explosion. And should the Soviets have elected to conduct extensive underground tests similar to our own, our ignorance of the nature of these tests will be complete. In this context it is important to understand that we really have only the most sketchy knowledge of low-yield Soviet tests. Since these yields are representative of those most preferred for tactical military operations it is both misleading and dangerous to assume that our tactical arsenal is superior, more diversified, and more numerous than that of the Soviets. Unfortunately, the current administration, and, but to a lesser extent, its predecessor, have elected to take a "what we don't know won't hurt us" attitude toward unknown and poorly known Soviet nuclear tests. This has been both fallacious and highly perilous, considering the great importance of the test issue to our national security.

In order to assess Mr. Foster's remarks on the progress that could be made in the event of a test ban treaty it is necessary to obtain an idea as to how effectively a violator might operate through clandestine testing which cannot be verified under the treaty conditions. In discussing these possibilities, what are believed to be our present detection and verification capabilities—in terms of our more recent proposals to the Soviets—should first be briefly summarized.

It is generally conceded that the major obstacles to effective detection and verification of clandestine tests arise from considerations of underground and outer space testing.

Over the last few years the proposals we have advanced toward monitoring underground tests have reflected a belief that explosions of approximately 20 kilotons and above could be effectively policed. The advisors to the current and the last administration have, in their considered judgment, on the matter tended to minimize the effect of seismic decoupling, and have, in effect, ruled it out from serious consideration. Rather than making serious efforts to reduce this yield threshold, that is, 20 kilotons, to a lower, and presumably safer, value, the recent gains in seismic verification capability which have been claimed have been used to wipe out any threshold whatever and to lower the inspection quota, and thus constitute a concession to Soviet demands instead of an increase in the effectiveness and security of the system. In this light, let us examine some of Mr. Foster's statements on the possibilities of successfully catching the Soviets at clandestine underground testing.

Mr. Foster states that—

> None of the seismic systems proposed by the United States from 1959 on would be capable of detecting with any certainty many explosions of 3 kilotons or less if they occurred in alluvium, a common soil formation similar to gravel. Moreover, artificial decoupling (i.e., the so-called big hole technique), might permit considerably larger yield explosions without detection. Furthermore, an evader testing in alluvium would probably have little assurance that the cavity produced by the explosion would not collapse, leading to a large visible surface crater which might itself be detected. Moreover, due to the variability in the size of the seismic signals which can occur from explosions of the same size, an evader could not be sure of evading even seismic detection at low yields by testing in alluvium. "Big hole" decoupling is both time consuming and expensive. Preparation of a large cavity might itself be detected during the construction phase. Moreover, since this form of decoupling has never been tried on any practical scale so far as we know, a potential evader would again be unsure that he could escape detection. Finally, while single tests might sometimes escape detection by seismic means, a test series would be far more difficult to hide. Yet little progress can ordinarily be made with individual, isolated tests.

An examination of these statements shows that they are incomplete, inconsistent, and illogical—with respect to those facts which are incorporated in our actual test ban proposals, present and upcoming.

Perhaps the seismic network can detect some number of underground—but also undecoupled—events in the range, of, say, 3 to 20 kilotons. But what about the probability that these detected events can be distinguished from earthquakes and be verified, through on-site inspection, as cheat nuclear explosions? Considering that we are now bargaining over an inspection quota which involves but only a handful of inspections each year and taking into account the fact that there will be many hundreds of earthquakes each year in the Soviet Union which will be indistinguishable from nuclear explosions in the 3- to 20-kiloton range, many more below that, it would hardly seem that we stand a good chance of catching a violator even if no other problems existed.

With respect to the remarks on the efficacy of decoupling, the conclusions reached in Mr. Foster's statement are misleading and contain a strange brand of illogic. It is stated that "big hole decoupling is both time consuming and expensive." It would appear from this that we have made up the Russians' minds for them on whether they felt that such procedures would work toward their advantage—this is certainly fallacious reasoning. However, what is perhaps more important than "big hole" decoupling is "small hole" decoupling, which need not entail excavations too much larger than those we have been making in our underground tests in Nevada; and the AEC has recently stated that underground testing has actually proved to have a number of advantages not previously foreseen. To decouple a nuclear explosion to the maximum theoretical extent—that is, by a factor of 300 in reducing the strength of the seismic signal—might well entail a "big hole" and involve considerable time and expense. But the far more germane point is that a relatively "small hole" type of decoupling could lead to a serious degradation in the efficiency of the monitoring system.

For example, a 20-kiloton explosion could be reduced in seismic strength to well below 1 kiloton, and thus be undetectable, less alone be distinguishable as an explosion, in a hole which is but a few tens of yards in diameter—hardly an evacuation which is too time consuming and expensive. Perhaps we could get a much better idea of how far the Soviets might be willing to go in decoupling if the Disarmament Agency would release some rough estimates of the relationship between the cost of such measures and the gains in weapon system effectiveness which can be achieved. After all, it must be realized that such gains can represent sizable cost savings in weapon systems for which we have spent, or will spend, billions of dollars.

Without meaning to do so, Mr. Foster unconsciously displayed a degree of both illogic and conceit in stating that—

> Since this form of decoupling has never been tried on any practical scale so far as we know, a potential evader would again be unsure that he could escape detection.

Because we have not yet done decoupling experiments on a practical scale by no means should lend any degree of assurance that the Soviets have not done so. And if the Soviets have achieved a reliable understanding of how far they can go in such evasive tactics, they could get away with a lot more than Mr. Foster's estimates indicate.

How much the Soviets can get away with is something which only they can decide, not we. But one statement that does seem reasonably safe to make is that they can test underground, without too much difficulty, at yield levels in excess of 20 kilotons, and with propensively less difficulty at successively lower yields, with little fear of detection and with a really trivial chance of being caught. In this respect, if the cheating is not even detected, it will be of precious little good to have observed the preparation of the test during the construction phase. The treaty we are proposing does not allow for suspicion, it covers only the positive verification that a nuclear explosion has taken place.

It is most peculiar that the possibility of cheating through tests in outer space is not even mentioned in Mr. Foster's paper. Perhaps this is because our present state of knowledge does not permit any practical scheme which could detect and verify nuclear explosions in outer space.

In testifying before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee last September, Dr. Franklin Long, who is Mr. Foster's technical director in the Disarmament Agency, answered a number of questions posed by Senator JACKSON, regarding outer space detection and verification. Dr. Long made the following remarks:

> I think the Senator's point is basically correct; namely, that if you have a test in far outer space, the type of verification that for near tests we think of as adequate, is not accessible to you—the thing is very far away. But you do not get positive verification in the sense that you can never know for sure that some natural phenomena might have produced the same signal. So in that kind of sense, verification of an outer space test is difficult.

The best that Dr. Long could say about attempts to monitor such tests was that they could lead to a "heightening of suspicion, perhaps."

Should we sign a test ban treaty with the Soviets if it is extremely doubtful that we would attempt to establish an effective monitoring system, such as satellite detection systems orbiting around the earth and the sun. The expense of such systems would be prodigious and they would not be able to provide positive verification; and, as previously remarked, suspicion is not covered by the treaty.

The question to which the American people deserve a fair answer is what types of gains in nuclear technology can be made by our outer space testing? Several years ago, when space technology was in its infancy and we were making efforts to orbit grapefruit-sized objects, it was fashionable to dismiss space testing of nuclear weapons as being Buck Rogers stuff. It is not so easy to do this today and our recent Venus shot gave proof enough of the great wealth of information that can be telemetered back to earth. And we should keep in mind that the Soviets are still adjudged to be ahead of us in placing large payloads in outer space.

Admittedly, space testing will be expensive but it would now be irresponsible to claim that it is infeasible. The question then is whether such tests would be worthwhile to the Russians; and, of course, only the Russians can provide the answer. However, we might get some clue to the answer by considering our own possibilities.

Take for example, the warhead for our Minuteman missile, which will soon constitute the major strategic weapon system of the Air Force, or equally well, one could consider the warhead for the Navy's Polaris missile. Over the coming years we are going to invest tens of billions of dollars toward developing and maintaining these systems.

Suppose that it was possible, through such improvements as increasing warhead yield and decreasing warhead cost, to effect a substantial decrease in missile requirements, or, conversely, achieve a substantial increase in missile firepower. Substantial fractions of tens of billions of dollars represent substantial sums indeed, and thus the question of space testing is far from trivial.

Many experts hold the firm belief that space testing, expensive as it may seem, would be a huge bargain to a would-be cheater. In all fairness to the American people, they should be provided by the Government with the opinion of the Disarmament Agency on this matter and the relevant factors—which need not reveal sensitive information—should be brought into the light of public scrutiny.

Having discussed the frailties of the arguments which Mr. Foster advanced to defend the effectiveness of our proposed detection system, we can now turn to an examination of his statements regarding the effect of clandestine testing upon the balance of military power.

Mr. Foster states that with a treaty "the U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time" and "our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer." It is interesting to note that his views on this matter were not quite so optimistic a few months ago. Testifying before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Mr. Foster was queried by Senator GOLDWATER, who said:

> The point that I would like to raise is this: Is detectable testing required to develop the type of tactical weapon in which some of us believe we are still deficient and in which the Soviet Union is also believed to be deficient?

Mr. Foster replied:

> There can be some developments in that type of weapon, presumably below the threshold of detection. Whether this is adequate, in a sense, to distort the tactical balance, I don't know. The military decision has been—the military advice is that in weighing that risk against the risk of continued testing, it is in the national interest to attempt to get a comprehensive test ban which would terminate presumably tests in all environments and at all levels.

Senator GOLDWATER:

> I can appreciate that. But knowing the nature of the enemy, I don't think we can have much faith in their stopping testing at any level at which they think they need further development. I can believe that they might agree to stopping the testing of large yield weapons. They might even agree to stop testing at all levels. But they could continue with the testing of weapons of a strength that we could not detect. I am talking now of the yield of weapons that will measure in pounds and small tonnages, not kilotons or megatons.

It would appear that the discussion between Senator GOLDWATER and Mr. Foster, was based upon consideration of the much publicized all-fusion bomb, or, as popularly called, the neutron bomb, and Mr. Foster admitted to some uncertainty as to whether the development of this weapon might distort the tactical balance. Furthermore, he divulged the military opinion on this matter—namely, that it would be in the national interest to get a ban which would not permit clandestine testing of such weapons.

But is such a ban possible? Apparently not, and Mr. Foster's statement on all-fusion weapons confirms this.

Mr. Foster states:

> Many important scientific principles involved in nuclear weapons can be studied with nuclear explosions of less than 3 kilotons, including certain of the principles involved in developing possible pure fusion weapons and in reducing weight-yield ratios. This figure is significant, for explosions of this size and smaller may not always be detectable. However, for the weapons developments and knowledge of weapons effects which are of primary concern to us, and which might make a substantial change in the military balance in a way which would be unfavorable to us, clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory * * * and pure fusion weapons would not be of a great advantage to us because they would constitute primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already large stockpile of nuclear weapons. Hence, any inhibitions on the development of these weapons would appear to be to our net advantage.

An analysis of this train of reasoning quickly reveals two gross discrepancies: First, a complete ignorance, or avoidance, of the fundamental importance of pure fusion weapons, and, second, a strange inconsistency regarding the importance of pure fusion weapons.

First, we shall consider the inconsistency, and then we shall examine the implications of all-fusion weapons. It is contended by many of our most knowledgeable experts that this class of yet undeveloped—at least by us—weapons is one of the most important factors, if not the most important, entering into the test ban issue.

The inconsistency is briefly, the following:

It is first implied that pure fusion weapons can be developed by testing at yields, less than 3 kilotons—which are well below the threshold of effectiveness of the monitoring system we have proposed. Next, it is claimed that such weapons would not be of great advantage to us. And, finally, it is concluded that inhibitions on the development of such weapons would be to our net advantage.

It is quite apparent that the thought process behind such remarks could not have been very deep, for they are plainly self-defeating. If the pure fusion weapon is not advantageous then why worry about whether or not its clandestine development can be detected? On the other hand, if, as stated, inhibiting such development works to our good then there must be some advantage to the weapon. But plainly, since our proposed monitoring system is incapable of inhibiting such development, there is this puzzling inconsistency which leads to the growing question: Are those weapons advantageous or are they not? It is truly surprising that a statement dealing with a subject of such great importance should contain such obvious inconsistences.

During the past 3 years, a number of public statements regarding the importance of pure fusion weapons have been made. To do those statements full justice would be far too time consuming. and only a relatively brief synopsis of them is presented here.

In May 1960 Senator THOMAS J. DODD gave a major speech in the Senate on the test ban issue. In an incisive analysis of the then existing weakness of our proposals at Geneva—which have since became increasingly weaker—Senator DODD brought up the importance of the neutron bomb:

> The production of a clean tactical nuclear weapon would open the way to a whole series of technologically significant breakthroughs. By definition such a weapon would have to have a fusion warhead—that is, a heavy hydrogon or tritium warhead. If a straight fusion weapon can be developed—and there is no doubt that it can—this would open the way to the production of thermonuclear weapons of all yields in vastly increased quantities and at much smaller cost.
>
> And then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reference in the press. Such a bomb can be theoretically produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would in short, operate as a kind of deathray.
>
> I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disastrous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

In April 1960, Freeman Dyson, a nuclear physicist and also a consultant to the AEC nuclear weapon laboratories, wrote an article in the magazine Foreign Affairs. The article discussed the important characteristics and military implications of pure fusion weapons. In concluding the discussion of these weapons, Dyson stated:

> Imagine a hypothetical situation in which the United States is armed with existing weapons, while some adversary (not necessarily the Soviet Union) has a comparable supply of nuclear fuel and has learned how to ignite it fission-free. The adversary's bombs would then outnumber ours ten or a hundred to one, and theirs could be used with far greater versatility in infantry warfare. Suppose that in this situation a local war of the Korean type should begin. God help the American infantryman who is sent in to fight, against these odds. Practically speaking, our army would have only two alternatives, either to retreat precipitously or to strike back with our much more limited number of heavier nuclear weapons and thoroughly destroy the whole country. This is not a pleasant situation to contemplate, and yet it is necessary that our people understand that it is a possibility. Any country which renounces for itself the development of nuclear weapons, without certain knowlege that its adversaries have done the same, is likely to find itself in the position of the Polish Army in 1939, fighting tanks with horses.

John Wheeler, a nuclear physicist who did pioneering work with the famed Niels Bohr on the physics of nuclear fission and has long consulted with the AEC and the Department of Defense on nuclear weapons problems has very recently issued the following statement:

> As a physicist and specialist on nuclear fission I see a decisive loss to national security from a test ban.
>
> It will prevent us from developing a technology of pure hydrogen devices free of fission fallout. I am convinced that present nuclear weapons will be outdated in 3 to 10 years. The new technology will have important peacetime applications in mining and earthmoving and will revolutionize ground warfare.
>
> If we do not keep this scientific leadership others will take it. Second level nations will be able to make these ultimately inexpensive devices. No responsible proponent of any detection system has claimed ability to detect a minuscule pure hydrogen detonation underground.
>
> It is unconscionable to renounce for the free world a revolutionary device which others will then make without our knowledge.

If these statements, and many others made by responsible public officials and scientists—who have held access to the so-called secrets of nuclear weaponry—are at all correct, then Mr. Foster's statements that a test ban treaty would allow "our advantage in smaller weapons" to "persist over a longer time" and that "our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer" simply do not bear out. In fact, quite the contrary would be true; we would fall greatly and tragically behind and the credibility of our tactical forces would disappear, and so might much of the free world.

After introducing a bold and imaginative new strategic counterforce concept which held high promise of greatly reducing the level of death and destruction to the civilian fabric, in case of thermonuclear war, the Department of Defense is now retreating to a position of nuclear statemate. If this transition is to actually occur the balance of thermonuclear terror will again begin to act upon the will of the American people—a prospect which is not a happy one to contemplate.

The rationale behind this new and unpleasant shift is twofold:

First. Both sides will soon have invulnerable strategic weapons, that is, hardened missile sites and undetectable nuclear submarines armed with ballistic missiles; and

Second. There is no evidence that the defense against ballistic missile attacks will become feasible and practical.

Both of these premises are inherently dangerous because they are based upon an inherent smugness that technological breakthroughs will not occur to destroy the strategic balance. History has invariably shown such assumptions to be ill-founded and disaster has frequently resulted from such stubborn opinion.

Indeed, it was little more than a dozen years ago when some of our leading nuclear weapons experts were arguing against the H-bomb development and were recommending that we concentrate upon improving our A-bomb technology. Incidentally, in the foreground of those who argued against the H-bomb in this vein was Hans Bethe, and it is revealing to note that Bethe was an early pioneer in helping develop the new "nuclear stalemate" concept.

At present it is difficult to perceive how hardened missile sites can be destroyed in an economical fashion and how Polaris submarines can be located and destroyed. But it is not nearly as difficult to conceive of advanced antimissile weapons which could dangerously offset the presently envisaged nuclear stalemate.

From time to time there have been reports in the press that the pure fusion bomb would have an important effect upon the development of a successful antimissile system. Very recently, Senator DODD intimated quite strongly that this is the case. With these in mind, we return to Mr. Foster's statement that a test ban treaty would slow down the development of antimissile systems on both sides.

If these contentions about the importance of the pure fusion warhead ballistic missile defense are essentially correct, then Mr. Foster's claim is only half true—we would be slowed down, but not the Soviets. And, if pure fusion warheads were to provide the final step to the feasibility of an antimissile system under development by the Soviets, a test ban treaty might portend a disaster of a magnitude which is difficult to even comprehend.

The criticisms which have been leveled here against Mr. Foster's statement are not intended to be a personal attack against him. Indeed, Mr. Foster must bear the responsibility for his statement, but it is incorrect to state that he is fully responsible for its contents. Like any high-ranking Government official who is called upon to guide a large, complex effort which embraces many different skills, some of which are extremely technical, Mr. Foster is in no small measure at the mercy of his advisers and consultants. It is against certain of these advisers and consultants, particularly the technical experts, that this criticism is directed.

That a certain body of scientists has figured prominently in the test ban positions held by this administration, and its predecessor, is a subject which has not been thoroughly understood and appreciated by the public. However, such has indeed been the case; and although proved wrong and even biased, time after time, these scientists have continued to have a profound influence upon the proposals we have made at Geneva and upon the rationale which the current and past administrations have adopted.

To question the intellectual competence of these scientists would be folly; practically all of them represent top caliber in their fields. But to question their judgment on these vital matters appears to be well in order.

Mr. Foster's statement is far from reassuring. Without questioning the validity of his political judgments, relating to such subjects as the proliferation of nuclear capabilities and the effect of a test ban treaty upon future arms control agreements, the great variance between the technical-military arguments he presents and those which have been presented here in rebuttal is extremely disturbing. And its is emphasized again that the judgment of his scientific advisers is open to serious question as it appears highly probable that their technical judgment has been conditioned to a large degree by nontechnical considerations.

The differences in opinion, on such a crucial issue, which have been brought out here are too great to go unresolved. If our democracy is to remain strong, effective, and truly democratic then a greatly concerned, worried, and confused citizenry must be given sufficient data to participate in debates which affect their very existence.

Thus far, the artificial security barriers erected by the current and past administrations have prevented the necessary healthy public debate. The basic information necessary to foster such debate need not include numerical detail and specific weapon designs; such information would not even be understood by most people. What is needed is a qualitative appraisal of the important technical factors which bear the test ban. Such information should be released as soon as possible.

We should keep in mind that all of these secrets will be of little avail in the future if we are to act falsely and unwisely in our negotiations with the Soviets and consummate a treaty which will allow them to fully exploit their potential while we remain paralyzed by our good intentions. It will be of precious little comfort for our Nation to perish with its secrets clasped tightly to its bosom.

The importance of secrets is not whom they are kept from but how they are handled and interpreted in deciding the destiny of our country. The American people have every right to know whether these secrets are being treated objectively in the deliberations of those who provide the guidance for our top decisionmakers, such as Mr. Foster. If the strong criticism made here is essentially fair and correct then the advisers to Mr. Foster have not been objective in their interpretation of the meaning of classified material. Let the people decide for themselves who is more nearly right. They have every right and reason to do so; it is their fate which hangs in the balance.

Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of my recent questionnaire, distributed to every resident of my district whose address was available through telephone directories.

The questionnaire covered two main fields—domestic and foreign affairs. I feel sure the views of my constituents as expressed through this questionnaire will be of special interest to my colleagues. The questionnaire results are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
Domestic affairs:			
1. Do you favor tax reduction without an equal reduction in Federal spending?	10	88	2
2. Do you favor stricter controls over agricultural production and marketing?	11	84	5
3. Do you prefer the present voluntary medical care program for the aged over a compulsory plan, financed by increased social security taxes?	76	20	4
4. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC's of the thirties?	36	55	9
5. Do you favor the establishment of a domestic Peace Corps?	19	69	12
6. Do you favor aid to public schools below the college level?	36	58	6
7. Do you think the President is doing a good job in domestic affairs?	22	59	19
Foreign affairs:			
1. Should we continue to support the U.N.?	63	25	12
2. Would you favor elimination of the foreign aid program?	33	52	15
3. Do you favor substantial reduction in foreign aid?	84	9	7
4. Would you maintain the foreign aid program at about its present level?	15	64	21
5. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in Cuba?	28	62	10
6. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in the Congo?	20	49	31
7. Should the existing foreign Peace Corps program be expanded?	31	52	17
8. Do you think the President is doing a good job in foreign affairs?	26	53	21

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Gershon B. Chertoff, of the Temple B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the universe, whose law is perfect: Do Thou instruct out of Thy law the Members of the Senate of these United States, that they might exercise just and rightful authority. Confer upon them the wisdom and understanding to convert righteousness into law, and justice into statute. Remove from them a sense of guilt in the employment of power, by alerting them to the ethic of power. Uphold them in their conviction that the complexities of international relations admit of no easy solutions: so that they shall pursue peace, not despair, and seek security with quiet confidence.

The days proclaimed by Daniel are at hand: *There shall be a time of trouble such as never has been since there was a nation.* Do Thou, O God, confirm Daniel's hope and trust in Thee that: *Every one of your people shall be delivered.*

May God bless you with every good, and keep you from all evil. May He enlighten your heart with lifegiving prudence, and favor you with enduring insights. May He befriend and prosper you with peace, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, March 25, 1963, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR WAIVED

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was ordered to be waived.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

STOCKPILING, STORAGE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ESSENTIAL FOODSTUFFS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STRENGTHENING RESEARCH ON UTILIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on "Strengthening Research on Utilization of Agricultural Commodities," dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses," for the fiscal year 1963, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the 7-month period ended January 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO REMOVE DANGEROUS OR UNSAFE BUILDINGS AND PARTS THEREOF, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES"

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF RETENTION BY GENERAL DYNAMICS/POMONA OF CERTAIN REFUNDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF THE SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF ELECTRIC LAMPS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF UNNECESSARY COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR PACKING SHIPMENTS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS FOR CERTAIN ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT UNDER SALINE WATER ACT OF 1952

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on operations under the Saline Water Act of 1952, during calendar year 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 115

"Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to reject the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury

"Whereas capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code of the United States has been a major factor in the progress of the State of Georgia in forest management and in the development and growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

"Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment to the owners of forest lands would constitute a most severe setback to the development of the timber and forestry industry in Georgia; and

"Whereas thousands of Georgians are dependent upon the forest industries for employment and their jobs are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber; and

"Whereas the taxing of income derived from the sale of timber at ordinary income rates by the United States would be disastrous to a major portion of the overall economy of the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia:

"1. That the General Assembly of the State of Georgia does petition the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States on February 6, 1963."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan

"Whereas it has been the experience in the State of Wyoming that the detailed feasibility reports required in connection with the application for a Federal small projects loan are such that the cost of such feasibility reports are clearly out of proportion to the cost of many small supplemental water supply projects in Wyoming that could benefit from such a loan program; and

"Whereas for small supplemental water supply projects for entities within a growing and established agricultural economy, the detailed and costly feasibility studies which are necessary for large new projects are not needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary so that the feasibility reports required in connection with an application for a Federal small projects loan for a small supplemental water supply project be required only when such are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 22

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by park rangers

"Whereas the animals that range within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park in the State of Wyoming constitute a part of the natural resources of Wyoming; and

"Whereas the natural resources of the State of Wyoming should be utilized to the greatest good of the people of the State of Wyoming and of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the slaughter of over 4,500 head of elk in the past 2 years in Yellowstone National Park by the park rangers was a gross waste of an important natural resource as aforesaid; and

"Whereas better methods of control of these resources than those now being utilized by the National Park Service are available: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior be and are hereby memorialized to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park as has been the practice in the past to permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming and if trapping and transplanting practices do not give the necessary reductions, to permit the hunting of such animals in remote areas of the park; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.
"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House.
"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 16

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means

"Whereas there is not a shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide the best working conditions, equal to or above other nations; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing out their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to such advantages as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped into Canada, lower charter rates for coastwide and intercoastal shipping, and a cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about a sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing in all lumber-producing States with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are memorialized to give immediate attention and take the action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable basis of competition with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that foreign lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 23

"Joint memorial memorializing the U.S. Congress to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs

"Whereas the U.S. Congress by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962 has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases; and

"Whereas the workmen's compensation laws of the individual States were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

"Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

"Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitutes a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming and the Senate of such Legislature concurring are opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of the State of Wyoming to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation laws and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urge that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and the State legislatures of all States of the United States.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate,*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 25

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate

"Whereas the Federal Insurance Contribution Act was passed by Congress in 1935, effective January 1, 1937, establishing a social security tax rate of 2 percent on the first $3,000.00 of employee earnings to be paid in equal amounts of 1 percent by each the employer and the employee; and

"Whereas since January 1, 1937, the social security tax rate has increased from 2 percent of employee taxable earnings of $3,000 to 7½ percent of employee taxable earnings of $4,800, with further increases scheduled in 1966, and 1968 to reach a maximum of 9¼ percent; and

"Whereas the social security tax has become a heavy burden, as is presently programed, and will be more burdensome to the end that neither the profits of employers nor the wages of employees can absorb the tax increases; and

"Whereas in the interest of good government and sound economics the presently effective social security tax rate should not be further increased except on a voluntary basis and not as a result of further imposition of taxes levied upon both the employers and employees: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby memorialized to amend the Federal Insurance Contribution Act to stabilize the social security tax at the rate effective as of January 1, 1963, with no further increase except on a voluntary basis; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Government Operations:

Enrolled Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress to enact legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the 13 Western States

"Whereas general authority does not presently exist in Federal law for the Federal Government to restore to the States legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the States; and

"Whereas in the late 1950's a special committee set up by the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, in cooperation with a Federal Interdepartmental Committee established by the President, developed proposed Federal legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment by the Federal Government of legislative jurisdiction over such Federal holdings; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments and its affiliated organizations, including the National Legislative Conference, the Governors' Conference, the National Association of Attorneys General, the General Assembly of the States, and the Council's several regional conferences have gone on record in support of the proposed Federal legislation; and

"Whereas the suggested Federal act, which in its present form—S. 154—would apply to Federal holdings in all States, has not been enacted by Congress; and

"Whereas in view of the fact that the bulk of the Federal land holdings is located in the 13 Western States, and the lack of suitable Federal laws governing acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over such lands is of critical importance in the West; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That Congress be urged to enact legislation similar to S. 154, but applying only to the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction by the Federal Government over Federal holdings in the 13 Western States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:*

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is at a disadvantage due to the fact that in excess of 50 percent of the land area of the State is owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming has received 2 sections per township from the public domain for the support of public schools and whereas many States, including several Western States have received 4 sections per township for similar purposes: *now, therefore be it*

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to return to the State of Wyoming the two additional sections from the public domain the same as have been granted other States, or the equivalent thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 1:37 p.m., January 29, 1963.
"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursables; and

"Whereas many Federal reclamation projects provide recreational facilities, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health and protection of national defense benefits which are of more value to a river basin and to the Nation as a whole than they are to the irrigation water users under the projects; and

"Whereas it is no more logical to make the local irrigation water users pay for these benefits to the region and to the Nation than it would be to make them pay for flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits which are now nonreimbursables: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor legislation which would authorize (1) recreational, (2) general salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) public transportation, (5) protection of public health, (6) promotion of national defense, and (7) fulfillment of international obligation benefits; to be nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 1:32 p.m., January 29, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.

"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.

"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management, with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale, of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals, on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming; the people of the sovereign State of Wyoming recognize that the United States of America controls over 50 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 70 percent of the minerals on, in or under the lands of the State of Wyoming.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the surface and minerals constitute an important part of the life and economy of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas only 37½ percent of all royalties that the Federal Government collects on Federal lands in Wyoming is returned to the State; and

"Whereas the financial needs of the States are becoming more acute each year; and

"Whereas Alaska in its act of admission was given 90 percent of the mineral royalties on Federal lands and on private lands in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals; and

"Whereas the tideland States have been granted the mineral rights on offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas historically, Eastern States were given all of the land within their confines; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming and the Western States have been denied equality of treatment as given Alaska, tideland States, and the Eastern States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming to be used as the Legislature of the State of Wyoming may direct; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and to the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 5:53 p.m., January 31, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.

"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.

"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 11

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the States of the United States relating to the control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States boundaries

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the recognition by the Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the States relating to control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States boundaries is one of the fundamental concepts of Wyoming law and of the reclamation law as stated in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902; and

"Whereas at the present time there is uncertainty in regard to the validity of this fundamental concept of State and Federal law: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor Federal legislation providing for recognition of the rights of the State of Wyoming and her sister States to regulation and control the appropriation, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their respective States, and to require compliance with such laws by the Federal agencies and their licensees; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 9:05 a.m., February 2, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.

"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.

"MARTIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 24

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent by legislation, the curtailment, by departmental regulation, of the acquisition of rights-of-way across Federal lands in the State of Wyoming

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture have proposed to adopt similar regulations respecting the granting of rights-of-way for transmission lines across Federal land under their respective jurisdictions; and

"Whereas those regulations would provide that such rights-of-way would only be granted if the applying company agreed that any unused capacity of the transmission line constructed thereon could be appropriated by the Federal Government for the transmission of power generated by the United States through its agencies and, secondly, that the use of such transmission line would not, in the opinion of the Secretary, interfere with proposed sales of power by the United States; and

"Whereas such regulations would restrict the multiple use of the lands of the United States to the detriment of the industrial development of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas such regulations would constitute an usurpation by such departments of the power of Congress to prescribe the uses to be made of the land of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to prevent such usurpation of its authority and to continue the multiple use of such Federal lands in the State of Wyoming for the benefit of its citizens and to promote its development; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"Approved, 9:27 p.m., February 15, 1963.

"CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
"Governor.

"CHARLES G. IRWIN,
"President of the Senate.

"MARLIN T. KURTZ,
"Speaker of the House."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Legislature of the State of Wyoming respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the

following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

" 'Sec. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justices of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

" 'Sec. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capitol, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

" 'Sec. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

" 'Sec. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

" 'Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'

"*Be it further resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress for this State.

"Approved 10:24 p.m., February 14, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is an inseparable part of the Federal Union; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land; and

"Whereas since its founding, the State of Wyoming has cherished, supported and defended the Constitution and the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas there are certain insidious movements alien to our free society which are engaged in a concerted effort to destroy our form of Government, the Constitution of the United States, the constitutions of the several States, and deny to the citizens of this Nation those rights, privileges and liberties which are fundamental to free men; and

"Whereas in the Congress of the United States there are duly authorized committees constituted to investigate the activities of those insidious movements and to make known their perfidy, for truth will render them impotent; and

"Whereas there is currently in progress an attack upon those legally established committees of the Congress of the United States by certain organizations and individuals designed to abolish or weaken those committees so that this Nation and its citizens will be denied their protection: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized that the Legislature of the State of Wyoming pledges and reaffirms its unequivocal support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee of the Congress of the United States, and openly condemns those organizations and individuals who would destroy those committees or reduce their effectiveness in the investigation and exposition of subversion and subversive organizations; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, John W. McCormack; U.S. Senator, Gale W. McGee; U.S. Senator, Milward L. Simpson; and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 5:50 p.m., January 31, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would provide that the Federal Government may not, through legislative or judicial action restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming,* That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 37th session, voting separately, concurring therein that this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Section 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'

"*Be it further resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 1:56 p.m., February 9, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 15

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States, with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution of the United States which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming,* That the house of representatives and the senate of the 37th session, voting separately, concurring therein that this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission." '

"*Be it further resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 9:12 p.m., February 15, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 19

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere

"Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

"Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

"Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

"Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

"Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to exhort its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

"Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming* (*the Senate of such Legislature concurring*), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and well-being; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 9:08 p.m., February 13, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 20

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government

"Whereas the Cooperative Extension Service was established as a means of conveying to the user the results and general education in the field of agriculture; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming bears the major portion of the cost of the program; and

"Whereas there are efforts being made to alter the traditional objectives of the Extension Service to one which promotes the agricultural program of the Federal administration, thus having political instead of educational aspects: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming,* (*the Senate of such Legislature concurring*), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take whatever steps necessary to prohibit the use of the Cooperative Extension Service as a means of promoting political programs as a tool of the Federal administration, which, if continued, might necessitate a review of the whole extension program as to the intent thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Milward Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and to the Governors of the 50 States.

"Approved 9:20 p.m., February 13, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the substantial elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

"Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

"Whereas the enacting into law of the President's proposal will most certainly affect the economy of the State very adversely; and

"Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

"Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives* (*the senate concurring*), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the substantial elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each Member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

"Inez Watson,
"*Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

"Senate Resolution 40

"Resolution relating to the air defense of the Nation in northwestern Alaska

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska and the Alaska delegation in Congress have continually expressed their alarm and complained to Federal defense officials regarding the defense gap along the western and northern coasts of Alaska; and

"Whereas the western and northern coasts of Alaska are the back door to the Nation; and

"Whereas it has been established for years that Soviet Russia has ringed western Alaska with air bases along the coast of and throughout Soviet Siberia posing a continuing threat to Alaska's meager interior defenses which are the defense frontier of the Nation; and

"Whereas while official attention is showered on a few Russian troops 60 miles from Florida and Soviet air surveillance of American ships at sea, Soviet reconnaissance planes have been flying over the American defense frontier territory of southwestern Alaska; and

"Whereas the area flown over by the Russians is without any American military base and the nearest defense bases are from 700 to 1,000 miles distant; and

"Whereas this entire frontier area so close to Russian bases is not immediately served by American reconnaissance and interceptor forces which are considered essential in the Caribbean area; and

"Whereas there is a former Air Force airfield now available at Nome which along with other sites along this defense perimeter could and should be used for the stationing of fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, is most respectfully urged to take immediate action for the realistic defense of this back door to the Nation by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate, March 18, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 31

"Resolution relating to the restoration of medical care to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen under Federal law

"Whereas S. 978 has been introduced and referred to the Senate Commerce Committee to restore medical benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and other self-employed seamen; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation seeks to restore medical benefits to working owners and working part owners who have been deprived by administrative ruling of medical care in Public Health Service hospitals and other facilities since 1954; and

"Whereas it is only equitable that medical benefits be restored to this segment of the maritime force in recognition of the vital role it plays in the Nation's oldest industry: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress is respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen as an equitable action and a forward step toward the revival of the Nation's maritime industry; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 25

"Whereas a serious need exists for increasing water flows on the lower Yakima River; and

"Whereas additional water storage for the Yakima River can be obtained by construction of a storage dam at the Bumping Lake Reservoir; and

"Whereas such a project would provide great benefit to the Yakima River Valley, particularly in the areas of fisheries, flood control, reclamation, and recreation; and

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior has completed a study of this project; and

"Whereas Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON have introduced legislation authorizing this project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the Senate of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that the President and the Congress of the United States enact legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution immediately be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member in the Congress of the United States from the State of Washington.

"Attest.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 15

"Resolution relating to the national defense system in Alaska

"Whereas the Governor and congressional delegation of Alaska have again urgently renewed their representations that there is a defense gap in the national defense system in western Alaska; and

"Whereas the existence of this gap was demonstrated last week when Russian reconnaissance aircraft were allowed to violate American territory in western Alaska without challenge; and

"Whereas while it has been known for years that Alaska, the defense frontier of the Nation, has been ringed with Russian air and ground bases in Soviet Siberia 40 miles from American territory, national defense officials have been giving their attention to a handful of Russian troops located 90 miles from Florida; and

"Whereas existing American bases in Alaska are located from 700 to 1,000 miles from Alaska's defense perimeter leaving western Alaska with meager radar coverage and completely without on-the-scene fighter interceptor and reconnaissance support; and

"Whereas an adequate airfield for Air Force interceptor and reconnaissance planes already exists but is unused at Nome: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, is respectfully urged to direct that immediate action be taken to effect a realistic defense of Alaska as the continent's and Nation's defense frontier through the placement of two or three interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the house March 19, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Wayne County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation relating to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transactions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 6, 1963, the Senate of the State of Illinois considered and adopted Senate Joint Resolution 4 suggesting an article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The secretary of state of Illinois has transmitted a copy to me, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.'

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate January 29, 1963.

"SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.,
"Speaker of House of Representatives.
"FREDRIC B. SELIKE,
"Clerk of House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, last week the South Carolina Senate forwarded a resolution to me expressing appreciation to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman for his action holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound. Today I have received a similar resolution from the South Carolina House of Representatives commending Secretary Freeman. This makes it unanimous on the part of the South Carolina General Assembly endorsing Secretary Freeman's price support program on cotton. While this resolution does not memorialize Congress, I do want this resolution placed in the RECORD as a testimonial of South Carolina's support to Secretary Freeman's cotton program. Therefore, I am asking that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family-size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling 1 inch upland cotton as 32.47 cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

Attest:

Inez Watson,
Clerk of the House.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate an expression of the will of the people of Wyoming.

The Wyoming State Legislature voiced a belief of the people of Wyoming when it memorialized Congress to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming.

The 37th State Legislature of Wyoming is convinced that the creation of wilderness areas would interfere with the development of Wyoming's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas which gives protection to the water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities.

We should not prejudice the interests of the Rocky Mountain West by locking up in a Federal vault vast areas of land within our Western States.

It is the sense of Wyoming's lawmakers that the multiple-use concept, an effective guideline for over 50 years, has shaped the economy of the West and must not now be abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Enrolled Joint Memorial 12

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming

Whereas bills have been introduced in the U.S. Congress to establish a national wilderness preservation system; and

Whereas these bills would create wilderness areas in Wyoming; and

Whereas the creation of wilderness areas would interfere with the development of Wyoming's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas for the projection of water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities, which multiple-use concept policy has been in effect for over 50 years, and has shaped the economy of the West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming: that, furthermore, if such wilderness areas are necessary and desired in other States, that areas adjacent to centers of population be purchased and returned to the wilderness state, believing that such a program would make wilderness areas available to more people of the country than the creation of such areas in the West; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

Clifford P. Hansen,
Governor.
Charles G. Irwin,
President of the Senate.
Marlin T. Kurtz,
Speaker of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature both houses passed House Joint Memorial No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial No. 1 as passed by the New Mexico Legislature be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000

Whereas a current evaluation of Federal bank deposit insurance in relation to the expansion of deposits in commercial and mutual savings banks made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation evidences the advantages of increasing the present limit of $10,000 on insurance deposit accounts and supports to the preferable limit of $25,000; and

Whereas this evaluation is derived from projections through 1971 based on insurance operations for the 10-year period ending December 31, 1961; and

Whereas increasing the limit of deposit coverage to $25,000 would (1) have practically no effect on the Insurance Fund; (2) result in worthwhile extended opportunities for the depositing public of New Mexico and of the several States; (3) increase the circulating monetary media; (4) give assistance to the expanding economy of the several states; and (5) be of advantage to insured banks, whether small, medium or large size in New Mexico and the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the 88th Congress, 1st session, be respectfully memorialized to amend title 12 United States Code Annotated, section 1821, to increase the present limit of Federal insurance deposit coverage to the amount of $25,000; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack; to the U.S. Senators from New Mexico, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson and the Honorable Edwin L. Mechem; and to the U.S. Representatives from New Mexico, the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya and the Honorable Thomas G. Morris.

Bruce King,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Mack Easley,
Speaker, Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature both houses passed Senate Joint Memorial 11, a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial 11 as passed by the New Mexico Legislature be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 11

Whereas H.R. 2332 was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on January 18, 1963, and was referred to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and

Whereas the veterans of World War I in New Mexico consider that passage of H.R. 2332 by the Congress will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be sent to New Mexico's congressional delegation, and to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO STATE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature the State senate passed Senate Memorial 15, memorializing the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States to protect the U.S. lumbering industry. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial 15 as passed by the New Mexico Senate be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Memorial 15

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada and Mexico, due to advantages such as:

1. Depreciated currency;
2. Low stumpage rates;
3. Noncompetitive bidding;
4. Less costly and restrictive forest practices;
5. Lower wage rates;
6. High tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada and Mexico;
7. Low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping;
8. A cooperative Government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the worker, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 26th Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress and President of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to call to the attention of the Members of this body a joint memorial from the 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming. This memorial voices the support of the Wyoming Legislature for the resolution that I have been privileged to introduce in Congress to name the lake and recreational area that will be created by the Flaming Gorge Dam after the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

Mr. President, I am sure the Members of the body who served with Senator O'Mahoney and especially the 53 Members who have cosponsored this resolution, will concur in the language of this memorial and its tribute to the late "Senator Joe." This action is a further indication of the great works and record of this man and the nonpartisan support for this resolution to provide a permanent memorial to his name.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this memorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOINT MEMORIAL 18

Whereas for many years, the late Honorable Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of the State of Wyoming, labored to improve Wyoming and the West; and

Whereas because of the dedication and labors of men such as Joseph C. O'Mahoney, reclamation and water development and recreational facilities of the West have been developed and increased; and

Whereas a lake and recreational area will be created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border, and it would be a suitable memorial to the late Joseph C. O'Mahoney to name said lake and recreational area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam the "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and

Whereas the name of such lake and recreational area after the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney would be indicative of his love for the State of Wyoming, his monumental record on reclamation projects throughout the West, and his interest and concern for people: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to name the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border the "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Livestock Association at its annual meeting in Wichita recently approved resolutions affecting the growth and development of their livestock industry in our State.

The resolutions deal with national problems, as well as State problems.

I want to call the Senate's attention to the resolutions adopted by the association affecting national programs and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON BRUCELLOSIS ERADICATION

Whereas calfhood vaccination is one of the most important tools we have in the eradication of brucellosis, and

Whereas some of the States surrounding Kansas are not yet modified certified; and

Whereas a large amount of money has been spent in the last 8 years in testing and vaccinating in the brucellosis eradication program: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association request the livestock sanitary commissioner, the State budget department, and the Governor, to endorse and approve, and for the Kansas Legislature to continue to appropriate funds to be used to pay for brucellosis calfhood vaccination at public expense until all States bordering Kansas are modified certified brucellosis States.

RESOLUTION ON THE 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM

Recent national legislation provides for a national wheat referendum to be held in 1963. This referendum provides for a wheat program starting with the 1964 crop.

Under this program such wheat will probably be channeled into use as a food grain. Since this will directly affect livestock production, and since many of our livestock producers also are wheat growers, we believe that livestock producers have a vital interest in this referendum.

We condemn the use of any Federal agency such as the Extension Service, the FHA, the ASCS, and others, as a means of selling any farm program. We feel that this is completely improper and that their role should be only in the administration and educational fields.

We find it all the more objectionable because we feel that the recent USDA publications (printed at taxpayers expense) are being used to promote the 1964 wheat program.

Therefore, we urge that all members of the Kansas Livestock Association vigorously let their reasons be known for supporting a no vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum.

RESOLUTION ON TAXES

Since the livestockman's income varies widely from year to year because of weather fluctuating prices, we are in favor of the proposed tax reform insofar as it provides for averaging the taxable income of farmers and livestock producers over a 5-year period.

We are in favor of a continuation of the present capital gains provision on capital assets, including the sale of breeding livestock.

However, we are strongly opposed to an administration sponsored capital gains tax on appreciation in property upon gift, transfer, or death. We feel few farmers and ranchers could get the necessary cash to close an estate without selling off land, livestock, or both: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association will vigorously oppose passage of such a bill.

RESOLUTION ON WATER RESOURCES

Whereas the Kansas Livestock Association feels that U.S. Senate bill 2246 providing for regional planning of water resources would create unnecessary bureaus: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association oppose this and any other bills of like content.

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL LIVE STOCK AND MEAT BOARD

The Kansas Livestock Association and the Kansas Meat Industry Committee recommend the continuation of the National Live Stock and Meat Board under its present method of financing. They have always vigorously supported the nationwide program of research, education, and promotion conducted by this board.

Therefore, we ask all livestock producers and the officers of our Association to urge the Secretary of Agriculture to rescind P. & S. regulation, chapter II, part 201, which is scheduled to be effective July 1, 1963. This order would virtually eliminate the financing and seriously curtail the work of this board.

RESOLUTION ON REAFFIRMATION

Be it resolved by the Kansas Livestock Annual Convention at Wichita, Kans., March 16, 1963, That we reaffirm the following resolutions previously adopted:

1. The resolution urging steps be taken to expedite watershed planning.

2. The resolution to continue opposition to the establishment of the Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County.

3. The resolution requesting that Lyon Creek Watershed have opportunity to develop their plan without interference from outside sources.

4. The resolutions on public relations pointing out that livestock continues to be a major segment of the Kansas economy.

Therefore, members of the association should be on the alert for opportunities to create better public relations.

BYPASSING OF VETERANS QUALIFIED FOR CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the McKinstry-Jones Post No. 380, regarding the bypassing of veterans who are qualified for civil service appointments.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this community that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further resolved that this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and national levels of this organization.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1172. A bill to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Edmondson):

S. 1173. A bill to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1174. A bill to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1175. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Gagne; and

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of William B. Plumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1179. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May;

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Robert Fair;

S. 1181. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cafiso; and

S. 1182. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1184. A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1185. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1186. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACTS WITH SHIPOWNERS DEALING WITH CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement submitted to me by the proponents of this legislation be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, requires that the operator of a subsidized vessel in the foreign trades, whenever such vessel operates in a domestic trade, shall pay annually to the Government that proportion of one twenty-fifth of the construction differential subsidy paid for such vessel as the gross revenue derived from the domestic trade bears to the gross revenue derived from the entire voyages completed during the preceding year. Public Law 86-518, which established the depreciation period of U.S.-flag vessels at 25 years, instead of 20 years as formerly, failed to take into account the effect of this changed depreciation period on vessels of various ages operating in the foreign trades when Public Law 86-518 was enacted.

Shipping interests affected thereby now ask that the refund base be recomputed by spreading the unallocated balance of the construction differential subsidy cost over the remaining years of the vessels' now 25-year life. For example, a vessel 5 years of age at time of enactment, with a construction differential subsidy cost of $2 million, would have used up one-fourth of its construction differential subsidy base. Applying the 25-year law, the vessel should have as its annual base thereafter the remaining three-fourths of the subsidy payment divided by the balance of the vessel's present 25-year life, or 20 years. Under existing law the computation base would be $100,000, but enactment of this proposed amendment would reduce that base to $75,000 per annum over the longer remaining life of the vessel.

Proponents say that the Maritime Administration's position is that in computing the adjustment due the Government in such cases one twenty-fifth of the entire construction differential subsidy cost must be used annually as a base for subsidy refund, because of the prescribed 25-year life of the vessel.

However, they argue, a method of computation which spreads the balance of the construction differential subsidy base over the remaining years of the vessel's 25-year life is the most equitable and logical solution of the problem, in that it eliminates duplication of the base. Otherwise, assuming a vessel was 10 years old at the time of passage of Public Law 86–518, there would be the illogical situation where an operator would have passed one-half of his subsidy base, but then would have three-fifths of the base to use up over the balance of the vessel's life. In other words, he then would have to extinguish 110 one-hundredths of the construction differential subsidy base over the life of the vessel, or 110 percent. Under such an interpretation, the operator would have to pay a larger adjustment to the Government under section 506 than was intended by Congress when the 25-year-life statute was passed.

Section 2 provides a technical correction of an ambiguity in section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Though section 506 provides for payment of the refund for domestic service on a formula based on the depreciable life of the vessel in question it has not made clear that the obligation to make such payments ends on the completion of the vessel's useful life. Section 2 eliminates this uncertainty.

CHANGE OF NAME OF SHORT MOUNTAIN LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA, TO ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], I introduce a bill to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir, in the State of Oklahoma, to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir.

It is unnecessary to speak of the late Senator's interest and leadership in resource development. His accomplishments in that field are legion.

In his beloved State, every community which has a project, either completed, under construction, or authorized, wishes to honor him by making its project a memorial to him and having it bear his name.

After careful consideration and after ascertaining the wishes of Mrs. Kerr and her family, the Oklahoma congressional delegation has come to the conclusion that this is the best and most logical project to bear the name of Robert S. Kerr.

First, it is in Le Flore County, Okla., the same county in which he had developed a beautiful ranch for his great herd of Angus cattle, and in which he and Mrs. Kerr built their beautiful home.

Second, it is the first large lock and dam in Oklahoma on the Arkansas River, through which traffic bound upstream to Tulsa, Muskogee, McAlester, Okmulgee, Henryetta, and Oklahoma City will pass, and through which downriver traffic will pass to ports of the world.

Third, it symbolizes the might and bigness of Bob Kerr. With each end of the dam anchored to a towering hill, and holding the mighty Arkansas River, to be used at man's will to generate power, to motivate traffic, to control floods, and to provide pleasure to man in recreational developments, its utility suggests the name we wish it to bear.

The Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir wil be located entirely in Oklahoma. The dam will be about 8 miles south of the town of Sallisaw, Okla., and about 25 miles north of Wister, Okla. The dam will be a concrete and rolled earthfilled structure, with a total crest length of about 6,700 feet, and a maximum height of 64 feet above streambed. The concrete portion of the structure will contain a 2,500-foot spillway, topped by 50 steel tainter gates 50 feet high. A navigation lock 110 by 600 feet will be located at the left abutment, and a powerplant housing 4 units, with a total installed capacity of 110,000 kilowatts, will be located at the right abutment. The pool behind the dam will impound 500,000 acre-feet of water, and will have a surface area of about 42,000 acres.

The total cost of the lock, dam, and reservoir is estimated at $101 million at 1961 price levels. They are now being budgeted for advance planning, and are presently scheduled for completion in June 1970. The Short Mountain project is truly an imposing water-resource development. It will be the first large, multiple-purpose project to be encountered in Oklahoma by vessels moving upstream on the Arkansas navigation project, and will be the largest and most costly of the improvements for navigation.

This lock, dam, and reservoir will be a fitting memorial to Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, who was so very greatly instrumental in the development of public works for the Nation, including the Arkansas River Basin program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1173) to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir; introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. EDMONDSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for introducing the bill to change the name of the Short Mountain lock, dam, and reservoir, in Oklahoma, to the Robert S. Kerr lock, dam, and reservoir.

I know of no one in the Nation more entitled to this recognition than the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma. Those of us in the Middle West are deeply indebted to him for his great vision in dealing with problems of conservation and the control of water runoff. I sincerely hope that early action and passage of the bill will occur.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES TO SURVEY AND PLAN EXPANSION OF COLLEGE FACILITIES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing Federal assistance to the States to survey and plan expansion of college facilities.

The bill was approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the last Congress as part of an omnibus measure expanding the National Defense Education Act, but was not brought to a vote in the Senate.

The bill is intended to stimulate the States, and the public at large, to recognize the extent of the problem we face and to begin making comprehensive plans for its solution. Wise planning will bring facilities for higher education to areas now without them, and will avoid duplicating facilities in other areas.

The President's manpower report to Congress this month pointed out that the trend in youth unemployment demands special concern and action. Alarming numbers of our youth lack work opportunities as well as the educational preparation necessary for a rewarding adult life.

One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation, and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

Our educational level is the highest in our history, but it will have to advance at a faster rate to keep pace with the growing complexities of the scientific age. The education received is often out of step with rising skill and versatility requirements of our advanced economy.

The manpower report also pointed out that shortages of qualified workers are particularly widespread in scientific, engineering, teaching, health, and other professional and technical fields, because expansion in scientific research, greater education and health needs have led to increased demand for such manpower.

These ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. Extensive education and training are needed for such demands; the supply of well-trained personnel cannot be built up overnight from existing unemployed manpower resources.

The report underscored the need for effective planning to develop additional college facilities, adequate to the needs of our population and the demands of the time in which we live.

The college survey bill would provide up to $2,500,000 in matching grants to the States. It is a companion measure to my community college legislation, which would assist the States in establishing and expanding 2-year public community colleges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1174) to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CHANGE OF DATE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the date of Memorial Day from the 30th of May to the last Monday of May in each year.

The practical reason for such a change is very simple. As it is now, Memorial Day may fall on any day of the week. This year, for example, it falls on Thursday; next year it will come on Friday, and so on.

If Memorial Day were to fall on a Monday each year, our people could count on a long weekend for relaxation and spiritual refreshment, just as they do now in observing Labor Day, the first Monday of September; and Thanksgiving, the fourth Thursday of November. This would work to the benefit not only of those millions of workers in offices and factories but also of their employers in scheduling their work.

But there is another reason, Mr. President, why a change to a Monday would be beneficial. I believe that more of our people would observe Memorial Day as a holiday and consequently pause to reflect upon the real meaning and purpose of this day.

We ought to be, and we are, thankful for every new day that our country is at peace—or, at least, not in a shooting war. At the same time, we should never let ourselves forget our gratitude to those departed for their supreme contribution to the preservation of freedom. Nor should we allow the new generations to forget.

I believe we can better achieve these aims, Mr. President, through the legislation I am offering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1179) changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Davey Moore's death is another tragic milestone in the boxing industry's history of mishandled human beings. It underlines the desperate need for a National Boxing Commission with authority to require thorough physical examinations of all boxers.

Today, I am introducing a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, and establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner.

This is the same bill which was before the last Congress as S. 1474. The need for this bill is even greater today than it was when the bill was previously introduced. Hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee showed beyond any doubt that professional boxing has had too many connections with the underworld. Nothing has taken place since those hearings to indicate that professional boxing ever will, on its own initiative, free itself from control by racketeers and other undesirables.

The primary purpose of this bill is to aid the States in their efforts to drive the racketeers out of boxing and, thus, to end their monopolistic control of one of our most popular sports. Also the health of the boxers must be protected. If strong measures are not taken to clean up boxing, it will not survive as a major sport. If boxing cannot be cleaned up, then it should be abolished.

The sports tradition of our country has been enriched by the contributions of boxing, and many a young man has found that boxing can develop a sound body and strength of character. In many of our cities, boxing programs for boys have been an important factor in combating juvenile delinquency. In accord with the principles of the President's physical fitness program, the training these young men receive in the ring can be of great value.

The bill I am introducing will make it easier for State and local governments to do their job of regulating boxing and keeping the sport free of the criminal element. It will make it possible to insure that only those men who are in proper physical condition will be allowed in the ring. The bill is necessary because the interstate nature of boxing contests makes it impossible for any State to regulate boxing fully and effectively without Federal help. Many of the States whose own boxing commissions have made substantial efforts to regulate boxing within their States recognize that many of the problems are interstate in nature, and support this bill.

Mr. President, an article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald recently reporting a statement made by the Boxing Writers Association before the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing. The boxing writers urged a strengthening of regulation of professional boxing to prevent the death of the sport. This statement highlights the problems confronting boxing today and emphasizes the need for this legislation. Just last week the New York Standard carried a story that the chairman of the New York investigating committee has introduced a bill calling for Federal regulation of professional boxing. I request unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Standard, Mar. 19, 1963]

BILL TO ASK FEDERAL CHECK OF BOXING

A bill calling for Federal regulation of professional boxing will be introduced in the New York State Legislature Tuesday. Assemblyman Hayward H. Plumadore, Republican of Saranac Lake, who will submit the bill, also said he would ask for changes in State laws governing the sport.

Plumadore is chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing, which recently ended its inquiry into boxing following the death of Benny (Kid) Paret as a result of injuries suffered in a fight.

He does not expect any action to abolish boxing and wrestling, which also was covered in his unit's inquiry.

He said many of the injuries in competitive sports are caused by a lack of conditioning. That can be corrected by physical fitness programs, he added.

The final report of the Plumadore committee's study of boxing is due within 2 weeks.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

ABOLITION OF SPORT OPPOSED

NEW YORK, January 2.—The Boxing Writers Association today called for a strengthening of regulation of pro boxing and not the death of the sport in a statement to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing.

The writers urged that candidates for jobs as officials, especially referees, should be screened carefully on the basis of personality, experience, and integrity, to assure a supply of qualified officials.

They also called for a new testing device for boxers to determine a young man's psychological attitude as a complement to the clinical examination now provided by the medical advisory board.

The writers asked a firmer supervision of training and urged that fighters, no matter what their status, should be required to space their fights in keeping with sound medical judgment. The present regulations were called inadequate.

"Even a victorious fighter might be subjected to an unreasonably heavy drain on his physical resources," the statement read. "We cannot stress this point too strongly. It is a vital matter."

The writers offered their opinion that the New York State Athletic Commission's record over a 40-year period supported the claim that nowhere in the world has boxing been better regulated and administered than in this State.

In conclusion, the writers' statement read:

"We have over the years divined a goodness in boxing. We deplore gangsterism and death and dishonesty, which does not mark us as men striking a singular posture.

"We seek with you a strengthening of boxing regulation and not the demise of the sport, either through legislation or atrophy. We believe it is important and in the public interest."

The committee was set up shortly after the death of welterweight Benny (Kid) Paret following his knockout loss to Emile Griffith in a television fight at Madison Square Garden last March.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1182) to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF FIRE AND CASUALTY INSURANCE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on December 1, 1962, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, a beloved and revered Member of this body for almost 30 years, died at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., at the age of 78. As the last act of Senator O'Mahoney's distinguished legislative career, he introduced in the Senate a bill to regulate fire and casualty insurance rates in the District of Columbia, in a manner consistent with his deep and abiding lifetime belief in competition as the guiding force in our free enterprise system.

Along with many other distinguished Members of this body, Senator O'Mahoney applauded the Supreme Court decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case in 1945, which applied the Sherman Antitrust Act to certain monopolistic and anticompetitive practices in the fire insurance field. Senator O'Mahoney was instrumental in the enactment of the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945, which continued the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of insurance to the extent that such business was not regulated by State law.

Under his direction, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee conducted a 3-year study to examine the adequacy of State regulation and to measure the vitality of the insurance industry under the McCarran Act. I welcomed the opportunity to participate actively in these hearings, and joined with Senator O'Mahoney and the other members of the Judiciary Committee in Report No. 831, 87th Congress, filed in the Senate August 1961. The bill which Senator O'Mahoney introduced in the Senate on August 29, 1960, and which I reintroduced on January 23, 1961, reflected the views of the Judiciary Committee as contained in its report.

Along with Senator O'Mahoney, I was appalled to learn during the course of this study that certain of the monopolistic practices which the Supreme Court had condemned in the South-Eastern Underwriters case were actually sanctioned by the fire insurance rate law for the District of Columbia. This law had been enacted a few days prior to this decision, and Congress has never seen fit to amend it. I refer to the requirement in the District of Columbia fire rate law that compels all insurers to belong to the rating bureau. This forces companies to join a price-fixing combination and denies them the right of independence, even though membership in a rating bureau may be completely anathema to the philosophy and to the traditions of such companies. As the Judiciary Committee noted:

> There can be no doubt that coercion in insurance is the antithesis of the congressional purpose in enacting Public Law 15.

Laws which require membership in rating bureaus, or which eliminate all rate competition are in direct conflict with the McCarran Act.

In the course of this Antitrust Committee's insurance study, we learned that the casualty insurance rate law for the District of Columbia enacted in 1948 did not contain either this restrictive feature or other tight controls over rates which were in the early fire rate law. My essential purpose in introducing this bill today is to repeal the fire rate law and to apply the salutary principles of the casualty law to both fire and casualty insurance rates.

The original bills which Senator O'Mahoney and I introduced met wtih considerable opposition from certain groups in the insurance industry, primarily under the belief that they were designed as model bills upon which the States would be required to pattern their rate laws. This was not our intention, and is not now my purpose. I concur in the remarks of Senator Morse, who cosponsored this bill with me, when he stated during the hearings before the District of Columbia Committee that the bill is intended to be a model of good legislation for the District of Columbia, and not as any congressional mandate that the States are obligated to follow.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners has frequently encouraged the development of all-industry bills which have served as models. However, the Congress possesses no authority to establish model laws which the States shall be required to adopt. But, as Senator Morse properly noted, if there is anything in a rate law enacted for the District of Columbia which the States find to be valuable, they would, of course, be free to draw from such laws whatever comfort they can in enacting their own laws. It should be noted, however, that the Constitution prohibits the enactment by the States of laws which conflict with valid Federal laws.

I think largely because of this unfortunate misconception concerning the original bills, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which held hearings on this legislation last year, never saw fit to bring this issue to a vote. Regrettably, the full membership of the District Committee had no opportunity to register their views on this measure.

In the hearings which were conducted last year, the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia testified in favor of a rate bill which had been introduced by Senator Bible, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. This bill repealed the fire rate law of 1944 and subjected fire rates to the provisions of the casualty rate law. In addition, it denied rate bureaus the status of aggrieved persons in opposing rate deviations. I consider this bill a very constructive measure in correcting the principal defects which the Antitrust Committee had found in the District of Columbia rate law. Therefore, during the hearings which were held last June, together with Senator Morse, I agreed to support this bill, and to abandon the approach endorsed in the previous bills I had sponsored, provided a few basic amendments could be incorporated.

The bill which I introduce today is modeled after the original bill introduced by Senator Bible, at the request of Superintendent Jordan, but containing the amendments which I proposed last year. I am firmly convinced that there are now only minor differences separating my views from those of the insurance superintendent. It is my sincere hope that the superintendent will join with me and other industry groups in support of this bill, in order that the District Committee may act favorably upon the bill promptly, and that the Congress will have an opportunity to vote on this issue this year.

While the bill I introduce today adopts the approach proposed by Senator Bible, at the instance of Superintendent Jordan, I feel some amendments are necessary. One of these amendments would deny status as an aggrieved person to rating organizations, not only in opposing deviations, but also in opposition to independent rate filings. During the hearings last June, Superintendent Jordan indicated agreement with this amendment. The only major issue raised by these amendments is the requirement that like bureau and independent filings, deviated rate filings be effective upon filing. Such deviations, of course, remain subject to the right of subsequent disapproval by the superintendent if they do not comply with the standards of the act. This would also be true for either bureau or independent filings. Superintendent Jordan wants to keep deviations subject to the prior approval requirement, in order that he can deal effectively with the possibility of flash filings, that is, filings deliberately made at inadequate rates to capture a particular piece of business. However, in response to questions, he did say that flash filings had not been made under the file-and-use provision of the existing casualty rate law. The superintendent contended that flash filings cannot occur under the existing law, because of the power to retroactively disapprove certain filings. The bill which I offer today not only retains this authority the superintendent deems necessary to curb flash filings, but specifically makes it applicable to deviations, as well as basic filings. As now drafted, I believe that any differences we have with the insurance superintendent are minor. Nevertheless, I believe the principle must be preserved that deviations cannot be subjected to any more onerous requirements than obtain in the case of other rate filings.

The bill which I am introducing contains a number of other minor amendments to which the superintendent has raised no specific objections. These amendments would, first, expressly authorize public inspection of all filings; second, permit a filer to incorporate by reference any previously filed material open to public inspection; third, clarify the partial subscribership provision; and fourth, define the term "excessive and inadequate" rates. I want to point out that the definition of "inadequate rates" contained in this bill affords the superintendent an additional tool to combat the problem of flash filings. The superintendent's concern about flash filings is also met by the new provision included in this bill which prescribed a 1-year minimum period for deviations.

Because of the importance of preserving reasonable competition in the insurance industry in the District of Columbia, Judge Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, appeared personally before the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce last year and urged the adoption of legislation substantially the same as that contained in the bill I am now proposing. I think the Congress ought to give great weight to the special competence of the experts in the Department of Justice on this vital issue. Only the magnitude of this issue would have caused the Assistant Attorney General to appear before the Subcommittee of the District of Columbia to testimony in favor of this remedial legislation. It is important, therefore, to note that Judge Loevinger concluded his testimony by saying:

> We urge that legislation be enacted to provide within the District the competitive climate which Congress intended to create in the insurance industry when it passed the McCarran Act; and to provide the States with an unequivocal expression of the type of regulation which Congress contemplated when it granted the States the authority to regulate this great industry and immunize it from the full impact of the antitrust laws.

I am entirely in agreement with the Assistant Attorney General that a competitive climate for the insurance industry should be provided by Congress for the District of Columbia. I believe that the bill which I introduce today would provide that climate, and I urge its serious consideration by the Congress.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1184) to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE C. & B. LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1185) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc., introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the State of Oregon (without cost to the United States) a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon in and to the following described land (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon): the west half of the southwest quarter of section 22, township 4 North, Range 28 East, Willamette meridian, Oregon, such land being a part of a tract of land conveyed to the State of Oregon by patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, pursuant to the aforementioned Act.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the State of Oregon conveying to the United States the land described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, of Hermiston, Oregon (without cost to the United States), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon, upon the condition that:

(1) The C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, convey to the United States fee simple title to the following described parcels of land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon: The west half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", the east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", less the westerly 135 feet thereof; the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, less railroad right-of-way; that portion of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22 and of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, lying south and east of U.S.R.S. canal "A", excepting from said north half of said northwest quarter of section 22, that certain portion thereof as conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed recorded October 19, 1960, in deed book 260 at page 512, records of Umatilla County, Oregon. All being in township 4 north, range 28 east, of the Willamette meridian, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Excepting any and all roads and water rights-of-way.

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the property to be conveyed to the United States by such company is of less value than the property to be conveyed to such company by the United States, the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value, which amount shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, authorized under subsection (b) of this section shall be made subject to a right-of-way in the land so conveyed for ditches or canals constructed under the authority of the United States, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon) conveyed to the United States by the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pursuant to the first section of this Act; except that there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, referred to in the first section of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION FOR IRRIGATION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS, CROOKED RIVER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, to provide for the irrigation of additional lands. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1186) to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon", approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "and the Crooked River project extension. The principal new works for the project extension shall include six pumping plants, canals, and related distribution and drainage facilities".

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Crooked River project extension $995,000 (January 1962 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said extension.

SEC. 3. Power and energy required for irrigation pumping for the Crooked River project and the Crooked River project extension shall be made available by the Secretary of the Interior from the Dalles Dam powerplant and other Federal plants interconnected therewith at rates not to exceed the costs of such power and energy from the Dalles Dam, taking into account all costs of the dam, reservoir, and powerplant which are determined by the Secretary under provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to be properly allocable to such irrigation pumping power and energy.

TO AMEND THE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary dated February 23, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it and also a memorandum in regard to this joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, and letter, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 381) is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$7,250" in section (b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$15,000".

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose a proposed draft joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. The legislation would allow the increase of the maximum annual U.S. contribution to the Bureau from the present $7,250 to $15,000.

The Bureau, located in Geneva, Switzerland, is the secretariat of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property. The Union is composed of the 51 countries, including the United States, which are parties to the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property. This Convention is and has been for more than 70 years the major instrumentality through which the patents, trademarks and industrial designs of U.S. inventors, industries, and business are assured protection in the other 50 member countries. Many millions of dollars are collected abroad each year for the assignment or licensing of these industrial property rights, and thus they are important dollar earners for this country.

The Bureau is in the process of complete reorganization and revitalization. We hope that, as a result of this reorganization, it will provide for increased services to the member countries, assist industrially less developed countries in their industrial property problems, and increase its publications in the English language. This reorganization and assumption of new tasks, together with the general increase in salaries and the rising costs of goods and services, make necessary an increase in the Bureau's budget (a background memorandum relating to the proposal is enclosed).

I believe it is in the best interests of the United States to raise its annual contribution to the Bureau in order that the extremely valuable and important services performed can be continued and increased in scope and efficiency. Our contribution to the total budget of the Industrial Property Union is expected to remain between 5 and 7 percent.

I hope that the Congress will be able to take action on this request during the current session since the recommended effective date of the increased contribution is January 1, 1963. The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

The obligation of this Government to pay contributions to the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property results from the fact that the United States is party to the Convention of the International (Paris) Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, established in Paris on March 20, 1883, and revised at Washington on June 2, 1911 (38 Stat. 1645; TS 579), at The Hague on November 6, 1925 (47 Stat. 1789; TS 834); at London on June 2, 1934 (53 Stat. 1748; TS 941), and at Lisbon on October 31, 1958 (13 UST 1; TIAS 4931). In accordance with article 1 of the Convention, the countries to which the convention applies constituted themselves into a Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The convention provides basically that each country shall accord to nationals of other member countries the same protection with respect to industrial property rights that it accords its own nationals. Nationals of member countries are also accorded, throughout the Union, certain special rights and advantages, such as the right of priority and protection against arbitrary forfeiture of patents, if not immediately worked. The provisions governing priority are particularly important. Under these provisions, when an American inventor has filed for a patent in the United States or a member country on a given date, he has a 1-year period from the date of his first filing to file a corresponding patent application and acquire appropriate protection in other member countries. A similar 6-month right of priority applies to trademarks.

The convention also establishes an international office known as the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property which performs the following administrative functions: (1) Serves as a clearing house for information on and interpretation of patent and trademark laws; (2) serves as a medium to promote the ratification by members of revisions of the convention and the adherence of new members; (3) collects and publishes information relating to matters of general usefulness to members of the Union, and prepares a periodical paper concerning matters of interest to members of the Union; (4) holds itself at the service of members of the Union in order to supply them with any special information they may need on questions relating to the international system of industrial property; (5) handles the preparatory and administrative work of the conferences of revision.

The Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property provides that the budget of the International Bureau shall not exceed 140,000 Swiss francs (approximately $33,000). This amount was written in the convention in 1925.

Attempts were made at the Lisbon Conference in 1958 to raise this amount to 600,000 Swiss francs (approximately $140,000) by revising the convention. Such a revision, for which the United States voted at the diplomatic conference, would have required the unanimous decision of all member countries. The decision was vetoed by the Soviet bloc for political reasons, in retaliation for the conference's decision not to seat the representatives of the Eastern Zone of Germany. Thereupon, the conference adopted a simple resolution inviting the countries to raise their contributions to an extent which brought the ceiling of the Bureau's budget to 600,000 Swiss francs. This budget did not, of course, take into account any increased costs arising out of the proposed reorganization of the Bureau which was only approved by a committee of members of the Union in October 1962.

At the present time, the United States and almost all the other member countries pay their contributions on the basis recommended by the Lisbon resolution. The contribution of each State is computed according to a system in which countries belong in one of six classes. Each class is allotted a certain percentage of the total budget, and each state freely chooses the class in which it wants to belong. (The United States and five other countries belong to class I.) The percentage of each class may undergo slight variations from year to year, as the total number of the members and their appurtenance to a given class change. The present annual contribution of the United States and other countries in class I is approximately $7,000.

Congress gave authority in 1960 to the Department of State to pay on the basis of a yearly maximum of $7,250 (Public Law 86–614; 74 Stat. 381) which is roughly 5 percent of the present total budget with a $140,000 ceiling.

This ceiling, voted in 1958, is going to be insufficient in the next few years primarily for three reasons: (1) general increase in salaries, and the rising cost of printing, materials, and services; (2) the reorganization of the Bureau in order to increase its efficiency and usefulness to member states; (3) new activities. The salaries will be brought to a level comparable with the salaries paid by other intergovernmental organizations having their headquarters in Geneva. This is necessary for the recruitment of a truly international and high quality staff. The cost of printing, materials, and services has considerably increased in Switzerland in recent years. The most important new activities include increased efforts to have additional countries adhere to the Union; cooperation with the United Nations in industrial property matters; and technical-legal assistance to less developed countries.

A 15-member Committee of the Paris Union (called the "Permanent Bureau"), on which the United States is represented, has carefully studied the financial implications of the proposed future activities in a meeting held in October 1962. It estimated that the yearly amounts needed in the near future will be in the neighborhood of 900,000 Swiss francs (approximately $210,000). The question of increase was brought before this committee rather than before a diplomatic conference because the Soviet bloc countries would have probably again vetoed a revision of the convention in protest against the nonrecognition of East Germany. Thus it was necessary once again to resolve the question of an increase by way of a recommendation not requiring unanimity. Consequently, the committee adopted a resolution recommending that the supervisory authority (i.e. the Swiss Government) "invite the Govments of the States members of the Paris Union to accept that the ceiling of that Union be raised to 900,000 Swiss francs per year and to pay their contributions on this basis from January 1, 1963."

This represents an increase of 50 percent and, assuming that the percentage of the countries belonging to class I would remain 5 percent of the total budget, would mean for the United States that its yearly contribution would increase by $3,500 (i.e., from the present $7,000 to $10,500; all amounts being approximative).

The Department of State recommends, however, that the authority sought from Congress allow us to contribute up to $15,000 per annum in order to avoid the need of seeking new authorizations in the next few years, should the $10,500 prove to be insufficient. It is, in fact, possible that the percentage of class I countries will become slightly higher, since some countries may change class or withdraw. The amount of $15,000 would allow for a 2-percent increase on this account. Furthermore, it is possible that because of increases in salary due to rising costs of living and other increases, the ceiling of $210,000 would prove to be inadequate. The amount of $15,000 would allow the raising of the ceiling to approximately $300,000 if contributions of class I members continue to represent about 5 percent of the total budget. If this percentage rises, the authority to pay $15,000 per annum would allow a budget of correspondingly less than $300,000. However, it is believed that an authorization to contribute not more than $15,000 per year will suffice for the foreseeable future.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] be placed on S. 943 as a cosponsor, and that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] be placed on the bill S. 1013 as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 987) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] be added, and that when the bill is again printed, it may include their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 887, related to the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 14, 1963:

S. 1100. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism: Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

Authority of March 19, 1963:

S. 1117. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Engle, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NORTHWEST POWER PREFERENCE BILL, S. 1007

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate that the public hearing on S. 1007, the Northwest power preference bill, previously scheduled by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to begin on April 2, has now been rescheduled to begin on Monday, April 1, at 10 a.m., in our committee hearing room.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

Statement by Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 14, 1963, on the subject of the 1963 tax message.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT DEDICATION OF O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHICAGO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Saturday, President Kennedy spoke at the dedication of the O'Hare International Airport in Chicago.

I recommend to Senators a reading of his remarks on that occasion. They remind us how much our country owes to men such as "Butch" O'Hare, for whom the airport is named; at the same time, they demonstrate our need for such men in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the President's dedicatory address and also the text of a speech he delivered later that day at a luncheon in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President at the Dedication of the O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.

Mayor Daley, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, Government and State officials, ladies and gentlemen: 21 years ago this year, a young Navy officer stood at the White House and was decorated by President Roosevelt with the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism extending far beyond the line of duty. I remember as a young naval officer myself how the extraordinary feat of "Butch" O'Hare captured the imagination not only of our Armed Forces but also of the country. His extraordinary act in protecting his ship, shooting down, while he was alone, shooting down five of the enemy, during difficult days in the Second War, gave this country hope and confidence not only in the quality and caliber of our fighting men, but also in the certainty of victory.

Therefore, 21 years later, I am proud to come to Chicago, to this airport, to take part in this act which commemorates his public service, his great naval service, and also reminds me of how much we owe to those who made this country of ours great.

I think one of the extraordinary facts of the Second War was this number of men who were highly decorated, particularly with the Congressional Medal of Honor, who later lost their lives in combat in later days. "Butch" O'Hare was one of them, being killed 18 months after the act of honor by the President of the United States, when his life could have been much easier. John Basilone, who got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in the Marine Corps, in Guadalcanal, and who was later killed on the beach at Iwo Jima, was another. But time after time, men who could have stayed at home and felt their duty done, went out again and some of them were killed. So today we not only dedicate the International Airport, but we also recall all those who made it possible. This is an extraordinary airport in an extraordinary city, in an extraordinary country, and it is a tribute to the constructive action of the Federal Government, the State government and the city government, under the distinguished leadership of your great mayor, Mayor Daley.

To keep these various interests working together and make this the most extraordinary airport in the world for this great city is an amazing feat. This airport lives up to its name. There is no other airport in the world where planes can make instrument landings on parallel runways, simultaneously. There is no other airport in the Nation which maintains three instrument landing systems. And there is no other airport in the world, and this should be a source of satisfaction to the people of Chicago, there is no other airport in the world which serves so many people and so many planes. Some 13.5 million airline travelers passed through O'Hare Airport last year. In 5 years it has gone from the 16th most active field in the country to the first, like so many other things about Chicago. During this airport's daily peak periods, an airliner lands and takes off every 43 seconds. Every day, one out of every five air travelers in this country passes through this airport, enough people in one day to equal the population of Bloomington, Ill. Every day, some 1,300 to 1,400 landings and takeoffs occur. So I think this airport is an extraordinary national asset named after an extraordinary American.

All of this traffic in and out of Chicago proves, as it has since the beginning of this country, that Chicago occupies a most important and vital strategic area in the United States, where all the lines of communication cross. That is why the future of this city is so bright. Indian canoes traveled this route from Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River before this was the United States.

And it will be doing the same thing in the year 2000. Railroads, highways—all the rest will come and meet in Chicago and make this a vital, booming city. These are all the things that can be done, but I think a good deal more must be done. One of the problems is with the people who live around the airports. I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half-million people whose homes are in the immediate area. In addition, air cargo is only beginning in importance. In addition, I think we must make a special effort at O'Hare and all our other airports to welcome the people who come from abroad. This may be the first view they have of America. We want them to know what a warm and vital and vigorous country this is. And I hope we will make every effort to make them at home, and to urge their countrymen to come and visit us.

Finally, we look forward to the day in aviation when we are going to travel three times the speed of sound, and go to any place in the world in a few hours. And when that happens, we want the United States to be in the lead, as it has been in the lead in jet transportation since the jet was invented. All in all, I am proud to be here in Chicago taking part in a great ceremony, honoring a great American to whom we owe much, looking to the past and saluting him and looking to the future and saluting the city of Chicago.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President at a Civic Luncheon, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Mayor, Your Eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best, that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business, labor, the civic groups and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

As Mr. Smith said, all these things do not just happen; they are made to happen. And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize, which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country, of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the mayor has said, after a great Chicagoan who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth, and I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depression, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity. The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find work.

The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions, but also during periods of prosperity; and there are three reasons why I regard this as the No. 1 problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago, Ill., and across the country. There are three reasons for it: First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now one farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans; compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research, and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the man-hours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year; comparable to the population of the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half million, while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated that, disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth.

The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year, 3.8 million will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one third of our unemployed. Last year, the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained are declining, in factories, mines, farms, and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society, even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school, but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those coming out of high school. But unfortunately, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly 2½ million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises to 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years, the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly 2 million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.

This is not a blue collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farm Home Administration of the U.S. Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard-driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion work days, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer.

This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse, after each recession, and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of the manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession. Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downward.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten million dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the workweek, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work.

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington; depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at their head, and my fervent hope is that the United States of America in meeting the needs of this decade will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities."

Thank you.

DR. WALTER P. WEBB

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, each generation is privileged to know certain individuals of whom it readily can be said that they carry the torch of wisdom, from which untold numbers light their own fires of thought and learning.

One of that number of wise men, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, the eminent Texas and Southwest historian, recently was torn from this life by a tragic traffic accident.

It was the same Dr. Webb, professor emeritus of the University of Texas, who provided "A Tribute to the Southwest" for the official inaugural program, January 20, 1961, from which I am privileged to quote the following:

> There is something infectious about the magic of the Southwest. Some are immune to it, but there are others who have no resistence, and who must spend the rest of their lives dreaming of the incredible sweep of the desert, of great golden mesas with purple shadows, and tremendous stars appearing at dusk in a turquoise sky.
>
> And I am one of those.

On March 17, 1963, the Dallas Morning News published an article written by Dr. J. Frank Dobie, who walked, talked, and taught with Dr. Webb for many years. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the Record, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 17, 1963]

On the Projected Shadow of Walter Prescott Webb

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I cannot speak freely of Walter Webb apart from personal life. Each of us was born in the year 1888 and reared in the country. We were underling instructors together, he in history and I in English, in the University of Texas; we came to know each other better along in the thirties. The evening he was killed in a car accident, March 8, 1963, I and two other men were sitting down to dinner as guests of Frank Wardlaw, director of the University of Texas Press, all of us expecting Webb to appear before long.

Many times in newspapers and elsewhere I've seen the names of Roy Bedichek, naturalist and humanist, Walter Prescott Webb, historian and thinker, and Frank Dobie linked together as a triumvirate of writers. Bedichek, the dearest comrade of my life, died in 1959. We three not infrequently went out in the country late in the day to cook steak and eat it along with a bottle of beer. Bedichek was the planner of these parties, also the cook. He saw that each man paid his part of the expenses. There was no host. There was not much drinking. Webb didn't care for beer. A sip of wine suited him. If he took whisky, he didn't take more than a jigger without water.

The site for our camp suppers came to be Friday Mountain Ranch in the hills about 17 miles southwest of Austin. It consists of approximately a section of land; an ancient two-storied rock house on it was once a kind of academy. After Webb acquired the place it entered into his bones—into the very fibers of his being. He spent an enormous amount of time and money restoring the soil and bringing back a turf of grass. Bear Creek, normally running, twists through the land. Webb dammed it, compounding a fine hole of water. The water, the soil, and the grass restored him as much as he restored the land.

In 1945 or 1946 Roy Bedichek was provided with a grant of money by a civilized man who demanded anonymity. He spent a year at Friday Mountain batching and writing the book published in 1947, "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist." Webb wanted humanity to benefit from the land. Without living on it and there associating with himself and with nature, free from everything else but the occupation of writing, Bedichek probably could not have achieved the classic that he did achieve.

It was only after rains broke the terrible drought of the fifties that grass really came back on Friday Mountain land. In 1962 it was at its prime and Walter Webb was also.

He wrote an essay, published in Harper's and then reprinted in Reader's Digest, telling of the poverty of his boyhood and of a stranger named Hinds in New York who sent him books to read and aided him in getting a college education. Hinds died many years ago. Webb never saw him and remained to the end concerned over some way to pay him back. His paying back seems to have lain in aiding certain struggling and able students.

He was always on the side of humanity, the people. One of his books, "Divided We Stand" (1937), analyzes the dearth of prosperity in the South while the North burgeoned and for a long while treated the South pretty much as a colony. Webb himself prospered through investing earnings from teaching and writing—especially from two textbooks—in real estate.

Webb had a dim view of certain English teachers under whom he had studied in the university. He wanted to write but learned by himself the craft of writing. Some time after World War I, he was avidly reading O. Henry and writing some short stories of his own. One that I remember was based on an electric sign above Joske's store in San Antonio that flashed every night, showing a cowboy roping a steer. Webb taught for a while in a San Antonio high school.

His superiority as a historian lies to a marked degree in power of thought, in revealing the meaning of things as well as characters, and in interpreting the ever-evolving currents of human affairs. His last big book, "The Great Frontier" (1958), interprets the Western Hemisphere as a frontier for the expansion of Europe. It says plainly and emphatically that America has been consuming irreplaceable resources and that the future of such a policy is not bright. This book came out during the outrage of McCarthyism, and some fanatics, without reading it, slammed it as a rebuke to free enterprise.

When Webb took a stand, he took it. If the radical right seemed to him unjust and undemocratic the radical left annoyed him. He was not a crusader and was not contentious. Much went on in his mind that he never gave words to. He sometimes wished, he once told me, that he didn't have to think. One time while we were walking along the railroad about Third Street in Austin, we stopped beside the oldtime steam locomotive. It was stationary but was throbbing with power. Webb said, "That is the greatest manifestation of power in the world."

Whether Webb actually ever hated anybody or not I cannot say; I never heard him express hatred toward anybody. He was more inclined to set forth the facts about a man than to praise or condemn. He was tolerant of the vagaries of individuals.

He developed as a professor and historian under the late Dr. Eugene C. Barker, for years head of the history department of the University of Texas. The older Barker grew, the more conservative he grew. His directness and his integrity were admirable. I myself owe considerable to him. He came to think that the masses of mankind need a kind of dictatorial direction in religion, in politics, and in other regions.

While Dr. Barker became hostile to the New Deal, active against Homer Price Rainey as president of the University of Texas, and was standing with the by-no-means-intellectual regents who deposed Rainey, Webb was for Rainey, also for Franklin D. Roosevelt, as he was later for Truman. But he was never against Barker. "I did not understand him," I heard him say, "but he stood by me. He was generous. He stood for fine things. I remember him with respect and gratitude."

The first Mrs. Webb, after having been married to Walter for more than 43 years, died in the summer of 1960, survived by a daughter, Mildred, of whom Dr. Webb as well as Mrs. Webb was very fond. In December of 1961 he married the widow of the late Maury Maverick, of San Antonio, a very spritely mind and a delightful lady. Considering his love for her and her marrying him, he said, "This is an unexpected dividend from life."

Any man who has seen and been a part of life wants to leave it before decomposing into a senile vegetable. Webb died standing up, as Caesar considered it mete for a man to die. In a flash he passed from wisdom and happiness to whatever death means. No person who has added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb added ceases to be. His living, thinking, writing, standing up will surely continue as parts of his projected shadow.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on this date 142 years ago the people of Greece, unwilling to tolerate any longer the oppressive domination imposed by their Ottoman conquerors, began an all-out struggle for their freedom—a struggle which was to last for more than 6 years, and was to culminate, in 1827, in the establishment of an independent Greek state. It is entirely appropriate that we here in the Senate, and Americans everywhere, pause to commemorate this occasion and to pay tribute to the valiant courage and indomitable spirit of the Greek people.

The entire Western civilization owes an incalculable debt to the Greeks for the contributions they have made to almost every facet of modern life. In architecture, literature, philosophy, and sculpture, to mention only a few, the imagination and creativity of the Greeks have served as sources of inspiration to all of us over the years. But the Greeks are perhaps best noted for their political theories. Their early philosophers are recognized as the true architects of democracy, believing as they did in the dignity of the individual man and the supremacy of the law. It is indeed ironic that the Greek nation, so steeped in democratic principles, should have been subjected for so long to the despotic rule of alien tyrants. But the people of Greece, united by the dream of national political independence, and sharing the will and determination to be free, were ultimately successful in reestablishing a democratic state, which has survived countless threats from would-be aggressors, even in the span of our own history.

The struggle to maintain the independence won in 1827 has not been easy. But with a maximum of perseverance and a minimum of outside assistance, the Greek people have built a state which today stands as a bastion of freedom in the turbulent eastern Mediterranean area. In a locale where constant vigilance and courage are vital in order to protect against Communist advances, the Greeks have proven themselves capable of resisting the onward push of the Communists. The Greeks are continuing to strengthen the economic and social fibers of their nation, and have become a valuable and trusted ally in the NATO pact of nations.

We Americans can never completely repay our debt to the Greek nation and people, who have contributed so significantly to the development of democratic ideals and institutions. We are indeed proud of and grateful to the more than 1½ million Americans of Greek descent who have done so much to strengthen democracy and freedom in our own land.

In my own State of Massachusetts, there are many eminent citizens of Greek descent to whom I wish to pay special tribute today. Their influence is widely felt throughout the Commonwealth, and they have provided constructive leadership in many aspects of our community life.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him in tribute to the 142d anniversary of Greek independence.

The Senator from New York calls attention to the many fine contributions which the Greeks have made to the Western civilization, and points out the fact that Greece has been a significant outpost of freedom in the free world today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Keating

I am happy to pay tribute today to the 142d anniversary of Greek independence. One hundred and forty-two years ago today —in 1821—the freedom loving Greeks cast away the dark forces of oppression and set out on a new course of liberty and self-determination.

On this significant day, Americans should pause and remember the many fine contributions the Greeks have made to Western civilization. We need only to look about us here in Washington at the many Government buildings inspired by Greek architecture and Greek culture. In 18th-century America, architects turned to Greek prototypes in an effort to anchor our art upon the best ideals of the past in a desire to find lasting monuments to the spirit of human achievement.

American Government today reflects the concept of the Greek city-state which has served for centuries as a forerunner of government by and for the people. Greece has inspired and enriched many areas of our own society—in art, literature, music, to mention only a few.

The culture of the United States has been vastly enriched not only by the Greek heritage but also by the manifold contributions that American citizens of Greek descent have made to the building of our nation. In work and in play, American citizens of Greek origin have done their part and more in fulfilling the vital functions of citizenship and enriching our society.

Also noteworthy is the fact that Greece has been a significant outpost of freedom in the free world today. Only 15 years ago, the liberty of Greece was threatened with the black cloud of communism. It was possible, as a result of determined free world resistance and the full backing of the United States, for the heroic people of Greece to throw off the Communist guerrillas and to reestablish an independent nation which today is a vital part of the free world. The Greek example clearly demonstrates that freedom and independence are cherished principles of the Greek people today.

I am happy to take this opportunity to salute the Greek people: their heritage has contributed immeasurably to our own; their spirit of freedom has set a dramatic example for the free world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 25 marks the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is a day of great significance for Greek people everywhere, since it commemorates the successful outcome of Greece's centuries-long struggle against the domination of the Ottoman Empire.

This anniversary gives us an occasion to consider the importance of Greece to the free world. In the first place, the history, philosophy, and literature of ancient and modern Greece are a continuing source of inspiration for freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. One of the two cradles of Western civilization, ancient Greece gave birth to such vital traditions as democratic government, individual liberties, and the rule of law.

In recent times Greece has played an important role in the evolution of the cold war. In the aftermath of World War II, Greece was wracked by civil dissension and imperiled by Communist infiltration. These dangers were eliminated through the valiant efforts of Greek patriots and assistance from the United States. The repulsion of the Communist menace in Greece marked an early turning point in the cold war. Additional economic aid through the Marshall plan enabled Greece to rebuild her economy.

Greece is now a member of the Council of Europe, NATO, and the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia, and last year she became an associate member of the European Economic Community. Greece is thus a valued partner in the community of free nations. Its continuing prosperity and freedom are a matter of vital concern to us all as we observe the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

IMPORTANCE OF GREECE TO AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is Greek Independence Day, a day of special significance for our own great Republic.

Without the philosophy and principles bequeathed to our Founding Fathers by the ancient Greeks, we today might not enjoy the fruits of representative government firmly based on individual freedom.

President Monroe recognized our great debt to Greece when, 142 years ago, he announced the New World's sympathy for the Greeks then striving to sunder the shackles of foreign domination. Since then, the ties between our two countries have continued to be close, and the United States has particularly benefited from those million and a half Americans of Hellenic background who have enriched our Nation in so many fields, and are amongst our most distinguished citizens.

I treasure my own associations with that great people, and take special pride in the award of Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix bestowed on me last year by the King of Greece through his Consul General.

Modern Greece has the distinction of having fought communism longer than any other nation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and is one of our most trusted allies in the cold war with Communist tyranny. As in the past, she is today a bulwark of freedom, and a cherished friend of the United States.

Mr. President, Louis H. Simons of the Beaver County Times made an interesting proposal in the March 6 edition of that newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Bring Foreign Youth to United States To Study Our Ways" be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE: BRING FOREIGN YOUTH TO UNITED STATES TO STUDY OUR WAYS

(By Louis H. Simons)

The Peace Corps marked its second anniversary last Friday and a blurb received here from Washington had a lot of nice things to say about the organization. This included the statement that 1 year ago there were 698 volunteers working abroad in 12 countries and that today there are 4,595 either overseas or in training for programs in 44 countries. Congress appropriated $59 million for the second fiscal year.

The anniversary appears to be an appropriate time to evaluate the Peace Corps' contributions in the broad perspective of world events. And in any consideration of their work there is bound to be unanimity in the conviction that the Corps' achievements are deserving of their country's commendation.

In these extraordinary times, however, we must regard the work of the Corps in relation to its impact on the revolutionary change brought on by Marxian ideology. In this context, we must consider the Corps as constituting nothing more than a mere gesture in the promotion of understanding among nations.

The most urgent problem in these times is to find ways and means to stem the tide of communism. It is the most pressing problem that will be occupying the attention of the Western World for many years to come. Therefore, every endeavor should be keyed to the general theme of doing something about it. The powerful Soviet colossus poses a long-range threat to all free nations.

(The Soviets have invaded India, they are making headway in southeast Asia and are now strongly entrenched only 90 miles off the Florida coast.)

But the Peace Corps, although directly concerned with foreign affairs, is unable to be effective in this enterprise. Such an undertaking would prove beyond its capacity. It work is confined within certain narrow limitations. The members of this worthy group are admittedly overwhelmed by the magnitude of the tasks before them. And in the performance of their special skills they are regarded, locally, as ambassadors of good will.

It must be acknowledged, however, that something of great depth and substance must be done about the dangerous imbalance in the world today. Something has got to be done to implant the American idea into the consciousness of the common man in the underdeveloped countries. This must be achieved in a manner that will reach great multitudes in the briefest possible time.

What is the answer? Perhaps the approach has been suggested in a statement made to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, by Ashadevi, an associate of the late Mahatma Gandhi. "They (the Peace Corps) must bring more than science and technology," the distinguished woman told the Director. "They must be carriers of your best values and ideals. Can your Peace Corps touch the idealism of America and bring that to us?"

Of course they can. The men and women in the Peace Corps have fulfilled unusual requirements to qualify for their mission. But they can accomplish comparatively little. The immensity of the task is generally understood. There must be some other way.

Indeed, there is another way. The idealism of America can be made to pervade the underprivileged areas of the world by a peace corps in reverse. This can be done by the simple procedure of getting their own people to come over here so that they could sense the mood and idealism of the American people.

Who should qualify for the mission in reverse? These should be selected not from the oil barons of the Near East, but from the populaces who live in poverty over the world's richest oil deposits; from among those who are kept down by an antique feudalism; from the areas where there is no middle class; from those parts of the world where there appears to be inherent instability by reason of disease and hunger. An actual case will serve to illustrate.

In recent months an administrator of elementary schools in Kenya, Africa, came to this country on a Fulbright scholarship. The pupils under his supervision numbered 230,000. He took some courses in a great university and then spent several weeks as an observer in the elementary schools of Elizabeth Borough in Allegheny County. Before his departure he explained what he had learned in a typical American public school. Among other things, he said this:

"In Kenya we give the children in the fourth grade a final examination to determine their fitness to continue with their education, and in the eighth grade we give another test that further reduces the number that can go on into high school. When I get back those examinations will be discontinued, for we not only got the cream of the crop in our high schools, we got the cream of the cream."

That the idealism of America rubbed off on the Kenyan educator is beyond any doubt.

It is essential that qualified young people with good minds, who are underprivileged, be brought here to our high schools and universities. Let them come so that they may discern for themselves the true concept of democracy. Let them be the carriers of our best values and ideals. In a word, let them become imbued with the spirit of free men in a free society.

With this type of Peace Corps, we can help the weaker nations mobilize the spirit and capacities of their people and thereby create a bulwark against the Communist threat.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on this day, 142 years ago, Greece won its independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The Greek war of independence, like ours, was a long, bitter struggle and is historically interesting because it showed how stubbornly a people can cling to a democratic tradition despite years of dictatorial oppression.

The Greek democratic theory, of course, is the ancestor of ours. If there had been no Greece, would there be an America? Or would there be a Senate in which I could stand to speak admiringly of the Greeks? An academic question, perhaps, but a fascinating one.

Democracy was not an inevitable historical development. The Egyptian civilization stood for several thousand years without finding any necessity for it.

But Egypt, of course, had the disadvantage of being flat. One man could survey and rule a lot of country and a lot of people.

But in the privacy of their mountains, the Greeks learned to be free and individualistic. They developed a theory of democracy with so much appeal that it spread through the world and has endured to this day.

The Greeks have defended that theory more than once. They defended it against Persians, against the Turkish emirs, against the Nazis and against the Communists.

A long democratic tradition and the will to defend it has left its mark. It has given the Greeks dignity and pride. On this anniversary of their nation's independence, Greeks everywhere and their descendants certainly deserve a congratulatory salute—and a nod of thanks.

GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON POULTRY, BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, AND OPPOSITION TO CHANGE IN TIMBER TAX

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, which recently concluded its annual session, adopted three resolutions concerning matters of great importance to the people of my State.

Unreasonable and discriminatory import levies imposed by the European Common Market countries are inflicting great economic damage on the poultry industry of Georgia, which brings the State $500 million a year directly, and indirectly is responsible for an annual business of $2.5 billion.

The general assembly rightly fears that unfair import levies on U.S. poultry, if allowed to stand, can lead to similar inequities concerning other agricultural products of this country. I join my fellow Georgians in urging that every effort be made to remove discriminatory import levies on poultry and to prevent the imposition of any similar barriers on U.S. agricultural products.

Another resolution calls for construction of a bridge across one of nature's true wonderlands, the Okefenokee Swamp, in south Georgia. As proposed, the bridge would connect the northern and southeastern ends of State Highway No. 177.

In the third resolution the general assembly urges that no changes be made in the present capital gains tax laws relating to the cutting or disposal of timber.

Mr. President, for myself and in behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 170

Resolution urging construction of a bridge across the Okefenokee Swamp connecting State Highway No. 177; and for other purposes

Whereas State Highway No. 177 has been constructed so that the northern portion thereof extends southward from U.S. highway No. 23 and the southern portion extends northeasterly from U.S. No. 441 into the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas there is a 16-mile gap between the northern and southeastern terminus of said highway; and

Whereas it is possible and feasible to construct a 16-mile, 6-foot vertical clearance, tangent, two lane level concrete bridge with pulloff parking areas to complete said highway; and

Whereas said bridge would have a 6-foot vertical clearance, permitting sufficient clearance for passage of boats and wildlife thereunder; and

Whereas the right-of-way for such bridge would not exceed 50 feet in width, thus leaving the tall and majestic cypress trees which abound in said area, thereby providing an abundance of natural shade, beauty and scenic views; and

Whereas the erection, maintenance, and use of this proposed bridge would not in any way be harmful to fish, serpents or wildlife, which inhabit said area; and

Whereas through the employment of appropriate wildlife rangers, restrictions prohibiting the use of firearms as a protection to wildlife population could be easily imposed; and

Whereas a tourist attraction of this type would be the only one of its kind on the North American Continent; and

Whereas the assistance afforded to the students of the study of biology, entomology, wildlife and forestry would be untold; and

Whereas construction of this bridge would provide a national landmark that would greatly assist private, commercial and military aviation; and

Whereas construction of this proposed bridge would furnish a bountiful market for employment in a depressed area which is suffering from a critical unemployment problem; and

Whereas the construction of this project would make available and accessible to the general public the natural beauty possessed by this vast wilderness known as the Land of the Trembling Earth, who would never have an opportunity to observe it otherwise; and

Whereas the benefits to be derived from the construction of this bridge would be many times the cost of the initial investment in its construction cost; and

Whereas the author of this resolution, in the early twenties, was employed and assisted in surveying and building many miles of piling track railroads throughout the Okefenokee Swamp and is fully aware that this bridge is feasible and could be built at a reasonable cost; and

Whereas completion of Georgia Highway No. 177 would connect the Stephen C. Foster State Park and the Laurel S. Walker State Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby solicit from all members of the Georgia congressional delegation their cooperation and support in seeking the completion of the connection of Georgia Highway No. 177 by the erection of a 16-mile bridge to be constructed through the heart of the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge; be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend and request the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Roads, to approve and begin construction of this project; be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend and request the U.S. Department of Interior to approve and begin construction of this project; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit to the Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and to each and every Member of the Georgia congressional delegation, a copy of this resolution.

In house, read and adopted, February 27, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

In senate, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

H.R. 206

Resolution urging the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Georgia congressional delegation to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber, and for other purposes

Whereas forest land comprises 25,772,200 acres, 69 percent of the total land area of the State; and

Whereas 23,931,100 acres are in private ownership and constitute 93 percent of the total forest land; and

Whereas these forest lands are providing approximately a gross return of $1 billion to the State's economy through forest industries; and

Whereas forest industry represents the third largest dollar volume of industry and supports 200,000 or more persons annually; and

Whereas Georgia has led the Nation in reforestation for many years, having converted almost 700,000 acres from cropland to trees under the soil bank program in recent years; and

Whereas investments are made for long periods of time during which they are continuously subject to many hazards, such as fire, insects, disease, and market fluctuations; and

Whereas the State and Federal Governments have encouraged forest land owners to develop previously unproductive lands for timber products; and

Whereas Georgia leads the Nation in the number of acres under the tree farm program; and

Whereas an incentive must exist to encourage the production of crops that must be produced over two or more decades before any substantial financial return is realized; and

Whereas the capital gains tax treatment on long-term timber gains recognizes these various factors; and

Whereas this type of tax treatment has been effective in stimulating private forest owners to adopt management plans and programs to produce timber to meet the national needs; and

Whereas private forest land is in a wide variety of ownerships with 197,000 owners in Georgia; and

Whereas the repeal of capital gains taxation will materially reduce the ability of private individuals and industry to continue reforestation and will accelerate the cutting of present timber growth; and

Whereas, forestry has made its greatest advances during the last 20 years as the result of stimulus of capital gains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Governor of the State of Georgia and all Members of the Georgia congressional delegation are urged to do everything in their power to maintain the present capital gains tax treatment regarding the cutting or disposal of timber; be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Georgia and to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

In the house, read and adopted, March 6, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

H.R. 142

Resolution calling upon the President to take certain measures relating to the poultry industry; and for other purposes

Whereas the U.S. poultry industry has developed a $50 million a year market in the Common Market countries, primarily West Germany; and

Whereas the market has grown each year and could continue to increase considerably in the absence of unreasonable and discriminatory barriers; and

Whereas the U.S. poultry industry has done extensive promotion in these countries so that consumption and local production have also increased; and

Whereas the imposition of gate prices and variable import levies have brought about a loss of this valuable market; and

Whereas levies on U.S. poultry were increased from approximately 16 percent to approximately 43 percent on whole broilers and 320 percent on certain parts; and

Whereas U.S. imports from Common Market countries have continued to increase each year; and

Whereas Georgia producers and processors were shipping over 4¾ million pounds per month prior to the first levies, with shipments dropping to approximately 1½ million pounds per month following the first levy and to practically nothing following the additional levy; and

Whereas this means a direct loss to Georgia of $16 million of export income; and

Whereas additional losses through depressed domestic prices might result if this volume is continually forced back into domestic channels; and

Whereas the loss of these poultry exports which generated $80 million of business for the State annually means a loss to feed, ports, utilities, banking, insurance, transportation, paper, retail, wholesale, and many other industries; and

Whereas the levies in question are contrary to the general agreement on tariffs and trade; and

Whereas immediate action to obtain fair import levies on U.S. poultry is of vital importance to the Georgia poultry industry which represents over 32 percent of total farm income and brings the State $500 million a year directly, and generates $2½ billion a year business; and

Whereas 160,000 Georgians earn their living from poultry and others benefit indirectly from this giant agri-business; and

Whereas this is a forerunner of problems for other commodities which might be avoided if the U.S. Government acts forcefully and settles this one; and

Whereas the United States is now exporting one-sixteenth of our agricultural production and Georgia is exporting one-fifth of its production; and

Whereas 41,600 Georgia farmworkers may be attributed to the production of farm products for export; and

Whereas quick results might serve as a deterrent of other problems which would affect the State and Nation; and

Whereas the barriers proposed by the Common Market would destroy the competitive position our farm products have gained through efficiency; and

Whereas the loss of agricultural exports which may result if the Common Market agricultural proposals are imposed on our agricultural products will weaken our ability to carry the heavy financial burden which the United States now assumes in the effort to protect and strengthen the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That this body does recommend that the Georgia congressional delegation continue and redouble its efforts for immediate action and that this body further recommends that President Kennedy take immediate steps including use of the retaliatory powers of the Trade Expansion Act if necessary, to obtain prompt removal of these unfair and discriminatory levies; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to forward appropriate copy of this resolution to each Member of the U.S. Congress from Georgia, President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and Ambassador Christian Herter.

In house, read and adopted February 20, 1963.

Glenn W. Ellard,
Clerk.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations for the Department of Commerce only.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the certified text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil—Executive C, 88th Congress, 1st session—sent to the Senate today by the President, and that the document be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith a certified text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, which were adopted by a Conference of Contracting Governments convened at London on April 11, 1962. The amendments would strengthen and expand the present Convention in ways deemed advantageous to United States interests.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the amendments.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 25, 1963*

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. Dirksen, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar in the Department of Commerce will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator defer to me for a moment so I may ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on the vote to confirm the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce, but I wish the Record to show that I am unalterably opposed to his appointment.

I have been in politics long enough to understand the meaning of political debts, but I resent very deeply that in this instance Mr. Roosevelt is being rewarded for what some consider to be "below the belt" political attacks against a distinguished Member of the Senate, whose views I do not always share but for whom I have the highest personal respect—rewarded by appointment to an office for which, in my judgment, he is not qualified.

If Mr. Roosevelt's activities of the past several years were subjected to close scrutiny, I believe the inescapable conclusion would be reached that, to say the least, he lacks the experience, the administrative ability, and the sense of public and personal responsibility essential to the proper fulfillment of his duties as Under Secretary of Commerce.

Inasmuch as there are persistent rumors to the effect that Mr. Roosevelt may become Secretary of Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a biographical sketch of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; a biographical sketch of the present very distinguished and able Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges; and a biographical sketch of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who was designated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Sketch of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. was born on August 17, 1914, at Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada. After graduating from Groton School, Groton, Mass., he received his A.B. from Harvard College in 1937 and his L.L.B. degree from the University of Virginia in 1940.

As a graduate of the Harvard naval ROTC he was called to active duty in March 1941, and served until 1946. He was awarded the Secretary of Navy's commendation, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Roosevelt practiced law from 1946 to 1958 as a senior partner in the firm of Roosevelt and Freidin of New York City. He was a Member of Congress from 1949 through 1954 representing the 20th District of New York.

Since 1957 Mr. Roosevelt has been owner and manager of the Roosevelt Automobile Co. of Washington, D.C., U.S. distributor of Fiat and Jaguar automobiles.

Mr. Roosevelt returned to politics in 1960 and campaigned for President Kennedy in his primary and general election campaigns.

Biographical Sketch of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges

Luther Hartwell Hodges was born March 9, 1898, in Pittsylvania County, Va.

He attended public schools in Leaksville and Spray, N.C., his family having moved to this area in the year 1900. Following graduation from high school in 1915, he entered the University of North Carolina and was graduated in 1919 with the A.B. degree. He served briefly in the U.S. Army, in which he held the rank of lieutenant.

Following his military service, he began his career in the textile industry starting as secretary to the manager of a local textile mill in the Leaksville-Spray area, and in 1938, following several intermediate promotions, he was made general manager in charge of manufacturing for Marshall Field & Co. In 1943 he became vice president of that corporation.

He was head of the Textile Division of OPA in 1944, and consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in 1945.

In 1950, upon retirement from private business, he spent over a year in West Germany as head of the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and was consultant to the State Department in the latter months of 1951 on the International Management Conference.

In November 1952 he was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, and succeeded to the governorship in November 1954 upon the death of the then Governor, William B. Umstead. Governor Hodges was reelected Governor of North Carolina in November 1956, and his term ended in January 1961.

He is past chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference and of the Southern Region Education Board. He was one of the nine American Governors to make an extensive tour of the Soviet Union in the summer of 1959 and was subsequently in charge of his State's trade and industry mission to Europe in November 1959.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ADM. LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Lewis L. Strauss was born in Charleston, W. Va., on January 31, 1896, and educated in the Richmond, Va., public schools.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Years 1917–19: Secretary to Herbert C. Hoover (then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium) in relief operations in Belgium and elsewhere overseas, and in the U.S. Food Administration. Served as U.S. Delegate at Final Armistice Convention.

Years 1941–46: In Naval Reserve 1926; active duty from February 1941 to May 1946; successively promoted through officer grades to the rank of rear admiral, being one of the first Reserve officers to reach that rank. Navy assignments included:

Years 1941–43: Staff assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. General Inspection of Ordnance;

Years 1943–44: Assistant Chief of Procurement and Material; Special Assistant to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations;

Years 1944–46: Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy; Navy member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board;

Years 1945–56: Navy member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Atomic Energy.

Year 1946: Appointed member of the first Atomic Energy Commission; resigned in April 1950.

Years 1946–52: Served as a member of the Naval Research Advisory Committee (the Office of Naval Research, was established following Admiral Strauss' recommendations to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal).

Year 1950: Appointed consultant to Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Years 1950–58: Adviser on occasions to congressional and executive agencies studying and reporting on production and procurement problems for the Department of Defense.

Year 1953: Completed report on hazardous duty and other special pays, requested by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Year 1953: Appointed special assistant to President Eisenhower on March 9.

Years 1953–58: Nominated by President to be Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on June 24, confirmed by the Senate on June 27, and took oath of office on July 2. Retired at end of 5-year term, June 30, 1958.

Years 1955 and 1958: Chairman of U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, Switzerland, August 8–20, 1955, and September 1–13, 1958. Developed concept which resulted in President Eisenhower's speech of December 8, 1953, before the United Nations General Assembly. Administered the actions taken to implement that program, representing the U.S. Government at the sessions at the United Nations and as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the first meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency. (Proposed the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.)

Year 1958: Appointed special assistant to the President on matters concerning atoms for peace.

Year 1958: Appointed on October 24 as Secretary of Commerce; took oath of office, November 13.

BUSINESS SERVICE

Years 1919–46: Associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York, N.Y. Became partner in 1929, resigning in 1946 to take office as AEC Commissioner. At same time relinquished all business directorships.

At various times was director of business enterprises, including Radio Corp. of America, National Broadcasting Co., General American Transportation Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., Industrial Rayon Corp., Hudson and Manhattan Railroad, Rockefeller Bros., Inc., Rockefeller Center, Inc., Merchants Fire Assurance Corp., etc.

DECORATIONS, HONORS, AND DEGREES

Awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star (Navy) in lieu of a second award and an Oak Leaf Cluster (Army) in lieu of a third award.

Officer of the Legion of Honor (France); Grand Officer, Order of Leopold (Belgium); and other decorations from foreign governments.

Year 1958: Awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Eisenhower in person in July.

Recipient of 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities in the United States and abroad.

TRUSTEESHIPS AND OTHER OFFICES

President of the board of trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

Trustee of the Hampton Institute, the Sloan-Kettering Institute Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, the New York Institute for the Crippled and the Disabled, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Belgian-American Educational Foundation, Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., Virginia Museum of Fine Arts at Richmond and Congregation Emanu-El of the city of New York (also its past president).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if an evaluation is made of the records of these three individuals, I am sure Mr. Roosevelt's will be notable only for its lack of notability.

In her column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 12, Doris Fleeson capsuled the situation very effectively. When referring to Mr. Roosevelt she wrote:

> Most Members of Congress wish the appointment had not been made. They would like to get rid of it quietly. Democrats in particular hope that Mr. Roosevelt will sink into decent obscurity.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since this is an important nomination, which has engaged the interest and attention of the country, and since I have known Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., personally for not less than 17 years, I think I owe an explanation to the Senate as to why I have interposed no objection to the confirmation of his nomination, and why I do not interpose one now, especially in view of the seriousness with which his qualifications have been analyzed in the committee which considered the matter and the very serious, interesting, and important analysis which has been made by my distinguished colleague from Vermont.

Mr. President, I interpose no objection to the confirmation of the nomination for two reasons.

First. I believe that the President is entitled to the widest latitude and discretion in the choice of his assistants and that the confirmation process should not be utilized to deny to the President the assistants he seeks, unless we find some reasons over, above, and beyond a matter of judgment—that is, ideology, venality, immorality, or some obvious and clear inability to carry out the functions of the appointed office.

All those are very apparent reasons for objecting. There are many other reasons which may come closer to the borderline.

I have stated the general policy which has motivated me in my attitude toward the confirming of nominations of other appointees, when before the Senate—and we have considered a number of them on which there have been very close debates. I remember very well, Mr. President, a nomination the confirmation of which I opposed very strongly, recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, if I recall correctly, for a position on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. I felt that the record, which demonstrated an attitude of mind upon the question of segregation and discrimination in our country and the enforcement of civil rights of Americans—a matter quite removed from the bases of judgment exercised by the President, in the choice of the appointees for that particular job—dictated that that nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. President, I find no such situation here now. Whatever may be said for or against Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.—whom, as I say, I have know personally for 17 years—there is no element of an extraneous set of considerations, other than his capacity, his outlook—as my colleague so properly explained—his experience, his administrative ability, and his sense of public accountability, to qualify or disqualify him for the position.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Vermont has said on that subject—and I say this in order to be helpful to a man I know well—should be taken to heart with the deepest seriousness by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. I hope he will listen to the words of the Senator from Vermont and perhaps even more than he does to mine, because that will do him far more good in making something of a life for him in the future, as the son of so distinguished and historic an American President as Franklin D. Roosevelt.

So, Mr. President, I say that, according to my own definition of what is proper in the way of the confirming process, I did not find those elements which would entitle me to object to the confirmation of the nomination.

Second. I believe Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., upon this record, has done at least some things which I and most of us wish he had not done.

I have little doubt that my dear friend and colleague who was the subject of the matter about which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] spoke, was consulted about this nomination. I have no doubt the recommendation would not have been made without his consent. Knowing him as I do, he would not have had it within his heart to turn Mr. Roosevelt down, in spite of whatever deep grief he may have been made to suffer.

Mr. President, I say, in conclusion, that the nominee has a fine opportunity before him.

Incidentally, and while I say this for myself, I am sure I speak for others, I do not think anybody need fear that Mr. Roosevelt's name will come before us for nomination as Secretary of Commerce unless he demonstrates by his future career a very different order of "performance and public accountability"—to use the words of my colleague from Vermont—from that which he has evidenced thus far. Here is yet another opportunity, given to few men, to demonstrate capacity, performance, and ability in the service of the Nation in one's lifetime. I express the hope and expectation that this opportunity will be used in the true spirit of a son of a four-time President of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I support the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

I have known Mr. Roosevelt personally for many years—first as a youth when his father was elected President of the United States, and later when he returned to civilian life after having served his country courageously for more than 5 years as a naval officer during World War II.

It was with interest that I watched as he followed his distinguished father into the public life of this Nation and won his seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. His service during the 5 years when he represented the 20th District of New York was exemplary. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he was active, able, and effective. He ably supported the passage of legislation important to the progress of our country.

Through the vagaries and vicissitudes of politics, with which most of us in this Chamber are familiar, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in 1954, was temporarily removed from what I believe to be the mainstream of his life—the field of public service. He returned to the practice of law in New York City where he had previously practiced immediately after his period of service in World War II.

After 3 more years as a successful attorney, he entered business in 1957—and in an especially competitive area, the distribution of automobiles. His business acumen, judgment, and energy helped his firm to be chosen by two world-famous European automobile companies as their U.S. outlet, responsible for the sale of their cars in an area embracing more than 20 States. The men who headed these European companies are capable businessmen, and I am confident that it was on a hardheaded business basis that they appointed Mr. Roosevelt, appraised the results of his work, and retained him for the past 6 years. The top executive officer of one of these companies was quoted as having said, after the announcement of Mr. Roosevelt's appointment was announced by President Kennedy, that replacing him would be a difficult task.

As I review Mr. Roosevelt's record over a 22-year period of adult life, it appears clear to me that he is an effective person—a man who gets tasks done. During that period he became a distinguished naval officer, having progressed from lieutenant, junior grade, to commander, and having been entrusted with ship command. He was cited several times for meritorious performance of duties, as well as for "conspicuous bravery" in combat. Following this service he became an effective Representative in Congress, an attorney at law, and a businessman.

Mr. Roosevelt's record of success is not, however, the only reason why I endorse his appointment. His confirmation by the Senate is merited because I am convinced that the capacities and talents he will bring to his new position will help to advance the economic and business interests of our country. I believe the Department of Commerce will be a more valuable and more useful instrumentality with Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as one of its top officials.

The Commerce Department has served our Nation for the past 60 years. At present it has approximately 30,000 employees. It comprises more than a dozen agencies, each carrying out programs that are essential to our Nation's economic growth and to the well-being of our 187 million citizens. Included are such important agencies as the Census Bureau, the Patent Office, the National Bureau of Standards, the Maritime Administration, the Business, and Defense Services Administration, the Bureau of International Commerce, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Weather Bureau, and the U.S. Travel Service.

Some of these agencies are important to us mainly because their work enables the business community of this Nation to function more effectively, to prosper and expand, to create more jobs for American workers, to raise the American standard of living, and to provide the industrial capacity that is so essential to national defense. Other Commerce agencies serve both the business community and the general public, and contribute to our individual and national well-being.

In the aggregate, the activities of the Department of Commerce are important. Some of them are vital to national strength and progress. And these programs are being made even more valuable and useful under the kind of inspiring leadership and capable direction which Secretary Hodges has given to the Department during the past 2 years. This has been the Commerce Department's period of exceptional service.

The principal reason for this is because the Commerce Department under Luther H. Hodges is fulfilling its rightful role as the American businessman's principal spokesman in the economic councils of the Federal Government.

The Commerce Department, with Secretary Hodges at the helm, enjoys the confidence and support of the U.S. business community, and is conveying the businessman's point of view with increasing emphasis to the President, his advisers, and the other executive departments and agencies. These views are being listened to with respect, and they are being reflected in new national goals and programs. For example, the business community and the Commerce Department contributed to the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The President's current tax program incorporates many of the businessman's ideas—and the Commerce Department's ideas—on how our national economy can be stimulated and accelerated by removing some of the tax shackles which have for years impeded the growth of American business firms. The Commerce Department is also responsible for implementing the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, which is now beginning to bear fruit and provide jobs for workers who live in economically depressed areas.

In one of our most important goals and most critical problems, the Commerce Department has major responsibility for stimulating increased sales of American products in foreign countries. This is essential to the solution of our international balance-of-payments problem.

I am confident, Mr. President, that colleagues will agree when I say that the Department of Commerce has progressed in the past 2 years, and that the Department's effectiveness in carrying out its new activities and responsibilities will have significant and far-reaching effects on our future national growth and development.

I am equally sure that all of us realize that to carry out these programs successfully the Commerce Department needs leadership of the highest order—leadership that emphasizes imagination, energy, determination and sound thinking.

This is the kind of leadership that Secretary Hodges is providing, and it is the kind of leadership that Mr. Roosevelt will also bring to the Department. Mr. Hodges' effectiveness and competence will be enhanced by having Mr. Roosevelt as his principal assistant, because in addition to his general qualifications, Mr. Roosevelt has other, more specific attributes that are especially applicable to the work he will be doing. I mention these:

First. He enjoys the personal friendship, respect and confidence of the President and his advisers. This will provide yet another channel through which the views and opinions of the business community can be effectively conveyed to the White House.

Second. He has a good understanding of the legislative branch and the legislative process, as well as a personal relationship with many Members of Congress. Thus he is uniquely competent to represent the Commerce Department to the Members and committees on the Hill, and to speak accurately and authoritatively before them on behalf of the U.S. business community.

Third. As Secretary Hodges recently commented, Mr. Roosevelt has the happy faculty of being able to work with other people. This ability will help to implement those programs for which the Commerce Department shares responsibility with other executive departments and agencies, where the Department must work closely with these other groups in carrying out such multifaceted programs as export expansion, area redevelopment, civilian technology, job retraining and other national efforts involving several agencies.

Fourth. In addition, Mr. Roosevelt is both knowledgeable and experienced in the field of foreign trade. The most important program of the Commerce Department, as I have said, is to implement the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, expand our exports, and thus improve our unfavorable balance of payments. Accomplishing this means educating, stimulating and assisting thousands of American manufacturing firms to go out and fight for their rightful share of foreign markets. It involves working closely with the Honorable Christian Herter and others in negotiating with nations the new arrangements for the international exchange of goods. It also means protecting the interests of American firms in such negotiations, and in providing them Government assistance of various kinds if they should be adversely and unavoidably affected by the revolution in international commerce that is now in depth and scope in the world. With his knowledge and practical business experience in foreign trade, plus his energy, dedication and rapport with people, Mr. Roosevelt can contribute greatly to the realization of our national goals in this tremendously important field of international commerce.

I have mentioned, Mr. President, the attributes, both general and specific, that I believe make Mr. Roosevelt eminently qualified to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce. There is also one other reason why I am so wholeheartedly in favor of this nomination, and it is this: Both the President and Secretary Hodges, after thoughtful consideration, want Mr. Roosevelt to serve in this post. Mr. Hodges was consulted fully, in advance, by the President concerning this appointment; and I believe that Mr. Hodges expressed his own true convictions when he publicly described Mr. Roosevelt as a dynamic and gifted person, as well as a successful businessman, and when he said that he will be delighted to have a man of Mr. Roosevelt's capability as his principal assistant. I also have genuine respect for the President's ability to select the people who can best serve the Nation, and I believe this faculty has been demonstrated by the outstanding performance of the President's Cabinet and most other key officials of the executive branch during the past 2 years. Mr. Roosevelt's performance will be no less successful.

I believe, Mr. President, that when Mr. Roosevelt actually begins to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce, both the business community and the American people will be as well pleased with his performance as they are now with the performance of Secretary Hodges and the other dedicated, competent leaders who serve the President and the Nation so well.

Mr. Roosevelt is bringing to this position intelligence, education, integrity, energy, sound basic knowledge of the field of work, the faculty of getting jobs done, the ability to cooperate with other people, and the determination and persistence to become a valuable, competent, dedicated public servant. I do not know what else we can, or should, ask of him. Mr. President, Mr. Roosevelt is worthy of confirmation, and I am confident that most of my colleagues will agree that he is eminently qualified to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish the Record to show that the vote of the junior Senator from Wyoming on the Roosevelt nomination was "nay."

NOMINATION OF RICHARD H. HOLTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not present during the call of the Executive Calendar, when the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce was under consideration and his nomination was confirmed.

I have known Mr. Roosevelt for many years, as a legislator and as a friend. I know his philosophy of life. He has great ability. He has untiring energy. He understands legislative problems. He understands business problems. In my opinion, he will make an excellent record as Under Secretary of Commerce.

I congratulate the President for nominating him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF 1913 OHIO FLOODS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him concerning the 1913 floods in Ohio.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Lausche

This is a significant date in Ohio history. Fifty years ago my State faced one of the major problems of the first half century. Many Ohio communities were faced with oblivion—and all because of disastrous flooding—a result of a severe and tremendous storm, which accelerated the melting of heavy snow and ice covered rivers.

One portion of the State did not hesitate in facing its problem squarely. Recovering from the major flood of recorded history in the area, as much as 11 feet in the center of urban communities, the citizens of the Great Miami Valley reaching from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, saw dawn breaking on new and better days ahead. These citizens, having returned from burying their dead and facing property losses estimated at over $100 million, banded together to write a new law—enabling assessments on their properties in the amount each benefited, which after much study and planning provided a major wonder of the world, the Miami Conservancy District.

The cost of this protection, $34 million, has long since been paid for by the valley property owners—not the Federal Government or the State government—but by the people themselves. Even today this valley pays its own way for flood control projects in areas rural in 1913—urban now—and still without outside aid.

Today is the anniversary date of the great flood in the communities in the Miami Valley. Tonight in Dayton—that metropolis of industry, commerce, and education—the citizens will pause and remember. They are not celebrating a flood—they are observing 50 years of economic and commercial development—and this in a community that 50 years ago was devastated, virtually destroyed.

Much has been written and spoken about the great leadership required to motivate this recovery, but the property owners, large and small, have accomplished this gigantic task which has done so much to make Ohio great.

Tonight, as those citizens gather to reflect and ponder their contribution to the recovery of their valley, they carry in their hearts a pride in the knowledge that their community has done much to build the economy of the State and of the Nation.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him on the subject of Byelorussian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Lausche

The Byelorussians form one of the lesser known and less numerous of the Slavic peoples. This is partly because they probably never numbered more than 10 million and partly because they have been overshadowed by their far more numerous and powerful neighbors. One reason we know so little about them is because they have been subjected to alien rule and oppressed by foreigners in their homeland. For centuries the Russians have done their utmost to eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct national entity. But we know from history that these people formed a distinct national group between Poland and Moscow long before the rise of modern Russia as the colossus of the Slavic world.

The czarist rulers of Russia failed to eliminate the Byelorussians as an ethnic group. The more these people were oppressed by their Russian masters, the more they hung to their ethnic and national ideals, and longed for the day of their deliverance. This came about at last early in 1918. On March 25 of that year the Byelorussians National Republic was proclaimed, with its capital in the historic city of Minsk. Soon this Republic was recognized by the governments of many countries, and it looked as if the new state was to attain sovereignty in historic Byelorussia. Unfortunately the independence thus attained and jubilantly proclaimed did not last long. Russian Communists attacked and overran it early in 1921, thus putting an end to the Byelorussian Republic.

Since then some 10 million Byelorussians have lived under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. But the Byelorussians have not abandoned their ultimate goal, national freedom and independence. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their Independence Day we ardently pray for their deliverance from Soviet tyranny. We also wish that we could do more for them, by showing our determination to help these people combat Communist totalitarianism with all the means at our disposal short of open warfare. We could, however, be of considerable aid to these poeple in their fight for freedom by refusing to make concessions to the Kremlin in the Cuban question as well as on the Berlin issue, and also by broadcasting in the Byelorussian and Ukrainian languages our determination to oppose communism. I know full well that some or even all of these measures cannot easily liberate the Byelorussian people from Soviet tyranny, but I am sure they will serve as a definite boon to their sacred cause.

THE NEW LIBERALS: ARE THEY REALLY "20TH-CENTURY TORIES"?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a keenly perceptive essay entitled, "The New Liberals: Are They Really '20th-Century Tories'?"

Its author is the senior Senator from South Dakota, whose highly professional and entertaining skill as an author is well known to his colleagues.

Senator Mundt's thesis is that the present-day liberals of both parties are not liberals at all, in the original sense of the word. They have altered the meaning of "liberal."

The essence of the essay can be caught in these excerpts:

> It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as "liberals," while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government, might be described more accurately as the "20th-century tories."
>
> Somewhere along the line these tories have lost confidence in the American people and have—by some curious form of self-delusionment—convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want.
>
> Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals continue to chip away at the power, the rights and the free choice of the people while transferring to big-time politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny.

Senator Mundt with his characteristic and constant fairness, gives assurance that no charges of insincerity or ulterior motives are made; but points out rather that they seek a fundamental and deplorable change of emphasis and place of National Government in the lives of Americans. He puts it in this language:

> This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and tory governments.
>
> The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, desserts, and abilities.
>
> They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to "provide for the common defense" and the responsibility of the Central Government only to "promote the general welfare" as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution.

Mr. President, I fully subscribe to the reasoning and conclusions set out by the Senator from South Dakota.

I highly commend this thoughtful and well-reasoned article to the Senate. Those who carelessly use the words, "liberal" and "conservative" to describe today's political philosophies will find in it something of a shock.

Senator Mundt seeks to debunk this tendency to pin labels as "forensic fakery." He seeks to distinguish between what he calls today's "linguistic liberals" and the philosophy espoused by Jefferson, Wilson, and Senator Wheeler.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 25 edition of the U.S. News & World Report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report magazine, Mar. 25, 1963]

The New Liberals: Are They Really 20th-Century Tories?

(Editor's Note.—Who are today's political liberals? What do they stand for? How do they compare with the liberals of an earlier day—such men as Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson? In this article, a prominent Republican Senator examines the present-day liberals of both parties. His finding: They have altered the meaning of the word "liberal." The ideal has moved from preservation of individual freedom to the concentration of power in authoritarian government. And the liberals have become the American tories of the 20th century.)

(By Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota)

"All down the ages, the fight of the true liberals has been to take power from the executive and give it to the legislative branch. Now the so-called liberals want to give more power to the executive."—Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat, of Montana.

Nobody familiar with our political history of the past three decades can deny that Burt Wheeler, of Montana, is rightfully one of the great fighting liberals of this era. It is likewise pertinent that his liberalism was demonstrated on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in his public career rather than in the safe, serene atmosphere of a college classroom or the impersonal and untested philippics of a book.

Senator Wheeler expressed his convictions with a consistent courage that made him an effective advocate willing to wager his reputation and political future on the logic and wisdom of his viewpoints.

As a consequence, when former Senator Wheeler speaks of today's liberalism and the curious and irrational projects which its present-day disciples advocate, he speaks as an authority on what comprises genuine liberalism in public life and what principles and concepts give validity to the term "liberal" as a political philosophy. Thus, he serves the Nation well when he bluntly calls attention to the fact that our latter-day liberals have deserted the traditional liberal crusade and have, strangely enough, associated themselves with power drives similar to those of the Tories of early America.

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as liberals, while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government, might be described more accurately as the "20th-century tories."

THERE IS A SHIFT TOWARD AN AUTHORITARIAN AMERICAN STATE

Somewhere along the line these tories have lost confidence in the American people and have—by some curious form of self-delusionment—convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want.

Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals continue to chip away at the power, the rights, and the free choice of the people while transferring to bigtime politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny.

This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and Tory governments.

The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, desserts, and abilities.

They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to "provide for the common defense" and the responsibility of the Central Government only to "promote the general welfare" as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution.

Our wise and prudent constitutional forefathers evaluated and weighed every word before it was enshrined in our great charter of freedom.

It was with specific purpose and prudent forethought that they drew the distinction between the terms "promote" and "provide." They deliberately emphasized their conception of the vast difference between Federal responsibilities for the common defense and the promoting of the general welfare.

The programs and projects which our modern liberals espouse eliminate that difference and shift to the Federal state the same responsibilities and authority for the general welfare that are rightly exercised by it in maintaining the common defense.

BACK TO AN AGE OF TORYISM

By placing primary trust in bigtime politicians, instead of in the people our Government was designed to serve—not control—these illegitimate liberals revive a golden age of toryism when the king—Federal Government—could do no wrong.

During the past 30 years, the growing influence of those I prefer to designate as "20th-century tories"—instead of identifying them as "liberal"—has made an important but unfortunate impact upon our national destiny. We have been following a global drift toward overcentralization of Government and glorification of the central politician over the rights and privileges of the individual.

We live in an era of big Government with big powers. We are witnessing a shift toward an authoritarian American state in which big politicians hold the whip and in which "whom you know" in Government circles seems likely to replace "what you know."

As yet, this consolidated central state is neither Socialist nor Communist nor Fascist in nature. But, neither is there anything remotely liberal about its design. It is bigtime politics in action.

Regardless of which "ism" it eventually embraces or which embraces it, it would be a careless student of history who could not see that our basic American concepts of private ownership, reward of merit, self-determination, and effective control of the politicians by the people are being threatened.

This switch of emphasis, and the exaltation of the Federal politician at the expense of the private citizen, is a deplorable change. It is the more deplorable because it has been promoted by a sustained drive for concentrated political power led by self-designated liberals who have practiced a semantic sham unprecedented in political history. It is a sham because it espouses the same type of proposals for expanding political controls over the people as advocated by the reactionaries, the tories, and the royalists of the past.

RECOGNIZING A TRUE LIBERAL

The true, tried, tested liberal of history and of today is the private citizen or public official who advocates maintenance or extension of individual liberties free alike from the power and the encroachments of an economic or political monopoly.

It is the danger—and presence—of a political monopoly and of programs moving toward that ugly goal which is the "blind spot" in the thinking of today's liberals who are so busy looking at the problems of our times that they fail to see the even greater perils created by their proposals for solution.

Our American dream has evolved from the idealistic concept that proper ethics, sound morals, good judgment, prudent economy, and wise decisions are not the monopoly of those holding positions of power and authority in Washington.

It is an ideal our current pretenders to the liberal label seem unable to comprehend or to accept.

While the Republican Party has excelled its major adversary in clinging to this liberal ideal which has had its greatest fruition on American soil and which has provided more happiness for more people and greater individual liberties than man has attained in any other era or area of human history, it must be admitted that some Republicans, also, have succumbed to the seductive concept that the people must be pushed around by their political officials rather than have them retain the power and push the politicians toward the goals which they desire.

It is not, however, my intent to identify basic republicanism with true liberalism nor to stigmatize all Democrats as people seeking personal and political power after the manner of tories.

Rather, it is my purpose to point up the forensic fakery involved in trying to identify a candidate, a party or a cause involved in seeking more power over more people through Central Government, with any realistic, accurate, honest or historic relationship with liberalism unless the relationship is to show how these "linguistic liberals" differ sharply and deeply from programs and philosophies of such recognized liberals as Jefferson, Wilson, and Wheeler.

One of the great responsibilities of any administration is to protect and wisely use what we usually term, "the American system." To me, the American system means that system which seeks to provide a maximum of opportunity and freedom for our individual citizens. It is a system which manifests confidence in its people. It is a system which has produced results unequaled and unexcelled by any other, any place, any time.

WE MAY BE DESTROYING THE SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

Those who would change our system to place basic responsibility for progress in the hands of Federal politicians instead of with the local citizens and governments are turning back the clock of history.

If one were to accept the pratings of the current crop of self-appointed liberals as providing courses of action and programs of progress which are, in fact, liberal in nature, one would logically be forced to conclude that the greatest liberals of current history are such advocates of concentrated power as Khrushchev, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar and Castro.

WHAT DICTATORS PROMISED

Each promised the more abundant life, better schooling, better health, better economic opportunities and greater well-being to their people.

Each sought to provide them by reducing areas of self-determination and free choice enjoyed by the private citizen and by expanding areas of control and power enjoyed by the politicians in their lands.

Each failed to achieve the degrees of well-being and human happiness enjoyed by the peoples of free countries where even the right to err in judgment is an inherent part of any system which provides unlimited rights to succeed and to aspire.

How, then, can one recognize an actual liberal in the great American tradition and in conformity with the true meaning of the term as shaped by the flow of human history? Obviously, not by accepting the unsupported boast of an ambitious politician who proclaims, "I am a liberal." A real liberal must be tested by his actions, his programs, his goals and his methods just as we test the veracity and worth of any sloganeer or propagandist who hopes to persuade by rhetoric rather than reason.

There is available a test which every intelligent and thoughtful citizen should use to decide whether any public proposal or public personality is in fact liberal in conception and nature.

Simply stated, a man or a program is appropriately described as liberal if identified with circumscribing excessive power over the people from any source whether it be concentrated economic, political or hereditary power.

On the other hand, if any man or program is identified with expanding and increasing the power of politicians or economic tycoons over the average citizen, that smacks of reactionism, toryism, and has no place anywhere in the dictionary of valid liberalism.

This do-it-yourself test of whether a political party, an individual citizen or a proposed change is in fact liberal in nature can be employed by applying the following tests to any given circumstance:

1. Does the proposal expand individual freedom or does it expand the power and authority of the central state?

2. Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater decisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?

3. Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing speeches, votes and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying recommendations of an organization, a political party or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what is proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary and paternalistic in conception.

With clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or cause on the pretext it is liberal when, in fact, it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each citizen.

We have been moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the preamble to our Constitution.

We have endeavored to extend the vote to all citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

AN EBB TIDE OF FREEDOM

But the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which, in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it.

Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever seen, but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate, or perhaps less prudent, countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom providing for the most liberal Government in the world—one in which the wishes and ideals of the people can predominate.

The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place.

Let us not reduce that light to a mere smudge pot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government.

Let us examine each proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or a mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal. If he is true to the liberal heritage which is his, he cannot embrace concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

RETRAINING WORKERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on the editorial page of today's Wall Street Journal there is an interesting article on the retraining of workers. The Journal reporter selected Connecticut and Massachusetts for his study, and in general a very favorable impression emerges of the retraining programs that have been set up in these two States.

Even before Congress approved the Manpower Development and Training Act, early in 1962, Connecticut had initiated a program to teach unemployed workers new skills that could be used by businesses located in the area where the workers reside.

The results in Connecticut have been most satisfactory. To quote the Journal:

> Proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks in typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

The article goes on to describe briefly how Connecticut officials approach this problem. It is an excellent example of how the American system can work. State officials and businessmen consult and cooperate with each other, labor market surveys are made, and not until it is determined that there is a need for certain types of skills is a training program started.

And now that the Federal Government helps to finance approved training programs, we have both Federal and State governments working together with private industry, to help unemployed persons find a good job.

Not only do these retraining programs help thousands of people enjoy a better life. They also help businesses find workers trained in important, even essential, skills, workers who otherwise might not be available in the local labor market.

I want to highly commend the Connecticut officials, and the Connecticut businessmen who have cooperated with them, for their work in setting up "no nonsense, businesslike programs." The success that has been achieved in my State is a tribute to their dedication and to their intelligent approach to helping the unemployed find a new place in their communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, "Retraining Workers, Two States Find It Pays To Pick Students Carefully," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETRAINING WORKERS—TWO STATES FIND IT PAYS TO PICK STUDENTS CAREFULLY

(By Ralph E. Winter)

HARTFORD, CONN.—Retraining idle workers with skills to fill labor vacancies sounds like a simple and noncontroversial solution to at least part of the Nation's unemployment problem.

In Washington, Congress has appropriated money and whipped up blueprints for massive retraining programs. The trouble is, though, that out in the shops and classrooms retraining often proves to be difficult, frustrating and unrewarding. For example, only about half of 5,000 unemployed West Virginians trained in State and Federal programs, often run just for the sake of having a program, found work in their new fields.

This contrasts with results in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where the States began practical retraining on their own long before Federal programs were set up. Nearly all of the 3,700 workers retrained in these two States during the last 4 years are working at better jobs.

Retraining officials here, however, long ago lost any Cinderella-like illusions they may have had about retraining magic. "Retraining is a salvage operation to help individuals without a marketable skill, not a real solution to unemployment," asserts Edwin Gooding, Boston Federal Reserve Bank economist who studied retraining in the two States.

"Most of the unemployed couldn't fill the jobs where most openings are if you trained them 100 years," adds John J. Higgiston, manpower coordinator for Connecticut's education department.

WASHINGTON'S PLANS

Washington officials apparently do not agree. For, although the size and scope of the Federal effort has not been finally determined, the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act is designed to retrain up to 570,000 people in the next 3 years at a Federal cost of $430 million.

In addition, the year-old Area Redevelopment administration plans to spend $14.5 million during the next 4 years on retraining the unemployed in depressed areas. And Congress is considering a youth conservation program involving retraining for young people.

The quality of job retraining, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. Results depend upon intangibles such as the individual's native ability and such pragmatic things as the number and kinds of jobs available. "Paradoxically, retraining is most successful where it is needed least in terms of numbers of unemployed," says Mr. Gooding.

Any evaulation of retraining in West Virginia, for example, must take into consideration the high rate of joblessness, about double the national average, caused by a drop in demand for coal miners and lack of widespread industrial diversification. There just are no jobs even for many of the retrained. Industrialized southern New England offers more varied job opportunities.

Even here, no one claims retraining can make a big dent in unemployed rolls, now accounting for more than 6 percent of the Nation's work force. Only economic expansion that sharply boosts job openings can do that. Most workers now rejected for lack of skill probably would find jobs without Government retraining if business were booming, economists agree.

CONNECTICUT'S RESULTS

However, proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks of typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

John Perry, Jr., 34, a periodically unemployed father of six from Montville, Conn., is an example. "I was working at construction labor, but I got laid off every winter so I decided to take a pipefitter course," he says. "I'm starting at $1.95 an hour on what should be a steady job," he adds.

Rene E. Theroux, 20, an apprentice electrician, demonstrates the upgrading retraining often gives income. On his last job as a maintenance worker he made $1.60 an hour. As an apprentice he draws $2.11 an hour.

In Massachusetts 1,600 adults have been retrained since 1958. Graduates with a year on the job have increased their incomes an average of $1,000 a year, or 35 percent, according to Mr. Gooding of the Federal Reserve.

Yankee retraining officials attribute the high placement rate to no nonsense, businesslike programs, in contrast to what they consider a shotgun welfare approach in some other places. West Virginia is an example. Among the factors retraining officials have learned are necessary ingredients are close cooperation with industry, careful selection of courses, high admission standards and concentration on younger people.

A NUMBERS GAME

"Some Federal people and State politicians are playing a numbers game," observes one State training official. "They just want us to hurry up and get a lot of people in some kind of training."

So far, Connecticut and Massachusetts have resisted such pressure. Connecticut, for example, does not set up classes "until area employers tell us they want a retraining program," says Thomas J. Yoczik, coordinator of manpower training in the State's department of labor. "Then we start with a labor market survey to determine skill needs. And we don't overtrain. If companies say they want 90 machine operators, we train 60 and add more classes later if necessary," he adds.

One result of tailoring courses to employers' requirements: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn., has hired 1,036 trainees so far, often employing entire classes the day after graduation.

"This program has been very good for us because we were consulted in advance," says Lawrence Crowley, trade training coordinator for Electric Boat. "The men we hire work out extremely well because their training covers skills we need." The company sends two of its own training supervisors to the State-run classes at least once a week to answer questions and keep track of progress of individual students.

"We find that the welders who were trained to our specifications work out very well," agrees an official of Crusader Lancer Corp., North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., maker of immersion gas water heaters.

Failure to pin down job openings can cause a fiasco. Rhode Island officials just assumed, without questioning many employers to find actual openings, that growing use of electronic data processing would make it easy for persons trained to operate and program computers to find jobs. But after more than 4 months of training, graduates of the State's computer course found openings scarce.

Another principle New England authorities follow is to avoid the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any job. Unfortunately, many of them can't absorb training either.

"Many of the unemployed are not well educated enough to benefit from what we understand as vocational education," says Mr. Gooding. "To include them we would have to create new courses including basic reading, writing, grammar, and arithmetic."

STANDARDS ARE HIGH

Connecticut and Massachusetts officials are convinced that high admission requirements are a major reason for their success. Only persons scoring high enough on general intelligence tests and specific aptitude tests to indicate probable success in the field are allowed to enter a course.

"We select about one applicant out of three for retraining," says Connecticut's Mr. Yoczik.

Even size can be a factor. Massachusetts authorities recently turned down a 275-

pound applicant who wanted to train for tree care work involving climbing trees to remove dead or diseased limbs.

"We are not going to be caught dead training people who are inadequate," adds Connecticut's Mr. Higgiston. "That would destroy employer confidence in the program. We can and do drop anyone who has the wrong attitude, doesn't attend regularly or can't do the work."

Another factor aiding success of retraining in the two New England States is concentration on younger workers who have many productive years ahead of them. In Connecticut few trainees are more than 40 years old. In a typical Massachusetts group more than half were less than 25 years old and another 25 percent were younger than 35. West Virginia's placement ratio is held down by a higher proportion of trainees over 40, officials admit.

Although their State-fashioned programs have been successful over a broad range of courses, both Massachusetts and Connecticut were unable to resist the lure of Federal funds. But Connecticut, while welcoming Federal money, has some complaints. "When we ran our own program, starting a new class was simple, but under the Federal program I have to make 26 copies of every document and get 9 different signatures," complains Mr. Yoczik.

ADMINISTRATION TAX PLAN

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, more and more, as people throughout the Nation study the administration's tax cut and tax reform plan, as people look at the sluggish state of the national economy, and as people observe higher State and local taxes in the offing, it becomes clear that the President's tax proposals are inadequate.

One of Honolulu's fine daily newspapers, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, ably edited by William H. Ewing, has analyzed the situation with great care and perception. The last three paragraphs of its March 15 editorial tell the story succinctly and clearly:

> For every dollar the taxpayer saves at the Federal level, he may find he will have to pay an equal or greater amount to his local or State government.
>
> So where is the great shot in the arm to the economy that the Kennedy tax program is designed to produce?
>
> The Kennedy tax cut may well go down in history as the great illusion of 1963.

This is in line with what I told the people of Hawaii on January 31, just after the President submitted his tax plan to Congress. I said then, in an address over radio station KGU, Honolulu:

> Because the President has spread his tax cut proposals over 3 years, many experts fear the reduction will be too small to relieve unemployment to any great extent.

I also pointed out that social security taxes on workers and their employers had just gone up all over the country and that State and local taxes were rising. In addition, I noted that the President wants corporations to pay their taxes much sooner than in the past, and that, as a result, corporations may pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before.

With all these factors, people and businesses may actually have far less to spend and invest than the administration hopes. So the stimulus to the economy may be minor, when what we need is a major injection.

Because of the great interest everywhere in taxes, unemployment, and our Nation's fiscal picture, the Star-Bulletin editorial is most timely and informative I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. I also ask to have printed my January 31 KGU radio script on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin,
Mar. 15, 1963]

TAKING UP THE SLACK

Even if President Kennedy gets the Federal tax cuts he wants, the American taxpayer in most cases will be no better off.

States and local governments are moving right in to take up the slack—and in some cases to add an even heavier burden.

Governor Burns deplores any general tax increase for Hawaii at this time, but has indicated he approves a higher fuel tax to pay for the State-accelerated roadbuilding program. Mayor Blaisdell has asked the city council to approve an increase in the real property tax. Although these won't hit all taxpayers, they will affect enough so that any saving in Federal taxes, provided cuts are voted will be lost in additional local and State levies.

This is true across the country. Business Week magazine reports that 44 of the 47 State legislatures meeting this year are considering total tax increases of $1.5 billion.

This increase, which may be on the conservative side, would bring the State tax bite on individuals and corporations to $22 billion. That's more than a 7 percent increase over last year, and double the total of 10 years ago.

While proposals range from an increased corporation tax in Connecticut to a gift tax in New Mexico, sales taxes remain in the easiest and most politically appealing way for legislators to boost revenue, Business Week reports.

Eight of the 14 States that do not now have a broad-based sales tax will consider one, while at least 13 other States will propose raising existing sales tax rates. All told, sales taxes should account for $1.3 billion of the total State tax increase this year.

A mixed bag of selective sales tax increases on gasoline, cigarettes, and liquor will be voted on by lawmakers in 15 States. In addition motor vehicle license fees may rise in six, including Hawaii, where it has been proposed that the automobile weight tax be doubled.

Pressures on States to raise more and more cash are relentless. While the Federal budget has registered several dips in spending over the past 10 years, State expenditures have risen in an almost straight line. In recent years, nearly two-thirds of the States spent more money than they took in. In 1961, there were 29 States operating in the red.

On the municipal level, few cities enjoy the kind of home rule that would enable them to keep their fiscal house in order and still provide the services their citizens demand. While States normally reserve income and sales taxes for themselves, they usually forbid their cities to operate at a deficit. The result is an annual tug-of-war between city hall and taxpayer groups over whether nuisance taxes should be levied or services cut.

New York's Mayor Robert F. Wagner, with a city income greater than the entire Federal Government's in 1933, says he's now faced with the unpleasant task of either trimming essential services or imposing an array of unpopular levies such as a payroll tax, an auto use tax, an overnight parking fee, or taxes on beer and liquor licenses.

Other cities have similar problems. And, to the city taxpayer burdened by nuisance taxes, it often seems that his mayor's definition of essential services gets broader each year. But, as New York's Budget Director William W. Shea points out, those who cry for economy often change their tune when it comes to a pet service.

Generally speaking, we would prefer to see cities and States providing more of the services and taking a larger share of the tax dollar than the Federal Government. The closer taxing and spending power is to the voter, the greater his influence over it, the better chance there is of rational limits to Government spending.

But the point in this case is that for every dollar the taxpayer saves at the Federal level, he may find he will have to pay an equal or greater amount to his local or State government.

So where is the great shot in the arm to the economy that the Kennedy tax program is designed to produce?

The Kennedy tax cut may well go down in history as the great illusion of 1963.

REMARKS BY SENATOR FONG ON RADIO STATION KGU, JANUARY 31, 1963

Good evening, friends. The President's long-awaited tax plan is now before Congress. It is a plan with two main parts: one, reductions in tax rates for persons and for businesses; two, many changes in such items as personal deductions, dividend treatment, capital gains, and mineral depletion which will partly offset the lower tax rates.

The President says lower tax rates will save $13.6 billion in income taxes, while the other tax changes he proposes will put a tax bite on persons and businesses of $3.4 billion. So the net tax reduction would be $10.2 billion.

Now Congress must decide whether the tax cuts are big enough to stimulate our lagging national economy, whether the reforms are fair and just, and whether the tax changes are timed to take effect so as to do the most good.

Our Nation's economy rose about 3 percent last year and shows no signs of doing any better this year. This rise was not enough to reduce unemployment significantly. Unemployment continued at more than 5 percent throughout 1962 and still exceeds 5 percent today. Every year we need more than 1 million new jobs just to take care of the men and women entering the labor force.

Because the President has spread his tax cut proposals over 3 years, many experts fear the reduction will be too small to relieve unemployment to any great extent. For individuals and for business with profits under $25,000, the President wants the lower rates to be effective starting next July; for other business, not until next January. So the impact in the year beginning next July would be only $4 billion in Federal income taxes.

Meantime, social security taxes on workers and their employers have just gone up all over the country. State and local taxes are in an upward trend in America and still climbing. Here in Hawaii, for example, the Governor has announced he wants an increase in gasoline taxes and the City Council of Honolulu is considering a raise in the property tax rate.

In addition, the President wants corporations to pay their taxes much sooner than in the past. As a result, corporations may pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before. Corporations may not get the promised percentage basis of reduction until 1969, whereas the economy needs a boost in 1963.

With all these factors, people and businesses may actually have far less to spend and invest than the administration hopes. So the stimulus to the economy may be minor, when what we need is a major injection.

Congress must carefully assess the overall impact of the President's tax plan. At the same time, Congress must study the so-called reforms to make sure they are fair and just to taxpayers.

For example, I am disturbed that the President wants workers who are off the job because of illness to be taxed on money they receive under sick pay plans. This may well cause hardship to families trying to make ends meet on sick pay while the head of the family cannot work.

I am disturbed also by the President's plan to tax workers on the amount their employers pay toward premiums for employees' group term life insurance.

I am happy that the President proposes to liberalize the deduction allowed for expenses of child care of a working parent. I am also happy about the proposed tax breaks for the elderly. These would exempt from taxation single persons over 65 with income under $2,900 and married couples under $5,800. Elderly persons would not have to file tax returns unless the earned at least $1,800, instead of $1,200 as now.

Without question the tax bill is the most important domestic issue before Congress today. Next Wednesday, the House Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to start some 7 weeks of hearings. Writing the bill may take 7 more weeks, with passage by the House perhaps in June. Senate Finance Committee hearings and action may take another 2 months, followed by floor debate and then conferences between House and Senate Members to iron out differences. So it looks as if summer is the earliest that Congress could complete action on such a complex bill.

What Congress finally does will depend a great deal on the size of the Federal budget deficit. The President now predicts almost a $12 billion deficit in 1964. If by July an even higher deficit appears likely, Congress may not reduce taxes as much as the President wants. So the President must hold the line on Federal spending. This is indispensable to enactment of tax cuts large enough to invigorate our national economy.

Thank you for listening, friends. Until next week at this same time, this is your Senator, HIRAM FONG, saying goodnight and aloha from the Nation's Capital.

EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON—an "unabashed partisan of education"—went to Atlantic City in New Jersey recently to address the American Association of School Administrators. At that time the Vice President described to the school administrators the challenge and promise facing not only education, but our entire democratic society. He asked his audience to see beyond the "mountains of immediate problems" and to see in the distance "even higher mountains which should not be ignored in determining the course for the present." And he also asked the people of America to recognize their own strengths, to see the weaknesses of nations ruled by force, and to fulfill the cause of freedom "through the policies we pursue as leaders of the grand alliance of freemen."

Mr. President, the address was an inspiring summary which should be shared by many other Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., FEBRUARY 17, 1963

CHALLENGE AND PROMISE

In the early years of his administration, President Franklin Roosevelt was a strong advocate of the U.S. Navy. He loved the sea, he had served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and he believed a modern, two-ocean Navy was essential to our security. The story is told of an encounter F.D.R. had with the Army Chief of Staff at that time, Gen. Malin Craig.

The general and the President had been holding many conferences on the defense budget. The President noted some discomfort on the part of the general and asked him to speak frankly. General Craig is said to have replied, "Mr. President, I don't mind that when you refer to the Army you always say 'they'—but I would be more comfortable if, when you refer to the Navy, you did not always say 'we.' "

Whenever I meet with public school administrators or teachers, I have to guard against a longstanding personal inclination to use "we" in references to "them and us." Today the typical public school principal is a 40-year-old man, with 14 years of experience, who works 55 hours a week and who is paid $6,181 a year. Thirty years ago my first jobs after college were as principal of small schools in the Southwest—and if both my age and experience were considerably less than today's average, I can say that the paycheck was in proportion, also.

That experience left its indelible impression. I make no apology today for continuing to be an unabashed partisan of education, or the untiring champion of our administrators and teachers whose work is so vital to the strength, stability, and success of our country and our cause in this century.

In coming here today, it is not my purpose to take the time of this informed and responsible audience to discuss those questions and topics to which your attention is given continuously. Instead, it is my purpose to talk with you about the broad challenges—and broader opportunities—of this period of your Nation's leadership and freedom in the world.

DRAMATIC CHANGE

As school administrators, you are acutely aware that this is a time of decisive and dramatic change in public education. The basic concepts of education's mission and purpose are undergoing revision. The role and leadership of public schools to our society is changing. You—and all associated with public education—are faced with mountains of immediate problems which must be dealt with immediately. At the same time, you can see in the distance even higher mountains which should not be ignored in determining the course for the present.

In world affairs now, we are passing through a period of change—one of the most profound such periods in history—in which it is difficult to achieve answers which are both quick and responsible. As seldom before, the hasty answer is unlikely to be the right and lasting answer. It is most important to our national success that we understand, first, that only the strong can afford to be patient, and, second, that the tide of world affairs is running with us—not against us—and that our staying power is the key to our ultimate success.

OUR POSITION AND POLICY

In this perspective, then, let me make to you several key points about the position and the policy of this America at this period in the affairs of the world.

1. To display patience is not the same as displaying weakness. If we are to be patient and prudent, it is mandatory that we also be prepared. This assault which communism has mounted against us aims at the total destruction of our freedoms. We must maintain our strength on a scale commensurate with the clear and present danger to our survival.

2. The strength of our position depends upon the collective total strength of the free world. If the prospects and high promise of the future are to be realized, we cannot—and we will not—permit the penetration of the perimeter of the free world by Communist aggression, and subversion or default on our own part. Each attack, each threat, each bluff and bluster must be met—and this we shall do.

3. The ultimate success of our cause depends not merely upon preserving the integrity of the free world from assaults from without. That success rests upon the uses we make and the strength we build from the resources which lie within the free world. We must and we shall pursue on a day-to-day and a year-to-year basis a positive program of adding to the strength of our own free world community.

In speaking of a world divided, of a world part free and part slave, we cannot—and we do not—accept this division as permanent, eternal, and unchanging. Men cannot live as freemen as long as they must live under the shadow of what Winston Churchill once called "the two giant marauders of war and tyranny." We do not propose to accept for our children and our children's children a life of constant threat and constant fear of nuclear destruction. There is no ceiling on the price we are willing to pay to preserve ourselves and the free world and to maintain the strength of the free civilizations until the forces of history have wrought the great changes which will improve the condition of man and the climate for peace.

TO BREAK THE BONDS

It is on this point that I believe Americans need to keep their thinking straight at this time—and to recognize the full significance of the forces we see at work within the Communist world. We are not dealing in abstracts. We are not dealing in intangibles or theory. There is clear and growing evidence that influences are now at work within the Communist world which may well break the bonds with which the Communists have shackled both themselves and the people they rule.

In the nations of the Communist bloc, the future is not being controlled by the mechanical and arbitrary laws conceived by antisocial and mystical Marx. The aspiration of the different national groups now living under Communist rule are being asserted and the course of the present clearly contradicts Communist assumptions about its own future.

When the Communist empire was established—reaching from the shores of the Adriatic to the seas of Japan and from the North Pole to the Himalayas—first Stalin and then Khrushchev proclaimed it as an irrevocable shift in the "balance of world forces" in favor of the Communists. That empire was supposed to live forever. The countries captured and controlled by the Communists were to be united in a single cohesive unit which would move forward with a singular will to rule the world. Like all the visions of world domination of the past, this Communist vision is being shattered and a vital process of disintegration in the Communist camp has begun before our eyes.

Instead of assuming—as too many among us have assumed—that communism is an irresistible wave of the future, we must realistically reassess the record—which contradicts that assumption.

COMMUNIST FAILURE

The proof of this last half of the 20th century is convincing that communism is failing as both an international conspiracy and as a domestic economic system.

1. Of the more than 50 countries which have moved from colonial status to independence since World War II, Communists have failed to win control of a single one.

2. In every country under Communist control, the Communist system has failed to produce enough food to make possible improvements and advances in the standard of living for the people under their subjugation.

3. On the mainland of China, the application of the Communist system has tragically failed to resolve the basic problems of that country.

4. After almost two decades of indoctrination and thought control, Communists have not been able to overcome the deep antagonism and hostility of the peoples of the satellite states of Eastern Europe.

5. Within the Soviet Union itself, the Communist leadership is plagued with growing problems about the allocation of limited resources, conflicts over policy decisions, and stirrings among the people aspiring to greater intellectual freedom, a larger voice in their own affairs, and for greater opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their own labors.

The Communist vision and dream of solidarity within an empire ruled by force is fading. The Russian Communists and the Chinese Communists are experiencing a division which places the inner debates of the free world in perspective as passing disagreements. The Russians have, to all intents and purposes, cut off economic and military aid to the Chinese. They have tried to undercut Chinese influence within the Communist movement. They have mobilized other parties outside Russia to criticize and challenge Chinese positions. The Russian attempts to whip the Chinese into line have only produced greater defiance—and open and bitter conflict.

On our part, there is no value in attempting to guess when or whether the conflicts between Peiping and Moscow will reach a formal break. What matters to us is that a change of historical significance is under way in this relationship within the Communist bloc. And this conflict is not merely ideological dispute. It is a conflict of basic national interests.

OLD TIMES CHANGING

The Chinese Communists are refusing to accept the old line of Lenin and Stalin that whatever is good for the Soviet Union is good for Communists everywhere. The Chinese reaction to Russian domination of the Communist empire is a reaction against a basically unnatural system—a system running counter to fundamental forces of history and human nature.

With this great new force asserting itself within the Communist empire, it must continue to be the object of our policy to make sure that communism is not permitted to bring the world down in ruins before collapsing itself from within. The split between Communist Russia and Communist China does not relieve us of any immediate dangers or threats. Neither is it likely to bring improvements in the world climate during the years immediately ahead. Should we of the West relinquish either our vigilance or our unity, the forces of communism would be quick to seize upon the opening thus presented to fulfill their ambition of burying us.

What this situation does demand of us is to maintain the strength to permit patience and to preserve the patience to permit the free world's strength to work its influence upon the disintegration from within the Communist bloc. The world we face today is vastly different than most Americans imagined it could be as recently as 10 or even 5 years ago. We must recognize that change has come.

RECOGNIZE OUR STRENGTH

As a people, we of America must—above all else—examine and reexamine our national attitudes. We will deny and betray the opportunity of the future if we fail to recognize fully the strength of our national position today. We cannot win the future if we allow our confidence to be impaired by false cries of those who monger the idea that we are losing the present. Our efforts as a Nation—our sacrifices as a people—have preserved freedom against the high tide of Communist danger. Our success in the past permits us to have confidence in the future—and Americans must carry such confidence into the period of challenge and change which will dominate the remaining years of this century.

While this is and will continue to be a time of peril for freedom, we will be stronger as a Nation and we will be a stronger force as leaders of the cause of freedom if we realistically and honestly recognize that we have come upon one of the great moments of promise in mankind's history—and it is our destiny to fulfill that promise through the policies we pursue as leaders of the grand alliance of freemen.

LOBBYING IN WASHINGTON

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Felton West, chief of the Washington bureau of the Houston Post, has written an outstanding series of articles on lobbying in Washington. The inadequate regulation of lobbyists has troubled Members of Congress for several years. I believe that Mr. West's series indicates that our concern is not misplaced. I therefore ask unanimous consent to place in the Record the text of the articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Patient Persuaders—Lobbying Act of 1946 Needs Overhaul Job

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Every few years an incident comes to light that prompts Members of Congress and the public to say, "For shame, look how brazen those lobbyists are getting." Or words to that effect.

There will be an investigation, maybe a particular culprit will be identified and shamed, rarely even convicted for violating a law. But usually that is the end of it, until the next case that stirs the imagination.

Meanwhile, the persuasive and enduring lobbyist, as one writer described him, goes right on persuading and enduring, his profession getting more widespread and powerful all the time, with nobody paying much attention to it. At least, not enough attention to find out much about it and disturb it.

The last case that stirred Congress and the country much was in 1956, when the late Senator Francis Case, Republican of South Dakota, dropped the bombshell that he had been offered a $2,500 campaign contribution he thought was strictly to get his vote on the Harris-Fulbright bill to relieve natural gas of Federal regulation.

Congress was shocked, though not too shocked to go ahead and pass the bill. Although indicating he favored the bill, President Eisenhower was so shocked that he vetoed it because of such arrogant activities.

The incident touched off a Justice Department investigation and prosecution that led to the only convictions so far under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946—Elmer Patman and John Neff each drew a $2,500 fine and a 1-year suspended sentence and their company, the Superior Oil Co., was fined $10,000.

SENATE GROUP RAPPED LOBBYING ACT

It also touched off a lengthy investigation by a special Senate committee, headed by Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas. Congress authorized the committee to spend more than $400,000 looking at the whole subject of lobbying and the adequacy of the 1946 law, along with studying campaign contributions.

This committee produced an interesting final report that pointed fingers of scorn at weaknesses of the 1946 law. It recommended a complete substitute.

But, as so often happens when the furor over an initial disclosure dies down and a serious report on the problem necessarily comes along much later in competition with more current sensations, the suggestions for strengthening the law fell on deaf ears.

Since then, there have been occasional speeches critical of lobbying, even a few remarks by the President of the United States, but nobody has been pushing for reform.

So when Congress came back from the hustings in early January, there was still waiting for it that army of persuaders considerably outnumbering it, still doing business just as usual not telling anybody much about it, some of its troops registered as lobbyists, some not, although doing the same things as the registrants, some disclosing their sources of money and their spending, some not.

LOBBYISTS QUICK TO PICK UP CHECK

There are close to 1,200 lobbyists in this army, at least—and if the truth were known, probably hundreds more.

They include many friends of the reelected Congressmen, many as close as their most influential constituents back home. And soon a lot will be close friends of the new Congressmen, if they did not get that way during their election campaigns last fall.

The lobbyists are ready to wine and dine the lawmakers at the drop of a hat, pick up the checks for their parties, do all sorts of favors whether asked or not. A lobbyist is eager to please.

They'll meet a lot of Congressmen in the lobbies outside the legislative halls. That is how they got their name, hanging around legislativies lobbies, starting with that of the British House of Commons.

But nowadays most of their work will be done elsewhere.

Many will direct as much of their attention to you voters back in the Congressman's district as directly as to the Congressman. They hope your pressure on him will have more effect than theirs, which it probably will.

As long as the lobbyists keep within the bounds of propriety and beyond bribery, there is nothing improper about what they are doing. They are within their rights and their clients' rights of freedom of speech, assembly and petition guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In fact, they undoubtedly perform a valuable service. One or more of them may even be representing you, indirectly if not directly.

Congress and the courts have taken the position that lobbyists should not and could not be limited.

The only special law they are subject to is the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, which to start with was misnamed—it is not a regulatory law at all but merely a disclosure requirement.

But this law is one of the most confusing ones ever put on the books. It was vague and indefinite, poorly written. Court decisions have weakened it. Few people understand it, including the highest-paid lobbyists.

It has become a Washington joke. Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, recently called it a "farce." It is inconceivable that the Congressmen who wrote it intended for lobby disclosure to turn out to be the botched-up job it is.

The law creates the impression lobbyists are regulated, or their activities well disclosed, when they are not, which may be as much a disservice to the country as no law at all.

There are people registered under it who doubtless did not need to register, while probably others who are really professional lobbyists are not registered, or at least are not reporting their spending. Some follow the advice, "If in doubt, register and report." Others give themselves the benefit of the doubt.

No agency of the Government is designated to see that lobbyists do report or pay any attention to what they do report. The reports are just accepted and filed. Nobody is designated to report violations.

Nobody has been prosecuted since 1956.

Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said after the Neff-Case incident in that year that the lobbying act was practically worthless. The main thing wrong, he said was its failure to make anybody responsible for administering and enforcing it.

Twice he introduced bills to improve the law, one of the main changes being to make the Department of Justice administer it. But the bills got nowhere.

Now, as President, Mr. Kennedy has complained bitterly at least once about powerful lobbying that he said misrepresented the facts on his proposals to Congress. His legislative program has taken some big lumps from several lobbies. Big lobbies are opposing all his major legislative proposals, though at the same time he has big lobbies giving him some support.

Recently the President was reported to be discouraged over the power of lobbies, feeling that some are more persuasive and powerful than the Office of the President.

But so far, since becoming President, he has left the lobby problem strictly in Congress hands, not recommending any reform legislation on the subject.

Meanwhile, lobbying is getting to be bigger business all the time.

Although no recent estimate is available on how much is really spent on lobbying, a House investigating committee estimated in 1950 that, in all its ramifications, it was a billion-dollar industry then. It has been growing ever since, even though disclosed spending figures do not indicate it.

And thanks to a change in the Federal tax laws last year that amounts to an incentive to lobbying, such activity in Washington, State capitals, and local communities may increase in the next few years at a rate much faster than in the past.

Whether this is good or bad, the fact is that the law and the machinery the Federal Government has for disclosure of such activity are puny.

In the Supreme Court opinion upholding the constitutionality of the lobbying act, Chief Justice Earl Warren said Congress has not tried to prohibit pressures but "wants only to know who is being hired, who is putting up the money, and how much."

Unfortunately, under the present law, neither you nor Congress knows much about that. And nothing is likely to be done about it this year.

[From the Houston Post Feb. 4, 1963]

The Patient Persuaders—Spending Reports of Lobbyists Fail To Keep Pace

(By Felton West)

Washington.—For the first quarter of 1962, quarterly reports required by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act were filed by 1,187 individuals and organizations.

Only 643 of them listed expenditures for lobbying.

In 1961, 312 pressure groups and their lobbyists reported lobbying expenditures that totaled $3,770,108—the smallest annual total of lobby spending since 1947, the first full year of operation of the lobbying act.

The total of spending reported in 1962 is not yet available, but in the first 6 months of the year 273 organizations and their lobbyists reported spending $2,007,866. If as much was spent in the second half of the year as in the first, the year's total would still be about $1 million less than the spending of $5,191,856 reported in 1947.

Since, as the New York Times observed in early 1962, "there is abundant evidence that Washington's 'Third House' has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium," the decline in reported expenditures would seem to indicate the lobbying regulation act is not working well as a disclosure requirement.

In view of the inflation since 1947 and the many controversial matters before Congress in 1961 and 1962, it is rather unlikely that lobby spending was actually less than in 1947. It is more likely that considerably less of the total spent is being reported now than in past years.

The total reported spent in a year ballooned to $10,303,204 in 1950. Since 1952, however, it has ranged between $3 and $4 million a year.

The count of 1,187 individuals and organizations who filed reports during the first quarter of 1962 is the best indication available of the number of lobbyists active at that time. But there could have been many more, such is the state of confusion over the law and the lack of administration and enforcement.

Between January 1 and October 30 of last year, 367 individuals and organizations registered with the Clerk of the House and the Senate as lobbyists, as required by the law. The average number of registrations a year is 383.

The total number of registrations since enactment of the law in 1946 was 6,504 as of October 30, which represented only 4,586 different lobbyists or groups because some registered more than once or registered for two or more organizations.

There is no accurate way of telling how many of the 4,586 were still lobbying, unless you assume that all who were filed the quarterly reports. Many are dead and haven't reported the fact; nobody has wiped their names off the rolls. Others perhaps once thought they needed to file reports but don't think so now. Some of them and others may be violating the law by not reporting, or not registering.

But nobody is checking up to see. The law does not require notice of discontinuance of legislative representation.

The Justice Department will investigate complaints of noncompliance and either bring about voluntary compliance or prosecute if it thinks the facts warrant it, a spokesman said. But it does not consider itself the policing agent for lobbying. Somebody has to bring it complaints and no particular person is designated to do this.

Through warnings, the Department has brought about voluntary compliance in a few cases in recent years after investigations that stemmed from inquiries by Congressmen, the spokesman said. But it has not prosecuted anybody for illegal lobbying since the Neff-Patman-Superior Oil case in 1956.

In the whole history of the lobbying act there have been only five cases taken to court, with convictions only in the 1956 case.

The 4,586 different lobbyists registered since 1946 included 3,798 individuals, 231 public relations and law firms and 557 organizations.

For most of the statistics in this story, the public is indebted to Congressional Quarterly, a Washington research organization, which compiles registration and spending statistics periodically and is the only source for such information unless one wants to wade laboriously through the spending reports and compile them himself.

No official agency keeps tabs on them. The House clerk and Senate secretary merely accept and file the lobby reports and prepare alphabetical lists of those registering and reporting, showing their clients, their total contributions and total expenses, for publication quarterly in the Congressional Record.

The lobby law is considered so weak that if there were not so much uncertainty about what it does require, many people now filing reports probably would not be.

"After 17 years," said an influential and affluent lobbyist who dutifully files reports in spite of his contention that it is a clerical nuisance serving no worthwhile purpose, "I still don't know what the law means."

By its own language, the law applies to those persons and organizations which receive or spend money for the principal purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of legislation by Congress.

The law says every person or organization paid to influence legislation shall register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, identifying himself and his employer and disclosing the source and amount of his compensation, expense money, and the nature of his expenses.

Exceptions to this are persons who merely appear before committees of Congress, public officials acting in their official capacity, and newspapers or periodicals, their owners or employees, as long as they do nothing outside the ordinary course of business to influence legislation. The law does not state any similar exemption for radio or television.

Those receiving contributions are required to keep accounts and keep receipts for expenditures of more than $10. Money received and spent for lobbying is supposed to be reported quarterly to the House Clerk and the Senate Secretary, showing the identity of contributors of $500 or more and the identity of those to whom aggregate expenditures of more than $10 have been made.

A lobbyist is required to show in his reports the proposed legislation he was employed to influence and the names of publications in which he has caused articles or editorials to be published.

Violation of the law is punishable by a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to a year and prohibition from lobbying for 3 years.

The act does not apply to activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which deals with campaign contributions and expenditures, or to political party committees.

Senate and House committee reports accompanying the law when it was passed were identical. Both said the law applied mainly to three classes of lobbyists: (1) those who without visiting the Capitol initiated propaganda letters and telegrams from all over the country; (2) those who are employed to come to the Capitol * * * and spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence on legislation but carefully conceal from Congressmen the purpose of their presence; and (3) a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views * * * many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose.

Both reports said the act did not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed. This was probably the first monkey wrench that started confusing the works.

The words "principal purpose" have caused confusion ever since. Some organizations and individuals do not register, or register but do not file spending reports, on the ground that lobbying is not their principal purpose. Others in the same circumstances follow the principle of "if in doubt, do".

In upholding the constitutionality of the law in *United States* v. *Harris* in 1954, the Supreme Court severely limited coverage in a way that seemed counter to the congressional authors' intention.

The Court laid down these prerequisites to coverage:

1. The person must have solicited, collected, or received contributions;

2. One of the main purposes of such person, or one of the main purposes of such contributions, must have been to influence the passage or defeat of legislation by Congress, and

3. The intended method of accomplishing this purpose must have been through direct communication with Members of Congress.

Some groups which formerly filed reports claim the Harris decision made the law inapplicable to them because they do not engage in direct communication with Congressmen; some that lobbying is not their principal purpose; some that their function is not to influence legislation but to inform and educate their members and the public.

Among the national groups which did not file spending reports in 1961 were the American Bankers Association, Americans for Democratic Action, the American Public Power Association and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The NAM has not filed a spending report since 1950, claiming it is not subject to the reporting requirements, although its lobbyists do register.

Students of the lobby law point out that the Supreme Court's first prerequisite for coverage by the law exempts a corporation or group which might spend several million dollars to obtain passage of legislation solely to line its own pockets, as long as it spends only its own money. Some of the Nation's largest defense contractors, incidentally, have large Washington offices but no registered lobbyists.

Students of the law argue that the Supreme Court's second prerequisite—main purpose—is difficult to apply and leaves too much to a lobbyist's conscience. It is suggested that a dollars-and-cents standard on lobby spending would be more practical than the purpose test.

The direct communication prerequisite exempts from coverage of the law the area where the most lobbying money is spent.

However, investigation would show that, unpoliced, even those lobbyists registering and filing quarterly reports do not comply fully with the letter of the law.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, told the Senate last year he estimated that less than 25 percent of all lobbyists in Washington comply fully with the requirements. He based the statement on a study his staff made of oil and gas industry representatives during the 1960 session of Congress.

"Of the 41 lobbyists who did file reports," he said, "36 violated the law by failing to give their specific legislative interests, 21 failed to comply with the law by stating whether they had received contributions of more than $500, 20 illegally refused to list the parties they had paid money to, and 17 did not state the nature of their employers' businesses as the law requires."

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—EVERYBODY HAS A LOBBYIST

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Just about everybody has a lobbyist or lobbyists these days, at least for part of his total interests—even if he's not paying for it.

Doctors have their American Medical Association lobbyists. Bankers have theirs. Workingmen have various labor union lobbyists; nonunion workers have certain business lobbyists who work indirectly for some of their aims.

Practically every kind of business has its own trade association that lobbies for it, and other groups try to further business' common aims.

If you are a veteran, there are organizations looking out for your particular interests in this field.

It requires a lot of thought to look at the list of organizations registered as lobbies or represented by individual lobbyists and think of somebody not represented directly or indirectly, at least in some way, by registered lobbyists.

Those registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act range from spokesmen for the Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, the AMA, the AFL–CIO, and the American Legion to the Council for Exceptional Children, the Christian Amendment Movement, the Sacramento (Calif.) Municipal Utility District, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

In between are lobbyists for numerous tribes of Indians.

The 312 pressure groups which filed spending reports totaling about $3,770,100 in 1961 were classified by Congressional Quarterly, the Washington research organization, in 6 categories. This breakdown showed that 171 business groups reported spending $1,598,091, 52 citizens groups $437,695, 40 employee and labor groups $857,788, 22 farm groups $365,887, 10 military and veterans groups $133,734, and 17 professional groups $376,911.

Five organizations reported spending more than $100,000 each on lobbying during 1961, and 14 other groups reported spending more than $50,000 each. (See accompanying table for a list of these groups and their reported spending.)

Eight organizations reported spending more than $50,000 each during the first half of 1962, while 11 other groups reported spending more than $25,000 apiece during that period. Compilations for the whole of 1962 are not yet available.

The 171 business lobby groups that reported spending in 1961 included the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, scores of trade and industry associations like the National Association of Chain Drug Stores and the American Petroleum Institute, and many individual businesses, like insurance and oil companies.

They included some notable omissions, like the National Association of Manufacturers, which claims the reporting requirements do not cover it.

The 52 citizens groups included such organizations as the American Cancer Society, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Reclamation Association, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Committee To Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, and the National Council on the Facts of Overpopulation.

Employee and labor organizations included a dozen organizations in the various transportation industries, 14 Federal employee organizations and a number of AFL–CIO affiliate groups.

Among farm groups represented by lobbyists were the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, and organizations of cattlemen, citrus growers, vegetable growers, milk producers, soil conservation districts, wheat growers, turkey growers, wool producers, cotton growers, and tobacco growers.

Military and veterans lobbying groups, in addition to the American Legion, included the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), the Disabled American Veterans, the Disabled Officers Association, the Jewish War Veterans, the Reserve Officers Association, the Retired Officers Association, and the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.

The latter group, incidentally, known as the "Wonnies," was the biggest spender of all lobbies in 1960, according to the reports; it reported spending $200,623 then in behalf of a pension bill, mostly on bringing World War I vets to Washington.

The 17 professional groups reporting in 1961 included dental, nurse, optometric, surgeon, veterinary, professional women, engineer and social worker associations, in addition to the AMA.

The more powerful pressure groups have whole batteries of registered lobbyists. For example, during the third quarter of 1962, lobbying reports were filed by 10 persons for the American Farm Bureau Federation, by 7 for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, by 6 each for the AMA and the AFL–CIO national headquarters, and by 5 for the American Petroleum Institute.

Many lobbyists are integral units, such as executive vice presidents, of the organizations for which they lobby. Many are Washington business representatives of business firms elsewhere and spend only part time at legislation influencing. Some lobbyists, though, are full-time pros who do nothing but lobby, sometimes for several clients.

Of the 239 registrations in 1962 that represented individuals or organizations filing for the first time, 188 were individuals, 14 were public relations or law firms and 37 were organizations.

Thirty-five of the individuals or firms were registered lobbyists for more than one employee, representing a total of 88 employers. One Washington law firm registered for 13 clients, another for 8, another for 7.

Many of the better known lobbyists are former Members of Congress. Turning lobbyist is quite the accepted thing for a Congressman to do when defeated or looking for a better paying job. About 85 have registered as lobbyists after leaving office since the lobby law was passed in 1946, but some of these are dead and some others apparently are no longer active as lobbyists.

Probably the best known of those still active is former Senator Scott W. Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, onetime Senate majority leader, who usually has several clients. Another well-known one is former Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, the AFL–CIO's chief lobbyist. Another is former Representative Frank Ikard, of Texas, who resigned from Congress last year to become the American Petroleum Institute's chief lobbyist and executive vice president, at a salary said to be $50,000 a year.

Quite a few former high officials in the executive branch of the Government also turn lobbyist, especially after changes in administration. The best known of these is probably Oscar L. Chapman, President Truman's Secretary of the Interior.

It has often been said that in Washington there are lobbyists for everybody except "the people." But this is an oversimplification not as accurate as it sounds.

In the first place, all lobbies represent people. Put them all together and you have quite a lot of people and different kinds. Secondly, Members of Congress are lobbyists themselves—for the people in their States and districts—and work to influence each other.

Finally, the largest paid lobby of all in Washington consists not of spokesmen for the AMA, the NAM, the AFL-CIO or any such group. It is made up of spokesmen for the various agencies of the Government—Cabinet members, "legislative liaison" staff members, experts in various fields—who, under the direction of Presidential assistants as expert as any business lobbyists, push legislation or oppose it, often as effectively as any "special interest" lobbyists.

This network is at the President's fingertips, and some Members of Congress have called this "White House lobby" the most powerful there is. The "White House lobby" has almost unlimited sources of information, unusual powers of persuasion in patronage, public works projects and other ways to pay off Congressmen for support, and the best forum in the world for presenting its views.

What it spends influencing Congressmen has never been added up. But if it were, this lobbying expense would be impressive.

Theoretically, the "White House lobby" is a lobby for the people, since they elect the President. Actually, of course, it may represent only those who think like the President. But if it does not represent the people, they have the chance to change that by choosing a different President, just as any special interest organization has the chance to change the course of its lobbying by selecting a different administration.

TOP SPENDERS

The following 19 organizations reported spending more than $50,000 on lobbying during 1961, the latest year for which complete figures are available:

American Medical Association	$163,405
AFL-CIO (national headquarters)	139,919
American Farm Bureau Federation	111,364
American Legion	103,566
U.S. Savings and Loan League	101,801
National Farmers Union	88,273
American Trucking Associations	84,986
National Committee for Insurance Taxation	73,012
District Lodge 44, International Association of Machinists	71,737
National Housing Conference, Inc.	68,675
International Brotherhood of Teamsters	68,012
National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc.	55,936
National Association of Electric Companies	55,205
American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies	54,028
National Association of Home Builders	53,712
Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy	53,101
National Education Association	51,910
National Retail Merchants	51,042
National Association of Letter Carriers	50,920

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—TEXANS ARE ACTIVE LOBBYISTS

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Texans are prominent among the lobbyists in Washington, and quite a few Texas interests have representation of their own in the so-called Third House, in addition to the countless ones represented by lobbyists for various trade and industry associations.

One of the most successful lobbyists in the Capital, and by far the one most identified with the Lone Star State, is Dale Miller, a 53-year-old native of Corpus Christi.

Congressmen call him the dean of Texas lobbyists.

Holiday magazine once called Miller and his wife, whose friends call her Scooter, a "social lobbying team par excellence." It said that in 20 years in Washington they had "danced rings around other lobbyists on the party circuit and know just about everyone worthwhile to Miller's clients in the city."

Though Miller says he and Mrs. Miller don't do nearly as much entertaining as they get credit for, the birthday parties they gave for 18 years for the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn made them the talk of Washington. This annual event became a 440-person party with an all-star crowd.

Miller has long been close to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as he was to Speaker Rayburn. His father, Roy Miller, a lobbyist too, was a friend of both Rayburn and JOHNSON. Roy Miller helped JOHNSON get the job that first brought him to Washington years ago as an administrative assistant to Congressman Richard Kleberg.

Dale Miller grew up in Corpus Christi and as a boy did cub reporting chores on the Corpus Christi Caller, which his father owned then. After college—New Mexico Military Institute, the University of Texas, the University of Missouri Journalism School—he taught journalism at the University of Texas, wrote for Texas Weekly magazine and handled publicity for the Texas centennial celebration of 1936.

In 1941 he moved to Washington to represent the Dallas Chamber of Commerce as an experiment, which proved so successful that the Dallas Chamber is still one of the clients for whom he lobbies.

His other clients are the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, of which he has been executive vice president since 1946; the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., and the Port of Corpus Christi, which he represents only in navigation matters.

The canal association and Texas Gulf Sulphur, which have offices in Houston, are clients he inherited from his father, who represented them before his death in 1946. Dale had shared the same office, his present suite in the Mayflower Hotel here, with his father. He was familiar with the clients' affairs and naturally gravitated into representing them after his father's death.

Miller describes himself as "about the most unlobbying lobbyist you ever saw," saying he does very little persuading on legislation.

Actually, he said, in none of his jobs is the primary purpose influencing legislation. Most of his work involves visits to Government agencies, helping visitors to Washington and giving people in Washington information about Texas, he said.

He testifies every year before House and Senate Appropriation Committees, about every other year before Public Works Committees of both Houses, and occasionally before other congressional committees on general legislation in which the Dallas chamber is interested. He appears from time to time before the Civil Aeronautics Board and other executive or independent agencies in behalf of his clients.

Being here permanently and well known for his interests, Miller says he never has to ask a Congressman to vote for or against particular legislation. "They know my interests," he said.

Indeed, some say Miller is consulted more often by Congressmen than they are consulted by him because he is an expert on intracoastal waterway affairs, the Trinity River and other subjects.

He says he is more useful to his clients simply by finding out what is going to happen and alerting them than by influencing what happens.

Miller is proud of his profession and thinks it is essential and important and becoming more so as civilization becomes more complex and Congress must deal with more technical matters.

In frequent conflict with Miller's activities as lobbyist for water transportation interests are the activities of another Texas lobbyist, Tom Pickett. One of several former Congressmen from Texas who registered as lobbyists after leaving office, Pickett now represents the Association of American Railroads. He formerly represented the National Coal Association.

Former Congressman Fritz G. Lanham of Texas has been registered recently as a lobbyist for the National Patent Council, Inc., and Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.

The chief lobbyist for the powerful American Petroleum Institute is former Congressman Frank N. Ikard of Wichita Falls, who resigned from Congress last year to become executive vice president of the API and is now its president.

Former Congressman J. T. Rutherford, of Odessa, who lost his bid for reelection last November, became a legislative consultant soon after his term expired and said he would be doing some lobbying. Some of it will be for the American Trucking Association, Inc.

Former Republican Congressman Ben H. Guill of Pampa, who served a short term by special election in 1950, is a lobbyist for the National Automobile Dealers Association and has in the past done lobbying for the American Smelting & Refining Co.

Another Texan, like Ikard, lobbies for a major oil industry organization. He is Joe T. Dickerson of Houston, who represents the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association.

Two of the American Medical Association's six registered lobbyists are Texans—Dr. Roy T. Lester and Cecil B. Dickson. Dr. Lester, from Dallas, is the AMA's Washington office manager. He formerly was the chief medical officer for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organization in Texas. Dickson, who was a close friend of the late Speaker Rayburn, is a former Texas newspaperman, Associated Press reporter and once coordinator of information for the House of Representatives.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, headquartered at League City, is represented here by Clair P. Guess, Jr., who recently moved to Washington from League City.

Joe G. Fender, of Houston, general attorney for the National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, is registered as a lobbyist for that organization.

C. Herschel Schooley, a former Abilene newspaperman and journalism teacher, who has spent 20 years in Government information positions, recently resigned his position as press assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican of Texas, to become Washington office manager and a lobbyist for the Independent Bankers Association.

Several Texas oil and gas companies have registered lobbyists.

One well-known one is James H. Pipkin, a Texan, who represents Texaco, Inc.

Harold S. Skinner of Houston is registered to represent the Continental Oil Co., which is headquartered in Houston.

The Humble Oil & Refining Co., headquartered in Houston, is represented by Paul H. Long of Houston and Charles C. Keeble and John M. Sprague, both of Washington.

Leonard F. Lee and the Washington law firm of Hedrick & Lane are registered as lobbyists for the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. of Houston.

The Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. of Houston is represented by the Washington law firm of Chapman & Friedman, which is registered as a lobbyist. This is the law firm of Oscar L. Chapman, President Truman's Secretary of the Interior.

Dick Tullis of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for the Superior Oil Co. of Houston and Los Angeles, Calif.

William L. Shea of Washington is registered as a lobbyist for the Delhi-Taylor Oil Corp. of Dallas.

W. O. Reed of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for Texas railroads.

Several persons have registered as lobbyists for Dresser Industries, Inc., of Dallas, and two have registered as lobbyists for the American Life Insurance Co. of Dallas.

Sydney C. Reagan of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for the Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association of Durant, Okla.

The Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries of Dallas and the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of Lubbock are registered as lobbying organizations.

The North Texas Municipal Water District at Wylie, the Texas Aluminum Co., Inc., at Rockwall, and the Wherry Housing Association have Roland Boyd of McKinney as their registered lobbyist.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBYISTS WINCE AT TITLE

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—A common caricature of a lobbyist pictures a fat, cigar-smoking, diamond-stickpin-wearing slob carrying a suitcase of bills to be doled out to lawmakers, whom he buttonholes in legislative halls, saturates with food and booze and butters up with blondes.

The picture had some basis in fact many years ago. But it is probably not accurate anywhere in the United States any more, though some elements of it still appear in State capitals.

Lobbying now lacks the color of the old days, and the picture is far from descriptive of the current Washington lobbyist. But the "new lobbyists," as Potomac persuaders like to think of themselves if they have to embrace the term "lobbyists" at all, are still having to overcome that picture implanted in the public mind.

In State capitals, lobbyists still call themselves lobbyists. But in Washington the term is unfashionable with lobbyists—it makes some of them wince—though they can't escape it because the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act's title hung it on them.

The "new lobbyist" calls himself a "Washington representative," "legislative counsel," "consultant," "legislative liaison man" or "information specialist."

His business is big business, and he is more businesslike than his professional ancestors—in fact, so businesslike he is often dull by comparison with flamboyant lobbyists of the past.

The names he gives himself actually describe him better than "lobbyist" in many cases.

He is trying, and succeeding slowly, to convince the world he is straight where some of his predecessors were crooked, a gentleman where they were boors, sophisticated where they were ignorant, honorable where some of them were bribers and cheats.

He may be a former newspaperman; many lobbyists are. He may be a former public relations man, or "press agent"; many lobbyists are. He may be a lawyer who spends only a little time lobbying, as many do. He may have become a lobbyist, as many do, via the route of petty civil servant to law student to Capitol Hill staff man to Washington lawyer to high-paid legislative persuader.

He may be a former Congressman or Senator, as many are, and have a distinct advantage over most lobbyists because he has the privilege for life of going on the floor of the legislative body he served in and talking with present Members at any time.

The Government has become so complex in the last 30-odd years that, if he is successful, the lobbyist likely has had years of familiarity with it.

The successful lobbyist may earn anywhere from $15,000 to $50,000 a year. If he is especially sharp and has a loaded client with sufficient interest at stake, he may draw down $100,000.

If he is successful, he is probably articulate, convivial, a hustler, and has an organizing knack. He will ooze confidence in whatever he is promoting and convince you be believes sincerely that what he advocates is in the national interest, whether he does or not.

He will probably be very persuasive, but not necessarily highly influential. Most lobbyists belittle the idea that they and most others are personally very influential with Congressmen, and they are probably telling the truth. Of course, when selling a client on themselves many probably tell a different story.

Most are much more successful at channeling toward Congressmen pressure from persons more influential than themselves than they are at influencing the lawmakers themselves.

A spokesman for one of the biggest lobbies in the country says a lot of money is wasted on lobbying in Washington because lobbyists don't have the personal influence the spenders think they do. The usual lobbyist does not have any personal influence with more than a few Congressmen, he said.

The lobbyist nowadays has a much bigger theater of operations than the persuader of the past. He works on at least five fronts.

First, in the only activity that by definition of the law is actually lobbying, he works directly with Members of Congress and their staff members, trying to influence legislation.

Then he represents his clients before various agencies of the executive branch of Government, roaming the halls and offices of places like the Pentagon, seeking information or contacts, trying to shape regulations and specifications in his client's interests in visits with Cabinet members and subordinates, testifying before quasi-judicial boards or arranging for others to testify, seeking administration support of his clients' legislative objectives.

None of these activities is subject to the lobbying regulation act, although some are subject to certain agency regulations on ex parte communications or other agency disclosure requirements.

The lobbyist acts as a public relations man for his clients, seeking to help their image in the press by issuing press releases or planting information with newsmen at the National Press Club.

He keeps his clients posted on what is happening in Washington that affects their interests. He may write regular reports or report regularly by telephone. Often he will try to stir them into lobbying or prodding others into it.

Much of his time is spent maintaining social rapport with various officials of value to both him and his client. He attends many parties and entertains a lot himself. One Congressman, who said he seldom accepts lobbyists' invitations, claims he would be going to parties 15 nights a week if he accepted all. New Congressmen accept plenty, but the older Members learn to be highly selective.

Naturally, Congressmen with seniority—particularly committee chairmen—are the lobbyist's preferred targets. But they are also the busiest and most difficult to see.

A chairman of two House committees, for example, said he would be talking to lobbyists 18 hours a day if he would see all who tried to see him, so he sees very few. But a Congressman with little seniority said not even one lobbyist a day tries to visit him.

In his lobbying activity as narrowly defined by the law, the lobbyist is a legislative engineer who concentrates most of his efforts on congressional committees handling legislation in which he is interested, particularly the chairmen and ranking members. The power of committees has grown with the expansion of Congress and, just in the past 2 years, with the weakening of congressional leadership in both Houses.

Just winning the favor of a committee chairman is doing half of the lobbyist's job, a prominent persuader says.

If the lobbyist wants to pass a bill, he often will write it himself or have it written, then find a Congressman—preferably a committee chairman and one for whom he has done favors—to introduce it.

He will find witnesses for the bill before the committee, perhaps write their testimony and coach them on how to answer questions, plant friendly questions with committeemen. He may testify himself. He may help the committee staff prepare a report on the bill that will get it off to a good start on the House or Senate floor. He may write the sponsor's floor speech.

Generally, he will try to make a case for his bill with facts, while buttering up the chairman and committee members to vote it out. But if mere facts won't do the trick, there are other ways he tries to win friends and influence Congressmen.

He may arrange for some legal business to come the way of the law firm in which a Congressman has not given up his interest. He may make a campaign donation or arrange for somebody else to. He may promise blocs of votes, or opposition. He may arrange a speaking engagement for which the Congressman will get an honorarium—$1,000 would not be unusual.

He may help a busy and expense-burdened Congressman in many other ways, such as taking him on fishing trips, finding tickets for sold out Broadway shows, making it possible for a daughter to have a nice social debut or be queen of the such-and-such festival. He may pick up an assortment of night club and hotel bills and dinner checks along the way to success.

Probably he will be more discreet than to say he's doing anything for the Congressman's vote. He had better be discreet, for opposition lobbyists will be looking for a chance to expose him and pour his work down the drain.

When the bill reaches the floor, he'll count votes, stiffen the backbone of waverers and direct pressure from home against opponents.

While doing everything else, he may have been arranging for influential contributors and constituents of various Congressmen to call them and urge support for his bill. And he has probably been working for a long time on indirect lobbying; that is, lobbying the people back in the Congressmen's districts so that they'll put on pressure with letters, telegrams and telephone calls.

If the lobbyist is opposed to a bill, he will also concentrate on the committee and try to bury it there, using many of the same tactics as in supporting one.

Friendship with a committee chairman, or bringing the right influence to bear upon him, may get committee vacancies filled with friendly Congressmen, get pesky legislation dropped, get an investigating committee deflected to a less bothersome pursuit, get a bill written in obscure ineffective language, or leave a tax loophole undisturbed.

How effective lobbyists are is a subject of much debate. It is easy to show that Lobby X spent so many thousands of dollars and bill Y in which it was interested was passed; but it is nigh impossible to show that the bill would not have been passed anyway and that Congressmen have not voted the way their constituents collectively probably would have voted.

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, says some lobbies "are wholly ineffective but take credit for what happens without, in fact, having in any way influenced events."

There are indications that the most effective lobbying consists of merely presenting true facts to Congressmen and then directing the propaganda at the people, to turn them into lobbyists.

Though lobbies are often accused of bringing ruthless pressure on Congress, lobbyists themselves and most Congressmen say the persuaders actually perform a very useful service by providing Congress expert information on legislation. To the claim that they often provide slanted information, they reply that a counter lobby on the other side of most questions will slant the information from the other side and Congress can get the truth somewhere in the middle.

Senator McCarthy has another argument: That expert lobbyists can help maintain a balance between Congress and the executive branch. The executive branch usually has a prepared case on legislation, sustained by expert witnesses, he said. Congress can offer in opposition the knowledge and experience of its Members, committee staffs or assistants, he said, but "often this is an unfair contest." The lobbyists can make it fairer, he said.

[From The Houston Post, Mar. 8, 1963]

The Patient Persuaders—Lobbyists Enlisting Public

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Senator Stephen M. Young, Democrat, of Ohio, tells the story that more than a century ago Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, quickly gave in to pressure from several lobbyists to help nail down a profitable ship subsidy.

The story goes that Benton threw in one condition: That "when the vessels are finished they will be used to take all such damned rascals as you out of the country."

Young commented:

"Today Senator Benton's inspired remedy might be impossible. Thanks to the activities of the 'new lobby' such a solution would mean a big population loss."

He's right.

The reason is that today's lobbyist is not just going his solitary way trying to put the bite on Congressmen. He's trying to make lobbyists for his cause out of everybody else.

Indirectly, by interesting as much as possible of the general public in his cause, he is putting far more pressure on the lawmakers than he could possibly exert himself.

There is a growing trend toward this kind of lobbying, which already is pretty full-blown.

The spare-no-expense, no-holds-barred publicity and public relations campaigns are exciting the voters and turning the heat on lawmakers with pleasant or angry letters, telegrams and votes that are far more persuasive or frightening than mere lobbyists face to face.

Such campaigns sometimes express the will of the majority. But often they distort, exaggerate and oversimplify, and sometimes it is not clear who is behind them.

Said Senator John L. McClellan's special committee investigating lobbying in 1956–57:

"The ability of pressure groups to stir up such deluges (of inspired letters and telegrams) is well known to all Members of Congress. In the absence of adequate disclosure laws concerning pressure groups, Members of the Congress can only conjecture as to whether or not direct communications they receive are spontaneous expressions of constituents' views, or strands in a net held by the unseen hand of a pressure group attempting to scoop up a vote here, a vote there."

Senator Young said the abuses in political pressure today are precisely in this area.

The way the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act has been interpreted—as applying only to direct communications with legislators by persons principally engaged in trying to influence legislation—Congress is barred from policing these indirect efforts of the new lobby.

Thus the expenditures reported under the lobbying act are a feeble gage of how much is really spent on lobbying these days. Only a fraction of the cost of these massive advertising and public relations campaigns, or none of it, shows up on spending reports.

This probably is much of the explanation of why the total of lobby spending reported has dropped and leveled off in the neighborhood of $4 million a year in spite of inflation, the expansion of lobbying that is obvious but difficult to prove, and the annual totals that were much higher in the early days of lobby registration.

Illustrative of the magnitude of such indirect lobbying campaigns is the program sponsored by the American Medical Association against President Truman's compulsory health insurance legislation for about 3 years, starting in 1949.

The AMA hired a California public relations firm, Whitaker & Baxter, for a grassroots campaign which, according to testimony before Senator McClellan's committee, cost the doctors' association $4,678,157. Whitaker & Baxter registered and reported under the lobbying act, the committee said, although it allegedly made no contacts with Congress and confined its activities to public relations work at the grassroots level.

The McClellan committee developed information about an expensive campaign conducted in the mid-1950's by an organization called the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee (NGO), which supported the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill.

NGO was organized by a cross-section of the oil and gas industry in October 1954, with the avowed purpose of carrying out a long-range educational program about the gas industry, including the harmful effects of Federal regulation and the benefits of an unregulated industry.

NGO raised $1,950,000 in contributions from more than 1,000 donors and between October 1954, and March 31, 1956, spent $1,753,513 in an advertising and publicity effort.

It did not consider this lobbying, since it made no direct contact with Congress to influence legislation, so it did not register under the lobbying act.

The donors, it developed, were counting on considering their contributions as operating expenses for tax purposes, until the McClellan committee brought this to the attention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Bureau ruled they did not qualify as allowable tax deductions.

Afterward, the McClellan committee proposed that the Lobbying Act be amended to require reporting of expenditures on advertising and public relations campaigns containing implicit appeals to the public to contact Congress to influence legislation.

Pressure mail and telegrams from such campaigns often flood Congressmen's offices. Often the communications are obviously parts of inspired campaigns. Sometimes those who own the signed names don't even know the communications are sent.

In May 1961, Senator Young received thousands of letters from Ohio, each asking that he oppose Senate bills 1089 and 1197 concerning the railroad industry. He concluded this was an inspired mail campaign, and a mighty sloppy one at that. Each was addressed Stephen A. Young, whereas his middle initial is M. And the lobbyist made a telling mistake in having writers use bill numbers. Most Senators don't know bills by numbers themselves, let alone the people out in the sticks.

The McClellan committee conducted hearings on two spurious telegram campaigns. It showed that 1 Minnesota Senator in 1956 got about 900 telegrams in 2 days urging passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill and that many of the wires were sent without the knowledge or authorization of purported senders. An oil company had staged and financed the campaign.

Also in 1956, the two Senators from Massachusetts each received 80 telegrams opposing a social security bill which, though varying somewhat in content, often spelled amendment with a double m. Two insurance agents had charged the costs to their firm, the investigation showed, and some of the purported senders said they had not authorized the wires.

A campaign, fostered by the U.S. Savings and Loan League and others, last year demonstrated how a well-timed grassroots lobbying effort can bowl over Congress and the President without much of its expense being subject to reporting under the Lobbying Act.

It dropped a hailstorm of mail on Senators, urging that they oppose President Kennedy's proposal for withholding income taxes from dividend and interest payments, just as taxes have been withheld on wages for years.

Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, said he got about 75,000 letters against the plan, while Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said he got about 60,000.

The campaign resulted from sample letters sent out by the Savings and Loan League to its several thousand member institutions to help them prepare letters to their millions of savers.

The resulting flood of letters to Congressmen contained thousands indicating the writers thought Mr. Kennedy was proposing a brandnew tax on dividends and interest, instead of just a new way of collecting taxes already owed but often not paid.

So many misunderstood that Mr. Kennedy and the Treasury Department complained that the lobbyists had badly misrepresented his proposal. But it did not do any good to complain. The Senate killed his plan 66 to 20, although it had been passed by the House before the letterwriters went into action.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 9, 1963]

The Patient Persuaders—Foreign Lobby To Come Under Senate Committee

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Like domestic lobbying directed at the American public, lobbying by representatives of foreign interests has not received much attention from Congress in past years.

But some startling testimony about it may be developed this month by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which began both public and closed hearings on the subject last Monday after months of investigation.

Already, in the first 3 days of hearings, Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, has charged that the Department of Justice has failed to enforce well the existing law for disclosing foreign lobbyists' activities. Already Fulbright has accused the Department of State of being "rather casual" about the law's enforcement and failing to complain about lack of compliance with it.

Already, a State Department official testifying has suggested new legislation to require the licensing of foreign agents, subjecting them to review of their qualifications, and to outlaw foreign contributions to American political campaigns.

And already a Justice Department spokesman has testified that the criminal penalty in the present law is a heavy but unwieldy weapon and recommended that Congress give his Department a new tool. He suggested authority to seek injunctions against foreign agents operating until they satisfy disclosure requirements.

Last year, when Congress dealt again with a bill establishing foreign sugar quotas, lobbyists for both domestic and foreign sugar interests were, in Senator FULBRIGHT's words, "thick as flies" around sugar on Capitol Hill.

FULBRIGHT started his committee's extensive investigation because of this.

Both FULBRIGHT and President Kennedy criticized the fact that fees of some of the foreign lobbyists depended on the size of the sugar quotas they could get from Congress for their clients.

If foreign governments found such success in lobbying for sugar quotas, FULBRIGHT said, they might try to increase their military and economic aid from the United States that way—or maybe already had.

The committee is trying to assess the extent to which foreign agents try to influence U.S. policies, through Congress, the executive branch, and the American public.

Unlike domestic lobbying, foreign lobbying of the public is subject to reporting.

Lobbying on the sugar bill, which sparked the current investigation, was one of the most intensive efforts in a long time, and many Congressmen thought it got out of hand.

Senator FULBRIGHT said only four lobbyists had spoken at public hearings when Congress revised the sugar quota bill in 1956, but last year no less than 22 were heard. He was disturbed not only by the proliferation of them, but also by the types of contracts they had and the size of their fees.

Shortly before he announced the investigation, the Senate Finance Committee released a document showing fees paid lobbyists who sought changes in the sugar bill. The information came from statements filed at the committee's request by 15 lobbyists for domestic interests and 25 for foreign interests.

Examples of what the document showed were:

That Oscar L. Chapman, who was Secretary of the Interior in the Truman administration, represented Mexican sugar interests and would receive a $200,000 retainer over 4 years beginning January 1, 1961, plus 25 cents a ton for any increase in Mexico's basic quota.

That I. Irving Davidson, representing Ecuadoran sugar producers, was to receive basic compensation of $500 but was to receive $1 a ton for all sugar shipped from Ecuador to the United States for 1 year after July 1, 1962, and 50 cents a ton for the following 3 years.

That James W. Riddell, representing the India Sugar Mills Association, was to receive a basic fee of $50,000 plus up to $5,000 in expenses; but if India received a quota for 3 years or more, he was to receive $99,000 plus up to $15,000 for expenses.

Riddell is a member of the law firm of Donald Dawson, one-time White House aid to President Truman.

Foreign sugar lobbyists included former assistants to Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, a former Congressman, a former congressional adviser and member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, a former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a former General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a former Assistant Secretary of Labor, in addition to former Interior Secretary Chapman.

Democratic industry lobbyists included a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Nearly all, if not all, of the domestic and foreign sugar lobbyists had registered under the Federal Lobbying Act. The lobbyists for foreign interests were registered also with the Department of Justice, as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Administration of this act is the main concern of the Fulbright committee.

Although the term "foreign lobbyist" sometimes is applied to all who register under this act, this is very loose usage. By definition of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, such agents are not really lobbyists unless they work directly on Congress trying to influence legislation. That is when they should register with the House and the Senate.

Under the Foreign Agents Act, every agent doing business of a political nature in the United States for a foreign principal must register with the Justice Department, describe the nature of his work, list his offices and employees, list the principal's activities and report every 6 months all funds received and spent in the United States.

Distributed propaganda, printed matter sent through the mail and speeches on radio and television must be labeled foreign propaganda and copies furnished to the Library of Congress.

The Justice Department requires foreign agents to fill out registration and reporting forms much more extensive than those used for the lobby regulation act.

FULBRIGHT's committee staff, in a published preliminary study, said the four forms would satisfactorily fulfill the disclosure requirements if completed fully and accurately.

But the study said that so far the requirement of full and accurate completion of the forms has been enforced only sporadically by the Justice Department.

It said 29 indictments had been brought by the Justice Department for violations of the act between 1939 and mid-1962. But it said the Department had not brought a single action since 1945 for failure to list all activities, expenses, or principals, although a study of the registration statements disclosed a number of apparent omissions and evasions.

The study also said the Government had never brought a single case under the 1942 political propaganda labeling provisions of the act.

As of last June 30, 411 foreign agents were registered in active status. A breakdown of the 376 active agents at the end of 1960 showed 202 American citizens and domestic business firms and 174 aliens and foreign concerns.

Many large U.S. law, advertising and public relations firms and many prominent American individuals are or have been registered foreign agents.

They include Thomas E. Dewey, the former Governor of New York and 1948 Republican presidential candidate; former Congressman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York; former Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and George W. Ball, now Under Secretary of State.

Foreign agents promote travel in countries they represent, seek U.S. loans, promote industrial development, buy embassies, draw up peace treaties, buy armaments and machinery, conduct propaganda campaigns, lobby bills through Congress and other things.

Their activities concerning legislation have been little explored heretofore.

[From the Houston Post, March 11, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—TAX DEDUCTION ACT WILL REDUCE LOBBYING EXPENSES

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—As if there were not already enough unidentified lobbying, Congress passed a law last year that will make lobbying cheaper and no doubt encourage a lot more.

It made expenses for direct lobbying of Congress by businesses tax deductible.

The deduction feature passed through the House of Representatives a sleeper—"a sleeping giant," Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, called it critically—without debate after the House Ways and Means Committee quietly slipped it into what had started out to be President Kennedy's tax reform bill. The committee held no public hearings on it.

President Kennedy had not proposed this windfall.

Not until the bill was being considered in the Senate did opposition come alive. A small group of Senators, mostly so-called liberals, then fought it stubbornly but lost the fight to kill it by a vote of 51 to 13.

The deduction provision has been labeled by some critics the Lobbyists Aid Act. It has also been called the Legislators Aid Act, since one highly disputable argument made for it was that it might bring legislators information lobbyists might not otherwise present.

Another critic suggested it be called the bill to authorize the purchase of State legislatures. The reasoning: Its biggest effect will be to increase lobbying in the State capitols tremendously.

Congress made the deduction apply to expenses for lobbying State and local legislative bodies as well as itself.

Here's what the provision, section 3 of Public Law 87-834, provides:

1. A business firm may deduct for income tax purposes all "ordinary and necessary" expenses for appearing before individual legislators, committees or legislative bodies of all levels of government concerning legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to it or an organization of which it is a member. The deduction includes travel, preparation and submission of statements and the sending of communications. It does not apply to entertainment.

2. The business firm and an organization it belongs to may also deduct expenses of communicating with each other about legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to them.

3. Dues paid by the business firm to such an organization are also deductible to the extent to which the organization uses them for lobbying.

The law specifies that no deductions will be allowed for spending in behalf of candidates in political campaigns or for advertising or other grass-roots methods to influence the general public on legislative matters, elections or referendums.

The latter specification was all the comfort Senate opponents of the deduction feature could find in the law. An effort to let business firms and their trade associations deduct lobbying expenditures for all purposes, including grass-roots campaigns, was made but failed.

The deduction provisions became effective for taxable years beginning after last Dec. 31.

Except for the few critical Senators, about the only voices raised in Washington against the deduction provision were those of the Treasury Department, the AFL-CIO and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon told the Senate Finance Committee the provision would be a "substantial change" in the law, which since 1919 had forbidden deductions for lobbying expenses. Dillon said the Treasury was opposed to all of several forms of the lobby deduction that were discussed. But the administration made no real fight against the change.

AFL-CIO spokesmen, who urged the Senate to kill the provision, said it would permit corporations to double their expenditures on lobbying and thereby increase substantially their lobbying activity.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, however, took another tack with its criticism: The deduction section was not broad enough; it should grant tax relief for all forms of lobbying.

The House Ways and Means Committee's report on the tax bill made two arguments for the lobbying deduction:

1. Action was needed to put expenses for presentations to legislative bodies on the same tax-deductibility basis as expenses for presentations of a business firm's case in courts and before executive or administrative bodies.

2. It * * * is desirable that taxpayers who have information bearing on the impact of present laws, or proposed legislation, on their trades or businesses not be discouraged in making this information available to the Members of Congress or legislators at other levels of government.

Opponents, including Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, called the deduction provision unconscionable, discriminatory, shocking and outrageous. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, called the day the Senate passed it "one of the saddest days in the history of the Senate."

Critics said the change would cut the effective cost of lobbying for business about in half and, by shifting the burden of lost revenue to the general taxpayers, make them pay for the privilege of being lobbied, often against their own interests.

Until this change came along, the critics pointed out, the Federal tax laws had been neutral concerning expenses incurred by different groups lobbying.

The change discriminates against the ordinary citizens, who cannot deduct expenses for visiting his Congressman if he is not a businessman, they said.

PROXMIRE said the deduction gives "a thoroughly unjustified tax advantage to special business interests over the public interest." A corporation can deduct some of its dues to a lobbying trade association, but a member of the League of Women Voters or some other nonprofit organization could not deduct any of the dues to her organization for lobbying on the same legislation, he pointed out.

KEFAUVER said he could not believe "that there is such a shortage of lobbying activity that we need to encourage it by tax advantages." He added:

"It is already unfortunate that there is no lobby for consumers and the public at large to represent their interests in legislation, but it will only compound the one-sided picture we often get if we allow tax incentives to encourage more and better lobbying."

Opponents have dreamed up all sorts of inequities they say can result, such as:

A racetrack could deduct expenses of lobbying before a State legislature for on-track betting, but a minister could not deduct his expense for opposing the same legislation on moral grounds.

A manufacturer dumping waste into a stream could deduct expenses for lobbying against a State pollution law, but homeowners interested in purifying that stream by law would have to pay their legislative expenses with no deduction.

Some Senators have made predictions that the deduction will expand lobbying at all levels of Government and flood their offices with a lot more mail, telegrams, phone calls and visits.

How much it will cut Uncle Sam's revenue has not been estimated by anybody. Nobody can say how much the deductions may total.

The Internal Revenue Service expects to publish proposed regulations to carry out the new law in the spring and issue the regulations in final form this summer.

If the IRS ever adds up the lobbying deductions taken by businesses in 1963, the country should have a figure on total lobby spending in the United States that is much nearer the actual amount than has ever previously been available.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBY LAW FAILINGS KNOWN

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act's weaknesses and shortcomings have been fairly well identified since it was included almost as an afterthought in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

As long ago as 1957, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN's special committee to investigate lobbying political activities and campaign contributions offered the Senate a substitute law that would seem to be a considerable improvement.

But the proposals stemming from this committee's expensive investigation got no action.

Students of the present lobby law, who agree that lobbying should not be restricted but only properly identified, have pointed out these major shortcomings:

1. There is too much confusion about who should register and make contribution and spending reports, and too much is left to the discretion and conscience of the lobbyist about what he should report and need not report.

This has resulted mainly from the interpretation that the act applies only to those whose principal purpose is to influence laws—a standard hard to pin down. Some now register and report who probably do not need to, while others who probably should do not. Some report contributions and spending they probably do not need to, while others do not report such items when they probably should.

2. Nobody is administering and enforcing the law, because the law designated nobody to do it. And nobody is continually studying and suggesting improvements in the law, as is the case in most situations where an agency is charged with administering a law.

The House Clerk and the Senate Secretary, with whom reports are filed, merely act as depositories and compile the reports for listing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They do not advise persons to file or not to file, do not check on those who file once or more and then cease filing, do not check the information filed even for obvious omissions or contradictions, and do not recommend investigations of suspected violators.

For a while in 1947 and 1948, the Justice Department made an attempt at enforcing the law, getting copies of lobby reports and checking into some. But the act did not give it this responsibility, and finally the Department dropped it.

3. The law does not cover lobbying of the people in grassroots campaigns designed to bring pressure on Congress from the voters, by far the biggest effort in lobbying these days and growing all the time.

4. It does not cover lobbying in the executive branch, where lobbyists actually spend most of their time. They lobby there for two things: (1) For administration support of their legislative aims, and (2) for favorable actions on purely administrative matters. But the lobbying law does not cover either.

5. The law does not require groups or corporations which do not solicit or collect money for lobbying to register or report spending—a gaping hole through which a big business, such as a defense contractor, can pour wads of influence money of its own to make things go its way, all without bothersome disclosure.

6. Reporting requirements of the present law are so complicated they are a clerical nuisance, though they could easily be simplified.

There have been other suggestions for changes—that contingent fees for lobbying should be outlawed, a suggestion with which, however, there is strong disagreement; that Government lobbyists, such as White House and other agency legislative liaison people, should be required to register; that notices of termination of representation should be required of lobbyists or their employers; that there should be more publication of contribution and spending reports, including lists of contributors and recipients; and that a penalty should be established for sending spurious communications to lawmakers.

In 1957, after months of investigation, the eight members of McClellan's Senate committee—including then Senator John F. Kennedy—introduced a bill designed to cure many of these shortcomings. It would have done a complete overhauling.

Called the Legislative Activities Disclosure Act, it even had a name that was more to the point than the old law, which was not designed to "regulate" as its name implied and which did not even use in its body the word "lobbyist" that lobbyists so dislike.

It would have called one hired to influence legislation by direct communication a "legislative agent" and required him to register and report receipts and expenditures for lobbying.

It would also have required reports from the legislative agent's employers if they spent more than $300 a year for lobbying; from persons with legislative and nonlegislative duties if they received $300 or more a year for legislative activities, exclusive of personal traveling expenses; from persons who conduct campaigns specifically urging others to communicate with Congress in order to influence legislation; and from persons who conduct large (more than $50,000 a year) campaigns which implicitly urge others to communicate with Congress to influence legislation.

Thus the proposed law would have extended to most direct lobbying campaigns and removed some of the uncertainty about who was covered by the reporting and registration requirements by using a dollar standard instead of a hazy "purpose" standard.

The committee's bill proposed to make the Comptroller General of the United States, an agent of Congress, responsible for administering the law. He had said he thought his agency could do a good job of it.

He would have been directed to prescribe new forms and reporting procedures, compile and summarize information from the reports and report it to Congress, make investigations to determine whether all who should register and report did so and whether reports were accurate and complete, report violations to the appropriate law enforcement agencies and tell Congress what they did about them, make studies and recommendations to Congress that would further objectives of the law, and report annually to Congress on his administration—almost all duties or powers nobody has now.

The bill would have required notices of termination of representation.

It would have given radio and television the same exemptions newspapers have under the lobbying law.

It would have established a maximum fine of $10,000 (twice the present one) and the present 1-year maximum imprisonment for failure of a legislative agent to register and report. Falsification of reports would have been made punishable by a maximum of $10,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment.

The bill would have given the attorney general power, at the request of the administrator, to seek mandatory civil injunctions to force compliance by persons or organizations other than legislative agents, such as those conducting grassroots campaigns.

Only three spending reports a year, instead of the present four, would have been required, and report-filing problems would have been simplified. Lastly, the bill would have made transmitting, uttering or publishing forged, false, countrefeit or fictitious communications to Congress punishable by up to $10,000 fine and 5 years in prison.

When MCCLELLAN introduced this bill in behalf of himself and his colleagues on May 31, 1957, the Senate referred it to its Government Operations Committee, of which McClellan was and still is chairman. And there it died.

What happened?

The Senator from Arkansas said no hearing was ever scheduled or any action taken on the bill. The bill would have required a hearing, but the committee had more time in session that year and all of the next year's session in which it could have held one.

"There was no real demand for the legislation then," McClellan said, "and there was a lot of opposition."

He said he thought then and still thinks that the bill would have been a considerable improvement over the present law. But he has no plan to introduce the bill again.

The only legislation introduced so far this session that would do anything about overall revision of the present lobbying act is S. 177 by Senator Clifford Case, Republican of New Jersey. This bill, which Case introduced in behalf of himself and Senators Joseph S. Clark, Jr., Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York, would establish a commission on congressional organization and direct it, among other things, to study the operation and effectiveness of existing lobbying laws. It would also direct the commission to study conflicts of interest of members of Congress.

Congress is never eager to crack down on lobbyists, and doesn't seem in the mood now. It could stir up so much trouble.

A lobbyist says it is almost impossible to get a major bill through Congress without a big lobbying campaign. He is probably right, and if he is, the prospects of better lobby disclosure legislation's being passed are pretty dim.

There's no lobbying for it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

THE GOSPEL OF FEAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 30 years ago this month, Franklin Roosevelt stood before a vast crowd, within a stone's throw of where we sit, and proclaimed, in the midst of a depression, that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Thirty years later to the month, President Kennedy, before a vast crowd in Chicago, spoke of concern, of recession dangers, of growing troubles, of the jobless problem, of the turbulent sixties, of warnings, of chronic troubles. In pursuit of this fearful theme, he cited the retreat from the farm because of production efficiency, the maturing crop of war babies entering the labor market, the school dropouts, automation, the number of women in the labor force, longevity, and the availability of our senior citizens for useful work.

But in all candor, it must be pointed out that every one of these factors was operating years ago when the Republicans were in power, and at a time when Mr. Kennedy was charging them with timidity, retreat, lack of faith, lack of vision, lack of leadership. One might surmise from the general temper of the President's observations that these factors have taken on new force, new size, to plague him.

I believe a reminder is in order. It is now 2 years and 5 months since the election of 1960. The charges against Republicans made in that campaign are on the record for all to see, but so are the pledges and promises of what the New Frontier said it would do. Many things have been tried, but the number of jobless increases and Mr. Kennedy predicts that unemployment will increase some more.

But despite this concern, despite their fear complex, there is still no hint that the administration will draw back from the new ventures it proposes, such as the Domestic Peace Corps, the Youth Conservation Corps, Federal aid to education, and numerous other New Frontier proposals that will not create a single new job.

Despite all this, there is no hint of an effort to reduce the gigantic budget deficit, the swollen budget.

It is certainly not amiss to point out that:

First, the travel and entertainment regulations of the Internal Revenue Service have disemployed thousands and thousands. I have seen an estimate as high as 200,000.

Second, that the arbitrary treatment of the steel industry has built no confidence in the future.

Third, that the drive for more and more intense regulation by the regulatory agencies have not won friends and influenced future job-creating investments.

Fourth, that a planned deficit of $12 billion produces little faith and little confidence.

The lament of this tearful and fearful New Frontier over the future might better be supplanted by some words from the administration and some action which is calculated to inspire faith, not fear; confidence, not concern; hope, and not despair.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week there appeared on the front pages of the newspapers considerable publicity concerning the so-called Secret Service people who give protection to the Vice President of the United States. In one account I read, it seemed to appear that this was something which was contrived by Vice President Johnson.

In all fairness, I think I must say that the bill to provide this protection was introduced by me, and was ordered reported and put on the calendar on the 16th of May 1960.

It came from the Eisenhower administration, and it had the endorsement of the Treasury Department, as indicated in a letter which they wrote on January 27, 1960. The letter was signed by Acting Secretary of the Treasury A. Gilmore Flues. It was not done at the request of the Vice President, either the incumbent or the previous Vice President. It was an administration request. It called for an amendment of title 18 of the United States Code so that the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President of the United States or the Vice-President-elect should have this kind of protection. It provided for a criminal penalty for anyone who violated that act. It did not indicate how many people were to be assigned; nor is there an indication as to how much money Congress should appropriate for that purpose.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that this protective legislation for the Vice-President-elect and others was sponsored by the prior administration. It was introduced by me, was reported to the Senate on May 16, passed in the Senate on May 26, and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee on May 27, 1960.

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege. It was my distinct honor and opportunity to serve as one of the Senate delegates to the Costa Rica conference which was held last week under the very statesmanlike leadership of the President of the United States.

Last Tuesday morning the seven Presidents met in executive session at San José, Costa Rica. It was well understood that at the conclusion of that executive session the Presidents would reach an agreement on the principles to be encompassed in the final communique, but that some further time would be needed to reduce the understandings to a final draft, both in Spanish and in English. Those who have attended such international conferences, where there exists the language barrier, know that it is necessary to be particularly careful in seeing to it that the drafts in the two languages mean identically the same thing. It was understandable, therefore, that when we came out of the executive conference, the press would attempt to seek to find out what had transpired in executive session.

Each member of the U.S. delegation, including the senior Senator from Oregon, was set upon—which I believe is an appropriate descriptive phrase under these circumstances—by members of the press. They were determined to find out whatever they could as to our understandings, if any, of what transpired in the morning session.

We on the delegation took the position that it was a conference of the President and the Secretary of State, and that it would be presumptuous of us, as Members of Congress, to be holding press interviews or commenting on anything that had transpired in any conference attended by the President of the United States as the spokesman for our country.

As we walked from the National Theater, where the sessions were held, to the hotel across the street at least six or seven times various members of the press, sometimes singly, but very often by twos and threes and fours, and other numbers, sought to elicit some judgment or information about the morning session. I said the same thing to each group. As I was leaving the lobby of the hotel to go up to my room there was present Pierre Salinger, who is in charge of press relations at the White House, and who heard me when I said that I would not even comment on the weather. I said I would make no statement. I said that in my judgment the two people who should speak for the American delegation were the President and the Secretary of State, who, I said, were doing a grand job. I said if I had anything to say about the conference I would say it when I got back to Washington, and that I had no intention of having any press interviews in San José.

In one of those instances the correspondent for the Newhouse papers—and the Portland Oregonian is the largest newspaper in my State—was quite understandably insistent upon getting some statement that he could send back to his home newspaper. I told him that my position went for him as well as the other correspondents, and that I was not even commenting on the weather in San José.

This correspondent of the Portland Oregonian sent a statement to that effect to his paper, indicating that I had declined to give the press any statement about what had transpired in that meeting. It appeared in the Oregonian of March 21.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Morse Mum on Meeting

President Kennedy seems to have done what no one else has been able to do—muzzle the voluble Senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse.

Morse talked freely at previous Latin American conferences attended only by Secretary of State Dean Rusk or lesser officials, even to the point of differing openly with the U.S. position.

Tuesday, Morse emerged from an economic session to be met by reporters.

"I'm not talking until I get back to Washington," Morse said. "This is a State Department matter."

Mr. MORSE. Well, Mr. President, it was surprising—and, in my judgment, shocking—to note the journalistic irresponsibility shown by the story written by Mr. Paul P. Kennedy of the New York Times, which resulted from my refusal to give any information in regard to what had transpired at the executive session of the seven Presidents.

I fully appreciate the job that the journalists have to do. I can understand how they would have welcomed someone in the delegation speaking out—in this instance such a person would have been speaking out of turn—and giving them some kind of story as to what had transpired in the executive session. I can understand their desire to get that kind of information. However, I cannot understand such a story as Mr. Kennedy wrote.

Mr. President, freedom of the press carries with it the responsibility of being responsible. I am shocked by the increasing frequency of irresponsible journalism in this country. In fact, we had some of this kind of experience at Punta del Este. Sometimes we get the impression that journalists are laboring under an illusion that they are a supergovernmental body in this democracy. That is not characteristic of a majority of journalists, but of too many.

As the record shows, I have never hesitated in my many years in the Senate in telling off journalists who I thought needed to be told off because of their irresponsibility.

I find none of them to be supermen; in fact, it is my considered judgment that they are very average men who, very often, write out of the depths of great ignorance, because too frequently they do not do their bookwork and are not well informed.

Any injustice that was done to the senior Senator from Oregon as a result of Mr. Paul Kennedy's article is inconsequential, for I am never concerned about injustices which are done to me by the press. Those injustices, for the most part, particularly strengthen me. The people in my State have long ago come to learn that they will never read the truth about their senior Senator from American newspapers—although I would be less than honest if I did not say that I should prefer to have the newspapers supporting my campaigns, for that would make campaigning a little easier. Nevertheless, I have learned that it is not necessary to have their support. I have been treated for many years to the overwhelming opposition of the press of my State. In the last campaign there were 3 dailies, out of all the dailies in the State, which endorsed me; and 3 weeklies out of some 60 weeklies. I have often said that the opposition of the press made me thousands and thousands of votes.

So the misrepresenting article by Mr. Paul Kennedy, published in the Western edition of the New York Times for Wednesday, March 20, 1963, will not harm the senior Senator from Oregon in Oregon. What I do resent is the injustice which it does to the Nation and the President of the United States. The article is a gross misrepresentation of the fact. It was a gross misrepresentation of fact to plant the seed of falsehood in the New York Times, Western edition, for Wednesday, March 20, 1963, seeking to give the American people the impression that the congressional delegation at San Jose was not solidly behind the President.

In my judgment, no President could possibly have had such unity of support as President Kennedy had at San Jose from the congressional delegation; he deserved it, for he displayed magnificent statesmanship at San José. As I have said since returning home, in my judgment the President never missed a cue, so to speak. He rose to every occasion in magnificent form. In fact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion to my remarks the final communique which was signed by the seven Presidents. I think it should appear in the Congressional Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the inspiring speech delivered by the President of the United States at the dedication of a great housing project in San José. I only wish that Senators could have heard and seen the reaction of that crowd to the high ideals which the President of the United States set forth in his address, his challenge to the people of Central America to carry out the opportunities for cooperative action that the Alliance for Progress offers them and offers us. It was one of the President's great speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the speech which was delivered by the President of the United States at the University of San José. It, too, was a strong challenge to the peoples of all Latin America, not merely Central America. It discussed the economic problems of Latin America, and it also discussed the Cuban problem. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the speech by the President at the University of San Jose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two other statements by President Kennedy be printed at the conclusion of these remarks. One is the text of his remarks upon arrival at the San Jose airport; the second is the text of his remarks upon the convening of the President's Conference on March 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 4 and 5.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the article written by Mr. Paul P. Kennedy, which was published in the New York Times, western edition, on Wednesday, March 20, 1963. Incidentally, I do not know Mr. Paul Kennedy; I would not know him if he walked through the doorway. I feel that is no loss. However, this is a correspondent with whom, so far as I know, I have had no previous associations; and if this is the last one, the senior Senator from Oregon will be very happy. On the basis of this kind of subversive journalism, I do not wish to have interviews with newspaper reporters of that stripe; and this is subversive journalism because an article which misrepresents the position of the U.S. Government in a foreign land to the detriment of our country is a form of subversion. The headline reads: "Six Latin Nations and United States Sidestep Cuba Showdown."

Interesting, but untrue. If ever a subject was thoroughly discussed, it was the subject of Cuba. In fact, it was important that our Central American friends understand what our record has been with respect to Cuba. Speaking for myself on the floor of the Senate today, I can say that they were very agreeably surprised. They were not aware of the policies which the United States has followed since Punta del Este, based upon the Punta del Este Pact which all the nations signed. The headline continues: "Costa Rica Declaration Is Limited to General Pledges To Combat Communism."

The subheading reads: "Morse Dissatisfied—Kennedy Pledges Fund for Economic Study—Panama Moves Toward

Markets." And the byline is credited to Paul Kennedy, special to the New York Times.

Then the article begins. I shall read the first paragraph and then go to the gross misrepresentation in the article:

> San José, Costa Rica, March 19.—President Kennedy and the six Presidents of the Central American States signed today a declaration covering the economic and political aspects of their 2 days of discussions here.

Down in the body of the article, the correspondent writes:

> There were numerous indications this afternoon that some of the legislators in the U.S. delegation here were not happy over the Declaration of San José, as the final document is formally entitled. Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America, was obviously nettled as he walked from the meeting of foreign ministers and the delegations this afternoon.
>
> He declined to comment on the proceedings, saying: "I won't even comment on the weather here but when I get home I will make my views known."

Mr. President, I have already told the Senate what the senior Senator from Oregon said, as the press tried to get out of us information which would have been very improper for us to give; namely, information based upon our personal knowledge of what had happened at the executive session participated in by the seven Presidents. Mr. Kennedy simply drew a completely false and unfounded conclusion from what I said.

I told those reporters that any statement concerning the Conference should come from the President or the Secretary of State and that I would not even comment on the weather. I said:

> If I have anything to say in regard to the Costa Rica Conference, I will comment on it on the floor of the Senate when I return to Washington.

Mr. President, that is what I am doing this afternoon.

Apparently, Mr. Paul Kennedy had to have a conflict. Apparently he felt impelled to write an article which would have controversy in it, without regard for the great injustice which this kind of misrepresentation does to the President of the United States. The article spreads across the continent and the hemisphere a false statement to the effect that the U.S. delegation was dissatisfied with the communique. Actually, to the contrary, we were highly pleased with the communique, as I feel certain every Member of the Senate will be when it appears in the Congressional Record tomorrow, after having been placed in the Record today.

The next day, the editorial board of the New York Times, taking the misrepresenting article by Paul Kennedy, wrote an editorial, which was published in the western edition of the New York Times of Friday, March 22, 1963. The editorial, which is entitled "After San José," reads, in part, as follows:

> Some of the delegates (Senator Morse, of Oregon, is apparently one of them) seem to be dissatisfied with the results achieved at the Central American Conference at San José. Not enough Cuba. Not enough fire and brimstone about Castro. No threat of invasion or even an embargo on oil. Merely a call to the interior ministers of the six Central American republics to meet next month "to effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda and funds from that country."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire New York Times western edition editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

After San José

> Some of the Delegates (Senator Morse, of Oregon, is apparently one of them) seem to be dissatisfied with the results achieved at the Central American Conference at San José. Not enough Cuba. Not enough fire and brimstone about Castro. No threat of invasion or even an embargo on oil. Merely a call to the interior ministers of the six Central American Republics to meet next month "to effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda and funds from that country."
>
> Cuba, in fact, is scarcely mentioned in the new San José manifesto that bears the name of the Declaration of Central America. Practically this entire document is concerned with humdrum economic matters, such as fiscal policy and tariff rates. The six Republics agree to accelerate the establishment of a customs union for the benefit of the new Central American common market. They agree to cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary commodities. They welcome the promise of the President of the United States to consider a long-term loan to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration. They agree—and this is perhaps the most important item in the catalog of their agreement—that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income.
>
> Scarcely a mention of Cuba and Castro. Yet this declaration contains, as does the Alliance for Progress, the real nub and core of an effective anti-Castro program. The best defense against Castro—and the best offense, too—is to lift the Latin American Republics to a level of prosperity and economic democracy at which they will be impervious to Cuban propaganda and in fact a continuing incentive to the Cubans themselves to seek their own advancement by ridding themselves of Castro.
>
> In a noteworthy speech to the Senate a few days ago, entitled "Our Castro Fixation Versus the Alliance for Progress," freshman Senator George McGovern of South Dakota said:
>
> "There can be no mistaking the fact that much of Castro's appeal to the oppressed rests on the knowledge that his presence has forced every government in the hemisphere to take a new and more searching look at the crying needs of the great masses of human beings.
>
> "The real issue turns upon the question of whether or not the people can overturn an unjust social order through a peaceful democratic revolution, or whether they will do it by a violent Communist-led upheaval.
>
> "The Alliance for Progress is a mutual effort to raise standards of living through the painstaking, often frustrating, method of democratic reform and economic development * * *.
>
> "It is easier to make loud speeches against an irritable bearded dictator than to face the tough and sometimes painful tasks of making Alliance for Progress work. I suggest that we have had * * * not enough courageous and thoughtful men giving their attention to the real problems confronting the Alliance."
>
> To the degree that it focused interest on these problems and pushed things ahead in this direction, the conference at San Jose can be considered a success.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the deans of all American schools of journalism that if they wish to see a good exhibit of irresponsible editorial writing to use in their classes on that subject, I refer them to this New York Times editorial, published in the western edition of Friday, March 22, because here again we find that an editor has engaged in the pastime of intellectual sophistry called "supposing," and, on the basis of his suppositions, has written an editorial which simply is factually untrue.

It is not pleasing to make these comments about any person or any institution, even a newspaper. But American foreign policy is so vital to the American people and is so important to the security of this country that the representatives of our free people in the U.S. Congress should not remain silent when such irresponsible journalism is spread on the pages of U.S. newspapers.

I close these remarks by saying—as the Secretary of State and the President and the members of the official executive branch delegation know—that at all times at the San José Conference the President had the support and cooperation of the congressional delegation. He was entitled to have it for many reasons, but the most important is that he was completely correct at every turn of events at the conference.

So a great disservice has been done by the New York Times, through its correspondent, Paul Kennedy, and through its board of editors, by giving the American people these two false representations concerning me and, by implication, the congressional delegation. The editors of the New York Times owe me nothing; but certainly, in my opinion, they owe an apology to the U.S. President.

I recognize that an apology never rights a wrong; but I think there is no excuse when a U.S. newspaper which claims to be responsible undermines the President of the United States by publishing an untrue article in regard to the position of the congressional delegation—or in regard to one of its members, and, by implication, the others—and which also does damage to the President of the United States, in connection with an international conference.

I have made these remarks today because in my judgment I owe them to the President, and I also have an obligation to the country to set the record straight.

Whenever I find myself in disagreement with the policy of this administration or any other administration, I shall never hesitate to say so. But I attribute the fact that I have the confidence of a great many officials in Latin America in no small measure to the fact that they know they can sit down with me and talk about United States-Latin American problems and the Alliance of Progress program, and that when I walk out of their offices I will not then proceed to hold a press interview in regard to the

matters we discussed, but will do my discussing after I return to my country.

So, Mr. President, I hope the New York Times will proceed without delay to correct the clear misstatements of fact which it has made in the editorial and in the article, which in my judgement do damage to the President of the United States. I do not care what they say about me, but I do care what they do in regard to damaging the President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Department of State Press Release No. 145, Mar. 20, 1963]

DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENTS OF CENTRAL AMERICA, PANAMA, AND THE UNITED STATES MARCH 19, 1963

The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples, and are aware that such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social and administrative structure, within the framework of the principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States of America in San Jose, Costa Rica, to review the difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America, convinced that the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration, and bearing in mind the extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

To accelerate establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central American Common Market;

To formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating them at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for the various sectors of the economy;

To establish a monetary union and common fiscal, monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration;

To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities;

To complete as soon as possible the reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration, and social welfare;

To take the above measures with a view to achieving the creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationships with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

The Central American Presidents affirm that the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the Isthmian Republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments have already taken measures to coordinate national plans so that their execution will aid rather than impede the achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program. It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the Isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable the appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct economic feasibility surveys relative to this program of regional development.

The Presidents of Central America reaffirm their hope that the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement, and the President of Panama declares that his Government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares that his Government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the Governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate the association of his country with this program.

The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American Republics to move as rapidly as possible toward the integration of the economies of their countries, and of their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans would be coordinated, and he believes that the coordination of their respective monetary, fiscal, economic and social policies is a great step forward in the achievement of this objective as well as toward the achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in the preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America, and the development plan being prepared by Panama.

To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration, to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution, to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by the regional organizations.

For the longer term, he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan, and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with the procedures established in the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other free world resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector, and declare their intention of taking the necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept the normal responsibilities compatible with the development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purpose of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation.

Concurrently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through a better distribution of national income. Furthermore they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare.

The Presidents also agree that opportunities should be given to the people of Central America to build and purchase their homes. There exist in Central America national savings and loan institutions which have been assisted under the Alliance for Progress, and others are about to be created. In order to give further support for these national efforts, the Presidents of Central America suggest that a regional home loan department, which would be a secondary source of home mortgage funds, should be created as a division within the Central American Bank for Economic Integration and the President of the United States agrees to offer technical and financial assistance to it.

The Isthmian Presidents indicate that Central American institutions should be strengthened as much as possible to enable them to play a major role in training the personnel who will be needed to put into effect the plans for integration of the Isthmus. A large part of the responsibility for training will devolve on the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA). Recognizing, moreover, that trained manpower at all levels is needed for economic development, they agree to the proposal of the President of the United States to establish a multimillion-dollar scholarship fund for vocational training in agriculture and in industry for young people of outstanding ability who cannot afford the normal expenses of such training, to which the United States will offer substantial financial assistance.

The Presidents note the primary role of coffee in the economies of Central America and the importance of the International Coffee Agreement for the achievement of stable and remunerative prices.

They reiterate the intention of their governments to fully support the agreement so that it will serve as an effective instrument to improve the earnings of exporting countries from coffee and to promote their economic development.

Other primary commodity problems exist and the Isthmian Presidents will hand to President Kennedy studies on these problems.

President Kennedy agrees he will have them reviewed immediately on his return to Washington.

The Presidents, notwithstanding the fact that present conditions are favorable to undertake a solution of the economic and social problems of the isthmus through joint action of the countries of the area, believe that all of them are faced with an externally provoked political problem, which by its very nature can imperil the exercise of representative democracy and the normal development of the plans in which their respective governments are engaged to attain as rapidly as possible the highest levels of economic and social justice and to bring to full realization the plans for Central American integration. Consequently, the Presidents declare that in order to carry out their programs for social and economic betterment, it is essential to reinforce the measures to meet subversive aggression originating in the focal points of Communist agitation which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America.

The Presidents note that the Council of the Organization of American States is actively engaged in maintaining vigilance over the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere as requested by the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers. They express special interest in early completion by the Council of the OAS of the studies on Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere, and particularly in early action by the Council on recommendations to the governments for counteracting those activities in these areas.

The Presidents agree that Ministers of Government of the seven countries should meet as soon as possible to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba, and the flow of materiel, propaganda and funds from that country. This meeting will take action, among other things, to secure stricter travel and passport controls, including appropriate limitations in passports and other travel documents on travel to Cuba. Cooperative arrangements among not only the countries meeting here but also among all OAS members will have to be sought to restrict more effectively not only these movements of people for subversive purposes but also to prevent insofar as possible the introduction of money, propaganda, materials, and arms, arrangements for additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters will be worked out with special cooperation from the United States.

In addition to these measures, a more rapid and complete exchange of intelligence information on the movement of people, propaganda, money, and arms between Cuba and our countries is to be developed by the meeting of ministers.

The Presidents voice their deep sympathy for the people of Cuba, and reaffirm their conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations. The Presidents recall how, in 1959, the Cuban people were fired with the hope of a purely Cuban revolution that was to bring them freedom and social justice; honest government and free elections; fair sharing of goods; opportunities for all; more schools and jobs, better health and housing, and constructive land reform; no collectivization of the land. In sum, a progressive republic which, in the words of Marti would be "con todos y para todos." The Presidents declare that they have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again, and its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history, and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in the common undertaking to secure for each individual the liberty, dignity, and well-being which are the objectives of all free societies.

Finally the Presidents solemnly reaffirm their adherence to the principles established by the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio de Janeiro, the Charter of the OAS, in the Act of Bogotá and in the Charter of Punta del Este.

March 19, 1963.

Exhibit 2

Remarks of the President at El Bosque Housing Project, El Bosque, Costa Rica

Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Ambassador, our friends from Costa Rica, we celebrate here today a great victory, and that is a victory for the human spirit, for these houses, these medical units, these books, are today freeing men and women from centuries of bondage and poverty which has imprisoned their capacity, their happiness and their future, and I am proud, as a citizen of the United States, to be here in Costa Rica taking part in this great effort.

As a citizen of a sister republic, as a strong believer in the democratic faith, we take pride in the democracy of this Republic and the other Republics of this hemisphere, but we know that our enjoyment of freedom is not so much a gift from the past as a challenge for the future. not so much a reward for old victories, but a goal for new struggles, not so much an inheritance from our forefathers as an obligation to those of us who follow, for democracy is never a final achievement. It is a call to effort, to sacrifice, and a willingness to live and to die in its defense.

Every generation of the Americas has shaped new goals for democracy to suit the demands of a new age. These goals for today's America are summed up in the words Alianza para el Progreso. They call for an end to social institutions which deny men and women the opportunity to live decent lives. They call for a better standard of living for all of our citizens in order that they may produce and live up to their capabilities. They call for an end to the remnants of dictatorship in this hemisphere, and they call for an unyielding defense against all those who seek to impose a new tyranny in this hemisphere. They call, in short, for a recognition that no man's job is done until every man in this hemisphere shares an equal opportunity to pursue his hopes as far as his capacities will carry him. That is the commitment of this country and my own, and the commitment of our sister Republics.

It is sometimes easy for us, living in our nations' capitals, to become disheartened about the nature of the struggle. but it is here with you in this project, sharing in your achievements, participating in your labors, that we renew our faith and determination to succeed, for in this project, hundreds of people will move into decent housing. By October 1st of this year, almost 8,000 people will have moved into homes financed under the Alliance for Progress, and built by the labor of the people of Costa Rica, and in every country in this hemisphere, similar housing programs must go forward. These medical units which we have seen are only a few of the 60 which will be in operation throughout Central America and Panama this year. They will provide 4 million medical examinations a year, reaching almost a third of the population of the isthmus. In them, doctors and nurses will bring modern medicine to our people who have had no protection against disability or disease, entering hundreds of villages where no doctor has been. Approximately 8,000 people in Costa Rica already have received treatment under these units.

These books we have distributed to these children are a token of a massive program which will bring more than 2 million new schoolbooks to the children of Central America and Panama. With these books, millions of children for the first time will have the tools to conquer life and make something of their future.

Education, homes, jobs, health, security—those are the things for which this country stands. Those are the things in which the people of the United States strongly believe. Those are the things which together we must achieve for our people, and I want to assure you through the Alliance for Progress we will stand and work shoulder to shoulder in making this hemisphere an example of what democracy can mean.

Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica.

Exhibit 3

Remarks of the President at the University of Costa Rica, San José, Costa Rica

Mr. Rector, Mr. Minister, I would like first to present to you my colleagues from the U.S. Congress who have traveled with us on this voyage of the last 3 days, and I would like to have them meet you.

First, I would like to present the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the former president of the University of Arkansas, Senator Fulbright.

I would like to present the leader of the opposition in the U.S. Senate, but we both agree that we love Costa Rica, Senator Hickenlooper.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, formerly dean of the University of Oregon Law School, Senator Wayne Morse.

Congressman Selden, who is chairman of the House Committee on Latin America, Congressman Selden, of Alabama. And the Republican leader of that committee in the House of Representatives, Congressman William Mailliard.

And the U.S. Ambassador.

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington, where I am lectured to by professors, to come to Costa Rica where I can speak to students.

I think it is appropriate that the first speech by any U.S. President to any student audience in Latin America should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy, and I am honored that you have invited me here today.

For the past 3 days the Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with the central question which faces this country, my own country, and my hemisphere, and that is whether, under a system of political liberty, we can solve the economic problems that press upon our people. We are embarked upon a great adventure together, and that is the task of demonstrating to a watching world that free men can conquer the ancient enemies of man, poverty, ignorance, and hunger; of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it; of bringing hope to those who search for hope; of extending liberty to those who lack it.

This is an immense task, filled with difficulty and hardship and danger, but you have been given an opportunity to shape the destiny of man which has been given to no other generation in the last 2,000 years. And as a fellow American, I know that you welcome that responsibility and that opportunity. What Franklin Roosevelt said to the American people in the 1930's I say to you now: This generation of Americans, your generation of Americans, has a rendezvous with destiny. I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous, for I can remember my own country when it was quite different from our country today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now, and at that time, only 1 in every 10 American farms was electrified, half of the farmers in our Southland were tenant farmers and sharecroppers, thousands of families in the Tennessee Valley had cash incomes of less than $100 a year, and all this in addition to a great depression which threw 12 million men and women out of work and had 20 million Americans on relief—that in that time I was at the university.

Then, under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, we carried through a great New Deal for the United States. One program after another brought an end to tenant farming in the United States, electrified nearly every farm in our country, transformed the poverty-ridden Tennessee Valley into one of the richest agricultural and industrial areas in the United States. It demonstrated in those great years the immense power of affirmative, free government, the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to individual liberty.

The history of your country in the last years has demonstrated that same quality. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, more subtle, and more difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of that challenge. We are committed to four basic principles in this hemisphere in the Alliance for Progress. The first is the right of every nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation and coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of the people.

Second is the right of every individual citizen to political liberty, the right to speak his own views, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him, and to reject it when it no longer serves the need of a nation.

And third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless, and education for those who are denied their education today in this hemisphere. It means that ancient institutions which perpetuate privilege must give way. It means that rich and poor alike must bear the burden and the opportunity of building a nation. It will not be easy to achieve social justice, but freedom cannot last without it.

And the fourth principle of the Alliance is the right of every nation to make economic progress with modern technological means. This is the job, it seems to me, of all of us in this hemisphere, in this decade, all of you who have the opportunity to study at this university, and that is, as I said at the beginning, to demonstrate that we can provide a better life for our people under a system of freedom, to demonstrate that it is our adversaries who must build walls to hold their people in, who must deny their people the right not only of freedom, but economic advancement as well. It is no accident that this year in Cuba agricultural production will be 25 percent below what it was 5 years ago. The great myth of the 1950's was that through a system of communism it was possible to produce a better life for our people; through a denial of political freedom we could provide more material advances, but the fifties showed us well, in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, East Berlin, and Cuba, that when you deny political and social freedom, you also deny the right to advance economically.

Gracias. I want to express the thanks of all of us to you for having us here today. Occasionally, universities are regarded as dangerous places for Presidents, and we are grateful to you for your warm welcome to all of us on this occasion. We also want to express our thanks to the people of Costa Rica. Every one of us will go home with the most profound impression of what a strong, vital people can accomplish, and I think that this journey to Costa Rica has illuminated the minds of 180 million people of what a great opportunity and privilege we have to be associated together in our common cause. Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica. Muchas gracias.

EXHIBIT 4

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY UPON ARRIVAL AT LA SABANA AIRPORT, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Mr. President, I want to express my warm appreciation to you and the people of Costa Rica for your welcome to us today.

About 500 years ago, Christopher Columbus, after having discovered Costa Rica, turned from Panama and began his last journey home. He described this fourth voyage as the "high journey," the high voyage, and I feel in a very real sense that this is a high voyage for all of us who meet today in this free and democratic country. Our high voyage, Mr. President, is not to seek new lands to conquer, but to make sure that old lands remain free. We don't seek gold for a few in our voyage; we seek a better life for all of our people.

Mr. President, the purpose of our meeting is, as you have suggested, to see what our countries, working together, the United States and the countries of the isthmus. we working together, can do for our people to make sure that along with a system of political independence, hand in hand will go economic well being.

It is our responsibility in this hemisphere, in this isthmus, in my own country in the 1960's, to demonstrate that economic prosperity is the handmaiden of political liberty. That is the responsibility of all of us. If we meet that responsibility, then this country and all countries like it in this hemisphere will remain free. If we do not meet this responsibility, then their inevitable fate will be one of enslavement by those who already have indicated their desire to crush out independence in this hemisphere.

So this meeting is most vital, and I want you to know, Mr. President, that I come here today not only with the Members of the Congress and the Secretary of State and others, but I come here today with 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century and this decade.

And, Mr. President, I want to express again our thanks to you. We could not feel more at home a thousand miles from the United States than here in Costa Rica.

EXHIBIT 5

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON CONVENING THE PRESIDENTS' CONFERENCE, TEATRO NACIONAL, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Presidents of the Central American Republics, President of Panama, Your Excellencies the First Ladies of the Central American Republics, members of the diplomatic service, the Archbishop, ladies and gentlemen, I think the extraordinary statements which we have heard this afternoon will serve to illuminate for the people of this hemisphere, and particularly for the people of the United States, the harsh and striking challenges we face in these Republics and in the other Republics of this hemisphere in attempting to improve the life of our people. The statements that have been made today I think serve as a call to action by all of us, north and south, to move ahead in these days before time passes by.

In 1825, a son of El Salvador and a citizen of Central America, Antonio Jose Canas, the first minister accredited by the United Provinces of Central America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay. He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which, he said, the struggling new nations of this hemisphere "might consider upon and adopt the best plan for defending the states of the New World from foreign aggression, and * * * raise them to that elevation of wealth and power, which, from their resources, they may attain."

Today, 138 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals—the preservation of our independence, the extension of freedom, and the elevation of the welfare of our citizens to a level as high as from our resources we can attain. And today I have come from the United States at the invitation of a Central America which with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed the dream and creation of Bolivar, and Canas, and Jose Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—the dream which became the inter-American system and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful and the most enduring of international order in the history of the world.

We can say this because every effort to reimpose the despotisms of the Old World on the people of the New has ultimately been beaten back—because within this system 20 Republicans have attained the full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations, and because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members. There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principles of nonintervention and the peaceful resolution of disputes have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world would this be true.

We have not attained this strength by merely trying to protect what was already won, to preserve the gains of the past, to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals, it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled. Instead, it has survived, prospered and grown, despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has itself been an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity in all lands. As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspiration has swept across our shores, the inter-American system has been able to translate these ideas and aspirations into a working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration. That is why it has endured in the past and must endure in the future.

In the first three centuries of our history, the seeds of Western civilization and culture were planted here.

In the next century, we established an inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule. This freedom has often been challenged—as today it is challenged in Cuba. But with the help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented the Spanish reconquest in 1866, men such as Costa Rica's Mora, who helped to drive out William Walker—with such help, we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past, as we will ultimately triumph over the new conquerors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation, the inter-American system worked to establish the political equality and national dignity of all its members, to extend political democracy and strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another. Those goals have been largely met. The equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced. Machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands. It will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

Now, in our own time, the inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges; and it is again demonstrating the capacity for change which has always given it strength. The foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and the challenges are more difficult, more complex and burdensome. For today we are faced not merely with the protection of new nations, but with the remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies, but with the destrucion of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity but with the preservation of human dignity.

To meet this enormous challenge, the peoples of the Americas have fashioned an Alianza para el Progreso, an alliance in which all the American States have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in the fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move towards the goals of the Alianza.

You have made enormous strides toward the creation of a Common Market of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created; a central bank has been established; and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields. I congratulate you on your effort to reestablish an historic unity to meet new needs; and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that great effort.

In addition, you have begun to formulate the long-range economic development plans essential to the success of the Alianza. The organization of the Central American Joint Planning Mission gives new impetus to planning on a regional development scale.

In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet the basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the Charter of Punta del Este and demanded by all of our people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1961, under programs supported by the United States as part of its contribution to the Alliance, almost 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in the nations represented here today; almost a million new books have been distributed; and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more to children hungry for learning. Much more remains to be done.

Some 7,600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under Alianza programs in these nations—but much more remains to be done.

Three-quarters of a million children will have been fed, but many are still hungry.

Nearly 6,000 new teachers have been trained, as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health, and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months, almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slumdwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under the Alianza; and almost $250 million of external resources have been committed in support of the Alliance in Central America and Panama, to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet the basic needs of the people for improved health, education, housing, and institutions.

Finally, a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. As every speaker here today has said, all of these countries sell their agricultural commodities in a sense at wholesale, and buy their manufactured goods at retail, and pay the freight both ways. And we are also willing to move ahead on agreements stabilizing the prices of other commodities, so that your future prosperity will not depend on the often destructive fluctuation of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see with our own eyes how the Alianza enters into the lives of citizens of Costa Rica—providing them with new homes in which they and their families can find decent shelter for the first time.

We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities, and better utilization of resources.

Yet we cannot be, and I know none of us are, satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to the common good, unless the young and the educated are given opportunities to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our Alianza will fail, and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward, we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For, at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean—the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to a new imperialism, more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any this hemisphere has known. Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union, through its Cuban puppets, absorbed the Cuban nation into its empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered that the American Hemisphere is not fertile ground for foreign tyranny, and that any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will not easily yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting, and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion. I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent the infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their freedom and sovereignty. And in this effort, as in all the other necessary efforts, I can assure you the United States will play its full part and carry its full burden.

In 1822, Bolivar, the father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit, and in aims, this continent * * * must raise its eyes * * * to peer into the centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to the full the blessings that heaven bestows on this earth, and recalling in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day."

My friends and colleagues, today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in aims. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising the living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward to future centuries knowing that our descendants may also gratefully recall in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day.

Thank you.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BY ADDITIONAL STATES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to the States last August. Those States are Tennessee and Connecticut.

This brings to 25 the number of States which have ratified this important Constitutional amendment which would eliminate the prerequisite that payment of a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting for President, Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased by the favorable action of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee. The Senate of the Tennessee Legislature on last Wednesday, March 20, approved the amendment by a vote of 22 to 1; and on the following day, March 21, the Tennessee House approved the amendment by a vote of 55 to 20, thus completing ratification by that State—the first Southern State to ratify the amendment.

I wish to express my profound appreciation to my distinguished friends, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], who cosponsored and vigorously supported passage of my resolution proposing the amendment in the 87th Congress, and his colleague [Mr. Gore], who likewise supported passage of the resolution. Each of them has worked valiantly in seeking its ratification by the legislature of their State.

I likewise express my deep appreciation to Governor Clement, of Tennessee, for his most effective leadership in this matter.

In the case of Connecticut, the senate of that State's legislature approved the anti-poll-tax amendment on last Wednesday, March 20, by a unanimous vote of 33 to 0, completing ratification by the State, the house having previously approved the amendment on March 6 by the overwhelming vote of 251 to 4.

Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut—Senator Dodd, who cosponsored, warmly supported, and directed his efforts toward ratification of the amendment by the Legislature of Connecticut; and Senator Ribicoff, who likewise has vigorously supported ratification by the legislature of his State.

In addition to the good news from Tennessee and Connecticut, I have been informed that the House of Representatives of the Pennsylvania Legislature has voted favorably on ratification of the amendment, but I do not know the date on which the Pennsylvania House acted or the vote. I understand that the concurrent resolution is now pending before the Senate of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and that the indications are that it will be favorably acted upon at an early date.

Either the house or the senate of the legislatures of four other States have approved the amendment. Those States are Arizona, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Missouri.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend. First, I wish to say that in connection with this matter I am very greatly indebted to the senior Senator from Tennessee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee, he kindly allowed me to be heard on this matter on two or three different occasions, in different Congresses. Under his leadership, the subcommittee favorably reported the resolution proposing adoption of the amendment.

He supported us on the floor. He went further, and in the 86th Congress, when an amendment of his own was pending, he was gracious and generous enough to permit me to offer my amendment and to aid me in offering it as an amendment to his amendment. Then he followed with the superb work which he has done with the legislature of his own State. I wish publicly to express on the floor of the Senate and as a part of the permanent Senate RECORD my sense of very deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Tennessee, who has done a yeoman's work in this whole matter.

I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am most gratified for the kind remarks of my colleague from Florida. It has been easy to work with him for this important resolution for a constitutional amendment because of the consistent, progressive, and intelligent leadership that he has given the effort. The Senator from Florida is doing one of the finest services that has been done in the Senate during my tenure here in pointing out the importance of this amendment to the Constitution and in urging State legislatures to ratify it.

I am gratified that the Volunteer State, the State of Tennessee, has ratified the amendment by overwhelming votes—as has been stated, 22 to 1 in the senate, and 55 to 20 in the house of representatives—and that the ratification of the amendment by the State of Tennesseee represents the first ratification by a Southern State. I know that as the legislatures of other Southern States meet, the amendment will be approved by other States which realize the importance of doing away with the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Mr. President, in all States where poll taxes have been in existence and where they have been eliminated there is a better grade of citizenship. We have more participation in elections. We have better expression of the will of the voter and a better formulation of public opinion. I did what I could to urge ratification of the amendment on the part of the senate and the house of representatives in Tennessee. My colleague [Mr. GORE] did likewise.

But without the leadership of the Governor of Tennessee, Frank Clement, this great record would not have been made. He has worked diligently on the problem. He has urged the legislature to ratify the amendment. While on some matters we have not always seen eye to eye, I have been very happy to join with him in this effort. While we in Tennessee think we have the most progressive State in the South, I feel that other Southern States will follow suit in this march toward greater democracy in the United States and greater rights to the voters of our country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate those cordial and very generous remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. We have here exemplified again the fact that people in public life who do not agree on many things have made common cause on this particular subject. We have seen it in the bipartisan pressing of this issue on the floor of the Senate, on the floor of the House, and in the followup with the State legislatures. We have seen it in almost every State. I think that the remarks of my distinguished friend from Tennessee have made it clear that, even within a party, leaders who are not of exactly the same philosophy have found it equally important to join in the furtherance of this effort. I have already expressed my appreciation of Governor Clement's leadership in this field. I say again that without the continued, devoted effort of the senior Senator from Tennessee, I doubt very seriously if the State of Tennessee would have acted as it has. Certainly we would have had greater difficulty in getting favorable action here in the Senate without his help. I again express my appreciation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to know how many States have now ratified the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to say 25 States have now ratified the amendment, so far as I know. We have been informed that one more State may complete ratification of the amendment today or tomorrow. We know of five States altogether which have ratified by action of one house of the legislature. We know of several others which are considering the matter with apparent favorable prospects.

We are pushing as rapidly as we can. We do not have an organized campaign. We have not attempted anything of that kind. The good and kindly efforts of the Senators here on this floor, on both sides of the aisle—and I include in those who have worked hard the distinguished Senator from Idaho—those efforts have been more responsible for favorable action than any other one source. But in some States we have had, just as we have seen in Tennessee, aggressive action by the Governors of those States. I hope that we shall learn as we go along just who has been providing the aggressive leadership. I certainly want to be equally fair to all who have participated and will participate. The effort is not a personal one. We wish to eliminate something which I think has been harmful to good government and the citizens of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. I think the signal progress of so many States having ratified the amendment in so short a time testifies to the high merit of the amendment. I wish personally to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Florida for his effort. He has rendered very great service to his country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I, too, wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his ingenuity and foresight in bringing the amendment to the attention of the Senate and the people of America. He sponsored the resolution at the last session of the Congress. Maryland was, I believe, the fifth or sixth State to ratify the amendment.

It is very fitting that today, the 330th birthday of Maryland, the Senators should bring up this matter.

On behalf of Marylanders, I desire to say to him that we are very grateful to him for having brought to our attention the fact that the Tennessee Legislature ratified the amendment. It is very fitting that on our 330th birthday of Maryland we should pay tribute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I have already stated in the RECORD previously that we are indebted to him and to his colleague for the bipartisan leadership which resulted in favorable action by his great State. I appreciate his kind remarks today.

I yield the floor.

PEACETIME VETERANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a result of our country's farflung responsibilities, American servicemen stationed in many parts of the world are frequently exposed to dangers as great as those in active warfare. These brave men should be entitled to receive the same protection and benefits as our wartime veterans. I have joined in sponsoring legislation which would authorize benefits for such veterans and their dependents who have served in an area which the President may designate as an "area of hostilities."

A recent series of reports published by the Newhouse newspapers throughout the country graphically describes the kind of fighting that these so-called peacetime veterans are experiencing. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the three-part series by Jules Witcover, which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal and other Newhouse newspapers on February 10, 11, and 12.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 10, 1963]

UNITED STATES AT PEACE, BUT AMERICANS DYING IN HOT "COLD WAR"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Though the United States has been officially at peace for nearly a decade, Americans have been serving and dying in foreign lands throughout that time. For these men and their survivors, there has been nothing cold about the cold war. This is the first of a three-part series about their sacrifices.)

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—On July 27, 1953, the day an armistice was signed in the Korean war, Soviet Mig fighters gunned down an American RB–50 reconnaissance plane over the Sea of Japan. Sixteen Americans lost their lives. Since then, more than 100 others have died in the cold war.

Many of them, like those who have perished in south Vietnam and Laos; have been soldiers and airmen in a kind of hot combat that mocks such expressions as cold war.

Many others, including several score in south Vietnam and four in Laos, have died in incidents the Pentagon calls "not the result of actions by hostile forces." The distinction is lost on the families of such men.

To the casual reader, the recent heavy casualties in southeast Asia may have seemed to be a sharp, sudden break in a long period of unruffled peace. To hundreds of service families and their friends, they have constituted a particularly hard period in a decade of apprehension, uncertainty and sorrow.

On November 7, 1954, a B-29 was shot down by a Soviet plane over northern Japan. All 11 crewmen bailed out and were picked up. But one American was dead when they found him.

On August 17, 1955, a propeller-driven T-6 trainer was shot down by a North Korean plane in the Korean theater, killing the American observer.

On September 2, 1958, a C-130 transport was attacked by three Soviet jet fighters over Soviet Armenia and crashed. The bodies of six crewmen were returned by the Russians 3 weeks later. Eleven other crew members were never heard from and are presumed dead.

On July 1, 1960, an RB-47 reconnaissance plane was shot down over the Barents Sea off the Arctic coast of the Soviet Union. Four Americans lost their lives. Two others were released 7 months later.

Until the start of the major U.S. military commitment in southeast Asia, these were the most highly publicized cold war incidents in which Americans made the supreme sacrifice. But there were others—scores, even hundreds of them.

In the same periods, American military men died in what have come to be considered routine incidents—routine in terms of military experience: Planes crashing in training, on patrol or trying to land on the deck of a carrier in rough seas: auto and truck accidents, accidents in everyday drill.

But to the widows, parents, and children of the men who lost their lives, there was nothing routine about them. The incidents brought grief just as profound as did any death of an American soldier or sailor in World War II.

The Army alone lists 2,909 "accidental military fatalities" to its troops overseas in the period July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1962, of which 2,007 occurred in Europe and 902 in the Pacific. Comparable statistics are not kept by the Air Force and Navy.

Just how many lives have been lost in the cold war is a question neither the Pentagon nor the State Department is prepared to answer. To draw the line between a man who died in a hot incident along the Iron Curtain and one who perished in training made necessary by the cold war conflict, their officials say, would be an injustice to both.

Thus, in the recent Cuban crisis, the only clear-cut fatality listed by the Defense Department was Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., pilot of the U-2 photo reconnaissance plane reported shot down over the island October 27.

However, in another incident directly related to the crisis, seven Air Force crew members of the C-135 stratolifter cargo transport perished when their plane crashed while making an approach to the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, October 22.

The Navy does not list this crash—nor any other that has occurred in the last decade—as a cold war casualty. The term is a diplomatic one, not a military one, service spokesmen insist. The loss of any service life in this twilight period of limited war and counterinsurgency, whether under fire overseas or in training in the States, is a cold war casualty, they say.

Even on the so-called quiet fronts of the cold war—like Korea, where an armistice has been in effect for nearly 10 years—Americans are dying. The latest was the death last November 20 of 18-year-old Army Sp4c. James Allen Johnson, of Paris, Ky.

Johnson, who was one of three cold war victims mentioned by President Kennedy in this year's state of the Union message, was ambushed by North Koreans while he stood guard in an observation post along the South Korean border. He had been in the Army 13 months and 16 days.

It is perhaps a measure of the casual American attitude toward the cold war that the Army, asked how many other James Allen Johnsons there have been in Korea since the armistice, cannot provide the answer.

In World War I, in World War II, even in what is still euphemistically called the Korean conflict, a compilation of the number of Americans killed in any theater of action was readily available after notification of next of kin.

So it is now concerning Americans who die in Vietnam. The Pentagon prints up a weekly list of deaths there, dating back to January 1, 1961, from actions by hostile forces. The situation has become hot enough to warrant hot-war treatment in this regard.

But in Korea and in West Germany the Americans who have died as a result of hostile action or otherwise are not toted up on any list by the services. War's grimmest statistics, like the cold war itself, become blurred and hard to lay your hands on in the era of limited war and limited concern.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 11, 1963]

Three Deaths Point Up U.S. Cold War Losses

(By Jules Witcover)

Washington, February 11.—President Kennedy, concluding his state of the Union message to Congress on January 14, singled out three men who died in the cold war in recent months as a reminder of the commitment the United States continues to make in the fight against communism.

The name of one of the three, Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., was recognizable to millions of Americans as the U-2 pilot killed on a photo-reconnaissance flight over Cuba in the heat of the October crisis.

The names of the other two—Marine Sgt. Gerald Pendall, of Macomb, Ill., and Sp.4 James A. Johnson, of Paris, Ky.—were not. Pendell was one of five Americans killed last October 6 when their helicopter crashed into a mountainside in south Vietnam. Johnson was killed last November 20 when North Koreans ambushed his observation post on the border between North and South Korea.

Of the two, the marine sergeant is the more typical of the men who are on the firing line of the cold war—a career serviceman, married and the father of four small children, a specialist in marine aviation enroute to an outlying fuel station established to meet the heavy demands of U.S. helicopters.

The Army specialist 4, the equivalent of a World War II corporal, was single, 18 years old, just out of high school, an enlistee only 13 months earlier. He was standing his post peacefully with two other young soldiers who survived the ambush.

Sergeant Pendell's wife, Donna, back at Macomb with the children—ages 8, 5, 4, and 2—is a service wife who has lived with the risks of the cold war for a long time and has been exposed to the military environment. She knows why her husband was sent to Vietnam, and why he had to die there.

"My husband was a very dedicated Marine and he was satisfied he was doing his work," she says calmly. "His letters told me some things, but I didn't think it was so bad over there until it happened.

"I've always been around military bases and have been more aware of the cold war than the people in a small town in Illinois. I know it's necessary."

Specialist Johnson's mother, Mrs. James Johnson, at home with her husband and three other sons, knows only that going into the Army was what her son wanted to do. To her, the cold war is an indefinite thing that suddenly entered her home.

"He joined the Army to serve his country, and they put him in Korea," she says. "He never complained. He was doing what he wanted. I appreciate the President taking time out to mention him."

Though brief conversation quickly reveals the difference between the two women in terms of their comprehension of cold war politics, there is little basic difference in their attitudes in this first difficult period of adjustment.

They are proud of their men in an unspoken way; somewhat surprisingly perhaps, they voice no bitterness that their men have been taken from them while the rest of America goes blissfully about its peaceful pursuits.

"A lot of people here woke up when the news came about my husband," Mrs. Pendell says. "But people in a small town can't be expected to really comprehend. They need something like the Cuban crisis close to home to reach them."

Says Mr. Johnson: "Most people listen to the news, but if it doesn't hit their own families they don't know. You can't blame them."

Others who have lost men in the cold war reflect in different words the same mood of understanding.

Mrs. Archie T. Bourg, of Baton Rouge, La., mother of Airman 2-C Archie Bourg, Jr., one of 11 Americans never recovered in the crash of a C-130 transport over Soviet Armenia in 1958, says: "The American people are always ready to take up arms to defend their country. But this is just something they read about."

There is, of course, some bitterness among some of the widows and mothers. But it is mostly bitterness against bureaucratic callousness in handling personal matters, or in the Government's inability to project to the public the depth of American sacrifices. They do not question the need for committing troops to cold-war fronts.

Mrs. Julia Oshinskie, of Shamokin, Pa., mother of Airman 1-C Robert J. Oshinskie, another of the never recovered in the 1958 crash over Soviet Armenia, says she never has received a satisfactory answer on what happened to the plane, and adds:

"Hardly anyone remembers how that plane was shot down 4 years ago. We throw out a lot of propaganda on our gains, but why didn't they keep reminding the public of the toll we have paid?"

Mrs. Edgar W. Weitkamp, of Arlington, Va., wife of an Army warrant officer whose body never was recovered from a transport crash in Laos in March 1961, says, "We've got to stop communism someplace." But she does not understand why the Government did not press at the Geneva talks later that year for the return of her husband's body.

And of the public's apparent apathy toward the cold war, she adds: "Only in this thing with Cuba did people suddenly realize something is going on in this world. For the first time they felt fearful. They don't even read the papers. It won't be a personal thing until they're personally involved, the way I am."

And there are those, like Mrs. Pauline Tencza, of Fairfax, Va., wife of Army Lt. Col. Anthony J. Tencza, who died in Vietnam in a helicopter crash last July, who have lived through "hot" conflicts like World War II and Korea and feel somehow singled out by the cost of a "limited" war.

Her husband had 21 years in the Army and had received two Purple Hearts in Korea before he was sent to Vietnam.

"In total war you expect it to happen, and every family is in the same boat," she says. "But it's hard for the families that are hit when it's less than a total war."

According to a man who has dealt with numerous survivors of men lost in the cold war, Chief of Air Force Chaplains Gen. Robert P. Taylor, those who express bitterness or any doubts about the need for cold-war losses are in a distinct minority.

"Most widows react as courageously as those of World War II did," he says. "They may not comprehend the full meaning of the cold war, but they respond with the same patriotism that has buoyed up American women in all wars."

As for the public's reaction, General Taylor says:

"I'm not so sure the people at large are to blame for their lackadaisical attitude. Maybe the military hasn't kept them abreast of the importance of the cold war. When the people are truly informed about what it really means, they will rally."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 12, 1963]

U.S. FIGHTERS IN VIETNAM GO BENEFITLESS AND UNSUNG

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—Though hardly a week goes by now without the death of another American serviceman in Vietnam, the U.S. troops there are still considered by their Government to be serving peacetime duty.

Among the official distinctions drawn by Uncle Sam concerning these and other cold-war combatants are:

1. They are not eligible for the major combat decorations for heroism—the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, the Silver Star.

2. They are not eligible, after discharge, for the same pension given World War I, World War II, and Korean war veterans totally and permanently disabled by a non-service-connected cause.

3. They are not eligible for the so-called GI bill of rights providing educational, housing loan, and other readjustment benefits available to men who served in the last three hot wars.

4. They are not eligible, if they lose a limb, for a special automobile made available for men who suffered such losses in World War II or Korea.

5. They are judged by much more stringent presumptions of preservice fitness than are applied to bonafide "wartime" servicemen in determining eligibility for service-connected disability compensation.

6. They cannot buy the cheap $10,000 national service life insurance policy available to men who served in the last three hot wars.

The first-mentioned distinction—their ineligibility for major combat decorations—soon may be removed. The Kennedy administration has asked Congress for legislation permitting the award of these medals, now restricted to distinguished service in active conflict with an armed enemy of the United States in time of hot war.

Until last April, men killed or wounded by hostile action on cold-war fronts were not even eligible for the Purple Heart. An executive order by President Kennedy changed that ruling, but Congress must act on the remaining decorations.

As far as other benefits are concerned, there is no distinction made between those servicemen who are on active duty on the front lines of the cold war places like Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Berlin, and those who are carrying out normal military peacetime pursuits in the States.

If a man is permanently disabled or killed in a cold war front, he or his next of kin may be eligible for a somewhat higher disability compensation or death benefit payment based on "extra hazardous" service. But this is one of the few instances in which a special consideration is given.

The Government's distinction between hot and cold war apparently is not drawn by a number of insurance companies. Widows and parents complain that life insurance policies they hold on their deceased men are not paid because death occurred overseas and on a hazardous mission of war.

Mrs. Julia Oshinskie of Shamokin, Pa., mother of A1c Robert J. Oshinskie, one of 11 Americans never recovered in the 1958 crash of a C-130 transport over Soviet Armenia, says:

"We had two personal policies on Bob, and when he was lost they refused to pay the full benefits because he was overseas and was on this type of mission."

Mrs. Edgar W. Weitkamp, of Arlington, Va., wife of an Army warrant officer lost in a transport crash in Laos in 1961, says:

"This wasn't supposed to be a war, but the insurance company won't pay double indemnity for an accidental death. How can it be both ways?"

Other survivors wonder at the distinctions drawn. Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Connard, Sr., of Milton, Del., parents of Capt. Edward S. Connard Jr., navigator of the Air Force transport that crashed attempting to land at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the outset of the Cuban crisis, are among them.

They frankly question why the Pentagon singled out Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, the U-2 pilot who lost his life on a photo reconnaissance mission over Cuba, for full military honors and did not list their son and the other six crew members of the Guantanamo crash as Cuban crisis casualties.

"We don't think they received proper recognition," Captain Connard's father says. "They were there to bring out the women and children. They were doing their part as much as anyone."

Another parent, one more closely associated with the military's attitude toward the problem of casualties, gets down to the nub of things—more important than how a casualty is categorized is public understanding of the necessity for it.

Maj. Gen. William F. Train, commandant of the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., is the father of Lt. William F. Train III, killed in south Vietnam in June, 1962, while traveling with a Vietnamese army convoy. He says:

"The desirable thing would be to have everyone fully understand the term cold war. Insofar as the Vietnamese are concerned, their nation is a battleground and the shooting makes it a 'hot' war for them.

"Lives are frequently lost in the periphery of the Nation's interest.

"I think my son's loss of life in the service of his country is similar to the loss of life in any operation providing the freedom we know—in war or peace."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to consider Calendar No. 69, S. 6, which is known as the mass transit bill, and to have general debate on Friday of this week. I expect the debate to continue for some time. The Senate surely will be considering the bill until at least Monday of the following week.

I thought I should give notice now, so that Senators who are interested in discussing the proposed legislation can be prepared to initiate debate on Friday of this week.

ELECTION OF KARL ROLVAAG AS GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota has been in the news lately. At long last there has been settled the question as to who is Governor of the State of Minnesota. I am happy to note, for the edification of my colleagues, that as of this day Mr. Karl Rolvaag, Democrat-Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor, the man we thought and knew had been elected Governor, has now been certified as the Governor of the State of Minnesota and will take his oath of office today. He will deliver a message to a joint session of the legislature this week.

Then, on April 16, it is our plan to have a sort of replay of Andrew Jackson's inaugural, Minnesota style, for a genuine community and statewide celebration. I hope that all my colleagues who know Minnesota and Minnesotans, and who know the distinguished Governor-elect and now Governor, Karl Rolvaag, will keep this date in mind.

I note that my friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] who is so well known in Minnesota that he "bowls over" everybody whenever he contests with anyone in Minnesota, is in the Chamber. I hope that he will see fit to arrange his travel plans so that he can be with us. That would be a wonderful occasion for all of us.

The distinguished present Presiding Officer (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair) is beloved in the State of Minnesota, as well as respected and admired. We should like to have him there.

I see my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] the former Governor of that State, is in the Chamber. He should be at the celebration.

Senators will have to pay their own transportation costs, but we would like to have them come. They may be able to get a free lunch or two.

I include everyone in the invitation. I would even like to see my good friend the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] there, if he could find the time to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I ought to make one suggestion to our distinguished friend. Since the candidate won by only 73 votes——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh no; it was a landslide victory, with a margin of 91 votes. It was a major victory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Whoever may be in the entourage who go, full garrisoned and full panoplied, to the inaugural, the majority delegation should not exceed the minority delegation by more than one, to keep the ratio straight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. Actually, it ought not to exceed it by more than 14/1000ths of 1 percent, because that was the margin of victory. We will try to keep the arithmetical proportion in mind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is very kind of the Senator from Minnesota to invite us all to his State. We all enjoy visiting in Minnesota.

The only successes I have had in Minnesota have always been in the wintertime. I do not know how I would fare at this season. I am sure it will be a most enjoyable occasion, especially if it is to be along the line of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson.

I know Karl Rolvaag. He has been through a very tortuous route. He is a capable man, with great experience in government, who has had many years of enlightened politics.

In my opinion, Karl Rolvaag will become one of the great chief executives of a wonderful State. If I cannot be present, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will extend to him my very best wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be happy to do so.

We would be honored if the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] could also find her way out to Minnesota for one of these occasions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would make it more interesting for all of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be more interesting for all of us. Of course, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], has been to Minnesota before. We would love to have him return. We should like to see him as soon as possible.

To the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] I extend a cordial invitation.

I extend the invitation to all Senators. As I said, we are frugal people. In the light of the fact that there has been a rather extensive campaign, I imagine we shall not be able to provide too much of what are called "representation allowances."

In Minnesota we have a new slogan. Instead of "Travel now, pay later" we say, "Run now, pay later".

We have proved the value of a vote. We vote in November and count all winter.

This has been a wonderful experience. I am delighted that the Senator from Tennessee has paid such a well deserved tribute to my personal good friend and political associate and colleague for his many years of politics in Minnesota, Hon. Karl Rolvaag. He is a remarkable man, and a truly outstanding public servant.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am curious to know one thing about Minnesota politics. After such a long winter, is there any place left for the governor to appoint a good Democrat to office, or have all the places been filled?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fear the pickings will be rather slim. Most of the appointments have already been made.

I should like to make another comment about Minnesota politics. It has been a long, cold winter, and there was not much else to do but to recount the votes, anyway. Now that spring is here—with work to be done, fields to be plowed, and wheat to be planted, to prepare for the future—we have put a Democrat in as Governor of Minnesota. During the winter months we just let the Republicans hang on. [Laughter.]

THE LAKES OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as long as I am dealing with my beloved, great State of Minnesota, I would like to talk about prospects for summer and the subject of the lakes of Minnesota.

Mr. President, Minnesota has long been known as the "Land of Ten Thousand Lakes."

What may not be as well known is Minnesota's proclivity for understatement. We are, indeed, a modest people.

I do not know whether this Senator should be making that statement or not, but, at least, this is the statement I have prepared. [Laughter.]

Having never subjected Minnesota's myriad lakes to actual count, we were content to claim a mere 10,000. For residents of other States this probably sounded like blatant extravagance; for Minnesotans it only represented another example of our great modesty.

Minnesota is currently engaged in the first statewide lake census.

You see, Mr. President, not only are we going to count votes, we are going to count lakes.

Although the results are not yet fully known, it is already evident that the record must be corrected.

Mr. President, it takes a long time for the results to be known in some of these hotly contested elections in our State.

Latest returns disclose 12,211 sparkling lakes dotting the Minnesota countryside and 2 of our 87 counties remain uncounted. Moreover, these two counties—Cook and Lake Counties—are among the most heavily dotted with those sparkling gems of sky-blue water.

Clearly, the final total will run well in excess of 13,000 lakes. And, my colleagues, these are genuine lakes, not swamps, bogs, mudholes, or pools of stagnant water that are often identified as lakes by other sections of this country less restrained and circumspect in their claims.

Mr. President, for those Members of the Senate who still harbor vestiges of doubt regarding the extent or beauty of Minnesota lakes, the Senator from Minnesota extends a cordial invitation to make an on-site inspection.

The matter of on-site inspections has received a great deal of international comment, but I believe I can say, without fear of successful contradiction, that in Minnesota we will welcome any number of on-site inspections by Members of the Senate at our lakes.

Come this summer; bring your family and friends. Explore the cool clear waters of Minnetonka, Winnibigoshish, Mille Lacs, or Ottertail Lakes, or the 13,000 other lakes. Mr. President, try your luck fishing on Kabetogoma, Burntside, Itasca, or Leech. We guarantee a Minnesota welcome. If you do not like one lake, we have another waiting around the corner for you.

I am grateful to my colleagues for their attention on the matter of statecraft and public policy.

I yield the floor to Senators who want to talk about the lakes in their States.

THE STRUGGLE FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with the President's return from Costa Rica, there will be renewed interest in the course he has chosen for dealing with the problem of Castroism in Latin America.

Stewart Alsop's timely article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Fruits of Castro's Plotting," develops the thesis that the struggle for Latin America, which President Kennedy has described as "the most critical area in the world today," may be won for freedom and democracy in part because of the lessons the hemisphere is learning from the Marxist revolution in Cuba. He says that Castro has dramatized the importance to us of Latin America, shown the Latin American "intellectuals" the reality of communism, thrown a badly needed scare into the Latin American ruling classes, and given the United States an opportunity to demonstrate that the real center of power in this hemisphere is in the United States.

The article reports some interesting first-hand observations by Mr. Alsop, and acknowledges that he is "now convinced" that the key decision made by President Kennedy last October was the right one. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRUITS OF CASTRO'S PLOTTING

(By Stewart Alsop)

President Kennedy flies to Costa Rica in a few days for a summit conference with the leaders of Central America. Two questions, which have been on his mind before, will surely be on his mind still.

Is it enough that the Soviet missiles and other offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba? Or must Fidel Castro himself be removed, and with him the Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere?

The final responsibility for answering these questions belongs to the President. But a reporter can at least try to put the questions in a meaningful context. To that end, this reporter recently traveled some 10,000 miles through the Caribbean and Central America.

Toward the beginning of the trip, an American Ambassador in one of the countries most dangerously threatened by Castroism made an oddly optimistic remark. "You remember the old saying about the Lord protecting drunks and the United States," he said. "Maybe Fidel Castro is one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

When I heard the remark, it seemed to me a rather feeble attempt at originality. But by the time I had got home again, the Ambassador's remark had begun to make a surprising amount of sense to me.

No one but a fool would deny for a moment the seriousness of the threat Castro represents to this hemisphere. The threat is visible to anyone with eyes to see and a mind to understand.

It is visible, for example, in the left hand of Rómulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. Since he became President in 1959, there have been five attempts to assassinate Betancourt. The attempt that most nearly succeeded was unquestionably inspired and directed by Fidel Castro. When his car was bombed by Castro's henchmen, Betancourt put his left hand down on the pavement, which was covered with burning gasoline. The hand is still a raw, puffy, scabrous red.

Betancourt's hand is an ugly symbol of the means the Communists use to achieve what Castro calls the liberation of Latin America. Because Betancourt's reform-minded government represents a real alternative to Castroism, Venezuela is Castro's chief target for liberation among Cuba's neighbors, and the Communists have resorted to what they call direct action. The Communists and their allies regularly explode "Cuban dinamitas"—plastic bombs—in stores, warehouses, factories and, on one occasion, in the American Embassy.

Elsewhere conditions are not judged ripe for direct action, and other means are used. A Soviet-financed campaign is underway to achieve what Lenin called the alienation of the intellectual. Latin Americas who go to a university—1 or 2 percent of the population in most countries—are the main object of this campaign, for the university students of today are the ruling class of tomorrow.

Universities are flooded with Marxist books subsidized by the Russians and on sale for a few pennies. The Communists make every effort to seize political control of the universities. When I was in Panama, the university's student body in a free vote had recently elected a slate of pro-Castro student leaders. In Guatemala several hundred students have illegally made the round trip through Mexico and Cuba to Prague or Moscow and back home again to form the hard core of the Communist underground.

Communism's drive to conquer Latin America is, in short, carefully planned, well financed, and deadly serious. Many countries in Latin America are, moreover, in what the Marxists call a prerevolutionary situation. Because I wanted to sense the immediate impact of Castroism, I confined my trip to Castro's closest neighbors—Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Panama, Guatemala, Mexico, with a last stop in Guantanamo, the great American naval base in Cuba itself.

The countries I visited are all very different in various ways. But they all have certain characteristics in common, which are also shared by almost all countries in Latin America. All have a long history of despotism, violence, and political corruption. All have a near-cancerous rate of population growth, higher in some cases than in Asia. All are raw-material producers, perilously dependent on the world price of oil, coffee, bananas.

In all these countries there is a dark and massive underlayer of illiterate or semiliterate Negroes or Indians, ruled by a thin upper layer of intellectuals with white or near-white (or, in Haiti, mulatto) skins. And in all these countries there is a constantly visible contrast between the gleaming skyscrapers and expensive cars of the world of the rich, and the slums and mud-walled villages of the poor.

These characteristics suggest what President Kennedy meant when he recently said, "I think the big dangers to Latin America are the * * * desperate conditions in the countries themselves, unrelated to Cuba." But the threat of Castro and communism to this hemisphere is also visible in Cuba itself. It is visible in the Czech helmets and Soviet arms of the Cuban militiamen who stand guard sullenly around the fenced periphery of the Guantánamo base.

"We used to exchange cigarettes and chow and call each other amigo, even after Castro took over," a marine private told me. "Not anymore, not since the Russians came."

Since the Russians came, Cuba has been transformed into a Soviet satellite and a military base 90 miles from Florida. That ugly fact remains true, even since the withdrawal of the offensive weapons and the reduction in Soviet troop strength. As one result, Guantánamo is today locally indefensible—the corporal's guard of marines on the base could not possibly hold out against Castro's big Soviet-equipped army, let alone the remaining Russian troops.

As another result, communism is now so firmly established in Cuba that, according to current Pentagon estimates, it would require a Korea-scale war to dislodge it. Even minus the missiles, the Communist establishment in Cuba thus represents the most serious military threat to this hemisphere since the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated.

For all these reasons, it is easy to see why President Kennedy has said, "I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today." It is much more difficult to see how any sensible man could maintain that Castro may be "one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

But the Ambassador's remark was a sensible remark all the same. There are four distinct ways in which Fidel Castro has served the vital interests of the United States. Let me list them:

First, he has reminded us North Americans of the existence—and the importance to our Nation—of Latin America.

Second, he has shown the Latin American intellectuals the reality, not the dream, of communism. In so doing, he has acted as a sort of inoculation against the Communist smallpox in this hemisphere.

Third, Castro has thrown a badly needed scare into the Latin American ruling class. Without such a scare, the Kennedy administration's Alliance for Progress would not stand a ghost of a chance of succeeding.

Fourth, Castro and Khrushchev have given the United States an opportunity to demonstrate for all the world to see, where the real center of power in this hemisphere lies. It lies in the United States. Since Khrushchev's October backdown, all Latin Americans know that this is so.

Castro's harsh reminder of the existence of Latin America was by no means the least useful of his services to the United States. For historical and geographic reasons, we North Americans have long suffered from a sort of mental block about Latin America. Except for a minority of specialists, we have simply refused to read about, or think about, Latin America. This national complacency about Latin America has been reflected in American policy.

In the pre-Castro era Latin Americans could—and did—accurately complain that the United States sent more dollar aid to Communist Yugoslavia than to all the 20 Latin American states with their more than 200 million people. If Castroism is not to be the wave of the future in Latin America, one reason is that last October's great Cuban crisis made Americans belatedly realize that Latin America is indeed the most critical area in the world today.

Castro's second useful service to the United States—the inoculating effect of his visible demonstration of the reality of communism—is admited even by the Communists themselves. One of the most interesting persons I interviewed on my travels was Señor Gustavo Machado, secretary general of the Venezuelan Communist Party.

Because his party is in semirevolt, Senor Machado was in semihiding. When I finally tracked him to his lair, in the comfortable, California-style Caracas house of a brother-in-law (Machado's family, like Castro's, is rich) he turned out to be a mild-mannered man in his midsixties, with gold cuff links and the air of a Spanish don.

Senor Machado was remarkably candid. There is no doubt, he said, that 80 percent of the people of Latin America were for Castro 2 years ago. Now 80 percent are against him. Why? He shrugged. Fidel should not have admitted he was a Communist. (As this suggests, communism as such is not admired among Latin America's heavily Catholic people.) Khrushchev "saved civilization" by withdrawing his missiles from Cuba, Senor Machado said, but Khrushchev "should have asked Fidel first instead of treating him like a puppet." But, he concluded, "our party is very militant, and we shall win in the end, all over this continent."

Maybe so, but old Senor Machado sounded oddly dispirited. He has reason to be. Castro's immense popularity in Latin America a year or so ago is an undisputed fact. But the precipitous decline in Castro's following, sadly acknowledged by Machado, is also a fact—it is confirmed, as President Kennedy has said, by all American intelligence surveys. Yet it is important to understand what the decline means, and what it does not mean.

It does not mean that the United States is universally loved in Latin America. In Guatemala City I gave a dinner party for five university student leaders. A sample of the way those five boys talked is worth recording, for it reflects both the nature of the decline in Castro's popularity, and the dangers of being too complacent about it. All five boys agreed that a year or so ago Castro had been their hero. He was a hero still to one—a sallow-faced youth who looked remarkedly like a beardless Castro and talked only in the glum Marxist dialectic. Castro was no longer a hero to the four other boys. But there were very audible Marxist overtones in their talk too, especially on the subject of the United States. Here is a sample:

"You Americans are not Greek people. You are Phoenician people—traders, materialists, no things of the spirit."

"You need our raw materials, our markets, so you do not send money to us because you want to help us but because you must. The Alliance for Progress is just some sort of business. Now Fidel is a monkey on your back, so that is another reason why you must send us money."

"The United States owned Cuba, and there would be no Castro if there had been no Batista. You Americans forced Castro to turn to the Russians."

SPREADING MARXIST GOSPEL

In most Latin-American universities the science of Marxism-Leninism is taught as gospel, and the students' mental image of the United States—with an assist from some local business interests—is twisted to fit the gospel. Anti-Americanism, like anticommunism in the United States, is part of the air Latin-American students breathe. Marxist simplifications were also reflected in their talk about Castro:

"Castro put in social justice in Cuba," said one. "He built houses, he sent poor children to schools. But we do not like his totalitarian state."

"Castro has done good things," said another. "But in Cuba, under communism, speak the wrong thing, and al paredón." "Al paredón" means "to the wall"—the wall against which Castro's critics are shot.

"Here is false democracy," said another boy. "Big show, but vote is directed. Yet there is some sort of democracy here, because I can speak what I want to speak. Not in Cuba."

In most of Latin America the freedom to "speak what I want to speak" is a new thing. Take the area I visited. Only in Cuba has one old-style dictator, Fulgencio Batista, been replaced by the new-style dictator, Fidel Castro. In Haiti, hated Francois Duvalier, surrounded by the bully boys of the Tonton Macoute, maintaining his torture chamber in the cellar of the presidential palace, still clings precariously to power.

Other old-style dictators have gone down like ninepins. Guatemala's Jorge Ubico was one of the first to be thrown out, back in 1944. Venezuela's corrupt and greedy Marcos Pérez Jiménez took to his heels in 1958, and the Dominican Republic's little Hitler, bloody Rafael Trujillo, was assassinated in 1961. The old-style dictators are a dying breed.

What is to replace the breed? A lot depends on the students and intellectuals like those Guatemalan boys, for they—not the dark-skinned, illiterate people of the underlayer—are the ruling class of the future. The minds of those boys, like the minds of the other Latin-American students, are being pulled in two directions.

One pull is the instinctive distrust of the Yankee colossus, the lure of the neat Marxist explanation for everything, the need for change. The other pull is the urge to speak what I want to speak—and Castro's wall. The wall in Cuba, in short, is as vivid a symbol of communism as Khrushchev's wall in Berlin.

But wall or no wall, Latin America is ripe for change. The only question is whether it will be Castro's kind of change. The Alliance for Progress is a carrot-and-stick device for promoting another kind of social justice. The great roadblock in front of the Alliance for Progress is the established ruling class in most Latin-American countries. This is understandable, since, from the point of view of the ruling class, everything is dandy already, and any change would be for the worse.

Consider one rather typical member of the ruling class, whom we shall call Rafael Castillo. Rafael is an amusing, American-educated Panamanian in his midthirties. His family is immensely rich. In the last election Rafael was the chief coiner of slogans. "My best poster was a picture of a slum and another picture of a rich man's horse in an air-conditioned stall. Below was the slogan: 'Are you for the people or the horse?'

"Did your side win?" I asked.

"Of course," said Rafael. "That was all arranged."

"And are the people still in the slums and the horse in the air-conditioned stall?"

"Of course," said Rafael, and laughed hugely.

Rafael is an oligarch, a member of the handful of families who run, and largely own, such countries as Panama. Many oligarchs, like Rafael, are agreeable people, but they usually invest their money abroad, pay few taxes and feel no responsibility for their own people. Rafael, in short, represents the old way of doing things in Latin America.

The old way of doing things in Latin America has deep roots. Among the Presidents I interviewed, Roberto F. Chiari, of Panama, and Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of Guatemala, are fairly representative of the old way. Both are agreeable old gentlemen—Ydigoras especially: a gutty, shrewd old man of great physical courage. Both are personally very rich—Chiari has a near monopoly of milk in Panama, and Ydigoras' income from government and other sources is estimated at around a million dollars a year. And although both have introduced minimal reforms in a bow to the Alliance for Progress, both are essentially conservative—they are themselves members of the oligarchy and represent its interests.

There is a pro-Castro underground in both countries. In Panama the incestuous, blandly luxurious life of the "Zonians"—the privileged Americans in the Canal Zone—provides a constant irritant which is the Communists' greatest asset. Guatemala had the first overtly pro-Communist government in this hemisphere—fellow-traveling President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman was thrown out with an assist from the CIA in 1954—and the Communists are waiting to make a comeback. They may make it.

But Castro and communism no longer represent the only alternative to old-style oligarchical governments in Latin America. One reason is that Castro's wall frightens the Latin-American ruling class as much as the intellectuals. Another reason is that a new breed of modern-minded businessman is challenging the power of the established oligarchies. Rómulo Betancourt's progressive Venezuelan Government, which has redistributed land, increased taxes on the rich and undertaken a massive educational program, has survived in part because it has the support of the more sensible portion of the Venezuelan business community. Dr. Pedro Tinoco, Jr., of Caracas, who is the spokesman for these business interests, told me that economic and social reform are both essential in Latin America, since "they represent the only real alternative to Castroism." A few years ago such views were anathema among the Latin-American ruling class. Thanks to Castro, that is no longer so.

Thanks again to Castro, a new kind of politician is beginning to emerge in Latin America. Betancourt is an example. So is Juan Bosch, new president of the Dominican Republic, a white-haired, very handsome man in his mid-50's, with a lined, thoughtful face. Betancourt and Bosch are members of what is sometimes known as the club—other members are men like Governor Luis Muñoz Marin of Puerto Rico, and ex-President José (Pepe) Figueres of Costa Rica. The members of the club know each other well, often correspond. In sharp contrast to traditional Latin-American politicians, they are not in politics for money. The members of the club are idealists within reason, and prophets of peaceful, non-Communist social and economic change.

They are left-leaning—Betancourt is an ex-Communist, Bosch had a pro-Castro period. They are not necessarily pro-American, not in the sense some dictators of the past have been. (Franklin Roosevelt said of Trujillo: "He is an s.o.b., but he is our s.o.b.") Yet in the opinion of the ablest American observers on the scene, men like these represent the best bet we can make. In fact, the Kennedy administration has already bet heavily on Betancourt and Bosch.

Overt American support is another reason Betancourt has survived so far. And although Bosch is no American stooge, American power, including plain old gunboat diplomacy, which was used to prevent the reestablishment of the Trujillo gang's dictatorship, made his presidency possible.

And here we come to the last of Castro's four great services to the United States. The successful American blockade of Cuba in October was a public demonstration of a simple fact. In the Caribbean and Central America the power of the United States is unchallengeably predominant.

We have become oddly shamefaced about American power—like female legs a century ago, it is not mentioned in polite liberal society. Yet our power exists, and we need only be ashamed of it when it is used badly or for wrong ends, or when it is not used when it ought to be used.

American power takes many forms—propaganda, economic pressure, economic and military aid, and the quiet persuasion of diplomacy. But simple military power is the essential ingredient. And the essential ingredient of military power is the willingness to use it. That is why Castro has not attacked Guantanamo. If he attacked Guantanamo or a neighboring Latin-American state, he would be in a war he would quickly lose, and he knows it. In short, Castro's big, expensive army isn't going anywhere. Neither are the Russian troops in Cuba, not unless Khrushchev wants a war.

WHAT STEPS SHOULD WE TAKE?

Even so, Castro's Cuba still represents an important Communist military base in America's backyard. That brings us back to the question with which this report began: Should American power, even at the risk of general war, be used to pull communism out of Cuba by the roots?

President Kennedy decided against that course during the crisis of October, when he overruled the "hawks," who wanted to strike directly at Cuba and thus remove not only the missiles but Castro himself. He has since reaffirmed that decision. I am now convinced that it was on balance the right one.

Mind you, it is extremely unlikely, in the opinion of the best observers on the scene, that the Cubans themselves will get rid of Castro. Castro's secret-police system, let alone the backstop of Soviet troops, all but rules out that happy ending. Nor will half measures suffice, as we learned at the Bay of Pigs. In short, bar an American invasion in force, Castro for the foreseeable future is here to stay.

But President Kennedy has ruled out an unprovoked invasion, for what now seem to me three good reasons. One reason is suggested by Woodrow Wilson's smug remark when he ordered the American landing at Vera Cruz in 1914. His purpose, he said, was to "teach the Latin Americans to elect good men." We have since learned that heavy-handed military intervention only teaches the Latin Americans to hate the United States.

Thus military intervention is a desperate last resort. Even so, we must be willing to use that last resort if necessary. President Kennedy has already made it clear that aggression by Castro against Guantanamo or a neighboring state will mean war. We must also make it clear that we will, if necessary, use our power to prevent the Communist smallpox from infecting Castro's neighbors—that we will intervene with force to prevent a Communist takeover anywhere in the Caribbean or Central America.

If we make this clear in advance, we are far less likely to have to use our power in this way. Latin Americans (like everybody else) are bandwagon jumpers. Much of Castro's former popularity in Latin America derived from the notion that his bandwagon was going places. Khrushchev's big backdown in October helped to dispel that notion. But it is still important to make it abundantly obvious that Castro's bandwagon is going nowhere. The fact that we have the military power to prevent Castro's bandwagon from going anywhere is a second good reason for ruling out an invasion of Cuba under present circumstances.

A third good reason is that the example of Castro's own regime makes it more practical than ever before for American power to be used in order to promote the kind of Latin American governments described by Simón Bolívar. Bolívar's rule was, "Do not adopt the best system of government, but the one most likely to succeed."

A carbon copy of our own system of government is not at all likely to succeed. In countries where assassination is considered a standard political instrument, where the mass of the people cannot read or write, where the opposition regards incitement to rebellion as its proper function, a certain executive ruthlessness is essential.

The Mexican Government, for example, is a peculiar, bland dictatorship in which individual freedom is permitted, but the mass of the people have no real voice. Betancourt's government in Venezuela is building a powerful internal police system and practices press censorship—necessarily so, where the opposition expresses its displeasure with "Cuban dinamitas." The "system of government most likely to succeed" in such countries stops short of full libertarian democracy. But it also stops short of both Duvalier's torture chamber and Castro's wall. Except in Cuba and Haiti, the young men in the countries I visited can "speak what I want to speak." They cherish that new-found right.

It may seem corny to say so, but the freedom to "speak what I want to speak" remains our greatest asset in the struggle with communism. The Latin American students of today are the rulers of tomorrow and nothing has so successfully "alienated the intellectual" as Castro's wall—but not in the sense Lenin meant. That is why it may indeed turn out that "Fidel Castro is one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

ANNIVERSARY OF MARYLAND STATEHOOD

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today is the birthday of the most beguiling member of the sisterhood of States, the great Free State of Maryland.

Since 1634, this ever youthful charmer has won the hearts of all who have been fortunate enough to enter her company, captivating them with an alluring mixture of her southern coquetry and her Yankee ingenuity.

Perhaps, Mr. President, the secret of Maryland's attraction lies in that combination of factors which was the inspiration for her sobriquet, "America in Miniature." And this she truly is, Mr. President.

Temperamentally, for instance, she represents the heritage of our industrious North, the zest for gracious living of our romantic South, and the enormous promise of our expansive West, all assimilated into one unique and unforgettable personality.

Physically, too, Mr. President, she is truly "America in Miniature," and like one of Nature's true beauties, she takes justifiable pride in flirtatiously displaying her lustrous seashores, her verdant farmlands, and her softly rolling mountains.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that these remarks betray my longtime love affair with fair Maryland, and if this is true, I can only admit that I am one of the multitude of suitors who have fallen under her spell.

May her birthday anniversary be a pleasant one, and may all the Members of this body join me in wishing her many more centuries of happiness and prosperity.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to join with the Senator from Maryland in celebrating Maryland's birthday. I have a special interest in Maryland, because she was one of the first States to adopt an antibillboard law. I recommend to my colleagues a drive to Frederick, which they will find absolutely free from signboards. I commend Maryland for having taken that forward step.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator for those remarks. I may say, with some modesty, that 33 years ago I was one of the original sponsors of the elimination of signboards at roadsides, when I was a member of the State senate.

AN END TO DETERGENT POLLUTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the American housewife is deeply in debt to modern industrial technology for eliminating one after another of the backbreaking chores that long plagued her daily life. Yet, while new products have most often proved a blessing, they have from time to time also proved costly in unexpected and even grotesque ways. And nowhere has this been more dramatically illustrated than in the case of the modern synthetic detergent.

For the housewife depressed by soap rings and by stubborn particles clinging to dishes, and by the unpleasant knowledge that hard water makes for hard washes, the synthetic detergent promised an efficient economical solution—with no apparent defect.

Today, however, the housewife has begun to wonder if her detergent is not more bane than blessing. She has now discovered that it is impossible to buy a container of detergent in a standard size and shape with its contents clearly marked. She is met at the supermarket counter with a cockeyed array of squeezeable, narrow-waisted, slant-shouldered detergent packages in odd and mystical measurements. The selection of a suitable detergent at an economical price has become a dismal, new, and unrewarding chore.

But one dispenser of detergents that the housewife had not bargained for was her own tap faucet. Yet just last summer the inhabitants of Lindenhurst, Long Island, discovered that they could draw from the taps in their kitchen sinks long draughts of white sudsy water. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, the suds were not strong enough to wash any dishes. Neither was the water potable. Ironically, the Lindenhurst housewife found that, while detergents came out of her tap, she was forced to buy her drinking water in containers. This is scarcely my idea of progress.

The experience of Lindenhurst was not unique. Synthetic detergents have infiltrated water supplies in both this country and in Europe, clogging water and sewage systems, and polluting rivers and streams. Many an idyllic city on the banks of a river has been punctuated by the sight of an enormous floating raft of suds.

There is some evidence that drinking water containing substantial quantities of detergents may be harmful to human health. There is additional evidence that not uncommon levels of detergent pollution are harmful to fish.

The reason for the emergence of the synthetic detergent as a prime source of pollution is quite simple. The detergents presently being marketed simply do not decompose as soap through the natural action of bacteria decomposes. Detergents, once finding their way into the water supply, are removed neither by the natural action of bacteria nor the artificial action of water purification plants. And as greater and greater quantities of detergents are discharged into our sewage systems, they remain in the water supply building up at an alarming rate.

Is this the price we must pay if we are to have the convenience of detergents? The answer, fortunately, is "no." Representative Reuss of Wisconsin who has long been a leader in the fight to rid our environment of artificial contaminants has made an exhaustive review of the detergent problem and has suggested what I consider to be a sound and feasible approach to the detergent problem. Congressman Reuss discovered that Germany—which ironically produced the first synthetic detergent—has enacted legislation banning nondecomposable detergents from German markets after December 31, 1964. Synthetic detergents capable of satisfying the standards set by the German Government have already been developed at Huells, at Gelsenkrichen, and at Hamburg. These new detergents are fully as efficient as their predecessors but they decompose as quickly and harmlessly as soap made from animal and vegetable fats. And they do so without leaving great traces of foam. They are only slightly more expensive than detergents now on the market.

Representative Reuss introduced legislation in the House embodying the essential elements of the successful German legislation. The Reuss bill would require that detergents manufactured or imported into the United States after June 30, 1965, comply with standards of decomposability set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

My colleagues, the junior Senators from New Hampshire and Wisconsin, and I share Representatives Reuss' concern over the detergent problem. Working together, and utilizing the Reuss bill as a basis, we have prepared legislation which I believe will insure the removal of the incriminated agents from all detergents.

For myself and on behalf of Senators McIntyre and Nelson I introduce at this time a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be included at the close of my remarks and that the bill lay over for 3 legislative days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1183) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger (for herself, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. McIntyre), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is a coworker in this field and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me at this time so that I may add my views on this worthwhile cause.

New England's preeminence in higher education, research, per capita income, and advanced manufacturing indicates an excellent potential for future growth. But its distance from national markets and the exhaustion of some natural resources means that extra effort is needed to achieve results that are sometimes taken for granted elsewhere. And the early lead of the New England States in the industrial revolution has saddled the present generation with such inherited obstacles to progress as an illogical transportation system, high population density in unplanned urban centers, overcrowded stands of poor second-growth timber, and polluted waters.

Thus, New England's public problems are apt to be persistent, stubborn, and intractable. This is why the citizens and governments of our region must usually combine conservative methods of solution with the most imaginative long-range planning. Our complex inherited problems rarely yield to quick or easy solutions, so our determination to overcome them must be all the greater. And water pollution is such a problem.

Water pollution is a bar to our long-term development. It is a menace to public health. It imposes immense responsibilities on cities, far beyond the financial resources available to them for treatment facilities. As mayor of the city of Laconia, N.H., I helped to build a new treatment plant and am well aware of the difficulties faced by cities all across the Nation. The needs of recreation and modern industry for clean water constantly increases. Today 40 percent of Americans drink water that has already been used once. This national need for reusing both ground and surface water is the basis upon which I join the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] in introducing the detergent control bill to correct an increasingly critical element of our national pollution problem. In my opinion, the proper division of responsibility between the States and the Federal Government in controlling water pollution deserves further study. But the control of detergents seems a proper subject for Federal action.

In the United States we use 4 billion pounds of synthetic detergents every year, virtually all of which eventually enters the ground-water system of our navigable waters. By devising chemical substances which clean effectively and leave no sludge in hard waters, the manufacturers of detergents have earned the approval of consumers in an immense market. But with the widespread use of modern detergents has arisen a serious national problem which commands the attention of Congress.

The principal ingredient of modern detergents is a type of chemical which cleans effectively but contains a refractory kernel which resists decomposition by the bacterial action of waste treatment systems and natural waters.

The surface-active agents in detergents, of which the principal variety is known as ABS, very rarely decompose more than 50 percent in waste treatment. The chemical has a half-life of about 15 days in most water and may travel for a week over 100 miles in a river and still be less than one-third decomposed. By that time, the river water may have been taken for use by a downstream user. ABS persists for years in ground water as well. This gives rise to interstate problems upon which I urge Congress to act.

The national average of ABS in navigable waters is now about one-fiftieth of 1 part per million. In waste treatment even this concentration may impede coagulation and floc formation, adding to the expense and difficulty of operating municipal treatment works.

The national average in drinking water is now one-twentieth of a part per million, one-tenth of the minimum level recommended by the Public Health Service, but there are areas in which even that concentration of one-half part per million has been reached. In existing concentrations, ABS promotes the growth of undesirable oxygen-demanding algae in streams and of slime obstructions in treatment systems. A film may form over streams, delaying gas exchange with the atmosphere, reducing river water's capacity for reoxygenation by a very sizable percentage. These are the chronic problems, but in areas of greater concentration there are acute problems.

As concentration increase with reuse, the problems become even more serious. In the Ohio River, where water is reused 4 times, the concentration is already 10 times the national average for streams. The city of Cleveland, Ohio, has installed high pressure water jets in its sewage plant to beat back the foam, and a similar problem at Chanute, Kans., several years ago attracted international attention. In many places in the country billows of foam blow from streams and clog municipal treatment plants. In large apartment houses detergent suds clog drains, backing up water to create very serious health hazards. Other acute problems, which indicate concentrations greater than the national average, include the drowning of ducks whose feathers are permeated by detergent chemicals, refusal of water by livestock, side-effects on irrigated crops, and injury to fish.

I do not advocate increased assistance for local treatment plants. For one thing, it is unfair to expect our cities or the Federal Government to bear costs which should be assumed by the manufacturers of detergents. Also, such a subsidy could deal only with surface waters and would not reach the pollution of ground waters. In Suffolk County, N.Y., for example, the Federal Housing Administration has been refusing to insure mortgages because the quality of well water has been adversely affected by the very long-term effects of detergents from septic tank effluent. Congress has the power to protect the interstate ground water table, which is bound up with navigable waters in many ways. For this reason, the detergent control bill reaches beyond local treatment to control the process of manufacture.

The detergent control bill requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards to be met by all detergents which may enter the navigable waters of the United States after June 30, 1965, to assure that they no longer contain biologically "hard" surface-active agents that resist decomposition in natural waters and treatment plants. This bill does not contemplate a national tolerance level for detergent materials, but is directed at the elimination of a specific class of ingredients and their replacement with materials that will decompose.

I am happy to be able to say that this direct, effective approach to the problem has been made possible by advances in chemical technology and the experience of one of our European allies.

The West German Bundestag has passed an act requiring that all detergents meet minimum standards of decomposability. The very able Congressman from Wisconsin, Mr. REUSS, studied that act in operation and concluded that the United States could and should profit from West German experience.

The chemical companies which supply detergent manufacturers with ABS and other ingredients are contemplating a shift to the production of more readily decomposable chemicals. It is my confident hope that the manufacturers will greet legislation which recognizes their technical achievement and the sizable market that I am sure awaits the introduction of a better product. The detergent control bill will require the replacement of present chemical structures, not up to some uncertain national tolerance standard, but to the limit of technical feasibility consistent with commercial reasonableness. No company need fear that some kind of artificial bar will impede rapid technological development in devising new materials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent discussion of this subject in the Chemical & Engineering News of March 18, 1963, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as the West German Act, a competent technical report by an expert of the Public Health Service, and a telegram describing the city of Cleveland's foam abatement works.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. It is because very satisfactory alternatives exist within the range of commercial reasonableness that we today move to eliminate biologically hard surface-active chemicals from detergents. Their replacement with more advanced substances will improve what is obviously too threatening a type of contamination to be permitted to continue. Without this legislation, users of ground and surface waters will face unnecessary increases in concentrations of detergent chemicals whose chronic effects are economically injurious and whose effects in acute concentrations are a menace to the public health and safety.

Mr. President, the advanced industrial societies of the West have benefited greatly from quickening technology, which has carried us to the threshold of interplanetary travel and brought us the fruits of abundance and leisure. But at the same time our standard of living may decline in other ways. I have spoken today in hopes of helping to maintain our traditionally high standard of natural resources. America has been uniquely blessed by nature in a world largely denied the beauty and natural abundance that has always been ours.

We must not accept a declining standard of water that threatens health, industrial development, the resources of local governments, and the very outdoors which are a source of spiritual strength to us all.

Exhibit 1

Biodegradability of Detergents—A Story About Surfactants

Detergents—a boon to mankind—have come in for a fair share of criticism these days. The reason: pollution. Although ABS accounts for only a minor share of water pollution, a spate of pending legislation would restrict the use of alkylbenzene sulfonate (ABS) based detergents. Notwithstanding the fact that the role of ABS in pollution is probably overemphasized, industry spends more than $5 million annually on research aimed at reducing the problem of undegraded detergents in our water supply. This research takes many forms. At the one extreme, it is aimed at developing more degradable surfactants. At the other extreme, it attempts to prove—quite successfully, it might be said—that ABS is only a very minor contributor to overall water pollution.

Roughly 75 percent of all household detergents contain some ABS. In 1962, some 4 billion pounds of household detergents were sold—meaning about 560 million pounds of ABS. ABS-based detergents get most of the blame for pollution stemming from detergents, but other types—alkylphenol nonionics—are also at fault.

With pressure mounting to ban ABS detergents, raw material suppliers are scurrying around to come up with suitable materials. Alpha olefins are often mentioned as starting materials that would make a more degradable product. Five companies are building plants to make these olefins. It is generally agreed that they are more degradable than present materials; but, at present, their cost is in question.

Price may not be a factor though, if legislation forces a switch to new materials. Two Federal bills have been proposed by Congressman Henry S. Reuss, Democrat, of Wisconsin, which would do just that; and States are also pondering such legislation. Meanwhile in West Germany, where the problem is more critical than in the United States, legislation has been enacted. German detergent makers must switch over to products which are at least 80 percent degradable by October 1, 1964.

U.S. makers, although not now saddled with a deadline, appear to be shooting for new products by about 1964–65. Right now there is a 50–50 chance that Federal legislation will be enacted, but with the large stakes involved, detergent makers would surely like better odds.

In the final analysis, many experts say, pollution in general will prevail, whether detergents are improved or not. The call is out to improve our basic sewage treatment facilities and replace archaic cesspool type disposal systems with sewers.

Alkylbenzene sulfonate is the largest single surface active agent in household heavy-duty detergents. It is produced today almost entirely by alkylating benzene with propylene tetramer, followed by sulfonation of the benzene ring. The propylene tetramer is predominantly C_{12} but it may also contain varying amounts of C_9 to C_{15} molecules. It consists of a multitude of branched isomers that have never really been specifically characterized. Commonly referred to as ABS, it might be more descriptively called TPBS to distinguish it from proposed substitutes where the alkyl radical is some type of "straight" chain.

The opinion most widely held is that the highly branched isomers of the alkyl chain cause the problem—these just don't degrade rapidly enough under treatment conditions.

Dr. R. D. Swisher, research group leader in Monsanto's inorganic chemicals research department and the one most referred to in discussions on biodegradability and branched chains, says there are 3,057 isomers for the $C_{12}H_{25}$ group and about 80,000 different structures possible from C_{10} through C_{15}. "Thus, when we read in the newspapers that ABS is not biodegradable, we are reading a very broad statement. And furthermore, it is a statement that is not true."

Dr. Swisher's work shows that the present-day mixture of TPBS does, indeed, degrade. In river-water tests (a few parts per million of surfactant are dissolved in river water, and the solution is analyzed every few days, the methylene blue method being used to determine the amount of degradation), a typical household TPBS will drop from 7 parts per million at the beginning to 2 parts per million after about 3 weeks. While not all of the isomers present degrade equally fast, even the more resistant components degrade if given enough exposure to microorganisms, Dr. Swisher points out.

Much of the research effort in finding a more degradable detergent has been to develop a straight-chain hydrocarbon to make alkylbenzene. If these materials degrade readily in sewage treatment plants in a matter of hours, the detergent part of the overall pollution problem will be solved.

Most soapers will agree privately to a maximum of 10 percent of the total organic residue from a sewage treatment plant as TPBS (public health officials are more apt to say 5 to 10 percent). Assuming the soapers' most damning figure of 10 percent, then, a readily degradable detergent will leave about 90 percent of the pollution problem unsolved for surface water.

Sewage treatment plant effluent, however, is only part of the water pollution problem. The 1960 census showed that about 34 percent of all housing units may lack public sewage facilities. Many of these households obtain water from their own wells. Here, detergents must be degraded mainly in the ground rather than in a sewage treatment plant. Most significant is the fact that there are many questions yet unanswered about the rate of degradation even of improved detergents under such conditions.

The ground water problem has become most acute in New York's Suffolk County. Close proximity of septic tanks to drinking water supplies has led to foaming in fresh water from private wells, is seriously affecting this area. It has led to a concerted effort on the part of industry and State, local, and Federal authorities to pinpoint the degradation of detergents in soils and ground water. During this past fall, tests began in Long Island to gather basic knowledge on the problem.

The Soap and Detergent Association got from its members composite samples of more degradable detergents. SDA hasn't said what they are specifically, but likely candidates are a straight-chain ABS material, an alcohol sulfate, and a normal TPBS detergent for control purposes. These products are being used individually for 8-week periods in an Oakdale (Long Island) home. About 30 test wells have been drilled in the area to check the flow from the cesspool. Weekly samples from each well are analyzed in order to get an idea of the amount of degradation taking place. The concentration level of other sewage constituents is also being checked. Just 2 weeks ago, tests were begun at a second home and within the next 2 months the goal is to have four test sites in operation.

The tests, partially sponsored by New York State's Temporary State Commission on Water Resources Planning, will be completed possibly in another year. At that time the authorities involved hope to have the answer to many questions. Probably the most important: What type of detergent, if any, is most easily degraded under these conditions?

TWO PROBLEMS

Actually there are two problems in the United States. One involves ground waters, the other surface waters. Surface waters receive waste from sewage plants where aerobic degradation is used to clear the effluent of contaminants. Without sewage systems, septic tanks or cesspools are used to degrade wastes. In these systems, some anaerobic degradation may take place within the tank. (Some experts question whether septic tanks are completely anaerobic systems or a combination of anaerobic and aerobic.) From there the waste seeps into the soil. Should the soil be saturated, there is little chance for proper degradation since an abundance of oxygen is lacking. Many feel that the more serious of these problems is in ground waters.

This attitude is shared by Dr. R. L. Woodward, chief of the engineering section at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center. He says surface water is not so great a problem as are ground water problems in the United States. His colleague, M. B. Ettinger, chief of chemistry and physics (engineering section), pointing to the surface water problem, says from 5 to 10 percent of total organic matter in a sewage plant effluent is TPBS. But removing this will not nearly solve the whole pollution problem.

Toxicity is also mentioned frequently in discussion of ABS. A report to the Soap and Detergent Association in January states "In a statistically controlled experiment, beagle dogs consumed for a 2-year period 1,300 grams of food per week, containing up to 1,000 parts per million of ABS, with no discernible differences apparent in the health of any of the animals as determined by outward appearance or medical examination of the vital internal organs." This confirms previous 2-year tests that were carried out on rats.

Bad odor and taste are also at times attributed to ABS. Yet in Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards, revised 1962, it is stated, "ABS itself is essentially odorless * * * odor and taste characteristics are likely to rise from degradation of products of other wastes rather than from ABS."

Major organic chemicals used in detergents—over-all consumption, 1962

[In millions of pounds]

	Alkylbenzene zulfonate	*Alkylbenzene*
Procter & Gamble	235	165–170
Colgate-Palmolive	95	70
Lever Bros	90	65
Others	140	95
Total	560	395–400

	Alkylphenol adducts
Procter & Gamble	None
Colgate-Palmolive	15– 20
Lever Bros	55– 60
Others	30– 35
Total	100–115

	Alkanolamines
Procter & Gamble	10 –12
Colgate-Palmolive	0. 5– 1
Lever Bros	5 – 6
Others	1 – 2
Total	16. 5–21

	Fatty alcohol adducts [1]	*Fatty alcohol* [2]
Procter & Gamble	190–200	95–105
Colgate-Palmolive	None	-------
Lever Bros	None	-------

	Alkanolamides
Procter & Gamble	50–55
Colgate-Palmolive	3– 4
Lever Bros	22–25
Others	6– 8
Total	81–92

[1] Roughly 95,000,000 to 100,000,000 lbs. lauryl alcohol sulfate; 95,000,000 to 100,000,000 lbs. tallow alcohol sulfate.

[2] Roughly 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 lbs. lauryl alcohol; 50,000,000 to 55,000,000 lbs. tallow alcohol.

Source: C. & E.N. estimates.

The revised PHS standards do recommend a 0.5 part per million maximum ABS content in drinking water, although tests by PHS show most surface waters are below this limit. ABS does not foam until concentrations reach about 0.5 part per million, and odor and taste cannot be attributed to ABS where concentration is below 0.5 part per million. This revision is apparently directed to improving the esthetic qualities and economic utility of drinking water rather than as a protective limit.

It has been stated that one favorable result of ABS's occurrence in drinking water is that it is an indication of other pollutants. The revised standards bear this out by saying, "concentrations of ABS above 0.5 milligram per liter are also indicative of questionably undesirable levels of other sewage pollution."

SUBSTITUTE

The scramble for a TPBS substitute has led to much discussion about straight-chain materials—and alpha olefins take up a good share of this. The list of companies known active in alpha olefins stands at eight and probably hasn't stopped growing. Most significant, apart from the implications of a new volume organic chemical, is the potential reshuffling among major alkylbenzene producers. This market today is under the predominance of California Chemical, Continental Oil, Atlantic Refining, and Monsanto. Eyeing the hassle over degradability as a chance to carve out their share are a number of newcomers, including Gulf, Enjay, Union Carbide Olefins, and Phillips.

Continental Oil is well on the road to becoming an alpha olefin producer. It soon will have a semicommercial plant with about 10 million pounds' capacity at Lake Charles, La. Conoco's alpha olefins, already available in small quantities, range from C_8 to C_{20}. The company uses a Ziegler-type ploymarization route.

Atlantic Refining put an alpha olefin unit on stream late last year. The company uses its own process, based on cracking paraffin, and can supply tank car quantities. Capacity of the unit is probably in the 10 to 15 million pound-per-year range, and the process turns out C_6 to C_{13} alpha olefins.

California Chemical, another of the more recent public entries in the large scaled plants derby, is building a commercial unit at Richmond, Calif., which will use a paraffin-cracking route. Completion is set for this spring, and the capacity for 1963 will probably be about 20 million pounds. Prices of its alpha olefins range from 7 to 15 cents per pound and should hold at this level when the plants are on stream.

Monsanto, fourth of today's Big Four AB producers, doesn't say much about what direction its efforts will take, but does indicate that it feels alpha olefins are not the solution. Henry Moss, director of product quality in Monsanto's inorganic chemicals division, says the best approach, considering all the factors, is tailoring AB. Length of the chain, position of the aromatic ring on the chain, and the position of the sulfonate group on the ring in relation to the alkyl group all must be considered.

According to Mr. Moss, Monsanto is now at the point where it has two approaches that offer commercial feasibility. What these are, Monsanto isn't saying at this time.

Enjay is the latest official entry into alpha olefins. The company says it will build a plant at Baton Rouge, La.; and the process, developed by Enjay, will involve cracking petroleum wax. Completion is set for the second quarter of 1964. Trade sources have speculated that Enjay (via its parent, Jersey Standard) has been working closely with Monsanto. These sources add that Monsanto is a likely customer for Enjay's output. Neither firm will comment.

Gulf Oil, a purveyor of development quantities of various alpha olefins for some time, is one of the most recent entrants into the larger scale plant field. Its Port Arthur, Tex., refinery is the site of a unit to make alpha olefins via ethylene polymerization. The unit will make either blends of from C_8 to C_{20} or specific olefins with purities as high as 98 percent. Gulf says the unit, slated to start up next month, will make tank car quantities. Trade observers say the company will have a capacity to produce 8 million pounds of alpha olefins this year.

Union Carbide Olefins has also been mentioned in the trade as a possible producer of alpha olefins. Industry sources say Carbide has contracted for the paraffin output of South Hampton Oil (Silsbee, Tex.), estimated at 500 barrels a day. Carbide has no comment on this report, but does admit it is studying the olefins as a business possibility. Carbide could get to alpha olefins through molecular sieve separation of paraffins or by ethylene polymerization.

Sinclair, also linked with alpha olefins, apparently had a small pilot plant size polymerization unit going about 4 years ago. It decided at that time not to go ahead, although various sources mention the company as a possible producer.

Sohio, also listed as a possible among trade observers, says it has looked at the alpha olefins market, but no decision has been reached.

Phillips, mentioned in most discussions on alpha olefins, will not comment on details, says only that it "has been active for some time in the research, development, and sampling of biodegradable detergent intermediates produced from several different routes. At this time, however, no decision has been reached regarding manufacturing plans."

One trade source feels Phillips is close to making this decision and that the route would be a molecular sieve extraction of kerosene to get a straight-chain paraffin. Then it would use the chlorination-alkylation route to a straight-chain AB.

Dow is another name mentioned as a possible producer of a new type of detergent alkylate. Dow admits to following developments in this field, but declines to give any specifics as to what directions its own work might pursue.

A new, or what some people might consider a variation of an old, approach has come from Stepan Chemical. Stepan has revealed a group of alpha-sulfo fatty acid esters, which it has trade-named Bio-Terge. These compounds include a variety of materials, but Stepan is mainly promoting Bio-Terge TMS (alpha-sulfo-tallow methyl ester) and Bio-Terge MMS (alpha-sulfo-myristic methyl ester). Stepan says that in its river die-away tests Bio-Terge TMS has completely degraded in about a week compared to either semicommercial straight-chain ABS or standard ABS, neither of which was completely degraded at the end of 30 days.

Alfred C. Stepan, Jr., president, said before the Chemical and Drug Analysts Group in January that Bio-Terge detergents "make it possible for the major soap companies to shift over to a biologically soft detergent which will eliminate the problem in the water supply and at the same time have no loss in cleaning efficiency and no increase in costs." He added that it appeared likely that Stepan "will build a large plant to make substantial quantities of Bio-Terge, probably late in 1963."

Another source of alpha olefins, around for a long time, is natural fats. Archer Daniels Midland is one of the oldest producers from this source. Economics do not allow them to be competitive with petroleum derivatives, however.

While alpha olefins generate the most talk and appear to be the replacement leader for propylene tetramer, not all agree. California Chemical, well along with its alpha olefin plant, says it is basing its plans on a spectrum of markets, including specialty surface-active agents, plastics, fibers, and lubricant additives. The company adds that the potential outlet for alkylating benzene to make a more degradable detergent alkylate does not enter into its plans because of cost. Atlantic also seems to be heading for markets other than detergent alkylate for its alpha olefins.

OVERSEAS ACTIVITY

West Germany has also come in for its fair share of activity in this area. With the deadline on its detergent legislation little more than 18 months off, producers of nondegradable detergents are readying substitutes to meet legal requirements.

Chemische Werke Huels (West Germany's largest syndet manufacturer) has decided to work with straight-chain (99.2 percent) paraffins in the C_{12} to C_{14} range as a raw material. It will buy this material from Gelsenberg Benzin, which has licensed UOP's Molex process to produce the straight-chain paraffins. Then, through a Friedel-Crafts reaction the paraffin is used to alkylate benzene. Final step is then sulfonation.

Huels will guarantee at least 80-percent biodegradability according to the government test, but says the product will do considerably better. Cost is slightly higher than that of TPBS. Huels has completed all of its testing and has a pilot plant working. It expects it to go into production in about a year, Dr. Franz Broich, vice chairman of the board of directors of Huels, says.

Huels started work back in 1956 on this problem and, before deciding on its present route, had considered other methods. It looked at alpha olefins based on petroleum wax and on Ziegler chemistry. But Huels feels alpha olefins are too expensive. It also points out that only about 30 to 50 percent of the olefins are C_{12}'s. For the process to be economical, there must be a substantial credit for the non-C_{12} olefins, Dr. Broich says.

The firm also considered fatty alcohol sulfates, which are 100 percent biodegradable, but it feels fatty alcohols are too costly at present.

A question concerning the toxicity of the new unbranched-chain ABS detergents has been raised. Huels says that the new material, considered by itself, is no more toxic than TPBS. But it emphasizes that, with the higher degradability, the final product in treatment plant effluent is less toxic than TPBS.

Other companies are also at work in West Germany. Rheinpreussen says it has been making a biodegradable material in quantity, which it calls Korenyl. This is probably an unbranched dodecylbenzene sulfonate similar to Huels' product, but derived from a different starting material. The company won't comment.

Conoco and Deutsche Erdöl have joined hands in a new 65 million pound-per-year fatty alcohol sulfonate plant being built near Hamburg. The plant will probably start up late this year or early next year. It will make Ziegler-type Alfol alcohols, as starting materials for various sulfates and will be similar to Conoco's Lake Charles, La., operation.

As the deadline nears, other firms will probably come up with candidate syndets. H. J. Zimmer, A.G., made news last month with its sugar esters of fatty acids. Although Zimmer seems confident, other firms tend to downgrade the sugar esters as serious contenders for any large share of the detergent market. They feel that the products are too expensive and will probably find use in higher value products, such as cosmetic detergents.

One of the earliest entries in the biodegradable market is Dobane JN, Dutch Shell's product. Dobane, a straight-chain AB produced from wax cracking, has been made and marketed on a limited basis—mainly in England. At present Shell is building a urea wax plant at its Pernis chemical complex near Rotterdam in the Netherlands. The plant, slated for completion in mid-1964, will make commercial quantities of Dobane JN.

LARGE PIE

Why all this activity in the United States and abroad? Contenders are vying for a piece of a multimillion-pound pie. Total sales (active plus inert ingredients) of solid and liquid household detergents were about 4 billion pounds (containing about 560 million pounds of ABS) in 1962. Growth is roughly 4 percent per year. These figures exclude floor and wall cleaners as well as scouring cleansers. The Soap and Detergent Association reported sales at 3.75 billion pounds in 1962, but their reporting does not account for the entire industry. The big three of the industry—Procter & Gamble, Lever, and Colgate—have between 80 and 85 percent of the business, C. & E.N. estimates.

In the industry's parlance, last year's sales amounted to about 140 million cases. Solid detergents average 32 pounds a case (varying from 30 to 36 pounds), while the liquid detergents average about 20 pounds a case. The various light- and heavy-duty liquids comprised about 22 percent of last year's sales, compared to 11.5 percent in 1957.

Detergent composition can vary widely among producers. The solid products generally use TPBS as the key surface-active agent. But some producers, such as P. & G. use fatty alcohol sulfates in combination with TPBS, or as the sole active ingredient. These products also contain other ingredients, such as phosphates, dyes, optical bleaches, sodium carboxymethyl cellulose, and fatty acid amides (Colgate does not use amides in its solid detergents).

Variations continue in the liquid area. Procter & Gamble avoids ABS in its liquids, while Colgate and Lever use these sulfonates. Otherwise, the major organic components are generally an ethoxylated fatty alcohol sulfate or an ethoxylated alkylphenol adduct. Too, the liquids have various other materials, such as phosphates and hydrotropes (sodium xylene sulfonate or sodium toluene sulfonates), and they usually average 4 to 6 percent amides, compared to 2 percent for solid detergents. Moreover, some new liquids in early stages contain lauryl ether sulfate and an amine oxide, such as lauryl dimethyl amine oxide. The amine oxide could displace amides in household detergents.

Biodegradability problems seem destined to affect the outlook for present-day alkylphenols as well as alkylbenzenes. Although most of the concern as to biodegradability of synthetic detergents is for TPBS, where it rightly belongs, the biodegradability of alkylphenol is in question. Alkylphenol nonionics are generally quite markedly resistant to biodegradation. Alkylphenol adducts comprised 105 to 115 million pounds of household detergent formulations in 1962, with nearly half being accounted for by Lever. P. & G. does not use alkylphenols, primarily because its interest over the years has centered more on fatty acid derivatives.

These adducts require about 40 to 46 million pounds of alkylphenol, some 33 percent of the total alkylphenol market. Colgate does not purchase the alkylphenol, but rather buys the sulfated adduct for use in its formulations. Lever, although it does buy some alkylphenol for its own sulfonation, also buys sulfated adducts.

All told, household detergents account for about 40 percent of all nonionic detergent consumption. The trade feels that alkylphenol-based nonionics will decline because of the biodegradability fracas, although they could possibly be made more degradable with a straight side chain, while alcohol-based nonionics will rise rapidly. The decline phase for alkylphenols should become evident by 1965; and it is probable that, once it starts, alkylphenol adducts will be completely out of the household detergent market within a year.

The TPBS market faces the biggest turmoil because of the biodegradability problem. Last year, the detergent industry consumed about 560 million pounds of these sulfonates. The use of TPBS has virtually leveled off, since it has just about completely penetrated the high-sudsing, heavy-duty, solid detergent market.

The sulfonate production in 1962 meant a domestic demand for about 395 million pounds of alkylbenzene, chiefly as dodecylbenzene. Alkylbenzene production in 1962 was 527 million pounds, and exports ran about 102 million pounds. Procter & Gamble is the big consumer, taking about 170 million pounds last year. Colgate used 65 million pounds and Lever, 70 million. Miscellaneous detergent makers had consumed the balance.

With the biodegradability problem weighing heavily on detergent makers, it seems likely that a switch to straight-chain alkylbenzene could come quite strongly by 1964–65. This move, then, would not affect the benzene part of the demand, but it would cause serious repercussions in the propylene tetramer market. Whether a shift is the final solution to biodgradability or not is hard to say at this time.

Meanwhile, the use of fatty alcohols to make detergents should continue its upward trend. Procter & Gamble uses between 45 and 50 million pounds of lauryl alcohol and 50 to 55 million pounds of tallow alcohol annually in its detergent manufacture, with practically all going to household products.

HIGH STAKES

The stakes are just as high in West Germany. Total production in 1961 (latest available figures) of detergent raw materials was about 282 million pounds (active material). This includes some 56 million pounds that were processed into finished detergent material by the raw material producers themselves. Net production sold in 1961 to final processors was thus about 224 million pounds, valued at about $30 million. This includes some 31 million pounds of exports. The net amount sold in Germany was thus about 19 million pounds. Imports were minor, amounting to about 550,000 pounds. Exports were mostly to ECM countries, with smaller amounts going to EFTA countries, South America, and Asia. The bulk of imports came from the Netherlands, with a small amount coming from the United States. In the first half of last year, total production was 16 million pounds.

Estimates vary, but of total production, about 60 to 80 percent is ABS type, and about 20 to 40 percent is fatty alcohol sulfates and nonionic types, such as fatty alcohols, polyglycol ethers, and alkyl polyoxyethylene ethanol. Probably nonionics had the larger share of the 40 percent non-ABS type.

Huels produced about 9 million pounds of tetrapropylene ABS last year. Smaller producers, such as Sunlicht (owned by Unilever) and Elektrochemische Fabrik Kempden (owned by Rheinpreussen), accounted for an estimated 4.5 million pounds of ABS raw materials used in synthetic detergents.

In the United States, where the situation is a step or two behind West Germany, detergent makers either have not settled on what raw materials will do the trick, or they aren't saying. But something should break soon.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH

All sizable detergent makers have extensive research programs going on for new products. Also, raw material suppliers are almost constantly furnishing new samples for testing by detergent makers. Dr. Richard B. Wearn, director of research at Colgate-Palmolive, says that in his labs at present there are about 70 samples of straight-chain material which are in some stage of processing. He feels the straight chains are feasible as substitutes for TPBS, but the economics are in question. Dr. Wearn adds that he believes alpha olefins could be used as intermediates to make alcohols or sulfates and possibly replace lauryl alcohol, if their price were in the 6- to 7-cent range.

Proctor & Gamble says either Ziegler or wax cracked alpha olefins may do the trick, depending on price. P. J. Weaver, head of P. & G.'s sanitary engineering research services, and Frank Coughlin, associate director, product development division, state that the company is receiving tank car quantities of straight-chain materials for evaluation.

P. & G., as well as other detergent makers, would apparently like to get a degradable product out before any Federal legislation, and for two apparent reasons. As the Federal bill appears now, it may follow the lead of the West Germans, meaning a minimum of 80 percent degradation in a product under a particular type of test. If this should go through, some detergent makers might feel they have no incentive to come up with a product any better than to pass the test. Without legislation, P. & G. states—and other detergent makers appear to agree—the industry will come up with the most degradable product it possibly can under a wider range of field conditions.

The second reason involves price. Although the Reuss bill would not take effect until June 30, 1965, there would probably not be enough time for cost of the new raw material to come down to that of tetrapropylene. Therefore, detergent makers would end up paying a premium which would have to be passed on.

YEARS 1964–65

As to when we can expect to see some new products from P. & G., Lever, Colgate, and other detergent makers, 1964–65 seems to be the date most heard. P. & G. and Colgate have reached the tank car test stage with some products, and it is likely that other detergent makers have also.

Detergent makers seem most interested in three qualities in any product to replace TPBS. First, it must be more biodegradable. As to how much more, the only answer detergent makers give is, "as much as possible." Second, performance must equal present ABS-based products. Third, the price must be in line. At present there are these prices to consider: Propylene tetramer at 4 cents per pound, alkylbenzene at 10 cents per pound. Since most detergent makers do their own sulfonation, the price to shoot for is a 10-cent-per-pound detergent alkylate.

Industry observers expect that initial offerings of straight-chain detergent alkylates will be about 15 cents per pound. These will be from commercial plants of 50 million pounds or more. These sources also qualify this further by saying that the materials will be obtained by cracking paraffin or by extracting straight-chain paraffins from kerosene or heavy naphtha. By 1963–64, this price will drop to 12 cents; by 1964–65, to 11 cents; beyond 1965, to 10 cents; and eventually down to 8 cents per pound.

On the other hand, alpha olefins from ethylene polymerization can also be expected to go at 15 cents per pound as an initial offering from commercial plants. By 1965 this could come near the 10-cent mark, depending to a great degree on the ethylene situation of any particular maker.

Among the many questions in this area is the one as to which route to take to alpha olefins—Ziegler or paraffin cracking. Paraffin cracking gives a product mix that contains a broad range of olefins of different chain lengths, and this mix must be fractionated to provide a specific fraction. The Ziegler route does not give a wide product range, although fractionation is also needed.

The Ziegler chemistry route starts with ethylene at less than 5 cents per pound. No one has said in so many words what the cracking routes start with, but a slack (high oil content) wax is the likely candidate. With the wide variation in refinery economics, it is hard to pin down the price of slack wax. Some experts put it at 1.8 cents per pound, but it depends heavily on a particular refinery's situation—long or short on slack wax.

Whichever the route, raw material suppliers are gearing for the change. Whatever the change is, and whenever it takes place, pressure is building. State and Federal legislators got off to an eager start this year, throwing "ban the detergent" bills into the hopper in quick succession.

The legislative action was topped off late in January, with Representative REUSS introducing a bill which would prohibit use of degradation-resistant detergents. H.R. 2105 would take effect June 30, 1965. Before then, standards of decomposability would be set up by the U.S. Surgeon General.

EVEN ODDS

The bill is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearing date has been set. When such a date is set, the U.S. Public Health Service will probably put forth its opinion on the bill, which could easily affect its outcome. Should the technical people in Public Health Service back the bill, its chances for passing would increase. On the other hand, should they take a stand against the bill, its chances of passing would be lessened. At last check, the bill was given a 50–50 chance of passing this year.

Latest word from Washington: Congressman REUSS has followed H.R. 2105 with a second bill. H.R. 4571, introduced about a week ago, plugs a loophole in the previous bill. Although H.R. 2105 would ban detergents that don't meet decomposability standards from interstate commerce, it would have no control on intrastate manufacture. So detergents made in a State could be sold within that State. But some of these products would presumably end up in interstate waterways, and here's where the second bill plugs the hole. It bans detergents completely which could possibly end up in interstate waters.

Also the new bill would empower the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out its provisions. H.R. 2105 gave authority to the Surgeon General.

Five State legislatures have seen some type of detergent bill introduced this year. These vary from calling for study committees to all-out bans on nondegradable detergents.

Maryland's bill (No. A464) would make it unlawful to sell detergents containing alkylbenzene sulfonate. Also in Maryland, a joint resolution requests the Governor to appoint a committee "to review the need for a standard of degradability in waste treatment systems for detergent materials and to recommend a standard of and method for determining such degradability."

The third bit of legal action taken against detergents in Maryland would forbid the discharge of untreated detergents into streams and septic tanks from coin-operated laundries and car-washing operations. Effective date is January 1, 1964. A new bill proposed in Maryland would defer this matter until the committee reports on degradable matters.

Wisconsin, also bothered by water pollution, has set up a study committee to examine the detergent problem. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would ban any nondegradable detergent.

Another bill will soon be introduced in Wisconsin to outlaw the use of nondegradable detergents and also set up authority for the State board of health to formulate rules and regulations for detergents.

Nebraska is also in the act, with two bills. One would place a 10-cent-per-pound tax on hard detergents, and the other would set up standards of biodegradability and ban detergents not meeting these standards after January 30, 1965.

Behind these bills is the Nebraska Department of Agriculture's plan for a degradable detergent based on corn. Midwest Research Institute, working under a grant from the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and Inspection, has developed a process which would start with cornstarch to make what MRI says is a detergent showing promising biodegradability.

On the surface, Nebraska's proposed legislation looks like a serious attempt at solving a problem. But the remarks of Dr. E. A. Rogers, State health director, cast some serious doubt on the need for such legislation. Dr. Rogers has told the State health board that foam on rivers and streams created by nondegradable detergents is not a health hazard, merely a nuisance. He adds that if the bill is an attempt to raise tax funds, then why not present it on an economic basis and leave out the health problem propaganda? Despite the possible lack of need for or motives behind the proposed legislation, some observers feel the bill may pass this year.

The remainder of proposed State legislation comes from California and Connecticut. California would ban nondegradable syndets. The Connecticut bill would also ban these products, although biodegradability is not specifically mentioned in the bill.

The Soap and Detergent Association, acting as spokesman for the industry, says legislation will not help the situation and therefore is unnecessary. In general, detergent makers believe no legislation is required, neither State nor Federal, because they feel no health emergency is involved. Producers agree that eventually they must shift their raw materials to a more degradable material, and they feel they will do this as fast as possible. But because test methods for degradability do not yet correlate with actual field experience, there is no sound basis for regulation now, SDA says.

The West Germans echo this feeling. As Dr. Broich of Huels puts it, "The chemical industry must do whatever it can do."

As in the United States, however, German detergent producers feel the problem has been exaggerated as a result of constant pressure by the press and politicians. The producers don't deny that there is a growing problem and that detergents—especially TPBS, which is only about 25 percent degradable in West German treatment procedure—contribute significantly to it. But they emphasize that syndets are only part of the problem, and perhaps a smaller part at that.

FOAM, A NUISANCE

Foam is mainly a nuisance, the Germans say, although it may possibly lower the efficiency of sewage treatment plants by its effect on the surface tension of water. Further, they point out, syndets alone don't cause foaming in rivers, where their concentration is about 1 part per million. It's TPBS in the presence of protein material in sewage that makes the foam. Thus, surface-active agents are a visible indicator of a polluted stream. But the general public tends to place full blame on detergents. Far more serious a problem, it is felt, is the unseen pollution.

What of the future? Apparently, nobody is completely convinced that the new unbranched-chain ABS material is the ultimate solution. One highly placed West German executive of an ABS producer feels that, if fatty alcohol prices come down, then fatty alcohol sulfonates, with their 100 percent biodegradability, might be the big detergent of the future. But this doesn't seem likely.

Even in West Germany, where the situation appears nice and tidy on the surface, things aren't completely nailed down. For instance, there is talk of raising the 80 percent requirement to 100 percent and adding a nontoxicity requirement. Neither action seems likely in the near future. But some in the industry feel that the law will become progressively more severe.

Some feel that the Government test, based as it is on a miniature treatment plant, is unrealistic for Germany, which has few treatment plants. They feel that the Warburg test, which measures oxygen uptake, and hence gives a measure of true degradation to CO_2, water sulfates, etc., is more realistic. It more closely matches degradation in a river, they say. The Government test, on the other hand, is a measure of loss of surface activity. This doesn't necessarily mean complete degradation of the molecule. Supporters of the Government test say that it is imperative that more treatment plants be built (only about 20 percent of German communities have such plants) and that as time passes, tests will become more representative of actual conditions.

The United States has its uncertainties, too. Biodegradability and new raw materials, in the end, will cause major changes in the detergent industry. The multi-million-dollar industry will solve its share of the pollution problem as well as it possibly can, but it has been shown that a very substantial water pollution problem will still exist. Added to this, the reuse of water will increase. At present, some industries recycle waste waters or use municipal sewage effluent to conserve water and reduce stream pollution. Water reclamation has also been practiced to a certain extent in municipalities.

Already, reuse of water is widespread in the United States. A summary report put out by Taft Sanitary Engineering Center clearly points this out. "One fact is clear, we are already reusing our water; 40 percent of the United States' population is using water that has been used at least once for domestic or industrial purposes. This natural reuse will increase."

There seems to be general agreement that increased and improved water and waste treatment facilities can remove greater amounts of detergent pollutants, and, equally important, greater amounts of other organic and inorganic contaminants. The Taft engineering group says that work at the Center—lab scale—has shown that, under proper conditions, percolation through unsaturated soils reduces ABS content by 90 percent. Total organics will be reduced similarly. Facilities to treat secondary effluent for further removal of organics and inorganic materials, including ABS, could include adsorption techniques, foam fractionation, ion exchange methods, and electrodialysis.

Adsorptive techniques have centered mainly on the use of activated carbon. The Taft group believes that, of the methods studied to date, the carbon technique offers the most promise for removal of organic wastes, with cost for carbon adsorption to achieve 90 percent ABS removal and 70 percent overall organic removal being estimated at 6 to 8 cents per 1,000 gallons of effluent processed. Foam fractionation cost is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 5 cents per 1,000 gallons to remove 90 percent ABS and 30 percent overall organic content.

At the annual meeting of the Soap and Detergent Association in January, three research men from California Research Corp. told of their success in removing 95 percent of the ABS in a sewage plant. This was done by foaming and recycling the foam to the activated sludge reactor in the plant. Taft's advanced research treatment section is considering a pilot-size foam operation to investigate overall organic removal, including use of the recycle system.

Ion exchange has proved effective in removing contaminants, although the cost depends to a high degree on success in regenerating the resin. The Taft research group points out that ion exchange is most successful in removing inorganics, since organic materials may foul the resin. But ion exchange resins also hold promise for removing organics. Dr. Irving R. Abrams of Diamond Alkali's research labs has stated that in his labs products have been developed which are now being used commercially for removing organics similar to those encountered in sewage and industrial waste water.

Electrodialysis has also shown some worth in lab-scale setups. The Taft team says that, although organics are reduced in concentration in the purification cell of an electrodialysis setup, the organic particles tend to lodge in the membrane. But, they add, electrodialysis has been able to reduce inorganic content from a range of 500 to 600 parts per million to one of 100 to 200 parts per million in sewage waste. All of these, and other methods, are being studied. The more successful, if applied on a large scale, would remove not only detergent contaminants if they are still around at that time, but also all pollutants from sewage effluents.

Act Concerning Detergents in Washing and Cleansing Media (Act on Detergents) of September 5, 1961

(Bundesgetzblatt, pt. I, 1962)

The following act has been enacted by the Bundestag:

ARTICLE 1

(1) It is the purpose of this act to achieve maximum decomposability of surface-active and cleansing agents (detergents) contained in washing and cleansing media.

(2) Washing and cleansing media containing detergents shall not be put on the market by the manufacturer or importer, unless the decomposability of the detergents meets the requirements of the statutory ordinance to be issued under article 2.

(3) Paragraph 2 shall not apply where washing and cleansing media are supplied to third persons as samples for testing and experimental purposes.

(4) Nor shall paragraph 2 apply to the export or transit of washing and cleansing media.

(5) Any other conveyance of washing and cleansing media into or out of the area to which this act applies shall be deemed to be import or export.

ARTICLE 2

(1) The Federal Government shall be authorized to establish, by a statutory ordinance requiring the consent of the Bundesrat, the requirements of decomposability with regard to detergents in washing and cleansing media, as well as the necessary methods of testing. Such requirements must be in keeping with the level of scientific knowledge and technology attained in the field of detergent manufacture and sewage plant efficiency.

(2) The Federal Government shall issue the first statutory ordinance under paragraph 1 not later than June 30, 1962.

ARTICLE 3

(1) The authority competent under land legislation may take samples of washing and cleansing mediums needed for inspection at the importers' or manufacturers' premises. Part of the sample, officially packed and sealed, shall be left behind, if so demanded.

(2) The persons commissioned by the competent authority shall be permitted to enter rooms and premises insofar as their duty so requires. The fundamental right of inviolability of the home as defined by article 13 of the basic law shall be restricted to that extent.

(3) The officials of the authority competent under land legislation or their authorized agents shall not, without authority, disclose or make use of any business or technical secrets which have become known to them in the course of their duties, even if they are no longer in the service or if their employment has come to an end. This shall also apply to other persons who, by reason of official reporting, have obtained knowledge of the facts stated in the first sentence.

ARTICLE 4

(1) Any person violating the obligation imposed on him by virtue of paragraph 3 of article 3 shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year and a fine, or to either of these penalties.

(2) If the offender acts for remuneration or with the intent to secure pecuniary benefit for himself or for a third person, or to cause damage to a third person, he shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years. In addition, a fine may be imposed.

(3) Prosecution shall only take place upon petition of the injured person.

ARTICLE 5

(1) Any person who, in his capacity as a manufacturer or importer, deliberately puts washing or cleansing media on the market which do not meet the provisions of article 1, shall be guilty of a statutory offense.

(2) A statutory offense may render the offender liable to (1) a fine not exceeding DM10,000, where such offense has been committed intentionally; (2) a fine not exceeding DM5,000, where such offense has been committed negligently.

ARTICLE 6

(1) The provision in respect of fines contained in article 5 shall also apply to any person acting as an executive organ on behalf of, and authorized to represent, a body corporate, or as a member of any such organ, or as the legal representative of a third person. This shall also apply if the legal act establishing the representative authority is void.

(2) Any person charged with the management or supervision of the enterprise or of part of the enterprise of a third person, or who is expressly entrusted by such third person to fulfill, on his own responsibility, any duties imposed by this act shall be accorded the same legal treatment as persons specified in paragraph 1.

ARTICLE 7

If, in an enterprise, any person commits an act subject to a fine under paragraph 1 of article 5, the owner or manager of the enterprise or the owner's legal representative or a member of the executive organ in charge of the legal representation of a body corporate or a partner authorized to represent a partnership (Personengescellschaft) under German commercial law may be liable to a fine, provided that they have failed in their duty of supervision either intentionally or negligently and the offense is attributable thereto. The amount of the fine shall be determined in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 5.

ARTICLE 8

(1) If any person, in his capacity as a member of the executive organ in charge of the legal representation or as a "Prokurist"[1] of a body corporate or as a partner authorized to represent a partnership under German commercial law or as a "Prokurist" of a partnership, commits a statutory offense under the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 5, a fine to be determined in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 5 may also be imposed on the body corporate or the partnership.

(2) Article 6 of the law on statutory offenses shall also apply in respect of any remuneration or profit which the body corporate or the partnership under German commercial law has received in consideration of the statutory offense or derived therefrom.

ARTICLE 9

Objects may be confiscated which are connected with an offense punishable under paragraph 1 of article 5. Paragraph 4 of article 18 and articles 19 to 26 of the law on statutory offenses shall apply correspondingly.

ARTICLE 10

In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Third Transition Act of January 4, 1952 (BGBI[2] I, p. 1), this act shall also be valid in the land Berlin. Statutory ordinances made under this act shall apply to the land Berlin in accordance with article 14 of the Third Transition Act.

ARTICLE 11

This act shall come into force on the day following its promulgation.

The constitutional rights of the Bundesrat have been observed.

The foregoing act is hereby promulgated. Bonn, September 5, 1961.

Lübke,
The Federal President.
Ludwig Erhard,
The Deputy for the Federal Chancellor.
Ludwig Erhard,
The Federal Minister for Economic Affairs.
Balke,
The Federal Minister of Nuclear Energy and Water Economy.

Aspects of Synthetic Detergents in Water

(By Jesse M. Cohen, Engineering Section, Water Supply and Water Pollution Branch, Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cincinnati, Ohio, at the July 1959 meeting of the American Society of Sanitary Engineering, Washington, D.C.)

INTRODUCTION

During the past 20 years, the development of petrochemicals for household and industrial uses has undergone tremendous expansion and diversification. Leading this burgeoning market are the synthetic detergents. Derived from crude oil, they emerged about 20–25 years ago as a poor competitor for soaps, which are produced from vegetable and animal fats and oils. The challenge of synthetic detergents to soap supremacy as a cleansing agent began on a very modest scale. In 1939, sales of soaps totaled 3.3 billion pounds, compared to a sales total of synthetic detergents of only 18 million pounds, as illustrated, in figure 1 (not printed in Record).[1] [2] This beachhead was to advance steadily into a full-scale invasion of the detergent market. Ten years later, in 1949, soap sales totaled about 3 billion (2.96) pounds while total synthetic detergent sales, although still far behind, had expanded to 815 million pounds. In 1953, for the first time, total sales of synthetic detergents surpassed those of soap products, until today they comprise 75 percent of all detergent sales with a total of 3.8 billion pounds. Eighty-five to ninety percent of this impressive total is sold to the household market.

Synthetic household detergents are mixtures of at least 3 and sometimes as many as 10 individual components, each of which plays a specific part in the washing process. The one essential ingredient common to all is the surface-active agent, often referred to as the "surfactant" portion. Supplementary compounds, generally termed "builders," include polyphosphates, sodium silicates, sodium sulfate, and sodium carboxymethylcellulose. Other constituents, such as foam stabilizers, perfumes, and optical bleaches are usually added in minor amounts. Some typical formulations are shown in figure 2.

---

[1] Translator's note: "Prokurist"—proxy authorized by virtue of article 49 of the German Commercial Code to perform all judicial and extrajudicial legal acts arising from the management of a commercial enterprise.

[2] Translator's note: "BGBI" is an abbreviation for "Bundesgesetzblatt," which has been the official legal gazette since 1949.

[1] Macon, J. R., "Detergent Market Trends," Soap and Chemical Specialties, 31, 41 (March 1955).

[2] Anon. "Specialties Ignore Recession," Chemical and Engineering News, 36, 113 (September 1958).

FIGURE 2.—*Examples of household synthetic detergent formulations*

Component	Amount (percent)			
	A	B	C	D
Alkyl aryl sulfonate	9	18	8	31
Alkyl sulfate	9	------	22	------
Sodium polyphosphates	50	47	------	------
Sodium silicate	7	7	------	------
Sodium sulfate	18	23	63	62
Moisture	5	3	5	5
Other compounds	2	2	2	2

Although soaps perform well in warm, soft water, they all form insoluble calcium and magnesium salts which lack cleansing properties and cause deposits on plumbing fixtures and appliances. Soaps also lose cleansing activity in acid waters. To overcome these difficulties, chemists have created entirely new substances whose molecules are enough like those of soap to have essentially the same cleansing properties, but differ enough to be immune to the effects of acids or hard water.

Synthetic detergents are divided into three groups: anionic, cationic, and nonionic compounds. When soaps and most of the synthetic detergents are dissolved in water, their molecules split into two electrically charged parts, or ions. These ions consist of a large organic group which is hydrophobic, that is, relatively insoluble in water, and a smaller inorganic group which is hydrophilic, or soluble in water. This hydrophobic-hydrophilic structure is characteristic of all synthetic detergents. The various classes of synthetic detergents, including soap, are illustrated in figure 3 (not printed in RECORD). Of the hundreds of different commercial surfactants available, the one compound in greatest use is an anionic surfactant, the sodium salt of dodecylbenzene sulfonate, which is frequently referred to as alkyl benzene sulfonate or ABS for short.

Synthetic detergents have caused concern among waste and water treatment people for the past few years for two important reasons. One is that almost the entire industrial production of 3.8 billion pounds is eventually discharged to surface or ground water; second that some of the surfactants are endowed with remarkable abilities to resist the treatment processes available to the sanitary engineer. A portion of the detergent materials consistently resists absorption and sedimentation in the primary treatment of sewage. Even sewage plants possessing secondary treatment processes are able to reduce only partially the surfactant content. Hence, practically all sewage effluents contain some surfactant, which, because it has survived the rigors of sewage treatment, is inherently prepared for an even longer survival against the purification agencies in surface and ground waters. In many instances the stream water containing the persistent surfactant is used for municipal drinking water supply.

During the past few years an extensive technical literature has appeared covering many aspects of synthetic detergents in sewage and water. I will confine my discussion to synthetic detergents in water and water treatment plants.

EFFECTS ON RIVER WATER

Streamflow is commonly relied upon to dilute and further degrade treatment plant effluent by natural stream purification processes. It becomes pertinent therefore, to consider the persistence of synthetic detergents in river waters.

The surfactants that reach the rivers in sewage plant effluents are those residual materials that have resisted the intense biological activity of sewage and, hence, are not likely to be easily oxidized in river water. In fact, it has been shown that the surfactant in greatest use today will resist natural stream purification processes. In figure 4 (not printed in RECORD) are shown the data of Hammerton[3] which illustrate the rates at which various types of surfactants are destroyed in river water. It is apparent from these curves that a portion of surfactants C and D will persist for longer than 20 days, long enough for this contaminated water to arrive at a water treatment plant as part of the water supply.

Along with the surfactant, one of the "builders," polyphosphate compounds are discharged into streams in quantities 2-2½ times the amount of surfactant. Phosphates are an essential nutrient for biological life and the constant discharge of synthetic detergents into a river provides additional material for growths of algae. Algae may cause difficulties with water plant operation and frequently are responsible for unpleasant tastes and odors in water. The polyphosphates also become important in water treatment, as I will show later.

DETERGENTS IN WATER TREATMENT

During the years 1950–54, when synthetic detergent sales were mounting rapidly (fig. 1) a number of instances were reported throughout the country of difficulty with the coagulation process in water treatment plants. These difficulties were generally ascribed to the presence of surfactant in the raw water supply. At about this time, in response to requests from various State agencies, the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center initiated research on the effects of synthetic detergents on the coagulation process.[4] [5] Other research laboratories have since published results which have substantially confirmed our work.[6]

At the center we studied the individual components commonly included in household synthetic detergents to determine which of the major ingredients was responsible for the coagulation difficulties with alum and with iron salts. They were discovered to be two chemical compounds, the organic surfactants which generally is an alkyl benzene sulfonate, or ABS, and sodium polyphosphate which invariably is sodium tripolyphosphate.

Extensive investigation was done on the concentration of surfactant material which interferes with chemical coagulation. The data showed that damage to this process does not occur until relatively high concentrations of organic material are present. These interference concentrations are much higher than ever recorded as present in any drinking water supply. It is clear, then, that difficulties with chemical coagulation cannot be assigned to only the presence of surfactants.

Experiments with various concentrations of polyphosphates demonstrated that very small amounts of these phosphate compounds can interfere with coagulation. With a slight increase in phosphate concentration, the process of coagulation can be disrupted completely. Figure 5 (not printed in RECORD) illustrates the damage that small amounts of sodium tripolyphosphate can cause to a coagulation with ferric sulfate.[5] As little as 0.025 parts per million, or 0.2 of a pound in a million gallons of water, can decrease the quality of chemical coagulation in a water treatment plant. While many water supplies now contain interference concentrations of polyphosphates, fortunately no serious damage to water quality has occurred, for several reasons. First their interference may be overcome by increased coagulant dosage. Second, hardness which is present in varying degrees in practically all waters tends to reduce or eliminate their interference. Third, polyphosphates are rapidly converted in sewage to relatively innocuous forms of phosphates.

REMOVAL OF SURFACTANTS FROM WATER

I have already indicated that all sewage contains surfactant material in concentrations varying from a few parts per million to 20 parts or more per million. Sewage treatment processes at best remove up to 50–60 percent of the original surfactants and sewage effluents contain resistant forms which do not readily decompose. Dilution by river water further reduces the concentration so that municipal raw water supplies now contain surfactant concentrations ranging from a few parts per billion up to perhaps a few parts per million. This water will also contain varying amounts of phosphate compounds, but now in a form which will not interfere with chemical coagulation.

Water treatment processes have been shown to be ineffective in achieving significant removal of surfactant material.[5] [7] Chlorination, which is common to all water treatment plants in this country, has no effect in reducing the concentration. Chemical coagulation has been shown by several investigators[5] [7] [8] to be incapable of removing more than minor amounts, from 5–10 percent. Chemical coagulation is, however, very effective in reducing the phosphate compounds to very low concentrations. No research has been reported on the effect of rapid sand filtration which is a step in the water treatment process, on removal of surfactant. This unit process is used in all plants which chemically coagulate water, and indirect evidence indicates that no removals of dissolved materials such as surfactants would be obtained. It has been reported[7] that slow sand filtration, which is more common abroad than in this country, has shown removals up to 40 percent.

When synthetic detergents first became a problem to sanitary engineers, it was stated that turbidity present in most surface waters would adsorb surfactants and remove them by sedimentation. This has since been shown to be wishful thinking, since such predicted removals have not occurred in practice.

To date only one water treatment process will remove substantial amounts of surfactants, but at such great cost, unfortunately, that it is unlikely any plant will undertake the treatment. This process consists of the addition of activated carbon, which is commonly used in many water plants for the control of tastes and odors. The activated carbon is generally applied in amounts up to 10 p.p.m., with some exceptional plants using more during short periods of difficulty. Activated carbon will remove surfactant compounds at rates which can be predicted, as shown in figure 6 (not printed in RECORD).

---

[3] Hammerton, C., "Observations on the Decay of Synthetic Anionic Detergents in Natural Waters," J. Appl. Chem., 5, 517 (1955).

[4] Smith, R. S., Cohen, J. M., and Walton, G., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Water Coagulation," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 55 (1956).

[5] Cohen, J. M., Rourke, G. A., and Woodward, R. L., "Ferric Sulfate Coagulation in the Presence of Synthetic Detergent Components," accepted for publication in the Journal, American Water Works Association, (1959).

[6] Howells, D. H., and Sawyer, C. N., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Chemical Coagulation of Water," Water and Sewage Works, 103, 71 (1956).

[7] Hammerton, C., "Synthetic Detergents and Water Supplies," Proc. Soc. for Wat. Treat. and Exam., 5, 145 (1956).

[8] Vaughn, J. C., Falkenthal, R. F., and Schmidt, R. W., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Water," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 30 (1956).

For example, if 1.6 p.p.m. of surfactant are present in a water supply, removal to a residual of .01 p.p.m. will require treatment with 120 p.p.m. of carbon; if residuals of 0.1 p.p.m. of surfactant are desired, then 60 p.p.m. of carbon would have to be added.

In both cases, the required doses of carbon are prohibitive economically. Up to the present time, there is no economical way of removing surfactant material from drinking water. Present research activities are more logically directed toward removal at the sewage treatment plant.

GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

Growth of suburban areas has increased the use of individual household water supplies from ground water and of sewage disposal to septic tanks or cesspools. Use of small lots for both waste disposal and water source has resulted in increasing incidents of contamination of the ground water with sewage.[9] [10] [11] One of the first evidences of detergent pollution of drinking water is foaming at the tap. This qualitative test for surfactant is surprisingly sensitive and will indicate concentrations as low as 0.8 ppm. Pollution with greater concentrations produces, in addition to increased foaming, unpleasant tastes and odors. The polyphosphates which almost always accompany the surfactants apparently do not travel too far through the ground, but are precipitated and immobilized. While the surfactant material may not in itself be hazardous to health, its mere presence serves to warn that sewage has contaminated the ground water. Pollution of ground water is far more serious than similar pollution of a surface water. Underground waters move slowly; it may take months or even years before contamination appears, but once it has occurred it may require as much or more time before the water is free again from contamination.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The tremendous expansion in the use of synthetic detergents has posed problems for the sanitary engineers that were not present when soap was the common cleansing agent. Those difficulties have appeared for the very reasons that make synthetic detergents more desirable as a cleanser than soap. Soaps are precipitated by hardness, synthetic detergents are not. Soaps are easily decomposed both by acid conditions and biological activity; synthetic detergents are immune to acids and, more important, will resist biological decomposition and hence will survive, at least in part, sewage treatment, river self-purification processes, ground water travel and will appear in varying reduced amounts in drinking water. At the present time and under normal conditions of rainfall, the concentrations of surfactant in drinking water are low, probably in the parts per billion range, but under conditions of abnormally low rainfall or increased pollution of the raw water supply with sewage effluents, concentrations have reached a few parts per million. These concentrations are easily detected both by foaming and by off-tastes and odors. The deteriorated quality of the drinking water and apprehension about the possible chronic effects of continued ingestion of small amounts of synthetic detergents have spurred research on the problem. Most of the effort at present is directed toward removing the surfactants at the sewage treatment plant. Some consideration has also been given by the major producers of synthetic detergents to the development of other suitable compounds equal to the present surfactants in cleansing properties but different in the important characteristics of being decomposable by biological life. A step in this direction has been the development of a synthetic detergent based, not on petroleum as most of them are, but on sugar.[12] The compound is still largely in the development stage.

I have no doubts that continued active research will discover means for increasing the efficiency of removal of surfactants by sewage treatment processes.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 22, 1963.*

Hon JOHN J. MCINTYRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding foam control measures, Cleveland Easterly Sewage Treatment Plant: Recent investment to the extent of one-quarter of a million dollars for process equipment to control foam has been expediency rather than a cure for the situation. Briefly a water spray system provides the energy to depress or break up the foam, driving the foam back into the liquid system. This method largely prevents the contamination by foam of any surface within the wind carrying distance.

The basic problem of removal of foaming constituents from the treatment process has not been changed. We are well aware that existing process equipment only partially removes refractory materials.

The new chemical molecules used by man are reasons for investigation. Molecular complexes are in the foam which we see. To a lesser extent they are unseen in the waters which we use. For this reason we search to find answers for complex relationships with which you are concerned.

JOHN J. WIRTS,
Chemical Engineer.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire upon his freshman speech in the Senate and upon taking an active interest in a problem which is of concern to the Federal Government. The Senator from New Hampshire brings to the Senate experience in local government. He is aware of the difficulties which descend upon us as we become more and more an urban community.

The housewives of New Hampshire will welcome his participation in this action, as will city fathers and others interested in the health of the State.

I am also glad to have heard the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the field of conservation, the need for which we in the West are aware, but for which we are always in need of the support of easterners. I am pleased to join forces today with the junior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who has a long and distinguished record in the field of the preservation of America's natural resources. She represents one of the great natural recreation States of the Nation.

I am also pleased to join with the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who has had a long and abiding interest in the broad aspects of the preservation of America's natural resources, and a wide knowledge of the specific aspects involved in the bill introduced a few minutes ago by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The bill seeks to end the growing problem of detergent chemicals in our water supplies. It is gratifying to note that a number of distinguished Senators and Representatives, including Representative REUSS, of the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin, understand this serious problem and are willing to provide the leadership to meet it. It is likewise gratifying to note the interest shown by leaders in the field of conservation and in other fields in the serious problem raised by the pollution of our waters in a number of different ways, especially pollution by detergents.

As Governor of Wisconsin, I spent much time in the past year or two working on this rapidly increasing menace to public health and recreational enjoyment. At my request, the Wisconsin State Board of Health, the State committee on water pollution and the natural resource committee of State agencies, made an exhaustive study of the triple threat which detergent chemicals now constitute: The pollution of our drinking water and the fresh water in rivers, lakes, and streams; the serious disruption of our sewage treatment plants, and the blighting of the landscape with detergent foam which scientists warn may contain dangerous bacteria.

These Wisconsin studies produced a wealth of valuable information. They revealed that the problem was far worse than we realized. They showed that detergent chemicals already had polluted some of the underground water supplies in 64 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. They found mountains of detergent foam piling up on some of our most scenic rivers.

But most important of all, they proved that it is almost impossible to deal with this problem at the State level.

First of all, it is extremely difficult for a single State to do the research and testing necessary to set standards and impose adequate controls on detergents. Second, it is a principle of physics that water—and the dangerous pollution which stalks our water—does not respect State boundaries. Wisconsin is almost an island, surrounded by rivers and lakes which lead to every part of the Nation. Its underground water supplies follow mysterious underground routes which lead for hundreds of miles.

A determined effort still is being made to enact legislation immediately in Wisconsin to deal with this problem, but even if successful, such legislation cannot guarantee the people of my State that their water will be free of detergent chemical pollution. This can be done only by the U.S. Congress, with a bill such as the one introduced today.

Should anyone have any doubts, as to the urgency of this problem, I want to emphasize this basic fact:

The control of detergent pollution is just one part of what I consider the most urgent domestic crisis facing our Nation today—the preservation of our priceless natural resources and the defense of the environment in which we live against the most powerful assault in the history of our Nation. Unless this Nation girds for battle immediately, its people are not going to have clean water to drink, clean air to breathe decent soil in which to grow their food, and a green outdoors in which to live a few decades from now. This is a battle to preserve the simplest, basic elements necessary to human survival.

---

[9] Flynn, J. M., Andreoli, A., and Guerrera, A. A., "Study of Synthetic Detergents in Ground Water," Journal American Water Works Association, 50, 1551 (1958).

[10] Neel, J. K., and Hopkins, G. J., "Experimental Lagooning of Raw Sewage," Sewage and Industrial Wastes, 28, 1326 (1956).

[11] Metzler, D. F., "Recommended Action Against Effects of Severe Droughts in Kansas," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 999 (1956).

[12] McCarty, P. L., "Effects of Syndets on Some Sewage Treatment Processes," research report on project DSA-7554, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (September 1957).

I am familiar, of course, with the tremendous threats our country faces around the world. We are all deeply concerned about Cuba and atomic bombs, with Communist subversion, crime, and human suffering. I support the programs our Nation has developed to meet those great problems.

But while we mobilize all the powers of our National Government to meet those perplexing problems, we cannot be blind to the growing crisis of our own immediate environment. Our soil, our water, and our air are becoming more polluted every day. Our most priceless natural resources—trees, lakes, rivers, fish spawning grounds, wildlife habitat, scenic landscapes—are being rapidly and systematically destroyed.

Wisconsin, one of the Nation's favorite outdoor playgrounds and a State having a great tradition of enlightened conservation, has moved to meet this crisis as best it can. My State has earmarked $50 million, in addition to all other conservation budget money, to be used in the coming decade to preserve as much as can be saved from this vanishing public treasure—to buy up land for public parks and forests, to preserve scenic vistas with long-term easements, to save the wetlands for fish, birds, and wildlife habitat.

But even this program cannot begin to save the environment in which we live against the powerful assaults of industrialization, congestion, pollution, erosion, blight, and decay.

We need a comprehensive, nationwide program to save the natural resources of America.

We need this just as desperately as we need a defense against atomic missiles.

This rather simple bill—to call a halt in 2 years to the pollution of water by detergents—is one small but important step in that direction. We must fight the destruction of our natural environment on every front where the battle is joined.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a report which I have prepared on the detergent pollution problem and also a letter from a constituent of mine. The letter relates to this specific problem in his area.

There being no objection, the report and the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Threat to the Public From Detergent Pollution

The U.S. Congress must ban the use in this country of certain detergent chemicals which are polluting our water supplies, disrupting our sewage treatment plants, and blighting our landscape with detergent foam which may represent a serious health hazard.

The Congress can do this without upsetting the soap and detergent industry, and without denying housewives a valuable aid to household cleanliness.

All that is necessary is to use the powers of the Congress to shift the soap and detergent industry into production of a slightly different type of detergent which will not pollute water, will not interfere with sewage treatment, and will not smother the landscape with foam.

These facts are solidly supported by scientific evidence.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

"The off-taste has been described as oily, fishy, or perfume like.

"The toxic effects of the surface active agents studied in the experiments with rats were produced by irritation of the gastrointestinal tract (10,000 parts per million or more in the diet). To an extent which depended on the concentration of the surface active agents in the diet, this irritation prevented proper nutrition. In severe cases of irritation, death resulted" ("Drinking Water Standards, 1962," U.S. Public Health Service).

Detergents as we know them today have been an important part of our lives only since about the end of World War II. But ever since 1950, their rapidly increased use has caused concern in the minds of scientists, some public officials, and lovers of the outdoors.

Today, after more than a decade of serious research and experience, the detergent threat to public health and to outdoor resources has been thoroughly documented.

Most of our popular detergents today contain a chemical made from crude oil. It is this powerful chemical, alkyl benzene sulfonate (ABS) which makes the detergent such an excellent cleaning agent. It cuts through grease and dirt in hard or soft water. It does not leave a scum or deposit as soap does.

But it is this same chemical which threatens our water supply today. By its very nature, this "surface active agent" or "surfactant" forms a union with the water which is extremely difficult to break. It follows the water wherever it goes. Even the complex processes of a modern sewage disposal plant, which remove the most dangerous human wastes and industrial acids, cannot remove all of this detergent chemical, ABS.

The sewage effluent from these plants, which ultimately is discharged into lakes and streams, is loaded with this detergent chemical.

Similarly, this chemical also defies the purification processes of nature, which we rely on where there are no such sewage plants. Many parts of Wisconsin, including heavily populated suburbs around Milwaukee and highly desirable rural residential land in other areas, rely on individual wells and septic tanks.

In such situations, the detergent chemical—unlike other wastes—passes through the septic tank and the drainage system, filters down through the soil and enters the underground well.

HOW BIG IS THE PROBLEM?

Americans are presently using detergents at the rate of 3.8 billion pounds every year. If packed into one pound boxes 6 inches high and laid end to end, this would more than reach around the world.

A Public Health Service report from the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center at Cincinnati, Ohio, says:

"This is cause for great concern because almost all of this material ultimately finds its way into our surface and ground waters. Until recently, we believed our water supplies were inexhaustible. Today, however, we know this is not true. We must use our waters over and over if there is to be an adequate supply for all of us."

This pinpoints the problem: The use of detergents is growing at a phenomenal rate, and the presence of their oil-based chemicals in our water supplies is steadily increasing because water is used and reused.

This matter of reuse of water is one of the most important aspects of detergent pollution. Until recently, water could be safely reused because most of the conventional pollutants were removed or rendered harmless by the sewage disposal systems and by the effects of oxygen, sunlight, and dilution if they did manage to reach our lakes and streams. But these forces cannot combat the detergent chemical, ABS.

SCIENTIST URGES REMOVAL

After an exhaustive review of 10 years of research on this problem, this conclusion was reached by Edward Wise, senior specialist in science and technology in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

"It has been the writer's observation that removal of detergents and other contaminants at the source is most essential to the protection of our water supply with our increasing population. The old theory, 'dilution is the solution to pollution,' would seem no longer valid."

A similar conclusion was reached by F. M. Middleton at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center:

"No one would want to give up detergents, antifreeze, synthetic fibers, miracle drugs, insecticides, modern paints, and the myriad other products that make our lives efficient and pleasant. Progress is not, however, always an unmixed blessing. Man may, in his rush forward, foul the environment and unleash forces that will deter him in his progress."

Fortunately, in the case of detergents, there is no need to "foul the environment" any longer. The legislation proposed here to the Congress, combined with the research already done by the soap and detergent industry, makes a prompt solution possible.

Detergents came to us from Germany, where a substitute was needed in the prewar years for the animal fats used in soap.

Germany led in the development of detergents; it was the first to find them a serious public problem; it was the first to pass a law such as this one; and it is the first to develop an adequate substitute for the chemicals which have been found to be dangerous to the public.

Mountains of foam on Germany's historic rivers and the increasing pollution of water supplies led West Germany to pass a law setting December 31, 1964, as the cutoff date for manufacture of detergents containing ABS, which would not break down in the water. In October 1962, the West German government drafted standards for detergents which requires that they decompose at least 80 percent after entering the water supply.

Meanwhile, German scientists have developed new detergent chemicals made from sugar which will decompose, instead of flowing along with the water like the oil-based chemical, ABS.

WILL THIS BE A COSTLY PROGRAM?

Passage of this bill, setting June 30, 1965, as the cutoff date for manufacture of detergents which do not decompose in the water, will involve some temporary disruption to the soap and detergent industry. But it will not put anyone out of business and it will not be a serious problem to anyone.

It allows more than 2 years for a transition which is already technically possible.

The firms which make detergents also make soap, and they also will make the new type of detergent. The most they face is the problem of developing and marketing a slightly different product, but with the same production and marketing facilities and the same vast and growing market.

Engineers tell me that the new type of detergent at present would have to sell for about 15 percent more. Presumably, extended mass production and continued research would bring this cost down.

For the present, however, the slightly higher cost makes it impossible for any detergent firm to shift over to the new type of detergent, even though detergent company scientists themselves have documented the dangers in continued use of ABS detergents.

As long as competitors can manufacture and sell the cheaper type, no company will undertake the transition.

Here is an obvious case where the Congress should simply draw the ground rules, and let free enterprise proceed with the steps it already knows should be taken.

IS 2 YEARS TOO LONG TO WAIT?

Presumably, the only opposition facing obviously necessary legislation of this type would come from the soap and detergent industry. Therefore, simply in the interests of getting a corrective program started, it seems reasonable to allow the 2 year transition period.

Meanwhile, the public should not be too alarmed. The tests made of public water supplies, while astonishing, still do not show the presence of detergents in such quantities as to pose an immediate threat to public health.

However, two important points must be remembered.

First, no one knows exactly what effect these powerful oil-based chemicals have on the human system, even in small quantities, especially when drunk over a long period of time. It stands to reason that their very power to cut the caked grease off a frying pan, and their amazing ability to combine with water and cling to it wherever it goes, make them a danger to the human digestive and nutritional system.

Second, the relatively slight concentrations of detergent in our water supply today should not lull us into inaction because scientists have proven conclusively that this concentration will continue to climb upward and upward. Remember, almost 4 billion pounds a year are being dumped into our water supply, and also that through the reuse of water, the concentration tends to multiply.

The Public Health Service tests indicated that death resulted, in the experiments with rats, only when the detergent concentration rose far above any level conceivable in our water supplies today. However, there have been no conclusive long-term tests involving the human system.

A publication of the official West German Institute for Water, Soil, and Air Hygiene of June 1962, prepared by Dr. H. W. Janicke, finds indications of cancer-producing effects of detergents in the water supply.

This remains to be proved, of course. But let it be proved in the laboratories of the future. Let it not be proved in the stomachs of American citizens. It would be idiotic for Americans to go on drinking this powerful, oil-based chemical, which creeps into their water supply through the sewage system, until some scientist on some future day proves that it is truly deadly.

THE FOAM PROBLEM

I want to discuss two final aspects of the detergent problem: Foaming, which has caused so much public protest, and the disruption of our sewage disposal systems.

It is important to understand this fact: Foaming is part of the detergent problem, but it is not the heart of the problem. If housewives voluntarily used only detergents which did not foam, or if industry voluntarily shifted over to such detergents, or if this bill was aimed only at foaming detergents, the problem still would not be solved. Any detergent containing ABS will find its way into our water supply, whether it has foaming properties or not. Furthermore, the only way to eliminate the problem of foaming is to eliminate detergent chemicals from the water supplies.

It was foaming which brought the detergent problem to the attention of scientists, public officials, lovers of the outdoors and even housewives. The foam has been piling up now for a decade.

On Long Island, some citizens have had to carry water in from the outside because the tap water was so detergent-polluted that turning on the faucet produced a glass of foam.

I am attaching a report of the Wisconsin State Board of Health which describes the most incredible amounts of foam desecrating our landscape. As early as 1950, the board of health reported a wall of foam on the Mississippi River in western Wisconsin which was 15 feet high, 35 feet wide and 300 feet long. In 1956, a helicopter had to be used to blow away foam on the Baraboo River so rescuers could search for a lost boy.

Last week foam cascaded down the Wisconsin River in central Wisconsin. I have a letter from Mr. R. G. Barz, of Merrill, protesting this disgusting sight.

The Milwaukee Journal photographed detergent foam filling the entire bed of Turtle Creek in Rock County in southern Wisconsin. The Janesville Gazette warned citizens to "duck unless you want to be clobbered by suds in downtown Janesville" and pictured "giant billowing seas of foam on the Rock River."

And the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star, in a photograph which looked like a spectacular ice jam at Niagara Falls, showed a 40-foot high wall of foam filling the bed of the Rock River at Oregon, Ill.

This is simply revolting. We cannot continue to allow our beautiful lakes and rivers and country streams to be buried in foam—foam which everyone knows comes from detergent pollution which in turn comes from sewage.

This will destroy the recreation industry if it is not stopped at once.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM AS WELL

But I want to emphasize one very important point: Foaming is not merely an esthetic problem; it is a serious economic problem and I now believe that it carries a graver threat to public health than the pollution of underground water.

The Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, in a 1962 report, discusses the foaming which has been a growing problem at sewage disposal plants since 1950.

Detergents disrupt sewage disposal plants in two ways. First, their oily mixing powers disrupt the normal coagulation process used in these plants (when the detergent concentration is high enough).

Secondly, foam billows up above the sewage aeration tanks which shuts off oxygen and sunlight, a vital part of the process.

This Taft Center report goes on to state:

"The effect most often mentioned by sewage treatment operations has been excessive foaming in aeration tanks. Bacterial counts in the foam phase have been found to be at least 20 times as great as in the liquid phase. Thus, wind-blown foam could be a significant health hazard."

So far as I know, this shocking fact has been completely overlooked in the discussion of the detergent problem.

Does the American public realize that foam containing 20 times the bacteria count of liquid sewage is blowing away from our sewage disposal plants and spreading itself across the countryside?

This final example—the problem of foaming and the problem at sewage disposal plants—shows the economic issues at stake in this detergent question.

THE CONSERVATION ISSUE

It seems almost unnecessary to mention the threat which detergents present to the conservation of our natural resources, which I believe is one of our most urgent duties as American citizens.

Scientists have found that fish shun water polluted with detergents. It's not that they are smarter than humans. Apparently they just have better detection equipment.

No bubbling spring in the forest is safe today from detergent pollution. No canoeist in the wilderness can be certain that he will not round the bend and become lost in a disgusting mass of detergent foam.

The problem is there for all to see. The only question is whether we have the intelligence and the courage to meet it.

Excerpts From a Report by Jesse M. Cohen, Engineering Section, Water Supply and Water Pollution Branch, Taft Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio

Synthetic detergents have caused concern among waste and water treatment people for the past few years for two important reasons. One is that almost the entire industrial production of 3.8 billion pounds is eventually discharged to surface or ground water; second, that some of the surfactants are endowed with remarkable abilities to resist the treatment processes available to the sanitary engineer. * * * Even sewage treatment plants possessing secondary treatment processes are able to reduce only partially the surfactant content. Hence, practically all sewage effluents contain some surfactant, which, because it has survived the rigors of sewage treatment, is inherently prepared for an even longer survival against the purification agencies in surface and ground waters.

In many instances the stream water containing the persistent surfactant is used for municipal drinking water supply. * * * A portion of surfactants * * * will persist for longer than 20 days, long enough for this contaminated water to arrive at a water-treatment plant as part of the water supply. * * *

Pollution of ground water is far more serious than similar pollution of a surfact water. Underground waters move slowly. It may take months or even years before contamination appears. But once it has occurred, it may require as much or more time before the water is free again from contamination.

Up to the present time, there is no economical way of removing surfactant material from drinking water.

Surface Water Foam Occurrences—Report of Wisconsin State Board of Health

Year 1950: On February 6 foam was observed below the Government dams at Lynxville and Genoa on the Mississippi River. A wall of foam 35 feet wide, 300 feet long and 15 feet high was noted at Lynxville, and 50 feet wide, 300 feet long and 10 feet high at Genoa. These occurred simultaneously. There was ice cover on most of the river.

Year 1955: April 2 to April 15 foam was observed below the flood gates at Petenwell Dam. Foam 3 to 4 inches thick. There was ice cover on lower part of Petenwell Pond. April 12 to 15 foam observed over eddy currents below dam at Wisconsin Dells rose to a height of 12 feet.

Year 1956: On March 4 foam 30 inches high was reported below the New Lisbon Dam on the Lemonweir River. On March 7 foam occurred below the Reedsburg Dam on the Baraboo River. There was ice present on the river. Helicopter was used to break up foam in an attempt to assist in search of body of a boy who had fallen into the river.

Year 1957: On February 11 water rushing out from beneath ice on Turtle Creek at the dam at Shopiere in Rock County, churned up a foam at least 7 feet high.

Year 1960: A news report dated December 28 stated that foaming had occurred at the city of Milwaukee water filtration plant.

Year 1961: A news photo dated February 28 shows high foam below a small dam on the Neshoto River in Manitowoc County.

Year 1962: On September 20 an accumulation of foam on the southeast side of Lake Waubesa was investigated. Foam 15 to 20 inches high had accumulated along this shoreline for a distance of about 20 feet out. Samples of the foam were determined to contain less than 5 mg/1 of ABS. In the fall of the year foam was observed on Lake Nemahbin where Highway 30 crosses between upper and lower Nemahbin Lakes. The foam was reported to reach a height of 4 to 5 feet, and occurred early in the week. Beach water analysis in the area showed 0.5 mg/1 of ABS.

MERRILL, WIS., *March 20, 1963.*

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: * * * I was particularly pleased with your program to bar the use of detergents in their present form in this State. I live on the Wisconsin River, south of Merrill, and spend much time on its shores. Nothing disgusts me more than to see much raw sewage and large balls of detergent foam cover the water. Efforts have been made locally to put an end to this practice. However, no tangible results are noticeable. What suggestions can you give me to enable me to pursue this contamination problem?

I am enclosing a photograph removed from the Sunday Milwaukee Journal which illustrates a condition caused by detergents in another community. The condition here has not reached such proportions, however, at times there are hundreds of large balls of detergent foam floating down the river and lodging on the shoreline. This along with paper mill runoff still exists in proportions enough to make fish taken from this water unfit for consumption.

The Wall Street Journal recently carried an article about the Federal Government enacting some legislation to eliminate the use of detergents having components to cause this condition. We, who are dependent on the use of dry wells and water wells are particularly concerned. I believe your name was mentioned as championing the curtailment or barring of further use of detergents. There is no question in my mind that the soap lobby in Washington will strenuously oppose any action.

Having spent several years in Washington during World War II in the War Production Board and also in the Pentagon as a staff member for the U.S. Engineers dealing with supply matters, I am cognizant of the problems involved in passing legislation. Your comments regarding the continued flow of sewage into the river and the detergent problem will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

R. G. BARZ.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Wisconsin on his freshman speech before the U.S. Senate. My spirits have been buoyed very high this afternoon by having two such eminent freshmen Senators announce their interest in and their concern with conservation. Indeed, it is not the first time for either of them, for the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was successful, as Governor of his great State, in obtaining probably the most comprehensive program of any of our 50 States for the preservation and development of the natural resources of his State.

Mr. President, today we have heard remarkable comments from persons in varied offices in government. One was by the former Governor of Wisconsin. Another was by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTIRE], and was based on his experience with local government. I hope I have contributed from the viewpoint of the housewives. All of us are united in recognizing the danger to health, the danger to fish, and the danger to esthetic values in our country from the excessive use of detergents. I look forward to control of this problem through the Government of the United States.

The bill (S. 1183), introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MCINTYRE), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466–466k) is amended by redesignating sections 10 through 14 as sections 11 through 15, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 9 thereof the following new section:

"REGULATION OF DETERGENTS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Congress finds that the navigable waters of the United States are being polluted by surface-active chemicals used in detergents which resist decomposition in natural waters and water treatment systems, and that the presence of such chemicals constitutes a national problem. The undesirable taste and foaming of drinking water, the additional expense of water treatment, and the ever-increasing concentration of these materials through re-use of water require regulation of the composition of detergents in order to protect navigable waters and public health.

"(b) It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1965, for any person to import for use in the United States or manufacture for use in the United States any detergent, unless such detergent conforms with standards of decomposability prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall, on or before the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this section prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), standards of decomposability for detergents which will assure that all surface-active chemicals in detergents conforming thereto will decompose reasonably quickly and completely after use so as not to pollute the navigable waters of the United States. Included with such standards shall be specific methods by which detergents shall be tested by the Secretary to determine if they conform to such standards. Such standards shall be the sole standards of decomposability applicable to any detergent manufactured for use in or imported for use in the United States.

"(d)(1) Any detergent which after June 30, 1965, does not conform with standards prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be liable to be proceeded against on libel of information and condemned in any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which such detergent is found.

"(2) Such detergent shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this subsection shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this subsection, involving the same claimant and the same issues, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (A) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (B) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

"(3) Any detergent condemned under this subsection shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such detergent shall not be sold under such decree for a use which would result in the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States contrary to the purpose of this section; except that after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such detergent shall not be used contrary to the provisions of this section, the court may by order direct that such detergent be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this section under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the detergent under bond.

"(4) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the detergent, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the detergent.

"(5) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

"(A) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

"(B) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

"(e)(1) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this section.

"(2) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this subsection, which violation also constitutes a violation of this section, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

"(f) All libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this section shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the

United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of subsection (i) of this section, except as otherwise provided therein. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice as the Secretary shall determine.

"(h)(1) The Secretary is authorized to conduct examinations, inspections, and investigations for the purposes of this section through officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or through any health officer or employee of any State, or political subdivision thereof, duly commissioned by the Secretary.

"(2) For purposes of enforcement of this section, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (A) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which detergents are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such detergents; (B) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials; and (C) to obtain samples of such materials. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

"(3) If the officer or employee obtains any sample, prior to leaving the premises, he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained. If an analysis is made of such sample, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge.

"(i)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary, upon his request, samples of detergents which are being imported, or offered for import, for use in the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that such detergent does not conform to standards prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, such detergent shall be refused admission, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of any such detergent being imported and refused admission unless such detergent is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations.

"(2) Pending decision as to the admission of a detergent being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such detergent to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(j) As used in this section, the term 'detergent' means any cleaning agent which contains surface-active chemicals."

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Williams of New Jersey in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Without objection, is is so ordered.

AMBASSADOR RAYMOND TELLES, FROM TEXAS TO COSTA RICA, RENDERS GREAT SERVICE WITH SEVEN PRESIDENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the tremendous success of President Kennedy's visit to Costa Rica is now recognized all over the world.

From the welcome given President Kennedy, it is apparent that the President himself is one of our greatest assets in our efforts to strengthen our friendships with Central and South America.

Credit should also be given to the U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica, Raymond Telles, the brilliant former mayor of El Paso, Tex.

On February 20, 1961, I made the following statement on the Senate floor, at the time of Senate confirmation of the nomination of Mayor Telles to be Ambassador to Costa Rica:

> Mayor Telles and I have been friends for many years; and I know him to be a man of exceptional ability, powerful personality, and deep dedication to the ideal of human liberty.
>
> My prediction is that not only will he make an outstanding record of service in Costa Rica, but this will prove only the beginning step toward even bigger assignments in the future.

Mr. President, Ambassador Telles is bringing a long-range prediction into reality by his outstanding service in Costa Rica.

Texas is proud, as the United States may be proud, of the work being done by Mr. Telles, formerly mayor of El Paso, Tex., where some 40 percent of the population is of Latin American ancestry. Ambassador Telles is a fourth-generation American of Latin American ancestry who, as an Air Force liaison officer, built an admirable record of achievement, in working with Latin American countries during World War II.

The trip by President Kennedy was more than a visit to Costa Rica. It was a visit to Central America, with six Central American presidents as cohosts. They were: President Orlich, of Costa Rica; President Ydigoras, of Guatemala; President Rivera, of El Salvador; President Vielleda, of Honduras; President Somoza, of Nicaragua; and President Chiari, of Panama.

Indeed, it was a visit to all Latin America.

This indicates something of the scope of the planning that faced Ambassador Telles when President Kennedy decided in January to go to Central America.

Ambassador Telles, working with the distinguished Costa Rican Foreign Minister, Daniel Oduber, was in charge of arrangements covering the broad fields of public information, aid, transportation, protocol, security, accommodations, administration, and finance. This included everything from when and where the President would speak and would attend receptions, to where new desk space for additional secretaries would be found.

President Kennedy set up residence in Ambassador Telles' residence in San Jose, so that the Ambassador had to manage protocol arrangements for seven presidents while rearranging his own domestic schedule, as well.

The assignment for Ambassador Telles for this trip by President Kennedy required broad vision and minute attention to endless detail.

It is obvious from all reports that Ambassador Telles has successfully ridden a whirlwind.

I wish to extend my congratulations to President Kennedy, to Ambassador Telles, and to the six Central American Presidents, for an unprecedented demonstration of international goodwill.

This is the kind of diplomatic achievement that builds lasting friendships.

Out of the San José Conference came a Declaration of Central America signed by the seven participating Presidents in the San José Conference. It is a declaration of solidarity, of progress, of peace, and of prosperity for Central America that may well be copied all over the Americas. The San José Conference was not a mere talkfest—it was a conference of solid accomplishment. A brief summation of those accomplishments is set forth in the Declaration of Central America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the official text of the Declaration of Central America as printed in the Wednesday, March 20, edition of the Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Official Text of Declaration of Central America

San José, Costa Rica, March 19.—Text of the official English translation of the Declaration of Central America issued tonight:

"The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples and are aware such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural, and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social, and administrative structure within the framework of principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States in San José to review difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

"Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America are convinced the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration and, bearing in mind extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

"To accelerate the establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central America Common Market—to formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for various sectors of the economy.

"To establish a monetary union and common fiscal monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration.

"To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities.

"To complete soonest possible reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the Act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este, especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration, and social welfare.

"To take the above measures with a view to achieving creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationship with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

"The Central American Presidents affirm the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the isthmian republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments already have taken measures to coordinate national plans so their execution will aid, rather than impede, achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program.

"It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development will be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct an economic feasibility survey relative to this program of regional development."

PANAMA LINK SOUGHT

"The Presidents of Central America reaffirmed their hope the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement and the President of Panama declares his government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares his government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole, with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate association of his country with the program.

"The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American Republics to move as rapidly as possible toward integration of the economies of their countries and their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans will be monetary, fiscal, economy, and social policies. It is a great step forward in achievement of this objective as well as toward achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

"The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America and the development plan being prepared by Panama."

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION

"To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by regional organizations.

"For the longer term he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with procedures established in the Charte of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other Free World resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

"The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector and declare their intention of taking necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept nomal responsibilities compatible with development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purposes of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation."

BETTER LIVING STANDARD

"Currently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income. Furthermore, they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare."

BILLBOARDS AND THE HIGH ACCIDENT RATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the vehicular accident rate is three times greater per mile in areas having advertising devices such as billboards than in areas without advertising.

This is the report of a study prepared for the New York State Thruway Authority by Consulting Engineers Madigan-Hyland, Inc., of Long Island City, N.Y. Consideration of a certain sentence in the report is vital as we proceed to deal with the subject of billboards and their effect upon accidents. I quote that sentence from the report:

> It was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents, principally because they distract the motorists' attention.

The New York authority requested an analysis of accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the past 2 years, 1961–62, to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway.

A copy of this study was released on February 19, 1963, and has been sent to me by the Honorable R. Burdell Bixby, chairman and secretary of the New York State Thruway Authority.

It is significant that the study showed that almost one-third of the accidents attributed to driver inattention on the thruway mainline occurred on the one-eighth of thruway mileage upon which motorists were exposed to advertising devices.

Thus there is now scientific evidence to refute what some billboard apologists have often stated, which is that billboards and roadside advertising help maintain driver attention and reduce accident rates.

Because this coming June 30 is the expiration date for States to elect to participate in the billboard control program in the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway System this study is of tremendous value. I know that many State legislatures at this time are currently considering legislation to allow their States to participate in the billboard control program and receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the highway costs in their jurisdictions. Seventeen States to date have elected to participate in the program, including Oregon and New York. The States soon will be receiving the first of Federal payments under the billboard control legislation.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and I have been consulting about plans to reintroduce the proposed legislation to continue that provision. The Senator from Kentucky has long been a great advocate of the control of signboards, in line with the amendment to the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway Act. I think that he and I both feel that this statistical and impartial study bolsters our plans for further signboard control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the engineers' study which clearly shows the relationship between accidents and advertising devices on the New York State Thruway.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 19, 1963.

Mr. R. Burdell Bixby,
Chairman, New York State Thruway Authority, Albany, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Bixby: You have requested that we analyze the accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the past 2 years (1961–62) to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway.

As you know, authority personnel on the basis of onsite inspections determined the exact locations where signs and other similar devices could be seen by motorists. After examining the authority's detailed records of all accidents occurring on the thruway, we noted that the records indicate, among other things, the type of accident, the location of the accident, and the probable cause. These data are punched into tabulating cards and can therefore easily be summarized.

By correlating the information describing the locations of the advertising devices with the accident records for the past 2 years, it was possible to determine the number of accidents that occurred where the motorist was exposed to these advertising devices and the number that occurred where there was no such exposure.

In preparing the analysis set forth below, however, it was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents principally because they distract the motorists' attention. It was therefore considered essential to endeavor to eliminate all accidents caused by factors other than driver inattention.

The New York State police, at the on-the-scene investigation, classify each accident by probable cause and this information is coded on the authority's tabulating cards. It was therefore possible to exclude from the analysis all accidents except those in which the investigating State trooper reported the probable cause of the mishap as driver inattention.

In order to further restrict the analysis to data that are pertinent, all factors that might influence the pattern of these accidents due to inattention, other than the distracting effect of the advertising devices, should be eliminated from the statistics, so far as possible.

About one-quarter of the accidents due to driver inattention occurred at thruways toll barriers and interchanges. These areas are more likely to have a proportionately greater number of advertising signs and similar distractions situated in relatively close proximity because of their advantageous locations. Accidents occurring at most of these areas therefore are included in the category "accidents that take place where advertising devices were visible." However, there are other factors that increase the likelihood of accidents due to driver inattention at these same locations, such as the need to locate money for toll payment.

We therefore eliminated from the statistics all accidents that occurred at these sites on the ground that the factors noted above might unrealistically increase the accident ratio in such areas of exposure.

In order to evaluate this information about "driver inattention" accidents properly, it also was necessary to relate the accident statistics to the one-way miles of roadway involved.

Drivers were exposed to advertising devices on approximately one-eighth (13.1 percent) of the thruway's 1,118 miles of one-way roadway.

Our analysis of the data for the last 2 years showed, however, that almost one-third (32.6 percent) of the 1,550 accidents attributed to driver inattention on the thruway mainline occurred on the one-eighth of the thruway mileage upon which motorists were exposed to advertising devices.

There was an annual average of 1.7 accidents per mile due to driver inattention on the portions of the thruway mainline where advertising devices were visible, and only 0.5 of an accident per mile for this cause on the stretches where advertising devices were not visible.

The relative number of such accidents per mile in areas with advertising devices, therefore, was three times greater.

Another factor that was considered in our analysis was the effect of traffic densities on accident frequency. Areas of greater traffic volumes are likely to have a greater accident frequency. Such areas also tend to have more advertising devices. Pursuing this evaluation, accident-per-mile data were developed for the New York division of the thruway, which includes high density traffic along virtually its entire length. Separate figures were developed for the Buffalo division, which features a combination of high density traffic in the Buffalo area and moderate traffic volumes in other areas such as the Erie section. A third set of figures was developed for the Albany and Syracuse divisions, which do not have substantial stretches of high density traffic. The results of these studies are shown below in terms of annual accidents per mile of mainline roadway due to driver inattention:

Heavy density area (New York division): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 2.9 accidents per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 2 accidents per mile.

Combination heavy density and medium density area (Buffalo division): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 2.5 accidents per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 0.30 accident per mile.

Medium-density area (Albany and Syracuse divisions): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 0.40 accident per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 0.26 accident per mile.

As expected, the areas of heavy density showed a much higher number of accidents per mile.

However, in all cases (heavy density areas, combination areas, and medium density areas) there were proportionately more accidents per mile where drivers were exposed to advertising devices than in areas where no such exposure existed.

Even in the areas of medium density, where the effect of heavy traffic is minimized, accidents caused by driver inattention were still 1½ times more frequent along thruway stretches where advertising devices were visible as in other areas.

Our analysis of thruway accident records for 1961 and 1962 clearly demonstrated a pattern of substantially more "driver inattention" accidents in all areas where motorists were exposed to advertising devices than in the areas where no such devices existed.

Very truly yours,

Madigan-Hyland, Inc.
Daniel W. Greenbaum.

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Thursday, March 7, an editorial entitled "The Mallory Rule." It was sent to me by a former constituent. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received from my former constituent and the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Minneapolis, Minn.,
March 7, 1963.

Dear Wayne: As one of your transplanted constituents and admirers it is always refreshing to see your name in print, especially when the Minneapolis Morning Tribune takes special pains to be complimentary to you.

I hope the enclosed clipping is of interest to you—and with all my good wishes for you.

I remain, as ever, your friend,

Phiell P. Harris.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Mar. 7, 1963]

The Mallory Rule

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon has served notice that he will fight police pressure groups who are attempting to get Congress to outlaw the Mallory rule laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Mallory rule is a simple and fundamental declaration of a basic right of free men—to be taken before a magistrate without delay following arrest. The high court has said that confessions obtained when this rule is violated will not stand in court. In brief, police cannot hold suspects as long as they please and they are not the valid judges of their own arrests.

"The Mallory rule," Morse told the Senate, "constitutes a protection of a basic freedom in this Republic and I do not intend, under the pressure of a police department, to support any modifications of it whatsoever. There is no reason at all why anyone arrested for crime should not be taken forthwith to a committing magistrate for commitment or for freedom from commitment."

We haven't always cheered Wayne Morse in the past—but we do so now. He couldn't be more right.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed in the Record an excellent editorial published in the Washington Post of March 21, 1963, entitled "Revising Mallory."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

Revising Mallory

The difficulties inherent in any attempt to revise the Supreme Court's Mallory rule by legislation are made painfully clear by the tortured report of the District Bar Association's so-called Killough committee. The committee recommends a bill which backs and fills, advances and retreats and demonstrates, in short, how hard it is for conscientious lawyers to tinker with basic constitutional rights.

The bar association bill begins, like proposals already advanced in Congress, by declaring that "confessions otherwise admissible shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner." Troubled by what this entails, however, the lawyers have added a proviso—"unless the effect of the delay is to render the confession involuntary."

This is, of course, sheer surplusage. The Constitution itself forbids the admission of involuntary confessions. The trouble is that it becomes exceedingly difficult to determine whether a confession was voluntary or involuntary after it has been wrested from a defendant in the lonely and frightening atmosphere of a police station where he was questioned without a lawyer or even a friend to advise him. This is precisely why the Supreme Court decided to exclude all confessions obtained in such circumstances.

The bar bill proceeds, then, to a section requiring that a defendant be advised of his right to remain silent before being interrogated and at once reveals its complete lack of confidence in this requirement by a succeeding section which says, "Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit or abridge the privilege against self-incrimination." The Mallory rule was designed to assure an accused person of a judicial warning as to his constitutional rights. The lawyers ought to understand full well that a police warning is by no means as efficacious.

Recognizing that police zeal will lead inevitably to coercion of confessions if policemen are allowed to interrogate suspects in police stations, the lawyers have added two sections designed to provide for the disciplining of such conduct by a police trial board. This is a wholly illusory remedy. Policemen are not going to punish each other for having cut constitutional corners in an effort to catch criminals.

One member of the bar association committee, James J. Bierbower, dissented because of constitutional qualms, which do him honor. Those who glibly assume that legislative revision of the Mallory rule raises no constitutional issues, simply because the Supreme Court found it unnecessary to reach such issues in deciding the Mallory case, would do well to read the Court's recent opinion in *Wong Sun* v. *United States.* The Court intimated plainly in that case that it could see no distinction between physical and verbal evidence in determining admissibility. In other words, the Court may protect constitutional rights by excluding confessions obtained as a result of arbitrary arrests just as it has for many years excluded physical evidence obtained as a result of unreasonable searches.

In any case, it is sad and strange indeed to find a bar association inviting the police to arrest and detain citizens without judicial authorization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Modifying Mallory Rule Opposed By Bar Group," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 22, 1963]

Modifying Mallory Rule Opposed by Bar Group

(By Jack Landau)

The District Bar Association Criminal Law Committee has dissented sharply with a blue-ribbon report approved by the board of directors which advocated substantial modification of the Mallory rule.

The blue-ribbon recommendations for changes in the Mallory rule were made public March 14 and have been submitted to House and Senate District Committees now considering proposed legislation to alter the rule in favor of increased police questioning of arrested persons.

The Mallory rule excludes from criminal trials confessions and other evidence obtained by police from an arrested man during a period of unreasonable delay between his arrest and his preliminary arraignment.

A specially appointed bar association committee recommended that confessions not be excluded merely because they were obtained during a period of unreasonable delay; advocated a police questioning period with a 6-hour minimum during which police could obtain voluntary confessions; and supported proposals to permit arrests of material witnesses to allow the taking of testimony for future use in trials.

SENT TO CAPITOL

The special committee report, from which one member dissented, was sent to the congressional District Committees and to the District Commissioners after it had been approved by the board of directors but not by the membership. Last Monday, the criminal law division attended a hurriedly called meeting at the behest of Joseph Sitnick, vice chairman of the committee.

The criminal law committee, which is the association's standing committee on criminal law problems, unanimously approved a resolution asking that the Mallory rule not be disturbed, a committee spokesman reported.

The spokesman said that the blue-ribbon panel was composed of prominent members of the bar associations, but not of attorneys who had extensive experience in criminal law. The spokesman said the committee unanimously opposed three pending bills in Congress which are similar in substance to the blue-ribbon committee's proposals for changes in the rule.

The committee also resolved, the spokesman added, to insist that its views favoring the Mallory rule be given the same association publicity as the blue-ribbon report—publication in the Bar Association Journal, submission to the congressional District committees, and to the District Commissioners.

APPARENT CONSENT

The criminal law committee meeting, which was attended by 21 of the 30 members, the spokesman said, also opposed the blue-ribbon report on the grounds that its publication appeared to be with the full consent of the bar association.

The spokesman said the criminal lawyers believed that bylaws require a full bar association vote on any committee recommendations made with a dissenting vote before the association backing is attached to the report.

The criminal law committee also voted against any 6-hour questioning period and against arrests for investigation, which were prohibited last week by the District Commissioners.

In addition, the spokesman said, extreme resentment was expressed at bypassing the criminal law committee by not submitting to it the blue-ribbon recommendations prior to their publication. There is a feeling among committee members, the spokesman said, that the select committee was packed to obtain a predetermined report supporting repudiation of the Mallory rule.

TO ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

The spokesman said that all the resolutions were sent to Thomas Jackson, bar association president. Mr. Jackson reported that he had received the letter with the resolutions, but declined to comment further pending the letter's presentation to the board of directors.

The criminal law committee meeting also supported the recent Killough decision handed down by the U.S. Court of Appeals. That decision held that a confession obtained during a period of unreasonable delay so tainted a second confession given after a preliminary arraignment that the second confession was also to be excluded from evidence.

The bar association special committee had taken no position on the Killough decision, and had recommended that any further amplification or limitation be left to the courts.

The whole matter is now expected to come before the next monthly meeting of the bar association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I was in Mexico this last week talking to a group of Mexican lawyers, it was very interesting to observe the extent to which those lawyers have full knowledge of the principle which is involved in the Mallory rule in the United States. They are at a loss to know why there should be a serious attempt to change the rule.

I am receiving an increasing amount of mail from lawyers throughout the country who are beginning to familiarize themselves with the due process principle that is involved in the Mallory rule. I am gratified that the Minneapolis Morning Tribune and the Washington Post are leading the way in calling the attention of the people of our country to the soundness of the Mallory rule. I welcome this opportunity to put this material on the Mallory rule in the Record.

CHANGE IN CHAIRMANSHIP OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I was out of the country there appeared in the Washington Evening Star for March 18 a story entitled "Beall Let Out as Chairman." The article refers to the fact that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, a post formerly held by my very good friend the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], a member of the opposition party. In the course of the story the following language appeared:

> It was understood, too, that Senator Morse was at odds with Senator Beall on some local legislation due to come before Senator Beall's old Subcommittee on Business and Commerce. So, the Oregonian reportedly preferred the new Subcommittee Chairman McIntyre.

Mr. President, that statement does the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] a great injustice. I rise to clear the Record, for I have served with the Senator from Maryland on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for a good many years. He is a dedicated member of that committee and has performed a great many valuable services for the people of the District of Columbia. In the course of the news story the Senator from Maryland is quoted as saying, in effect, that there is no partianship on the committee.

When the majority members came to organize the Senate District Committee, they observed that the Senator from New Hampshire, a member of the majority party, had been appointed as a new member of that committee. The senior Senator from Oregon, along with other Democrats on the committee—with no reflection on the Senator from Maryland whatsoever—took the position that the chairmanships of the subcommittees should go to the members of the majority party. After all, the majority party will and should be held responsible for the policy course of action taken by the Democratic Party in all committees, including the District of Columbia Committee. The fact that I shared the point of view that the subchairmanship should be held by Democrats is no reflection on my good friend from Maryland. I would be glad to welcome him into the Democratic Party if he desired to come in. But in my judgment, a subcommittee chairmanship should be held by a Democrat when the Democrats are in the majority. It should be held by the Republicans when the Republicans are in the majority.

I make these comments only because I think they are due the Senator from Maryland. I consider him a warm, personal friend. In fact, out in Poolesville, Md., where I have a little farm, I refer to him as "my Senator." I josh him occasionally because I think there should be a little road repair operation out there which I would like to put him to work on. The finest personal relationships exist between the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Maryland. I make that statement today to clear the Record. There is certainly no basis for anyone thinking that the senior Senator from Oregon joined in an effort to have the senior Senator from Maryland removed as chairman of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, because we do not always vote together, either in the committee or in the Senate. I supported a proposal that all of our subcommittee chairmanships should be held by Democrats. I offer no apology for it. I am proud to take that position, and in taking it I cast no reflection whatsoever on my good friend from Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Bassett Evening Star editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Beall Let Out as Chairman

(By Grace Bassett)

Senator Beall, senior Republican on the Senate District Committee, today lost his subcommittee chairmanship for the first time in 8 years.

The Maryland Senator said immediately after an organization meeting that he thought the nonpartisan approach to local affairs would continue.

"We never vote along party lines," said Senator Beall, who is up for reelection next year.

BIBLE WILL SERVE

The official reason for the change was that Chairman Bible, Democrat, of Nevada, for the first time took the chairmanship of one of the four subcommittees. He will handle fiscal affairs because of his experience and the city's pressing need for funds this year, committee spokesmen said.

Politics, both of the Democratic and committee varieties, appeared to be more persuasive if less vocal reasons for the demotion of Senator Beall.

There are four Democrats and four subcommittees on the District Committee. Privately, Democrats Bible, Hartke of Indiana, Morse of Oregon, and McIntyre of New Hampshire, all subcommittee chairmen, have wondered if their party was undercutting their own future candidates against Senator Beall by giving the Maryland incumbent the prestige and publicity that goes with a subcommittee chairmanship in this area.

MORSE FOR M'INTYRE

It was understood, too, that Senator Morse was at odds with Senator Beall on some local legislation due to come before Senator Beall's old Subcommittee on Business and Commerce. So, the Oregonian reportedly preferred the new Subcommittee Chairman McIntyre.

Senator Morse was absent when the committee organized today. He is attending the Central American Conference in Costa Rica.

On his insistence, however, Chairman Bible postponed consideration of seven bills, considered noncontroversial after their passage last year by the Senate.

Senator Beall was named the first minority chairman of any subcommittee of a standing Senate committee 8 years ago by the late District Committee Chairman Matthew Neely, Democrat, of West Virginia.

NEELY SURPRISED BEALL

"I was very much surprised when Senator Neely chose me," Senator Beall said. "Naturally, the majority has the right to hold subcommittee chairmanships.

"I am grateful for anything I can get from the majority but I can't expect anything," Senator Beall said.

He said he was not surprised that Senator Bible wanted to be chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

"Senator Bible is interested in fiscal affairs and this move is understandable and is his prerogative," Senator Beall added.

Asked if he thought politics motivated the change, the Senator said:

"I suppose that at the other end of the avenue nothing is ever done without political motivation."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the story which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald for March 19, 1963, entitled "Senate District Committee Organized With Chairman Heading Fiscal Unit" represents the fact, in contrast to the story which appeared in the Evening Star. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bible Assumes Key Post—Senate District Committee Organized With Chairman Heading Fiscal Unit

The Senate District Committee was organized yesterday with Chairman Alan Bible, Democrat, of Nevada, assuming the chairmanship of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

Bible said he was taking over the chairmanship of the subcommittee because of the importance to the District of the President's fiscal program. Mr. Kennedy has proposed a formula for Federal payment that would represent taxes lost to the District and has recommended an increase in the city's borrowing authority.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee also will take up tax increases proposed by the Commissioners. Bible has not headed a subcommittee since he took over as chairman of the full committee.

He said he is still hopeful the Senate and House District Committees will hold joint hearings on the entire package of fiscal legislation. He has made such proposals to House District Committee Chairman John L. McMillan, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat, of Indiana, retained his post as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee, Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, as chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, and Senator Thomas J. McIntyre, Democrat, New Hampshire, recently appointed to the committee, was named chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee. He replaces Senator J. Glenn Beall, Republican, of Maryland, who has headed the subcommittee for the past 8 years. It is most unusual for a Republican to hold a chairmanship when Democrats control the Congress.

Bible said the full committee would consider bills to curb crime on which joint hearings already have been held and will take up transportation legislation when it comes from the White House.

Action on seven bills approved by the Senate last year was put off by the committee after it was decided new hearings should be held on them. The legislation failed to clear the House.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the January, 1963, issue of Higher Education, Mr. Oliver J. Caldwell, of the Office of Education, has published an excellent article on the liberal arts, which I feel will be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate as the President's comprehensive education legislation is considered during this session.

I announce today, Mr. President, that I hope to be able to start hearings on the education bill before my subcommittee immediately following Easter.

I commend Mr. Caldwell on the lucidity and clarity with which he has set forth his thesis. It presents in short compass background material which we would do well to keep in mind at the time the specifics of education legislation are under discussion. The type of appraisal and reorientation which Mr. Caldwell advocates if our colleges are to perform their function are, or should be in all of our minds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Liberal Arts in a Revolutionary World

(By Oliver J. Caldwell)

(Note.—Oliver J. Caldwell has been acting associate commissioner for international education, U.S. Office of Education, since April 1962. Since joining the office in 1952, Mr. Caldwell has visited more than 50 countries and has served as education consultant to many organizations. He also served with the Department of State and on the faculty of the University of Amoy and the University of Nanking, China. Mr. Caldwell holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees from Oberlin College. He has received two honorary degrees.)

We live in a time of continuing multiple crises. The status of mankind is changing. There is a rapid change in the relationships of man to his fellows and to his universe. This is a time of paramount danger. Once we could defend ourselves against danger by force. But now the nature of the forces available to us prohibits their use except as a last resort. Our best defense in these times is the universal understanding which is the goal of liberal education.

The American liberal arts college today has a new mission. Although these colleges owe much to Europe, they are unique. In the past, they have served an evolving American people exceedingly well by giving millions of Americans an intellectual grand tour of their cultural heritage. The liberal curriculum has been a powerful force for sanity in a troubled world. It has built for our country a foundation of idealism and has created a sense of identity with our neighbors of the Western World. Liberal education has been the platform on which we have built a towering edifice of technical and scientific achievement. Our social and political wisdom, which so far has guided us through a growing crescendo of crises, we owe largely to the liberal tradition in our colleges.

But education in a dynamic society must keep pace with social changes and new obligations. I have an uneasy feeling that our system of liberal education is losing touch with reality, that it is not adapting effectively to a new world. The intellectual structure of yesterday is growing obsolete.

There is a critical need for a reappraisal of the processes and goals of liberal education. The nature of the opportunities which challenge our children requires that they receive an intensified and broadened liberal learning which will accurately reflect the realities of their generation.

When we consider the more serious changes in our world, we see that a reassessment of our ideas of liberal education is required.

Recently the president of the American Bible Society and a prominent Russian rocket expert separately stated that the world is becoming a village. Isolation and distance have been destroyed by improved communications and transportation, by nuclear weapons, and by the rocket. Suddenly the earth is shrunken, and every man is neighbor to every other man. Herein lies a great danger because everyman does not understand his neighbor. There are barriers of prejudice and ignorance, supported by political, social, racial, and religious differences. The survival of the village of man requires the removal of ancient barriers by new skills and wisdom, and the creation of a new awareness that all of mankind are one species.

The removal of barriers is a special challenge to American education. Today our liberal arts curriculum emphasizes Western Europe and North America. But Americans live everywhere, and every American is part of the Main. Our Western civilization is only one of several great traditions. The truly educated man of tomorrow must also understand the other great traditions.

Living together as a family of man requires new awareness and understanding. Liberal education may no longer be based on a single culture. Monocultural education in a polycultural world is obsolete. Liberal education adequate for tomorrow must be polycultural education.

It is said that the volume of man's knowledge is doubling every 15 years. A recent news release states that 90 percent of all of the people in human history who have made major contributions to the natural sciences are alive today. This certainly could not be said of the social sciences, the humanities, and the fine arts. Knowledge has expanded suddenly and also unevenly.

We are faced by a critically unbalanced growth in our intellectual heritage. We seem to know much more about what happens inside an atom than we do about the workings of a human mind. This is dangerous because the energies in the atom may be misused by man's mind. To protect ourselves against ourselves we must learn to know ourselves at least as well as we understand the forces of nature.

We also are challenged by the changing value of various kinds of knowledge. In today's world a 1946 curriculum is not valid, because whole new sciences have been developed. One of the hardest problems we face is the assignment of appropriate priorities to new knowledge; an even harder problem is how to get rid of surplus intellectual baggage to make room for important new knowledge. Perhaps the hardest problem is to identify and preserve the knowledge of the past which is eternally valid.

There is a dangerous temptation to rate only the hard sciences, mathematics, and related subjects as essential, and to eliminate broad humanistic studies to make room for the skills which contribute directly to the conquest of the cosmos and to our military strength. This is very bad reasoning. It is true that we must increase our physical power in order to stay alive and free, but an increased knowledge of humanity and a fresh awareness of spiritual values, are essential if we are not to abuse the new physical power we already have. We must cultivate wisdom if we are to survive in a world in which potential enemies also possess the physical power necessary to destroy mankind.

Surely the answer lies in part in a new and stronger liberal education for everyone. It is our responsibility to make opportunities available to our young people to acquire this new and stronger learning.

Many other changes in our society present challenges to the educator which our fathers never faced. I will discuss only two more, two which have a special bearing on the importance of learning. One is the Communist revolution. The rapid expansion of communism should be likened to the spread of Islam in the first half century after the Hejira. Communism should be considered as both a revolution and a religion. We are more familiar with its revolutionary than with its religious aspects. We should become more familiar with its religious aspects.

It is a religion which denies the validity of religions. It is to other religions as the newly postulated antimatter is to our own material world. For this reason, any genuine coexistence will be difficult until the nature of communism itself has changed. There is, however, reason to believe that communism does change. There are now at least three types of communism which all claim to present the true revelation; these are the Russian, the Chinese, and the Yugoslav versions of Marxism.

Communists of all three types agree on one thing: the importance of the human mind as the source of all social, political, and economic advancement. Thus communism challenges all the nations to educate all of their children.

Americans, though they are only a small minority—6 percent—of mankind, stand as an effective barrier against the conquest of the whole world by communism; to help them continue to stand, American education today has special responsibilities.

It must give Americans the technical skills they need to compete effectively against Communist polytechnic education.

It must also equip every American with a broad general background.

It must help the many emerging hungry nations to develop their human resources.

It must impart to our students reverence for beauty and humility before the unknown lest man in his arrogance destroy himself.

The other multiple pressure of our society and system of education which I will mention is the rising power of the non-Western World. For the past 300 years mankind has been dominated by Western Europeans. They conquered the weaker inhabitants of North and South America and Australia and established new nations on these continents. They made colonies of almost all of the peoples of Africa and southeast Asia. Only Japan of all non-Western nations was able to thrive in the face of Western power, and then only by developing superior military force.

There has been a sudden collapse of the old empires of Western Europe. The former colonies are emerging as free and independent nations. The rapid economic, political, and social developments in many of these new countries are matched by a transfer to them of the authority which once rested in Western Europe.

This situation is aggravated by prejudices, ignorance, hatred, and envy. Much of the trouble rises from the fact of race; the Western World is predominately white, but the emerging new nations are largely nonwhite.

The social, political, and economic facts of our times require that liberal education no longer be content to introduce young Americans to the traditions of Western Europe, the Mediterranean world, and North America. If the principal function of liberal education is to introduce a young mind to its world, then it is clear that the young minds of today must be introduced to the great cultures which now vie with the Western tradition for power in the world of tomorrow.

The Slavic cultures are dominant in areas controlled by the Soviet Union; Chinese culture in its many variations is dominant in eastern Asia; Indian culture is predominant in southeast Asia; Islamic culture dominates the Arabic world which extends from Pakistan to Morocco; the countries of Latin America are rapidly becoming a powerful cultural unit which combines elements of the traditions of Spain and Portugal with the great traditions of the American Indian. There are also a number of important smaller cultures, especially in Africa.

A new liberal education must introduce young Americans to the total cultural traditions of mankind. The inadequacy of our present education structure to this task is dramatized by the failures of many individual Americans to adapt to life in the new nations and by the unwillingness or inability of many Americans at home to understand the nature of the new world in which they live. Americans abroad often establish plush-lined ghettos for themselves in Africa and Asia, and sometimes also in the Latin American countries. While many Americans have been welcome and understanding guests in other countries, millions who have lived abroad have huddled together suspiciously as they looked out at a world they had not been taught to understand. This lack of understanding has been a serious barrier to our success in helping to build a peaceful world order.

We need a new kind of education in the liberal arts college which will perform at least the following functions:

It will prepare all of its graduates to understand that our culture is not an island, that we stand as an equal among equals in a world in which there are many cultures. It will teach every young American, that, while there are many differences among the world's cultures, there is also a common foundation of humanity which all peoples share.

It will prepare a new generation of teachers who at all levels will teach in the context of a single human family.

It will prepare an increasingly large number of young Americans to serve with charity, courage, and insight among men of all cultures. It will also contribute to the evolution of an international civil service under the United Nations which may enable that organization to fulfill its historic function without infringing on any nation's heritage.

There are many efforts underway to meet our growing national need for polycultural education. There have been many attempts to broaden our present monocultural curriculum to make it an effective introduction to mankind. Although it is doubtful whether any of them have been fully effective, all of these efforts are significant:

1. The East-West Center in Hawaii is a noble experiment which will undoubtedly increase understanding among the peoples on both sides of the northern Pacific Ocean. However, it is an incomplete effort because it is limited by law and by the intent of its sponsors to the peoples who live on the shores of one ocean.

2. A great many colleges and universities are developing new languages and area programs. These are excellent and significant enterprises, but they prepare too small a number of specialists in a few fields of knowledge. We need many more of these specialists, and we also need a general reorientation toward mankind for all of our students.

3. Several States, including New York, Pennsylvania, and California, have decreed that their elementary children shall begin to study foreign languages and non-Western cultures. However, according to reports, the educational authorities in these States are finding it difficult to locate teachers who can carry out these directives effectively.

4. Several years ago Colgate University launched an experimental project in which undergraduates were required to take a minor in a non-Western culture. Apparently this effort was not fully successful and the project has been considerably modified.

5. The Elbert Covell College at the University of the Pacific, in an interesting new experiment, will teach all subjects in Spanish except English language and literature. The college should be very useful in helping students from the United States become experts in Latin American affairs, and students from Latin America become experts in U.S. affairs. We need more colleges of this type, and they should cover all the major non-English cultures.

6. Two New York State experiments are of particular interest. The Plattsburgh State University College of Education is trying to reorganize its curriculum to enable instructors to teach most subjects from the standpoint of the total contribution of all cultures to specific subject areas. The State teachers college at New Paltz has for some years carried on highly effective inservice summer training programs to inform elementary and secondary teachers about Africa and Asian affairs. In addition it has established a world study center and now requires all of its graduates to have credits in certain courses in the history and traditions of non-Western cultures.

7. Several of the foundations are promoting the idea of mobilizing total academic resources of a few of our institutions for experimental work in polycultural education.

All of these and many other experiments are an indication of the intellectual ferment of our times. We may hope that we are on the verge of a new renaissance, since the great outburst of learning and creativity of our earlier renaissance was probably stimulated in part by contact with other cultures.

What should we do in the face of all of this activity? A few years ago the faculty of one of our largest universities worked for 2 years on a plan which it adopted, only to have it vetoed by the board of trustees. This plan is worthy of our consideration today, since something like it could be a major step toward providing adequate polycultural liberal education.

First, this plan would establish a core of 54 semester hours which all undergraduates would study. These 54 credit hours would be distributed equally among the social sciences, the humanities including the fine arts, and the natural sciences. These courses would emphasize the total contribution of all of mankind to these specific areas of knowledge. For example, a philosophy professor would no longer teach that certain philosophical concepts originated in Greece, were modified by the Hebraic-Christian tradition, and are the exclusive heritage of a superior people who live in Western Europe, North America, and certain parts of the British Commonwealth. Instead he would teach that certain ideas emerge at a given level of the evolutionary development of many cultures and are in fact a common ground on which men and women everywhere may meet.

Students would be able to count 18 hours of this core toward the fulfillment of their major requirement.

In addition the plan would intensify traditional language and area studies, and each student would be required to take a minor in a non-Western culture. Thus every graduate from this undergraduate college would have a broad polycultural background and also an introduction to a specific part of the world.

This plan could be the beginning of a new conception of the liberal arts in this country. Something like this approach to liberal learning is seriously needed in the United States today.

The 4-year course of study outlined above could be followed by 2 years of study which would lead to a master of international arts for those who desire a more thorough introduction to the world in which they live. Candidates for this degree would take their first year of study abroad in a university approved by their American colleges. They would then return for a second graduate year competent in a language and in the culture of another country. On fulfilling normal academic requirements for a master's degree, they would be better prepared than any people now graduating from American higher educational institutions for a variety of services, including national and international civil service and teaching in American and foreign institutions.

How can these objectives be achieved, and who should attempt to achieve them?

The second question is more easily answered. It is the duty of the American educator at every level from elementary through graduate school to emphasize the fact that we live in a whole world rather than in an island culture in that world. It is going to be many years before we can solve the problem of what should be taught at each level, and how the new subject matter should be taught. There may be a wholesale revolution in American education which will involve a strengthening and deepening of the American curriculum at every level. It is possible that completion of a junior or community college may become a universal requirement, adding 2 years to the traditional 12 of compulsory-free education, and that on top of this perhaps a new 4-year polycultural liberal arts college may be built as the foundation of a new university.

The increased complexity of knowledge, the need for new skills and new wisdom, together with the rapid increase in our average life span, are likely to require not only higher standards, but an expansion of the time allotted to the formal schooling.

The need for polycultural education grows out of the new interdependence of all mankind and the new role of the United States as a leader in a rapidly evolving world. The responsibilities of world leadership compel an increasing number of Americans to live and to work in non-Western societies. If Americans are to serve effectively overseas, and if Americans at home are to understand the nature of their world, it is imperative that we develop a new polycultural education.

A number of Federal programs are already creating, both directly and indirectly, a new polycultural foundation for American education. The various exchange programs now united under the authorization of the new Fulbright-Hays Act are directly contributing to this goal. Since 1947 thousands of Americans have received opportunities to broaden their educational horizons through study, teaching, lecturing, and observing in non-western areas. Indirectly, American education has been enriched by the experience of these Americans and thousands of others who have served as educators in such programs as schools for American children overseas and the activities now administered by AID (the Agency for International Development). Our schools and colleges now have a growing number of teachers at every level who have had polycultural experience as participants in various Federal programs. The supply of American educators with polycultural experience will be greatly increased in the next few years by returning Peace Corps volunteers.

One of the more substantial contributions to polycultural education has been the program under the National Defense Education Act, administered through the Office of Education. The Office now has an important new resource in section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act. The section will enable the Office to cooperate with American institutions in offering polycultural education opportunities to Americans both at home and overseas. This enterprise can be effective only if there is effective cooperation between American educators and the Federal Government in carrying out this program.

Private efforts of the foundations, colleges, and universities, and mission boards created the beginning of an American polycultural education. Private initiative will continue to play an important part in the development of this new education. But time is short, the need is great, and the consequences of failure to instill a new wisdom into our students through our educational processes might be catastrophic.

TERCERA REUNION PARLIAMENTARIA MEXICO-NORTEAMERICANA—REMARKS BY JOSE LOPEZ BERMUDEZ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also had the privilege, in recent days, of serving as one of the U.S. congressional delegates to the Third Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico. It was a great pleasure for me to serve on that delegation with the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE].

Some very notable speeches were made by our Mexican colleagues at that conference. There were two in particular, Mr. President, by Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez, which deserve the very careful consideration of the Senate. There were others of the same high quality, which undoubtedly will be discussed in the Senate with respect to other foreign relations matters in the days ahead, and some of which will also be offered for printing in the RECORD.

At one of the sessions Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez delivered an able speech entitled "Let Us Win a New Independence," which contained inspiring proof that our friends in Latin America—and particularly in Mexico—are determined to join with us in a cooperative spirit to preserve and strengthen freedom in the Western Hemisphere. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US WIN A NEW INDEPENDENCE

In the name of the Congress of Mexico, I wish to express our profound acknowledgment to the Legislators from the United States for making a pause in our deliberations in order to render homage to the first of our liberators.

Hidalgo has deserved the highest title in our history: the Father of the Nation.

Like Bolívar and Martí, like Washington and Lincoln, like Sucre and San Martín, like O'Higgins and Santander, like Morelos and Juárez, Hidalgo projects his image upon our time with the universal dimension of the great heroes of America.

Under the shadow of his glory here in Dolores, we are filled with a clean, American pride when we declare that the Independence of Mexico is not the result of the action of cannon, but rather the supreme outgrowth of culture. Hidalgo was the rector of one of the oldest educational institutions of new Spain. The students and professors, who daily listened to his exhortations on liberty, began to see about his head not the soft radiance of the saints, but rather the aureola that marks the great leaders.

Because in his classroom he expounded his ideas as a reformer, Hidalgo was expelled from the illustrious College of San Nicolás. Without fear or sorrow he left his academic teaching, and Hidalgo became the dean of freedom for his people.

Hidalgo, degraded, arrived in Colima with a temporary appointment as a parish priest. There he continued his redemptive preaching: to the children he would speak of hope, to the women of self-sacrifice, to the men he would speak of liberty.

It is said that each morning, accompanied by an old man named Pablo, Hidalgo would go out for a walk. Going from house to house, he would speak words of encouragement and also buy small pieces of copper. One day the old man asked him: "Father, why do you want so many pieces of copper?" Hidalgo replied: "I am going to melt them and cast a big bell, so big that it will be heard around the world."

Hidalgo did not have to cast the bell of liberty over there in Colina; because the bell of liberty was already here in the humble belfry of the Church of Dolores. Ringing the bell, Hidalgo called upon all Mexicans to attend the first liberty mass. All men of his day heard the sound of that bell.

Later when he was urged to seek his own safety, because it was clear that it would be impossible to win a war without soldiers, Hidalgo refused to flee. He knew that wars are won by soldiers, but a revolution is won by the people. And so Hidalgo was able to make of the war of independence a movement designed to become a regime of law. Simultaneously, he started a profound social revolution which aspires to constitute itself into a state where justice shall prevail.

In the wonderful human resources present in his people, Hidalgo found all those values on which a nation can be built, and its moral wealth preserved.

In the person of Doña Josefa Ortíz de Domínguez, wife of the Magistrate of Querétaro, Hidalgo found the stoic and faithful soul of our women. In a humble heroine in Guanajuato, named Doña Gertrudis Vargas, he found the infinite fortitude of Mexican mothers, Doña Gertrudis stopped Hidalgo near the hill of Zempoala and told him: "Reverend Father, inasmuch as my age and the fact that I am a woman do not allow me to join your ranks, I want to offer to you the life of my only son, because he, as well as you, wishes to live or to die for the achievement of independence."

In the midst of fire in Guanajuato, Father Hidalgo found in the person of El Pípila—the legendary hero who covered his back with a flat stone to protect himself from the bullets of the enemy, and thus set fire to the doors of the fortified Alhóndiga de Granaditas—the spirit of Mexican youth, which is capable of burning down with the fire of its faith the doors of all despotism, in order to open for the fatherland the road to the fullness of human dignity.

Hidalgo, the teacher of patriotism, was able to recognize in Morelos the disciple who was to exceed him in achievements and who equaled him in immortality.

From the moment when Hidalgo became the leader in the struggle for independence, he manifested, not the stature and brilliance of military genius, but rather the character and the determination which made him the first of our social heroes. Not quite 3 months after that memorable night in Dolores when, with a shout, he proclaimed independence, Hidalgo drafted in Guadalajara, in December 1810, two historic decrees. The first proclaimed the abolition of slavery on our soil. The second was the first agrarian decree in the New World. "Because it is my will," declared Hidalgo, "that land should be for the exclusive benefit of the native people in their respective villages."

We do not defend what is Mexican merely moved by that profound sentiment of attachment to our country, something natural to the soul of men in every country. Neither are we moved by blind devotion when we bow before the greatness of our historic relics. Our veneration for Hidalgo flows from what Hidalgo represents in terms of prophecy and as a forerunner on the road to a better justice, without which both emancipation and the happiness of man are precarious values.

What Hidalgo proclaimed when he shouted: "Long live independence. And death to bad government" is the same thing that the hand of Jefferson wrote in a glorious declaration. "But when a long train of abuses and usurpations," stated the first builder of your Nation, "evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

Fellow legislators, a son of Guanajuato declared that in our country, in America, and in all parts of the world there are still many "alhóndigas" or strongholds of oppression which must be set on fire. These are the presidios erected during centuries among men by misery and violence, by ignorance and despotism, by sickness and injustice.

Let us reaffirm here in Dolores our determination to endeavor to win the new independence completely, the new independence toward which the American peoples are resolutely advancing. It is independence with peace and prosperity; independence with law and culture; independence with health and equality.

Let us bring together the honor of our flags. Let the immortal bells of Philadelphia and Dolores join their voices in order to recall to the world the example of two peoples who, notwithstanding the marked differences in their cultures and in their economies, in their power and in their customs, in their beliefs and in their technologies, have decided through their own sovereign will to live, with mutual respect, in concord and to grow in labor and dignity.

May liberty rule again wherever dictatorship has despoiled the people of their mandate. May democracy triumph in those territories which violence and terror have delivered to the temporary dominion of tyranny.

Let us establish measures of justice wherever inequality has erected walls of hatred or maintains extensive areas of poverty.

In our living together as nations and also in regard to the internal tasks of our respective countries, let us, from day to day, improve our relations and our policies with such equity and intelligence that neither adverse prices nor unfair wages shall become factors producing hardship or oppression.

Let us disarm within ourselves the law of force, in order to strengthen our spirit and conscience with the noble, peacemaking force of law. Maintaining respect for the borders of our national habitations, let us live fulfilling an ascending destiny wherein men and nations will both know how and be able to earn their bread without fear and to achieve progress without weapons.

Mr. MORSE. Following that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have other remarks by Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez at the Interparliamentary Conference held in Mexico, before Committee IV of that conference, dealing with the whole question of nuclear disarmament, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before no other Congress of the world does the appeal for peace made by the Congress of Mexico acquire greater importance than before the Congress of the United States, because the Congress represents one of the nations which have reached the highest level in nuclear power. The decision of its Legislators to work for peace would be a determinant factor to bring about the disappearance of the anxiety in which humanity lives. This anguish is justified, because while war with conventional weapons which formerly resulted in the destruction of armies and cities, and then ended in an armistice which permitted the people involved both the rebuilding of their societies and the rehabilitation or renewal of the human groups affected. But now the unleashing of nuclear war would mean the total destruction of man and the surrender of civilization and history itself.

For this reason our country has raised its voice in support, invariably of its decision not to admit within the national territory nuclear weapons of any kind, nor the means that could be used to transport them. This decision is based on our purpose not to participate in military blocs or alliances which, as products of cold war are an antithesis to the principle of collective security, the unsubstitutible basis of peaceful living together within the order and principles established in the Charter of United Nations.

Such is the degree of danger of the bombs now at the disposal of the nuclear powers that in their devastating capacity lies, in our judgment, the possibility of controlling the use of the same. This has been the possible reason which illuminated the conduct of the nuclear powers in their decision to use in the settlement of their problems every objective save nuclear war. A few days ago distinguished Senator MORSE stated that the possibility of one nation to destroy its adversary with atomic weapons is in turn accompanied by the risk of being destroyed.

Just as youth, and vital energy and potentiality must be correctly channeled in order to produce good results, otherwise they would only produce danger—likewise nuclear energy should be directed toward its most useful aspect: its use for peaceful purposes.

From the allocations for the warlike use of nuclear energy reductions corresponding to personnel, budget and the general effort should be made, in order to apply the amount resulting from such reductions to peaceful purposes. All activity in connection with nuclear energy for a warlike purpose involves a very small number of countries who control it; whereas with its use for peaceful purposes there would be a way for each and every country to be able to cooperate in the measure of its capacity, and such advance would constitute universal progress. This approach requires the technical and economic assistance so that all countries may participate and cease to be mere spectators, and in turn become actors who cooperate in the utilization of nuclear energy for peace.

This points to the necessity of obtaining the adequate training of a large number of persons, the granting of subsidies in order to study special problems, and the guidance and coordination of programs of scientific world interest, feasible of achievement in the different regions of the world in accordance with their particular interest.

Undoubtedly, the greater the number of trained and competent persons more firmly the world will be guided concerning its responsibility.

I wish to insist on the necessity that exists for us as legislators to make an effort to go forward to meet a new area of law being born: nuclear war.

Man has unleashed a force which man must control. He must control it not only in its technical aspect but also with regard to its moral aspect. While it is possible to speak about the area of atomic energy used for warlike purposes of a desire of the nuclear powers to reach a balance of forces; on the other hand, when we transfer this problem to the area of cold war we can speak of a balance on the basis of fears. A nuclear power may resort to creating a degree of panic among peoples who do not possess atomic powers, in order to impress the immense majority of men and women with the power of its warlike strength.

I consider that this fear to which I refer is produced by each threat that invokes the possibility of nuclear war, by each statement that reaches us, in the manner of radioactive rain which has the power to penetrate our homes and our conscience and to contaminate us with such fear, without any fault or guilt on our part.

The statement of the National Commission on Science of the United States which points to the danger that every person undergoes under ionizing radiation, sufficient would be to entertain the justified hope that we legislators listen to the men of science and to the experts on nuclear energy, with the desire to undertake an effort to present in our Congresses the adequate principles for the protection of our peoples.

If nuclear energy is not controlled both in experimentation for warlike uses as well as for peaceful purposes, attempts against the first and most sacred right of man: the right to paternity.

On the other hand we face the grave international responsibility of states who possess the means for the production of nuclear energy.

The immense majority of peoples who do not possess nuclear weapons face a situation of anguish: ocean currents or atmospheric currents can bring us highly ionized harmful radiations which inexorably harm our population, and forever. We ask ourselves with consternation: Against whom shall we establish responsibility? How can we determine who was responsible and what is the sanction he deserves?

In short, honorable legislators, I invoke your patriotism to the end that we may express a common purpose in support of the appeal for peace addressed by the Congress of Mexico to all the parliaments of the world, so that as the essential outcome of this meeting we take with us one sole conviction: to continue working for peace, to study those measures that we as legislators can propose in our countries in order to establish principles which provide a greater protection for our populations. One final conclusion: we must make every effort at our command so that our people can demolish that blind alley in which fear of nuclear war holds captive the conscience of the world. Let us break down this dangerous obstacle and come out upon the broad and innumerable roads which peace and science have opened to mankind.

ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL AWARD TO SENATOR LISTER HILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Alabama, was recently honored by the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc.

When the first Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf award was presented to him on March 3d on the 116th anniversary of Alexander Graham Bell's birth, Mr. Justice Burton, honorary vice president of the association, made the presentation.

Mr. President, there is little that I can add to the citation which accompanied the award. All of us, I am sure, join in saluting Lister Hill for his great humanitarian achievements; and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I can testify to the wholehearted support he has always given to legislation designed to assist the handicapped and particularly those who suffer from auditory defects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded, which appears on pages 118 and 119 of the Volta Review, be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the citation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First A. G. Bell Award Given to Senator Lister Hill

The first Alexander Graham Bell Award for service to the deaf was presented to Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama, in Washington, D.C., on March 3, the 116th anniversary of Bell's birth. Justice Harold Hitz Burton, honorary vice president of the association, made the presentation.

Senator Hill's sustained interest in combating deafness, and his compassion for the deaf are reflected in his outstanding record of legislative achievements in the fields of medical research, research training, rehabilitation, and education.

His legislative successes in behalf of the deaf speak eloquently of his leadership, his wisdom, his parliamentary skill, and his persuasiveness in the U.S. Senate where he serves as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee that has jurisdiction over all legislation on public health, medical research, hospitals, rehabilitation, and education. In addition, he is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over funds for the programs administered by the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Office of Education, Gallaudet College, and other agencies of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator Hill was a sponsor of the legislation in 1949 that directed the Public Health Service to establish the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness to mobilize our research and research training resources against deafness, other sensory disorders, and all neurological diseases.

The funds available to the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness for research and research training to combat deafness and speech impairments have increased fivefold since 1958—from $1.3 to $6.5 million. Some of these funds have been used to support the scientists who have contributed to the development and further refinement of techniques that are now so successful against otosclerosis.

Senator Hill provided the leadership for the program initiated in 1962 to provide professional and technical assistance to the States and their committees in the prevention, early detection, and treatment of deafness and other sensory disabilities. High priority is given to refining the methodology for screening procedures of children at an early age so that the necessary early education of the deaf can be initiated.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator Hill has been a leading advocate of legislation that would improve and strengthen educational and training programs for the deaf. He strongly supported the legislation enacted in 1958 that authorized a loan service of captioned films for the deaf to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1962 the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under Senator Hill's chairmanship, approved legislation to expand and strengthen the program of captioned films for the deaf. With the enactment of this legislation, the scope of the program was broadened and authorization for appropriations was raised from $250,000 to $1,500,000 per year.

It was Senator Hill who introduced the legislation to authorize Federal assistance for the training of teachers of the deaf in 1961 in order to meet a critical shortage of such teachers in the United States. In September of that year his bill was enacted into Public Law 87–276 and the full authorization of $1.5 million has been appropriated by the Congress in each of the last 2 years.

Under this law, scholarships and grants-in-aid have been made available through approved university and college training centers. It has been estimated that approximately 380 persons have undertaken the training to become teachers of the deaf as a direct result of this financial aid under Public Law 87–276, sponsored by Senator Hill.

Senator Hill's leadership in the Appropriations Committee has also greatly benefited the programs of Gallaudet College. Senator Hill's subcommittee recommended appropriations totaling $9.1 million over the past 4 years, and the increases approved each year were earmarked for higher faculty salaries, additional operating funds and new physical facilities.

Senator Hill has also been a consistent supporter of the programs for the deaf that are administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and in each of the past 2 years the annual appropriation for vocational rehabilitation has included funds especially earmarked by the Congress for new programs related to the rehabilitation of the deaf. In 1964 the number of individuals with hearing disabilities rehabilitated will reach an estimated 7,000. The increasing level of financial support to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has made it possible to facilitate the establishment of speech and hearing centers. Also, between 1962 and 1963 the number of traineeships in speech pathology and audiology increased from 253 to 452.

When the presentation of the award was made, the following citation was read:

ASSOCIATION CITATION TO SENATOR HILL

"From time to time there comes upon the scene of human events a man of unusual insight and conviction. After surveying the circumstances involved, he sets his course, and thereafter his faith and confidence in the rightness and justice of his decision are unshakable. Such a man is Senator Lister Hill.

"Children born profoundly deaf are cut off from the normal experience of speech and language, the prime avenue to information, education, and self-fulfillment. Until medical science produces a cure, the opportunity for them to reach their full potential lies largely with unusually supportive parents and specially trained teachers. Since World War II the shortage of fully qualified teachers of deaf children has become an acute national problem.

"In August 1959, Senator Hill introduced legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide scholarships and grants-in-aid to assist in attracting capable young people into our profession and training them as teachers. His initiative, leadership, and persistence were essential ingredients in the outcome. Public Law 87–276, which has in 1 year doubled the number of students in our training centers, stands as a monument to his effective efforts, and represents a significant and substantial step forward for all deaf children.

"The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf extends its most sincere expression of gratitude to Senator Lister Hill for his stanch championship of the cause of deaf children, which will assist materially in bringing to them the abiding blessings of human fellowship through speech and language. In token of deep appreciation, the association does this day confer upon him its highest honor for distinguished service for the deaf, the Alexander Graham Bell Award."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OHIO'S DEVASTATING FLOOD OF 1913

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 50 years ago, on March 22 through March 27, 1913, one of the worst floods ever to occur in this country swept the Miami Valley in southwest Ohio.

More than 300 people lost their lives and thousands of the residents of this area suffered untold hardships. Property loss alone exceeded $100 million in 1913 values. At that time I was a new member of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio. I can vividly recall helping, along with many of my colleagues, in the rescue operations. It was a terrible tragedy to witness.

The residents of the cities of Piqua, Troy, Dayton, West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Middletown, and Hamilton, and in villages of other sections of Ohio could have thrown up their hands in dismay, disgust, and despair, and quit. However, these hardy, resourceful men and women were not quitters—they were initiators and inventors.

They voluntarily donated $2,156,616 to initiate flood control in the Miami Valley to protect forever their loved ones and their homes from a future terrible natural disaster such as they had just suffered.

From these donations evolved an engineering staff led by Arthur Morgan, who roamed the valley seeking suitable sites for high retarding basins.

A new law was drafted, and passed by an emergency session of the Ohio Legislature, enabling citizens to form conservancy districts and assess their own properties to pay for the necessary flood protection structures.

Thirty-four million dollars was eventually required to construct the necessary dams and levees. Every cent came, not from the Government, but from the pockets of these hardworking residents of the valley. During this week the cities of the valley have been observing the anniversary of this great flood—not in celebration, but in review of the tremendous economic progress of the valley since the communites were flat on their backs and almost counted out.

They can be justifiably proud of their communities and of their fathers and mothers and grandparents, for their wisdom, foresight, and self-reliance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the President on his recent civil rights message.

The proposals the administration has made are both the most far-reaching and the most practical that have been submitted by a President during this century. There are some who would like to solve every civil rights problem this year. However, because of the inability or unwillingness of this body to reform its rules, we know that it will be difficult even to bring to a vote many of the measures in this category.

President Kennedy has not proposed a radical, divisive program or one subject to constitutional objections. Rather, it is a program designed to overcome the most pressing facets of the civil rights problem. It is bold, intelligent, constructive, and well conceived. Most important, it is one that, with sincere bipartisan support, can pass this Congress. These recommendations are not political bones tossed to an interest group with no hope of implementation. They are desperately needed tools with which to fight the insidious disease of bigotry and discrimination.

Mr. President, there was one aspect of the President's message that impressed me as being of great importance. For the first time since 1952, a President has endorsed America's need to observe basic human rights on other than political or legal grounds. Heretofore, Presidents have told us that constitutional government demands our obedience to the Supreme Court's decision; that our international image will suffer unless we treat all men with respect; that our economy will not achieve its full potential until the opportunity for equal employment is granted without regard to race; that no governmental official is truly representative unless every qualified elector is allowed to cast his ballot. All of these are important reasons for eliminating discrimination. They are politically sound judgments based on cold logic. However, for the first time in many years we have a President who has had the insight and compassion to say simply, that integration is right, that discrimination is wrong, and that equality is demanded by every moral and religious principle. This would be true even if all political considerations dictated otherwise. President Kennedy's affirmation of the dignity of man is important to every American, but especially meaningful to the Negro who is struggling to obtain the equality which rightfully should have been his a hundred years ago.

In itself, the President's recognition of the moral principle underlying the civil rights problem is a major step toward its solution. The next major step, enactment of the President's program, should be taken by Congress.

Having made these general observations on the President's message, I would like now to comment briefly on each of the recommendations. The first of these concerns voting rights. Inasmuch as the ballot is the cornerstone of democracy, it is most appropriate that the Congress first assure the most basic of our rights. To those who argue that national voting legislation would constitute usurpation of the rights and powers of the States, I say that Federal intervention to guarantee the right to vote will make less urgent certain other civil rights legislation. I have always contended that if every qualified person were given the franchise and exercise that franchise, that many civil rights problems would be resolved at the local level without the necessity for Federal intervention in his behalf. The vote gives the individual a voice in his own destiny. This is a voice that is heard clearly by all those persons who periodically place their personal careers in the hands of the voters.

Almost without exception, Federal judges are men of great integrity. However, their crowded calendars in many instances have made a mockery of the swift justice which is indispensable in securing basic civil rights.

I am sure all of us agree with the legal maxim that justice delayed is justice denied. With the heavy calendars in our courts, it is very difficult to have a prompt adjudication of these many cases. In one case, the President noted, it took 19 months to resolve a voting complaint. When a man's right to vote is not determined expeditiously, his right to vote in the next election is lost forever.

The Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 were great advances, and this administration has been the first to take full advantage of their provisions. But they are not sufficient. To fill the gaps in our Federal election laws, to guarantee the integrity of the Federal electoral process, the President has made four recommendations. First, in counties where less than 15 percent of eligible persons of a race are registered, Federal registrars would be authorized to register those who are qualified under State law immediately upon filing of a suit. The decision of the Federal referee would be subject to review by the court. In my opinion, this is a moderate approach to a difficult problem. In any county in which there are fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes registered—and the President noted that there are 200 such counties in the country—a pattern of discrimination is clearly apparent. In such a case it is not only unwise, but also morally wrong to force an applicant to wait another year before his right to vote is vindicated. We know that one vote can conceivably change the result of an election. We must be certain that that vote is cast.

Earlier today I spoke about the recent gubernatorial election in my State, in which 1,265,000 votes were cast. The question of who was elected, after a recount, was settled by a majority of 91. Therefore a single vote is important. We must be certain that every impediment to the casting of a vote is removed. We must make certain that the vote can be cast legally without interference.

This is by no means a radical proposal. It is a principle of American law that justice delayed is justice denied. If the threat of immediate harm is so great that to await the decision of the court would deny effective relief, then courts should adhere to the time-honored precedent of granting temporary relief. The President's proposal provides one more judicial tool for preventing the frustration of deferred justice in the process of litigation.

The second request of the President is that voting suits be given first priority in the Federal courts. This would mean that voting cases would be decided by the courts much more quickly than such cases are decided now. This is another measure which would help make every man's right to vote a reality in the present, not a hope for the future.

Like the proposal for registrars, this expediting legislation is not a radical innovation in our legal system. As early as 1903, legislation was passed which provides that cases brought by the United States arising under the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust laws shall be accorded expedited treatment in the courts (49 U.S.C. 44).

Mr. President, when we can give expeditious treatment to the matter of railroad charges and transportation rates, and matters related to antitrust laws, it seems to me that such a basic political right and privilege as the right to vote should be given equally expeditious treatment.

The denial of the right to vote is indeed a threat to national security in that it is a threat to the foundation of democracy, and the fight against it cannot await the solution of other lesser problems. Together, Federal referees and expedited court action would be effective weapons against the frustrating delay that now exists.

Next, the President requested legislation which would specifically prohibit the application of different standards to those seeking to register for a Federal election. The Civil Rights Commission's 1961 Report on Voting is replete with examples of Negroes being given ridiculous, impossible tests, while white residents of the same county were being registered as a matter of course. This practice is a flagrant violation of the 15th amendment; and the President's recommendation is designed to combat it. The proposed legislation is not only constitutional in the sense that it does not violate a constitutional provision; but such legislation is also affirmatively required by the mandate of the 15th amendment.

The last voting proposal is essentially the same as the principle provision of the administration's 1962 civil rights bill. It would create a presumption that those who have completed the sixth grade are literate for the purposes of election registration. We all have heard of cases where Negroes with postgraduate degrees have been denied the franchise because of a literacy test, while uneducated whites have passed the same tests. This being true, how many perfectly literate Negroes with a grammar or high school education are unconscionably denied the right to vote on the basis of their alleged illiteracy? The President's proposal is designed not to abolish the literacy test, but to insure that it is administered on an objective basis. This would be a legitimate, reasonable exercise of Congress power to implement the 15th amendment.

These, then, are the President's recommendations concerning voting, and these are the proposals that must be enacted if we are finally to eliminate the evil which has haunted the conscience of the Nation so long. For 2 years the President has enforced the existing voting laws with unprecedented vigor. Of 35 suits which have been brought under these laws, 25 have been brought by this administration. It is time for Congress to meet the challenge and to assume its responsibility by passing the requested measures. I hope there will be early action on these four proposals.

Education is the second area of concern which the President treated in his message. He noted the great progress that has been made recently in school integration. He also noted, however, that the progress is much too slow. There are a great many things that I feel Congress could do to help solve this problem. But since politics is the art of the possible, the President has wisely chosen those proposals which will both aid the progress of integration and have the greatest possibility of being adopted by Congress.

The message asks action of Congress on two proposals. First, he advocated a program of technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in desegregating. All of us here are well aware of the great social and financial burden which was placed upon the South by the Supreme Court's decision in 1954. The Court, of course, was the first to recognize the various problems which the school boards would face; and it was with this in mind that the Court left to each locality the difficult task of the implementation of its decision. It is now for Congress to join the other two branches and authorize the Executive to alleviate the difficulties faced by school districts honestly attempting to obey the law of the land by providing them with financial and technical assistance.

The President has also again asked Congress to remove the words "separate but equal" from the Morill Land-Grant College Act. This phrase is not simply outmoded. It is unconstitutional and self-contradictory; it should be deleted from the act immediately. This could be done rapidly and, I would hope, with little or no controversy.

In both these proposals the President has asked Congress to do that which it has unfortunately failed to do for the last 8 years; that is, to recognize the legality and the morality of the Supreme Court's school integration decision.

The President then considered the extension of the term of the Civil Rights Commission. Again, this year the Commission will die if its term is not extended. It is ridiculous for Congress to spend its time rehashing the same objections in this biennial fight; and I know it must be discouraging to those who work so hard for the Commission to have to wait for our approval every 2 years before they can plan their studies.

I say "objections"; really they are objections without much substance. It is needed as a guardian of our basic civil rights, not only the rights of the Negro, but of every person in the land.

The President has asked that this year the commission be extended for at least 4 years and that it be authorized to act as a national civil rights clearinghouse. This request must have top priority, for if we do not act during this session there will be no Commission. Every member is or should be familiar with the scholarly, objective reports the Commission has made during the past few years. In themselves, they justify the Commission's continued existence. I compliment the members of the Civil Rights Commission for service beyond call of duty, for the highest form of patriotism. Civil rights are so closely associated with emotion and politics that the aid of an independent and expert group is essential for the dissemination of objective information. Too much of the information the country receives is from those in both the North and South, who, consciously or not, color the facts to conform with their convictions. The Commission is the organization which informs Congress and the President of the true facts. The Commissioners are disinterested and nonpolitical experts from all sections of the country whose integrity and objective approach are above question.

When I say they are disinterested, I mean they are without prejudice. They are not zealots. They are men who have earned the right to advise the Nation on the difficult problems of civil liberties and civil rights—earned the right because of the exemplary performance in the law, in education, in the civic life of the Nation, and in their scholarly attainments.

We now know that all civil rights problems will not be solved in the next 2 years. In fact, both because of the failure of Congress to use its power to help solve the problem, and because of the size of the problem itself, I hold no illusions about the chances of full solution in the near future. The Commission has proved its worth beyond a shadow of a doubt, and we must extend it for 4 years at the very least.

The value of the Commission's work to Congress and the executive branch is inestimable. However, this expertise should also be made available to others—to Federal agencies, States, local communities, and the general public. The people need to know the true facts as much as we do, and there are many governmental bodies and organizations which could profit greatly from technical assistance by the Commission. It was for this reason that the President asked for an extension of its authority as well as its life. It is for this reason that we must grant it.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] introduced the administration's bill (S. 1117) to extend the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 4 years and also to broaden the scope of the functions and work of the Commission.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his constant efforts in the area of civil rights and civil liberties. He is a source of great inspiration and strength to the Members of this body. He deserves our cooperation and support.

The bill which was introduced by the Senator from Michigan has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I sincerely hope that the committee will give this important legislation early and favorable consideration.

The President reported in his message the accomplishments and goals of the administration in the fields of equal employment, equal public accommodations, and the use of Federal funds, as well as in the fields of voting and education. The record is indeed impressive, but the President alone should not have to carry the whole burden, and he alone cannot solve all the problems. He must have our help. His program is meaningful; it is not oppressive to any section of the country; in fact, it is fair, it is just, it is considerate, and it deserves our immediate attention and our wholehearted support.

Mr. President, the Attorney General recently addressed a meeting of the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council at which he commented extensively on the President's civil rights message. The speech is an excellent analysis, and I believe Senators will find it interesting and informative. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a fine address by the Honorable Chester Bowles delivered at Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa., be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. The speech is entitled "Emancipation: the Record and the Challenge" and is another example of the wisdom, courage, and commonsense of this outstanding and distinguished public servant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many Senators have asked: Will the Senate be able to pass important civil rights legislation? My answer is that there are Members of this body who have made personal commitments, as well as political commitments, and who, as well, have endorsed the commitments of political parties to pass civil rights legislation. The number of such Senators is a majority. Congress can do much to alleviate the growing tension in this country over racial problems by acting constructively, by acting with a sense of intelligent moderation, which is exactly the kind of program proposed by the President of the United States.

Many of the President's critics will say that the program does not go far enough. Many will say that it invades the rights of the States. What the President has done is to analyze where we are and to attempt to bring the Nation another step forward in the guaranteeing of the basic political and social rights of the American people.

The right to vote is a precious right. It is a right that this Nation has fought for, and for which many of our people have died. It is a right which we insist upon for people behind the Iron Curtain as well as for people on this side of the Iron Curtain. It is a right that we talk about for the peoples of Latin America. It seems to me that the least we can do is to assure this right to every American of qualified age. Every American should be entitled, at least, to have one voice and one vote in the decisions of his government.

The only way that decision can in any way be affected by the individual citizen is through the exercise of the franchise, the right to vote.

I wish to commend President Kennedy for his forthright and statesmanlike message on civil rights. It has been before us for some weeks; and I believe the message carries a message of hope and reassurance, if Congress will but expedite its action upon it.

I heard the comments of several of my colleagues on the occasion of the adoption of the resolutions which provide the funds for the respective committees of the Senate. Those comments clearly outlined the fact that civil rights measures will be given prompt attention in the appropriate committees of this Congress. I call upon those who have responsibility in the committees to see to it that these bills are introduced, that they are promptly referred to the appropriate committees, that they are scheduled first for subcommittee hearings, consideration, and report to the full committees. Then the full committees will take whatever action they see fit and will report the legislation to the whole Senate for decision.

This Congress will be unworthy of being called a great Congress, or even of being called a good Congress, if it fails to respond to the demonstrated need of the American people for protection of their voting rights and voting privileges.

Once we in Congress have acted to give proper protection to those rights, we can say to the American people that the rights should be exercised fully, intelligently, and constructively, so that the citizen can exercise his responsibility to participate in the election process as a well-informed and conscientious citizen.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, MARCH 9, 1963

I suppose it is inevitable that most of us are near-sighted about national problems. We are able to focus on them only as they apply close to home and we find it difficult to see how they affect people in other fields and other States. One of the curious things I have found since becoming Attorney General, however, is that when it comes to civil rights, we very quickly become farsighted. We are quite ready to point accusing fingers at the South and are easily outraged by a Little Rock, by the beating of Freedom Riders, or by a Meredith case. Yet we respond to discrimination right around us with blank and uncomprehending stares. The attitude is "the other fellow is wrong" and the more wrong he is, the more that automatically puts us on the side of the angels.

There is no question that segregation in the South is socially, politically, and morally wrong. But there is deep-seated segregation in the North, also, and it is just as wrong. Racial discrimination is a national, not a regional problem, and it cannot be solved simply by individual instances of Federal action on behalf of freedom riders or a single college student. The solution requires the hearts, the voices, the mind, and the muscle of individuals and organizations all over the country, public and private. The President said last week, in his civil rights message:

"The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad."

I am particularly pleased to be with you here today because labor, and especially groups like yours, historically have been committed to social justice and social action. For years, unions have been in the forefront of efforts toward equal opportunity for all workers and all citizens.

Last year, Mr. Van Arsdale's local 3 provided an example of such leadership by including 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans among its 1,000 new apprentices. The New York Council of Painters also has opened its apprenticeship program to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In the past few months, 122 international unions, representing more than 10 million workers have joined with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and pledged themselves to union programs for fair practices. The dual seniority problem is the subject of wide and serious attention by labor. Segregated locals are fast disappearing. Indeed, probably at no time in the long history of the American labor movement have so many union leaders given such deep and effective attention to the problem of providing equal opportunity for all, regardless of race.

Yet we would be dishonest with ourselves if we did not admit that some discrimination continues to exist within the labor movement, and by no means only in the South. I am thinking, for example, of a particularly ironic situation that exists right now in Washington. Howard University, a distinguished Negro institution, is building a new gymnasium. At least four of the building trades locals involved, however, have no Negroes working on the project. For that matter, these locals have only a handful of Negro members or apprentices.

The fundamental responsibility for solving problems like this is that of labor itself. Your group and others like it do a great deal to help. The Government also has a responsibility in this field: the work of the Vice President and the Equal Employment Committee is well known to you and the President has directed me to seek legal techniques, rules, and procedures to deal with such discrimination.

But there is a more fundamental responsibility for both you in the labor movement and for us in Government. We are as firmly opposed to discrimination in voting, education, and other fields as we are to discrimination in unions. It is in order to help the Nation act more effectively against discrimination that the President last week sent Congress a special message on civil rights. The administration's program includes three legislative proposals, concerning voting, education, and assistance to areas and organizations undertaking desegregation.

The first and most important bill deals with voting. The people's vote is the people's voice and when some people cannot vote they cannot effectively speak against injustice and deprivation of other rights.

It's like the story told at the time the 19th amendment was being voted on by the States. A decided antifeminist complained to his Congressman: "Can't you do something to stop them scarecrow suffragettes from voting?" The Congressman replied, "You mean my charming constituents of the fairer sex?"

We have worked very hard under existing law seeking to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. The Department of Justice has filed 35 voting suits, 25 of them in this administration, challenging discrimination or threats in southern counties against Negro registration applicants. But this is a painfully slow way of providing what is, after all, the fundamental right of citizenship. There remain more than 200 counties in the South where less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered.

Even where we have brought suit, the cases require extremely detailed preparation. In our suit in Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voted applications and to subpena 185 witnesses for the trial. Such suits each require the total attention of 4 to 6 of the 40 lawyers in our civil rights division for several months.

It often takes many more months before Negroes finally can register and vote. In Ouachita Parish, La., for example, the Department filed suit in July 1961. Although 24,000 out of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered to vote, only 725 of the 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Another 5,000 Negroes had, in fact, been purged from the voting rolls.

In the 33 months since we brought the suit, a special election for Congress has passed. A general election has passed. And still not even the date for trial has been set. It may well be 1964 before we finally secure a decision and Negroes can register and vote freely.

This is neither an extreme nor an isolated case. There is a real and immediate need for speeding up the process.

We are asking Congress, therefore, to authorize that voting suits be given preference on court dockets and tried in an expedited manner. This parallels the laws of many States which give priority to election suits in an effort to resolve them before the election is over and the chance to vote wiped out.

Even if cases can be expedited, there still will be a timelag between the filing of a suit and the issuance of orders against further discrimination. Therefore, we have asked Congress to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal referees to determine the qualifications of registration applicants during the time voting suits are pending in court.

In addition to the need for speed in guaranteeing the right to vote, there also is a great need for insuring fairness in determining who is qualified to vote.

Some Southern States use the literacy test to make this determination. As a result, barely literate whites, coached by the registrar, often are registered. Meanwhile, Negroes—like a National Science Foundation graduate student from Cornell, or teachers with advanced degrees—arbitrarily are declared illiterate and thus ineligible to vote.

Other States have used the constitutional interpretation test. Applicants must copy and explain sections of the Federal or State Constitutions. Negroes often are required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of a State constitution, or are required to explain what due process means, to a registrar who knows no law.

Whites, meanwhile, copy such provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt." One white gentleman, who was registered, interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be for voting Be couse He dont under Stand."

We should reflect on such examples more in sadness than in irony, because they demonstrate the double burden of injustice inflicted on the Negro. Not only is he prevented from registering and voting, but the method of doing so is a grotesquely unfair test.

There's an acid joke about the Negro who attempted to register in a southern county. The registrar asked him to copy and interpret the 14th amendment. He did so, brilliantly. "All right, if you're so smart," the registrar said, "recite the Gettysburg Address from memory." The Negro did. "OK, give us the second inaugural speech." Again the Negro came through beautifully. Finally, the registrar pulled a Chinese newspaper out of his desk and asked, "Can you read this?"

"That's easy," said the Negro. "It says, 'No Negroes are going to vote in this State this year.' "

We are asking Congress in our proposed voting measure to prohibit specifically the use of different tests or standards for different registration applicants. And we have asked that completion of the sixth grade should be regarded as evidence that an applicant is literate.

We also are asking Congress for two other pieces of legislation, both stemming from a need for assistance as well as enforcement. Our experience has demonstrated that people want to obey the law. In the field of education, for example, the violence last fall at the University of Mississippi should not overshadow the fact that 60 southern school districts were desegregated last year—peacefully and without fanfare. In many cases the Department of Justice assisted through informal consultations.

Communities in the South not only want to obey the law, but they want and need assistance in doing so. One of the laws we seek would establish in the Office of Education a program of technical and financial assistance to communities in the process of integrating their schools.

Such a program would help such school districts profit from the lessons of others—such as Atlanta, where public and private bodies combined with great success in 1961 to desegregate schools without incident. Many communities lack the background and resources required to minimize tensions both outside and inside the schools and to assure the maintenance and improvement of educational standards.

We have applied the same principle of providing information in our third legislative proposal, for the extension and expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights. Not only community governments, but many organizations, both public and private, both in the North and the South, can benefit substantially from expert guidance and information about how others have handled integration problems.

The Civil Rights Commission has the background and ability to satisfy this need and the President consequently has recommended that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse—providing information and technical guidance to any requesting agency.

Combined with continued effort under existing laws and policies, this, then is the administration's civil rights program. There are those who say this program does not go far enough. It is true that there is other civil rights legislation which might be introduced, such as a bill seeking authority for the Government to initiate school desegregation suits. But I would say to these critics that it is perfectly simple to introduce and support bills that have no chance of passage. But to do so would endanger measures that do have a chance. These critics have no responsibility for action. It is the aim of this administration to seek action and progress, not merely talk and headlines.

Further, let it be clear that this civil rights program is only that—a program. To sit back and wait for progress to come just because somebody in Washington has asked for new laws is as starry-eyed as waiting for the day labor minstrels once described when "the mills are made of marble and the machines are made of gold."

It took courage and effort for the labor movement to achieve the economic standards it enjoys today. It will take the same kind of effort to achieve the social ideals we profess in the field of civil rights.

We stand not only for labor or the Negro or minority groups, but for the ideal of freedom and dignity which underlies our society.

I come here today to call on you for your efforts on behalf of the administration's program. I come to ask you to speak out and act as a body. I ask you to go back to your internationals, your locals, and your communities to seek their support, both for this program and for its aim.

"Race discrimination," the President said in his civil rights message, "hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong."

EXHIBIT 2

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CHESTER BOWLES, PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE AND ADVISER ON AFRICAN, ASIAN, AND LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AT LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, PA., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

EMANCIPATION: THE RECORD AND THE CHALLENGE

Last autumn I made a month-long trip through 13 African countries. At each of my stops one question was inevitable, urgent, and recurrent: What about James Meredith at the University of Mississippi?

Time and time again, at press conferences, official dinners, and meetings with students, I was asked to explain events in Mississippi, their meaning for the future, and the views of the U.S. Government.

I soon found that the most effective means of extricating myself from a difficult tactical position was to take the offensive.

Where else, I would ask, have you ever heard of a government with such strong convictions about racial equality and such respect for law that it was willing to muster 16,000 soldiers to enforce the right of 1 Negro student to an integrated education?

The Meredith case, I would add, demonstrated that the United States is dedicated to the rule of law and to equal rights, despite the most bitter opposition from many Mississippians.

Fortunately, my questioners were so polite that they failed to ask me what surely occurred to them as an obvious followup question: Why, 100 years after our Emancipation Proclamation, was it necessary to call up an Army division to secure a basic human right established under the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution?

The answer to that unasked central question is clear to all of us: The process of fully integrating the 10 percent of our Nation which is Negro into the fabric of American society has been painfully slow—tragically and outrageously slow.

In regard to the democratic rights of our Negro citizens we have lived for nearly a century in a condition of moral sickness—relieved to have ended slavery, but callously indifferent to the child of slavery.

We have refused to face up to the implications of our faith and our democracy; we have postponed the action that our national conscience must demand of us.

And so a majority of Americans have continued to procrastinate and to refuse to become involved—sometimes out of malice or fear, more often because their attitudes have become insulated by the hardened cake of custom.

Yet when the history of our era has been written, it will be said that the pace of progress toward true emancipation has been far more rapid in the last decade than in the preceding nine decades, and that in 1963 the struggle for equal dignity and opportunity at long last began to assume promising new forms and extraordinary new vigor.

It is startling to remind ourselves that only a few years ago Negroes were still segregated in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Indeed I recall my own astonishment in 1949 when, as Governor of Connecticut, I desegregated our State National Guard and discovered that I was the first State Governor to do so.

Of all the changes that have marked these years of progress, however, none has been so important and so dramatic as the change in the attitude of Negroes themselves. In the last few years there has emerged a new sense of urgency, of impatience, of determination.

I might illustrate the pace of this change by citing a personal experience in 1954, the year of the Supreme Court decision.

I had recently returned from service in India, deeply conscious of the influence of Gandhi and especially of the moral power he had used in gaining freedom for his people from British rule: the moral power of passive resistance, victorious against the physical force of an empire.

In the spring of 1954 I was invited to speak at a distinguished Negro institution in Atlanta. In my talk I said that I knew of no case in history where one race had been able to deliver both freedom and dignity to another. Freedom, I said, was something that had to be fought for and won; regardless of the rights and wrongs, it could never be achieved without struggle.

I then described the role of Gandhi in leading such a fight for Indian freedom and how, through a passive but militant program of action, he and his followers eventually triumphed over the vastly superior military and economic power of the British Raj.

I concluded my talk with an appeal to the Negro students present to hold up their heads with pride and confidence and to develop a comparable program of cooperative action directed at achieving the equal opportunities guaranteed under our Constitution and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court.

To my surprise, I found that what I had regarded as a logical, temperate appeal had left my audience in something of a state of shock.

This was later explained by a student leader on the grounds that most of my hearers had never felt any personal responsibility for group action designed to establish their rights as citizens, and were hesitant to accept such responsibility now.

In the following months a remarkable pioneer, Dr. Martin Luther King, a man deeply influenced by Gandhi, assumed leadership in a historic first step toward firm, direct action on the Gandhian model—the Montgomery bus boycott.

Yet the temper of the times was slow to change. Even as late as 1958, when I wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "What Negroes Can Learn From Gandhi," I received many letters from thoughtful Negroes who questioned my central thesis. Though sympathetic with my objectives, they felt that action by Negroes could not be expected to solve their problems; responsibility belonged to others.

How dramatically the atmosphere has changed in these last 5 years. Today it is evident that Negroes with a new vision and a new commitment to results have taken command.

This is true not only among student groups—although many of them have led the way—but among the older and more established elements as well.

Indeed, what has been most striking about this new movement among our Negro citizens has been its dynamism, its depth of moral commitment, and its explicit charge of inaction against many leaders of previous generations.

Impatience is the watchword of the new generation of Negro students—and high time it is for such impatience.

Yet impatience is a quality of mind, not a program. What lies ahead? And, the most important question of all, what are the implications of the Negro's struggle for the future of American society?

In the last 10 years the principal focus of the continuing battle for equal rights has been twofold; in the area of school integration—the route to the intellectual excellence, and peaceful human relations both inside and outside the school building; and in the area of voting rights—the route to political responsibility.

Let us consider in some detail the first of these basic areas: what has been accomplished, and what we have learned for the future.

Much has been said about progress toward school desegregation, and we should be gratified by this progress. Yet 9 years after the Supreme Court's historic decision, out of 3,200,000 Negro children attending schools in the 17 Southern States and the District of Columbia that formerly practiced segregation, only 200,000 are in fact now attending integrated schools. And of these 200,000 the vast majority are in schools that are either 95 percent Negro or 95 percent white.

In other words, the record still shows that old patterns of segregation remain largely unchanged for the vast majority of Negro students. And because of the complexities of our laws, the opportunities for delay, and court acquiescence in so-called token integration as evidence of compliance, this situation will be slow to change.

As our new Ambassador to Finland, Carl T. Rowan, pointed out in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post "There is something about these legal dodges, these obvious frauds, that leaves me baffled."

Nine years after the Supreme Court's decision, it seems to me that not just Negroes, but all of us, are entitled to ask: Precisely what is the meaning of "all deliberate speed"?

I for one think it means something more than the so-called token integration that we have witnessed so far. I am tempted to say that the 14th amendment, as the "law of the land," should be regarded as exactly that, and enforced like any other law.

Yet it is far easier to deplore the slow pace than to provide effective answers. On the basis of our experience, what can be said about the nature of segregation as a problem?

In the first place, it would be simple but unfair smugly to castigate the South for the snail's pace of integration—for its failure by and large to comply with a court decision that is overwhelmingly unpopular in that region. In view of the equally slow rate of change in many parts of the North, this would be sheer hypocrisy. Segregation is clearly a national problem, not a regional one.

Now can we escape from our national dilemma and responsibility by thinking of integration as purely a legal question dividing those who believe in upholding the law from those who seek to circumvent it. This turns the problem inside out. The Supreme Court acted because the constitutional guarantee of equality involves the deepest political principles of this Nation; on the basis of these principles, segregation poses a moral issue which goes to the heart of our society.

In short, the primary reason why racial discrimination in America must ultimately be ended is not because of a clause in our Constitution, nor, as we sometimes hear, because of the Communist challenge, nor because of the need to curry favor with the new African States which now account for nearly one-third of the United Nations.

The reason is purely and simply because racial discrimination is fundamentally wrong. It flies in the fact of our Judeo-Christian heritage, our democratic ethics, our sense of how man should treat his brother.

And it is every bit as wrong in the North, where custom and economics serve unwittingly as the enforcement agency, as it is in the South, where the local police and often the school boards themselves more dramatically strive to hold back the clock.

Let us look the facts squarely in the face: In many Northern cities which customarily elect liberal mayors, liberal city councilors and liberal Congressmen, the professed equal protection under law still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion and by the natural selection of poverty. As a result, in only a handful of northern cities do more than 20 percent of the Negro students now attend school with white children.

If we are to be honest, therefore, the conclusion seems to me inescapable that an immediate and perfectly executed legal application of the Supreme Court's order—welcome though it would be—would not by itself eliminate the pattern of segregation; it would only establish it along new lines.

This is not to minimize the tremendous achievements of a whole generation of able lawyers and strategists who have fought and won literally hundreds of legal battles on behalf of racial democracy. Without the dedication and leadership provided by such men as the late Walter White, A. Phillip Randolph, Lester Granger, Roy Wilkins, Thurgood Marshall, Robert Weaver, Whitney Young, and many more, we would not be making the extraordinary progress we are achieving today.

Yet these great leaders would be the first to agree that their efforts have been designed to establish the legal rights of our Negro citizens in order to create a solid framework for the civil rights breakthrough which is yet to come—that legal action alone is inadequate to free the 15 million Americans who still suffer discrimination because of the color of their skin.

To illustrate the point, let me briefly consider the present results of integration in the city of Washington, D.C., from a hopefully impartial viewpoint.

Here is a city that has rapidly evolved from a southern to a northern community. Yet after a program of successful school integration, approximately 80 percent of the schools in Washington, although theoretically integrated, are in fact still attended mostly by Negro students.

The problem does not lie, as some have charged, in the mechanics of integration. If responsibility can be fixed anywhere, it should focus on the totally inadequate social, health, welfare, and educational programs forced on the District of Columbia by a long record of congressional stinginess, indifference, and neglect.

What can be done about this? A great deal can be done about it—starting with home rule for the Capital City of the United States, continued White House pressure along the lines of the President's recent message, and increased welfare and educational program funds.

In the meantime, our experience in Washington underscores the fact that school integration alone is not an adequate answer. The Supreme Court decision and the enlightened and courageous action of many school boards and city governments in carrying out its provisions are important steps toward the elimination of all discrimination. Yet such action cannot be expected by itself to solve the basic problem.

What can we conclude from these first years of struggle toward full equality for the Negro student?

The primary lesson for us, I believe, is that what has to be changed is not simply the school districting and admission process, but the attitude of the whole community—white and Negro alike.

Court orders cannot transform the hearts and minds of people. A reluctant and grudging acceptance of the inevitable force of the law will prove inadequate, for laws can win support only if they embody the moral purposes of our society.

Therefore, the task of those who are determined to establish equal rights, opportunities, and responsibilities for all Americans goes beyond victorious court decisions and becomes a task of persuasion: to convince people that these decisions are right, and especially, to convince white people that integration is not personally or economically damaging.

Only in this way can we bring the divergent elements of every community into growing harmony.

This particular aspect of the problem was aptly put in a recent magazine article in which the writer described our objective in terms of persuading the man who wouldn't mind a Ralph Bunche as a next-door neighbor also to accept a Ralph Brown.

Unless we can so broaden his perspective, white neighborhoods will remain white, Negro will remain Negro, and all the laws, court orders, and Federal directives in the world will not suffice to make a fundamental alteration in the ugly persistent pattern of segregation.

What I am saying is that school integration is not an end itself but one means among many of reaching the fundamental objective of our democratic society which is nothing less than complete social, economic, and political equality for all Americans.

A second means to full democracy, of course, is the right to vote. On this vital issue I am proud of the record that the present administration has made toward the enfranchisement of Negroes in Southern States.

But here again progress is inevitably slow, with a tangle of legal obstacles to be overcome, county by county, State by State.

The 1960 Democratic platform, which as committee chairman I helped to draft, pledges this administration "to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities."

In my opinion, that pledge still stands at the top of our agenda in dealing with the unfinished business of our society.

So much for the lessons of the past decade. What are our responsibilities for the future?

Let me begin with the task facing Negroes.

It seems to me that the basic question that confronts the Negro community today is essentially a tactical one of how our democratic objectives can best be achieved.

As I see it, there are three courses of action available:

At one extreme is the strictly legalistic approach through continued court action and patient efforts at public education.

At the other extreme are those, such as the Black Muslims, who assert that the only answer lies in violence and separation.

A third course which lies between these two extremes can perhaps be best described as a policy of continued legal action backed by a persuasive militancy among all Americans—white and Negro directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the greatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This means nonviolence undertaken in full acceptance of the risks of the violence it may provoke; but nonviolence directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the geatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This brings me to an important point: One of the most remarkable phenomena of the struggle for equality in this country has been the extraordinary patience of most of our Negro fellow citizens.

James Baldwin recently wrote, in "The Fire Next Time," of his immense respect for generations of Negro Americans who understood that "the country was in no hurry to educate Negroes," and who "put their pride in their pockets in order to do it." He spoke of "that unsung army of black men and women who trudged down back lanes and entered back doors saying 'yes, sir' and 'no, ma'am' in order to acquire a new roof for the schoolhouse, new books, a new chemistry lab, more beds for the dormitories, more dormitories."

I share Mr. Baldwin's respect. After 100 years of penitent yes, sir's and no, ma'am's, it is extraordinary that the Negro's patience has not long since erupted into violence.

However much we may deplore it, a sense of frustration, antagonism, and belligerence after a century of patient and until recently largely fruitless effort, is understandable in human terms. Indeed, it is possible that the new dynamism we are witnessing among today's Negro students and leaders may in fact be turned toward negative and destructive channels.

This would be both tragic and self-defeating. Instead of eliminating the evils of segregation, it would tend to perpetuate them.

On the other hand, blind, unquestioning patience, I regret to say, is unlikely to produce results either. After a century of waiting for the courts and the Government fully to implement the 14th amendment, we may conclude that in this revolutionary era "trickle-down democracy" is much too slow a process.

What is needed is not just equal rights in law but equal skills in fact, leading to equal opportunities. The quality of Negro education must be improved through local school boards, by court action, by militant pressure from local citizen groups, and by more adequate budgets.

There must also be a greatly invigorated new effort to strengthen and to assist Negro youngsters who are now handicapped by inadequate housing, education, and cultural opportunities.

Can this be done by whites working in behalf of Negroes? Can it be done by legal recourse to the courts, the Federal Government, and State legislatures? To some degree—perhaps to a large degree—it can.

But I believe the major progress that has been made in the last decade has been due, not to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, great as it was, which acted essentially as a trigger, nor to meager and long overdue legislative handouts, but to the new militancy, the new unity of purpose, and the new willingness to make sacrifices which is becoming evident throughout the Negro community.

The problem for the Negro community is to find a constructive approach that is vigorous enough to produce results, yet not so provocative as to close doors that have already been opened or are in the process of opening.

What now can we say of the chief responsibility of all Americans, both white and Negro, in this struggle for the realization of our democratic objectives?

One easy reply is reliance on Government action.

Yet there is a clear limit to what even our Federal Government can do. To be sure, Government must be prodded and pressured; but Government has to deal with scores of problems; and its attention is necessarily divided. Discrimination is only one among many problems, all important, all clamoring for solutions.

For this reason alone, it is shortsighted and inadequate to look wholly to Government. What white Americans need is a new climate of urgency, a new framework for action, a new perspective on the basic problem and the means of dealing with it on a local neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis.

Basic to such an approach, in my opinion, is a nationwide inventory, an analysis, of the civil rights problems of every community in the United States as a basis for community action.

I am not suggesting a critical exercise by unfriendly snoopers armed with sliderules and IBM cards. What I have in mind is an honest evaluation by a committee of public-spirited local citizens of both races, working through religious and civic groups with the support of the community.

The efforts of these committees would be narrowly directed at factfinding. But their reports would inevitably become vehicles for discussion, disagreement and, I am sure, in many cases an evolving consensus about the unfinished business of local democracy and what can and should be done about it.

If the growing national concern about discrimination can be channeled into hundreds of community programs throughout the country, spectacular progress may be achieved in the finest tradition of American democracy.

A citizen's "check list" for communities both North and South of the Mason-Dixon line might include the following questions:

How many Negroes are members of the police force? The fire department? City hall? The school system?

Do Negroes have a full opportunity to get such jobs? And if so, are they promoted solely on merit and performance?

What kind of housing, both public and private, is available to Negroes? What kind of medical and hospital care?

Is there direct or indirect discrimination in public housing and entertainment facilities?

What about private enterprise jobs? Do Negro workers have jobs which use their skill to the fullest?

Is vocational and professional training freely available to qualified Negroes?

Are the police and the courts as fair to them as to other sections of the population?

A widely-publicized, objective study by nongovernmental groups in each city under the sponsorship of a national committee of outstanding citizens, with able and respected local leadership, supported by churches and synagogues, could do much to develop agreement in thousands of communities in regard to such questions.

And once the facts are agreed upon, responsible Negroes and whites working together can learn to deal with them effectively through constructive democratic action.

In closing, let me add a few words about the vitally important role of the Negro in contemporary American history.

Thoughtful observers recognize the new Negro movement toward full equality and first-class citizenship as a unique phenomenon in American society. No other cause is compelling the allegiance of so many young Americans with such intensity and fervor.

This fact has deep significance in the present condition of American society. For the Negro's struggle is taking place within a Nation that too often appears to have forgotten its own moral values, and to have largely lost its sense of positive purpose. Indeed, it may be said that our Negro citizens have a clearer idea of what they really want than any other Americans.

In our efforts to deal pragmatically with a vast agenda of new and unfamiliar problems, we Americans have been losing something of the moral direction which has always been basic to the health and vigor of our society.

We have not only condoned the slick operator and cynical manipulator; in a backhanded sort of way, we have glorified them. We have adopted the semantics of materialism and manipulation to explain some of our most admirable actions. It is as though we felt it necessary to justify decency by proving that the real reasons for our actions are not so decent as they might seem.

Indeed, at the very moment in history when the true nature of our world contest with communism is coming into focus, we find ourselves faced with a crisis in values. The moral standards in which we profess to believe are marred by our immoral tolerance of tax evasion and false expense accounts, of fake advertisements, the thumb on the scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our national effort not to seem gullible, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, and to prove that we are "realists" who do not "go off half-cocked," we have developed a moral gap between the beliefs to which we subscribe and our actual day-to-day performance. This moral gap can become an increasing danger to our survival as a free society.

It is in this context that I see a special responsibility and opportunity for American Negroes. For in the course of removing our national curse of racial discrimination, the Negro can force all Americans of good conscience to reexamine their own sense of values.

And so the leaders in the civil rights struggle can help to bridge the dangerous gap which increasingly exists between beliefs and actions. They can reawaken in their fellow Americans a commitment to the moral objectives on which our society was founded—and this reawakening can give a new tone, a new vigor, and a new honesty to the American Nation.

Regardless of color, most Americans now know in their hearts that the time for explanations is over and that the time for action is here on the great frontier of civil rights.

The challenge to the American Negro is enormous.

Today we see him increasingly accept that challenge, and in so doing set a standard for all Americans to follow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, until noon on Thursday of this week.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25, 1963:

In the Coast Guard

Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1963:

Department of Commerce

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

March 25, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable Carl Albert to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 2: 17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that the motives, which daily impel our thoughts and actions and the aims and aspirations, which dominate our lives, may not be at variance with Thy will and the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Inspire us with a passionate desire to devote and dedicate our strength of body, mind, and heart to every worthy enterprise and forward movement that will minister to the health and happiness of all mankind.

May we never seek to avoid and escape our responsibilities to have a share in promoting not only the material and physical welfare of humanity but in elevating and enforcing its moral and spiritual well-being.

To Thy Name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we shall give all the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was read and approved.

COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE SHOWS SUPPORT FOR ACTION TO ISOLATE COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the conference of Central American leaders meeting with the President and congressional representatives recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, has produced evidence that a firm basis for hemispheric isolation of Communist Cuba not only exists, but cries for leadership and action.

The exuberance and warmth which our President and delegation received in Costa Rica dramatically proves that the hopes and aspirations of our Latin neighbors are riding with the United States, a fact which is given additional credence by the unanimous support which this Nation received in the Organization of American States last October during the Cuban missile crisis.

But the Communists are organizing rapidly in Latin America, ironically they plan to convene in Brazil shortly, a country which is at this moment pleading for U.S. financial aid. In the face of this threat to the freedom of this hemisphere, we cannot withhold a solution to the Cuban problem.

As the President has now stated, our immediate policy is the isolation of Cuba. It is gratifying to see that one of the topics discussed at Costa Rica included measures I have long recommended as necessary to place Cuba in solitary confinement—namely the ban on movement of Castro agents and propaganda, and the restriction of Cuban Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the United States assume the first step of leadership by closing U.S. ports to nations which engage in sea trade with Cuba, then make the following proposals to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First, close hemispheric seaports to nations engaged in sea trade with Cuba,

Second, close hemispheric airports to airlines flying into Cuba,

Third, ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America,

Fourth, ban relay of unofficial telecommunications messages to and from Cuba, and

Fifth, freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this plan by the Organization of American States would effectively place Cuba in solitary confinement. Isolation of Cuba is now a matter of official U.S. policy, and the above steps are our only immediate recourse to the Cuban problem short of an act of war.

If we are serious about fighting communism in this hemisphere, we will act quickly in the coming days with a concentrated, hard-driving campaign to place the policy of isolating Cuba into practice.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered into for tomorrow and Wednesday be carried over until Thursday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would those that were scheduled for tomorrow come first then on Thursday?

Mr. BOGGS. That would be my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the majority whip whether his request was to the effect that all special orders for today and tomorrow go over?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the request is for those special orders for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. James J. Rowley, Chief, U.S. Secret Service, relative to the protection of the Vice President of the United States.

The letter follows:

Treasury Department,
U.S. Secret Service,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Honorable John W. McCormack,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: In response to your request for my comments on the remarks yesterday by Congressman Silvio O. Conte, regarding the Secret Service's appropriation request for additional staff to carry out its responsibilities under present law which calls for the protection of the Vice President, may I say that a number of questions were raised that need clarification.

As you know, the present law states: "Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President, or the Vice President-elect; protect a former President, at his request, for a reasonable time after he leaves office."

This law was approved October 15, 1962.

The request to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, made on March 11 of this year, was the first time that the Secret Service sought, in the routine presentation of its operating needs for the coming fiscal year 1964, the funds it had determined as needed to carry out its responsibilities under the law.

At the hearings last week I furnished the subcommittee the number of personnel the Service had determined was needed, after careful consideration of the responsibilities and nature of duties required. As this testimony was made in executive session, and has not been made public by the subcommittee, I feel I must stand upon my position as outlined to the subcommittee.

At this point it is appropriate to point out that Vice President Johnson had not made any requests for the protective services proposed nor was he consulted concerning the number of personnel determined to be necessary to properly protect the person of the Vice President. The request for appropriations was made because the present law, Public Law 87-829, broadened considerably the scope of the Service's protective responsibilities which in turn requires additional personnel to carry out its provisions.

The present law differs markedly from the law under which the Secret Service protected the Vice President during the previous decade. On July 16, 1951, spurred by such events as the assassination attempt upon President Truman at the Blair House, the law which set forth the protective duties of the Secret Service was amended to include protection of the Vice President at his request.

The new law has three objectives: To close loopholes that existed in the old law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line for the Presidency. Second, to remove from the Vice President the discretion as to whether he should or should not receive Secret Service protection. Third, to authorize Secret Service protection of a former President for a reasonable time after he leaves office.

Therefore it was clear that the intent and purpose of the present law was to focus upon the inadequacies of the old law regarding the succession to the Presidency, by authorizing adequate protection to the President and the Vice President, or in the event of their deaths, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, etc. The law closed the gap by recognizing the reality that Presidents in the past have been killed, or died in office, and so have officers in the sequence of possible succession.

Further than that, the new law took heed of the fact that in the period 1951 to 1962 the President had no choice whether or not he was protected by the Secret Service. But as to the Vice President, he was to be protected only upon his request. Should he not choose to request it, the Secret Service was not authorized to furnish it.

The reasoning behind this phase of the law was clear: If a Vice President did not ask for protection, he was highly vulnerable to attempts upon his life. When he asked for protection only upon occasion, this kind of part-time protection was highly unsatisfactory, and indeed, ineffectual. Anyone who wanted to harm him need only plan to do so at a time when the Secret Service was not guarding him.

A bill to eliminate the discretion of the Vice President as to whether or not he will receive protection was first proposed in 1960, and was passed by the Senate in that year, but was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. When the law was first proposed, the Treasury Department, in its transmittal of the legislation, expressed the opinion that the existing law, providing protection for the Vice President only at his request, "presents an untenable situation." The Treasury further pointed out that part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded.

The bill was again introduced in 1961, and lay pending until it was passed by the Senate and approved on October 15, 1962. In retransmitting it the argument was again put forth that gaps in existing legislation needed closing with respect to those individuals who were next in line to the Presidency.

I would like to further emphasize that the growing importance of the Office of the Vice Presidency, the troubled times in which we live—marked by international plots and counterplots, the possibility of actions of the mentally unstable—all have fortified my belief that the assignment of Secret Service agents to the protection of the Vice President is in the best interest of the U.S. Government.

Congressman Conte referred to the difference between the number of men assigned to protect Vice President Johnson prior to the passage of the current law, and the number now being requested. In the light of my experience over the past 24 years, and through the accumulated experience of our agents in protecting Presidents of the United States, I feel that I am in a position best suited to make such plans and prescribe the manpower needed.

Under the old law, the protection by the Secret Service was intermittent, and not around the clock. To provide the manpower needed, the Service drew upon its existing personnel, generally from the field offices. Now that the law calls for adequate, full-time protection, it is obvious that more individuals are needed.

In order to carry out its responsibilities, the Secret Service must now provide full-time around-the-clock protection for the Vice President's residence and for his person. To provide such protection on a minimum basis it estimates 36 persons will be required on the basis of a 40-hour working week for each agent, plus time off for holidays, sickness, and annual leave.

Congressman Conte indicated he would agree to protection of the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, but that no more than two agents should be made available to do this entire job except when the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission. Such a limited number of agents, of course, could not even begin to provide protection on an around-the-clock basis, 365 days a year.

I agree as to the inadvisability of taking agents away from their duties in the field in order to provide protection. This is just what our request for personnel is designed to avoid. The only way to insure adequate protection is to establish a detail specifically charged with the task, and not to rely upon part-time services from personnel assigned to other duties.

The issues raised by Congressman Conte are sensitive ones. No one impugns the courage of the President or the Vice President, or any of the gentlemen covered by the provisions of the law. This is not a question of their courage, nor of their own desire for privacy or freedom from the burden such protection necessarily imposes. The responsibilities we face are the safety of the men who stand at the highest elective posts in the land. We must adequately plan to meet such contingencies as accidents, or deeds of violence, as unpleasant as they may be. The Secret Service as the organization which must meet this full-time responsibility, cannot do so on a part-time basis.

It is clear that the protection called for in the law, and for which we have asked the necessary appropriations, is not for the individual, but for the position of the Vice President—a position second only to that of the Presidency of the United States—the position from which the Nation will draw its next Chief Executive in the unhappy event that this would become necessary because of death.

There are a great many Americans whose lives may be in greater potential danger than that of the Vice President, as Congressman Conte said, but they are not the President nor those who would be, in the event of tragedy. We in the Secret Service feel strongly that this is what the law considers in assigning us the responsibility of providing the necessary protection.

If Congress does not wish to provide the funds necessary to carry out the mandate of the new law, it should be repealed. As long as the law is on the books, however, I feel that it is my duty to provide for its proper administration.

Sincerely yours,

James J. Rowley.

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Treasury Department today said that the request of the Secret Service for 36 positions in order to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of protecting the Vice President has apparently been subject to misunderstanding because of the nature of protective work.

There will not be 36 agents accompanying the Vice President at once. There will normally be only 4 assigned at any one time to protective duties, which means advance work as well as on-the-spot protection. The protective organization would also include two agents assigned to the Vice President's Washington residence and one agent to his Texas home.

How, then, does the total figure come to 36? Because there are three 8-hour shifts to be filled, because the weekends must be covered as well as week days, and because sick and annual leave must be taken into account. The overall number includes supporting personnel bringing the total to 36.

Under the old law, Vice Presidents were furnished protection upon request (not necessarily the request of the Vice President, but also of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury). This was unsatisfactory because a Vice President or other people acting on his behalf should not be required to make the decision as to whether or not he needs protection. That is the reason for the legislation giving this responsibility to the Secret Service through the Treasury Department. It was first proposed and passed by the Senate in 1960. It became law last October.

The following points will also help clarify recent discussions of this matter:

1. The Secret Service as an interim measure assigned 19 agents to the protection of the Vice President last fall after the new legislation was approved. In order to meet its responsibilities to the extent possible in the absence of any appropriated funds, it became necessary for the Secret Service temporarily to draw agents from the field for this purpose.

2. The law authorizes rather than directs this protection of the Vice President. This provision is identical to that authorizing protection of the President. The purpose of last year's legislation was to give the Secret Service responsibility for protecting the Vice President in the exact same manner as it already had the responsibility for protecting the President.

3. Under the former law, Vice President Johnson refused to request full-time permanent protection. He made only occasional requests for oversea travel and where large crowds or other special circumstances made temporary protection necessary in domestic travel.

GRATEFUL MEMORY AND HOPEFUL FORECAST

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the centennial year of Boston College. Boston College has exercised a mighty and beneficial influence upon the intellectual and moral thought of our country and has been a glory and credit to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. All sacrifices of the past in establishing this institution are vindicated as one beholds this magnificent higher institution of learning as it stands today.

A nobler civilization is the dream of all men through the ages and it has been this high hope that Boston College has served so steadfastly. Beginning humbly, it has flourished in the great traditions set down by Jesuit educators some four centuries ago. Prompted by the age-old search for truth, goodness, and beauty, its endeavors have enriched our civilization.

I recall once reading an anniversary address by Henry Van Dyke in which he said: "The occasion is one of grateful memory and hopeful forecast." Such an event is this. Grateful memories of a heritage won by toil, hopes, and prayers, and hopeful forecast for a better world won by the search for truth and the attaining of wisdom.

Boston College has been fortunate indeed in the dedicated and talented men who have been associated with her through the years. I might add that Father Walsh, who is providing one of the richest periods in the history of Boston College, is a worthy successor to the great men who built this school.

A small but determined group of men led by Father John McElroy saw their hope for a college to serve the large Catholic community of Boston materialize with approval of a charter for Boston College on April 1, 1863. The years ahead were filled with struggle but the college grew and the city grew around it. The enrollment increased steadily each year and by 1905 it had reached 500. Cramped college facilities led to the building, under the leadership of Father Gasson, of this loveliest of campuses at Chesnut Hill and the first classes were held there exactly 50 years ago. The school continued to expand and today the original faculty of six Jesuits has grown to become the largest collegiate teaching community of Jesuits in the world.[1]

Although the history of Boston College is not unique in its growth amidst tremendous hardship, it is a towering monument to the devoted men of the Society of Jesus who have made this community of learning possible. The test of the ages imparts confidence in the Catholic system of education where the teaching of Christian morality is never lost sight of and goes hand-in-hand with the mental training of youth.

While recognizing the value of specialized skills, Boston College has adhered to the Jesuit belief in the excellence of a liberal arts education. In his "Idea of a University," Cardinal Newman wrote:

> A university training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspirations, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility.

This has been the function of Boston College.

The 100th anniversary of this institution brings forth grateful memories of great men and great ideas which have been fulfilled throughout the years of growth and maturing. And the occasion also brings to mind illustrious men who have passed through the portals of this college as students, such as our beloved Cardinal Cushing and the honored and eminent Cardinal O'Connell who exclaimed as a student:

> I am more in love with the college than ever. There is plenty of hard work, but there is happiness and fine feeling all around.

Because of its solid foundation and rich heritage, Boston College offers today a hopeful forecast. In these critical times, with the ever increasing needs for an educated citizenry, Boston College is a fortress of broad and humane learning, a kind of learning which is often overlooked in today's clamor for vocationalism in American education. With higher learning so essential to our democratic way of life, the role of the private college becomes vital. The Jesuit school, particularly, provides the necessary well-rounded mental development for coping successfully with the deepening complexity of our age. The undergraduate and graduate schools of Boston College must continue to send out men and women who will provide leadership for our Commonwealth and other parts of the world. Our American way of life depends upon these graduates sent out as well equipped teachers, priests, lawyers—serving as judges, legislators and attorneys, and leaders for industry, business, and the community.

A century ago Ralph Waldo Emerson penned these lines:

Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,
Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,
And marching single in an endless file,
Bring diadems and fagots in their hands,
To each they offer gifts after his will,
Bread, kindom, stars, and sky that holds
them all.

Our age brings days of unlimited opportunity—days in which our moral strength and intellectual power can be used to shape a better and more peaceful world despite pessimistic moods and alarm over the development of nuclear weapons, inordinate scientific knowledge, and precarious international relationships. The days bring gifts of greater challenge than ever before. In a recent writing, Cardinal Cushing warned:

> The urgency of the times makes it imperative for us to take counsel, to sharpen our thought in regard to the specific ideals for which we stand. This is a period of transition, of realinement. We are seemingly at the end of a civilization.

The times are dangerous, but there is hopeful forecast in a university such as this one, dedicated as it is to truth and wisdom, both human and divine. The knowledge and morality imparted by Boston College will be of no small value in the contests which face us. We echo the words in Proverbs:

---

[1] Frost, Jack, "The Crowned Hilltop," Boston: Hawthorne Press, 1962.

> Through knowledge shall the just be divided.

I congratulate Boston College on its splendor and successful achievements. My sincere hope is that Boston College may continue to develop and prosper, that the sphere of its influence may ever increase, and that the sons and daughters of Boston College will be found in the coming years, as in the past, leading useful lives, doing good to their fellow men, ever faithful to the teachings of their glorious alma mater, and improving and strengthening our institutions of government.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 142d anniversary of the Greek war of independence. I am pleased to pay tribute to the Greek people and their indomitable spirit. Greek learning, philosophy, science, and drama have had a profound impact upon our modern civilization. In the United States we live under a system of government propounded from Greek culture—democracy, a word held sacred by all Americans.

In their homeland, the spirit of ancient Greece resides in the hearts of all the inhabitants, just as it did when their nation was a conquered territory under the rule of Ottoman might. The Greece of 1821 was governed by Turkish officials and had been since the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century. The populace was not unduly persecuted by their Muslim overlords; in fact, many Greeks had attained responsible positions in the government of the Sublime Porte. Yet ethnic mores and deeprooted traditions recalled to the citizens of the Hellenes that their land was the home of the hero, of democracy, and freedom. Bondage could not and would not be tolerated forever.

The weakening of the Turkish Government gave to the conquered peoples of the empire an opportunity to seek autonomy and, as in the case of Greece, independence. Borrowing from their heroic past, a group of peasants armed with clubs, scythes, and slings, and led by the Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the banner of liberty at Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, and declared their fight for freedom. Ships, so important to the defenders of Athens against the forces of Darius and Xerxes, were employed to defend the coastlines against invading armies from Turkey and Egypt. Familiar terrain was used to great advantage against alien troops by selecting in advance propitious sites for battles to be fought. Rebellion soon spread across the Isthmus of Corinth to Attica and Boeotia.

The nations of the world first became cognizant of this struggle when the Greek Orthodox patriarch, Gregorious of Constantinople, was executed. His execution was followed by a series of massacres of Christians which the Russian czar, as Protector of the Orthodox Church, took as a personal affront. The cause then became one for all of Christendom.

In the United States the sympathy of the American people was so great that cities and towns were named to honor this struggle for liberty. Thus we have several Athens, a Spartansburg, Corinth, an Ithaca, and 31 Troys. Groups of Philhellenes sprang up throughout America to fill ships with much needed clothing, medical supplies, and food. Daniel Webster spoke in the House for official support of the Greek patriots, while President Monroe inserted in his famous address, which contained the Monroe Doctrine, a section expressing America's sympathy and urging aid for the Greeks.

The ranks of the insurgents, swelled by volunteers from America and Europe, including the poet, Lord Byron, were at first highly successful. The Acropolis at Athens, the symbol of democracy for the world, was seized, as were many other cities throughout the Peloponnesus. A constitution was proclaimed in January 1822 with Prince Alexander Mavrocordato presiding over the first national assembly at Epidaurus. The Turks, in retaliation for their losses on the mainland, attacked with full force some of the islands and proceeded to massacre the inhabitants. Chios was used as an example to the others, as a threat not to join with the rebels; 25,000 inhabitants were slaughtered, and 45,000 were sold into slavery. This warning only enraged the Greeks to greater ferocity; so when Turkish garrisons fell into their hands, all were put to the sword. The reciprocal atrocities left the land ravaged and war torn.

There followed a period of internal strife among the victorious Greek forces. Mavrocordato was discredited and challenged by other leaders, which led to civil war between the Greek parties. The Government, though, was able to suppress the internecine strife and prevent the Turks from reconquering any territory.

In 1824, the sultan, unable to check the advance of the insurgents, called upon Mehemet Ali, Governor of Egypt, for succor. The pasha's son, Ibrahim, eluded the Greek fleet and, on February 24, 1825, landed at Modon in the Morea with a well-equipped army of 4,000 regular infantry and 500 cavalry. There followed a series of victories for the Turks, and the Greek forces retreated to the cities which they held in the south. Missolonghi was besieged for 12 months and capitulated only when command of the sea was lost. Athens, too, was taken, but the Acropolis held out until forced to surrender 9 months later.

It was now the turn of the European powers to enter into the fray. England, France, and Russia had pledged on May 6, 1827, that Greece should be given autonomy under Turkish suzerainty. Fearing now that the Porte would again enslave the populace, a joint British-French-Russian fleet entered Greek water and attempted to relieve the besieged rebels. At the battle of Navarino on October 20, 1827, the allied fleet completely destroyed the Turkish ships, thus preventing supplies from reaching Ibrahim's troops. When the hard-pressed sultan called for a holy war against the insurgents and their allies, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire and proceeded to attack the Porte from the north. The command of the Greco-allied fleet in the Peloponnesus was entrusted to Lord Cochrane, while the land forces were put under the command of General Church.

Now on the defensive, the sultan agreed by protocol, signed on February 3, 1828, and implemented in the treaty of Adrianople, September 1829, to complete independence for the Greeks. Turkish troops soon began evacuating Greek territory, and independence became a reality. The rebellion had lasted many years. Victorious but utterly devastated, Greece emerged as a sovereign state, created and sanctioned by the Convention of London on May 11, 1832.

The years following independence were ones of internal consolidation and acquisition. Thessaly, most of Greek-inhabited Epirus and Macedonia, Crete, and the majority of the Aegean Islands were added to the kingdom. Dissension between the Greek people and their Bavarian Prince Otho, who had been selected by the convention powers to be ruler, brought about the deposition of the king and the election and installation of Prince William of Denmark, who took the title George I of the Hellense, the progenitor of the present king. When he took his oath of accession, he promised to uphold a new constitution which proclaimed a monarchical democracy.

With the advent of World War II, much of what had been accomplished since independence was destroyed. On October 28, 1940, the Italians invaded the country from Albania, and were immediately repulsed by the Greek army under the command of Alexander Pagapos. The Germans, though, came to the aid of their stricken ally and soon overran the entire mainland and islands. The King and his government fled into enforced exile. During the 3½ years of occupation, the country suffered severe economic damage. The merchant marine, the lifeblood of the nation, was reduced to one-quarter of its size. Industrial production fell by 80 percent, while half the roads were destroyed and railroads were completely immobile.

Resistance to the Germans began with passive noncooperation, which soon developed into sabotage and the formation of guerrilla bands. Severe reprisals by the invaders only instilled in the people greater determination and courage. When the Germans finally retreated in 1944, they left behind them a situation comparable to 1821—complete chaos and devastation.

Peace was not yet destined for the war-weary Greeks. Guerrilla bands in the north, lured by Communist propaganda and promises, refused to surrender their arms to the central Government. Abetted by aid from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, these Communist bands seized towns and carried out acts of terrorism against those loyal to the regime in Athens. To insure complaisance in the regions under their control, children were captured and held as hostages. It has been estimated that over 24,000 boys and girls had been spirited into Yugoslavia and Albania by the guerrillas. The Communist forces were so successful as to lay siege to Athens. On December 24, 1947, the Communist leader Markos Vifiades felt confident enough to proclaim a provisional government.

The central Government, an unworkable coalition, was unable to decide on a course of action. Moreover, when the army did take to the field, obsolete methods and armaments proved ineffective against the elusive guerrillas.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman asked and received from Congress authority for immediate financial and economic aid to Greece. This commitment, known as the Truman Doctrine, proved to be the catalyst for effective action against the Communists. By 1949, with the defection by Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc and the closing of its border to the Greek guerrillas, the last of the Communists had surrendered or had fled into Albania.

At the conclusion of the civil war the Government was able to turn its attention to internal development and the alleviation of the financial crisis caused by the two wars. It was only by means of massive aid from the United States (almost $1 billion granted under the European recovery program and other aid programs) that recovery was effected. A visitor touring Greece today sees much construction work. Port facilities, piles of rubble a few years ago, have now been cleared and enlarged to accommodate increased shipping. Large factories rose in the cities and the countryside to increase an already expanding industrial production.

Perhaps the most phenomenal recovery has been the merchant marine. In 1946 the fleet totaled only 500,000 tons. Today shipping is surpassing the 5 million ton mark. The Greek flag, a white cross and horizontal stripes on a field of blue, is seen in ports-of-call throughout the world, flying from the masts of freighters, tankers, and liners.

Tourism, too, has played an important part in Greece's resurgence. Emphasis is placed on the ruins of their ancient past. In Athens the Acropolis and the partly restored Agora are the major attractions. Dramas are held in the Roman theater built on the side of the Acropolis by one of Rome's conquering Emperors. Elsewhere, Delphia and the ancient Greek city-states of Thebes, Corinth, and Sparta, receive their share of the tourists' curiosity. A booming resort center is attracting many to Rhodes, where Greco-Roman architecture mingles with Crusader fortification.

To America and the Western World, Greece is more than just a tourist spot. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it is a link in the chain encompassing the Soviet bloc, a bulwark for democracy and the free-world. The United States has strategic bases on the Greek mainland. The country joined NATO in order to increase its security against Communist aggression from within and without. With the combined allied weapons to support its claims, Greek security is thus safeguarded.

Greece continues to be a bridge between Europe and Asia. Militarily, because of its strategic location, it is the link between NATO and CENTO. Its people, though, have remained primarily unchanged. As in 1821, Greece is a nation of small farmers. With all its contributions to civilization, the average Greek tilled his few acres and raised enough food to support his family. Population increases have demanded that every available acre be cultivated. Where none existed, terraced plots were hacked from the mountain sides or gorges. Unfortunately, the land could not support its own people. Emigrants by the hundreds of thousands left their homeland and settled in other parts of the globe. Those who came to America brought with them their religion and their crafts. Throughout the United States, Greeks and descendents of Greek immigrants form an integral part of the community, be it mayor, representative, restaurateur, or wine grower. These people of Greek origin have been told the story of how their forefathers fought for liberty during the war of independence in their homeland. They know that the Greek nation celebrates its independence day on March 25, the day when the glorious struggle for freedom began. We in the United States, whose own forefathers strove for Greek sovereignty, extend to our friends and allies in the Hellenes greetings on their independence day. We, too, remember our past and salute with pride the Greek nation.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on Saturday called attention to the seriousness of the unemployment problem, which he termed the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem for the 1960's.

The proposed tax cut will certainly provide a stimulus to economic activity. But the extension of the accelerated public works program would have more immediate and tangible effects than a tax cut. I believe that Congress should not only appropriate the $500 million which the President has requested to meet the current authorization, but should extend the accelerated public works program another year. On February 4, I introduced H.R. 3311 providing that an additional $900 million be authorized beyond the $900 million currently authorized for the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the beneficial results from this program. Men have been put back to work on useful, productive work. More than that, these projects—water and sewer lines, sewage treatment systems, public buildings, streets, and other projects, have made communities all over the Nation better places to live and more attractive to the expansion of industry.

I therefore urge that Congress take action to appropriate the $500 million requested by the President, and also to extend the authorization of the accelerated public works act.

Perhaps the excellent report of General Clay on foreign aid will give the Congress some ideas on how we may obtain the necessary funds to carry on the accelerated public works program.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate on March 26, 27, and 28 of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DENIAL TO THE FEDERAL COURTS OF JURISDICTION IN LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT CASES

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recently proposed in a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature.

This proposed amendment would deny to the Federal courts jurisdiction in legislative reapportionment cases in States affording direct initiative by the people in voting on this subject. It would restrict Federal court activity in this traditionally State area to cases in which a

State does not provide to its citizens a procedure whereby they can directly initiate a vote on State legislative reapportionment.

Control of this issue by the people is fundamental to our Federal system. This is basically the business of the people, not of the Federal courts, and as long as a State provides a rational means for the people to express their will the Federal courts should stay out.

This proposal is not an attack on the Tennessee decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. In cases where there is no recourse of initiative from the acts of the State legislature the amendment would not apply.

It may be that the Supreme Court does not now have jurisdiction in this field. But I believe the Oklahoma Legislature is right in its stand that a point of such significance should be specifically resolved.

THE ROYAL GREEK DECREE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I read a release from the Royal Greek Embassy and Information Service dated March 16 announcing that "a royal decree has been issued banning vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports." My enthusiasm rose as I completed reading the first paragraph. Immediately I was reminded of President Truman's determined action to save Greece in their hour of greatest peril. President Truman engaged in no if's, and's, or but's. He made no exceptions. He decided the road ahead was clear—we must not permit the Communist takeover of Greece. Pursuant to his determined stand, he initiated a historic program which stopped the Communist takeover of Greece as well as Turkey, and which has preserved the national independence of the Greek people. I could not help but feel that here was an act of real reciprocity in the cause of freedom.

My enthusiasm was chilled as I read the second paragraph, coming as it did like a cold, biting, friendless storm out of the north. That paragraph stated, and I quote:

> Exception is only being made for ships under time charter contracted prior to the promulgation of the present decree.

The effect of the royal decree was thereby nullified. Anyone with an iota of commonsense understands that the need is now to stop all, and I repeat, "all," merchant vessels entering Cuba flying any flag of the free world. We are not primarily interested in what countries may do to help our cause; that is, the cause of the whole Western Hemisphere, in the next year or two ahead. Our interest is what are they doing to help the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere now.

I ask that the Greek Government make a full public disclosure of the number of vessels flying the Greek flag which are under time-charter contracts to anyone who has shipped cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. That disclosure should include such time-charter contracts with any government or individual. That disclosure also should divulge the length of time left on each contract for every vessel authorized to sail under the Greek flag which has carried any cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. Anything less will confirm my judgment, and the judgment of any reasonable person who understands the realities of international commerce, that the royal decree is made meaningless by the second paragraph of the news release which I have quoted. This is a necessary disclosure, a practical disclosure to which the American people are entitled, concerned as they are by the Russian beachhead in Cuba.

The record shows that the American people, among other things, have contributed nearly $3½ billion to Greece since 1945. The Presidential advisory committee, which has made its report to the President, makes note of the fact that Greece stands 10th among all the nations of the world in terms of the amount of money received from the American taxpayers.

No one, in honesty, can say that the American people have not been generous toward the Greek nation in its hour of greatest need, as they have been generous to all who are willing to fight for freedom. That record suggests that the Greek Government should move with haste to make public the information which I have requested. Any response short of 48 hours would make an equal sham of the word "haste."

SUMMARY OF THE NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS (THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET) IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 (AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1963) COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I include the second monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of February 28, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $4,091,000,000, over actual budget revenues for fiscal 1962. Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,051,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of $85,500,000,000 for fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of $33,537,000,000 in the 4 months, March–June 1963. In the corresponding 4 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues were $33,497,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal 1962, of which $1,901 million is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,644,000,000, of which $2,323,000,000 is for national defense and $2,412,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,757,000,000—slightly less than the projected average of $7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and also slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the net budget expenditure prediction of $94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 4 months March 1–June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least $32,249,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least $8,062,000,000 during the 4-month period as against the actual monthly average of $7,757,000,000 in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average in the 4 months, March–June, could rise $305,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 8 months without exceeding the budget total of $94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. On the other hand, the table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average $544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average for all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison to this, in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 8 month average of fiscal 1962 by $580,000,000. Stated another way, in the first two-thirds of the fiscal year about 71 percent, or $4,644,000,000 of the officially projected $6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual deficit is $10,099,000,000, or $593,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will, of course, vary each month between March 1 and June 30 in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget), 8 months of fiscal 1963 versus 8 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 8 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	1963	1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate, 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	51,963	47,912	+4,051	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	34,603	32,371	+2,232	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	27,459	25,047	+2,412	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures	62,062	57,418	+4,644	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−) (line 1 minus line 3)	−10,099	−9,506	−593	−8,811	−6,378	[1]−2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,325			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,432			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,757	7,177	+580	7,850	7,315	+544

[1] That is to say, the budget predicts an increase of $2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Feb. 28, 1963.

THE GREAT FLOOD OF THE MIAMI RIVER IN 1913

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week in Ohio, citizens in the Miami River valley are assembling in many meetings to recall and discuss the great flood which took place 50 years ago, between March 22 and March 27, 1913, in which more than 300 persons lost their lives in the floodwaters of the Miami River and its tributaries. Cities such as Dayton, Middletown, and Hamilton were inundated; thousands of homes and factories were destroyed or greatly damaged; commerce and industry were brought to a standstill. Smaller communities, such as West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Piqua, and Troy, were virtually turned into ghost towns.

As a young law student, I went into the devastated area as the floodwaters receded to make reports for the great Bradstreet credit concern and saw firsthand the catastrophe that had struck that section of Ohio. I heard and I saw there how men and women of all walks of life worked and labored against great odds to save lives, to take care of the injured and the sick, and to feed the hungry.

Once the waters had receded it would have been easy for the citizens of many of these cities and towns to have turned their backs on their home communities and to perhaps move elsewhere to start a new life. Yet, they came from a hardy stock of pioneers and made their own hard decision to stay and to do what they could to see to it that there would never be another such major catastrophe in that area.

They did not appeal to the Federal Government. Instead, they sent their representatives to the Ohio General Assembly in Columbus, which had been called into an emergency session, and requested that legislation be enacted under State law to permit those in the flooded areas to solve their own problems through the establishing of a conservancy law under which the Miami Conservancy District came into being. This conservancy district built a huge system of dams to hold back floodwaters in the future and to give protection to the communities that had been destroyed in 1913. The conservancy district was given the authority to levy taxes against the properties that would benefit from this great new flood-control program. Rich and poor, alike, working together to attain freedom from future flood disasters, contributed more than $2 million to the project. At a cost of more than $33 million, the great Miami Valley was given flood protection through huge dams and levees which ever since that time have withstood the ravages of recurrent storms and high water and have given flood protection to the communities in that area of Ohio.

As a result, the people of the Miami Valley have prospered. Today the valley is a great industrial and commercial center, growing and thriving, equaled by few areas in the United States. All this has come about by the courageous reaction of the Miami Valley people in 1913 and their willingness to meet themselves the tremendous cost of attaining the flood protection they desire. No Federal funds were sought or used; no State funds were made available. Instead, the miracle that was accomplished—one of the greatest engineering feats in modern times—came about through men and women who stood on their own feet and met their own responsibility to solve their own area problems.

So, this week, many citizens of the great Miami Valley are looking back 50 years to the time of death, destruction, danger, and despair. All of those who personally experienced the disaster, or learned of it from their elders, are recalling the great efforts that were made to restore the valley and its cities to that which they had been before 1913; and, in rebuilding, to build even better communities than ever before. As a result of their efforts their great homeland in western Ohio has prospered, and also the State and the Nation have benefited, through the readiness, the willingness, the courage, and the faith of Ohioans to meet their own problems and to create the great Miami Conservancy District which has protected the valley from floods and permitted their dreams to be fulfilled, their families to live in safety, and to so rebuild as to make the Miami Valley one of the most productive, one of the most prosperous, one of the most beautiful areas to be found anywhere in the whole Republic.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as a lad nearly 14 years old at that time I have many vivid memories of the terrible flood disaster which struck the great Miami Valley 50 years ago on March 25, 1913. My father owned a rather large grocery store located on the northeast corner of Broadway and Riverview in Dayton. Wolf Creek, usually only a few inches deep, crossed Broadway about a block south of my father's store and as it began to rise higher and higher toward the top of its banks everyone became alarmed. One of the first thoughts was, naturally, to get in a supply of food. People began to crowd into the store in such numbers that the clerks could not get around to wait on them. It finally became necessary, in fairness to all, for my father to close the doors from time to time and limit the amount of food that could be sold to each customer. This was my first experience, Mr. Speaker, with a distribution system similar to the food rationing restrictions that were put in effect during the war years later.

The floodwaters continued to rise until they finally got up as high as the handrails of the old iron Wolf Creek bridge there on Broadway. The water came up Broadway almost to my father's store and reached the second floors of the homes south of the bridge. Boats began to appear as though by magic and folks of all ages in both good and bad health were rescued from the second floors, attics, and rooftops in spite of the very treacherous crosscurrents. Deeds of bravery without number could be cited. As the boats reached shallow waters men and boys would wade out to help the folks disembark and get them to the homes of friends or strangers who provided them with food, shelter, and medical care. Schools, churches, and other public buildings were immediately pressed into use to care for the victims. Farmers and other folks from the surrounding higher areas came to their aid with wagonloads of food, clothing, and other needed supplies of all kinds. I shall never forget the great thrill, Mr. Speaker, of seeing all those people open their hearts, their homes, and share their possessions with the flood victims without any hesitancy and with no thought whatsoever of being repaid. It was a time and experience I shall never forget.

After the first fright and removal of the victims from the scene, new dangers began to appear. Explosions occurred—buildings were destroyed—the sky was lit by fires in areas where it was later discovered there were people who could not be reached for rescut. People prayed—some had forgotten how but they prayed anyway and God did answer them. The rains slackened; the floodwaters began to recede a small fraction of an inch at a time until finally the great Miami and its tributaries were once again within their banks.

Gradually, Mr. Speaker, many amazing stories came out about the work that was done during the tragic disaster. The National Cash Register Co., for example, under the personal direction of its founder and president, the late John H. Patterson, had made all its facilities available to the flood victims. Boats were built to use in rescue operations. A hospital area was set up in the plant and a number of babies were born there. One baby, appropriately named "Cash" Durst, grew up to become employed by the National Cash Register Co. Mr. Patterson, a man of tremendous vision and ability, devoted his energies after the flood to developing plans for preventing any recurrence of such a disaster in the Miami Valley area. As soon as his plans were well underway Mr. Patterson set about revitalizing the economic growth of the entire valley, improving its governmental structure and its educational facilities and programs. We who live in that area owe much to the vision, leadership, wisdom, and energy of this great man. Inspired by John H. Patterson, others have followed his example and continue to develop the potentialities of the area to an extent never equaled in any other part of the country. Mr. Patterson had many close, personal friends who gave generously of their time and resources in helping him spearhead a drive to raise a fund to study the problem and do something about it. In a community just prostrated by a great calamity, the raising of funds by public subscription was a tremendous undertaking. Nevertheless, the people, poor and rich, young and old, contributed $2,156,616 within 3 months following the flood. Goaded by the leadership of the Honorable James M. Cox, who resigned after serving two terms in the U.S. Congress to become the Governor of Ohio, the State legislature in a special emergency session enacted a law that has withstood the tests of courts and time, the conservancy law of Ohio. This later led to the formation of the Miami Conservancy District, which was administered by a board of directors headed by Col. Edward A. Deeds, its first president. One of the board members was the Honorable John A. McMahon who had been an illustrious and distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives for three terms during the years between 1875 and 1881. It was he who actually drew up the Conservancy Act. Arthur E. Morgan who, you probably know, at one time headed the Tennessee Valley Authority and later became the president of Antioch College, was appointed the chief engineer for the conservancy district. It was he who masterminded the whole complicated flood prevention plan that has protected and will continue to protect the Miami Valley area from disasters such as occurred in 1913. We who live in that area take justifiable pride in the success of this unique and effective flood prevention program. I say "unique" because every cent, amounting to more than $34 million, to provide this protection has come from the residents of the valley. Not 1 cent has come from the Federal Government or the government of the State of Ohio. Even now, as the citizens of the area desire to improve the system, they pay for it themselves.

This week in Dayton, Ohio, and in the entire valley, one of the major industrial and commercial centers of our Nation, an observance of the 1913 flood is in progress. We are not celebrating a flood anniversary—we are proudly recalling and recognizing 50 years of economic recovery and progress unequalled in our Nation's history. Yes, we are remembering that the "Promises Made In the Attic" were kept and that hard work, adherence to the underlying sound principles of our Nation, cooperation with our neighbors, and love of our homesites have produced a valley of vitality and progress. On behalf of the people in the Third District of Ohio whom I have the privilege of representing here in the Congress, I am happy to join my colleagues from our neighboring districts in paying tribute to those great men in the past whose vision and leadership brought about the establishment of the Miami Conservancy District and to those dedicated men who now administer the program so effectively.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it will, in my opinion, serve a useful purpose to reflect upon a major disaster in the great Miami Valley a half century ago, and what was done to prevent its reoccurrence.

The unprecedented and uncontrolled floodwaters of that river from March 22 through March 27, 1913, brought death and destruction to the Miami Valley from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, with all of its attendant suffering. Cut off from the rest of the world by the devastating floodwaters, the residents could only seek shelter and food from their neighbors and pray for better days. But these hearty souls, after the floodwaters receded, refused to abandon their homes and communities to seek homesites elsewhere. They chose to remain and begin anew, and this they did in a manner and with success never previously attained.

These citizens, through their elected representatives in the Ohio Legislature, enacted into law the authority for a system of flood control unequaled in excellence and accomplishment in the United States, if not in the entire world. The Ohio Legislature provided the legal system—through the Ohio conservancy law—but the local people, by approving and paying tax assessments against their own property in accordance with individual benefit to each parcel within the flood plain, insured completion of the project and its completely satisfactory operation ever since completion.

Today, the valley is free from floods in its urban communities. Five huge earthen dams, levees, and channel systems provide complete protection for the major communities. Unbelievable as it may be to those who say that an all-powerful Central Government is needed to solve all our problems and to pay for the solution of them, in part, at least by deficit financing, this great flood control system was conceived, planned, executed, and paid for by the people within the flood plain of the great Miami Valley without any help from State or Federal Government.

This week the valley citizens are observing the flood date of 50 years ago, but they are celebrating the effective conquering of the elements and with justifiable pride. They can without reservation point out that this undertaking was accomplished by local people for the benefit of the valley, the State, and the Nation, and it has served as a model for much of the world.

The valley is now one of America's industrial, commercial, and educational empires and the people did it by and for themselves.

Lest my colleagues and others who may hear and read our story think we have magnified our performance, I wish to incorporate in my remarks the objective editorial found in the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of November 16, 1946. I quote the editorial in its entirety.

THIS FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT WASN'T ON THE CUFF

When the spring rains start washing down the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi River Basins next year, residents of nine western Ohio counties will not be obliged to grab their cots, frying pans, and chicken coops and scramble for higher and drier ground.

Their security was assured by their own action 30 years ago when the Miami Conservancy District completed five dams and improvements of channels in the Miami, Stillwater, and Mad Rivers. There have been no serious floods in the district since 1917, although neighbors in the Ohio Valley each spring prepare to pack up and leave with the first thaws and heavy rains.

Unbelievable as it may be to many American communities today, the Miami Valley this year completes this course in self-treatment for a $100 million flood headache without once calling in Dr. New Deal or any of his interns. The local remedy was applied after a 1913 flood swept through the rich agricultural lands and busy industrial centers of Dayton, Troy, Middletown, and Hamilton. Four days later, as they kicked at the mud and debris, the stunned citizens counted the actual damage at $100 million, plus 400 lives lost, business as stagnant as the pools of dirty water in the streets, thousands of head of livestock drowned, and tons of good black dirt gone forever.

Despite this heartbreaking disaster there was no anguished cry for aid from Washington or the State capitol at Columbus. True, the refinements of Federal aid had not been thought of then, but Congress was only too happy to logroll a hodgepodge of river and harbor bills to relieve localities of the costs of local improvements. Instead of calling on the logrollers, the thoroughly drenched Miami Valley citizens took the quaint stand that control of the river was their job, and not a legitimate burden on the taxpayers of Montana or New York.

All they asked from the lawgivers at Columbus was permission to form the conservancy district, with power to levy taxes for the purpose of keeping the rivers from their doors and barnyards. That permission was granted by the State legislature. No appeal of any kind went to Washington, and the only entrance of the National Government came when a Federal district court ruled that the United States had no objection.

The district issued almost $34 million in bonds. Proceeds were used for construction of dams and channel regulation, and that ended the floods for the Miami Valley. In this engineering project there were no extras such as hydroelectric power, swanky fishing and recreation resorts or resettlement projects. Flood control was what the Miami Valley people paid their money for and flood control is what they got.

Today, as the district prepares to levy the final assessment for retirement of the last bonds, the flood-free communities, farms, and individuals of the Miami Valley are pretty proud of their accomplishment. It's theirs and they paid for it without outside help, advice, second guessing or the nostrums of the District of Columbia school of medicine. Equally pleasing to most is the fact that the district provided no plum tree for anxious jobseekers. Only 56 persons are employed on the entire project, hardly enough to staff the public relations office of almost any Washington bureau you care to name.

COMMUNISM IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens in this country will argue that communism is negotiable. The people using this argument are usually those who have only a surface understanding of communism. The following article from the Northwest Progress, of Seattle, Wash., very graphically points out our current stance against communism:

NOT NEGOTIABLE

If there is any lesson that can be learned from Castro's takeover of Cuba it would seem to be this: That as far as our State Department goes, we have learned absolutely nothing at all.

The U.S. policy in Cuba is based upon the same political principle that has determined our dealings with atheistic communism in China, Hungary, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Poland, and all the other nations that have fallen to Red aggression.

Our State Department has always operated on the principle that communism, however dangerous, is negotiable. As long as that principle is maintained as a modus agendi by the U.S. Government, regardless of the sincerity of the men involved or the name of the administration, what happened in Hungary had to happen in Cuba and what has happened in Cuba must happen in all of America, North and South, unless we change our policy.

Communism is not negotiable. The reason for saying this is not political but philosophical. Despite the new "nice guy" mask Khrushchev is wearing, he is still a Communist. As such, he will be content with but one objective: mastery of the entire world. He has told us this, he has set about scientifically and methodically to prove it. Cuba is just one more step along the way.

Communism understands but one law: force. And brute force is not negotiable. Force is only countered by counterforce. The brief blockade was a beautiful example of this simple fact.

We have been told that we must not "fear to negotiate." Where communism is concerned, dare we make such a statement? It might be good rhetoric—but what about the logic? It would seem that in dealing with Khrushchev, negotiation ought to be our greatest fear. If Cuba has not taught us this, it has taught us nothing.

Our verbal threats against Russia's presence 90 miles off the Florida coast are beginning to sound about as dangerous as the "do that again and I'll spank" of an indulgent mother to her spoiled child.

Soviet presence on the island of Cuba cannot be tolerated. Everybody in the free world agrees to this. This presence cannot effectively and completely be removed by mere negotiation. Recent history attests to that.

An editorial in this week's issue of Life magazine outlines some excellent steps that could be taken to rid ourselves of Castro's so-called defensive Russian army.

While the Life editorial's specific recommendations may not be in every instance as carefully conceived or outlined as those of a military strategist, still the principle upon which they are based is absolutely correct. The editorial rightly contends that "It is time for deeds as well as negotiations * * *."

BRAZILIAN LOAN

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, again we have been had. The Brazilian Government has announced plans for hemisphere Communists to hold a conference in Sao Paulo starting today.

On March 18, in a speech in the House of Representatives, I called to the attention of Congress the fact that Brazil was going to host the second Communist-inspired continental congress of solidarity with Cuba. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

This is obviously giving aid and comfort to the enemy of democracy, and literally thumbs the Brazilian nose at the United States.

Furthermore, in a speech on the floor of the House on March 21, I called attention to the fact that three members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, two others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secreary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger. Regardless, the State Department will loan Brazil the money she requested.

While we heard anguished cries from the Brazilian Government when the State Department announced Communist infiltration of Brazil, it has yet to refute these charges.

As far as I am concerned, Brazil should not get a plugged nickel from the United States.

YUGOSLAV MILITARY ATTENDING ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our citizens know that a uniformed military officer from Communist Yugoslavia attends the regular Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I wonder if they know that no less than four general officers of the Yugoslav Army are graduates of our top staff college. I wonder if they know that clearance for this must come from the White House. I wonder if they know that this has been happening for some years.

Mr. Speaker, what goes on here? Even the most uninformed among our citizenry knows that such military men have sworn allegiance to a Communist flag; that everything they learn at our General Staff College goes right back to Communists; that Yugoslavia is in close military liaison with the Soviet general staff.

Whether or not attendance at classified classes is barred to these men, the vast military knowledge they gain in a full course at Fort Leavenworth is undeniable. It is the sheerest lunacy to condone educating Communists about the operations of our general staff on the theory that it encourages splinter groups within the Soviet periphery.

I believe that we should investigate so that we can know just who cleared this assignment in this administration as well as under whose individual direction and initiative this sorry practice was initiated years ago. It is not the Army's fault. Orders for such inanity come from on high, not from the Army, of that we can be certain.

This is further glaring evidence that the present administration does not understand that all genuine Communists are deadly serious in their fanatical desire to destroy the United States. This is so whether they are Russian Communists or Chinese Communists or Yugoslav Communists. One does not appease a rattlesnake by inviting him into his house.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest, over the weekend, the Clay report on foreign aid and think that there is much of value in it. Many of the things that it points out are matters which some of us in the Congress who have been studying the aid program have been saying for years.

Perhaps, the thing that catches the attention first is the suggestion that hundreds of millions of dollars can be cut from the annual programs without damaging them. In fact, the inference is clear that the programs would be better for having reduced amounts of money to spend.

But, there are other, less obvious, but equally important proposals. One of those relates to the selection of the countries which receive our aid. From the report, I gain the very strong impression that the committee feels that we should be much more selective in the matter of our aid and should concentrate our efforts in those countries with which we have a community of interest and which will not treat our assistance as a mere basis for bargaining with the Communists to get aid from them also.

Reference is made to the participation of the private sector of our economy and here again is a matter upon which most of us in the Congress acted a year ago over the strong protests of the Agency for International Development and the State Department. Now, the committee finds that this action has been helpful. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, one feels anew that before we act upon the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills this year most careful scrutiny should be given to the whole program to the end that, as a minimum, very substantial dollar reductions be made and that the recipients of our assistance be more carefully chosen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stated dedication of higher echelon personnel in the Peace Corps, I offer the following news article without comment:

TOP PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL TO TAKE 2-WEEK RETREAT

Some 160 executives of the Peace Corps will spend 2 weeks at the Corps training camp in Puerto Rico, reports Deputy Director William Moyers.

"The idea is to spend 2 weeks in a close and familiar setting with the volunteers and also to balk desk flabbiness," explains Moyers.

While on the Caribbean island they will collect their regular salaries ($11,000 a year and up) and have their expenses paid.

WHY THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE 15-ACRE FARMER, MR. FREEMAN?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 of this year I expressed my fears to this House that Freeman and company would attempt to use a double set of standards for our Nation's farmers in the forthcoming wheat referendum in that one method of voting would be required for the small 15-acre wheat farmers and another for the larger producers. My fears were not unfounded as the Department of Agriculture has now filed its "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" in the Federal Register to amend existing regulations relative to voting in the 1964 wheat referendum. The Department is proposing that the regulations be changed to read as follows:

(4) WHEAT

Any producer who has a farm acreage allotment shall be eligible to vote in any wheat referendum held pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1336, as amended: *Provided*, That a producer on a farm with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres shall be eligible to vote only if the operator on such farm files with the county committee, not later than 7 days prior to the date of the referendum, an election in writing to be subject to the wheat marketing quota for the farm.

Should this regulation be put into effect by Mr. Freeman it would mean that our Nation's 15-acre wheat producers would have to agree in writing at least 7 days before they voted that they would comply with the administration's program—should it be approved in the referendum. If they did not so signify their intent to comply with these new Freeman rules, they would be ineligible to vote. Large wheat farmers would be eligible to vote on election day automatically without previously signifying their intentions to do so.

Is it consistent for the administration to protest the inability of some citizens to vote in general elections due to unnecessary and discriminatory voting regulations and then to arbitrarily place such regulations in the paths of the Nation's small wheat farmers to keep them from voting in a referendum?

Why double standards for our American wheat producers, Mr. Freeman? Is it necessary to make first- and second-class citizens out of our wheat farmers in order to make your supply-management theory work? If so, this is another good reason why your supply-management approach for agriculture should not be adopted.

What is the real reason for this pre-election signup for our 15-acre wheat farmers, Mr. Freeman? You cannot argue that you need this information in order to ascertain who these 15-acre farmers are as your county committees already have this information. It cannot be argued that a farmer could not just as easily and as quickly signify his intent at the time he came in to vote. It could, however, be argued that since your program will be extremely detrimental to our small wheat producers and as a consequence they will probably not look upon it with favor, that the powers that be do not want them to vote and this accounts for these additional and burdensome regulations being placed upon them. It also could be argued that a 7-day open season on our 15-acre farmers who do sign up will be needed in order to launch an all-out, concentrated attack upon them in the hope of convincing them to vote right. If this is the case, someone has misjudged these farmers as they do not succumb to badgering and cajoling.

Whatever the reason for this proposed regulation, it is not sufficient to warrant such rank discrimination among the wheat producers of America. I therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, in fairness to these small wheat farmers, not to put this proposed regulation into effect.

THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the President's speech made at Chicago on Saturday, I am wondering when he is going to stop his changing moods and let the American people know when and where he expects to find the New Frontier. On Saturday he said that perhaps if we do not have a tax reduction we may not have a recession, but here he changed his mood. He went on to say:

> But, if we do not have tax reduction our unemployment may go from 6 to 7 percent.

In the campaign in 1960 President Kennedy promised he was going to end unemployment, but I say seriously that in his changing moods and changing course of action, he might at least let everybody know what the New Frontier is and whether he ever expects to find it. His changing mood is giving the American people and business the jitters. Perhaps if he stopped changing his position so frequently, business could settle down, expand, and be in a position to put more people to work and end the rise in unemployment.

CAN WE CUT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN YOUR DISTRICT?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much talk about the need for reducing Federal expenditures for years, but getting very little action.

Although the talk still continues, the fact remains that in fiscal 1963, out of a total Federal budget of $94 billion, the following appropriations were passed unanimously: About $50 billion for national defense, $5½ billion for veterans' benefits, and $3½ billion for space exploration. These items, together with interest on the national debt which is a fixed charge, account for approximately 75 cents out of every tax dollar.

Because of the unanimity with which these appropriations were endorsed by my colleagues, those who are calling for decreased spending evidently want cuts to be made in the appropriations which consume the remaining 25 cents out of every tax dollar.

Since each Congressman knows his own district the best, I would appreciate hearing from each of my colleagues about his suggestions for cutting down on Federal spending in his own district. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would be pleased to total the suggested amounts and pass the information along to my chairman.

If a flood control or land reclamation project which is scheduled for construction in a Representative's district is considered unnecessary by him, I would appreciate hearing from him about it. Likewise, those of my colleagues who object to their districts receiving area redevelopment funds or moneys for their local schools under the aid to federally impacted areas legislation should not hesitate to let me know about it.

Those of my colleagues from farm areas should feel free to tell me how much less they want spent in their own districts for price supports, and those who represent urban districts should similarly advise how much less they wish their districts to receive for urban renewal.

Does any Congressman wish to file objection to the spending of money in his district under the Federal road program? If so, just let me know. For that matter, I should also like to hear from anyone who dissents from the expenditure of Federal funds in his area for hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act.

Naturally, I should also welcome any information from anyone who would like a large defense contract terminated in his district.

When I total all the response, I shall announce the result. I doubt that I shall require an adding machine.

WASTING MONEY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, I have been advised that a number of bills will be considered tomorrow. This has reminded me of a wasteful practice that has gone on for years and which is proposed to be perpetuated in another way. I am referring to the printing of calendars which are distributed to the Members. Now that is a small item and I will probably be branded as a nitpicker. But we are spending $27,473 a year to print calendars to be distributed to the Members, and each one of us gets 10 of these calendars and more if we request them. To me that is an utter waste of money and I intend to try to stop it. If there are others who concur in my views with respect to this, I would appreciate it if they would so inform the Subcommittee on Printing stating that they do not endorse this waste of money. With millions of calendars of every conceivable size and design being distributed by all types of businesses as well as individuals, I cannot believe that anyone is being denied a free calendar, and for that reason can see no reason why the Congress should approve this waste of money. This is just one of many small ways in which Members of Congress can effect small savings, which total a substantial sum. The greatest good that can come from this action of discontinuing this practice is that it would indicate Congress' desire to practice economy—and once we make the start, I believe it will result in greater and substantial savings.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET HYPOCRISY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the partisan statements of Republican leaders in reference to the President's tax reduction and budget proposals border on political hypocrisy.

They have apparently forgotten, in their zeal to discredit the Democratic program, that the largest peacetime deficit in history occurred during a Republican administration in 1959 and totaled $12.427 billion.

They have apparently forgotten that the cumulative deficit during the Eisenhower Republican administration was $21.953 billion.

They criticize the President's efforts to stimulate the economy with a tax reduction at a time when a deficit will occur.

I would call their attention to the year 1954—during the Republican administration—when there were tax reductions totaling an estimated $7.4 billion. This came at a time when it was obvious there would be a deficit, and there was a deficit.

The tax reduction included removal of excess profits tax, reductions in individual income taxes, reduction in excise taxes, and revisions of the Federal Revenue Code.

The Republican leadership now takes the position that tax reduction in the face of a deficit is an unpardonable financial sin.

But in 1954, when the economy was lagging, the Republicans turned to tax reduction and the economy showed a substantial upswing. With the healthier economy, the Republicans were able to achieve surpluses.

The Republican leadership questions an increase in the national debt ceiling. Yet during the Republican administration the debt ceiling was increased for fiscal 1955, for 1958, for 1959, and 1960.

So it is apparent that the criticism of the Republican leadership stems from sheer partisan politics. When a Republican President called for tax reduction, an increase in the debt ceiling, and a deficit budget, this was acceptable, even praised.

But when the Democratic administration in office attempts to stimulate a lagging economy and increase Federal revenues looking toward ultimate balancing of the budget, then—in the Republican view—an outrageous financial crime is being committed.

The facts are that we are falling $30 to $40 billion short of our potential in national output, $18 to $20 billion short in wages and salaries, and $7 to $8 billion in business profits. We have an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and persistent, large budget deficits.

Failure to act now to stimulate the economy is inviting another recession. Our high tax rates are repressive. A tax reduction is needed urgently.

Certainly our expenditures should be carefully studied. They have been carefully studied. Some reductions are being made. But to achieve the sort of budget reduction the Republicans advocate would seriously hamper our defense efforts—because that is where the bulk of the budgetary increases have been.

The best way to balance the budget is to balance the economy. The increased economic activity from a tax rate will produce more revenues which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

The Republican leadership would do well to lend its support to a sensible economic program of this kind, rather than devoting its time to irresponsible sniping for political purposes.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to correct what I believe to be a serious inadequacy in this legislation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall include in his standards for designation of counties under this act, standards based on the migration out of the county.

The present law provides that this shall be one of the things considered in formulating the standards. But it is very necessary to make counties eligible on this basis alone if we are to stem the tide of migration to already overcrowded metropolitan areas.

The many communities which are losing population today because of a lack of jobs would like to be able to retain the young people who are leaving today. With just a little help, such as assistance through the Area Redevelopment Act, these communities could establish new industry and provide new jobs for these young people.

The figures on unemployment and income do not show these counties to be within the standards adopted by the Secretary of Commerce for designation under this law. However, the fact is that many of these counties which are rapidly losing population are in very serious trouble. What has happened is that, instead of hanging on, these people who have lost jobs have moved out of the county. Those who had businesses have shut them down and gone elsewhere, usually to work for someone else rather than open a new business.

The net effect has been that the unemployment rate and the income rate in the counties do not reflect the total situation. Those who are unemployed show up on the rolls of a big metropolitan city. They show up on the welfare rolls of these cities. The effect is the same on the national economic picture. The people are still unemployed. The county still is deteriorating from lack of industry and employment opportunity. And we are now doing nothing about it.

The expansion of this program, Mr. Speaker, as proposed in the bill I have introduced today, will have an immediate stimulating effect on the economy of many rural areas across our land just because of the existence of this provision. The effect when the provision is implemented with proper funds and administrative action would be tremendous.

When people want to help themselves, I feel we should assist them in this effort. That is the purpose of this bill. I hope my colleagues will give it their prompt and serious consideration.

COMMUNIST INSPIRED CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF SOLIDARITY WITH CUBA MEETS IN RIO WHILE UNITED STATES GIVES MORE AID TO BRAZIL—TO BUILD TRADE WITH RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I along with other Members of this House of Representatives had the privilege over the weekend of visiting Guantanamo Bay, the American military base in Cuba. I do not want to make that particular visit the principal subject of my remarks, but it does have a relationship to the subject which I do want to discuss rather briefly and that is the question of the proposed foreign aid to Brazil, particularly in view of the announcement which we see on the UPI ticker just today, to the effect—it has been known before of course, but the number of countries attending has not been known—the fact that the Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity With Cuba meets in Rio de Janeiro the 28th of this month, Thursday of this week, and who is going to be in attendance—78 countries have decided to attend at this meeting which is commonly known as a meeting for the purpose of ultra liberals and some Communists to carve out a solidarity with Cuba—that means Communist Cuba program. Included in these 78 countries are Cuba itself, Russia and Red China, and a number of other countries are to be involved including many in this hemisphere. Representatives from 78 countries are attending. Despite this and other evidence of the growth of communism in Brazil as even stated by the State Department itself in Brazilian Ambassador Gordon's testimony before the Selden subcommittee to the effect in Brazil the Government has been infiltrated with Communists, the student movement has been infiltrated with Communists as well as the labor union movement.

Of course, there was an effort by the State Department to claim that this testimony which appears in the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs was taken out of the context and did not really mean what it says. Anybody who reads it will note that it is very clearly stated that there has been Communist infiltration in the Government, in union movements, and in student groups—on page 247 of the hearings I quote "The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government staff there has been infiltration. The student movement in another major area of penetration with the National Student Union now being dominated by Communists."

What does all this amount to? And I am going to take a few minutes to review the extent of Communist infiltration and buildup in Brazil. As a matter of fact, the fearless reporter who had the intestinal fortitude to state the facts of what is going on in Brazil was just recently declared to be persona non grata by the Government because he had the intestinal fortitude to put in the record for all to read the story of the Communist buildup in Brazil. I am sure most of you have read that article by Mr. Stein with regard to the amazing Communist buildup in Brazil which is, I believe, self-explanatory. I include the article at the close of my remarks.

Here is what happened, for instance, in Costa Rica during the visit of the President on March 20 with regard to our policy in giving foreign aid to these Latin American countries who still recognize and do business with Castro's Cuba and who do not do all they can to oppose Communist subversion within their countries, but, as a mater of fact, in some instances are even encouraging it.

Here is what one Costa Rican student stated at the time of this visit at the University of Costa Rica:

> It is foolish for you Americans to give money to corrupt, oligarchy-controlled Latin American governments without supervising the expenditure of every dollar. You're throwing money down the drain, and in the end you'll lose both the money and the country. And you shouldn't make an exception of our own Government, however advanced it might be.

These were students in a university in a country with a long history of democracy and social progress, conditions lacking in most Latin American countries. This was the advice of students given to reporters at the time of the President's visit at the Costa Rican Conference on March 20, 1963. Good advice, I believe, but advice which we are not heeding these days.

Who is going to be in attendance at this conference in Rio, in a country to whose Government we are proposing to give $55 million of a $1½ billion program for the purpose of building up the economy of Brazil so she can continue to trade with Soviet Russia? I understand, although it has not been officially announced at the movement, by the wire services, that the President is expected to make a pronouncement concerning it sometime today that this $55 million to Brazil has been agreed to as the first installment despite the fact the Government of Brazil refuses to condemn this conference, as a matter of fact is going to let it go on in Rio de Janeiro, is weakening in its opposition to communism, is doing business with Russia, and continues to recognize Castro.

Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this conference? I think this indicates the extent of the infiltration of communism in the country. Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this Red continental congress?

There is going to be Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Brazilian Communist Party. Another is General Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; and Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants' Leagues.

Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers, and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal Chamber.

Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command. Mario Shemberg, a well known Sao Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

Where did this list come from? This list came from a list of those expected to be in attendance, taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. It was taken from his luggage by Carlos Lacerda of the city where the convention is going to be held; namely, Rio de Janeiro. His public security officers were the ones who got possession of these documents. No one has denied them. There is not any question but what in all probability these persons named are not only going to attend but it also gives best evidence of their background and their inclination.

Many of them are very substantial people in the Goulart government. How could these people maintain these positions under the Brazilian Government setup if the President did not agree to their receiving these positions, because the appointive power in Brazil is with the Executive, not even subject to confirmation by the legislative branch.

So these people are in the government at least by sufferance of the President himself.

I am not going to read in detail, but I have in my possession a document that reviews the history of the buildup of the Communist Party and of Communist subversive activities in Brazil, starting back in April of 1960, when Francisco Juliao, whose name I just mentioned, and Santos Morais, accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate on his visit to Cuba in April 1960.

During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was to not support the leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government.

The reason I am spreading this information on the RECORD is I believe our Government should seriously reconsider any approval of a loan to Brazil until Brazil shows its ability to clean out the Communists that are known to have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, and insist that Brazil withdraw recognition of Castro's Communist government and stop doing business with him and to side with the forces of freedom—having opposed the United States at Punte del Este and during the quarantine refusing to join it.

I made a similar request that related to Mexico the other day. Until Mexico stops permitting the inflow of persons for subversive purposes—including U.S. citizens—through the open door of subversion out of Mexico City and the Cuban Embassy, we should not give it any aid. Even the CIA Director himself admitted there were individuals going to Cuba for training purposes in 1962, at which time I brought out the fact that there were some 73 Americans as well going down there in violation of the U.S. laws—and unprosecuted.

After a strong protest, that aid should be withdrawn from Mexico until this open door is closed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend him for the statement he has just made. For the life of me I cannot understand how this Government can seriously consider giving one thin dime to Brazil under the circumstances that exist. The Finance Minister of Brazil and the Ambassador of that Government in Washington told our subcommittee that Brazil would not hold the Continental Congress for Cuban Solidarity or whatever the specific title of that meeting, the Communist meeting in support of Cuba. But now the meeting is to be held, apparently, with the sanction of the Government of Brazil, and President Kennedy and this administration ought not to give Brazil one single dime as long as this meeting is in the works.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, he is an authority on this subject, being a member of the Selden subcommittee, at least to that extent, and I am glad that he placed on the RECORD the fact that assurances were made to that committee. This is something I did not have knowledge of myself, that Brazil did make assurances that this congress would not be held, which obviously seems to me to be a condition precedent in Alliance for Progress funds being seriously negotiated at this time. And, I will say to the gentleman further that I called the State Department, Mr. Moscoso's office, and I inquired in regard to the Alliance for Progress funds and I tried to get some information even in regard to what requests had been made, and that was denied me. As to the conditions that were being considered, they would not even discuss that. I said, "Are you going to attempt to gain assurances that if they get this money, they are going to fight communism instead of permitting it to grow in that country, as part of the policy of the United States, and what should be the basic policy of our Alliance for Progress funds" and I was denied any information of any kind at that time and have received none subsequently.

So far as the buildup is concerned, I could quote, for instance, from the Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday, March 17. And that happened to be the very weekend that I was asking for this information, the very weekend that the State Department was trying to expunge from the official records of the Selden committee the testimony of its own Ambassador to Brazil to the effect that there was infiltration in the Government, in the unions, in the student movement. Here is what the Worker said on that very Sunday, March 17, when the papers reported the fact that the State Department did not mean what it said. This is a report by Art Shields:

> Brazil Communist Party's strength doubles in 2 years, says Carlos Prestes.

The very man I was just referring to who is going to this Rio conference:

> Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture.
>
> Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general-secretary.
>
> They say in the last 2 years that the Peasant Union has expanded from 50,000 2 years ago to 600,000 today.

Further quoting from the article:

> The movement for peace, which is the party's central issue, has made great advances.
>
> I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

Further quoting from the article:

> Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.
>
> The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.
>
> "The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes, who used to be an army colonel himself.

Further quoting from the article:

> The big job internationally is to win socialism with the least sacrifices. "But socialism" he said, "cannot be prevented." He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

This was the very day the State Department was trying to expunge from the records of the Congress its own testimony with respect to the Communist buildup in Brazil.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman made a request of the State Department to give the gentleman information as to the amount of money we have spent in Brazil in this Alliance for Progress program?

Mr. CRAMER. No; that information is readily available to everyone, including the gentleman from Florida, and the gentleman from Florida is well aware of it. What I asked for was how much they are now negotiating for; how much have they requested? The news reports vary as to the amount of money involved.

I was told that I could not get this information—that I was not entitled to it—and they would not discuss what the Brazilian Finance Minister asked for.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, how long ago was that request denied to the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMER. That was on Saturday, March 16, 1963, the very day before this Worker article came out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason I ask this is the fact that I have a constituent who is interested in the amount of money being proposed that we spend in Brazil. He asked me that question in a letter.

Has the gentleman from Florida any information or is the gentleman going to place in the RECORD the amount of money that has been spent heretofore in Brazil?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado if the gentleman will look at my remarks of March 18, 1963, page 4428, the gentleman will see that information, indicating that some $450 million to date is to be repaid by Brazil, and they are asking for forgiveness on that. He is asking, according to the press, for release of $84 million to the $553 million U.S. aid which was given to Brazil since 1951. And according to today's report, $55 million more is requested as the first of three yearly amounts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman discussed with them the question of the request that had been made, did they give the gentleman any substantial reasons why they would not give the gentleman the information?

Mr. CRAMER. They said negotiations were underway and that they had no information to give, even though my request related to the request of the Brazilian Government at the outset of the negotiations which, at least speculatively, was printed in the press time and time again. But a Member of Congress is not entitled to have this information. Mr. Moscoso, who is in charge of the Alliance for Progress administration, would not advise me as to present demands or negotiations which were made even at the outset, and this I cannot understand.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa. However, permit me to say before I yield to the gentleman that my interest is obviously not only a personal one but I believe the people of this country are entitled to know that information under these circurmstances.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the asking price of the Brazilians is the round figure of $500 million—one-half billion dollars. That is what they want.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand from testimony which is available that the asking price now by Brazil is that they want one-half billion dollars for next year?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to take my word for that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Oh; surely.

Mr. GROSS. The asking price, the Brazilian asking price, is in round figures $500 million. This is on top of, as I understand it, somewhere near $1.5 billion already made available to Brazil in various financing deals. And from the $500 million there would be a refinancing, as I understand it, of payments to Soviet-bloc countries of certain short-term credits that are due or very shortly coming due. In other words, they would like to obtain money from U.S. taxpayers to refinance their obligations to the Soviet-bloc countries, among other things.

This is a rather complicated thing, but it boils down to the asking from this country in various ways of refinancing, new money, and so on and so forth, approximately one-half billion dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. To substantiate what the gentleman from Iowa says on trade with Russia as part of the Brazilian deal it was reported from Rio de Janeiro in the press that just before Dantas, the Finance Secretary, came to this country to negotiate as follows:

> Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance.

The announcement further stated:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may be increased to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman, with reference to his treatment by the State Department, that Mr. Martin, who is Chief of the Latin American Desk in the State Department is the same Mr. Martin who not too long ago stated in hearings before our own subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture that he had proceeded to carry out one program, having to do with Brazil, by the way, without any regard to the wishes of the Congress or even, for that matter, taking the trouble to bring the matter to the attention of his superiors as under the law he was supposed to do.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I believe that the American people are entitled to this information. That is why I requested it, as well as because of my concern over the statement of the Department of State itself to the effect that Communist infiltration in Brazil had reached what I would call serious proportions and still existed, which is found in the record of the hearings of the Selden Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about training schools for subversives in Cuba, by Castro and the Communists. This report which I am placing in the RECORD gives an example in very specific detail of how these schools are carried on, how the students are brought in, and even names some of the students. They follow up their activities in Brazil, after their training.

For instance, from July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

This was way back in 1961. The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were, for instance:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the state of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aide of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "SUDENE," a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado.

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvelho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions included daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The "students" were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M-1 and M-3, Garand, and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of "Molotov cocktails" and the M-26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

> Some theoretical classrooms were operating in Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz [Saiz Brothers People Farm] under the direction of Major Franco, where the "students" attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held

the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the "students." These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jimenez, and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreira, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

It goes on to describe the balance of the course and how they were hidden in the hotel and were taken out on a 1-day basis for the trip, so it would not appear they were other than tourists:

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961, arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines, and Paraguayans was overfilled, because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching São Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free, together with the propaganda, on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants' Leagues in Brazil—

And that is what has been happening—

transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban Revolution. In the meanwhile Juliao would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants.

They set up a general headquarters in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel. I will put those names in the Record.

They went on with the initiation of the establishment of Peasants' Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. The name of the head of this movement to maintain contact with the Cuban movement and the description of these activities likewise will be in the Record.

Quoting again:

Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962 six separate locations existed, in Goiss, Maranhao, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahis, Rio, and Rio Grande de Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Dianopolis Farm in the State of Goias, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

It goes further through the buildup of the Peasant League movement, how they operate, the training they receive, the contact they have not only with the Cuban Embassy but the Embassies from Russia and Red China and Communists from throughout the world as well.

I think you will find this heretofore unpublished documentation in detail of the buildup in the Peasants' League, a Communist organization in Brazil not only interesting reading but essential information in connection with this consideration of a loan to Brazil at this time. This entire history of the League from which I have taken excerpts appear at the end of my remarks. This comes from a source I consider beyond question—and related to known incidents reported to the press and from other sources.

History of the Development of the Communist Peasants' Leagues in Brazil—Proof of Subversion in Brazil

Deputies Francisco Juliao and Clodomir de los Santos Morais accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate, Janio Quadros on his visit to Cuba in April 1960. During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was not to support the Leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these Leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese Government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government. This financial aid would not be extended under the heading of support to the rural organizations led by Juliao in Pernambuco, but would be for the purpose of creating and developing the guerrilla groups in Brazil which would be capable of spearheading a violent revolutionary movement with the objective of overthrowing the Government of Brazil.

Juliao returned to Brazil at the end of December 1960, and immediately left for Cuba in order to attend the celebration of the second anniversary of the Cuban Revolution. When he returned later to Brazil, he selected Clodomir Morais to head the revolutionary groups of Peasants' Leagues, while he acted as the figurehead of an organization ostensibly dedicated to the peaceful promotion of interests of the Brazilian farmers. In his speeches and statements to the press in the beginning of 1961, Juliao said that he hoped that the P.S.B. Socialist Brazilian Party and the P.T.B. Brazilian Workers' Party, presided by João Goulart and the Communist Party would be able to unite in their efforts to bring about agrarian reform through peaceful means. When he was reminded of the belligerent nature of communism, Juliao answered the reporter by stating that "communism is different in Brazil."

While Clodomir Morais was engaged in the work of the basic organization of establishing the mechanism of guerrilla warfare, Juliao alternated his tasks between making speeches in favor of the Leagues and traveling between Brazil and Cuba. In 1961 Juliao made three trips to Cuba. In June and July of that year, Morais selected 11 members of the Peasants' Leagues to accompany him to Cuba, where they were taken for a specialized course in guerrilla warfare.

This group of 13 Brazilians left Recife on July 21, 1961. They traveled together with a group of Argentines and Paraguayans in a Britannia plane chartered specially by the "Compañía Cubana de Aviación." The plane made a stop at Rio de Janeiro to take on other passengers, also making another stop at Port of Spain, for refueling before landing on July 22, at the José Marti airport in Havana.

The group were welcomed and shown around by representatives of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with Nations (ICAP) an organization which ostensibly promoted the trip. The group pretended to be members of the Brazilian delegation to attend the 26th of July celebrations.

They were lodged in the hotel Riviera in Havana. During the first few days they took an active part in all the various festivities commemorating the 26th of July anniversary. On the afternoon of July 24, a reception was held in honor of the Soviet's cosmonaut, Maj. Yuri Gagarin, who was visiting Cuba, followed by a public dance, that night. On July 25, a sports parade was held; the following day, the 26th, a huge public demonstration was held and on the 27th, the visitors were taken on a tour of Cuban beaches in Havana. On the night of July 28, together with representatives from other Latin American countries, the Brazilian left the hotel and riding in official Cadillac cars they were taken to the instruction camps for guerrilla warfare, where they were divided into nationality groups and lodged in different instruction centers.

From July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues, there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were the following:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the State of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aid of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "Sudene" (a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado).

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonille, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvalho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date, as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions include daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The students were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

Same theoretical classrooms were operating in (Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz)

(Saiz Brothers People Farm) under the direction of Major Franco, where the students attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the students. These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jiménez and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreire, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

When the other students asked why this special treatment for the Panamanians, they were informed that the group from Panama were being prepared to act as saboteurs in the Panama Canal Zone.

In order to maintain their appearances as tourists, the students returned to the point of their departure, the Havana Riviera Hotel. While there, they told everyone who asked that they had been visiting the interior of the island on a tourist jaunt. The students in the hotel made contact with delegations of Czechs, Russians, and Red Chinese, who were introduced to them as "technicians." The guerrilla students had little contact with these visitors from the Iron Curtain because they remained aloof and unfriendly, limiting their encounters to more social amenities.

On completing the course, the Brazilian students were told that they had passed the course with exceptional qualifications and as a premium for this achievement they would be given the honor of an informal meeting with Fidel Castro in the Cienega de Zapats, where they were taken in Fidel's personal helicopter. Castro congratulated them on the splendid results they obtained from the course, relating some of his own experiences as a guerrilla fighter and entered into the discussion of the political scene in Latin America. He exhorted them not to be deceived by apparent measures of agrarian reform, such as those proposed by Janio Quadros, of Brazil, but to continue fighting for revolutionary and radical reforms.

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961 arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines and Paraguayans, was over-filled because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return, remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching Sao Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free together with the propaganda on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants Leagues, transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban revolution. In the meanwhile, Julião would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants. In this interim, the major part of Cuban money poured in for the organization of guerrilla fighters. Julião and Morsis decided to adopt the following measures to give shape to the leagues:

1. To enlarge the general headquarters of the leagues in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel:

Francisco Julião: Honorary president.

Maria Ceares Barreto Novais: Secretary (also consulting attorney in the Economic Department of SUDENE).

Jonas Alburquerque Sosa.

José Severino Cunha.

Dzacy Megalhaes Florencio: Treasurer (Recife attorney and member of the state committee of the Communist Party of Pernambuco).

Emmanuel Egberto de Araujo.

Rivadavis Braz de Oliveira: One of the group trained in the guerrilla warfare course in Managua, Cuba.

Luis Serafín los Santos.

2. Initiation of the establishment of Peasants Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. In various regions, Julião procured and obtained the support of ex-student leaders. In 1961, the leader of the Deliberative Council of the Peasant Leagues, was Tarzan de Castro, 25 years of age, who had formerly presided over the Brazilian Union of High School Students (U.B.E.S.). Jarbes Miranda de Santana, ex-president of the U.B.E.S. was made head of the Deliberative Council of the Leagues in 1961.

3. Formation of a movement to serve as the convert sector through which recruits for guerrilla training was conducted. This organization was known as Movimiento Revolucionario Triadentes (MRT) (Triadentes Revolutionary Movement). The two principal recruiting officers of the MRT were Clodomir Morais and Joaquin Ferrairs Filho. Both had attended the guerrilla course in Managua, Cuba. Later the MRT was transferred to the offices of La Liga, the official newspaper of the Peasants Leagues, directed by Julião, and managing director, Antonio Avertano. La Liga leases the buildings 1001 and 1002, situated at No. 15 Alcino Guanabera Street.

4. Julião established an agency in Rio de Janeiro in order to maintain contact with the Cuban Embassy. Regina Coelho de Alburquerque and Nives Borges do Brazil, were in charge of the agency. Regina Coelho's apartment in Avenida Rainhe Elizabeth No. 587, became a frequent meeting place for the leagues as well as a nightly stopover for members of the league who were traveling. Regina Coelho was the recipient of all correspondence and verbal messages of representatives arriving in Rio de Janeiro. She immediately contacted Nives Borges do Brazil passing on all information received; on the other hand Nives Borges contacted a member of the Cuban Embassy, usually the Third Secretary, Ana Sermiento, who was informed of the matter in question.

In December 1961, Nives Borges do Brazil left for Cuba in order to receive special instruction in clandestine activities, in preparation for becoming the intermediary between the leagues and the Cuban Embassy. Notwithstanding the extreme caution exercised by the personnel of the Cuban Embassy to separate Regina and use Nives as intermediary, at times Regina was invited to participate in receptions and other social functions given by Embassy personnel. Besides representatives of other Embassies of the Communist bloc, such as Ludwick Nekar of the Czech Embassy, were occasional visitors to Regina's apartment, generally for the purpose of meeting Julião and Morais. These two, during a certain period, frequently spent the night in Regina's apartment; later, fearing that their activities might be under scrutiny, Julião changed his temporary residence in Rio for the home of Osny Duarte Ferreirs, Magistrate of the Court of Appeals.

5. Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962, six separate locations existed in Coiss, Moranhöa, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahia, Rio, and Rio Grande do Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Disnapolis Farm in the State of Goiss, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

Later, this farm was turned over to Carlos Montalrroyo. The Farm of Naranhão was directed by Carvalho through his assistant Cleto da Conta Campolo Neto. The farm in Parana was directed by Diniz Cabrel Filho, another longtime member of the U.B.E.S. who joined the leagues. The farm at Rio Grande do Sul was under the supervision of Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, Secretary of the State Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party of Rio Grande do Sul.

6. Morais continued in his purpose to recruit candidates for guerrilla instructors selecting from them a group which was to be sent to Cuba for intensified training. In a general way, the procedure covering the trip to this group was similar to that of the first group of the Peasant Leagues trained in Managua, Cuba. The candidate traveled to Cuba as a delegate from Brazil to one of the many Cuban anniversaries. Frequently he stayed at one of the best hotels in Havana, visited the city for several days as a tourist, and then began his training in Havana itself or in nearby surroundings. After approximately 1 or 2 months training, the candidate returned and began to put into practice in one of the farms belonging to the leagues, the new technique just learned.

Morais and Ferreira attempted to evaluate each candidate before final acceptance and providing training. Before being invited to join the leagues, the candidate was usually subjected to a test on several questions to be answered, such as:

Do you believe in a social revolution for Brazil?

Would you swear to dedicate yourself, even at the expense of your own life, to the success of your objective?

Have you any other interests which would interfere with the bringing about reforms for your country?

Do you consider it advantageous in the event of having to take part in guerrilla warfare in order to introduce these reforms in Brazil?

On November 8, 1961, Josquín Hernándes Armas, new Cuban Ambassador in Brazil, presented his credentials to President Goulart. Already at this time, the Ambassador was aware that his government was giving support to the guerrilla groups of the leagues.

On December 8, 1961, when the major number of the farms were being opened, the translation by Mauricio Grabais, of Che Guevara's book, "The War of Guerrillas," was published. This book became the basic manual for all guerrilla activities undertaken in the farms belonging to the leagues.

On December 27, 1961, Alexina Line Crespo de Paula, the wife of Julião and her two children left Brazil for an extended trip to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Red China, and North Korea. Alexina acted as messenger for the leagues, which she had frequently done in Brazil. On this trip she spoke to Mao Tse-tung, giving him information on conditions existing in Brazil, all of this mission was confided to her by Morais. Alexina told Mao that the leagues counted on the support of many high ranking officers of the army; that the leagues were in possession of arms, munitions and money necessary to explode a violent revolution. When Alexina returned from China and related what she had told Mao to various members of the leagues, her statements caused a great feeling of animosity against Morais among leaders of the leagues. In the opinion of these dissatisfied leaders, the optimism of Morais had cost them valuable financial support from Red China.

In January 1962, the Brazilian Army discovered that arms, manufactured in Czechoslovakia were being introduced into the country for distribution, possibly among the Peasant Leagues.

On the 22d of April, Julião issued a statement of his convictions in his "Declaration de Ouro Preto," in which he said that the Brazilians should aspire toward giving their lives for the creation of a new society, which he said would be "like the dawn."

On April 30, 1962, the Communists Jaos Amazonas de Sosa Pedroso and Mauricio Grabois arrived in Havana to participate ostensibly in the celebration of Labor Day, but this was only a pretext to cover their real objectives. They both attended the guerrilla course. In the middle of August 1962, two more Communists, Carlos Danielli and Angelo Arroyo arrived in Cuba to take the same course.

At the end of May 1962, Pedro Mota de Barros, another member of the leagues, who accompanied Morais to the Cuban training camp in Managua, left Brazil on a trip to establish links between Julião and other Communists revolutionaries throughout Latin America, Mota de Barros visited Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, where he met with revolutionaries who had trained with him in Cuba. In several interviews he asked them what type of support they could give to the leagues and what could the leagues give to them.

In the beginning of July 1962, the farm in Parana was closed after one of the men who had been trained in Cuba, was mortally wounded by local farmers. The victim was 19-year-old Antonio Thiago Filho. Upon learning of this assassination, Morais instructed the leaders of the farm to bury the young man and to close the farm, without giving the news of his death for publication.

In August 1962, the revolutionary plot of the Peasant Leagues began to appear. The first incident took place in Pernambuco when Joel Arruda Camara and Manuel Tertuliano, brother of Julião, and 12 other members of the leagues were arrested by the Brazilian Fourth Army. When arrested, they had in their possession documents revealing guerrilla operations plans prepared against rural properties located in nearly 30 municipal districts of Pernambuco. Julião reacted by stating that the imprisonment and the documents were part of a lie created by reactionaries against the leagues, and sent a telegram to President Goulart, protesting the Army's action.

The second public manifestation took place in August when Rivadavia Bras de Olivera, the same person who attended the training course in Managua, together with Atauslpa Alves de Lima and José Bartolomeu de Souza, were served with a prison warrant in an office belonging to the leagues in Rio de Janeiro, situated on 496 Russel Street, apartment 803, which had been rented by Paulo Bezerra de Andrade, and employee of the newspaper A Lig, official organ of the Peasant Leagues. On that occasion a large quantity of Communist propaganda was found in the office.

The third manifestation of this revolutionary plot was the discovery of one of the farms of the leagues in Dianopolis, in the State of Goies on November 23, 1962. Guerrilla operation plans again were seized.

Temporary imprisonment was decreed against 26 members of the leagues by Judge Moreira Marquez. Among these were Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Amaro Luiz de Carvalho and Joaquin Ferriers Filho, all of whom had been trained in Managua, Cuba. Besides these, another training companion was included, Clovis José Estevez de Souze.

The fourth manifestation was the imprisonment of Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Celia Lima and José Francisco da Silva on December 13, 1962. Clodomir was arrested while transporting a shipment of arms to members of the leagues; he carried a visiting card of Antale Chardin, chief of the consular section of the Soviet Union Embassy on which Chadrin had written a note apologizing for failing to keep an appointment with Julião. Celia Lima, who had been traveling companion of Morais for some time, was more than just a companion. Morais had included her in his guerrilla activities, giving her the supervision of what she called School of Revolutionary Development, situated in a house in the northern zone of Rio de Janeiro, where courses ranging from ideological indoctrination to sabotage were held.

The fifth and most recent manifestation of the guerrilla activities is the contents of the documents found in the wreckage of the Varig plane which crashed near Lima, Peru, on November 27, 1962. The documents will explain many of the leagues' problems, in the development of their guerilla capacity as well as their overall program.

Beginning in 1962, many of the leagues' leaders commenced complaining about the activities of Morais, accusing him of dedicating more importance to his own interests than to those of the leagues; of not concerning himself with the welfare of the leagues' members, and what is even more important, of diverting funds given by the Cuban Government for promoting guerrilla activities, for his own personal use.

During the development of the Peasants Leagues, the Cuban Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, constantly directed their activities. The official of the Cuban Embassy, principally responsible for the operations of the leagues, was Miguel Brugueras del Valle, in reality a member of the Cuban Secret Service in Brazil, acting under the pretext of his post of cultural counselor of the Cuban Embassy. At times, Brugueras had two other assistants—"cultural attachés," Felix Pita and Arturo Garcia Rodriguez. They maintained constant contact with Morais and occasionally with Julião. Haroldo Hall, representative of "Prensa Latina" in Rio de Janeiro, also helped Brugueras in his contact with the leagues. Brugueras directed the Cuban subversive operations which involved Brazilian Communist organizations, through the mediation of such well-known Communists as Mullis Bandsire, Joëo Amazonas and Maurico Grabios. In July 1962 Brugueras accompanied a group of Brazilians on a trip to Cuba to attend the celebration of the 26th of July anniversary. On August 24, 1962, Brugueras accompanied the Cuban Ambassador, Josquin Hernándes Armas, to Goisnis, where the Ambassador addressed the law school. On this occasion, Brugueras met with Tarsan de Castro, head of the Deliberative Council of the Peasants Leagues of Goise. This meeting between Brugueras and Castro is referred to in one of the documents found in the wreckage of the plane which crashed in Lima. Brugueras and Tarsan maintained frequent meetings to discuss the actions of Morais, with which they were not in accord. Later, they continued their frequent meetings to discuss the disagreements occurring in the leagues during the last 6 months of 1962. Brugueras wrote two letters to his chief (Petronio) in the Cuban Government in 1962, explaining the then existing conditions in the leagues, signing them with his pseudonym, "Gerardo." Brugueras gave the two dispatches, with a copy of a letter in which he complained of the actions of Clodomiro Morais to the postal messenger, Raúl Capero Bonilla, who headed the Cuban delegation in the recent Congress of the FAO, held in the Copacabana Palace Hotel, shortly before the delegation departed on their ill-fated journey. These dispatches have been recovered, the material referred to showing subversion in Brazil has been summarized in the press. Brazil frantically tried to cover up the dispatch report and to keep it secret because it documents Communist activities in Brazil.

NOT EVEN THE REDS FORESAW THEIR RISE TO POWER

(By Louis R. Stein)

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazilian Communists wield more power today than they would have dreamed of when President Joao Goulart took office a year and one-half ago.

The man most responsible for giving a leg up to the Communists is the President himself.

Sr. Goulart has named numerous Communists and fellow traveling nationalists to key administration jobs and facilitated election of Communist slates in labor unions formerly controlled by more conservative leaders.

Yet anyone in Brazil will tell you the President is not a Communist.

The 15-man Cabinet contains three notorious Marxists: Hermes Lima, Foreign Minister; Joa Mangabeira, Justice and Interior Minister, and Almino Afonso, Labor Minister. Two doubtfuls in the Cabinet are Celso Furtado, Minister for Planning who was a Communist in his youth, and Jose Ermirio de Moraes, millionaire industrialist who financed the election campaign of Miguel Arraes, Communist governor of the northeastern State of Pernambuco.

DECLARED

Raul Riff, Sr. Goulart's press secretary, is a self-declared Communist. Evandro Linse Silva, director of the presidential secretariat, is closely linked with the Communists.

The most important labor organization taken over by the Communists since Sr. Goulart's inauguration is the National Industrial Workers Confederation which unites most industrial unions in the country.

Sr. Goulart personally intervened in the last CNTI election on behalf of the Communist-backed slate led by Dante Pelecani.

Sr. Goulart named Francisco Mangabeira, an extreme leftwing nationalist son of the Justice Minister, to be president of Petrobras, the Government oil monopoly. Petrobras is the largest single firm in Brazil.

"Watermelons" (green outside, red inside), a term used here to describe fellow travelers, hold many lesser posts in the Government.

NO VETS

Congress has no control over composition of the Cabinet or choice of government agency directors. It can summon ministers to give an accounting but cannot veto nominations.

Sr. Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party has assisted election of Communists to Congress. Communist Party leader Luis Carlos Prestes says the current Congress contains 17 Communists. Most ran with PTB backing.

There were only 16 Communists in the Federal Legislature at the time the Party was outlawed in 1948. Sr. Prestes, then a senator, was among those who lost his mandate. The Party still is officially illegal but operates openly without interference.

It is feared in democratic circles here that Sr. Goulart is riding a tiger. Leftist forces around him could cause considerable trouble and possibly destroy his austerity program if they decided to actively oppose it.

Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas, now in the United States for money talks, has already run up against leftist criticism which, for the nonce, is being held in check by Sr. Goulart.

All efforts to bar Commmuists from the armed forces and Government jobs have been thwarted.

The latest attempt was a bill written by Social Democratic Party (PSD) Deputy Mendes de Morais. It was killed in committee.

NAMELESS

Sr. Prestes said this month that since the Cuban revolution Communists sympathizers have increased six-fold in Brazil.

The Prestes' estimate may be high, there is no denying that there are more Communist sympathizers in Brazil today than ever before.

And, if Sr. Prestes had spoken the whole truth he would have added that the bulk of the new strength yearns for revolt instead of a silent revolution through subversive infiltration.

The mellowed chief of the bloody 1935 revolution now professes to believe the Communists can eventually bring off a bloodless coup in Brazil.

Sr. Prestes wrote the 1958 party manifesto laying down a new nationalistic, anti-American policy to bring the party into line with Nikita Khrushchev's program of subversion as opposed to revolution.

The new line split the party and fostered the formation of several deviationist groups. The strongest of these is led by veterans Joao Amazonas and Mauricio Grabois.

Their weekly newspaper Classe Operaria gives extensive play to Chinese communism and ignores Russia except to criticize the Kremlin. So does the weekly Politica Operaria, published by the Frente Operaria, another splinter group.

The Chinese and Castroites are flooding the country with propaganda. Castro portraits unfailingly appear at student rallies and meetings of the revolutionary rural leagues, led by self-proclaimed Marxist Deputy Francisco Julião.

In his latest comment on the subject Sr. Julião said, "The only way out for the oppressed masses is armed struggle."

No one in Brazil could hope to mount a successful coup without control of the armed forces.

The Communists know this. Leftwing nationalist officers also appear to realize it.

Hence, both groups are courting the noncommissioned officers.

Sr. Julião flatly stated recently that "we expect to carry out our revolution with the help of the sergeants in the armed forces."

BRASS

The importance of the noncoms as an emerging new power within the armed forces was stressed recently by the presence of high brass sitting down front at a noncommissioned officers meeting.

On hand were: Admiral Pedro Araujo Suzano, navy minister; Brig. Reynaldo de Carvalho, air minister; Gen. Osvino Ferreira Alves, first army commander; Admiral Candido Aragao, marine corps commander.

The generals applauded political speeches by noncoms who criticized Congress and the courts. The military code actually prohibits any person in uniform from making political statements.

All the officers present were leftwing nationalist supporters of President Goulart. Fellow officers call Admiral Aragao a Communist while General Alves proclaimed at a public gathering that he and fellow traveling Labor Minister Afonso "have the same ideology."

Several sergeants were elected last October to state assemblies with nationalist and Communist backing and one was sent to the Federal House of Deputies.

Although the electoral laws require that they resign from the service before they may be seated they are fighting in the courts to retain their military status while serving as congressmen.

Brazilian Envoy Giving Explanation

Brazil's Ambassador Roberto Campos today said his hour-long talk with Under Secretary of State George W. Ball yesterday had "helped to clarify unwarranted misunderstandings" of a U.S. charge that Communists had infiltrated the government of President Joao Goulart.

But the Brazilian envoy sternly warned that "one should be extremely careful in making these accusations."

The controversy has cast a shadow over a visiting mission's efforts to get U.S. aid for Brazil's 3-year multimillion-dollar economic reconstruction program.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FROM COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA AND POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I brought to the attention of the House the fact that our President has not taken the action which section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act clearly requires him to take. Section 231 requires that the President shall withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from Communist Yugoslavia and Poland and require that the products of these countries be dutiable at the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. Although this is a matter of principle more than anything else, I want the House to understand that it is not just a demand for action based on legality alone, but that the factual situation is such that serious injury is being caused to domestic industries because of the failure of the President to act in accordance with the explicit requirement of the statute.

There are two rolled zinc plants in Indiana. One is located in Greencastle and the other in Muncie. These plants manufacture zinc sheet and zinc strip. There is substantial production of zinc strip by these plants. Formerly there was substantial production of zinc sheet but imports now have ruined the zinc sheet business in this country. In 1962 more than half of the imports of zinc sheet were of Yugoslavian origin. These foreign zinc sheet imports had an average declared foreign value in 1962 of only 12.1 cents per pound—less than the price which my constituents must pay for the metal from which to manufacture zinc strip and zinc sheet. In 1952 imports of zinc sheet represented a quantity equivalent to only 1 percent of domestic industry production. For 1962 zinc sheet imports represented a quantity equivalent to 48 percent of domestic industry production. I am presenting zinc sheet import statistics and not zinc strip import statistics because the Bureau of the Census only collects data on zinc sheet imports. Zinc strip imports are in a category with a number of other products even though interestingly enough, zinc strip production is many times that of zinc sheet.

Employees in rolled zinc plants in my State, I am pleased to say, are well paid. Their wages are more than eight times the wages paid in metal industries in Communist Yugoslavia. With a situation such as this, combined with the fact that the raw material in the United States costs more than the declared Yugoslav value of the finished manufactured product, it is no wonder that domestic zinc sheet manufacturers virtually have been put out of business and that domestic zinc strip manufacturers probably will suffer the same fate if the President does not act at once to require Communist Yugoslav products to be assessed the same full-duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Under the circumstances, I ask you, why does not the President act? Even if the law were discretionary and he only had authority to act to assist an American industry confronted with ruinous import competition from Communist Yugoslavia, you would think he would act. But this is not a discretionary matter. The law clearly requires that the President shall take this action. He has not acted, and he has given no indication of when he is going to act. This is one of the greatest affronts Congress has ever received from a President. A law is passed which the President signs, and then he does not act as the law specifically provides that he shall act.

New, let us be completely fair about the matter and see if there is any basis for the President failing to act. In 1951 in the Trade Agreements Extension Act the same language was used to require the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from countries which are members of the world Communist movement. This involved 13 countries and yet President Truman was able to complete action and issue the necessary directives within 2 months—August 3, 1951, Proclamation No. 2935, 16 Federal Register 7635, and 16 Federal Register 7637. You see, most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland at that time because it was determined that these countries, while Communist countries, were not members of the world Communist movement but instead, so-called independent Communist countries—an interesting refinement and distinction.

Because of this distinction and the fact that most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland under the 1951 act, it was necessary to include an additional provision in the 1962 act which directed that most-favored-nation treatment be withdrawn from any Communist country irrespective of whether or not the country is a member of the world Communist movement.

Five months have now elapsed since the effective date of the law. Only two countries are involved and yet the President has not acted. President Truman was able to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from 13 countries within a 2-month period, but President Kennedy has been unable to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from only 2 Communist countries in 5 months.

Are we Members of Congress going to do nothing while the President disregards the explicit requirement of the law and American industries are being ruined by import competition from Communist countries?

Zinc strip produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1959	32,364	32,221	10,773,634	1,052	242	459,716	$2.37	$0.48	$2.85	14.55	$505,347
1960	30,843	30,433	10,823,882	637	228	392,573	2.44	.49	2.93	14.63	(73,197)
1961	31,902	31,890	11,028,920	761	236	407,691	2.47	.51	2.98	13.70	(98,273)
1962	33,924	34,056	11,635,416	1,016	220	405,171	2.56	.54	3.10	13.67	116,920

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheet produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales		Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
		(A) Tonnage	(B) Dollars								
1952	6,930	6,864	4,281,164	299	349	635,493	$1.71	$0.18	$1.89	21.98	$52,571
1953	6,881	6,700	4,098,844	449	334	655,710	1.81	.24	2.05	28.85	205,229
1954	6,129	6,101	3,671,196	292	320	587,668	1.85	.30	2.15	30.55	160,057
1955	6,583	6,442	4,118,618	339	320	642,008	1.90	.30	2.20	28.53	126,104
1956	5,888	6,013	4,063,219	367	315	612,658	2.03	.33	2.36	29.72	6,350
1957	4,640	4,596	3,367,451	335	276	511,653	2.11	.37	2.48	32.90	63,408
1958	4,214	4,175	3,024,755	294	259	428,353	2.21	.40	2.61	34.62	37,774
1959	3,825	3,756	2,849,939	221	245	430,992	2.26	.46	2.72	36.68	(130,826)
1960	3,356	3,276	2,575,121	224	223	380,767	2.30	.48	2.78	33.65	(251,348)
1961	2,647	2,933	2,194,504	164	188	279,641	2.36	.54	2.90	32.66	(421,886)
1962	2,699	2,752	2,026,750	172	157	279,478	2.43	.62	3.05	33.70	(357,641)

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheets—Imports by volume and value, average value of imports in terms of cents per pound and imports as percentage of domestic production

Year	Imports		Average foreign value of imports (cents per pound)	Imports by volume as percent of domestic production
	Tons	Dollars		
1952	47	23,557	25.0	1
1953	196	76,751	19.5	3
1954	259	88,010	17.0	4
1955	431	148,389	17.2	7
1956	450	170,416	18.9	8
1957	732	244,722	16.7	16
1958	823	262,324	15.9	19
1959	950	310,855	16.3	25
1960	904	301,667	16.6	27
1961	1,177	350,200	14.9	44
1962	1,298	363,916	14.0	48

Source: Imports by tons and dollar value are as reported by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce Commodity Classification 6559000 except that for the years 1952 through 1958 they have been revised in accordance with the findings of the U.S. Tariff Commission in Report on Zinc Sheet—Escape Clause Investigation No. 81, dated January 1960, table 12. Other data as computed by Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association. Excludes quantities erroneously reported as having been entered from Canada.

1962 zinc sheet imports—quantity, value, and average foreign value by country of origin in terms of cents per pound

	Belgium	Japan	Netherlands	West Germany	United Kingdom	Yugoslavia
Quantity (pounds)	235,638	1,788	223,011	541,395	42,557	1,552,513
Value	$35,250	$626	$33,559	$99,585	$7,300	$187,596
Average value (cents)	14.9	35.0	15.0	18.4	17.1	12.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Zinc sheet imports by country of origin

[In tons]

	Yugoslavia	West Germany	Belgium	Netherlands	United Kingdom
1956	--------	323	43	75	--------
1957	236	314	78	103	--------
1958	267	361	112	141	17
1959	222	450	113	155	6
1960	411	251	92	58	5
1961	769	244	67	92	5
1962	776	271	118	111	21

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. First, I would like to say that I am completely in agreement with the fine statement the gentleman from Indiana is making, because I know he is well aware I represent the community of Greencastle, Ind., that has one of these zinc mills. I know firsthand of the tremendous damage, the tremendous loss of employment and business which has resulted from interfering foreign imports of zinc. I want to commend the gentleman for the wonderful job he is doing in explaining this to the Congress, and I certainly hope that as a result of his efforts here today and of the astute remarks he is making that the administration will bring in a directive to grant relief to a very worthwhile industry in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I also wish to commend the gentleman for bringing this information out. I would like to ask him a couple of questions.

First, is this zinc that is being imported into the United States from Communist Yugoslavia identified in any way so the purchaser of this zinc plate in this country can identify it as being manufactured in a Communist country?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge, let me say to the gentleman, I think not.

Mr. STINSON. So a consumer in this country could possibly buy this zinc sheet on the open market in the United States without any knowledge of its having been manufactured in a Communist country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge I am sure that is correct.

Mr. STINSON. Another question if the gentleman will permit: Is it possible that the industry manufacturing this zinc sheet in Yugoslavia is subsidized by the American taxpayers through the foreign aid program?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am very sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not have that information.

Mr. STINSON. The fact that the United States has given something over $2 billion in aid to various foreign constituencies and economies, it is just possible that some of it went to establish the zinc sheet industry in Yugoslavia, and that our own aid is being used against American workers in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman and can only say I think that is entirely possible.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman for the presentation of these facts here today. The imports of zinc are having a very seriously damaging effect, as the gentleman has pointed out, upon our American economy and upon American employment; and I sincerely hope that these remarks will serve to bring to those charged with the responsibility in this respect the need for direct and immediate remedial action.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. As a very knowledgeable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I am very sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is aware of the impact of these importations, and I am very hopeful that through his support and that of my other colleagues in the House we will be able to bring this forcefully enough to the attention of the President that he can take action.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 24, 1963, marked an historic milestone in the long and proud history of the State of North Carolina. Three hundred years ago yesterday King Charles II of England issued a charter at his royal court in Westminster, conveying to eight of his close friends and supporters a vast tract of land in North America. The grant extended southward from present-day Virginia to Florida, which was then a Spanish possession, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the South Seas, or Pacific Ocean.

Over his royal seal King Charles officially designated the territory conveyed in the charter as "Carolina." March 24, 1963, therefore, marked the 300th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of North Carolina.

The people of North Carolina take pride in the history and the accomplishments of our great State. They are fully aware of the fact that our State existed long before there was a United States of America. They are proud of the tremendous progress the State has made in industry and in the arts and sciences during the past 300 years.

To make appropriate plans to commemorate the tercentenary of North Carolina, the general assembly of the State established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission in 1959. Distinguished North Carolinians from every part of the State are serving on the commission. Under the direction of the commission pageants, plays, and historical observances are being held this year over North Carolina to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State.

Mr. Speaker, out of the vast tract of land designated "Carolina" on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, 14 great States of the Union, wholly or in part, were subsequently created. In view of this fact, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission felt that the observance of the 300th anniversary of North Carolina was an event of significance, not only to North Carolina, but to the other States of the Union and to foreign nations as well. To place the tercentenary, therefore, in its proper perspective, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission requested the North Carolina delegation in the Congress to sponsor legislation to create a Federal North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was pleased to introduce the House bill creating the Commission. The Commission consists of 15 members, 4 of whom are Members of the Senate and 4 of whom are Members of the House of Representatives. In addition, seven members have been appointed to the Commission by the President of the United States.

I have long felt that the magnificent story of the founding of America and the growth of its democratic institutions has largely been a story as yet untold. God has surely blessed the efforts of our forefathers to found a new order in America based on the dignity of man. We have grown to be the most powerful nation in the world, and our voice commands attention in the councils of the great.

As we have made material progress I am afraid we have failed to give enough attention to the wonderful and inspiring history of our Nation. In our zeal to build a new order of material wealth we have overlooked, to a great extent, some of the basic lessons to be learned from our illustrious past.

I sincerely believe that if we are to maintain our position of greatness and if we are to reach the fulfillment of the grand design bequeathed to us by our forefathers, we must rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and ideals of our forefathers. In short, Mr. Speaker, we must again study and learn to appreciate the history of our Nation.

The venerable poet, historian, and philosopher, Carl Sandburg, has said:

> If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin rot and dissolution.

The citizens of North Carolina are well aware of the truth of Mr. Sandburg's statement. Thus, in this year of the 300th anniversary of our great State, they are rededicating themselves to the eternal principles upon which their free society was founded.

For a moment let us examine the events that led up to the founding of Carolina. It is a remarkable page in history. On January 30, 1649, King Charles I of England was beheaded. There followed a period of great upheaval and political unrest in the country. England was without a king. Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector, ruled the land as a virtual dictator.

With the death of Cromwell in 1658 the English people called to the throne Charles II, the son of the beheaded Charles I. On the 28th of May, 1660, his 30th birthday, Charles II entered London.

During the despotic rule of Oliver Cromwell in our mother country, King Charles II had been forced to live in France. Penniless and with few friends, he had eked out a meager existence. On the restoration of the monarchy, therefore, Charles II was understandably generous to those who had supported him with money and who had espoused his cause in England during his exile.

To eight men who had been his strongest supporters and who had done the most for his restoration to the English throne, Charles II gave the Carolina grant of land on March 24, 1663.

These eight men, known in history as the Eight Lords Proprietors of North Carolina, were distinguished Englishmen. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, was Lord High Chancellor of England. George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, was Master of the King's Horse and Captain General of all his forces. William, Lord Craven, had been a great friend of Charles II's father. John, Lord Berkeley, had supported Charles I and had joined the royal family in exile. Sir George Carteret was Vice Chamberlain of the King's household. Sir William Berkeley, as Governor of Virginia, had persuaded his colony to stand by Charles II, even though he was in exile. Sir John Colleton had supported the royal cause in the Barbados. Anthony Ashley Cooper was Chancellor of the Exchequer and subsequently was created the Earl of Shaftesbury.

The Eight Lords Proprietors, of course, were not aware of the extent of the vast property they acquired in the New World through the generosity of Charles II. In 1585 an unsuccessful attempt had been made by Sir Walter Raleigh to establish an English settlement on Roanoke Island, N.C. This was 20 years before the settlement of the Virginia Jamestown Colony and more than three decades prior to the founding of the Plymouth Colony.

When the Carolina Charter of 1663 was given to the Proprietors, North Carolina had approximately 2,000 European inhabitants. Most of these had filtered into Carolina from the Virginia colony. The ill-fated Sir Walter Raleigh Colony, founded in 1585 on Roanoke Island, had disappeared from the face of the earth. The fate of the 117 members of the colony still remains a mystery.

The Charter of 1663 described Carolina as "not yet cultivated or planted and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of Almighty God." The charter, however, extended to the people then in Carolina and to the future citizens of the colony all of the rights and privileges that Englishmen had inherited in the centuries since Magna Carta.

The Lords Proprietors were required:

> To ordain, make, enact, and under their seals to publish any laws whatsoever, either appertaining to the public state of the said province or the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion of, and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or of the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies; whom, for enacting of the said laws, when and as often as need shall require, we will that the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; and their heirs, shall, from time to time, assemble, in such manner and form as to them shall seem best.

At another point in the charter King Charles said that the people of Carolina as his subjects:

> Should enjoy, give, sell, alien, and bequeath; as likewise, all liberties, franchises, and privileges of this our Kingdom of England and of our dominions aforesaid, may freely and quietly have, possess, and enjoy as our liege people born within the same, without the let, molestation, vexation, trouble, or grievance of us, our heirs and successors; any statute, act, ordinance, or provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, it will be seen, that North Carolina was founded upon the principle of representative government and that the rights of Englishmen were guaranteed to Carolinians. For 300 years the citizens of the State have cultivated their free institutions. The people of North Carolina have always been jealous of their rights and privileges as free citizens.

Even the Lords Proprietors were well aware of the independent nature of North Carolinians. A few years after Carolina was founded the Proprietors said plaintively in a message directed to Carolinians that they were "a people that neither understood your [their] own nor regarded our—the Proprietors'—interests."

Approximately 6 months after the Lords Proprietors received their charter from King Charles one of their number, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia, was given the authority to exercise the powers of government in Albermarle, the only portion of Carolina settled at that time. Sir William Berkeley, in turn, appointed William Drummond, "a sober Scotch gentleman of good repute" in 1664 as Governor.

In 1665 the first formal plan of government for Carolina was adopted pursuant to the charter. It is known as the Concessions and Agreement of 1665. Under the Concessions, a popular assembly was created which had much broader powers than were actually required by the Proprietors' charter.

The Concessions and Agreement of 1665 was, in turn, succeeded by the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina in 1669. This plan of government was known as the "Grand Model." It was not as successful an instrument of government as the Concessions. The colony was plagued by what has been described as "many and various commotions, disorders and irregularities."

Although there was friction and turmoil in the Carolina Colony, it made great advancement under the Proprietors. Tobacco, the "bewitching vegetable," as it was called then, was widely used as the currency of the colony.

The proprietary government of North Carolina lasted until the Carolina Charter was surrendered to the English Crown in 1729. In that year North Carolina became a royal colony and so remained until it threw off the English yoke and assumed its position as a sovereign State in the American Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is the inspiring story of the founding of representative government in North Carolina. From the approximately 2,000 people who inhabited Carolina in 1663 we have grown to a great State stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the highest crest of the Appalachian mountains and embracing within our borders nearly 5 million citizens engaged in industry, commerce, and the arts and sciences.

The motto of our great State is "To Be, Rather Than To Seem." We have fulfilled the meaning of this motto in every respect. The history of North Carolina has been carved by men of vision and faith in the American ideal.

As the people of our State pause this year to mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter which gave birth to their free society, they will take renewed faith in the great principles which have enabled North Carolina to reach a position of eminence among the States of the Union. In developing an understanding of the glorious past of North Carolina, and indeed of the founding of liberty in the New World, our people will be better prepared to face the trials of the present and the uncertainties of the future.

It is my hope that our sister States will join with North Carolina in this proud moment in her long history. May the 300th anniversary of Carolina be a spark which will rekindle a desire on the part of every American to learn more of the heritage of their Nation and by so doing become better citizens.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay the gentleman from North Carolina the highest tribute I know for delivering here this morning a historical paper that calls to the attention of America the great occasion that is taking place in the State of North Carolina in this tercentenary event.

Mr. Speaker, in 1584 and 1585, the first and second efforts of Sir Walter Raleigh to settle the New World were made on Roanoke Island, North Carolina. At that time the entire area was christened "Virginia" in honor of England's virgin Queen Elizabeth. The third expedition, due to trials and tribulations of the second, moved on to the deep waters of the Chesapeake and settled at Jamestown.

This occasion is particularly significant to me because it is in the district that I have the honor to represent that the first vestiges of permanent colonization took place in the Carolinas. The charter that we commemorate today was the first to provide for the beginning of religious tolerance in the area encompassed by the grant.

It is this tolerance and the Charter's concepts of freedom of thought, that have been handed down through the centuries and have helped make this country what it is today.

The fact that the first effort by the English to colonize the United States occurred in what is now North Carolina is well known. What is less known is that in Edenton, N.C., and Bath, N.C., we find the first permanent North Carolina settlements that stimulated the migration which swept across the State and to the south. Just yesterday tercentenary exercises were held at old St. Thomas Church at Bath, N.C. The communion service at this church was given by Queen Anne. Other historical homes and buildings of the community were open. It was here that the first library in Carolina was established.

On April 6 in Edenton, N.C., the Post Office Department will issue a commemorative stamp that honors the Carolina Charter. There is some question as to whether the first post office in the area encompassed by the grant was in Edenton or Bath, N.C., but the question does not take away in any respect the privilege that is Edenton's in being the focal point for the issuance of this commemorative stamp, that is of significance to all America and particularly to the North Carolinians.

It is right and proper that this 300th anniversary observance should extend far beyond the boundaries of the district I represent, for each part of the State has played a part in the development of the area covered by the grant. It is also fitting and proper that the observance of this 300th anniversary should extend to the schools, the colleges, and the universities, to cultural projects and religious programs, and in effect to all the peoples of the State, for each is concerned with the events of the first century of the colony's history and the provisions for the above that were written in the charter.

One of the great traditions of North Carolina has been the fact that progress has been made through the cooperation of all its peoples. This is why it is quite fitting that no specific city or area be designated as the focal point for the celebration of this 300th anniversary.

Because it is a statewide project of interest to all the State's peoples, it is best that the programs which are being conducted are done at a local level and centered upon local personalities, sites, or events of significance during the early history of the colony, and the entire area is full of great historic events that had bearing on the eventual founding of the independence and the freedom of the peoples of America who exist today.

I am proud that the real history of the development of North Carolina began in the district I have the honor to represent, and the first English-speaking child was born on Roanoke Island, which is now part of Dare County, N.C., and that a drama has been held at Fort Raleigh for 20 years or more portraying that first effort to settle the New World. However, it pleases me that this is a tercentenary celebration that reaches all parts of the State—the Albemarle, the Pamlico, the Cape Fear, the Piedmont, and the Blue Ridge. For it was people who came through from the eastern part of the country and from the eastern seaboard that made the march across our country that caused our country to grow. They banded themselves together and went into the forest and conquered the wild and laid the foundation so that men could live today in freedom and in comfort and enjoy their respective ways of life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I congratulate my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] for introducing the resolution that commemorates this great occasion and for arranging these proceedings today so that we might speak about this tercentenary celebration.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner] for his splendid remarks, and I would join him in emphasizing that on April 6 at Edenton, N.C., the Carolina tercentenary commemorative stamp which the gentleman has mentioned will go on sale for the first time. I understand there is a great public interest in this outstanding event.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] for bringing to the attention of this body this historical event. The word "tercentenary" is a large word. The tercentenary celebration in North Carolina calls for large plans throughout our State to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the founding of North Carolina. Visitors to North Carolina this year will find a wide variety of attractions to make their stay a memorable one. Throughout the State local groups and communities are scheduling programs of varying type and degree, which usually will be centered on local personalities, sites, and events of significance during the early history of our State and our colony. As an example, on June 27 through the 29, the people of Watauga County and the town of Boone, which is situated in the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina, will join in these commemorative events. An outstanding program and appropriate events are being planned including the opening presentation of the 1963 edition of "Horn in the West," which is a superlative outdoor drama. This part of the State is of particular significance because 200 years ago that famous frontiersman and explorer, Daniel Boone, first crossed the Blue Ridge to open up the western part of our country. In this program at Boone, which is named for this great explorer, there will be events to commemorate his great achievements. A wagon train will be sent across the original route that he took to cross the Blue Ridge and to open up our great West.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] concerning the historical significance of these events in North Carolina and the importance that they have even today in the history of our country. You know history shows us that many civilizations have risen and have fallen and history also shows us that these civilizations have built many monuments to materialism, usually under a dictatorship-type of government.

It also shows us that these monuments have rotted and decayed. They leave their silent remains as proof to us that these civilizations failed. Why did they fail? It is because human freedom was not the basis for their existence.

I am certainly glad to see that our educational institutions are taking part in this great celebration that we are planning and are having in North Carolina and that the young people and all of the people today can be made aware of the past history not only of our State but also of our country as a whole. Through these and other events, let us rededicate ourselves to the continuation of liberty and freedom in America.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague for his participation in this discussion and assure him that the people of North Carolina are aware of the activities planned in his congressional district in the Watauga County area, particularly.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina for being the author of this resolution which provides for the celebration of this significant historical event in our State.

North Carolina is rich in history and tradition; it has a great heritage. It has a greater heritage, I might say quite vainly, if you want to call it that, quite vainly, than any State I know of. I think it is significant for us to keep in mind that this charter that was issued 300 years ago yesterday embraced the grant area that it did. As has already been mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] and by the distinguished gentleman from the First Congressional District [Mr. Bonner], and our friend from the Blue Ridge area of North Carolina, it started at what would be now the northern boundary of Virginia and extended southward to what is now the northern boundary of Florida. That is a great expanse and area, and then from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, embracing today 14 or perhaps 15 of our finest States in our union of States.

It is significant to me that just in 1949 after many years of search, North Carolinians were able to locate the original charter. They found it in the hands of a bookseller or merchant in England, in London, to be more precise. Funds were forthwith raised to purchase this historic document to bring it back to North Carolina where it is now housed in our archives of history at our capitol at Raleigh. Here it is seen visually and studied by literally hundreds of thousands of people every year, not only people from North Carolina but people from all the States that are embraced in this total grant covering some 14 States of our Union.

It is significant to me that in this so-called statewide celebration, historic as it is, it was deemed advisable to keep it at the lower level, the level of the community where the people themselves reside, the grassroots, where they can get inspiration from what took place 300 years ago when the forebears of the present generation had the drive and the initiative to move westward to what is now our Pacific coast.

To me it is a very great event. We share with all the people in this great area our pride that the gentleman must have [Mr. Whitener], a member of this Commission, and the others in North Carolina, who have meant so much in bringing this to the attention not only of the North Carolinians but to people everywhere.

I commend the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. Broyhill and Mr. Bonner], and the other members of the North Carolina delegation, and others who will offer for the Record their statement and thinking along this line.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from the Seventh District for his contribution. I take note of his reference to what may be derived today from the lessons of the past. I known that the gentleman comes from one of the leading tobacco districts of America. I am sure in his section of the State the people will take great interest in the fact that the first known crop control program in the history of the world, I suppose, was proposed for Carolina territory.

In 1666, Gov. William Drummond, of North Carolina, met at St. Mary's the first capital of Maryland, with representatives of Virginia and Maryland to investigate the possibility of controlling tobacco prices. The plan called for a temporary suspension of tobacco planting which would result in a tobacco shortage. The shortage, they hoped, would in turn increase the price paid for the tobacco crop. The Carolina Legislative Assembly was willing to impose the controls, but the plan failed of adoption because Lord Baltimore, the proprietor of Maryland, refused to go along with the agreement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying honor to North Carolina on the 300th anniversary of the North Carolina Charter, issued in 1663.

This document, on display in the North Carolina Hall of History at Raleigh, was issued on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, of England, to eight loyal supporters whose assistance helped the King regain the English throne.

The original area granted to these eight lord proprietors would dwarf North Carolina's present size. The area was so immense it extended southward from Virginia to Florida and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, or

"South Seas," as the Pacific was known in those early days.

By 1763—100 years after issuance of the charter—the colony's population had grown to approximately 200,000 persons and the settlement had extended westward to the Blue Ridge Mountains.

It should be pointed out that North Carolina did not officially become North Carolina until December 7, 1710, when the area then referred to only as Carolina was divided into North and South Carolina.

I wish to take this occasion to pay particular tribute to the North Carolina Tercentenary Commission for the outstanding contribution it has made in calling to the attention of North Carolinians the importance of this 300th anniversary in our history and heritage.

One hundred years ago, we were in the midst of the War between the States and little time was available to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Carolina Charter. Two hundred years ago, the French and Indian War was drawing to a close and few stopped to look back over the previous 100 years.

This makes it even more fitting that we should pause this year to commemorate North Carolina's 300th year as a unit of government.

As a closing thought, I would state that the last 300 years have been years of progress for North Carolina so that its future today is bright and promising. We are proud of our history and are proud to be one of the 50 States which, collectively, make America what it is today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 24, will mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter of 1663. The grant was issued by King Charles II of England to eight prominent military and political leaders of the time whose help had been indispensable to him. It embraced an immense territory: all the land between the 36th parallel of latitude on the north and the 31st parallel on the south, and stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. This tremendous tract included not only the present-day States of North and South Carolina, but also all or part of a number of States of our country.

Although the charter of 1663 was not the first, nor the last, patent affecting the modern Carolinas to be issued by English sovereigns, it was the most significant because it put the new colony on a permanent footing and added yet another brick to the structure of our American heritage. For this charter qualified the vast powers of the lords proprietors, as its beneficiaries were called, to "enact any laws whatsoever pertaining to the public state of the said Providence, or to the private utility of particular persons," by making such laws subject to the "advice, consent, and approbation of the freemen of the said Providence, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies" who were required to be assembled from time to time.

The 87th Congress by its Public Law 437 provided for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans for the observance of this most significant occasion. The Federal Government has also put its stamp of approval on the event, literally, by arranging for the issuance next month of a commemorative postage stamp honoring the tercentenary of the Carolina Charter of 1663.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the House when I extend felicitations to the present-day beneficiaries of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and express confidence that the principles of freedom and justice which it conveyed to our land will continue to flourish and be strengthened in the decades and generations that lie ahead.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to join with our distinguished Speaker, the members of the delegation in this House from North Carolina, and with the people of the great State of North Carolina in calling the attention of the entire Nation to the tercentenary celebration of the Charter to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina by King Charles II on March 24, 1663.

Certainly, the granting of the Carolina Charter ranks among events of primary historical importance to this Nation. From these vast tracts of territory, a large segment of this Nation has been formed. From the people it has produced have come a succession of leaders who have helped to fashion the detailed architecture of our democracy and its social and economic institutions. Surely these leaders and the people who sent them forth have added to the strength, prosperity, and wisdom of the Nation.

Again, let me express the assurance that all Americans celebrate with you and that their interest will be proved when they join with Carolinians this summer in attending the festivals and ceremonies that are being planned to mark this historic occasion.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, by appointment from you on January 31, 1963, I have the honor to serve as a member of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission, established by joint Senate and House resolutions, enacted into Public Law 437 of the 87th Congress. The House division of the tercentenary celebration commission, under the able chairmanship of my North Carolina colleague, the Honorable BASIL WHITENER, works in cooperation with the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, created by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The purpose of the State and Federal Commissions is to assist in developing plans for the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II to the eight Lords Proprietors. The territorial scope of the charter was tremendous, running southward from Virginia to Florida and west to the Pacific Ocean. I believe even my colleagues from the Lone Star State will admit that this is nearly as big as the State of Texas.

But even more significant than its territorial dimensions were the guarantees contained in the charter to the settlers within the boundaries to form a government of freemen with the rights enjoyed by Englishmen under English laws. Thus the shadow of the Magna Charta was extended, through the Carolina Charter, to the shores of the New World.

The impact of this guarantee of political freedom was reflected in the first General Assembly of North Carolina in 1665 and in the several constitutions which were to follow. And so we feel that in Carolina was the genesis of those democratic ideals which have become the cornerstone of our great country and which, please God, will continue to motivate our national life.

The formal opening of the tercentenary celebration occurred in January of this year at the Governor's mansion in Raleigh. The occasion was highlighted by an immense birthday cake, shaped like the U.S. map, bearing 300 candles, which Governor Sanford handily extinguished in four mighty blows.

There are many more events to follow in our observance of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, for when anything of such import becomes 300 years old, it calls for a statewide celebration. These events will call into play all our State resources in the cultural arts, and they are many. Long before the National Capital became concerned about the preservation and enhancement of our national cultural heritage, the State of North Carolina was quietly going about its business of encouraging the arts—through many channels: the State Literary and Historical Society, which every year holds a "culture week" in our State capital of Raleigh; the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra, widely renowned; the Carolina Playmakers at Chapel Hill and the Little Theater movement throughout the State; the State Art Gallery, the finest, say some, south of Washington, and many other university and private art galleries; our grassroots opera company; and our impressive galaxy of writers in all areas of the written word.

If we appear too fulsome in praise of our State today, Mr. Speaker, we are but carrying out the injunction of the late Dr. R. D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, a historian of note and the first Archivist of the United States, who said:

> A people who have not the pride to record their history will not long have the virtue to make history that is worth recording.

In connection with our tercentenary celebration, we are very much gratified that the Post Office Department will issue a 5-cent commemorative stamp, depicting the first page of the Carolina Charter against a background of red velvet. The stamp was unveiled by Postmaster General J. Edward Day at ceremonies held here in the Capitol on February 28. First-day sale of the stamp will take place on April 6 in Edenton, N.C., one of the early settlements of the State which even today retains much of its colonial atmosphere.

We extend to our colleagues in the Congress a cordial invitation to visit North Carolina, either for the first day of issue of this stamp or for some of the subsequent celebrations which will be held in this tercentenary year from Murphy to Manteo.

Come down and drive over our fine highways which unwind like silver ribbons from the mountains to the sea. Visit Mount Mitchell, the highest peak east of the Rockies; visit Roanoke Island, birthplace of Virginia Dare, the first white child born in America; see Kill Devil Hill, where the first flight of a power-driven airplane was made by the Wright Brothers; and by all means visit our capital city of Raleigh, with its brandnew State House and its beautiful old Capitol Building of classic Greek design. And while there do not fail to visit the Hall of History, a component of the State Department of Archives and History, where you may see the selfsame charter we are talking about today, for North Carolina owns the charter, one of the most rare and interesting documents of the world.

Although I have referred to our State cultural activities and interests, let me assure you that we Tar Heels are really as plain as old shoes. The Old North State was not settled by the aristocracy but by plain people. So along with our culture, come down and enjoy our corn pone and chittlin's, our coon hunts and fish fries, breathe our fresh mountain air, sniff our sea coast medley of smells; play our splendid sandhills golf courses; go deep-sea fishing off our coast; see our rolling, industrialized Piedmont where my own district is located and where you will find many colleges and universities, including the University of North Carolina, the first State university to open its doors to students, and Duke University, as well as famous-name textile, furniture, and tobacco factories, famed battlegrounds, and the finest people in the world.

In short, do just about whatever you enjoy doing. You name it, for we believe we have it.

And so, in the vernacular of some sections of our State, let me extend this invitation, which in North Carolina is unsurpassed in neighborliness and enthusiasm: "Y'all come."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and in commemoration of that great historical event, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, established by the North Carolina General Assembly, has planned appropriate observances throughout 1963.

The original charter itself is preserved in North Carolina's Hall of History in Raleigh, where it is carefully encased in such a way as to protect it while still making it available for page-by-page inspection. It is one of only six of the original charters so preserved.

A number of significant programs and ceremonies are planned for the entire year. Some have already been held and others are scheduled. The U.S. Post Office Department has approved the issuance of a special commemorative stamp for this occasion and was recently unveiled in the Capitol by Postmaster General Day. The stamp will be placed on sale for the first time at Edenton, N.C., on April 6.

Texans and Alaskans who like to boast of the size of their respective States might note that the original Carolina Charter established a land grant to eight men extending from coast to coast in a strip bordered roughly to the north by what is now the present-day border of Virginia, and to the south by what is now Florida.

To those interested in colonial history, 1963 is the ideal year to visit North Carolina, as local groups will be sponsoring various programs throughout the entire year in observance of the tercentennial of the charter, and colonial history will be highlighted throughout the entire State.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission upon the valuable and lasting service it has rendered, and will doubtless continue to render throughout its existence, to the great State of North Carolina by bringing into better focus and emphasizing the early history of our State. I would also commend the hundreds of others who are assisting in a variety of ways to publicize and dramatize our colonial history and to make a memorable success of the celebration of Carolina's 300th year.

North Carolina is justly proud of the part it has taken in the founding and building of the greatest nation on earth. No country in the world has ever started so humbly and achieved so much in so short a period as America. It did not happen by chance.

As we celebrate Carolina's tercentennial in song, pageant, documentary, narrative and otherwise, I sincerely hope that all North Carolinians will be constantly mindful, or at least often reminded, of the character and spirit of the men and women of 300 years ago who undertook the building of a State in a strange, desolate and wild region. The events which marked the development and progress of colonial Carolina are of immense historical interest, of course, but we of modern North Carolina should find something more than mere interest in the spirit and attiude of the people in whose lives and activities our State had its beginning. We should find inspiration and a challenge.

Three hundred years ago, Carolina was not merely an underdeveloped area, as we understand and so often use that term today, but was an undeveloped raw wilderness. Early Carolinians had no indulgent and benevolent government upon which to lean and depend for their needs from the cradle to the grave; there were no public welfare programs, no government lending agencies, and no foreign aid programs. But they had something of far greater worth, the qualities of character and spirit that underlie all individual and State stability and progress. They actively sought a way of life which they knew beforehand would bring them face to face with dangers, obstacles, barriers, and challenges unnumbered and unknown.

What kind of people were they? What possessed them? They were proud, independent, and self-reliant; their undertakings and accomplishments under hardship conditions required great personal courage, initiative, stamina, and determination. They were willing to work, strive, venture, and sacrifice much in the hope and belief that the future would bring large returns. But they did not know that it would—they ventured much. Most of the natural obstacles they encountered have now been removed and we in modern North Carolina have no occasion to test our mettle against the forces and challenges which the early Carolinians met. Even so, while we celebrate the 300th anniversary of Carolina's first charter, it is in the best of order to ask ourselves a couple of questions: How do we of today compare with them in the qualities of self-reliance, fighting spirit, personal courage, initiative, general strength of character, and urge for individual and collective freedom? Do we as willingly and courageously meet the challenges and responsibilities of modern life as they met those of a far more difficult period?

In this tercentenary year, let us celebrate and glory in the achievements of those early Carolinians who broke the ground and laid the foundation for our great State. But let us be constantly reminded that the glory is theirs, not ours, and that all of our narratives and pageants will not add one whit to the significance and worth of their struggles and accomplishments. As we celebrate, then, let us also pause and take stock of ourselves with the view of honestly determining whether we individually and collectively possess those qualities of character and spirit that would prompt, urge, and enable us, if such were possible, to stand in their stead and duplicate their feats. A negative finding will be cause for concern because real progress in an individual or in a State involves intangibles which are neither seen nor measured by material standards.

In substance, all recorded history is an account of how individuals and nations have met and dealt with the challenges and responsibilities of their times. Other peoples, as well before as since 1663, have taken ignominious flight before challenge and responsibility, having neither the will nor the courage to assume the posture of men and take on the responsibilities essential to the creation and development of a stable system of free government. Such peoples abound in the world today.

I believe the qualities of character and spirit essential to the establishment of a stable system of free government are the same today as they were 300 years ago or 3,000 years ago and as they will be 300 years hence. And I believe that the maintenance of such a system is more difficult than its establishment.

It is suggested from time to time that the so-called underdeveloped countries of the world can eventually be stabilized economically and politically by giving them economic, military and technical aid. I do not agree. Such aids may temporarily serve an apparently good purpose but they will never imbue the people of these countries with the character and spirit which moves and drives individuals and peoples to fight for the privilege of assuming responsibility. Freedom grows out of the assumption of responsibility; it has no other source. To personally or collectively face up to the challenges of responsibility is the price of freedom.

Little more than 100 years after the charter of 1663, Carolinians joined in a war and fought and died for the privilege of assuming the responsibilities of independence and self-government. I wish that the people of all the restless and underdeveloped countries of the world today could be taught and made to understand and take unto themselves the lessons that may be learned from the example of early Carolina. Let us remember them, too. Our system is established; so let us look to its maintenance.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marked the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II of England. We North Carolinians proudly trace our American heritage to this historic document.

When the charter was granted, North Carolina as we know it today is estimated to have contained but 2,000 people. They had emigrated to a wild, unexplored, undeveloped wilderness seeking religious and political freedom and an opportunity to improve their economic status. From this humble beginning, North Carolina has grown to the point where our State now contains over 4½ million people.

We are all rightfully proud of the advances our State has made in agriculture, industry, education and the arts during three centuries of progress. The emphasis in North Carolina today is on industrial expansion and the improvement of our educational facilities, in short, on the future. This is well and good because no civilization can progress by resting on its oars and reliving the past. But as the French poet Lamartine said, "History teaches everything, even the future."

So I think it is important that in the year 1963, which marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the charter from which comes North Carolina as we know it today, the attention of the people of our State and the Nation should be focused on some of the lessons to be learned from the past. Our forefathers brought representative government to this land and they earned their freedom by a great outpouring of blood, sweat, and tears. Many of us take this heritage too lightly. We can all glibly recite the things we feel we have a right to expect from our country but many fail to realize that there is a corresponding obligation. The North Carolina General Assembly in 1959 established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and the commission is planning a series of festivals and ceremonies designed to refresh the memories of our people about some of the significant events in our State's great history.

A cordial invitation is extended to our fellow citizens from the other States of the Union, and to friends from abroad, to visit North Carolina during this tercentenary year. They will find that North Carolina indeed has a glorious past and a bright and promising future.

The Congress of the United States recognized the importance of this anniversary by creating a North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission composed of four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House, and seven members appointed by the President of the United States. I am very proud to serve as a member on that Commission by appointment of the Speaker of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject on which I just spoke.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of this House to developments involving the Federal Republic of West Germany and the United Arab Republic, with respect to the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction, that I regard as a grave threat to peace and stability in the Near East.

These events indicate a need by our Government for closer scrutiny of West Germany's role in NATO.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the active collaboration of German scientists and German industries in the efforts of Colonel Nasser, dictator of the United Arab Republic, to perfect rockets with radiological and bacteriological warheads for use in the destruction of Israel and other countries in Nasser's aggressive designs on his neighbors.

In justifying the nefarious work of German scientists and technicians, authorities at Bonn are trying to hide behind a cloak of spurious legalism all too reminiscent of the "laws" of the Nazi era under which Germans perpetrated horrendous deeds and later said they "were only doing their duty."

German morality may now be reasonably questioned at the very time we hear demands from Bonn for stronger influence in NATO and nuclear weaponry. Instead of contributing a fair share to the peaceful development of developing countries in cooperation with the United States—and I must stress the prosperity of German economy—some Germans are irresponsibly seeking to grow even more prosperous as merchants of death catering to the treacherous Colonel Nasser.

Bonn has as much governmental responsibility to keep radiological and German rockets out of Egyptian hands as the United States has to prevent its citizens and industries from doing similar work for Castro Cuba, which, incidentally, is a good friend of Nasserite Egypt.

I wish to direct attention to the following authoritative news reports pertaining to the situation I have described.

FOUR HUNDRED GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILE

(By Antony Terry)

BONN, March 23.—In Egypt's closely guarded missile center Project 333, near Cairo, nearly 400 German scientists and technicians, most of them from the wartime German V-2 missile center at Penemunde, are working on the first Egyptian-made rocket missile with warheads containing radioactive materials designed for President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Details of this work have been known to Bonn authorities for some time and have caused some concern here.

Israeli anxiety over the military effects of Egyptian rocket development on the power balance in the Mideast at a time when talks on federation of Egypt, Syria and Iraq are getting underway has led to the recent "underground war" by Israel agents in West Germany.

Their aim has been to buy off or scare off German experts engaged on this rocket work.

Though their efforts have been widespread and, according to some German sources, as efficiently organized as Eichmann kidnapping commandos, they have met with only moderate success.

VANISHED MYSTERIOUSLY

One of the West Germans who vanished mysteriously last September is Heinz Krug, a former insurance clerk who ran a firm with headquarters in Munich, whose job was to purchase materials and technical equipment in Europe for Egypt's missile research and construction.

After the war and before joining the Egyptians, Krug was a member of the German research physics under West Germany's best known missile expert, Prof. Eugen Saenger, who was among the first to advise Nasser on his rocket program. Saenger is reported to have received a $5.6 million fee for himself and his German team. Saenger was persuaded to return to West Germany and is now teaching in West Berlin.

West German authorities believed for a while that after Krug vanished and left his family in Munich that he had defected to Israel. When he disappeared, he was said to be in the company of "an Egyptian visitor" and information since received from Cairo showed that documents this man was carrying were forgeries.

But West German intelligence has since received hints that Krug, who was more a businessman than a scientist, may after all have been wanted by the Egyptians—for having tried to doublecross and sell information on his purchasing group to the Israelis.

TAKEN BY TWO OTHERS

Krug's place has since been taken by two other German scientists who normally work in Egypt. One is Paul Gercke, the electronics missiles guidance expert whose 25-year-old daughter, Heidi, is alleged by the Swiss authorities to have been pressured by two Israeli agents who were arrested by the Swiss police earlier this month after they had tried to get her father to join the Israelis. Bonn security authorities have been watching rival activities of Israeli and Egyptian agents in their competition for West German missile experts with growing anxiety. The Bonn constitution gives every West German citizen nominal right to work where and for whom he chooses and the Bonn Government claims it has no power to direct labor or stop the German scientists and technicians from selling their specialist knowledge to the highest bidder.

UNREPENTANT NAZIS

Nevertheless, it is known that the hard core of the German scientific colony in Egypt are unrepentant Nazis, many of whom fled there after the war with avowed aim of helping the Arab world with scientific know-how to continue the fight against the Jews. In addition to Israeli protests, the Egyptian Government has also been flooding the West German security authorities recently with details of the alleged activities of Israeli commanders in West Germany who are trying to intimidate the German rocket experts.

Egyptians, for instance, provided Bonn with full details of passports accidentally left behind by three men who fled after alleged shooting up of another rocket and electronics expert, Hans Kleinwechter, who was on visit to Loerrach near the Swiss-German border a month ago. Egyptians showed that passports were forged and in names of persons living in Egypt at the time of the incident in prison there.

REAL TARGET

Egyptians also showed that official signatures on passports were forgeries. Throughout the story runs the name of Professor Saenger, West Germany's most prominent rocket expert, who was employed by the French Government after the war and for whom many of the German rocket missile team have worked, including both missing Krug and near-assassination victim, Hans Kleinwechter, as well as Gercke who was involved in the Swiss arrests incident this month. A prominent figure in the Egyptian atomic missile team in Cairo is known by West Germans to be Prof. Wolfang Pilz, another Saenger man who during the last war was on Wernher von Braun's staff in Peenemünde research station designing the V–1 flying bombs and now heads the German missile research team in Cairo.

Pilz was the real target of one of the mysterious powerful bombs which exploded on being opened in Cairo and killed five persons. The parcel bomb and letter, which also exploded destroying an eye of Pilz's secretary, was posted in Hamburg and police there are trying to trace who posted it. One major success for the Israeli efforts to sabotage Project 333 has been Austrian Prof. Otto Joklik who was a member of President Nasser's missile research group in Cairo. Joklik one of two men arrested by Swiss police, alleges that while in Cairo he discovered Egyptian plans to use radioactive materials in warheads of new rocket missiles and was so shocked by the discovery that he refused to continue work and offered his help to Israelis. Since leaving Cairo, he has appealed to other Austrian and German scientists working there to follow him.

[Usually reliable sources in Cairo say Swiss, Italians, and Spaniards as well as Germans are employed on jet aircraft and rocket research in the United Arab Republic, according to the Associated Press.

[They said Germans engaged in rocket research are believed to number no more than 10 and that none is engaged in rocket production.

[A spokesman for the West German Embassy in Cairo said he felt an estimate that 400 Germans are working on secret U.A.R. projects is exaggerated. Other sources put the figure in excess of 250.

[Some West German experts live in closely guarded apartment buildings in Cairo. Others have homes in the suburbs.]

A-THREAT TO ISRAEL BEGAN IN 1954 WHEN GERMANS ARRIVED IN EGYPT

TEL AVIV, March 23.—The affair of the German atomic scientists in Egypt, which Israelis see as a growing threat to their survival as a nation, all started 9 years ago, when the Arab-Israeli border warfare was nearing its peak.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, then new to office, was seeking new allies against Israel. He concluded an arms deal with the Soviet Union, and his representatives also began enlisting likely Germans.

The first group of West German technicians arrived in Egypt in 1954. They helped to establish an iron and steel plant—now producing 300,000 tons annually. A growing stream of German scientists has followed them during the past 2 years.

According to Israeli information, they now number almost 500, and have succeeded in laying the foundations of Egypt's heavy industry and war plant. These items include the construction of an atomic reactor plant for the production of heavy water, a jet aircraft factory, rocket and missile installations and bacteriological and poison gas warheads.

Prof. Otto Bahn is said to be engaged on the construction of a nuclear reactor with a planned capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. When completed, this will be considerably bigger than Israel's Negev reactor and will be the largest in the Middle East. Its plutonium production will only theoretically enable Egypt to produce atomic bombs.

The rocket installations, which he considered the most menacing aspect of the German contribution, are believed to be situated in Helouan.

Concern over the Egyptian rocket development program has increased considerably since the launching of four Egyptian rockets last August—the Al Zafir (Victor) of 180 miles range and the Al Kahir (Conqueror) of 360 miles. Commenting on these launchings, President Nasser then said they were capable of reaching "just south of Beirut"—thus including Israel's entire territory.

In an interview on the Israeli radio this week, Eugen Saenger, who once headed the German rocket team in Egypt, expressed his willingness to work for other countries including Israel. He also said that President Nasser would not be able to launch military rockets within the near future due to a number of technical reasons.

Two particular problems are hindering the rocket program, Israelis believe. The first is the question of accurately guiding the rockets. The other problem is what warheads the rockets should carry.

According to an Austrian who worked in Egypt and has since been arrested in Switzerland as an Israeli spy, the Egyptians are experimenting with genocidal weapons, including so-called death rays, biological and bacteriological warfare and poison gas.

It is feared that German scientists also are trying to help the Egyptians develop a cobalt warhead. A cobalt bomb would scatter radioactive particles over large areas: this also falls into the prohibited weapons category.

Some light on possible ties between the Bonn Government and Egypt's rocket development program are disclosed in a letter written by Sanger's Stuttgart lawyer, Adolph Karch, to a correspondent of a German press agency.

It pointed out that "the Egyptian Government undertook to put at the full disposal of the German Federal Republic all the results of the (rocket) development works and, as the occasion arises, to also put at German disposal the Egyptian ground installations and launching pads for such German experiments as could not be carried out in the Federal Republic."

The original of this letter, dated August 14, 1962, has been shown to this reporter.

The Knesset (Israeli Parliament) this week proclaimed that "the German people cannot absolve itself of responsibility for the continuation of this vile work." The resolution also said: "It is the duty of the German Government to put an immediate end to this dangerous activity of its citizens and to take all steps required to prevent this cooperation with the Egyptian Government."

Alvin Rosenfeld, correspondent for New York Herald Tribune, reported from Jerusalem:

"This week's session of the Israeli Knesset was in fact sitting in judgment on Premier Ben-Gurion's policy of conciliation with postwar Germany, according to the influential and respected Israeli newspaper Haaretz.

"This and other bitter editorial comment in the wake of the Knesset resolution appeared to reflect a deep public resentment of Germany's position and a revival of the old wounds and memories of the Nazi period. It seemed clear that Ben-Gurion's policy had suffered at least a psychological defeat which may postpone full Israel-German reconciliation.

"The Knesset session had been forced upon a reluctant government by the opposition. The overwhelmingly approved Knesset resolution was more strongly worded than the government's official statement delivered in Parliament.

"The liberal nonparty Haaretz, known for its staid responsible views, noted with surprise that Ben-Gurion was not at the Knesset session—he is officially on vacation—and said the Premier had good reasons for not appearing. Ben-Gurion's pro-German policy had once been acceptable to the Israeli public, Haaretz said, 'but he went too far in his belief that in Western Germany we could find an anchor in all storms.' "

GERMANS BUILDING ROCKETS FOR NASSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have given careful attention to the reports of the last several days concerning the German role in the development of rockets, reportedly with radiological and bacteriological warheads, by the United Arab Republic.

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic openly proclaims that he is developing a powerful arsenal of military rockets for the destruction of Israel. There can be no doubt in the minds of the many German scientists and technicians, bearing valid German passports, who are in Egypt perfecting these rockets, that the weapons are intended for the completion of Adolph Hitler's goal, the mass murder of the Jewish people. Nor can the German industries exporting parts and equipment for rockets and weapons systems have any reasonable doubts of the use intended by Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that West Germany has defaulted on a grave moral responsibility by permitting Germans and German interests to help Nasser effectuate his aim to destroy those escapees from German barbarism who now reside in Israel. This is definitely not a technical or legalistic issue of what the Bonn Government can or cannot do to influence its scientists or industrialists.

What this is, Mr. Speaker, is a test of the German conscience and the pious professions of sorrow over the murder of 6 million human beings merely because of their religion. I refer, of course, to the Jewish people whose survivors are seeking to rehabilitate themselves in the democratic new State of Israel.

I might note that Israel is sending its scientists and technicians abroad to help the new countries of Africa and Asia. But they, unlike the Germans in Egypt, are bringing medical skills to heal the sick and agricultural skills to feed the hungry and construction skills to shelter the homeless. I cannot understand how any civilized German scientist can go to Egypt, in view of the events from 1933 to 1945, to build vicious bacteria warheads or warheads using radioactive waste materials or any kind of rocket at all.

Bonn could quickly enough find applicable laws and authority to prevent German scientists from going into East Germany and building the same kind of dreadful weapons. Yet the zealous and efficient German technicians and scientists, unrepentant Nazis among them, are now working with the Soviet-trained and Soviet-equipped Egyptian military force.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by the blindness of the West German authorities to the humanitarian aspect involved and blindness to the desire of civilized people for peace and stability in the Near East, and even German blindness—or defiance—to President Kennedy's policy against proliferation to small nations of mass destructive weapon systems.

The time may have come, Mr. Speaker, for us to more carefully observe the alleged maturity of West Germany as a leader of NATO, a nation which wants to be entrusted with more say on use of thermonuclear weapons that may seal the fate of all humanity.

I have made known my deep concern to the Department of State on these matters and will continue to observe developments. I am certain many other Members share my hope that the West German Government will assert the stature of a truly new Germany by terminating this dangerous foolishness in Egypt.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, among the Nation's leading supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is President Barnaby C. Keeney, of Brown University, who has this to say on the subject:

> It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements of lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

The American Council of Learned Societies has also shown great interest in this subject, and published in its newsletter of November 1962, a most interesting article by Gustavo O. Arlt, president, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. President Arlt quoted from the Seaborg report, the important policy statement issued on November 15, 1960, by the President's Science Advisory Committee, which I should like to call to your attention at this time:

> Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.
>
> We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth.

This statement was signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, immediate past director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, president of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and others.

I am introducing a bill today to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments. This measure would also expand the present activities of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

I include as part of my remarks the article by Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States which was published in the November 1962, newsletter of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Also, as part of my remarks I include a speech by W. McNeil Lowry before the Association of Graduate Schools which was published in a recent issue of the Art Journal of the College Art Association.

Mr. Lowry is director of the Ford Foundation program in the humanities and the arts. His speech was delivered at the meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools which took place in New Orleans, October 24, 1961. It is a very important and highly significant speech.

The former Federal Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has said:

> The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

In conclusion I include the text of my bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, and to expand the activities and programs of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

The above-mentioned material follows:

A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION? [1]

(By Gustave O. Arlt)

On July 17, 1962, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, arose in the House of Representatives and began a lengthy speech with the following words:

"Mr. Speaker, there is a pressing need today for Federal legislation that will build up nationwide support for the arts and humanities, on a basis comparable to the support that is provided in other areas, such as science and technology. Progress in the arts and humanities is essential to true national strength."

These are strange words, indeed, to be heard in the Halls of Congress. Fifteen years ago they would have been branded as subversive. Only 3 years ago they would have been called incompatible with, even adverse to, the national interest. That they could be spoken in 1962 in the introduction of a bill in support of the humanities and the arts indicates a remarkable change in the attitude of Congress toward American higher education.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when universities and colleges financed their own teaching and research, when professors expected no subsidies in support of their creative work, and when graduate students were grateful for a small stipend for teaching or for grading papers. No one had heard of a research grant, let alone a contract. A Guggenheim fellowship represented the pinnacle of the hopes and aspirations of the dedicated scholar. And this condition prevailed more or less in all departments and disciplines in the university. The chemist and the philosopher, the physicist and the art historian—all were supported equally well and equally badly. As a result, academic society was homogeneous and virtually classless, for where no one is rich no one is poor.

This academic homogeneity extended down into and pervaded the graduate student body. The student in languages had no reason to cast envious eyes at his colleague in biology because one had as good and as poor a chance at a small fellowship as the other, and when they received their degrees they had equal prospects of a poorly paid instructorship. As a result there were no status problems and academic excellence rather than field of study constituted the badge of distinction.

---

[1] This article is also scheduled to appear in the December 1962 issue of the Journal of Higher Education.

This classless utopia came to an abrupt end about 1940 when the Federal Government discovered that the natural scientist had something to offer that the Nation badly needed. Almost overnight the universities became purveyors of scientific expertise and the Government became their best, perhaps only customer. Before the end of the war, hundreds of scientists in scores of universities, along with thousands of their students were subsidized to perform research in physics, chemistry, and the biological sciences.

But this was only the beginning. The Nation had become science-conscious and its leaders were not about to let the universities relapse into their comfortable prewar torpor. The establishment of the National Science Foundation was inevitable and it was only surprising that its budget for the first year was a mere $3.5 million. By 1961, of course, this meager budget had risen to $261.7 million, and in fiscal 1963, the National Science Foundation aims to spend $360,800,000. But even these impressive figures are dwarfed by the sums disbursed through the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These various agencies between them support some 12,000 to 15,000 predoctoral and postdoctoral students annually by nonduty fellowships and traineeships. In addition, an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 graduate students in the sciences and engineering hold research assistantships paid from Federal funds.

It hardly seems necessary to document what is now called the imbalance between the natural sciences and the humanities, but a few comments and conclusions from recent studies are pertinent. Both Bernard Berelson in "Graduate Education in the United States" and James A. Davis in "Stipends and Spouses" have made use of the same NORC survey of graduate student finances. This survey is somewhat misleading for our purposes since it does not differentiate between Federal support and subvention from other sources. It tends, therefore, to obscure the full extent of the imbalance. Nevertheless, Berelson concludes that "the sciences, including engineering, are at a clear advantage over other fields" (p. 149). Davis, whose entire book is devoted to graduate student financing, is naturally much more specific. He says, "In every comparison, natural science students are more likely to have high aid than social science and humanities students" (p. 62). "Over-all, natural science students have a marked advantage over their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities. Seventy-nine percent have some sort of stipend, as contrasted with about 60 percent in social science and humanities, and in every subcategory their stipend holding is higher. The extreme is in research assistantships. One out of five natural science students is an RA compared with one out of nine students in social science and one out of a hundred in humanities" (p. 60).

On the faculty level the contrast is, if anything, even more marked. In 1961, the National Science Foundation alone awarded 611 fellowships to persons of faculty rank (postdoctoral, senior postdoctoral, and science faculty). The figures for NIH, AEC, and NASA are generally comparable. In the humanities fields, on the other hand, postdoctoral and other faculty awards are virtually nonexistent, with the exception, of course, of Fulbright and a few other specialized awards that are available to all fields."

No one intended, of course, to relegate the humanities and the arts to an existence in obscurity and poverty and, in a sense, they were not so relegated. They were actually no poorer and no more obscure than they had been in the prescience era. They had become poor and obscure only by contrast with their affluent and distinguished neighbors. But relative poverty and obscurity are as painful as though they were absolute. And even in Academia, much as it hurts to admit it, affluence and public recognition bring with them enhanced academic status. (Of the 60 graduate deans in the land-grant universities, 47 are in the natural sciences, 8 in the social sciences, and 5 in humanities.) At any rate, there is no question that the financial imbalance has brought about a status imbalance in our universities, both on the faculty and graduate student levels, that constitutes a very real threat to higher education.

As one of the results, the number of students entering graduate study in the humanities fields is declining and there are some indications that their quality is deteriorating. In the past 5 years the production of Ph. D.'s in the humanities, arts, and social sciences has not kept pace with the overall increase in all fields nor with the needs of the colleges. In some areas, as for example history, the supply is already critically short of the demand.

Ever since the early 1950's the educational associations, the universities and colleges and the U.S. Office of Education have tried to secure legislation that would help to restore some sort of balance in the lopsided academic world. In 1958 they almost succeeded. In that year the Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act which was designed to stimulate advanced study and research and particularly to expedite and improve the training of college teachers. Under its various titles it provides for graduate fellowships, student loans, summer language institutes, subsidies for courses in critical languages, and for experimental programs in new educational media, including television. For the humanities and the arts, title IV, the graduate fellowship program, seemed to offer the greatest hope, since it provided 1,500 3-year fellowships without any apparent restriction by field of study. And, indeed, in the first year approximately 32 percent of these fellowships were awarded in the arts and humanities fields and 26 percent in the social sciences. But as soon as the lists of awards were published the Congress wanted to know what possible relation to national defense could be claimed for folklore, art history, and ancient languages. When the awards for the second year were to be made, the House Committee on Labor and Education drew up a sharp directive forbidding fellowship awards in fields that had no direct connection with national defense, and specifically naming ancient languages, literatures, and history; arts, folklore, music, philosophy, and religion. No protests availed and the tabu against the arts and humanities still stands. No awards in the prohibited fields were made last year nor will any be made this year.

But perhaps this is a very good thing. For since this drastic congressional directive, a swelling chorus of voices has been raised on behalf of substantial aid to the arts and humanities as well as of those social sciences that are not recognized by the National Science Foundation. Some of the voices came from expected sources: the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools, the presidents of many liberal arts colleges. But some came from unexpected sources and were therefore all the more welcome. On November 15, 1960, the President's Science Advisory Committee issued an important policy statement which has since become known as the Seaborg report. Its introduction includes the following significant paragraphs:

"Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.

We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth."

And this statement is signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, President of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanograph, and others.

On December 15, 1961, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, said in a speech before the Council of Graduate Schools that he believed the time was ripe for legislation in support of the arts and humanities and that he would wish personally to introduce such a bill in the 88th Congress. He has further evinced his continuing interest, suggesting preparatory steps to be taken. At the same meeting, Dr. Robert M. Lumiansky, provost of Tulane University, proposed the establishment of a national humanities foundation, specifically defining the term "humanities" to include the fine arts and certain of the social sciences.[2]

In the past 6 months, interest in Federal aid to the humanities has been building up rapidly and there are indications that a favorable climate is developing in the Congress. Various formats have been suggested, three of which seem to be gathering more support than others. The first is the establishment of a national humanities foundation, patterned after the highly successful National Science Foundation. The latter is a unique cross between a private foundation and a Federal agency which has the dual function of setting science policy and of supporting basic research and education. It is governed by a 24-member National Science Board, appointed by the President for 6-year terms, plus a director. The national humanities foundation would be similarly organized and governed and it would support, besides the humanities and the arts, those social sciences which are not included under the National Science Foundation.

The second program proposes the expansion of the National Science Foundation into something like a national arts, letters, and science foundation, with at least two governing boards and perhaps a coordinating body. This type of organization is favored by some Members of Congress who are disturbed over the growing number of agencies disbursing Federal funds for education. Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, for example, has pointed out that the current

---

[2] ACLS Newsletter, vol. XIII, No. 1 (January 1962).

Federal outlay for 689 education programs is $2 billion, administered by 40 separate agencies. "This," she complains, "makes it impossible for any Member of Congress to know what is going on."

A third proposal is the establishment of a bureau or an institute within the Office of Education, charged with the specific support of the arts and humanities. This would place the ultimate control of the activity in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This proposal naturally has the support of the Commissioner of Education, and probably of the administration, but it might not find much favor in Congress and it would not satisfy the Council of Graduate Schools.

On April 17, 1962, the executive committee of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States voted unanimously to support the first of the three proposals, that is, the establishment of a national humanities foundation. As a second choice, it would reluctantly support a national arts, letters, and science foundation, but it would accept a bureau of an institute in the Office of Education only as a last desperate resort if all else failed. A fourth proposal to meet the situation by amending and expanding the National Defense Education Act received no support whatever.

Early this year, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY of Rhode Island drafted a bill for support to the arts and humanities which he introduced in Congress on July 17, 1962. He calls it the Cultural Development Act of 1962 and it is carried on the House docket as H.R. 12560, a bill to establish a national institute of the arts and humanities.

This institute is to be located in the United States Office of Education and is to consist of a Federal advisory council on arts and humanities and a director and staff. It is authorized and directed to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities; to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or other nonprofit agencies; to provide through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals or through arrangements by contract or grant with institutions of higher education for the conduct of institutes or seminars for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel needed to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities.

The Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities shall consist of 24 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for terms of 6 years each. They shall be persons eminent in the education in or practice of the arts and letters; they shall be selected solely on the basis of distinction; and they shall be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by the act. And finally, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to employ a Director of the Institute and a staff of not more than 20 professional and technical persons to carry out the functions of the Institute.

It is apparent that Mr. FOGARTY, in outlining the format of his Institute, has drawn freely from the sucessful model of the National Science Foundation. Like the latter, his plan also provides for a 24-member Federal Advisory Committee plus a Director and staff. The chief difference here is that the Science Board is appointed by the President, while the Arts and Humanities Board is to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, the functions of the two organizations are similarly defined as far as the differences between their fields permit. This, of course, is all to the good; it is always sensible to follow a sucessful pattern.

Since the bill was introduced so late in the year it obviously could not expect action by the 87th Congress; nevertheless its introduction has served a very good purpose. It gives the learned societies and the educational associations an opportunity to clarify their thinking on the type of organization they wish to support and it gives them time to build up nationwide interest. Mr. FOGARTY has indicated that the does not insist upon the format now provided by his bill but is quite ready to alter it to meet the needs and the wishes of those concerned. He says, very reasonably, that he wants to provide the kind of support that the humanities and the arts need in a form acceptable to them and to the Congress.

So far, this account has been nothing more than a dry, objective report of the present efforts to provide Federal financial support for the humanities. This reporter, however, whose academic life was dedicated to language and literature, cannot refrain from adding an editorializing conclusion. He need hardly begin by saying that the realm of the spirit in the life of an individual, of the Nation, and of the world is of equal importance with the realm of science. Nor need it be said that the Nation and the world today need spiritual, ethical, and esthetic leadership at least as sorely as they need scientific leadership. Granted that we need scientific leadership to survive, we need spiritual leadership to make survival worthwhile. There was a time when these sentences were axioms. Perhaps they still are today.

A great deal has been written in the last two decades about the ailing humanities but there is little agreement on the nature of the ailment. The only certainty is that the humanities have been relegated to a place of secondary importance, not only in the world at large but unhappily also in the academic world. Our teachers and scholars have gradually accepted this inferior position and, as the strong grew stronger, the weak grew weaker. And today we suffer not so much from financial impoverishment as from status impoverishment. No one can deny the crying need for financial support of our scholarly and creative activities but no one can be so pragmatic as to believe that money alone is the panacea for all our ills.

What we need is reassurance of the validity of what we study and teach and practice. What we need is public recognition of the importance of the humanities and the arts to our system of higher education, to national welfare, and to the life of the individual. This means restoration of the principle of universality and indivisibility of learning. It means equal availability of opportunity accorded to all disciplines—not necessarily equal dollar support. It means, therefore, the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, parallel in structure, administration, and status to the National Science Foundation. Or it means the establishment of a National Arts, Letters, and Science Foundation, dedicated to the support of the entire edifice of higher education on an equal and impartial basis. Anything short of the establishment of one or the other of these agencies would not constitute restoration of balance and equality of discipline. An Institute or a Bureau or a Division in the Office of Education—no matter how much money it might disburse—would only serve to accentuate the status distinction between the natural sciences and the humanities and deepen the schism in higher education. The healing of the schism is the gravest problem that we face today.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

(By W. McNeil Lowry)

(The following discussion on the university and the creative arts was prepared for an audience of graduate deans under conditions noted in the first two paragraphs of the text. It is admittedly one sided: I had suggested to the Association of Graduate Schools that a professor of drama, music, or the visual arts be given a hearing on the same program. The AGS urged me to take the role of prosecutor, with the promise that its committee on policies would keep the subject on its agenda and afford opportunities for rebuttal. I am confident that readers of the Art Journal will take up the debate and thus help to clarify many of the issues involved in university training in the arts—W.M.L.)

I hope I have the sympathy of every member here who has read the report of your committee on policies in graduate education. When the committee in that report reaches the problems of higher education in the creative arts, it says:

"The facts of what has occurred are not fully available, however; nor, we believe, is there widespread understanding of the national conditions in the arts which have led to the present trends.

"The committee recommends no action by AGS on the subject. Instead, it has invited Dr. W. McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, who has long been concerned with the state of the creative arts in the United States, to discuss with us 'The University and the Creative Arts.'"

So I am on the spot. You are too, of course, for at the very least your committee has given me a clean slate upon which to write, and though I recommended it they were unable to associate with me upon this program a member of an arts faculty who might really know something about the problem from the inside. Furthermore, if I remember my academic politics, few fine arts, music, or theater professors ever become graduate deans, so there may be none in the audience who will feel like talking back.

My own dilemma remains the more acute, nevertheless, because there are too many ways to begin in analyzing the place of the creative arts in higher education and the impact upon the arts of what the universities do about them. Let us stipulate at the outset that the limit to what I can do today is to raise provocative questions, in the conviction that your committee on policies will keep the subject on its agenda for 2 or 3 years at least. To cover any ground at all, I can not even leave everything I say in the form of questions, and at times I shall have to appear dogmatic without, I hope, being so.

We could spend a great deal of time on the historical developments which have led deans of graduate schools to concern themselves with the relevance of education in the creative arts to the objectives of a university, but for the most profitable discussion the historical background must be treated in summary fashion. In the early days of the Republic private tutors were the source of education in music and the visual arts, creative writing was a thin adjunct of formal education, and only elocution had a remote connection with the theater arts. In 1804 a society of artists and their friends formed the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Its original purpose was the professional instruction of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, but it was thought necessary to collect works of art from the past in order to guide potential artists, and regular training in the history of art was launched. (It is at least worth noting that most of our oldest American museums in the same way grew out of independent art schools.)

It was not until the days of Charles Eliot Norton that history and interpretation of the fine arts became a really proper subject for concentration in those private institutions of higher learning that had their roots in the classics. Until then painting and sculpture (and music too) had been treated as sketchy backgrounds to history. Even in the second and third decades of this century, the students of Paul Sachs at the Fogg were chiefly young men who were destined to take over the museum directorships of the country, for which, as one of them said to me recently, their qualifications were "70 percent social and 30 percent professional." By 1934 a special study of the subject showed that the history of art was well entrenched as a major discipline in both private and public universities, and every college had art appreciation and at least one course in art history. Today's graduate student in the fine arts only rarely trains for curatorial work in a museum. He finds in college or university teaching more sustained opportunities for his own scholarship, higher pay, and more fringe benefits than our financially hard-pressed museums can offer him.

The 1934 study to which I referred also showed that not only the history and appreciation but the practice of art had invaded the universities. Led by the public institutions, the universities had started a process which was less conscious than gravitational but which since 1934 has had a profound impact upon the future of the independent art school and upon art and the artists as well. By 1950 rising costs of operation in the independent professional schools were sharpened by an increasing loss of student tuitions. It was now possible to major in painting or sculpture in State supported universities with lower tuitions, and more important, one could gain a regionally accredited college degree while doing so. Many parents who had only mild enthusiasm for their son's or daughter's desire to become an artist insisted that he or she at least gain the passport to a marketable vocation like teaching. Independent art schools in the past decade have faced a bitter struggle for survival. Many have not survived, many have joined the opposite camp and merged with nearby colleges or universities in their programs, a few have taken leadership in gaining regional accreditation without sacrificing too many professional studio requirements, and only a very few have maintained intact a tradition that was always Spartan financially anyway.

As the universities increased their offerings in studio practice, the professional teacher was joined by the professional artist, first as an artist in residence and then as a regular member of the faculty. The principal economic base of the contemporary American painter and sculptor today, even among the top rank, is university and college teaching. In many ways these men were interlopers upon Olympus so far as historians of art were concerned, and in the early 1950's fine arts deans of the Midwestern State universities had to lead a revolt in the College Art Association to give the practice of art and its practitioners greater recognition within the fraternity. When the president of a small liberal arts college became the president of Harvard, he asked whether Harvard students too should not have some of the liberalizing benefit of aesthetic practice, and there followed a report on visual instruction at Harvard University which still can engender heat between disciples of the künstgeschichte and those who believe that students should be allowed to play with colors on canvas, if only as a sort of extracurricula activity.

I can myself attest to the liveliness of the controversies occasioned by the university's assumption of professional art instruction as a legitimate part of its curriculum. For 4 years in our program in the Ford Foundation we discussed with art historians, museum directors, artists, independent art school heads, and representatives of teachers colleges the need and timeliness of a national study of higher education in the visual arts. Our ultimate aim was to see such a study made under the most objective conditions, with the interests of the artist, the museum director, and the independent art school head as firmly maintained as the interests of the historian of art. Success, as always, came in personal terms, meaning in this case the breadth and judgment of the study's director, and 6 days ago we announced a grant of $180,000 to the College Art Association for an independent study to be led by Andrew Ritchie, director of the Yale University Art Galleries and formerly curator of painting at the Museum of Modern Art and director of the Albright Gallery in Buffalo. Two years from now you and I should know a great deal more about what is going on in your institutions in at least the visual aspects of the creative arts.

Among the many things we already know is that the normal course requirements for a liberal education and even the minimal concentration on technical practice, when put together in a university required more than 4 years and hence a new kind of degree, the master of fine arts. In a few institutions the doctorate itself has been modified to include a program that consists not primarily of history and theory but practice in art.

And the process I have sketched for the visual arts has been paralleled in music, the drama, and creative writing. Independent drama schools, never very strong in the United States, as well as the much stronger music conservatories have generally decayed as the universities, nominally at least, have taken over some of their functions. As your committee on policies has said in its summary:

> "Since the 19th century, a steady migration to the campuses has occurred of types of instruction that formerly took place largely in independent schools and institutes. Training in the creative arts has joined this procession. Academic institutions now increasingly perform functions that formerly fell chiefly to independent drama schools, art institutes, music conservatories, and other forums of personal instruction not associated with educational institutions of more general purpose. [And] modern universities seem increasingly to be expected to offer instruction in the creative arts beyond the bachelor's degree."

So much for what has happened. Its implications range far more widely and intricately than we shall have time to discuss today, but the most important of these are, I think, clear, as is their relevance to your own responsibilities. Before coming to analyze the implications, however, I must digress for a moment to sharpen the frame of reference. There are some ways in which the arts are involved with university education which create no problems either for the objectives of a university or the state of the arts in the American society. But the professors of drama, music, and the visual arts for various reasons are on the defensive in many ways, and it is necessary for any critic to say what he is not talking about as well as what he is.

Let me state, therefore, that in analyzing the condition your committee has noted I am not concerned with university education in esthetics or in the history and theory of music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, the dance, or any other of the creative arts. Perhaps it is necessary to say this because we can recall that in the generations shortly preceding ours even the literatures written in contemporary tongues were not considered proper subjects for scholarship, particularly of the advanced sort prescribed for graduate students. Twenty years ago I myself was a witness to a tiny change in this fashion when I became the first student in a very large graduate department ever to have the privilege (if that is the word) of writing a dissertation on a living author.

At any rate, I am assuming in this discussion that neither the undergraduate nor the graduate deans in the universities you represent have any special problems from the inclusion in the curriculum of musicology, theater history, the philosophy of art, the history of painting, and other such courses. This is, I take it, what we all mean when we include the fine arts, music, and drama in the humanities, whether we are talking about liberal education for the undergraduate or whether we are trying to get more of society's money into the support of doctoral and postdoctoral scholarship. As some of you know, in the Ford Foundation's support of humanistic scholarship through either the postdoctoral fellowships offered by the American Council of Learned Societies or our subsidies to new material published by university presses, we have tried to stress the importance to the humanities of musicology, art history, theater history, and aesthetics generally.

There is another large area I should like to except from the discussion, and this is harder to do because in one way it can be thought of as the crux of the whole matter. Throughout history institutions of formal education, primary, secondary, or higher, have generally afforded some opportunities for students with a taste for the arts to express this taste in peripheral or informal ways. It was only in our own century that one of these ways became the course in so-called appreciation of art, a curricular practice hard to defend unless such courses are taken in addition to a full and formal schedule. It has always seemed to me that the appreciation of literature, for example, can best come through a fairly rigorous course in literature, and similarly for the other arts. The more traditional ways—chamber music societies, the opportunity to participate in a dramatic performance without regard to courses in acting, literary clubs—all help to enrich the experience of young people living together in an educational community. I think this rather large and general view was what actually motivated President Pusey when he asked whether formal art history and the existence of the Fogg Museum really gave the Harvard undergraduate all the benefits of the visual arts as a means to the liberal education of the individual.

But these two digressions into which I have wandered forcibly bring us back to the subject of the university and the creative arts. The objective of undergraduate education in the humanities, I assume, is the liberal education of the individual; the objective of graduate education in these disciplines is the training of scholars competent to grasp a whole corpus of systematic knowledge and subject it to philosophical analysis. What is the relevance, to either of these objectives, of training in the techniques of painting, acting, directing, dancing, instrumentation, musical composition, creative writing, or any other branch of artistic creation? Can such training, given the objectives of a university, be offered under what are known as "professional" standards? If it cannot, what importance should the university attach to it? If it can, what are the problems to the university of adapting professional training in the arts to its other, more primary objectives?

If we look back at the historical timetable by which the university expanded its role in the creative arts, we find an almost exact coincidence with the growth in the American society of the vague idea that "the a-r-t-s are somehow good for people." Some of us have long hoped that the sources of money in the United States, private or public, individual or corporate, would find a greater share for the professional arts. That greater share for the arts is actually becoming visible, though by no means as yet proportionate to the importance of the arts in any society. But largely it is becoming available to the amateur artist, rather than the professional. So-called cultural centers are on the drawing boards in many U.S. communities; somehow in our country businessmen or municipal and State officials appear to think that art begins with real estate. But by far the greatest number of these centers have no professional performing groups as components; many of them are to be built by State funds and will use State university budgets as the financing vehicle. It seems that we are to have the audience before we are to have the creators and performers.

Whence does this audience come? It is my belief that it has come largely from the increase in the proportion of our population that has been university trained. The whole phenomenon of that segment of our theater known as off-Broadway is supported, for better or worse, by an audience that has been educated in colleges and universities. Abstract expressionism is kept alive, critically and otherwise, by allied interests. The most consistent proportion of ticket buyers (though not of patrons) of the Metropolitan Opera is found among the physicians, very few of whom, I imagine, ever had courses either in singing, in musical composition, or even in the history of opera. Some of the richest and most varied concert programs outside our largest cities are supported in State university communities. And there are numerous other examples to be cited.

They all would seem to support the idea that the arts are somehow good for people, and given the nature of our democratic and laissez-faire economic society this evolution within it is undoubtedly a necessary step in the development of cultural resources. But it antedates (by how long a period we can only guess) any realization that it is the highly talented and professionally trained artist on whom all depends; it lacks as yet, in short, discrimination as to what the arts are really about. And if I have given the university the bulk of the credit for providing a new audience for the arts in the United States, I feel I must also give it a strong share of the blame for the lack of discrimination visible in that audience.

How did all this come about? I think, to put it bluntly, the university has been having it both ways. It says on the one hand that its function is the liberal education of the individual, and exposure to the creative arts is merely one avenue toward that end. It acts on the other hand as if it were training young people for vocations, and not merely the vocations of scholar or teacher of the arts but the vocation of the professional artist per se. Let me illustrate what I mean generally from two contrasting art fields, one in performance and the other in creation.

The best equipped theaters in the United States are not those in which professional actors appear but those maintained by the universities. The drama is quite legitimately an important vehicle for liberal education, and this is what university administrators say when forced to defend the existence of both the theater and the theater department. It is not the university's function to train professional actors and directors—historians of the drama, of the theater, and of stagecraft, yes, but not performing artists per se. So far, so good. But in the catalog are course sequences not only in theater history or dramatic literature but in acting, directing, technical direction, costuming, even in theater management. And the university, through its accreditation to grant degrees if not through its tuition, competes with the few remaining independent drama schools for the student who thinks he wants to make the theater a career. Such a student will be expected, of course, to take many other subjects in fields he would not have time in which to concern himself if he were apprenticing as an actor in a resident company or would not be required to take in a professional drama school. From these subjects he is expected to receive the balance of the liberal education for which the university intends him. But if his university career is the only training as an actor the young person either expects or knows how to obtain, then for him this is his professional training. It goes on, generally, in a well-equipped theater, but also generally with amateur directors and amateur acting ensembles, and if criticized at all, criticized again by amateurs. He is told by the professors that academic theater stands for the classical, cultural, or avant garde theater, in contrast to Broadway, which is commerce, though with its large budgets and a few great stars Broadway may now and then produce a work of art. He is told that university productions are often "better than Broadway." But in any event, the young actor normally is led to believe that there is nothing in the American theater between academic theater and Broadway; this is the choice given to him; and he leaves the university to beat a path to New York or Los Angeles, where he joins hundreds of other young actors who have been similarly indoctrinated. The fact that he still has not had a professional apprenticeship, and that this is all he is ready for, is ignored. To the theater professor who stays behind, there is always the consolation that if the young actor does not make his way into the professional theater, he has had a liberal education and that is the university's objective anyway. Since, as you must realize, the opportunities for serious actors in spoken dramas are steadily being curtailed on Broadway, the supply of frustrated young academic theater products becomes greater and greater.

I ask your indulgence to quote at length from the analysis of a talented academic theater director, Prof. James H. Clancy of Stanford University. He is talking about a recent opportunity he had to test in Europe Giraudoux' hyperbole that theater is "the only form of a nation's spiritual and artistic education." I quote:

"But unfortunately this is not the sense in which the word 'education' is applied to much of the 'theater in the school' with which I am most familiar [in the United States]. Here the word has been used variously, but most frequently to make palatable the fact that art was neither the possibility nor the aim. This frightened and furtive use of the word 'education' resulted not only from technical incompetence [and helped perpetuate it] but also from faintness of heart and spiritual debility. One of its results has been to produce a strange dichotomy in many of the institutions of higher learning that profess the dramatic arts. On one side tend to be the 'researchers.' Their results may be useful in the theater when and if the artist finds a meaning for them, but they are material to the artist in the same category as any other material. In this sense the theater will possibly find more use for an intensive study of Pepys' diaries than of a calendar of the production at Drury Lane in the last half of the 18th century—although the latter is apt to be considered, mistakenly, more directly the provenance of the department of dramatic art.

"On the other side of this uneasy dichotomy are the 'practical' theater men who, sure of the myopia of their colleagues on the 'research' side, are not troubled by their own astigmatism. Sensing the artistic unlikelihood of the Drury Lane Calendar they remove themselves scornfully from such 'ivory tower' considerations, forgetting, if they ever knew, that the ivory tower and its dreams are an important and necessary extension of reality, and not a substitute for it. Caught in their centripetal activities of box office, billing, and good, clean entertainment, they soon come to regard the construction of a flat as more important than its function [poor Gordon Craig, he didn't know how to stand 'em up in Moscow] and that the values of a play can be best judged by the number of people who can be cajoled or chivied into attending its performances. Working in an institution such as the theater which is fortunately still primitive mechanically, the educational theater is fast developing a large group of extremely competent men who are 'practical'—about the major matters of unimportance.

"One thing, it seems to me, the college or university is eminently fitted to do for the education of the artist: serve as the source of what I can only think to call chronological integration. The university has traditionally served as a repository of the past, a place where the experiences of past generations are sifted, analyzed, and interpreted. Social pressures outside the academy, plus the political pressures of world events, tend to prevent the contemporary artist from becoming a racial or geographical segregationist, but the university can be a major aid in preventing him from developing into a chronological segregationist, producing a gauche and baseless form of 'art moderne' that serves only to express his dissociation from the streams of humanity. This does not mean, God knows, that the academic theater should persist in archeological reconstructions of presumed theatrical methods of the past. The academy rightfully preserves the past only when it constantly interprets in light of the present: it maintains the past by demonstrating its imminence. It helps create the future by demonstrating its continuance."

Let me turn now from the performing to the creative arts. In my introduction I sketched the process by which economic and popularizing forces turned hundreds of would-be painters and sculptors from the independent art schools to the universities. The burgeoning of university curriculums in the practice of painting and sculpture since 1950 has coincided with the supremacy of a particular artistic style—call it action painting, the New York School of Abstract Expressionism, or whatever your favorite term may be. For good or bad, this style in painting particularly lends itself to intellectual and technical imitation even by those young artists who have not had 2 or 3 years of rigid grounding in drawing and design. The result is that we now have a new academic style that has spread throughout college and university studios almost without check. A couple of years ago I was examining student paintings submitted from a variety of institutions as a part of the requirements for admission to an independent art school that will not take candidates before their junior year in college. "You know," the instructor said to me, "each time I leave the room and come back, I couldn't for the life of me prove that all these paintings weren't the work of the same person."

Another result of great importance to all of us whose first interest is in the professional arts, is the effect upon the painter or sculptor who has been brought into the university to teach his craft. This is a subject I hear about all the time in the running conversations we keep up with artists. A few enjoy teaching as a second vocation and believe their own creativity does not suffer from it. Some enjoy teaching while believing their own work does suffer. The great majority endure teaching as a means of livelihood, suffer the fact that there may be only two or three students a year in whom they glimpse any potentialities of talent, agonize over that portion of their own creative quotient which ends in the canvases of amateurs, and yearn for the unlikely year when some agency like the Ford Foundation may permit them simply to paint. Unanimously, even including those who believe their own creativity does not suffer from teaching, the artists to whom I have talked are bitter about the fact that their students are handed to them in groups and they have no voice in screening or selecting them.

One of the first sculptors of his generation chose to go without a regular livelihood when he came to the United States 14 years ago rather than teach students he himself could not select. He was merely more courageous or more optimistic than his colleagues, who are probably equally dedicated to the old atelier system in which social democracy was not allowed to excuse the total absence of talent.

I think you will by now have foreseen my first conclusion: The university has largely taken over the functions of professional training in the arts but in the main has sacrificed professional standards in doing so. The absence of discrimination has proceeded partly from the strong popularizing currents already at work in the society outside the campuses, and partly from the university's original objective, the liberal education of numerous individuals drawn from an affluent democracy.

You may be somewhat more surprised at my second conclusion: The trend is irreversible. The future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists, and second, upon the provision of postgraduate opportunities for professional apprenticeship removed from an academic environment.

My final conclusion is a mixture of pessimism and optimism: The requisite shift in the university environment for the arts will be achieved only under great difficulties, if at all. Opportunities exist for new forms of cooperation between the university and professional institutions in the arts, provided the university will regard the arts as important and give financial support to the cooperative mechanisms that must be established.

I shall proceed to elaborate on the last two conclusions and to single out the implications for the university graduate school.

As Director of the Ford Foundation in Humanities and the Arts, it has been my privilege since 1957 to study not only the trends in the arts but the ways in which the arts are now or can be financially supported. It is as a result of this latter study that I am convinced we can not reverse the migration to the campuses of all forms of training that formerly took place under independent auspices. There are still many individual patrons of the arts, despite the income tax, but the motives of many of these are largely social and they like to support buildings or performances. Many of them also like to support education, but they think of education in terms of schools and colleges. Organized donors, such as corporations, put education first in their philanthropies, though they still, as you know, do not give the maximum allowed by law. The proportion they give the arts again chiefly reflects the social interests of individual patrons in the arts. The foundations grant much more money through universities and colleges than through the professional arts. When Government bodies come into the act, which in this country is rare, they too act either for public institutions in the arts or for the interests of the schoolchildren.

Academic deans coping with deficit financing in their annual budgets may not make the best audience to which to say it, but the fact is that so far as artistic training is concerned the universities have the money. The retiring president of Indiana University has often said that the State institution in our generation has taken over the regional role in the arts once played by the German princeling and later by the German stadt. He was not thinking merely of training the would-be artists, either. He was thinking of providing Indiana communities with musical and dramatic performances and with art exhibits, both professional and student. But if we think only of training in the creative arts, the future is clear. An enterprising academic theater director in Texas runs a repertory theater in a $1 million building in Dallas with M.A. candidates at Baylor University in Waco. The same illustration emphasizes another reason why individual and organized donors prefer to support the amateur artist in universities. It is safer to give money to people like yourselves and the institutions you represent, and though the donor may get less of the beautiful he gets at least as much of the good and the true.

In short, I think you and I were probably in agreement before I started that except for a few institutes and conservatories that may (and only may) survive our generation, except for a peculiar art like ballet in which the practitioners are already too old if they wait until college age, the university of the future will get the first crack at most potential artists. My question today, and it goes first to your undergraduate deans, is whether the university can change the environment on one part of its campus while holding its traditional atmosphere on another. It does not help to say you have done so on the agricultural campus or in the physical education school. The requisite atmosphere for professional training in the arts is somewhat more subtle than that in the dairy barns or in the locker rooms.

What is that atmosphere? It is easier to describe it than to analyze it. I have met it frequently in the 50-odd cities I have visited, often three or four times, in my personal fieldwork in the arts. I have encountered it most often in two otherwise quite unrelated institutions—the independent school of art and the resident theater company. Even at first blush, the independent art school looks different from the university art department, and not because the models in the latter place generally wear halters and shorts. And the resident theater's atmosphere, contrasted to that of the academic, is not merely a product of its physical inadequacies. (It may interest you to know that the capsule report of the European drama training expert, Michel St. Denis, after his first trip outside New York, was of the amateur work going on in wonderful university theater plants and the truly professional work going on in a few cramped cubbyholes.)

No, the Spartan effect one detects in professional environments is not merely physical, though that situation is general. It has much to do with the drive or fanaticism or whatever of the person who has made his choice, and will eschew anything else—money, the elite identification of a university degree, even health—to develop the talent he hopes he has. It comes also from the pride of doing for oneself, of making ends meet, of giving society what it will pay for even if what it pays is inadequate to sustain a normal life, of working in the midst of a fraternity that will show the same fanaticisms and abnegations. It comes from the endless time, time, time spent on doing one thing, only one thing, and then starting all over again. It comes, finally, from the acceptance of such distortion as a way of life, a way of life, you will note, that is in some ways completely antithetical to the ideal objective of a liberal and humane education. Some of the most professional, the most talented, and the most mature artists I have met lack either the time or the capacity to sort out a decent personal life from the endless hours of their artistic concentration. Only a rare heredity or early environment and not, I am afraid, a very good education, has given some of these artists a humanity that separates them from the talented bums in their midst.

I shall waive the question whether you even want this sort of atmosphere on your campuses, and go instead to whether you can have it if you want it. The best answer is, I do not know. But despite that, there are some implications more obvious than others. The most obvious is that if the university is going to allow the student's distorted concentration on hardnosed doing and redoing it, it cannot also require of him all the courses in humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences that are even minimally thought to constitute a liberal education. The university can, of course, stretch out the years to be applied, as it has done in the MFA. But there is a limit to that adjustment. I have already noted that the ballet dancer, starting at 9 years to train her body as her artistic instrument, knows she must forego the university completely, at least if the potentiality of a professional career still seems good by the time she is 18. There is a real question whether under professional conditions an actor, even if he spent 5 years in college, could leave more than 2 hours a weekday in those 5 years for anything but rehearsal or performance. It is not an accident that the university now probably does a better job in training the musician than in training other artists. Historically there have been so many branches of the musical art required of a training musician that the universities have allowed more concentration in that program. And secondly, the most technical accomplishments of a musician are more easily tested than those of an actor, a writer, a director, or even (these days) a painter. But again it can be argued, as the musicologist, Paul Henry Lang has done, that "pseudoscholarship is the fateful consequence of the indiscriminate mixing of university with conservatory." (Lang was commenting at the time on the University of Michigan's announcement of a doctoral program in piano.)

Another obvious implication of my general argument is that neither the professors of the creative arts nor the students can be selected for a professional curriculum and atmosphere according to the patterns now employed in universities. No one has found the litmus paper that can make a positive or a negative test for artistic talent, or even for artistic drive, which would help us almost as much in this context. But drives can be isolated for identification if certain choices are forced. Roughly 80 percent of the university students now concentrating in one of the creative arts have chosen to major in art education; they are insuring their ability to have a second vocation if the first fails. For four-fifths of the students, then, I would be so dogmatic as to say no special atmosphere, no distorted concentration need be attempted. By all means excuse them from none of the normal requirements of a liberal education. Let them hunger for the true. Their hunger for the arts is not fanatical enough. They are not, as Brooks Atkinson once said about talented theater directors, hopefully crazy. I would recommend that the universities screen creative arts students twice: once by their own choices, as I have indicated, and again by the choice of the individual teacher after the student has had a term or a year of the distorted concentration for which I am groping to find other words.

Selection of the directors for a truly professional training in the arts will be difficult. But in one stroke, the university will have a wider field of talented artists from which to choose if the reform I have just recommended is taken and the teacher is allowed to have his atelier of potential talents by his own selection. I think this principle from the training of painters and sculptors should be extended to performing artists and to composers and to writers, as indeed for the last named it has already been in many universities. Another obvious corollary is that the man who is trained to teach theater history is not necessarily qualified to direct a play, any more than the historian of arts is qualified to teach painting or sculpture.

The concentration of courses and the selection of students and faculty, though difficult, are probably more feasible than the creation of that intangible atmosphere of professionalism to which I referred a few moments ago. I do not want to be misunderstood; I am not suggesting that the universities simply borrow outright the curriculums and atmosphere of independent institutes and conservatories; I am certainly not suggesting that these independent institutions have done a perfect job in the professional education of the artist. They have not, and today they cannot, because already they have found themselves unable to compete with the universities in the salaries and tenure and fringe benefits of faculty. When I cited the atmosphere of the independent art school and the resident theater company, I was citing an intangible spirit and not model institutions for training. How to translate this spirit into a very different location is problematical. Yet undoubtedly the spirit is a product of motive and procedure, to a large extent, and the changes to which I have already alluded may help produce it. To face the necessary distortion of the primary objective of a university, to reflect that distortion in a highly concentrated curriculum, to open that curriculum only to the students with the most fanatical drives, to give to the artist-professor responsibility for testing both the drives and the talents—these motives and procedures may go part way toward producing a professional atmosphere. That is as strong as I can put it confidently.

There is one other possibility, again by analogy. Wherever Spartan restrictions are logical and natural, they should be applied to the whole enterprise of professional training in the arts. Nothing so much as the raw need to survive pares a resident theater or other institution in the arts to the essentials of professionalism or makes it a better place for hard-nosed apprenticeship. It is fortunate that universities by and large have well-equipped theaters and concert halls, and fairly adequate painting and music studios. It is still possible, perhaps, to emphasize repeatedly that what goes on inside is of prime importance and real estate of only secondary. One of the most influential of all theater departments has flourished for years in shockingly inadequate quarters.

I said earlier that the future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists and, second, upon the provision of opportunities for professional apprenticeship through nonacademic persons or institutions.

Most of these opportunities, I believe, will be found only when the student is ready to leave his undergraduate career. Not all of them, however. At the University of Utah, for example, mature professional actors are mixed with each student dramatic production. Indiana, Minnesota, Catholic University, and others give graduate and sometimes undergraduate students experience in the trials of the touring theatrical company. Minnesota hopes that Tyrone Guthrie will use some of its student actors in small parts at the new repertory theater going up in Minneapois. And so forth.

In the past 3 years a few universities have been groping toward other developments in the arts, You are all conscious of the festival seasons and seminars involving professional artists on the campus; it would be difficult to assay the lasting impact of these on undergraduates training in the arts. A more important innovation is the idea of maintaining on the campus a professional resident theater company as a cultural resource on a footing with the library. Only the Extension Division of the University of California at Los Angeles has to date pulled it off satisfactorily, and there the secret was actually the long mailing lists of southern Californians addicted to any kind of adult education. Princeton University's experience was instructive, for good and for bad. With the McCarter Theater a white elephant on its hands, Princeton decided it would have two short seasons in the performing arts including the theater. But the university did not want to put much money into the enterprise, so its original plan was to give the professional director and actors 4½ days to rehearse each play. I had occasion to point out that Princeton would not start off a new science laboratory in that fashion and expect the result to reflect the institution's own standards. But as the agenda before us today suggests, the universities are still groping for new patterns in the arts, and I am sure we are all sympathetic to the attempt Princeton is making. Harvard did not have a white elephant, and through the generosity of an alumnus built its own new and challenging theater. To date, however, so far I have learned, this theater is destined as another extracurricular home for the undergraduate.

If they will move in still more unorthodox fashion, the universities can build many more cooperative mechanisms for students who are graduating or have become postgraduates. Our own program in the Ford Foundation affords illustrations; I shall cite two in contrasting fields. Young composers, most of them holding advanced degrees, are selected to write music directly for performance by high school orchestras and choral groups. You are no doubt aware that young composers generally must write for their filing cases rather than for performance, and you may not be too old to recall that the repertoire of even the best high school musical organization is deficient in contemporary music. The other example is the so-called theater communications group, which among other aims, will attempt to point out to both the most talented undergraduate actors and their professors where the young actors may get a year-round professional apprenticeship instead of going off to beat the streets of New York and Los Angeles.

The field for new modes of cooperation between the universities and artistic groups in the same or more distant communities in 1961 appears very wide. I say this rather confidently because my mail and my fieldwork bring me new ideas for such cooperation almost daily. I am even more confident that these artistic groups expect either the universities or the foundations to support such mechanisms, and they are realistic enough to know that a national foundation does not expect to give widespread support to local activities. Theatrical and musical organizations want your students as paid audiences; they will take the best of them as paid apprentices if you will put up the money, and if you want to give them graduate credit for such apprenticeships, that is all right too. Museums want to join with you in the training and retention of curators and directors (as is already being done in half a dozen places), but again they want you to find the money for this.

As administrators in important and complex institutions, you, of course, are most conscious of the fact that raising the funds for existing activities is already a difficult undertaking. But I presume we are talking of the future, too. And I believe that in addition to the trends your Committee on Policies has noted, there is an inevitable trend toward a greater sharing of both your facilities and your funds by community institutions in the arts, particularly and most extensively when your funds come from the taxpayers of your States.

The choice you make in this decade may be crucial for the arts, because already the universities have drifted along with the society in the perpetuation of the amateur and of the imitator. It would be very discouraging to think that your efforts and your financial resources, like most of those being utilized in other quarters, could be expended toward a greater and greater popularization of standards. Whether you can make a home on your campus for what I have called distortion as a way of life, I do not know. If you cannot, I hope you will confine all your activities in the arts to historical and theoretical treatment.

When President Wall came to talk to me about this session, he said you would all be prepared for the fact that in addressing myself to the subject of "The University and the Creative Arts" I would have to speak largely without distinction between the undergraduate and graduate schools, and this is certainly what I have done. But I think whatever specific advice I have to give about graduate curriculums has already emerged from the contest. Just to recapitulate it, however—

Graduate schools, it seems to me, have two responsibilities for the creative arts. One is very old and one is very new. The very old one is to recognize the history, theory, and esthetics of the arts as legitimate subjects for scholarship and research on a par with any of the other humanistic disciplines. The very new responsibility is to support new forms of cooperation between the university and truly professional institutions in the arts, however small or financially pressed such institutions may be. The training resulting from such cooperation will largely go on outside the campus; it will be unorthodox; it will have to be extemporized; but it will not be any less integral a part of the university than many of the scientific and other institutes which you all have tucked away here and there. Whether you will give graduate degrees for such training, and which degrees, I am not prepared at the moment to argue.

Unless and until such new forms can be developed, however, I would not want, if I were a graduate dean, to give either credits or degrees to technical (as distinguished from historical) proficiency in the arts beyond the first year. Under present conditions, the best service you can perform for the potential artist is to throw him out. If he is more interested in the shadow than the substance, in pretense than in intensity, he will readily find his enclave somewhere else anyway. And if he just should happen to be an artist, he will begin his long and painful education. No play was ever more dramatic, no musical composition more evocative, no novel truer to the imagination merely because its author was given a Ph. D. for creating it. And that is probably the safest thing I have said this afternoon.

H.R. 5140

A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cultural Development Act of 1963".

TITLE I—MISCELLANEOUS

Findings and purposes of Act

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds that the vitality, quality, and further development of the arts and humanities in the United States are matters of profound national interest, and that the preservation and extension of the Nation's cultural resources requires that the Federal Government provide appropriate encouragement and support to public and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, and associations engaged in education in, sponsorship of, or otherwise advancing, artistic and cultural interest and activity. The Congress also finds that the many Federal programs and activities which involve, or which affect or are related to the arts and humanities should be assessed and evaluated in terms of their impact on American culture, and, insofar as it is practical, be coordinated and related to broad cultural needs and objectives.

(b) While the Congress strongly affirms that individual initiative and personal choice are the inviolable characteristics of American art and culture, it recognizes that government has a responsibility to help assure that conditions in our society encourage creativity. Increasing urbanization and population growth, greatly increased leisure time afforded by industrial and agricultural technology, early retirement, and extended lifespan and related factors have created an enormous need and opportunity for the pursuit and enjoyment of cultural interests. The failure of our society to meet this need and to exploit this opportunity would be a tragic blow to the general welfare of the American people.

(c) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a means by which the Federal Government can render effective assistance, in ways entirely appropriate for government, to efforts to encourage cultural development.

Assurance against Federal interference

SEC. 102. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization, or association.

Definitions

SEC. 103. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(3) the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia;

(4) the term "nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations" means those organizations described in section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(5) the term "art" or "arts" means both the performing and the nonperforming arts, including but not limited to music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, and the dance; the term "humanities" includes modern and ancient language and literature, history, and philosophy; the term "culture" or "cultural" is used more broadly to characterize the whole range of interests and activities that promote the enlightenment and refinement of the public in intellectual and esthetic matters.

Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of Advisory Council

SEC. 104. (a) Any member of the Federal Advisory Council appointed under this Act, who is not a regular full-time employee of the United States, is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 105. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

TITLE II—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 201. There is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Institute of Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Institute"). The Institute shall consist of a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Council") and a Director and staff.

Functions of the Institute

SEC. 202. (a) The Institute is authorized and directed—

(1) to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities and in the advancement of culture;

(2) to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities, including the evaluation of such activities, through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations;

(3) to promote and advance education in the arts and humanities by the production or commissioning, collection, and dissemination of films, records, tapes, reproductions, or printed matter suitable for use in courses or lectures in the arts conducted by schools, colleges, and universities, or other nonprofit institutions engaged in providing education in the arts and humanities;

(4) to maintain a central clearinghouse of information covering the various aspects of the arts and humanities in the United States, including activities of other Federal departments or agencies, and to make such information available to the public;

(5) to provide, through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals (within the limits of such sums as the Congress may specifically appropriate for this purpose), or through arrangements (by contract or grant) with groups specified in paragraph (2) for the conduct of institutes or seminars, for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel who, in the judgment of the Council, are in short supply and are most needed by educational and other cultural institutions and agencies to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities; and

(6) to render consultative and advisory services to other Federal departments and agencies, State and other public agencies, public and other nonprofit educational agencies and institutions, and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations concerned with education in or advancement of the arts and humanities.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the Institute shall place primary emphasis upon the educational aspects of the arts and humanities but it shall interpret "education" broadly so as to include all levels, conducted formally or informally by both public and private groups specified in paragraph (2) for the benefit of people of all ages.

(c) The Commissioner shall render an annual report to the Secretary for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Institute and making such recommendations as he may deem advisable. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Council.

TITLE III—FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 301. (a) The Council shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Secretary, and of the Institute Director ex officio, and shall, as provided by this Act, advise the Commissioner in the exercise of the authority granted to the Institute by this Act, and advise the Secretary on national needs relating to the arts and humanities in the United States. The persons appointed as members (1) shall be eminent in the education in or the practice, performance, administration, criticism, or promotion of the arts, letters, or cultural interests of the United States; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council (except that of the Director) shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of members first appointed after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the Secretary, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years.

(c) The Secretary shall call the first meeting of the Council, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman. The Institute Director shall be secretary to the Council.

(d) The Council shall meet at least once annually and at such other times as requested by the Commissioner. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum, and each member shall be given reasonable notice in writing of the call of a meeting.

(e) The Chairman and the Vice Chairman shall be elected by the Council at the first meeting for a term of two years, and at every succeeding annual meeting occurring at the end of each such two-year term, except that a vacancy in either office may be filled by vote of the Council.

(f) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Council pursuant to its authorization, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Authority of Commissioner

SEC. 302. In order to carry out the functions of the Institute, the Commissioner shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act (other than title IV), including but not limited to the authority—

(1) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the Institute's operation and organization and personnel;

(2) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for the administration of this Act;

(3) to make grants or enter into contracts or other financial arrangements as authorized by title II, except that such grants, contracts, or other financial arrangements shall be limited to those recommended by the Council, or by a committee of members established by the Council for this purpose;

(4) to make advance, progress, and other payments in connection with contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(5) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(6) to receive and use funds donated by others, provided that such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to further one or more of the general purposes of the Institute;

(7) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by law for persons serving without compensation;

(8) to employ such personnel as he may deem necessary to carry out the functions of the Institute under this Act, not to exceed twenty of which may be technical and professional persons including the Director of the Institute compensated at rates not to exceed $19,000 per annum without regard to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; and

(9) to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

TITLE IV—FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

SEC. 401. Section 3(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) to promote and support activities, projects, and education in the arts and humanities in order to encourage and assist cultural development in the United States in conjunction with the programs provided in titles II and III of the Cultural Development Act of 1963."

SEC. 402. (a) Section 4(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "education, or public affairs" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "education, the arts and humanities, or public affairs";

(2) by striking out "scientific leaders" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "leaders in these fields"; and

(3) by striking out "other scientific or educational organizations" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "other organizations in the fields of science, the arts and humanities, and education".

(b) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) A Division of the Arts and Humanities."

(c) The first sentence of section 9(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(except that in the case of the Division of the Arts and Humanities six of the members shall be eminent in the arts and humanities and five in other fields)".

(d) Section 9(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "activities".

(e) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting after "engineering, and other sciences" the following: ", and for study or work in the arts and humanities,".

(f) Section 11(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "such basic scientific research activities" and inserting in lieu thereof "such basic scientific research and other activities".

(g) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

(h) Section 11(i) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

GREECE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here in this distinguished hall in the first week of spring in the year 1963. Each year at this time we celebrate the end of the long cold of winter, and the promise of the fine warmth of summer soon to come. It is a day of joy. But it is something else. It is the day on which we celebrate the freedom of a tiny nation. On a map of the world it is scarcely a dot, it is so minute. But on the great map of time and civilization it looms like a veritable Colossus, like a towering mountain of learning and culture. The sands of time may have many footprints, but the prints of this nation walk across all the Western World, and indeed all the Eastern World. It is the day we celebrate the freedom of the great nation of Greece.

The very name conjures up haunting memories.

There is the memory of art. We remember the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, and among them the great statue of Zeus by Phideas, and the splendid temple of Artemis at Ephesus and the Colossus of Rhodes by Chares. We remember the splendor of the Doric, the Ionian, and Corinthian temples. From across 2,000 years the sculpture of ancient Greece reached its magic hand to form Michelangelo Buonarotti, and still haunts the beauty of Rodin today.

There is the memory of poetry. All of us have learned the wonders of epic poetry from Homer. All of us have encamped outside the walls of Troy with the avenging Greek Army; and all of us have wandered the world with Odysseus, with the distant memory of Penelope haunting the pages of these great books. We remember the odes of Pindar and the lyric poetry of Sappho.

We remember also the drama. There were the great and moving dramas of Aeschylus, with long forgotten death of Iphigenia still waiting to be avenged upon the head of Agamemnon. Sophocles is the one we most remember, with the enormity of the tragedies of Oedipus and Antigone still towering over the world today. And Euripides with Elektra. They are the great foundation stones of the drama, and so well were they written that when Rome turned to the drama, she achieved greatness only when she translated the Greeks, and even in the 20th century, the greatest of American dramatists, Eugene O'Neill, turned back to the Greeks to frame his own dramas, with Euripides and Sophocles walking anew in the pages of "Mourning Becomes Electra."

We remember the wars of Greece. We remember their strength when they stood against the tyranny of the Persians. We remember Thermopolae, and we remember Marathon.

"The mountains look on Marathon
And Marathon looks on the sea
And musing there an hour alone
I dreamed that Greece might still be free.
For, standing on the Persian's grave,
I could not deem myself a slave."

So spoke the poet Byron in "Don Juan," and so indeed speaks all the world when we read anew those tales of heroism, when a small nation stood against the power of an enormous empire.

We remember philosophy. We read again the works of Socrates, of Plato, of Aristotle. We walk through the grove of Academe with the men who came to be taunted, prodded by Socrates. We sit with Plato at the feet of Socrates, and we stand in awe before the ponderous mind of Aristotle. Their footsteps echo like distant thunder all through the history of Western philosophy, and for the great minds of each age, there is that moment when in desperation they turn again to the greatness of the Greeks.

We remember their politics. We stand in awe before the minds which first set up a system of government so similar to our own. We know that if these souls returned from the shades of the past, they could sit beside us in this very house, and could deliberate with us; indeed, would add new notes of wisdom to our deliberations.

These we remember, and these are only part of the greatness of Greece. I sat beside the Greek Orthodox Bishop Iakovos only a week ago when he was honored at a dinner in my district. After a long evening of moving speeches he rose solemnly, knowing that this would be an audience difficult to hold after all the other talks.

Ladies and gentlemen—

He said—

this is a great nation, with freedoms unheard of, especially freedom of speech. But for every privilege there is a price. Tonight the price of freedom of speech is patience.

I assure you, the audience was his, and listened to the wise words of a man who has been chosen president of the World Council of Churches.

Today we celebrate the freedom of this nation. For nearly 400 years Greece was a captive State in the Ottoman Empire but the seeds of freedom would not die and in the war for freedom from 1821 to 1829 Greece proved she had a right to stand among the nations of the modern world. In 1830 her freedom was guaranteed by the nations of the West.

There is a lesson in this for all of us. The freedom of Greece stood strong at the end of the Second World War when the power of communism sought to crush out the flame of freedom, but they fought with bullets and ballots and Greece is a free nation today.

The wisdom of Athens has prevailed over the power of Sparta. The love of liberty that burned brightly at Marathon still burns even brighter from the heights of the Acropolis today. When men look at the awesome brute power of Moscow standing upon the bodies of so many enslaved nations today, let them remember to ask, "Where is Sparta today?" And if Khrushchev is proud of his name among the nations today, let him remember that we all remember Sophocles and Aristophanes, and Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle, and Phidias, but who remembers the tyrants of Sparta?

Today we can all look with Byron at Marathon. Today we can celebrate the freedom of Greece, and if the course of history runs true, tomorrow we may celebrate the freedom of all the other oppressed nations of the world. In the strange course of history, in the not too distant future children may ask in puzzlement, "Who were Mao Tse-tung, and Stalin and Khrushchev?"

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 45th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia. Like millions of other oppressed victims of Soviet colonialism, the people of Byelorussia today live in conditions near slavery behind the Iron Curtain. However, in coordination with representatives and spokesmen for other captive peoples, Americans of Byelorussian origin are maintaining the struggle for freedom of the land of their forefathers.

Therefore, this 45th anniversary of Byelorussian independence takes on additional significance since it serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the people behind the Iron Curtain, and that the determination of all anti-Soviet peoples continues to be the fundamental weakness of the Soviet Union.

In comemmorating Byelorussian Independence, I join the other Members in encouraging them in their perseverance and hope for national independence through the principle of self-determination, and remind the brave Byelorussian people that they do have the sympathetic alinement of other captive nations who, in the cause of justice, must eventually triumph in their drive for political and economic liberty and freedom from the Soviet colonial yoke.

NATIONAL VISITOR AND STUDENT CENTER

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a "19-whereas" resolution that would lead to the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia.

Most of the whereases deal with the reason why we should have an adequate information center here in Washington, D.C., so that the millions of people who come here every year—and it is estimated that over 15 million people visit here each year—may have a better opportunity to benefit from seeing the memorials, the Capitol Building area, the Library of Congress, the Archives, the Art Gallery, and all the other things that can be seen here. This resolution calls for the creation of a committee of 20: 12 Members of Congress, 6 House Members and 6 Senators, to be appointed on a bipartisan basis; the Superintendent of National Capital Parks; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; 2 distinguished citizens to be appointed by the President of the United States; and 2 members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

This bill calls for the study of the feasibility and advisability of having such a center here in Washington, patterned after the one you can see in Williamsburg, where people may go, park their cars, go into an information center, be refreshed, and see a film demonstrating the historic role of this community.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, my resolution proposes the appointment of a Commission which will carefully study and subsequently report to the Congress its conclusions respecting ways and means of effectively and relatively inexpensively educating the public, both at home and abroad, respecting American history, traditions, democratic processes and devotion to peace.

To be sure, the executive departments carry on some activities toward this objective. The Members of both Houses of the Congress give preferred attention to the subject in talking to their constituents and when speaking before many groups throughout the land. But it is clear that we have neglected to take advantage of the unequaled opportunity for influencing public opinion along these lines here in the Nation's Capital.

Almost 15 million people are now visiting Washington every year. This number included delegates to some 400 conventions, several hundred thousand students and an increasing number of visitors from other countries of the world.

Despite the fact that our National Capital contains a fabulous array of historical material and patriotic shrines as well as living demonstrations of democracy at work, there is no methodical and organized method for educating the millions of visitors concerning their existence and the lessons which can be learned in them.

In my opinion an appropriate designed and operated visitor center should be provided. The Park Service has recognized this need and made a small and very inadequate start by conducting a visitor center in the Old Haines Point Sea House. The residents, particularly the business people, see this need too and have included the outlines for such a center in their plans for revitalizing the central business district. It has also been suggested that the polo field in Potomac Park which provides ample space for parking of cars and sightseeing buses be converted into a visitor center.

My resolution does not contain any specifications respecting the solution to the shortcomings to which I have referred. Its preamble recites in detail existing needs and inadequacies and outlines in broad generalities the wisdom of establishing a vast educational program to create a true image of America in the minds of our millions of visitors.

NEWSLETTER FOR MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, several of our exceptional and capable freshman Members have already written with great clarity and forcefulness on the problem of minority staffing.

One of those, who has been most active in studying this problem and urging this remedial action, is Congressman Robert McClory, of the 12th Congressional District from Illinois. His newsletter, dated March 7, in a few and well chosen words, clearly presents the need for more adequate minority staffing, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, thoughtful students on this subject, and members of the press:

Your Congressman Robert McClory Reports From Washington

A great deal is being said and written these days about minority staffing. It is important for residents of the 12th Congressional District to become better acquainted with this issue and to understand how greater minority staffing can assist their Congressman.

In the first place, congressional committees are composed of majority and minority members. In the case of the Committee on Government Operations on which this writer serves, there are 19 Democratic Congressmen who make up the majority and 12 Republicans representing the minority. This 3-to-2 ratio is roughly that of the total House ratio of 258 Democrats to 177 Republicans.

Committee staffs which consist of lawyers, researchers, writers and other specialists of various types provide committees with the assistance they require in performing their tasks. This assistance consists of factual and legal research, bill drafting, preparing of analyses, summaries and reports, and many other detailed and necessary tasks. If minority members of a committee are to be served equally with the majority, it is essential that minority staff personnel should be provided in the same ratio as the total membership of the committee. For this reason, the Republican Conference (composed of all the Republican Members) urged that 40 percent of committee staffs should be named by the Republican (minority) members of the committee. The Democratic majority in the House opposed this move, and the Republicans in their efforts to serve as an articulate opposition party have been obliged to rely on Democratic assurances that increased minority staff personnel will be furnished as required. While not an entirely satisfactory arrangement, this is a vastly improved situation.

Again, with respect to the writer's Committee on Government Operations (the so-called watchdog committee of the Congress), the majority has engaged 51 while the minority members have been allotted only 3 staff personnel. One can readily see that the staff ratio of 51 to 3 is completely out of line with the committee ratio of 19 to 12. Unless additional staff members are assigned to the Republican minority, there will be roughly three staff members for each Democratic Congressman on this committee, while four Republican Congressmen will have to share one of the minority staff members. In fairness, it must be pointed out that the staffs of some committees, such as the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees, are essentially nonpartisan and strictly professional.

But the members of the Government Operations, Appropriations, Education and Labor, and other committees have vital responsibilities to draw attention to the weaknesses of the majority's position. How, for instance, can the minority of the Committee on Government Operations point out specific objections to the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration, the TVA, the executive department's improper management of the news, the Agriculture Department's abuses (responsible for the Billie Sol Estes scandal), foreign aid waste, etc., unless the minority has the staff with which to do its job? Without adequate staffs, the minority's investigations will result in whitewashes and inactivity in areas where close scrutiny and criticism should be provided.

Respect for and encouragement of the minority party are essential elements of our two-party system. Democrats as well as Republicans should support a vocal, constructive, and responsible minority. Adequate staffing for minority members is essential in performing this role.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, partially in response to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and secondly, as a matter of clarification of the on-again-off-again attitude of the President and his deficit spending programs, I would like to point out that Mr. Kennedy is running up a deficit at more than twice the rate of the Eisenhower administration. Not that I, in any form, approve of deficit spending under any administration, either Eisenhower or Kennedy or anyone else, but I find it rather amusing that the gentlemen would refer to the increased national debt under Mr. Eisenhower, when Mr. Kennedy will have, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, upped the national debt more in 3 years than Eisenhower did in 6 years.

Also, Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. In only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8 years.

At this point, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which points out some very interesting and informative comparisons of the two administrations referred to:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 23, 1963]

A DEGREE OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In his most recent plea for a tax cut without a cut in spending, President Kennedy asserted that such a program would offer a thrust to the economy "and also a degree of fiscal responsibility."

We note that Mr. Kennedy is withdrawing, by degrees, from his earlier contention that the tax program is fiscally responsible without qualifications. And well he might. Not even the most agile economic propagandist could devise a definition of fiscal responsibility which would cover everything put forward in its name by the New Frontier.

Last summer, for example, fiscal responsibility meant delaying a tax cut because a recession did not appear to be imminent. Today Mr. Kennedy's position is that "we don't believe there will be a recession this year" but that, nevertheless, "merely because our prospects look good in 1963, I would think it is all the more pressing for us to take action at this time."

In short, what was fiscally irresponsible last year has, for reasons which may have more to do with politics than economics, become fiscally responsible "to a degree."

In his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy voiced firm opinions about fiscal responsibility. Here is what he said on November 4, 1960:

"I want to make it clear that * * * if I am elected President of the United States, we commit ourselves to a sound * * * fiscal and responsible monetary policy.

"From fiscal 1954 to fiscal 1960, the last 6 years, we increased the national debt by $21 billion. In the last 6 years, $21 billion.

"Never before in the history of the United States did any administration in peacetime have a deficit larger than this [the Eisenhower] administration in 1958, $12 billion. They would have had an increase in the debt of more than $10 billion except a Democratic Congress in the last 6 years cut the budget requests of the President of the United States by $10 billion.

"So if we are going to talk about fiscal responsibility; if we are going to talk about meeting our obligations; if we are going to talk about balanced budget; I want to look at the record.

"[The Eisenhower] administration [came to power] on a commitment to reduce Federal spending to $60 billion. It has never been close to $60 billion. They have spent 46 percent more than Harry Truman spent. They have added 106,000 new Federal employees, I think it's about time the people knew."

Very well, then, let's look at the record after 2 years of the Kennedy administration, which was likewise elected on a clear promise of fiscal responsibility.

In 3 years, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, Mr. Kennedy will have run up a cumulative deficit of $26 billion. In 3 years, $26 billion. This is more than double the Eisenhower rate. The Kennedy deficit for 1964, now pinned precariously at $11.9 billion, is almost certain to end up higher than the Eisenhower bellringer of 1958–59.

Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. And in only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8.

Mr. Kennedy cannot, with consistency, call his program fiscally responsible, even to a degree. It's time for Congress to do what Mr. Kennedy commended it for doing under Mr. Eisenhower: Cut the budget requests of the President and make certain that our fiscal policy is responsible—not by the wavering Kennedy definition, but by the definition of sensible economists and businessmen everywhere. It's time the people knew—and, fortunately, many of them already do.

GROSS MISMANAGEMENT IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT SELF-SABOTAGES U.S. MILITARY COMBAT READINESS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1963, the Comptroller General issued a report on its study of the supply of repair parts needed for combat and combat-support vehicles of the U.S. Army. This General Accounting Office—GAO—review covered the years of 1958–62.

The management inefficiencies, neglect, and irresponsibility of the U.S. Army Logistics, Ordnance, and Materiel Commands seriously endanger our defensive and offensive military commands.

The operational deficiencies for the supply of vital repair parts for tanks, artillery, and other combat-support vehicles can be attributed to the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

A partial checklist of Army installations showed the following out-of-combat-readiness vehicles due to lack of spare parts:

First. In Korea, many of our M–48 medium tanks, and other combat vehicles were out of commission due to lack of parts, some of which had been on order for more than a year.

Second. On December 2, 1960, our M–48 medium tanks were in need of 3,900 booster coil items that were in short supply, many of which were urgently needed in Korea.

Third. U.S. Army tanks and combat vehicles were out of combat readiness in the United States, Europe, Korea, Okinawa, and the Panama Canal Zone due to 994 unfilled orders for parts on December 2, 1960. Some of these parts orders had been on order for as long as 313 days.

Fourth. The lack of cylinders was putting many self-propelled artillery howitzers in Europe out of commission.

Fifth. In six Army installations in the United States, 600 tanks, artillery pieces, and combat-support vehicles were out of commission during 1960 and 1961 due to a short supply of repair parts.

Sixth. At Fort Bragg, N.C., 87 combat or combat-supply vehicles were not combat ready on March 8, 1960. Repair items had been on order for from 3 to 9 months.

In its thorough review of the Army Tank-Automotive Center, the GAO found that, on June 30, 1961, that organization had 688 active items out of stock, 260 of which were identified as essential for combat purposes.

The Comptroller General cited three specific management deficiencies that were primarily responsible for the lack of repair parts:

First, delays in awarding contracts after procurement decisions were made; second, delays in determining whether to procure; and third, delays in determining needs for parts.

In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General cautioned that his "review of unfilled orders disclosed a very serious condition. As of September 10, 1961, the ATAC had 15,662 orders outstanding for repair parts from Army installations throughout the world."

The Comptroller General's report cited an alarming number of instances which attested to the failure of this system to function properly:

> Lack of repair parts in the Army supply system contributed to the reduction in the combat readiness of certain of the Army's combat and combat-support vehicles. In addition, the lack of repair parts was the primary reason for the incurrence of unnecessary costs of over $500,000 during fiscal year 1961 by procurement of parts locally that are normally procured centrally at lower prices.

The GAO revealed that the Red River Arsenal, during fiscal year 1961, procured 184 repair parts for about $362,000. On the basis of unit prices paid for identical parts by ATAC on previous occasions, these parts should have cost only $249,000. The arsenal, therefore, paid $113,000, or 46 percent, more than ATAC would have paid for the same items through centralized procurement.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for the gross mismanagement that permeates our U.S. Army supply operations for vital parts needed to keep our tanks, artillery, and combat-supply vehicles in instant readiness. The revelations of the General Accounting Office constitute, in effect, a self-sabotage of our military capabilities.

Our Federal system of administrative management is in sore need of a major and complete reform. It lacks production objectives, production techniques, production accountability and responsibility.

Our management process encourages mismanagement and discourages efficiency and good management.

RUSSIA'S CZARIST DESPOTISM CRUSHED HUNGARY'S 1848 WAR OF INDEPENDENCE—RUSSIA'S SOVIET-COMMUNISM TOTALITARIANISM THREATENS ENTIRE FREE WORLD

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I had the honor of addressing the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland, Ohio, on the occasion of the 115th Anniversary of Hungary's 1848 War of Independence.

It was my privilege at that time to pay tribute to Hungary's great leader and patriot, Louis Kossuth.

The following is a quote from a speech delivered by Kossuth in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 3, 1852:

> Yours is a mighty republic, destined to enforce the law of nations, upon which rests the delivery of the world from an all-overwhelming despotism.

By "overwhelming despotism," Kossuth was specifically referring to the then ruling Russian Czarist Government. The Soviet-Communist depotism that we have today is both an extension and an expansion of the czarist tyranny. Kossuth was truly prophetic. The United States is confronted with an all-overwhelming threat led and directed against us by the Russian Soviet-Communist Party and government.

My address before the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland follows:

> Mr. President, Andrew Dono, reverend and, respected members of the clergy; the distinguished mayor, Ralph S. Locher, honored guests; my esteemed fellow Americans of Hungarian ancestry, I appear before you today with a deep sense of attachment by personal and ancestral ties.
>
> We share a common Hungarian inheritance of moralities, of political ideals, of culture, of language.
>
> We share an appreciation of the gay and, at times, sad emotional harmonies of Magyar music.
>
> We have a common acceptance of those highest moralities of the Christian-Judaic religions and our Western civilization.
>
> There is implanted in our Hungarian background an abiding faith and love for one's fellow man.
>
> That greatest Hungarian, Louis Kossuth, has inculcated in every Hungarian some of those political ideals upon which this great country was founded.
>
> That is why I am especially grateful to you for your kind invitation to meet with you, my Hungarian kinsmen.
>
> I extend to this distinguished Hungarian community my respects and offer you my good wishes.
>
> My compatriots, we, each of us, share a deep sadness on this commemoration of Hungary's war of independence of 1848.
>
> That was was a struggle between tyranny and freedom.
>
> It was not a new struggle.
>
> That clash has occurred in every generation since the beginning of recorded history.
>
> One-hundred and fifteen years ago, the Hungarian war had for its objectives: Political home rule for Hungary; an equal political status in a dual monarchy; emancipation of Hungarian serfs and peasants; economic, social, and political reforms to raise the status of the peoples of both Hungary and Austria.
>
> The war of 1848 was a revolution against the tyrannies resulting from the political absolutism of an aristocratic monarchy.
>
> It is appropriate to recall the events of that period.
>
> They are quite applicable to our own unrecognized struggle to maintain our freedom.
>
> In the year of 1848, Europe was in a state of political fermentation.
>
> The forces of liberty, of constitutional limitations upon government, of constitutional guarantees recognizing the sovereignty of the people, were reaching a crescendo.
>
> These popular demands were the aftermath of the American and French Revolutions.
>
> America has her Revolutionary War of 1775; Hungary has her Revolutionary War of 1848.
>
> In our own war of independence, George Washington came to the fore and carried the cause of freedom to final fulfillment.
>
> We, here today, are the beneficiaries of Washingtons personal abilities and devotion.
>
> We are the legatees of man's greatest inheritance, freedom.
>
> The testators are those heroic American soldiers and people who sacrificed 8 years of war to hand down to us our most precious inheritance.
>
> Historians record the 1848 Hungarian war of independence as a failure.
>
> They unanimously state that Kossuth's objectives and Hungary's cause were lost in that war.
>
> That is not my interpretation of the events of that time.
>
> It is not my evaluation of the life work of Louis Kossuth.
>
> No one can possibly understand the casual relationship between the noble efforts of Louis Kossuth, the war of 1848, and subsequent events unless one fully understands and appreciates the "Father of the Hungarian Revolution," Louis Kossuth.
>
> We are not gathered here today to commemorate a lost revolution or to pay our respects to the memory of the leader of a lost revolution.
>
> The Hungarian ideals of independence in the war of 1848; the Kossuth principles of the brotherhood of man were not merely vainglorious, frustrated dreams.
>
> The war of 1884 did result in the attainment of Kossuth's objectives in a very short time after 1848.
>
> Kossuth's grand designs, his platforms, his objectives were fulfilled and came to pass due almost wholly to his political leadership; to his devotion to the cause of freedom; and to his sympathetic understanding for his fellow men.
>
> These are some of the Kossuth reforms that came to fruition: Measures for the emancipation of serfs were enacted; freedom of the press was granted in both Austria and Hungary; flogging and corporal punishment were abolished.
>
> The constitutional settlement in 1867, between Austria and Hungary, was effected. This settlement was based upon the Kossuth Hungarian Constitution of 1848.
>
> Under the terms of the 1867 settlement, the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary was created.
>
> Power for concerted action within international and military spheres was centralized.
>
> Austria and Hungary were each allotted equal, separate and autonomous powers in domestic affairs.
>
> His crusade for orphanages, for hospitals, for mass education, for fiscal reforms, for economic growth, for industrialization, succeeded in bringing about an early realization of these sociological and economic goals.
>
> Kossuth's character and political ideals were influenced and patterned, to a large degree, upon the life of George Washington.
>
> As a youth, he attended that outstanding law academy at Sarospatok.
>
> Part of his catechism at Sarospatok were these questions and answers:
>
> "Who was the first man?"
>
> The answer to that question was "George Washington."
>
> "What form of government is the best?"
>
> The answer to that question was "The Republican form of Government."
>
> Although Louis Kossuth was the greatest Hungarian, he was also a great American—in his beliefs, in his heart.
>
> Louis Kossuth was a profound philosopher, an eminent historian.

He was a humanitarian above all. His most profound conviction was the brotherhood of man.

He was equally humble, loyal and devoted to his associates, to the peasants, to his superiors in rank.

He was a masterful linguist. He had a remarkable command of a beautiful Shakespearean English.

In addition to his native Magyar language, he was fluent in Latin and German.

Louis Kossuth was an eloquent orator, a fervent inspirational crusader. Yet, he was never a demagog.

He was a strict moralist, a truly devout practitioner of Christian-Judaic moralities.

Kossuth was Hungary's first modern journalist. It was his editorship and his contributions that successfully established the Pesti Hirlap.

It is said that Kossuth was proud. That is true. But it was not an arrogant self-pride.

It was a pride in the principles he believed in.

He had a mind that was conscious of its own rectitude. He zealously protected the sanctity of his grand concepts, of his moralities, of his principles.

Louis Kossuth belongs not alone to the history of Hungary. His concepts are eternal. His work will live in the recording of world history.

My friends:

Father Kossuth still lives. He holds a special place of honor in our hearts.

He remains a symbol of those rare qualities that are so lacking today, that are so sorely needed by this Nation and the free world.

His brilliant concepts provide an answer, the only answer, to these forces that threaten our existence.

Effective countermeasures against the Soviet-Communist politico-military war against all freedom, against all free peoples cannot be founded upon compromise of fundamental principles.

Survival cannot be predicated upon policies of vacillation, conciliation, compromise, retreat, and surrender.

It is a sorrowful commentary to recall that the aspirations of the Hungarian people for freedom have been brutally crushed, bathed in Hungarian blood on three occasions by Russian despotism and totalitarianism.

On August 11, 1848, General Gorgey surrendered his Hungarian Army not to the Austrians, but to the Russian Field Marshal Paskiewitisch.

Hungary's desperate struggle for freedom was defeated not by its oppressor, Austria, but by the overwhelming military forces of Russia.

In the year 1919, Bela Kun overthrew Hungary's democratic government. He cold-bloodedly murdered thousands of Hungary's leaders.

He imposed a Communist regime upon her people. He extinguished all Hungarian freedoms.

Bela Kun was a Moscow-trained murdering revolutionist. Bela Kun was the forerunner of Castro.

That revolution was conceived, planned and its execution directed out of Moscow. History repeated itself in Cuba.

It is most tragic that the State Department of the United States is so incapable of reading and understanding, and interpreting historical events.

It is only 6½ years ago, that these same Soviet-Communist murderers machinegunned the children of Budapest, in October and November of 1956.

Again, the Russian Soviet-Communist despotism crushed Hungary's struggle for freedom by brutal bloody massacre.

The security of neither the Russian nor the Soviet nation was threatened on any one of these occasions. There was never a scintilla of legitimate justification for these shocking brutalities.

We must not allow time to soften or dim the atrocities of Budapest.

The sacrifices of the children, the women, the men of Hungary will have been in vain if we do not recognize the diabolical purposes behind these events.

These massacres of Hungarian people are a prolongation of a more than 400-year-old fixed obsession for aggressionist expansion—First under Russian czarist despotism and now under Soviet-Communist world totalitarianism.

The Nikita Khrushchev who ordered military mass murder attacks upon the Hungarian civilian population is the same Nikita Khrushchev who repeatedly threatens the evaporation of the American people, you and I, with 50- and 100-megaton nuclear bombs.

The Hungarian Freedom Crusade should serve as a reminder to each of us, every day, every hour, that the same diabolical forces seek our destruction too.

The United States happens to be only a few years further away, on Mr. Khrushchev's timetable.

Today, 1963, marks another anniversary that is of critical significance to we Americans.

It was in 1933, that this Nation gave diplomatic recognition to the Soviet.

The year 1933, marks the beginning of self-defeating policies toward the Soviet and world communism.

This year is the 30th year of our shameful, ruinous policies that are based upon self-deception.

We like to believe the myth that the inherent strength of freedom, the weakness of a tyrannical government assure the United States of victory in this deadly global power war.

Many people have laid down their lives to learn the contrary.

It is not ordained by anyone that freedom cannot be lost.

It is still true that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. We have lost all vigilance.

The most honest homage we can pay to those who died in Budapest is to recognize, and to admit that freemen can, and do, die in vain.

We have become corrupted by prejudices, by false images. Chastity of mind, the stark truth, is a prerequisite virtue for a free people.

A large segment of our intelligentsia, and of those teachers and news media who form and shape public opinion offer the theory that communism is only an ideology, another political philosophy, an alternative series of sociological and economic principles.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a completely false concept of the crises that confront us.

The sociological and economic theories of Karl Marx have been proven to be fallacious almost in toto.

We are not dealing with Marxist dialectics or ideology.

The Soviet-Communist world conspiracy is a system of world political-military power. It is the product not of Marx, but of that mad evil genius, Lenin.

This Moscow-directed worldwide campaign is a permanent international revolution played with the skillful advance planning of a chess game.

All military, economic, social, cultural, ideological resources are focused and concentrated upon world power politics.

Neither freedom, nor prosperity, nor materialism, nor patriotism, nor military strength offers security for this Nation.

We must learn that the survival of this Nation is dependent upon a combination and coordination of truth, power, policy, and will.

For an accurate assessment of the requirements for survival, this Nation and every other nation demands:

First. An accurate appraisal of its own strength and capacity.

Second. Assess correctly the power of the forces against it.

Third. Assess correctly the potential combination of actions the enemy may take.

Fourth. Plan correctly, and be ready to activate, political and other actions under foreseeable future circumstances.

We must, as a people, as a Nation, first establish our national aspirations and human values.

We are currently befuddled in vague, abstract gossip about freedom, survival and peace.

These concepts should be clarified and assigned their proper priorities.

A large segment of our population judges peace to be of supreme importance. They are the citizens who accept the pro-Communist slogan: "Peace at any price."

This attitude is reflected in our national policies, that too often materialize into appeasement, and the attempted bribery of the Communist-Soviet forces.

Another large segment of Americans consider survival to be all important. This spirit is exemplified by another pro-Communist slogan: "Better Red than dead."

These Americans have forgotten that survival without freedom is servitude.

It is heartening to know that there is a third segment of the American people. It is they who accept freedom as the indispensable ingredient of man's existence.

Human history is a record of man's struggle to be free. This Nation was founded, not upon concepts of survival or peace. It was founded upon the concept of human freedom.

In order to effectively bear the burden of our world responsibility, this Nation must reestablish freedom as the keystone of our national purpose. We must never forget that freedom is indispensable, survival is crucial, peace is desirable.

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who maintain that this country must choose between freedom, survival, or peace. I do not believe that we must necessarily sacrifice any one of these objectives in order to preserve the others.

I am convinced that a realistic approach by this Nation, and our people, to the causes of the world crises would realize freedom, secure survival, and attain an enduring, true peace for all humanity.

My friends, the United States and the free world have completely failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons systems of the Soviet-Communist war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration, and destruction.

It is a relentless, unlimited war of indefinite duration.

It is a war of total enmity, to which our enemies are irrevocably committed.

It is a dual war.

One war is carried on by the more than 100 Communist parties, organized and operating in every nation on this globe. These parties recognize and serve under the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The second war is the one being waged by the Soviet and its satellite bloc of nations. This second war concentrates the total military, political, economic, diplomatic, and all other human resources upon the disintegration of the free world. Khrushchev is the commander in chief for both of these wars.

While the Soviet-Communist forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of political, military, economic, diplomatic, and psychomoral war, the United States has been waging a unilateral campaign for peace.

Our foreign policies, for the past 30 years, have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of the Communist offensive.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years.

There has not been one 5-year period in the past 30 years during which the Soviet Union has not become relatively stronger and the United States has not become relatively weaker.

We are losing the war for survival at an ever-accelerating pace.

Permit me to review some of the failures of our foreign policies that have contributed to our present critical posture:

First. For a period, we relied upon military superiority. Yet, our heaviest losses—the loss of middle Europe and China—were sustained between 1945 and 1950 when the United States had a clear military superiority.

Second. For a time, we relied upon military alliances. NATO and SEATO were not an effective answer. They are today rapidly disintegrating.

Third. The policy of massive retaliation is now only a memory.

Fourth. The United Nations is now recognized as no hindrance to Soviet-Communist subversions.

Fifth. Summit meetings and endless negotiations are an exercise in futility.

Sixth. Foreign aid, atoms for peace plans, international loans, disarmament negotiations, nuclear test bans have proven to be self-defeating.

As a people, we continue to be guilty of oversimplifications. We like to believe that there are easy, simple answers to our most complex international problems.

Let us remind you of some of these oversimplifications that have been peddled to our people.

First. The only missile we need is to distribute Sears, Roebuck catalogs around the world.

Second. The only trouble with the State Department is the failure of our diplomats to speak the language of the nation to which they are accredited to.

Third. Electrify all rural villages.

Fourth. Land reform.

Fifth. Get rid of all dictators—Cuba is an example.

These are samples of our simpleness and gullibility.

Ladies and gentlemen: It is my conviction that the steady decline of the U.S. power and prestige is backing us into the desperate alternatives of either:

Surrender or a preventive thermonuclear war.

Our present unrealistic foreign policies invite and encourage the horrors of either a nuclear war or a cleverly hidden continuation of retreat and eventual surrender.

But, my fellow Americans, there is a third alternative if we have the will to accept the realities of our situation.

The Nation and its people must first of all face up to the grim truth:

First. That the Soviet-Communist international conspiracy is dedicated to the destruction of all free nations and all free peoples.

Second. That the Soviet-led Communist conspiracy is waging a total war against the free world.

Third. That the United States is the No. 1 target of the Soviet-Communist campaign.

Fourth. That the Soviet-Communist forces are winning that world politicomilitary struggle and the United States and the free world are losing it.

Fifth. That we cannot win this struggle unless we recognize its existence, and arouse in our people a will to defend themselves, and to win this conflict.

Sixth. We cannot formulate effective policies to counter Communist-Soviet aggressions, guerrilla wars, and subversions until we identify our enemies, correctly appraise and locate the deployment of their forces.

Ladies and gentlemen; if we accept the need to give national and official recognition to the Soviet-Communist self-proclaimed and self-admitted campaign to destroy all free nations, there are two additional fundamental requirements that this Nation must accept and fulfill if we wish to survive.

The first requirement is that the United States restore a clear, preponderant military superiority over the Soviet-Communist forces.

We have permitted our military power to erode until the Soviet now has a relative parity of military firepower. This policy invites national and international suicide.

Our military superiority and firepower should be in a ratio of at least 1½ to 1 over the Soviet at all times.

We have the wealth, the economy to attain and to maintain this supremacy.

It is essential for our survival.

We must have sufficient military power to prevent a Khrushchev miscalculation of our will and ability to completely eradicate the Soviet Empire. Our first aim must be to avoid the inception of war and still attain our national and international objectives.

The second requirement is in the field of foreign policy.

We sorely need a complete reevaluation of our national goals, our foreign policies, our policymaking machinery.

There is a serious lack of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policies, our economy, our military capabilities are interdependent and must support each other to attain our national objectives and aspirations.

The three successive fiascos of Cuba are a classic example of the complete lack of coordination between the President's Office, the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I refer, first, to our policies that aided Castro's overthrow of Batista when our officials were fully aware of the fact that he was a Soviet-Communist agent.

Second, I refer to the Bay of Pigs debacle—the most ill-conceived, misplanned, and mismanaged military fiasco in all history.

Third, I refer to the recent and present policies that encouraged and permitted the Soviet to convert Cuba into a military base that critically threatens our margin for survival.

Our present policy of halfhearted containment is ineffective and wholly inadequate to meet the Soviet-Communist challenge.

This Nation cannot continue in its present state of schizophrenia psychosis, its split personality and vacillations toward communism.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, realistic foreign policy is the only hope for our survival.

It is the only hope for the liberation of Hungary and the captive nations.

The sacrifices of the Hungarian people upon the altar of freedom will not have been in vain, if we can remember that freedom is not free. It demands vigilance, courage, dedication, and sacrifice.

The moral principles upon which our freedom is founded are irreconciliable with totalitarianism. Freedom is not compromisable.

Communism is an absolute evil. It is not debatable.

The survival of this Nation, of the free world is not negotiable.

RHODE ISLAND CHARTER TERCENTENARY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 300th anniversary of the Rhode Island Charter of 1663; I ask permission to revise and extend remarks in order that it may be printed in full in the RECORD.

Rhode Island was colonized by religious dissenters from Massachusetts, led by Roger Williams. For them he obtained a parliamentary charter in 1643 by which the colony was governed until the restoration of Charles II in 1660. As soon as the restoration had been officially proclaimed, John Clarke was sent to England as the deputy of the colonists in order to solicit a new charter. This was necessary since the charter of 1643 had been granted by parliamentary rather than by royal authority.

Clarke's petition to Charles II contained the following words which found their way into the charter, and are now inscribed on the south front of the Rhode Island Statehouse:

> Wherefore your petitioners have it much on their hearts (if they may be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civill State may stand, yea, and best be maintained, and that among English spirits, with a full liberty in religious concernments.

The charter of 1663 was the first creation by British patent of a body politic. Previously, of course, corporations had been constituted within the realm for the government of colonial plantations; but now specific powers were granted for administering all the affairs of a colony within the colonial territory. And in its provision for representation of the freemen of the colony the charter was a major improvement on that granted to Massachusetts.

The colony was given its new name in the clause establishing it as a body politic:

> We create and make them a bodye politique or corporate, with the powers and privileges hereinafter mentioned. And accordingly * * * wee * * * doe ordeyne, constitute and declare, that they, the sayd (named persons and all subsequently admitted freemen) shall be * * * forever hereafter, a bodie corporate and politique, in fact and name, by the name of The Governor and Company of the English Collonie of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantation, in New-England, in America.

Then follow provisions relating to the Governor, Deputy Governor, and 10 assistants, for an annual general assembly with power to admit freemen, elect officers, and make laws:

> So as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but (as near as may be) agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England, considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there.

Provisions of the charter grant the power to establish courts, and to hold annual elections. The first officers are named. The power to bear arms is granted:

> And to use and exercise the law martiall in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require.

There is to be no interference with fishery rights. There shall be freedom of migration from England. The inhabitants and their children are to have the rights of persons born in England. There shall be appeals to the Crown in controversies with other New England colonies, and there shall be freedom of movement among the colonies. This clause is of interest since it is the germ of the idea of what much later became the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States:

> Itt shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of sayd Collony of Providence Plantation, without let or molestation, to passe and repasse with freedom, into and through the rest of the English Colionies, upon their lawful and civill occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce and trade, with such of the inhabitants of our other English Collonies as shall bee willing to admit them thereunto, they behaveing themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the sayd Collonies provided, or that shall bee provided, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.

And most important of all:

> The government is to be held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants.

By the charter of 1663 complete religious liberty was granted. This is the famous provision:

> Noe person within the sayd colonye, at any tyme hereafter, shall bee any wise molosted, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any differences in opinione in matters of religion, and doe not actually disturb the civil peace of our sayd colony; but that all and everye person and persons may, from tyme to tyme, and at all tymes hereafter, freelye and fullye have and enjoye his and theire owne judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments * * * any lawe, statute, or clause, therein contayned, or to bee contayned, usage, of custome of this realme, to the contrary hereof, in any wise, notwithstanding.

Founded by those to whom freedom of conscience was more precious than life itself, Rhode Island, throughout its history, has preserved its proud heritage. At this time of celebration of the tercentenary of a famous charter, Rhode Islanders will honor the distinguished past of their State in its days as a colony by preserving in the present and in the future its tradition of freedom.

LUCAS, SAMUEL. CHARTERS OF THE OLD ENGLISH COLONIES IN AMERICA. LONDON, J. PARKER, 1850. JK49.L8.

RHODE ISLAND, GRANTED BY KING CHARLES II, IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR OF HIS REIGN.

Charles the Second, by the grace of God, &c. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting. Whereas we have been informed by the humble petition of our trusty and well beloved subjects John Clarke, on the behalf of Benjamin Arnold, William Brenton, William Codington, Nicholas Easton, William Boulston, John Porter, John Smith, Samuel Gorton, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, Samuel Wildbore, William Field, James Barker, Richard Tew, Thomas Harris, and William Dyre, and the rest of the purchasers, and free inhabitants of our island called Rhode Island, and the rest of the colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England in America, That they, pursuing with peace and loyal minds, their sober, serious, and religious intentions, of godly edifying themselves, and one another, in the holy Christian faith and worship as they were persuaded, together with the gaining over and conversion of the poor ignorant Indian natives, in those parts of America, to the sincere profession and obedience of the same faith and worship, did not only by the consent and good encouragement of our royal progenitors, transport themselves out of this kingdom of England into America; but also since their arrival there, after their first settlement amongst other our subjects in those parts, for the avoiding of discord, and those many evils which were likely to ensue upon those our subjects, not being able to bear in those remote parts their different apprehensions in religious concernments; and in pursuance of the aforesaid ends, did once again leave their desirable stations and habitations, and with excessive labour and travel, hazard, and charge, did transplant themselves into the midst of the Indian natives, who, as we are informed, are the most potent princes and people of all that country; whereby the good providence of God (from whom the plantations have taken their name) upon their labour and industry, they have not only been preserved to admiration, but have increased and prospered, and are seized and possessed, by purchase and consent of the said natives, to their full content, of such lands, islands, rivers, harbours, and roads, as are very convenient both for plantations, and also for building of ships, supply of pipe-staves, and other merchandize, and which lies very commodious in many respects for commerce, and to accommodate our southern plantations, and may much advance the trade of this our realm, and greatly enlarge the territories thereof; they having by near neighbourhood to, and friendly society with, the great body of the Narraganset Indians, given them encouragement, of their own accord, to subject themselves, their people and lands, unto us; whereby (as is hoped) there may, in time, by the blessing of God upon their endeavours, be laid a sure foundation of happiness to all America.

And whereas, in their humble address, they have freely declared, That it is much on their hearts (if they be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, and that among our English subjects, with a full liberty in religious concernments, and that true piety, rightly grounded upon gospel principles, will give the best and greatest security to sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyalty: now know ye, That we being willing to encourage the hopeful undertaking of our said loyal and loving subjects, and to secure them in the free exercise and enjoyment of all their civil and religious rights appertaining to them as our loving subjects; and to preserve unto them that liberty in the true Christian faith and worship of God, which they have sought with so much travel, and with peaceable minds and loyal subjection to our loyal progenitors, and ourselves, to enjoy: and because some of the people and inhabitants of the same colony cannot, in their private opinion, conform to the public exercise of religion, according to the liturgy, form, and ceremonies of the church of England, or take or subscribe the oaths and articles made and established in that behalf; and for that the same, by reason of the remote distances of those places, will, as we hope, be no breach of the unity and uniformity established in this nation, have therefore thought fit, and do hereby publish, grant, ordain, and declare, that our royal will and pleasure is—

That no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be any-wise molested, punished, disquited, or called in question, for any differences in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony; but that all and every person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments, throughout the tract of land hereafter mentioned, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others, any law, statute, or clause therein contained, or to be contained, usage or custom of this realm, to the contrary hereof, in any wise notwithstanding. And that they may be in the better capacity to defend themselves in their just rights and liberties against all the enemies of the Christian faith, and others, in all respects, we have further thought fit, and at the humble petition of the persons aforesaid, are graciously pleased to declare, That they shall have and enjoy the benefit of our late act of indemnity, and free pardon, as the rest of our subjects in other our dominions and territories have; and to create and make them a body politic or corporate, with the powers or privileges hereinafter mentioned: and accordingly, our will and pleasure is, and of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have ordained, constituted, and declared, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do ordain, constitute, and declare.

That they the said William Brenton, William Coddington, Nicholas Easton, Benedict Arnold, William Boulston, John Porter, Samuel Gorton, John Smith, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, William Dyre, Samuel Wildbore, Richard Tew, William Field, Thomas Harris, James Barker, Rainsborrow, Williams, and John Nickson, and all such others as are now, or hereafter shall be admitted, free of the company and society of our colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England, shall be, from time to time, and for ever hereafter, a body corporate and politic, in fact and name, by the name of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America; and that by the same name they and their successors shall and may have perpetual succession, and shall and may be persons able and capable in the law to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, to answer and to be answered unto, to defend and to be defended, in all and singular suits, causes, quarrels, matters, actions, and things, of what kind or nature soever; and also to have, take, possess, acquire, and purchase lands, tenements, or hereditaments, or any goods or chattels, and the same to lease, grant, demise, alien, bargain, sell and dispose of, at their own will and pleasure, as other our liege people of this our realm of England, or any corporation or body politic within the same, may lawfully do; and further.

That they the said Governor and Company, and their successors, shall and may, for ever hereafter, have a common seal, to serve and use for all matters, causes, things, and affairs whatsoever, of them and their successors, and the same seal to alter, change, break, an make new from time to time, at their will and pleasure, as they shall think fit. And further, we will and ordain, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do declare and appoint, That for the better ordering and managing of the affairs and business of the said company and their successors, there shall be one governor, one deputy governor, and ten assistants, to be from time to time constituted, elected, and chosen, out of the freemen of the said company, for the time being, in such manner and from as is hereafter in these presents expressed; which said officers shall apply themselves to take care for the best disposing and ordering of the general business and affairs of and concerning the lands and hereditaments herein aftermentioned to be granted, and the plantation thereof, and the government of the people there. And for the better execution of our royal pleasure herein, we do for us, our heirs, and successors, assign, name, constitute, and appoint, the aforesaid Benedict Arnold to be the first and present governor of the said company, and the said William Brenton to be the deputy governor, and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Cogeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, to be the ten present assistants of the said company, to continue in the said several offices respectively, until the first Wednesday which shall be in the month of May now next coming.

And further, we will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain and grant, That the governor of the said company, for the time being, or in his absence, by occasion of sickness, or otherwise, by his leave or permission, the deputy governor, for the time being, shall and may, from time to time, upon all occasions, give order for the assembling of the said company, and calling them together, to consult and advise of the business and affairs of the said company; and that for ever hereafter, twice in every year, that is to say, on every first Wednesday in the month of May, and on every last Wednesday in October, or oftener, in case it shall be requisite, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company, not exceeding six persons, for Newport, four persons for each of the respective towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Warwick, and two persons for each other place, town or city, who shall be from time to time thereunto elected or deputed by the major part of the freemen of the respective places, towns or places for which they shall be so elected or deputed, shall have a general meeting or assembly, then and there to consult, advise and determine, in and about the affairs and business of the said company and plantations. And further, we do of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, give and grant unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America, and their successors.

That the governor, or in his absence, or by his permission, the deputy governor of the said company, for the time being, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company as shall be so aforesaid elected or deputed, or so many of them as shall be present at such meeting or assembly, as aforesaid, shall be called the general assembly; and that they, or the greatest part of them then present, whereof the governor, or deputy governor, and six of the assistants at least, to be seven, shall have, and have hereby given and granted unto them, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to appoint, alter, and change such days, times and places of meeting, and general assembly, as they shall think fit, and to chuse, nominate and appoint such and so many persons as they shall think fit, and shall be willing to accept the same, to be free of the said company and body politic and them into the same to admit, and to elect, and constitute such offices and officers, and to grant such needful commissions as they shall think fit and requisite, for ordering, managing, and dispatching of the affairs of the said governor and company, and their successors; and, from time to time, to make, ordain, constitute or repeal, such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, as to them shall seem meet, for the good and welfare of the said company, and for the government and ordering of the lands and hereditaments herein after mentioned to be granted, and of the people that do, or at any time hereafter shall inhabit, or be within the same; so as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but, as near as may agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there; and also to appoint, order and direct, erect and settle such places and courts of jurisdiction, for hearing and determining of all actions, cases, matters and things, happening within the said colony and plantation, and which shall be in dispute, and depending there, as they shall think fit; and also to distinguish and set forth the several names and titles, duties, powers, and limits, of each court, office and officer, superior and inferior; and also, to contrive and appoint such forms of oaths and attestations, not repugnant, but as near as may be agreeable as aforesaid to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as are convenient and requisite, with respect to the due administration of justice, and due execution and discharge of all offices and places of trust, by the persons that shall be therein concerned; and also to regulate and order the way and manner of all elections to offices and places of trust, and to prescribe, limit and distinguish the number and bounds of all places, towns and cities, with the limits and bounds herein after mentioned, and not herein particularly named, who have or shall have the power of electing and sending of freemen to the said general assembly; and also to order, direct and authorise, the imposing of lawful and reasonable fines; mulcts, imprisonments, and executing other punishments, pecuniary and corporal, upon offenders and delinquents, according to the course of other corporations, within this our kingdom of England; and again, to alter, revoke, annul or pardon, under their common seal, or otherwise, such fines, mulcts, imprisonments, sentences, judgments and condemnations, as shall be thought fit; and to direct, rule, order and dispose of all other matters and things, and particularly that which relates to the making of purchases of the native Indians, as to them shall seem meet.

Whereby our said people and inhabitants in the said plantations, may be so religiously, peaceably and civilly governed, as that by their good life, and orderly conversation, they may win and invite the native Indians of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind; willing, commanding and requiring, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and appointing, that all such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, instructions, impositions and directions, as shall be so made by the governor, deputy, assistants and freemen, or such number of them as aforesaid, and published in writing under their common seal, shall be carefully and duly observed, kept, performed and put in execution, according to the true intent and meaning of the same. And these our letters patents, or the duplicate or exemplification thereof, shall be to all and every such officers, superior or inferior, from time to time, for the putting of the same orders, laws, statutes, ordinances, instructions and directions, in due execution against us, our heirs and successors, a sufficient warrant and discharge. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby for us, our heirs and successors, establish and ordain, That yearly, once in the year for ever hereafter, namely, the aforesaid Wednesday in May, and at the town of Newport, or elsewhere if urgent occasion do require, the governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, and other officers of the said company, or such of them as the general assembly shall think fit, shall be in the said general court or assembly, to be held from that day or time, newly chosen for the year ensuing, by greater part of the said company for the time being, as shall be then and there present. And if it shall happen that the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants, by these presents appointed, or any such as shall hereafter be newly chosen into their rooms, or any of them, or any other the officers of the said company, shall die, or be removed from his or their several offices or places, before the said general day of election (whom we do hereby declare for any misdemeanor or default, to be removeable by the governor, assistants and company, or such greater part of them, in any of the said public courts to be assembled, as aforesaid), that then, and in every such case, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, deputy-governor, assistants and company aforesaid, or such greater part of them so to be assembled, as is aforesaid, in any of their assemblies, to proceed to a new election of one or more of their company, in the room or place, rooms or places, of such officer or officers so dying or removed, according to their directions.

And immediately upon and after such election or elections made of such governor, deputy-governor, assistant or assistants, or any other officer of the said company, in manner and form aforesaid, the authority, office and power, before given to the former governor, deputy-governor, and other officer and officers so removed, in whose stead and place new shall be chosen, shall, as to him and them, and every of them respectively, cease and determine: provided always, and our will and pleasure is, That as well such as are by these presents appointed to be the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, as those which shall succeed them, and all other officers to be appointed and chosen as aforesaid, shall, before the undertaking the execution of the said offices and places respectively, give their solemn engagement by oath or otherwise, for the due and faithful performance of their duties in their several offices and places, before such person or persons as are by these presents hereafter appointed to take and receive the same; (that is to say) the said Benedict Arnold, who is herein before nominated and appointed the present governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before William Brenton, of any two of the said assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Brenton, who is hereby before nominated and appointed the present deputy governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before the said Benedict Arnold, or any two of the assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Coggeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, who are herein before nominated and appointed the present assistants of the company, shall give the said engagement to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the said Benedict Arnold and William Brenton, or one of them, to whom respectively we do hereby give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same.

And further, our will and pleasure is, that all and every other future governor, or deputy governor, to be elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, shall give the said engagement before two or more of the said assistants of the said company for the time being, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same; and the said assistants, and every of them, and all and every other officer or officers, to be hereafter elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, from time to time, shall give the like engagements to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the governor, or deputy governor, for the time being; unto which said governor, or deputy governor, we do by these presents give full power and authority to require, administer, or receive the same accordingly. And we do likewise, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that for the more peaceable and orderly government of the said plantations, it shall and may be lawful for the governor, deputy governor, assistants, and all other officers and ministers, of the said company, in the administration of justice, and exercise of government, in the said plantations, to use, exercise, and put in execution, such methods, rules, orders, and directions, not being contrary and repugnant to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as has been heretofore given, used, and accustomed in such cases respectively, to be put in practice, until, at the next or some other general assembly, especial provision shall be made and ordained in the cases aforesaid. And we do further, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, or in his absence the deputy governor, and major part of the said assistants for the time being, at any time, when the said general assembly is not sitting, to nominate, appoint and constitute such and so many commanders, governors, and military officers, as to them shall seem requisite, for the leading, conducting, and training up the inhabitants of the said plantations in martial affairs, and for the defence and safeguard of the said plantations; and that it shall and may be lawful to and for all and every such commander, governor, and military officer, that shall be so as aforesaid, or by the governor, or in his absence the deputy-governor and six of the assistants, and major part of the freemen of the said company, present at any general assemblies, nominated, appointed and constituted, according to the tenor of his and their respective commissions and directions, to assemble, exercise in arms, marshal, array, and put in warlike posture, the inhabitants of the said colony, for their especial defence and safety; and to lead and conduct the said inhabitants, and to encounter, repulse, and resist by force of arms, as well by sea as by land, and also to kill, slay, and destroy, by all fitting ways, enterprizes, and means whatsoever, all and every such person or persons, as shall at any time hereafter attempt or enterprize the destruction, invasion, detriment, or annoyance of the said inhabitants or plantations; and to use and exercise the law martial, in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require; and to take and surprize, by all ways and means whatsoever, all and every such person and persons, with their ship or ships, armour, ammunition, or other goods of such persons as shall in hostile manner invade or attempt the defeating of the said plantation, or the hurt of the said company and inhabitants; and upon just causes to invade and destroy the natives, Indians, or other enemies of the said colony.

Nevertheless, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare, to the rest of our colonies in New-England, that it shall not be lawful for this our said colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantations in America, in New-England, to invade the natives inhabiting within the bounds and limits of their said colonies, without the knowledge and consent of the said other colonies. And it is hereby declared that it shall not be lawful to or for the rest of the colonies to invade or molest the native Indians, or any other inhabitants in having within the bounds or limits hereafter mentioned, (they having subjected themselves unto us, and being by us taken into our special protection,) without the knowledge and consent of the governor and company of our colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation. Also our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare unto all Christian Kings, Princes and States, that if any person, which shall hereafter be of the said company or plantation, or any other by appointment of the said governor and company, for the time being, shall at any time or times hereafter rob or spoil, by sea or land, or do any hurt, or unlawful hostility, to any of the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, or any of the subjects of any Prince or State, being then in league with us, our heirs and successors; upon complaint of such injury done to any such Prince or State, or their subjects, we, our heirs and successors, will make open proclamation, within any parts of our realm of England, fit for that purpose, that the person or persons committing any such robbery or spoil, shall, within the time limited by such proclamation, make full restitution or satisfaction of all such injuries done or committed, so as the said Prince, or others so complaining, may be fully satisfied and contented; and if the said person or persons, who shall commit any such robbery or spoil, shall not make satisfaction accordingly within such time so to be limited, that then we, our heirs and successors, will put such person or persons out of our allegiance and protection; and that then it shall and may be lawful and free for all Princes or others, to prosecute with hostility such offenders, and every of them, their and every of their procurers, aiders, abbetors and counsellors, in that behalf.

Provided also, and our express will and pleasure is, and we do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and appoint, that these presents shall not in any manner hinder any of our loving subjects whatsoever, from using and exercising the trade of fishing upon the coast of New-England in America, but that they, and every or any of them, shall have full and free power and liberty to continue and use the trade of fishing upon the said coast, in any of the seas thereunto adjoining, or any arms of the sea, or salt-water, rivers and creeks, where they have been accustomed to fish, and to build and set upon the waste land belonging to the said colony and plantations, such wharfs, stages, and work-houses as shall be necessary for the salting, drying and keeping of their fish, to be taken or gotten upon that coast. And further, for the encouragement of the inhabitants of our said colony of Providence plantation, to set upon the business of taking whales, it shall be lawful for them, or any of them, having struck a whale, dubertus, or other great fish, it or them to pursue unto that coast, and into any bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, and it or them, upon the said coast, or in the said bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, to kill and order for the best advantage without molestation, they making no wilful waste, or spoil; any thing in these presents contained, or any other matter or thing to the contrary notwithstanding. And further also, we are graciously pleased, and do hereby declare, that if any of the inhabitants of our said colony do set upon the planting of vineyards, (the soil and climate both seeming naturally to concur to the production of wines,) or be industrious in the discovery of fishing-banks, in or about the said colony, we will, from time to time, give and allow all due and fitting encouragement therein, as to others in cases of like nature.

And further of our more ample grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant, unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation in the Narragansett bay in New-England, in America, and to every inhabitant there, and to every person and persons trading thither, and to every such person or persons as are or shall be free of the said colony, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to take, ship, transport, and carry away, out of any of our realms and dominions, for and towards the plantation and defence of the said colony, such and so many of our loving subjects and strangers, as shall or will willingly accompany them in and to their said colony and plantation, except such person or persons as are or shall be therein restrained by us, our heirs and successors, or any law or statute of this realm; and also to ship and transport all and all manner of goods, chattels, merchandize, and other things whatsoever, that are or shall be useful or necessary for the said plantations, and defence thereof, by any law or statute of this our realm; yielding and paying unto us, our heirs and successors, such the duties, customs, and subsidies, as are or ought to be paid or payable for the same. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain, declare and grant, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, that all and every the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, which are already planted and settled within our said colony of Providence plantations, or which shall hereafter go to inhabit within the said colony, and all and every of their children which have been born there, or which shall happen hereafter to be born there, or on the sea going thither or returning from thence, shall have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects, within any the dominions of us, our heirs or successors, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, as if they and every of them were born within the realm of England.

And further know ye, that we, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, all that part of our dominions, in New-England in America, containing the Nahantick and Nanhyganset alias Narragansett bay and countries and parts adjacent, bounded on the west, or westerly, to the middle or channel of a river there, commonly called and known by the name of Pawcatuck alias Pawcawtuck river, and so along the said river, as the greater or middle stream thereof reacheth or lies up into the north country, northward unto the head thereof, and from thence by a strait line drawn due north, until it meet with the south line of the Massachusets colony, and on the north or northerly by the aforesaid south or southerly line in the Massachusets colony or plantation, and extending towards the east or eastwardly three English miles, to the east and north-east of the most eastern and north-eastern parts of the aforesaid Narragansett bay, as the said bay lieth or extendeth itself from the ocean on the south or southwardly, unto the mouth of the river which runneth towards the town of Providence, and from thence along the eastwardly side or bank of the said river (higher called by the name of Seacunck river) up to the falls called Patucket falls, being the most westwardly line of Plymouth colony; and so from the said falls, in a strait line due north, until it meet with the aforesaid line of the Massachusetts colony, and bounded on the south by the ocean, and in particular the lands belonging to the town of Providence, Patuxit, Warwicke, Misquammacock alias Pawcatuck, and the rest upon the main land, in the tract aforesaid, together with Rhode-Island, Blocke-Island, and all the rest of the islands and banks in the Narragansett bay, and bordering upon the coast of the tract aforesaid, (Fisher's-Island only excepted) together with all firm lands, soils, grounds, havens, ports, rivers, waters, fishings, mines royal, and all other mines, minerals, precious stones, quarries, woods, wood-grounds, rocks, slates, and all and singular other commodities, jurisdictions, royalties, privileges, franchises, preeminences and hereditaments whatsoever, within the said tract, bounds, lands and islands aforesaid, to them or any of them belonging, or in any-wise appertaining.) To have and to hold the same, unto the said governor and company, and their successors for ever, upon trust, for the use and benefit of themselves, and their asociates, freemen of the said colony, their heirs and assigns.

To be holden of us, our heirs and successors as of the manor of East-Greenwich, in our county of Kent, in free and common soccage, and not in capite, nor by Knight's service. Yielding and paying therefore to us, our heirs and successors, only the fifth part of all the ore of gold and silver, which from time to time, and at all times hereafter, shall be there gotten, had or obtained, in lieu and satisfaction of all services, duties, fines, forfeitures made or to be made, claims and demands whatsoever, to be to us, our heirs or successors, therefore or thereout rendered, made or paid; any grant or clause, in a late grant to the governor and company of Connecticut colony in America, to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding; the aforesaid Pawcatuck river having been yielded after much debate, for the fixed and certain bounds between these our said colonies, by the agents thereof, who have also agreed, that the said Pawcatuck river shall be also called alias Narrogancett or Narrogansett river, and to prevent future disputes that otherwise might arise thereby, for ever hereafter, shall be construed, deemed and taken to be the Narrogancett river, in our late grant to Connecticut colony, mentioned as the easterly bounds of that colony. And further, our will and pleasure is, that in all matters of public controversies, which may fall out between our colony of Providence plantation, to make their appeal therein to us, our heirs and successors, for redress in such cases, within this our realm of England; and that it shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of the said colony of Providence plantation, without lett or molestation, to pass and repass with freedom into and through the rest of the English colonies, upon their lawful and civil occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce, and trade with such of the inhabitants of our other English colonies as shall be willing to admit them thereunto, they behaving themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the said colonies provided, or that shall be provided, to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. And lastly, we do for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that these our letters patents shall be firm, good effectual and available, in all things in the law, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, according to our true intent and meaning herein before declared; and shall be construed, reputed and adjudged, in all cases, most favourably on the behalf, and for the best benefit and behoof of the said governor and company, and their successors, although express mention &c. In witness, &c, witness, &c.

Per Ipsum Regem.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II there have been some 47 new nations created out of the once vast colonial empires of England and France, and the smaller oversea possessions of Holland and the United States, 47 new nations whose people are learning to live and develop alongside their own institutions, under their own leaders, under their own independent governments.

Today I want us to remember a nation that was not so fortunate, a nation whose short-lived independence was one of the first submerged into the monolithic wave of what has become the world's leading colonialist power, Soviet Russia. March 25 is the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Republic, a Republic that lived for 3 short years between 1918 and 1921, after 300 years under the subjection of czarist Russia. The people of Byelorussia are known as White Russians—a name synonymous with heroic resistance against oppression. Their leaders declared their people's independence during the height of Russo-German fighting toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist empire was falling into pieces and when at last it appeared the Russian autocracy was to be destroyed. During Byelorussia's brief independence there was a constant struggle to survive; it was absorbed back into Russia as soon as the new Red autocracy could consolidate power and destroy any self-sought freedoms on the part of former czarist subjects. Today 10 million Byelorussians may find their only vestige of freedom to be membership in the United Nations, but this is a fictional independence, supported and totally controlled by the Kremlin.

On this anniversary we must not, in the onrush of events, forget the peoples past and present, who have fought and are fighting for freedoms that we consider part of our daily lives. We must, in remembering their struggles, renew our determination to see their eventual liberation.

BIRTHDAY OF THE FREE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the birthday of the Free State of Maryland. Although a relatively old State, Maryland was described in a recent report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, as a State "whose economy has been showing the boundless energy of a teenager."

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago today, a group of colonists under the leadership of Leonard Calvert, brother of Lord Baltimore, landed on St. Clement's Island, and the colony of Maryland was founded. The first Lord Baltimore had arranged for a charter for the colony which Charles I insisted should be called Terra Mariae or Maryland in honor of his Queen Henrietta Maria. Lord Baltimore died before the charter was issued, and King Charles granted it to his son Cecil on June 20, 1632.

It took some time to assemble the colonists and supplies for the trip to the New World and it was not until November 22, 1633, that the expedition sailed for America. The two vessels chartered by the colonists—the *Dove*, weighing 50 tons, and the *Ark*, 350 tons—carried Leonard Calvert and about 200 others of various trades, professions, and religious beliefs. On March 25, they landed on St. Clement's Island in the Potomac River and held a religious service. A few days later, they sailed up the St. Marys River and founded the town of St. Marys, which became the capital of the colony. The colony was founded in the spirit of tolerance and religious freedom.

There are many other outstanding events in Maryland's history. In 1783 Annapolis, Md., became the temporary capital of this Nation and in 1791 Maryland ceded to the United States land for the District of Columbia and location of the Nation's Capital. Our National anthem was written at Fort McHenry in September 1814. The first railroad in America and the first telegraph line in America were established in Maryland. Of all these events, however, the initial element in the founding of the colony of Maryland—tolerance—is the most important and much needed in today's world.

On the 300th anniversary of the founding of Maryland, a great American, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoke over the radio in honor of the anniversary and highlighted the significance of the founding of Maryland. He said:

> Lord Baltimore and his colonists sought in their charter liberty not alone for the members of the expedition, but for all later comers as well. It is a good thing to demand liberty for ourselves and for those who agree with us, but it is a better thing and rarer thing to give liberty to others who do not agree with us. We would do less than our duty to Lord Baltimore if on such an anniversary we paid no tribute to this, his greatest contribution to America, a free America.

TRIBUTE TO A SOLDIER-PRIEST

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, frequently the heroic deeds of men are not revealed in full until many years after they have occurred. Such is the case of a distinguished and heroic service rendered by the Very Reverend Dr. Vladimir Klodnycky, pastor emeritus of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of Newark, N.J. Father Klodnycky formerly served a pastorate in my home city of Bayonne, N.J.

The New Jersey region of the Anti-Defamation League has honored Dr. Klodnycky for his humanitarian efforts to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20.

What follows is an excerpt from an article, "Soldier of Peace," which appeared in the ADL bulletin published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The article was written by Dr. Joseph H. Lichten, director of ADL's department of intercultural affairs:

SOLDIER OF PEACE

More than 40 years ago, a time when eastern Europe was plagued by anti-Semitic pogroms, a rabbi in the small Ukrainian town of Chmelnyk wrote an unusual letter and gave it to an army officer. The letter, addressed to the rabbis of all Jewish communities, identified its bearer, Maj. Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky, as a man who had "distinguished himself for his great spirit, love of truth, and love for the Jewish people." It also appealed to the rabbis to recognize and aid the major in all things he sought to do.

This month in New Jersey, a different type of Jewish community honored the Chmelnyk rabbi's appeal. Through the Anti-Defamation League's New Jersey regional advisory board, tribute was paid to the former major who is now Reverend Klodnycky, a 70-year-old Orthodox priest who was ordained 30 years ago in the United States and, for the past 23 years, has been pastor of the Holy Ascension Church in Newark.

The League citation to Reverend Klodnycky begins: "In recognition of his humanitarian efforts to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20 * * *." The story of the major turned priest is one of the brightest memories of a dark and troubled era.

In August 1919, Major Klodnycky's unit of the Ukrainian Galician Army was sent to Chmelnyk in the center of an industrial area. There were two problems in Chmelnyk—plunderers and pillagers had a special interest in the rich territory and unrest had spread throughout the whole region. In addition, the relationship between the Jewish population of 15,000 and the peasantry was an uneasy one. When Major Klodnycky's unit entered the town, antagonism between Christian and Jew had reached the point of crisis—a crisis set off, oddly enough, by love.

The only daughter of a Jewish merchant living in a small village outside of Chmelnyk had eloped with a Christian peasant and converted to Christianity. The Jewish parents, unhappy about the marriage and conversion, severed relations with their daughter. Or, at least, the girl's father did. Her mother secretly met the girl and her husband and invited them to the parents' home—when the father was away. One night the young couple left the house with gifts—two cows, featherbeds, money, and jewelry. When the girl's father returned and found out what had happened, he vowed to destroy his son-in-law's house. The father set fire to the straw-thatched house; the wind carried sparks to other houses, and soon the entire village was burned to the ground. The disaster took place on the eve of Major Klodnycky's arrival.

The Jews feared a pogrom. They knew the inhabitants of the burned village and neighboring villages were waiting for an excuse for vengeance. "The Jews burned down the village of Chmelnyk" would be the cry. Despite their fears, the Jews appeared in town for their market day. On that day, too, an unusually large number of farmers and peasants appeared on the streets of the town, carrying rifles, revolvers, and, as was later discovered, machineguns concealed in their wagons. At the inn, near the center of town, was a small army unit and patrol.

Major Klodnycky ordered his soldiers to ride, fully armed, through the streets. After the villagers had a chance to see the strength of the troops, they were assembled in the main square in front of the city hall. The major addressed them.

"Dear brothers," he said, "certainly every one of you built his own house. When you began laying the foundation, you crossed yourself three times, recited the 'Our Father,' sprinkled your work with holy water, and in a whisper to heaven asked our Lord to help you build.

"My men and I have been summoned by the Ukraine Government to help you build your homes, and your state. We are building a nation, my brothers. How can you think of sprinkling the foundation of our nation with blood? There must be law and order in our nation. To take the law into your own hands to settle real or imagined grievances is sinful."

The peasants put away their weapons and began to return home. In a half hour, the streets of Chmelnyk were empty. Major Klodnycky had stopped a pogrom before it was started.

PRESIDENT'S PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot recently about our President's physical fitness program. The Nation has been swept by an enthusiastic hiking movement.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to be the purveyor of additional good news on physical fitness from the Fourth District in Florida. It concerns the sponsors and members of the Homestead, Fla., Bicycle Club. This small group of interested people, who are enthusiastic about the joys and therapeutic effects of the sport of bicycling, had an idea and stanchly went to work to put it into operation.

And so these dozen people of Homestead, Fla., without a budget and at very low cost, propelled the bicycle and the urgent need for a bicycle safety campaign into national prominence.

In order to accomplish their goals—demonstration of the healthful effects of bicycling, and the promulgation of safety measures—this little band of amateurs approached Dr. Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, he is a very astute man in other areas than his own specialty. He is a frequent vacationer in Homestead and has made public his appreciation of Homestead as, in his words, "a homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation." Dr. White is one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness. He prescribes proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding as preventives of heart attacks.

Next, the Homestead bicycle enthusiasts begged, borrowed, and earned sufficient money to erect bicycle signs through the city of Homestead, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

High point of the bicycle safety campaign was the dedication ceremony at which Homestead Mayor Richard Conley, Dr. and Mrs. White arrived, all pedaling bikes. Addressing a group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past middle years, Dr. White commented:

Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation. It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people who have worked to get these safe-for-cycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment.

So successful were the efforts of this little band of Florida amateurs that they have engaged national attention through nationwide press stories, radio and TV coverage, including mention on network TV shows, and stories in Time and Life magazines.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to acquaint my colleagues with the full report and editorial comment on this event in the News Leader, Homestead, Fla., on February 26, 1963:

UNITED STATES NOTES HOMESTEAD BIKING—PEDALCADE HIGHLIGHTS BIKE ROUTE OPENING

Homestead, bicycles and hearts made national news Sunday with the visit of Dr. Paul Dudley White to South Dade to take part in the dedication of Homestead's bike routes—a first in the Nation.

It was Dr. and Mrs. Paul Dudley White Day, proclaimed by Mayor Richard Conley to coincide with the dedication and with National Heart Sunday, in which the noted cardiac specialist is especially interested.

Kicking off the day's events was the cutting of blue and white ribbons stretched across North West Fourth Street at Krome Avenue—one of the bicycle routes mapped out by traffic experts and marked with new blue and white signs.

Some 500 people turned out to see the ceremony and hear Dr. White. Almost half of them joined in a bicycle tour of the town, led by the famous doctor after the ribbon cutting.

Homestead is the first city in the Nation to be officially proclaimed "The City of Bicycles"—a fact that drew Time and Life magazine photographer-reporters, newsreel cameramen from all three Miami television stations, representatives from a number of newspapers in the area, and cycle-minded visitors from as far away as Missouri.

After more than an hour of pedaling around Homestead and the immediate area, cyclists wound up at the city's ball park and picnic grounds for a chicken barbecue, where caterers served more than 200.

Another group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past-middle years, turned out Sunday evening at the Homestead Armory to hear the famous cardiac physician tell how to prevent heart attacks through proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding.

The famed heart specialist arrived at dedication ceremonies pedaling beside his wife and Homestead Mayor Conley, and stopped to pose for pictures before mounting the speaker's platform.

"Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation," Dr. White said. "It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people who have worked to get these safe-for-bicycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment."

The doctor, one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness. first visited Homestead last year, when the city of bicycles movement was only beginning.

Since then, he has talked of the town and its project to groups all over the country, and has given Homestead untold publicity by his remarks.

"Doctor," said Mayor Conley, "you and your wife are officially citizens of Homestead and we salute you." With a grin, he added, "And no taxes."

The Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead, at whose invitation Dr. White officiated at the bike route dedication, presented Mrs. White with a charm bracelet from which dangled three miniature bicycles. Dr. White's "charm," presented by Milton Fischer, was one of the 300 safety route signs, to which a bronze plaque had been attached in tribute to his interest in the bicycle city idea.

Also lauded during the ceremonies was Irvin Barnett, who has been one of the bicycle club's most ardent supporters, both with work and in financing the signs which were dedicated Sunday.

Barnett accepted a framed certificate of appreciation, which he immediately presented to Conley, who was serving as president of the Chamber of Commerce when the bike movement got chamber endorsement and backing.

Congratulations from Gov. Farris Bryant were conveyed by J. Robert Terry of the Florida Development Commission, and a lengthy telegram of approbation from Senator George Smathers was read.

During the bike parade which followed, some 250 cyclists streamed along behind Dr. White, who was preceded by a truck bearing newsreel cameramen, photographers, and reporters.

At first, cyclists filled the streets from curb to curb, but the agile doctor, an advocate of safe cycling, hopped aboard the news truck to direct riders to go two abreast or single file. * * *

Local Bike Club Goes to Town on National Scale

The boosters of Homestead's Bicycle Club deserves the praise and imitation of all organizations in South Dade.

They have taken the bicycle and a campaign of bicycle safety and lifted it to a high position as a "vehicle of national publicity.'"

Nationwide press services have carried the story of Homestead to the newspapers and radio stations.

Time and Life magazines covered the event.

Three TV stations photoed the affair.

And it was mentioned on network TV shows yesterday morning.

Such a job, as these dozen people of a bicycle club, at a very small cost and with no budgeted money, have done is a better job than the heavily financed Dade-Miami Publicity Bureau would have done, or could have done.

In order to accomplish their purposes, this little band of amateurs, enlisted the help of Dr. Paul Dudley White, a heart specialist, who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast, and vacations in Homestead frequently, finding it a "homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation."

This group also begged and borrowed and earned enough money to put up bicycle signs throughout the city, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

These two factors were put together by the bicycle club and with only this to go on, parlayed into a really worthwhile nationwide advertising of Homestead and South Dade.

Other efforts of a similar nature should be invited and promoted by other areas in South Dade, an area which is neglected by the leaders of our county, who know little about our area, and who concentrate their effort to other areas, with South Dade paying part of the bill.

So it is up to the initiative and effort of local groups such as the Dr. Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead.

Hats off to these promotion pioneers of South Dade, who are pushing a new club slogan: "I'd rather bike than hike," which is a twist of the hiking craze which recently started in Washington governmental circles, and which amounted to little because the politicos couldn't take it. They too should take up cycling.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to compliment Dr. White for his selection of Homestead, Fla., as a frequent vacation spot and his public service in encouraging and participating in this bicycling and bicycle safety movement, which not only aids the middle-aged and senior citizens by giving them healthy recreation and constructive exercise, but contributes to the well-being and happiness of our youth and all our citizens.

I should like also to commend Mayor Conley and the Homestead City officials, the sponsors and members of the Homestead Bicycle Club, the News Leader, and the citizens of Homestead, for their public-spirited efforts which have brought merited recognition to the Homestead area.

We in Florida have demonstrated that it can be done. We have led the way. Other communities should be inspired to follow our example. I challenge other cities and States to adopt similar programs. Let us get all of America aboard bicycles for health and happiness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Goodling), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of of Mr. Goodling), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Cramer (at the request of Mr. Goodling), for 30 minutes, on Thursday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Huddleston and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Edwards.

Mr. Willis in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Joelson.

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. St. Onge.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goodling) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.

Mr. Daddario.

Mr. Multer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gill) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Hemphill.

Mr. Morris.

Mr. Patten.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

584. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during February 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

585. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relating to the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses" for the fiscal year 1963, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

586. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

587. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the January 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

588. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

589. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes,' approved March 1, 1899, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

590. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the U.S. Information Agency's 19th semiannual report, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to

amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

592. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

593. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona (Convair), a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

595. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Saline Water Act for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

596. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1989. A bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 116. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 117. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 118. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend paragraph 368 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to duties imposed on the importation of clocks, clock movements and other measuring devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5098. A bill to repeal section 2(d) of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5099. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for addition to the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5100. A bill authorizing the modification of the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5101. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5102. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Cancer Society; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 5103. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5104. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5107. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities of certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to prevent discrimination because of sex in payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5112. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5113. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5114. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5116. A bill to prohibit the extension of Grand Teton National Park without the expressed approval of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 5117. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 5118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5119. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5120. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5121. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5123. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5124. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5126. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5127. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5128. A bill to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5129. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5131. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards based on the extent of migration out of certain areas for the purpose of designating such areas as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 5133. A bill to make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton, to authorize the Secretary to permit cotton-growers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5134. A bill to provide transportation for certain parents and unremarried widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces who are buried in national cemeteries outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5135. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 5136. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 5137. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the National railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 5139. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5140. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to authorize the several States to permit the offering of a prayer in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study the feasibility and advisability of and to formulate preliminary plans and recommendations for a site and for the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restricting the judicial power of the United States in State legislative apportionment cases to those States which do not provide their citizens with the opportunity to initiate and vote upon plans of State legislative apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document, the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and auxiliaries regarding proposed amendments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 297. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred for minority purposes in the Education and Labor Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Res. 298. Resolution to amend clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 299. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred to as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to naming the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border after the Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Senate, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine protesting against the proposed transfer of internal revenue personnel and services from the State of Maine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging immediate action by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the national defense system in Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the rejection of the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protecting the U.S. lumbering industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation to the Secretary of Agriculture for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging consideration of legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to asking consideration of the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor Federal legislation providing for regulation and control of appropriations, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their State and her sister States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging legislation to prohibit the killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follow:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5141. A bill for the relief of Leung Kar Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5142. A bill for the relief of Dana Hinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Paul Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5145. A bill for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Adamo Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5147. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Pei-Chi Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5149. A bill for the relief of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Spyridoula Mavrogianopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Harry Cornish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5154: A bill for the relief of Wilfredo Larar de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. Fred Wynn, chairman, Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling upon Congress in the public interest to initiate proper legislation to make labor unions subject to the same laws as industry, amenable to the national security and public welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

73. Also, petition of John Biancucci and others, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Bernard E. Hanus, assistant committee clerk, Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Detroit, Mich., relative to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transaction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Democratic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I proudly join my colleagues in paying tribute to the inspiring courage and determination of Byelorussians all over the world. I am certain that the independence they once enjoyed, will be regained and that freedom will flourish.

Byelorussia was once an independent country and made important contributions to the medieval history of Eastern Europe. In 1795, this freedom was crushed when Byelorussia was made a part of the Russian Empire by force.

Since then, Byelorussians have fought to regain their independence, without success. Major attempts were made in 1812 and 1863; and in 1917, after creating a congress with the goal of establishing an independent Byelorussia, the democratic body was attacked and scattered by the armed power of Soviet Russia.

Unconquered, despite this tragic defeat, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed independence by passing the Third Constitutional Act on March 25, 1918. But Soviet Russia attacked and defeated the young democratic state, consisting of 10 million persons.

Demonstrating their indomitable courage and love for freedom, the people of Byelorussia rebelled and fought in the Slutsk District in 1920, but were defeated by the Soviet armies, and again during

World War II, when the central council organized armed forces.

Despite 45 years of Soviet despotism and exploitation, Byelorussia has not surrendered, and never will. The flame of freedom is never extinguished by the violent winds of tyranny. And as Byron wrote of those who perish in freedom's constant struggle, "they never fail who die in a great cause."

Freedom is the greatest cause of all and its ultimate victory is inevitable.

Byelorussia will be free and happy again.

News Register Becomes a Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I address the House of Representatives today on a most felicitous occasion. As you and many of my colleagues know, the most populous portion of the Ninth Congressional District is southerly Alameda County, an area of incomparable climate, rich farmlands, vineyards, and delightful cities and towns.

One of these cities is Fremont, northern California's largest city area. Formed in 1956 by incorporating the five rural communities of Centerville, Irvington, Niles, Mission San Jose, and a large amount of agricultural land, Fremont's population has risen since 1956 from 22,443 to nearly 60,000. The projected constant growth over the next 15 years is 8,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, such a rapid growth too many times means chaos for a community, but this is not the case in Fremont. The reason is that our city is a planned community in the most perfect sense, a city whose master plan has provided for a proper balance of industrial, commercial and residential development, of parks, recreation, and wildlife areas. As the American Institute of Planners stated in awarding Fremont the 1962 honor award for "outstanding achievement in comprehensive planning," Fremont is, of course, almost unique.

The fact that this explosive growth has been guided and controlled pursuant to sound and imaginative planning is a credit to the city government, its staff, its elected officials, and ultimately to the entire citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, this steady course that I have described has not been easy. After all, what has been accomplished here is the blending into one great city of five rural communities, each with its own leaders, its own points of view. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to have done this continuing job without the existence of an enlightened newspaper, whose first loyalty was to the community and its people and not to any personal partisanship of its publishers.

This newspaper is the News Register, Mr. Speaker, published by Mr. George P. Oakes and Mr. George H. Oakes, and serving, in addition to Fremont, the growing and vital cities of Newark, Union City and Milpitas.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in sending congratulations to the News Register on its joining of the great American family of daily newspapers. May it live long and prosper well, continuing to serve its community and its country in the fair and impartial dissemination of news, and in the honest and incisive criticism of its editorial page.

Tribute to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison Who Is Retiring After Long Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress fully realize that in order to properly carry out our duties and responsibilities we must have efficient staffs, particularly competent administrative assistants. And not only do the services of these employees mean so much to each of us but to the successful operation of Congress as a whole.

It is most fitting to pay tribute to a congressional aid who will retire March 31 after 22 years of faithful and meritorious service. I refer to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison who has served as an assistant to Louisiana Members of Congress longer than anyone else, having begun her congressional employment in 1922 as secretary to former Representative Leonard Allen of the Eighth Louisiana District. When the latter retired from Congress, Mrs. Harrison became secretary to former Representative Henry D. Larcade of Louisiana's Seventh District and following Representative Larcade's retirement she has served as administrative assistant to his successor, Representative T. A. THOMPSON, since January 3, 1953.

Incidentally, Mrs. Harrison is closely vied for the longest service to the Louisiana congressional delegation by three other members of our staffs. Miss Florence "Flo" LeCompte, personal secretary to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, began her congressional duties May 1, 1942, while Mrs. Florence Cooley has been administrative assistant to Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, of the Sixth Louisiana District, since January 3, 1943. Bill Candler, who has been my executive secretary for a number of years, has been on the Hill since November 4, 1942, having previously served with former Representative James Domengeaux, of the Third Louisiana District, and with former Representative Larcade.

A native of Louisiana, Mrs. Harrison was born at Marthaville. She graduated from Northwestern State College at Natchitoches, La., with a bachelor of science degree, and from Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge with a master's degree in business administration, and served as supervisor of student teachers in Louisiana. She is a member of the Baptist Church.

Mrs. Harrison is the wife of Derwood D. Harrison, a career employee with the General Accounting Office. "Bud," as he is best known, came to Washington from North Carolina as an employee of former Representative and Comptroller General Lindsay Warren.

Mr. and Mrs. Harrison maintain a delightful home in Bethesda. In addition to her congressional work she is popular in Washington social circles, numbering among her close friends and personal acquaintances many Members of Congress and others in Washington official circles.

Since Representative THOMPSON has interested himself over the years in assisting young men to secure an education in Washington, "Miss Clara," as so many know her, has been a veritable Washington housemother to these young people, many of whom have successfully completed their professional educations.

After these many years of devoted, loyal and most helpful service to Congress and to her employers, and her years in the teaching profession, making approximately 30 years she has served the public, Mrs. Harrison is certainly entitled to a well-earned rest although she will no doubt continue many of her activities. Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation and their staffs join with all the many others in her wide circle of friendships in wishing for Miss Clara a very pleasant and happy retirement.

Comparison of Gross Tax Burdens of Various Nations in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in order to compare the relative tax burdens of industrialized and nondeveloped countries, it is best to show total taxes either as a percentage of gross national product or national income. The generally accepted definition of national income does not include indirect taxes. Many countries rely to very different degrees on indirect taxes—some have a high proportion of indirect taxes in their tax structure, while others do not have such a high percentage. Thus using national income as a yardstick of taxload may result in an overstatement of the fiscal burden for the one class and an understatement for the other.

The United Nations Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics for 1961 gives latest available gross national product and tax figures for 1960. Since the data for gross national product are collected on a relatively uniform basis, percentages of taxes calculated as part of the gross national product of each country have the advantage of international comparability. These taxes include all indirect taxes collected as well as all social security contributions.

On the basis of latest available U.N. statistics, total taxes as a percentage of gross national product show the following relative tax burdens among various countries for 1960:

Country	Taxes as percent of GNP	Rank
West Germany	34.0	1
France	33.2	2
Austria	32.9	3
Norway	32.1	4
Sweden	31.3	5
Finland	30.8	6
Netherlands	30.1	7
Italy	28.7	8
United Kingdom	27.9	9
United States	27.5	10
New Zealand	27.5	11
Denmark	25.1	12
Canada	24.8	13
Belgium	24.2	14
Australia	23.5	15
Chile	22.9	16
Ireland	22.1	17
Japan	20.2	18
Burma	19.8	19
Greece	19.6	20
Mauritius	19.3	21
Portugal	17.5	22
China-Taiwan	15.5	23
Malta	15.2	24
Republic of South Africa	15.1	25
Ecuador	15.0	26
Costa Rica	14.7	27
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	14.2	28
Korea	14.1	29
Jamaica	13.0	30
Panama	12.2	31
Colombia	11.4	32
India	9.7	33

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD a tribute to the freedom-loving Byelorussians on the occasion of the anniversary of their independence.

For more than four centuries the Byelorussians, one of the oldest and proudest national groups in Eastern Europe, have been living under Russian rule. Except for a brief period of independence, they have been subjected to the worst excesses of the autocratic czarist regime and the Communist totalitarian system. Although they have suffered more than any other national minority group, the Byelorussians have steadfastly maintained their national identity and their love of freedom. They have struggled for independence and liberty for centuries despite hardships, privation, exile, and death.

The turbulent events of World War I and the Russian revolution gave the Byelorussians their long-sought opportunity to break away from the Russian shackles. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed. The Byelorussian government quickly set to work to expand its activity in such fields as education, culture, and social protection, despite the wartime difficulties and devastation. With the retreat of the German armies in November 1918, the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The government, unable to oppose this aggression, was forced to leave the capital city of Minsk and withdraw to Grodno. The fledgling republic's leaders were unable to build up enough military strength to defend its independence and integrity. In 1921 the country was partitioned by Poland and Russia in the treaty which ended the war between these two powers.

Early in World War II Byelorussia was unified under Soviet rule as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The freedom-loving Byelorussians are still under the heel of their Russian oppressors. They do not even have the freedom to observe the anniversary of their Independence Day. We in the free world celebrate the anniversary of that historic event and echo the deep-felt sentiments of the Byelorussian people.

Boom to South Jersey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, when New Jersey State Senator Frank S. "Hap" Farley, Republican, of Atlantic City, said recently, in speaking of the proposed southern New Jersey expressway, "This is the culmination of an 8-year dream," the senior New Jersey State senator spoke of a dream which has been the aspiration and the hope of every citizen who lives in the southern New Jersey seashore area.

The new expressway provides speedy access to and from Atlantic City and the adjacent resorts. It is worth noting that the $46,800,000 road was made possible by the determined efforts on the part of State Senator Farley and Charles W. Sandman, Republican, of Cape May, and the Republican members of the New Jersey House of Assembly.

This new toll road will be open for the summer of 1964. It will enhance the travel of tourists to and from the area. It lends to the growth and development of business. I foresee, with the opening of the expressway, the beginning of a whole new era of employment and development in south Jersey.

In the not too distant future south Jersey will be highly industrialized, with an easy flow of traffic on a year-round basis into and out of the area.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, with the hundreds of thousands of miles of highways in our Nation, a simple expressway might not appear important. What is important is the fact that for many citizens travel to and from Atlantic City has been difficult, if not awkward. It has cost the area millions in employment, hampered industrial growth, and relegated the area to a place of second consideration for our traveling population.

Now, due to the forthright action and determination of our legislators, we see the dawn of a new day. A day when more of our citizens will come to the world's famous playground, to bathe in the Atlantic Ocean, and to walk upon the most famous boardwalk in the world.

The land of the salt water taffy will again take its rightful place in the hearts of people everywhere.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the smaller Slavic ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, the Byelorussians are little known in the West, and their distinct national identity is often confused.

This is partly because they have always intermingled with other more numerous and powerful Slavic peoples, and partly because for centuries they have been subjected to the oppressive rule of foreign overlords. For hundreds of years their far more powerful neighbors, the Russians, have done all in their power to subdue them and represent them to the world as Russians.

The history of Byelorussian people proves beyond any doubt that they formed a distinct national group in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, long before the formation of the modern Russian state. However, during most of modern times Byelorussia has been part of the Russian Empire just as it is part of the Soviet Union today.

The autocratic czars of Russia and their callous agents could not eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct ethnic group. The more the Byelorussians were oppressed by their Russian overlords, the more these sturdy people clung to their traditional national ideals and longed for the day of their independence.

Finally, this came about in 1918, when the czarist regime in Russia was no more. On March 25 of that year Byelorussian leaders took the fate of their people into their hands and proclaimed the Byelorussian National Republic. Independent Byelorussia was recognized by the governments of numerous countries, and the new state seemed to be on its way to full sovereignty in historic Byelorussia with Minsk as its capital.

Unfortunately, the independence thus attained and proclaimed could not last long without effective foreign aid. Such help did not come, and the Republic soon succumbed. It was under constant attack by the Communist forces of Russia. Once the Red army was effectively organized, one of its first tasks was to overrun and occupy, and then annex Byelorussia to the Soviet Union. The Byelorussian National Republic actually existed little more than a year. By late

1919 its status was very shaky and early in the next year it ceased to exist.

Since then, for more than four dreadful and dreary decades, some 10 million Byelorussians have been living under oppressive Soviet tyranny. It is no exaggeration to say they have suffered longer under Soviet communism and have sacrificed more than any other non-Russian people in the Soviet Union. But they have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence, and they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation from Communist tyranny.

On the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians constitute one of the less numerous and little-known Slavic peoples on the East European borderland, east of Poland and west of Moscow. Their modern history is inextricably blended with and sadly overshadowed by Russian history, because for centuries they were subjected to ruthless Russian czarist regimes. But the Byelorussians, who have had a longer history as a nation than the Russians themselves, were never willing to forgo and forget their distinct national identity. They always longed to regain their national independence. This supreme goal was attained in 1918.

On March 25 of that year, after Russia's detested czarist regime had collapsed and the new Communist regime in Russia was still weak, the Byelorussians proclaimed the establishment of the Byelorussian Republic. At the time it was hoped that these 10 million hardworking and liberty-seeking people, having become sovereign in their historic homeland, would be able to enjoy the fruits of freedom in peace. Unfortunately their subsequent history took a disastrous turn. Early in 1921, long before the Byelorussians had the chance to consolidate their new government and put their own house in order, Soviet forces attacked and overran the country. Byelorussia as an independent and sovereign nation vanished from the international scene. For more than four decades since that time these sturdy and stouthearted Byelorussians have been living under the unrelenting and ruthless rule of their Communist overlords in Moscow. As much as any other people subdued by Russia's massive might, these unhappy subjects have been completely isolated from the free world, and today they are no better off as a nationality group than they were under the most ruthless of Russian czars. Even so, they have not given up their hope for their eventual freedom and independence. They all cherish that noble ideal, and on the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their deliverance from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Appropriation for Conservation Program Should Not Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement I submitted to the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations urging that the 1964 appropriation for the conservation program of the Department of Agriculture should not be reduced.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO THE AGRICULTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am grateful for the opportunity to present to you and the distinguished members of your subcommittee a brief statement in regard to the 1964 appropriation for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

May I direct your attention to page 126 of the Budget of the U.S. Government, 1964, Appendix, where it is stated as follows in connection with the budget for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:

"A level of $150 million for the 1964 programs is proposed, a reduction of $100 million below the 1963 program. Payments for the 1964 program will be made from the 1965 appropriation."

The proposed reduction from $250 to $150 million for this program in the coming fiscal year—a reduction of 40 percent—is very disturbing. I have received letters of protest from the Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in the State of Connecticut urging that "this budget proposal should not be cut from $250 to $150 million". In a letter dated March 5, 1963, the president of this association, Mr. Erwin Kelsey of Middletown, Conn., in my Congressional District, informs me as follows:

"We feel that without the Federal cost-sharing our objective in developing the conservation plan with landowners on each acre of his holdings according to its needs and used within its capabilities will be greatly jeopardized."

Your committee is well aware, I am sure, of the aims of this program in encouraging conservation by Federal sharing with farmers of the cost of carrying out approved soilbuilding and soil and water-conserving practices, including also benefits to wildlife. Without this assistance from the Government the farmers would not and could not undertake these conservation projects by themselves with their limited resources. The rate of this cost-sharing program is approximately 50 percent, and that is a fair rate. These conservation measures include the establishment of permanent protective cover, improvement and protection of vegetative cover, conservation and disposal of water, protection of soil from wind and water erosion, and benefits to wildlife.

In Connecticut, the local agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, participating in this Federal cost-sharing program, place particular emphasis on the physical type practices seeking to benefit wildlife, provide protection of vegetative cover and conservation of soil and disposal of water.

This program is extremely important to the State of Connecticut. A reduction of $100 million in the budget for this vital program is, in my view, shortsighted and may in the long run prove to be a waste of resources rather than an act of economy. I am interested in economy and will gladly support such efforts, but this is most certainly an example of false economy.

I urge you and the members of your committee to increase the amount of the conservation program to the same level as it was last year, namely, to provide the full amount of $250 million for this service which is beneficial to the whole country.

Greg Samuels Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the State finals of the Indiana High School Athletic Association's annual basketball tournament was played last Saturday, March 23, at Indianapolis, Ind.

Garfield High School, of Terre Haute, Ind., which is located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, was one of the final four participants in this statewide competition.

An outstanding member of this Garfield team coached by Mr. Willard Kehrt, is Greg Samuels, who was awarded the tournament's coveted Arthur L. Trester Award for mental attitude and scholarship following the final game at Butler University Fieldhouse.

The Trester Award is the highest athletic and scholarship honor that can be attained by an Indiana High School boy and Greg Samuels certainly deserved the honor.

In addition to being a star player for Coach Kehrt, leading his team into the finals with a great performance in the defeat of defending champion, Bosse of Evansville, Greg has compiled an outstanding scholastic record at Garfield.

Greg has been president of his class for 4 consecutive years and has maintained an "A–B" average throughout his high school career.

Greg's achievement in winning the Trester Award is a tribute not only to Greg himself, but his teachers and coaches at Garfield High School, his parents and the entire community of Terre Haute.

Fortunately, for the State of Indiana, Greg is planning to continue his education at either Indiana State College at Terre Haute, or Wabash College in Crawfordsville. Both of these excellent colleges are also located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, and Greg could make no finer choice of schools than Indiana State or Wabash.

I am pleased to bring news of Greg Samuels' achievement to the attention of this body. This talented and dedicated youth deserves national recognition for his record at Garfield High School and his personal triumph as Indiana's outstanding athlete-student for this season.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am thinking, not only of the people of ancient Greece who laid the foundations of democratic government and the men, women, and children of modern Greece so close to our hearts, but as well of those of Greek ancestry and blood who as our fellow Americans have made such a mighty contribution to our own United States in culture, religion, business, the professions, in all of our activities, and so well in the new land of America have kept aflame the torch of democracy first lighted centuries ago in ancient Greece.

In my own city of Chicago no nationalistic group is held in higher esteem and affection. Its sons and daughters are numbered among the leaders in all the worthy activities of a great metropolis.

It is only natural that a nation's independence day have a particular significance for the people of that nation. This is the case for Greece, but her independence day is also meaningful for other peoples in the world. The Greeks, it will be recalled, were the first people to conceive and advocate the concept of independence in ancient times, yet for some 2,000 years they were deprived of this precious right. This is why the rebirth of free and independent Greece 142 years ago is such an important milestone in the history of mankind. The Greeks' unceasing determination to fight for their liberation from alien rule earned them the admiration of many people throughout the world, and the free and sovereign state of Greece was welcomed into the family of nations.

The past 400 years of Ottoman rule had proven particularly arduous. The Greeks who have also always cherished the ideals of individual freedom and dignity, were treated as mere subjects to be exploited, rather than as citizens. Their uprisings and rebellions were never successful, however, for the Sultan's forces were superior. It took a 9-year war of independence and the assistance of European powers to wrench Greece free from Turkish rule.

For 142 years now the Greeks have been independent, and their country has become a valued member of the community of free nations. Greece was admitted to the Council of Europe in 1949, to NATO in 1951, and is a party to the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia. Greece took a historic step last year in becoming associated with the European Economic Community. This association presents both a challenge and an opportunity for the Greek people in their efforts to modernize the economy of their country.

On the occasion of the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day we congratulate the Greek people on their achievements and reaffirm the close ties between our two nations, democratic Greece and democratic United States.

Maryland Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate a significant anniversary in Maryland. Monday, March 25, is Maryland Day, the 329th anniversary of the first founding of the colony of Maryland when the tiny ships, the *Ark* and *Dove*, brought the first Maryland colonists to St. Clements Island in the Potomac River. Then they landed at St. Marys to found what has become a historic and a great State.

We should take time in 1963 to consider what the State of Maryland means to us now and what it has meant over the years. Maryland has been a place where great ideas have been developed, where great concepts of government have been tried. When proven, they have been handed down to other States and to the world at large. Some of the institutions of Maryland have been preserved in the Government of the United States. And so we have good reason to examine what is great in our own Maryland history.

Last year on Maryland Day we recalled the Act of Toleration. That act was passed by the General Assembly of Maryland 3 centuries ago to give all persons in Maryland the right to practice their religion in their own manner. This was religious freedom and individual liberty which was unique in the 17th century. We can be very proud of our Maryland heritage for developing a climate of toleration which is now a fundamental part of our constitutional right as Americans.

There were other things which we can remember with great pride. For instance, in 1648 there was the incident in the general assembly in which a woman claimed for the first time in recorded American history the right to sit as a legislator. The Journal of the General Assembly of Maryland for Friday, January 21, 1648, records:

> Came Mrs. Margaret Brent and requested to have vote in the House for herself and voice also.

On this occasion the Governor denied Mrs. Brent both voice and vote as a member of the General Assembly of Maryland, but she had asserted for all time the claim that a woman had a right to sit as an equal with other members of the legislature. Today, of course, Mrs. Brent's claim has been vindicated. There are women in Annapolis who are valuable members of the general assembly. And in Washington the Congress, which is in a sense a direct descendant of the General Assembly of Maryland, also has valuable Members who are women. This is a principle which had its birth and its first expression in Maryland. It is another incident of Maryland history which can make us proud of our heritage.

If today we are sometimes discouraged because our political progress in Maryland seems to be slow; if we are discouraged because interest in good government seems to be limited to too few, we can look back to our long and proud history and I think gain good cause for our optimism for the years ahead.

Because of its historic interest I append the Journal of the general assembly for January 21, 1648, as follows:

[From Archives of Maryland, Proceedings and Acts of the Assembly of Maryland 1637/8–1664]

MARYLAND DAY—1963

The freemen bownd to attend the Assembly appeared except Mr. Ffenwick, Mr. Thorneborough, Mr. Brookes & George Saphyer.

Summons to George Saphyer to be att the Assembly forthwth. vppon sight & c

was read certaine orders to be obserued in the howse during the Assembly

Came Mrs. Margarett Brent and requested to have vote in the howse for her selfe and voyce allso for that att eh last Court 3d Jan: it was ordered that the said Mrs. Brent was to be looked uppon and received as his Lps Attorney. The Gov.r denyed that the s.d Mrs Brent should have any uote in the howse. And the s.d Mrs. Brent protested agst all proceedings in this pnt Assembly, unlesse shee may be pnt. and have vote as afores.d.

Byelorussian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the date of March 25 marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The people of Byelorussia first proclaimed their freedom on March 25, 1918, but their young Republic was soon turned into a battlefield for the armies of Russia and Germany and later of Russia and Poland. Engulfed from the east and from the west, Byelorussia was conquered and her territory divided. During the occupation resistance continued and during World War II Byelorussia was able to organize a free government and arm herself against Soviet Russia. Russian might once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 45-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of that 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored. From their tragic history we have come to respect and admire the valiant courage and determination of the Byelorussian people. They have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to the flood of communism and it is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

Justice Department Asked To Investigate Satevepost "Fix" Story Violations of Federal Wiretap Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Saturday Evening Post article in the March 23, 1963, issue entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix" is false generally in its charges against Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts.

However, it also is emerging more clearly now that the alleged source of the article has a record of convictions on bad check charges, various financial difficulties, and obtained the information on which the article is based illegally. It appears, from the story in the Satevepost, that the man, George Burnett, of Atlanta, overheard a conversation between two men over the long distance telephone. His reporting of the conversation appears to be in violation of title 47, section 605 of the United States Code.

I have written the Attorney General the following letter asking that appropriate action be taken. I insert the letter as a part of my remarks herewith:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.

Hon. Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General of the United States,
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Attorney General: I am writing to call your attention to the Saturday Evening Post article entitled, "The Story of a College Football Fix," which appeared in the issue dated March 23, 1963. The article begins on page 80 and refers to a telephone conversation between Wallace Butts, University of Georgia athletic director, and Paul Bryant, University of Alabama athletic director, allegedly overheard by a George Burnett. The alleged phone call originated in Atlanta, Ga., by Butts calling Bryant in Tuscaloosa, Ala. The article referred to gives details of the conversation which Mr. Burnett "overheard" after he was "accidentally" cut into the conversation.

Although I am personally convinced that the alleged conversation in no way incriminates either of the athletic officials in a fix, it is apparent that the article is based on what Mr. Burnett says he overheard. It is my belief that the article is defamatory and libelous. But that is a civil matter which will be decided in the courts.

I believe that it is equally clear from the language of the article that the author, Frank Graham, Jr., of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Curtis Publishing Co., of New York, N.Y., publishers of the Saturday Evening Post, and George Burnett, of Atlanta, Ga., are in violation of title 47, section 605, United States Code, the Federal wiretap statute. The statute is, as you know, part of the Federal Communications Act. It reads in part as follows:

"And no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and no person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiving any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and no person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto."

I will appreciate your investigating the circumstances surrounding the alleged telephone conversation, keeping in mind the pertinent provision of the Federal wiretap statute, herein quoted, and taking appropriate action in the premises.

Very truly yours,
George Huddleston, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The 1963 Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of the Fifth South Carolina District, last week made a most comprehensive detailed statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on the 1963 tax message. I ask that these remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 1963 Tax Message

(Statement of Robert W. Hemphill, Member of Congress, Fifth South Carolina District, before the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, March 14, 1963)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am most grateful to you for allowing me to appear here today. I am not an expert on taxation, but my appearance here today is stimulated and inspired by the realization that I represent a precious segment of taxpaying American people, the people in the 5th Congressional District of South Carolina, who have a stake in your decision on any changes made in the tax laws in the 88th Congress. Let me assure you that I respect the position of decision and power which each of you holds as a member of this committee, and I recognize that you are members of this committee because you have been recognized by the respective political parties which elected you to this committee.

Let me begin by saying that I favor a tax cut. I also favor tax reform, although I am not in favor of certain proposals which I hope to discuss with you today, and which adversely affect the well-being of the people of my district, or the business which is carried on by or for or with the people of my district. I pause here to salute the President of the United States for his courage and his foresight in proposing tax legislation and change this year, particularly a tax cut. I have every confidence in his sincerity of purpose, his ambition to keep the American economy not only rolling along at the prosperous rate it has enjoyed, but to improve the status of the economy. When the President of the United States stated in his tax message of January 24, 1963, "Our present income tax rates structure now holds back consumer demands, initiative, and investment," he was saying the same thing that I have heard from hundreds of businessmen. Sadly I report that most of these businessmen are people who have expressed a dislike to Mr. Kennedy, and now that he has said it I am sure it is not as popular with them as if others had said it. Nevertheless, he has said it, he has spoken the truth and I am happy in the confidence that your committee will do something about our tax laws, and if any feeble effort on my part can be of assistance to the members of this great committee I am as near as your telephone.

Recently there came across my desk a little booklet entitled "Comments on the President's 1963 Economic Report," put out by the Department of Economics and Research of the American Bankers Association. I quote from that report:

"In our judgment, the requirement for implementing a tax cut 'within the bounds of fiscal prudence' would not preclude a temporary swelling of the Federal deficit—if this increase resulted from a tax reduction of the magnitude proposed by the President. For practical as well as economical reasons, our endorsements of tax reduction has not been coupled with the demand that the reduction be accomplished without exerting a temporary adverse of impact on the Federal budget. We regard tax reduction as an investment in future economic vigor, and we look upon the accompanying temporary enlargement of the deficit as the price, though the purpose, of the tax cut. Even a temporary enlargement of the Federal deficit resulting exclusively from tax reduction is not without risk at this time—the risk of generating renewed inflationary prices and compounding our balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet our confidence in the constructive forces that tax reductions can unleash leads us to believe that the price, in terms of a temporary and manageable swelling of the deficit, can and should be made."

I hope I have not taken this out of context. I respect the group that made the study.

I share your wishes that we could accomplish a tax cut without any enlargement of the deficit. I also share the belief that the President of the United States and those who have recognized the advantages of a tax cut at this time, that a tax cut will be of great benefit to this country, even with a corresponding rise in the national debt. My recollection is that this is the first time in the history of this country that the President of the United States has proposed a tax cut as a stimulation for business. All of us who are privileged to have enjoyed any length of maturity as American citizens, or as people privileged to serve their people as Members of Congress, recognize the fact that this is the last needle in the economic doctor's kit. We continue to be under the influence of a wartime military budget, which has become a basic foundation of our economy—or should I say we depend more than we realize on expenditures for military purposes to keep the plants running, the people employed, and production steady. We are going to have to face, someday, and soon, the impact of this economic factor, and the problem of reduction of defense outlay without hurting our economy. If we are to stimulate the economy in any way, the tax cut seems to me the last and only hope that we have in our store of possible remedies, under present economic realities.

Before I proceed into discussion of specifics of the proposed tax legislation that I will discuss with you because of the effect on my district, let me ask your indulgence in one area of tax practice. In any consideration of reform of the tax structure of the United States today, or tomorrow, or in the immediate future, one ambition of this committee should be to simplify the filing of tax returns to such an extent that a man with an income of less than $5,000, in order to claim the grace, the benefits allowed him by certain deductions, would be able to accurately and honestly fill out the form without having to hire someone to do it. I believe most of the accountants of this Nation would share that wish with me. I am a country lawyer, and I have filled out hundreds of tax forms; naturally, when I did, I had to charge people for them. I have not filled out any but my own since I have been a Member of the Congress, but I have observed others filling out their forms, and the forms today are too complicated. They encourage mistakes, and I think a major challenge to this committee, not today because I realize that this particular tax legislation you are considering today must be limited to the scope intended, is the challenge shining like a light in the faces of the members of this committee and the Members of the Congress of the United States, to do something about the difficulty of making a return. Perhaps you say that this is an administrative matter; it may be, but you and I as Members of the Congress have some responsibility, too, and the fact that the forms are so complicated, or maybe the laws are so complicated, that people have to pay to get their tax forms filled out, even simple ones, seems to me an added burden of taxation which I know the legislators who passed the tax laws never intended. I plead with you for a simple form at some future date.

I do not believe the average taxpayer in the Nation knows how big a stake he has before this Congress, and which we must meet before we recess this year. The business people know, as a change in travel and entertainment expense account procedure brought them home to reality: the business of the Government is the business of the businessman as well as the responsibility of the Congressman, the Senator, the executive branch of the Government. Everything we do here affects every businessman in America in some way.

I make no apologies for singling out matters of importance to the people of my district. Their problems are my responsibility. I wish time permitted my dwelling on more facets of the tax proposals.

REVISION OF CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES

In the committee print of the President's 1963 tax message, February 6, 1963, under subdivision XVIII, C–2(b) (see p. VI of index), at pages 142, 143, I find the following:

"Under present law, a lump-sum distribution of an employee's interest in a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan is taxed as long-term capital gain if the distribution is made to the employee on account of his separation from the service of the employer or is made to the employee's beneficiary on account of his death. Under the recommendation, the recipient would not treat the lump-sum distribution as a capital gain; rather, it would be regarded simply as ordinary income. However, he would be permitted to average the lump-sum distribution in the manner described below.

"The special averaging treatment would generally be available in the case of lump-sum distributions which qualify for capital gains treatment under present law; that is, those that are made on account of separation from service or death. It would not be available, however, unless contributions had been made for the employee under the pension or profit-sharing plan for at least 5 previous years.

"This averaging technique will result in a tax comparable to that which would be payable if the distribution had been received over the first 5 years of the employee's retirement. For the average employee, the tax on his lump-sum distribution will be roughly the same as he would pay under the present capital gains rates. For those employees who are presently covered under pension and profit-sharing plans, the tax may be even lower because a portion of their distributions will qualify as capital gain subject to the new rates.

I am afraid the intended purpose of this proposal will be defeated if drastic change in the proposals are not made. I gather from exhibit No. 17 (p. 483 supra) that this is aimed at "highly paid employees * * * able to withdraw huge sums from the company's pension or profit-sharing plan when they retire or leave the company and pay only the low capital gains tax." The trouble is that we find ourselves at the muzzle end of a scattergun instead of watching someone shoot a rifle at a selected target.

In my district approximately 10,000 people share in a wonderful profit-sharing plan—I believe it is second to none in the Nation—as employees of Springs Cotton Mills. For the calendar year 1962 the employees' share was $4,240,485. I quote from the Springs Bulletin of Wednesday, February 27, 1963:

"In releasing these figures, H. W. Close, president of the Springs organization, pointed out that the company's contribution to the Springs fund was the largest since the fund was established in 1953. There are 9,310 employees in the Springs fund and their share accounts now total $15,420,004.

"PLAN REVISED

"The largest contribution made previously by Springs to the Springs fund was $2,800,000 in 1960. The increase in this year's contribution was made possible by the revision of the plan in 1962. As approved by the Internal Revenue Service, the formula for the amount of the annual contribution is now based on profits, after dividends, without regard to the amount of capital invested.

"On the recommendation of the Internal Revenue Service a division has been made in the Springs fund setting up one trust for hourly and piece-rate employees and another for those on salaries. This change does not affect present account balances but will give hourly and piece-rate employees a larger share in the future.

"The distribution of extra pay in the form of vacation and Christmas checks was begun in 1948 by Col. Elliott Springs. These checks add up to approximately 1 week's pay for employees with less than 5 years' service and range up to 4 weeks' pay for those who have been on the job 25 years or longer. This cash distribution amounted to $879,919 in July 1962 and $862,484 at Christmas.

"FUND GROWING

"Participation in the Springs fund has grown steadily since it was established in 1953. There were 8,836 share accounts in 1960, 9,222 in 1961, and 9,310 at the end of 1962.

"There has also been a steady increase in the total funds in these accounts. This total was $10,404,532 in 1960, $12,515,625 in 1961, and $15,420,004 at the end of 1962.

"The Springs fund has been built up entirely by contributions from the Springs Cotton Mills and through earnings on investments of the trust funds.

"Employees are eligible to participate in the Springs fund after 3 years' employment. They make no contribution to the fund nor is any deduction made from their paychecks.

"They are not compelled to remain in the Springs fund but the greatest benefits build up for those who stay in until they retire, die, or are disabled. Those who 'draw down their cash' forfeit part of the money credited to them and must wait 3 years before they may reenter."

From a little booklet on the profit-sharing plan, I call your attention to certain excerpts:

"The profit-sharing plan is for all employees. If you are an hourly paid or piecework employee, you may join the plan if you have worked for the company for 3 years or more.

"When you have been with the company for 3 years, you simply fill out a registration form, and you are a member.

"You also name the person you want to get your profit-sharing money in the case you die.

"You don't pay a cent to get into the plan. You don't pay a cent to stay in the plan, but it does cost you money to get out of the plan * * * if you pull out before you retire, get disabled or die.

"Let us take an example:

"We take the case of a typical weave room or spinning room employee, presently age 25, who earns $3,500 a year in wages. If he stays in our employ, and in the profit-sharing plan, until retirement at age 65, if his earnings continue at the same rate, if the company's profit experience continues at the present level until that time, and if the plan continues until that time with its current rate of earnings and forfeitures, our typical employee will have a credit at retirement of $36,268.

"Under present capital gain provisions, 50 percent of this credit or $18,134 would be included in taxable income. Assuming no other income and assuming exemptions and deductions of $2,000, our typical employee would pay a tax at current rates, of $3,268.

"Under the proposed capital gain provisions, our typical employee, on the same set of assumptions, would pay a tax, at the proposed reduced rates, of $6,994.20.

"The reason for this rather amazing consequence is to be found in Mr. Dillon's statement respecting the so-called 'averaging' or 'mitigating' provision. Thus, although the lump sum distribution is to be divided by 5 before computing the tax, it would appear that exemptions and deductions (where they exceed other income as in the case above) are to be 'subtracted from the lump-sum distribution before the averaging provision is applied.' (See the end of the fourth subparagraph under paragraph (2)(b).)

"If the exemptions and deductions were deducted after the averaging provision had been applied, our typical employee would pay a tax of only $4,128.25.

"To summarize:

"a. Under the present capital gains provisions and at current rates:

Lump sum distribution	$36, 268. 00
Includible income (50 percent)	18, 134. 00
Less deductions and exemptions	2, 000. 00
Taxable income	16, 134. 00
Tax	3, 965. 00

"b. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted before averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	34,268.00
Divided by 5	6,853.60
Tax on the above	1,398.84
Tax (5 times the above)	6,994.20

"c. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted after averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Divided by 5	7,253.60
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	5,253.00
Tax on the above	825.65
Tax (5 times the above)	4,128.25

"With respect to an employee whose profitsharing credit at retirement is $20,000, the comparable tax figures are (a) $1,680, (b) $2,680, (c) $1,400.

"If we are correct in our reading of the proposal, it would appear that there is no real averaging, no real effort to spread the impact over a 5-year period, for only 1 year's exemptions and deductions are given any effect in computing the tax.

"Perhaps the most disturbing part of this proposed new treatment of lump-sum distributions, at least from the viewpoint of those charged with administering the plan, is the proposal that the new tax treatment shall not apply to that portion of a lump-sum distribution which equals the amount in the employee's account on February 6, 1963, plus future earnings, on this amount. (See the third subparagraph of par. (2) (b) of Mr. Dillon's statement.)

"In other words, the company, or someone, shall have to maintain two accounts for each participant. Instead of 9,310 accounts, there will be 18,620. Each time there is a forfeiture, or an appreciation in investment value, or a dividend or interest item, there will have to be thousands of additional computations in order properly to divide the item and allocate it between that part of each participant's account representing 'the amount in the employee's account as of * * * February 6, 1963, plus the future earnings on this amount,' and that part of the employee's account which represents the balance.

"I'm sure you are aware that this increases the burden imposed on industry to report this project, to make this return, or to supply that information, to Federal, State and local governments."

I represent the people who are in this pension plan. There are other pension plans in effect in my district. Every man, woman, and child in my district will eventually be affected, adversely, if this change takes place. I solicit your earnest consideration.

REPEAL OF UNLIMITED DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

As I understand the statement on page 100 of the committee print on the President's 1963 tax message, the recommendation for repeal of the unlimited deductions for charitable contributions was based upon the premise that such is a special deduction of limited application which enables individuals with substantial incomes to escape all Federal taxes on their income. I am frank to admit that I do not have enough expertise on taxation statistics or practice to refute that statement. Certainly, as a taxpayer, I want to pay my tax, but not more, but, at the same time, I want the other fellow to pay his share because the man who doesn't pay his share adds to the burden of the taxpayer who is honest about his taxes.

I recognize the concern about people who do escape all Federal taxes on their income. I do not think that the rule of unlimited deductions applies only to people with large incomes. If this committee wants to write a limitation as to large incomes, since that is where any alleged inequity is pinpointed, I would certainly consider it proper if it means that the man with the smaller income is paying more tax because a man with a larger income is getting out of paying a fair share of taxes due because of this deduction. But let us consider the matter in the light of facts.

I am happy that I live in a portion of the country where people are moral, extremely religious. We have numerous churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. Many of these churches have small congregations, a majority of which make $5,000 to $7,000 or less. Many of the individuals of these assemblies tithe and I salute them for doing so; they are not rich nor do they try to get out of paying their taxes. If you repeal their right to deduct contributions, it is my opinion that you will do great harm because you would discourage the working people of this country from making contributions to their churches, to their orphanages, to their church schools.

It is not that their contributions are motivated by income tax regulations allowing deductions, but this has been the practice over many, many years, and as a Member of Congress I do not expect to be a part of any effort, or support any legislation, which will reduce the contributions so necessary to the churches, the church schools, and the orphanages.

Many of our orphanages and other charitable and educational church institutions rely heavily on contributions from various groups, particularly those of incomes below $20,000 because, in my section of the country, $20,000 is a tremendous income, and the people who support the various orphanages usually give $5 to $10 at a time; I know because I read the bulletins from the various church orphanages and I am interested in them and I know of the good work that they are doing.

To put a damper on this method of financing charitable institutions would be a disservice to the Nation, a disservice to the churches of this land and the good works they accomplish because they are financed, in large part, by contributions.

Many ministers have talked to me about this and many lay members of the various churches. We today are laboring to improve the education of every American, and were this tax effort to put a stumbling block in the path of church schools that use contributions to help finance the education of pupils who need it, would be a backward step in American progress and not in keeping with our overall purpose as a nation.

I am confident in your consideration of this proposal and your ability to preserve charitable accomplishments. I believe this proposal can be amended to do justice and to accomplish the purpose basically intended, and at the same time take care of the people with smaller incomes, the smaller contributors, and thus take care of our charitable institutions.

Churches, church schools, church orphanages are necessary, magnificent, institutions of this free land. They deserve every consideration from the Members of Congress.

CARRYOVER OF EXCESS DEDUCTIONS

On page 33 of the committee print (Feb. 6, 1963), I read from the statement of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury:

Under present law, taxpayers are able to reduce their taxable incomes from other sources by deducting substantial amounts of development costs and other expenses incurred when a mineral property is not yet profitable. But they are not required to take these deductions into account in determining net income for the purpose of computing the limit on the percentage depletion allowance on the property when it does become profitable. Even if the deductions are carried forward in the form of a net operating loss carryover and used to reduce future taxable income, they are never subtracted from net income from the property for purposes of the percentage depletion limitation. As a result, the amount of percentage depletion deducted over a property's life may be far more than one-half of its total net income. This result would seem to be clearly contrary to the purpose of the 50-percent net-income limitation on percentage depletion. The operation of present law is illustrated in the technical explanation.

But let us reason about this.

The President stated in his budget message that deductions taken with respect to a mineral property, to the extent they exceed the gross income from the property during the year taken, must be carried forward to future years for the purpose of reducing percentage depletion through reduction of the limiting net income from the property. All costs deducted with respect to the property would be subject to this provision, presumably even to State and local real estate taxes paid on idle mineral land. A careful study of this proposal will show that it is based on an error in reasoning as to the history and intent behind the depletion provisions of the present law and that it would operate to the broad detriment of the mining and quarrying industry. It would unfairly penalize both the small operator with a smaller margin of profit and the large operator who is required to incur heavy carrying costs to maintain levels of reserves in keeping with the size of his operations.

Secretary Dillon has stated that he felt the purpose of the 50 percent of net limitation is violated unless percentage depletion is limited to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. A brief review of the history of percentage depletion will reveal this to be erroneous.

In 1918 Congress granted discovery value depletion which in effect placed the finders of any mineral deposits on the same level with those producers who had found their deposits prior to March 31, 1913, and were entitled to deduct the 1913 value thereof. Once the valuation of the mineral deposit was completed the per unit depletion deduction was established and did not fluctuate with prices thereafter. As a result when market values decreased or when operations went sour causing a loss from the operation of the property there was still available a depletion deduction based on the original valuation in 1921. Congress limited the discovery value depletion to 100 percent of the net income from the property during the taxable year and this was later changed to 50 percent of the net income from the property in 1924. Subsequently when percentage depletion replaced discovery value depletion the 50 percent of net income limitation remained unchanged. Congress did not give any reason for its action in 1924 and prior but it is quite evident that the purpose was not to limit the deduction of discovery depletion to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. It would seem on the other hand that Congress was somewhat unhappy with the fact that inherent defects in the valuation procedure could result in values for depletion which in light of subsequent events seemed absurd and permitted deduction against nonmining income without the actual expenditure of funds. If the present recommendations are adopted this move cannot be explained by alleging it will carry out the original intent of Congress. In essence this proposal is simply another method of reducing the benefits and effectiveness of percentage depletion and related provisions of the tax law.

The recommendation that carryover of excess deductions be used to reduce depletion in future years would cause some very inequitable results and would bear much more heavily upon the operation of a marginal quarry or mine than upon the operator of a heavily successful quarry-mine or mine. As an illustration let us assume that two properties have $10,000 excess deduction in the nature of development cost during the first year. In subsequent years assume that each property produces 20,000 units which market for $100,000; if property A makes a small profit so that it is already limited by the net under present law it will eventually lose $5,000 of its depletion deduction because of the proposed carryforward. However, if property B has net income of $30,000 in the first year of operation it will not lose any of the depletion deduction, even if the proposed changes are adopted. Imposing heavier burdens on the marginal mine seems very inequitable and undesirable since these are the properties which will first be driven out of business by this type of taxation. The unfairness of the proposed carryforward can be further illustrated as follows: Assume that two different properties are adjacent, each producing 20,000 units selling for $100,000 with a net profit before depletion of $10,000; assume further that property A has operated at this rate of profit since commencing operation but property B had loss of $5,000: under present law each of these properties having the same gross and net income will have a percentage depletion deduction of $5,000. However, if the proposed carryforward is adopted, property A will continue to have a depletion deduction of $5,000, whereas property B will have its depletion deduction reduced by $2,500, simply because it had an operating loss in the preceding year.

The carrying costs on reserve mineral property would eventually operate under the proposed carryforward to reduce the percentage depletion allowance. Companies which move large tonnages are forced to acquire and hold reserve mineral properties if they are to survive. They cannot wait until a deposit is exhausted before searching for another to replace it. Where ad valorem taxes are imposed during this idle period the payment of those taxes should not reduce the depletion allowance in future years when the property goes into production. Nevertheless this would be the result under the proposed carryover provision.

We do not have lucrative quarrying or mining in my State, my district. As a result, the cost of removing overburden is a factor of economic life or death. I do have mining and quarrying in York, Cherokee, Fairfield, Lancaster and Kershaw Counties in my district and elsewhere in South Carolina. They must be kept in operation.

Actually the appellation "excess depletion" is a misnomer. We are talking about depletion, expense, and cost of production.

MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTIONS

The President has recommended in his 1963 tax message to the Congress that corporations which are members of an affiliated group should be restricted to one surtax exemption, both where a common parent holding company exists (parent-subsidiary group), and even went so far as to favor restriction to one surtax exemption, and to force a single consolidated income tax return on a group of corporations where, by the difficult and complicated attribution rule under section 318 of the code, 80 percent of the stock is owned by five or fewer individuals in substantially the same proportion (brother-sister groups).

In this brother-sister grouping, you are dealing frequently with grassroots, county seat, small, and family-owned businesses. The relation of brother and sister and parents, some quite militantly independent of each other, is difficult to unify by wording of an attribution statute.

As to the impracticality in forced consolidated returns, let me give you an example of a widow aged 80, whose four sons and one daughter are in five separate incorporated businesses in one country town with each member of the family owning approximately 10 percent in each of the units, except that the widow and the child who manages each separate unit own the remainder. Each son and daughter are very independent in the management of each of their separate units, three units are in retailing, two in farming and farm processing.

Merely because the elderly widow continues to live but is sick and is completely inactive, forces all of these business units under section 318 to file one consolidated income tax return wherein all in fact are on a different accounting basis or a different fiscal year basis, and would be in serious management and personal difficulties if forced consolidation were to occur. There is no business relevance to the contended longevity of an aged lady not engaged in business activity.

Section 318 of the Internal Revenue Code has been referred to as a Pandora's box of construal problems (Ownes, "Stock Redemptions and Partial Liquidations under the 1954 Code" 32 Taxes 979 (1954)). To force it upon family-owned businesses is a serious mistake.

The feuding and difficulties in executive management resulting from such a situation would be incalculable, and would greatly hinder the formation of new business units at the family capital level, where the largest volume of new business units start. The difficulties of the average small business dealing with the vagaries of substantially proportionate ownership as set forth in the principal statement of Secretary Dillon, and the tremendous complexities of construing section 318 of the "Code on attribution of Ownership of Stock" will result in a reaction from small business units that would be violent. A mere list of topic headings under section 318 in Mertens, "Law of Federal Income Taxation, Code Commentary," is indicative of the complications:

"TOPICAL HEADINGS, SECTION 318 U.S. INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

"From Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation

"Section 318. Constructive ownership of stock

"Section 318:1. General

"Section 318:2. Legislative background

"Section 318(a) (1) :1. Attribution between members of a family

"Section 318(a) (2) :1. Attribution between partnerships, estates, trusts and corporations and their respective partners, beneficiaries and shareholders

"Section 318(a) (2) :2. Meaning of 'directly' or 'indirectly'

"Section 318(a) (2) (A) :1. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a) (2) (A) :2. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the person to the entity.

"Section 318(a) (2) (B) :1. Trusts—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a) (2) (B) :2. Trusts—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a) (2) (B) :3. Trusts—Meaning of 'maximum exercise of discretion'

"Section 318(a) (2) (B) :4. Trusts—Attribution to grantors from the trust entity

"Section 318(a) (2) (B) :5. Trusts—Attribution to entity from the grantor

"Section 318(a) (2) (C) :1. Corporations—General rules of attribution

"Section 318(a) (2) (C) :2. Corporations—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a) (2) (C) :3. Corporations—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a) (3) :1. Options

"Section 318(a) (4) :1. Constructive ownership as actual ownership

"Section 318(b) :1. Cross references."

I know that the recommendations as to the change and reduction in normal tax and surtax is worthy, but in the particular situation of attempting to unify individuals and families at the grassroots level of small business into one consolidated return under the concept of brother-sister affiliated group is one of the most inherently dangerous administrative problems faced in the President's tax message.

This entire matter of multiple corporations was thoroughly considered relative to section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code by your eminent committee in 1951 and many capital investments, creative to our citizens, have been made in the assumption of reasonable continuity and stability in this field of taxation. I urge your eminent committee not to disrupt business organization without compelling reasons which do not appear at present.

RELATION ALSO TO THE PARENT-SUBSIDIARY GROUPS AS WELL AS "BROTHER-SISTER" AFFILIATED GROUPS

I am opposed to the proposal to limit the surtax exemptions of a group of related corporations to one exemption. Congress in 1951, in considering section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code, gave to newly organized corporations which were organized as part of a program of expansion, a separate surtax exemption for each. This provision led to expansion. Expansion is what is now desired. Continuation of the present provision will encourage such expansion. Adoption of the Treasury provision on surtax exemption limits would curtail expansion with consequent loss of employment. If the Treasury provision were applied to existing corporations, this would be a breach of faith on the part of Congress and would unduly penalize stockholders who invested their capital in reliance on the existing provision. Denial of the surtax exemption to a small corporate enterprise, albeit a subsidiary, is economically unrealistic and discriminatory, since perforce, it must compete at the community level with other enterprises of surtax size and nature.

This is a matter which also deeply concerns small business.

I particularly refer to the well phrased testimony on March 12, 1963, of John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association where he stated:

"We have also had considerable comment about the proposal to eliminate the corporate surtax exemption in certain cases. This may appear to be primarily important to larger corporations, but it is pointed out that the expansion of small business by the acquisition of small corporations is a sound device, both from a legal and an economic standpoint, and it has a proven and useful place in the small-business segment of the economy. In cases where the separate corporation is established or acquired for a legitimate business purpose, the fact of common control does not destroy its local identity; its contribution to local economy, or its responsibilities under local statutes. It would seem that any attempt at this late day to make a fine distinction between those corporations which should pay the surtax, and those which should not, would result in many unjustified hardships and dislocations which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rectify. As a point of general tax law such a move would appear to be the imposition of an additional corporate tax on a discriminatory basis. The motive for the proposal is beyond us. The revenue would not be material, and the present safeguards are adequate to prevent abuse."

Let me assure you again that I am no expert, but the proposals so seriously affect the future of many businesses in my district, and the enterprising people who work there, that I must ask your serious consideration in opposing this recommendation.

ORDINARY INCOME ITEMS TREATED AS CAPITAL GAINS—TIMBER AND COAL

On page 145 of the President's 1963 tax message, we find the proposed treatment of capital gains on timber outlined. This involves a provision of section 631 and section 1231(b)(2) relating to timber and coal.

Under present law, a taxpayer who owns timber is accorded capital gains treatment upon the sale of the timber, whereby an economic interest is retained by such owner whether the taxpayer is making a casual sale or whether the taxpayer is in the trade or business of selling timber.

The new proposal seeks to allow an annual exemption to each individual taxpayer only up to $5,000 of timber sale income for the purposes of capital gains treatment, but amounts in excess of $5,000 would be accorded ordinary income treatment. I fully recognize the loopholes of the present law in connection with some real estate tax shelters, but I must outline to this great committee the damage which might be effected if the proposal is honored by the committee as stated by Secretary Dillon.

We must realize that tree farming has become a major industry in certain parts of America. The growth of this industry has been significant since World War II, and thousands of people are employed in the pulpwood and lumber industry, who otherwise would be unemployed because of the decline in row crop farming, and particularly cotton farming in the South and Midsouth. As a result of the capital gains treatment of timber transactions, not only have many people been able to go into the business properly expecting a profit, but, in addition, this means employment to those who work in the woods as producers of timber or pulpwood, or employees of those producers.

Thousands of people are now employed in paper mills in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other Southern States. The proposal to limit, or put a ceiling on the capital gains expectations would be a blow to the future expectations or plans of this industry, possibly cause loss of jobs.

Frankly, we need this industry to replace the farming which the soil bank and mechanization have affected.

It is my opinion that capital gains offers the soundest procedure for taxing timber as a natural resource. It is the same for large and small producers, all growers of timber. If the treatment were only to large growers we might speak of special privileges but such is not the fact.

Perhaps the capital gains treatment which has been practiced was enacted in part to recognize the incentive for reforestation in America. Reforestation is expensive and we in Congress well know, for we have appropriated money for the soil bank and other programs. In addition, the capital gains treatment, we believe, acknowledges the risk from fire, insects, diseases, and other hazards in that long period of growth (pine pulpwood about 20 years) between planting and harvesting.

Timber growing is a unique and somewhat new enterprise in some parts of our Nation, which now knows heavy investments in this sort of farming; money is tied up for long periods of time during which there are hazards of fire, insect, and disease, which constitute potentials of physical and economic risk.

Much of the timber farming in the United States is affected by small private forest owners.

Until World War II economic circumstances were adverse to private investment in forestry and only limited progress was made in developing the permanent productive use of the three-fourths of the Nation's forest land in private ownership. The postwar period brought greatly changed economic conditions. Classifications established in the Revenue Act of 1943 in essence permitted capital gains treatment of revenues resulting from long-term increases in timber growth and value, regardless of the method used in disposing of the timber. This removed a major tax barrier to investment in forestry by timber-processing companies and by investors who retain an economic interest in the forest being cut as required by sound forest management. This was of fundamental importance in releasing the flow of investment into private forestry which has occurred during the postwar period. The major improvement in the Nation's timber supplies, the large-scale investment in wood-processing facilities with related permanent employment in many rural areas, and the watershed and recreational benefits derived from forest management which have been achieved on private lands during the last 20 years are directly traceable to this classification of timber revenues.

Private forest land is held in a wide variety of ownerships, ranging from small farm woodlots to large corporate holdings. The owners of the larger holdings have taken the leadership in the development of private forestry; progress has been slower on the small holdings. Equity requires comparable classification of timber revenues regardless of the size of holding. Removal of capital gains treatment from large holdings would penalize the very ownerships which have made the greatest progress in forestry.

Because of the long period of timber production, the greater part of the investments in timber growing which have been made since 1943 have not yet come to fruition. Good faith requires a continuation of the capital gains classification of timber revenues which was a condition of these investments.

Let me give you some idea of the farming business in my home county, Chester County, S.C.

Number acres land in Chester County, 377,000; number acres woodland, 259,000; number farms, 1,322; average size farm, 157.4 acres; percent farm acreage in woodland, 51.5; percent of woodlands in farm woods, 41.3.

Annual farm income in Chester County, $4,156,000; percent income from forest products, 18.2; forest income, $717,000.

Number board feet lumber sold: Pine, 11,700,000; hardwood, 3,600,000; annual income, $319,198.

Number sawmills operating in county, 12; number sawmill workers, 120; weekly sawmill payroll, $6,000.

Number cords pine sold, 57,113; number cords hardwood sold, 10,627; wood chips sold, 250 cars.

Pulpwood income: Pine, $371,234.50; hardwood, $26,567.50; chips, $60,000; total, $451,802.

Number companies buying pulpwood, 10; number pulpwood dealers, 8; number pulpwood workers, 300.

Additional income from pulpwood employment, $664,784; annual income from all forest products and related services, $2,359,784.

Number trees planted yearly: 1959, 1,964,000; 1960, 2,879,600; 1961, 2,580,500.

Number tree farmers, 17; acreage in tree farms, 44,207.

Number professional foresters in county: Private, 1; company, 12; Government, 4.

Let us recognize the fact that growing timber is a long-term risk for every owner. When a tree is cut, a capital asset is gone, no matter how it is sold. The 1944 law placed an owner who cuts his timber or disposes of it under a cutting contract on the same tax basis as an owner selling outright. This was recognition that all such owners are essentially doing the same thing and should receive the same tax treatment.

It takes 20, 50, or 100 years to grow timber. Land and investment are tied up. There are many risks. The Congress recognized that it would not be fair to tax the gain from long-term increase in value under these conditions as if it all occurred in the year when the tree is cut. To tax this long-term growth at steeply graduated income tax rates was confiscatory in effect.

The 1944 tax reforms recognized the national interest in growing and conserving timber. They removed an existing impediment to the practice of sustained renewal of timberlands.

Since the capital gain treatment recognizes the long-term risk and the slow accrual of capital value, owners are now conserving and reproducing timber at rates never before achieved in the Nation's history.

Timber capital gain taxation has proved itself to be in the national interest for nearly two decades.

It has removed inequities in prior law, resulting from different tax treatment of similar transactions.

Our forest resources are expanding.

America's forest owners, 4,500,000 in number, have as a group taken great strides in forestry management and improved the supply of timber, on a sustained yield basis, for the Nation.

Their output is vital to the national economy.

Under fair and equitable taxation, they can be counted on to increase our national wealth in forest resources, meet the national need for forest products, and provide an enduring source of tax revenue to the National Government.

IN CONCLUSION

There are other proposals I would touch on, but I have concentrated on those possibly affecting jobs in my district, my State. I would like to borrow from the fine statement of Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, before the committee, February 6, 1963.

"In order to provide jobs for the unemployed, to accelerate the rate of economic growth and thus demonstrate to the rest of the world the dynamic strength of which we are capable, we must furnish greater incentives to the private sector to improve its performance. These incentives, I believe, are best provided by reductions in individual and corporate income taxes. The tax reduction approach to the solution of our present difficulty is two pronged. The reduction of the individual income tax rates in the middle and lower brackets will serve for the most part to increase consumption expenditures. These are the groups which spend the highest proportion of their incomes. With the expansion in consumer demand, idle plant capacity will be put back into operation and employment will increase. Corporate profits, which are especially sensitive to increases in the rate of plant utilization, will increase. Corporate profits motivate investment in new plant and equipment. Therefore, the gain in consumer spending will lead to greater corporate profits and more funds and incentive for investment.

"The second prong of the tax approach bears more directly on investment incentives. By reducing the tax rates on individuals in the upper brackets and on corporations, the motivation to exploit new opportunities in product and process investment is encouraged directly. Reduction of the corporate income tax to the recommended level will mean that Government is no longer the senior partner in sharing corporate profits. Furthermore, reduced income taxes mean greater cash flow for corporations.

"The President's tax program, therefore, would remove the overburden of taxation from the economy and provide the bigger markets and the greater incentives necessary for more vigorous economic growth."

Again let me assure you that I salute our President for the courageous approach to our tax problems. I hope to work with this committee in solving them. Thank you for listening to me today.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 23, 1963)

THE STRUGGLE—CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM

The real struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. The free world, and especially we in the United States have allowed the Communists to put us on the defensive and have made us afraid to say what we are fighting for. They have made capitalism a dirty word and we have let them get away with it. We cannot win the struggle for survival and the freedom of mankind until the people and Members of Congress have the courage to stand up and shout that we believe in capitalism, that the choice man must make is between capitalism and socialism. The victory between these two basic systems will decide whether or not man will be free, for only under capitalism can he be free; he can be only a slave under socialism. The time has come for us to stop being apologists for a system which has given mankind its greatest opportunity and freedom in the history of the world. We know, and it is time to say it out loud, that profits are good, not evil.

The people know what the world struggle is all about. Members of Congress know the real issue, but few have the courage to name the combatants in this world struggle. We see the failure to say what we are fighting for in the stalling tactics of the present session of Congress. Nearly 3 months of this session have gone by and little, if any legislation has been passed by Congress. Indeed, no measures are being reported from the committees. Why? Because practically all of the New Frontier sponsored legislation moves us farther along the road to socialism and Congress is stalling in an effort to save our free enterprise system—capitalism. The only way we can save it is to face the issue openly and squarely, call socialistic legislation socialistic and serve notice that we are out to save and strengthen the capitalistic system.

The first step is to proclaim fiscal responsibility. Cut Federal spending and balance the budget. To be positive in support of capitalism and freedom a Member of Congress, in my opinion, must say "no" to new welfare porgrams and increased Government spending. The budget can be cut. I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week an excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report in which ways were listed to chop $3 billion from the President's spending programs. I suggested ways to chop off an additional $10.5 billion as follows: No public works until the budget is balanced; get the Government out of the power business; liquidate public housing; cut out federally sponsored urban renewal; eliminate Federal participation in depressed areas; cut the farm programs 20 percent; cut foreign aid by $3 billion; cut military authorizations 5 percent, and research 12.5 percent; knock $1 billion off the space program. This is the beginning of the way back to a sound and healthy economy, protection of the value of our dollar, renewed confidence in our system with the increased spur to individual and private initiative which are the weapons to win the war for capitalism and freedom.

DANGER SIGNS IN OUR DEFENSE STRATEGY

There are many danger signs in the various statements by the State Department and in the disarmament programs advocated by the White House and our military leaders. Each item in itself seems harmless, but pulling all the factors together a pattern seems to develop and in it I recognize a potential threat to the sovereignty and freedom of the United States. First, there was the establishment of the Disarmament Agency in the last session of Congress. Many Members of Congress voted for it because they believed it to be a valuable means of propaganda, but would mean nothing. I felt otherwise and voted against the disarmament resolution and said we should not give the world the impression that we were ready to disband our military forces so long as we were faced with a powerful enemy with a military machine dedicated to our destruction. Second, the now-famous State Department statement 7277, "Freedom From War," in which the suggestion is made that we turn our military forces over to the United Nations. Third, a new concept seems to be developing (U.S. News & World Report, March 25) to withdraw all our forces from Europe and Asia and create a Fortress America. It is this pattern that worries me and should worry the American people because we are not being told by the Kennedy administration of its plans—as a Member of Congress, I have to read about the development of a Fortress America in a magazine. Fortress America may be a sound concept, it seems to me, but let's talk it over. Members of Congress and the people should not be bypassed.

WHITHER THE UNITED NATIONS

If the American people are to lose their sovereignty to the U.N., what about a bill of particulars on the purposes of the U.N.? In recent research I am making there are further disturbing signs. The U.N. support of Communist slave states such as Cuba—the tendency of some of our representatives of the U.N. to swear greater allegiance to the international body than to the United States—the throwing the cloak of respectability around international gangsters such as Castro—the acceptance by the U.N. of international immorality in the conduct of government. Additional research has revealed to me direct conflicts between the U.N. Charter and the Constitution of the United States (examples: the charter delegates power to the Security Council to declare war. Under our Constitution only Congress can declare war for the United States. We saw this part of the charter in operation in the Korean war. The Security Council may regulate the kind and size of armaments for our national defense.

Since we have only one vote out of seven our sovereignty is in the hands of seven European and Asiatic nations whose interests are hostile to the United States, and our foreign policy would be in their hands. The charter destroys the Monroe Doctrine and scuttles the Pan American Union by subjecting them to the approval of European and Asiatic nations. We cannot continue to foster an international organization whose authority supercedes our own Constitution unless the people are told the whole truth about our relationship to the United Nations are given an opportunity to decide for themselves if they wish to trade our Constitution for the U.N. Charter. I am pointing out the danger points in this area so that the people may know about them for whatever action the people see fit to take.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN COSTA RICA?

There are no apparent results in the President's trip this week to Costa Rica. We provided no leadership except to squelch any action or desire toward action to eliminate communism from Cuba. Little militant action on the part of the leaders of Latin-American nations against Cuba was indicated. No commitments have been made by Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile to tighten up on air travel to Cuba. Frustration continues throughout South America. Out-and-out Communists, according to late news stories, do hold key posts in Brazil's Government. The leftists are due to cause trouble in Argentina in the June elections. Americans fear the Communists will score heavy gains in Chile's 1964 elections. Khrushchev continues to thumb his nose at the United States in his arrogant withdrawal of a handful of troops from Cuba and no guarantee that he intends to do more than that. The stage is now being set for the successful subversion by the Russian Communists of Latin America and South America. I raise these points now as a warning in the hope tragedy can be averted, much as I did my best to sound warnings in my newsletters and on the floor of the House for 22 months before Cuba was blown into a crisis by becoming the armed base for Khrushchev and communism in this hemisphere. Our foreign prestige continues to slide as the world sees us, under this administration, unable to lead the cause of freedom and unwilling to exercise domestic discipline required to bring about fiscal responsibility. In hearings before my Committee on Ways and Means I am now seeing the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American bankers, the NAM, all who have denounced deficit spending and an unbalanced budget now accepting them in order to get a tax cut. In the cause of freedom for all mankind, America must face up to the struggle—we must name the war as a war between capitalism and socialism and win the war for capitalism as only in such a victory can man truly be free.

Legislative History of Public Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of preparing the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, I am constantly concerned with methods of making the publication of the laws more understandable and useful.

I want to call to the attention of the House a most significant and valuable improvement in the publication of the laws by the General Services Administration; and I want to extend to the Administrator and to his staff in the Office of Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, responsible for this improvement, my warmest congratulations.

In my hand is a copy of Public Law 88-1, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. This print, which is popularly called a "slip law," is the initial publication of a Federal law upon enactment, and may be obtained at the National Archives. At the bottom of the page of this law is a legislative history, showing that this legislation was reported from the House Appropriations Committee, House Report No. 35, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Report No. 9, and that it was considered and passed by the House on February 27, 1963, and by the Senate on March 4, 1963—with a reference to volume 109 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This information, available for the first time as an addendum to the slip law itself, gives the essential information needed for research regarding the law. It will save untold hours of research. Without the information in this form it has, until now, been necessary for interested persons to have recourse either to the House Calendar or to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—which are not always readily available even here in Washington—presupposing that they have the necessary familiarity with those publications to enable them to know what to look for. From now on, with the guide published in the legislative history, that part of the research is already done and all that is necessary is to obtain the reports from the Superintendent of Documents and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for the days indicated.

I understand that the legislative history printed on the slip laws may be expanded in the future to give a reference to printed committee hearings on the legislation. In this connection, I hope that it will be possible for all committees to adopt a uniform simple method of identifying hearings—such as by serial numbers—so that only a brief refence to a serial number in the legislative history will be adequate. This would avoid lengthy descriptions of the subject matter of the hearings now frequently necessary to identify them.

I also understand that it may be planned to present the legislative histories in tabular form in the volumes of the statutes at large in the future. These volumes are, of course, the cumulation of the slip laws for each session. Incidentally, one of the recent improvements in the printing of the slip laws is the marginal reference to the volume and page of the statutes at large in which the particular law will ultimately be printed. Another recent improvement was in the numbering of the laws by incorporating a prefix indicating the number of the Congress. For example, this law is Public Law 88-1 and the next one will be Public Law 88-2. This system precludes the uncertainty that used to prevail when reference was made to, let us say, Public Law 601, without identifying the Congress.

I know that the Members and all other persons who must have recourse to legislative history join me in expressing this commendation to those responsible for these notable improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, a copy of Public Law 88-1—called a slip law—to illustrate these improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 88-1, 88TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 284, MARCH 6, 1963

Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480," to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Approved March 6, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 35 (Appropriations Committee).

Senate Report No. 9 (Appropriations Committee).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109: February 27, 1963, considered and passed House; March 4, 1963, considered and passed Senate.

President Kennedy's Chicago Speech—A Sound Warning to Both Democrats and Republicans About America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the people of Chicago had the great pleasure of entertaining President Kennedy, who flew there to dedicate O'Hare Field. Huge throngs greeted the President along the 22-mile route from O'Hare Field to the Conrad Hilton Hotel, where the President was honored at a civic luncheon arranged by Mayor Richard J. Daley.

The President took this occasion to sound a clear and decisive warning to the Congress of the United States and the people of this Nation that unless we start meeting the mounting problem of creating new employment opportunities for the millions of additional Americans coming into the labor force, this Nation could face very serious problems.

President Kennedy's prophetic Chicago speech, in my judgment, is one of the great pronouncements of this century. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the compelling facts marshaled by President Kennedy in his Chicago address should, above all, serve to unite the Democratic majority in the Congress from North and South into a common cause. But just as decidedly, Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues can no longer ignore the grim consequences that face our Nation if they do not face up to the staggering problem and instead oppose administration measures merely for the sake of partisan objection.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that every Member of Congress in both Chambers will take the time to read President Kennedy's vitally important message delivered in Chicago and then unite behind this common cause—not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans.

The President's address follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CHICAGO SPEECH—A SOUND WARNING TO BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ABOUT AMERICA'S FUTURE

I am grateful for the warmth of your greeting. My gratitude to this city, and to your dynamic mayor, goes back many years; and I shall always welcome the opportunity to come once again to Chicago.

On each trip I see new signs of progress. Today we dedicated a great international airport. Already this city is becoming a great international seaport. And when I contemplate Chicago's role as a hub of American commerce—as a point of concentration for north, south, east and west—and as a point of convergence for rail, highway, air, and waterway travel—I am reminded that the decade in which we live seems to have been given a similar role in history. For in almost every sphere of activity, at home and abroad, countless rivers and streams which began long ago as tiny hidden springs are now all converging at once, in full floodtide, upon the turbulent sixties.

Today I want to talk about one tide that is causing us particular concern—the tide of manpower. That tide could be either favorable or ill fated. If this Nation can provide enough jobs to make the most of that flow, it will surely be a tremendous asset to our economic strength; and those nations which are short of manpower—such as most of those in Western Europe—will then envy America's good fortune.

But if this tide continues to flood our labor markets with pools of idle men, then, I must warn you, this Nation faces a decade of chronic trouble and recession—characterized by the economic waste and the human tragedy of unemployment, by higher welfare payments and weaker consumer markets, by recurrent problems of crime and delinquency and unstable labor relations. Already the issue of job security is placing an undue strain on collective bargaining—as those out of work demand negative solutions, such as import restrictions, featherbedding rules and a 35-hour week—and those still on the job grow less secure in the face of so much labor surplus.

That is why our No. 1 domestic concern is, and must be, jobs—jobs for the sixties, jobs for the tidal wave of men and women now flooding our labor market. It is a concern which requires the best efforts of us all—Federal, State, and local governments—management and labor leaders—builders of education and moulders of opinion.

Some may think it strange that the issue of jobs looms as large in the 1960's as it did in the 1930's, when the Nation was in depression. The difficulty then was an inordinately low supply of jobs to meet the manpower demand. The difficulty now is an inordinately high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made to strengthen our economy so that the supply of jobs will equal the demand.

I would like to review with you today three of the principal causes of this manpower tide now converging upon our Nation. For if we can better understand these causes, we can see more clearly that unemployment in the sixties cannot be reduced by the usual platitudes and pious hopes. The effects of all three of these tides, I might add, can be felt right here in Chicago.

FARM

1. First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has long been this Nation's largest employer—engaging more people than steel, automobiles, public utilities and the transportation industry combined. But now one farmer can meet the food and fiber needs of 25 Americans, compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. High speed farm machinery is much more widespread, and much more efficient and automatic. New fertilizers, insecticides and research are multiplying the yield per acre and worker. Since 1947, our farms have increased their output by more than 30 percent at the very same time that the number of man-hours worked on our farms was cut nearly in half.

Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million—an average of 200,000 a year, comparable to the entire work force of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work each year.

In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by 500,000 while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated—as disturbing as it sounds—that not more than 1 out of every 10 boys now living on the farm will find full-time work in agriculture.

YOUTH

2. This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower—our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through the elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16—but this year there will be 3.8 million reaching that age. Altogether, in the 1960's 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market—an increase of 40 percent over the fifties and a far greater number than this country has ever had to train and absorb in any previous 10-year period.

Already workers under the age of 25, though they comprise less than one-fifth of the labor force, constitute more than one-third of the unemployed. Last year the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was roughly 4.4 percent—but for those age 20 to 24, it was 9 percent; and for those age 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent.

Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts—4 out of every 10—is still far too high; for job openings for the untrained and the unskilled are declining, in factories and mines, on farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries. Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among unskilled and semiskilled workers. In our modern society, even high school graduates find their skills too often insufficient. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school but in later years as well. The latest available survey also showed a rate of unemployment among college graduates, whose job opportunities are broadening continually, to be only one-fifth as high as it was among those who had not completed elementary school; but unfortunately, only 1 out of 10 finishes college.

In short, as challenging as it will be to provide first jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problems posed by the 7.5 million of them who will not have completed high school, including nearly 2.5 million who will not even have completed the eighth grade. I ask you to mark those figures well; for youth unemployment poses one of the most highly explosive social and economic problems now facing this country—and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade, when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's.

AUTOMATION

3. Finally, underlying all of these trends is a third phenomenon, both cursed and praised; and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of "automation." During the last 6 years, this Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent—but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers; and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours. I do not wish to be misunderstood; increasing productivity and advancing technology are essential to our ability to compete and to progress—but we also have an obligation to create an additional 2 million jobs each year for those displaced by these gains.

This city is no stranger to these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to more than 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to produce the coal dug by 100 workers in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only a short decade ago. (Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also provides the exception to this pattern—since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.)

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processors. I know, for example, that the Farmers Home Administration processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with its efforts for Government economy—but we must also expand the private economy to find jobs for all who are willing.

OTHER FACTORS

There are other trends affecting manpower in the 1960's, in addition to those I have mentioned:

Far more women are in the labor market than ever before, now that so many more of them live in urban areas, receive a better education, enjoy more laborsaving devices at home and find more acceptance in industry.

There are more older workers than ever before, and those who lose their jobs must endure an average period of unemployment that is far above the national average.

Job discrimination against Negroes continues to hurt every age and occupational group, with even skilled Negro workers finding that their race keeps them out of work much longer and more often than their white counterparts.

And particular communities, called distressed areas—46 out of our 150 major labor market areas in February—continue to be extra hard hit by persistent and substantial unemployment.

CHICAGO

All these trends you have seen in this city and State—workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm or the mines or a railroad or a distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though, under Mayor Daley's hard-driving, hard-working leadership, this city is creating new jobs faster than most.

THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years, but the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years, we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total output (gross national product) grew at a rate of only 3 percent—while unemployment remained continuously at 5 percent or above. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion workdays, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks. Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962. And 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer—15 percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation can do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grows worse after each recession—and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of our manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth—unless we create a supply of jobs that is more equal to the demand—our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession.

Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential. Without stronger consumer demand, plant capacity is not fully in use. Without full plant utilization, profit margins are reduced. Without higher profits, investment lags behind. And so the sagging spiral continues.

OUR MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR THE SIXTIES

Our task is to reverse this spiral—and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems.

Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth to create more jobs. Ten billion dollars more in tax savings, in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging on it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay. No world crisis strains our resources. The dollar is strong and respected. New investment incentives have been enacted. World raw material prices are stable. And the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb more expansion.

But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to distressed areas. And tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we have offered.

To mention but a few:

We urgently need to improve our schools and colleges—to reduce the number of dropouts—to reduce the number of unskilled workers—to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a new youth employment opportunities program, to give young people training and job experience, and to put their energies to good use.

We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, for more security for the aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment.

These are all controversial measures. They all take time to enact and take effect. But meanwhile the growing pool of manpower continues to grow, a burden that should be a blessing, a liability that could be an asset.

I have no doubt that these problems will someday be solved. The question is, Will they be solved in ways that impoverish us—with restrictions on the workweek, or on efficiency, or on competition? Or will they be solved in ways that enrich us—by expanding our economy and putting all hands to work? The choice is up to us all—to you in Chicago as well as to those of us in Washington. It depends on the will of the people as well as the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago.

"Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at its helm. And my fervent hope is that the United States of America, in meeting the needs of this decade, will also be peopled and governed by men able to use their opportunities.

Foreign Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the December 17, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried a splendid question and answer exclusive interview with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [OTTO E. PASSMAN] on the subject of foreign handouts.

Mr. PASSMAN knows more about our foreign aid program than anyone else, either in or out of Congress. For the fiscal year 1964 budget he proposes a 50-percent cut in the appropriation for foreign aid.

I commend this interview to all who wish to be informed on a program which is rapidly undermining our economy.

HARD LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

(NOTE.—Are Americans getting their money's worth out of the foreign-aid billions? Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign-aid Appropriations, has studied the U.S. program more thoroughly than any other one Member of Congress. Mr. PASSMAN has just returned from a world tour, taking a look at foreign aid in operation. What are his impressions now? In this exclusive interview, the Congressman tells of widespread waste and mishandling, and what he thinks should be done about it.)

Question. Mr. PASSMAN, after this latest checkup at firsthand, what is your impression of the foreign-aid program?

Answer. I'm completely disgusted with foreign aid. I can convince any reasonable man that we've substituted aid for trade, we've substituted appeasement for a firm and fair foreign policy. The people are taking advantage of us all around the world.

Question. In what way?

Answer. It is a waste of the wealth of the American taxpayer to pour foreign aid into nations that are enjoying a good standard of living and where they do not tax their own people on the same basis we tax ours—we who are giving the aid.

Let me give you an example:

I was in Bangkok, Thailand, having dinner with one of the wealthier merchants, and I asked the specific question: "If you should earn $100,000 net from your business, how much income tax would you pay?" He said: "I'd have to pay $12,000. It's robbery."

I said: "Do you realize that if an individual in the United States earns $100,000 net he must pay the Government $72,000?" He couldn't believe it.

Question. You spoke earlier of waste in foreign aid—

Answer. I mean money going in on a political basis rather than going in actually to help the masses. That's almost the pattern of aid throughout the world, with the exception of a few industrialized nations.

I find the masses in many countries just don't know anything about American aid. The aid is going to governments, not to the people. It's not accomplishing the objectives we wish for it.

The money isn't being used effectively. In almost any country you visit, you'll find a few powerful individuals who are anxious to get hold of cash—and it winds up in some bank in the United States or Switzerland. It doesn't do the country any good.

Question. Is there some way to straighten out these things?

Answer. We're trying to apply the Marshall plan formula that worked successfully in industrialized nations in Europe to primitive and underdeveloped nations around the world. Well, the fact is, you see, many of these people are perfectly happy with things as they are.

Question. Are there fields where aid can be beneficial in these primitive, underdeveloped areas?

Answer. The aid program, in my candid opinion, is uncontrolled and uncontrollable.

Question. What makes you say that?

Answer. A lot of the appointments are made on a political basis. Men are placed in charge of huge programs who have never met a payroll in their lives. They may be good, patriotic Americans—of course, they are—but they just don't know anything about what they're doing.

And many times the aided countries, themselves, don't do anything like their own share to help their people.

Question. Can you give us a concrete example?

Answer. Take Hong Kong. I recommended the full amount requested for the refugee program out there because of suffering caused by a typhoon. Well, when you speak of funds for refugees, that doesn't just mean food. It involves resettlement, sending the children to school, many other things. These take careful, knowledgeable planning.

Another thing. Hong Kong has some of the wealthiest merchants in the world. There are some 3,000 shops there and practically all of the money they take in is either in dollars or can be converted into dollars. Still, a man in Hong Kong who makes $100,000 pays only $3,000 in taxes.

So what we're doing is taxing ourselves into destruction to help people all over the world before we make sure that they are taxing their own people on the same basis as we tax the American people.

Question. Do you expect any major changes as a result of the appointment of David E. Bell to head foreign aid?

Answer. I do not. I don't think the Director has any more to do with running the aid program than I have to do with the doctors who run Walter Reed Hospital. He may make certain decisions as to levels of aid, but, in the end, it is an arm of foreign policy. We're handing out dollars from the top level. It's hard for any man who has been successful in life to take the punishment he has to take as Foreign Aid Director. We've had, if I'm not mistaken, 12 Directors in 14 years.

I think Mr. Bell is quite able. I think he should have the opportunity to do a thorough job and cut down on expenditures. If he does, I'll cooperate with him.

But if he's being put in there to find ways to spend money, I'm going to fight him with all the ability I have.

Question. How much will the administration want next year?

Answer. I hope the request is for far less. Since I became chairman I have had a foreign-aid goal of $2.5 billion annually. We did work it down to where we appropriated $2.8 billion, but then the thing started up again. This year it was almost $4 billion.

Question. Will you still work for that $2.5 billion ceiling

Answer. I shall. Since coming back, I'm just as disgusted with foreign aid as I've ever been—maybe more so. We've gotten to the point where we try to let the American dollar do everything in the world. The world has got to help itself.

The Test-Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the March 18, 1963, Washington Report of the American Security Council, entitled "The Test-Ban Trap":

THE TEST-BAN TRAP

By 1958, the long Communist propaganda campaign to arouse world hysteria over nuclear fallout had succeeded even beyond expectations. Perhaps that is why the United States, during that year, plunged into the Geneva nuclear test-ban treaty negotiations without resolving the basic issue of whether any such treaty is in the fundamental U.S. national interest.

There have been attempts since then to resolve this basic question concurrently with a second vital one, namely, whether various proposed treaty terms under negotiation are safe. This has only served to confuse and obscure the answers to both.

The answers cannot be found in well-intentioned hopes for a less dangerous, more peaceful world; they must come from a realistic, hardheaded evaluation of today's risky facts of international life, among which are these:

1. The prime objective of the United States—survival of the Nation and its free world allies—is in direct conflict with communism's unalterable objective—world domination.

2. To deter Communist leaders from choosing nuclear war to quickly gain their

objective, U.S. national policy is to maintain a superior nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation.

3. Risk-reducing international agreements are made difficult by communism's consistent record of treaty breaking, which caused former President Eisenhower to warn, "We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party, except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms."

IS A TEST-BAN TREATY IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES?

Any consideration of this question must assume that an enforceable treaty can be negotiated with the Soviet Union, that is, one under which significant nuclear testing by the U.S.S.R. and the United States would be equally inhibited.

Test-ban adherents contend such a treaty would bring about a net reduction of the risks faced by the United States and its free world partners. Prudence, however, requires that this assertion be examined in the light of whether an actual net reduction in risks would occur, or whether new and different risks might be created which would leave matters worse off than before.

On this score, the reader will be left to his own evaluation of the arguments for and against a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments—the air, underground, underwater, and outer space. Here are the arguments most commonly heard:

Pro. A treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons by limiting research to the laboratories, unassisted by the important element of practical experimentation.

Con. The Soviets can keep top-quality scientists working under these conditions; a free society cannot. Thus a shift of nuclear weapons superiority would be inevitable. What happens then?

Pro. A treaty will slow down proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries—holding down the chances of accidental war and the number of parties to be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached.

Con. It is dangerously naive to believe one nation can "handle" another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons—France, for example. Attempts by the United States to "handle" European allies will strain NATO to the breaking point.

Pro. A treaty will help to open up the closed Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent for working out other and more comprehensive arms control agreements.

Con. It is idle to think a very small number of inspections in the U.S.S.R would have significant impact on the structure and attitudes of a Communist society.

Pro. A treaty will eliminate whatever danger exists from fallout from U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons testing in the air.

Con. Only a simple atmospheric treaty is needed for this. Until the U.S.S.R. agrees, fallout from tests is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

Pro. A treaty will promote international good feeling and will spur arms control and disarmament.

Con. Artificially manufactured good will would generate euphoric pressures for schemes in fact disarming the West and only in theory disarming the Communists.

ARE TEST-BAN TREATY PROVISIONS UNDER PRESENT CONSIDERATION SAFE?

Whether or not a study of the pros and cons leads to a conclusion that a test ban treaty is undesirable, the U.S. Government is in the process of negotiating one. Thus it becomes pertinent to inquire: Will provisions the United States now wants to put into the treaty stop the U.S.S.R. from conducting significant nuclear tests and clandestinely capturing nuclear weapons superiority?

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is writing a new draft treaty for submission at Geneva this spring. During recent hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the draft's "enforcement" provisions were outlined as:

1. Cheat detection machinery capable with fair reliability of spotting underground tests of 3 kilotons or larger in geologic formations of alluvium;

2. Seven "on-site" inspections annually on Soviet soil of "suspicious" events which can be detected; and,

3. Relatively unreliable machinery to detect cheating in space.

We need not examine here the possibilities of cheating in space or at yields above 3 kilotons. This is simply because the draft contains at least three other bigger and more attractive holes through which the Soviets could sneak forward secretly to surprise nuclear superiority and its equivalent: world domination.

HOLE 1: UNDERGROUND TESTS BELOW 3 KILOTONS

A parade of witnesses told the Joint Committee that tests underground—singly or in series—below 3-kiloton yield simply cannot be detected at all. In this testing range the United States would forego wholly any and all weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply trust to the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests and secretly develop nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons which Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's director of military applications, told the Joint Committee could be clandestinely tested and developed in this undetectable area:

1. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

2. Much high-yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from explosions as small as 1 kiloton without the necessity for proof testing.

3. At least one-half of all strategic weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military—also without the need for proof testing.

As an indication of where weapons development interest lies, General Betts stated that about 50 percent of all actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is carried out in this low, undetectable, below 3-kiloton range.

HOLE 2: DECOUPLED UNDERGROUND TESTS

The simplest expedient of conducting tests in underground cavities drastically muffles their seismic effect. Shock waves from the explosion are decoupled from the surrounding earth. In this manner, seismic signals of 10 kilotons to 30 kilotons can be reduced far below the 3-kiloton threshhold of nondetectability.

General Betts authoritatively told the Joint Committee that by this means a cheater, without any possibility of detection, could develop a substantial fraction of all large yield strategic weapons of military interest. The remaining one-half of tactical weapons not sneaked through hole No. 1 could, of course, be sneaked through this hole.

HOLE NO. 3: SURPRISE ABROGATION

Surprise abrogation is possibly the most serious of all holes in the new test ban treaty draft. Even Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster admits surprise abrogation might put us "as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test." He minimizes its effect by saying:

"The Government will make it a matter of national policy to maintain readiness to test, and to provide funds necessary to keep competent scientific talent available. Under these circumstances, our scientists should retain incentives to continue nuclear weapons research and our weapons laboratories should function effectively."

This, however, is wishful thinking. The best answer to it comes from President Kennedy himself. On March 2, 1962, in announcing test resumption at that time, he said:

"But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

In summary, there is no rational ground to argue that the test ban treaty draft soon to be offered by the United States is safe—there is more ground to argue that it is not even sane.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

A Salute to Sacony and S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1963, I was privileged to attend the celebration marking two decades in South Carolina for Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. On that occasion, along with Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, I flew to Cheraw and there visited the Cheraw Division of the Sacony Manufacturing Co. Later that afternoon I was privileged to stand in the receiving line at the reception when many of the citizens of Cheraw gathered for the purpose of speaking to the various guests. At 7:30 in the Cheraw armory an enormous banquet was held, and 500 people met to do honor to Sacony Manufacturing Co., S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and to salute the members of the Sacony family who have contributed to our growth for 10, 15 years, and more. It was a happy and festive occasion, and pins were given to those with 10 and 15 years of service. The pins were distributed by Mr. Sidney Augstein, president, and chief executive officer of S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

After the national anthem, a most appropriate invocation was given by Rev. H. Dwight McAlister, of Cheraw. The Honorable Reginald R. Sipe, mayor pro tempore, city of Cheraw, delivered the address of welcome in the absence of Mayor Russell Bennett, who had to be out of town on business. Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr., president of Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc., made appropriate remarks and presented to Mr. Adolph M. Augstein, chairman of the board of directors, a memento from the many officials and employees of Sacony, who were delighted to do him honor and pay him homage on the occasion.

Mr. Adolph M. Augstein then made an address which was followed by the presentation of the gold service pins by President Sidney Augstein. The list of those receiving the pins follows:

Cheraw—10 years: Loyd Allen, Martha Ammons, Dora Bailey, Ruby Baker, Ruby Baucom, Gladys Bone, Geneva Braswell, Edythe Brigman, Eva Mae Brigman, Annie Brock, Christine Brock, William Brown, Dorothy Bruce, Myrtle Campbell, Uzell Campbell, Annie Sue Carpenter, Allen Cassidy, Ramona Cassidy, Emma Jean Chapman, Flora Chavis, Grace Chavis, Mattie Cheves, Vernie Clark, Catherine Crawley, Cora Lee Curry, Lucy Deese, Eva Mae Dixon, Clara Mae Driggers, Mary Driggers, Kathryn Easterling, Rose Evans, Geneva Freeman, Doris Gardner, Edith Gardner, Jean Gaskins, Joan Gaskins, Jayne Gentry, Clyde Hair, Sue Harpe, Mary Etta Keith, Clyde Kimrey, Ruth Kimrey, Lawrence King, Kermit Q. Kirby, Tululah Knight, Charles Kudrna, Edna Lee, Oscar Lewis, Janie Livingston, Nellie Lofton, Geneva Lowrey, Margaret Mathis, Gertrude McDonald, Edith Miller, Alice Moore, Hester Moore, Nora Morris, Lucille Phillips, Betty Margie Pruitt, Virginia Quick, Mary Ruth Rivers, Nezzie Sings, Ethel Spencer, Robert Tanner, Clyde Tolson, Ethel Tolson, John Tucker, Ruby Turnage, Doris Wallace, Jessie Wallace, William Wallace, Ruby Watts, Margaret White, Thelma White, Ophelia Wood, and Irene Wooten.

Fifteen years: Louise Barfield, Beatrice Boatright, Doris Brigman, Viola Bruner, Ruby Butler, Mary Chapman, Victoria Crould, Ruth Culbreth, Mildred DeBerry, Mary Lee Eddings, Evelyn Fisher, Louise Frazier, Eva Graham, Grace Hall, Viola Mathis, Grace McDonald, Pearl McDonald, James McQuaige, Sr., Jaine Parker, Sarah Quick, Nelle Rivers, Josephine Russell, Sue Spease, Elizabeth Strickland, James Stuard, Howard Thomas, Bertha Tilley, and Virgie Wallace.

Chesterfield—10 years: Ethel Adams, Evelyn Adams, Ola Baker, Almeter Brantley, Mary Brantley, Mary Brock, Nell Burch, Frances Burr, Lucy Burr, Maggie Davis, Margaret Davis, Katie Lee Deese, David Douglas, Mildred Douglas, Evelyn Eddins, Barbara Evans, Marguerite Gaskins, Ruth Gaskins, Betty Harpe, Joyce Hinson, Mary Huneycutt, Flora Huntley, Martha Huntley, Mary Huntley, Bessie Lee Jackson, Hallie James, Sally Johnson, Otis Jones, Alberta Jordan, Betty Jordan, Melba Faye Jordan, Marie Kirkley, Mary Lee, Clara Belle Lisenby, Leila Lisenby, Mary Ella Lisenby, Mildred Lisenby, Vivian Lisenby, Eva Mills, Nell Moore, Mary Pate, Nealie Polson, Mary Raffaldt, Carolyn Rhyne, Alma Rivers, Betty Rivers, Elizabeth Rivers, Ralph Rivers, Leila Rollins, Anthel Sellers, Daisy Sellers, Essie Sellers, Ruby Sellers, Vera Sellers, Sara Shaver, Emma Mae Smith, Margaret Smith, Ruby Smith, Ruth Stroud, Marion Teal, B. Thurman Teal, Mary Vaughn, Geraldine Watson, Eleanor White, Eva White, and Leatha White.

Fifteen years: Bessie Oliver and Olivia Watson.

Manning—10 years: Maggie Alsbrook, Cecil Anderson, Margaret Ardis, Frances Broadway, Janie Campbell, Emma Clark, Eunice Clark, Edith Cook, Frances Evans, Mary Evans, Minnie Evans, Sally Gardner, Caddie Gibbons, Aurelia Green, Edna Hodge, Ella Hodge, Rachel Hodge, Mary Johnson, Coline Kennedy, Jewell Langston, Anna Lowder, Corrie Mae McElveen, Mary McRoy, Virginia Melton, Helen Morris, Vista Peebles, Azilea Plowden, Catherine Prescott, Corine Rhodus, Annie Richbourg, Louise Richbourg, Edith Ridgeway, Cornelia Spigner, Ola Spigner, Dorothy Strange, Lucy Tarte, Lila Mae Thames, Corrie Thigpen, Liffie Thigpen, Richard Thigpen, Ruth Timmons, Hummin Tobias, and Luvenia Welch.

Pageland—10 years: Annie Allen, Betty Anderson, Laura Brock, Inez Byrd, Nell Carnes, Vera Cato, Ellen Clark, Evelyn Clark, Martha Clark, Crissie Clontz, Letha Donahue, Loretta Eubanks, Allie Evans, Henrietta Evans, Cleo Funderburk, Eva Funderburk, Marion Funderburk, Eunice Haithcock, Nettie Haithcock, Blondell Hamilton, Wilma Hancock, Azilee Hicks, Lavinia Hinson, Paul Hunter, Harry Jackson, Curtis Jenkins, Bessie Lee Johnson, Marsha Kelly, Lois Knight, Estelle Laney, Worth Lee, Theda Lynn, Cora Mangum, Johnnie Medlin, Virginia Mills, Joanna Nicholson, Lucy Nicholson, Mae Oliver, Mary Outen, Nelle Pigg, Lucy Price, Margaret Rallings, Gladys Rivers, Azilee Robertson, Grace Rogers, Bessie Rollings, Evelyn Rollings, Ola Rollings, Violet Rollings, Flora Rollins, Blanche Rorie, Winona Rorie, Maude Rushing, Clara Short, Grace Shrum, Annie Sims, Leila Sulivan, Cora Taylor, Mary Taylor, Grace Terry, Gladys Thomas, Minor Threatt, Mary Lois Timmons, Gladys Turner, Lessie Walters, and Helen Watts.

Fifteen years: Ovie Agerton, Christine Brewer, Mary Broome, Mildred Byrd, Henrietta Carter, Ethel Courtney, Mae Courtney, Vera Gibson, Lucy Griggs, Eva Gulledge, Ella Hancock, Lela Hicks, Jane Huneycutt, Bessie Jackson, Cloria Kirkley, Mae Laney, Bertha Little, Lillie Mangum, Mary Lee Maples, Janie Nash, Addie Price, Leona Price, Claire Robbins, Azilee S. Robertson, Nell Robinson, Rosa Robinson, Lee Roy Rollings, Lena Rollings, Thelma Rollings, Vinnie Rollings, Pearl Rorie, Mary Sanders, Zula Smith, Thelma Sutton, Allie Terry, Lennie Threatt, Willie Threatt, and Henry Watts.

Appropriate remarks were made by the Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of the State of South Carolina, who told of the happiness of our people in having Sacony as part of the South Carolina industrial family and pledged the continuing cooperation of the State of South Carolina in Sacony's magnificent production and posture.

As a pleasant and welcome surprise, Mr. Sidney Augstein presented to Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, dedicated legal counsel for the company, an appropriate plaque. This plaque saluted the wonderful legal services Mr. Wannamaker has rendered to the company over the 20-year period of its efforts in South Carolina. Mr. Wannamaker then introduced the Honorable Olin D. Johnston, U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina, who told of the coming of Sacony to South Carolina when he was Governor. He recited the incidents surrounding the visits to the Governor's office when he was Governor and not only welcomed Sacony to South Carolina, but pledged the cooperation and effort on behalf of the State of South Carolina. Then Senator Johnston took occasion to salute the Augstein family, whose significant history is intertwined with the company presently giving employment and production in South Carolina, and I am sure I speak the feeling of those present when I say that his address was heartwarming, appropriate, and inspiring. I include Senator Johnston's address. It was preceded by a magnificent introduction by Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, whose very cadence reflected the happiness of the occasion and his delight in participating. The address of Senator Johnston is as follows:

Address of Senator Olin D. Johnston

Caston, I am not quite sure what you want me to do for you but whatever it is, you let me know because I guess I will have to come through after all those nice things you said about me.

Governor Russell, Mayor Bennett, Mr. Adolph Augstein, and Mr. Sidney Augstein; and other distinguished guests: When I was first asked to attend this 20th anniversary celebration, I hesitated to agree to deliver any speech because I have been so close to the development and life of the Augstein Industries in South Carolina that I thought I might be a little handicapped, or you might say prejudiced, in what I would say.

Today in South Carolina when a great percentage of our people in business, government, and industry think in terms of the industrial growth of our State, we like to pat ourselves on the back, rightfully so, and talk about the miraculous changes that have taken place in our economy as a result of our efforts to bring new industry into our State.

Too often we fail to pat the backs of those who in the early days of our industrial development had the foresight and the pioneering spirit to come into our agricultural area and promote industry. Industry begets industry and I feel that today we owe a deep debt of gratitude to companies such as Sacony, headed by Mr. Augstein, for helping us in South Carolina to grow industrially.

Twenty years ago when Adolph Augstein first came to South Carolina, surveyed our assets and liabilities, I was in my second term as Governor of South Carolina. We had been fighting the freight rate battle and had established the first State development board, the industrial commission, labor department, as well as our ports authority and other institutions looking toward industrial development. Caston, many of the industries we have brought to South Carolina in recent years probably would not have come here if such men as the late Senator Jim Leppard, of Chesterfield and yourself, as legislators, had not followed my recommendations as Governor, and passed laws creating the labor department, the workmens compensation law, and other similar progressive acts necessary for a good industrial climate. But we did not have all the anwers to the industrialists who came into our State wondering whether or not they should move or start new industries within our borders. Anyone starting a new industry in a primarily agricultural society, necessarily took a certain risk in their development. Sacony is one of those industries which helped to lead the way for other industries.

In our early development years we pointed with pride to Sacony as an example of what other industries could do in our primarily agricultural economy. We looked to Sacony as one of our examples of success. I know Sloan Gable with the State development board can well remember in those early days how Mr. Augstein and Sacony helped us with the many industrial prospects who came to South Carolina. Once we had them inside a Sacony mill we let Mr. Augstein and his people do all the talking. We couldn't have hired better salesmen to help us get new industry to South Carolina. So you can see, Sacony has played a principal part in the overall industrial development of our State.

When Sacony located in South Carolina in 1945 the war had ended and it was before the great South Carolina industrial development revolution.

Today Sacony employs over 2,500 people in Pageland, Chesterfield, Bethune, and Manning plants, and the future, because of wise planning and cooperation on local levels, continues to be bright. Throughout these 20 years of growth in South Carolina, I have maintained close personal relations with Sacony and from time to time have been involved in some of the problems and some of the jobs that have come the way of Sacony.

Many people who hear the name Sacony, think of it in terms of just another plant or another industry and another payroll and another source of tax revenue, but the impact on our economy goes far beyond just these factors.

I guess people know more about Sacony through its products than they do about Sacony. Sacony has established high standards of plant operation and relations with employees. From the first day of its operation until now, Sacony's record in South Carolina has never been marred by any labor-management dispute. This speaks well for management and for those employed in these plants.

Sacony represents the kind of industry South Carolina needs and wants. We are glad in South Carolina that we had something to offer Sacony, but let it never be said that South Carolina has not been thankful for what Sacony has given her. I speak in terms of South Carolina because it takes the whole State to cooperate and keep an industry operating successfully and smoothly and to remain on its feet.

But certainly I cannot commend the relationship between Sacony and our State without singling out the people of Chesterfield County who cooperated in this pioneer venture 20 years ago. What the people in Chesterfield County did in cooperation with Sacony equals in contribution to our entire State's industrial growth to what Sacony contributed. The harmonious relationship and the success of Sacony in Chesterfield County has been a living example for other areas of our State to follow. No section of our State has met the challenges of industrial expansion and contributed to our State's growth in a more splendid manner than Chesterfield County.

Sacony is one company that has spanned the entire postwar industrial growth era of our great State, and I predict they will continue on matching their growth and success with our State's growth and success throughout the coming years.

I think I should cite here the executive management of S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. They are as follows:

S. Augstein & Co., Inc.; executive management: Chairman of the board of directors, Mr. Adolph M. Augstein; president and chief executive officer, Mr. Sidney Augstein; corporate secretary, Mrs. Carolyn A. Winik; treasurer-controller, Mr. Leon Reinharth; vice president, manufacturing division, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; vice president, women's wear division, Mr. Arthur R. Travis; vice president, assistant to chairman of the board, Mr. Saul N. Pollack; director, children's wear division, Mr. Irwin Alfin; director, fabric division, Mr. Albert S. Baris; and director, sportswear division, Mr. Chester S. Strasser.

Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc.; executive management: President, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; manager, quality control division, Mr. Charles G. Kudrna; manager, shipping and warehouse division, Mr. William J. O'Donnell; manager, Cheraw cutting division, Mr. Kermit Q. Kirby; manager, Cheraw sewing division, Mr. Clyde Hair; manager, Chesterfield sewing division, Mr. Otis M. Jones; manager, Chesterfield special manufacturing division, Mr. David F. Douglas; manager, Manning sewing division, Mr. Harold Lee; and manager, Pageland sewing division, Mr. Linwood Zeigler.

The young and vigorous president of S. Augstein & Co., Mr. Sidney Augstein, made a most significant address as part of the festivities of the occasion. He recalled the ambitions and the dedication of his family, and in the audience were his father, mother, and his sister. Rather than try to embellish his statements, I include at this point the complete text of his remarks:

Remarks of Sidney Augstein at Cheraw, S.C.

Honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I don't need to tell you how proud we are that you have taken the time to come here tonight to break bread with us, and remind us how warm and hospitable the people of South Carolina can be. It was Emerson who said: "Hospitality must be for service not for show." Certainly the hospitality of South Carolinians is one of service and the manner in which you extend it is gratifying indeed.

When we first came to this State 20 years ago, there were, undoubtedly, some among you who were dubious about the establishment of a factory to make women's and children's apparel. There has always been a certain precariousness about the apparel trades, a doubt that any given company can long endure. Justification for this attitude lies, no doubt, in the industry records which show that the average length of company life in the apparel trades is less than 10 years.

I am sure that you recognized something in Sacony, even 20 years ago. At that time we had been in business for over 50 years. I for one am ready to admit that the very real assistance which you gave us has made it possible for us to chalk up more than 70 years of continuous operation, something rare in the apparel trades.

But I want to stress that we are in an important industry, one that is often underrated in a Nation that has become accustomed to the workings of giant corporations; where total business and profits are measured in billions or hundreds of millions of dollars.

By contrast there are no apparel manufacturers who can show as much as $100 million in annual sales, maybe a half dozen have passed the $50 million mark, and only a handful do better than $10 million.

I repeat, we are in an important industry, nevertheless. It is one essential to the welfare of the Nation, and one that we can be proud of even though the individual producing units are relatively small.

Will there ever be a General Motors in the fashion industry? I doubt it. Sacony will grow and so will other apparel manufacturers, but not to a point where any one will ever account for more than 2 or 3 percent of total fashion industry sales.

As apparel producers, we are doing something more than just covering the human body; we are helping the wearer to create an image of good grooming and, I like to think we are helping to uplift her spirit to give a sense of security and well-being.

There is a subtleness in this business that precludes the use of any fully automated process. A good apparel style is like a work of art, but not a work or art that can be reproduced on a printing press. Each garment has in it, a little bit of the maker, his skill, his concern, a little bit of his love for humanity.

Women's apparel alone is a $12 billion industry in the United States. This is at the wholesale level, our level. Including infants' and children's and men's and boys', the figure would easily reach over $20 billion annually. Expenditures for apparel at the retail level are probably in excess of $31 billion a year.

This Nation boasts of the highest standard of living in the world. This is reflected in the expenditures our people make, not only for the essentials of living but for luxuries as well.

Expenditures are now running at a rate of $360 billion a year. Clothing stands high on the list of articles that consumers buy, and contrary to what many think, there is more money spent for the purchase of clothes than the purchase of automobiles. Clothing expenditures are also greater than those for furniture and household equipment.

The late Thorstein Veblen, a brilliant critic on modern business, wrote: "The material framework of modern civilization is the industrial system, and the directing force which animates this framework is business enterprise."

I quote Veblen only to spotlight something we are often reluctant to admit; namely, the goal of business is to make a profit. I believe this is a legitimate goal, but—and it is a big but—if this were our sole aim, we will have failed. We must take into account other human goals, and the hopes and aspirations of the people involved, their friendship, and the need to help the individual achieve a sense of personal identity, a sense of belonging to this endeavor.

It has been said that the ultimate goals in life are often achieved by indirect means. We have among our goals the desire to create products of true economic worth, to offer the buyer a genuine advantage, and serve him better than anyone else. In the Sacony philosophy there is the axiom that building of customer loyalty will pay off.

And we will invest in people, particularly those who work with us, we will seek to create a climate in which they will want to work with us, where they can do the best they have in them to do.

We believe that a company of this kind will prove more profitable in the long run than one in which the "fast buck" is the sole objective, regardless of human values.

We hope that we shall never get so big that we will be out of touch with those who work with us. It is physically impossible, of course, for management to come into daily contact with everyone in our factories, but we want you to feel that we are establishing policies that do fulfill our obligation to you, no matter what your task, and that our supervisory personnel will be ever mindful of these policies.

Someone facetiously once said: "A corporation is an ingenious device for obtaining individual profit without individual responsibility." I disagree. Rather I would subscribe to the thought expressed recently by Mr. Greenewalt, chairman of the Du Pont Co., and I quote him:

"A corporation is not a cold legalistic instrument existing without heart or emotional involvement, but a sensitive human institution, reflecting nothing more or less than the human cells and sinews of which it is composed."

Mr. Greenewalt also expressed a simple truth in successful business operation that we often lose sight of:

"The difference between the notably successful institution and one whose record is simply run of the mill," he said, "is seldom very great. It does not consist of brilliant and inspired flashes of genius—certainly not over a considerable period of time. The difference rather is the small increment of extra performance diffused over a very large number of individuals at all levels of the organizations."

Looking at the business prospects for 1963, I would say that we certainly will have to expend a little extra effort to insure a successful year. The American woman, in large city and small hamlet, is probably more fashion conscious than ever before. And more quality conscious, too. This does not mean that she is looking for the high price items. She expects quality in the medium-range apparel too.

The women we are concerned with mainly are those between the ages of 17 and 35. This market totals about 21 million. While this is less than 20 percent of the entire population, women in this age group are responsible for purchasing 35 percent of all women's apparel.

The children's market is constantly expanding. The segment of this market that we are concerned with is even larger than our women's market. There are 24,500,000 girls in ages from 1 to 12 years. The birth rate now is well over 4 million a year, soon it will be 5 million, and we can figure that about one-half will be girls.

But most important is the consumer's ability and willingness to buy. We haven't much doubt about his ability to buy. Personal income is at peak levels. There is the prospect of a cut in Federal income taxes that will put many more billions of dollars into the hands of the consumer.

In evaluating prospects for apparel, we never know for sure whether the consumer will show greater or less favor for soft goods as against hard goods, or whether he will decide to save more and spend less.

If we are going to forge ahead with Sacony products, we must make them well and make them attractive to insure that we get a fair share of the soft goods dollar. And this is what will take that little extra effort.

What about the future of Sacony? I can say that we have every intention of expanding our lines and our markets. We are not excluding the possibility of merging other apparel companies into our own. This will pose no danger for our factories in South Carolina, rather it will most probably bring more business and employment to this area.

I might add that apparel manufacturing has become an important industry in South Carolina. Plants turning our men's, women's, and children's apparel employ over 30,000 people, or more than 13 percent of all factory employees.

Our roster of employees who have been with us 10 to 20 years not only indicates that we have been here a long time but demonstrates a real measure of stability. With your help, we will continue to grow.

Thank you.

We welcomed Sacony to South Carolina 20 years ago. Our purpose on the evening of March 15 was not only to celebrate the 20th anniversary, but to assure Sacony our welcome continues, that they are an appreciated part of our industrial family, and to wish for them many more decades of successful production in South Carolina.

As we saluted those employees who have given such fine service over the years, we acclaimed also those who have made possible the fine record of this company. I hope I will have the privilege of attending the 30-year dinner, and many more.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Harley S. Hill, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Herrickville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 1:1, 2: *Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.*

Our Father which art in heaven hallowed be Thy name. We come to Thee in the name of Thy Son, Jesus. The poet wrote: "In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea, with a glory in His vision that transfigures you and me. As He died to make men holy so He died to make men free." O, God, build this Nation not with second-growth timber, but with virgin growth made strong by the north wind until our taproot gets down to the solid rock of God's divine grace. The Bible states about a nation which should be the head and not the tail. O, God, do not allow our eyes to become besmeared so that we cannot see the way Thou hast marked out for us, nor our minds dulled with selfishness and greed, nor our ears deaf to Thy voice.

The Bible says, "Ye shall hear a voice behind thee, saying 'This is the way, walk ye in it.' "

There will be such voices heard, but may we listen only to Thy voice. We believe that Thou hast raised us up as a nation to make a safe home for the free and the brave.

Bless Mr. Kennedy, our President; help us to hold up his hands in all that is right and strong. Bless the Speaker of the House, each officer, and each Representative. Give each divine wisdom to know the right and the wrong.

Blot out as a thick cloud our transgressions and, as a cloud, our sins.

In the name of the triune God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 25, 1963, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 3120 and H.R. 3845.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities have permission to file the annual report of the committee for 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, at the request of President Kennedy, I introduced H.R. 3920, the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963. As I am sure all of you are aware, this is the President's proposal for health insurance for the aged under the social security insurance system. I am today proud to state that 21 of my distinguished colleagues from the State of California have introduced identical bills. I also am very proud to state that a number of my colleagues in the House already have introduced identical bills and, I am confident, there will be others who will do so as time goes by.

I think it is a significant development that 22 Members of the California delegation are now cosponsors of this exceedingly important legislative proposal and that, as of the present time, a total of 49 Members of the House are sponsors of the bill, or bills quite similar in purpose. I am gratified that this is the case.

I should like to take this occasion to again state that this legislation in my judgment will solve a problem which becomes more pressing with each passing month, and it deserves early and careful consideration. This is meritorious and fiscally sound legislation. Its adoption has been far too long delayed. I am urging that it be given executive consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means as soon as we complete our current schedule on the President's 1963 tax message. I am hopeful we will be successful in this endeavor. I now invite and urge other Members of the House who have not already done so to join with me in sponsoring and working for the early enactment of this legislation. Illness among the aged, and its aftermath of financial crises and ruin, wait for no one. We can and should act now on this bill.

ATTACKS ON FOREIGN SHIPS BY EXILES FROM CUBA

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am reading with increasing concern of attacks being made on foreign ships by exiles from Cuba who are presently in the United States.

These attacks are directly in contravention of U.S. policy and have been made in spite of repeated requests from high Government officials of the United States to desist. The only purpose that can possibly underly these attacks is to create incidents which will involve the people of the United States in an all-out shooting war.

To put it very bluntly, these Cuban exiles have been admitted to the United States in order to give them a place of asylum. We must now make it clear to them that we will immediately expel from these shores any Cuban exiles who so deliberately flaunt the policy of our Government.

We in the United States certainly are determined to oppose Castro-Cuba and Communist intrusion in this hemisphere. However, we work through our duly constituted leaders in the tradition of the democratic self-government. Any Cuban exile who presently finds haven in this country should get out immediately if he will not abide by the processes of orderly democratic government.

A STRANGE POLICY DECISION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Mr. WYMAN, performed a public service on Monday last in directing the attention of the House to the attendance of a succession of Yugoslav officers at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.

As our colleague pointed out, and as I should like to reemphasize, these Communist officers were not sought as students by the Army. The Army was required to accept them by decision of higher authority. No criticism should attach to the Army in regard to this policy, which has been in effect for more than 10 years.

I am sure it will be incomprehensible to many citizens, however, that it was decided the national interest would be served by admitting officers of Communist Yugoslavia to one of our most important military schools to learn at first hand how we train for top command and staff assignments the promising officers of our own Army—a force which may be called on to fight a Communist aggressor.

Obviously, the Yugoslav Government has taken full advantage of this opportunity to learn of American military doctrine by sending some of its best officers to study under our instructors at Fort Leavenworth. Three of these students, who attended the school while in the rank of colonel, now are major generals, and one is the chief of Marshal Tito's military cabinet.

Why should the U.S. Army have thrust on it instruction of officers of a Communist nation?

DEDUCTION FOR PAYMENT OF REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 10, insert:

"(c) REDEEMABLE GROUND RENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'redeemable ground rent' means only a ground rent with respect to which—

"(1) there is a lease of land which is assignable by the lessee without the consent of the lessor and which (together with periods for which the lease may be renewed at the option of the lessee) is for a term in excess of 15 years,

"(2) the leaseholder has a present or future right to terminate, and to acquire the entire interest of the lessor in the land, by payment of a determined or determinable amount, which right exists by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or privately created condition, and

"(3) the lessor's interest in the land is primarily a security interest to protect the rental payments to which the lessor is entitled under the lease."

Page 3, line 11, strike "'(c)" and insert: "'(d)".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, H.R. 1597, which was passed by the House under unanimous consent on February 26, in effect deals with the tax treatment in Maryland of both the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this real property subject to the redeemable ground rent. Under the bill, for the home buyer the ground rent paid would be treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, deductible by him for tax purposes. As to the seller of the real property, the property would be treated as if sold subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent, and as a result, the redeemable ground rent would be taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and would be reflected in any gain or loss recognized to him.

An amendment to the bill was adopted by the other body which adds a section providing a definition of the term "redeemable ground rent." This is in the nature of a clarification and does not alter the substance of the House bill or its basic effect.

I urge that the House concur in the amendments of the other body.

DESIGNATING APRIL 11, 1963, FOR CELEBRATION OF PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up House Resolution 300, designating April 11, 1963, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 11, 1963, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been cleared with the minority side and there is no objection to it. We think it is an excellent idea.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING WEEK OF APRIL 15, 1963, AS "NATIONAL HARMONY WEEK"

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 282 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 11, 1963, marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Incorporated; and

Whereas the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Incorporated, a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing, will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding during the six-day period beginning April 15, 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the six-day period beginning April 15, 1963, and ending April 20, 1963, both dates inclusive, is hereby designated as "National Harmony Week", in recognition and appreciation of the successful efforts of the members of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Incorporated, to maintain the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing as a traditional form of native American music, and of their efforts, through their stimulus to good music and vocal harmony, to keep America singing. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels], be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, although I am the sponsor of the bill (H.J. Res. 282), I want to call attention to the fact that similar resolutions have been introduced by my colleagues, Congressmen Horton of New York, McIntire of Maine, Quie of Minnesota and Schadeberg of Wisconsin. I would like to point out that we have had complete harmony in the presentation and advancement of this proposal to designate April 15–20 as National Harmony Week in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America.

You will note the terms of the resolution provide that the Senate and House of Representatives shall designate National Harmony Week:

> In recognition and appreciation of the successful efforts of the members of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., to maintain the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing as a traditional form of native American music, and of their efforts, through their stimulus to good music and vocal harmony, to keep America singing. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Barbershop singing is a longtime American favorite. It is a traditional American style of singing which has brought entertainment and pleasure to millions of people over the years. We believe the society has made an important contribution to our American culture by its programs to preserve the barbershop tradition and to keep America singing. I believe we are indebted to the society for saving barbershop singing from going out of use with the barbershop mustache cup.

The Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America is a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to good fellowship and harmony. It has more than 30,000 members in 650 chapters throughout the United States and Canada and is a force for creating goodwill and comity among people of all walks of life.

I am hopeful that my colleagues in Congress will sing out in favor of this resolution. Some people may say that Congress should not concern itself with matters of this kind. But with all the pressures and tensions in the world today, I think it would be good for the country and the Congress to designate and observe a National Harmony Week with the society created to promote good fellowship and to keep America singing. We need more groups dedicated to pleasantness and friendliness in the world, and we should honor them when there is such an opportunity. I, therefore, urge my colleagues in the Congress to give their unanimous endorsement to this resolution.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of House Joint Resolution 282 designating the 6-day period, April 15 through 20, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," this in observance of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

I would like at the outset to establish this point—that I am not prone to support many of the requests for national observances that in recent years have in number and purpose gone way beyond the border of the plausible into the realm of the ridiculous.

I introduced similar legislation to House Joint Resolution 282, House Joint Resolution 320, for a number of what I believe to be excellent reasons. First is the fact that barbershop quartet singing is American in its origin and is in the field of music symbolic of America. On that basis alone, we should welcome this opportunity and this means of helping in the preservation and encouragement of this great American institution—barbershop quartet singers.

There is nothing more natural, when men get together under conducive circumstances, for them to break in harmonizing some of the old favorites. What member of this committee has not enjoyed many hours of such wholesome activity over the years? And think of the many hours of entertainment the amateur singers in SPEBSQSA have provided audiences throughout the country during the past quarter century. One of the concerts which most of us in the Washington area know about, of course, is the one held at the Water Gate and which regularly attracts an estimated 12,000 persons.

Such concerts for the general public, staged by the nearly 30,000 men in the SPEBSQSA chapters, nowhere begin to tell the story of this very worthwhile organization. The following figures may help to tell that story: In a 6-month period last year, nationwide statistics show that this organization through its local chapters and local quartets entertained free of charge some 32,000 persons in hospitals, homes for the aged, charity, and church organizations, et cetera. The following breakdown of the 8,500-man hours put into such charitable performances may be of interest to you:

	Man-hours
Hospitals	981
Homes for the aged	995
Charitable organizations	2,935
Church groups	747
Schools for the handicapped	1,721
Banquets	232

And that during the short period of 6 months last year.

A significant aspect of SPEBSQSA is that it draws from all areas of our social complex. Workers, teachers, merchants, doctors, truck drivers, lawyers—men from all walks of life—join together in making harmony. Members know little and care less about each other's station in life. In this organization it does not matter.

Last year, 36 States cooperated in helping to observe the 24th anniversary of this organization by issuing either proclamations or letters of commendation. So also did 150 city mayors of metropolitan areas.

Though of special importance to me is the fact that barbershop quartet singing is American in every sense of the word. But not to be overlooked is the fact that when America creates and develops something truly outstanding, it is bound to find wide acceptance elsewhere in the world. And I am sure we all are pleased to know that barbershop quartet singing is becoming popular in other countries.

Especially significant in this respect is the fact that for the first time in its 25-year history, the SPEBSQSA this year will hold its annual convention in Canada, July 2 through 6, in Toronto. I might add that this seems to me most appropriate when harmony between our two neighboring countries could use a little assistance.

The American and Canadian barbershoppers call their frequent trips back and forth across the border to sing for each other—"Hands Across the Border." I for one would like to do what I can for the encouragement and preservation of such activity.

I feel specially privileged, and specially authorized, you might say, to speak in behalf of this legislation. The international headquarters of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., is located in my congressional district, in the city of Kenosha. The international headquarters home, very appropriately, is named Harmony Hall.

There is much more I could say, Mr. Chairman, but I realize time is limited. I believe this to be a most worthy cause, one I trust the House will unanimously agree is worthy.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 282.

I introduced a similar resolution—House Joint Resolution 307.

My warmest thanks for the deep interest and proper action by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester]. As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee that give this resolution prompt hearing and to the Judiciary Committee for its prompt consideration.

My legislation—House Joint Resolution 307—is one of several bills that would designate the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week." In so doing the bill would give national recognition to a popular national pastime—barbershop singing.

It is my understanding that some 29,000 men throughout the country spend their leisure time singing with barbershop groups. And it is recognized that many of these groups make a valuable contribution to the community life of

America, offering freely their services not only in singing but also in work vital to the well-being of the community.

Barbershop singing is unique in the respect that it traditionally is an American form of music, a musical product that has taken root in the American culture. As such, it should receive proper recognition and support, thereby assuring it a permanent place in the American setting.

It is indeed heartening to observe that there are those who, in spite of world uncertainties and confusion, are bright enough of spirit to bring happiness to others and satisfaction to themselves through song—my legislation is designed to encourage these dispensers of good solid harmonies to keep up their very good work.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of this legislation, and I want to express my appreciation for being able to present this statement for the consideration of the members of this committee.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 21, 1963, I sponsored House Joint Resolution 333 designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week." I was pleased to lend my support and endorsement of this measure in recognition of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. This kind of singing is native American.

In Union City, N.J., we have a very active chapter of this organization, J-20 chapter, which has done much to further this proposal. The society is celebrating its 25th anniversary of spreading musical harmony and good will throughout the Nation. The good people of my congressional district are aware of the many contributions this organization has made to our home area during the past 18 years.

As well as introducing a resolution to this end, I have also contacted our President urging approval of the resolution. President Kennedy has received numerous indications of interest in the designation of National Harmony Week. In the event my colleagues, Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, of Florida, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee which reported the measure favorably, and Hon. HAROLD OSTERTAG, of New York, and those of us who joined them in this effort, are successful in gaining House approval today, I am assured the President will comply in inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of National Harmony Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, a very timely newspaper article appearing in the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J., March 27, 1963, entitled "Close Cropped Harmony Is American Through and Through." This article points out that "there were no barbershop quartets on the Mayflower" and reminds us that the art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing is uniquely American:

Close Cropped Harmony Is American Through and Through

(By Paul McElaney)

There were no barbershop quartets on the Mayflower.

That kind of singing is native American. It reached its heyday in the 1890's when young swains in striped blazers congregated at the local tonsorial palaces with guitars and ukuleles.

The music produced by these stringed instruments was so wild—so far out in those days—it was inspirational.

The gay young blades tried to sing in accompaniment and discovered the only way to vocalize was to harmonize. It was a great revelation.

When the jukebox became popular in the early 1930's, barbershop harmony declined. By 1938 it was almost a lost art. A precious slice of Americana was vanishing from the scene and Owen C. Cash, a tax attorney from Tulsa, Okla, crusaded for its revival.

In Rupert Hall, an investment broker, he met a kindred spirit. One day they sat down and wrote a letter informing the Tulsa citizens that the Bill of Rights still guaranteed them the right to sing barbershop style.

They were going to hold a songfest on the roof garden of the Tulsa Club and everybody was invited. They sent out 100 copies of the letter.

The 26 men who responded to the rebels first meeting sang again the following week. In the interim, word had spread and 70 men showed up.

For the third meeting Cash rented a suite in the Alvin Hotel. On that day 150 men strolled into the lobby humming happily.

A reporter from the Tulsa World was sent downtown to check out an alleged accident that caused a traffic jam. Searching for the "wreck" he asked one of the cops.

"Wreck?" said the patrolman. "There's no wreck. It's just some darn fools up there in the Alvin singing their heads off. Everybody stopped to listen."

As stories go, the Tulsa World printed it and the wire services picked it up and flashed it across the country.

That was it. Cash had struck a responsive chord in the hearts of every bathtub crooner in the Nation. The Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., was off to a roaring start.

Since then, their motto "Keep America Singing," has spread to Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone. The 700 scattered chapters contain 2,000 quartets and 60 choruses.

Today, the society is the largest singing outfit in the world—and exclusively male.

Some prominent personalities are listed among the 30,000 members: Bing Crosby, Hoagy Carmichael, composers Geoff O'Hara (K-K-K-Kay), and Harry Armstrong (Sweet Adeline), Fred Waring, and that former White House piano player.

What is a barbershop quartet? Simply a tenor, alto, baritone, and bass who produce four-part harmony. The melody is sung below melody note.

It looks easy and sounds great but it takes a lot of practice. When a smooth-blending, chord-bending quartet rigs up a few fast "changes," "slides," and liberal halftones, the harmony becomes more exacting than any other four-part vocal music.

Good close harmony quartets ignore or scorn conventional musical patterns and toss "swipes" around with the insolent abandon of clown jugglers in a circus. "Swipes" are several chords on separate melody notes.

The singing of a skilled quartet is pure tone adjustment through acute ear sense. Actually, the vibrations, overtones, timbres, and slight modulations in pitch defy analysis.

Some people have extremely sensitive ears and can follow rapid chord changes or distinguish tone elements. On the other hand, recent tests showed that some professional singers, while proficient in musical techniques of one kind or another, have no ability to arrange or blend harmony chords.

Good vowel sounds are another controlling factor in smooth harmony. Consonants have a tendency to distort because they require too much breath. You can't play S's and R's on your vocal chords any better than you can on a violin or piano.

Jersey City was one of the first cities to apply for a charter back in 1938. In those days the Hudson County members used to meet in the old Globe Hotel at Danforth Avenue and the Boulevard.

Currently, there are 52 members in the Jersey City chapter. Known as the Garden State Glee Club, they have been active in numerous benefits for charities throughout the State.

In 1946 they won the international quartet singing contest.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to speak in support of the joint resolution which would designate April 15 to 20 as "National Harmony Week."

As we know, this joint resolution, among other things, recognizes the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. My home community of Rochester, N.Y., is proud to have, as one of its outstanding citizens the International President of this worthy musical organization. He is Mr. S. Wayne Foor.

In fact, it was through Mr. Foor that I first became interested in National Harmony Week. I received a copy of a letter from Mr. Foor, addressed to the President of the United States, asking for the designation of "National Harmony Week."

I wrote to the President and indicated my interest in this matter and suggested that consideration be given to it. In response, I received a letter from the Office of the President indicating that such a designation would have to originate in the Congress.

Thereafter, I introduced a resolution identical to the one we are considering today. I would like to point out that following the introduction of that resolution, I heard from several of our colleagues who expressed their enthusiastic support of this measure. It has been gratifying to note that this support is truly bipartisan; coming as it has, from both sides of the aisle.

Another source of pleasure for me has been to witness the wonderful cooperation which the Committee on the Judiciary, both as a full committee and through its Subcommittee No. 4, have extended in order to expedite this floor consideration. I was given the opportunity to testify before the subcommittee along with our other colleagues who introduced this joint resolution. The subcommittee was most gracious and I appreciate the prompt action they took.

In reporting the bill to the full committee, they added that their action was "without a note of discord."

Like my colleagues who support these resolutions, I feel this is an appropriate tribute to the S.P.E.B.S.Q.S.A.'s nationwide efforts to keep America singing. And I might point out that their motto is "Keep America Singing." With chapters in all 50 States, their 30,000 members are fine Americans, who are dedicated to harmony in their songs and in their lives.

I would urge the designation of "National Harmony Week" in a broader sense, too. Challenged as we are by the evils of a totalitarian system that is unaware of the blessing of harmony among men and nations, this special week could serve to emphasize the unity of noble purpose which is the character of a free people.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of the adoption of House Joint Resolution 282 introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. Quartet singing and other vocal and choral group singing in the American style of close harmony is conducive to a strong national unity and purpose. In addition, American singing of American songs in close harmony promotes a favorable American image throughout the world. This great native American institution deserves the fullest recognition and encouragement.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR FLAG"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 86 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled "Our Flag", published by the Office of Armed Services Information and Education, Department of Defense, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that three hundred thousand additional copies be printed, of which two hundred thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and one hundred thousand shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has a series of these bills that deal with the printing of publications of one kind or another, is that correct?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And they are all limited strictly to the printing; they carry no other amendments of any kind?

Mr. HAYS. Nothing except the authorization to print.

Mr. GROSS. There are no employees involved in any of these bills?

Mr. HAYS. No.

Mr. GROSS. No additional employees, I should say?

Mr. HAYS. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1,001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by WRIGHT PATMAN, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousands copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALL MAP OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 98 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be compiled and printed fifty-nine thousand three hundred and fifty copies of a wall map of the United States, prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, showing information, including historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States, to be printed on a single sheet, approximately three and one-half feet by five and one-half feet, of which forty-three thousand nine hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifteen thousand four hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain that this is similar to and replaces House Concurrent Resolution 574 which was passed in the 87th Congress which would call for this map to be printed on two sheets. We found that we could save 25 percent by making it slightly smaller and printing it on one sheet. I asked the staff of the Joint Committee to hold up the printing on it, which they did. This will permit the resolution of the last Congress to go ahead but on a slightly smaller scale at a saving of more than 25 percent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 108 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 136 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed thirty thousand nine hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH ANALYTICAL INDEX

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is authorized to be printed as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, prepared by Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; and that twenty-five thousand additional copies be printed, of which five thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the balance prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT, COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 296) to print as a House document, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the message from the President, dated March 11, 1963, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, covering the period ending December 31, 1962, together with the accompanying report, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that three hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two hundred and twenty thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on this Sunday, March 31, we will celebrate the 30th anniversary of the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, one of the most far-reaching and successful of the domestic programs inaugurated by Franklin D. Roosevelt. In a time of national domestic crisis, when the chaotic economic state of the country and the desperate unemployment situation created unprecedented social unrest, our President had the imagination and the courage to establish personally this unusual program, confident as he was of its value and its potential success.

His confidence and his judgment and his foresight were borne out during the years of operation of the CCC—both by its magic with press and people and by its splendid record of accomplishments. The CCC camps, set up in every State of the Union and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, provided food, clothing, shelter, and work experience for the better than 3 million young men enrolled. From the work of the Corps this Nation reaped rich benefits, the impact of which may still be demonstrated today: 3 million acres of trees were planted; 4 million acres of wooded land were cleared; millions of acres of grassland were saved from erosion through the erection of dams and other conservation facilities. Through the construction and renovation of recreational facilities, our national parks and forests became treasure grounds for the millions of young and old seeking peace, beauty, sport, and adventure.

While the contributions of the CCC still affect us today, we have reached a critical stage where we must take positive action to preserve these contributions and to assure similar benefits to our children who are richly deserving of a proud heritage from us. There exists currently a critical need for improvements in our national parks, forests, and other public areas, both in the realm of conserving our natural resources and of providing recreational facilities. Each year more and more of our people are visiting our national recreation areas. Last year the total recreation visits to national forests climbed above 112,700,000—an 11-percent increase over the 102 million visits in 1961. This figure, which does not even include people just passing through, represents three times the number of visits made just a decade ago. Officials expect even more people to seek this pleasant leisure diversion during 1963 and the coming years, yet the present facilities are inadequate for these millions of pleasure seekers.

Our backlog of even more vital conservation projects is staggering. Among the things which mightily need to be accomplished are such diversified undertakings as reforestation of public and private lands, timber stand improvements, fish and wildlife, and Western rangeland works, the development of parks and recreational lands and the construction of access roads, and soil and watershed conservation. To bring these programs in line with our present needs, we would have to spend a total of $12.2 billion.

But our conservation needs—and the far more urgent employment needs of our young people—can be met directly, simply, wisely, and far more economically by the reinstitution, not of the CCC itself, but of a version of the Corps designed to meet the problems of today's young people. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have for many years been sponsoring legislation to aid the youngsters of our country who are inexperienced, untrained, and minimally educated. All too often these young men and women have found the doors to employment shut in their faces. They have frequently faced undeserved reprimands at home. They have felt unwanted and unneeded by their communities. They need training and they need motivation. They cannot wait 5 years, nor even 1 year, for our help. They need right now, this year, the opportunity to realize that this Nation has need of them and has a place for them. They need in 1963 a chance to demonstrate to themselves and to the Nation that they can contribute significantly from their abundant personal and individual potentialities.

Mr. Speaker, as we recall the days of the CCC, which some of us, especially those of my generation, remember fondly and well, let us salute its great achievements by an equivalent accomplishment of our own. I am inserting in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a history of the efforts Senator HUMPHREY and my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, CARL PERKINS—whose effective leadership as chairman of the House General Subcommittee on Education has helped get the CCC legislation favorably reported during several Congresses—and I have been making for some years to endow America of the 1960's with the same domestic magic which Franklin Roosevelt gave her in the 1930's. I sincerely request all my colleagues to read this story, to reconsider the Youth Employment Act of 1963, and to support this measure. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly request that our Nation take the bold step forward it once had the courage to take in the time of F.D.R.

HISTORY

Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1963, marks the 30th anniversary of one of President Roosevelt's first and most important domestic programs—the Civilian Conservation Corps. April 17 will note the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the first CCC camp—in the George Washington National Forest, near Luray, Va.

These two anniversary dates take on additional significance this year because during the first part of April the House will consider and, I certainly hope, pass legislation establishing a Youth Conservation Corps.

This proposal, part of President Kennedy's overall program to do something positive to remedy the continuing problem of youth unemployment, is modeled on the CCC experience. As a former educational director of the unique and renowned CCC, I believe I can speak with some authority, and I think with justifiable pride, of some of its accomplishments.

For the 3 million young men enrolled in the program, the CCC provided—in camps located in every State and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—shelter, clothing, good food, and wholesome and healthful surroundings. But far more important, it proffered the individual stimulus and discipline, and not infrequently the incentive needed by many of those depressed young men of the thirties to seek and to acquire more in the way of formal education.

At its termination on June 30, 1942, the CCC could review with pride its record of achievements in conserving our natural resources. Three million acres of trees had been planted, 4 million acres of wooded land cleared, 8 million acres of forest lands freed of insect pests and tree diseases. Through the building of dams and other conservation facilities, other millions of acres of grassland had been saved from erosion. In addition, and directly attributable to the efforts of the CCC, picnic facilities, fishing areas, and other recreational sites had been improved, and a better environment provided for our wildlife.

Again today there is a critical need for similar work in our national parks, forests, and other public areas. This has been evidenced most vividly by the testimony of the numerous witnesses appearing in support of the Youth Employment Act of 1963 before the House General Subcommittee on Education. Our backlog of conservation projects is astounding. Included on the list of things to be accomplished are such diversified undertakings as reforestation of public and private lands, timber stand improvements, fish and wildlife and western rangeland works, the development of parks and recreational lands and the construction of access roads, and soil and watershed conservation. To bring these programs in line with our present needs, we would have to spend a total of $12.2 billion.

But what strikes me as being even more detrimental to the welfare of this great country is the present unemployment situation which is forcing 1 million of our young people who are out of school and out of work to remain unemployed. The alarming figures indicating a serious upswing in the high school dropout and the juvenile delinquency rates have a direct and most pertinent relationship to the incredibly high proportion of youth unemployment. Indeed, this Nation seems to be again experiencing some of the social maladjustment which appeared during the bleak depression days.

The excellent work in reviewing the YCC legislation performed by the General Subcommittee on Labor under the able leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], both in 1961 and in 1962, can atone only in part for the indifference and neglect of years in trying to meet the snowballing problem of youth unemployment. The years of procrastination since the first Youth Corps bills were introduced in 1950 visit upon us all a guilt which can only be eradicated by our swift response to duty and necessity in this year 1963.

In 1933 the CCC legislation was introduced in the Congress on March 21, and just 10 days later President Roosevelt signed the bill into law.[1] Now no one contends that the current economic situation, serious as it is, compares with the dark days of the thirties, nor does anyone advocate such extraordinary legislative speed. In the 1930's with the whole of society out of focus, the immediacy of the need was obvious. Today's problem of youth unemployment is glossed over by the apparent general prosperity the country is experiencing. We look at the Nation with our sunglasses of affluence, and everything seems lush and green with promise. But the pockets of structural unemployment and the almost total elimination of unskilled labor may erupt into a serious national crisis. The need for palliative measures is only too evident to those of us from distressed areas.

No one considering the attempts over the past several years to alleviate this potentially explosive situation by establishing a Youth Corps would regard the record of the Congress with any feeling of pride, nor would one view it as a model for future emulation. If anything, it is but a lesson in persistency on the part of the realistic and informed.

It is fitting, however, on this anniversary occasion, to review briefly the history of the dedicated efforts which have been made in the Congress to aid our Nation's unemployed youth.

In the 2d session of the 81st Congress—1950—four proposals to revive the CCC spirit were introduced in the House and one in the Senate.[2] No action was taken on the Senate bill, and the House action was limited to a second referral of three of the four bills from the Committee on Education and Labor to the Committee on Public Lands. On June 27, 1950, this country entered into the Korean conflict, negating, at least for a time, any need for a program such as the YCC.

In the 1st session of the 85th Congress—1957—a bill entitled the "Youth Conservation Act of 1957" was introduced in both the House and the Senate,[3] but no action was taken on either proposal.

Two years later, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress—1959—14 bills relating to the establishment of a YCC were introduction in the House,[4] and in the 2d session—1960—8 more bills were submitted.[5] Again, although 2 days of hearings were held, no action was taken.[6] The Senate story for the 86th Congress was somewhat different. Senator HUMPHREY and 20 others introduced S. 812, providing for the creation of a YCC.[7] After hearings by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the bill was reported out, with amendments, on July 20, 1959.[8] On August 13, by a rollcall vote of 47 to 45,[9] the Senate passed S. 812. The 45 supporting Democrats were joined by 2 Republicans, whereas 15 Democrats and 30 Republicans opposed the measure.[10] This Senate bill was then referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor,[11] where it died.

In the 87th Congress—1961–62—some legislative progress was made though neither the House nor the Senate actually voted on the YCC proposal. Twenty-one bills were introduced in the House during the first session.[12] Hearings were held on H.R. 7536, the administration bill. The General Subcommittee on Labor, under the excellent guidance of the chairman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], reported out a clean bill (H.R. 8354) on August 2, 1961.[13] The House Committee on Rules, however, took no action.[14]

As reported, H.R. 8354 not only contained recommendations comparable to those in the legislation now proposed in H.R. 1890 and in my bill H.R. 1, but also included provisions for an on-the-job training program. These latter suggestions were subsequently incorporated into the Manpower Development and Training Act. Thus, the House Committee on Education and Labor once again reported the bill, this time as H.R. 10682.[15] The House Committee on Rules still refused to take action.[16]

In September 1962 several of us attempted to bring H.R. 10682 to the House floor under the Calendar Wednesday procedure. After some hours taken up with rollcalls, quorum calls, and a demand for the reading of the House Journal, we had to abandon our efforts[17] in behalf of the YCC in the House.

---

[1] S. 598, 73d, introduced on Mar. 21, 1933, by Senators Robinson, of Arkansas, and Wagner, of New York; reported by the Committee on Education and Labor (with an amendment in the nature of a substitute) on March 23; passed the Senate on March 28; passed the House, amended, on March 29; again considered in the Senate, which concurred in the House amendment on March 30, and signed into law on Mar. 31, 1933. Became Public Law 5 (48 Stat. 22). (77 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 652, 853, 937, 995, 1013, and 1102).

[2] S. 3144 introduced by Senators Murray, of Montana; Thomas, of Utah; Pepper, of Florida; Green, of Rhode Island; Kilgore, of West Virginia; Taylor, of Idaho; Humphrey, of Minnesota; Neely, of West Virginia; and Lehman, of New York.

[3] S. 871 by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota and H.R. 4618 by Representative ROOSEVELT, of California.

[4] H.R. 425 (Roosevelt, of California), H.R. 3709 (Blatnik, of Minnesota), H.R. 3744 (Pfost, of Idaho), H.R. 4247 (Addonizio, of New Jersey), H.R. 4462 (Rabaut, of Michigan), H.R. 4516 (Miller, of California), H.R. 4561 (Roosevelt, of California), H.R. 5188 (Diggs, of Michigan), H.R. 5856 (Boyle, of Illinois), H.R. 7686 (Stratton, of New York), H.R. 7777 (Kee, of West Virginia), H.R. 7831 (Toll, of Pennsylvania), H.R. 8303 (Sikes, of Florida), and H.R. 8404 (Perkins, of Kentucky).

[5] H.R. 9334 (Kasem, of California), H.R. 9767 (Doyle, of California), H.R. 9704 (Bailey, of West Virginia), H.R. 10057 (Holland, of Pennsylvania), H.R. 10691 (Murphy, of Illinois), H.R. 11072 (Daniels, of New Jersey), H.R. 11715 (Green, of Oregon), and H.R. 12086 (Fulton, of Pennsylvania).

[6] Hearings were held on April 20–21, 1960, but apparently not printed.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 1, p. 1317. Cosponsors included Senators Murray, of Montana; Byrd of West Virginia; Church, of Idaho; Gruening, of Alaska; Hart, of Michigan; Hennings, of Missouri; Jackson, of Washington; Johnston, of South Carolina; Langer, of North Dakota; Magnuson, of Washington; Mansfield, of Montana; McCarthy, of Minnesota; Morse, of Oregon; Moss, of Utah; Neuberger, of Oregon; Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Randolph, of West Virginia; Yarborough, of Texas; Cannon, of Nevada; and Carroll, of Colorado.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, p. 13753.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 12, pp. 15792–15793.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 12, pp. 15792–15793; 1959 C. Q. Almanac, p. 433.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 12, p. 15916.

[12] H.R. 110 (KEE of West Virginia); H.R. 268 (ROOSEVELT, of California); H.R. 272 (ULLMAN, of Oregon); H.R. 363 (GREEN, of Oregon); H.R. 600 (ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin); H.R. 1089 (STRATTON, of New York); H.R. 2375 (ADDONIZIO, of New Jersey); H.R. 3256 (DANIELS, of New Jersey); H.R. 3327 (MULTER, of New York); H.R. 4002 (PFOST, of Idaho); H.R. 4158 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); H.R. 4264 (PUCINSKI, of Illinois); H.R. 4531 (O'HARA, of Illinois); H.R. 4971 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); H.R. 5004 (HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania); H.R. 5167 (ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois); H.R. 5418 (TOLL, of Pennsylvania); H.R. 5586 (SLACK, of West Virginia); H.R. 6039 (DIGGS, of Michigan); H.R. 7536 (PERKINS, of Kentucky); and H.R. 7541 (BLATNIK, of Minnesota).

[13] H. Rept. No. 833, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Aug. 2, 1961; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, p. 14369.

[14] 1962 C. Q. Almanac, p. 228.

[15] H. Rept. No. 1540, 87th Cong., 2d sess., March 29, 1962; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 4, p. 5455.

[16] Supra, footnote 15.

In the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY and 22 of his colleagues cosponsored S. 404 early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.[18] Later, in June, Senator HUMPHREY sponsored the administration bill, S. 2036.[19] Hearings were held on both bills, and S. 404 was reported, with amendments, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.[20] The Senate, however, did not vote on S. 404, because, as Senator HUMPHREY then stated:

> The policy committee of the Senate has approved S. 404 for action, but * * * we want to make sure that this time we are going to have the cooperation of the other body th :t the bill will become law, and that we will not be engaged in a mere exercise in legislative processing.[21]

This brief legislative chronology of our efforts to establish a YCC program brings us to the present—to the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

As of mid-March, 36 bills had been introduced in the House. Also, the House Committee on Education and Labor had scheduled and completed hearings on the YCC proposals in the General Subcommittee on Education, under the able leadership of my good friend and distinguished colleague, CARL PERKINS of Kentucky. Congressman PERKINS, after the recommendations of his committee had been approved, submitted a revised administration bill, H.R. 5131.

In the Senate, Senator HUMPHREY was joined by 34 of his fellow Senators in support of the administration bill, S. 1. Last week the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare favorably reported S. 1, after public hearings very similar to those held by Mr. PERKINS' House committee. Today, the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet in executive session to vote on reporting this measure.

I am sure that many of my colleagues here in the House join me in urging our colleagues in the Senate committee to favorably report S. 1, so that President Kennedy's wish to have this bill on his desk about the time of the Easter recess will be fulfilled.

AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY ACT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, Congress amended the Social Security Act in 1956 to provide benefits for totally and permanently disabled persons covered by the act. Since that time, the social security disability program has been expanded greatly. I am concerned that this expansion has brought about certain developments which, in my opinion, were never envisioned or desired by the Congress.

Take for instance the effect of the repeal of the offset provision in 1958. This action permitted a qualified person to receive both State workmen's compensation and social security disability benefits. I am told that as of today there are 47 jurisdictions where a person receives more in dual benefits than in take-home pay, as an able-bodied workingman on the job.

Such a situation is bound to have a decided effect upon our rehabilitation programs everywhere. I am told that already the incentive for these disabled people to become rehabilitated is practically nil.

A far more serious result of this expanded program is its effect upon the State workmen's compensation programs. These programs last year reached their 50th anniversary. Well known are the contributions made by these plans to the industrial progress of our country.

Workmen's compensation assures payment for job-connected injuries and diseases without costly legal actions, provides for rehabilitation and medical benefits, furnishes artificial limbs and training, provides incentives to employees to emphasize safety and most important of all to an injured person—makes payment of claims promptly. In the minds of some people the State programs, furnishing these services, are in serious jeopardy from the inroads made by the Federal disability program.

I, personally, do not believe it ever was the intent of Congress to bring an end to these State programs through enactment of the Federal program. In Minnesota, however, a law enacted there, as a result of the expanded Federal program, reduces State compensation benefits by the amount of social security disability benefits paid to a qualified person. This year, in Colorado and Maryland, legislation has been introduced to enact this "reverse offset." Such action reveals the handwriting on the wall for the State workmen's compensation programs.

Many persons concerned with this problem have called this matter to my attention, and I could recite other detrimental effects resulting from the expansion of the Social Security Disability Act. This matter concerns me to the degree that I am of the opinion it should be explored fully. To this end, I am today introducing a bill which will provide an opportunity for a complete review of this entire problem area.

MINORITY RIGHTS AD ABSURDUM

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the March 26 edition of the Evening Star, a leading newspaper of Washington, carried a most interesting column on the subject of civil rights. It was exceedingly refreshing, as well as encouraging, in that at long last someone from these parts has taken public note of the fact that the vocal minorities do not have a monopoly on all of the rights in these United States. As the author of this article has so well pointed out, some day the majority will get good and tired of being pushed around by the minorities. In fact, he has clearly indicated that the majority is already tired of it, and he is so right.

Since the earliest colonial days it has been customary to observe in our public schools the Christmas and Easter seasons and to recognize through prayer and reading of the Holy Bible the existence of the Supreme Being. These observances were the daily practice and common custom in the days when our forefathers assembled the Constitution. Had there been any intention on the part of the authors of this great document to throw the Bible out the window and erect a wall between God and the schoolroom, then such would have been made crystal clear in the Constitution, and the observances mentioned would have been summarily stopped.

These and other observances are now under vicious and unwarranted attack by some individuals associated with our minority groups. For quite a long time there has been a strong feeling among the majority that it is being pushed around quite too much, a feeling that self-restraint will repress just so long.

I commend the reading of the above mentioned article to the Members of the Congress, to the people of the country, and particularly to the men who sit on the Supreme Court. The article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones is as follows:

MINORITY RIGHTS AD ABSURDUM—IF COURT BARS BALTIMORE SCHOOL PRAYER, HOW FAR CAN AN INTOLERANT FEW GO?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The U.S. Supreme Court now has under advisement another school prayer case, and if it hasn't learned anything since its decision on the New York regents prayer last fall it is likely to come up with another dizzy ruling.

The new suit came out of Baltimore, where a mother who is an avowed atheist sued the Baltimore school board because a passage from the Old Testament and the Lord's Prayer were part of the daily opening exercises at her son's school.

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Cosponsors included Senators RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; BYRD, of West Virginia; BURDICK, of North Dakota; CANNON, of Nevada; CARROLL of Colorado; CLARK of Pennsylvania; CHURCH, of Idaho; GRUENING, of Alaska; HART, of Michigan; JACKSON, of Washington; LONG, of Hawaii; LONG, of Missouri; MAGNUSON, of Washington; MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; METCALF, of Montana, MORSE, of Oregon; MOSS, of Utah; NEUBERGER, of Oregon; PELL, of Rhode Island; WILLIAMS, of New Jersey; YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 7, p. 9698.

[20] S. Rept. No. 976, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 12, 1961; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 14, p. 18986.

[21] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 11, p. 14718.

When she complained in the lower court the school board promptly offered to let her son be excused from hearing the offensive words. But now the mother claims that this sets her son apart and subjects him to ridicule and abuse. She has demanded that no Bible readings or prayers be made in the hearing of any Maryland child while in public school.

Now some day the majority are going to get tired of being pushed around by the minority. Because we have moved into an era where the minority is demanding satisfaction for itself even where it interferes with the satisfaction of the majority. This can get absurd.

The overwhelming majority of Marylanders are not atheists and they think it is a good idea if their children listen to a few preachments. The Communists think so, too. They smother Russian and Chinese children with preachments, most of them from their pickled god, Lenin. Well, the Bible contains preachments. So does the Koran, the Zend Avesta and the sacred books of Buddha—all filled with good advice to youth. But all but a handful of Americans subscribe to religious bodies that venerate the Old Testament.

Yet the angry lady in Baltimore holds that even though it is okay with the majority of Marylanders that her son duck out when the Bible is opened, his "rights" are being outraged. They will only be satisfied if all Marylanders agree to conform to her taboos. Otherwise, Maryland shall be damned as "intolerant."

Is it possible for the minority to be intolerant, too?

Both houses of Congress open with prayer. Isn't this an affront to atheist citizens? Let's fire the chaplains.

On most of the coins and bills we carry there is the legend, "In God We Trust." Aren't we being cruel to sincere atheists in forcing them to purchase their groceries with this pious money?

The school assembly salutes the flag. The students stand with their hands over their hearts intoning the words—"this Nation under God." Surely the cops should be called and the principal arrested.

School lunches offer meat. Meat is an abomination to honest vegetarians. Shall we, therefore, feed our children pea soup and yogurt?

Last December, three public schools in Sharon, Mass., removed all Christmas trees and Christmas decorations from their classrooms on the theory that they were an affront to Jewish students. By-by Santa Claus, because St. Nicholas was a Christian saint. However, the Russians have shown us how we can still get our presents. We welcome Grandfather Frost. Merry Present-Giving Day.

And by-by to all the school Easter bunnies. Easter is a Christian festival in which the resurrection of living things from the death of winter is symbolized by observance of the story of Christ's resurrection, which you may or may not believe. This has got to go. But on the other hand, the millinery business, the garment industry, and the candymakers need something like Easter. So let's train our children to look forward to New Hat, New Dress, Chocolate-Egg Day.

We've got to clean up Thanksgiving, too. These silhouettes of obviously Protestant Pilgrim Fathers that we have the kindergarten kids cutting out are an insult to all other sects and religions. And the whole business is a slam at our atheists. For Thanksgiving means giving thanks to God. What shall we substitute? The United Nations?

American Negroes have properly battled for the right to live where they choose and go to school where they live. In some places the reluctant majority have had to be spanked. These rights have long been guaranteed there.

Yet, at the urging of the NAACP, Negroes are boycotting a school in northern New Jersey because 90 percent of the students are colored. Why? Because white families exercised what Negroes have been demanding, namely, the right to move where they pleased. And they moved out of the neighborhood. So the Negroes are demanding that white children be driven back into that school.

It is one thing to insist that the majority accord a minority the rights the majority enjoys. This is justice. But it is another thing to chase the majority around the block with a stick, demanding that it behave in a way decreed by the minority.

We're getting close to that point. The tragedy is that a growing public consciousness of minority rights is likely to be soured by the arrogance of some minority leaders. This could set us back—way back.

The majority will stand just so much kicking.

EFFICIENT UTILIZATION OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY U.S. AGENCIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the record of the House of Representatives in effecting responsible savings in expenditures of the agencies of our National Government is a commendable one. It is a record which was built on day-to-day study and hard work in determining where any dollar could be saved or better utilized. We have made a painstaking effort to investigate each possible saving and to consider each possible plan to increase the efficiency of every agency's service to our people.

It is to continue this critically important work of the House, striving to give our people better essential service for fewer tax dollars wherever possible, that I am introducing legislation today which will save our Nation's taxpayers $145 million in its first 5 years of operation and will save more than $100 million each year afterward.

This proposal which I am offering for the consideration of the House would simply authorize the purchase, lease and utilization of electronic data processing equipment needed by Federal agencies to be effectively coordinated by the General Services Administration.

Mr. Speaker, these significant figures of estimated savings were carefully prepared by the General Accounting Office following an extensive study of the electronic data processing equipment which will be used by Federal agencies by June 30, 1963.

It is estimated that 1,006 electronic computers are budgeted to be leased and in operation by this coming June. A comparison on the cost of leasing versus cost of purchasing of 523 of these machines shows the startling fact that if these machines were actually purchased over a 5-year period instead of leased, we could effect a net saving of $148 million. Purchase price would include maintenance and interest. Ultimate savings each year after these machines were paid for would total an estimated $105 million each year.

These hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, are sound, accountable, direct savings which I am sure each Member of the House of Representatives will want to effect as soon as possible. However, these estimated savings do not include additional significant savings which can follow an intelligently coordinated purchase, lease and utilization policy developed by one Government agency determining the most economical way in which all agencies' needs for electronic data processing equipment can be efficiently met.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest each of us has in getting a full dollar's worth of good government for every tax dollar we pay to our National Government, the text of this proposed legislation follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 111. The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of electronic data processing equipment by Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment. Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the Administrator through purchase, lease, transfer of equipment from other Federal agencies, or otherwise and the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the maintenance and repair of such equipment. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section the Administrator is authorized to transfer electronic data processing equipment between Federal agencies, to require joint utilization of such equipment by two or more Federal agencies, and to establish equipment pools and data processing centers for such joint use when necessary for its most efficient and effective utilization: *Provided*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate (1) general classes of equipment, (2) equipment of special design needed to fulfill some unique requirement or special purpose of a particular Federal agency, and (3) equipment necessary for national defense and security.

"There is hereby authorized to be established on the books of the Treasury, an electronic data processing fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for expenses, including personal services, other costs, and the procurement by lease, purchase, transfer, or otherwise of equipment, maintenance and repair of such equipment by contract or otherwise, necessary for the efficient coordination, operation, utilization of such equipment by and for Federal agencies.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to said fund such sums as may be required which, together with the value, as determined by the Administrator, of supplies and equipment from time to time transferred to the Administrator, less any liabilities assumed, shall constitute the capital of the fund: *Provided*, That said fund shall be credited with (1) advances and reimbursements from available appropriations and funds of any agency (including the General Services Administration), organization, or persons utilizing such equipment and services rendered them, at rates determined by the Administrator to approximate the costs thereof met by the fund (including depreciation of equipment, provision for accrued leave, and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges and for amortization of installation costs, but excluding, in the determination of rates prior to the fiscal year 1966, such direct operating expenses as may be directly appropriated for, which expenses may be charged to the fund and covered by advances or reimbursements from such direct appropriations) and (2) refunds or recoveries resulting from operations of the fund, including the net proceeds of disposal of excess or surplus personal property and receipts from carriers and others for loss of or damage to property: *Provided further*, That following the close of each fiscal year any net income, after making provisions for prior year losses, if any, shall be transferred to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which would deal with the whole question of congressional ethics, including travel abroad, nepotism, and payroll manipulations. We have investigated every activity of the Federal Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the Congress adopt a code of ethics which would warrant the respect not only of this Nation, but of the whole free world. Free peoples everywhere are looking to this great instrumentality of the people for guidance and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I feel sure, will be referred to the Committee on House Administration under the leadership of its distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson]. The resolution I have introduced is a rather long one, but I sincerely believe that this great committee will conduct an exhaustive study of many allegedly shameful practices which are threatening to undermine this great institution we all love—the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to balance the budget and give our people tax relief, we must start with the Congress itself. If we are to deal honestly and fairly with the staggering unemployment problem now approaching 5 million and increasing daily, we must start with our own payrolls and our own committees. We cannot tell the unemployed government student about the glories of democracy with some family friend or campaign ward worker on the payroll. Congress must set the example; we must lead the way.

We must protect the honor and integrity of the Congress. We must preserve this great House for all posterity. It is the most direct contact the people have with the Federal Government. We are close to the people and are the guardians of their individual liberty and freedom. No Member of this House can be replaced nor can any vacancy in this House be filled except by the sovereign will of the people. In the other body, Governors of our States can fill vacancies by appointment. The Vice President can succeed the President, but may I repeat, only the people can elect a Member of this House.

The Congress is a great institution. This House is a great institution. It is a tradition. It is a part of our heritage. We must keep faith with the people. We must continue to warrant their trust and their utmost confidence. The Congress is losing its power to the decrees and whims of unelected bureaucratic officials. We are becoming a rubber stamp to the executive and the slave of party platforms.

We have from history the example of the Roman senate, whose power was eroded and corrupted by the Roman emperor, and they sank into oblivion with presents, gifts, luxurious chariots, villas, and nepotism. Through such conduct, the doom of the Roman republic was sealed forever.

THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONTINUES ITS INTEREST IN THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in discussing matters relating to the captive nations.

This subject has been of considerable interest and concern to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, and to me, personally. The extent of this concern can be measured, I believe, by the record of activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, relating to the captive nations. I would like to take this opportunity to summarize and review that record.

During the past year, as the Membership of this House knows, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings on development within the captive European nations. I had the honor of chairing a good number of those hearings. We invited Members of Congress, officials of the executive branch, private individuals and organizations interested in this subject, to share their views and recommendations with our committee. No less than 49 persons with different backgrounds and different views participated either orally or in writing in the 1962 hearings. The list of witnesses who appeared before our committee, and of those who submitted statements for the record, reads as follows:

List of witnesses who appeared, arranged chronologically:

Hon. Foy Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

Hon. Henry Loomis, Director, Voice of America, U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee.

Hon. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland.

Mr. W. O. Biernacki-Poray, architect-engineer, Montclair, N.J.

Prof. Jan. Karski, Georgetown University, former member of the Polish underground movement.

Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires, Lithuanian Legation, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Joseph Miklovas, a recent escapee from Lithuania.

Mr. Jack Stukas, a recent American visitor to Lithuania.

Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

Hon. Samuel S. Stratton, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Jim Wright, Member of Congress from the State of Texas.

Mr. Bruno Albats, secretary general, American Latvian Association.

Hon. Donald C. Bruce, Member of Congress from the State of Indiana.

Mr. Josef Lettrich, former Member of the Czechoslovak Parliament.

Hon. William W. Scranton, Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Constantin Visoianu, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Rumania.

Mr. Brutus Coste, secretary general, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Hon. Ferenc Nagy, chairman of Assembly of Captive European Nations and former Prime Minister of Hungary.

Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman, Bulgarian National Committee.

Mr. Vasil Germenji, Free Albania Committee.

Mr. Aleksander Kutt, Committee for a Free Estonia.

Hon. William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

Mr. Harold C. Vedeler, Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Robert Lee, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State.

Hon. Michael A. Feighan, Member of Congress from the State of Ohio.

Statements submitted:

Hon. Frank J. Becker, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Edward P. Boland, Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. Emilio Q. Daddario, Member of Congress from the State of Connecticut.

Hon. John H. Dent, Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Member of Congress from the State of South Carolina.

Hon. Thomas J. Dulski, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. Leonard Farbstein, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. Seymour Halpern, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Mr. Stefan Korbonski, chairman, Polish Delegation to the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Hon. Harris B.McDowell, Jr., Member of Congress from the State of Delaware.

Mr. Vaclav Majer, member of the executive board, Committee for Free Czechoslovakia.

Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Hon. Philip J. Philbin, Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. Melvin Price, Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Hon. George M. Rhodes, Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Fernand J. St Germain, Member of Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Zbigniew Stypulkowski, Washington representative of the Polish Council of National Unity in London.

Dr. Albert N. Tarulis.

Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

Hon. Petr Zenkl, former mayor of Prague, First Deputy Prime Minister and Member of Parliament of Czechoslovakia, now president, executive committee, Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

Following the completion of our hearings the Special Subcommittee on the Captive Nations submitted a report of its findings to the full Committee on Foreign Affairs. This report, released in the form of a committee print, received wide circulation and, I may add, aroused considerable public notice and discussion. I believe that the following passage from a letter which I received from Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, is indicative of the public reaction to our hearings and to our committee's report:

Mr. Dimitrov wrote:

> The impressive volume embodying the transcripts of the hearings is certainly an important contribution to a better understanding of conditions prevailing in Eastern Europe and of the policies consonant with the principles guiding U.S. foreign policy and best suited to serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. The report, in turn, is a brilliant document, remarkably accurate in its findings, foward looking, lucid and realistic in its recommendations. It is a state paper which does honor to the Subcommittee on Europe and which bespeaks the painstaking care and good judgement of the man who assumed the burden of presiding over the hearings.

While I feel that Dr. Dimitrov may have been overly enthusiastic and generous in complimenting my contribution to the hearings and to the report on the captive nations, I would like to place his entire letter in the Congressional Record at this point because I believe it may help to dispel the apprehension of those who appear to feel uneasy about leaving matters relating to the captive nations where they belong under the rules of the House, namely, in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Dr. Dimitrov's letter reads as follows:

Assembly of Captive
European Nations,
New York, N.Y., January 9, 1963.

The Honorable John S. Monagan,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Monagan: It is my privilege to convey to you the sincere gratification of the Assembly of Captive European Nations for the hearings you have conducted on behalf of Representative Edna Kelly, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, and more particularly for the report you have forwarded to the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the findings you made and the recommendations you agreed upon as a result of the hearings.

The impressive volume embodying the transcripts of the hearings is certainly an important contribution to a better understanding of conditions prevailing in Eastern Europe and of the policies consonant with the principles guiding U.S. foreign policy and best suited to serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. The report, in turn, is a brilliant document, remarkably accurate in its findings, forward looking, lucid and realistic in its recommendations. It is a state paper which does honor to the Subcommittee on Europe and which bespeaks the painstaking care and good judgment of the man who assumed the burden of presiding over the hearings.

We are most grateful to the subcommittee for recommending that the United States continue to manifest its refusal to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe and to support the right of self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations; that the United States expose Soviet colonialism and attach to this task as much importance as our Government does to the championing of the right of self-determination and national independence of the nations of other continents, and that the United States press the Hungarian question before the United Nations.

We are particularly gratified by the findings and recommendations the subcommittee has made in respect to the broadcasts of the Voice of America, in regard to which several of our witnesses felt obliged to present rather negative comments. It is our hope that the subcommittee will pursue this matter with a view to inducing a change in the policy of the Voice of America which would permit a greater emphasis on news which is stimulating for the east-central European audiences.

I take great pleasure in expressing the deep satisfaction of our assembly for your recommendation that consideration be given to the establishment of a special subcommittee on foreign affairs to deal with matters relating to the captive nations. Let me express our sincere wish that this suggestion earn the early approval of the Foreign Affairs Committee and that in the meantime the Subcommittee on Europe maintain its concern for our nations.

Please convey our warm thanks and appreciation to your colleagues in the committee and to the members of your staff for their outstanding work.

I avail myself of this occasion to express to you the warm congratulations of our assembly upon your reelection. The size of your victory was gratifying and indicative of the support your activities in the Congress have found among the people of Connecticut.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. George M. Dimitrov,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want the membership of the House to rely on a single evaluation of my committee's work in this field. I could introduce into the Record many other letters received from persons living in different parts of the country, commenting on our efforts. But to simplify the whole matter, I believe that it would be best to let the Members judge for themselves. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record, at this point, the Findings and the Recommendations of the 1962 Report on the Captive Nations Hearings. These are as follows:

Findings

(A) U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

I

A congressional inquiry relating to the European captive nations must begin with a statement of U.S. policy toward those countries.

The subcommittee pursued this issue with Assistant Secretaries of State Foy Kohler and William Tyler, and with other witnesses, and was encouraged to receive a firm affirmation of the two fundamental principles underlying that policy.

These are the continued refusal by the U.S. Government to accept the status quo of Soviet domination of the captive nations and our Government's insistence on the right of the peoples of the captive nations to live under institutions and governments of their own choice.

In the words of Secretary Tyler:

"The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries."

The pursuit of this goal is founded on the traditional adherence by the United States to the principle of self-determination for all peoples.

II

While the policy of the U.S. Government, thus affirmed, is clear and meets with the approval of the subcommittee, we cannot escape the conclusion that certain executive agencies have failed to implement it to the proper and necessary degree. There is a lack of knowledge, and confusion, behind the Iron Curtain about the U.S. position on the captive European nations. That policy is not clearly understood even in the United States. This tends to undermine the spirit of resistance to communism in the captive nations, and should have been remedied long ago. Indicative of the attitude of executive agencies toward this issue is the failure of the Voice of America to give news coverage to the hearings of this committee on the captive nations even though responsible officials of that very Agency stated that it was obviously important for the people behind the Iron Curtain to be made aware of the continuing U.S. concern about their welfare.

III

There are other examples of this attitude—such as the reluctance to press for the condemnation, by the United Nations, of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, and the State Department's failure to counter Soviet threats to Berlin by insisting on a prompt settlement of all Central-East European issues pursuant to treaties entered into by the Allied Powers in connection with the conclusion of hostilities in World War II. Far more could have been done than actually has been done to sustain the spirit of resistance and the nationalistic aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations.

IV

The committee has been disturbed by the inconsistencies in the implementation of the U.S. policy of restricting strategic exports to the captive nations. Complying with the Export Control Act, the executive branch will not issue a license to an American manufacturer for the shipment of certain types of machinery and of other strategic goods to the Soviet bloc. At the same time, the captive nations frequently can import similar items from our allies in Western Europe. Under these circumstances, the members of the Soviet bloc are not denied the opportunity to purchase many products of strategic importance—but the American manufacturers are denied a prospective market. In the committee's view, the executive branch should increase present efforts to effectuate the purposes of the Battle Act by working for the adoption of a uniform policy toward this problem by all of our allies.

V

A majority of the committee feels that U.S. economic assistance to the captive European nations, when limited to nonmilitary, nonstrategic items and made subject to strict conditions, can serve the security interests of the United States. The committee is under no illusion that such assistance will produce a change in the Communist regimes of those countries, or free them from Soviet domination. It is, however, in our national interest to sustain the spirit of resistance to communism among the peoples of the captive nations, to maintain their friendship and good will, and to strengthen their orientation toward the West. To the extent that economic assistance authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 can achieve these goals, it may prove to be a sound investment in the future.

VI

The committee strongly supports the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 which state that no aid shall be extended to any Communist country unless the President determines that such assistance is vital to the security of the United States and that other conditions set forth in the law are fulfilled.

(B) CONDITIONS IN THE CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

I

The people of the captive nations, as distinguished from the regimes governing them, constitute a tremendous reservoir of good will for the United States. Their desire to be oriented toward the West, and their hope of eventually regaining their national independence, serve as a powerful brake upon the Soviet Union's freedom of action and capability to extend the Communist empire in Europe through intimidation and overt aggression.

II

Communist indoctrination, repression of religion, and their attempts to destroy the foundations of family life, have not succeeded in creating any substantial popular support for the Communist system in the captive nations. This is true even with respect to the youth of those countries who have been the object of concerted Communist indoctrination.

III

The committee is distressed to note that not only are antireligious activities continuing generally but that anti-Semitism and persecution of other minorities is on the rise in the Soviet bloc. Communist efforts to repress religion far from abating appear to be intensifying even in Poland where the regime has tried to avoid an open showdown with the Roman Catholic Church.

IV

The socialization of industry within the captive nations has frequently produced disappointing and even disastrous results. Collectivization of agriculture has been accompanied by widespread failures. Doctrinaire Communist insistence on the industrialization of each and every bloc country has frequently led to overinvestment in heavy industry, inefficient utilization of resources, and distorted patterns of intrabloc trade.

V

Because of the failure of bilateral trade agreements within the bloc, the Communists are now attempting through the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, to create a Common Market behind the Iron Curtain. Thus far, however, CEMA has failed to effectuate multilateral settlement of balances, or to produce a system of trade based on any realistic division of labor within the bloc.

(C) SOVIET POLICIES TOWARD THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

I

The policy of the Soviet Union toward the captive nations remains one of control and subjugation, even though its application differs in form and intensity from country to country. The military power of the Soviet Union is the sole cohesive agent which presently binds the captive nations to each other and to the Soviet Union.

II

The Soviet Union, in its trade with the captive nations, continues to discriminate against them and to exploit them. This is especially evident in the sales of Soviet oil to the captive nations.

III

Soviet domination of the captive European nations violates binding international agreements entered into by the Allied Powers—including the Soviet Union—in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II. The forcible imposition of Communist regimes on the captive nations has deprived their peoples of the right to self-determination guaranteed them by those agreements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends that the appropriate executive agencies—

1. Take prompt, continuous, and energetic steps to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States continues to support the policy of refusing to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe, and the right to self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations;

2. Avail themselves of every opportunity to expose—especially to the peoples of the developing countries—the methods, the implications, and the consequences of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, attaching to this task as much importance as our Government does to the championing of the right to self-determination and national independence of the nations of other continents;

3. Urgently press the Hungarian question before the appropriate organs of the United Nations Organization;

4. Expand the Voice of America broadcasts, in native languages, to the captive nations;

5. Give proper coverage in those broadcasts and in other communications media to the activities and achievements of escapees and of organizations composed of individuals of Eastern European ancestry, and to other events of particular interest to the peoples of the captive nations;

6. Endeavor to expand exchanges and other contacts between the United States and the peoples of the captive nations;

The committee further recommends—

7. That the Congress provide the various agencies of the executive branch with the funds and support necessary to implement the above recommendations;

8. That all assistance to any captive nation be terminated promptly when it becomes apparent that such assistance is not serving the objectives of U.S. foreign policy;

9. That the Committee on Foreign Affairs continue to study developments in the captive European nations, and make appropriate recommendations to the Congress and to the executive branch;

10. That consideration be given to the advisability of undertaking a congressional study of the condition of other Communist-subjugated peoples; and

11. That consideration be given to the establishment of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to deal with matters relating to the captive nations.

In conclusion, the committee believes that we can achieve diplomatic and strategic gains in the cold war if we pursue our objectives with vigor and determination. The Soviets push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the free world. We should push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the Communist bloc. In this respect, while the captive nations add some strength to the Soviet Union, it must be remembered that they are captive nations, seeking to regain their freedom at the earliest opportunity. As such, they constitute large areas of vulnerability for the Soviet Union.

We must always remember that our support for the legitimate objectives of liberty and self-determination for these friendly peoples may exploit a woefully weak spot in the Soviet system.

The reaction of the public to the activities of our subcommittee has been both encouraging and gratifying. As examples of this reaction, I include several selected items. The first is an article from Draugas, the Lithuanian language newspaper of Chicago, as follows:

MAY THE CHIPS FLY

(An interview with Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN)

For the last several months, the House has been holding hearings on captive nations. They are being conducted by the Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Europe and chaired by JOHN S. MONAGAN, Connecticut Fifth District representative.

The Lithuanians know well the Fifth District, encompassing the city of Waterbury. They also know well their Congressman, former city mayor, a distinguished lawyer, and father of a nice family—JOHN S. MONAGAN. There hardly has been a Lithuanian celebration the Congressman would not have attended, patiently listened to long speeches, enjoyed folk songs, and feasted his eyes on folk dances.

Draugas' Washington correspondent requested Mr. MONAGAN to tell the readers about the hearings on captive nations. Not only did he oblige; he also bought Draugas correspondent lunch so that the two could talk at length.

The first question was: What are the objectives of the hearings? It developed that the House wants to obtain new evidence on today's conditions in captive nations. What happens to the people and the national economy after several years under Soviet control? How is the Soviet economic system operating? What are its weak points? Does it lead to crises and debacles? Is it going to be replaced by some other form of a free enterprise? Are the captive nations being subjected to economic exploitation? Who gets the lion's share of the national production?

In the political field, the subcommittee wants to find out what happens to the enslavement technique in several years? Do the enslaved people turn Communists? Which groups of population are most resistant, which are the weakest? What can we expect in the future?

The subcommittee also would like to get a clearer picture of the views held by captive peoples on our foreign policy, aid and cultural exchange programs, VOA impact, and so forth.

Asked about the progress, Mr. MONAGAN replied that he already had heard witnesses from the State Department, VOA, Radio Free Europe, also Lithuanian, Polish, Latvian, Estonian Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Rumanian, and Albanian representatives. All the captive nations' representatives have recently arrived from behind the Iron Curtain or recently visited there. All of them maintain close, often secret contacts, with their countries.

In some instances, the contacts proved so important that the subcommittee will be unable to make public the entire material lest it would endanger the established communications and expose to danger certain persons behind the Iron Curtain.

It was a pleasure to hear Mr. MONAGAN refer to Engineer Juozas Miklovas as the best witness the subcommittee ever had. He had supplied the most valuable information. He had talked from his firsthand experience, rather than from what he had heard or read. "Read can we, too," the Congressman pointed out. At the same time, he brought out a strange fact, the difficulty of finding good witnesses, who would have recently arrived and held a broader view than their village.

Information the subcommittee received will help both Congress and administration to formulate a clearer idea as to the captive nations problem at this point. In Mr. MONAGAN's words, the subcommittee has barely scratched the surface. A great deal of work in connection with the processing and publication of the data received still lies ahead. Hearings are expected to close soon, since witnesses from all nine captive nations have already been heard.

Mr. MONAGAN withheld comment on the reasons for the failure to hear witnesses from the most populous captive nation—the Ukrainians. Draugas has already reported that the State Department regards the Ukraine as "a traditional part of historic Russia." No reasons are known either for the failure to hear witnesses from East Germany.

Unauthorized to speak on behalf of the whole Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. MONAGAN did not answer another question: Why the Committee is showing no interest in captive nations in Asia, including Asians in the Soviet Union, or in the captive Cuban nation, right beside us. The Congressman himself, while speaking on the floor on July 16, on the occasion of the Captive Nations Week, listed the Ukrainians, the Armenians, the Tibetans, and the North Koreans among the once free nations, now in Communist slavery.

The chairman of the presently conducted hearings on captive nations vigorously denied the oftenheard claim that the whole undertaking will amount to nothing more than whitewash of the State Department, opposing any mention of the captive nations problem. Mr. MONAGAN pointed out that he had not made up his mind ahead of time in regard to the deductions. "May the chips fly where they may," he said. The main objective of the hearings was to demonstrate to the captive nations that they had not been forgotten, that America is on their side, supporting their endeavor to regain freedom.

Mr. MONAGAN mentioned as an example that the captive nations problem lies deep in the heart of Congress: Congressmen who are not members of the subcommittee on Europe or even are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs dropped in at the hearings—some did so repeatedly. The Congressman cited more than a dozen names. Democrats and Republicans alike showed a great deal of interest in the hearings.

In concluding the interview, Mr. MONAGAN said quite a few warm words about the Lithuanians who had made a contribution to the hearings, namely, Dr. A. Trimakas, Lithuanian Charge J. Kajeckas, both witnesses Engineer J. Miklovas and J. Stukas, and the interpreter Dr. A. N. Tarulis.

I include also a column from the Washington Daily News of November 28, 1962, by Marshall McNeil, as follows:

GROUP WOULD BARE RED COLONIALISM

(By Marshall McNeil)

The United States should mount a stepped-up campaign to make the rest of the world know it does not accept the captive status of Eastern European nations now in the Kremlin's grip.

A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee today appealed for this, saying we should continually expose to the developing nations of Africa and Asia the results of Russian Communist colonialism.

The people of the captive nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania—as distinguished from their Communist rulers—"constitute a tremendous reservoir of good will for the United States," the committee said.

"Their desire to be oriented toward the West, and their hope of eventually regaining their national independence serve as a powerful brake upon the Soviet Union's freedom of action and capability to extend the Communist empire in Europe through intimidation and overt aggression."

The committee, whose report was filed by Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, said it was "distressed to note that not only are antireligious activities continuing generally but that anti-Semitism and persecution of other minorities is on the rise in the Soviet bloc."

But it said Communist indoctrination, repression of religion and attempts to destroy foundations of family life "have not succeeded in creating any substantial popular support for the Communist system."

Assistant Secretary of State William Tyler told the committee: "The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries."

But, the committee report said, while U.S. policy is clear, "we cannot escape the conclusion that certain executive agencies have failed to implement it to the proper and necessary degree."

Another interesting article was written by Philip Warden and appeared in the Chicago Tribune on the same date, as follows:

URGE UNITED STATES KEEP HOPE OF RED CAPTIVES ALIVE

[By Philip Warden]

WASHINGTON.—A House foreign affairs subcommittee dominated by Kennedy Democrats and Eisenhower Republicans issued a report today which was sharply critical of the Kennedy administration in dealing with the problems of the captive nations in Europe.

The report charged that confusion behind the Iron Curtain over America's position on the captive nations has tended to undermine the spirit of resistance to communism in Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the others.

The subcommittee accused the Kennedy administration of failing to make a good fight in the United Nations to condemn Russian "colonialism" in eastern Europe, and urged officials to avail themselves of every opportunity to expose Russian methods of colonization and their consequences.

The subcommittee also accused the Voice of America of failing to provide captive nations with news coverage of the extensive hearings conducted by the subcommittee into captive nation problems.

The subcommittee began its hearings last July on matters affecting United States relations with Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, was chairman of the subcommittee of six Democrats and three Republicans. Four of the Democrats and two of the Republicans traditionally vote with the Kennedy and Eisenhower wings of their parties, and usually vigorously support administration foreign policies.

Democrats on the subcommittee, besides Monogan, were Edna F. Kelly of New York, Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, Armistead I. Selden, of Alabama, Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey, and Lindley Beckworth, of Texas. The Republicans were Peter Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, Robert R. Barry, of New York, and Horace Seely-Brown, of Connecticut.

The subcommittee said that while there is "continued refusal by the U.S. Government to accept the status quo of Soviet domination of the captive nations," certain executive agencies have failed to implement this policy to the proper and necessary degree.

"There is a lack of knowledge and confusion behind the Iron Curtain about the U.S. position on the captive European nations," the report said. "That policy is not clearly understood even in the United States. This tends to undermine the spirit of resistance to communism in the captive nations, and should have been remedied long ago."

A further article by C. P. Trussell appeared in the New York Times, as follows:

UNITED STATES SAID TO FAIL CAPTIVE LANDS—HOUSE UNIT WOULD STIMULATE SPIRIT OF RESISTANCE

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON.—A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee accused the State Department and the Voice of America today of failing to stimulate the spirit of resistance to communism in the eastern European nations behind the Iron Curtain.

In a report on 10 public hearings held earlier this year, the subcommittee contended that resistance was undermined by confusion among the people of these nations regarding the U.S. position.

The panel criticized U.S. reluctance to press for United Nations condemnation of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe.

The State Department should counter Soviet threats to Berlin, the subcommittee declared, by insisting on a prompt settlement of all Central and East European issues pursuant to treaties entered into by the Allied Powers in connection with the conclusion of hostilities in World War II.

"Far more could have been done than actually has been done," the subcommittee said, "to sustain the spirit of resistance and the nationalistic aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations."

The panel, headed by Representative EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, of Brooklyn, concentrated upon conditions in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania. The hearings were under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

GENERAL POLICY BACKED

In its report the subcommittee emphasized its approval of the Government's policy toward the Iron Curtain nations, but said it had not been given full force.

"Indicative of the attitude of executive agencies toward this issue," the subcommittee said, "is the failure of the Voice of America to give news coverage to the hearings of this committee on the captive nations even though responsible officials of that very agency stated that it was obviously important for the people behind the Iron Curtain to be made aware of the continuing U.S. concern about their welfare."

The panel endorsed provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 under which foreign aid can be extended to a Communist country if the President determines that such assistance is vital to the security of the United States. The report went on:

"The committee is under no illusion that (nonmilitary) assistance will produce a change in the Communist regimes of (captive) countries, or free them from Soviet domination. It is, however, in our national interest to sustain the spirit of resistance to communism among the peoples of captive nations, to maintain their friendship and good will, and to strengthen their orientation toward the West.

"To the extent that economic assistance * * * can achieve these goals, it may prove to be a sound investment in the future."

Also interesting was the reaction of individual citizens and I include herewith two letters which are characteristic of many others which were received.

The letters follow:

NOVEMBER 28, 1962.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very grateful to you for sending me a copy of the "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Europe" and so forth. I have read the book from cover to cover and have learned much from it. I also wish to thank you again for all you have done in behalf of these captive nations.

Sincerely yours,
ANN I. KOKERNAK.

WORCESTER, MASS.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have read and reread with great interest hearings and reports on captive European nations and your remarks made in Congress as well as your speech I heard at American-Lithuanian rally in Waterbury, St. Joseph's School, on February 17, 1963.

All American-Lithuanian people appreciate you and your efforts you have made as a chairman of a subcommittee which held hearings on the captive nations of Europe, and we feel that the material you have got from hearings is useful for free world to keep it well informed against Moscow propaganda.

By the way, I ask you cordially to support all resolutions in Congress that request to restore free, democratic Lithuania.

I am very thankful for all your reports, records, and letters I have got from you.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH GELUMBAUSKAS.

Mr. Speaker, my committee's concern with the developments in the captive nations did not end with the publication of our report. After the adjournment of the Congress, together with the Honorable HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., of Delaware, and the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, both members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I traveled on a factfinding mission to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. The Honorable ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan, accompanied our group in order to inquire into matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, of which he is a member. We have hoped and planned to visit a number of the other captive European nations. Unfortunately, difficulties in obtaining visas and time limitations prevented us from realizing that part of our plans.

As a consequence of this study mission, we submitted a second report relating to the captive nations to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This report is available to all Members of Congress and to the public. It deals with recent developments in Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as in the Soviet Union, the captor nation. The report is too long to be placed in the RECORD in its entirety. I ask unanimous consent, however, to place in the RECORD at this point the opening part of the report, entitled "The Iron Curtain Stands Fast," and the "Conclusions."

These read as follows:

THE IRON CURTAIN STANDS FAST

Our committee returned from its visit behind the Iron Curtain with strong reactions. First of all, we had the physical reaction of revulsion at seeing the Berlin wall and the cruel barrier between free Austria and captive Czechoslovakia. No amount of words can convey the impression one gains from the sight of these barricades.

Secondly, we concluded that the Russians, in spite of great advances in some fields, continue to suffer disastrous results in many others and that the triumph of communism over the free world is not implicit in the Marxist system.

Thirdly, we found that many changes have occurred, and are occurring, in the Soviet Union, in her relations with the captive nations, and in her relations with other Communist countries. We would caution, however, against any belief that these changes presage any immediate or large-scale change in the nature of Communist control, of its totalitarian trappings, or of its imperialistic tendencies.

Lastly, we decided that present attitudes on the part of the U.S. Government must change if we are to take advantage of the opportunities for significant gains presented by these changing conditions.

The reality of the Iron Curtain as a barrier remains. It signifies a failure on the part of the Soviet system to reach its goals and to provide successful competition with the free world for the minds and loyalties of the captives behind the barrier.

CONCLUSIONS

Mediocre industrial performances and severe agricultural lags continue to plague several of the captive European nations as well as the Soviet Union. Concurrently, partly as a consequence of the Sino-Soviet rift and partly because of the rising level of expectations and other internal developments within some of those countries, the cohesion of the Communist bloc is being subjected to considerable strain. The latter development affords the West an opportunity to establish broader contacts with the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, to influence their basic orientation, and to sustain such resistance to Communist persuasion as currently exists in that area of the world.

As mentioned in an earlier report of the Subcommittee on Europe, it would be foolhardy to expect any major changes to occur within the Soviet bloc in the near future. The national Communist regimes continue to exercise effective control over the peoples of those countries. This control shows no sign of any significant cracks. The bloc's economic relations with the United States and with other free countries, and such exchange programs as are currently in effect between the free world and some members of the Soviet bloc, will not alter this situation. They will not produce an overflow of the national Communist regimes, nor cause them to suffer a change of heart and abandon the goal of a "Communist world system." At best, they constitute an investment in maintaining Western presence behind the Iron Curtain and in sustaining the captive peoples' basic Western orientation—an investment which may pay off in the long run when the interaction of other, more weighty events will make it possible for the peoples behind the Iron Curtain to exert direct influence upon the domestic and external policies of their countries.

The study group is of the opinion that the Congress and the executive branch should continue to give careful attention to developments within the captive European nations. The study group further believes that sparing and carefully designed use of the instruments of our foreign policy—including trade and other relations—with respect to these countries is appropriate and, in the long run, may produce results beneficial to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that I have imposed excessively upon the time of the Members here present. I felt, however, that the things I have said needed to be put into the RECORD to keep the Members of the House fully apprised of the activities of my committee, relating to the captive nations. I can assure the membership of the House that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Europe, under the able chairmanship of Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY, of New York, will continue to pay careful attention to developments within the captive nations, and to make appropriate legislative recommendations bearing on this subject to the House of Representatives.

CUBA—THE GREEK SHIPPING RECORD

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 I made a statement on the floor of the House drawing attention to a press release issued by the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service announcing a royal decree had been promulgated to stop all Greek shipping to captive Cuba, known to all who are literate and many who are not as a Russian beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. A careful reading of that Royal Decree, however, revealed an exception to its application which for all practical purposes nullified the decree. That exception applied to all Greek-flag ships under time-charter contract, that is, Greek ships under contract to carry cargo to Russian-occupied Cuba for a period of time set by contract.

When I read that press statement I was shocked by the all too obvious attempt to create by a mirror of words, a public impression that did violence to the facts. Anyone with a passing knowledge of international commerce and the meaning of time-charter contract in the shipping business would have been equally shocked. To right this situation, very likely provoked by the growing public pressure in the United States against all who provide succor to the Russian regime in Cuba, I called upon the Greek Government to move with haste in making a full public disclosure of the facts about Greek-flag ships calling at Cuba. I felt the American people were entitled to all the facts, not a carefully tailored press statement, and suggested action within 48 hours was a reasonable expectation.

That 48 hours has passed and I am unaware of any public disclosure of the facts being released by the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service. Consequently, I will provide an assist. The information which I have been able to secure from official U.S. sources is not claimed to be complete. But I do state it to be accurate and very revealing.

Since January 1, 1963, up to March 25, 1963, a total of 43 ships flying the flag of a free world nation have carried cargo to captive Cuba. Greek-flag ships head the list—a total of 13 with an estimated total cargo in excess of 100,000 tons.

This questionable first place honor is shared with British-flag ships, a total of 13 carried cargo to Cuba during the same 3-month period. The British-flag ships won first prize in total tonnage—over 150,000 tons. But the British have made no official gesture to conceal their tarnished laurels.

A further look at the record reveals that a total of 31 Greek-flag ships carried cargo to captive Cuba during the period September 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962. That was the period of intensive Russian military buildup in Cuba. At that time the danger signals on what the Russians were up to in Cuba were clear for all to see. Those danger signals reached such a critical point in early October that President Kennedy was required to meet the threat head on, which he did in his address to the Nation, and to the world, on October 22.

The record also reveals that a total of 171 Greek-flag ships have carried cargo to captive Cuba since January 1, 1962—a short period of 15 months. That averages over 11 Greek-flag ships per month for the 15-month period.

It is estimated that 80 percent of Greek-flag ships were under time-charter contract to the Russians or Russian bloc regimes during 1962.

That is the record, at least a large part of it, up to last Monday, March 25, 1963. I preferred and hoped that the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service would make this disclosure, but when they did not, I did so in the interest of keeping the record straight.

One large question remains to be answered in the form of a public disclosure by the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service. That question is—How many Greek-flag ships are still under time-charter contract to the Russians or any of their stooge Communist regimes and how much time remains on each of those contracts? This is an important question because an answer to it will reveal how many Greek-flag ships will be carrying cargo to captive Cuba during the months if not years ahead. Every ship, regardless of which flag it flies, carrying cargo to captive Cuba, strikes at the cause of human freedom in the Western Hemisphere. That is a reality with which we and our sister republics of the hemisphere must live.

CONGRESS CAN KEEP A SECRET

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, former CIA Director Allen Dulles told the Magazine Publishers Association last Tuesday evening that he knew from experience that Congress could keep a secret.

To prove his point, Mr. Dulles revealed that he had told Congress about our U-2 flights some 5 years before one was shot down over Russia in May 1960.

I certainly agree with Mr. Dulles, and to prove my point I would like to cite the Hoover Commission report which recommended the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee to oversee the CIA. That report, transmitted to the Congress in 1955, showed the similarity between such a watchdog committee and the now existing Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has jurisdiction over our Nation's nuclear secrets. To my knowledge, there has never been an atomic secret which has leaked from that committee into alien hands.

We live in a free society. That is our Nation's strength. We are forced by world circumstances to engage in the clandestine affairs of international espionage, and have made exceptions to national principles where such efforts are necessary. When Congress created the Central Intelligence Agency in 1947, it granted the CIA privileged exemption from the scrutiny of a free society. However, Congress was painfully neglectful in not providing itself with a sufficient channel for communication and liaison with CIA stewardship.

And Congress knows that no Government agency should be left alone to police itself. Lack of congressional supervision only permits Government bureaus to follow an independent course of action—in effect, to bypass the Congress itself, leaving the American people with a diluted voice in their own affairs.

The CIA is the only Government bureau not subject to routine control by Congress. CIA activities should be given careful and regular review. Secrecy can be maintained in the Congress, and the right of congressional review in sensitive areas should not be questioned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee to give constant and needed review to the intelligence activities of this Nation.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 1

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week and for the balance of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. There will be some matters brought up today from the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary, which should not take long. When those matters are completed we will have finished the business of the week and it will be our hope that we may adjourn over until Monday.

With reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished minority leader, as to the program for next week, Monday is Consent Calendar day and there are seven suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 199, deaf veterans, increase compensation.

H.R. 211, increase compensation, parents of children of deceased veterans.

H.R. 214, statutory award for aphonia.

H.R. 220, new modified life plan for NSLI policyholders.

H.R. 228, additional pay, directors and chiefs of staffs, VA medical installations.

H.R. 243, increased compensation for certain service-connected disabled veterans.

H.R. 248, paraplegic housing program.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and we will take up the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964.

The program for Wednesday is undetermined.

On Thursday we will take up the Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices appropriation bill for 1964.

This announcement, of course, is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S 85TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate one of the great Americans of our times on his 85th birthday—Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

As Governor of New York, as U.S. Senator from New York, as Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and most of all as a beacon of American liberalism, Senator Lehman has made a substantial and everlasting contribution to our democracy.

Herbert Lehman's supreme integrity, great intellect and deep concern for justice, human dignity and freedom all combine to make him one of the most respected and beloved politicians of all time. Throughout his career he has been a vigilant defender of civil liberties and his courageous fight against the scourge of McCarthyism long will be remembered.

At the age of 80, when he had already received the highest honors the people of New York State could bestow, Senator Lehman undertook a crusade for political reform and against the boss system in New York. As the spiritual father of the reform Democratic movement, he has been a source of great inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, last night on the eve of his 85th birthday Governor Lehman celebrated with his family and friends. It was wonderful to see him surrounded by those who love him and to know that he is recovering so well from his recent accident.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members will want to join today in extending to Senator Lehman and Mrs. Lehman and their family our best wishes on this happy occasion and to wish the Governor many more happy birthdays.

WELFARE OF ALL THE PEOPLE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration came into being in 1935, 12 years after I came to Congress. The program has proven highly effective. In that year only 6 percent of Missouri's farms, and 11 percent of the Nation's farms, were electrified. Today, 98 percent of our farms are electrified, and every farm and home in rural America that wants this service can have it.

There are some who point to the $3 billion REA has outstanding on its electrification loans and say the cost is too high. But this is not an item of cost. It is investment, gilt edge and the best investment the Government ever has made in a domestic program.

Look at the record. From its beginning, REA has advanced just over $4 billion to its electrification borrowers—$1.1 billion has been repaid on principal, $200 million of this was paid in advance of due date. In addition, $550 million has been paid in interest. Losses total less than $50,000. No bank, no Government agency, no group of borrowers have ever before built up such a record.

The benefits have not stopped at our city and town lines. The rural electrification program has stimulated expenditure of as much as $20 billion of private funds, $5 for each $1 of Federal investment. This has gone for electrical wiring, appliances and equipment, all manufactured in our cities from the raw materials of our mines and farms. It has kept down rates and reduced monthly electric bills in the city as well as in the country. Labor has benefited, as have industry and commerce. Rural electrification has been good for all America. It is truly an all-American program.

Time after time, attempts have been made to cut back and cut down on rural electrification. These attacks have been made in the courts, in the Appropriations Committee, in other commitees, and on the floor of this House. The guns were always loaded by the power company lobbyists who have never stopped trying. When they could not put through cuts in loan funds, they tried to cripple REA by cutting administrative expenses appropriations. Their main target has always been and still is loans for generating plants. These loans—the main defense of the electric cooperatives against the raiders—have been the lifeline of the rural electrics. Only last year, we defeated an attempt to cut down that lifeline. And we can expect them back again this year. Like Khrushchev, they have warned us they will be back.

Another line of attack over the years has been to put the electric cooperatives' generating loans under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. This was tried by a Senate committee rider to the urgent deficient appropriation bill for 1946. It was beaten down by a vote of 52 to 21 after Senate friends of rural electrification warned that adoption of the rider would hamstring the program. Bills to achieve this same result were brought to the floor of the House in 1946 and again in 1948. Even our Appropriations Committee in the House urged this in its May 1947 report on the Agriculture appropriation bill for 1948.

We have held the line all these years in the Congress. We have so far saved rural electrification when it was threatened. But a new threat from a new direction faces the program today. The Federal Power Commission has in recent weeks made the opening moves in the direction of exercising jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives. I have heard from systems in my own State who are deeply concerned about the Commission moving in on them. They are concerned with more than the threat to regulate them as public utilities—which they are not. They see the predatory power companies seizing upon this as a new opportunity to interfere and delay. And if the companies do not succeed before the Commission, they can take them to court, piling further delay and expense on their nonprofit operations—hoping to break them down.

There is nothing in the REA and FPC statutes, absolutely nothing, to warrant FPC's assumption of jurisdiction. Congress has never intended that FPC review loans made by REA. The Federal Power Act gave the Commission jurisdiction over public utility financing to protect private investors. The United States does not need protection as an investor in rural electrification. The Federal Power Act gives the Commission jurisdiction over electric power rates charged to the public by the public utilities within its regulatory sphere. The electric cooperatives are self-regulating in this respect. Their member-consumers set the rates. If the rates are higher than needed for nonprofit operation, the overage comes back to them.

I have yet to learn what lies back of this outrageous proposal. Whatever the motive, it has no legal basis. If the Commission wants its jurisdiction extended to include cooperatives, let it come to the Congress legitimately and ask for such an extension.

I append an authoritative exposition by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

FEBRUARY 14, 1963.

HON. JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to a succession of actions taken by the Federal Power Commission and its staff which appear to be steps toward the exercising by the Commission of jurisdiction over electric cooperatives which are borrowers from the Rural Electrification Administration. It is not altogether clear what significance these actions may have.

We are aware that in a few instances in the past where REA borrowers have entered into arrangements with public utilities already subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, the particular transactions have been reviewed by the Commission, generally with the full cooperation of the REA borrowers affected. In discussions of these cases with Commission staff members, REA representatives have stated their understanding that these cases did not constitute an assertion of, or acquiescence in, the Commission's exercise of general jurisdiction over REA-financed cooperatives. REA representatives have assumed that, before any such step was taken by the Commission, REA would have an opportunity to present its views.

I am aware that the Commission has certain responsibilities imposed upon it by law. REA not only would not wish to interfere with the Commission's exercise of these responsibilities, but would feel bound to cooperate fully to assist in every way it could in the proper exercise of the Commission's functions. At the same time, however, the Commission should be aware that Congress has imposed certain responsibilities upon the REA Administrator, not only with respect to protection of the Government's security and financial interest as lender of funds, but also with respect to the achievement of the program objectives of rural electrification set forth in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. These responsibilities of our respective agencies contained in statutes enacted close to each other in point of time should be exercised in such manner as to exclude conflict and to promote most effectively the respective statutory purposes.

I am seriously concerned by indications that assertion of Commission jurisdiction in ways which seem to be contemplated by Commission staff members may interfere with the orderly functioning of the REA program and the performance of my statutory duties. I cannot believe that Congress intended to divide responsibility between REA and the Commission in the making of loans under the Rural Electrification Act. Besides the ineffective administration which would result from having two Federal agencies passing on whether or not a loan was feasible, such fragmentation of authority is completely out of keeping with the nature of the REA program and the expressions of its sponsors in the Congress. The legislative history of the Rural Electrification Act is replete with references to the urgent need for prompt correction of rural America's lag in electrification. The only concession which the Rural Electrification Act made to "second guessing" of the Administrator's loanmaking power when the emergency agency created in 1935 by executive order was given statutory recognition in 1936 was the proviso in section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act that for generating plant loans the consent of commissions which under State law had jurisdiction had to be obtained. Certainly, if Congress intended the Federal Power Commission to enter into the REA program functioning, it would have expressly so provided.

In the more than 25 years since establishment of REA, cooperative borrowers have functioned outside of FPC jurisdiction, with the rare exceptions mentioned above where the transaction before the Commission involved a party clearly subject to FPC jurisdiction. The reason, we believe, your predecessors took no action to exercise general jurisdiction over REA-financed cooperatives (even if we assume for purposes of argument they believed they had the legal power to do so) is to be found in the following two factors which are present in the operations of REA-financed cooperatives as distinguished from electric public utilities generally:

1. Consumer owned service: The need for Commission regulation to assure acceptable standards of service and reasonable rates to the users of the service simply disappears when the users of the service own and control the supplying facilities. In the words

of the Supreme Court of Utah (*Garkane Power Co.* v. *Pub. Serv. Comm.*, 100 P. 2d 571, Annot. 132 ALR 1495):

In its argument the Commission contends that as a matter of policy it would be bad to allow cooperatives such as Garkane to escape supervision and regulation on the theory, largely, that they must be protected from themselves or the members be protected from mismanagement. On the contrary, it appears that there is no need for regulation of true cooperatives. There is no conflict of consumer and producer interests—they are one and the same. If rates are too high the surplus collected is returned to the consumers pro rata. If rates are too low, the consumers must accept curtailed service or provide financial contribution to the corporation. If service is not satisfactory the consumer-members have it in their power to elect other directors and demand certain changes. Resort to equity, as in the case of all mutuals, may be had if one group of members seeks to over-reach the others. The function of the Commission in approving rates, capital structure, etc., is unneeded by Garkane, its members, or the communities which it will serve.

2. REA Loan Application Review and Loan Document Controls. The need for Commission regulation to protect the investing public against unsound financing disappears when the lender of substantially all of the funds involved is the United States itself. Especially is this so where the statute authorizes the making of these loans "on such terms and conditions relating to the expenditure of the moneys loaned and the security therefor as the REA Administrator shall determine." The Rural Electrification Act expressly requires that the Administrator shall find and certify "that in his judgment the security therefor is reasonably adequate and such loan will be repaid within the time agreed." It must be assumed that the Administrator will diligently perform his statutory duties, making the necessary feasibility studies and imposing loan document controls which will assure that only economically sound projects will be constructed.

On a number of occasions, interests hostile to the sound development of the REA program have sought, without success, to amend the REA Act to expressly provide for FPC jurisdiction over REA functioning in certain areas. For example, H.R. 5555 (79th Cong. 2d sess.) would have required FPC consent for generating and transmission loans if they were no State commission with jurisdiction. After a full week of hearings a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not report the bill. Another bill would have required FPC certification that there is insufficient power available at reasonable rates as a prerequisite to generating loans. This was defeated in the Senate in 1946 by 52 to 21 rollcall vote (92 Congressional Record 1799). These and other efforts to inject FPC into the functioning of the REA program show that (i) opponents as well as REA program supporters have regarded the REA operation as outside of FPC jurisdiction under the law as it existed and has continued to exist and (ii) Congress, despite the prompting of opponents of the program, has not considered that it would be in the public interest to change the existing REA–FPC relationship by superimposing on the REA operations and FPC review jurisdiction

The indicated enlargement of FPC jurisdiction would provide a forum and opportunity for obstruction of the program which hostile interests have failed to gain, either before Congress or the courts. It would open the way for burdening the REA borrowers and the REA staff with the expense of protracted hearings and appellate proceedings, affording these hostile interests new opportunities for undermining or crippling cooperative projects.

This entire matter is of serious concern to us and we would like to discuss this with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Norman M. Clapp,
Administrator.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon. The bill in its present form represents the work of many months on my part and a great deal of prior work by many persons. It is, I think, as carefully drawn as it can be. Though I am sure additional refinement can be discovered.

A similar bill has been introduced in the other body, the chief differences being the boundaries of the proposed park area. I hope that these differences can be satisfactorily resolved in the legislative process, and that there will be legislation presented to the President and enacted into law to establish this important recreation facility.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter to the people of my district. Although there is opposition to establishment of the park. I believe the concept is sound, and I am convinced the bill as written protects the interests of the people of the area as well as the interests of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the text of a press release issued from my office in connection with the introduction of this bill:

Congressman Robert B. Duncan, Democrat, of Oregon, today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the Fourth District of Oregon.

"My objective," Duncan said, "has been to outline as fine a seashore park as possible. My further objectives have been to make certain that the interference with individual private property, with the tree farms and with the local woods products industries is minimal, and that we do not nullify the bills which we passed last session in the Oregon Legislature to insure new woods products industrial development near Gardiner.

"Senator Neuberger, Secretary Udall, and I are very close to agreement," said Duncan. "The scope of the park is the only serious disagreement. I am hopeful that this can be resolved so that the entire park issue can be solved. I think this is of prime importance to the coastal area which I represent."

Duncan's bill defines the seashore park as extending from the Siuslaw River on the north to a point opposite Lakeside on the south and with certain exceptions following the boundaries of the present national forest. The southern boundary is substantially the same as in all the prior proposals. This means that in some areas the park would not extend to the highway. Those areas generally would be along the southern half of Woahink Lake, west of the north half of Siltcoos Lake and in the area just north of the Umpqua River.

Duncan pointed out that it would be desirable to have public access in the park to those fresh water lakes. After conferring with property owners, he found that access can probably be obtained on a trade or purchase basis. Corridors of access could be obtained along the south end of Woahink, the southwest side of Siltcoos and the southwest side of Tahkenitch.

In preparing his bill, Congressman Duncan has spent uncounted hours conferring in person and by phone with members of the Oregon delegation, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Secretary of Agriculture, Governor Hatfield, Oregon's Game Department and numerous private citizens and property owners in the involved area.

"I have spent days reviewing other park legislation, poring over section maps delineating ownerships of various tracts and personally drafting language which was incorporated into the bill," Duncan said.

At a press conference late last week, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said of Duncan, "He has done a tremendous amount of work on the boundaries and on the problems—he has refined this bill down. I think we are much nearer to agreement than we were 2 months ago. I think Congressman Duncan had done a very outstanding job in eliminating some of the differences and in bringing a new approach to the legislation."

Duncan feels that his bill would provide Oregon, and the Nation, with a fine seashore park.

"It would preserve the dunes in the hands of the National Park Service. It would give substantial access to the fresh water lakes. Aside from county property, State property, national forest property and comparatively small parcels of property owned by Sparrow and Crown Zellerbach, which I am sure can be obtained by trade or purchase, there are only about 14 parcels of private property involved, and that all west of the highway."

The Fourth District Congressman said he will press for committee hearings as soon as possible by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. These hearings would be held in Oregon so that interested parties could voice their opinions.

"However," Duncan said, "it would seem unfeasible to hold such hearings during the coming Easter recess. There is a possibility of scheduling the hearings for some time this summer, but it seems likely this fall would be a more reasonable target date."

Duncan pointed out that he has had many letters about the dunes park with all varieties of suggestions—from an all-encompassing park to no park at all.

"I feel the time has come to settle this dispute," he said. "Leaving this matter in doubt, in my opinion, is having an adverse effect on the entire local community of Western Lane, Western Douglas and Coos Counties. I am convinced that my bill will draw strong support from the local area and will result in settling this matter."

Duncan said he recognizes that one of the big problems in achieving an agreement is the failure of the counties to achieve any zoning that would prohibit an undesirable development along the proposed borders. He has urged the county courts to move in this direction.

"I am encouraged that work is now underway and I hope that we may have some prompt, affirmative action along this line from the counties," Duncan said.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS SITUATED IN THE CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg. An identical bill is being introduced today in the other body by the two Senators from Oregon. I anticipate early action on this legislation, which is technical in nature and entirely noncontroversial.

This property was originally conveyed to the Federal Government without any payment to the city of Roseburg, and it is now surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. The property will make a fine addition to the municipal park which it abuts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point the text of a resolution in regard to this matter passed by the City Council of Roseburg at a meeting early this year:

> Whereas officials in charge of the U.S. Veterans' Administration facility at Roseburg, Oreg., have indicated that the two separate parcels of land now constituting a portion of the properties of that facility and which are more particularly described in exhibit A attached hereto are no longer needed by that facility and will be recommended to be declared as surplus real property; and
>
> Whereas all of the real property of said facility lying north of the South Umpqua River originally was acquired by the city of Roseburg, Oreg., for a substantial monetary consideration and thereupon was conveyed to the U.S. Government without the payment of any monetary consideration whatsoever; and
>
> Whereas the lands described in exhibit A are adjacent to Stewart Park, a municipal park owned by said city, and are desirable as an addition thereto, and the city desires to acquire the same for said purpose; and
>
> Whereas in all equity and in view of the land transfer by said city to the U.S. Government as aforesaid, it is considered that the provisions of Federal law relative to the disposal of surplus real property should not be applicable to this situation: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Roseburg, Oreg.*, That the Honorable WAYNE MORSE and the Honorable MAURINE NEUBERGER, U.S. Senators from Oregon, and the Honorable ROBERT B. DUNCAN, U.S. Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, be and they hereby are requested to introduce and work for the passage of a bill in the Congress of the United States to provide for the transfer of title to the said city of Roseburg of the lands described in exhibit A, without the payment of any monetary consideration therefor.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMEN WHO CHEAT

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "Congressmen Who Cheat," appearing in a nationally distributed Sunday supplement under the cloak of anonymity, was a vicious attack upon Congress itself and unidentified Members.

As one Member, I resent this bitterly. So do the great majority of Members.

It must be remembered, without any apology, that Members of Congress are human beings endowed with all the frailities and virtues of human nature.

Certainly, I do not condone or excuse any abuses of their positions of trust.

These attacks have been arising with increasing regularity so that I have asked the chairman of the Committee on House Administration to conduct open hearings at which the author who purported to report the statements of an anonymous Member would be called to present openly whatever facts he claims to have.

How else can we correct the so-called abuses or cheating, as he calls them? We must have the facts. And, is not the accused entitled to face his accuser?

It is difficult for me to believe that any Member would degrade himself in such a cowardly manner by making charges without providing the proof.

If he has the facts and has not reported them to the proper committee, he is guilty of gross negligence and violation of his oath.

Many things occurring in our country and abroad have aroused my anger this year. But, nothing so riles me as articles like this, that tend to destroy the confidence of the people in Congress.

Frankly, I do not believe this was a statement of any "anonymous Member." I hope the appropriate committee will invite the author of this article at once and ask for proof of facts, and air this subject once and for all and lay it to rest.

OUR AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there is little consolation in being able to say, "I told you so." But anyone who is interested in the economy of this Nation and particularly in the agricultural economy must certainly be able to see by now that "the chickens are coming home to roost."

And, I am not necessarily referring to broilers when I use the word "chickens." I am referring to agriculture in general.

For a number of years I have been pointing out to the Congress and to the Nation that this constant increase of agricultural imports could only mean destruction to American agriculture. Each time we have had a farm bill on this House floor I have pointed out that the problem of agriculture is not one of domestically produced surpluses, but one of foreign agricultural imports.

Last year, when we had the so-called Trade Expansion Act on this floor for consideration, I again pointed out that the further reduction of tariffs and quotas and the further use of our agricultural industry as a "foreign aid" program could only lead to complete destruction of American agriculture.

As I said at the outset, there is little consolation in saying, "I told you so," but last year I pointed out that beef imports in 1961 had jumped to 2¼ million head, and I said that unless the policy was changed these imports would be bound to increase. I have just completed a tabulation on the 1962 imports of beef, and find that last year we imported over 2¾ million head of thousand-pound beef. All this while our beef exports have been on the decline.

Beef prices have dropped from 9 to 10 cents a pound which means $90 or $100 on a thousand-pound beef, and which has already cost the American rancher and farmer over a billion dollars.

There has been a great deal of talk about "getting the country moving." One of the poorest ways to improve the economy of this country is to take a billion dollars out of farm income by importing the food that goes onto the American tables and the fiber that goes onto the American backs.

BILLION-DOLLAR-A-WEEK CLUB

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to my colleagues today I am proposing some remedial measures to save us some money in connection with our spending on defense items. The letter reads:

> DEAR COLLEAGUES: The billion-dollar-a-week club in the Pentagon is spending almost $16 per week of the earnings of every family head. Some of that money can and should be saved and left in the pocket of the family breadwinner without in any way damaging our Nation's defense posture.
>
> Too much of the over $1 billion a week being spent on defense is spent via the method of sole-source and negotiated procurements; that is, procurements without competitive bidding. I have completely authenticated this observation during a long and painstaking study of many individual cases. I have set forth 10 of the latest cases and the waste they entail on an enclosed sheet.
>
> Some savings have already been effected as a result of my study. Regulations have been changed which make it easier for industry to compete for Government contracts and which reduce the number of sole-source contracts. Yet, the surface has only been scratched. There is much more to be done.

Monday, April 1, I will outline on the floor of the House another case in great detail to prove my point. If you do not have an opportunity to hear this report, I hope you will find time to read it in the RECORD. It is made to order to explain what is wrong with defense purchasing.

Additionally, I want you to know that I have already introduced two pieces of legislation which will go far toward remedying the ills of defense purchasing. H.R. 4409 provides for the setting up of a blue-ribbon watchdog committee to ride herd on all sole-source and negotiated contract awards. This committee can justify defense budget cuts in the billions. The second is a bill to give the Comptroller General the same before-the-contract authority on sole-source and negotiated contracts that his Office now has on competitive awards. The provisions of this bill are strongly supported by GAO.

I hope you will take time to read these bills, the attached fact sheet, and my speech on the floor. Please be assured that I welcome your support and cooperation in this nonpartisan endeavor.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EARL WILSON,
Member of Congress.

FACT SHEET ON WILSON DEFENSE PROCUREMENT STUDY

Following are a few reports on cases which Hon. EARL WILSON of Indiana has uncovered before the contracts were signed for procurement of the items mentioned. In each case, information developed before the fact proved the savings that could be effected. Had bid sets been received as a matter of course, many additional cases could have been developed, and those cases which are shown here could have been spotted much earlier. These cases are simply typical examples. There are scores more.

Case No. 1—AS-1018/URC(XMI) antenna, Navy: In a current procurement (Navy RFP 26057) the Navy says it does not know if patent rights are involved. The fact that permission to use patent rights might cost a manufacturer dearly is enough to frighten most bidders away from this procurement. WILSON's study proves the Navy paid for development and production of this antenna (NObsr 85111) then purchased it again from another company for $541 per unit. A few days later Navy negotiated another purchase from sole source developer for $970 per unit. Thus, Navy has wasted money, should know if patent rights are involved, and should have seen to it that all rights were given to government for use by contractors.

Case No. 2—VHF radio set, FAA: Raleigh, N.C., firm (Aerotron, Inc.) notified Representative WILSON it had been declared nonresponsive to bid for equipment it is presently making. Representative WILSON's study and presentation to GAO enabled Comptroller General to set aside FAA ruling, order award of contract, and save taxpayers 18 percent of purchase price.

Case No. 3—USM-116 multimeter, Navy: This procurement was called competitive when, in truth, a Navy wall surrounded it and made it a sole-source purchase. The Navy insisted that prior to bidding on this equipment, a bidder must manufacture the equipment. Before getting plans to build equipment and have it approved, however, bidder must win contract—which he can't win until he builds a set and has it approved. As Representative WILSON said on the House floor, "You can't get from here to there." His attack on this policy resulted in plans being released to all responsible companies.

Case No. 4—USM-117 oscilloscope, Navy: Same type case as the USM-116. Plans are now available to responsible bidders and a savings to taxpayers of 50 percent is anticipated.

Case No. 5—AT-948/U antenna, Navy: In this case the Navy certified no drawings available in setting up a sole-source purchase. Congressman WILSON learned of this and investigated. His study turned up the exact people in Navy who said drawings were available. Case is presently being studied by GAO, and a savings of 50 percent or more will result if procurement is made competitive.

Case No. 6—AN/MRN-12 mobile communications control, Air Force: This case is now in final stages. WILSON study has uncovered waste in past procurement amounting to over six figures. Study has also disclosed that sole-source contract was based on time of delivery, and that schedule was not even close to being met. Objective here is to show waste in sole-source procurement and try to force competition.

Case No. 7—VRC 12 radio, Army: In two separate sole-source contracts the Army spent almost $100 million. WILSON's study can now prove that almost $30 million was wasted. Had bid sets been available to a Congressman pursuing a study such as WILSON's, this $30 million would have been saved.

Case No. 8—AN/UPM-98, Navy: This set, a tape recorder, was bought for maximum of $4,800 each. After being miniaturized, sole-source price was to be up to $77,000 each. Representative WILSON forced this into open competition. Admiral Corp., Chicago, won the contract in competition—for $1,833.13 each.

Case No. 9—APS-88 radar, Navy: This set was purchased at prices of $28,000 to $30,000 with two companies bidding. Two months after last purchase, Representative WILSON forced procurement into competition and low bid was $11,319. The company that won the bid was same firm that bid $28,000 2 months earlier.

Case No. 10—PP-2100 power supply, Navy: The GAO has documented excess profits of over $100,000 for this equipment. This was another before-the-fact case developed while Representative WILSON was receiving bid sets.

In addition to these cases, check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 12, 1961, for eight more in a block. All point toward gross waste in procurement, toward regulations rigged for favored contractors, redtape meant to snarl up any unwanted bidder. In these and other cases, Representative WILSON's study has forced competition, forced the military to release plans for equipment, and has torn down the Chinese wall stifling competition. Savings can be counted in millions, and more can be effected if more before-the-fact information is developed through use of bid sets.

REMOVE CONFLICTING FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER FARM OPERATIONS

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a farm bill. Basically, it provides for the removal of conflicting Federal controls over farm operations. I believe it deserves the immediate attention and consideration of the Congress.

Too long we have witnessed the hamstringing of the Nation's farmers by complex and unrealistic regulations. The farmer has been denied independence. He has been overregulated. Consequently, to meet the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, the American farmer has been strait-jacketed. Farming, as a basic part of our economy, has suffered. At the same time, the consumer has been placed at a price and tax disadvantage because of commodity surpluses.

Freedom of production and freedom of the marketplace have been denied the farmer because of these complex controls.

If they are removed, as my bill provides, I firmly believe the American farmer will be able to operate his farm successfully; to sow and harvest essential crops to feed this Nation and the world. But farmers will find it increasingly difficult to prosper, to grow the needed food and fiber, if we continue the agricultural policies laid down under existing law.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues know there has been considerable interest in this House about the statements in a book published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R."

However, this book, written by two Russians, proved an elusive target. At one point the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] told us here that even our American Ambassador to the United Nations has not been able to get his hands on one of these booklets. I was informed by the U.N. Information Center Director here in Washington that the U.N. has none of the booklets available and does not sell them at its bookstores.

And yet, somehow this booklet has been distributed in the name of UNESCO. It purports to be a factual document. As we know UNESCO projects, along with all other United Nations projects, are financed up to 40 percent by American taxpayers under our subsidization of the U.N.

Through the courtesy of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], who had the foresight to send cash money, United States, with his order, I was given the opportunity to study a copy of this UNESCO document.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] are more expert upon this matter than I—as is evidenced by the fact that they have been able to obtain personal copies of this suppressed booklet. I have studied their comments upon it.

I wish, today, only to quote a few statements from this book—things that are presented therein as facts. I ask only that Americans consider these statements, all the time remembering that they contributed between 30 and 40 percent of the money to pay for publishing this booklet.

American taxpayers paid so that the world could be told:

> It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression.

American taxpayers paid so the U.N. could tell the world:

> Each of them [the Soviet states] embodies the collective will of its people and can decide its own future in entire freedom.

American taxpayers paid so the U.N. could tell the world:

> Soviet citizens of all nationalities are working enthusiastically to build a Communist society.

American taxpayers paid so this statement of Soviet "rights" could be presented to the world and to history as a fact:

> Your [Soviet] beliefs, your traditions and your national cultural institutions are henceforward [after 1917] declared free and inviolable. Organize your national life in complete freedom.

American taxpayers paid to help publish this outright lie:

> The principal of national and racial equality of citizens of the U.S.S.R. is fully applied in the electoral sphere. All citizens have equal electoral rights and are equally eligible for election to all organs of the state.

American taxpayers who well remember what happened to America in 1776 are paying to present this statement to history:

> The multinational Soviet state grouping the equal peoples of Russia in a single state in a manner unprecedented in history was a mighty achievement.

American taxpayers paid to help rewrite history thus:

> In 1940, the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics [Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia], which voluntarily joined the union.

American taxpayers paid to publish these alleged joys of communistic life:

> Peoples and nationalities are assured of the right to organize their national life freely.

To cap it all off, American taxpayers will find that their subsidization of UNESCO helped pay the Russians to tell the world:

> It is Soviet power, and that alone, which has brought freedom and the right of self-determination to all the peoples of old Russia. It was the Leninist policy of the Communist Party which made it possible to solve all the problems.

Mr. Speaker, there are the quotations from this U.N. booklet which are being cast out to the world and to history. These statements have the approval of the U.N. and are backed by its prestige which lends credence to these lies. American taxpayers should think twice—or three times—about what is happening to them. It is happening largely at their own expense, and it usually is only an accident that they find out that it is happening.

March 21, 1963.

Hon. Durward Hall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Hall: I believe you may be interested in the attached material in connection with comments you indicated you might make today on the House floor.

Sincerely,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Fact Sheet on UNESCO Publication "Equality Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.

The booklet entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," by two Soviet nationals, I. P. Tsamarian and S. L. Ronin, was published by UNESCO in March 1962 as part of a series of studies on "Race and Society." An earlier work in this series was written by an American social scientist and reviewed Federal and State antidiscrimination legislation in the United States.

While these two publications were intended by UNESCO to present comparative scholarly studies of race relations in the Soviet Union and the United States, it is obvious that the Soviet publication has been used instead as a vehicle for political propaganda. It ignores recognized standards of scientific research by presenting a distorted and often fallacious picture of the treatment of nationalities and minority groups in the Soviet Union. It contains numerous blatant examples of Soviet and anti-Western propaganda, making references to "revanchist neo-Fascist elements" in Western European countries, "colonialist oppression" in "capitalist countries" and so forth. In so doing, of course, it serves the national objectives and policy of the Soviet Union and not the objectives of international understanding espoused by UNESCO.

In April 1962 the Department of State vigorously protested publication of this booklet to the Acting Director General of UNESCO, citing the reasons above and pointing out that it violated the principles of the UNESCO constitution. In his reply to this protest the Acting Director General said that the book was a counterpart to the American publication and was to "reflect as faithfully as possible the views of competent Soviet authorities." The Acting Director General added that criticism "elicited by the publication of this brochure throw light, in a more general manner, on the difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in matters of publication, owing to the lack of precise instructions from the governing bodies of UNESCO."

To compensate for this lack of guidance from the governing bodies, the UNESCO Executive Board, with the full support of the Department of State, last fall appointed a committee to prepare policy directives on UNESCO publications. The Department, after seeking the advice of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, formulated comprehensive criteria which, if adopted would prevent the use of UNESCO publications for Soviet propaganda purposes.

The chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 12th General Conference of UNESCO, Assistant Secretary of State Lucius D. Battle, summarized U.S. policy in this regard as follows:

"My Government considers that UNESCO should abandon activities such as tendentious publications, and those seminars, meetings, and other projects which experience has shown lead to polemics rather than to scholarly results. The question is not only one of cost but one of integrity, for UNESCO's standards of scholarship, like Caesar's wife, must be above reproach."

The Organization is expected to take final action on publications policy directives during 1963 taking into account the recommendations by the United States and other member states.

Although UNESCO publishes hundreds of objective and impartial studies every year, the lack of precise policy guidance does, from time to time, result in publications objectionable to the United States. The Department is fully aware of the necessity of formulating publications policy directives and will continue to pursue the matter vigorously.

(Office of Public Services, Department of State, Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.)

Statement Issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in Answer to Queries Relating to the Organization's Publication, February 15, 1963

"EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R.," VOLUME 3, "RACE AND SOCIETY"

In its effort to help eradicate all possible ways of discrimination and more particularly race prejudices, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has published a number of special studies elucidating problems.

Following the publication in 1954 of a book on "Racial Equality and the Law," which deals with the United States, by American expert Morroe Berger, it was decided in the light of a resolution of the General Conference of the same year to publish another volume on "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." In 1955 the U.S.S.R. Academy of Science was invited to nominate experts to prepare this report for printing by UNESCO. The volume appeared in a French language edition in 1961, and an English language edition in 1962. The views expressed in this book, as in other studies prepared by authors nominated by competent authorities of member states, and under their signature, are entirely theirs.

In order to clarify the Organization's publication policies, the present Director-General requested the recent UNESCO General Conference to provide the Secretariat with more specific rules governing the Organization's activities in this field. As a result of this initiative, a special 10-nation committee of the Executive Board will meet in April 1963 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris.

(Note.—The book, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," is not available in the United States as it is out of stock.)

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, and have sent to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary and expiring provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, both 81st Congress, as amended. These provisions are due to expire on June 30, 1963.

As all Members know, these laws authorize Federal payments to public school districts which have experienced a degree of impact due to Federal activities in the area. Public Law 815 authorizes payments for school construction; Public Law 874 payments are made for operation and maintenance of public schools. In both instances, generally speaking, the amount of the Federal payment is determined by the number of children attending the public school whose parents live or work, or both, on tax-exempt Federal property. The expiring provisions authorize payments on account of those children who live with a parent who is employed on Federal property but who lives on private property, or who lives on Federal property but is privately employed. These children represent by far the greater number of all those on account of whom Federal payments are made.

These two acts have been in operation since 1950. They have come many times before Congress for amendment and extension. Since the fiscal year 1951 approximately $2 billion has been appropriated by Congress and distributed to several thousand school districts to carry out the purposes of the acts. Despite all the controversy and difference of viewpoint within the Congress concerning Federal aid to education, these acts have received strong congressional support. The reason for this is that these acts carry out a recognized Federal responsibility. Essentially, they authorize Federal payments in lieu of the taxes which local public school districts would be able to levy on property, were that property not owned by the Federal Government.

Over the years there have been a variety of proposals for the amendment of these acts, and a number of changes have been made. Now the Kennedy administration is proposing extensive amendments to the temporary features of both acts. These would have the effect of sharply reducing the assistance to eligible school districts and, moreover, would render a great many districts wholly ineligible for further assistance. Our committee has not yet been told how many school districts would be eliminated from the program. We have not been told how severely the remaining districts would be affected. Indeed, we have not been presented with a rationale for the proposed changes.

Last year the administration indicated that a major study would be made of the operation of these two acts, and that proposals for amendment would be based upon the findings. To my knowledge, no such study has been conducted. The current proposals, embodied in H.R. 3000, are not based upon a broad reconsideration of the acts.

In my judgment—which I believe is shared by many other Members—the operation of these programs deserves the kind of detailed study that has been promised. Among other things, the nature of the impact of Federal installations upon surrounding school districts requires careful study, if we are to determine the most equitable means of discharging the Federal responsibility. Meanwhile—without sufficient information upon which to act—I doubt that Congress is prepared to make drastic changes in programs which affect public schools in over 3,000 school districts, located in virtually every State and territory.

I am disturbed that the administration has included sweeping amendments to these acts in a huge and highly controversial omnibus bill. They seem to be holding hostage these popular and vital acts to facilitate the enactment of new, expensive, and controversial programs in the field of education. The administration made a similar attempt last session. Their stratagem then was overwhelmingly rejected by Congress.

There is a compelling reason why Congress should act promptly to extend the expiring provisions of these acts. Thousands of federally impacted school districts are beginning to prepare their budgets for next year. Federal funds represent a vital component of those school budgets, and the schools should not be left in doubt as to the amount and availability of the funds. Most particularly, the essential planning of thousands of school districts should not be thrown into confusion because of a dubious legislative strategy.

My bill would extend the expiring features of these acts for 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1964. Meanwhile, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have time to conduct thorough study of these programs and to make recommendations soundly based upon the results. Our Committee on Education and Labor would then have time to consider these recommendations and to make its own appraisal.

Accordingly, I urge that this bill be enacted at an early date.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has shown an understandable concern for the plight of the unemployed worker and his or her family. Newsweek magazine for April 1, in a few short paragraphs, puts this problem in sharp focus:

> Some 4.9 million people are jobless; on a seasonally adjusted basis, 6.1 percent of the labor force is unemployed.
>
> At least one in every five persons in the U.S. labor force, what's more, will be unemployed at some time this year. At least another 2.6 million workers will be restricted to part-time employment because a full-time job is unavailable. At least 1 in every 11 workers in the Nation's 30 biggest cities will continue to tramp the streets in search of a job that isn't there. And nowhere will the paradox be more pronounced than in the hard core of unemployment, where there will be at least 5 million persons jobless for 15 weeks and quite probably more, about half of them the breadwinners in their families.
>
> All this adds up to what President Kennedy calls our No. 1 economic problem—and the problem has been growing steadily worse.

Unfortunately, the problem will get even worse unless some existing attitudes and policies within the administration are reversed. I have in mind one situation and am confident the President is not aware of it for if he were I am sure he would not permit gainful employment for a substantial group of American workers to be abolished.

I refer to the increasing tendency on the part of the Department of the Navy to lean in the direction of procurements from foreign shipyards. Only last week, the Navy, with Defense Department concurrence, approved a contract which contemplates the use of midbody sections to be obtained from a Japanese shipyard.

By this action many man-hours of employment will be lost in this country. By this action several thousand tons of steel will not be produced in this country. By this action the balance of payments situation will be made more sensitive by the outflow of several million U.S. dollars.

Of equal importance, by approving this procurement, a very dangerous precedent has been established. Unless corrected, more unemployment for U.S. shipyards and U.S. steelworkers—with a further resulting outflow of dollars, can only follow. Apparently, if a change is to be accomplished, the backbone of the Pentagon must be strengthened, and to that end, I submit a bill "to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels." I hope this measure will be scheduled for early consideration.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the American public find themselves, from time to time, victimized by self-serving information policies of the Federal Government. Often, as part of a campaign to prevent or encourage public acceptance of some Federal action or program, we see a flurry of headlines which would justify what the administration wishes to do or is doing. Crisis creation is becoming a fine art in Washington.

This is one aspect of news management which has received little attention in the current controversy. It certainly deserves more examination since it is becoming an all too accepted daily process.

Today, the drumbeat for the President's tax reduction and reform program includes dire predictions that vastly greater unemployment is inevitable if this proposal is not enacted. No one in his right mind would willingly fail to act if through a course of action a recession could be prevented. In terms of human misery, such a failure would be monstrously callous and wholly indefensible. Repetition of the threat continues from the White House, but when we look at the mystical economic wool gathering that supports the President's program, we are doubly concerned and troubled. In the view of many competent observers, the program he is urging could lead to the same drastic consequences he explains he is trying to avert.

Unemployment continues at an unacceptably high rate. How high it actually is remains an unanswered question. Serious doubts exist about the precision of the figures we are being given and we have a basis for doubting the motivation of the releases that are coming from the Department of Labor.

It is a good sign that the Nation's news media are beginning to seek out and to analyze such instances of news manipulation as they are able to piece together. Today, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress recent thoughtful editorial comment on this important issue by station WRAL–TV in Raleigh, N.C. The station's comments are as follows:

NEWS MANAGEMENT

A few years ago, just when the Congress was buckling down to the annual task of making a decision about military appropriations, a prominent Congressman remarked to a friend: "Well, it's about time for that Russian submarine to be sighted off our coast again."

The next day, sure enough, there came reports of the submarine. The Congressman chuckled: "See what I mean? There's always an emergency to stampede us into spending money."

The same is true, he said, with respect to practically every other phase of government. "Take unemployment," he said. Let the Congress begin to consider a welfare measure, he said, "and we inevitably meet a barrage of alarming statistics."

The point that the Congressman was making was that, while any unemployment is bad and ought to be corrected, the picture that the Congress and the American people get is distorted and exaggerated out of all proportion. He suggested that citizens do three things: (1) Look around their own communities to see what is the picture there; (2) see how many jobs are going begging; and (3) make a fair estimate of how many of the so-called unemployed would rather be on relief than hold down a job.

We would add another: Take a good, hard look at the unemployment statistics.

Every time we see an official announcement from the Labor Department, we recall a confession made by Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz a few weeks ago while he was in Charlotte for a speech. Mr. Wirtz, in a moment of candor, acknowledged in an interview that just before the election last November, the Labor Department issued a doctored-up report describing the Kennedy administration's achievements in employment.

Also, we recall that about 2 years ago, the Labor Department reported that almost 5 million people were out of work in the United States. This, said the Department, was about a half-million less than the previous month. Still, it represented about 7 percent of the Nation's working force.

We decided to look into these figures. A relatively new Deputy Secretary of Labor, Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, frankly admitted that our Government's absurd recordkeeping is what makes us look bad. He said that if we used the same measurements of unemployment as other countries do, our unemployment figure would drop to below 3 million.

At the time, out of a total of nearly 5 million so-called unemployed persons, 497,000 of them were teenagers down to age 14. There were 225,000 students attending school full-time—but they were counted as unemployed. Of course they didn't have jobs, and weren't seeking them, but they showed up in the unemployed column just the same. There were 860,000 married women living with their husbands and keeping house. They were included in the Government's unemployed figure. Another 120,000 workers were included, even though they had orders to report back to work within 30 days.

This brought the so-called unemployment total down to 3,260,000, but there were still others who could not logically be counted as unemployed. For example, 140,000 of the people counted by the Government as being out of work were people who were changing to new jobs, moving from place to place. Also included were 187,000 retired persons who actually had no intention of returning to work.

That brought the figure down to 2,933,000—and we haven't even mentioned the uncounted army of people who cannot or will not stick to any job for very long.

So how are the Labor Department's figures arrived at? They are not compiled by actual count but by the sampling method. The most charitable thing that can be said about the system is that it is full of holes. Once each month, 600 Government employees visit an average of 55 homes each. From the findings of these 33,000 visits, the Labor Department, by arbitrarily multiplying the totals by 1,400, "projects" the "unemployment" statistics that are used to shock Congress into appropriating more money for emergency use.

So, we have the Russian submarine approach—an emergency to justify every proposal. Governmental budgets grow greater, more people find it easier to turn to the Government for a degrading sort of "security." And then they vote to keep it coming.

It would be interesting to know what the people of America would do if they had access to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we stubbornly refuse to accept the obvious and while we continue to resist all attempts to capitalize on the American urge to gamble, hundreds of millions of dollars are gambled every day in the United States.

With and without our approval, gambling in this country has grown into a $50-billion-a-year industry. Unfortunately, most of it is illegal and has become the chief source of revenue for organized crime syndicates.

Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of this House one type of gambling activity in this country that has been accepted and recognized as legal and proper, yet, nonetheless gambling because in every transaction an element of chance exists.

To those who consider a national lottery conducive to sin, I would like to remind them that the purchase of a Government lottery ticket is no more wicked or sinful than the buying and selling activities at every stock exchange where hundreds of millions of dollars change hands every day.

Mr. Speaker, a recent report from the Security Exchange Commission shows that in 1962 the volume of sales effected on all exchanges in the United States totaled over 1,664 million shares. These transactions in 1 year alone represented a total market value of over $56½ billion.

Are not these activities at the stock exchanges, games of chance? Are not stock manipulations subject to the risk of loss for the chance of some gain? Does hypocrisy clothe this type of activity with respectability because we identify the gamblers at the stock markets as investors?

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery is the only painless, sensible, and voluntary way to raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue.

No one, Mr. Speaker, not even this Congress, has the right to be careless of the tremendous tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery. Especially in these days of rising budgets and a crying need for tax relief.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled during peacetime services outside the United States.

The current Federal law concerning compensation for disabilities incurred during peacetime service in our Armed Forces, works to the disadvantage of many American service men and women serving overseas.

The present construction of section 336 of title 38, United States Code, limits disability compensation payments for injuries sustained in peacetime service, to 80 percent of the wartime rate. That is, at least, the way the law applies to most cases of disability incurred in peacetime.

I believe this to be an arrangement out of keeping with the American concept of the cold war, and therefore unfair to a large number of American service men and women.

As things stand today, the only service personnel in no way threatened by the potentially explosive nature of the cold war, are those on duty within the limits of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and U.S. possessions. All others—and there are, indeed, many others—are scattered throughout the so-called trouble spots of the world. As of this moment, most of them are probably not in danger of destruction; but that, for all we know, and for all they know—may be only a temporary state of affairs.

For this reason, then—in recognition of the important part played by our service men and women overseas, it is high time that we move to amend our compensation laws, to the benefit of all veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by service overseas.

With this object in mind, I have reintroduced this bill.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mr. **BURLESON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BURLESON**. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most every Member is aware of an article appearing in Parade of last Sunday, March 24. The author of the article is a Mr. Jack Anderson, whom I understand to be an associate of a Mr. Drew Pearson, a rather well-known columnist. Mr. Anderson alleges that the information contained in the article came from an anonymous Congressman. Among other accusations is one which may possibly constitute a felony. This has to do with an allegation that a Member of Congress, knowing that property was to be purchased on which the new House Office Building is now being constructed, purchased it himself immediately following his knowledge of the location of the building. It is alleged that in the deal he made $4,000 profit in 60 days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ordinarily my personal reaction to articles of this kind is to follow the adage known to most of us who are in political life, that the newspapers come out every day and have a wider circulation and more interested readers than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has been my feeling that to ignore the many unsubstantiated aspersions cast upon the Congress as a whole is the best treatment. Furthermore, few people remember denials, but only the allegations of wrongdoing.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker, it becomes a serious matter when a Member of this or the other body is accused of the perpetration of an act which would constitute a felonious act. Therefore, following the suggestion, and in fact, the direction of my House Administration Committee in session on yesterday, we invite Mr. Anderson or anyone else who can support these charges to come before us in public hearing and reveal all or any part of the allegations in the article referred to and to support the same with legal evidence. I emphasize that the conduct of such an investigation would be in open session, and incidentally Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Administration Committee, I give notice that I will not be a party to receiving any confidential information of whatever nature relating to any of these matters. There will be no privileged communications with me.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, and even more especially, we invite the Member of this House of Representatives or the other body to come forward in open session of the committee and reveal these matters alleged to have been related to Mr. Anderson. As a matter of fact, it is my feeling, and I believe it probably is the feeling of 533 other Members of the entire Congress, that this anonymous Member should not wait to be called before the committee but should come down in the well of this House or the other body, as the case may be, and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, prefer his charges in order that they be cleared of the reflection cast upon the Congress as an institution.

Mr. Speaker, there is serious doubt in the minds of many that there is any such Member.

Near the close of the article this alleged anonymous Member of Congress is supposed to have said that the reason for his revelation to Mr. Anderson was to help turn the public spotlight on abuses. He advises people to write their Senator and Congressman, demanding they put an end to secrecy on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine no greater practice of secrecy than for a Member of Congress, who is supposed to have this sort of information, not to reveal it in order that something can be done about it. It appears more to be the statement of the bounty hunter with which we are all familiar. The bounty hunter is one who carries a ballpoint pen on each hip as his weapons.

Certainly I am not one who wishes to cast the first stone, and neither do I, nor does my committee, wish to place ourselves in the position of being the overseers of the membership of this House. We have no responsibility as such in this matter, but we all have the responsibility as Members of this great body to find the truth. My committee is willing and ready on short notice to convene itself for a public hearing on these matters. I feel it will meet the approval of this House to say that it is the responsibility, not only legally but morally, for any person who has knowledge and who can support the accusations in this article to come forth and make it known.

Mr. **KYL**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BURLESON**. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **KYL**. Mr. Speaker, I think that to this time it is not sufficiently known that the House Administration Committee is continuously investigating all sorts of charges, almost all of which we find to be completely fallacious and baseless; but beyond that point, the Members should know that under the direction of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], the Committee on House Administration has gone further in trying to establish the kind of principles, policy, and rules of procedure which would make bad practices impossible.

In other words, I think this occasion offers an opportunity for the Congress to tell the people that they are not without watchdogs inside the House of Representatives and the other body, that all of the good guys are not employed by the press and all of the bad guys employed in the Congress of the United States.

The second thing which should be noted is that the Congress has always welcomed publicity. We need good reporters to continually search out wrongdoing, bad practices, and inefficiencies in the Congress. Always those people who make such investigations should have as their basic purpose the same purpose which we must have, and which I feel we do have; that is, to strengthen the institutions which are so basic to this free Government, so that the people may have faith in the Congress, so that the Congressmen may act in an atmosphere of freedom in trying to do what is right for the country, instead of continually facing the necessity of defending themselves against accusations which, as I said before, are almost always groundless.

The gentleman from Texas is to be congratulated for his efforts now and in the past in seeing that there is indeed no wrongdoing in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. **BURLESON**. I am grateful to my colleague for those kind words. He has made a real contribution to our efforts here today as he has done in other matters relating to the duties of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. **WRIGHT**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BURLESON**. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. **WRIGHT**. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], for his extremely well chosen remarks, and I want to congratulate him on his diligence in attempting to see as chairman of the House Administration Committee that wrongdoing does not occur.

In addition, I think he is to be congratulated for the forthright manner in which he has invited this alleged anonymous Congressman, if such person does indeed exist, to come before his committee to divulge any facts he may have to bear out these otherwise unsupported allegations.

For years now I have read many exposes as printed in the newspapers which have related to individual Members of Congress for the most part. But this is the first time I have read in any such otherwise responsible journal one which cast such a blanket indictment, or one whose author, if an author there is, other than Jack Anderson, seeks to cloak himself with anonymity, or one which tends, as this one does, to cast doubt on the entire Congress of the United States by failing to identify the specific individuals against whom its shocking allegations are made.

I have scarcely seen a more irresponsible piece of journalism than this, and I hereby challenge the veracity of some of the statements it contains. I do not believe any of my colleagues have been guilty of some of the things herein alleged. I say here and now that if such a person exists, who is supposed to have told this tale to Jack Anderson, then he has, or if he does not exist, then Jack Anderson himself has, a responsibility to his country, a responsibility to the Congress, and a responsibility to his own reputation for truth to appear before a grand jury. If Members of Congress have been guilty of buying "liquor, clothes, cars, refrigerators, and TV sets simply by putting the salesmen on the congressional payroll until the purchases were paid off" as the article alleges, then those people are guilty of a felony, and the matter ought to be reported to a grand jury. Those men should not only be exposed individually, but should be prosecuted. If any Member has been guilty of otherwise appropriating Federal funds to his own use, as alleged elsewhere in the article, he clearly deserves to be prosecuted.

I take the position that the rest of the Members of this Congress are as honorable as I want them to consider me to be.

Numerous distortions of fact occur in this article. For example, it says:

> Above our salary, each of us draws a yearly stationery allowance of $1,800, another $1,800 for field office rental and expenses, and an indeterminate amount for clerk hire.

That is incorrect, as all Members know. For one thing, it is definitely not true that each Member of Congress draws $1,800 for field office rental and expenses. I do not know whether my situation is typical or not, but I have not drawn money for field office rental because I have not considered it necessary.

As to stationery allowances, every year I have overshot the stationery allowance and have paid the difference out of my pocket. I am sure many other Members have done so. I am sure that other Members, like myself, have consistently gone into their own pockets by several thousands of dollars to supplement the telephone and telegraph allowance. Certainly this is true of Members who represent populous constituencies.

Many Members, like myself, must have received upward of 7,000 or 8,000 letters in a month. I am sure others take the position, as I do, that everyone who writes his Congressman is entitled to an answer as thoughtful and factual and responsive as the crushing volume of mail will permit. To help perform this task requires a dedicated and efficient staff. It simply could not be done with drones on the public payroll. Unfortunately, no journal has ever undertaken to tell this story of the conscientious and hard-working congressional offices that regularly work 12 and 14 hours a day.

This story has never been told. Ever since I have been in the Congress I have overshot my travel allowance which permits one round trip a year. Most members surely do. Last year I spent $2,700 out of my own pocket for airline fares in an effort to stay as close as possible to the needs of my district. I am not singing the blues; I am not asking for anybody's pity or sympathy; I am not saying I am underpaid. I am, however, saying that the vast majority of the Members of Congress are decent, honorable, hard-working men. This article implies that they have time to go to liquor parties given by lobbyists and go to poker games wherein the lobbyists almost always lose and the Congressmen allegedly almost always win. Perhaps I am naive, but I have been a Member of Congress for 9 years, and I have never heard of a poker game of that sort, or any of my colleagues having been invited to a game of that sort.

I challenge the author of this story to go to the grand jury, if he has that information, and divulge the identity of the Members of Congress who are violating the law and committing the abuses that he is talking about, and thus clear the good names of other Members, or admit that he cannot do it. I challenge Jack Anderson or his unnamed informant to produce the evidence of the things to which he refers in this story. I do not believe some of them exist. If they do exist, those guilty parties ought to be exposed to the proper light of public attention. The facts ought to be made known. If proved guilty of a felony, they ought to be prosecuted. But it seems the height of irresponsibility to cast an indiscriminate blanket indictment upon the entire lawmaking branch of our Government.

So far as the possible remedies suggested in the closing paragraphs of the article are concerned, I think probably they are all right; I think perhaps these three suggestions are good. In addition to that, every Member of this Congress has a responsibility, a responsibility to this Government of the United States, to uphold the honor of his country and the integrity of his constituency. If the faith of the people of America is shaken in those people whose responsibility it is to make the decisions of this Government, then the people cannot long be expected to keep faith in the system itself which produced these people. This is the danger, and a grave danger it is. If the public's faith in the elective process is shaken, then what is there left in which to have faith?

I say, enough of this sort of thing. I have written as of yesterday a letter to this magazine and asked them for the privelege of writing an answer. I would like to write an article about the great majority of my colleagues, about Congressmen who do not cheat. I want the public to get the full story about the fine, dedicated public servants, both Democrats and Republicans, who have not increased their economic well-being by serving in the Congress. I feel certain that most of them have seen a decline in their net worth. But, they did not come here to get rich in the first place. They are willing to serve in the Congress because they love the United States; they love public service; they love and want to serve the cause of freedom and the principles our Nation stands for. And they do not think of it as a sacrifice but as the grandest and noblest opportunity a man can have. For that reason, the average Congressman works harder than he would at any other job in the world.

I think that is a story that ought to be told. And I think the magazine ought to let us write that sort of a story. If they will let me or another of our colleagues do that, we will not hide behind the cloak of anonymity but sign our names to it.

Mr. BURLESON. I accept with sincere thanks and appreciation those remarks. A colleague said to me yesterday, facetiously, of course, that he would like very much to know the formula as to how various fringe benefits could be obtained to increase our compensation by twice the amount of the salary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If someone acquired title to certain of this property prior to its acquisition by the Government, would that not be a matter of public record that could be determined as a matter of absolute truth?

Mr. BURLESON. I assure the distinguished gentleman and my longtime friend, that we are now making that effort through the General Accounting Office to see if that information can be obtained. It should be available, although this article says that the Member used a broker as a go-between. We want to find out who the broker is or any other detail which might throw light on this alleged transaction. We expect to pursue other inquiries on this particular allegation.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. He knows he received a letter from me, and I am delighted that he will hold open hearings and invite the writer of that article to appear before the committee. I had in mind what my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said, and I actually believe it in my own mind and heart, that the regularity with which these attacks have taken place in the last 2 or 3 years is for the purpose of demeaning this greatest of all legislative bodies in the world, which will ultimately result in loss of faith and confidence by the people. And, that is what I am afraid of, and I resent it, because it is unjustified, unwarranted. If they have an ax to grind, let them come forth and give us the facts, and let us iron out our own problems, and I am sure we will.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I know the gentleman will do a good job for this body. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like also to commend the gentleman and the Committee on House Administration. I would like to ask this question: Do I understand that the Committee on House Administration has, or will, extend a formal invitation to Mr. Jack Anderson to appear before the committee?

Mr. BURLESON. This is an invitation being publicly offered the writer at this time.

Mr. GROSS. This is the invitation?

Mr. BURLESON. This is the invitation.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the committee extend him by mail—by registered mail—an invitation to appear at a public hearing.

Mr. BURLESON. I would assume that he probably reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The committee did discuss the possibility of taking formal action to ask for subpena power and that he be brought before the committee. I would not favor dignifying the controversy by that action and in addition, there is, of course, the matter of what is privileged information. But if he wants to volunteer to come before the committee, which would be the duty of a citizen to do, then we shall see that the committee is convened in a matter of hours to hear him, or anyone else who wishes to bring in substantiating proof of these charges. If it were not of such serious nature, I would not bother to react in this proposed manner. To attempt to respond to every criticism would require just about our full and total attention. Furthermore, we would likely find ourselves chasing myths.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I want to commend the gentleman and the gentleman's committee for bringing this matter out and for the action which it has taken.

I think this is the only way that we can hope to get to the bottom of it and clear the Congress of the aspersions that have been cast.

I know that the gentleman and the gentleman's committee are doing a good job in bringing to rest these charges and bringing to account anyone who might be guilty as charged in this article.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this is my 25th year in Congress and represents a total of 45 years since I first became an elected State official. In those 45 years I have known a great many men and women who have been in the public service. It is my firm conviction that one will find a greater degree of honesty and decency among those who hold public office, whether it be in the Congress or whether it be in the State, than one will find in the ordinary walks of life. But I would like to point out that in the years I have been here alone; that is, the 25 years, I have seen, as many of the Members may recall, several Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle brought into Federal court, tried and convicted for alleged crimes that were far less felonious than those which have been charged in this article. It has always been my understanding that the responsibility of a good citizen is that any citizen who knows of any violation of law, any commission of a crime, he has the responsibility of giving information to the proper officials so that such violator may be prosecuted and sent to prison where he belongs. That has been done in the past. If there is any person in the Congress or out of the Congress engaged in public service anywhere who has violated a law and committed a crime, then he should be prosecuted and his name should be turned in, or the names of those individuals, and action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], on the position he has taken here today.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks and certainly agree with his conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, a great man said a long time ago that "no one can fool all the people all the time." The great former Speaker of this body, Sam Rayburn, often said that not very many bad men ever come to Congress at all, and a bad man would not stay here very long. During the course of his tenure both as a Member of Congress and as Speaker of the House of Representatives, he saw hundreds go and come.

It just does not happen. As to these matters to which the gentleman from Ohio has referred, the men either get caught and the few who are involved are punished, or the people back home retire them, and that is about it.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every responsible Member of the Congress should be concerned, not only with the vicious attack on Congress in "Parade" last Sunday, but with continued efforts of this kind to discredit the Congress and the President of the United States, and to destroy the confidence of the people in representative government.

There may, of course, be some abuses of congressional privileges, but an effort to smear and discredit every Member of Congress is a disservice to our country and the people.

We should most of all be concerned about the objective of these attacks. A few weeks ago I received a publication with a headline "Is Congress Obsolete?" No one can doubt the fear some groups have for representative government in this country. They fear the people and as a matter of philosophy have opposed all the great social advances made in this century through the democratic process.

There is nothing strange about these name-calling and smear campaigns and efforts to block essential legislation by creating suspicion and distrust of government. We have only to look back to pre-Hitler Germany where the same type of irresponsible attacks on representative government led not only to the end of freedom of the German people but to world conflict, death and destruction.

It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we took a good look at slanting, distortion of the news and the corruption that pollutes the bloodstream of news and information in our country. I do not blame the working press. For the most part they are a fine group of people. But I think we should look behind the few hired men who write these stories and see who is really responsible and what their interests and objectives really are.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to commend the gentleman and the Committee on House Administration, and then point out that in this allegation about office space, for example, it is not only a matter of record of the House from whom each Member rents the office space, if he does not have space in a Federal building, but he has to sign a lease and the lease has to be on file here. We have gone further than that. We publish every year a book telling exactly who gets the payments. The press does not even have to go down and look it up for themselves. It is there in book form. It seems to me that the Congress probably goes far in advance of any other branch of the Government to make available exactly how every dime that is spent, is spent. I do not know of any bureau downtown that, every time a person from that bureau travels, puts it in book form and gives it to the press.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. RHODES, and others, have put their finger on it, that either by design or by accident—and I doubt that it is by accident—there is an attempt to discredit the Congress in the eyes of the people. The people are unhappy now. We are living in a world in which nothing is really black or white any more as far as foreign affairs are concerned. I see that every day in the committee. People are unhappy. If a man lives with his wife for 25 years and everything is all right, he does not make the paper, at least the front page. If they have a silver anniversary celebration, he might make some inside page of the paper. But if he steps out of line just once, it is on the front page, it is a front-page story. That is, of course, sensationalism and that is all that they are seeking. I read in the paper about a nationally published magazine that is being sued for $10 million on an article they had published. The editor of the magazine says, Well, we are going to be sensational, we are going to stir them up. In effect, he said, we are not too concerned with whether what we print is true or not as long as it sells magazines. And this magazine, it is well known, is practically bankrupt, is losing money. I suppose if they can prop up their business for a time this way they think it will be good for them. But I do not think it will be good for the country.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman and his committee are to be commended for issuing the invitation that they issued to the author of the article. Last weekend when I was home, coming down the steps of the church which I attended, at least five or six people who had read the article that morning prior to coming to church said, "What gives with you Congressmen?"

Now I see in this morning's mail a number of letters obviously prompted by this article. One question: It made mention of a contract with Nationwide Foods and the Senate restaurant and a Federal subsidy involved. As I recall, at one time Nationwide Foods did operate one or two of the restaurants here on the Hill. Was that contract not terminated some time back?

Mr. BURLESON. The Nationwide Food Services have not had the contract since August 1961. The article says that your distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader of the other body, got some favoritism at a birthday party given by the contractors of this service. If such a thing ever occurred it would have been more than 2 years ago. As I understand this particular charge it was supposed to have been fairly recent. This among several others is discrepancy, as it is slanderous by innuendo.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman clarifying that for the record.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I think the chairman very properly clarified the situation, that he was inviting the author of this article and would not lend the dignity of a subpena for him to come before the committee. Is it proper to inquire of the chairman what his view is or what the innuendo is if the author of this article declines this invitation. Is there not to a certain extent established the fact that, perhaps, this is based on fiction and not on fact in the very fact that he does not accept the invitation?

Mr. BURLESON. I would conclude either that there was no fact or else that he did not respond to the call to exhibit good citizenship and responsibility to come before the committee and tell us what he may actually be able to prove.

Mr. AVERY. I would just like to make one further observation. I would hope the article would not hide behind the conventional adage that the press reserves the right not to divulge the source of their news. It would seem to me that that would be just a little thin and a bit irrelevant in this particular instance.

Mr. BURLESON. That is a factor in our not subpenaing him.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. With further reference to the question by the gentleman from Kansas, I note that the committee would not want to cast any aspersion on the writer of this article as he has cast in our direction. And as evidence of perfect good faith on our part we have, indeed, gone much further than simply inviting the gentleman to tell us what he knows. We have, indeed, asked the General Accounting Office to get the facts and figures if such can be found. If there is basis for investigation there can be further action and if there is no proof of any wrongdoing then the membership of the House will be vindicated in that respect.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House Administration Committee on being willing to take the initiative in eradicating any abuses which may have occurred, as reported recently in the press.

I believe that either this committee or some special committee on grievances should always be available to the public, so that taxpayers and others may lodge any complaint in order that the true facts can be found and appropriate action taken. When the truth is found to be contrary to the published articles on the subject then that also should be made widely known, for it is not in the public interest that published untruths about Government officials should go unchallenged. I would like to mention that there is now pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee a bill I have introduced to provide for similar enquiries on a Government-wide basis. This would establish a Commission on Ethics to do the job. I hope it will be approved.

ERRANT CONGRESSMEN

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, writing anonymously in the March 24 issue of Parade magazine, a Member of the Congress charges that at least 12 Members of the House of Representatives are guilty of petty graft, payroll padding, nepotism, kickbacks, embezzlement, and other shady practices that are considered morally, if not legally wrong. The author's amanuensis is Jack Anderson, the magazine's Washington correspondent.

Ordinarily no one pays any attention to an anonymous writer but when allegations like these appear in a responsible magazine they cannot be summarily dismissed.

From the standpoint of congressional ethics, the article was in bad taste. It was also shocking.

It was in bad taste for two reasons: It is somewhat beneath the dignity of a Congressman who has something important to say to hide behind the shabby curtain of anonymity; and if the allegations are true the place to make them known is not in the pages of a magazine but on the floor of Congress.

The article was also shocking because: the allegations place a severe strain upon the credulity; and if they are true it will be plain enough that we have Congressmen who are unfit to hold a public office.

The author states categorically that he can:

> Mention a dozen Congressmen who not only charge their oversea vacations to the taxpayers, but come back bronzed, fit, and showing a profit. They merely draw more money than they need and pocket the unspent balance. This money is handed over to them by our embassies. Except for lump-sum totals, no accounting is asked or given. I remember one colleague pulling out a fat roll of francs upon his return from Paris. He turned them in at the Idlewild exchange counter for a sheaf of $100 bills, which he regarded as a bonus for the hardships of visiting Paris.

This anonymous author tells us that the more "ingenious and unscrupulous Members of Congress" buy cars, radios, clothes, refrigerators, liquor, and TV sets simply by putting salesmen on the congressional payroll until they are paid for. He declares he can name Congressmen who pay their maids, handymen, and babysitters by putting them down for a Government salary.

These allegations should be taken gravely by the Congress. There are already signs that they will be. Chairman OMAR BURLESON of the House Administration Committee, of which I am a member, has said that newsman Jack Anderson, the amanuensis, will be invited to appear before the committee and reveal his sources. If Anderson declines to offer enlightenment, it is hoped that all other avenues of inquiry will be traversed until the truth is established.

There is little hope that the anonymous author will crawl out of hiding and offer assistance. In his article he sought to justify his anonymity, but his argument was not very convincing.

> If I were to sign my name to this article—

He wrote—

> I not only would be ostracized by my colleagues but I would never get another bill out of committee.

I believe the gentleman is somewhat exaggerating the moral turpitude of his colleagues for this can only mean that he believes he will suffer persecution for discharging a plain duty to the public.

But if he is still trembling with vague fears and alarms over persecution, I suggest this: If he can produce evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that his allegations are true, I am sure he will encounter no trouble finding a Congressman willing to lay his case before an avid Nation, leaving him free to keep himself warm in the ambuscades of anonymity.

MODERNIZING THE MINING LAWS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, early in this session I introduced a bill, H.R. 935, to modernize the mining laws of the

United States. The applicable act under which citizens of the United States and others who have declared their intention to become citizens may enter upon the open public lands of the United States to explore for, locate, and remove valuable mineral deposits and to occupy such lands in which mineral deposits are found is now nearly 100 years old.

Much good has been accomplished under the mining law of 1872. Its contributions to individual, community, and national welfare have been great. This has not been accomplished without attendant difficulty, however, and in crediting the contributions made possible by the 1872 act we dare not overlook the problems that have been created by our continuing insistence that a once-applicable philosophy of inexhaustible resources and sparse population should be projected into the 20th century. This has proven wrong in other resource areas, and there is plenty of evidence that it also is wrong in this instance.

My bill, H.R. 935, is based on information and supplementary material developed during the course of hearings on mining and related matters held over the last several years by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 935 has a dual purpose. First, it would protect the interest of legitimate prospectors and miners by establishing an orderly procedure for the exploration and discovery of mineral deposits and the patent of mining claims on public lands; second, it would protect the overall public interest in the public lands on which such mining activity is permitted by assuring that mining is conducted in a manner compatible with other multiple-use objectives of the public lands.

The need for modernization of the mining law of 1872 has been demonstrated repeatedly. Delay serves to worsen the situation and to make its solution more difficult and more costly. In its report on legislation that led to enactment of Public Law 167 of the 84th Congress, the House committee noted that:

> The Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the House and Senate have in the past several years been made increasingly aware of the abuses under the general mining laws by those persons who locate mining claims on lands for purposes other than that of legitimate mining activity.

The 1955 act prohibits all uses not reasonably incident to prospecting, mining, or processing operations on unpatented claims located after July 23, 1955. This law has resulted in an intensified program to eliminate use of mining claims for purposes inconsistent with mining purposes. This program, in effect, has served to illustrate the need for further and substantial reform.

The committee observed that:

> The ingenuity of American citizens which has made our Nation strong has also operated to develop new and better ways of abusing public land resources through obtaining color of title under the mining law.

Among the possible and practiced abuses under the provisions of the antiquated mining law, the committee cited the staking of mining claims in order to claim title to valuable stands of timber. The widely reported Al Sarena mining case in the Rouge River National Forest, Oreg., is a case in point. Al Sarena mines produced about $16,000 worth of gold, silver, and lead on its claims during the years 1935–43. Payroll reports filed with the Compensation Commission of the State of Oregon showed that the company paid out more than $47,000 during the same period. The total gross from mining operations would not be adequate to defray the cost of assessment work on 23 claims at $100 per claim per year over an 8-year period. Al Sarena did not extract much mineral from its claims, but it did cut and sell more than 2 million board feet of choice timber from the former national forest lands.

Mining claims have been staked in order to get land for such commercial enterprises as filling stations, curio and souvenir shops, cafes, and for residences and summer camps. The term "weekend miner" is widely recognized throughout the West to mean an individual or a group that has used the loopholes of the 1872 act in order to stake out claims and get personal and preferential use in outstanding recreation, scenic, and hunting and fishing areas. These are not rare or isolated instances, Mr. Speaker. There are many thousands of them, and they all were made possible because the 1872 act for many years has been clearly inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended.

The effect of all this has been to cause the heaping of abuse on the legitimate miner and on his industry and to obstruct the proper management of public lands open to mining activity. H.R. 935 seeks to remedy this.

No one knows how many mining claims have been staked on the public lands or where they are located. No record of claims was required prior to the 1955 enactment of Public Law 167. The best agency estimates show that there may be thousands of unpatented mining claims on the public lands. Unpatented mining claims are bought and sold on the open market in the public land States, and the holder or occupant of an unpatented mining claim need not be the original locator in order to be a bona fide occupant in good faith.

The 1872 act presently permits mining claims to run on indefinitely as a claim against the lands of the United States unless the Government takes action to invalidate each claim. It would cost millions of dollars to invalidate all the known mining claims either by publication or by contest proceedings.

H.R. 935 approaches this central problem by requiring that old mining claim locations be recorded along with a description of the minerals considered to be of value in the claim. This requirement holds promise of clearing thousands of mining claims made over the past 100 years that have been lost to antiquity except in the county recorder's office or in the files of the old mining district. The matter of identifying unpatented mining claims that are outstanding against the lands of the United States lies at the very heart of correcting the abuses and confusion that obstruct public lands management.

In addition, and as a means of assuring that mining claims are staked by persons actually interested in mining, H.R. 935 would require increased assessment work and report thereof. The valid claims would normally continue to have assessment work done and the invalid ones would be relinquished.

H.R. 935 would require application for patent within 10 years of location of a mining claim. Failure to make application for patent within that time limit would terminate the claim. Claims presently may go on for years and years with established rights under the law being maintained by little or no assessment work. The exorbitant cost of terminating these claims has prevented earlier action by the Federal Government. And as I said earlier, the situation is further compounded by the fact that these claims also pass in the private real estate market through quitclaim deeds and other ways.

The provision in H.R. 935 that would require termination of patent would eliminate such situations as necessitated the enactment last year of the Mining Claim Occupancy Act, Public Law 87-851. The purpose of that act is to give the Secretary of the Interior sufficient latitude when, in his determination that the public interest will not be injured, to permit persons who live on invalidated or relinquished mining claims for residential purposes, and who were in possession at least 7 years prior to July 23, 1962, to continue to reside in their homes. That act is clearly a relief measure designed to aid mainly otherwise unqualified people on whom a hardship would be visited were they to be required to move from their long-established homes on mining claims.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 935 seeks to correct a situation that every fairminded person will admit has long been in need of correction. This need has arisen because past Congresses have not approached the total problem, viewed it, and decided on a course of action that would protect both the interests of the legitimate miner and also the very profound and deeply entrenched interest of all the people of this country in their public lands. H.R. 935 forms the basis for that approach. It offers suggestions on all of the many involved and often complicated situations that are likely to develop and to be encountered. It covers situations ranging from the first exploration for a mineral to its discovery and ultimate patent of the claim and the removal of the minerals.

I do not claim that H.R. 935 offers all the answers or that it is perfect in every detail, Mr. Speaker. But I am claiming that it forms the basis for a necessary and thorough approach to the problem that already exists and has existed for many years. For that reason I am hopeful that a public hearing can be scheduled by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and that ample time can be provided for the full expressions of the views of members of the mining industry, people from all walks of life who have a legitimate and proper interest in the use and management of the public lands, and from the various land administering agencies charged with the responsibility of administering those lands in the overall national interest. Then, and only then, Mr. Speaker, can we develop a legislative recommendation that will overcome the very difficult and complicated situation in which we now find ourselves. The mining laws must be rephrased in terms of the needs of the last half of the 20th century.

An editorial, appearing in the Oregon Journal, and dated Thursday, December 13, 1962, comments with appropriate timeliness on this very vital challenge to public-land management. I ask that it be included in the Record as part of my remarks.

Special Privilege for Miners

The miner is a specially privileged man. He has rights which are not enjoyed by hikers or fishermen or loggers or cattlemen or any of the other interests who use the national forests and most other public lands.

This fact was brought out at the citizens' conference on high mountain policy, held this week at Timberline Lodge.

It is a startling exception to the principle of multiple use which now applies by law to the national forests. That principle means that the Forest Service is supposed to consider the various possible uses of its lands and decide which are the best for each particular tract. And it means that at times there have to be compromises among those who favor logging, recreation, grazing, wildlife management, or the preservation of water supplies.

But when it comes to prospecting and mining, there is no compromise. A man with a valid claim can carry on mining no matter how much damage his operations may cause to the other values in a forest.

This special privilege is based on the mining laws which sprang up spontaneously in the gold-rush camps more than a century ago. They were frozen into Federal law shortly after the Civil War, when few men could see clearly that there might not always be enough public land to satisfy every demand. And they have not been changed materially to this day, in spite of a few attempts to reform them.

Not even the national forest lands which have been set aside to be untouched wilderness are safe. For example, a man with a claim on the Chetko River in southwestern Oregon is preparing right now to dredge for gold well within the Kalmiopsis Wild Area.

Some fear that his operations will ruin fish spawning beds in the river, and others point out that roads are supposed to be excluded from wild and wilderness areas. But because of the provisions of the mining laws, the Forest Service cannot consider what harm he may cause to fish, and must even allow him to build a road into his claim.

The mining industry argues that national security, as well as its own prosperity, requires that the search for minerals should be allowed over as wide a range as possible. This argument has some merit, of course.

The trouble is, though, that the public's officials have no power now to decide whether a particular mining operation really is so valuable that it should be allowed to override other uses of the national forest. Virtually the only test the miner has to pass is to show that he probably can make a profit from his mine. The only way a man with a valid mining claim can be stopped is by getting Congress to pass a special law, and such laws are hard to obtain.

Mining certainly is a vital industry, but it is no more vital than raising cattle or timber, or guaranteeing fresh, clean water, or providing outdoor recreation to the people of our crowded cities. These interests all must meet the multiple-use test. Mining should be made to meet it too.

RING THE BELLS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 339 authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, as part of the observance of the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, to ring the bells of all churches and appropriate public and private buildings at such time and for such period on the Fourth of July as the President may designate.

This grand idea was suggested to me last year by Father George, pastor of St. Raphael's Church in Los Angeles. It might well serve to remind us of our constant need for vigilance to protect our liberty. My colleague, the Honorable Edward R. Roybal, has recently made a similar suggestion.

I cannot imagine a better way to commemorate the signing of the first document of freedom in our country than to have the bells across our great land ring out simultaneously to be heard by people in every farm, village, town, and city to remind us of our heritage of freedom and our courageous beginnings. Although the sound of these bells may not reach across the ocean, who knows but that their reverberations of liberty and peace may somehow be felt by all people, enslaved and free.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that the Committee on the Judiciary consider expeditiously and favorably report this resolution so that the President may issue a proclamation in time for our Independence Day celebration this year.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of the coming week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] is recognized for 3 hours.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic date for on this day, along with my distinguished colleagues from New England and the eastern seaboard, we will prove that the recent Interior Department decision on residual oil imports is contrary to our wishes and unsuitable to the economic health of the United States. In the course of our 3-hour discussion, we will prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that we have been seriously wronged and by reviewing the history of the import program demonstrate conclusively that our section of the country has been given the very short end of the political stick. New England and the east coast consumers have, for 5 years, been compelled to pay a strong tribute to the so-called depressed coal mining industry. This import quota on inexpensive crude and residual oil has raised prices, disrupted distribution of oil, and caused havoc with our economy in New England. This discriminatory practice has taken place because of the mistaken and naive belief that it will relieve unemployment in the coal mines. This is, I suggest, an improper application of one system of political thought against another more basic, more intrinsically accurate point of view. For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, since President Eisenhower unwisely gave his go-ahead to this import system, I have vigorously searched for the truth. I say here today, as I have said in the past, that the truth—the heart of the matter—is that we have been discriminated against in New England and on the eastern seaboard. Our fight against this system has been, for the most part, ignored. Before reviewing some of the past history of this issue, I would like to begin with a statement on February 13 of this year.

The President's Office of Emergency Planning, which had been studying the effect of residual oil on national security, said this:

> In light of the circumstances as I find them today, a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemisphere objectives.

The report, written by Edward A. McDermott at the direction of Mr. Kennedy, gave some encouragement, but only temporarily so. It seemed to me that the recommendation removed the primary barriers of the restrictions. These restrictions had been costing the New England economy $30 million a year in increased fuel costs since 1939 when residual oil was put under the mandatory import program. Back in 1959, it was claimed that national security was the reason for doing so. The McDermott report stated essentially this: National security is not at stake and controls can be relaxed. I, along with other members of the New England delegation, had urged this report, and it appeared for a moment that we were on the road to victory. It became apparent, however, that President Kennedy, who directed the report, did not feel that the report should contain anything substantive. Soon, however, another encouraging factor appeared on the horizon in the visit of President Bentancourt to this country. He was given the red carpet treatment by the White House and was told that every effort would be made to help the economy of Venezuela and that the oil import program would be reviewed carefully. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Venezuela exports 90 percent of their crude and residual oil to this country. This is the same oil that New England uses for heating public buildings, schools, hospitals, apartment houses, and for utilities. Its domestic production has been declining steadily in recent years. New England and the east coast must depend on foreign sources for its supply. After the Presidents' meeting here in Washington, it occurred to me that both the economies of New England and Venezuela could be strengthened by lifting the import restrictions.

I feel that the following telegram which I sent to the President when President Betancourt was here should be included at this point in the Record:

February 20, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

By dramatically lifting crude and residual oil restrictions you could impress President Betancourt with U.S. desire to assist him in combating communism in the Americas and vigorously aid New England economy at same time.

If these unnecessary controls were scrapped immediately the action would be consistent with national security and attainment of hemispheric objectives.

I fully support, with you, Mr. Betancourt's attempt to resist Castroism in Latin America.

The logic of my request is precise, Mr. President. By lifting these odious restrictions you will advance notably the great cause of Venezuela as well as our own economic growth.

Silvio O. Conte,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I was gratified a day later when I read the text of a joint statement by both Presidents to the effect that they had reviewed the oil situation and recognized that "the United States has been Venezuela's largest market," and stated that they were both confident that it would continue to be on an expanding scale. They concluded that "Venezuela's position in the U.S. petroleum market is, therefore, a matter of continuing concern" to both Governments, and that this position would be recognized in the "administration of the U.S. oil export program." The two leaders also agreed that there should be an exchange of information and views at a technical level with the goal of reaching "better trade agreements" between the two countries in that they would review "in advance such substantive changes in the oil export program that the United States might contemplate in the future."

These were very definite signs of agreement and at the time, Mr. Speaker, I was convinced that the deadline for the Department of Interior report would end the restrictions. Just a few days later, however, the President met with Mineworkers President Tony Boyle and "assured him" that the OEP recommendations would "not be made effective" until or unless further discussions were held with the Mineworkers. I was absolutely furious when I heard this and checked all over the city for confirmation. Mr. Boyle told my office that he had been quoted exactly and the White House press office refused to either confirm or deny the substance of what Mr. Kennedy told Mr. Boyle. This suggested that the President had completely given in to pressure from the coal industry and domestic oil producers for reasons which were not logically apparent and had no basis in fact. Now this same John F. Kennedy joined with me immediately in 1959 to protest these restrictions. As a new Republican in the House it was not an easy thing for me to question my own President. I was pleased to have the then junior Senator from Massachusetts join with me in appealing to the President. I now would like to enclose a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Eisenhower on September 8, 1959, which includes the signature of John F. Kennedy, now President of the United States, and then U.S. Senator:

September 8, 1959.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We, the undersigned, are deeply concerned over the restrictions you imposed last March on the importation of residual oils, and the effect this will have on the economy of Massachusetts.

As you know, residual oil is a scrap product of oil processing. In 1957, the amount of residual oil imported represented less than 5.1 percent of the total petroleum products used in the United States. Modern refinery design in the United States permits the distillation of many crudes so that there is no residual oil produced in the refining process. Refiners of domestic oil have not produced sufficient quantities of residual oil. Users of residual oil have been forced to import. As the demand for other more valuable petroleum products increases and the production of residual oil decreases, the use of imported residuals is necessary to fill the gap between domestic production and domestic demand.

The east coast uses more than 50 percent of the residual oil consumed in the United States, and of this amount more than 55 percent is imported. Restrictions would severely disrupt the use of fuel in Massachusetts and would affect industrial heating, shipping, and public utilities, as well as other phases of industrial activity. A reduction in the supply of residual oil would increase substantially the cost of power in Massachusetts.

This is critical in the entire northeastern area, which is already burdened by the high cost of fuel because of the great distance over which such fuel must be transported. The continued use of residual oil imports will aid and not impair national security, and the maintenance of a large tanker fleet is necessary for national defense. In addition, restrictions on importation of this product would threaten the ability of the electric industry to provide a reliable supply of electricity and would affect the price of electricity for a large number of users vital to the national security. Such a restriction is particularly onerous and discriminating to the very important northeastern section of this country.

Also, it would seem to us that the limitation of residual imports would tend to injure the friendly relations we are striving to maintain with Central and South American countries which are important to Western Hemisphere solidarity. For example, Venezuela is one of the large exports of residual oil in the northeastern ports in the United States.

It is our understanding, Mr. President, that the operation of these import controls is subject to continuing review by the appropriate Government departments, and that modifications are made from time to time as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

We respectfully urge your sympathetic consideration of this problem, and ask that residual oil be exempted from the mandatory import controls before the coming of fall and winter demands lead to a price increase in this type of fuel which is so vitally necessary to the economy of Massachusetts and New England and in the interest of national defense.

With every good wish, we are,

Sincerely yours,

Leverett Saltonstall, U.S. Senator; John F. Kennedy, U.S. Senator; John W. McCormack, Member of Congress; Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Member of Congress; Silvio O. Conte, Member of Congress; Harold D. Donohue, Member of Congress; William H. Bates, Member of Congress; Torbett H. Macdonald, Member of Congress; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Member of Congress; James A. Burke; Member of Congress; Philip J. Philbin, Member of Congress; Edith Nourse Rogers, Member of Congress; Thomas J. Lane, Member of Congress; Hastings Keith, Member of Congress; Laurence Curtis, Member of Congress; Edward P. Boland, Member of Congress.

The signatures, among others enclosed, as I mentioned, include John F. Kennedy and also the distinguished Speaker of the House and other Members from both parties. I am not stating here that the President is dutybound by a stand taken as U.S. Senator, but I must say here that I think the whole situation rather curious. I had hoped that he had, as President, reviewed the facts involved and in doing so considered the conditions today so critical that he would remove these restrictions and, therefore, alleviate the situation in New England.

Mr. Speaker, it grieves me to confess that those of us in this body who represent the consumers of New England have been led down the primrose path. As I have emphasized in remarks on this floor on many previous occasions, the New England States, and indeed all of the seaboard States up and down the Atlantic coast, have a vital interest in an adequate supply of residual fuel oil, a product which is widely used in institutional heating, and also under utility boilers to generate electricity.

I repeat, many of us who have attempted to represent the legitimate interests of New England fuel consumers were under the impression that this matter was receiving fair and impartial consideration at the White House in recent weeks. We were encouraged by the publication of a report by the President's own Executive Office—undoubtedly with White House blessing—which showed conclusively that there is no scintilla of justification for any restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, we had been encouraged to hope for a fair and nonpolitical resolution of this festering problem, a solution which would place the national security and the legitimate interests of east coast consumers ahead of the special interests of the coal industry, and the political interests of this administration.

We were led to understand that if we would just be good boys and hold our peace, everything would come out all right in the end. The import quotas on residual fuel oil, which the President argued against so persuasively when he was a Member of the other body, would be removed, perhaps gradually, and a free and open fuels market would be restored to the New England States.

Well, we all know what happened. The President bowed once again to the pressures of the coal barons, and continued the restrictive import quotas for another year. This means that New England consumers will continue to lay out millions of dollars annually for fuel and power in a cynical political payoff to the coal industry.

And since the deed was done, I have turned up some evidence which casts quite a different light on the nature of the impartial consideration which the White House staff was giving to the question of residual oil quotas during the weeks after the Executive Office report on heavy fuel oil was issued and before the Interior Department announced its new "liberal" quota.

I discovered that evidence right in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was in the form of a letter, a short note to a Member of the other body, a Member who represents one of the coal States.

I was surprised to see the letter there, and I imagine that the writer was surprised to see it there, too. I do not think he intended that it receive such wide distribution.

It is a short letter of three paragraphs, and I want to read through it, so that Members who represent the fuel-consuming States, rather than the fuel-producing States, may know where they stand with the White House these days.

The letter starts out:

> DEAR SENATOR: The time is approaching when the final decision of the President with respect to the future of the program of import controls on residual fuel oil will be made and announced.
>
> Your correspondence with the President, particularly your letters of February 13 and 28, together with your statements on the Senate floor with respect to this problem, have, I believe, made a substantial contribution to clarify the several issues involved.
>
> I feel sure that the President's final decision will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry that you have so ably delineated.

The letter is signed by Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant to the President.

There it is in black and white, Mr. Speaker. The President's final decision "will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry." No window dressing about the national security. No nonsense about wartime supplies. No political doubletalk about liberal trade policies. Just the vital interest of the coal industry.

What this letter asserts in black and white, over the signature of one of the closest associates and political advisers of our President, is that New England consumers and ratepayers are being mulcted of millions of dollars every year to pay off a political debt of this administration to the coal industry and the coal-producing States.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, what the Executive Office report said: The heavy fuel oil quotas are doing nothing to put coal miners back to work. If all imports of residual oil were to be cut off tomorrow, the coal industry would not hire one additional coal miner. They would just speed up their production schedules a bit, operate their machinery for a few more hours, and the needed coal would pour out. This is what the Government experts said. It is not what this New England Congressman says.

No, the truth is that the residual oil quota program is being operated for the benefit of the coal companies, not the coal miners.

Mr. Speaker, now that we have this testimony on the true motivations behind the administration's actions on heavy fuel oil imports, from an unimpeachable source, let us examine the nature of the quota.

Now of course the new quota appears on the surface to be a little bit bigger than the present quota, and Secretary of the Interior Udall played up the "liberalized" aspect of the program when the new quota was announced.

But, if the administration had wished to be fair about it, they would have admitted that the new quota, in the light of existing circumstances, is even tighter than the present quota, which reduced stocks of heavy fuel oil in New England during this past winter to dangerously low levels. The proof of this last fact lies in the action of the Interior Department granting an emergency increase in the quotas for the last 90 days of the quota year.

What you have to know in order to understand the deception behind the "liberalization" claim is the fact that New England stocks of heavy fuel oil, available for consumption, are currently at much lower levels than they were last year at this time, so that we enter the new quota year with much smaller on-hand supplies of this essential fuel.

The second thing you have to know is that domestic refiners are continuing to reduce their output of residual fuel oil, so that there will be less of the fuel available in the next 12 months from domestic sources than has been during the last 12 months.

And then you have to be aware that the Bureau of Mines has estimated that U.S. demand for heavy fuel oil will rise sharply during 1963–64, over the levels of the last 12 months.

When you put all of these facts together, Mr. Speaker, the lower stocks, the lower domestic production, the higher demand and the slightly higher quota, you immediately become aware of the prospects for a serious fuel shortage in the New England States next winter.

The actual truth is that the Interior Department, in arriving at the quota for the approaching year, used precisely the same formula that was employed in arriving at last year's formula—which proved to be so restrictive that it had to be adjusted in an emergency action by the Interior Department in the middle of the winter heating season. This so-called liberalized program, then, is actually the same old program, with the only change being an increase in the quota figure which is more apparent than real.

As a matter of fact, heavy fuel oil suppliers in the east coast area are already drawing down their quota for next year, in order to meet emergency needs for the current fuel oil import year. This is the actual fact. The inadequate quota for next year is already being used up in order to meet this year's needs.

Under the new regulations, an importer may apply during the last quarter of the qouta year for a higher allocation in order to meet the emergency needs of his customers. These regulations took effect immediately, and the stocks of residual oil along the eastern seaboard were so reduced as a result of the abnormally low temperatures this winter, that several importers have already approached the Interior Department and received permission to bring in more oil to supply urgent needs.

But, under the new regulations, emergency grants of this type have to be paid back by the importers out of their quotas for the first quarter of the ensuing year. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the residual oil quota for April, May, June, 1963, is already being used up before April has even arrived.

It occurs to me that it is highly appropriate that this "liberalized" quota of which the Interior Department boasts goes into effect on April Fool's Day, because when that day arrives, residual oil importers will know, even if the general public does not, that the supposed quota of 575,000 barrels of oil per day has already been shrunk in an effort to meet the emergency requirements of the previous winter.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his kindness in yielding at this point. I certainly wish to associate myself most strongly with those who are opposing the continued control of imports of residual fuel oil which is a great detriment to the people of my State who are so vitally affected through the price that they pay for public utility services. I associate myself with that attitude on the part of the able gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the following letter by Mr. E. A. Evans, managing director of the Oil Users Association of Miami, Fla., and also an information bulletin by Mr. Evans of February 20, 1963.

OIL USERS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., January 22, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Oil Users Association, an organization representing industry and electric utilities and whose members have plants in every State of the Union, views with alarm the continued pressure by the National Coal Policy Conference that you reduce the import quotas on residual oil.

The elimination of restrictions on residual oil imports was requested in a joint formal statement by the Oil Users Association, New England Council and American Public Power Association to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization filed July 21, 1961, and also in a rebuttal statement to the Office of Emergency Planning filed August 21, 1961. Both statements pointed out that import restrictions on residual oil as compared with crude oil are entirely different insofar as national security is concerned; that restrictions on residual oil imports are not in the best interests of national security, but do in fact have the opposite effect. Both presentations also pointed out, among other things, that artificially induced high prices have resulted from the restriction and, further, that the imports of residual oil are in no wise responsible for the depressing effects in the bituminous coal industry.

We would respectfully invite your attention to the fact that the artificially induced high prices on residual oil are still continuing. As a typical average example we have taken a single electric utility and a single industrial plant, both located in Florida. The electric utility has been forced to pass on to their consumers during the year 1962 an additional fuel cost of approximately $429,000 and their estimate for 1963 is three times this amount, approximately $1,400,000. In the case of the industrial plant, its costs increased approximately $500,000 during 1962, which must be absorbed by consumers as reflected in higher prices of finished products.

We would like to reiterate our feelings with reference to the situation as outlined in these formal presentations and, furthermore, to indicate that the entire elimination of restriction of residual oil imports would appear to be in line with your Alliance for Progress program and in accordance with the program outlined in the Trade Expansion Act.

Because of the facts that: (1) Importation of residual oil has no harmful effects on our national security; (2) importation of residual oil has not adversely affected the coal industry; (3) continued high prices of residual oil must be absorbed by the consumer; and (4) elimination of import restrictions on residual oil would be entirely consistent with your Alliance for Progress and reciprocal trade programs, we most urgently and sincerely request that restrictions on the importation of residual oil be eliminated.

Yours very truly,

E. A. EVANS.

INFORMATION BULLETIN, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

Under date of February 13, 1963, the Office of Emergency Planning issued a press release stating that: "A careful and meaningful relaxation of controls on imports of residual fuel oil to be used as a fuel was recommended today by Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President. Mr. McDermott stated that an extended study proved to his satisfaction that this decision is consistent with the national security and the attainment of Western hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

The next development is now up to President Kennedy and, since the present allocation period expires on March 31, a decision by the President prior to that date may be expected.

A copy of Mr. McDermott's "Memorandum for the President" is in our hands. It is lengthy, consisting of 47 pages. In order that you may have a short brief of the principal portions of the report, as well as some pertinent comments thereon, we submit this bulletin for your information.

COMMENTS IN GENERAL

1. While it is disappointing that complete elimination of import restriction on residual was not recommended at this time, we feel, nevertheless, that definite progress has been made.

2. While a careful and meaningful relaxation of residual controls could be helpful, it is felt that nothing short of complete elimination of such controls will solve the problem.

3. It appears that the general tone of the "Memorandum for the President" implies strongly that there should be a substantial relaxation of residual controls, not a token one.

4. We believe the progress we have made is principally contained in the following points:

(a) Only one governmental department suggested the retention of the present program; this was the Department of Interior and their support was mild.

(b) The memorandum clearly indicated the belief that national security requirements do not call for the restriction of imports on residual oil. We have held to this point consistently and the National Coal Policy Conference has strongly held to the opposite view. It should be noted that the only reason for the inclusion of restriction of residual imports in the original 1959 Presidential proclamation was that it was necessary from the standpoint of national security to include residual oil in the restriction program.

(c) The memorandum refutes the claim made by the National Coal Policy Conference that the importation of residual oil was responsible for the unemployment situation in the coal States. We have strongly contended that this was not true, but rather that mechanization of the coal mines, dieselization of the railroads and the shift of small users away from the use of coal were the reasons for their problems. The OEP memorandum strongly supports our viewpoint.

(d) The restriction on residual imports did, in fact, create an artificial price control with increased prices to consumers as the result.

(e) The entire tone of OEP's memorandum tends to indicate that the initial 1959 program probably never should have included residual oil and that the error should be gradually corrected by continued relaxations.

(f) Finally, while at the present time we have not obtained our goal—complete elimination of residual controls—nevertheless we can feel that we have been instrumental in bringing about a move that can reasonably expect to end in complete discontinuance of residual controls in the not too distant future.

QUOTES AND STATEMENTS FROM MEMORANDUM

The following are pertinent quotes from the "Memorandum for the President." They are taken out of context, however we have attempted in each case to be sure we held to the original thought contained in the entire quotation and are included because of their interest and their support of the above comments.

Department of State: "A number of friendly countries and allies have expressed skepticism of the national security justification on which our oil import program is based." Also, "It has been particularly difficult in the case of residual fuel oil to relate, with any effectiveness, the framework of our restrictions to clearly demonstrated national security needs."

Department of Defense: "We cannot see wherein residual fuel oil imports can seriously endanger the national security." The Department also referred to the impact of price increases and difficulties of obtaining domestic supplies of residual.

Department of Commerce: "The continuation of the residual fuel oil import quota plan as a method of increasing exploration, drilling, reserves and crude oil output appears rather tenuous." Also, "First, the program has increased the price of residual fuel oil and has had the tendency to increase the price of other energy fuels. Second, the program has resulted in 'spot shortages' of residual fuel oil resulting in considerable hardship."

Department of Justice: This Department reports its view that the present controls of residual imports are detrimental to existing and future competition, particularly in fuel oil marketing. The result has been, according to the Department, occasional shortage of supply and serious loss to marketers, compromising not only their present competitiveness but their ability to compete in the future.

Department of Labor: This Department stated they believed that the current program should be maintained and that consideration should be given to periodic adjustments in import levels to provide for the growing number of consumers of residual who are dependent on imports. Also, "At the same time, however, we do not believe that there should be further restrictions on the imports of residual fuel oil. The national interest requires a favorable attitude toward the continued receipt of residual fuel oil, particularly from such countries as Venezuela. These imports are required not only to maintain the economy of these exporting countries but also from the standpoint of the interests of consuming centers on the eastern seaboard."

They also stated that the unemployment problem of the coal miners has only in part been the result of reduced demand for coal. The principal contributor has been the 85-percent increase in output per production worker man-hour in the decade following 1949, a change accomplished largely through mechanization.

In the conclusions which finalize the memorandum, the following appears:

"Western hemispheric sources have predominated in the imports of residual fuel oil to the United States. Substantial reliance on this area for an important component of residual fuel oil needs contributes to the achievement of long-term hemispheric goals for the promotion of economic, political, and social progress. At the same time this use of those petroleum resources is compatible with national defense requirements, current and contemplated. Therefore, national policy should not inhibit the realization of the appropriate capacities for oil production, refining, storage, and transportation needed to assure the continuation of the present role of the Western Hemisphere as a source of imported residual fuel oil.

"An inevitable conclusion of this investigation is that the imposition of tighter residual fuel oil controls than those now in effect would be inconsistent with national security objectives. Such action would not contribute in any important degree to the security of fuels for the United States itself or in the broader context of its international security obligations. A more drastic import control program would impose serious economic, political, and social burdens within the Western Hemisphere where it is essential that progress be achieved. That the national security investigation reveals the Western Hemisphere as a suitable source for such imports would accentuate the unfortunate repercussions which would follow the imposition of tighter controls.

"In light of circumstances as I find them today, a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security. Such a relaxation should be designed to achieve the maximum reduction of the burden on the economy, given the import levels resulting from the easing of controls."

The war has not been won, however at the present writing it would appear that we may have won the first skirmish, perhaps even the first battle.

We will continue to work with the many individuals, organizations, and areas with whom we have coordinated all of our moves during the past 2 years, and who have our sincere appreciation for their cooperation which created the close harmony that exists between us. Special appreciation is also given to the many Members of Congress who have been most helpful, particularly the congressional delegations of Florida, New England, and New York.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of the able gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] and we are certainly proud to have him join with us in this fight.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this discussion of the residual fuel oil problem to make better known the impact upon the State of Florida of the present restrictive policy and, more specifically, the dire effects of the policy upon the economy of the Jacksonville area.

For a number of years before President Eisenhower established the control program, the free availability of fuel oil promoted industrial growth in Florida and encouraged the production of low-cost electricity to meet the consumer needs of my State's booming population.

Partly because of the ease of transporting residual fuel oil by ship to Florida's coastal cities, it took an artifically rigged market to make other fields competitive. Coal and gas are newcomers to Florida, as the Office of Emergency Planning pointed out in its February 13 report to the President. The President's restrictions on the free flow of fuel oil have resulted in higher costs for power of all kinds and in something of a shift to other fuels which are not so controlled.

Yet even in 1961, according to the Federal Power Commission, oil was still the primary source for the production of electric power in Florida, accounting for 43 percent of the total production, when measured in B.t.u. content. Many Florida industrial plants have found it too expensive to convert to other fuels and are captives of higher oil prices.

The higher cost of power is the chief problem for Floridians as a direct effect of the President's import program. Let me cite two examples. The Florida Power Corp. estimates that the import restrictions were responsible for about $429,000 in additional fuel costs in their operation in 1962 and that this year, 1963, the figure will be more than tripled, to about $1,400,000. These costs are being passed onto consumers of electric power.

To take another example, the single industrial plant of the St. Regis Paper Co., Jacksonville, had higher power costs of $500,000 in 1962 directly attributable to the import program. The company's officials decided that these costs would have to be absorbed by buyers of the firm's finished products and this thereby lessens the company's competitive position in the national market.

How does the President's fuel oil program drive up the costs of power in Florida? Let me explain, using the example of the municipally owned electric system in Jacksonville, my home city.

The Jacksonville Electric System is owned by the city and serves 145,000 customers in the northeastern section of Florida. This is not only an area of major industrial, commercial, and transportation importance, but is critical to the national defense effort. In the immediate area are the Jacksonville Naval Air Station, Cecil Field Naval Air Station, and Mayport Naval Station, a major carrier base, together with such support establishments as the Navy Fuel Depot, Naval Air and Fleet Reserve Training Centers, and other military installations.

Three power generating stations in the Jacksonville Electric System depend upon residual fuel oil and the demand for their output grows steadily. In 1961, the latest year for which I have complete statistics, the electric system consumed about 3,500,000 barrels of residual. This was an increase of 57.6 percent over a 5-year period. Three years from now, in 1966, the system will need at least 5 million barrels to meet the continuing requirements of the area.

Now, any action of the President which restricts residual fuel oil imports in the eastern seaboard creates there a short supply, raises prices, stimulates certain trade practices which amount to rationing, and discourages construction of additional generating and industrial capacity.

Domestically produced residual has never met the Florida demand either in quantity or in competitive prices. Our industries, therefore, are caught in the dilemma of relying upon high-priced but inadequate supplies of foreign and domestic residual oil or of converting their plants, at great cost, to be able to use high-priced supplies of other fuels. In some cases they can do neither and face extinction.

This is a major reason for my opposition to the continuation of the President's restrictive quota policy. I am joined in this position by the Florida Municipal Utilities Association—which consists of cities owning their own electric systems as well as rural electric cooperatives—by the Jacksonville Electric System, the Florida Power Corp., the Florida Power & Light Co., the Oil Users Association of Miami, the Florida REA Statewide Association, the Minute Maid Co., and many other industrial firms and municipalities which have expressed a position.

I do not believe there is a single consumer of power in Florida who supports the President on the residual oil problem.

Moreover, the entire Florida congressional delegation is united in its opposition.

The full use of residual oils from abroad would serve our international security interests by backing an ally, Venezuela, in helping itself to combat communism. It would also help us in the United States to retain and not deplete unnecessarily reserves we have at home which may be needed in time of war.

Whatever may have been the reasons for the restrictive policies in the last years of the past administration and the early years of the present one, I feel that the facts of today argue eloquently for an immediate abandonment of the artificial and detrimental restrictive import program. The President's own Office of Emergency Planning has also ably cited many other valid factors for a full liberalization of residual oil importation.

I hope the President will act promptly.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett], and we are glad to have him join us on this very important matter.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte].

It is becoming a frustrating exercise for New England Members to take the floor to ask for elimination of mandatory restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil. Still, we will continue to protest with all our might these unwise and unfair restrictions that cause New England consumers such hardship.

Perhaps our efforts up to this time have served a useful purpose, for through our diligent research and our collective voices, the erroneous claim that residual oil imports were responsible for a loss of jobs in coal mines, has been fairly well dispelled. And, too, it has been proven beyond all reasonable doubt that the American oil industry is in no way threatened by residual oil imports.

Every New Englander from the President on down can testify to the damaging effects of inflationary fuel oil costs in this area of the country as a direct result of these discriminatory restrictions.

The recent 9.6-percent increase in residual oil imports is encouraging only in the sense that it gives recognition to the validity of our arguments in the past, as well as the unbiased advice of the Office of Emergency Planning.

However, this small increase of about 50,000 barrels daily is not the "meaningful relaxation of controls" that Director of Emergency Planning McDermott termed in his report "consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

The U.S. coal and domestic oil producers who still labor under the misapprehension that residual fuel oil imports harm their industries should take a very careful look at the facts and consider the adverse effect their "protectionist" campaign is having on the northeastern States of the Atlantic seaboard. They should ponder well upon the great damage their activities are having on U.S. relations with Venezuela, and indirectly, with all Latin America.

Venezuelan President Betancourt made the position of his country unmistakably clear when he visited Washington a few weeks ago. The continuance of his pro-U.S. government in Venezuela depends upon expansion of residual oil imports by the United States from his country.

In summary, the record must show that:

First. Residual oil restrictions are harmful to our national security.

Second. They weaken the domestic economy rather than strengthen it and create great economic hardship to New England.

Third. They are harmful to the economies of our anti-Communist friends, and weaken economic and military ties with friends and allies.

It is difficult to understand in the face of these facts why the mistaken objections of special interests are not ignored and these restrictions eliminated.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the fine statement and the support of our colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in protesting the function of the quota system that presently is in effect for imports of residual oil.

It was on February 13, 1963, Mr. Speaker, that Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, recommended a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls on imports of residual fuel oil.

This recommendation was welcomed as encouraging news to those of us who have a great reliance on residual oil as a fuel.

For several years, I have urged not only that controls on residual oil imports be relaxed but that the quota system on such imports be eliminated entirely. Time and time again I have pointed out to the authorities that there is no good reason for this import control to be in effect, and that its only result is to boost the price on residual oil for those of Maine and the other New England States who use this oil as a fuel.

I want to mention that Director McDermott's recommendation for a relaxation of import controls on residual oil came forward as the result of an investigation that commenced in May of 1961. Under the law, the Director of Emergency Planning is required to maintain constant surveillance of imports of petroleum and its primary derivatives in respect of national security.

In addition, numerous petitions from industrial, consumer, and congressional sources had urged an examination of the merits of the import quota on residual oil.

The coal industry has very understandably been an opponent to the removal of the quota system for residual oil imports, feeling that this oil acted to replace coal for fuel purposes. It is interesting to note, however, that the Office of Emergency Planning found—as a result of its study—that any difficulties confronting the coal industry could not justifiably be charged to residual oil but, instead, to various patterns of change in fuel uses.

Those of us who had entertained high hopes for import relief had our hopes somewhat shaken when just the other week it was reported that President Kennedy, meeting in conference with Mr. Boyle of the United Mine Workers, had pledged to Mr. Boyle that no relaxation would be effected on import quotas for residual oil.

At that time I promptly telegraphed President Kennedy, urging that he reconsider any such pledge that he might have made to Mr. Boyle. I also urged the President to give serious attention to the recent recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning, which called for a relaxation of the quota system on residual oil imports.

Just a few weeks ago, it appeared to some that the administration was making an effort to relax these import restrictions. At that time it was announced that there would be an increase of 9.6 percent in residual oil imports.

However, upon closer examination, it was discovered that this adjustment would not increase the amount of residual oil available for fuel users; instead, this percentage increase just acted to take up the slack in our domestic production of this fuel. This slack, it should be noted, results from the fact that domestic refineries do not find it profitable to produce residual oil, and most of their efforts are spent in trying to increase the production of better grade oil at the expense of residual oil.

Essentially, then, the situation is the same as it was before, and New Englanders are still confronted with restricted supplies of residual oil as a result of the operation of the quota system. And it is reported in some quarters that this restrictive program is requiring New England residual oil consumers to pay just about 23 cents a barrel more than do consumers in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on March 9, I received a reply in response to a wire I had directed to the White House on this matter. In that communication it was stated as follows:

> We expect an announcement soon from the Department of the Interior on the level of residual oil imports for the coming year. Your telegram is being sent to the Secretary of the Interior for his information, and your comments will be considered in the final analysis which is being made of this entire problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to find anything encouraging to my interests in this statement. And I want to state for the record that I think a relaxation of the quota system on residual oil imports is long overdue.

It is difficult to see how this restrictive program contributes an iota to our national security. The program—as studies show—brings little, if any, help to the coal industry, and it appears to do little toward encouraging the development of new domestic oil sources.

About the only thing it accomplishes is higher prices for domestic residual fuel oil consumers, and it is difficult to perceive how this can be considered a positive accomplishment.

The quota system on residual oil imports should be abolished, and the quicker the better.

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL QUESTIONS LEGALITY OF PRESIDENT'S RESIDUAL OIL DECISION

BOSTON.—The New England Council has questioned the legality of the recent White House decision to maintain residual oil quotas and said the decision perpetuates a Government protected cartel.

In a joint statement, James S. Couzens, chairman of the council's fuel committee and Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president of the council, condemned the decision as contrary to the administration's own study done by the Office of Emergency Planning and called on the President to either directly regard or disregard the report.

The council statement said that section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, as amended by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, gives the President authority to establish residual oil quotas once a national security justification has been established; but in the absence of such a finding or determination he does not have legal authority to maintain it.

"In its February 13 report, the Office of Emergency Planning stated residual oil controls were not in the interest of national security, and that they have little to do with unemployment in the coal industry," said Mr. Caverly. "Accordingly there appears no valid economic or security reason for controls to continue and this would give rise as to whether the Trade Agreements Act is being violated."

"The announced 9.6-percent increase in residual oil imports will do little more than replace the domestic production decline," Mr. Couzens said, "and this still leaves strong enough supply demand pressures to require New England residual oil consumers to pay 23 cents a barrel more than in other countries such as Canada." Residual oil is used as heating fuel for apartment houses and large office buildings and it also affects the cost of many electric utilities.

"The residual oil import quotas let only enough oil into the country to meet demands and this keeps per barrel costs artificially high," said Mr. Couzens.

The statement also said the quota system "locked buyers and sellers together, thus eliminating competition—a situation that the Justice Department condemned in the O.E.P. report.

"The only reason for the President's decision to maintain residual oil import restrictions appears to be pressures put on the White House by misguided leaders of the coal industry," Caverly concluded.

The statement also said the council is not giving up its battle for removal of residual oil quota restrictions but is considering expanding its program to include removal of restrictions for the entire industry and not just residual oils.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, together with other remarks which have been approved for extension in the RECORD, and add to my own remarks a statement on the part of New England Council which is pertinent to this point, and which is a release of the New England Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the State of Maine who has been continually aware of this problem has assisted myself and other Members from New England who have been fighting since 1959 to have lifted this unfair restriction on the importation of crude oil.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and say that these residual oil import restrictions have been unnecessarily severe in the past, remain so at the present time, and it is now hoped that eventually the administration will give consideration to a lessening of these restrictions so they will not be so prohibitive on our free enterprise system in this country.

I wish to ask the gentleman a number of questions. First, What are the causes of the chronic unemployment in the U.S. coal industry?

Mr. CONTE. Primarily, technology. The average productivity per mineworker has risen steadily from about 6 tons per day in 1948 to 13 tons in 1960. Other factors are the loss of coal to natural gas in space heating and to diesel oil as a railroad fuel.

Mr. CRAMER. Recognizing that the imports restrictions work a hardship on all residual fuel oil marketers on the east coast are these restrictions at least equitably administered among all affected marketers?

Mr. CONTE. No. The existing regulations discriminate against most independent marketers by making them captives of one or two major company suppliers.

Mr. CRAMER. How is this done?

Mr. CONTE. The Government has decreed, in effect, that any marketer who in 1957—2 years before the restrictions went into effect—happened to have brought imported residual oil into the United States through another company instead of buying it directly offshore, is forever tied for that portion of his imports to that other company.

Mr. CRAMER. How should the imports regulations be changed pending their eventual complete elimination?

Mr. CONTE. They should be changed in such a way as to restore as far as possible, the previously existing relationship between buyers and sellers of this commodity. This should be done by revising current regulations and the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., is presently studying this problem. This would suitably distribute the import allocation among all marketers instead of concentrating two-thirds of the total in three companies as is now the case, thereby creating a monopoly cartel.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the imposition of restrictions on imports of residual oil by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has done more harm to industry in New England than any other act by a Chief Executive.

I want to express the gratitude of the people of my district to President John F. Kennedy who inherited this situation.

Action by the Kennedy administration on three different occasions has brought about relief of conditions as my good friend from Massachusetts knows.

Mr. CONTE. I know that this administration could help the economy in New England merely by repealing this mandatory restriction. This they have failed to do.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire residual oil consumers feel they are being unfairly treated by the Kennedy administration. They are being forced to pay 27 cents extra for a barrel of residual oil than foreign consumers pay.

What does this mean in dollars and cents to my fellow New Englanders?

New England uses 70 million barrels of residual a year, which means we pay an annual penalty of almost $20 million for a program that does no one good, and is harmful to the country.

President Kennedy has done absolutely nothing about wool imports. He might at least be consistent and adopt the same attitude about residual oil.

Under President Kennedy's policies, New England wool businesses are being ruined by foreign imports and at the same time New England consumers are paying a premium for residual oil. We are getting it coming and going.

KENNEDY CHANGES HIS SPOTS

When President Kennedy was a Senator from Massachusetts, he fought against residual oil quotas. In those days, he showed rightful concern for New England consumers. But that is all back in 1960.

During his campaign for the presidency, Mr. Kennedy made certain promises in the coal regions of West Virginia.

COAL NOT INVOLVED

Unemployment in West Virginia is of concern to all Americans. None of us can object to help for an important area of our country. However, there is absolutely no evidence to prove that residual oil restrictions will help West Virginia's economy. There is abundant proof that these restrictions are very costly to the New England consumer. So the President is hurting New England consumers without really helping his new-found friends in West Virginia.

Since becoming President, Mr. Kennedy appears to have forgotten the New England consumer.

Coal has increased its share of electric utilities consumption of energy, while residual oil has been reduced percentagewise. The residual import issue has been cynically promoted by the coal industry as an excuse for all its problems. Most of these problems are the result of its own lack of foresight.

ONLY $20 MILLION FOR R. & D.

For example, the coal industry spends less than $20 million a year in research and development. It has pressured the Kennedy administration into establishing a Coal Research and Development Agency within the Interior Department. The American taxpayer is paying for coal industry research and development instead of the coal corporations.

The budget for this Department of Interior coal operation has been doubled for next year.

The coal industry is spending millions through the National Coal Association and the National Coal Policy Conference Board in Washington to sell false propaganda. Throughout the world the coal industry is fighting not only for the status quo, but a turning back of the clock. Because of their unity they are temporarily winning this battle through various forms of controls and unfair taxation on competitive fuels.

The price the New England taxpayer is paying for a few New Frontier West Virginia votes is very high indeed.

According to the Congressional Quarterly magazine, some U.S. oil interests have joined the coal industry in favoring residual oil quotas. There is no convincing evidence that removal of residual oil restrictions would hurt American oil companies. All the evidence suggests the opposite.

SYMPATHY MAY WEAR THIN

American oil companies should carefully consider the facts before joining an embargo movement on New England progress. One of these facts that I hope they will pay particular attention to is: they traditionally look to intelligent Representatives of New England for assistance in their annual fight to maintain the 27½-percent depletion allowance. One of the main purposes of this allowance is to insure an abundance of petroleum products to benefit the American consumer. This allowance was never intended to act as a handmaiden of restrictions. Intelligent and thoughtful people in New England are sympathetic to the needs of the U.S. oil industry. However, when we find the oil industry combining with groups who want to unnecessarily raise the price of New England fuel, I think it is reasonable to point out that our sympathy may wear thin.

IMPORT QUOTAS NOT JUSTIFIED

Last year, the Interior Committee of the U.S. Senate held that import quotas were not justified and did not endanger national security. Further, the Office of Emergency Planning has said:

> The present controls of residual imports are detrimental to existing and future competition, particularly in fuel oil marketing.

The changes in import regulations, which become effective April 1, in no way solve New England's oil problem. We need to import about 130,000 barrels of residual a day. The administration increase of 50,000 will leave a gap of 80,000 barrels a day.

No program of just enough oil promotes competition. Competitive pricing is still impossible because of this 80,000-barrel gap.

In announcing the April 1 residual import regulation changes, the Interior Department made the questionable statement that the "program assures consumers of the opportunity of obtaining the fuel of their choice."

Before the quota program was put in effect, there were 10 independent heavy fuel oil marketers in the 6 New England States. As of today, there are only three.

BUREAUCRATIC REVIEW

In addition, the Oil Import Administration says that in order for a user to obtain an emergency allocation, the supplier must provide: First, disclosure of the customer's requirements; second, the efforts made by the customer to obtain residual supplies; third, the customer's ability to utilize alternative fuels and the availability of such fuels.

It is perfectly clear that before the prospective customer can decide on the fuel of his choice, his application has to undergo a time-wasting review by Washington bureaucrats.

We in New England do not want to be told what fuel to use. Nor do we want someone else to determine whether the price is right. We do not want this, and we are sure no other American wants it, either.

We want to decide for ourselves what fuel to burn, and we want to pay the free world market price for that fuel. Our competitors in Canada are buying the same residual fuel for less, with the obvious result that many of our jobs may be in jeopardy. Our homes, our hospitals, and our schools are forced to pay higher utility bills because of import restrictions.

Residual oil restrictions are unfair and unnecessary. They must go.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I want to compliment my colleague from New Hampshire on what I believe is his maiden speech.

Mr. Speaker, New England, which has no natural source of fuel, has suffered needlessly under the residual oil import control program, a program which has been shown to serve no greater purpose than to appease the coal-State bloc and certain small segments of the oil industry.

Two important considerations were originally advanced as the justification for this quota system—national security and protection of domestic fuel industries.

If the administration could have proved that the restrictions were essential to national security and could insure a healthy domestic coal or oil industry, by preventing severe industrial dislocations, then, I am confident, that no New England member would have challenged the right of the Federal Government to continue to curtail the flow of imported residual oil, even if it meant that New England consumers and New England industry would be penalized by higher fuel costs and fuel shortages.

The administration, however, failed to establish the need for this program from the outset and we, rightfully and through channels provided by law, called for an investigation. I am pleased to note that I was the Member of Congress who initiated the petition calling for this investigation.

On February 13, after some 2 years of study, the Office of Emergency Planning finally issued a memorandum for the President—based on this exhaustive study—recommending a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls. To those of us who had been urging a complete removal of controls, this recommendation was considered inadequate, but welcome nonetheless, if it would break the impasse and start a movement toward the ultimate abolishment of the burdensome quota system. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we have always been reasonable in our approach to this problem.

The administration's disregard of this study by its own agency, however, is probably good evidence of the fact that we have been too reasonable and too patient.

There is only one fair price for residual oil in New England, and that is the price that it can be shipped there in a free and competitive market—frée of the discriminatory restraints of the import control program. The unfairness of the current program has been harshly dramatized by the fact that—having suffered the economic hardships imposed by the program since 1959—it has been shown by an impartial report to have no justification under the two criteria set forth for inclusion of petroleum imports on the national security list, as provided by the Trade Agreements Extension Act and the subsequent Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The imports of residual oil cannot be shown to adversely affect national security requirements—to the contrary, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning concludes his report to the President with the statement that "a relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

The imports of residual oil cannot be shown to significantly affect labor conditions in coal producing regions—Director McDermott's report states that cutting residual fuel imports would be of only "marginal assistance" to the domestic coal mining industry.

To ignore the pleas of New England consumers, then, obviously is for other reasons than national security or the proper protection of domestic industries. I have previously said that such an action would have to be motivated, purely and simply, by political considerations.

Certainly, I do not know what other interpretation can be placed on the decision of the Interior Department when, 1 month after the OEP report—which drew on the advice of the entire executive branch—the Secretary announced a continuation of the control program with modifications so minor they can only be described as "meaningless."

The Interior Department's action did more than overlook Mr. McDermott's principal recommendation; it treated the entire Office of Emergency Planning as if it had never existed. The OEP report had gone well beyond recommending a "meaningful relaxation" of residual import controls. It had demolished, factually and logically, every argument—save one—for the continuance of the residual import control program. If facts were as powerful in the councils of this administration as they would have us believe, then the residual oil import control program would have collapsed like a tent without a centerpole on the issuance of the OEP report of February 13.

The one argument OEP failed to dispatch proved too potent to overcome with mere facts or logic or equity. Unfortunately for New England, it develops that a truly meaningful relaxation of residual oil import controls was politically inexpedient.

The campaign against residual imports is an excuse for not facing reality. It is a way around hard truths and painful solutions. It satisfies, apparently, the need for a scapegoat—a visible enemy whose picture can be tacked on the post office wall.

The coal industry and the coal unions have managed to convince a good many people in West Virginia and elsewhere that residual imports are responsible for much of the unemployment in mining regions. The fact is that a flat prohibition of all residual imports would not materially improve the unemployment situation in these areas. As the OEP has pointed out, the loss in coal's markets has been "essentially due to causes unrelated to residual."

Thus, between 1950 and 1961, consumption of coal as locomotive fuel virtually ceased due to dieselization of the railroads. Retail deliveries plummeted 67 percent. Use in steel mills declined 29 percent. Even internal use by the coal mines and sales to employees dropped 77 percent.

The only major gain for the coal industry during the decade was in the electric utility market—the precise market where coal and residual oil are in the most direct competition.

If residual oil imports have nothing to do with the decline in coal consumption, they have had even less to do with the drop in coal employment. The major, telling factor has been a phenomenal increase in productivity per worker. The average output per production worker man-hour rose 85 percent from 1949 to 1959, which was twice the average for the total private economy and three times the average for the nonfarm sector.

This productivity revolution in a mature industry was responsible for the 60 percent drop in employment.

I deeply sympathize with the plight of the unemployed mineworker. I understand the numbing effects of joblessness on the individual and on the people around him. And, I know what a high rate of unemployment in a major industry can do to the entire local economy—we have had the same kind of problems in New England and we have had to face facts.

But making residual oil the villian in this situation is a disservice to the unemployed miner as well as to the people of New England, on whom the cost burden of this quota program most directly falls. Miners have been led to believe that a large proportion of their industry's trouble would vanish if residual imports could be halted—this is a cruel and costly deception.

The truth is that in the 10-year period from 1951 to 1961, in the 18 Eastern States which comprise District I, the consumption of coal by electric utilities increased relative to residual fuel consumption, but both decreased in percentage terms relative to natural gas consumption.

Obviously, if residual fuel imports were stopped entirely, coal would not fill the entire gap. Furthermore, any boost given to coal employment would be temporary at best in view of the continuing rise in mining productivity and the continuing rate of improvement in coal utilization.

The administration fully understands these facts.

But even if there were some doubts about the OEP report, certainly this administration can understand the basic economic truth that you cannot successfully treat unemployment in one segment of the U.S. economy by placing inequitable burdens on another segment of the economy. This merely shifts the problem. It merely switches victims. In fact, to the extent that it adds uneconomically to the net cost of doing business in the United States, this kind of political tinkering adds to our overall economic problem instead of diminishing it.

The administration has chosen to ignore this fundamental economic truth.

The administration knows that this import restriction program is unfair to the 18 States of District I, and, as OEP Director McDermott clearly noted, without legal justification under the national security section of the Trade Expansion Act. But equity and the law have also been ignored.

I must conclude by saying that this is not my idea of how the business of the United States ought to be conducted. Facts and economic logic, fairness and propriety, ought to be the controlling factors in any administrative decision. When Congress enacted the Trade Expansion Act there were no provisions stating that these considerations could be ignored if it was deemed less risky or more expedient, politically, to do so. Congress assumed that the law would be administered fairly and in accordance with the carefully considered safeguards against economic inequities written into the law.

Political manipulation ends by undermining the very foundations of democratic government—this, to me, seems a heavy cost for any administration to pay for political expediency.

In this time of peril is our national security endangered by heavy fuel oil imports?

Mr. CONTE. No, for the following reasons:

First. Imported oil is merely supplementing, not supplanting, domestic production as publicly announced by Secretary Udall when the new residual fuel oil import regulations were adopted earlier this year.

Second. Caribbean production of this oil was the main source of energy for our naval vessels during World War II, and in any future national emergency these producing facilities would be recalled into action.

Third. On very short notice, refinery runs in domestic refineries could be changed in order to produce heavy fuel oil to replace imported products, thereby releasing Caribbean products for naval consumption in offshore fighting areas. This is what happened in World War II.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Do imports of heavy fuel oil endanger our international relations?

Mr. CONTE. No, for the following reasons:

First. The main source of imported heavy fuel oil is Venezuela. The dollars earned by her sales to the United States enable Venezuela to maintain an expanding economy, to lift the standard of living of an increasing number of her citizens, to embark on a healthy development of her social needs and economic infrastructure, and to thereby continue her fight, on our side, against communism and Castroism.

Second. The dollars earned by our friends overseas by their sales of heavy fuel oil to the United States of America is an important factor in strengthening and expanding the private enterprise system as well as world trade. All members of the free world benefit under the interflow of foreign exchange that these transactions generate—Venezuela alone spent in excess of $550 million in 1960 in the United States of America to purchase automobiles and trucks, manufactured goods and metals, and so forth.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Are imports of heavy fuel oil endangering our overall economic well-being?

Mr. CONTE. No, for the following reasons:

First. This product is in short supply in our country—domestic refineries produce insufficient amounts to satisfy domestic demand.

Second. The heavily populated and industrialized east coast area must have cheap energy, power and heat, and imported heavy fuel oil satisfied this need at fair and competitive prices.

Third. Imported heavy fuel oil is only marketed in areas adjacent to ocean terminals since only in these areas can it economically compete with other forms of energy. It supplants neither domestic production of the product nor any other domestic source of energy.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for that very well thought out and able presentation that he made here on the floor of the House today. I certainly welcome him as a member of the team, the team that is fighting for the poor consumer, so that the coal barons and the domestic oil producers will not be able to feather their nests any further.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues here today. I have in my hand here for immediate release as of yesterday an announcement made by the vice president of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., and officer in charge of manufacturing of the company's woolen and worsted division:

> After many months of painstaking appraisal and after exhausting all other alternatives, we have reluctantly reached the conclusion that we must discontinue operations at our Marland plant in Andover, Mass. Work now in process there will be run out and the plant will then be closed down. It is with the deepest regret that we have reached this decision as it affects the current employment of 453 people.
>
> This decision is unavoidable in view of the losses which the Marland plant has sustained over the last several years due to the disastrous effect of imports from low-wage countries. As an illustration, fabrics from Japan similar to those made in the Marland plant were offered freely in the domestic market at prices approximately 40 cents per yard under our actual cost.
>
> The losses of the Marland plant have occurred despite the fact that the machinery and equipment are thoroughly modern. Capital expenditures of $1,450,000 have been made in the Marland plant since the Korean crisis.
>
> The closing of the Marland plant with the resultant loss of textile employment is another example of the excessive burden of foreign imports on the American textile industry and its employees. This steadily increasing volume of imports of woolen products reached an all-time high during 1962, when imports were approximately 20 percent of domestic consumption. We, as well as others in the American woolen and worsted textile industry, have hoped for some time that positive action would be taken to correct these inequitable foreign trade problems. To date no such action has been taken.
>
> This action constitutes a further erosion of the textile industry's capability to supply the Armed Forces in the event of an all-out national emergency—for example, during World War II and the Korean crisis, the Marland plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets of our country's Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, the situation which is revealed there is very similar to that which was referred to by the gentleman from Maine when he pointed out that the cost of the residual fuel oil at the excessive price to our area is directly reflected in the manufacturing costs and puts us at a severe competitive disadvantage. There is a very distinct tie-in, and this is something which we feel in New England and which we not alone are going to pay the penalty for but many other sections of the country as well.

The J. P. Stevens Mill closing in Andover, Mass., is unfortunate. It need never have happened if the President had acted to protect the woolen industry. He has been asked to long ago. All that is needed is a Presidential Executive order under powers already given him by Congress. The woolen industry desperately needs such protection against the cheap labor foreign imports that flood this country. Why has not the President acted to help our New England industries? This is a fair question for those now losing their jobs because of it.

Some day, the Federal Government must realize that the United States of America is not run as a world charity. Homes and jobs and earnings for Americans are a first priority as against homes and jobs in foreign nations.

This most recent closing close at hand is one of the prices we are paying that started 16 years ago with excessive foreign aid handouts.

This I have protested against for 16 years. At long last I can now vote against it on the floor of Congress.

We in the New England area remember very well a letter which I now quote from written to Mr. Harry B. Hilts, secretary, Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc.:

> Dear Mr. Hilts: Thank you very much for your recent letter regarding the recently announced mandatory quotas which the administration is imposing on oil imports.
>
> I agree with you entirely that this is a completely unjustified, uneconomic, and short-sighted action which does no credit to either the economic judgment or political foresight of the administration. Of course, as a Senator from New England I feel this especially keenly, since we are already suffering consumer price increases as a result of this action.
>
> But quite beyond that this action cuts athwart our trade position, unnecessarily damages our relations in this hemisphere with Canada and Latin American nations, and does not contribute to the national defense and security.

Who wrote that letter? John F. Kennedy. It sounds good even with respect to Canada and Latin America. Perhaps the situation has changed and perhaps he does not feel the way he felt when he was a Senator from New England and a Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, all it takes is an Executive order to give us this relief. Mr. Speaker, we need this relief in New England. Prices are at an artificially high point and there is no reason why we in New England should be asked to pay more for residual oil in our area than cost warrants to subsidize the coal industry and the domestic oil industry in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Industrial Park Authority up in my State was headed for a long time by a man by the name of Jim Rogers. He operates an industry in Laconia. He wrote recently to me as follows:

> Like most of our national problems, there must be two sides to this question, but I am actively interested in the development of new industry in New Hampshire and I am also interested in the well-being of the industry with which I am connected in Laconia. I am told that heavy fuel oil delivered in Laconia is sold to us at a premium of $0.23 per barrel over the price quoted on the same oil taken out of bonded storage in international trade.
>
> I am sure you are well aware of the impact of this program on our industries and institutions and I am sure you will use your best efforts to improve the situation as the opportunity arises.

Then, we have had others like that from both Massachusetts and from my colleagues from various States in the New England area.

Mr. Speaker, I have reference to a letter along this line which I have received from the Wyandotte Worsted Co., of Rochester, N.H., from Thomas A. McEwen, who is the head agent of the Wyandotte Worsted Co. in New Hampshire. He says as follows:

> We are sure that you will readily recognize that this price inequality has an adverse effect on our operating costs and position in the competitive market. We, therefore, urge that these restrictions be entirely removed. These controls put an upward pressure on prices and thwart competition among sellers.

Mr. Speaker, we collectively work and seek this relief from this administration in the public interest. There is no reason why the President should not give it to us.

Mr. Speaker, a group of us wrote a protest down to the White House. I think all the Senators and Representatives from New England wrote a protest to the White House, and about a month later, on February 13, 1963, Mr. Edward A. McDermott wrote a 36-page answer, and in the 36-page answer he ended up with a final statement, and I quote it as follows:

> In light of circumstances as I find them today, a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security. Such a relaxation should be designed to achieve the maximum reduction of the burden on the economy, given the import levels resulting from the easing of controls.

Mr. Speaker, that last paragraph followed such paragraphs as those containing sentences like this:

> The possible effects of the modification or elimination of the present program on the place of Western Hemisphere residual fuel oil must be considered with utmost care.

And so on, mumbo-jumbo. I wrote to Mr. McDermott a reply which I am sure, although it was not circulated, would be joined in by all of the gentlemen not only from New England but all of us who feel so resentful of more and more jumbo out of Government agencies.

On February 18, 1963, I wrote Mr. McDermott, as follows:

> I have yours of February 13 just received in the matter of a memorandum for the President on the subject of residual fuel oil imports.
>
> With all due respect to the work that has obviously gone into the preparation of this memorandum, I must confess that I am unable to understand exactly what the memorandum recommends when it says there should be a "careful and meaningful release of controls on residual fuel oil to be used as a fuel." I don't see why under the circumstances as outlined in the memorandum with due regard to the interests in this neck of the woods that it would not be possible to recommend in plain English that controls on imports of residual fuel oil be ended once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, when a Senator from Massachusetts, petitioned President Eisenhower to do this. I should think now that as President he would take care of the serious New England problem, when all it requires of him is his Executive order. In my opinion the recommendation of the memorandum of February 13, 1963, is an equivocation and from my point of view an unsatisfactory and indefinite generality whereas some concrete objective action is genuinely needed.

I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that these things being said today will be heard by the administration and that New England and the areas that are so sorely affected by this whole picture of foreign competition and this whole picture of the failure to take Executive action, to give us relief in our hospitals and our industries and our communities, will get this relief from the President. All he has to do is to call in an assistant and say, "Take care of the situation." Mr. Udall put out a statement that they are going to change the quotas and allow 75,000 barrels a year more, 9.6 percent. That is no answer. That gives us no relief. Let us have the action that we need, the action that will relieve, the action that will give this very sorely beleaguered section of the country the relief for our industry that is reasonably warranted in the public interest.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and at this time I yield to my good friend, the former Governor of the State, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the others who have spoken this afternoon and to associate myself with the very able presentation of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and to join in the compliments to our new colleague from New Hampshire on his maiden speech. Let me point out that this is my maiden speech from this side of the well. Like my colleagues, I have received a number of communications from people in the great State of Vermont indicating the difficulties they are suffering from up there as a result of the shortage in residual oils and the cost of obtaining the oils which may be available.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the residual oil situation, may I briefly discuss the office of emergency planning report which was submitted to the President.

This study was undertaken by the OEP at the request of members of the New England congressional delegation, the New England Council, and other interested parties. A total of 105 individuals and organizations participated during the course of the study. They came from throughout the United States.

The OEP invited those concerned to submit briefs on the effects of residual oil quotas, and time was given for rebuttal from opposing factions.

To supplement this, the OEP obtained the views of the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

From this analysis came the McDermott report, which clearly shows that first, our fuel industry and specifically the coal industry can meet any potential emergency requirements without residual oil import controls; second, import controls of this fuel threaten our mutual security arrangements, especially in the Western Hemisphere.

These findings lead to the conclusion that residual oil import restrictions must be removed.

In spite of this, the President chooses to ignore this recommendation.

From the report itself the following quotes are taken:

Department of Defense:

> As residual fuel oil production continues to decline in Continental U.S. refineries, we feel that imports should make up the deficit which will have to be done in national emergencies. * * * We cannot see where residual fuel oil imports can seriously endanger our national security.

Department of Commerce:

> The continuation of the residual oil quota plan as a method of increasing exploration, drilling, reserves for crude oil output appears rather tenuous.

The General Services Administration, a consumer of 1.7 million barrels of heating oil and 872,000 tons of coal, annually, had this to say in the report:

> In summation we believe that our experience in procurement of residual fuel under the import oil program has restricted full and free competition in our procurements and has resulted in this agency, in the main, paying prices in excess of that which would have been obtained if there were no restrictions on the import of this product.

From the OEP report, page 18:

> The Department of Defense in writing us has also referred to the impact of price increases and of difficulty in obtaining domestic supplies of residual.

From the OEP report, page 30:

> I do not question the desirability to remedy the hardship in the coal region. Of course these measures should be continued. But I do not believe that the national security section of the Trade Expansion Act, can, under the showing of this investigation, be the medium for Government assistance.

The last quote shows clearly that the legal base for continuation of import quota restrictions is nonexistent.

Mr. Speaker, this report which comes from an Executive Office of the President effectively shows the urgent need for abolishment of residual oil quotas.

Mr. CONTE. I thank my distinguished colleague and former Governor of Vermont for his very able presentation, and for his continued interest in protecting the consumer rather than the coal and oil producers.

Mr. Speaker, bear in mind what the Executive order report said:

> The heavy fuel oil quotas are doing nothing to put coal miners back to work. Then you have to be aware that the Bureau of Mines has estimated that the U.S. demand for heavy fuel oil will rise sharply during 1963 and 1964 over the levels of the past 12 months.

When you put all these facts together, Mr. Speaker, the lower stocks, the lower domestic production, the higher demand and the slightly higher quota, you immediately become aware of the prospects for a very serious—and I repeat—very serious fuel shortage for New England next winter.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am very glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I first want to say I have enjoyed sitting here and listening to the people from New England presenting their side of the story. It has raised a question in my mind that leads me to wonder whether or not what I have read is correct.

First, I would like to ask my colleague whether or not John F. Kennedy is the President of the United States?

Mr. CONTE. I think that is quite obvious and does not warrant an answer.

Mr. SAYLOR. If John F. Kennedy is the President of the United States, is he the same John F. Kennedy who was a native son of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

Mr. CONTE. I believe that is fairly obvious also.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would not want a Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or those from New England and Florida who have joined with my colleague today to have go out on the wire press services of this country the impression that the President of the United States, a native of New England, would do anything that would harm the people of his own native Commonwealth. I think the very idea is almost preposterous to assume, and I would like to have the gentleman's comments with regard to that.

Mr. CONTE. As a great Democrat of the past, Al Smith, once said, "Let's look at the record." I think I have stated very clearly the facts that should be inserted in the RECORD. When he was a U.S. Senator, yes, he joined with me in petitioning President Eisenhower to remove the statutory restrictions on crude and residual oil. At that time he came to the conclusion, which I came to also, that the national security issue was a phony issue and, therefore, the restrictions should be removed.

But something happened, something happened between that time and now, and I think what happened is fairly obvious. The presidential election transpired. The President went to the coal mining areas of the gentleman's bailiwick and West Virginia, and made certain promises to the voters of that part of the country, and now he has to carry out those promises. I think that last week, around March 15, when Tony Boyle, the head of the United Mine Workers—and the papers carried a picture of the United Mine Workers talking with the President as he sat in his rocking chair, Tony Boyle a few feet away from President Kennedy—I think it is quite obvious that the meeting was designed to carry out some promises that he made in the campaign. But that does not help our situation in New England and on the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me comment, if my colleague will yield, on the visit of Mr. Boyle to the President of the United States. It is a well-known fact that Mr. Boyle is the newly elected president of the United Mine Workers of America. As such, having just assumed that position, one of the duties one of the obligations of an officer who occupies position of president of a great national labor organization, should be to call upon the President of the United States. He did the same thing which his predecessors, John L. Lewis and Mr. Thomas Kennedy did when they were president of the United Mine Workers. They called on the then President of the United States, President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and now President Kennedy. So I find nothing wrong with Mr. Boyle's going down there.

Mr. CONTE. I want to agree with the gentleman, and neither do I want to imply that there is anything wrong with Tony Boyle's visiting the President. I do, however, take issue with Tony Boyle's statement after leaving the White House, saying that he was "assured" by President Kennedy that he would not carry out the order of the Office of Emergency Planning in regard to liberalizing the restrictions on crude and residual oil.

Mr. SAYLOR. And I think it is a fact that after the visit of Mr. Boyle the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior did liberalize the quotas on residual oil.

Mr. CONTE. Well, that may be the gentleman's interpretation. I think the word they used—"liberalization"—was wrong. The Department of the Interior used that, and the President also used it. In a couple of days we are going to be celebrating April Fools Day. The Secretary of the Interior and the President may have moved up that day a few weeks because certainly they are not fooling anyone. This slight liberalization they gave us, if you want to call it that, cannot amount to a drop in the bucket. We had a cold winter in New England. The domestic producers' production declined, so we got nothing at all.

This is a question of supply and demand. When the supply is not there and the demand is there they boost the price of the fuel oil for New England and the Atlantic seaboard. I am out to protect the consumer, and I am not worried about feathering the nest of some coal barons and some domestic oil producers.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me carry this further.

I was interested in the comments of some of our colleagues from New Hampshire, for instance Mr. WYMAN. Mr. WYMAN explained that the President had done nothing to protect the wool industry of New Hampshire. I have heard Members from New England come down here in the well of the House, those on both sides of the aisle, and complain of the damage that was being done through the importation of woolen goods, through the importation of textiles from Japan, and through the importation of shoes from Czechoslovakia. Now I have heard one which I think is almost tops. They now say that the oil is being sold in Canada at a lower rate than it is in this country.

Does the gentleman realize that Canadian gas comes into this country without any restrictions whatsoever? And it has made quite an impact on the fuel markets in many sections of the country. In turn, when the domestic producers of this country of coal and of oil desire to ship their products to Canada they are faced with embargoes and quotas so that our people cannot ship to this great country to the north of us, Canada.

Mr. CONTE. I think the gentleman should take this up with the President, the Department of Commerce, or the new agency created under the Trade Expansion Act. I for one voted with the President in favor of his Trade Expansion Act. That is the crux of my argument.

Here we are in New England making a finished product. This is a highly industrial area of the United States. We have foreign competition from Japan, Germany, Italy, England, and France because of our liberalized trade laws. At the same time the squeeze is put on the same industrialists who have to compete with foreign imports. At the same time, the raw material needed to produce these finished products becomes prohibitive because of restrictions such as this.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman's statement does not agree with some of our colleagues who joined with him in support of his argument.

Mr. CONTE. I stand on my own statement.

May I point out that I would be the last one in the world to take this floor and do anything to harm the coal miners. I sympathize with them, my heart pains for them and certainly I can well appreciate their problems. But, as I said a few minutes ago, if we were to allow all of the residual oil from Venezuela to come into this country without restriction, it would not put back more than a small percentage of mineworkers, so small that it would not amount to anything.

Let me read a letter from E. A. Evans, managing director, Oil Users Association, together with an advertisement of the National Coal Policy Conference, regarding coal and residual oil:

OIL USERS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., August 31, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On August 21, 1962, there appeared in the Washington Post a full page advertisement of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Oil Users Association, whose members consist of organizations such as manufacturing industries and utilities that use large amounts of energy producing fuels, take strong issue with the statements contained in this advertisement.

The statements of the National Coal Policy Conference, in reference to their claim that coal miners of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio could be put to work right now by stopping all imports of residual oil, is clearly misleading and does not follow the facts as pointed out in our formal presentation of July 1, 1961, to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Residual oil has long been in short supply in this country and the imports of this product over the years has had very little, if any, effect on the employment of miners in the coal States. That this is true can best be pointed out by the three principal factors which have been responsible for such unemployment.

First. The mechanization of the coal industry, as shown by the data provided by the coal industry itself in "Bituminous Coal Data, 1960." In 1950 the bituminous coal industry employed 415,582 men and produced 516,311,000 tons of coal. The output per man-day was 6.77 tons. Ten years later the industry employed 159,100 men and produced 413 million tons at a productivity rate of 13.25 tons per man-day. In the 10-year period over a quarter of a million men have left the industry, yet the output of those that have remained has doubled. During the same 10-year period the use of residual oil in the United States remained relatively constant; 554 million barrels in 1950 and 556 million barrels in 1960.

Second. The railroads have caused a tremendous decline in the demand for coal. They used 114 million tons of coal in 1947 and they have now switched almost completely to diesel fuel and today use only about 2 million tons of coal per year. This is a loss in volume of approximately 112 million tons per year, or nearly half the total decline in coal demands since 1947.

Third. Millions of families throughout the country stopped shoveling coal into basement furnaces and installed oil burners or gas burners in their homes. In 1947 the figure for retail coal deliveries was 137 million tons; in 1960 the figure was 29 million tons, a loss of 108 million tons per year.

It is of interest to note that the National Coal Policy Conference chose to completely ignore all of these facts in attempting to present their case and it is also of interest that in addition to ignoring them, they chose not to base their case on whether or not the present import program is or is not in the best interest of national security—the only reason why imports of residual oils should or should not have their imports restricted.

Again, as we have clearly outlined in our reports to OCDM and OEP, a reduction in residual oil imports is not in the best interest of national security but do, in fact, have the opposite effect. We have the greatest confidence in the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and feel that at the proper time his report will be submitted to you with recommendations which will be fairly made. All of the inequities created and the increased costs suffered by the public, because of import restrictions on residual fuel oil, continue to exist in ever increasing quantities and we, therefore, urge that the question of the possibility of entirely removing import restrictions on residual fuel oil be considered by you as soon as conveniently possible.

Yours very truly,
E. A. EVANS,
Managing Director.

AMERICANS NEED JOBS, NOT A DOLE, MR. PRESIDENT

President KENNEDY: We must end unemployment and move the economy ahead, as you said in your recent television address on the state of the Nation's economy.

But a dole and a handout of surplus food are not the answer.

Only jobs will solve America's economic problems.

Extended unemployment compensation, aid to children of the unemployed, job retraining, work camps for unemployed youth * * * all of these things are fine and what you have done to ease the hardship of America's unfortunate unemployed families is commendable. But they are only stop-gap measures.

You say that employment and income are rising nationally and that other economic indicators do not warrant the conclusion that we are entering a new recession.

Unfortunately, this is not true of coal communities. Unemployment in some coal communities is not 5 or 6 percent—like the national average—but as high as 35 or 40 percent.

Our people want jobs.

You can help put them to work—right now—in the coal fields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois and Ohio * * * pockets of persistent unemployment and economic distress * * * in which, as you said in your TV address, coal miners can no longer find jobs to support their families.

How can you create the jobs our people want and need?

By using the powers of your office to stem the flood of foreign residual fuel oil imports. * * *

This imported waste product of foreign refining operations is taking jobs away from American coal miners in those very pockets of distress where the Government has been forced to undertake expensive temporary remedial action. If you cut back the amount of residual oil which can now be imported, and limit imports in the future, many of the unemployed miners will again find work and become self-supporting. No longer will their families be subjected to the degrading experience of living on Government handouts. They will again become taxpayers * * * good customers of the local merchant.

The coal industry is the key to economic recovery in many of the Nation's pockets of unemployment. * * *

But the coal industry cannot expand production and employment * * * it cannot put these unemployed miners back to work at productive jobs * * * as long as imported waste residual oil is permitted to take over coal markets.

The power to end this threat to economic expansion * * * to expanded employment * * * to economic vigor and growth in widespread areas of the Nation * * * rests with you, Mr. President.

We respectfully urge you to act today.

(This message is published by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in behalf of the following State committees working for the economic recovery of the bituminous coal industry: the Illinois State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Indiana State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Kentucky State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Maryland State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Ohio State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Pennsylvania State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Tennessee State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Virginia State Committee, of the National Coal Policy Conference, the West Virginia State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.)

So, the only thing you are doing here—and when I say "you" I mean the coal industry and the domestic oil producer industry—is to force the price of coal and residual oil to go up. You are both going to lose out in the long run, because people will convert to natural gas. You know as well as I do that it is economically unfeasible to transport coal from West Virginia or Pennsylvania out to Massachusetts or Connecticut or Vermont or Maine. The freight cost alone would be enough to prohibit the use of this fuel, and people will move into natural gas, and the coal industry and the residual oil people, the domestic oil producer, will both lose out in the long run.

Mr. SAYLOR. Now, if the gentleman will yield, because I knew he would get to this statement sooner or later, and I just wondered how long it would take me to draw these people from New England out and to show the basic fallacy of their whole argument: We have heard of how residual oil has gone up in price and we have heard how the coal industry has been mechanized. This we are proud of, and the entire argument has come down to this: The coal miner that works today produces more coal than any other miner in any country on the face of the earth, because these people that you call coal barons have been farsighted enough and willing enough to install the kind of machinery that will produce more coal per man per day than any other country in the world, and the coal operators are able today to deliver and are delivering, despite the increased cost of equipment, despite the increased cost of labor, despite every other factor that you can point out, at the pit mouth coal today a ton of coal at a lower cost than they did in 1950.

Mr. CONTE. Even at that, the use of residual oil in New England and the eastern seaboard States is cheaper—the price is cheaper—than coal. We also have many of these industries which have converted from coal to oil. How are you going to get them to reconvert back to coal? Oil is clean; it is not cumbersome like coal. You do not have to have the great big piles of coal outside your yard. In the home, oil is much cleaner. The little housewife does not have to go downstairs and shovel that coal in the pail and drag it upstairs and put it into the furnace or stove, or anything like that. You are not going to get these people to convert back to coal. So you might as well forget about it.

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield further, no one is talking about the housewife. But you cannot use residual oil in your home consumption. This is the basic policy of the people from New England, and the people up there believe if they get a lower price on residual oil, the cost of the oil which they use in their homes will be reduced. It is not used in the homes.

Mr. CONTE. No; but it is used in apartment houses, hospitals, schools, and factories.

I want to say this in behalf of the coal people: If the coal people are in trouble, assuming that they are, I doubt whether the coal producers are in trouble. It is the poor miners who are in trouble here. If the concerned parties face up to the facts such as the railroads are about to do, let them come into the Congress and ask for a subsidy. Do not subsidize coal now at the expense of New England and the eastern seaboard. We cannot afford it. Our backs are against the wall. It is difficult as it is, as I noted in my statement, to meet foreign competition in finished products. Many of our industries have left. The goods industries—the cottons, the woolens, and the leathers—left many years ago for cheaper labor markets down south.

Mr. Speaker, my people are desperate, and let us not hurt them any more with this foolish mandatory restriction on crude and residual oil. This is one of the most unwise things I have ever seen any President do.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say to my colleague from New England that for every person he finds in New England who is hurting as a result of the President's policy, my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and I from Pennsylvania can cite 10 persons in our States for every 1 in New England. The plight of the unemployed miners in West Virginia and Pennsylvania far exceeds the injustice to which the gentleman is pointing in his area.

Mr. CONTE. I think I have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that if all of the residual oil were to come into this country without any restriction whatsoever it would not put miners back to work.

Mr. SAYLOR. That I challenge.

Mr. Speaker, the generosity of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] in permitting me the floor at this time is deeply appreciated. I am especially gratified to have an opportunity to review the problem with the distinguished gentlemen who are speaking to the subject of residual oil imports, because past performances have indicated that the New England delegation would prefer to limit discussion to their own membership.

As a matter of fact, many of us have come to believe that the New England delegation wants to handle foreign trade problems strictly on geographical lines. In order to clarify this matter that has been developed by my colleagues over the past several years, I hope that the gentlemen who have participated in this debate will be good enough to ponder some of the questions which I should like to put to them at this time.

I have heard it said that there has developed a feeling that protection against imported commodities should be an exclusive inheritance for New England States. Their treatment of the subject under discussion today has been particularly responsible for the growing acceptance of this idea.

Now, so far as I am able to understand its position, New England wants protection for products of its industries but does not want the same consideration afforded to other areas. New England Members of this legislative body have stood on this floor asking for tariffs on brass mill products, rubber products, footware, watches, bicycles, textiles, fish, military rifles, and just about every other item produced in your great factories or your rustic little shops. You understandably want protection against the products of foreign countries that are responsible for creating unemployment in your constituencies and your States.

It is not understandable, however, why you are not willing to afford the same treatment to other Americans. The helter-shelter program which you recommend is obviously unfair and unjustified. To put an umbrella over one region exclusively while exposing the rest of the Nation to the damaging effects of a torrent of imports is not in keeping with this Nation's concept of equitable treatment for all.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Members of the New England delegation participating in this colloquy this afternoon to explain the basis for their subscribing to a policy of free entry of residual oil while demanding and expecting rigid barriers against foreign competiton for products native to their region. Or has there been a sudden change in their philosophy on international trade? Do they now approve of reduction or discontinuance of tariffs and duties on those commodities which they have heretofore sought to exclude or restrict?

Congress needs to know the answers to these questions. Since the residual oil import control program as administered by the present administration is little more than a sham and has at no time been adjusted to benefit affected coal producing regions, I am led to suspect that these periodical performances in opposition to the program are part of a sustained campaign to lead the general public into believing that the so-called restrictions on foreign oil are in fact of some assistance to the American coal industry. Whatever the case, the New England delegation is not relieved of the responsibility of explaining its clamor for a double standard with respect to quotas and tariffs.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I shall be glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I have not had the benefit of the gentleman's complete statement. But I am well aware of the intense desire that the gentleman has to protect the interests of the people he represents, and particularly the gentleman's intense belief that more residual oil has to come into the country if they are going to be able to compete in other areas. But the gentleman raises this premise on the basis that if no more residual oil comes in, or if the residual fuel oil that is coming in is not going to put any miners back to work, I think, perhaps, that is true.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] availed himself of our hearings before the Special Committee on Oil Imports of the Small Business Committee last year where testimony was given which perhaps would support the fact that the gentleman has stated here today; that is, if you were to stop residual fuel oil, that you have converted your fuel requirements up there in such a way that you cannot reconvert them back to coal; that if you could reconvert them, only 3 percent of the industries would go back to burning coal. I think that is what you base the premise upon which you have just stated. But what we in the coal industry are talking about, and what the miners are talking about, is a further erosion of the markets we have. This is what the ever-increasing arguments on residuel fuel oils do. It does not mean that this program as it is now developed, if it were turned back, that your people would go back to burning coal. I wish you would. But I am well aware from the facts developed before our subcommittee that you have so changed your standards of energy requirements up there that you could not aid the miners. However, what we are talking about is that every barrel that comes in writes an additional unemployment check for a coal miner. I know that the gentleman has expressed his desire today not to hurt a coal miner as such. But I would respectfully disagree with the gentleman that we even have a mandatory import oil restriction program today. Again I say, and the gentleman is very kind to permit me to make this statement on his time, that without question to say that we have a mandatory oil import program that prevents residual fuel oil from coming into this country is not a fact at all. Would the gentleman care to inquire of me why I feel that way?

Mr. CONTE. No. I want to comment on the gentleman's statement. I think he will find if he searches the record that since the mandatory restriction on crude and residual oil went into effect in 1959 the consumption of coal has not increased in New England or in the eastern seaboard States.

Mr. MOORE. That would be true.

Mr. CONTE. Ninety percent of all the residual oil that came in from Venezuela was used in that area of the country.

Mr. MOORE. That is right.

Mr. CONTE. Therefore, we are not deteriorating any future markets that the gentleman might have in mind.

Mr. MOORE. I would say at that point that at the present time your fuel requirements will be met about 71 percent of the time by residual fuel oil.

Mr. CONTE. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. So that 29 percent of that market remains. If we were to follow your thought with respect to this, which is very sincerely presented here today, that your people are entitled to 100-percent conversion to residual fuel oil, and we followed that to its end result, and that was the position you took, then coal has a necessary part in supplying 29 percent of the energy needs of that area.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman discounts the fact that out of the 29 percent that he referred to, much of it has converted over to natural gas. This is my argument. By having this restriction on residual oil, the supply is cut down. The demand is there. After the very severe winter that we had this year in New England, the demand was greater than any period I can recall. The demand was greater the last year and the year before but the supply was not. So what happened? The price of residual oil went up and the price of coal went up accordingly. What happened was this. When the price of residual oil went up and the price of coal went up—that is, bituminous coal—many people began converting to natural gas. As I said to my good friend from Pennsylvania, both the domestic residual oil producer and the coal producer, if they maintain this position, are going to be the losers in the long run. What is going to happen in New England is that more and more industries, more and more apartment houses, more and more hospitals, more and more schools, will convert to natural gas.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. CONTE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MOORE. On this one point you have so constructed your energy requirements in the New England States that you cannot even reconvert back to natural gas unless at tremendous expense; you cannot even reconvert back to wood without tremendous expense. So the question of reconversion to a more favorable energy source such as gas will mean that you have the same expense, the same problems that exist today.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with the gentleman on that statement. If you convert to natural gas from coal or residual fuel oil, you do not have the same expense. For one thing, you do not have the storage facilities to contend with that you do have with coal.

Mr. MOORE. That would be true.

Mr. CONTE. These people who have converted over from residual oil had to build up their yards, have had to put structures in their yards, and it is a physical impossibility for these people to do otherwise. They must convert to natural gas.

Mr. MOORE. That may be. Let us say that they do. The fact is you have created a situation, the people in New England have created this situation. They have put all their eggs in one basket, and that is residual fuel oil. I am quick to admit they have a good and sound and a vocal spokesman in behalf of that theory of all eggs in one basket.

Now what we are trying to do in the coal industry very basically is to preserve that area. I said in the hearing and I am very frank to say that my coal people, perhaps, did not like the observation I made, that we do not want any of that 73 percent. Someone may be quick to say to me, yes we want it. But my theory is that we do not want it. Leave our market areas alone today because our situation is so severe. Let me pick out, if I may, one point which the gentleman mentioned about prices. The gentleman knows far better than I do that the oil people, those who supply the residual oil were well aware of the fact that the Department of the Interior was engaging in a little game of arithmetic again and that the decision on the amount of barrels of residual fuel oil, whether it would be upgraded or not, was about to be declared and whether or not a national policy of doing away with the mandatory import program was going to be continued or whether a meaningful relaxation was going to take place; or whether or not a firm, mandatory program would be in effect. So, naturally, that has to occur. If I were in the business, I assume I would do this.

But I say to you, a very close personal friend of mine, that the oil people, and I will not call them oil barons, but the oil people in this instance have created the demand and they have created the scarcity of the fuel even though they were given the opportunity by reason of the severe winter conditions that existed in order that the pressure would be brought to bear upon the oil administrator and the Secretary of the Interior to get in a little better shape the amount of the residual fuel oil.

Mr. CONTE. I do not know where the gentleman received that information. Certainly, I do not have it available to me. I certainly would like to get it.

Mr. MOORE. Can I give it to you?

Mr. CONTE. As I stated, our quota did not increase very much over the last year. It was a very small percentage of increase and I can vouch that this has been one of the toughest winters and one of the coldest winters we have ever had in New England.

Mr. MOORE. I think that is true.

Mr. CONTE. There was a great deal of this oil, but we could not get it. You could not get it from the domestic producers because they did not want to produce it. It was too costly for them. They would rather coke bunker seed oil and make gasoline out of it and make a greater profit out of it than to produce residual oil. The only place you could receive it was from Venezuela. They did not increase the quota that much, as you mentioned. They were holding back. The demand was there because it was a very severe winter and, unfortunately, the supply was not there and they pushed the price up. And who got it in the back of the neck—the poor consumer.

I would like to call attention to what I said before, I believe the gentleman was not here at the time that I was having a little colloquy with our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I pointed out, and I do not want to rehash the argument again because it is so time consuming, but I pointed out the three reasons why the coal industry is experiencing difficulties at the present time.

Mr. MOORE. I am aware of what the gentleman said in that respect.

Mr. CONTE. None of those reasons—none at all—are related to the residual oil problem in New England and the eastern seaboard. Believe me, my colleague, I feel sorry for your people. I feel sorry for them, but I feel if you are experiencing difficulties, the proper way is to come down here in the House and offer a bill to subsidize the coal industry. I will tell you that I will give it my consideration. I will not say I will go along with it, but it will get my consideration. But this is not the way to do it. This is wrong, this is cruel. What you are attempting to do here is to subsidize the coal industry at the expense of New England and the eastern seaboard. I cannot take it. I think it is wrong. The President of the United States as a U.S. Senator felt the same way. I remember going over to his office with a petition to then President Eisenhower and the then Senator signed it in a split second. We sent it down to President Eisenhower, but unfortunately after that campaign in West Virginia, Mr. Kennedy changed his mind. Maybe I cannot blame him. He received a very good vote there. Thank God the people had the wisdom to see a good man in you and they sent you back. For that I have to give them credit.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. Certainly, I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOORE. I am aware of the three areas which you recited as being the cause of the loss of tonnage by the coal industry. That is exactly the same presentation that the New England residual oil advocates made before our subcommittee last year. The three points without question are substantial.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, no, this comes from the "Bituminous Coal Data, 1960," and is verbatim.

Mr. MOORE. This is the presentation made by the New England people before our committee as to the three areas you referred to and I did get to hear them.

Let me say to the gentleman that I am not so sure that he is willing to take me to task on my statement that we have no mandatory import control program at the present time.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, yes; I stand ready to question the gentleman's statements.

Mr. MOORE. Now, wait a minute. You say we do; I say we do not as a mandatory control program should work, because this thing works, again—and you used the term. I assume the gentleman knows how the Oil Administrator and the Interior Department work and establish these quotas. The Bureau of Mines sits down there. Everybody who wants residual oil regardless of whether he is from District No. 1, which is the gentleman's area, or anywhere else in the United States comes in and makes a demand for oil. That demand without question has been met by the issuance of orders from this Secretary of the Interior since he took office in increasing the allowables under the program. These are people; this is the Secretary of the Interior talking, the Oil Administrator, talking before our subcommittee in response to a question. What have they got to do to get it? All they have to do is to demand it, and the quotas went upward, and upward, and upward, in order to meet the demand.

Now, let me answer one thing the gentleman said.

Mr. CONTE. I must answer that. I know the gentleman has the report of the Office of Emergency Planning. It is the Interior Department which makes this study, and reports are made from the Bureau of Mines. This group says that there is not any national security involved here under section 7, the section which President Eisenhower used for his justification.

Mr. MOORE. This is the one agency of the Government that collects data from Interior and from the Oil Administration.

Mr. CONTE. It is part of the governmental family.

Mr. MOORE. I am not so sure they are part of the family because they will not answer questions as to their policy. They work on the theory of hemispheric solidarity rather than the national security of our country.

The gentleman said that all that the Government knew was the oil industry caused a lessening of the supply. We are aware that after 1959 when the mandatory program was established and went into effect that they busted the program by bringing into this Nation in one 3-month period a whole year's allocation, which prompted the then Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, to make the suggestion to the White House, to then President Eisenhower, that the quota be established based on quarterly arrangements so that the oil companies could not break the market and put the people of New England, for instance, in such severe circumstances that they could not get oil because they had brought it all in in the months of January, February, and March. The comeback of the oil people was that they had brought all the oil allowable in, and they would have to wait unless the quota could be raised. Then the Secretary of the Interior divided the quota into 3- or 4-month periods.

Mr. CONTE. Into four quarters.

Mr. MOORE. Into four quarters. Under such a program they could bring in the quota allowance in 1 month rather than spreading it over a number of months.

Mr. CONTE. The quota was for the quarter. They could not bring in more than the quota during the quarter.

Mr. MOORE. But they could bring the entire quota in during any 1 month if they wanted to.

Mr. CONTE. But they could not exceed the quarterly quota.

Mr. MOORE. The quarter system has been abolished.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CONTE. I am quite sure it has not been. I have received reports from the Department every quarter telling me how many barrels they are going to allow in that quarter.

Mr. MOORE. That generates the demand when they absorb the whole allotment in that period.

Mr. CONTE. I am not an economist, but I know this and the gentlemen knows it, that we have problems with subsidies on farm and agricultural products. The reason we have the problems is because production is so great, the production of wheat, barley, and corn is so great, the production of poultry is so great, the production of hogs is so great, and the demand is not great, and, therefore, you have a greater supply than you have demand. What happens? It decreases the price of that commodity. As a result they have to come to the Congress and ask for a subsidy. That is simple.

If we had a great supply of residual oil in New England, the price would go down, it would be decreased. At the same time, I am certain we would not erode any of your present coal production. I wish we could use your coal, I wish we could furnish a market for your coal, but it is not economically feasible to transport coal from West Virginia up to Boston or Pittsfield, Mass.

My good friend here said they are producing coal at the same price they produced it 10 years ago.

Mr. MOORE. Cheaper.

Mr. CONTE. That may be so, but what he failed to say was how much it costs to transport that coal by rail from West Virginia or Pennsylvania to Massachusetts today. That price has skyrocketed. That is why there is an economic problem, for the people in New England would love to help you, but we have to take every break we can receive to keep our heads above water.

Mr. MOORE. I know the gentleman does not advocate prosperity for his area at the expense of a nonprosperous climate in the areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, or any of the coal-producing States. But the gentleman talks as though we are not doing anything about it. The fact remains on this transportation proposition we have the establishment of the integral trains which means you get coal from the mouth of the mines to the point of consumption.

The gentleman has suggested a subsidy. Let us put it the other way around. Has the gentleman given any thought to the fact when the remaining 27 percent of your energy needs are met with residual oil and you and your industries have converted 100 percent to residual oil, what the price will be then, when it is on a nonconvertible basis where you cannot change back to your old coal or gas? The price of that is going to skyrocket.

Mr. CONTE. As I stated before, a good portion of the 27 percent the gentleman speaks of have converted over to natural gas. There will be many more convert to gas if you keep the price of coal going up. Bring the price of coal down, let them have the residual oil they have had in the past, and I am sure your market in New England and the Eastern Seaboard States will not erode. There is some use for soft coal in New England. But you are driving them down to the ground and if you keep raising the price on both residual oil and on coal we are going to convert to natural gas and you will be out of luck and the domestic oil producers will be out of luck.

Mr. MOORE. I want to join forces with the gentleman. I would love to have him on my side. Let us take on the gas industry if that is what we have got to do.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to bear out my point about that little sojourn the administration made there in the beautiful hills during the campaign——

Mr. MOORE. That was May 1960.

Mr. CONTE. I picked up the Washington Post of March 14, 1963, and there was an article entitled "Oil Issue Reportedly Resolved." This is common knowledge, so I am not disclosing anything. It is all over Washington. Everybody knows it is being done.

He speaks as follows:

> The hottest international oil issue facing the White House reportedly has been resolved largely in favor of domestic economic and political consideration.

The article states further:

> The decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers.

They should have added one more line and said:

> At the expense of the poor consumers and poor taxpayers of New England and the Eastern Seaboard States who are subsidizing the farmers in the West.

The housewives have to pay higher prices for eggs, butter, and other farm products because of the subsidies we are paying the farmers out west.

Now they have to subsidize the coal producers in West Virginia and Pennsylvania and the big oil tycoons of Oklahoma, Texas, and every other State. This is wrong, and it is about time that somebody started doing something and speaking in favor of the poor consumer not only as of today but 365 days of the year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that my colleagues and I have been forced to rise again in the House to protest the continuation of the program of import quotas on residual fuel oil. Time and time again we have pointed out the disadvantages of pursuing this course of action. Yet the administration has held fast to its position in the face of compelling reasons for discontinuing the program.

First, the import program has not contributed to a solution of the problems of the domestic coal industry. The real problem in coal is not competition from residual fuel, but wornout mines and increased productivity per worker. The number of jobs in the coal industry has declined at a much greater rate than the production of coal. Import quotas have not and will not stop this trend.

To oppose the imposition of import quotas on residual oil is not to be unsympathetic to the very real problem of unemployment in this country. But until the administration realizes that we cannot solve this tragic flaw in our economy with political gimmicks which operate at the expense of other important national interests, I am afraid that many, many able workers are going to remain idle.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that many east coast buildings—factories, hospitals, and public buildings—are not equipped to use coal. And the domestic residual oil production is just not sufficient to meet our needs. Therefore, east coast users are forced to obtain oil outside the import program, at a cost of up to 27 cents per barrel more than other free world users. This provides us with another strong reason for the elimination of the quotas.

Businessmen who must heat their plants at costs so far above the market price must pass this overhead along to their consumers in the form of higher prices for related goods and services. This raises the cost of living for the entire east coast, reduces the purchasing power of consumers, and generally contributes to the sluggishness of our economy. The additional 6.5 million barrels permitted in late January only covered the amount borrowed in the last quarter of 1962 against 1963's allotment to meet the demands of a severe New England winter. This relaxation, as I pointed out on February 6, only indicated "that real weaknesses exist because of the quota system."

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning told the President in a recent memorandum that "the fact remains that these people"—on the east coast—"are now being penalized by Government action taken on national security grounds." This brings me to my third point.

Although the residual oil import program was initiated under the National Security Amendment to the Trade Agreements Act in 1958, there is every reason to doubt that it is, in fact, serving our national security. Some of these doubts were expressed by the OEP Director, Mr. McDermott, when he wrote:

> In our national security interest there are forceful reasons for unhampered trade relations with other free world countries and an obligation to avoid actions which will weaken their economies and make it more difficult for them to maintain democratic institutions.

I submit that we are weakening the forces of freedom in Latin America by restricting the American market for residual oil to nations like Venezuela.

Surely the Members of the House recall the amount of time that was spent during the last session of the Congress both in committee and on the floor in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I voted for that bill in the hope that it would not only aid American access to world markets, but would also enable the developing nations of the world to gain access to our markets. Only economically independent nations will remain strong. By keeping Venezuela, a nation already beseiged by Communist terrorism and subversion, from the American market for residual oil, we serve neither our own national security nor that of the free world.

In a recent editorial, the Washington Post pointed out that the enemies of the current democratic regime in Venezuela would find "comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela." On the occasion of President Betancourt's visit to the United States in February, I urged the President to revoke all restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil. I said, at that time:

> I can think of no more effective step to demonstrate the friendship of the people of the United States to the people of Venezuela than the removal of restrictions on residual oil imports.

No action has been forthcoming from the White House, however. Here we have another example of the administration's vacillation on foreign trade matters. As the Washington Post noted:

> This administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism.

Let me spell out the meaning of this program to Venezuela. Petroleum is the key to the Venezuela economy. Residual oil accounts for 57 percent of its total output of refined oil products. Oil accounts for 90 percent of the foreign trade and 95 percent of the foreign exchange receipts of Venezuela. More than a fifth of the gross national product is due to oil activities. There is, of course, a close relationship between foreign exchange receipts, gross national product, and a nation's capacity to import capital goods. Without these capital goods many projected programs of economic development will be either curtailed sharply or eliminated entirely. The obvious point is that a nation on the threshold of economic viability and independence cannot stand a sharp reduction in its trade revenues.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am concerned lest we isolate our national security from the security of the Western Hemisphere in considering this program. As the events of last October so sharply demonstrated, only strong, independent nations in Latin America will be able to withstand the economic penetration, political subversion and ideological indoctrination to which Cuba has already succumbed.

It has been argued that reliance on foreign imports of residual oil is dangerous because those supplies may be cut off in the event of a national emergency. The fact remains that domestic production is not sufficient to meet our needs. In addition, the record of World War II, the Korean war, and Suez crisis demonstrated the ability, and indeed the necessity of Venezuelan oil to remain the main source of supply to meet both domestic and military needs. There is no reason to assume that in the event of another emergency Venezuelan oil would be substantially less available to the United States. Continuing technological developments in antisubmarine warfare will better enable us to contain enemy interference with trade than in the past.

It is all very well to state that a nation should not be so dependent on one commodity, or one export, but the fact is that oil will be the basis of the Venezuela economy for some time to come. Without revenues from trade with the United States, the Venezuelans will be less able to develop a truly diversified economy. In the meantime we cannot urge the Venezuelan people to build up their oil industry in an effort to encourage economic progress, if we then turn around and deny them access to one of the chief ingredients of that progress.

Last week, in San Jose, Costa Rica, the President described one of the goals of the United States in Latin America:

> We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, strong educational facilities, and better utilization of resources.

I do not disagree with the President's words. I only ask that he permit Venezuela to pursue these aims unhampered by these artificial controls which serve the interest of neither nation.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John K. Evans, executive director of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., recently wrote an interesting letter to Secretary Udall in regards the residual oil question. He said that the levels announced on March 15 did not "provide each of the energy fuels a fair opportunity to compete for the expanding energy market on the east coast" and that it did not "assure consumers of the opportunity to obtain the fuel of their choice" and that finally it did not "take into account increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers."

A number of other specific, factual points are made in this letter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Evans is certainly correct when he says this is the "spring of our discontent."

I would suggest that my colleagues in this House read Mr. Evans' letter closely, and in doing so, realize that an injustice has been done. He raises many interesting questions and I would like to include the complete letter in the body of the RECORD, certain that it will contribute greatly to this stand being made today by the New England and eastern seaboard Members.

MARCH 18, 1963.

Mr. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: We cannot allow your statements made in the press release under date of March 15, 1963, to go unchallenged. You have obviously been misinformed. As you know, this organization has led the fight to get controls on residual imports removed in line with the findings of both the Senate Interior Committee and Office of Emergency Planning studies on the subject. At the least we urged revision of the regulations so as to establish a program wherein the consumer had freedom of choice of his supplier—in other words whichever marketer obtained the customer's business that marketer would receive the covering import license. We failed to achieve either of these objectives.

To compound our difficulties and hardships, the levels you announced last week did not "provide each of the energy fuels a fair opportunity to compete for the expanding energy market on the east coast" and it did not "assure consumers of the opportunity to obtain the fuel of their choice" and finally it did not "take into account increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers." In proof of our contention that the new levels are utterly inadequate and instead places the consumer in a straitjacket of end-use control with no freedom of choice, we offer the following facts. Due to normal consumption increases caused by population increase plus a conservative industrial development on the east coast, powerplant needs through the years have averaged 6 percent increase per annum—this next year this amount will be 10,000 barrels a day. Add to this figure two new plants in the New York area that are equipped to burn residual fuel oil—one for 20,000 barrels a day and one for 5,000 barrels a day (there may be other new facilities similarly equipped but I omit including since I am not aware of the details). Based on latter facts 35,000 barrels additional per day are needed next year. It is estimated that a normal stock level for national security purposes on April 1, 1964, should be 16.3 million barrels (the April 1, 1962 level) but for the past year we have been living off the fat of our security stockpile and to attain the 1962 level requires 30,000 barrels a day increase for the coming year. Last year's allocation fell short of demand by 30,000 barrels a day. A conservative estimate of decreased availability from the gulf and west coast is 15,000 barrels a day. Through the years nonutility usage has gone up a conservative 3 percent or 20,000 barrels a day for the next license year. Adding the above increases up one arrives at a total daily increase in barrels: public utility 35,000 plus stock buildup 30,000 plus or minus 30,000 barrel compensation for previous year's shortage in supplying demand plus drop domestic availability 15,000 plus nonutility normal increase 20,000 equals 130,000 barrels a day. Yet your agency only allocated an increase of 50,000 barrels a day making a basic shortage of 80,000 barrels a day which automatically creates end-use control and eliminates all freedom of choice.

The consumer and the independent marketer lost this fight even though we had right on our side because we could not match the efforts, financial and political, of the coal industry. The trade journals have crowned the coal industry as champ—it's easy to be a champ when the opposition is a puny starved David facing a well fed and aggressively able Goliath and those who should support and help us walk away from the fight remarking "let George do it." The only consolation is that one day the chickens of cowardice and inertia will come home to roost and the oil industry will have even greater Government interference than now and the consumer even less freedom of choice—a negative and sad consolation. This is the spring of our discontent.

Sincerely,

JOHN K. EVANS.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the New England Council in Boston has raised some interesting questions regarding the legality of the recent Interior Department decision. The council statement said that section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, as amended by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, gives the President authority to establish residual oil quotas once a national security justification has been established; but in the absence of such finding or determination he does not have legal authority to maintain it.

In view of the February 13 OEP report, which stated that national security was not a justification for these restrictions, it seems absolutely certain that there has been a direct confrontation with the law. The statement of the council that the Interior decision represents a "Government protected cartel" is not without its truth. I would like to include the full statement made by the New England Council on the legal issues involved.

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL QUESTIONS LEGALITY OF PRESIDENT'S RESIDUAL OIL DECISION

BOSTON.—The New England Council has questioned the legality of the recent White House decision to maintain residual oil quotas and said the decision perpetuates a Government protected cartel.

In a joint statement, James S. Couzens, chairman of the council's fuel committee and Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president of the council, condemned the decision as contrary to the administration's own study done by the Office of Emergency Planning and called on the President to either directly regard or disregard the report.

The council statement said that section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, as amended by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, gives the President authority to establish residual oil quotas once a national security justification has been established; but in the absence of such a finding or determination he does not have legal authority to maintain it.

"In its February 13 report, the Office of Emergency Planning stated residual oil controls were not in the interest of national security, and that they have little to do with unemployment in the coal industry," said Mr. Caverly. "Accordingly there appears no valid economic or security reason for controls to continue and this would give rise as to whether the Trade Agreements Act is being violated."

"The announced 9.6 percent increase in residual oil imports will do little more than replace the domestic production decline," Mr. Couzens said, "and this still leaves strong enough supply-demand pressures to require New England residual oil consumers to pay 23 cents a barrel more than in other countries such as Canada." Residual oil is used as heating fuel for apartment houses and large office buildings and it also affects the cost of many electric utilities.

"The residual oil import quotas let only enough oil into the country to meet demands and this keeps per barrel costs artificially high," said Mr. Couzens.

The statement also said the quota system "locked buyers and sellers together, thus eliminating competition—a situation that the Justice Department condemned in the OEP report."

"The only reason for the President's decision to maintain residual oil import restrictions appears to be pressures put on the White House by misguided leaders of the coal industry," Caverly concluded.

The statement also said the council is not giving up its battle for removal of residual oil quota restrictions but is considering expanding its program to include removal of restrictions for the entire industry and not just residual oils.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly one of the most important aims of our foreign policy is economic development in Latin America. This aim is essential to our Nation's security.

Cuba has brought home to all of us the importance of close cooperation and understanding among the Americas, if freedom is to be preserved in our hemisphere.

One of our Latin American neighbors, Venezuela, has been recognized by President Kennedy for its progress in freedom. Speaking to their people, President Kennedy said:

> Here in Venezuela the meaning of the new Allianza Para El Progresso is being demonstrated, for you have made a transition from a repressing dictatorship to a free life for the people of this country, to a progressive democratic rule under one of the great democratic states of the Western Hemisphere. * * * The United States and Venezuela are bound together and in the 1960's I believe we can demonstrate, so that all the world will follow our example, that freedom and prosperity can move hand in hand and I am proud today to stand on this platform with your distinguished President, who has been working in this field for so many years and who is now showing the people of this country and hemisphere what real progress for the people can mean.

Mr. Speaker, our good relationships with Venezuela are in jeopardy if residual oil import restrictions are allowed to continue. This small Latin American country directly or indirectly supplies the United States with 90 percent of its residual oil, and since 1959 when import restrictions were imposed, the economic development of Venezuela has been severely hampered.

An Office of Emergency Planning report says that development of residual oil supplies from Venezuela is essential to our national security. We cannot expect Venezuela to turn her refineries on and off, holding her production at the ready, waiting to serve the United States in the event of war.

If we continue to deny Venezuela the natural established outlet for her production, we undermine her economy in time of peace and weaken her ability to meet extra demands in time of war.

The importance of residual oil to the Venezuelan economy can best be demonstrated by the following: In U.S. refineries less than 10 percent of every barrel of crude oil becomes residual. This byproduct is slowly decreasing because it is more profitable in this country to produce other petroleum products; quite the contrary in Venezuela.

Residual oil is a major product for this Latin American ally. Each barrel of crude oil produces 55 percent residual oil as compared to under 10 percent for the United States.

In Venezuela 95 percent of foreign trade income is from petroleum products, and the United States is their No. 1 customer.

Residual oil restrictions pose a real threat to the Venezuelan economy. They threaten the success of our Latin American policies and, therefore, undermine our national security.

The restrictions must be lifted.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues from New England have little reason to complain about the administration's policy with regard to import quotas on residual fuel oil.

The President's decision to increase imports by some 50,000 barrels in the import year beginning April 1 seems to demonstrate that he has not changed the views he held when as Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, he urged the unrestricted import of this cheap waste product.

The complaints should come from the domestic producers of oil, the coal miners, the railroad workers and many, many others who will suffer unemployment and economic loss because domestic welfare has been sacrificed ruthlessly to international politics.

This is of great importance in the State of Ohio where our great coal industry is already depressed and where the independent oil producers are having a very difficult time in the face of uncertain markets and the threat of increased taxation.

Nor do I believe that our New England friends are wise to place their reliance upon Venezuelan sources of fuel. They may pay dearly for the cheap fuel they enjoy this year if the uncertain political climate in the Caribbean cuts off this foreign source of supply.

They are closing their eyes to the Nation's welfare and to their own welfare.

The Office of Emergency Planning is equally shortsighted when it says that the Nation need not rely upon its own sources of energy.

I believe it is time for congressional review of this entire problem and congressional action to establish a realistic and effective control on the imports of residual fuel oil. Greatly as we may desire the friendship of Venezuela and wish to enhance its economic position, as much as we would like to assist our New England friends, and the tremendous volume of New England manufactured products sold in Ohio is a demonstration of this desire, it seems to me that the national security and the welfare of domestic industry must have prior consideration.

"U.S. CITIZENS GO TO CUBA ILLEGALLY BY WAY OF MEXICO WITHOUT PROSECUTION—ACTION NEEDED BY STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS TO CLOSE THIS OPEN DOOR OF SUBVERSION"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly concerned over the apparent lack of willingness on the part of the Justice and State Departments to prosecute U.S. citizens who over the past 26 months, have been illegally venturing to Cuba through the open door of subversion—the Cuban Embassy in Mexico—or to close this door.

Over the last 2 weeks, I have discussed this situation at length on the floor of this body and have inserted information pertaining thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, I have written letters to the President, Secretary of State and the House Un-American Activities Committee on this subject. From extremely reliable sources, I have furnished names of U.S. citizens making this trip to Cuba to the House Un-American Activities Committee for investigation—from the manifests of the Cubana Airlines in Mexico City. I have, today, given the House Un-American Activities Committee a list of an additional 24 American citizens bringing to 97, the number of U.S. citizens I have turned over to the House Un-American Activities Committee who have made this illegal trip over a 6-month period in 1962. I am doing so in hopes of prodding the Justice and State Departments into taking some action against these violators who openly and notoriously advertise their visits, many of whom are known Communists, and who are raising funds for Communist front organizations. I cannot understand why the executive branch has been reluctant to turn these names over to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Cuban Embassy in Mexico, the open door through which Communist subversives from throughout the Americas gain entrance to Cuba and then return to their respective homelands, including the United States, for purposes of subversion and sabotage, must be closed if the spreading Communist cancer in this hemisphere is to be arrested. Since January 16, 1961, this has been illegal.

In addition, the violators must be prosecuted and this flow of subversives must be halted if we ever hope to close this dangerous open door of subversion.

It is, therefore, shocking that the State Department has not demanded that this open door to hemispheric subversion be closed.

It is with these objectives in mind that I feel compelled to make public today, the names of some of the U.S. citizens who have not only made this trip, but openly and brazenly advertise and brag about their flagrant violations of the law and their aid and confort to the Communists.

I am doing so, as well, to illustrate how easily these violators could be found and prosecuted if the State Department was sufficiently determined in what should be one of its major efforts—to rid this hemisphere, including the United States, from the threat of Communist subversion.

I am at the same time reiterating my demand, first made in a speech on the floor on March 15, of last year, that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee be cited as a Communist front organization by the Justice Department and be placed on the subversive list.

The Attorney General's failure to place this group on the subversive list becomes increasingly baffling, particularly in view of the Annual FBI Report for Fiscal Year 1961 which states, in part:

> FBI investigations also have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers' Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee.

Naturally, the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers' Party are on the Attorney General's subversive lists.

In addition, overwhelming evidence pinpointing this organization as a Communist front subversive group has been produced at the several hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Committee.

I summarized this evidence on March 15, 1962, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The existing law, as publicly announced by the State Department on January 16, 1961, prohibits U.S. citizens from traveling to Cuba and willful violation of this law is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a number of pages from the Worker, which is of course the published voice of the Communist Party in the United States. On each of these pages, advertisements appear promoting lectures given by U.S. citizens who have recently returned from Cuba and who are, in turn, promoting the Castro-Communist cause. Most of their appearances are held under the auspices of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

In the June 9, 1962, issue of the Worker on page 15 the following ad appears:

> Cuba—today and tomorrow—as viewed by Gerald Quinn, executive secretary, Monroe Defense Committee who has just returned from Cuba. Monday, June 4, 8:30 p.m. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, Contr., $1. Students 50 cents. Ausp. Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

This individual, Gerald Quinn, was included in the list I obtained of U.S. citizens who took the route of the Communist subversive and traveled to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico. He did so in violation of the law, has openly and notoriously advertized the fact that he has done so, that he is aiding the Communist cause, and still no willingness on the part of the State Department to push for prosecution and no effort to stop this flow of subversion. Instead, he has been allowed to go to Cuba illegally and to return so that he can trot around the United State spreading Communist propaganda and subversion.

In the September 11, 1962, issue of the Worker, on page 6, the following ad appears:

> Eyewitness in Cuba: Hear John Read, just back from Havana. See the latest color slides of Cuba. Monday, September 17, 8:30 p.m. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, Contr., $1. Students 50 cents.

John Read was also included in the list I obtained of U.S. citizens who ventured to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico. He too was allowed to recite what he was taught in Cuba. He too has openly and flagrantly violated the law.

Dozens of other Quinns and Reads can still travel to Cuba because the U.S. Government has failed to close this open door of subversion.

One woman is known to have attended the Women's Congress of the Americas, a Communist meeting in Havana in July 1962.

Mr. Speaker, these ads, all from different individuals, go on in the same vein. In all, the theme is the same—American citizens recently returned from Cuba and gallivanting around the country spreading newly developed Communist propaganda, in violation of the law and, incidentally, raising funds thereby for support for a Communist front organization—the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

There is, however, one other entry which appears in the March 6th, 1962, issue of the Worker which I feel warrants comment. On page 6, the following advertisement appears:

> Current activities of the Cuban counterrevolutionaries in the United States of America, a report by V. T. Lee. Monday, March 12, at 8:30 p.m. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, Contr., $1. Ausp. Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. Lee, who is known to have made various trips to Cuba, one early this year, originated the Tampa, Florida, chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Tampa, incidentally, was in my district up until this year and now borders my district. He has apparently hit the big time in Communist circles, for my last recollection of him was as an unimpressive individual who, in a Castro-supporting scandal sheet he printed in Tampa, accused President Kennedy and Senator EASTLAND of "withholding diapers from Cuban babies." In this same issue, the Senator is labeled a hatchetman and a loudmouth and reference is likewise made to those "jackasses in Washington."

Although the trash he printed in his newsletter is not worth repeating, what is worth discussing is his present pastime which is apparently speaking for the Cuban counterrevolutionaries in the United States, a rather dangerous vocation. And what is further significant is that in so doing, he has apparently come up from the ranks to a position of national leadership in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Thus, I believe my concern is well founded. I have given here, examples of individuals, many with known Communist backgrounds, who not only violated the law, by going to and from Cuba, but brazenly thumb their noses at the law by advertising their travels in the Communist press published in the United States, preaching communism, and raising funds for the Communist-front Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

And, the Attorney General still refuses to place the Fair Play for Cuba on the subversive list. This organization, working in concert with these fellow travelers, are openly undermining our society, violating our laws, and still an apparent lack of willingness on the part of the State Department to push for prosecution or to close this open door of subversion.

Mr. Speaker, I find these facts alarming and again demand that the proper agencies of our Government prosecute these individuals, place the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on the Attorney General's list of subversives and close this open door to subversion in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to honor the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, the great and courageous American who was known as the First Lady of the World. When we said farewell to her last November, Congress was not in session. So it seems to me fitting that we pause now to pay tribute to her life and ideals. As the elected representatives of the American people, we have the constant opportunity through our work and efforts to enact programs which will strive to meet the humanitarian goals to which Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated her life. We are privileged to share this opportunity with her eldest son, our distinguished colleague from California, JAMES ROOSEVELT, who is making such a splendid contribution to the deliberations of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson captured the essence of the spirit of Eleanor Roosevelt when he observed, "She would rather light candles than curse the darkness, and her glow has warmed the world."

Millions of people the world over mourned her passing, for she touched the lives and earned the love and affection of people everywhere. She was the friend of the oppressed and dispossessed, the victims of tyranny and discrimination. Her life of goodness, kindness and compassion will live through the ages as a continuing inspiration.

It is difficult to realize Eleanor Roosevelt is no longer with us. We had become so dependent upon her. We knew that she would always speak out against oppression, injustice, and discrimination. She was our voice. She was our conscience. As the constant advocate of human rights, Eleanor Roosevelt became the great mother figure for all humanity. She was imbued with a sense of mission and a deep conviction that democracy and brotherhood are inseparable.

> Nothing we learn in this world—

She wrote during the early days of the New Deal—

> is ever wasted and I have come to the conclusion that practically nothing we do ever stands by itself. If it is good, it will serve some good purpose in the future. If it is evil, it may haunt us and handicap our efforts in unimagined ways.

In 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House, Eleanor Roosevelt had already demonstrated a deep social conscience.

Her husband's long illness had deepened her compassion for human suffering and strengthened her determination to find solutions to unresolved problems. Together they fought to overcome his physical handicap and to keep alive his interest in political life. She struggled to conquer her natural shyness so that she could help her husband and further his political career. Her interest in workingwomen brought her into the Women's Trade Union Movement in the early twenties, an affiliation she continued to the end of her life.

In the White House no First Lady ever matched Eleanor Roosevelt for causes espoused, crusades launched, precedents shattered and distances traveled. It has been said that in the 7 years between 1933 and 1940 Eleanor Roosevelt had traveled some 280,000 miles, written a million words, earned and given away over a half million dollars, shaken as many hands, delivered several hundred lectures and radio speeches, attended to her voluminous mail—150,000 letters in the year 1939—and in between times knitted sweaters for her 9 grandchildren.

She became the President's eyes and ears, touring the country, looking in on various New Deal projects and observing how Americans in those grim depression years were living. On these trips she chatted with anyone she met on the plane, bus, or train. She talked with West Virginia miners, many of whom had almost forgotten what it was like to have a job. She talked with small shopkeepers, with taxi drivers, with Americans in all walks of life.

In her autobiography she wrote of these trips:

> Franklin never told me I was a good reporter, nor, in the early days, were any of my trips made at his request. I realized, however, that he would not question me so closely if he were not interested, and I decided this was the only way I could help him, outside of running the house.

Desperate appeals came to her for help from desperate people all over the country in the depression years. Believing it was wise to put people to work to help themselves, she donated her own money to help establish people in small businesses.

During the New Deal days Eleanor Roosevelt was much more than a roving reporter for the President. She served in a real sense as his driving conscience, spurring the President, reminding him of the neglected needs of America: the illhoused, illclad, illnourished. And she constantly stressed the failure of America to live up to its ideals of full equality for all her citizens regardless of race, creed, or color. She helped to mold the fighting liberalism of her husband.

During World War II Eleanor Roosevelt visited battle areas both in Europe and in the Pacific, bringing cheer to men in the service camps and to the wounded in hospitals. Wherever she went, Eleanor Roosevelt always carried a constructive message which inspired our soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

In 1945 when Franklin D. Roosevelt died, Eleanor Roosevelt was 61 years of age. Another First Lady might well have retired to a life of ease. But for Eleanor

Roosevelt, this was only the beginning of a life she called "On My Own."

President Truman named Mrs. Roosevelt a delegate to the General Assembly when the United Nations came into being in 1945. The following year she was elected chairman of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

At the time she left for her first United Nations meeting, Eleanor Roosevelt said:

> Some things I can take to the first meeting—a sincere desire to understand the problems of the rest of the world and our relationship to them; a real good will for all the peoples throughout the world; a hope that I shall be able to build a sense of personal trust and friendship with my coworkers, for without that type of understanding our work would be doubly difficult.

It was her United Nations work that Mrs. Roosevelt considered one of the most wonderful and worthwhile experiences in her life.

As a result of her work in the United Nations, the esteem in which she was held transcended national boundaries and became virtually worldwide. She became the symbol, too, of the new role women were to play in the world.

Eleanor Roosevelt felt that it was her work on the Human Rights Commission that constituted her most important contribution to the United Nations. The drafting of the Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenants was an exceedingly difficult task. As she, herself, explained:

> It became apparent that it was going to be exceedingly difficult to agree on articles that would, if accepted, be legally binding on the various nations. This was difficult enough in regard to civil and political rights that have become fairly well accepted throughout the civilized world, but when it came to economic and social rights it seemed to me at times that agreement would be all but impossible. The reason for this, in part at least, was the vast social and economic conditions in the United States, for example, as contrasted to existing conditions in a country like India. The gap was so great that it was well-nigh impossible to phrase concepts acceptable to both countries.

The Declaration of Human Rights, a document expressing the aspirations of mankind, is a lasting memorial to the dedication of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt was fearlessly outspoken in her support of the Jewish homeland, Israel.

Her observations and experiences during her visits to refugee camps in Europe just after the war gave her a deep understanding of the sufferings of the Jewish people. She was particularly moved by an experience she had at a camp in Germany. In the mud of that camp, she wrote:

> I remember an old woman whose family had been driven from home by war madness and brutality. I had no idea who she was and we could not speak each other's language, but she knelt in the muddy road and threw her arms around my knees. "Israel," she murmered, over and over. "Israel. Israel."

It was while looking into this woman's weatherbeaten face and hearing her voice that Eleanor Roosevelt found herself for the first time realizing what Israel really meant to so many, many people.

As U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, Eleanor Roosevelt put the full weight of her influence behind the Palestine partition plan to establish the State of Israel. Her position was strengthened by a rare combination of idealism and practicality. She realized that the Balfour resolution for the establishment of a Jewish homeland, which had been accepted by the United States and Britain after the First World War, had encouraged the buying of land on the assurance that a homeland would be created in Palestine. The Balfour resolution, she declared, practically committed the United States to the creation of a government there, because, as she pointed out, there cannot be a homeland without a government.

In 1952, with the change in administrations, Eleanor Roosevelt resigned her position with the United Nations. She became active in the American Association for the United Nations, traveling extensively both in the United States and abroad. Everywhere she found friends whom she had come to know through her work in the United Nations. Everywhere she brought her warmth, sincerity, zeal, and everlasting patience.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of Eleanor Roosevelt's devotion to many causes—civil rights, the United Nations, Israel. When historians assess her magnificent life, I am sure they will find her role in the cause of political reform in New York was a reaffirmation of her belief in the individual's responsibility in a democracy.

In the late 1950's Eleanor Roosevelt, who had been an influential voice in New York and National Democratic politics since the adoption of the 19th amendment, became a tireless campaigner and outspoken leader in the battle to revitalize New York's Democratic Party. Perhaps more than any Democrat of her experience and years she understood how machine control had eroded the vital spirit of the Democratic Party, how too often it had stifled initiative, leaving the party bankrupt of ideas and ideals.

In some ways Mrs. Roosevelt fought to liberalize and move the Democratic Party just as she had sought to move the Nation 30 years earlier when, as I said, she served as a conscience of the President. It was my privilege to work closely with her in this fight.

In 1957, when the Riverside Democrats waged the first battle to bring reform to the West Side of Manhattan, Mrs. Roosevelt cabled from Europe endorsing my candidacy for Democratic leader.

In 1959, after the disastrous Buffalo convention, she joined with Governor Herbert H. Lehman and Thomas K. Finletter to establish the New York Committee for Democratic Voters which brought citywide focus to the reform movement.

Eleanor Roosevelt encouraged young people to enter the political arena. She believed in grassroots politics where decisions are made democratically at the local level. She recognized that mistakes would be made, but that the reform clubs would profit from experience.

Mrs. Roosevelt was the rock of the reform Democratic movement, a soldier as well as a general, a leader always available for advice, always understanding, always encouraging.

During the Democratic Party primaries of 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962, she went from meeting to meeting, rally to rally, urging the election of reform candidates. No district leadership fight was too insignificant, no crowd too small, no old line Tammany leader too abusive to keep her away. She spoke at more than 100 reform rallies. Climbing the ladders of sound trucks in all kinds of weather, she captivated people with her plea to recognize the importance of voting in primaries and her appeal to support the goals of reform. She was an energetic inspiration to countless volunteer workers and bellringers.

On July 12, 1962, she spoke for my renomination to Congress at two rallies. Although a light rain was falling, she refused to stop. She even refused an umbrella.

Late in August she was scheduled to speak for reform candidates in Queens. She had a mild fever. But she knew people were waiting, and she insisted on going. It was to be her last speech.

When she arrived, a group of children presented her with flowers. "You see," she said, "I had to come. They expected me."

The morning after the September 6 primary I called her to thank her for her help in the reform Democratic victories. She said, "I really didn't do a thing. I wish I could have done more."

She always wished she could do more. But she did more than enough. For beyond her work and leadership, she was a living spirit, an ideal for the reform Democratic movement.

Mr. Speaker, Francis W. H. Adams, Irving Engel, and Lloyd K. Garrison, members of the Advisory Council of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, have joined in an expression of the debt owed to Mrs. Roosevelt by the coordinating group of the reform movement.

Their statement follows:

STATEMENT BY FRANCIS W. H. ADAMS, IRVING ENGEL, LLOYD K. GARRISON ON BEHALF OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE NEW YORK COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRATIC VOTERS

> For 3 years we had the good fortune to serve with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on the Board of Advisers of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, the coordinating group of the reform movement within the Democratic Party in New York State.
>
> Her contributions to the work of this committee were, as always, far beyond the call of duty, and her selflessness served as an inspiration to all of us.
>
> Her advice was always sage and to the point. Her political understanding and practical good sense came to our aid time and again in local situations as well as in dealing with larger policy issues.
>
> Her leadership will be sorely missed in our efforts to attain a more vigorous and creative party in this State. The effects of her inspiration will, however, be long-lasting. Whatever improvements are made in our party, and through our party in the government of New York, will in large measure be due to her.
>
> The work of the NYCDV is partisan and Mrs. Roosevelt was a partisan too—yet the

essential political message she preached was a lesson for all Americans. Her basic theme was that all Americans should participate fully in the party of their choice and that it was their duty to stay informed on public affairs.

The reform movement was only one of the many causes for which Mrs. Roosevelt fought. We are grateful to have had the opportunity of working with her, and the balm of her spirit will be with us always.

Mr. Speaker, Arnold L. Fein, the chairman of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, has written with deep feeling of the many sacrifices Mrs. Roosevelt made for the reform movement. His account of her unique contribution follows:

Statement by Arnold L. Fein, Chairman, New York Committee for Democratic Voters, in Tribute to the Contributions of Eleanor Roosevelt to the Reform Movement in the Democratic Party in New York

As spring comes around again and talk quickens about upcoming primary fights and political campaigns, the reform movement in the Democratic Party in New York feels a special sense of loss. This year, Eleanor Roosevelt, for the first time, will not be with us to light our way and guide our paths.

Her contributions to our cause were too many to recount. Our debt to her is writ large in the life of our party and our town. Remembering and paying tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt, in death, is, as it was in life, a self-serving declaration. By talking with her, by being in her presence, by talking about her, yes, even by remembering her, we uplift ourselves. It was not easy during her lifetime to pay her tribute. A year ago, when we proposed a public tribute to her, she agreed to submit only because she thought it might be useful to the organization for fundraising and publicity.

As she wrote, afterwards:

"While, as I warned you, I did not completely enjoy the evening myself, I think everyone present had a good time. Therefore, I was happy that I was the instrument for bringing them together * * *. You were very kind to put so much effort into making the evening as easy and pleasant as possible and I want all of you to know of my deep gratitude."

As we wrote then:

"We pay tribute * * * to a great lady—Eleanor Roosevelt—

"For her tireless service to the reform movement;

"For her wise counsel;

"For establishing for all of us a standard of unselfish public service.

"We are grateful for the opportunity of working with a human being who exemplifies those attributes all men of good will hold dear and thankful that she has recognized our cause."

From the time Eleanor Roosevelt, Governor Herbert H. Lehman, Thomas K. Finletter and others helped to found and form the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, she was without stint in her efforts on its behalf. Her services to the reform movement in the Democratic Party in New York City demonstrated an overwhelming love of life and of people and a sensitive recognition of their needs and aspirations. Eleanor Roosevelt was a participant at every level. She went from meeting to meeting, rally to rally, preaching the cause of reform, democracy and liberalism in the Democratic Party. In a crowded little local campaign headquarters on the east side of Manhattan, airless, dirty and hot, in the midst of a bitterly fought summer primary election for a local office, she refused to sit in the seat specially provided. She insisted rather on standing, shaking hands with every last one of the many who wished to be in her presence, expressing her thanks that they had come to see and listen to her and urging upon them the meaning and need of democracy and participation. Eleanor Roosevelt was more capable than any in making people understand what they had to do and in making them want to do it.

This was not with a patronizing air, nor the cynicism of a political hand shaker, nor even the sentimentality of too many do-gooders. It was rather a frank confrontation on a person-to-person basis of those who were joined in a common cause. She made clear as no other could that there could be neither contentment nor complacency in the face of those in her party who were indifferent to hunger and distress or who would use them for their own purposes. Nor did she give any impression that she was engaged in a kind of sacrifice. She understood, and others knew from talking to her, listening to her, and being with her that this was not sacrifice, it was living.

She taught us too that it was not enough to be a voice of good works. She taught realism in the practice of democracy and strategy in its use. Far better than any other she understood, accepted and used its complicated and sometimes disheartening processes. She demonstrated her recognition that final solutions are never at hand; that absolutism is the death of life as well as of progress. With humor and understanding she made many of us recognize how it might be necessary, temporarily, to accept choices far from the ultimate goal, from which, she insisted, the eye never swerve. Mrs. Roosevelt imparted and demonstrated to us also her deep belief that slogans are not solutions.

At a meeting called at her home, on short notice, while en route from the South to New England, she sought to persuade some local political leaders that, however high minded or highly motivated the course they were taking, it was unwise in the interest of greater objectives. To the comment, "We don't like to be told what to do," she remarked, "Are you suggesting that I am telling you what to do? I know as well as you that the decision is yours, and I will abide by it."

In that moment she made clear, as she had on so many other occasions, that she was willing to accept the democratic process, albeit she would try to guide and enlighten it. When faced with ultimate disagreement, she neither thundered nor turned her back, nor played the boss, but shrugged and said, "I tried. I will try again. We will move ahead."

On another occasion, after a long and difficult evening in a local campaign headquarters, including speechmaking, handshaking and the rest, she indicated apologetically that she would have to leave. She rejected an offer to drive her home, with the remark, "There is work for you to do." When a cab was hailed for her in the middle of the road, she was right there, insisting on calling the cab herself and going home alone.

One dark and dreary day, when she came to a street corner meeting from her doctor's office, it was suggested, following the doctor's admonition, that she not climb the rickety steps to the top of a sound truck. Mrs. Roosevelt replied, "That is where the meeting is and that is where I am going to talk to the people," and she did.

In that moment, as in many others, she made us recognize that the business of living, particularly within a democracy, is a continuous meeting, a meeting within oneself and a meeting with others, ever seeking personal and community solutions. And so she came to our rallies, our parties and our meetings, sitting and listening with patience, fortitude and grace, and occasionally making realistic suggestions, with fire and humor. It mattered not that only a local candidate was involved, in a difficult district, on a bad day or night. It mattered only that this was democracy in action; that people were participating; that there was concern.

In her memory and in our own interest and in the interest of the many she served, we must and will keep the meeting going, remembering what she, above all others, knew; that in the meeting and in the memory we shall try to achieve the peace, the honor and the understanding that she herself, through all the days of her years, helped so many to find for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include at this point in the Record a statement by Richard A. Brown, executive director of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, who worked closely with Mrs. Roosevelt in the reform movement:

Statement by Richard A. Brown, Executive Director of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, March 21, 1963

During the past few years the New York Committee for Democratic Voters has served as the coordinating agency for 50 reform Democratic clubs in their fight to democratize and revitalize the Democratic Party in New York State.

Eleanor Roosevelt, with Gov. Herbert H. Lehman and Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter founded the New York Committee for Democratic Voters to provide guidance and leadership for the thousands of young people dedicated to this worthwhile end.

For the last few years of her life, the New York Committee for Democratic Voters was Mrs. Roosevelt's principal political interest.

She spoke at meetings of local reform clubs; sometimes making as many as five speeches in an evening. She was as readily available to speak at a meeting of 40 in the far reaches of Queens, as at a rally for 3,000 on the West Side of Manhattan.

She mounted sound trucks on street corners as willingly as she faced a $100 a plate dinner audience.

When money was in short supply, as it always is in good causes, she gave dinner parties in her own home and wrote and signed many financial appeals.

And as if all this was not enough—her personal financial contribution was always made without solicitation. Only 3 weeks before her death, while she was in the hospital, we received a substantial contribution from her.

Mrs. Roosevelt was more than a "do-gooder," she was a shrewd and knowledgeable politician. Her advice will be sorely missed in the years ahead.

But all of these contributions were small compared to that of the inspiration which she gave us.

For the knowledge that Mrs. Roosevelt believed in the reform movement gave us confidence, and reinforced our belief that our cause was worth while; that we were helping to create a better world.

It is this knowledge that will enable us to survive the loss of her personal help.

The knowledge that in bringing our work to successful fruition we will be advancing a cause close to Mrs. Roosevelt, will help us overcome the inevitable discouragements and obstacles ahead.

I am grateful that I had the opportunity of being associated with Mrs. Roosevelt and proud that she placed a small measure of trust in me, in the work of the reform movement.

In this association I found what I consider to be the core of Mrs. Roosevelt's greatness—she was a fine human being with compassion and humility.

Mr. Speaker, I have read many moving tributes to Eleanor Roosevelt, but one of the most revealing was written about her to me by Miss Maureen Corr who was her secretary and constant companion for so many years. Miss Corr wrote:

> She lived to be kind, and to me her private image far outshone her public one. There are few famous people who can have that said of them, but then famous people are not necessarily great. People used to say that Mrs. Roosevelt electrified a group when she appeared. May it be said to her credit that she never ceased to electrify me—even after 12 years of daily service.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always be thankful that I knew Mrs. Roosevelt from my earliest memories to the time she last stood on a platform expressing her commitment to democracy. When I was growing up, she would visit my family from time to time; and, of course, in my political career she was a constant inspiration.

I nominated Mrs. Roosevelt for the 1962 Nobel Peace Prize. After her death I urged the Nobel Committee to consider her for a posthumous award, for no one was ever more devoted to the cause of peace and the promotion of international understanding than Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the American dream Eleanor Roosevelt once wrote:

> We cannot any longer take an old approach to world problems. They aren't the same problems. It isn't the same world. We must not adopt the methods of our ancestors; instead, we must emulate that pioneer quality in our ancestors that made them attempt new methods for a new world.
>
> If our many young people have lost the excitement of the early settlers who had a country to explore and develop, it is because no one remembers to tell them that the world has never been so challenging, so exciting; the fields of adventure and new fields to conquer have never been so limitless. There is still unfinished business at home, but there is the most tremendous adventure in bringing the peoples of the world to an understanding of the American dream. In this attempt to understand, to give a new concept of the relationships of mankind, there is open to our youngsters an infinite field of exciting adventure where the heart and the mind and the spirit can be engaged.
>
> Perhaps the older generation is often to blame with its cautious warning: "Take a job that will give you security, not adventure." But I say to the young: "Do not stop thinking of life as an adventure. You have no security unless you can live bravely, excitingly, imaginatively; unless you can choose a challenge instead of a competence."

This Eleanor Roosevelt succeeded in doing. She lived her 78 years bravely, excitedly, imaginatively. Her life was a great adventure.

We can take heart that the world could produce an Eleanor Roosevelt—true friend and ally of mankind. If her life has meaning for us, it is that, regardless of race, color, or religion, humankind is one family and the welfare of each member of that family deserves the interest, concern, and labors of us all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and all the Members who are joining in this tribute for their eloquent remarks. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in tribute to the life and ideals of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it would require more time than we have before us today to pay adequate tribute to the life and ideals of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. It would take more foresight than we possess to gage fully the effects of her work upon present and future generations.

We can in complete truth say that Mrs. Roosevelt was in her day the world's most esteemed woman. Few careers, pursued by either man or woman, have embraced such an enormous span of interests and activities. Few lives have had such impact for good as that of this great lady.

Mrs. Roosevelt, of course, was first and foremost, a wife and a mother. That she was also the wife of a public official and for 12 historic and critical years the First Lady of the Land in itself suggests duties which might well have occupied her to the exclusion of any other activities. President Roosevelt regarded his wife not only as his helpmate, but as his teammate.

Her role as the wife of the President and party leader, of course, was a corollary one. Yet Mrs. Roosevelt's independent contributions in public service became so well recognized that after her widowhood and departure from the White House, she was named a U.S. delegate to the United Nations and later was elected chairman of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

It is fair to say that human rights more than any other thing were Mrs. Roosevelt's great concern. Her writings, her lectures, the causes she expoused and for which she worked with such energy and determination, all were tied to the fulfillment or defense of human rights, and to the solution of human problems.

She was deeply interested in the humanitarian measures of the New Deal. She worked for slum clearance, for children's projects, and for playgrounds. She worked for fair and equal labor laws, for public health and medical research. She worked for an end to racial discrimination and for peace throughout the world.

She was a willing and able spokesman for the weak, the underprivileged, the ignored, the forgotten, the unpopular. She prodded the conscience of the world. She pointed out the problem and proceeded to do what she could to improve the situation. She never grew fainthearted under the fire of personal criticism; she refused to be goaded into any unseemly, unkindly or uncourageous act. She did not react to the behavior of those who disagreed with her or who sought to deter her. Her detractors received the same fair and kindly treatment as those whom she sought to help and those who sought to help her.

Mrs. Roosevelt was a citizen of the world. Her compassion spanned the oceans, her sympathy spilled over the border lines of geography, race, creed, and color. Her industry in the human cause produced results equal to those which might normally have been expected of a score of people. She was a wise and selfless and gallant lady. We shall not soon see her like again.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I always have been warm admirers of Mrs. Roosevelt. We spent several hours with her on a number of occasions, and I recall one occasion when we were the only Americans to meet her when she arrived in Yugoslavia.

The occasion of her birthday led us to this discussion of some of our joint thoughts concerning her great contribution to this country and to mankind as a whole.

Eleanor Roosevelt will be remembered by the world for many things. She will be remembered because she did great work in the cause of peace. She will be remembered as an effective champion of social justice. She will be remembered because she lent a helping hand to thousands of people in need.

I would like to speak today about another great accomplishment of Eleanor Roosevelt. It is a thing that might be considered by many to be just a byproduct of her other achievements, but to me it ranks with her most important work. I would like to speak about what she did to expand the horizons of the women of the world, and about the effect this expansion has had on us all, men and women alike. In our own country, she made us all aware that what a woman thinks and what a woman does are important—to herself, to her family, and to the whole community. In the rest of the world, especially in those areas where women are still treated as chattels, she became a symbol of hope to women who are reaching out for recognition as human beings.

Eleanor Roosevelt was not a suffragette. In the days when women were parading and lobbying for the vote, she was leading a sheltered life as a schoolgirl and then as a young wife and mother. She was not a militant crusader for women's rights. She started always with a woman's traditional role as wife and mother. Yet she was able—both by her example and by her gentle insistence—to make women see that they could extend themselves, that they could use their brains and their energy to be the best wives and mothers of which they were capable—not only in the narrow confines of their homes, but in the community and the Nation and the world.

She began in the 1920's, by showing the women of the State of New York—and incidentally all the voters of New York—that a woman could be effective in politics. Her husband was chairbound, and he needed a channel back to productive life. So she became his eyes and his ears, and often his voice, as she went around the State to political meetings. In spite of her lack of experience and poor speaking ability, she conquered her timidity and became an effective force in the State's political life, respected by men and women alike.

During the great depression of the 1930's, Mrs. Roosevelt ignored the traditional image of First Lady, and traveled all over the country to see conditions firsthand. She visited hundreds of soup kitchens, invaded the camp of the Bonus Marchers, went down the West Virginia coal mines and into the great Dust Bowl of the Middle West. She talked to thousands of the unemployed, and reported their problems and their feelings to her husband. She wrote books, made speeches, did a daily newspaper column, and worked on all kinds of programs, both public and private, which might alleviate the human suffering she saw wherever she went.

Some people praised her; some criticized. Clare Boothe Luce put it in a nutshell when she said:

> No woman has ever so comforted the distressed or so distressed the comfortable.

But to many she symbolized more than comfort. She stood for hope and the courage to work hard in spite of the heartbreaking times. People were amazed at her simplicity and directness. As one lobster fisherman put it when she visited Maine in 1933:

> She ain't stuck up, she ain't dressed up, and she ain't afeared to talk.

Women in particular began to realize that something new had been added to their traditional role. Of course, they had already won the right to work at a variety of occupations, the right to vote, the right to participate in the professions and the arts and to do social service work in their communities. Eleanor Roosevelt made them realize that any woman, no matter what her situation, had both the right and the obligation to develop herself and to perform with her mind and her energies all the useful work of which she was capable. If you were in the White House you could do it; if you were in coal town, you could too.

During World War II, she extended her activities with unbelievable energy. Now she was not only the President's eyes and ears, but his wings as well. She visited scores of military camps, tramped hundreds of miles of hospital wards, reported to the President not only on things that affected the war effort directly, but on everything she saw that affected the welfare of human beings in wartime. She set up cots in the halls of the White House for servicemen, wrote thousands of letters to the families of service personnel all over the world. Again she was an inspiration to the women of the country, who followed her into warwork—not just into traditional bandage rolling, but into almost every activity of the military services and the productive life of the country.

In the postwar years, a widow now and no longer First Lady, it would have been easy for her to retire to her grandchildren and her many friends. But she did not want to stop being useful. And the human suffering she had seen during the war had left her with the great conviction that men must be brought to sit around a table to settle the difficulties between nations. So she accepted President Truman's invitation to become a member of our country's first delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. As an outgrowth of this she served on the organizing committee of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, then as the U.S. delegate on the Commission. Later she worked with the American Association for the United Nations. For more than 15 years she helped to build these council tables of the world and to persuade men and women to sit around them. Between official tours of duty, she traveled to many parts of the world, not as a tourist, but in order to see and understand people and their problems, and to do what she could to promote peace and understanding among the political leaders with whom she talked.

In all these activities, most especially in her role as delegate to the Human Rights Commission, she became a symbol of hope and of warm humanity to women everywhere.

She broadened the horizons of women; she brought millions of women into new responsibility in government and the life of the community. And in so doing she enriched the personal and public life of us all.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, during this last year I have had the challenging opportunity of serving on the President's Commission on the Status of Women under the chairmanship of Eleanor Roosevelt. I remember being privileged to be present one day during the World's Fair at Brussels when Eleanor Roosevelt spoke on the occasion of honoring American women. On occasions Mrs. Roosevelt has honored the city of Portland, which I represent, with her presence. And as I listened on each occasion to her wise words of counsel and judgment, I recalled that I, like millions of Americans, came first to know her as the wife of a great President some 30 years ago.

Depression, with its attendant unemployment and poverty, gripped the country. Countless professionals—lawyers, politicians, economists—gathered facts and proposed programs to cure our economic misery. Lights burned bright and long in Government offices along the Potomac. But it took Eleanor Roosevelt to breathe into the melancholy facts a sense of these facts. Her trips into the homes of coal miners, her visits to soup kitchens, her social concern for the American Negro, and her applied Christianity jarred the conscience of America—against the background of derisive laughter and abuse from the smoking rooms of the Union League clubs across our prostrate land.

Memory, a wise man once said, is a fable—a story with a moral. And so our small words here today are as nothing against the vital living memory of her good works. As Adlai E. Stevenson has said:

> In gathering here to honor her, we engage in a self-serving act. It is we who are trying, by this ceremony of tribute, to deny the fact that we have lost her.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this occasion I wish to place in the RECORD at this point two eloquent tributes by that great American, Adlai E. Stevenson, an editorial in the November 8, 1962, edition of the Portland, Oreg., Journal, a tribute by Muhammad Zafrulla Khan as President of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and a statement adopted by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, which as Chairman, Mrs. Roosevelt so splendidly served:

TEXT OF EULOGY DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, AT THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE, NEW YORK CITY, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1962

One week ago this afternoon, in the Rose Garden at Hyde Park, Eleanor Roosevelt came home for the last time. Her journeys are over. The remembrance now begins.

In gathering here to honor her, we engage in a self-serving act. It is we who are trying, by this ceremony of tribute, to deny the fact that we have lost her, and, at least, to prolong the farewell, and—possibly—to say some of the things we dared not say in her presence, because she would have turned aside such testimonial with impatience and gently asked us to get on with some of the more serious business of the meeting.

A grief perhaps not equaled since the death of her husband 17 years ago is the world's best tribute to one of the great figures of our age—a woman whose lucid and luminous faith testified always for sanity in an insane time and for hope in a time of obscure hope—a woman who spoke for the good toward which man aspires in a world which has seen too much of the evil of which man is capable.

She lived 78 years, most of the time in tireless activity as if she knew that only a frail fragment of the things that cry out to be done could be done in the lifetime of even the most fortunate. One has the melancholy sense that when she knew death was at hand, she was contemplating not what she achieved, but what she had not quite managed to do. And I know she wanted to go—when there was no more strength to do.

Yet how much she had done, how much still unchronicled. We dare not try to tabulate the lives she salvaged, the battles, known and unrecorded, she fought, the afflicted she comforted, the hovels she brightened, the faces and places, near and far, that were given some new radiance, some sound of music, by her endeavors. What other single human being has touched and transformed the existence of so many others? What better measure is there of the impact of anyone's life?

There was no sick soul too wounded to engage her mercy. There was no signal of human distress which she did not view as a personal summons. There was no affront to human dignity from which she fled because the timid cried "Danger." And the number of occasions on which her intervention turned despair into victory we may never know.

Her life was crowded, restless, fearless. Perhaps she pitied most, not those whom she aided in the struggle, but the more fortunate who were preoccupied with themselves and cursed with the self-deceptions of private success. She walked in the slums and the ghettos of the world, not on a tour of inspection, nor as a condescending patron, but as one who could not feel complacent while others were hungry, and who could not find contentment while others were in distress. This was not sacrifice; this, for Mrs. Roosevelt, was the only meaningful way of life.

These were not conventional missions of mercy. What rendered this unforgettable woman so extraordinary was not merely her response to suffering; it was her comprehension of the complexity of the human condition.

Not long before she died, she wrote that "within all of us there are two sides. One reaches for the stars, the other descends to the level of beasts." It was, I think, this discernment that made her so unfailingly tolerant of friends who faltered, and led her so often to remind the smug and complacent that "There but for the grace of God."

But we dare not regard her as just a benign incarnation of good works. For she was not only a great woman and a great humanitarian, but a great democrat. I use the word with a small "d"—though it was, of course, equally true that she was a great Democrat with a capital "D." When I say she was a great small "d" democrat, I mean that she had a lively and astute understanding of the nature of the democratic process. She was a master political strategist with a fine sense of humor. And, as she said, she loved a good fight.

She was a realist. Her compassion did not become sentimentality. She understood that progress was a long labor of compromise. She mistrusted absolutism in all its forms—the absolutism of the word and even more the absolutism of the deed. She never supposed that all the problems of life could be cured in a day or a year or a lifetime. Her pungent and salty understanding of human behavior kept her always in intimate contact with reality. I think this was a primary source of her strength, because she never thought that the loss of a battle meant the loss of a war, nor did she suppose that a compromise which produced only part of the objective sought was an act of corruption or of treachery. She knew that no formula of words, no combination of deeds, could abolish the troubles of life overnight and usher in the millennium.

The miracle, I have tried to suggest, is how much tangible good she really did; how much realism and reason were mingled with her instinctive compassion; how her contempt for the perquisites of power ultimately won her the esteem of so many of the powerful; and how, at her death, there was a universality of grief that transcended all the harsh boundaries of political, racial, and religious strife and, for a moment at least, united men in a vision of what their world might be.

We do not claim the right to enshrine another mortal, and this least of all would Mrs. Roosevelt have desired. She would have wanted it said, I believe, that she well knew the pressures of pride and vanity, the sting of bitterness and defeat, the gray days of national peril and personal anguish. But she clung to the confident expectation that man could fashion their own tomorrows if they could only learn that yesterday can be neither relived nor revised.

Many who have spoken of her in these last few days have used a word to which we all assent, because it speaks a part of what we feel. They have called her a lady, a great lady, the first lady of the world. But the word "lady," though it says much about Eleanor Roosevelt, does not say all. To be incapable of self-concern is not a negative virtue; it is the other side of a coin that has a positive face—the most positive, I think, of all the faces. And to enhance the humanity of others is not a kind of humility; it is a kind of pride—the noblest of all the forms of pride. No man or woman can respect other men and women who does not respect life. And to respect life is to love it. Eleanor Roosevelt loved life—and that, perhaps, is the most meaningful thing that can be said about her, for it says so much beside.

It takes courage to love life. Loving it demands imagination and perception and the kind of patience women are more apt to have than men—the bravest and most understanding women. And loving it takes something more beside—it takes a gift for life, a gift for love.

Eleanor Roosevelt's childhood was unhappy—miserably unhappy, she sometimes said. But it was Eleanor Roosevelt who also said that "one must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life." She did not mean that duty should compel us. She meant that life should. "Life," she said, "was meant to be lived." A simple statement. An obvious statement. But a statement that by its obviousness and its simplicity challenges the most intricate of all the philosophies of despair.

Many of the admonitions she bequeathed us are neither new thoughts nor novel concepts. Her ideas were, in many respects, old fashioned—as old as the Sermon on the Mount, as the reminder that it is more blessed to give than to receive, as the words of St. Francis that she loved so well: "For it is in the giving that we receive."

She imparted to the familiar language—nay, what too many have come to treat as the cliches—of Christianity a new poignancy and vibrance. She did so not by reciting them, but by proving that it is possible to live them. It is this above all that rendered her unique in her century. It was said of her contemptuously at times that she was a do-gooder, a charge leveled with similar derision against another public figure 1,962 years ago.

We who are assembled here are of various religious and political faiths, and perhaps different conceptions of man's destiny in the universe. It is not an irreverence, I trust, to say that the immortality Mrs. Roosevelt would have valued most would be found in the deeds and visions of her life inspired in others, and in the proof that they would be faithful to the spirit of any tribute conducted in her name.

And now one can almost hear Mrs. Roosevelt saying that the speaker has already talked too long. So we must say farewell. We are always saying farewell in this world—always standing at the edge of loss attempting to retrieve some memory, some human meaning, from the silence—something which was precious and is gone.

Often, although we know the absence well enough, we cannot name it or describe it even. What left the world when Lincoln died: Speaker after speaker in those aching days tried to tell his family or his neighbors or his congregation. But no one found the words, not even Whitman. "When lilacs last in the dooryard bloomed" can break the heart, but not with Lincoln's greatness, only with his loss. What the words could never capture was the man himself. His deeds were known; every schoolchild knew them. But it was not his deeds the country mourned: it was the man—the mastery of life which made the greatness of the man.

It was always so. On that April day when Franklin Roosevelt died, it was not a President we wept for. It was a man. In Archibald MacLeish's words:

"Fagged out, worn down, sick. With the weight of his own bones, the task finished, the war won, the victory assured, the glory left behind him for the others. (And the wheels roll up through the night in the sweet land in the cool air in the spring between the lanterns)."

It is so now. What we have lost in Eleanor Roosevelt is not her life. She lived that out to the full. What we have lost, what we wish to recall for ourselves, to remember, is what she was herself. And who can name it? But she left "a name to shine on the entablatures of truth, forever."

We pray that she has found peace, and a glimpse of sunset. But today we weep for ourselves. We are lonelier; someone has gone from one's own life—who was like the certainty of refuge; and someone has gone from the world—who was like a certainty of honor.

A Great Lady of Her Time

Much is to be learned from the life of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, which ended Wednesday after an illness of several months.

More than almost any other person of her era, Mrs. Roosevelt proved the power and resilience of a calm, unruffled spirit and the value of that simple, human quality, kindness.

The testing of her great spirit came early, in the pre-Presidential days of her famous husband, when polio made him a demanding patient just at the time she was rearing a family.

In the White House, she was a different kind of First Lady, whose activities drew the criticisms of those accustomed to a President's wife who stayed in the background.

She had to share with her husband the attacks by political enemies who hated him with a bitterness rarely seen in American politics.

Her travels, her lectures, her countless do-gooder activities drew scorn from people who thought she should retire to a rocking chair.

Through it all, she maintained her poise, refused to reply in kind to her critics. She fended insulting questions with courteous, gentle answers.

Mrs. Roosevelt freely spoke her mind. This sometimes brought her into controversy with other public figures. She had her differences with Harry S. Truman. She opposed the choice of John F. Kennedy at the Democratic National Convention in 1960. But in her criticisms she was never mean or small.

The driving force in her life was to help people. Her climb to greatness really began after her husband's death. Her tireless energy and her kindly manner turned former detractors into admirers. In recent years she had achieved a place in the hearts of many as the First Lady of the World.

Just about a year ago, after a Portland appearance, the Journal sought to explain the wide affection which Mrs. Roosevelt had captured by saying that in her was a blending of kindness and quiet dignity with both idealism and commonsense.

We noted that when she spoke, it was with words carefully chosen and that back of the words appeared to be a wisdom born of experience, a great heart and an honest, searching mind. She told of the need for knowledge and courage in today's world. She avoided slogans and catch phrases. She asked the people to try to understand the terrible burden of decisionmaking carried by the President. She said that the average citizen had no such burden but must be willing to contribute his share to the total strength of the Nation.

Her message then is worth remembering now, and so is the lesson of her life, which is that such qualities as simplicity, kindness, steadfastness, faith lead to greatness. She was truly one of the great ladies of her time.

Series of Statements Made in the United Nations General Assembly on November 9 in Tribute to the Memory of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Who Died at New York on November 7

Muhammad Zafrulla Khan:

"Since our last meeting we have learned with deep sorrow of the death of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The news came to all of us with a sense of profound shock.

"I need not review in detail Mrs. Roosevelt's outstanding contribution to the United Nations ever since the inception of the organization. She served as a member of successive U.S. delegations, and in particular as a member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and of the Commission on the Status of Women. Her contribution is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the Covenants on Human

Rights, and in the many related conventions and declarations which have been adopted by the United Nations during the past years. All her many activities reflected her own personal devotion to the cause of enriching the life of all peoples everywhere without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Through her work, her personal example, her generous support of many humanitarian causes, especially those sponsored by the United Nations, Mrs. Roosevelt has left us a deepened understanding of the words 'the dignity and worth of the human person.'

"Many of us knew Mrs. Roosevelt personally as a warm friend and an eloquent and thoughtful interpreter of the finest traditions of American life. We shall cherish the memory of her friendship.

"To the members of Mrs. Roosevelt's family and to her fellow citizens in the United States—and, may I add, throughout the world—we extend our deep sympathy.

"May I invite the members of the General Assembly to stand and observe a minute of silence in memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt."

(The representatives stood in silence.)

Adlai E. Stevenson (United States):

"I come here for the second time in little more than a year sad in heart and in spirit. The United States, the United Nations—the world—has lost one of its great citizens. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is dead; a cherished friend of all mankind is gone.

"Yesterday I said I had lost more than a friend. I had lost an inspiration. She would rather light candles than curse the darkness, and her glow had warmed the world.

"My country mourns her, and I know that all in this Assembly mourn with us. But even as we do, the sadness we share is enlivened by the faith in her fellow man and his future which filled the heart of this strong and gentle woman.

"She imparted this faith not only to those who shared the privilege of knowing her and of working by her side but to countless men, women, and children in every part of the world who loved her even as she loved them. For she embodied the vision and the will to achieve a world in which all men can walk in peace and dignity. And to this goal—a better life—she dedicated her tireless energy and the strange strength of her extraordinary personality.

"I don't think it amiss to suggest that the United Nations is, in no small way, a memorial to her and to her aspirations. To it she gave the last 15 years of her restless spirit. She breathed life into this organization. The United Nations has meaning and hope for millions, thanks to her labors, her love, no less than to her ideals—ideals that made her, only weeks after Franklin Roosevelt's death, put aside all thoughts of peace and quiet after the tumult of their lives, to serve as one of this Nation's delegates to the first regular session of the General Assembly. Her duty then—as always—was to the living, to the world, to peace.

"Some of you in this hall were present at that first historic assembly in London 17 years ago. More of you were witnesses to her work in subsequent assemblies in the years that followed. The members of the Third Committee—the committee on social, humanitarian, and cultural questions—and the Commission on Human Rights, which she served so long as chairman—you, in particular, will remember the warmth, the intelligence, and infectious buoyancy which she brought to her tasks. You know better than any of us the unceasing crusade that helped to give the world, after years of painstaking, patient travail, one of the noblest documents of mankind: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

"This is not the time to recount the infinite services of this glorious and gracious lady; the list is as inexhaustible as her energies. But devotion to the world of the charter, to the principles of the United Nations, to a world without war, to the brotherhood of man, underscored them all. And, happily for us all, she could communicate her devotion, her enthusiasm, to others. She saw clearly; she spoke simply. The power of her words came from the depth of her conviction.

"'We must be willing,' she said, 'to learn the lesson that cooperation may imply compromise, but if it brings a world advance is a gain for each individual nation. There will be those who doubt their ability to rise to these new heights, but the alternative is not possible to contemplate. We must build faith in the hearts of those who doubt, we must rekindle faith in ourselves when it grows dim, and find some kind of divine courage within us to keep on till on earth we have peace and good will among men.'

"While she lived, Mrs. Roosevelt rekindled that faith in ourselves. Now that she is gone, the legacy of her lifetime will do no less. Albert Schweitzer wrote:

"'No ray of sunlight is ever lost, but the green which it wakes needs time to sprout, and it is not always granted to the sower to live to see the harvest. All work that is worth anything is done in faith.'

"Mr. President, I trust you and the members of the Assembly will forgive me for having taken your time with these very personal thoughts. The issues we debate in this hall are many and grave. But I do not think that we are divided in our grief at the passing of this great and gallant human being—who was called the 'First Lady of the World.'"

Resolution of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, March 1963

TRIBUTE ACCORDED MRS. ROOSEVELT

Commission members, after honoring the memory of their late chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, with a minute of silence, approved the following statement:

"We meet together for the first time since the death of our chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Her clear philosophy and vast wisdom gave the President's Commission on the Status of Women its basic policy and direction. Eleanor Roosevelt's own life exemplified what we are working toward, in some measure, not only for all women but for all people in our democracy. Her words, insights and character have put her indelible stamp on the work of the Commission. We, who became her friends through the privilege of working with her, feel a deep sense of personal loss. It is our hope that the Commission report will capture and reflect the philosophy so richly illustrated in the life of Eleanor Roosevelt—that the potential for a full and useful life exists for all American women."

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to the name of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose passing from this life has been noted with great mourning by a vast army of admirers, all over the world.

Rising to prominence, originally, as the wife of a political leader, Mrs. Roosevelt, in short time, made clear that she was far too talented merely to sit back and adapt herself to the role of "gentle helpmate." Gentle she was, in fact, and certainly a true helpmate to her husband during the tumultuous years in which he served as President—but the deeds of Eleanor Roosevelt went far beyond the narrow confines of wifely assistance.

Indeed, she created a new role for the First Lady of the United States, by not only devoting her time to crusading for charitable purposes—in line with her predecessors—but also, to the astonishment of many, entering with zeal and purpose into hundreds of crusades in behalf of justice and democracy.

So impressive was the work of Mrs. Roosevelt in this regard that the people came to recognize her as an outstanding personality in her own right, irrespective of her husband's accomplishments. And when her husband passed away, Americans were pleased to see Mrs. Roosevelt continue in public life, as an American delegate to the United Nations and as a major adviser to Democratic Party leaders in the State of New York.

In these roles, and in many lesser roles—as adviser, counselor, lecturer, journalist and friend—she won the heart of the Nation and the world. She, therefore, is mourned today by a host of persons to whom her gentle, generous view of life came, in time, to stand as a symbol of American principles. Of her, it has been said: "She would rather light candles than curse the darkness." No truer words were ever spoken.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in expressing my admiration for Eleanor Roosevelt, one of America's truly great women, whose life from beginning to end was one continuous humanitarian adventure.

Although she was born into a family of great wealth and social position and was married to one of the greatest Presidents in our history, Eleanor Roosevelt identified herself not with the glamorous trappings of her background, but rather with the unglamorous lives of plain people, underprivileged people and suffering people. This was her unique achievement which earned for her the love and respect not only of her fellow Americans but of peoples the world over.

As First Lady she refused to permit the formalities of the White House to dominate her life. Rather, she used her position and influence to win support, both political and financial, for worthy causes and urgent projects which she felt would strengthen American society, particularly during the great economic and social upheaval following the great depression.

Her travels, her lectures, her radio talks and her magazine articles were without precedent in American history. She became the President's eyes and ears. Not only did she turn her earnings over to charitable causes, but she gave away large amounts of her personal wealth to finance projects which would provide Americans with useful employment and restore their self-respect.

When Eleanor left the White House she was 60 years old and a widow. Spurning self-pity, she threw herself into humanitarian causes worldwide in scope. As a U.S. delegate to the United Nations she was one of our most effective ambassadors. As chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, she worked tirelessly to obtain universal recognition of the human dignity of all peoples.

Eleanor Roosevelt's lifework will be a lasting monument to the cause of human understanding and world peace. Her life will also be an inspiration to every generation of American women who can pay her no greater tribute than to take up where she left off.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today has been set aside in the House of Representatives so that Members could have the opportunity to pay tribute to the ideals and life of Eleanor Roosevelt. Since the House was not in session at the time of her death on November 7 of last year, we have the opportunity to do so at this time.

She has been called the "First Lady of the World." That title, I believe, sums up rather well the feelings of people all around the world toward this great lady, who loved them for what they were themselves, not whether or not they represented wealth, power or could do something for her. She was sincerely interested in what happens to people. What their problems are. And what she could do to help. She was criticized in her lifetime, as is everyone who takes a stand and does anything, but I believe that she will live forever in the hearts of the people of this country and those around the world who learned to revere her name because she was a little bit of heaven and goodness which had somehow found its way into their lives.

Mrs. Roosevelt loved all of humanity. It returned her love in abundance. She never felt herself too high to speak to the poorest or lowest of human beings. Human suffering and poverty were diseases which transcended political boundaries, and racial and ethnic barriers. She made more than her own personal contribution to their eradication. She in fact lived a life which typified her beliefs. All of us can learn much from Eleanor Roosevelt. I am proud to salute her, her work, and her memory today.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, a woman who undoubtedly was loved and admired and respected by more people than any woman in history. I think this is true because Eleanor Roosevelt extended herself far beyond the confines of her position as the wife, and later, widow, of a President of the United States.

At the time of her death last November, tributes from persons all over the world poured in, moving, heartfelt, personal tributes. This was not surprising to those of us who had watched this gallant woman as she went out into the world, giving of her warm, human, generous self, trying to encourage where there was often little to encourage.

Wherever Eleanor Roosevelt went, she went as herself—a woman. To her the world was human and she accepted everyone as human beings who shared with her common aspirations and ideals of what "ought to be." She never responded to a distressing human situation in terms of abstractions or dogmas or theories. She responded in human terms. In her presence, people were themselves. There was never any need for front or face.

Over a long period of rich and active years, Eleanor Roosevelt lived her philosophy. To her, the happy life was the useful life. And she chose to be useful to everyone who called on her for a good cause. To leave the world richer for our having lived in it, she would say, was the best criterion for a successful life.

The largeness of Eleanor Roosevelt's vision was not at first appreciated during the early years of the Roosevelt administration. The often intense and bitter feelings in many quarters of our society during this tense crisis period often spilled over onto the President's wife. She became the butt of jokes and stories. But she proved herself capable of rising above the acrimony. She succeeded in doing so because her heart was large enough to understand human frailties and her vision was large enough to prevent her from retreating from public life.

> No human being is all wise—

She asserted—

> no human being always lives up to the best that he is capable of. Failure comes to everyone, except when one does nothing at all, which in itself is a failure. All we can do is to be honest with ourselves, be humble and try, as we gain wisdom, to rectify our mistakes and possibly to avoid some of them.

No one could quarrel with this frankness and this honesty.

Eleanor Roosevelt was tremendously successful in reaching the hearts and minds of people because she ground no ax for any one faction. She represented no one organization, no one group. She was nonpartisan in the largest sense of the word. One always sensed that her heart and her ideals transcended narrow political boundaries. She supported any organization which she felt was working for universal goals—tolerance, respect, and understanding among all groups.

> We talk so often about the differences between people—

She wrote just a few years before her death.

> Yet, in spite of circumstances which create great differences, we have certain great similarities. Rich or poor, we want our children to be well educated. Rich or poor, we want the respect of our neighbors and perhaps their affection. Love and death come to us all, no matter what the circumstances of our lives. In the big things that matter, the similarities are far greater than the differences. If this is true at home, it is true anywhere in the world. People want the same things. The differences are important but often superficial. The basic things are similar.

It was this intuitive feeling of kinship with humanity that marked Eleanor Roosevelt's life of service to others.

What shall we remember most of Eleanor Roosevelt? Shall we think of her as the first First Lady to ever hold a press conference in the White House? Shall we remember her because of her newspaper column "My Day" which ran for 25 years? Shall we remember her for her support of the Palestine partition plan to establish the state of Israel, or for her efforts to win universal acceptance in the United Nations for the Declaration of Human Rights?

Of course, we shall remember her for these things and many more. But I think her lasting claim to immortality rests upon her own self, her personal goodness, her deep loyalty to democratic ideals and her all-out commitment to improving the conditions of human existence.

A woman such as Eleanor Roosevelt is rare in any age. We are immensely proud that she lived in ours.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege to join my distinguished colleague from New York, Congressman RYAN, in the tribute being paid today to the outstanding woman of the 20th century, known most often as the First Lady of the World, the late Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mrs. Roosevelt, the humanitarian, spent her life aiding the world's underprivileged. She had an abiding interest in all people, their needs, and their conditions of living, from our own citizens to those in remote corners of the earth. Many men who served in our Armed Forces during World War II remember her kind and thoughtful visits to almost forgotten outposts of duty.

A philosopher, Mrs. Roosevelt devoted her life to leaving among people of the world a shining concept of the United States and its role in world affairs.

An author, she found time in her busy day to write some of the most delightful articles to be found in the English language. Those of us who enjoyed her columns now feel a great silence.

A mother of outstanding devotion, she gave us our distinguished colleague from California, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, who is making a significant contribution to our Nation, here in Congress, in the finest tradition of his father and mother.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was all these things and more. Her devotion to her country and to her fellow human beings marks her for the ages. We feel the absence of her counsel and guidance and we miss her gentle, loving presence. But her spirit will forever live among us.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, "Men don't make new worlds in an afternoon; brick has to be placed on brick, and the process is long and incredibly painful."

No one recognized this more than the First Lady of the World to whom we in the Congress are paying tribute today—Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Eleanor Roosevelt was much more than a mere abstract idealist. In serving as her husband's helpmate during his years as Governor and President, she saw for herself the human suffering and problems which existed in the country and throughout the world and determined personally to do something about them.

Through her desire to help others she came to know all sorts and conditions of men. No stranger was Eleanor Roosevelt to slum areas, to mines or even to the front lines during World War II.

Prompting her desire to find practical and effective ways to improve the world in which she lived was the innate ability this unselfish, courageous, and compassionate woman seemed to have for putting herself in the place of others.

Says Mrs. Roosevelt in her autobiography published in 1961:

> One curious thing is that I have always seen life personally; that is my interest or

> sympathy or indignation is aroused by an abstract cause but by the plight of a single person whom I have seen with my own eyes. Out of my response to an individual develops an awareness of a problem to the community, then to the country, and finally to the world.
>
> More and more—

She said—

> people are coming to realize that what affects an individual affects mankind.

It is not strange, therefore, that her later years found her not dealing as frequently with individual needs at home in the United States as with the deprivations of underprivileged people on a larger scale through her work in the United Nations.

> There is such a big, muddled world—

Said Mrs. Roosevelt on her 75th birthday—

> so much that can be done if we increase in depth of understanding, in learning to care, in thinking of hunger not as an abstraction but as one empty stomach, in having a hospitable mind, open like a window to currents of air and to light from all sides.
>
> Our obligation to the world is, primarily, our obligation to our own future. Obviously we cannot develop beyond a certain point unless other nations develop, too.

Mrs. Roosevelt died before her goals and aspirations for all peoples could be realized. We in the Congress, as well as all Americans, have a chance to aid in carrying on her work by placing that "brick on brick" in making a better world in which to live.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, if Congress had been in session on November 7th at the time of Eleanor Roosevelt's death, in the fullness of our hearts we would have eulogized her. We would have spoken then in the depth of loss and a sense of mourning for ourselves for what had been taken away.

But since the calendar of Congress had led us on to other pursuits, it seems to me now that the accident of chronology is letting us speak with a perspective that Eleanor Roosevelt would have far preferred.

Now that time has mellowed the sharp edges of loss, we can see more clearly the gentle and positive legacy she bequeathed us. Her energies were immense, and her activities broad and varied, but what emerges most clearly in looking back over them is her pervasive and unfaltering love and faith in humankind. She left us a last will and testament in that noblest of human documents, the Declaration of Human Rights, which is to the Charter of the United Nations what our Bill of Rights is to the American Constitution. Through this document she has left her imprimatur on the United Nations.

Eleanor Roosevelt would understand our wish to erect marble memorials to her. But what would please her most, and the greatest tribute to her, would be in our carrying on hopefully and constructively where she left off. Let us have her abiding faith. In our wish to take giant strides toward equity for all, let us be willing to follow her lead in taking the small patient steps that opportunity allows. If we do this, history may write in large and golden script the only epitaph she would have wished: "Eleanor Roosevelt, the Architect of Peace."

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the State of Connecticut and for myself, I would like to express our heartfelt grief at the loss of our beloved Eleanor Roosevelt. She had been a part of us for a long while.

She endeared herself to us from the first, as a gracious, retiring wife and mother. We will long remember her warm smile. During the long and eventful Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, we came to respect her for her courage and her constant devotion for our welfare. Then, at his death, we admired her strength and resolution. For these qualities alone, and her long public life, we would note her passing here. We would not grudge her the quiet rest and eternal peace that is the final due, of high and low alike. But for that, we mourn the death of Eleanor Roosevelt for it has taken something of value from us all.

Yet we are not alone the ones who bear the loss of this grand lady. For she was human, and in her own quiet way she bore the quality of greatness. The great amongst us are never quite possessed by those they serve. But, urged by a higher calling, ever search beyond the bounds of present expediencies for a new and better world for all of us. Eleanor Roosevelt was one such person. Though we are sorely in need of such bold and dauntless spirits, we are vaguely uneasy at times lest, in their seeking, they might upset our customary ways. But how else can we progress except through change? Within the broad sweep of their ambitious vision, pioneers sometimes see as accomplished things yet a little beyond our times and their impatience with our common progress is hard for us to understand. But it serves us too that we be not lax in our efforts. And if we are not always able to feel as they or honestly accept all the things they dream, neither can we at times accept those even of our closest loved ones. Eleanor Roosevelt dared to dream, but who could doubt her sincerity? She was more than a dreamer, she was a crusader. For her quality of greatness lay in her boundless love and compassion for humble people everywhere. In her dream for a world full of hope, prosperity, security, and acceptance among all humanity. She felt keenly the desperate plea for understanding and yearning for peace of all peoples. She did not speak many foreign tongues, but they mourn her loss in lands far from our Nation's shores as well as here at home. And good people of every shade of color and belief realized that they had lost a dear friend.

It is often hard and rarely rewarding in worldly ways to try to help the timid people who toil in silence, noted only because of their great numbers or when some signal disaster befalls them. Yet, in trying, who have not felt overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problems with which these dependent souls are beset. Rarely even do they themselves understand them. And so, in the constant press of one's daily cares, the service of those they love, seek not to brave the scoffs of closer friends in the service of such hapless causes. Eleanor Roosevelt was one who did. Who cannot but admire her stout heart that knew no compromise in the noble fight but fought with all her strength and soul for what she felt was right.

The dreams she dreamed perhaps never will be realized in the ways she had hoped. But oh, that we may share that dedication with which she fought so valiantly to bring them to reality. That we may share her courage to fight for the things of which we dream. That we may dare as she had dared, even when we might know as she may have known, the victory may never be ours to see.

Well, she is gone and her voice is stilled. This may bring relief to some, but for those who dare to love the whole human race, who dare to believe in the "Brotherhood of man" as more than a useful phrase, who dare to dream of a bright new world unfettered by the failures or superstitions of the past, they have lost a warrior of stature who will not soon be replaced.

Eleanor Roosevelt is part of us no more, but she has left to us a priceless legacy: A shining example, of courage and devotion; of a lifetime of duty and dedication to the causes she believed in. She gave freely of her life, and as freely at death; for each may share, fully as much as he would profit; limited only by the bounds of his own capacity.

Her name may even be forgotten, but her spirit will live on, for her heart was noble. Mr. Speaker, a brave or noble thought or deed never dies, but lives on. Like the light from a star. Traveling silently through the void. On and on, through all eternity. There for every world to see, in every age. For all who would but look up from their earthy tasks and dare to dream of fairer worlds and finer lives. A noble spirit never dies.

This is what I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I feel truly privileged to be able to join my colleagues here, and on behalf of the sovereign State of Connecticut, and our fair Nation, to honor the memory of a truly great lady, Anna Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the House in paying tribute to one of the greatest women of our time, Eleanor Roosevelt.

The honors she received were rare and many.

In 1946, Eleanor Roosevelt was given a standing ovation in the U.N. General Assembly for her magnificent work in directing the drafting of the widely heralded Declaration of Human Rights.

This was the first and only time a U.N. delegate received this honor.

Since 1948, when American women were asked which woman they admired most, Eleanor Roosevelt was selected first every year, with her vote often equaling the total for all other women mentioned.

And when this great woman died, President Kennedy ordered all Government installations to fly their flags at half mast—the first time in history that the White House honored a President's widow in this way.

Other honors were bestowed on this beloved "first lady of the world" after her death.

Because of her fine ability as Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, President Kennedy said:

> It is my judgment that there can be no adequate replacement for Mrs. Roosevelt. I have, therefore, decided not to appoint a new chairman.

The Nation's Chief Executive on November 15, 1962, further manifested the vast respect he had for Mrs. Roosevelt when he named a committee to promote the major interests she devoted her life to.

On October 11, 1963, on the 79th anniversary of her birth, a President's widow will appear on a U.S. stamp for the first time since Martha Washington.

There have been many other honors—and there will be more.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a great woman, a great American and a great Democrat. One of the most versatile women in history, she was a teacher of civics and literature, a lecturer, the author of five books and for 25 years, wrote the column "My Day."

Because of her husband's physical affliction, she became his "eyes and ears" during the most devastating depression and war in history.

She was champion of the underprivileged and oppressed; she was vice chairman of civil defense; she toured the war areas; she was appointed a delegate to the U.N. by Presidents Truman and Kennedy; she was named to a 4-year term on the U.N. Human Rights Commission; she was chairman of the group that framed the charter of human rights to be ratified by member nations; she was selected by the State Department to answer Soviet denunciations of democracy in the United Nations; the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research was started in Denver; she received an award for promoting achievement in medical research and public health, she helped raise funds to free Cuba prisoners of war; because her devotion to justice was real and strong, she proposed a fifth freedom: "equally before the law, which assures us of justice without prejudice."

"We remember her with love and gratitude. The entire world becomes one family orphaned by her passing," eulogized Rev. Gordon P. Kidd, who expressed the grief and mourning of a Nation and world that will miss her wisdom, love and understanding very much.

What was the secret of Eleanor Roosevelt's greatness?

She often said, "I feel" and not "I think."

This was her secret, her epitaph and her monument.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt is dead and yet she lives. Her lips are silent and yet she speaks. Her spirit rests and yet it roams. She belongs to the ages and she dwells in posterity. This knowledge is perhaps the greatest tribute which mankind can render unto Eleanor Roosevelt.

True, future generations will not enjoy the earthly treasures with which the legendary lady was so generously endowed: the simple smile that subdued suspicion; the vibrant voice that bespoke virtue; the earnest eyes that evoked encouragement.

But Mrs. Roosevelt was more than a memorable woman of flesh and blood. She was and always will be a symbol—a symbol of man's yearning for a fuller life in a wiser world, a symbol that in humanitarianism rests the hope of humanity, a symbol that in the end good will triumph over evil.

As Poet John Donne once remarked:

> No man is an island unto himself.

Eleanor Roosevelt knew the wisdom of these words perhaps better than any person in modern history. Rising majestically from the banks of the East River we see today the living monument of that belief.

Eleanor Roosevelt's life was filled with great works but writing the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights—a declaration of man's hope for tomorrow—was her most notable achievement. She was eminently qualified to write this declaration because it was one by which she lived. And because she clung to these precepts she added life to her years as she added years to her life. The Lord could ask no more of any of His children.

When Mrs. Roosevelt was placed to rest beside her beloved husband, a simple prayer, found in the drawer of her dresser table, was read. It begins:

> Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred let me sow love, where there is doubt let me sow security.

Let this Congress resolve here today to keep this prayer in its heart and in its mind. Let this prayer be reflected in its actions. Let us strive to deliver a living and meaningful eulogy to Eleanor Roosevelt.

In so doing, we can help insure that future generations will walk hand in hand with the spirit of the first First Lady—a spirit of hope, a spirit of faith, and a spirit of charity.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to join with my colleagues today to pay tribute to a very great lady, a lady whose name will remain in our hearts and memories as a true friend and benefactor of all mankind. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt passed away after devoting her life to work in all the spheres that honor man in order to advance our world to a better understanding of its great social problems.

She was a great champion of human rights and of all that is true and good and noble in human nature and in human relations regardless of race or color or nationality or of poverty or richness. Women, in particular, have reason to be grateful to her for, as no other American woman has done, she epitomized the women who have made the United States a society in which the rights and needs of the young, the weak, the poor, the tired, the aspiring, must be met.

She was not only a worthy companion of a great President of the United States, she was a great human being in her own right. I know that none of us who knew her will ever forget her enthusiasm and devotion to all mankind. And, happily for us all, she could communicate her devotion, her enthusiasm, to others. She saw clearly; she spoke simply. The power of her words came from the depth of her conviction. Knowing her, it is easy to understand why the following was her favorite Bible passage:

> Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

Eleanor Roosevelt has not left us; she will remain in our hearts forever.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent contribution on this occasion.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, each new day does not seem as welcome and promising since the death of this great lady, Eleanor Roosevelt. We no longer have the calm light of kindness, humanity and wisdom which she so generously cast upon the daily human events which rule our lives.

She was patient and understanding toward the youth of our country, and to the youthful nations of the world. A new country, painfully emerging from centuries of poverty and ignorance, could always find a generous friend in Eleanor Roosevelt.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will at last have a peaceful and just world, where all of the people live as members of the international community, under law, and free from the ancient terrors of poverty, disease, ignorance and war.

And Mr. Speaker that blessed day will in no small manner be because of the life and works of Eleanor Roosevelt.

A new idea, painfully emerging from the mind of a concerned man or woman, could always find a generous friend in Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, it has indeed been a privilege to be here today and to hear the inspiring speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very fine and inspiring tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of one of the most outstanding women of our times, Eleanor Roosevelt.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a rare and wonderful person. Her achievements were unique. She was born into a family of wealth and aristocracy and yet she devoted most of her life to serving the poor and the humble. She was married to a President with a towering will and a majestic personality, and yet she succeeded in making herself a person in her own right, and this despite the additional weight of her dominating and possessive mother-in-law. As a young woman she was terribly shy and, as she said, "afraid of everything." Yet she managed to "stare down" her fears to become a confident self-assured woman, universally admired and respected and loved.

One of her great achievements was what she did for Franklin Roosevelt. When he was stricken with infantile paralysis, it was his wife, Eleanor, who stood her ground against her mother-in-law's wishes that Franklin retire to invalidism. Eleanor Roosevelt went to work to bring her husband back into politics, to help bring him to the Governorship of New York and to the White House.

As First Lady she became her husband's eyes and ears. She helped the President enormously by going everywhere to see for herself how the country was responding or not responding to the early recovery measures.

When the President died in 1945, Eleanor Roosevelt went on with ever increasing vigor, looking into the causes of misfortune and misery everywhere in the world. She gave away thousands of dollars she earned from her magazine articles and radio talks. She never refused to see anyone who came to her with a righteous cause.

In 1946 when Mrs. Roosevelt walked through the United Nations General Assembly after the passage of the Declaration of Human Rights which she had labored so to achieve, the entire group of delegates rose and gave her a prolonged ovation. She was greeted on her trips abroad as though she were a head of state. People loved and admired Eleanor Roosevelt because she was a great humanitarian. She was never out for personal glory.

Her ideal was a life of usefulness to others. This she achieved and achieved mightily.

"I honor the human race," she said. "When it faces life head on, it can almost remake itself." Eleanor Roosevelt faced life head on and the human race was improved for her having done so.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, when nobility of thought and action chooses a woman for its vehicle of expression, it rises to the sublime. History is besmirched with the exploits of evil women, a Jezebel, a Helen of Troy, a Madam de Pompadour, a Tokyo Rose. But a good woman involved in public affairs is beyond price.

Mrs. Roosevelt's concern was with people. Let the poets speak for me in admiration of her character and in humble appreciation of her majestic influence on American life.

All honor to the one that in this hour
Cries to the world as from a lighted tower
Cries for the Man Forgotten.
—*Edwin Markham.*

A servant who made service seem divine.
—*Longfellow.*

And statesmen at her council met
Who knew the season when to take
Occasion by the hand, and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet.
—*Tennyson.*

Whene'er a noble deed is wrought,
Whene'er is spoken a noble thought,
Our hearts, in glad surprise,
To higher levels rise.
—*Longfellow.*

And yet when, full of years and grace and dignity, she passed on her burden to others, her most poignant regret was:

How little I have gained,
How vast the unattained.
—*Whittier.*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, although it was not my privilege to have known Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt personally, I was long an ardent admirer of her and her seemingly endless source of energy. The very mention of her name, in some of the remotest corners of the earth, evoked a warm and instant response from those who knew her and her vast capacity for work in behalf of all mankind.

She was a remarkable and unusual woman, wise, gentle, compassionate and understanding, who loved her fellow man and who stood ready at all times to give succor and assistance to those who sought her help, or those whose cause needed a champion.

Her passing left a tremendous void which cannot be filled. She was a legend in her own time, a living symbol of love and compassion to her own generation, and an inspiration to those generations which follow. Eleanor Roosevelt was a great humanitarian, and there is no way of determining just how much good she accomplished in her active and vigorous lifetime. However, as the great lady she was, as the First Lady of the World she was a true representative of these United States, and she has left a legacy of humanitarian ideals which we must continue to carry forward.

I believe it was most fitting that this House just recently approved legislation to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation as a loving tribute to her constant concern for the poor, the oppressed and the underprivileged. Because of her dedication to those less fortunate, I am sure she would approve of our actions to perpetuate her good works and her democratic ideals of human dignity and the rights of man.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with feelings of deep remorse that we pay our respects today to the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, a remarkable person who in her lifetime managed to retain a youthful outlook until and including her last moments on earth. In this manner, she succeeded also in retaining her faith in the ultimate perfectability of mankind.

Some 10 years ago Mrs. Roosevelt came to my district, to the town of Sugar Notch, with the object of dedicating a memorial to her late husband. I met her on that occasion and will never forget the impression she conveyed. Everyone present was impressed by the air of basic kindness, sympathy and wisdom, which won for Mrs. Roosevelt the love and admiration of all who came to know her.

Among the social and political leaders of her generation, Eleanor Roosevelt was one of the outstanding figures, beyond question. As the wife of an American President, she was expected to retire to the background, merely because that was the long standing tradition of American "First Ladies." Eleanor Roosevelt had a few longstanding traditions of her own, however, and none of them had anything to do with retirement. As a matter of fact, she is one of those who actually never retired, and so long as she was able to be up and about, she was fully involved in affairs of national significance.

She will be remembered as a public benefactor, as a writer, a world traveler, a lecturer, and diplomat of high order. In the United Nations, wherein for so many years she served as an American delegate, her philosophical contribution to world society is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the Covenants on Human Rights and in the many related conventions and declarations which have been adopted by the United Nations during the past two decades.

Her faith in mankind was constantly in evidence in all that she did, much of which concerned the welfare of the poor. As she saw it, many of those engulfed in poverty are capable of high attainment; that all they need to help them rise is the removal of unnecessary stumbling blocks. In this regard, she fought to establish equal economic opportunity, here in the United States and wherever else her influence could make itself known. For this, her fame has spread throughout the world.

Seldom in human history have a husband and wife had so much in the way of a mutual impact upon world affairs. In this case it was the husband, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who led the fight against the economic depression of the 1930's and against Nazi and Fascist tyranny in the 1940's. In the meanwhile, Eleanor Roosevelt assumed leadership of the struggle for human dignity for all, and by so doing, helped set the stage for sweeping social and economic reforms.

The battle for those things in which Eleanor Roosevelt believed is not yet over. Indeed, it may not be won in this century. And yet victory in this area is a certainty. All that we needed was to get the fight started, and awaken the masses of American people to the shocking absence of equality in their own country. This became a major purpose in the life of Eleanor Roosevelt; a purpose she carried out with everything at her command.

Indeed, it was the habit of Eleanor Roosevelt to try at all times to transform the catchwords of democracy from the realm of farflung theory to that of solid reality. The world will miss her much in this regard.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, of all the fine women of America who have made their marks in history, perhaps none was so much a citizen of the world as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. She was not content to work for the betterment alone of the less fortunate of her own country, her heart reached into the dark corners of this globe to give comfort to the depressed, to ease the pain of the suffering. To those for whom there was no hope, merely to feel the warmth of her smile was the one real joy of their lives.

She was a leader in her own country in the very early days of the fight for social justice and for the God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of every citizen regardless of race or religion to enjoy the full privileges of citizenship.

It is beyond our ability to tally the contribution Eleanor Roosevelt made to the betterment of mankind. But for these alone she would not have been revered as she is today, nor would her passing have been cause for such grief throughout the world.

It was the spirit of her giving, that brightened the dark corners, that gave comfort to the unfortunate and courage to the oppressed.

She had compassion and love for her fellow man and this love was returned a hundredfold.

That she shall be remembered and revered, as she is today by the Members of the House, for decades to come is itself a monument to her greatness.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is usual in paying tribute to the memory of one whose achievements have been great and whose loss occasions sadness and regret to recount those achievements. In paying tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt's memory this is unnecessary, since the entire world knows of those achievements, and honors her for them in death as it respected her for them in life.

In her lifetime she became a symbol of warmhearted and effective support for the cause of the underprivileged, the oppressed, and the ignored. When she adopted a cause it was almost as good as won; simply by her espousel of it she lifted the spirits of those whose hope was faltering. She never faltered, she never quit, and she rarely lost.

Some of the courage which came so naturally to her must have found its way into the character of that other fearless Roosevelt, her husband, when he was stricken with polio, faced a future without a career or health, and then went on with her at his side to one of the great American careers.

She was a shining example to the women of America that members of her sex were at last participants who counted in American political life. She was a power to be feared by those who exploited or oppressed their fellow men.

She was one of the great women of our generation, of our century, and perhaps even of our national history. She will be remembered always by those of us who had the privilege of knowing her.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleague in paying tribute to the ideals and life of Eleanor Roosevelt.

When we think of Eleanor Roosevelt, we think of a great woman whose heart was filled with loving kindness toward all mankind. In her role as first lady of the State of New York and then in the White House she fulfilled her public duties with eminent capability and graciousness; she was noted for her warmth and hospitality. Her energy was boundless; she devoted herself to many good causes which aroused her interest, and she spared no efforts to help suffering human beings. Her thoughts of others at all times overcame any inconvenience or discomfort to herself—her sacrifices cannot be numbered. She served our Nation with brilliance and excellence in the United Nations; we are in her debt for the many years she devoted to the best interests of the United States and in the cause of peace.

Millions of words have been written extolling Eleanor Roosevelt's many virtues; poets have written beautiful phases in her memory. Rulers and statesmen the world over expressed their bereavement and people of all nations wept and mourned when they learned of her death; when she left our midst, a grievous loss was suffered by all humanity.

I am certain that in the pages of history her name will be recorded as one of the truly great women of the world and in the history of our country it will be written that she was one of our most outstanding citizens of all time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from the instant of the first news announcing the death of Eleanor Roosevelt, the world was united in its universal mourning for the passing of the single most memorable woman of our time.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson has stated that, "Her glow warmed the world," and indeed his words express the feelings of all of us. For millions of people the realization came that a strong and steady light had been extinguished; a light which had become the beacon for social justice throughout every country in the world.

We live in an age which courts the future. We are constantly besieged to look ahead, to foresee conditions 5, 10, 50 years from now, to see life and society as they will be when we are no longer participants. Mrs. Roosevelt lived her life in tribute to the present. She could not abandon the problems of the living to dwell on problems which might be encountered in another generation. Time was precious to her and she did not waste it; and time repaid her, for she lived to see many of the social improvements which she had advocated come into being.

In this country, we like to think of Mrs. Roosevelt as particularly American: intelligent, resourceful, independent, and humanitarian. But in fact she belonged to every nation for her genuine concern for the plight of the underprivileged was felt far beyond our borders.

She made us universally aware of one another and particularly grateful for our abundant blessings here in America.

As the wife of a President of the United States and as a private citizen, she became the symbol of the great good which results from an unselfish life spent in service to others regardless of ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds.

We are in her debt for reminding us of our own individual abilities to serve mankind and one another. While we spend this brief time on earth, let us resolve once again to spend it wisely, productively and with renewed dedication to peace.

The great spirit which influenced so much of our times is embodied in these lines from an old poem:

> Her love was like the liberal air,
> Embracing all, to cheer and bless;
> And every grief that mortals share;
> Found pity in her tenderness.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the First Lady of the 20th century, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a sorrowful occasion, but a prideful one as well. We pay tribute today to a woman lost to us by death, but whose memory will last as long as courage, faith, and dedication to mankind are held in esteem.

As a wife and mother she was a pillar of strength to her husband and children. As First Lady she earned the admiration of the country. As a fighter for causes that benefited the lonely, the poor, the forgotten, and the oppressed, she became the best known and perhaps the world's best loved feminine public figure of our time.

During her years as First Lady she endeared herself to the country through her press conferences, through her trips to the projects initiated by the New Deal, and through her militant concern for the unemployed and the unwanted. It was her example to the women of America that brought them the realization that they were a political force in our national affairs. She was deeply interested in a number of the measures enacted by the New Deal, especially those for slum clearance, relief, and children's projects. She maintained her interests after the death of her husband. Later she was appointed to represent the United States at the U.N. She was elected chairman of the preliminary Commission on Human Rights which again elected her chairman when it was permanently organized in January of 1947. She became the leading force behind the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. From her early to her dying days she was an outspoken opponent of racial discrimination.

One eulogy, it seems to me, gave the key to her impact on the hearts of Americans, and accounts for the warmth of the reception tendered her in CCC camps, in coal mines, soup kitchens, slums, and in the halls of the United Nations and the governments of the world. A taxicab driver told a reporter for the New York Times that he had taken a photograph of Mrs. Roosevelt when she rode in his cab 4 years before her death: "She was a regular woman," he said. "I sent her the picture and she signed it and returned it to me. She also sent a warm letter. She always had time for people."

To honor the memory of this great American the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation Memorial was granted a charter of incorporation by the House of Representatives on March 18. The charter states that the foundation shall devote itself to continuing certain major interests to which she had dedicated her life, in particular, the relief of the poor and underprivileged, and the promotion of economic welfare and public health. It is appropriate that such a foundation has been created, but Eleanor Roosevelt's true memorial is the love and affection for her in the hearts of men and women throughout the world.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound respect that I rise to join with my colleagues in a tribute to the memory of one of the most outstanding women of this century, Mrs.

Eleanor Roosevelt. I do not intend, at this time, to recount the magnificent accomplishments of her long and full life—there is no need to reiterate what is so well known—but I do want to dwell for just a few moments on a basic quality of her character which made those accomplishments possible, if not inevitable.

To my mind, the genius of Mrs. Roosevelt was derived from the fact that she cared. Perhaps in a way not equaled by any other woman of her time, she cared for her fellow man, whether he was a member of her immediate family or an unknown native of a far-away land. To her they were, each and every one, human beings who possessed the dignity of all mankind. She had the deepest care for that dignity and her life was devoted to accord to them the respect to which they were entitled. None was too lowly to merit her attention and her industry.

It has been said that you cannot build a different world with indifferent people. It was because she was eminently not indifferent that Mrs. Roosevelt was able to accomplish so much in bettering the lives of people in almost every quarter of the globe. When travel entailed many more hardships than it does today she covered countless miles by air and rail, disdaining to spare herself in the interest of others. She was a familiar and most beloved figure to our own fighting men at the front, as well as to natives of many lands. Her presence alone gave cheer and promise of hope to all who saw her.

Mrs. Roosevelt firmly believed that the social advances in the United States accomplished through the New Deal during the depression of the 1930's had much to do with the military victory achieved in World War II. The despair of multitudes of people in stricken areas had given place to the hope engendered by those advances. Of all the individuals who assisted our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in making this all possible, none deserves more credit than Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most unforgettable sights I have ever witnessed was on the occasion of the launching of the U.S.S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard a few days after the tragic death of the President. I shall never forget the aura of dignity and grace that surrounded the former First Lady on that day. Her own personal loss was submerged in her anxiety for the successful termination of the war as she often had to merge her private cares with those on a larger scale.

No one who ever met Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt could fail to recognize instantly the breadth of her care for the dignity of mankind which she so truly exemplified.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the wife and widow of the 32d President of the United States died at 6:15 p.m. on November 7, 1962. The time of passing was such that it might well have been obscured by the other diurnal events in the world. The floodwaters of the Cuban crisis had receded only slightly from their high-water mark of tensions as that same night Khrushchev had announced formally, "we have taken our rockets out and they probably are on the way."

That day, too, was one of reaction to the national election, a readjustment in the body politic. The Democrats had scored a remarkable midterm election success, opined the New York Times. In India, a not-so-passive caucus cheered at Nehru's announcement that Mr. Menon had "resigned."

Thus, the passing of an ex-President's wife might have been lost in the shifting sands of the world, but for the fact that she was an international figure in her own right—a noted humanitarian, symbol of woman's new role, author and columnist, delegate to the United Nations General Assembly and chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, and an active force in political life. "In the death of Eleanor Roosevelt," said the Reverend Dr. Gordon L. Kidd, "the world has suffered an irreparable loss. The entire world becomes one family orphaned by her passing."

And so it is. For the woman who lived by the inspiration of the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi and who observed: "One must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life," will be remembered not so much for the early controversies stirred by her ceaseless activity and energy but by her warmth, sincerity, zeal, patience, and intellect. To these qualities our present United Nations Ambassador addressed himself when he said:

> Like so many others, I have lost more than a beloved friend. I have lost an inspiration. She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness, and her glow warmed the world.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to join with my fellow Members of the House in tribute to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—truly "The First Lady of the World."

Millions of people the world over mourned her passing last November—for her life touched the lives and earned the lasting affection of people everywhere.

As the years go on, Mrs. Roosevelt will continue to gain in respect and esteem for the great causes she supported, and the great missions she pursued.

She was the friend of the oppressed, the champion of the victims of tyranny, and discrimination around the world. Her memory will forever stand for the power of the human spirit over the destruction of war and the poverty of economic distress.

A truly noble person, embodying many of the fine qualities of what we might term the "New Woman" of the 20th century. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has bequeathed to us a boundless faith in the perfectability of man and the worth of each and every human being, regardless of that person's condition or circumstance, his race, religion or color.

As President Kennedy expressed it, our grief at the death of this extraordinary woman will be "tempered by the knowledge that her memory and spirit will long endure among those who labor for great causes around the world."

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself and the people of my district with the general sentiment here declared today, and to express the deepest condolences on the tragic loss of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

And yet, although we mourn her departure from this earth, that is not the only sad occurrence to darken the occasion, for her death marks the culmination of her dedicated labors, and therein lies another disaster for mankind.

It will now be necessary for some new champion to come forward in behalf of the poor and the politically weak and the socially downtrodden. By this, I do not mean merely some part-time champion; a good hearted, public-spirited citizen, willing to devote some of his time to alleviating the suffering of those in need. On the contrary, I mean someone like Eleanor Roosevelt, who regarded as a national catastrophe the condition of the poor and the depressed and the persecuted, and who never rested in her battle in their behalf.

This was a role that was necessary for someone to play, as a prelude to much of the social legislation that has come about in the period following World War II. For many years, millions and millions of persons of means in this country spent considerable time in cultivating the knack for looking the other way whenever the poor people and the persecuted passed by.

In this manner, they were able to avoid the pangs of conscience that would have driven them to action in behalf of those less fortunate than themselves.

What Eleanor Roosevelt did was to sound the battle cry in behalf of the American conscience, with the result that the Nation responded, to an astonishing degree.

I shall never forget the scene and some of the events surrounding the arrival of Mrs. Roosevelt at Medford, Oreg., some years ago. The occasion was the gathering of a group of persons who meet annually at Medford to honor the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. On this particular day, Mrs. Roosevelt appeared, with the object of delivering an address. Notwithstanding the fact that it was her late husband whom all were there to honor, it was nonetheless clear, by the way the audience responded in terms of friendship and affection, that Eleanor Roosevelt was also the object of love and admiration in the eyes of everyone on hand.

In paying our last respects to this great lady, we can only hope that there will appear, in the near future, others of her caliber, to aid in the work that she began. To do any more than hope, in this regard, would be presumptuous, indeed.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in this great tribute being paid to the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose passing last November was mourned not only in her own State of New York but throughout the world.

Mrs. Roosevelt was a most amazing and remarkable woman, with not one but many different careers of service—social worker, mother, nurse, teacher, adviser, and special confidant of the President of the United States, political party worker, lecturer, diplomat, political reformer, author, columnist, and friend.

No one has ever surpassed her in the breadth and intensity of her interests. Deeply involved in some of the most significant issues and movements of her day, she nevertheless always had time for plain, simple, friendly, and gracious acts, and she was willing, almost until the day of her death, to put herself out to be of service to the humblest individual.

When her husband was President of the United States, Eleanor Roosevelt exerted a profound influence on the shape of his administration. In many ways she served to keep the New Deal true to its basic humanitarian purposes; she was a constant force for good in a steadily growing Federal bureaucratic establishment.

When war broke out Mrs. Roosevelt saw to it that the top planners did not overlook some of the human problems that this vast undertaking of ours was bound to create. And as her husband's personal emissary to the far-flung battle fronts she not only brought back invaluable personal estimates of the progress of our operations, but she in a very real sense represented home and mother to the hundreds of thousands of troops she met in forward combat areas. I know from my own experience the impact of her visit to the South Pacific theater in 1943, for example.

With the end of the war and the death of her husband, Mrs. Roosevelt continued to assume an active and an independent career. She was one of the most eloquent and effective spokesmen for the whole concept of international cooperation embodied in the United Nations. And let us not forget either that she proved herself long ago to be one of the sharpest and most articulate critics of the kind of sabotage of genuine international cooperation which the Soviet Union has been conducting both within and outside of the United Nations. The Soviets never fooled her in the United Nations.

But perhaps most significant of all was the leadership which she gave in my own State of New York some 4 years ago to a new movement designed to revitalize her own Democratic Party, to make it more directly responsive to its traditional goals and objectives as the party of the people, and more directly representative of the views and wishes of the rank and file men and women who make it up.

In a way the success of that movement which Eleanor Roosevelt, together with Senator Herbert Lehman, headed is typical of her whole life. It was easy to brush Eleanor Roosevelt off. It was easy to make light of her efforts. Many in fact did, attacking her with even more virulence than was directed against her husband. But in spite of all their attacks, in spite of all the condescension, she got the results she went after, as those who opposed her discovered to their sorrow. Political leaders who had been regarded as invulnerable fell before the movement which this kindly, considerate, soft-spoken lady directed.

And over the years she has remained, not only First Lady of the World, but the woman most girls have respected, admired, and hoped to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, as one who had the privilege briefly to know Mrs. Roosevelt and to observe her service over a much longer period of years, I am proud to be able to share in this tribute today. I know that my State of New York, the United States of America, and indeed the whole world are better today because Eleanor Roosevelt has lived and worked among us for a little while.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Francis Bacon took all knowledge for his sphere. The great and gracious lady whom we honor today—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—took all humanity for her concern. When death took her great husband, and her career of exemplary and inspiring wife ended, she stepped out alone upon the stage of the world to fight man's inhumanity to man. Whatever cause was good and just, whatever was right, whatever would help mankind to walk on higher ground, was her personal cause for which she fought with unrelenting zeal and unfaltering faith and courage. Whatever degraded the dignity of man, whatever held people anywhere down or back, whatever threatened the peace and therefore the lives and the happiness of humanity, against these she fought with an unquenchable fervor and fire. She literally spent her precious life for others. So when she finally came to the end of what had appeared to be her illimitable strength and lay down for her long delayed rest the whole world mourned. Every man, woman and child who lived and those to come to birth in the ages not yet arrived had lost a friend. The glory of her life shall ever glow in the memory of her deeds and throughout the long span and reach of time all who love their God and their fellow man shall call her name blessed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by the touching tributes to my dear mother, and I find it quite difficult to portray my true feelings. No amount of words could really convey my sincere appreciation and heartfelt thanks for what has today been said on this floor. By honoring her, Mr. RYAN of New York and my colleagues have really honored the principles by which she lived and for which she fought throughout her life. Her upholding of human dignity and its advancement was a major preoccupation of her life. If she were here today, it would please her immensely, I am certain, to know of the high esteem by which her life's work was regarded.

I shall always remember and cherish this memorable day, and would like to once again express my gratitude, and that of my sister and brothers, to all of my colleagues for their poignant remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS THE NEXT MANEUVER ON A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are 27 resolutions before the Rules Committee calling for the creation of a necessary Special Committee on the Captive Nations. There will be many others soon, proposing this desperately needed action. Despite this substantial number of resolutions, the Rules Committee has as yet not even considered one of these. My own resolution, House Resolution 14, was submitted early in January. In the light of our experience in the 87th Congress, we raise now the question: "What is the next maneuver on a Special Committee on the Captive Nations?"

FOUR MANEUVERS IN THE 87TH

As we press on with the backing of popular demand for such a committee, I believe it is necessary to state for the record the four maneuvers that were staged in the last Congress to delay action on this legislation. They were as follows:

First. In May 1961, after it appeared that the Rules Committee would take positive action on this measure, two members of the Foreign Affairs Committee requested further hearings on the issue. The chairman of Rules graciously satisfied this belated request, but, as it turned out, the two members failed to appear and time was squandered;

Second. In July 1961, soon after the third Captive Nations Week observance across the Nation, a motion was made in Rules to table the resolutions, but this maneuver was defeated by the farseeing members of the Rules Committee;

Third. In August 1961, the chairman of Rules was requested to seek the personal testimony of a representative from the Department of State on the subject; instead, the now-famous Rusk letter was sent and the need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations was officially substantiated more than ever before;

Fourth. Beginning, in January 1962 but not getting off the ground until June, the subcommittee on Europe in the Committee on Foreign Affairs suddenly decided to spare some time on the captive nations and proceeded to conduct haphazard hearings on this vital subject. As in the case of the Rusk letters, these hearings have given us further solid proof of the necessity for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

THE EVIDENCE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. Speaker, as many of the proponents for a special committee had anticipated and warned, the hearings conducted by a subcommittee of a subcommittee in Foreign Affairs have actually clinched our case for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. First, to have assigned this basic issue of the captive nations to a subcommittee of a subcommittee unfortunately demonstrated the little value some of us attach to this vital subject. What a sharp and regrettable contrast this ill-chosen action represented to that taken by the Members of the 86th Congress when they passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and rocked Moscow to its foundation. Surely the value and dignity of the subject deserve vastly more than what a sub-subcommittee can accord.

Second, the incongruity of a subcommittee in a subcommittee on Europe dealing with the captive nations problem, which extends from Central Europe to the Far East and includes major portions of the U.S.S.R. itself, was obvious and startling to all conversant with the subject. The sub-subcommittee barely scratched the surface of the subject and actually distorted the whole real conception of the captive nations as spelled out in Public Law 86–90. In fact, judging by the hearings, one cannot but wonder whether some of the sub-subcommittee members are even familiar with the progressive contents of this law.

Third, the results of this fourth maneuver clearly show that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not equipped by reason of its already heavy burdens to do the job that the special committee resolutions envisage. An objective analysis of last year's hearings establishes beyond any doubt that the hearings were conducted in a helter-skelter fashion. They were haphazard, and grossly unbalanced. It is quite ironical to note the bibliography attached to the sub-subcommittee's report. It was borrowed from the solid results of the previous special committees which this Chamber had created—the Katyn Massacre Committee and the Kersten Committee. A comparison of their hard work and methodic labors with what was attempted last year stands as a contrast between day and night.

Mr. Speaker, for an incisive, objective and quite restrained analysis of the sub-subcommittee's hearings and report, I urge every Member to read the article; "How Not To Treat the Captive Nations." Written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor of Georgetown University, the article appears in the winter issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, an authoritative journal on captive nations problems. I request that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I should, however, like to quote here the conclusion of this article. It states:

> Against the solid contributions of preceding Congresses that made possible the Katyn massacre inquiry, the Kersten investigation, and Public Law 86–90, the sub-subcommittee products of the 87th Congress are well-nigh disgraceful. They confirm all the arguments on time, experience, specialized knowledge, and critical thought that have been advanced by the supporters of a special committee. The 88th Congress has an opportunity to eradicate this blot on America's growing understanding of the captive nations by creating the special committee.

Mr. Speaker, we do indeed have this opportunity. Each of the maneuvers to sidetrack the creation of a special committee has failed. The Rusk letters have indicated the need for this committee, which would immensely benefit those under the illusion that some captive nations in the U.S.S.R. are traditional parts of the Soviet Russian colonial system. The sub-subcommittee hearings also justify the creation of a special committee, which would also benefit our colleagues in foreign affairs. As has been pointed out time and time again, the well-planned work of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would be of tremendous benefit to our people and those in the free world by concentrating on the reality of the far-flung Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system. Among other things, the facts and truths that have yet to be systematically uncovered by such a committee will have greater impact on the still free peoples of Latin America and elsewhere than just economic attractions.

As the elected representatives of our people, it is our responsibility to see that this opportunity to explore methodically and critically the whole domain of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism is fully realized. We cannot in any circumstances allow this basic subject to remain hidden from public view. It is too crucial to our national security, to our eventual victory in the cold war, and to the preservation of peace among the major powers. I, therefore, urge that, as quickly as possible, the Rules Committee consider House Resolution 14, which I also request be printed as part of my remarks here today, and the other resolutions proposing the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

With the fifth Captive Nations Week approaching this July 14–20, the creation of a special committee would reemphasize Congress' leadership on a subject fundamental to our national interest. We have nothing to fear by probing into the full facts and truths about Moscow's imperio-colonial system, both within and outside the U.S.S.R.; only Khrushchev and his puppets have this to fear. I hope we have finished with maneuvers on this issue and are ready to seize this opportunity for congressional leadership.

Following is the text of House Resolution 14 and the aforementioned article by Dr. Dobriansky:

Resolution

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

HOW NOT TO TREAT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In January 1962, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives suddenly announced its intention to conduct hearings on the captive nations. To casual observers this announcement appeared as a self-motivated step of serious inquiry into the captive world. For those close to the subject, however, it basically represented a maneuver designed to deflect attention from the popular movement in this country for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. In fact, it was freely predicted at the time that the hearings held by the subcommittee on Europe would provide further substantial evidence justifying the need for a special committee.

Such evidence is contained in the two publications released by the Foreign Affairs Committee toward the end of the year. Both the hearings and the report on hearings readily fulfill the prediction that was made. Today, they constitute an additional, formidable reason for the necessary formation of a special committee.

Needless to say, it is somewhat of an unpleasant task to criticize the efforts of several friends who led the hearings. But this burden is lessened enormously by one's good faith in their undoubted desire to view this extremely important subject objectively and constructively. Such a view can only be well beyond the insular confines of jurisdictional prerogative and with selfless concern for the national security of our country. On the basis of the hearings held last year, this compact analysis aims to show in as objective a manner as possible the reasons why a special committee is needed now more than ever before.

Before we briefly consider the background to these hearings, from the very start it would do well for us to bear in mind certain guiding facts and perspectives. The first fact is that the hearings consumed in time parts of only 10 days over a period of 3 months. They were held spottily in June, July, and September, giving every indication of a dearth of testimonies and haphazard organization. Second, over 15 percent of the testimonies given upheld the thesis of a special committee on the captive nations, which wasn't within the purview of the hearings anyway. When one adds to this the approximately 15 percent devoted in the hearings brochure to the operations of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, the coverage of the captive nations, as envisioned by the proponents of a special committee, becomes slim and superficial indeed. The short time invested, the misappropriation of this time, and a heavy dose of duplication in output, albeit in an artificially restricted area of inquiry, all this and more add up to a rather sorry performance on the captive nations.

Without question, there is some solid and instructive material in several of the recorded testimonies. This will be pointed out in the course of this analysis. Nevertheless, much of it is lost in the poor organization of the hearings; and for purposes of popular reading by the average citizen it can have little constructive effect. Moreover, it is evident that the majority of the private witnesses were quite unaware of the causes and reasons that led to staging the hearings in the first place. What on the whole has been produced strongly substantiates the many arguments advanced by the supporters of a special committee, many of whom had anticipated the maneuver in the late summer of 1961. Regrettable as it may seem, to their arguments one can now add the further point that an established special committee would undoubtedly prove to be of tremendous educational benefit even to some members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

BACKGROUND TO THE HEARINGS

Essentially, the staging of these hearings has no significant meaning other than in terms of the whole background carved by the fight for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. To put it bluntly and accurately, if there had been no such educational campaign for a special committee, there certainly would not have been any hearings on the captive nations at this time and the manner in which they were conducted. Both in relation to the subject here and with regard to the continuing fight for such a committee, it is very important to know at least the bare outlines of this background.

Action for a special committee was initiated by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania as early as August 1960. House Resolution 626, calling for the establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations, was introduced at that time by its original sponsor chiefly for the purpose of sounding out public interest in the measure.[1] Congress was just about closing out its bobtail session; so there wasn't even the slightest possibility of realizing this measure then. On the other hand, the practical aim of obtaining a public consensus was fulfilled beyond expectations. In 1961, at the beginning of the 87th Congress, Congressman FLOOD reintroduced the measure as House Resolution 211, and a whole succession of colorful events was begun.[2]

It is not our purpose here to recount in detail the revealing developments that ensued. Once a special committee is established, the full story of this background will be in order. Only those facts that have a bearing on the foreign affairs hearings concern us here. And these facts are as follows: One, after public interest expressed itself intensely on the resolution, the House Rules Committee held hearings on it in May 1961, and was about to take positive action. However, both the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the chairlady of the Subcommittee on Europe requested for an opportunity to appear before Rules. The request was granted, but the opportunity was not seized, and the stall and delaying tactics were on.

Supporters of a special committee, such as Congressmen DERWINSKI, STRATTON and so forth, were well aware of the sources of opposition to the resolution. One of these has been, of course, the Foreign Affairs Committee, which regards the resolution as an encroachment upon its jurisdiction. The other source is the Department of State. Its fears of public evidence, showing not only the defects of our foreign policies but also, and more fundamental, the limitations of knowledge and understanding of some of our officials with regard to the Soviet Union, have been generally appreciated. Thus, it was no surprise that a second maneuver was engineered to table the special committee resolutions in the Rules Committee. In the summer of 1961, such an attempt was made. It was voted down.

As shown in an editorial written by the author, two more maneuvers were to be encountered.[3] Actually forming the third and fourth maneuvers respectively, the first was the involvement of the State Department; the second was the trumped-up hearings in Foreign Affairs. We need only be brief about the former.

After the tabling motion was defeated in Rules, steady public pressure caused the opposition to a special committee to invoke the opinion of the State Department on the issue, as though its opinion was not known. When the matter was brought up in Rules in August 1961, some members demanded that the Department send its representative to appear in person before the committee. This idea was carried, but the Department chose to send a letter signed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. This was the first of the two now famous Rusk letters which immensely confirmed the position of the special committee advocates.[4] Now State proved the need for a special committee with its two astonishing, blunderous letters.[5]

Following the backfiring results of the third maneuver, it was quite evident to all involved in this fight that a congressional whitewash would be the next step. Proponents of a special committee began to anticipate the hearings in foreign affairs with arguments such as these: (1) Foreign Affairs is ill equipped by reasons of time, preoccupation and composition to undertake satisfactorily the tasks underscored by House Resolution 211 and three dozen other resolutions; (2) the captive nations subject requires a broader and more independent base of inquiry than Foreign Affairs can provide, even in the area of informed personnel (there are many Members who are not on Foreign Affairs and, on the basis of experience and proven interest, have greater competence in this specialized field than do many Members in Foreign Affairs); and (3) because of these and other reasons, we can expect little in this most vital subject from this standing committee.[6]

---

[1] FLOOD, DANIEL J., "Freedom," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 13, pp. 17674–17694.

[2] FLOOD, DANIEL J., "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3518–3544.

[3] Editorial written by L. E. Dobriansky, "The Rusk Letters," The Ukrainian Quarterly, winter, 1961, pp. 293–300.

[4] DERWINSKI, EDWARD J., "The Rusk Letters," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 7, pp. 9553–9555.

[5] "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, pp. 3583–3585.

With a knowledge of this background, anyone reading carefully the Hearings of Foreign Affairs and also its Report on Hearings—which significantly was issued on October 29, 1962, about a week prior to the congressional elections—cannot but be impressed by these arguments. Both documents support them thoroughly. Time and time again, even for these acutely limited hearings, members are recorded having to excuse themselves because of other commitments. In helter-skelter fashion, many witnesses appeared without prepared statements, indicating the unbalanced proceedings that scarcely measure up to the sterling results of such previous select committees as the Katyn Massacre and the Kersten one. The contrasts are sharp and conclusive. Moreover, as one would expect, the questioning is slipshod, as though Public Law 480 and a couple of quick solutions to the captive nations problem were of conclusive concern; and the type of questions asked shows that some previous knowledge is necessary for an effective treatment of the subject. In short, just like the State Department, the Foreign Affairs Committee has now openly confirmed the position of the special committee advocates.

WHAT VALUE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

Looking at this record of events, the average American interested in the security of his country might well ask himself, "In the eyes of some of our officials, of what value are the captive nations in the cold war?" This record indicates that their views and behavior attach little and light value to what is indeed our most powerful nonmilitary weapon. The two documents of the Foreign Affairs Committee are now a part of this record. And it is for this additional reason that Congressman **Flood** has reintroduced again his measure to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. His House Resolution 14 has of the time of this writing been joined by 21 other resolutions.

The first obvious underestimation of the value of captive nations to the interests of our country is the relegation of the subject to a subcommittee of the subcommittee of Europe in the Foreign Affairs Committee. The setup of the hearings has all the markings of a cellar investigation. I doubt that legislatively we could descend any lower than this. Apart from considerations of real self-interest, what a sad reflection this is on the idealism of our Nation—indeed, on the 87th Congress which followed the one responsible for the world eye-opening Captive Nations Week resolution. For space, atoms, small business, export-import controls, and a host of other limited material interests, we hardly hesitate to establish special committees; for a billion people in captivity we seem to be satisfied with the meanderings of a sub-subcommittee that in the course of it all appears to be confused about its own status.

In addition to the low value assigned to the captive nations subject, another major criticism is the treatment of this aggregate subject by a group concerned solely with Europe, and at that only part of it. One of the chief arguments for a special committee has been the need for Americans to see the family of captive nations as a whole, in its total aggregate form. This has been one of the most profitable lessons learned from the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution. It is this fact of including all the captive nations in one operational concept that frightened Khrushchev in July 1959. But this lesson and this fact apparently have failed to rub off on some. The subcommittee of Europe shows no understanding of this all-important innovation and, with due unproductive report, has pursued the archaic channels of dealing with a minority of captive nations in central Europe. Little wonder that its work, such as it is, has stimulated almost no interest either here or abroad.

THE SUB-SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

With these general facts in mind, let's take a close, running account of the hearings. Confusion prevails not only with reference to the graded value of the subject and concepts, not to speak of perspectives, but also in relation to the body's own status, the sequence of testimonies, the objectives of the hearings and a number of other items deserving of our attention here. On the matter of the sub-subcommittee's status, in one place it is asserted "that within the Foreign Affairs Committee we have established this permanent Subcommittee for the Captive Nations,"[7] while in another place the assigned chairman of the sub-subcommittee states, "Mrs. **Kelly** is chairman of the European Subcommittee, and it is more of convenience, than anything else, that I am in this chair."[8] By now the reader must be asking himself, "Who's who, what, and where?" Well, after being told about an already established "permanent subcommittee," in the report we find a recommendation for "the establishment of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs."[9] This may appear as progress in an ascent from cellar investigation, but with all this confusion, don't bank on it.

As to the objectives of the hearings, the reader doesn't meet up with a concrete definition of them until after having read over half of the hearings. Then he is told that the objectives are to determine what our relations are with the captive countries, what the conditions are in those countries, and what our policy should be in relation to them.[10] Up to this point explanations vary from looking "into the present situation of the so-called captive nations of Europe" to "assuming to study the whole subject of the captive nations" to having the hearings "because so many Members had introduced resolutions on the captive nations." Really, if the sub-subcommittee members had bothered to read the resolutions for a special committee, they would have had a partial steering wheel from the start. The objectives of a special committee would be primarily informative and educational, but with legislative intent and in strict accord with the principles and judgments set forth in the Captive Nations Week resolution. The whole subject of the captive nations would be treated as it should be.

Concerning the testimonies themselves, it is obviously not our purpose here to evaluate their content and worth. But they should be considered in terms of the strictures applied to the sub-subcommittee proceedings. Indeed, there are many strange statements in them that were passed by uncritically. The first oddity confronting the critical reader is the illogical sequence of the testimonies. The published hearings start with witnesses from the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, operational media dealing with some captive nations. Sound methodology dictates that you first establish what is and then you proceed to what is being done about it, but the Celler investigation had to proceed rapidly and seized upon anyone willing to testify in these hastily contrived circumstances. Even along the line of these ill-planned hearings we find the chairman appealing to a supporter of a special committee, "If you do have any suggestions or witnesses we would be glad to have you get in touch with Mr. Schupp."[11] What a situation in contrast to the experiences of past select committees. Instead of a dearth of witnesses, special committee supporters can guarantee an overflow of witnesses—and this is no idle statement.

As pointed out earlier, the repetitive material would be enough to discourage an avid American reader—Poland, Public Law 480, sale of agricultural surplus, quick "workable solutions" and the like. The Loomis testimony on VOA operations covers much ground already cultivated in the 1958 hearings on the agency before another Foreign Affairs subcommittee.[12] Another VOA spokesman has this overall contribution to make, without any informed contest or challenge: "the interest of the average Soviet citizen as to the American way of life is insatiable. They are less interested in our form of government and democratic institutions."[13] The ignorance of this statement is accepted wholesale, but this is understandable when throughout the hearings many of the questioners are under the illusion that the U.S.S.R. is Russia. In the Radio Free Europe testimony which has many good points, one also finds some askewed conceptions, such as the identity of the captive nations concept with "the satellites" and Yugoslavia being a nation. Here, too, no informed, critical questioning, which in this task is just as vitally important as hearing, if not more so.

The acute limitations from the questioning side are clearly shown in the responses to the testimonies upholding the need for a special committee. To cite a few among numerous examples, let's consider first the **Bruce** testimony. Congressman **Bruce** mentions the Kersten reports: the chairman, showing a complete unfamiliarity with some 27 reports, asks, "What year was that report made?"[14] Another sub-subcommittee member asks, "I wonder if you have any ideas as to how a responsible Government such as ours, dedicated to noninterference in the affairs of other nations, could go about the business of doing what our opponents are doing in constant world revolution."[15] The premise in this statement is strange American doctrine. We know that imperial Moscow has used it for centuries to preserve its empire against intervening forces of freedom, but this writer has been unaware that we are so dedicated. Logically, if we are, then why these hearings, why continue to recognize the free Baltic legations; in short, why do many other things in relation to the captive nations, which by definition spell interference for freedom? Many other curious preconceptions tinge the questions of this particular member who, in the hearings, is constantly seeking a quick workable solution.[16] What an approach for the complex captive nations problem.

An excellent insight into the special committee issue can be obtained from reading the testimony of the Honorable William W. Scranton, now Governor of Pennsylvania. His arguments for a special committee are nowhere met by the sub-subcommittee. With past State Department experience, Mr. Scranton knows whereof he speaks. As concerns the captive nations, he emphasizes that the Department is "automatically inhibited" because "their work is with the so-called constitutional governments of those captive nations."[17] Apparently for the edification of the sub-subcommittee members who think the only European captive nations are in the so-called satellite area, Scranton points out his experience with Khrushchev at Camp David in connection with the Captive Nations Week resolution: "I think anybody who was connected with this visit in any way will tell you that this particular resolution made more of an impression on Chairman Khrushchev and he invected against it at greater rate almost daily while he was here than any other single thing that America was doing in the cold war."[18] Oddly enough, as shown in the hard-hitting Feighan statement and other testimonies, the meaning and significance of this resolution has made little impression on some of the sub-subcommittee members.

---

[6] "Why A Special Congressional Committee on Captive Nations?", Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 7, pp. 9617–9619; "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," ibid, vol. 108, pt. 3, pp. 3655–3578.

[7] Hearings, p. 197.

[8] Ibid., p. 308

[9] Report on hearings, p. 17.

[10] Hearings, p. 219.

[11] Ibid., p. 164.

[12] See Review of U.S. Information Agency Operations, hearings, Washington, 1959, p. 206.

[13] Hearings, p. 23.

[14] Ibid., p. 164.

[15] Ibid., p. 167.

[16] E.g., ibid., p. 170.

Several of the private testimonies are exceptionally good. It is a pity, however, that their potential impact was lost in this cellar investigation. The testimonies of Aleksander Kutt, Brutus Coste, Stanislaw Mikolaczyk and Dr. Jan Karski are of high quality and certainly deserving of a more serious use. On the questioning end we find the usual superficial queries about what specifically and hastily "could be done,"[19] about "not going to war to do it,"[20] about there being "nothing in the form of overt action that we could do,"[21] and about not winning "a physical victory over communism * * * because of nuclear warfare"[22]—these and many more queries that suggest a lack of perspective and understanding on the whole problem of the cold war. If there is a single argument that alone justifies a special committee, it is the one stressing a concentration on what is in the captive nations, not what the quickie solutions might be.

The State Department statement, submitted by Mr. William R. Tyler, is hardly illuminating. It is a typical statement of well-worded vagaries and some exaggeration. For example, with reference to the fundamental subject of Soviet Russian colonialism, Mr. Tyler tells the sub-subcommittee: "I do believe that sometimes people are unaware of the extent to which the United States has made an effort in the United Nations and elsewhere to publicize and draw attention to this."[23] Unless he's talking about subjective intentions, in the past 10 years there have been only two or three overt actions by us in this respect. Under informed questioning, Mr. Tyler would be hard put to prove his groundless statement.

Some parts of these hearings make for comical reading. For example, one of the sub-subcommittees holds that by relegating the vital captive nations subject to a cellar investigation, he has attached "a dignity" to the "Committee on European Affairs."[24] In inverse ratio, what an indignity to the subject. Here are some more examples of sub-subcommittee comedy: "A select committee, the first thing they are going to have to talk about is foreign policy" (what self-indicting fear); "the State Department and this committee constantly are studying methods whereby they can hope to penetrate the Iron Curtain." (Who's kidding whom?) "The first thing you have to face up to is, What are you going to do about these countries." (No, the first thing is enlightened knowledge); "if we work specifically to free the nations of Europe * * * we are interfering with the internal workings of those countries" (Moscow's favorite argument again). One can go on and on with these comedy errors. The biggest, perhaps, is the note of illusory self-satisfaction expressed by the chairman: "We have compiled a rather substantial record."[25]

THE REPORT ON HEARINGS

Turning finally to the report, the logical judgment that a weak edifice can never support a strong roof applies here thoroughly. As one should expect, the report is studded with contradictions, inaccuracies, misleading statements, and evidences of deficient perspective. These overbalance heavily some of its good points. Here, too, there is little cause for wonder when you know how all this came about and how it was conducted.

For a crass inaccuracy and also a contradiction, the reader is immediately struck by the map entitled "Captive Nations of Eastern Europe." An archaic historical note is given, "Boundaries as of January 1938." Now, are we talking about nations or changing States and imposed boundaries? With typical confusion, the two are combined here. However, if they mean what the caption says, then simple geography tells us that Eastern Europe does not end on the eastern borders of Poland and Rumania. Moreover, if the sub-subcommittee had ever read Public Law 86–90, they would have learned that far more populous and even more important captive nations exist in the U.S.S.R. What little hope the peoples of these nations could expect from some of our legislators who presume to spell out U.S. foreign policy.

As for further contradictions, it is interesting to note that in the foreword a sentence was inserted to absolve the sub-subcommittee of any arbitrary delimitation of the captive nations to the group that was studied—"due to practical limitations of jurisdiction and time"[26] (in itself a noteworthy confession for a body "assuming to study the whole subject of the captive nations").[27] Now, a report is certainly not written before the hearings, and a foreword is usually not written before the body of a report. Thus, it appears that since both the hearings and the body of the report contradict outright this single sentence, someone had an afterthought following a review of the sharply critical Scranton and Feighan statements. In short, the sentence cannot be used as a saving excuse for the malperformed hearings. Taking the sentence at its own face value, one may well ask, "Since when is the European sector of the U.S.S.R. not a part of Europe, and therefore not within the jurisdiction of a committee dealing with European affairs?"

This foreword sentence is also contradicted by many historically misleading statements in the body of the report. For instance, it is stated that one of the objectives of the hearings was "To expose to the rest of the world that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly welded these captive nations into the Soviet colonial empire."[28] Are the captive nations of Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine and others which are part of the U.S.S.R. responsible for this? As Public Law 86–90 points out, it is Soviet Russia, the real imperialist power, and not the legalistic facade, the Soviet Union, which has ruthlessly welded the captive nations, both within and outside the U.S.S.R. On exposing any of this to the rest of the world, the sub-subcommittees complain that even our official VOA failed to give news coverage to the hearings.[29] Considering the low quality of the hearings, VOA's apparent oversight may be construed as a service to the Nation. Disseminating inexcusable confusion is not exactly serviceable to the cause of world freedom.

Nonsensical, too, is the notion that the emergence of European captive nations began in 1939. The sub-subcommittee's special grouping of the Baltic nations "in the family of the European captive nations" is also an artificial device necessitated by a defective understanding of East European history. Where the sub-subcommittee criticizes the executive agencies for a lack of knowledge, and confusion, behind the Iron Curtain about the U.S. position on the captive European nations, one can only say that it has strongly intensified this condition with these hearings. The report's recommendations for a dynamic U.S. policy in the U.N., expanded VOA facilities for captive nations broadcasts, and a congressional study of other Communists subjugated peoples (by a special committee) are, of course, creditable.

When one scans the report's appendix and its bibliography of the Kersten committee hearings, he wonders whether the sub-subcommittee had ever read these works. An objective comparison between the Kersten products and what has been analyzed here would be enough to guarantee the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Against the solid contributions of preceding Congresses that made possible the Katyn massacre inquiry, the Kersten investigation, and Public Law 86–90, the sub-subcommittees' products of the 87th Congress are well-nigh disgraceful. They confirm all the arguments on time, experience, specialized knowledge, and critical thought that have been advanced by the supporters of a special committee. The 88th Congress has an opportunity to eradicate this blot on America's growing understanding of the captive nations by creating the special committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of a number of Members of Congress who have introduced resolutions to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of the passage of this measure.

We in the United States are faced with a great challenge. Our entire system of government, our basic belief in the inherent worth of the individual, and our conviction that people everywhere have the unalienable right to decide their destiny are being tested by a totalitarian system that denies to those under its imperialistic yoke all that we hold precious.

I believe it is incumbent on the United States to be constant in seeking the humanitarian goal of liberation for the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia, whose actions have demonstrated beyond doubt their love of freedom. We must be active in nurturing that desire and show by our actions that the liberty they cherish is worthy of their noble sacrifice.

By establishing this Special Committee on the Captive Nations, we can give notice to the world that the United States has a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of all people. This committee, through inquiries and studies of the immorality and illegality of Communist domination of once-free nations, can publicize before all the world the evils of the world's most oppressive colonial system.

---

[17] Ibid., p. 196.

[18] Ibid., p. 195.

[19] Ibid., p. 227.

[20] Ibid., p. 235.

[21] Ibid., p. 73.

[22] Ibid., p. 118.

[23] Ibid., p. 314.

[24] Ibid., p. 148.

[25] Ibid., p. 251.

[26] Report, p. vii.

[27] Hearings, p. 152.

[28] Report, p. 1.

[29] Ibid., p. 13.

The passage of this resolution will say to the brave people imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain:

> We in America are your friends in freedom; we are very much aware of your plight; and we are actively working for the day when you will join your brothers in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address the House on this occasion. I thank my colleagues for the consideration they are giving this measure.

H. RES. 175

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas four Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centurieslong authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in this discussion of the great need for a House Committee on Captive Nations. I have had the privilege of sponsoring such legislation, as have many others here in the Congress, in both the 87th and in this, the current 88th Congress.

Frankly, I cannot understand the continued opposition of the State Department to these measures, nor do I understand why the House is not permitted to work its will on this matter regardless of what the State Department position is.

The people of the captive nations have been called our secret ally, and certainly this is true. They are the living proof that communism does not work. The continued resistance, albeit necessarily passive in many instances due to the armed force which subjugates them, continues to make a mockery of the boasts of communism as to its effectiveness and individual opportunity and freedom. Certainly we owe it to the peoples of the captive nations to encourage them in their resistance, to encourage them to keep alive the history and tradition of their separate countries which have known the great joy of freedom and self-destiny, to encourage them to work in any way they can to secure a measure of freedom from the Soviet Communists who rule their countries, and to encourage them to teach to the young people the history of the independent countries in which they live.

As I have said, I consider it a privilege to be among the sponsors of legislation to create a Captive Nations Committee. I concur with the recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that special attention should be given by the Congress to the captive nations. For myself, I am not greatly concerned as to the mechanics. It could either be a special committee or a standing committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, but I do not see any reason why we cannot go forward with this opportunity to point out to the people of the world that the Communists, despite their talk to the contrary, are today the world's greatest colonial power and that it is military might that has created this empire and military, economic and political pressure which maintains it.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the history of man is in a sense the history of man's struggle for survival. It is difficult to know just what was man's first weapon for protecting himself. Possibly the evolution of weaponry went something like this: first, man's fist; then the stone; the spear; bow and arrow; gunpowder; modern conventional weapons; and nuclear weapons.

Man always has had the ability to change his weapons in order to meet new threats; always able to fashion new tools with which to defend himself. Even in war between men themselves, those who were capable of developing the best weapons had the best chance of survival. It is hardly a secret that the Communist international conspiracy rested upon the premise that the only way that capitalism, the free-enterprise system, the very free world itself could be destroyed would be by violent physical revolution.

It is to the credit of the United States as leader of the free world that the Communist conspiracy has been frustrated in its attempt to destroy our free institutions. It has been frustrated because we have taken the lead in the development of weaponry. We have had tremendous resources and the freedom to apply them. We have been so successful that the Communist conspirators have decided that they must look to other means by which to accomplish their godless ends.

And so they have developed to a fine science the waging of what we now call the cold war. Many of the people of the captive nations are not victims primarily of violent revolution with physical weapons, but rather of subversion—techniques of repetition of the big lie; of misrepresentation; of deceit and duplicity. They have learned, too late, the sad truth as stated by our first President, George Washington, that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance." Not necessarily that they were not vigilant, nor even that they were indifferent. I have a strong suspicion that their downfall was caused largely by their desire to be tolerant of those who on the surface appeared to be sincere in their support of a movement which would produce a utopia for all but did not, and indeed could not, reveal the price that would have to be paid in terms of the freedom of the individual.

So the Soviet colonial empire, because it has been unsuccessful in winning battles in which physical weapons hold the key to success, has declared an entirely new kind of war which we indifferently call a cold war. The Communists are waging it with as much determination to win as they would to win a hot war. Victory in the cold war means as much as victory in any military engagement in which free men have been able to buy time in which to pursue freedom. Defeat in this cold war brings with it disaster as great as the disaster should free men lose a hot war.

One of the greatest tasks before the American people today, and I am sure most Americans are aware of it, and thus expect those whom they have chosen to represent them to give leadership, is to fashion an entirely new set of weapons with which to win this war. While we must remain militarily strong, and continue to move from a position of armed strength, the facts are that we cannot successfully wage a cold war relying solely on the weapons used in a hot war. We cannot destroy an idea with a bullet or a philosophy with a nuclear bomb. We cannot meet adequately the challenge to preserve and strengthen free society threatened by an atheistic totalitarianism by destroying society itself. We cannot meet the challenges of a new threat peculiar to the age in which we live either by coexistence or by using weapons which in comparison to the threat of 20 years ago is like trying to fight a modern military war with the weapons of the stone age.

Yet in a sense the weapon is not new. It is only new to us because we have not admitted to ourselves that we are engaged in this different kind of war. What are the weapons the enemy is using? First, subversion or the modern adaptation of the Trojan horse of ancient Greece; second, a form of psychiatry, or, brainwashing a people into believing that black is white and white is black; third, lies, distortions, half-truths, deceit, all clearly outlined by Lenin, Marx, and Engels as part of the arsenal of new armament of the Communists.

It is not too late. America must have a complete arsenal of its own of cold war weapons and a vigorous program for waging the cold war. It would not include lies for lies, distortions for distortions, half-truths for half-truths, deceit for deceit. We have, because of the spiritual foundation on which our great Nation was founded and on which it rests—the greatest weapon of them all—truth—and our great need is for the courage to speak it, to live by it, and to demand of others the same. We have a better atmosphere in which to move—an atmosphere in which there is genuine respect for human dignity and deep appreciation for the worth of every individual.

We have a living example of what freedom produces. We have another great weapon—determination, which results from the innate nature of man to want to be free.

We have dedication on the part of our people, which leads them to be willing to pay any price—even with life itself—to preserve and extend freedom.

While the words of Patrick Henry may have been deleted from many of our history books, they still are a part of our thought and purpose. For Americans, "Peace is not so sweet and life is not so dear that it must be purchased at the price of chains."

There are millions of people in the captive nations who share our dedication to the principle of freedom, and they are looking to us for leadership. Our responsibility is to fashion and use whatever weapons we can develop. One of these weapons is a House Committee on the Captive Nations. While I know it is new, it can be added to the arsenal of weapons with which to wage the cold war more effectively. I think in this respect that the old sports axiom is especially pertinent: "The best defense is a good offense." A House Committee on the Captive Nations would contribute greatly to what must be and will be total victory over atheistic communism.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] on the initiative they have maintained over the past years in support of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Their consistent and enlightened advocacy of this vital cause is equaled only by the importance of this issue to the security of the United States and to the future of human freedom throughout the world.

The issue of captive nations is the primary issue of the cold war in which we are engaged. The captive status of more than a score of once free and independent nations is, in fact, the cause of the cold war. The dangerous international tensions which threaten the armed and shaky truce with imperial Russia springs from the captive status of those many nations. Our concern for the human rights of the hundreds of millions of non-Russian people in those captive nations is well known and conforms to our historic role as defenders of human freedom. As a nation, we support the aspirations of those captive people for national independence because that is our political heritage. But we are also aware that imperial Russia has set upon a course to colonize the world, including the United States. That awareness in the camp of freemen coined the phrase "cold war." The meaning of the cold war has not changed since the historic speech of Sir Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo., in 1947. That meaning will remain the struggle of freemen against Russian imperialism as long as the cold war remains with us.

In recent years there has been a tendency to brush the meaning of the cold war under the most convenient rug. But the cause remains the same. No amount of sweeping or issue-dodging can change that reality of life. Those who have doubts about the accuracy of this analysis should ask themselves these questions:

> Why do we appropriate billions of tax dollars each year for national defense?
>
> Why are we required to maintain military capabilities of a global nature?
>
> Why have we appropriated over $100 billion for foreign economic and military assistance since the defeat of the Axis Powers in 1945?

We stray from the path of reality when we fail to support, with all our national vigor, the cause of the captive nations. Therein we find several hundred million allies—proven in common cause—and who put no price tag on their allegiance to freedom. It is time we cultivated that alliance for freedom. It has been neglected for too long.

On September 19, 1962, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Europe, Committee on Foreign Affairs, in connection with hearings on the captive nations. At that time I raised a number of pertinent questions which I regret to say remain unanswered today. I suggested that answers to those questions have a vital bearing on our national security and should be determined with all haste. I recommended that either a special committee of the House or a Subcommittee on Captive Nations of the Foreign Affairs Committee be established to ferret out the answers to those questions. Neither the special committee nor the subcommittee has been established and the issue of captive nations remains in limbo. The fundamental issue of the cold war remains hidden under a number of convenient rugs.

I hope Congress will act on this matter without further delay.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, upon his excellent presentation of the subject of captive nations and the great need for the establishment of a House Committee on the Captive Nations. On January 21, 1963, I introduced House Resolution 157 providing for such committee; this is identical with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio; I was happy to join with him and the many others who have sponsored this measure.

The need for such a committee is clear and undeniable. We know that Moscow makes every effort to conceal the captive status of the Ukraine and all other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. The Special Committee on the Captive Nations would develop worldwide knowledge and expose the true facts and grave injustices prevalent under the imperio-colonial system which exists in the U.S.S.R.

It is my earnest hope that this Congress will take favorable action on this resolution without further delay.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with renewed determination and a degree of sadness that I add my voice in support of the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and our colleagues to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Sadness because I regret the long years which have passed in an attempt to adopt this resolution, and renewed determination because I am unwilling ever to yield in obtaining recognition for these enslaved people.

So fervent is my belief in this special committee that I have introduced a similar bill, House Resolution 62, and I further entreat my colleagues to give this measure their attention and concern.

Each year several of our distinguished colleagues speak out for adoption of this measure and reinforce their arguments with facts with which we are all familiar, facts which do not alter or improve with the passage of time. We earnestly believe in this cause and once again direct your attention to the critical plight of the millions now confined within the ominous shroud of Communist imperialism.

Congress has repeatedly supported, by word and often in deed, the oppressed people of the captive nations. I doubt if there is one among us who does not acknowledge the severity of their situation, a situation which is imposed on them by the Kremlin's ruthless denial of their freedoms.

The war has been over for the rest of the world for almost 18 years. Still these people are held in bondage; economical, political, even physical. They are not free to pursue their national interests, to perpetuate their identities as separate cultures. In addition to the loss of individual liberty, they must also suffer their history and tradition being altered to suit the Communist leaders in Moscow.

We in Congress are in a unique position to give these friends and former allies the moral assistance of recognition of their hated domination by Russia. By so doing, we would also serve notice on our friends and our enemies that we continue to support the freedom and self-determination of all men.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to speak out in support of this measure establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and, in so doing, to take a further step toward freeing all people enslaved by communism.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who had the privilege and pleasure of introducing, on January 24, 1963, House resolutions for the purpose of establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

My resolution, House Resolution 184, appeared to me to be necessary, in order to provide the means to expose the hypocrisy of the Soviet Union in their repeated attempts to brand the United States with the label of colonialism and imperialism. This in spite of the fact that for some time it has been apparent to the world that instead of the freedoms which the Communist regimes promise people of many nations who have been possibly dissatisfied with some aspect of their own existing governmental policies—they have—after successfully taking over the governments—given them slavery.

We have only to view the examples of the Berlin wall, the barbed wire fences, blockades, and border patrols established by Communist regimes all over the world. They have apparently found such means necessary in order to keep the supposedly free people within the borders of the areas they had succeeded in taking over and controlling. These examples clearly prove the fallacy of the supposed Communist freedom. Certainly it should not be necessary to erect walls or maintain border patrols around a country of satisfied citizens in order to keep them within the boundaries of that country. Our Nation is an outstanding example, on the other hand, of a government which instead has had to erect immigration barriers to keep people from all over the world from coming in hordes to this country. It recalls to my mind the descriptive words of the American Indian who said to the missionaries "your acts speak so loud that I cannot hear what you say."

Our United States, now 50 in number, was historically settled for some very opposing reasons. The French wanted to find greater fishing territory, as well as to preach Christianity to the Indians.

The Spaniards, actually the first to successfully colonize this great country, appeared to desire both material and spiritual gain by searching not only for gold and precious metals, "fountains of youth," but also to carry Catholicism to the heathen Indians.

The Dutch and Swedes desired trading posts for furs and other means of economic gain.

The English appeared to have both political, religious, and economic motives behind their efforts to colonize this country.

Most historians agree, however, that the primary and overriding motive in all attempts to colonize or explore this continent were economic.

We all know the first successful English colony was established at Jamestown, Va., and it appears to have been more for commercial or economic reasons.

The second English colony to succeed was at Plymouth, and this appears to have been motivated by the desire for religious freedom by Protestant dissenters.

But from these varied beginnings and varied motivations, we find the first really representative form of government established at Jamestown—the Mayflower Compact—the creation of the Massachusetts Bay Co.—all the result of the policy of colonialism consistently followed by all nations during that period of world history, all evolved gradually into the United States of America. Colonialism carried within its scope of influence the seeds of its own destruction in this country for by its very nature the people were prevented from exercising their freedom of choice. The sturdy, unusually hardy characters who survived those first struggles in this country, and who in the main were God-fearing people, developed in the crucible of hardship, suffering, privation, and danger that spirit of independence and strength of character which has remained a part of the American heritage all these years. It was perhaps too much to be expected that such people would willingly and cheerfully submit their necks to a yoke of slavery placed there by the mother country. Thus, on April 12, 1776, we find the first real and public manifestation of their dissatisfaction with colonialism when the North Carolina Legislature authorized its delegates to the Continental Congress to join with others in a declaration of separation from Great Britain, their mother country.

Virginia followed suit, and on June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, offered a resolution to the Continental Congress to the effect that:

> These United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

From this beginning grew the beautiful and eloquent document, our Declaration of Independence, adopted on July 4, 1776. It is with a deep feeling of pride and satisfaction, as well as humility, that we read the opening words of that declaration:

> When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

And so, they declared what these causes were, listing 27 in one of the most remarkable documents ever promulgated in this world.

Preceding the listing of injuries and offenses committed against them by the Royal House of England, their statement as to why they felt it necessary to do what heretofore was an unheard of thing, is worth repeating, and should be memorized by every citizen in this country:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

These last 10 words of the phrase I have just quoted formed the die which was cast, and from which a most marvelous thing evolved, our constitutional form of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. From this has developed a nation of people who cannot look lightly upon governments who in the name of freedom force conditions of slavery and servitude, both mental, physical, and spiritual, upon the unfortunate people they desire to control.

From this same mold has developed also the kind of men who feel the need now for a Committee of Captive Nations to be formed in this Congress. The sense of pity, and even guilt, which our resolution expresses, should be felt by each American citizen, because the plight in which these captive nations with which the resolution is concerned, is all too clear.

Our responsibility as a Congress, as individuals, and as a Nation, to make clear to the world and to the Soviets that we disapprove and cannot support or tolerate the legalistic pretensions and untruths spread abroad by the Soviet regime about their actual policy of colonialism and subjugation of these more than 23 non-Russian nations cannot be disputed.

We, in the United States, have a proud history of freeing, both in truth and in spirit, the nations for whom we have felt it necessary to intervene, such as Cuba, the Philippines, the European nations, and those in the Orient during recent years.

We are concerned over the pitiful plight of captive nations. Proclamations by the President, while excellent, are not enough. Setting aside and designating captive nations' weeks also is not enough. To these, all we who have introduced resolutions to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, feel should be added an expression of congressional interest in and a setting up of the machinery for investigation of all the facts surrounding the state of actual slavery and servitude imposed upon the unfortunate peoples of those nations.

The committee, I feel, would prove to be a proper forum for focusing public attention on the actual Soviet policy of colonialism—which they vehemently deny, but which they carry on to a greater and more ruthless degree than any other nation in the history of the world.

These captive peoples should be granted the God-gifted privilege accorded this Nation—of instituting their own government—"deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." It is noteworthy that in no case has the Soviet regime allowed truly free elections in countries which they have added to their colonies. Although originally promising such free elections to the people, one of the first acts taken by the Communist regime is to declare such free elections unnecessary.

Then and only then could such governments claim the "certain unalienable rights" of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

And then and only then can we in this most fortunate country prove we can accept and wholly believe in a statement made by the famous Greek orator, Demosthenes—which I quoted in my January remarks on the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence:

> What we have in us of the image of God is the love of truth and justice.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, Dan Flood, for the determination and perseverance he has shown in calling for the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations. The substantial support evidenced by many Members of the House this afternoon shows the true desire of this body for the creation of this committee.

Apparently, the main obstacle is the continued illogical resistance of the State Department and, in turn, the willingness of the Rules Committee to bottle up the various resolutions and prevent the House from working its will on the subject.

In view of continuing Soviet activities in the Western Hemisphere, it is shocking to note the failure of our State Department to cooperate with a long overdue congressional study of conditions behind the Iron Curtain. An effective House Committee on Captive Nations would serve to dramatize the truth concerning the criminal nature of Soviet colonialism and would, in effect, be a most useful aid to the implementation of our foreign policy. I certainly hope I am not presumptuous in thinking that our present foreign policy has for its goal the ultimate defeat of the worldwide Communist threat.

However, the facts are clear—the State Department objections thoroughly discredited.

I, therefore, join in an appeal to the Members of the House to move forward in establishing this special committee, to pursue our legitimate course regardless of State Department harassment, based as it is on either deliberate distortion by the Secretary of State or his personal ignorance of conditions behind the Iron Curtain. We, as an independent branch of the Government, should establish this committee, disregard State Department pressures, and proceed at once to put into operation the committee as called for in the resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and dozens of other House Members.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania on the relentless leadership he has given in the effort to win a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I rise in enthusiastic support of this objective, and trust that all our colleagues will join in a massive backing of the proposal.

This is the third consecutive session in which I have been a sponsor of resolutions to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and I am more convinced than ever of its need. The vital purpose for such a committee is grounded in the facts of the contemporary world situation. The efforts to create such a committee have received widespread support from many quarters: from my distinguished colleagues of both parties, from high officials in the executive branch, from numerous interested groups, and from many citizens of the land. Yet this important measure has not been given due consideration in the past.

This year, however, I am optimistic about the resolution's chances, for the events of the months while Congress was out of session have brought into dramatic focus the necessity of paying increased attention to the nations held captive by Communist totalitarianism. I refer, of course, to the Cuban crisis, which brought the world perilously near the abyss of nuclear war. This confrontation highlights both the dangers and the opportunities which the captive nations pose for the free world.

We are not yet accustomed to thinking of Cuba as an enslaved nation, for the Caribbean island has come under Communist domination much more recently than the long-oppressed satellites of Eastern Europe. This is the first time, however, that the Communist menace has entered our own backyard, and the specter of Soviet missiles aimed at American cities was a harrowing one. The crisis vividly demonstrated to the American people the grave dangers which the Soviet empire presents to the community of free nations. The very proximity of Cuba, on the other hand, points up the opportunities for constructive efforts to free this enslaved people, for there are numerous possibilities of studying the conditions on the island in order to base our policy recommendations on sound factual information.

The revealing comments of Fidel Castro which appeared last week in the Paris newspaper Le Monde illustrate the challenge which Cuba presents to U.S. policy. The Cuban leader was sharply critical of Khrushchev for withdrawing the Soviet missiles last fall without consulting him, although he went on to praise Khrushchev and the Soviet people personally and expressed his gratitude for Soviet aid. The uneasiness with which Castro wears the Moscow-imposed harness underlies his account of the origins of the plan to set up missile bases in Cuba:

> We had envisaged among ourselves the possibility of asking the U.S.S.R. to furnish us some missiles. But we had not arrived at any decision when Moscow offered them to us. It was explained to us that, in accepting them, we would strengthen the Socialist camp in the world. And, because we receive considerable aid from the Socialist camp, we figured that we could not refuse.

It is clear from these remarks that there are genuine disagreements between Moscow and its satellites on the governmental level, and we know from other evidence that there are seeds of discontent among the people of these oppressed states. I do not want to overemphasize the Cuban case at the expense of the other captive nations of the Soviet empire, for the plight of these countries deserves our attention no less than neighboring Cuba.

We must undertake a continuing and intensive study of all these captive nations. The hard facts produced by these studies would be disseminated to all Americans in order to keep them informed of the international status of these countries and their political, economic, and social conditions. For it is only on such solid foundations that the American people and their elected representatives can formulate a sound foreign policy toward the Soviet empire. Our general policy should be to assist—by peaceful means—these countries in their struggle to live under institutions and governments of their own choice. The specific measures of assistance must be tailored to the conditions and situations of the individual countries. For these reasons I strongly urge the favorable consideration this year of House Resolution 138 to establish the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is a pleasure for me to join with my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in urging in terms as emphatic as I can command the establishment in this body of a Select Committee on Captive Nations. As the gentleman knows, I have joined with him in sponsoring a companion resolution to establish such a committee.

Last year we came closer than we have in some time toward realizing this goal of ours when the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on our proposals and filed a report on it. But we still have not succeeded. And so, the fight must go on as the gentleman has eloquently said.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the mere creation of such a committee is not in and of itself overnight going to free the millions of peoples who are now captives behind the Iron Curtain. But the creation of such a committee will dramatically signal to the world our determination as a nation to continue to work for the freedom of these peoples and not just to forget them.

It is a cinch if we do not continue to remind ourselves of this policy objective we will never help them become free again. If we do remind ourselves, then we are more likely to move in the direction of policies and actions that will bring them ultimate freedom from the Communist yoke.

As I see it, it is as simple as that. Let us stop maneuvering, as the gentleman has phrased it, and get the committee created.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the Captive Nations Subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time on the floor in order to pick up where I left off last year on the subject of the financial problems of the United Nations and, more specifically, the peacekeeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East.

The 87th Congress enacted, after considerable debate, the United Nations bond issue bill. This bill was presented to the Congress by the administration as an emergency measure to raise necessary funds for the United Nations forces in the Congo and the Middle East.

The resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations authorized the issuance of $200 million worth of interest-bearing bonds. The U.S. Congress authorized our Government to purchase bonds up to the amount purchased by all other countries. I spoke and voted for the bill.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to the bond issue bill, which instructed the State Department to submit a report to the Congress by the last day of January 1963 "on steps taken in the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations." The amendment was adopted by the Congress and signed into law.

The purpose of this amendment was to force the Department of State to insist upon a clarification of the obligations of other countries and to bring about a long-term solution to the problem of maintaining a United Nations police force. Under any circumstances such a police force is a very expensive proposition. Since 1960 the expenses for the Middle East and Congo operations have amounted to about $140 million a year—approximately double the size of the United Nations regular budget. Regular assessments have been insufficient to pay these costs. Starting with the Middle East operation in 1957, the United States made large voluntary contributions each year in addition to its regular scale assessment. In the last several years no other country has made voluntary contributions of this kind, with the exception of the United Kingdom in respect of the Middle East operation.

This has not been a satisfactory arrangement. It is not a good relation for the United States with the United Nations or with other member nations, and vice versa.

Subsequently the bond issue was proposed. Admittedly it was a stopgap measure. The Congress passed the bill authorizing the U.S. participation on the basis of an emergency. But now let us see what happened to it. Although the General Asembly authorized the issuance of $200 million in bonds, only about $74 million has been subscribed by 58 countries other than the United States, despite our readiness to buy up to $100 million of bonds on a matching basis. Assuming that all the bonds subscribed are actually purchased, the U.S. matching purchase would bring the total up to only about $148 million.

Then there is the problem of arrearages. As of January 1, 1963, arrears owed to the United Nations amounted to $121 million. Twenty-five United Nations members have still paid nothing on their UNEF—Middle East—assessments, and 48 members have paid nothing on their Congo assessments.

As was frankly stated recently in an excellent speech by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard N. Gardner:

> It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the United Nations is not being supported.

To me this is an intolerable situation and some real leadership is required in order to put the United Nations on a sound financial basis. The United Nations is deserving of support, but it will not receive it without solid statesmanship and leadership on the part of the great powers.

Pursuant to the Lindsay amendment to the bond issue bill, the Secretary of State reported to the Congress on January 29, 1963, as to the steps taken in the 17th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations. At the conclusion of my remarks I am putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the Secretary of State's report.

The report is a good outline of the status of the matter, but Members will see that there is no conclusion other than "the job ahead remains difficult and challenging." The fact of the matter is that by June of this year the United Nations will have run out of all money for its peacekeeping operations and will be faced with the problem of raising the tidy sum of $50 million in order to finance operations between June and the end of the year.

Members will recall that the International Court of Justice rendered an affirmative opinion on July 20, 1962, on the question of whether expenditures authorized for the United Nations operations in the Congo and in the Middle East constitute "expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations." The opinion of the Court was accepted by the General Assembly of the United Nations by resolution in December 1962.

This, in theory, means that the assessments that are in arrears are binding obligations on member states and, if not paid, the members become subject to loss of vote under article 19 of the Charter, provided a nation's total arrears exceed its last 2 years' assessments on all accounts. Because of this it will be some time before the clause becomes operative. It will not solve the immediate problem of what happens in June of this year. On that I do not see any clear course proposed by our Government or by other member Governments of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to read the report of the Secretary of State so that Members will be apprised of the facts. I do not wish to see a last-minute crisis developing in June with the Congress unapprised in the meantime of growing difficulties. We are all grown men, and there is no use in not facing up to problems in advance. There is no point in being overwhelmed by a crisis when it is too late to solve it.

To this end, therefore, I urge that the Secretary of State and his colleagues in the Department of State convene a roundtable discussion of this whole matter in New York City at the United

Nations, with Members of Congress present and representatives of other member states who wish to attend. It should be informal in nature and it should be frank in admitting the problem. I would hope that at such a conference our Government would be in a position to lay out a more definitive course of action to be followed by the United Nations and member countries, and be prepared to stick to it.

Only by bringing this critical problem out in the open and subjecting it to constructive debate will the public be educated sufficiently to continue its long support of the United Nations.

The text of the report of the Secretary of State to the Congress follows:

JANUARY 29, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 4 of Public Law 87–731, 87th Congress, October 2, 1962, an act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor, instructs the Department of State to submit a report to the Congress. The Department is to "report on steps taken in the 17th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations."

The 17th Session of the General Assembly met from September 18, 1962, to December 20, 1962. The General Assembly took certain significant actions which were essential to the working out of future financing arrangements for the United Nations. The principal deliberations on financial and budgetary matters prior to plenary action were, of course, conducted by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee.

The Congress will recall that the 16th Session of the General Assembly, by Resolution 1731 (XVI), December 20, 1961, requested an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on whether the expenditures authorized for the United Nations operations in the Congo and in the Middle East constitute "expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations," and that the International Court of Justice rendered an affirmative opinion on this question on July 20, 1962. The opinion of the Court was placed on the agenda of the 17th General Assembly. By Resolution 1854–A (XVII), December 19, 1962, the General Assembly accepted the opinion of the International Court of Justice on the question submitted to it by a vote of 76 in favor, 17 against, with 8 abstentions. The debate on the resolution made it abundantly clear that the term "accepts" used in the resolution meant that the Organization was adopting the Court's view as its operating rule. This means that the assessments in question have been determined to be binding obligations on member states and are therefore due and payable. If not paid, the member becomes subject to loss of vote under article 19 of the Charter, if its total arrears exceed its last 2 years' assessments on all accounts. A copy of Resolution 1854–A, accepting the Court opinion, together with the breakdown of the votes by states, is attached.

Opposing the wording of the resolution as approved by the General Assembly, a number of states, including the Soviet bloc and France, urged in the Fifth Committee that the General Assembly only take note of the Court's opinion. The effect of this language, as brought out in the debate, would have left it to the discretion of each state whether it considered itself bound to pay for these peacekeeping assessments. An amendment to change the wording of the resolution from "accepts" to "takes note" was proposed in the Fifth Committee and was defeated; there were 28 votes for the change, 61 against, and 14 abstentions.

Quite early in the session, it became apparent that it would not be possible to resolve all of the aspects of the future financing of the Congo and Middle East operations at the 17th Session of the General Assembly. There was a very large body of agreement that, with the heavy volume of work facing the Assembly, adequate time and care could not be devoted to this delicate and controversial problem. The course of the Assembly was such that final action by the General Assembly on the advisory opinion of the Court did not occur until 1 day before the session ended; acceptance of the opinion was, of course, a necessary preliminary to other action on future financing. In addition, many nations recognized that a General Assembly committee of 110 nations was too large a group to work out this matter and that a smaller subcommittee or working group needed to be appointed.

Giving further feasibility to the idea of dealing with this problem outside the pressures of this regular General Assembly session, was the fact that it became clear to the membership that the bond issue proceeds, together with other collections, should provide adequate funds to permit the organization to carry on its activities until late spring or early summer 1963.

The General Assembly, therefore, adopted a resolution whereby a working group of 21 would study and report on "special methods for financing peacekeeping operations of the United Nations involving heavy expenditures, such as those for the Congo and the Middle East, including a possible special scale of assessments." The study and report is to be submitted with the least possible delay and, in any case, not later than March 31, 1963. This resolution was adopted by a teller vote of 78 in favor, 14 against, with 4 abstentions. A copy of Resolution 1854–B (XVII), December 19, 1962, together with the names of the member states appointed to the working group, is attached.

The General Assembly also adopted Resolution 1866 (XVII), December 20, 1962, to convene a special session of the General Assembly prior to June 30, 1963, for the purpose of considering, in the light of the report of the working group of 21, the financial situation of the Organization. This means that the United Nations expects to act on the recommendations of the working group of 21 before June 30, 1963, and to determine upon methods of financing the Congo and Middle East operations beyond that date.

In related Resolutions 1865 (XVII) and 1864 (XVII), the Secretary General was authorized to continue to expend for the Congo and the Middle East operations at not to exceed the existing authorized rates of $10 million per month and $1,580,000, respectively, up to June 30, 1963. The Secretary General has made it clear, however, that he hopes to reduce the size of the Congo force before that time.

The General Assembly, as a part of its budget authorization for 1963, included an amount of $4,650,000 in the regular budget of the United Nations for repayment of the interest and principal due on outstanding United Nations bonds. This action is in accordance with the terms of Resolution 1739 (XVI), the United Nations bonds resolution which authorized the sale of bonds, and is payable at the regular assessment rates of members. The U.S. share of the regular budget is currently 32.02 percent.

Under section 3 of the U.S. authorization to purchase bonds, Public Law 87–731, the U.S. share of the bond interest and principal repayment is to be deducted from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations. We have requested and secured the agreement of the Secretary General to handle the matter this way. A copy of his letter of agreement is attached. The amount to be deducted by the United States for repayments due for 1962 is $2,049,480, of which $1,849,858 is for principal and $199,622 for interest.

As of December 31, 1962, a total of $148,776,194 of bonds had been sold or pledged, including presumed U.S. matching of actual payments not yet made but already pledged by others. Nearly $121 million of this amount has actually been purchased. It is intended to extend to June 30, 1963, the time during which additional pledges can be made. Actual purchases against pledges can only be made up to December 31, 1963.

A full listing of bond purchases and pledges, by nation, is attached.

The General Assembly also decided to increase its Working Capital Fund from $25 million to $40 million by Resolution 1863 (XVII), December 20, 1962. This Working Capital Fund increase will add to the financial capability and resources of the Organization. The action also establishes a more rational relationship between the present level of the regular budget and the need for reserves. This $15 million increase was assessed against all members at the regular budget scale. The U.S. share of 32.02 percent, after subtracting minor credits due us on this account, is $4,797,713.

Taken together, the actions taken by the 17th session of the General Assembly indicate that each financial step was constructive and necessary to move from the financial impasse which existed 1 year ago and to set the stage for deciding upon future methods for financing peacekeeping operations. But the job ahead for the working group and for the special session of the General Assembly will not be easy. Nor are there at this time panaceas for resolving the problem which will be both painless and readily acceptable to all members. In particular, the Soviet bloc has not as yet paid any of its arrears for peacekeeping, France has not paid its Congo arrears, and the Arab States have not paid their arrears for the Middle East operation. France, moreover, recently advised the Secretary General that France intends to deduct from its regular budget payments for 1963 France's assessed share of the repayment of principal and interest on United Nations bonds; France has also threatened not to serve on the working group of 21, which is to work out future arrangements for financing peace-and-security operations.

Nevertheless, having settled the important preliminaries, we believe that most members are now prepared to look for and, if possible, produce a solution to the sharing of future costs for the Congo and the Middle East. A decision should emerge from negotiations leading up to the special General Assembly, before the end of our current fiscal year.

The job ahead remains difficult and challenging. The maintenance of sound U.S. positions will require the assistance and support of the Congress, as well as skillful negotiations on the part of U.S. representatives at the United Nations. We have already begun to consult with Members on the elements of U.S. policy and the positions to be taken by our delegates in the working group of 21. We shall expect to consult further with the Congress as developments occur during the next few months.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes to persons who are paying the expenses of higher education for themselves or their dependents. I am convinced this legislation is timely in terms of national economic and educational objectives. The Nation needs the services of all young people who can complete higher education. These students will benefit themselves and the Nation by obtaining a higher education and improving their ability to contribute to our society and our economy.

The growing demand of our citizens for higher education, and the increasing cost of that education, makes it desirable but difficult for persons of modest income to provide a college education for their children. Many students who enter college and show themselves to have college ability are forced to discontinue their education before graduation for financial reasons. We must recognize the national importance of encouraging and assisting able students to go on to college and to remain there until graduation.

In the United States, we have gradually raised the level of guaranteed educational opportunities to include the high school. We provide not only the teachers and buildings but also public transportation of students and in many cases books and supplies as well. We have done these things because our youth require educational opportunity to meet the increasing complexity of society. The world continues to grow more complex. The educational levels that led to intellectual maturity yesterday do not go far enough today. There has been a continuous upgrading of jobs. The increasing use of the products of scientific technology clearly calls for a higher degree of education and technical skill in every line of work. The same forces that caused us to raise guaranteed educational opportunities through the high school grades now necessitate providing similar opportunities at higher levels. The bill I have introduced is one means of providing some tax relief for those who must finance the costs of this higher education for their children, their spouses, or themselves.

To encourage increased investment in our advancing economy, it has long been our practice to provide for tax-free recovery of income-producing capital outlays through allowances for depreciation and replacement. By the same principle, the tax treatment of investment in education should be at least as liberal as it is for investment in capital goods, since education is at least as important as a basis for producing income as is investment in physical capital.

For some years, we have provided for tax reductions by professional individuals who must upgrade their educational training in order to meet the rising educational requirements of the work they are already doing. There should be some tax relief to encourage investment in the education of those preparing to enter the professions, especially since the amount of education required at the threshold level of most professions is rapidly increasing—and must continue to increase—to provide for the flexibility and adaptability needed to cope with our advancing technology.

My bill restricts its tax deductions to tuition and fees, books and supplies, and the cost of living away from home when necessary. The limitations to not more than $1,000 for meals, lodging and travel and not more than $800 for tuition and fees are safeguards to prevent abuses by those who might choose expensive colleges.

While tax relief would accrue before the individual receives income from the investment in higher education, it must be pointed out that in the long run increased individual incomes would more than offset initial tax income foregone in allowing deductions for amounts invested in higher education. Studies have shown that the median income of families with heads having 4 or more years of college is almost 40 percent higher than the median income of families with heads whose education stopped with completion of high school. Obviously, then higher education is an income-producing investment, and whatever tax relief we grant to encourage it will not only contribute to the economic progress of the Nation but will be more than recovered out of taxes on increased future earnings.

The point to be emphasized here is that there would ultimately be substantial tax gains to the Treasury as a result of the improved earning power of those who go on for higher education. To be quite practical, however, it must be noted that deductions for college expenses would be more effective as a retention device once students are enrolled in college than as a means of bringing to college those who might not have had the financial resources to start their higher education. This is true because the amount of income tax relief realized by the taxpayer—approximately $300 for a dependent in a public institution and $450 for one in a private institution—would not be available to the taxpayer until after the initial college expenses of the student had already been paid. In succeeding years, however, the tax relief might be sufficient to retain in college a substantial number who would have been forced to drop out for financial reasons.

It is currently estimated that about 40 percent of the students who enter college go on to graduate in regular progression from the institution of first registration, that another 20 percent transfer or return at a later date to complete the requirements for graduation, and that about 40 percent withdraw and never finish. Financial difficulties are reported to be among the chief reasons for dropping out, especially in the loss of the better students.

It has been estimated that a college graduate earns about $175,000 more in his lifetime than a high school graduate. If the provisions of this bill are successful in salvaging a fraction of those college students who fail to graduate because of financial difficulties the loss of tax revenue will eventually be offset and conceivably the amendment would improve the overall position of the Treasury.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, following the discussion between myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] with respect to residual oil imports, there are a few things that I respectfully want to submit at this time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts in his remarks gave no credence to the hearings conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 with respect to problems created by petroleum imports. On page 9 of that committee's recommendations to the Congress, recommendation No. 7 of the subcommittee was:

> That the import quotas of residual fuel oil to be used solely as fuel should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to the national security which residual oil imports now create, as well as to prevent the further erosion of the coal industry's markets and to alleviate the severe unemployment and overwhelming distress in the coal mining industry. Further, the subcommittee feels that firm assurance should be given by the executive branch that quotas will be maintained at levels no higher than this, so as to eliminate the uncertainties and instability which repeated and unpredictable increases in quotas have created in the domestic coal markets.

Furthermore, this subcommittee also found that excessive oil imports, particularly imported residual oil, was destroying the capacity of the coal industry to produce and contribute its share to the Nation's economy and security. I respectfully point out that the committee stated that the coal industry cannot maintain its production in the face of continued loss of markets to excessive imported residual fuel oil, and the most important observation made by the subcommittee, in my opinion, was to the effect "that a sound and expanding coal industry is also essential to the national security and to the Nation's continued economic expansion."

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has complained that the oil import program, which I say to all practical intents and purposes does not exist under this administration, forces the price of residual fuel oil up, thus penalizing people who rely upon this type of fuel to meet their energy needs.

I feel that the price adjustment in this program only occurs when the oil importers desire to bring pressure to bear on the proper agency of the Government to permit an increase in the number of barrels of imported residual oil that comes into the country. In other words, they use price as a factor to obtain public pressure, to obtain larger amounts of imported residual fuel oil on the theory if the additional residual oil is allowed to come in, the price will decrease. This is an ingenuous method of infecting the minds of those that use this oil.

I am amazed at the departure of this administration—one which with high-sounding words and phrases pledged themselves to relieve the plight of the coal-producing States, to find that they have permitted the abuse of the mandatory oil import program to the extent that they have said that national security is not now considered—but that a new word and phrase have been coined to do away with the program in the name of hemispheric solidarity.

I respectfully point out today that hemispheric solidarity has to be a two-way street, but if you look at the figures—Venezuela's economy has not suffered as a result of this Nation's oil import program, but this Nation has suffered as a result of an imbalance with its trade posture with Venezuela. It was brought out in the subcommittee's hearings that sales by Venezuela to the United States of all goods, but mostly petroleum, which includes residual oil, increased from 892.3 million in 1958, the year before controls were imposed, to 948.3 million in 1960. At the same time, purchase of goods from the United States by Venezuela decreased from 809.9 million in 1958 to 550.2 million in 1960.

Much more of this hemispheric solidarity and there will be nothing left for the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself to be discussing.

The statement that I have heard here today is exactly in form and content to that which was presented to the subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business by the Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy—the residual oil lobby—Mr. Charles W. Colson, counsel, and Mr. James S. Couzens, chairman, fuel committee, the New England Council for large imports of residual oil.

I did not have the opportunity to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what would occur, since his part of the country relies almost completely on residual oil to meet its energy requirements—if Venezuela fell behind the Castro curtain and expropriation were to set in as it did in Cuba. In that instance, I am sure the national security of the United States would be affected for we would lose this great industrial complex of New England. He would certainly not advocate that we buy this residual fuel oil from a Castro Communist-dominated nation—much less would the executive branch of the Government permit this.

We hear rumors and rumors—and rumors of rumors—of the instability of the Government of Venezuela. I would assume then if those circumstances were to occur, New England would be glad to receive that black diamond, produced by men who must have strong backs and who sweat in the bellies of the mountains of West Virginia.

Mandatory residual oil import quotas—a necessity for national security. Hemispheric solidarity—bah, humbug.

THE LATE H. D. "HAPPY" PAULSON

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, too many times in our busy lives we fail to recognize and accord full credit to many of the people in our communities who have dedicated their lives to the service of their fellowman. Day by day, these people go about their daily work rendering various types of service to their communities. The citizens over a period of years often become accustomed to these services, and though we are aware of them we do not pay proper tribute. What suddenly called my attention to this condition was the death of such a person in my home State of North Dakota.

The people of North Dakota, and particularly the journalistic fraternity, suffered a great loss March 24 with the death of H. D. "Happy" Paulson, editor emeritus of the Fargo Forum at Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. Paulson was a native son of North Dakota who spent all his active years in journalism on newspapers in Grand Forks and Fargo.

The late J. Fred Essary of the Baltimore Sun once described Mr. Paulson as one of the great reporters of our time, and this view was seconded by J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post, and by Lyle F. Youngstrom, vice president of Carl Byoir & Associates.

His work brought him membership in the American Society of Newspaper Editors. For several years he served on the Pulitzer Prize award jury, and he was a director of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association. He was a member of the North Dakota Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi and for a time was honorary secretary of the national organization of Sigma Delta Chi. He was a past president of the North Dakota Press Association.

In 1943, Mr. Paulson was appointed one of nine members of an advisory committee to the Director of the Office of War Information. Fargo was the smallest city represented.

Mr. Paulson began a distinguished career in political and legislative reporting in 1909, shortly after his 21st birthday, and for 20 years thereafter he regularly covered legislative sessions, resuming the job again during the World War II days of manpower shortages.

In 1915 Mr. Paulson covered a meeting in Bismarck out of which grew the Nonpartisan League, a dominant force in North Dakota politics for many years thereafter until its dissolution a few years ago.

His great faith in the future of North Dakota brought him into active roles in the North Dakota Historical Society and the Fargo Chamber of Commerce.

The initials "H. D." represented the names Holger Doran, but Mr. Paulson was known as "Happy" to all his thousands of friends in North Dakota and elsewhere.

His newspaper career began at the age of 15 with the now-defunct Grand Forks Plaindealer, where he swept floors, worked in the mailing room and in the advertising department. But it wasn't long before he found his field in the company of a pad and pencil.

In 1958, when Look magazine carried a feature story on Mr. Paulson, it said:

> He still sits at a littered desk in a corner of the city room, and he won't let anybody call him editor emeritus. Business is good and he is that rare bird, an editor with no problems whatsoever. No insoluble problems, that is.

The article noted that the economy of the area is throbbing and " 'Happy' Paulson sits there at his desk as though he were presiding over the whole operation."

And in spirit, at least, he was.

GETTING THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer at this time a brief statement in explanation of H.R. 4926, which I introduced to the House on March 18. The bill, which is entitled "A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations by the Government, which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise," is identical to S. 1093 which was introduced to the Senate by Senator BENNETT, of Utah, with the distinguished bipartisan sponsorship of Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, Senator TOWER, of Texas, Senator MILLER of Nebraska, and Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois. It is to be noted that Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, to which S. 1093 was referred.

The bill declares it to be the policy of the Federal Government to encourage private competitive enterprise to the maximum extent consistent with national security and the public interest, on the principle that production of goods and rendition of services by the Government tends to weaken private business and to deprive governments at all levels of tax revenues. The bill further requires the Secretary of Commerce to investigate complaints of unfair Government competition with private business, and calls upon the Director of the Budget to pass upon any new business activity proposed by a department or agency.

In other words, H.R. 4296 would definitely affirm the system of free enterprise, upon which our Nation and our business community have grown so great and would set up a policy barrier to the socialistic trend that seems from time to time to threaten us.

But you will note, in section 3(b), "Nothing contained in this act shall authorize the termination or limitation of any business-type activity which was established pursuant to specific statutory authorization," which I believe, Mr. Speaker, gives protection to the 126-year-old rope walk at the Boston Naval Shipyard, which you, sir, and other Members of Congress from your Commonwealth of Massachusetts look upon with the same sentimental affection that caused Henry Wadsworth Longfellow to write, many years ago:

> In that building, long and low,
> With its windows all a-row,
> Like the portholes of a hulk,
> Human spiders spin and spin
> Backward down their threads so thin
> Dropping, each a hempen bulk.

I know of no other governmental business enterprise that is so steeped in tradition or operated with such outstanding efficiency that it cannot be spared.

The real truth of the matter is that billions and billions of dollars of Government money—money obtained by the taxation of individuals and businesses—is today tied up in commercial, industrial, and financial operations, and that uncounted sums are squandered each year in the mismanagement of many enterprises that exist only because they are subsidized.

The scope of Government's involvement in competitive business is one of the best kept secrets in Washington. In 1932 the Shannon committee found Uncle Sam engaged in nearly a hundred categories of competitive business. In 1952 the Bonner committee made a similar study, but its findings were never made public. The Harden committee, in 1954, subtracted a few of the items on the Shannon list but added more than enough to replace them.

The Hoover Commission, in its 1955 report on business enterprises, stated the origin of most Government business operations in one terse paragraph. I quote:

> The Government creates business-type enterprises in economic emergencies, in the emergencies of war, and for the development of projects which are not adapted to private enterprise because of their nature or their magnitude.

The Boston Navy Yard ropewalk, Mr. Speaker, was established in the administration of President Andrew Jackson so that our Navy should not be dependent upon Russian hemp for the rope it then needed. The Mississippi Barge Line was established during World War I; it continued to operate, always at a loss, until just a few years ago. The Rural Electrification Administration was established during the depression of the midthirties, it completed 90-odd percent of its appointed task some years ago, but it keeps on going, at bigger and bigger expense. Such examples could be cited times almost without number.

The Hoover Commission report goes on to say:

> One of the major problems before us is the continuation of Government business enterprises after the emergency that engendered them has terminated. One reason that these agencies tend to perpetuate themselves is that by the time their tasks have been completed their personnel and the citizens in the communities where they operate resist termination. As a consequence, all too often they continue to function long after the original need has passed and even though the operation of many of them is not in the public interest.

I have even heard it said, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress themselves are among the greatest deterrents to getting Government out of business—for while most of us approve in principle the termination of competition with taxpaying companies, there is quite often a Government business enterprise in one's own district that seems somehow to be different from all the rest.

But the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when Government should get out of competitive business. The mounting expenses of Government call for reducing exercises—and Uncle Sam is a most inefficient businessman. The need for new tax revenue can be met in part by selling Government's nontaxpaying enterprises to taxpaying companies—and this has already been proved. Finally, if we are to preserve the free enterprise system we cannot continue to hamper and obstruct it by keeping Government in unfair competition with its own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Government Operations Committee may set a date for hearings on H.R. 4926 and similar bills, so that businessmen and trade associations may have an opportunity to tell us what goes on.

A PROFIT IS WITH HONOR IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at Yale University the President of the United States urged the American people to engage in a great debate on our country's fiscal and tax policies. We have endeavored to discuss the fiscal and tax measures being urged by the administration and have offered alternatives.

My committee colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means who also serves with distinction on the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable Thomas B. Curtis, has made an outstanding contribution to public understanding of the issues involved in this debate. He has made frequent public statements in constructive support of sound fiscal and economic policies. He has made a major contribution to the development of information during the tax hearings which have just been completed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Missouri, Tom Curtis, has pointed out that a prerequisite to tax reduction must be spending reduction. He has clearly stated the issue that we cannot reduce debts and deficits by spending more and taxing less. He has exposed the fallacy in the reasoning of those who maintain that we should balance the budget only when we have overcome the gap in our economic growth. The gentleman from Missouri, Tom Curtis, has established the need for public confidence in sound government policies as a condition for investment and growth. He has properly described the need for reasonable profit expectations as a condition for economic progress.

Mr. Speaker, jobs are created as a result of business activity undertaken for the purpose of profit. That is the way our free enterprise system works. As we strengthen the profit expectation we enhance the job opportunities available to our citizens. Our citizens save and invest because of a profit motive and without that motive there could be no progress within the framework of economic freedom. Profits even benefit the consumer because they make possible the productive efficiency that lowers costs.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include at this point in the Record two speeches made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] on the issues of fiscal policy, economic growth, and tax reduction. I commend the views expressed in these perceptive speeches to my colleagues. The first speech was made in Pittsburgh before the Tax Executives Institute, and the second speech was made before the Economic Club of Detroit.

The gentleman from Missouri, Congressman Curtis, has pointed the way to expenditure and tax rate reform; he has pointed the way to economic progress for the benefit of every American.

The Missing Prerequisites to Tax Reduction

(Remarks of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, before the Pittsburgh chapter of Tax Executives Institute, February 28, 1963)

Members of the Pittsburgh chapter of Tax Executives Institute, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, I am pleased to be in Pittsburgh, a city in which you have largely already done what we are now undertaking in St. Louis; namely, a program of urban renewal and revitalization with the impetus and the resources primarily being local in origin. I commend you for your achievement.

As I begin my remarks I would express appreciation to your Pittsburgh TEI membership for the outstanding public service many of you have rendered to promote effective tax administration and improved substantive tax law. I am not unmindful of the outstanding technical assistance and policy support that you have lent to measures I have sponsored. For the most part these started as mere tax ideas or concepts that were developed into statutory drafts with your assistance and became a part of our tax structure with your support. We have more to go on improvements in our tax structure on such things as income averaging and liberalized treatment of basic research expense and in finding revenue sources that ease the present undue reliance on taxation of initiative and incentive. We also need greater success in the avoidance of the taxation of capital investment and in the encouragement of a tax environment that enables economic principles rather than tax consequences to influence our capital utilization.

Tonight I will talk to you on the subject of "The Missing Prerequisites to Tax Reduction." I will not speak partisanly for the sake of partisanship, but as a partisan of my country with strong convictions on fiscal and economic policy, I must speak forthrightly and with candor. This I propose to do.

Prior to coming to Pittsburgh late this afternoon, I spent the day and yesterday with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee listening to the Secretary of the Treasury attempt to justify a two step temporary increase to $320 billion in the statutory debt ceiling from its present permanent level of $285 billion. He did this at a time when the administration for which he speaks is urging that we start from a budgetary deficit position and add to it more spending with less taxation purportedly so that we can have smaller debt. Therefore, if I sound a bit bewildered or confused or if my puritan ethic is showing, you will have to excuse me.

While I am on the subject of the debt ceiling, I might parenthetically add that the administration will probably get partial congressional approval of the first step in its two prong debt ceiling program. Thus, a $306 billion ceiling through June 30 of this year will be approved. But even here the administration will likely receive rather severe congressional censure for the way in which our fiscal affairs have been managed. The administration's prospects for obtaining the second step of a $320 billion ceiling for fiscal year 1964 are very doubtful. The Treasury will probably try to use the legislative reluctance to go to $320 billion on the debt ceiling as leverage to obtain some of the revenue raising substantive tax reforms being requested of the Congress, but my judgment is that neither goal will be fully achieved. The debt ceiling will be closer to $315 billion or less for fiscal year 1964 and the tax reforms will be commented on in more detail in a few minutes.

I would make one additional comment relative to the debt ceiling before I leave it as a specific subject of consideration. There are those who maintain the debt ceiling is a fiction, that its increase is a pro forma exercise, and that, therefore, it should be abolished. To the critics of the ceiling and to those who view it in an indifferent way, I say that our present attitude toward the ceiling in which we regard its annual legislative consideration only as a time for speechmaking and perhaps a protest vote is a tragic and wasteful neglect of an opportunity for the Congress to enforce frugality to some degree. In a practical sense, because the Congress passes a number of appropriation bills each year and because the spending committees have different memberships from the taxing committees, there is little effective chance to impose an overall degree of spending restraint on the executive. The debt ceiling is the exception. We could, I believe, find a source of spending control by preannounced and determined stringency on debt ceiling levels, perhaps to a more realistic degree than would be feasible under the single appropriation bill approach suggested by that great American, Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia. I merely mention this thought for your consideration and comment, if you will. I would welcome any expression you may care to make to me on this or any other subject at any time and by any means.

You may also find it a useful approach to mention to your own elected representatives.

I intend to develop the thought during the forthcoming debates on the ceilings for this and the next fiscal years. In suggesting this attitude toward the debt ceiling I am not urging that we repudiate our debts by suddenly making a substantial amount of them extra legal. What I am urging is that we restrain the compulsive spenders before their lack of fiscal discipline drives our Nation to involuntary debt repudiation through inflation and the chaos that would attend a further weakening in the confidence in the dollar.

With that rather lengthy but perhaps timely digression, I return to my topic—"The Missing Prerequisites to Tax Reduction."

The American taxpayer—long suffering, downtrodden, and oppressed—should in theory begin to experience a twinge of anticipatory joy. After enduring for the past 30 years the payment of more than $1 trillion in Federal taxes—after giving away $100 billion we did not have in foreign aid—after paying more than $50 billion for agricultural products we did not need—and, after instituting program on top of program of multibillion dollar Federal aid to States paid for with nonexistent Federal funds, the American taxpayer of our generation is to be rewarded with a tax cut. Because our generation has done so well in leaving over $1 trillion in unprovided for and unfunded obligations to our progeny we are to vote ourselves a tax cut at their expense and without their consent—a very unworthy form of taxation without representation.

But as we look about and seek to find the joyous citizen reaction that should be resulting from the promised tax cut, we don't find it. Instead, there are varying degrees of apathy, uncertainty, and apprehension present among our people. The doubt abounds over the economic wisdom and the fiscal propriety of what the administration proposes to do in making greater debt by paying less taxes for bigger government. Concern arises because of the missing prerequisites to tax reduction.

In my judgment, the essential prerequisites to any tax reduction vary according to the circumstances under which the reduction is being considered. For example, if we ever reached the fiscal millennium of having our revenues exceed the cost of government goods and services and had no existing debt, then it seems to me the only prerequisite to a tax cut would be that we devise a method of accomplishment that promised a result that was fair and equitable.

If, on the other hand, the circumstances attending a proposed tax reduction were not that favorable but instead involved an attempted remedy for an economic downturn that was already at hand and under a deficit situation, then the prerequisites are substantially different. Under this second situation, it is entirely likely that fairness and equity could be deliberately disregarded. We would be seeking maximum revenue benefit with a minimum even though substantial revenue loss. We would lose what we had to lose in order to bolster the economy but we would do it on a discriminatory basis designed to do the most good at least effective cost.

A third set of circumstances under which we could consider tax reduction describes a condition such as currently confronts us. Under this situation our economic health could be described as hesitant stability with the prospects for attaining a robust condition cloudy, and the danger of a relapse always a possibility despite the fact that we have spent lavishly on virtually every conceivable economic cure-all. In short, in this case we have a bad case of federalitis that finds us failing to pay for a government we neither need nor are willing to afford. Our condition is aggravated by a tax structure that is uneconomic in its impact and inadequate in its result. Hence, in this example, the recommendation to reduce taxes is designed to make the tax structure less an economic deterrent and to improve the revenue yield.

It is to the condition described in this third set of circumstances and the attending prerequisites for tax reduction that I will address the balance of my remarks. It is this situation that now is at hand in our Nation.

On January 21, 1963, the President reported to the Congress in his annual economic report that the outlook for expansion in the current year was favorable and that the year 1962 was ending with new records in such economic statistical categories as "personal income, wages, and salaries, and corporate profits." He went on to acknowledge it was "frustrating" not to be able to achieve a goal more nearly approximating of maximum production. Thus, he found what I have termed a hesitant stability with no recession in sight.

The President proposes as the means of achieving the maximum production goal a $13.6 billion tax rate reduction allocated $11 billion for individuals and $2.6 billion for corporations with a revenue recoupment of $3.4 billion from substantive tax reforms and a revenue pickup of $1.5 billion by a revised acceleration of corporate tax payments. In the face of mounting criticism to his tax panacea, the President suddently determined that a recession resulting from a failure to enact his program was not so remote after all.

He not only foresaw a possible recession but just 2 weeks after his Treasury Secretary had told the Ways and Means Committee that the Treasury would recommend a veto of any tax cut bill not containing substantive reforms, the President told the press he would sign a bill without reforms. My advice is that we hold out 2 more weeks and we might be able to get rid of the 16th amendment.

It is in the recession context presumably that the administration now would have us evaluate the decision of whether or not to reduce taxes and how. Yet if recession is at hand or in the offing the administration tax package is the poorest approach to remedial fiscal policy because of its increased tax burden in the early period on investment and middle and upper income taxpayers.

The President has properly found that our Federal tax structure is a deterrent to economic growth and an impairer of vigor in our traditional economy. I entirely agree with this conclusion. I do not agree that he has proposed the right remedy to correcting this shortcoming. Hence, the missing prerequisite of the right kind of tax reduction is missing from his tax program.

The proposed tax reduction program in net effect will increase the purchasing power available to lower income groups while increasing the relative tax burdens imposed on middle and upper income taxpayers. I need not spell out to this informed and knowledgeable group the details of the proposals that lead to this conclusion. Suffice it to say that the package of unwise rate reduction and inadequately considered substantive reform and revision negates any potential benefits from tax reduction and threaten to do harm from an impairment of confidence. If there is an absence of confidence then any feasible tax reduction will be to no avail in compensating for that absence. Accordingly, the administration's tax program is recession creating rather than recession curing. The fact that he now repudiates his reform proposals is little cause for confidence because we can all recall the Treasury "temporary" compromises on the 1962 act and the way the Treasury later acted to repudiate them.

The President should have proposed a more moderate revenue loss from tax rate reduction geared more realistically to stimulate incentive and investment. His reforms should have been less ambitious and less controversial at this stage. If the rate revising had been sounder and the reforms less controversial then the principle espoused by that distinguished Secretary of the Treasury Andrew B. Mellon that lower rates produce higher revenues could have come into play to buoy our economy and create sustainable economic growth. It is at the point of such growth that it would have been more appropriate to consider a sweeping tax reform program. What we need now is a minimum revenue loss allocated in such a way as to produce maximum growth and we must follow tax policy based on sound economics rather than tax policy seeking political advantages. In this way we could meet the first prerequisite that is now missing—namely a wisely conceived approach to tax reduction.

A second missing prerequisite to tax reduction as outlined in the administration's program is the prerequisite of fiscal integrity.

The currently pending tax recommendations completely ignore the possibility of increasing of incentives through tax adjustments achieved within the framework of a balanced budget.

Federal, State, and local taxes currently take 30 percent of our net national product—a shocking statistic that indicates the extent to which we have gone in socializing the endeavors of our people. Twenty percent of our net national product alone goes to the Federal Government. Approximately 85 percent of our Federal revenues come from taxes on income and capital; a comparable composite percentage for all levels of government in the United States is 77.7 percent. This heavy reliance on income and capital taxation is a strange paradox in a so-called free enterprise Nation.

These stifling and confiscatory taxes have been imposed on us to finance a cost of government that has been seldom met by revenues in the last three decades. In 1962 payroll tax receipts for social insurance alone were greater than total Federal taxes 20 years earlier. Despite a 25-fold increase in Federal tax collections in 30 years we find that we have failed to pay our way—in peace and in war—over 80 percent of the time.

But let us turn to more recent considerations that bear more directly on the issue at hand. The budget for 1964 proposes spending that is $19.9 billion or 25 percent over the fiscal year 1961 budget in effect at the time the current administration took office. Are we to believe that there is no room for reduction in a record spending level that has grown that fast?

The last balanced budget occurred in 1960. We are now told that 1967 will be the earliest time by which we can next achieve a balanced budget. In the meantime, we are experiencing a series of successively larger deficits with a certain total addition to the debt of $50 billion by the year 1967 if we do not in the meantime restrain the proclivity for extravagance. This prospect raises the serious question of how much longer our children can afford to let us handle our own affairs. Our deficits are part of their tax burdens; our abandonment of liberty to burgeoning bureaucracy is their government regimentation. "Hold that line" is more than a football cheer. It is the battle cry of our children as they seek to bolster our waning puritan ethic.

To satisfy the puritan ethic and meet the requirement of fiscal integrity that is prerequisite to tax reduction, I propose steps that would in my judgment represent sufficient budgetary savings to enable a substantial first step in achieving an economically sound tax rate structure.

First, I propose that the Congress reluctantly approve a temporary debt ceiling for 1964 that allows a spending level not in excess of that in effect for 1963. I believe this would be in the neighborhood of $312 billion.

Secondly, I propose that all Federal programs involving the granting of aid to foreign governments and instrumentalities be markedly restricted so as to minimize their contribution to deficit spending.

Thirdly, I propose that all new spending programs be deferred and that any scheduled increases in existing programs also be deferred so that only prior spending levels will prevail. If this requires the transfer of funds from nondefense to a higher priority defense purpose, let it happen.

And fourthly, I propose that the Congress proceed to the development of a legislative budget that will bring about a proper degree of self-restraint and spending discipline in the management of our fiscal affairs.

The French philosopher, De Tocqueville, once observed that if the time should ever come when a people should conclude that they can vote themselves benefits out of the Public Treasury, self-government by responsible men would be an impossibility. I submit to you the question: Isn't that what we are proposing to do today? Doesn't the administration's budget and the tax program now before the Congress and the Nation suggest that we should vote ourselves benefits out of the Federal Treasury? As parents we speak of the weekly allowances we give our children but as citizens do we ignore the debt we are daily adding to their future tax bills? These are questions that demand answers so that we can decide when we will pay our own way.

We must apply to any tax-reduction program the missing prerequisites of sound economic policy and fiscal integrity before we proceed to the urgent task of easing tax burdens. Only in this way can our Nation's achievement be worthy of the challenge to freedom's survival.

SHALL WE HAVE A TAX CUT, OR A BALANCED BUDGET?

(Remarks of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, to the Economic Club of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., March 11, 1963)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the President's proposals for "tax reduction and tax reform" submitted to the Congress before this distinguished forum of practicing economists. Underlying the President's fiscal proposals are economic ideas so novel that the academicians who have sponsored them now openly admit that the chance of the political implementation of these ideas by the peoples' representatives in Congress has been considerably lessened as a result of the people's lack of understanding and clinging to a puritan ethic. The stated program now is to educate the people. These theoreticians in economics apparently acted upon the advice of fellow theoreticians in political science to politically implement their ideas. Both groups express amazement that the people have not responded to the bait of tax reduction and are asking if the theory which supports it is not a "hooker." As a practicing politician, I must confess to some amazement myself, but it is heartening to realize that the people indeed are asking, What's the catch when you cut revenues and increase expenditures at the same time?

I do not shy away from novel ideas. In fact, I enjoy them and I constantly advance some of my own. However, I do not believe it is becoming for novelists to become angry and arrogant if their ideas are not immediately accepted. The burden of proof should always be, and indeed, human nature being what it is, will always be on the innovator.

The President, in his famous Yale speech, allowed himself to become a spokesman for the novel economic theories which lie at the base of his tax proposals. In this speech the innovators took the offensive to denigrate ahead of time possible opponents of the proposed innovations by stating they had become encrusted with economic myths and out worn shibboleths. In the speech the President suggested that there should be a national debate on the subject.

Ever since that challenge I have been trying to accept it. I have tried to use public forums such as the House-Senate Economic Committee, the forum of the Ways and Means Committee, the forum of the floor of the House of Representatives, the forums of various distinguished organizations of scholars and practitioners which have been opened up to me, such as the Tax Foundation, the National Council of Economic Statistic Users, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers Association, and Economic Clubs such as yours. I have written articles for newspapers and magazines, and appeared on television and radio to debate the matter.

From the record of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, let me say I can only conclude that it was mere rhetoric on the President's part to ask for a national debate on the subject. He and his advisers have studiously avoided debating the issue. They seek only to pontificate through press releases and prepared speeches. They refuse to come to grips with the questions their theories give rise to. Indeed, when pressed under cross examination, they obfuscate the issue by abandoning what logic lies behind their theories and fall back upon a professed belief on their part in what they had so recently termed shibboleths and myths, such as balanced budgets and avoidance of Federal deficits.

I watched the base being laid for the novel economic theory which the President is now advancing, back in 1957–58. At the time I had thought the purpose was more limited, merely to lay the groundwork for winning the 1960 presidential election. I had not thought that this would be carried to the point of trying to establish national programs in 1962 and 1963.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS became chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in 1957, and I became the ranking and senior Republican member of the committee. A special study into the subject of economic growth was authorized and Dr. Otto Eckstein of Harvard was given a leave of absence to head it up. From this study came the gap theory in economic growth. The theory is that our growth rate would be around 5 percent if we had full employment and full plant utilization. Full employment assumed a rate of unemployment of 4 percent. If our growth rate were 5 percent, than gross national product would be x dollars and from this increased gross national product we would realize x dollars in additional revenue. It is at the point of full employment and not until then that we should talk in terms of a balanced budget.

It was argued that governmental monetary, fiscal, and expenditure policies had not provided this kind of growth. Dr. Eckstein's group sought to bring this theory down to earth by relating it to a period from 1953 to 1958.

This theory was contested from the first day it was published. The minority views accompanying the Eckstein study spell out the basic disagreement. Dr. Arthur Burns points up the errors in the theory in detail in two separate papers, both of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It may still be a matter of judgment whether the gap theory has been completely disproved in the eyes of economic scholars. Certainly it has not been proven. Scholars should not take anyone's word either way. The Eckstein report, the minority rebuttals and Dr. Burns' critiques are there for anyone to read and reach his own judgment.

What has happened, however, is that the embryonic gap theory has been taken out of the womb of economic science before it has finished a minimum period of gestation. It has been brought into the field of politics by professional economists who have presented it as if it were mature, proven, and uncontested. This theory was promulgated by the President in the 1960 presidential campaign. Since then, a certain school of economists acting in the guise of their professionalism but, in essence, unprofessionally as politicians, have advanced it further and built other untenable premises upon it. Today many businessmen and others untrained in academic economics are told that they are economic illiterates, scoffers at scholarship, and generally suffering from a kind of cretinism if they do not adopt the faith.

I think these attempts at intellectual browbeating by this limited, though powerful, through their vested hold on the positions in our higher institutions of learning, group of economic scholars is shameful and very damaging to the maintenance of good scholarship in their important field and, through contamination, other fields as well.

We looked down our noses at Russian biology because of Lysenkoism—that is biology by politics rather than by scientific method. We can well look at home to the same type of operation in the science of economics.

Now to the issues. Has there been an economic growth gap as alleged by the President's Council of Economic Advisers and by the school of economics for which they speak? In light of a 3-percent growth rate measured in GNP for the past 70 years when our economy was growing more solidly and rapidly perhaps than any economy in history any talk of a gap because the growth rate has not been 4 or 5 percent for any particular short span is unrealistic. This becomes even more unrealistic when we realize the vast enlargement of our economic base would tend to lessen percentage increases. Furthermore, as an economy moves closer to its objectives of providing more freedom and higher standards of living for all its people, consumer choice is bound to play an increasing part in the allocation of resources, not the least important of which is the choice of allocating one's own time. These two items, (1) amount of time spent leisurely, including time in education, training, and certain kinds of research, and (2) increased variety of goods and services available for consumer choice are not measured in any adequate way in the GNP indicator which is the sole measure of economic growth employed by the neo-Keynesians.

Furthermore, increased consumer choice, which includes that precious choice which more and more Americans are finding lies within their power to make—to spend or to invest a dollar—modifies many of the old economic formulas which have been based upon economic scarcity, not economic plenty, particularly this is true in the fields of monetary, fiscal, and Government expenditure policy. The neo-keynesians are trying to put this new wine in old bottles.

Mislaid by the unrealistic and unsubstantiated gap theory, the neo-Keynesians reach the amazing conclusion that our economy is tired, listness, and suffering from tried blood. Using this metaphor, it is understandable that their remedies should be shots in the arm and probably, if they had their way, would include grafting monkey glands. They have diagnosed our economic condition as symptomatic of old age. Actually, the symptoms reveal growing pains.

There has been no economic gap. In fact, measured by the correct measuring rods, our economic growth since World War II has been extremely rapid. It has been this accelerated rate of real economic growth that understandably has created some serious structural problems, particularly in our capital plant and in our labor force. Indeed, when we break down the economic aggregates of GNP, employment and unemployment figures, plant utilization, profits, and consumer purchasing power into their components, as we must if we are to diagnose our condition correctly, we find clear evidence of rapid innovation, rapid obsolescence of both plants and skills, and greatly increased consumer choice of goods and services, vast increases in leisure time, education, training and research, and a very marked increase in our standard of living.

When technological advancement has been unusually rapid in history—and this had happened on a number of occasions—the historians usually come up with a name for it. So we refer to one period as the Renaissance, another as the industrial revolution. Today we are calling it automation.

When the President's economic advisers call this period of rapid technological growth—probably the most rapid in the history of the world—a period of listlessness and tired blood, I am reminded of the story of Hans Christian Andersen about the king's beautiful new suit of clothes. It took a child to break the spell in which the tailors had enmeshed the entire court and most of the populace. Of course, the king had no clothes on. Of course, this theory of a listless economy is nonsense to anyone who looks around.

We do have some real problems resulting from the rapid rate of growth we have been experiencing. If we do not realize that rapid growth creates such problems and so fail to set ourselves to meet them, we will stunt further growth and possibly cause permanent damage. Shots-in-the-arm, dope, and monkey glands may get rid of our growing pains all right, but they will do so by stopping the growth.

There is no question in my mind that the Federal tax structure, based as it is essentially on profits, is a drag on our economy. And this drag has increased as our rapid rate of growth has increased. The essence of the private enterprise system is profits. I would like to take the time to spell out the basic high personal and social morality in profits here, but I would have to digress too much from my immediate theme. However, let me say that this task must be undertaken with more force and repetition than ever before if we are to preserve the essential goodness of our economic system. More basic than the erroneous gap theory underlying the President's tax message is a theory which underlines the entire concept of all his programs, both foreign and domestic, not just taxes, which rests on the disbelief in the morality of profits. The economic Lysenkoists have spread their pseudo-scientific theories among our religious leaders, in our seminaries, and throughout our institutions of learning, based upon a subtle, not direct, attack on the morality of profits. The rest of us have operated on the assumption too long that the value of our private enterprise system is so obvious to all in its achievements that the basic features that go to make it up will withstand any and all attacks. We must recognize that an attack has been going on for some time and has met with enough success that on certain days of the week, at any rate, the President of the United States himself joins in pushing it. It is necessary for us to reevaluate our system and spell out with simplicity the ethics that make it work.

A tax based upon profits has two inherently dangerous features which show up markedly when too much reliance is placed upon it. The first feature I have mentioned * * * it relies upon profits, hence it dampens profits. Dampening profits, the profits tax lowers incentive to invest and particularly to high risk investment. Or innovation which is the life blood of any living and growing organism. The extent of this impact is all relative. When the tax take from profits is relatively small, the dampening effect is small; when it is large, the dampening effect is large.

The second dangerous feature of a tax on profits is the fluctuation of its revenue take with economic cycles and economic disturbances. The Federal Government, in the past decade and a half, has found it very difficult to estimate with any reasonable degree of accuracy the amount of revenues to be derived from the personal and corporate income tax in any given year. For example, the error for fiscal year 1963 is almost 10 percent off, $7.5 billion. The errors work both ways, underestimating as well as overestimating. To adjust to this fluctuation we have been urged to accept the thesis that the Federal budget need not be balanced annually, but rather in a business cycle.

However, for political structural reasons this need to adjust Federal budgeting and fiscal policy to the fluctuations of revenue, based upon a tax on profits, has created even graver dangers. Congress has never created the machinery to develop a legislative budget or even to consider the fiscal impact of the President's budget in its aggregate. Expenditure priorities have never been considered in any systematic manner. What budgetary discipline the Congress has developed is all directed toward annual, rather than cyclical considerations, or really toward ad hoc considerations. The net result is that, although balancing a budget over a business cycle to compensate for the fluctuations of revenue based upon a tax of profits is proper theory, the Federal budgets have not been enacted so that revenues have been recouped in periods of upturn to compensate for the deficits occurring in the downturns.

The one beneficial structural feature many have felt existed in a tax on profits, the countercyclical force it exerts on the business cycle, turns out to be one of the greatest deterrents to economic progress when we have to rely too heavily, as we are presently doing, on the profits tax to obtain revenues. When coming out of a period of economic downturn, the countercyclical force may be so great it dampens the upturn. This has led me to speculate that economic cycles may be in the nature of things and that this is the normal way for an economy to move forward.

We do know in nature that many organisms rely upon a peristaltic type of action for the forward movement. Perhaps, in our desire to eliminate what we have felt were bad features in economic downturns, we have tampered with the very forces that move us forward. I am merely speculating, not advancing a thesis here.

The King's tailors, pardon me, I mean President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, have utilized the public's partial understanding of the cyclical aspects of Federal fiscal affairs to promote an entirely different economic theory.

They argue that in budgetary policy we should not look to periods of cyclical upturns to recoup the deficits created during downturns, but rather, to the period when our economy is operating at full employment. It is at this point that the gap theory is fed into the syllogism.

Any resemblance that seems to exist between this theory and the cyclical theory is the result of semantics. The business cycle theory of balancing Federal budgets is related solely to the erratic nature of a profits tax. The cycle is, by definition, a relationship of conjunctive economic periods. It is measured relatively, in gross national product and unemployment figures, not in assumed absolutes. The new theory is based upon assumed absolutes—that gross national product should be at a 5-percent rate, that unemployment should be at a 4-percent rate, and if unemployment were at 4 percent, gross national product would be six.

Or, to state it in simple terms, we balance the budget when we have full employment which is defined to be 4 percent. When we have full employment we attain a 5-percent growth rate. This theory has nothing to do with compensating for the fluctuations of the revenues derived from taxes based upon profits. It seeks its revenues from an increased tax base measured in terms of gross national product.

What then is the force relied upon to bring about the full employment, the increased growth rate and the increased gross national product? It is increased spending. For understanding, spending may be divided into four parts, by two bisectors: (1) Government and private spending. (2) Consumption and capital spending. For no reason related to the new fiscal theory being advanced, primary attention is directed to private consumptive spending, with Government spending and capital spending theoretically held in reserve. We are told to ignore the figures in the 1962, 1963, and 1964 budgets which show Federal spending continuing to increase at double the rate of increase of the 6 years immediately preceding the Kennedy administration. We are asked to take the President's narrative which says Government spending except in defense, space, and interest is being held to the previous level. Even with these meaningless provisos, the narrative doesn't jibe with the figures. Be that as it may, the one quarter the theorists do not concentrate upon is the quarter which they have identified in the President's 1963 Economic Report as being the area of slack in 1962, private capital spending.

I believe the neo-Keynesians follow a sort of trickle-down theory when it comes to stimulating private capital spending. The argument is that if we increase private consumer purchasing power it will be translated into aggregate consumer demand. Aggregate consumer demand, in turn, through a miracle will break itself into the proper components to be demand for the kinds of goods and services for which our idle plant capacity has been designed and our unemployed labor force has been skilled to produce.

This will stimulate plant capacity to be utilized and people to be employed. I interpolate that this trickling down supposedly will create a rippling effect so private investment will be stimulated to expand into new plants and train people in new skills.

The Congress has been told not to examine into Federal expenditure policy, particularly if the intention is to cut back the aggregate amount. Congress is asked to believe that much of this expenditure is capital investment, as we are asked to believe that much of previous Federal expenditures has been capital investment. This is to lessen our worries over the size of the Federal debt because so much of it is said to be offset by capital assets. Regrettably, this is mostly hypothesis and untrue. Very little of Federal spending, the bulk being for military purposes, is of a capital nature. This is unlike State and local expenditures where a sizable portion is for capital outlay and, indeed, a great deal of it is financed through specific bond issues. However, if increased spending is the force upon which the neo-Keynesians rely to balance the budget in 1967 or 1972, when they have full employment, 5-percent growth rate, and full plant utilization, Congress must dig deeply into expenditure policy. The major political question is, Will Congress do this?

President Kennedy has correctly stated that we must judge borrowing by the purposes for which the borrowed money will be spent. He talks about the frivolous borrower and the prudent borrower. Then let us get on with our appraisals. It is my judgment that the Federal Government, in many respects, has been a pretty frivolous borrower and is seeking to continue on its frivolous ways. The only way we can determine this is by examining into expenditure policies. Certainly, increasing the expenditure rate from $13 billion in 6 years to $19 billion in 3 years as the Kennedy administration has done, calls for an appraisal of the aggregate expenditure policy. And this, in turn, requires hard work in reappraising the components.

We now come back to tax policy, because our spending rate continues to exceed our revenue collections. This means we must market additional Government bonds to make up the difference. A distinction needs to be made between spending, frivolous or prudent, based upon whether we pay for it from current taxes or from borrowing, which is merely deferred taxation.

The tax reduction proposals of the President are based upon stimulating the economy through increasing consumer purchasing power which will increase consumer demand which will increase employment which will increase plant utilization. We must think about what effect financing this tax reduction by deferred taxation, Government bonds, at each transition point, will have. If additional deficit financing results in increasing the Consumer Price Index by three points, there is no net increase in consumer demand. If it results in increases in interest rates, there is a lessening of any increase in consumer demand. If the saving rate turns out to be higher than the 7 percent estimated—two points higher—there will be little increase in consumer demand. The psychological impact of any course chosen, though hard to estimate, is of considerable importance. Here is where the belief of the people in the puritan ethic comes into play again.

Furthermore, we must project this economic theory over the period it is supposed to work and come into fruition. This is in 1972, according to the estimates of Dr. Arthur Burns; 1967 according to Secretary Dillon, on his assumption that Federal expenditures will start to level off in fiscal 1965. We have no budget for this year as yet, so who knows. Judging by the Kennedy budgets we already have, 1962, 1963, and 1964, Dr. Burns is conservative, and Mr. Dillon is dealing in Kennedy narration.

Dr. Burns estimated the additional Federal deficits would amount to $75 billion. Secretary Dillon had not made any estimates at the time he testified before the Ways and Means Committee. This is a rather strong indication that the promoters of this novel theory of balancing budgets only in times of full employment really aren't concerned about Federal deficits or balancing the budget. They seem to be giving lip service to the shibboleths of the people for political reasons. This devious technique robs those who wish to debate this issue out on economic grounds of the opportunity to do so.

Thus, the problems of debt management join expenditure policy as matters outside the national debate President Kennedy requested in his Yale speech.

If President Kennedy's economic and fiscal advisers will not discuss or debate the issues involved in expenditure policy and in the field of debt management, the Congress has only one recourse, to abide by the puritan ethic. This ethic has the merit, at least so far, of not preventing this country from attaining the highest standard of living of any society in history. My own judgment is that this puritan ethic lies at the base of our success and at our peril do we abandon it.

This should leave the people the same recourse, to abide by their basic beliefs, and not abandon them. It appears to me it is not the people who need educating. It is the Neo-Keynesians who advance new theories and refuse to defend them who need education, particularly in the basic rule of debate which places the burden on moving forward on the affirmative.

Finally, I would observe that the President's tax proposal is headed "Tax Reduction and Tax Reform." In this instance, we can learn something by considering the semantics. Under many people's concept of tax reform, which is my own, rate reduction is the greatest reform needed. Tax reduction is part of, not in conjunction or opposition to tax reform, as the Kennedy semantics make it. Tax rate reduction is the largest part of tax reform.

However, under the Neo-Keynesian theory, tax reduction is distinct from tax reform. Indeed, tax reform as they advance it seems to be a recoupment of revenues lost through rate reduction. Tax reduction to them is essentially to release consumer purchasing power, to increase spending, not to reform the tax system. If this action does not increase spending in sufficient amounts, we have been told that we must have increased Federal spending. Indeed, only through narratives and bookkeeping devices have the people been distracted from realizing that the present administration package pending before the Congress includes proposals for both tax reduction and increased Federal spending.

Tax reform, relying heavily on rate reduction, is always in order, whatever the economic cycle, whatever the state of economic growth. This theory looks upon high tax rates as impediments to economic growth. By lowering the rates, we remove the impediment; like replacing shoes and clothes that are too tight with larger sizes for a growing youth. We are not talking about a shot in the arm or grafting on monkey glands.

Under this theory, however, we must consider the economic impact we cause from any new problems we created in the field of debt management. In these critical times of balance of payments and gold flow and large debt to be managed, I think it is foolhardy to create any further problems in the field of debt management, particularly when it has such a close relationship to the problems in monetary policy.

There is a practical way out for those of us who believe that, and have advocated for so many years, there is a great need for tax reform. It lies in Federal expenditure reform. I am convinced that Federal expenditures reform will be beneficial in two basic ways: (1) In the aggregate, to enable us to cut taxes and balance the budget; (2) in its components, where so much of our Federal expenditure has been frivolous rather than prudent.

I want to close on this note. Economic reform is most needed. Today, in the areas where Government policy contributes to or fails to relieve, the price-cost squeeze. Profits are the life blood of a private enterprise system. We will continue to grow if we will preserve the incentive for our people to innovate, to risk, to explore, to research and to study. Taxes are only one of the impediments. Much needs to be done to remove the many other impediments which we have allowed to exist and, indeed, in some instances, we have created from past unwise governmental policies.

THE NEW PHILOSOPHY OF PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, while offering what they call new and sophisticated ideas, the administration's economic spokesmen are constantly urging our people to shed their absolete and outworn economic notions, such as concern over persistent budget deficits.

In the light of the current economic debate, it is especially interesting, therefore, to look back through the years and discover that the ideas which the administration calls new and sophisticated are, themselves, relics of a bygone era.

Into this category must fall the administration's assertion that a large and increasing public debt is not to be feared, but that any cutback in Government spending could result in economic collapse. According to the "new" economic theories, the desire for a balanced budget—at least in periods of relative prosperity—is nothing but obsolete economic dogma.

The administration's emphasis on the need for a capital budget is also offered as a product of the New Frontier, as is its assertion that there is really very little danger of inflation—or other harmful economic consequences—from steady increases in the public debt.

These ideas, which the administration tries to pass off as new, were the products of the depression of the 1930's and were thoroughly discussed—and refuted—in 1943 by an eminent economist, Harold G. Moulton, of the Brookings Institution, in a book entitled "The New Philosophy of Public Debt."

In that book, Mr. Moulton offered a clear and penetrating analysis of what at that time was still a relatively new philosophy on deficit financing and the public debt, but which today looks a bit stale. Mr. Moulton's analysis, however, is as fresh and sound today as it was two decades ago.

I want to commend to my colleagues Mr. Moulton's short and straightforward book. I have excerpted a number of sections from the book which have particular relevance to today's economic debate. I think that this brief condensation of some of the highlights of Mr. Moulton's book is so important and so potentially useful to the Members of Congress, the press, and the public, that I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

I. CONFLICTING DEBT PHILOSOPHIES

Two opposing philosophies with respect to public finance exist in high Government circles today. The first, which may be called the traditional view, is that a continuously unbalanced budget and rapidly rising public debt imperil the financial stability of the Nation. The second, or new conception, is that a huge public debt is a national asset rather than a liability and that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the Nation. According to this view, the conception of a balanced budget belongs in the category of obsolete economic dogma, the fallacy of which has been clearly demonstrated in recent years.

The new philosophy, as already indicated, holds that public finance is really only a matter of bookkeeping, that a rising debt has no adverse consequences, and that without a constantly increasing debt we cannot hope to have full employment and prosperity.

II. THE CRUCIAL ISSUE OF NATIONAL POLICY

The conflict of views so sharply revealed in the foregoing quotations is the crucial economic issue of the present time. If it be true that the recent experience of this and other countries has demonstrated that there cannot be any financial problem so long as we go ahead boldly with production—that just doing the job actually pays the bill; if it be true that all we have to do after the war is to continue public expenditures at whatever level is necessary to provide full employment, our economic future may be viewed in terms of easy optimism. On the other hand, if it be true that a great and continuous growth of the public debt imperils the financial stability of the Nation and undermines the very foundations of the economic system; if it be true that the war debt must be paid, or at least be greatly reduced, and that the treasury must be soundly solvent in order that the Nation may prosper and progress, then the mounting war indebtedness and the postwar outlook must be viewed with deep apprehension.

If we simply lay the issue on the table or put it from our minds because we are unwilling to take the time to think it through, we shall be confronted with ever-increasing difficulties. On the one hand we shall find the spending agencies, where the new philosophy is naturally ascendant, pressing for constant increases in appropriations with which to spend our way into permanent prosperity. On the other hand, we shall find the Treasury striving for ways and means of raising ever-increasing amounts of revenue with which to balance the budget, restrict the growth of the debt, and preserve the credit of the Government.

Until this basic issue of national policy is settled, we shall inevitably drift in the direction indicated by the new philosophy—because the money appropriating authorities can hardly be expected to muster sufficient resolution to resist the persistent demands for increased public outlays or to levy sufficiently heavy taxes to cover the appropriations. The apparently easy way is, moreover, always the popular way. Unless the issue is decided by the process of intellectual discussion, it is likely to be automatically determined by the temper and trend of the times backed by the educational activities and pressures of the spending agencies.

III. THE EVOLUTION OF THE NEW CONCEPTION

The new philosophy of public expenditures in relation to economic prosperity is an outgrowth of the disordered economic conditions of the early thirties; but it developed to its present form by gradual stages.

It was not until the recovery of 1933 had failed to reach the stage of prosperity, or greatly to alleviate the unemployment situation, that attention gradually shifted to the use of public expenditures as a positive and primary force in promoting recovery.

The next stage in the development of the present doctrine grew out of the business recession of 1937. Beginning about the middle of 1936, there was a very substantial expansion of business, and it seemed that the pump priming was really taking effect. But just at the moment when it appeared that at last we might be emerging from the mires of depression the incipient boom collapsed, to be followed by a new depression. Meanwhile, however, the expanding volume of national income had increased tax revenues; and, in consequence, by March 1937 the cash deficit, or to use the new terminology, the "Treasury's net contribution to purchasing power," or "net income-creating expenditures," had been reduced to negligible proportions and continued low during ensuing months.

Before this time the argument had been that we should increase public expenditures in periods of depression and decrease them in periods of prosperity; in other words, that we should have an unbalanced budget in bad times and a balanced budget in good times. (In the terminology of the time this was known as compensatory fiscal action.) But in the light of the 1937 episode, the doctrine that deficit reduction—whether due to increased taxes, reduced expenditures, or a combination of both—is deflationary in effect and will lead to depression became in due time a deeply rooted principle of the evolving philosophy.

It was at this stage that the idea of double and multiple budgeting gained popularity—with capital outlays segregated from current expenditures—without too careful a definition of what might properly be included in capital expenditures. It was about this time that emphasis began to be placed upon the assets created by public debts—whether such assets be in the form of tangible properties or intangible services, whether they yield revenues or are simply useful to society. Whatever their character all public outlays are in reality investments. From this point it was an easy step to the proposition that all increases in public expenditures represent income to someone and that all reductions in public expenditures represent loss to someone; and that costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield.

It should be apparent without argument that the present war experience has merely confirmed what was already known, namely, that a great expansion of employment can be provided by unlimited expenditures of public funds. But neither in this or other countries has the war experience shed any light on the question whether public deficits can be continued indefinitely without undermining the financial and economic system. If the conclusion is to be reached that internal public debts are of no moment, it must be justified either by convincing historical or other evidence or by irrefutable economic analysis.

IV. APPRAISAL OF THE NEW PHILOSOPHY

The 1937 episode

It has already been noted that the depression of 1937 played an important part in the evolution of the doctrine that continuous or expanding deficits are essential to prosperity—that any reduction in net government outlays will only lead to disaster. In testifying before the Temporary National Economic Committee Mr. Hansen said: [1]

"I think that recession of '37 was to a very large extent due to just that decline in the net income-creating expenditures of the Government.[2]

The implication of the phrase net income-creating expenditures in lieu of treasury deficit will be observed. It should be noted, however, that the decline in net income-creating expenditures was not due to an actual decrease in Treasury outlays; it was rather the result of the increased tax receipts which naturally accompanied the prosperity period. This automatic increase in tax receipts is evidently looked upon as more or less equivalent to a positive curtailment of Government financing and a corresponding restriction of purchasing power. It would appear that we must expand Government expenditures at least in proportion to increases in tax receipts, lest the shrinking cash deficit—that is, the decline in income-creating expenditures—dry up the stream of purchasing power.

This analysis obviously overlooks the fact that it is aggregate national purchasing power, private and public, that counts. The statistics of income disbursements, public and private, show that aggregate purchasing power was rising rapidly during the period in question.

Is the public debt a real debt?

The proponents of the philosophy that the only hope for full employment and continuing prosperity lies in permanent deficit financing recognize, of course, that this means a continuous expansion of the public debt. The economic implications of an ever-expanding public debt are, moreover, given consideration. We are advised that an internal public debt is not a menace and that we should not be "intimidated" by it. "On the contrary, instead of looking upon [it] with the sort of awe that was inspired in our savage ancestors by some incomprehensible phenomenon such as lightning, we must take a leaf out of the book of modern science. It is, in fact, so different from what we commonly think of as debt that it should scarcely be called debt at all." An internal public debt "has none of the essential earmarks of a private debt." [3]

---

[1] Alvin Hansen, Harvard University.

[2] Hearings, pt. 9, p. 3553.

As a preliminary, it is desirable to clear up some possible sources of confusion or misunderstanding about the public debt problem. In this way the range of controversy or disagreement will be narrowed and the basic issues more clearly revealed.

Must the budget always be in balance?

The answer to this question is obviously "No." The question is raised here only because it is frequently implied that those who are concerned about perpetual increase of the debt are adherents of the obsolete conception of a permanently balanced budget. It is of course generally conceded that in times of war public expenditures may have to run ahead of current tax receipts. Moreover, nearly all students of public finance are, I believe, in agreement that in times of depression and readjustment, public outlays not covered by taxes may be both essential and helpful in stimulating recovery. As for prosperity periods, it has always been taken for granted that the budget should provide a surplus with which to reduce public debt. Insofar as there may be disagreement with respect to the use of public expenditures in conjunction with alternating periods of depression and prosperity (the so-called compensatory fiscal action) it would relate only to the degree to which fiscal policy, as distinguished from other types of policy, might advisedly be relied upon to promote recovery.

Must the public debt be paid off?

It is widely believed that a public debt created by a war or other national emergency must, or at least should, in due course be completely liquidated. This view is fostered by official statements such as those quoted on pages 2 and 3. Students of public finance are, however, agreed on the proposition that there is no necessity of reducing a public debt to zero. Many countries have had large public debts for a century or more. Even the U.S. Government has not been completely out of debt since 1835. While the large debt incurred during the Civil War might readily have been extinguished in a generation, it was decided that some public debt was desirable—as security for bank note issues and as a highly conservative investment. The debt of the First World War was reduced during the twenties from approximately $26 to $16 billion; but no one seriously argued that it was necessary or desirable that the debt be completely paid off.

It is only necessary that the debt be kept under easy control—that is, well within revenue possibilities. Fiscal experts have always regarded it as wise to reduce the debt materially in easy times in order to have a margin of safety for possible hard times in the future. This is simply commonsense, prudent financial management.

Under what conditions may a public debt be gradually expanded?

There are two circumstances under which a gradual expansion of the public debt might occur without endangering financial stability. First, if the Government floats bonds for the purpose of constructing a public enterprise which yields sufficient revenues to cover maintenance, operation, and replacement costs, together with interest on the Government's investment, the accompanying expansion of the debt need cause no concern. The bonds issued for the construction of the Panama Canal are an illustration. The situation here is analogous to the common practice of private corporations in floating bonds with which to construct revenue-producing plant and equipment.

Second, at a time when, in consequence of private business expansion, the national income is steadily rising, with the taxpaying capacity likewise increasing, a country would obviously be able to support an increasing public debt. But prudent management, with forethought for possible difficulties in the future, still would suggest the importance of restraining the debt in order to provide an ample margin of safety for future periods of adversity.

How does an internal debt differ from a foreign debt?

It has long been recognized and repeatedly pointed out that there is an essential difference between a domestic public debt and an external public debt. In the case of a foreign debt the revenues collected from American taxpayers with which to pay interest have to be transferred to bondholders living in another country. In final analysis this means that we have to export goods and services to foreigners in order to obtain the foreign currency required. In the case of an internal debt the interest is paid to bondholders living in the same country as the taxpayers; hence exports and the acquisition of foreign currency are not involved. This obvious difference does not, however, dispose of the issue whether an internal public debt is of any economic significance.

With these preliminary questions cleared, we are in a position to consider the arguments advanced in support of the conclusion that a domestic debt involves no dangers but has positive advantages. It will be necessary to scrutinize a number of specific contentions.

The argument that an internal public debt bears no resemblance to a private debt

The view that "a public debt has none of the earmarks of a private debt," and that "it should scarcely be called a debt at all" arises from contemplation of the fact that the money collected as taxes flows back to the people as interest receipts. "Taxes will be collected to service the bonds, and when interest or principal payments are made on them the money is merely shifted about within the economic system."

The same line of reasoning might be applied to the debt of a State or a city, if such debt were held wholly by the citizens of the particular State or municipality. And, if we consider our States and our cities as a collective whole, all State and local public indebtedness could be looked upon as not really debt at all. Moreover, if we view the corporations of the country collectively, their bonded indebtedness would not really be debt because the income collected from the American people for the services rendered is paid out to the American people as interest. In this way we get rid of all debt problems.

On second thought, however, it will be reflected that particular railroad companies or industrial corporations, or State or local governments, might find themselves in difficulty because they are unable to make financial ends meet. Likewise, one may reflect that the Federal Government might, under certain circumstances, find it impossible to collect sufficient revenues to meet its interest and other obligations. National governments have, in fact, frequently found themselves in serious financial difficulties. Thus the mere fact that in all cases the collection of revenues and the payment of interest "merely shifts money around within the economic system" has not, as historical evidence shows, eliminated the debt problem.

While Mr. Hansen argues in some places that a public debt has none of the earmarks of a private debt, elsewhere he makes them directly analogous. For example:

"Public debt might be likened to the capital account of a corporation, made up, say, of long-term mortgage bonds and of one or more classes of stock. Such liabilities, it is important to remember, are offset by assets on the other side of the balance sheet. So long as these are of a character to produce sufficient earnings to meet the capital charges, including dividends on the stock, nobody would ever think of the corporation as being over capitalized. The essential element determining the soundness of the concern is the ratio of its earning power to its capital account. Precisely the same principle holds with respect to the public debt of a nation, of which the source of earnings or revenue is usually taxation. If the power to raise revenue is in manageable ratio to the capital charges (debt service), it is proper to say that the nation is not, so to speak, over capitalized." [4]

From this statement one could hardly conclude that public debts are something wholly different from other types of indebtedness.

The contention that tax payments and interest receipts are in fairly close adjustment

The contention that a domestic public debt has little significance because the income is merely shifted about within the economic system, going out of one pocket into another, was extensively discussed after the last war. At that time the basic issue was stated by the present writer as follows:

"It is undoubtedly true that the interest on the domestic debt accrues to the people of any given country in the form of revenue. But the particular individuals who pay the taxes do not usually receive back in interest anything like the precise amount of funds that they have parted with in the form of taxes. Some receive a great deal more from the Government than they pay to the Government; others receive a great deal less. The process thus involves a wholesale redistribution of wealth." [5]

That the process might at times involve a considerable redistribution of wealth is admitted by Mr. Hansen. He stated the matter as follows in 1941:

"Insofar as the Government can borrow from small savers, an increase in the public debt will not prove unfavorable to an equitable distribution of wealth.

"But if the growth in the public debt is very rapid, it will not be possible for relatively small savers to take any large proportion of the new securities issued. They will be absorbed by the rich and the well-to-do, and by large corporations. A rapid growth in the public debt is, therefore, likely to intensify the inequality in wealth distribution." [6]

But in 1942—a year of extraordinarily rapid debt increase, in which the bulk of the bond purchases were made by individuals of large means and by the commercial banks—Mr. Hansen contends that "under modern conditions" the ideal of an identity between individual tax payments and individual interest receipts is more closely approximated than was formerly the case. Most of the debt is now actually very widely distributed among individual citizens or among institutions that serve the citizens; and this state of affairs may be expected to continue." [7]

He cites as evidence the following distribution of Government bond holdings as of June 30, 1942, and adds that "Only a little reflection is needed to see that every one of these groups of bondholders—except the 'others'—does in fact serve the public or is itself the public; and even the 'others' are made up in considerable measure of endowments, foundations, and trust funds, rather than rich individuals." [8]

---

[3] The same, p. 166.

[4] Fortune, November 1942, p. 169.

[5] John F. Bass and Harold G. Moulton, "America and the Balance Sheet of Europe," p. 61.

[6] Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles, p. 179.

[7] Fortune, November 1942, p. 170.

[8] The same.

	Billions	Percent
Commercial banks	$28.8	37.7
Life insurance companies and mutual savings banks	12.9	16.8
Purchasers of savings bonds	13.1	17.1
Government trust funds	10.6	13.8
Others	11.2	14.6

The obvious intent here is to convey the impression that these figures show an extremely wide distribution of bond holdings among the masses—that they are not held mainly by the rich. The data cited do not, however, throw any light on the breadth of the distribution of Government bonds. The purchasers of savings bonds include wealthy individuals and business corporations as well as individuals of small means, and the mere statement that there are 13.1 billions outstanding does not show who holds them.

Nearly 40 percent of Government issues are held by commercial banks, and the proportion is rapidly rising. The bulk of deposits of the commercial banks are those made by large corporations, and represent working capital funds. At the end of 1942 the average size of the commercial deposits (excluding Government and bank deposits) of five large New York banks, having aggregate deposits of $5 billion, was roughly $30,000. Quantitatively speaking, the bulk of the deposits of most small commercial banks also are those of business enterprises or of individuals of substantial means.

Even if it could be shown that Government bond holdings were now very widely distributed, it would still be necessary to show that the tax burden is distributed similarly. But no evidence on this point is submitted.

The argument that "costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield"

It is emphasized that "Every cent expended, public or private, becomes income for the members of our own society." This conception apparently explains the statement of the National Resources Planning Board that costs are of no significance, that "doing the job pays the bill." Since the receipts are necessarily identical with the disbursements everything is satisfactory: cost equals income; and income equals cost.

Note that this argument is applied not only to interest on the public debt, but to all public expenditures. Veterans' compensation does not really cost us anything because the veterans receive the income. The war does not cost us anything because every cent expended (within the country) is income to the American people. Note also that the statement includes private as well as public expenditures. Since the costs of private business are represented on the opposite side of the shield by income disbursements, no one need worry about costs.

The initial error in this proposition is that costs and income are not opposite sides of the same shield. The costs are costs to the Treasury; the income is income to the public. And the Treasury cannot get back all of its outlays in the form of taxes. Hence there is no identity between outflow and inflow. The Treasury goes into debt.

The second error embodies the basic fallacy in the new philosophy of public expenditure and debt. The argument that all government expenditures, for whatever purpose, generate money income and thereby provide the means for liquidating the costs fails to take account of the differing effects of varying types of public expenditure upon future income.

When a government constructs a capital enterprise which sells goods or services in the market it derives revenues—presumably sufficient to cover operating costs and interest, to provide for eventual replacement, and to yield an income to the Government. Such a public outlay would impose no additional tax burden on the rest of the community. The enterprise is not only self-supporting but may even help support the government over a period of years.

Non-revenue-producing public works cannot cover their operating, maintenance, and replacement costs, or interest charges. Hence they involve continuing costs which must be borne by the taxpayers. It is obvious that most types of public works are useful or enjoyable; but it remains true that they do not for that reason yield continuing revenues with which to carry their costs. From a fiscal point of view, instead of carrying themselves, and possibly yielding net revenues to the Government in the future, they involve continuing annual outlays for an indefinite period. Similarly, expenditures for veterans' compensation, doles, interest, and so forth—necessary though they may be—provide no continuing source of public revenues.

But it is contended by Mr. Hansen that all the free services provided by the Government can readily be made to take care of themselves by the simple process of expanding the Nation's money supply and hence its taxable capacity.

"When the Government provides free services, some appropriate monetary expansion is justified. This would permit the collection of taxes sufficient to cover the expenses of operation together with amortization and interest charges." [9]

This seems to say that if: first, we expend public money to construct non-revenue-producing public works, to support the unemployed, and so forth; and then, second, issue an additional volume of money, the taxes will rise sufficiently to liquidate all the costs involved. By what process and to whom the additional money (from which the additional taxes would be derived) is to be issued is not made clear. Nor is there apparently any recognition of the fact that, in order to carry the continuing costs involved, this additional income would have to be issued not once only but in each succeeding year. The basic error in thinking pointed out above still remains. The Treasury simply cannot get back in taxes, levied upon the additional income it distributes through its disbursements, as much money as it pays out.

This general problem may be illustrated by wartime expenditures. Such outlays exert, immediately speaking, quite as powerful an economic stimulus, provide as much employment, and generate as much current money income as any other kind of expenditures, public or private. But neither the munitions and supplies consumed by the military establishment, nor the fixed capital embedded in bomber and fighter planes, in Government shipyards and docks, in naval bases and naval vessels, or in military roads and Army fortifications yield tax revenues. Moreover, they cannot carry their own operating costs or provide for their own replacement. They simply represent deadweight charges against the rest of the economic system. In addition to their original costs, they will entail large annual charges for continued upkeep.

That public expenditures for war purposes do not generate a sufficient increase in income to bring the budget more nearly into balance is readily apparent. When the Government expends $20 billion for war purposes the $20 billion of national income thus generated is only in small part available as revenue to the Treasury. If, say, 20 percent of the increased income be collected in taxes, the Government would receive back as a result of this operation only $4 billion, with a resulting increase of $16 billion in the public debt. This is what has been happening since 1940. This is what will continue to happen with non-revenue-producing Government outlays.

By way of contrast, it is well to note what happens when national income increases as a result of private business expansion. Then the ensuing increase in tax receipts is clear gain for the Treasury. Instead of an increasing deficit we get, inevitably, a decreasing deficit.

It must also be noted that an ever-expanding public debt would adversely affect the level of national income in the future by checking investment. The accompanying increase in taxes and the fears of more to come could hardly fail to prove a serious deterrent to new investment. Hence the rate of capital expansion and the rise in national income would be retarded.

V. THE PUBLIC DEBT AND INFLATION

In the popular mind the public debt is closely related to inflation. How is a great advance in commodity prices to be prevented if the public debt is allowed to increase continuously? Does not history show that an enormous rise in the public debt always results in disastrous inflation? We are assured by the advocates of the new philosophy that inflation can readily be controlled, even though the debt is constantly expanding.

Fiscal management under the new system of public finance, it should be noted, would involve control at two stages: First, whenever we are not making full use of our productive resources the Treasury would stimulate further expansion through borrowings from the commercial banks. If the banks should perchance at any time be unwilling to purchase all the Government securities offered, the Government might possibly endeavor to meet the situation by taking over the banks. Or, as an alternative, the Treasury might turn directly to the Federal Reserve system, which is now under political control. Still another alternative would be for the Treasury to issue its own non-interest-bearing notes.

The second stage is reached when the expansion process has resulted in full use of our productive resources. To check inflation at this point, it is held that the Treasury would henceforth cease to borrow from the banks, and raise the money required solely from taxes or from bonds sold to the investing public. Since the Government's revenues would no longer be derived in part from bank credit expansion, the total money supply would no longer increase; and inflation could not occur. Stated in theoretical terms, the problem sounds simple. But, as we shall see, the inflation appears much more complex than the foregoing statement would indicate, and the practical difficulties involved cannot be surmounted without a very elaborate system of control.

1. The problem of control

The nature of the inflation control problem thus raised may best be revealed by reference to the situation with which the United States is confronted in the year 1943. We are now operating the bulk of our productive resources at maximum capacity; we not only have full employment but a shortage of manpower. We have, moreover, a huge excess of purchasing power requiring absorption by the Treasury.

The experience of other countries during this war has shown that without controls over primary cost factors, an inflationary cycle cannot be prevented. And it has also been demonstrated that given such controls, and an effective rationing system, the rise in commodity prices can be checked even when the fiscal program is not adequate to meet the situation. Canada and England, as well as Germany, kept prices well in hand in 1942, even though all of the excess purchasing power was not currently absorbed.

In time of peace the control of inflation at the stage of full employment would be even more difficult than in time of war. The pressures emanating from special groups would be quite as insistent; and the necessities of a greater national emergency could not be invoked as a restraining influence. The sale of bonds to the investing public would be more difficult because opportunities for investment elsewhere would be more abundant and the patriotic urge for assisting the Government less compelling. Moreover, at the very time the Treasury was seeking to check inflation, the situation might be complicated by heavy public liquidations of existing bond holdings in order to obtain spending money. This problem may confront the Treasury in the early postwar period.

---

[9] Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles, p. 170.

If one were to assume that as the stage of full employment is reached the budget would be virtually in balance, the problem of control through fiscal policy would seem to present less difficulty. But, as we have seen, the very process of creating employment by means of deficit financing inevitably results in a perpetual shortage of tax collections as compared with Government expenditures. The budget thus cannot approach a balance. Moreover, the new philosophy, in one of its manifestations, holds that even in periods of prosperity there must be no reduction in the cash deficit—because this would mean a decrease in the Treasury's "net income-creating" expenditures, with resulting deflation.

In fact, there is nothing in the long history of public finance which indicates that any government, and especially a democratic government, can be depended upon to apply the brakes to credit expansion, when the proper moment has arrived. Always the pressures for continuation along the existing road are powerful and persistent.[10]

It should be recalled here that as a result of long experience with such pressures, the management of bank credit currency was, during the course of the 19th century, nearly everywhere divorced from political control. It was generally believed at that period that the central banks could, through appropriate credit policies, control the fluctuations of the business cycle. But now that experience has demonstrated that the central banks are powerless either to prevent deflation or to provide an adequate stimulus for recovery and expansion, we have turned to the Treasury as the one agency which can directly affect the volume of purchasing power in the hands of the public.

But the Treasury does not occupy a position of independence comparable to that of the Federal Reserve system as originally conceived and organized. The Treasury is basically an administrative agency. The policies which it executes, both in connection with tax levies and expenditures, are determined by Congress. This fact obviously involves difficulties from the point of view of developing a scientific, flexible plan of credit control.

To meet this difficulty, advocates of control of the economic system through fiscal policy recommend that the power of discretion in both taxation and expenditures be transferred from Congress to the executive branch of the Government. The function of Congress would thenceforth be confined to providing lump-sum appropriations and to setting certain limitations within which the administration might operate its fiscal program. In connection with expenditures Congress would merely appropriate totals and leave the administration to determine when, where, and how expenditures should be made.[11]

Such a program would obviously constitute a fundamental departure from the financial principles and procedures laid down by the Constitution. To make such a program really effective it would, however, be necessary to go a step further—for with the overall lump-sum appropriation plan Congress might from year to year so change the amounts appropriated as to cripple the operation of the plan. To assure real freedom of action for the administration a complete delegation of the power to raise and expend money would be necessary.

But even with such a delegation of financial powers the executive branch of the Government would not be free from public pressures. Such pressures are now exerted jointly against the Congress and the administration. With Congress eliminated from the financial picture, they would henceforth simply be concentrated on the Executive.

In any case, inflation could not be completely controlled by means of fiscal policy. As has already been shown, fiscal controls do not directly touch certain vital aspects of the problem—those operating from the side of costs. Moreover, history reveals that price inflation frequently occurs by a very different process from that which has thus far been discussed.

It will be necessary to make a choice. With unlimited debt expansion we cannot prevent inflation without the use of totalitarian methods of control. No compromise or halfway measures can adjust the difficulties. The choice is between regimentation and inflation.

The foregoing analysis serves to disclose the gravest danger with which the United States is now confronted. Unable or unwilling to perceive basic inconsistencies, or to choose between clearcut alternatives, we drift toward the deep financial waters from which there is no return other than through repudiation in one form or another.

AMENDING THE EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the annual hearings of the Joint Economic Committee last month, Gerhard Colm, chief economist of the National Planning Association, appeared as a witness. Dr. Colm was especially well qualified for this role since he was one of the nameless authors of the Employment Act of 1946, the statute establishing the Joint Economic Committee and the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In a recent article in Challenge magazine, Dr. Colm assessed the history of the Employment Act and suggested improvements in it.

Dr. Colm offered specific recommendations to strengthen the Joint Economic Committee in its role as an advisory body. He suggested, for example, that the committee could have a greater impact upon legislation if its members and staff were to testify before legislative committees on the economic effects of major bills under consideration.

Dr. Colm offered an interesting analysis of the past and future role of the Employment Act of 1946, and I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Government's Role in a Free Economy," from the November 1962 issue of Challenge be inserted in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN A FREE ECONOMY

(By Gerhard Colm)

It is almost a cliché to call the Employment Act of 1946 a milestone in the development of the Government's responsibilities in the economic sphere.

The act, and similar statutes adopted in other democratic countries, was an expression of the people's determination that appropriate government policies would be used to avert depressions and unemployment. It was, in a way, an expression of confidence that a satisfactory economic performance could be accomplished within the framework of a free society; not through a policy of laissez faire, but through deliberate economic and fiscal measures.

The U.S. Government—as well as every other government of modern times—was, of necessity, concerned with such matters as agriculture, industry, transportation, foreign trade, finance and labor relations long before there was an employment act. But the act marked a new era in that it proclaimed government concern with the performance of the economy as a whole.

Since the American Government is so organized that regional and local interests find effective expression both in the legislative and executive branches, the Employment Act established machinery in the two branches—the Joint Economic Committee and the Council of Economic Advisers—to articulate the Government's concern with the performance of the economy as a whole. The duty of the executive to submit an annual economic report to Congress and the duty of the Joint Economic Committee to evaluate these reports provided the link between the two.

Both the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee are advisory agencies. The committee has no responsibility for drafting any specific legislation, and the Council has no operating functions. While the act did not prescribe any specific policies to accomplish its stated goal of promoting "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," it is clear from the legislative deliberations that preceded its passage that fiscal and monetary policies were regarded as the main instruments for achieving the act's purpose.

Since 1947 was the economy's first year of operation under the Employment Act, we can now look back on 15 years' experience with it under the aegis of both political parties. Has this performance fulfilled the expectations of the act's framers? What lessons can we learn from our experience thus far?

The passage of the Employment Act of 1946 was largely motivated by the Nation's concern that post-World War II demobilization might cause the economy to revert to the depressed condition which prevailed during the 1930's. While no such depression has taken place during the last 15 years, nobody would claim that the avoidance of a serious depression can be attributed solely to Government policy under the employment act. As a matter of fact, the United States was faced with economic problems in the postwar years that were quite different from those expected by the act's framers.

The first problem economic policymakers had to face was inflation, which abated in 1949 but was resumed with the beginning of the Korean war. This period came to an end in 1952. Government policies certainly mitigated the inflation through a variety of measures recommended by the President in his Annual Economic Reports. In the switch from a proposed tax reduction in 1950 to tax increases in response to the Korean war, the Joint Economic Committee played a decisive role. In general, it is probably fair to say that the machinery of the Employment Act proved helpful in the fight against inflation without claiming anything like a perfect record.

---

[10] This is well illustrated by Schacht's failure in Germany in 1938.

[11] Hansen in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, June 27, 1942.

The problem of inflation, however, did not end with the Korean war. It continued in the form of a "creeping" price rise. The Economic Reports of the President and those of the Joint Economic Committee between 1952–62 greatly contributed to a better understanding of the difference between a price rise stemming from excess demand on the one hand and one resulting from the exercise of "market power" by business and unions on the other. However, only in exceptional cases did Government action go beyond admonishments to business and labor to exercise self-restraint in price and wage policy. The principal exception was President Kennedy's action last spring to prevent a steel price increase.

The Council of Economic Advisers, for its part, has developed general guidelines for a noninflationary wage policy, but there is no machinery to implement them. Proposals have been made that factfinding committees should look into the price, productivity, and labor cost situation of key industries. Yet even such apparently moderate proposals have been suspected as being steps in the direction of price and wage control. Both business and labor believe they can pursue their own interests better by "free" collective bargaining and "free" price policy than by injection of the "public interest" represented by Government as a third party in price and wage determination.

Yet the increasing talk about the public interest in such matters has undoubtedly had some restraining effect on business and union attitudes. Nevertheless, there remains the task of finding an acceptable structure within which prices and wages can be determined without jeopardizing the public interest.

A second characteristic of the postwar period were the frequent, but short-lived, recessions. As far as recessions are concerned, the machinery created under the Employment Act must serve first as a "storm warning system" and secondly as an instrument to formulate countermeasures.

Encouraged by the Council and the joint committee, tools for business cycle diagnosis have been greatly improved—first by the monthly publication of Economic Indicators and, most recently, by the monthly publication of Business Cycle Development. The latter publication organizes statistical data in an attempt to construct a kind of economic barometer.

Spectacular advances have also been made in sample surveys of businessmen's plans to invest as well as the buying intentions of consumers. In addition, electronic computers have been used for quickly processing available statistical information.

Still the record of the Council as a storm warning agency is far from perfect. Failures in diagnosis can be partly explained by the problem of politics. President Truman fought his 1948 campaign on an anti-inflation platform. It took some time until the Council found the indications of an approaching recession in 1949 clear enough to change the advice it was giving the President. Another example is the denial by the Chairman of the Council during the presidential campaign of 1960 that a recession was in the making when many economists thought that available economic indicators did not permit any other interpretation.

Not all failures in diagnosis, however, can be blamed on politics. In the summer of 1962 some observers of the leading indicators believed that a recession was imminent while others believed that a period of slow expansion might be followed by a new rise in economic activity in 1963. Thus, despite all the technical advancements in the diagnosis of the business cycle, economic forecasts remain statements about probabilities. Actions on the basis of forecasts therefore inevitably run the risk that the forecast was in error. Evaluating the possible harm by not acting in time on the one hand, or by acting prematurely on the basis of an uncertain forecast on the other, always requires a mixture of economic and political judgment.

There is no question that the current political debate about the need for antirecession policies is based on a quality of economic intelligence which is far superior to anything available 15 years ago. But this is still no guarantee that the right decisions will be made.

Not only have we improved our ability to predict recessions; we are much better at combating them, too. The use of variable financial terms for residential construction and home improvements has been particularly successful. Statistical analyses suggest that deliberate Government policies have made at least some contribution to mitigating recessions and promoting recoveries.

During the entire postwar period the desirability of using temporary but substantial tax cuts as an antirecession device was continually discussed. In order to use this device without the delay involved in legislative deliberations, it was proposed that the President be authorized to cut taxes up to a specific amount if the economic indicators demonstrate a need to bolster sagging purchasing power.

While there is no inclination in Congress even to consider such a delegation of authority to the President, the idea that tax reduction and the deliberate creation of deficits should be used as an appropriate antirecession tool is gaining acceptance. In recent discussions before congressional committees this principle was hardly contested. The questions under debate were rather:

Is it certain that a recession is imminent, or is it possible to wait until a tax cut can be worked out in conjunction with tax reform?

Should tax reduction be associated with an increase in expenditures or with a reduction in expenditures? Those who believe that Government expenditures are too high argued for expenditure reduction without considering that such action would counteract the economic effect of tax reduction.

Should the deficit be financed entirely by corporate and individual saving, or should the banking system play its part through action by the Federal Reserve System?

While at the time of this writing no immediate tax reduction has been recommended by the President or adopted by Congress, the debate again shows the advances in thinking about antirecession policies which have been made during the last 15 years. However, it is happening at a time when it is increasingly clear that the frequent recessions are but an expression of a more deeply rooted problem—inadequate economic growth. When President Kennedy appointed Walter Heller as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, he emphasized that growth was his major economic concern. This concern was reflected in some parts of the Economic Report of January 1962. But, in the final analysis, the available information on the factors which make for growth and the existing obstacles in their path have not been used as a springboard for proposing a comprehensive program of action.

The recent statement by the President that he does not intend to recommend an immediate tax cut probably reflects his opinion that such legislation would be supported by Congress and the public only if adopted in the case of a clearly visible recession. The American public, however, has not yet accepted the idea of a tax cut as one element in a comprehensive program designed to stimulate economic growth and combat chronic unemployment.

In any case, a policy of domestic economic expansion is complicated by our balance-of-payments deficit. Many people feel that the fiscal and monetary measures needed to insure full employment and a high rate of growth would at the same time aggravate the balance-of-payments problem. My personal view is that a policy of domestic economic expansion would not in the long run hurt our payments position.

Here, then, is a major unresolved problem which is one of the reasons why the administration's economic policies sometimes seem hesitant and wavering. Under the employment act, it is the job of the Council of Economic Advisers and of the Joint Economic Committee to help resolve such policy dilemmas. In this regard the machinery created under the act has not fulfilled its purpose.

Proposals have repeatedly been made to add to the Employment Act the objectives of price stability, economic growth and a balanced payments position. Actually, however, the act has always been interpreted to include these objectives which are completely compatible with its language and spirit. Therefore, I cannot see any particular reason to specifically add them. The main difficulty is that the Government has not been able to work out a policy which would place these various goals in proper perspective. Such a policy would integrate programs to promote price stability, full employment and an international payments balance with an all-embracing approach to balanced economic growth.

The Council of Economic Advisers has given advice in this direction, and I am sure that the President has recognized its soundness. There is, however, no unanimity within the administration on the relative importance of the various goals and of the monetary and fiscal policies needed to accomplish them. The Council can only advise the President on its own views and inform him of the conflicting views which exist. The Council cannot be expected to coordinate its own ideas with those of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System and private interest groups unless the President adopts a particular policy.

It appears to be the President's judgment that the time is not ripe for obtaining needed political support for such a comprehensive policy of balanced economic growth in his own official family (including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board), in Congress and in the various interest groups in the private sector. On the other hand, the political forces which might support such a policy cannot be mobilized unless the President provides determined leadership.

Consequently, hesitation in formulating and adopting a comprehensive program for economic growth cannot be regarded as a failure in the machinery established by the employment act. Nevertheless, improvements in institutional and statistical devices could be used to highlight the need for such a program.

Under the Employment Act the President in his Economic Report must present estimates of the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power necessary to achieve the act's goals. President Eisenhower and his Council have been criticized inside and outside Congress for their failure to live up to this provision. The report of January 1962—President Kennedy's first—was a big step forward, but further progress is still needed.

I believe that national economic projections, both long-term and intermediate, would help to demonstrate the potential levels that could be attained in key sectors of the economy if we attain full employment and utilize all the available technological possibilities. These projections would also indicate the investment required for technological advances and additional productive capacity. Such national economic budgets require coordinated projections of economic data and projections of Federal, State, and local transactions. These budgets would provide useful tools for the economic evaluation of various long-term Government programs. They could also serve as guides for tax and debt management policy. They would help businessmen to determine potential markets for their products and the feasibility of expanding capacity. Projections of this kind are now provided by private research organizations. But their usefulness for long-term business planning would be greatly enhanced if the business community could rely on the Government to contribute to a program of balanced economic growth through appropriate fiscal and monetary policies.

Congress recently appropriated funds for a study of the problem of economic growth under the direction of the Council of Economic Advisers. Thus the proposed development of a medium and long-range national economic budget requires no radical innovation but only a further development of programs which have already been initiated. There is no doubt, however, that a great educational effort is needed before national economic budgets are accepted as the tool for the formulation of long-range economic policies.

On the legislative side, a substantial improvement is needed if the Joint Economic Committee is to live up to the role which was envisaged for it under the Employment Act. It was created (a) to appraise the Economic Reports of the President, (b) to conduct economic studies of its own, and (c) to advise the Congress on legislation needed to accomplish the purposes of the Employment Act.

The committee has regularly issued appraisals of the President's Economic Reports and has conducted very valuable studies of relevant topics. It has held hearings which gave academic and research economists, and representatives of business and labor, an opportunity to discuss current economic issues. Some of the reports have become valuable material for teaching and have helped to bridge the gap between an academic and a more practical approach to economic policy. In all these respects the joint committee has made valuable contributions which have probably exceeded the expectations of the framers of the 1946 act. The joint committee has, however, been much less successful in giving legislative advice to its congressional colleagues.

At present, the joint committee has an impact on legislation mainly through the fact that its members are also members of other committees which consider legislation related to the economy. Actually, the joint committee has been most successful as a kind of postgraduate training ground for legislators. Some of the outstanding speeches on economic matters in the Senate and House have been made by members of the committee, and there is no doubt that its existence has raised the level of economic sophistication in Congress.

I believe, however, that a more regular channel should be provided to bring the joint committee's advice to the attention of the Congress as a whole. The fact that reports by the joint committee are made available to other Members of Congress hardly assures that much attention is paid to them. It would be desirable if other committees which are considering legislation affecting the economy would hear representatives of the Joint Economic Committee to obtain their views (if necessary, majority and minority views) before legislation is framed. If a committee's proposal is not in accord with the views expressed by the Joint Economic Committee, this conflict should be officially reported to the Congress. As far as I know, the joint committee has presented its views only in exceptional cases, such as the Korean war tax program, or in relatively minor problems, such as those involving appropriations for certain statistical programs.

It is significant that the House Committee on Ways and Means held its own hearings before those of the Joint Economic Committee on the economic outlook in July–August 1962, when the question of an immediate tax reduction was being considered. It is obvious that the Joint Committee has not yet been successful in obtaining recognition from the other committees as the source of advice on legislation affecting the economy.

The interest of busy legislators can only be assured if they know that the committee's work has a tangible impact on legislation. Consequently, if the Joint Committee were required to present its views on all legislation and appropriations affecting the economy, it would be more nearly playing the role assigned to it under the Employment Act.

Our 15 years' experience with the Employment Act has definitely proven the importance of this basic legislation, particularly as a means for dramatizing national concern with the economy as a whole. The machinery created under the act has assisted the President in policy formulation and has made him less dependent on Cabinet members who naturally tend to give advice from the point of view of their respective departments. The Joint Economic Committee has been most effective as an educational enterprise in the broadest definition of the term. It has been less effective in directly giving advice on economic and fiscal legislation.

The United States is engaged in a great venture to prove that an economy with free institutions can be adapted to the needs of the space age. But success in this venture requires deliberate Government policies. While the experience of the past 15 years has been encouraging, improvements in the machinery and more boldness in policy formulation and implementation are needed if we are to meet the great economic and social challenge of our time.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE REFORM

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the minority views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report, my 5 Republican colleagues and I offered 47 recommendations dealing with tax reduction and reform, expenditure control, agriculture, education and training, and other measures needed to strengthen our dynamic American economy.

Among the recommendations for expenditure reform which were offered was one urging the President to establish an Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures. The Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee believe that the establishment of a commission designed to take a hard, objective, and nonpartisan look at Federal spending is an essential part of any meaningful and sound program of expenditure control.

In addition to setting forth the recommendation for the establishment of such a commission in our minority views, we have taken the additional step of bringing the recommendation directly to the attention of the President in a letter dated March 19, 1963. In that letter, we set forth some of our observations on tax reduction and reform and on the urgent need to offset through expenditure reform the larger budget deficits that would result from tax reduction. The letter clearly sets forth our proposal for the establishment of the Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be inserted in the Record at this point.

U.S. Congress,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: In response to your recent invitation for a continuing dialog on the major economic issues before the Nation, we should like to set forth some of our observations on your proposed 1963 tax program and to offer a suggestion for expenditure control which we believe would contribute to sound and stable long-term economic growth.

While we recognize that knowledge of the sources of economic growth and the means of accelerating it are limited, it seems clear that well-conceived incentive tax reduction and reform is a major and necessary step toward improving upon our Nation's rate of economic growth. We have long supported tax reduction and reform as a high priority objective of our economic policy. However, it is also clear that such a program will involve costs as well as benefits. These costs must be weighed and, if possible, offset.

One cost will be budget deficits higher than those which would have been incurred without the tax cut. These would follow 3 years of steadily mounting deficits which have totaled more than $19 billion, or more than the net deficits of the previous 7 fiscal years combined. Some opinion holds that budget deficits need not concern us. We do not share this view.

The experience of the past suggests that it would be reckless to ignore the inflationary dangers posed by persistent and increasing deficits. The state of economic learning is neither so advanced nor so precise as to safely admit any other conclusion as a guide to policymaking. Sound long-term economic growth cannot be based upon a foundation of budget deficits. Furthermore, we cannot ignore the adverse effects such deficits could have on our continuing balance-of-payments problem and on the entire free world trade and payments system.

Recognition of the potential dangers of chronic budget deficits is implicit in your proposed tax program. As one of its objectives, the program seeks to bring the budget into balance by stimulating economic activity and thus increasing revenues.

We should not, however, pin all of our hopes for ending our chronic deficits on the possibility of rapidly rising tax revenues. It is clear that hard thought must be given to the other side of the ledger—to controlling rapidly increasing Federal expenditures.

We do not suggest an across-the-board cut in Federal spending. In view of the Nation's domestic needs and international and security commitments, such an approach would be self-defeating. What we should seek, however, is a reform of Federal expenditure policy so as to effect important savings without impairing the national interest or retarding economic growth. Indeed, thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures can increase our national security and stimulate our economic growth.

In view of these considerations, we believe that Federal expenditure policy requires thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination. Support for the principle of tighter control and more effective use of Federal expenditures is virtually unanimous; support for specific suggestions for achieving it is more difficult to attain. The difficulty of the task, however, should not deter us from making the attempt.

In our separate minority and additional views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report, we made several specific suggestions which we believe offer a sound basis for a reform of Federal expenditure policy. At this time, we wish to call one of these recommendations to your attention and ask that you give it your serious consideration.

As an essential step to a reform of Federal expenditure policy, we suggest that you appoint a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures, composed of private citizens from business, labor, education, the professions, and Members of Congress equally from both parties. The work of this Commission, assisted by a staff, should parallel the 3-year period over which your tax program is scheduled to take effect. During this period, the Commission should conduct studies and periodically make public its recommendations in the following areas:

(a) Establishment of spending priorities among Federal programs, separating the desirable from those that are essential, in order to serve as a guide to the administration in drawing up the budget, particularly in years of expected deficits.

(b) Appraisal of Federal activities in order to identify those programs which tend to retard economic growth and for which expenditures should be reduced or eliminated.

(c) Improvement of the Federal budgeting and appropriations process in order to increase the effective control of expenditures.

(d) Examination of responsibilities and functions which are now assumed by the Federal Government, but which could be better performed and with superior effectiveness by the private economy.

(e) Review of Federal responsibility and functions in order to determine which could be better performed at the State and local levels.

(f) Improvement of Government organization and procedures in order to increase efficiency and promote savings, including a review of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in order to determine how those already implemented have worked out in practice and whether those not yet implemented should be given further consideration.

(g) Determination of policies with regard to the level of user charges and fees to be made for special services furnished to members of the public by the Government.

The recommendations of an objective and nonpartisan Commission of the kind described should command widespread support among the public and within the Congress. Its proposals would offer a sound basis upon which to begin the reform of Federal expenditure policy.

In view of the relevance which expenditure control has for the success of a tax reduction and reform program, we earnestly hope you will give this recommendation your early and favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas B. Curtis.
Clarence E. Kilburn.
William B. Widnall.
Jacob K. Javits.
Jack Miller.
Len B. Jordan.

RIGHT OF EMPLOYEES TO EXAMINE PROMOTION EVALUATIONS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which is intended to give additional protection to Federal employees against arbitrary or unfair ratings by their supervisors and also to give employees the right of rebuttal.

Previously, employees have been given the right to examine the routine performance ratings by their supervisors, which become part of each employee's personnel file. But a practice has grown up of having confidential promotion qualifications inquiries which are never shown to the person being rated.

In personnel matters such as this, I believe it is important to take all possible steps to avoid possible unfair ratings or evaluations due to bias, personality clash, or other reason. Accordingly, the bill I introduced provides that employees have the right, first, to examine such supervisory evaluations and, second, to make written reply which shall at all times be part of that employee's personnel file just as the supervisory evaluation is.

I do not see any good reason why employees should be subjected to possibly damaging evaluations—which could be completely unwarranted—and yet be completely unaware that such damaging material is in their files.

The text of my bill is as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 7 of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 406; 5 U.S.C. 638) is amended by inserting immediately following the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Each officer and employee shall have the right to examine each supervisory evaluation of his qualifications for promotion and to file a written comment with respect to all or any part of such evaluation which shall be attached thereto."

To those who say opening these reports to the employee involved will not work, I would merely point to the military services. They have for many years allowed any member of the armed services full access to all unclassified material in his file.

Typical of the type of promotion evaluation to which I object is one used by the Public Health Service. On the face of this inquiry form there is this message:

> Information furnished in this qualification form will be considered along with other pertinent information in evaluating the potential for advancement, under the Public Health Service promotion program, of the individual whose name is shown on the form. As a person who is familiar with this employee's work, you are requested to complete the items on the form as they apply to the individual concerned, following the directions for each section. This is not a performance rating under the DHEW performance rating program.
>
> This form has been designed to cover major factors having a bearing on an employee's qualification for work at a higher level or with broader responsibilities. The success of the Service's programs is vitally affected by the skill and ability of its work force, and the importance of selecting, under the promotion program, the best qualified employees to fill Service vacancies cannot be stressed too much. Your cooperation in considering each factor on the inquiry form carefully and realistically and in completing the form promptly will contribute a great deal to the effective operation of the promotion program.
>
> The qualifications inquiry is confidential, and you are asked not to discuss your evaluation with anyone. The form will not be filed in the employee's official personnel folder but will be maintained as a part of the confidential promotion records. The completed form should be returned by the evaluator in a sealed envelope to the address shown on the last page of the form."

At the bottom of this page is the legend, "Confidential—Personnel."

This evaluation folder contains 63 questions concerning the employee's work haibts, abilities, potential, judgment and so forth. These questions seem reasonable to me, although I have not analyzed each of them. I can certainly understand where such a form would be valuable in seeking persons who have characteristics which are desirable in a supervisor. I do not object to this form, its use or the questions in it.

My only objection is to the fact that the completed forms are not available to the employee who has been rated. He does not know how he was rated, and in the event that there was some bias, he is unaware of it. I think my bill will correct the situation.

AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of this House to legislation before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which, if enacted, I strongly feel, would go far toward conquering one of the most vital problems plaguing so many areas and people of our Nation today—air pollution.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety concluded hearings last week on legislation covering this subject including my own bill, H.R. 4750. I am certain that the enlightening facts brought out at these hearings will prove the case for Federal leadership in this field and the need for meaningful Federal-State-local partnership to eradicate the problem. I was privileged to present my views at the hearings and to offer what I feel to be a constructive program in finding a solution to this plague.

As I pointed out to the committee, I have been particularly concerned with this subject and, in the effort to help formulate a meaningful program, I have had occasion to work with the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] and to observe firsthand his great ability and unique grasp of this complex problem.

In my own city of New York, often when I have flown in to the city, I have been struck by the fact that what seemed to be a perfectly glorious day from the air became dull and overcast when viewed from the ground. The vivid blue of the sky, the floating clouds, and the brilliance of the sun were all obscured by the gray haze that hung over the city. This haze is composed of smoke and soot, chemical vapors, and motor vehicle exhaust. It covers our buildings with grime and reduces property values. It destroys crops and gardens, and most important, it presents a serious threat to the health of our citizens, especially the aged. For these reasons I am vitally concerned about air-pollution control, and I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to urge the committee's support for my bill, H.R. 4750, and, of course, Mr. Chairman, your identical bill H.R. 4415.

As you know, air pollution is principally an urban problem, and in my city, America's largest, it is a severe one. With more than 7¾ million people needing heat and electric power for their homes and their offices or factories, vast quantities of combustion products are emitted into the atmosphere daily. Nearly a million automobiles are on the streets each day, consuming 1½ million gallons of gasoline and pouring burned and unburned waste products into the air—waste products consisting of 4½ million pounds of deadly carbon monoxide and 2,500 pounds of hydrocarbons which are believed to be responsible for our steadily rising number of deaths due to chronic bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer. Lesser quantities of nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide are also given off, as well as particulate matter, all of which contributes to the $150 million lost each year in New York City because of corroded building materials, soiled merchandise, and blighted garden produce.

As you can see, automobile exhaust is already a problem of large dimensions in New York City and other metropolitan areas. Moreover, a steady increase in the number of motor vehicles, the miles traveled per vehicle, and total gasoline consumption is predicted for at least the next two decades. We know that the pollutants in motor vehicle exhaust will induce cancer in experimental animals and that disability days for chronic respiratory conditions vary directly with the quantity of contaminants in the atmosphere. There is also evidence that such pollution contributes to the progress of various types of heart disease.

All of these subjects are deserving of further research, and for that reason my bill specifically requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct studies regarding the discharges from motor vehicles and their effect upon human health. I believe this is perhaps the most important aspect of the air pollution problem, and I feel that research in this area is vital and should be conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which can provide the coordination and focus necessary in order to achieve satisfactory results.

You may be wondering why the States cannot plan and implement their own air pollution control programs and why the Federal Government should become any further involved. First, let me say that in New York we have taken action leading to the abatement of air pollution from industrial sources and are operating monitoring stations and supporting research programs on the effects of air pollution and methods of pollution control. New York, along with New Jersey and Connecticut, is a member of the Interstate Sanitary Commission which is also actively working for a solution to this problem.

We know there are other States such as California where an intensive effort is also being made in this area. However, a recent study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reveals that only about half of our cities with populations over 50,000 have air pollution control programs, and many of those are seriously understaffed. Budgets are often too restricted to permit the development of adequate programs. In fact, only nine States are now spending more than $25,000 annually to combat this problem, and half of our States are spending less than $5,000 per year for air pollution control.

However, even if all the States had the funds and facilities to monitor air pollution levels, to enforce control measures, and to carry on urgently needed research, I do not believe it would be the most economical and efficient way in which to attack the problem. The Bureau of Environmental Health of the Public Health Service, on the other hand, is admirably equipped for the job with its research facilities at the sanitary engineering center in Cincinnati, Ohio, and its many monitoring stations as well as its highly qualified staff. I am not advocating usurpation of the States rights nor the shouldering of their responsibilities, but I believe, however, that this is an instance in which the Federal Government can be of great help to the States and can provide the incentive and the assistance needed if we are to see any progress in this area.

One other point that should be made in the case for a strong Federal program of air pollution control is that air pollution is no respecter of county or State boundaries. Countless incidents reveal that contaminants from one State may damage crops or cause illness in a neighboring State. The problem is really national in scope and requires a national effort if we are to deal with it successfully.

I believe a problem of such magnitude merits the expenditure of Federal funds. At the present time we are only spending 10 cents per capita annually from all sources in combating a situation which costs us approximately $65 per capita per year in economic losses plus incalculable losses from chronic respiratory illnesses and premature deaths. My bill, H.R. 4750, and yours, Mr. Chairman, would call for an additional sum of only 3 cents per capita annually for the next 5 years. I believe this is not an excessive amount for such an urgently needed program. Furthermore, these bills offer the advantage that after 5 years we would have the opportunity to review the progress that has been made under the program and to evaluate further needs.

I believe that it is imperative that we enact a Federal program this year to supplement the State and regional efforts already being made and to provide an incentive to those States which as yet have taken no action or only limited steps in this extremely important matter.

Much legislation has been proposed in recent Congresses on the subject of air pollution control, and it is heartening to me to note that two members of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman Roberts, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Schenck, have been successful in advocating measures to extend the Air Pollution Control Act and to investigate the extent and effects of pollutants from motor vehicle exhaust. I was privileged even though I am not a member of the committee, to have cosponsored the legislation for this extension. Congressman Rodino has also been interested in this problem for some years and was instrumental in the adoption of a tri-State agreement by Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey to authorize the Interstate Sanitary Commission to study means of air pollution control and to establish air quality standards and regulations. I trust I need not add that I, too, have long been deeply concerned about this menace and have previously introduced legislation providing for the abatement and control of air pollution.

We, then, have all recognized the dangers of air pollution. But in the past there seems to have been little public concern in this area, and Congress itself has failed to appreciate the gravity of the problem. I have noted in the past year, however, an upsurge of interest by the press and lately a marked increase in constituent mail on this subject. I hope, therefore, that this Congress will be aware of the urgency of the situation and will enact the necessary legislation at any early date. We cannot expect the contaminants in the air to disappear of their own accord; in fact, without some action on our part, they will continue to increase, becoming an ever greater threat to our health and prosperity. However, we have it in our power to do something about this problem; your favorable action on H.R. 4415 and H.R. 4750 would be an important step in that direction.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE MEETING OF HALIFAX COUNTY, VA.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 8, 1963, I had the very great pleasure of attending a regular meeting of the Board of Agriculture of Halifax County, Va., which is my home county. It was one of the most inspiring meetings I have attended in a long time. I was impressed with the work being done by every segment of our society to improve and enhance the agricultural, economic and civic conditions of our great county. Those present and participating in this agriculture program were among our best citizens, who have wrought well and who along with others have been responsible for the outstanding improvements made in our county. Among the group were prominent farmers and housewives, civic leaders, businessmen, bankers, and others.

In addition to the president of the association, Mr. R. W. Armistead and those associated with him, I am sure that Mr. C. L. Hall, who is now and has been for many years our county agent, and Mrs. Louise B. Tune, who is now and has been for some years our home demonstration agent, have done much to encourage these worthy endeavors.

In order that the Members of Congress, as well as other readers of the Congressional Record, may have some conception of the scope of this meeting and of the work being done by the various committees, I am glad, under leave heretofore granted me, to extend my remarks in the Record to include the minutes of this meeting which are as follows:

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HALIFAX COUNTY BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1963, R. W. ARMISTEAD, PRESIDENT, PRESIDING

The Halifax County Board of Agriculture held its annual meeting on March 8, 1963, 10 a.m., at Centerville Rose with 28 members present. The meeting was called to order by the president, Mr. R. W. Armistead, and the minutes of the 1962 meeting were read and approved.

Reports from the county agents office on "highlights of the extension program" for 1962 were given by Mr. C. L. Hall, county agent; and Mrs. Louise B. Tune, home demonstration agent. The agents asked for suggestions and ideas from the board on how they could improve their services to the people of Halifax County.

Commodity committee reports were given by committee chairmen as follows: Soils and crops, Mr. J. T. Burton; foods and nutrition, Mrs. B. A. Epperson; youth, Mr. Stanley Younger; house and house furnishings, Mrs. Robert East; dairy, Mr. C. B. Barksdale; home grounds beautification, Mrs. Ed Buckner; swine, Mr. W. R. Carr, Jr.; clothing, Mrs. A. M. Jones; forestry, Mr. Paul C. Edmunds, Sr.; tobacco, Mr. R. L. Shaw (in absence of chairman, Mr. H. W. Dunn); home management, Mrs. W. N. Tune; and community improvement clubs, Mr. F. G. Lacks.

Mr. W. W. Shapard made a motion that the committee reports be accepted. Copies of this and previous reports are on file in the secretary's book at the county agent's office. The board of agriculture was honored by the attendance and an address by the Honorable W. M. Tuck, Member of the U.S. Congress. Mr. Tuck commended the board of agriculture on its work and urges its continuance. County Agent C. L. Hall led a discussion on the rural areas development program. Upon motion duly seconded, the board voted unanimously that the board of agriculture and the chamber of commerce work together as one in the advancing of the future welfare of the county both agriculturally and industrially. The president of the chamber of commerce stated they would welcome the cooperation with the board of agriculture and the addition of representatives from the board of agriculture to the committee of the chamber of commerce.

Mr. W. W. Shapard moved the county agent's office be given authority to appoint any committee needed to work with the chamber of commerce. This motion was unanimously adopted.

Miss Judy Stitt was elected to fill the secretarial position of the board of agriculture left vacant by Mrs. Shirla Hudson.

A motion was made by Mr. W. W. Shapard and approved by the group that the board of agriculture go on record as approving the Southside Soil Conservation District watershed program for Halifax County.

Mr. Jimmy Shelton asked for a report on the securing of a soil survey for Halifax County. Mr. Hall told the group that the soil surveys by the experiment stations were made for the counties that showed most interest, other things being equal. The director of the experiment station had been contacted and set for the meeting to discuss the possibilities of getting a county soil survey.

Mr. C. B. Barksdale made a motion that the board of agriculture go on record asking for a soil survey and pledging the board's support in working for some.

The chairman of the board expressed appreciation to Mr. Leggett for providing the meal for the group.

Officers other than the secretary were not elected as the president, R. W. Armistead, and Vice President Carter Owen, were elected in 1962 to serve a 2-year term.

The meeting was adjourned by the president, R. W Armistead.

The group then enjoyed a meal prepared and served by the staff of Centerville Rose Restaurant.

SOILS AND CROPS COMMITTEE 1963

J. T. Burton, chairman; Edward Dixon, J. F. Stephens, Jr., Billy Hunt, Eugene Dixon, W. R. Carr, Jr., and A. J. Weatherford.

Corn is a profitable crop in Halifax County, where yields are sufficiently high. This can be accomplished by adopting proper known practices. Farmers are therefore encouraged to adopt these practices:

1. This committee recommends that these practices be demonstrated by two complete corn demonstrations.

2. A "20-ton silage contest" to promote increased yields and the feeding of more silage. Award certificates to those producing 20 tons or more per acre.

3. In order to keep farmers informed on other good crop production practices, conduct three alfalfa demonstrations in which known good practices are used.

4. Hold a 2-day soils tour in early March to further acquaint farmers with the up-to-date soils information. We recommend the following practices to county farmers:

(a) The keeping of permanent soils records on fields devoted to crops. Forms for these records are available from the extension office.

(b) Have a complete soils analysis made for each field including fields on which ASCS practices are applied.

5. Improve the accuracy of soils analysis by carefully taking samples and providing complete information on past fertilization, liming, and other practices that will help in getting the best fertilization recommendations.

6. The pooling of orders to purchase soil sampling tubes.

7. That farmers study experiment station results and especially those of the stations in the Piedmont area of the State before selecting crop varieties to grow.

8. Apply needed lime as indicated by soils test so as to secure maximum benefits from the fertilizer applied.

FOODS AND NUTRITION COMMITTEE, 1963

Present: Mrs. B. A. Epperson, chairman; Mrs. Lois Dismuke, and Mrs. H. P. Anderson.

Situation: The committee made a survey several years ago to determine some of the nutritional problems. This survey was made with all sixth grade pupils in the county. The committee felt that this information gave them a good indication as to the food needs of families. The survey pointed up the need for more milk and green leafy vegetables in the diet. After considering the longtime foods and nutrition program for the county, the committee selected the following phases of the program to put special emphasis on in 1968:

1. That two special interests meetings on food preparation be held during the year with special emphasis on the use of milk.

2. To continue to encourage the schools to replace carbonated beverage machines with milk vending machines. One elementary school in the county has done this and we are well pleased with the results.

3. That 4–H foods leaders continue to be invited to all leader training meetings for the home demonstration clubs.

4. That publicity be given on food supplies needed for fallout shelters and to encourage homemakers to keep an extra supply of canned foods on the pantry shelf.

5. That information racks in laundermats and beauty parlors be supplied with nutritional material.

6. That the "packet for the bride" that have been prepared as a means of reaching people that we are not now reaching should include some material on meal planning, buying, and preparing food.

7. That news articles and radio talks be given on foods and nutrition.

YOUTH COMMITTEE, 1963

Mr. Stanley Younger, chairman, Mrs. Albert Payne, Mr. R. W. Armistead, Mrs. Charlie Woosley.

Committee recommendation

1. Recognizing the problem of a large dropout of club members over 15 years of age the committee recommends the following to help remedy the situation:

(a) Attempt to have some form of recreation at all community 4–H Club meetings. Agents mail leaders a copy of recreation bulletin.

(b) Agents send list of members of last year's high school club to community leaders so they may invite those in their area not now attending a 4–H Club to join their club.

(c) Strive to interest more parents in 4–H work, possibly through a "parent recognition night" held by each individual club.

2. Stimulate more competition on the county level by holding a county demonstration contest. Include both senior and junior contests.

3. Agents provide community leaders with more information on the district and State awards program.

4. Reorganize county honor club; (a) have member of State 4–H staff as guest speaker, (b) award some type of recognition pin to members.

5. Prepare and mail to leaders a calendar of 4–H events for the year in September.

6. Explore the possibility of holding a fat hog and gilt show in conjunction with the baby beef show and sale.

HOUSE AND HOUSE FURNISHINGS COMMITTEE

Present: Mrs. Robert East, chairman; Mrs. Frank Epperson, Mrs. W. A. Childrey, Mrs. Harry Harris, Mrs. Joe Epperson, and Mrs. Carlton Hodnett.

Situation: There is an apparent building boom on in the county and the committee decided that many of these people are giving very little time and thought to storage space, convenience, and quality. After reviewing the longtime plan the committee decided to concentrate their efforts on the following points in 1963:

1. That more publicity be given to the services available on helping families in house planning, house remodeling by the Extension Service.

2. That home demonstration clubs devote some time during the year to kitchen arrangement to save time and energy.

3 That providing adequate storage space be given special emphasis in house planning and remodeling.

4. That the 4-H clubs carrying "room improvement" as a project be given an opportunity to participate in a class at a local furniture store on "selection of furniture."

5. That information on "what's new" in house furnishings be made available to the public through radio, news articles, and meetings.

DAIRY COMMITTEE, 1963

C. B. Barksdale, chairman; W. A. Patterson, John Cole, Carter Owen, Ralph Ward, and L. C. Owen.

Halifax dairymen must keep informed on the latest and best production and marketing practices to satisfactorily compete. The committee makes the following recommendations:

1. Participate in the 20-ton silage contest recommended by the agronomy committee.

2. There is a good opportunity for farms of limited acreage to produce manufacturing milk.

3. Hold a managed milking demonstration in July.

4. That a dairy school be held for the county's dairymen. That such school cover information on diseases, principles of breeding and other new improved practices that will add to the efficiency of dairying. This school also gives information on machinery for dairy farm and its operation.

5. Develop closer cooperation between dairymen and veterinarians. Invite veterinarians to dairy meetings and to participate in the meetings.

6. Farmers with small crop acreage and that like cattle can profitably produce manufacturing milk if they adopt good known practices.

HOME GROUNDS BEAUTIFICATION COMMITTEE, 1963

Present: Mrs. Ed Buckner, Mrs. L. S. Williamson, Mrs. Howard Burgess, Mrs. Jack Grinstead, and Mrs. Jack Collie.

The Home Grounds Beautification Committee recommends:

1. That home grounds beautification programs be continued in the Home Demonstration Clubs, community improvement, and 4-H Clubs.

2. That the VPI landscape notes be sent to interested people in the county.

3. That pruning demonstrations be given in those communities desiring one.

4. That more publicity be given to the services available through the extension service in planning home grounds improvements.

5. Sponsor a tour to a nursery where those people who are interested in studying and learning more about the desirable shrubs can participate.

6. That extension agents use radio and news articles to give information on shrubs and landscaping to the public.

7. That a special interest class on flower arrangements suitable for church be taught. Most rural churches are dependent on the ladies of the church for the arrangements each Sunday.

SWINE COMMITTEE, 1963

W. R. Carr, Jr., chairman; L. B. Hudson, Addison Solomon, R. I. Weatherford, John Crowder, and J. W. Shelton.

After considering the various potentials available for swine production in Halifax County, the committee is convinced that swine production can be a profitable enterprise for many farmers. That is, growers producing considerable grain may elect to feed out hogs for market, whereas those with a small amount of grain might elect to produce feeder pigs.

The committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That hog producers and those interested in producing hogs attend the area swine school scheduled for March 15.

2. The committee sponsor a tour of hog growers to a modern farrowing facility in early April.

3. Plan a tour to Washington, N.C., to observe a farm and facilities with a 700-sow operation.

4. Explore the possibility of holding a commercial gilt sale at Halifax in the fall to supply growers with needed breeding stock.

5. Investigate the possibility of holding a junior fat hog and gilt show and sale in conjunction with the baby beef show and sale.

6. Encourage feeder pig producers to take advantage of the cooperative feeder pig sales to be held June 13, August 8, and October 10.

CLOTHING COMMITTEE, 1963

Present: Mrs. Bennie Carlton, chairman; Mrs. A. B. Crute, Mrs. W. O. Carlton, Mrs. E. A. Lewis, and Mrs. John Burton.

Situation: Clothing is adequate but seems to continue to rise in price. Many families need help on selection, care, and value of clothing, so after reviewing the longtime clothing plan the committee decided to work on the following goals for the year:

1. That Home Demonstration Clubs spend some time in learning the techniques used to give homemade garments a readymade look. For those homemakers who do not sew, they should acquire the knowledge of what to look for in buying readymade garments to give the satisfaction desired.

2. That 4-H girls carrying clothing for a project be given some training in their project.

3. That a general educational program be conducted through radio, news articles, and bulletins.

4. Clothing information to be enclosed in information racks in beauty parlors and laundermats maintained by the extension service.

5. Clothing information be included in the "packet for the bride" kit that is being sent to all new brides in the county.

FORESTRY, 1963

Halifax County Forestry Committee: Paul C. Edmunds, Sr., chairman, Leeland Williamson, Stanley Younger, Linwood Palmer, Jesse Jones, John W. Boyd, Jr., and Franz Elliott.

Committee recommendations: This committee desired to continue the 1962 forestry recommendations through 1963. The committee recommends that special emphasis be given to the following practices.

1. Kill with chemical or otherwise get rid of undesirable hardwood species and other plants that seriously compete with newly planted seedlings.

2. It is recommended that each farmer divert at least a small area of their forest to more desirable trees each year. This be done by killing undesirable plants, cutting fire, fuel wood, or pulpwood or in certain instances, cut trees for a needed lumber supply for farm repairs. Then, plant to desirable trees.

3. Publicize often through the press and by radio, the value of diverting small areas as suggested above, and what this can mean in added wealth to the undivided farmer and the county.

4. Kill or utilize wolf-trees. These are large spreading trees which shade out other trees in a large area in the forest, and which are of little or no value.

5. Use selective cutting whenever harvesting timber for any purpose. In cutting flue or fuel wood, take out diseased, crooked, overtopped, or trees that are being crowded out.

6. Have timber estimated by experienced forester before selling. You need to know what you have for sale.

7. In order to secure full market value when selling timber, advertise to all buyers in the area.

8. When selling pulpwood, take from the forest only the undesirable trees such as crooked, diseased, overtopped trees or those being crowded out. The clean cutting of good growing timber is wasteful.

9. Farmers can make excellent wages by cutting their own timber even where it is necessary to hire the hauling to the plant.

10. More farmers carrying on a good forestry program should be selected for the tree farm award as an added incentive.

11. The committee solicits the help of industry in the publicizing of the many advantages to be gained by adopting good forestry practices.

TOBACCO, 1963

Halifax County Tobacco Committee members: H. W. Dunn, chairman; H. E. Moon, Madison Myers, F. G. Lacks, Harvey Palmer, James Seay, and A. C. Stevens.

Committee suggestions

1. That the county agents mail at an early date, copies of the changes in tobacco grades for 1963 to all farmers in the county.

2. Ask that the extension service continue tobacco demonstrations on farms having special soil problems as was done in 1962.

3. That agents keep growers informed on insecticides and their use. Also, on soil fumigation for root knot and Meadow Nematode.

Committee recommendations

1. As plant bed management is of major importance to the production of a successful tobacco crop, we urge growers to locate their beds in a protected situation, on a well-drained soil, relatively high in organic matter. Also, that the bed not be seeded too thick. A light mulch of sawdust or straw would be helpful.

2. Where cyanamid has been applied for weed control for 3 or more years, it is urged that a soil analysis be made to check the pH as a high pH is inducive to root rot.

3. It is recommended that growers keep their plants protected against blue mold and anthracnose by the use of fermate.

4. The watering of the plant beds before pulling to go into the field is desirable in securing a good stand.

5. Where growers have had problems with mosaic, it is recommended that they apply the milk treatment to their plants at the time the plants are pulled to go into the field.

6. For better stands, apply fertilizer deep or in two bands so plant roots do not come in direct contact with the fertilizer. Applying a portion of the fertilizer in the drill and the remainder as a side dressing soon after planting is very helpful.

7. In order to avoid injury to oneself and the crop, growers are urged to carefully read and follow instructions including precautions when using insecticides.

8. It is urgent that growers produce high quality tobacco. In order to do this, growers should not apply excessive amounts of nitrogen, plant not more than 6,000 to 6,500 plants per acre, top the tobacco, and control suckers. Growers should be sure that the tobacco is ripe before it is pulled and that it is well yellowed in the barn before curing.

9. Farmers are urged to take a good look at their tobacco soils to be sure they are planting tobacco on soils that are well adopted to the crop.

10. We urge that growers pay more attention to the grading of their tobacco before putting it on the market even though there is often very little incentive pricewise.

HOME MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE, 1963

Present: Mrs. W. N. Tune, chairman; Mrs. C. H. Russell, Jr., and Mrs. A. M. Jones.

Situation: Time and money management is a problem for most homemakers. This has been pointed up by many of the groups in the county in program planning. The majority of the demonstrations requested are on time and money management. After a study of the long-time plan, the committee selected the following points to be stressed in 1963:

1. That some time and energy be devoted to assisting homemakers in time and money management.

2. That the family record book be given some publicity and that it be made available to all homemakers.

3. That money management material be used in the information racks in laundermats and in the packets for the bride. This material should include some sample family budgets as guides.

4. That news articles and radio talks be given on management problems.

5. That money and time management be stressed in all the demonstrations given to 4-H, home demonstration, and community improvement clubs.

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CLUBS

Mr. F. G. Lacks, chairman; Mrs. Madison Hodnett, Mrs. Jack Grinstead, Mr. L. B. Hudson, Mrs. Frances Weatherford, and Mr. L. S. Williamson.

Committee recommendations

1. Sponsor the 4-H Club Day at Elkhorn Lake with all of the Community Improvement Clubs participating on Wednesday, June 19.

2. The committee would like to recommend to the chamber of commerce that the prize money for 1963 be set up with $200 for first prize, $150 for second, and $75 for third and $50 for fourth.

3. This committee is quite concerned about the litter problem along the roads in Halifax County. The Community Improvement Clubs have been working on this problem for the past 5 or 6 years. They are now soliciting the help of all the civic clubs of the county in this undertaking.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year Future Homemakers of America Week is observed from March 31 through April 6, and it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I pay tribute to this organization which does so much toward helping our young people prepare themselves to meet successfully the challenges of tomorrow.

The membership of 522,000 is drawn from those high school students who are studying homemaking in the schools of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The national organization is composed of chartered State associations which are made up of local chapters. Its inception took place in June of 1945 and there are at present over 11,000 chapters in existence. Cosponsors of the organization are the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the American Home Economics Association.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky was the first State to charter the Future Homemakers of America, and I am proud that in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, local chapters are numerous, active, and well organized. They conduct programs that give the homemaking student training and experience in home management, childcare, family relations, and community service. The members of the local chapters, through their participation in civic projects, demonstrate their sense of good citizenship, and become highly valuable members of the community. These young people are ably assisted in their endeavors by their home economics teachers and other interested women of the community who recognize the importance of training these girls in the art of homemaking.

The Future Homemakers' national program of work for 1962–65 has as its overall goal "to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living."

Future Homemakers, through their local chapters and individual activities, work toward four national objectives:

First, discovering myself and my worth to others;

Second, contributing to the joys and satisfactions of family living;

Third, strengthening my education for future roles; and

Fourth, launching good citizenship through homemaking.

It can readily be seen that concentration on these four objectives will ultimately bring to the young girl the maturity which is so necessary in a successful wife and mother.

Because of the complex nature of our modern society, the American housewife is no longer concerned solely with the traditional duties of homemaking such as cooking, cleaning, marketing, and childraising. She is now expected to be a skilled nutritionist, psychologist, practical nurse, hostess, educator, efficiency and budget expert as well. The mastering of such skills requires a thorough knowledge of home economics in its many and varied facets.

As important as these many skills are, the most important quality of a homemaker is her ability to bring love, harmony, and a knowledge of God to the family unit. Without the family's working together as a whole, comprised of separate and distinct individuals, the child would never learn the meaning of cooperation and of respect for the rights of others. It is in the home that the child learns a true faith and reverence for God, and a deep understanding of America's goals and purposes in today's world. The role of homemaker is vital to our strength as a free and Christian nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that it is a pleasure to commend the Future Homemakers of America for their many past achievements and to wish them continued success in all of their future endeavors.

CREDIT AGAINST FEDERAL ESTATE TAX

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will be interested in the bill H.R. 5039 I introduced on March 21, 1963, to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States.

The objective of my bill is to improve the coordination between State and Federal inheritance, estate, and gift taxes, to encourage the States to simplify the diverse and complex provisions of their tax laws, and to increase the States' share of revenue from these taxes.

Mr. Speaker, my bill addresses itself to a tax area in which legislation is long overdue. The provisions governing the Federal estate credit for taxes paid to States have remained unchanged since 1926. When first enacted, they made a constructive and unique contribution to sound Federal-State tax relations, particularly by giving States an incentive to pattern their tax laws along similar lines. During the intervening 37 years State and Federal taxation has undergone revolutionary changes which have left the 1926 enactment outdated and obsolete.

In their continuing search for more revenue, the States have successively patched, revised, and broadened their death taxes until it requires a veritable multivolume encyclopedia to detail their divergent and complex provisions. While the Federal tax credit no longer plays the important role for which it was originally created and which hopefully it can soon play again, the States are obliged to fit their own provisions around it. The resulting complexity has long concerned taxpayers, tax practitioners, tax students, and legislators alike. We have been urged time and again to update and modernize the Federal credit. Indeed proposals on this subject have probably outnumbered the other suggestions emanating from the long list of study committees and professional organizations which concern themselves with intergovernmental tax relations.

My bill embodies the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, created by the Congress in 1959, on which the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman FOUNTAIN, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Congresswoman DWYER, and I have the honor to represent this House. Our colleagues will recall that the Advisory Commission is composed of members actively representing both the executive and legislative branches of all levels of government in our Federal system which gives its recommendations a balanced quality. We shall want to consider its recommendations with care not only because the interests of each State are involved but also because the estate tax is once-a-lifetime levy and should be changed only infrequently.

I am hopeful that despite our crowded committee calendar, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will find it possible to schedule hearings on revision of the estate tax credit in order that representatives of the States and other interested groups can give us the benefit of their thinking so that the changes we enact can serve effectively for years to come.

REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would reimburse those States that have with their own funds constructed roads which are now included in the National System of Interstate Highways. This legislation has been introduced in previous Congresses without success but the inequities involved in this matter are so clear I am certain that in the not too distant future those States who on their own initiative went ahead and constructed roads which are up to the standards of the Interstate System we are now building in this country will soon receive the just payment due to them for the inclusion of these roads in the Interstate System.

I estimate that under my bill the Federal Government will pay the States a total of approximately $4,295,600,000. To balance off these payments the legislation I have introduced spreads the reimbursement over a 15-year period. As a result of this the U.S. Treasury will be obligated to pay in any 1 year sums ranging from $225 million to roughly $360 million.

All funds paid to the States under my bill require that the States use these funds only for further highway construction. This construction is to be on the Federal-aid primary system.

The obligation of the Federal Government to these States is clear. If the Federal Government should discover that States have constructed other facilities which were suitable for Federal Government use and the Government occupied these facilities then certainly none would contend that when the Government took over these facilities the States should be reimbursed for the Federal Government's use of them. The same thing applies to those roads which were State built and are now on the Federal system.

Spreading reimbursement to the States over a 15-year period is in keeping with the operation of the highway program as it was set up in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. There the entire original estimated cost was authorized to be spread over a 13-year period.

My bill provides that the money to be paid to the States will come from the general fund of the Treasury and will not touch the highway trust fund. It makes no distinction between toll and free highways. The Federal Government has encouraged the construction of toll roads and bridges since 1927 and tolls for highway use differ little from gasoline taxes used in some States to pay for highway construction.

The usefulness of the toll roads to the public has been endorsed by the inclusion of some of them in the Interstate System.

My bill, as I have said before, provides that the money the States are to receive will be used to add additional needed roads to the overall highway system of the country. It has two important objectives. It repays a valid obligation of the Federal Government to the States and it will further advance the highway construction across the Nation.

I enclose herewith a section-by-section analysis of the legislation as introduced today:

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED INTERSTATE HIGHWAY REPAYMENT BILL

Section 1: The title is "Interstate Highway Repayment Act."

Section 2: Congress declares it to be the policy that each State shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for certain toll and free highways which have been made a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The mileage, cost, and other details concerning these highways with respect to each State are shown on the annexed exhibit A [not printed in RECORD].

Section 3: This section authorized the appropriation over a 15-year period of the total "net reimbursable amount" shown on the annexed exhibit A. This amount totaling $4,295,600,000 is based upon the report (H. Doc. 301, 1958, 85th Cong.) (as brought up to date) concerning the depreciated cost of the free or toll roads, or portions thereof, included in the Interstate System. A schedule of authorizations follows:

Authorizations

Fiscal year ending June 30:	*Amount (000 omitted)*
1964	$225,000
1965	225,000
1966	225,000
1967	225,000
1968	225,000
1969	275,000
1970	275,000
1971	275,000
1972	275,000
1973	275,000
1974	359,120
1975	359,120
1976	359,120
1977	359,120
1978	359,120

The funds authorized are to be appropriated out of General Treasury funds and not out of the Highway Trust Fund.

The remaining sections of this bill amend title 23 of the United States Code, which title is concerned with highways. Some of these amendments are substantive, others are merely technical.

Section 4: This section amends chapter I of title 23 by adding a new section to be known as section 132. Paragraph (a) of this section provides that each State shall be entitled to receive the additional amounts for expenditure for the construction of highways under the Federal-aid primary system. Paragraph (b) of this section provides that any amount which a State is entitled to receive under paragraph (a): (1) shall be in addition to any other amounts authorized for the Federal-aid primary system; (2) may be combined with any other amounts authorized for that system; and (3) shall be available for expenditure for projects in either urban or rural areas.

Section 5: Makes it clear that section 104 of title 23 is not applicable to funds expended under the provisions of this bill.

Section 6: This section amends chapter I of title 23 by adding a new section to be known as section 104-A. Subsection (a) of this new section provides that the funds authorized by this bill shall be apportioned under the provisions of section 104-A. Paragraph (b) provides that each State shall receive as its apportionment for each fiscal year the same percentage of the total authorization for such fiscal year as appears in column 6 in exhibit A.

Section 7: This makes a technical change in section 118 of title 23 to make it conform to the insertion of section 104-A of the code.

Section 8: Subsection (a) of this section makes a technical change in subsection (a) of section 120 of title 23 to make it conform to the insertion of the new subsection (i) authorized in subsection (b). Subsection (b) of this section adds a new subsection (i) to section 120 of title 23 to make it clear that States entitled to reimbursement shall not be required to match any part of the fund to which they are entitled.

Section 9: Subsection (a) of this section makes a technical correction to subsection (a) of section 121 so as to make it conform to the new subsection (f) added by subsection (b) of section 9. Subsection (f) provides that the Secretary is required to make progress payments of the funds authorized not later than 30 days after the date that the payment has been requested by the State.

A BILL TO PREVENT THE RUIN OF SQUAW CREEK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill designed to prevent the ruin of the Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge near Mound City, Mo., because of faulty drainage conditions within the refuge area.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan to the end that the refuge will be protected and preserved for the purposes for which it was established.

The bill would authorize the expenditure of $60,000 for necessary biological, engineering, hydrological and topographic studies.

Poor drainage conditions within the refuge have resulted in a dangerous siltation problem, with silt from the watershed of Squaw Creek and Davis Creek above the refuge already having substantially filled up two of the four refuge pools.

If this drainage problem is not corrected in the near future, the refuge will be completely silted over and useless in a few years.

It is absolutely essential that we save this refuge, which has a value in excess of $18.5 million. The refuge provides sanctuary to hundreds of thousands of waterfowl using the Mississippi flyway. It is a great attraction to sportsmen not only from Missouri but from adjacent States. It is important to the local economy. The refuge is a vital conservation asset we cannot afford to lose.

WILL LEGALIZED MANSLAUGHTER CONTINUE?

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in the light of ring deaths in the past year among boxers of title caliber there is no longer any moral or legal justification for this as a sport. Pro boxing is no more than managed mayhem for money. For every fighter who reaches top billing and makes a buck there are a thousand maimed, disfigured, and half-senseless on the human junkpile. The rationale that injury rates are comparable to other sports is untenable. In no other sport is it the principal aim of a contestant to scar, maim, or induce concussion on his opponent. It is ludicrous that a society which prohibits cockfighting condones assault and battery as a public spectacle. We have lost two courageous champions in a year, Benny Paret and Davey Moore. Who will be next? Those who propose to license and promote the Liston-Patterson rematch with Patterson's record of knockouts and knockdowns are in effect constructively risking a manslaughter. Boxing as a professional sport is a throwback to the dark ages and should be outlawed. State statutes would be hit-and-miss and therefore inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to prohibit professional boxing for the reasons I have stated. I also call attention of the Members of the House to the March 25 column of Jim Murray in the Washington Post entitled "Another Parole for Boxing?" For those who missed reading this moving and pointed account of that fateful night at Dodger Stadium, I include it in the Record:

Another Parole for Boxing?

(By Jim Murray)

Los Angeles, March 24.—If Davey Moore dies, can boxing long survive him? Even if he doesn't should it?

Does a sport which has been on parole deserve a full pardon when it proves again and again it hasn't changed? Do we swallow our conscience one more time and continue to sanction prizefights? Are animals more precious than human beings? Are duels at dawn more immoral than death in the evening? Do we sell tickets to an execution? Is this the 20th century or the Roman Empire? How many deaths and comas are over the legal limit?

The evening at Dodger Stadium Thursday featured one fighter who had killed a man in the ring and, as it turned out, another who was about to be or nearly so. It also featured a boy who has been knocked kicking four times in a career so brief he's only been able to vote for a year. Battling Torres had the bad luck to be a drawing card so he got knocked kicking again from a punch so light that his vanquisher fainted dead away. Several of us watching didn't feel too good either.

Whatever he went down from, Battling Torres didn't get up. For that, they can light candles in Reynosa, Mexico, today. He will, thank God, join his family instead of Davey Moore.

Moore's tragedy is he is—or was—a good game fighter. He not only got up, he would still be fighting if his manager hadn't quit for him. It may have been the greatest service Willie Ketchum ever performed for Davey Moore. Davey had taken a savage beating, but he had dealt one out, too. His face was cruelly marked, he had swallowed and shed blood, his step was a stagger, and the hysterical sounds of the bloodthirsty crowds in the upper tiers must have sounded nightmarish to his muddled brain as they led him dazed and daunted from the ring. This was the face of boxing up close. We didn't know it, then, but if we had listened we could have heard the raucous, mocking laughter of death in the background. He didn't know it then but Davey Moore was in a bigger fight out of the ring than he had been in it.

We newsmen were milling around his locker room when they led this poor, broken, jockey-sized athlete into the airless little room that serves in a happier sport as manager Walt Alston's summer cubicle. The door was quickly barred. There were yelps of dismay from us gentlemen of the press. We had a deadline, we complained.

So did Davey Moore.

We are important to this spectacle of man's inhumanity to man. So they let us in anyway.

Davey sat up on the dressing table with effort, as if he just heard in the recesses of his hemorrhaging mind his own private referee toll the count of 8. Davey never would take a count.

"It just wasn't my night. I just can't take nothing away from that boy but—" He halted, looked around and tried to focus on the sea of faces around him. "Well," he began pathetically, "you fellows have times when you can't write as well as others." He was right. And this is one of them.

"I know I can fight much better than I did tonight," he almost whispered. His manager demonstrated a severed mouthpiece which had been ripped from his fighter's teeth by a savage right-hand punch. "I offered a doctor $100 yesterday to make him a new mouthpiece but there wasn't time," he explained.

But it was not Davey's mouth which needed protection. It was his brain. It was bleeding slowly as he talked. It was to gush later but three of us who leaned over to shake his hand as we left the room didn't know that. "I'm awful glad you stopped it," I told Ketchum.

Apparently, as soon as we left the room, the slow leak became a burst.

An hour and one fight later, surprised the door was still tightly locked as I passed through, I shoved it open again. They were just stripping his fighting togs off the ex-champion. Willie Ketchum and Eddie Foy III put fingers to their lips as they saw me. I closed the door softly. I thought the fighter was under sedation.

He was—God's sedation. A merciful curtain had been drawn over his awful pain the instant he said, "Ooh, my head hurts." Davey Moore, for the first time in his career, was in a fight in which he was the underdog before it started. It was a fight in which the line wasn't posted by Vegas but on an invisible tote board with no wire service, only a chart at the foot of the bed.

I have fought on this prose level before. The counter has been that people are killed in traffic, over water, under ground.

Sure, but we don't sell tickets.

But these are champions, the highest practitioners of their art, that we are admitting to hospitals, mausoleums and vegetation in boxing, not kids in unsupervised activity. Only one big league baseball player, only one big league football player has ever been killed. Even that is too many but no match at all for boxing's toll. People die in auto racing. But they kill themselves. And they are not trying to. As I said before, in boxing, it's the name of the game. "Kill him," the crowd cries. They boo at anything sublethal. They did Thursday when Luis Rodriguez fought as sensibly as if he had been put in the ring with a killer—precisely because he was.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY DURANTE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Durante recently celebrated his 70th birthday. Somehow it seems appropriate in the spring of the year to take a few moments to talk about this ageless entertainer whose impish magic has the fresh quality of the season of renewal. Chronologically he may be 70 years old, but his antic spirit denies the passage of years. It is joyous, human, ever-green.

Jimmy Durante has been a permanent fixture of American radio, movies, Broadway, and television for so many years that it is impossible to conceive of any of these vast fields of art and wit without him.

I am sure many aspiring performers would like the know the formula that has given Jimmy his enduring success. Possibly he has been studied to determine his secret; certainly from time to time there have been emulators. If they watched for tricks of expression or clever kinds of "business," they were on the wrong track. It isn't gimmicks that make him endure. It is the force of personality—a warmth of demeanor that stems from his having known all shades and circumstances of life—having known them, absorbed them, appreciated them, and conquered them.

The creation of a legend more often than not requires a passage of time during which a historical perspective gives luster to memories. Jimmy Durante is still with us, and God willing, many years remain to him to touch the quick of American humor. But because he has been a practitioner of the special art of American humor for more than 40 years, already human memory, which polishes and embellishes with loving care anything that represents a continuing and ageless part of itself, has made him into an American legend.

The entertainment world may claim him as their own. Their pride is understandable, but he belongs to all of us.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleague, James Corman of California, in paying tribute to a man who has been one of the stars of the entertainment world for more than 40 years. Jimmy Durante has had a long and distinguished career in every entertainment media.

Jimmy Durante first gained fame as a member of the outstanding entertainment team of Clayton, Jackson and Durante. This became one of the leading vaudeville acts of the era. He went on to star on Broadway, in motion pictures, radio, and television. In 1951, he won a Peabody Award for his work in radio and television.

The warm humor of this man has endeared him to millions of Americans. His ever-present hat, celebrated nose, and famous closing line, "Good night, Mrs. Calabash, wherever you are," have been symbols of the best in comedy for more than a generation. His career represents everything that is rich and fine in the entertainment industry. His charitable acts are manifold. He has brought in a most wholesome manner happiness and pleasure to countless of millions of persons. Hollywood, and the America of which it is a part, are justifiably proud of this good man and illustrious citizen. I wish for Mr. Durante many more years of a happy and active life.

AIR SAFETY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, although I have been quite critical in the past of Mr. Halaby's management decisions in the field of air safety, I do believe in giving credit where credit is due. In the past, Mr. Halaby has demonstrated a tendency to make decisions based upon whim, to react violently to technical questions concerning his judgments, and to resort to personal abuse in answering critics of his programs. It is clear that part of his trouble has been due to some poor advice given him by his assistants. However, Mr. Halaby has just overruled his advisers, and reversed himself on an important mater affecting aviation safety. He has decided to cancel his plans for a major involvement in an experiment with the SAGE system.

In mid-1962 Mr. Halaby announced a plan for the integration of certain air defense facilities—SAGE—and air traffic control. This plan called for the closing of the Great Falls Air Route Traffic Control Center—FAA—the transfer of certain responsibilities from the Minneapolis and Seattle Air Route Traffic Control Centers, and the establishment of three colocated air traffic control operations in SAGE Centers in Minot and Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Great Falls, Mont. At that time, August 1962, our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH, of Minnesota, objected to this plan and offered substantial technical information to prove that the plan was unsound, an experiment in which lives would be risked, and a demonstrated reduction in the already shaky safety standards of the FAA. At that time Mr. Halaby brushed aside the objections of Mr. KARTH, refused to answer the technical questions raised, and categorized any objections to the program as a challenge of the President's program.

Now Mr. Halaby has changed his mind. On March 8, 1963, Mr. Halaby announced that the FAA was abandoning the major part of the experiment in SAGE-air traffic control integration. Although this decision is belated, it does offer some encouragement concerning the future administration of the Federal Aviation Agency. It is of course interesting to speculate as to how much money might have been saved had Mr. Halaby acted in this manner last year. Surely the facts concerning the inadequacies of the SAGE facilities to perform the air traffic control function were as readily available in August 1962 as they are now.

I now direct your attention to another decision of this Administrator. I refer to the decision announced in 1962 to abandon the Air Route Traffic Control Centers in New Orleans and San Antonio, and to establish a new facility in Houston. It is significant to note that no mention of such a move was made in the budget then under consideration. No justification was offered, and apparently no opposition was anticipated. At no time was an adequate justification given, and none is forthcoming to this date. When pressed for answers, Mr. Halaby merely stated that he would reprogram funds for more than 100 air safety installations—facilities that were at that time still in the budget under consideration and totaling more than $8 million. These were items that had been laboriously justified in internal FAA budget reviews over a 2-year period, further justified before the Bureau of the Budget, and finally justified before the Appropriation Subcommittee. These items represented over $8 million worth of air safety, deemed absolutely essential by the Agency and its Administrator; then suddenly tossed aside in favor of a hastily conceived and poorly planned move.

As you may recall, after my request last year for an explanation, and after I had been subjected to as intemperate an attack as were ever made by the head of a Federal agency upon a Congressman, Mr. Halaby finally agreed to provide justification. This justification was based largely upon theoretical savings in the costs of computers, projected over a 16-year period. Bear in mind that there are no computers in use in New Orleans and in San Antonio air route traffic control centers today, and none programed for the new Houston center. The FAA is presently using five or six computers in various centers—computers of the 1957 vintage and for all practical purposes, obsolete. The research efforts of the FAA over the past 5 years toward the development of a new computer for air traffic control have been a failure, at a cost of well over $100 million. Bear in mind also that a $3 million building has just been constructed to house the New Orleans air route traffic control center; and a 10-year lease on the new air route traffic control center in San Antonio is only in its fourth year. The effort to foist this building off onto NASA will ultimately cost the taxpayers well over a million dollars for remodeling to suit the needs of NASA. We also know that the FAA is stuck with the remaining years of lease on the San Antonio property.

Later I asked Mr. Halaby for a list of the planned locations of more than 100 safety facilities which he was so ready to abandon in lieu of the new center. He refused to provide this information, stating that it was not in the public interest to divulge. One wonders whether we are here dealing with the FAA or the CIA. This whole sorry matter constitutes one of the most arrogant and flagrant disregards for the taxpayer and the safety of the flying public on record.

But, as I previously mentioned, there is hope. Mr. Halaby belatedly recognized the error of his decision concerning the use of SAGE in air traffic control. Perhaps he will soon come to the realization that his Agency does not have a defined plan for the consolidation of air route traffic control centers.

It is for these reasons I asked the House Subcommittee on Independent Offices to refuse permission and funds to Mr. Halaby for the purpose of moving the San Antonio Air Route Traffic Control Center.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DORN for Monday, April 1, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN, for March 28 and 29, 1963, on account of Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight Meeting at Cape Canaveral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS, for 2 hours, on Tuesday, April 2, on the subject of the Youth Conservation Corps.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana, for 1 hour, on April 1.

Mr. MOORE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 30 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for 1 hour on Tuesday, April 2, 1963.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for 60 minutes, April 2, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 3, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the **Congressional Record**, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. **Matthews** and to include an address by Mr. **Bass**.

Mr. **Wright** and to include a copy of an address by the Honorable **Joseph Montoya**.

Mr. **Dulski** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Feighan** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Finnegan** and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Gathings** and to include a speech.

Mr. **Pepper** in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. **Frelinghuysen**.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the body of the **Record** following the discussion on residual oil imports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Goodling**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Curtis**.
Mr. **Burton**.
Mr. **Cunningham**.
Mr. **Dole**.
Mr. **Mailliard**.
Mr. **Sibal**.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Ryan** of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Wickersham**.
Mr. **Corman**.
Mr. **Cooley**.
Mr. **Toll**.
Mr. **Morrison**.
Mr. **Gill**.
Mr. **Weltner** in two instances.
Mr. **Pucinski**.
Mr. **Green** of Pennsylvania.
Mr. **Multer**.
Mr. **Rains**.
Mr. **Sickles**.
Mr. **Flood**.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 25, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable;

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman; and

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency expenditures and also dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for travel outside the United States during the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, prints such report in the **Congressional Record** within 10 legislative days after receipt. The deadline for filing expenditure reports for travel during the calendar year 1962 was March 9, 1963.

On March 11, 1963, the Committee on House Administration placed in the **Congressional Record** all reports which had been received within the prescribed period of time for filing. There is submitted herewith a supplemental report received March 21, 1963, from a member of the 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Representative Dale Alford delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, expended between Oct. 19 and Nov. 2, 1962

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mexico	U.S. dollar		39.63		51.20				37.76		128.59
Peru	do		40.52		43.80		2.40		29.60		116.32
Argentina	do		35.07		77.92				27.54		140.53
Brazil	do		96.38		169.92		8.62		116.96		391.88
Trinidad	do		16.05		5.57				1.60		23.22
Total			227.65		348.41		11.02		213.46		800.54

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds (22 U.S.C. 276a)	$800.54

Dale Alford, *Delegate*.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1963 involving increases in the amount of $15,300,000 for the Department of Labor and $4 million for the Department of the Interior, and an amendment decreasing the budget for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $4 million for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

598. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $16,993,400, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs (H. Doc. No. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

599. A letter from the president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 13th Annual Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 272, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

600. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

601. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide protection for the employment opportuni-

ties of domestic agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

602. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

603. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

604. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

605. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of overpricing of spare electronic parts under Department of the Army fixed-price contracts DA-18-119-SC-651, DA-18-119-SC-654, and DA-18-119-SC-799 with Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich. These contracts were awarded in 1959 and 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

606. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of recreation and other selected land-use activities of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

607. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple-use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

608. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense Installations and Logistics, transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

609. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949, 63 Stat. 759, ch. 672 (32 D.C.C. 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudon County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

610. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report with respect to tort claims paid for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

611. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

612. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone and President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

613. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and to eliminate the free entry privilege for articles not accompanying a returning resident"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4423. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1049. A bill to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n); without amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1762. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2364. A bill for the relief of Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2859. A bill to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; with amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4555. A bill to extend the provision of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4347. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals; with amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, "Our Flag"; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 296. Resolution to print as a House document, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judical Procedure; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3120. A bill to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); with amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3845. A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); with amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5279. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1213. A bill for the relief of World Games, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1267. A bill for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird; with amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells; with amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1447. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co., and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MARTIN of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Oliver Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1561. A bill for the relief of Melborn Keat; with amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi; with amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2245. A bill for the relief of Stella McKee; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2302. A bill for the relief of James M. Norman; with amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner; with amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; with amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2706. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2708. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2736. A bill for the relief of William C. Jessup; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke; with amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer; with amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Gene H. King; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3356. A bill for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3450. A bill for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3662. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett; with amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock; with amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri; with amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4965. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 5156. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 5157. A bill to free farmers from Government control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5158. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands (61 Stat. 913) with respect to the leasing of mineral deposits in which the United States owns a partial or future interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5159. A bill to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5160. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5161. A bill to provide that surplus personal property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5162. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of State and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5163. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the donation of surplus property to volunteer lifesaving corps; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5164. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5165. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 5166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax, interest on obligations issued by tax-exempt colleges and universities to provide funds for educational buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 5167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from taxable income of expenditures for the construction of waste treatment works to control water pollution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5168. A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the highway use tax in the case of certain trucks and other vehicles which are used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 5170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served 90 days or more during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict to qualify for pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 5171. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5172. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to postpone for one additional year the effectiveness of the matching requirements of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5173. A bill to prohibit professional boxing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5174. A bill to provide for the payment of royalties for the public performance of copyrighted musical compositions by means of coin-operated machines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5175. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5176. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 5177. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 5178. A bill to grant officers and employees subject to the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, the opportunity to examine and reply to certain evaluations of their promotion qualifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5179. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5182. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 5183. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 5185. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5186. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5187. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5189. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5190. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend section 336 of title 38, United States Code, to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by oversea service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5193. A bill to extend for one additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 5194. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 5195. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5196. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5197. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to fix the premium for the insurance of cooperative housing mortgages at the minimum permissible level (one-fourth of 1 percent per annum); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5199. A bill to provide for housing loans to veterans of service in the Armed Forces of the United States who are residing abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5200. A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of the exemptions provided therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5202. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5203. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5204. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5205. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to postpone for one additional year the effectiveness of the matching requirements of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the limitation on the amount of allowable charitable contributions which may be made by individuals to certain organizations for the benefit of churches, educational organizations, hospitals, and certain medical research organizations operating in conjunction with hospitals, and certain other organizations which are organized and operated for the benefit of certain colleges or universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5210. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 5211. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 5212. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan for Squaw Creek National Refuge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5213. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces may not be held liable for damage to property of the Armed Forces except where the damage was caused by willful and wanton negligence and where the member has been afforded an opportunity for a hearing; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 5214. A bill to prohibit the printing and distribution of annual wall calendars for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 5215. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5216. A bill to establish in the government of the District of Columbia a Department of Housing and Planning; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5217. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a crime to steal certain trade secrets or to transport stolen trade secrets in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children, and to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 5219. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 5220. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 5221. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5222. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5223. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5224. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5225. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5226. A bill to increase the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5227. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5228. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5229. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5230. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5231. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5232. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5233. A bill to authorize the establishment of (1) a Youth Opportunities Administration, (2) a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas, (3) to authorize local area youth employment programs, (4) to authorize student work-study programs in institutions of higher education; and (5) to authorize student work-study programs in institutions of secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5234. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5235. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5237. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to postpone for one additional year the effectiveness of the matching requirements of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5239. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5240. A bill for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5241. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5242. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5243. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the famous naturalists, John Burroughs, John Muir, and Henry David Thoreau; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5244. A bill to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5245. A bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial participation in the cost of development and implementation of such programs and in the cost of colleges and universities in providing special courses of instruction and scholarships for persons preparing for professional participation in such programs, and for establishing research grants and special projects and by establishing and providing for consultation with a national training and research council and technical advisory committees on education of exceptional children in the administration of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5246. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 5247. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5248. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 5249. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 5250. A bill to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5251. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize additional disability compensation for certain veterans who have suffered the anatomical loss of a blind eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5252. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5253. A bill relating to the income tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 5254. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 5255. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5257. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the southern portion of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5258. A bill to amend section 2310 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional authority for review by the Comptroller General of negotiated procurement contracts by the military departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 5259. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes; contingent upon acceptance and approval by the Director of Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, as protector of the interests of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5260. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5261. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 5262. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5263. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5264. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 5265. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5266. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 5267. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5268. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 5269. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5270. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5271. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5272. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5273. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5274. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 5275. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5276. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 5277. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5278. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 5279. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as "Constitution Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as National Arbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the Sunday starting the last full week in October, each year, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to provide stricter control over expenditures by Members of Congress traveling outside the United States, to require employees of Members to serve at specific places, to promote ethical standards of conduct among Members of Congress, and to prohibit nepotism in Government employment; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to authorize and require the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to submit an annual report concerning its activities, programs, and proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 358. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a training program for governmental oversea employment of American youth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 360. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal sovereignty treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 301. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States, with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution of the United States which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN: House Joint Resolution No. 70 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to conveyance of Federal lands in Marin County to the State of California; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., be commended for their past and present contributions to the citizens of this State and this Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project with full consideration regarding the rights of all water users; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the 13 Western States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution which would provide that the Federal Government may not, through legislative or judicial action restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5280. A bill for the relief of Oskiyan Bedros Bedyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5281. A bill for the relief of Winsome Elaine Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5282. A bill for the relief of Liubimiro Iurasich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5283. A bill for the relief of Aron Falshpan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Vasilakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 5285. A bill for the relief of Emilio Vazuez Rouco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Galasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Henry White Bird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5290. A bill for the relief of Meguerditch Avakian, his wife, Loosin Avakian, and their minor children, Ayda Avakian, Verjine-Eugenie Avakian, and Chazaros Avakian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Fotini Zisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 5292. A bill for the relief of Miss Nellie Fedalizo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5293. A bill for the relief of Sister Nicoletta (Nicoletta Csekey); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5294. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5295. A bill for the relief of Irena Romkowska Pol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5296. A bill for the relief of Eftychia Drizis Sioukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5297. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hooshang Behroozi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5298. A bill for the relief of Zakharia Dorani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5299. A bill for the relief of Mah Ney Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 5300. A bill for the relief of Harry P. Nash, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 5301. A bill for the relief of Ettore Iavicoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5302. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5303. A bill for the relief of Hong Song Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5304. A bill for the relief of James D. Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5305. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 5306. A bill for the relief of Paul James Branan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5307. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5308. A bill for the relief of Manuel Oncina, his wife, Isabel Oncina, and their children, Juan Manuel Oncina and Jose Luis Oncina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5309. A bill for the relief of Russell D. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5310. A bill for the relief of Arthur Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5311. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kostera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

75. By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of George Kowalczyk, Judge W. O. Hughes, Sheriff Custer A. Dunifon, Dr. Harold R. Griffith, Father John J. Moskal, Gregory J. Bittner, and thousands of others, from Fort Wayne and Allen County, Ind., urging the Congress of the United States to conduct a complete and impartial investigation of the U.S. State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

76. By Mr. DEROUNIAN: Petition of the American Legion embodying resolutions 632 and 641 as unanimously adopted by the American Legion at its recent national convention, to further the continuance of a direct-action program to strengthen the American merchant marine and the furtherance of the extensive information and education campaign carried on by the American Legion; also to register the opposition of the American Legion to the imposition of tolls or user charges upon the enjoyment of inland waterways as a free passageway for commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

77. By Mr. McLOSKEY: Petition of beef producers of the 19th District of Illinois in opposition to the Federal Government subsidizing the beef industry or guaranteeing a profit on the cattle they feed as they feel these practices would be detrimental to the cattleman and beef industry by bringing about Government control and weakening agriculture; also request an investigation of the chain store control over the dressed beef market since the average price of Choice fat cattle has dropped approximately 21 percent and beef sold over the counter in local chain stores has dropped only 17 percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

78. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Stanley Molik, city clerk, Buffalo, N.Y., requesting passage of legislation which would make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, March 28, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Sam L. Fore, pastor, First Methodist Church, Weslaco, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, whose mighty spirit has guided us thus far and who desires that we act responsibly in Thy world, keep before us in sharp focus the vital issues that confront this assembly today.

In these days of frustrating, unsteadying, nerve-fraying living on the razor's edge of danger, may we refuse to be polarized by those who would push us around one extreme or the other.

Grant that the political health and security of this Nation and all nations who labor for freedom's cause be made strong in our struggle against all forms of totalitarianism.

O Lord, bless our Nation's President and Vice President and these Senators, that they may have stout nerves, steady faith, and quiet confidence in Thee.

Grant that in these days of change we may continue to be sensitive to the winds of change. May we avail ourselves of Thy power and wisdom as we gird ourselves for any emergency as well as the full stretch of the years to come. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 25, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof; and

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?"

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Kuchel, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigation Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

Also 233 postmaster nominations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the district judge nomination will be stated.

DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—MASS TRANSIT BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it was the anticipation of the leadership to bring up on tomorrow Senate bill 6, the mass transit bill. However, due to the fact that the membership has not as yet had an opportunity to study the report of the Commerce Committee and the amendments proposed by it, it is felt that in the interest of comity it would be better to bring up the bill on Monday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday morning next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next, instead of at 11 o'clock, as previously ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Section 8 (b) of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Protection for Employment Opportunities of Domestic Agricultural Workers in the United States

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide protection for the employment opportunities of domestic agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Contractual Actions Taken to Facilitate the National Defense

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contractual actions taken to facilitate the national defense, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Act Relating to Regulation of Practice of Dentistry in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Section 503 of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, To Authorize a Grant-in-Aid Program

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Overpricing of Spare Electronic Parts Under Department of the Army Fixed-Price Contracts With Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of overpricing of spare electronic parts under Department of the Army fixed-price contracts DA-18-119-SC-651, DA-18-119-SC-654, and DA-18-119-SC-799 with Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich., dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Relief of Certain Commissioned Officers of the Army or Air Force

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Retirement of Judges of the Territorial District Courts

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Girl Scouts of America

A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Amendment of Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 70

"Resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.

"Whereas on the 6th day of September 1781, British forces under the overall command of Benedict Arnold assaulted Fort Griswold, in Groton, Conn.; and

"Whereas these forces consisting of 800 British regulars in 2 battalions were opposed by a small body of poorly armed local militia, mostly youths of the immediate neighborhood led by Colonel Ledyard; and

"Whereas the British commander, Lieutenant Colonel Eyre, demanded surrender which the gallant Colonel Ledyard refused despite the overwhelming superiority of the enemy forces; and

"Whereas the infuriated British officer then sent a second demand, stating that no quarter would be granted if resistance was made, and Colonel Ledyard again returned an adamant refusal; and

"Whereas the British thereupon stormed the fort and overwhelmed it in a savage and bloody battle in which losses were very heavy on both sides, and Colonel Ledyard upon realizing that further resistance in the bitter hand-to-hand fighting against 8-to-1 odds would only lead to the useless slaughter of all his friends and neighbors under his command, did order his men to lay down their arms, while at the same time offering his own sword to a British officer in surrender according to the accepted customs of warfare; and

"Whereas this British officer accepted the sword so offered and immediately and most foully plunged the sword through Colonel Ledyard's breast killing him instantly: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by this assembly,* That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby memorialize the Congress and President of the United States to pay tribute to Lt. Col. William Ledyard, a true hero of America's battle for independence, by causing to be named in his honor a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to conveyance of Federal lands in Marin County to the State of California

"Whereas it was with great pleasure that the people of California greeted the recent announcement that all of Angel Island in San Francisco Bay has been turned over to the State of California by the Federal Government for development as a State park; and

"Whereas the continued growth of California, and the San Francisco Bay area in particular, requires still more park and recreational developments; and

"Whereas there are within the areas of Fort Barry, Fort Cronkhite, and Fort Baker in Marin County thousands of acres of extremely beautiful land, including desirable beach land, which is exceptionally well suited for recreational purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government already has declared certain of these lands to be surplus as unnecessary for military purposes, and indicated its plans to dispose of such lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)* That the Legislature of the State of California wishes to express the appreciation of the people of California upon the conveyance of Angel Island to the State of California for park development, and respectfully requests that the lands in the areas of Fort Barry, Fort Cronkhite, and Fort Baker in Marin County which are unnecessary for military purposes, also be turned over to the State for State park purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Administrator of General Services."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"Article —

"'"Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"'; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:*

"Section 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"Passed the house on the 6th day of March 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 8th day of March 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Y

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to designate the impoundment created by Garrison Dam as Lake Sakakawea

"Whereas there is statewide support for designating and naming the impoundment created by the Garrison Dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota by a more historical, romantic, or meaningful name than Garrison Reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, most respectfully petitioned and requested to designate and name the impoundment, known as Garrison Reservoir, located above the Garrison Dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota as Lake Sakakawea; and be it further

"Resolved, That the North Dakota delegation in Congress is earnestly requested to seek enactment of legislation which will give effect to this proposal; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1963 EX. 5

"Whereas the people of the State of Washington take great pride in the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard with its 65 years of building, converting, and repairing the ships of the U.S. fleet; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., has been rated No. 1 of its class in speed, efficiency, and economy throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the maintenance of this fine naval shipyard has been of incomparable aid in the successful termination of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and serves this Nation in readiness in such crises as recently encountered over Berlin and Cuba; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard which has been home port to thousands of young men from all parts of the Nation has, as such, contributed many fine citizens to this State; and

"Whereas the skills and training received by employees at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has been an important asset to the economy of this State when such employees have moved into other phases of industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the senate commend the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions to the citizens of this State and this Nation; their dedication to the security of this Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency and economy unmatched elsewhere in this United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this senate resolution to the officials in command of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1963, EX. 6

"Whereas the President of the United States has recently requested the Congress to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs to train American foreign service personnel for the multitude of tasks which confront them throughout the world; and

"Whereas such a proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would provide schools for the personnel of all governmental agencies in the United States involved in the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy, and would have graduate school status with a tentative student body of approximately 1,000 student officials; and

"Whereas the present Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State would be incorporated into the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which would also be open to Army, Navy, and Air Force officers whose military assignments involve the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy; and

"Whereas by concentrating such training in one academy there could be provided an essential unity of purpose and action so that all of these operations can be coordinated into a harmonious whole; and

"Whereas the proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would command respect throughout the Government, in academic communities, and with all knowledgeable persons concerned with U.S. foreign policy and oversea operations of our diplomatic and Foreign Service officers; and would provide the United States with added skill and strength to meet and overcome the continuously more complex problems of the cold war, and would be a source of pride and stability for freemen everywhere; and

"Whereas the cost of such an academy would be extremely small as compared to the cost of other service academies, and would provide the potential for a far greater dollar-for-dollar return on the cost of operation than these academies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington, That we do hereby express our approval and support for the recommendation of the President of the United States that Congress establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and do hereby urge prompt approval of this needed educational facility; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas a serious need exists for increasing water flows on the lower Yakima River; and

"Whereas additional water storage for the Yakima River can be obtained by construction of a storage dam at the Bumping Lake Reservoir; and

"Whereas such a project would provide great benefit to the Yakima River Valley, particularly in the areas of fisheries, flood control, reclamation, and recreation; and

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior has completed a study of this project; and

"Whereas Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON have introduced legislation authorizing this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that the President and the Congress of the United States enact legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project with full consideration regarding the rights of all water users; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution immediately be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member in the Congress of the United States from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 23

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary, to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Arkansas delegation to the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF DIGHTON, KANS., POST 190, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by Dighton Post No. 190, the American Legion, Dighton, Kans., regarding the bypassing of veterans who are qualified for civil service appointments.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this district that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and National levels of this organization.

ELMER CROWLEY,
Commander.
LOUIS UMMEL,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF KANSAS RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, my mail indicates great concern over the effect of the expense account legislation approved in the last session of Congress on unemployment and the economy in general.

There can be no question but what this legislation has had a serious effect on the hotel and restaurant business. It has resulted in unemployment and a reduction in the use of beef and other food products, which has caused real distress among the cattle feeders.

I have received a resolution adopted at an official meeting of the board of directors of the Kansas Restaurant Association at Emporia, Kans., on March 13 and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas restaurants, clubs, and food service operators in Kansas are generally reporting a drop in sales of from 10 to 50 percent because of the disastrous effect of the new expense account law and this decrease in business has resulted in unemployment as well as a reduction in the consumption of meat and other food products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Restaurant Association, at an official meeting of its board of directors held at Emporia, Kans., on March 13, 1963, goes on record as seriously opposed to the new expense account law; and be it further

Resolved, That each member be immediately requested to notify the Senators and Representatives of Kansas concerning this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Restaurant Association immediately contact purveyors and suppliers and offer assistance to them in opposing this law which is affecting their business as well.

Attest:

BILL MORRIS,
President.
J. A. WOLF,
Secretary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today I received a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives in Texas. It was authored by State Senator George Moffett, of Chillicothe, a distinguished and veteran member of the Texas Senate.

In a word, the resolution deplores the inequitable and impractical situation that now exists in the domestic cotton industry wherein American buyers of American cotton are placed in a disadvantageous position in relation to foreign purchasers. The resolution urges the Congress to review the present two-price support program with a view toward doing what we can to alleviate the problem.

I would like to associate myself with the resolution passed by the Texas Legislature, and ask to insert the resolution in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of Congress and have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the cotton industry of Texas has for many generations been the mainstay of this State's economy, bringing more gross income to the people of the State than any other farm crop and has thereby become one of the most important foundation stones upon which the prosperity of the people of this State is based; and

Whereas in recent years various economic forces have definitely threatened the welfare of not only cotton producers in this State but all segments of the cotton producing, marketing, and spinning industries in the other States; and

Whereas practically all segments of the cotton industry including producers, ginners, shippers, compressors, warehousemen, oil mills, merchants, exporters, and textile mills, have united in their efforts to seek a practical solution to the problem presented by dwindling cotton markets; and

Whereas the above-mentioned efforts including financial expenditures, have obtained partial but not ample results in the development of new and broadened markets for cotton and its byproducts; and

Whereas the Federal Government, in its prior attempts to revitalize the markets for cotton, has inaugurated a two-price system whereby foreign spinners are able to secure American cotton on a cheaper price basis than domestic cotton mills, thereby bringing unfavorable results to the operation of domestic mills which also have to compete with synthetic products on a lower price level; and

Whereas the foregoing together with other economic factors have contributed and are now contributing to the shrinkage of the overall market for cotton, which has in turn had definite, serious, and very unfavorable effects on the entire American cotton industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby respectfully but earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to promptly review the present Federal two-price support program with a view to providing the same assistance through a subsidy or otherwise to American cotton mills, as foreign mills now enjoy, it being our opinion that this action would bring domestic cotton to a competitive price level on world markets and also to a competitive price level with synthetics in the home market, thereby avoiding the prospect of a situation that would ultimately, seriously, and perhaps permanently impair the whole economic structure of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Texas delegation in the National Congress, and to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in each branch of the National Congress.

PRESTON SMITH,
President of the Senate.
BYRON P. TUNNELL,
Speaker of the Senate.

Adopted by the senate on February 27, 1963.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house on March 20, 1963.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 82)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 14, 1963, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit a report to accompany the bill—S. 6—to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinate mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes. I ask that the report be printed, together with individual views of Senators BENNETT, TOWER, SIMPSON, ROBERTSON, PROXMIRE, MUSKIE, and DOMINICK.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

MASS TRANSPORTATION—AMENDMENT—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 83)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Commerce, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill S. 6. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce may have until midnight to file a report thereon, and that the report may be printed with minority and individual views and considered along with the report submitted by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The report from the Committee on Commerce explains in detail the proposed amendments in the nature of a substitute, which I shall file at the desk.

Mr. President, of course, I wish to express the admiration of the whole committee for the expeditious handling of the measure by the subcommittee. It was a massive job. This subcommittee was working against a short time limit, but under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] some excellent amendments have been developed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Commerce and Government Operations, and the report of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], who is a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works Committees, concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Butler, John M.:											
Netherlands	Guilder	234.13	65.40	162.50	45.39	3,404.58	951.00	121.29	33.88	3,922.50	1,095.67
England	Pound sterling	16.14.2	46.90	27.0.11	75.92	37.1.9	104.11	41.18.2	117.63	122.14.0	344.56
France	New franc	345.60	69.12	303.45	60.69	306.00	61.20	644.95	128.99	1,600.00	320.00
Subtotal			181.42		182.00		1,116.31		280.50		1,760.23
Ficker, Hermann (on loan to committee from Library of Congress):											
France	New franc	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,035	207.00	4,035	807.00
Senegal	CFA franc	10,000	40.80	8,000	32.64			1,000	4.08	19,000	77.52
Guinea	Guinean franc	1,000	4.00	1,000	4.00					2,000	8.00
Ghana	Ghanaian pound.	10	28.00	10	28.00			5	14.00	25	70.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound.	10	28.00	15	42.00	15	42.00	10	28.00	50	140.00
Netherlands	Guilder					6,934	1,926.15			6,934	1,926.15
South Africa	Rand	20	28.00	20	28.00	100	141.00			140	197.00
Kenya	EA shilling	400	56.20	300	42.15	300	42.15	200	28.10	1,200	168.60
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	15	34.50	15	31.50	20	46.00	10	23.00	60	138.00
Jordan	Dinar					5	14.00			5	14.00
Israel	Israeli pound	90	30.00	100	33.33	200	66.67	60	20.00	450	150.00
Greece	Drachma	840	28.00	840	28.00	520	17.33	840	28.00	3,040	101.33
Italy	Lira	20,000	32.26	44,500	72.58	20,000	32.26	20,000	32.26	104,500	169.36
Subtotal			509.76		545.20		2,527.56		384.44		3,966.96
Hartke, Vance:											
France	New franc	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,035	207.00	4,035	807.00
Senegal	CFA franc	10,000	40.80	8,000	32.64			1,000	4.08	19,000	77.52
Guinea	Guinean franc	1,000	4.00	1,000	4.00					2,000	8.00
Ghana	Ghanaian pound.	10	28.00	10	28.00			5	14.00	25	70.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound.	10	28.00	15	42.00	15	42.00	10	28.00	50	140.00
Netherlands	Guilder					6,934	1,926.15			6,934	1,926.15
South Africa	Rand	20	28.20	20	28.20					40	56.40
Kenya	EA shilling	400	56.20	300	42.15	300	42.15	200	28.10	1,200	168.60
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	15	34.50	15	34.50	20	46.00	10	23.00	60	138.00
Jordan	Dinar					5	14.00			5	14.00
Israel	Israel pound	90	30.00	100	33.33	200	66.67	60	20.00	450	150.00
Greece	Drachma	840	28.00	840	28.00	520	17.33	840	28.00	3,040	101.33
Italy	Lira	20,000	32.26	44,500	72.58	20,000	32.26	20,000	32.26	104,500	169.36
Subtotal			509.96		545.40		2,386.56		384.44		3,826.36
Scott, Hugh:											
Philippines	Peso	52	13.00	80	20.00	44	11.00	84	21.00	260	65.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	866.40	152.00	1,026.00	180.00	190.15	33.36	167.45	29.37	2,250	394.73
Subtotal			165.00		200.00		44.36		50.37		459.73
Smathers, George A.:											
Turkey	Turkish lira	477.00	53.28	327.82	36.50	107.11	12.00	197.07	21.00	1,105	122.78
Thailand	Baht	862.90	41.32	527.53	25.26	50.00	2.39	59.57	2.85	1.500	71.82
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,524	265.68	1,013.17	176.71	103	17.92	383.14	66.83	3,023.31	527.14
Japan	Yen	117,474	328.92	68,975	193.13	8,357	23.39	45,424	127.18	240,230	672.62
Holland	Guilder					784.23	2,818.55			784.23	2,818.55
Subtotal			680.20		431.60		2,874.25		217.86		4,212.91
Trice, J. Mark:											
Netherlands	Guilder	234.14	65.40	171.85	48.00	3,136.12	876.01	61.79	17.26	3,603.90	1,006.67
England	Pound	16.14.2	46.90	27.0.11	75.92	37.1.9	104.11	41.18.2	117.63	122.14.0	344.56
France	New franc	345.60	69.12	275.00	55.00	315.60	63.12	663.80	132.76	1,600.00	320.00
Subtotal			181.42		178.92		1,043.24		267.65		1,671.23
Total			2,236.76		2,083.12		9,992.28		1,585.26		15,897.42

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$15,897.42
Total	15,897.42

MAR. 8, 1963.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations (Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations), U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ernest Gruening: [1]											
France	Dollar		100.00		73.45		6.59		57.10		237.14
Do	New franc			385	78.91	191	39.25	188	38.56	764	156.72
Turkey	Dollar		83.15		49.05		15.05		46.99		194.24
Do	Lira			1,308	148.83	538	59.86	600	66.42	2,446	275.11
Iran	Dollar		69.47		10.15		11.11		5.66		96.39
Do	Rial			5,489	72.25	3,032	39.90	2,936	38.65	11,457	150.80
Syria	Dollar		21.71		16.90		11.30		9.19		59.10
Do	Pound			23.4	89.09	11.35	43.14	7.7	29.40	14.46	161.63
Lebanon	Dollar		30.00		62.50		24.05		41.65		158.20
Do	Pound			340	114.03	150	49.60	144	47.43	634	211.06
Jordan	Dollar		10.71		3.00		11.00		13.33		38.04
Do	Pound			16.4	46.45	1	2.97	4.4	13.44	21.8	62.86
Israel	Dollar		83.00		31.69		43.56		37.33		195.58
Do	Pound			223	124.84	68	48.49	101	56.67	392	230.00
Greece	Dollar		35.07		10.90		.63		12.39		58.99
Do	Drachma			1,576	52.80	751	25.19	1,143	38.30	3,470	116.29
United States	Dollar						1,275.35				1,275.35
Subtotal			433.11		984.84		1,707.04		552.51		3,677.50
Herbert W. Beaser: [2]											
France	Dollar		95.87		67.72		5.42		27.85		196.86
Do	New franc			385	78.91	191	39.25	188	38.56	764	156.72
Turkey	Dollar		73.15		85.99		9.22		32.96		201.32
Do	Lira			1,308	148.83	538	59.86	600	66.42	2,446	275.11
Iran	Dollar		39.80		10.25		11.14		5.66		66.85
Do	Rial			5,489	72.25	3,032	39.90	2,936	38.65	11,457	150.80
Syria	Dollar		21.45		10.97		11.30		9.49		53.21
Do	Pound			23.4	89.09	11.35	43.14	7.7	29.40	14.46	161.63
Lebanon	Dollar		30.00		40.45		23.95		24.88		119.28
Do	Pound			340	114.03	150	49.60	144	47.43	634	211.06
Jordan	Dollar		14.35		3.00		11.30		12.33		40.98
Do	Pound			16.4	46.45	1	2.97	4.4	13.44	21.8	62.86
Israel	Dollar		43.78		38.84		34.43		22.53		139.58
Do	Pound			223	124.84	68	48.49	101	56.67	392	230.00
Greece	Dollar		19.09		14.51		.63		13.19		47.42
Do	Drachma			1,576	52.80	751	25.19	1,143	38.30	3,470	116.29
United States	Dollar						1,275.35				1,275.35
Subtotal			337.49		998.93		1,691.14		477.76		3,505.32
Total			770.60		1,983.77		3,398.18		1,030.27		7,182.82

[1] Senator Gruening returned to U.S. Treasury $450.00.

[2] Herbert W. Beaser returned to U.S. Treasury $330.79.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$2,728.94
Appropriated funds: Department of Defense	4,453.88
Total	7,182.82

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

MAR. 27, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Frank E. Moss:											
French Oceania	U.S. dollar		17.44		13.10		5.52		38.61		74.67
American Samoa	do						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands	do		3.18		5.19				9.38		17.75
New Guinea	do		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia	do		39.72		20.21		4.91		25.72		90.56
Malaya	Malayan dollar			167.75	54.92	68.03	22.88	11.22	3.74	247.00	81.54
Do	U.S. dollar		21.55		16.36		5.54		24.94		68.39
Cambodia	Riel	1,357	38.97	3,257	93.54	4,571	136.41	728	20.82	9,913	289.74
Do	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.92		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam	Piaster	2,182	30.00	3,137	43.13	2,701	37.50	1.898	26.87	9,918	137.50
Do	U.S. dollar		24.66		.82				12.64		38.12
Philippines	Peso			90.65	25.87	87.41	20.00	115.20	28.80	293.26	74.67
Do	U.S. dollar				4.48		.75		23.74		28.87
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	320	55.83	503	83.68	167	27.75	189	31.54	859	198.80
Do	U.S. dollar		29.46		31.33		.61		15.30		76.70
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar			845	21.16	888	22.26	806	20.18	2,539	63.60
Do	U.S. dollar		13.75		4.00				3.74		21.49
Korea	Hwan			2,215	17.11	2,067	15.96	31.02	23.95	7,384	57.02
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		3.00				5.58		12.58
Okinawa	do		1.50		5.07				8.22		14.79
Japan	Yen	21,983	87.45	23,541	92.06	34,750	139.51	9,250	31.26	89,624	350.28
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		22.30		1.40		11.05		75.67
Total			440.95		596.36		456.31		388.48		1,882.10

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,253.25
Appropriated funds: Defense	628.85
Total	1,882.10

FRANK E. MOSS.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 14, 1963, February, 20, 1963, and March 19, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Miss Caterina Gadoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Schumann; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 1190. A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Talmadge when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1191. A bill to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1193. A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register; and

S. 1194. A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1195. A bill to establish a system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to promote the uniform observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cotton when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. Long of Missouri):

S. 1197. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan for Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1198. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 1199. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Bible, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Dodd):

S. 1200. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. Eastland):

S. 1201. A bill for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Stennis when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1202. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey certain surplus property to the Aiken County Historical Commission for use as a historic monument; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1203. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1204. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas, Forestry, Fish and Game Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1205. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Carlson when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1208. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. Javits, Mr. Beall, Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1209. A bill to establish a procedure for adoption and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools; to provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools; to restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Fong, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1210. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

S. 1211. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment, in employment under Government contracts, and in employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1212. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 1213. A bill to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to families displaced by construction of highways forming a part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1214. A bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1215. A bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1216. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1217. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1218. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. FONG, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. PEARSON):

S. 1219. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1220. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes; contingent upon acceptance and approval by the Director of Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, as protector of the interests of the United States of America; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1221. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Menichelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1222. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to expand and improve vocational education, with emphasis on the need for providing employment training for youth in a fast-changing economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Mr. Miguel Antonio Acosta;

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Angles; and

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1226. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1227. A bill authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1228. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 1229. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution expressing declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, A REPORT ENTITLED "STUDY MISSION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA"

Mr. McGEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 117), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed, as a Senate document, a report entitled "Study Mission to Southeast Asia", submitted by Senator GALE W. MCGEE to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that twenty thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

LOANS WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON REAL ESTATE BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Senators BEALL, FONG, JAVITS, KEATING, and KUCHEL) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 118) concerning loans without discriminatory provisions, on real estate by financial institutions, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SCOTT, which appears under a separate heading.)

PUNISHMENT OF CERTAIN OFFENSES AGAINST POSTAL OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment. Currently, punishment is provided only in the case of certain offenses committed against post office inspectors. In my opinion, punishment should apply equally to such offenses committed against any officer or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department. The bill I have introduced will accomplish this objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1191) to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954. This measure authorized the departments and agencies to pay not to exceed $100 annually toward the cost of uniforms required by law or administrative order to be worn by employees in the performance of their official duties.

In many instances this did not meet the actual cost of the uniforms even in 1954. During the 9 years since that date, the cost of uniforms has gone up until today the allowance is often totally inadequate. In such instances, employees have no choice except to use part of their meager salaries for the purchase of uniforms that cannot be worn except in the performance of their official duties. This is not a fair or equitable situation.

The bill I have introduced raises the amount the Government can pay from $100 to $150 annually, except where overcoats or other outer garments are prescribed for protection against the elements, in which cases an additional $50 annually would be allowed. Enactment of this measure is required in the interest of justice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1192) to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 309(e) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO FILING OF PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD, together with an explanation of the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1193) to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program a proposal to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed within 30 days after publication of the hearing issues, or any substantial amendment thereto, in the Federal Register.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON N. MINOW,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 309(e) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO REQUIRE THAT PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION BE FILED WITHIN 30 DAYS AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE HEARING ISSUES

Delays in the administrative process are of serious concern to the public, the bar, administrative agencies, and the Congress. In order to promote efficiency, the Commission has been seeking methods of expediting its administrative process while at the same time balancing the requirement of protecting the public interest with its duty to also safeguard the rights of private parties. One of the areas in which undue delay seems to be a special problem is in the hearing process. The Commission's legislative proposal herein is one which it believes will reduce undue delay.

When an application is filed with the Commission, it must be processed to determine what action thereon would be appropriate. Basically, this processing consists of examining an application to determine whether it is complete and whether the applicant is legally, technically, and financially qualified. Assuming that he meets these minimal qualifications and there is no reason for a hearing, the Commission can grant the application without a hearing. But if the applicant's qualifications can be determined only after a hearing, or if some other reason exists, then the Commission is required by section 309(e) of the Communications Act to designate the application for a full hearing, specifying with particularity the grounds and reasons for such hearing.

When an application has been designated for hearing under section 309(e), any party in interest who has not been notified of the designation for hearing can acquire the status of a party to the proceeding by filing *a petition for intervention showing the basis* for his interest. "* * * at any time not less than 10 days prior to the date of hearing." This procedure has interfered with the expeditious handling and disposition of hearing proceedings.

The Commission's proposed amendment to *section 309(e)* would require a party in interest who wishes to intervene in a hearing to signify his intention to do so "* * * not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues, or any substantial amendment thereto, in the Federal Register."

This amendment will enhance the effectiveness of the prehearing conference which is one of the chief techniques the Commission has for expediting formal hearings. The Commission is particularly concerned that prehearing conferences be utilized to the fullest extent possible in every proceeding, to the end that there may be no unnecessary delays in the progress of a formal hearing once it is commenced. Our experience has been that prehearing discussions and negotiations, and the stipulations and agreements of the parties reached as a result thereof, are an effective means of insuring, not only an expeditious hearing, but, as well, that the hearing record may be kept down in size to the minimum consistent with the rights of the participants. Obviously, the effectiveness of all prehearing techniques is destroyed when a party in interest, who as of right may be allowed to take part in the formal hearing if he seeks intervention 10 days before commencement thereof, may completely nullify the effect of valuable stipulations and timesaving agreements reached by the other participants during several prehearing conferences held over a period of months, simply because he did not become a party to the case at an earlier date.

Once the hearing issues are published, any interested person knows at the time whether he will have to participate in the hearing to protect his own interests. There is no reason why parties should be given the legal right to delay their intervention when the issues are clear in advance of the hearing. The Commission feels that by requiring a party in interest to intervene within 30 days of publication of the hearing issues, an ample and reasonable period is afforded to parties to determine whether it is necessary for them to intervene to protect their interests and to indicate their intention to participate. The requirement will discourage the dilatory tactics now possible under the present provisions of section 309(e) and will substantially eliminate the need for holding repeated prehearing conferences. It will also have the virtue of providing a date certain for intervention, thus eliminating the present situation where the date for intervention changes every time the date for commencement of the hearing is changed.

The 30-day period provided in the proposal is consistent with the time allowed in many other sections of the Communications Act. For example, section 402(e) allows interested persons to intervene in appeals from Commission decisions within 30 days after the filing of any such appeal with the court of appeals. (See also sections 402(c) and 405). In addition, the 30-day time period takes into consideration the time necessary to comply with the requirement of section 311 of the act that local notice must be given of designation for hearing in broadcast proceedings.

We also wish to point out that section 309(e) deals only with the time within which parties in interest can intervene as of right. The Commission has the discretion to permit intervention by any person (including parties in interest) at any time (even after the period specified in the section or in the Commission's rules) where a showing of good cause and that the public interest would be served thereby, is made. See sections 4(j), 303(r) of the act; section *1.104(d) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR* 1.104(d). This discretion to permit intervention after the time specified in section 309(e), either on the Commission's own motion or on petition, would be equally true under the proposed amendment. Moreover, in any matter in which the hearing issues are substantially amended, it will be possible for new parties to intervene as of right if the changes affect their interests.

REMOVAL OF PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

Present law limits the number of enlisted men who may retire upon completion of 20 years of service in any 1 calendar year to not more than 1 percent of the total enlisted force of the Coast Guard. This limitation was enacted along with the adoption of 20-year retirements by the Coast Guard in 1939. One of the original purposes of this limitation was to prevent an excessive loss of experienced personnel. There is no comparable limitation on the retirement of officers. Nor is there a similar limitation applicable to enlisted men of the Navy.

In the years following World War II the large backlog of men who had been unable to retire during the war made it impossible to retire all those who wished to do so upon completion of 20 years of service. But by 1955 this backlog had been eliminated and all men who requested it were able to retire upon completion of 20 years of service or shortly thereafter. That situation has continued until the present. As a result most enlisted men in the service today have come to count on their right to retire at that time. They have made their plans on that basis and it has influenced their decisions as to whether to reenlist or not.

During 1962, 92 more men requested 20-year retirement than could be granted it under the 1-percent limitation. This development was a change which can be expected to continue and intensify as the large groups of men who served in World War II complete 20 years of service. From requests presently on hand it is estimated that at least 250 more enlisted men will request retirement in 1963 than can be granted it under existing law. This number will continue to increase and unless remedial measures are taken it is estimated that by 1968 enlisted men will have to complete over 26 years of service before they can be retired.

This inability to grant the retirement requests of those who have completed 20 years of service has created a morale problem which can be expected to become more serious each year. It will slow promotions to higher enlisted grades and make it more difficult for the career enlisted man to plan intelligently his service career and his post-service life.

The proposed bill would repeal the statutory limitation on retirements of enlisted men who have completed 20 years of service. Such retirements would continue to remain subject to the needs of the service and the availability of appropriated funds.

While removal of the 1-percent limitation on retirement would result in the loss of experienced personnel with over 20 years of service, this would be compensated for by the increased retention of men serving in their second or third enlistments. The absence of an assured 20-year retirement often is a deterrent to reenlistment for men in this latter group.

Removal of this limitation would result in increased retired pay costs. These would be partially compensated for by decreases in costs for active duty pay due to the decrease in average length of service of the active force. It is estimated that the net additional costs through 1970 resulting from removal of the limitation on enlisted retirements would amount to an average of $1,385,000 per year.

The bill would also equalize the Coast Guard's retirement laws with those of the other services in another respect. Coast Guard enlisted men retiring with over 20 years of service are presently eligible to receive an increase in retired pay amounting to 10 percent of their basic pay if they have maintained high marks in conduct during their service. The Comptroller General, in a recent report to Congress, has pointed out that enlisted men of the other armed forces do not receive this benefit and that it is no longer needed in order to insure good conduct. The Department agrees with the desirability of equalizing retirement benefits among the services but believes that this benefit should be retained for career enlisted men now in the service, since these men have probably taken this benefit into account in deciding on a career in the Coast Guard. The bill therefore would repeal the authority for this increased pay for all personnel with less than 4 years of service.

There would be no immediate savings due to repeal of this provision since it would not affect the rights of persons already retired or those who have at least 4 years of service. However, since it is estimated that this benefit amounts to $12,600 for the average Coast Guard enlisted retiree, the eventual savings would be substantial.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYSTEM OF TIME STANDARDS AND MEASUREMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in another month much of the Nation will advance its clocks and go on daylight saving time, and we will again be caught up in another round of time juggling and clock confusion.

Widespread variation in standard and daylight saving time across the country, complicated by frequent time zone boundary disputes, differing standard-daylight changeover dates, and a wide assortment of local options have all combined to create bewildering uncertainty and confusion in the minds of the public.

The time scramble has complicated the operation and the scheduling problems of the transport industry at untold cost. It confuses communications, industrial and financial interests, and confounds the individual citizen who misses his appointment or has to wait an extra hour for a train, plane, or bus.

This confusion is costly, time consuming, and unnecessary. We now operate on a Standard Time Act, adopted in 1918 and modified but little, despite the tremendous change in our clock habits since then. Furthermore, the present act has serious shortcomings, including a total absence of enforcement provisions. In short, our river of time is heavily shoaled, filled with jagged rocks and treacherous eddies. It is anything but a smooth highway of commerce and communications, and I think we should do something about it.

In its latest annual report, the Interstate Commerce Commission has pointedly called attention to the problems of clock confusion and recommended the enactment of legislation to end it.

The Transportation Association of America has launched a drive to promote greater standardization in the Nation's timekeeping, and has assembled some prime examples of the economic costs of clock confusion. There is, for example, the case of the confused driver and passengers on a bus which operates over the 35-mile stretch of highway between Steubenville, Ohio, and Moundsville, W. Va., and passes through seven different time changes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks some excerpts from a pamphlet published by the Transportation Association of America entitled "Project Timesaver."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A PAMPHLET PREPARED BY THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

PROJECT TIMESAVER

It has been said wisely that "Time and tide wait for no man." The poignant tragedy is that considerable time—which can never be regained—is being wasted and lost daily as a result of clock confusion.

How widespread is the use of daylight saving time? Of the 50 States in the Union, 28 States and the District of Columbia observe daylight saving time during the year. Fourteen of these 28 States have it in effect on a statewide basis. The other 14 observe daylight saving time over different areas, ranging from a single city to practically statewide.

Do those States observing daylight saving time make their time changes on the same dates? No. Eleven of the States follow daylight saving time from the end of April to the end of October. The remainder begin or terminate daylight saving time in other months.

Would greater uniformity in the use of daylight saving time help the bus industry? Indeed so. This time problem is particularly aggravating for the bus operators which serve the crossroads and byways of America. The proof: The Carolina Coach Co. deplores the plight of the Salisbury, Md., passengers to New York City who must keep straight the frequent changes in scheduled departures set for 1:45 p.m. in early April, changed to 2:45 p.m. on April 29, changed to 1:45 p.m. on May 30, changed to 2:45 p.m. on September 3, changed to 1:45 p.m. on October 28. As the company aptly observes, the passengers "lay the blame on the bus companies and wind up driving their cars and we lose the revenue."

Trailways complains of the traffic losses, rescheduling of work, reassignment of equipment, excessive cost of publishing timetables, etc., and estimates that up to 40 percent of the time devoted to preparation of schedules could be saved if greater time uniformity could be achieved. Trailways says that "the condition has worsened every year in the last few years."

The National Association of Motor Bus Owners asserts on behalf of the industry that "potential savings might reach a quarter of a million dollars on scheduling and timetable costs alone."

Would increased uniformity around the clock benefit the railroads? Undoubtedly yes. Modern railroading is precision railroading. For 80 years the railroads led the fight to eliminate confusion in time standards. This historical pioneering effort is well documented in "The Day of Two Noons," published by the Association of American Railroads.

In 1957, the New York Herald Tribune highlighted the impact of daylight saving time on the railroad industry under the title "Daylight Time Costs Railroads $1 Million."

Because Federal law still requires the railroads to operate on standard time, many of them are forced to publish two kinds of timetables, one based on standard time for the use by carrier employees and the other reporting passenger train schedules on local time (standard and daylight) for the benefit of the traveling public.

A 1962 survey of more than 20 railroads identified the following areas of general confusion and difficulty attributable to lack of uniform time:

General confusion in passenger timetables.

Difficulty in scheduling passenger trains to accommodate origin, intermediate, and destination requirements.

Extra expense of printing timetables.

Difficulty in handling mail to meet Post Office Department requirements.

Necessity for rescheduling freight trains to meet market delivery times on perishables and livestock, and to maintain adequate interline service.

Work of operating employees on standard time while nonoperating employees work on daylight saving time, resulting in confusion and inconvenience.

Revision of switching crew schedules to meet requirements of local industry.

Confusion, particularly for train and enginemen, for employees who follow standard time at work while using daylight saving time at home.

Reducing communication time between widely separated stations on the same railroad.

Lengthened dining car meal service at increased labor costs.

Are the airlines also concerned? Yes, the airlines are seriously concerned with the confusion, the passenger inconvenience, and the additional expense, caused by variations in daylight saving time observance in different areas of the country.

ITEMS

An airport usually serves a large geographical area which may even extend across State boundaries. These service areas frequently include both daylight and standard time zones. This causes confusion to many passengers, some of whom might arrive at the airport an hour early for their flight or, even worse, arrive an hour late and miss their flight. This frustration also extends to families and friends of departing or arriving passengers.

A missed flight is of serious and expensive concern to both the passenger and the airline. For the airline, a missed passenger today may well become a nonairline passenger of tomorrow.

During certain times of the year, the nonuniformity in dates for daylight time observance results in as much as a 4-hour time change on a coast-to-coast flight, 1 hour beyond the normal 3-hour change. This extra hour which the transcontinental passenger experiences in these circumstances makes his physical adjustment to the new time zone that much more difficult. Anyone who has ever had to adjust to a 4-hour time change on a 5-hour flight will understand this problem.

A very definite and measurable expense to the airline is the required reprinting and redistribution of system timetables with each time change at some individual point on the system. If cutoff dates for daylight saving time were uniform in all areas, schedule reissuance based on time changes would take place only twice each year. This would result in substantial cost saving to the airline industry.

Would less clock juggling help other interests? It's about time to streamline the hourglass for everyone. For example: Oregon and Oregon State Universities are continuing their campus clocks this summer on standard time, yet their classes will begin an hour earlier on daylight saving time.

During a 2-month period in 1959, some offices in the Minnesota State Capitol Building observed daylight saving time while others used standard time.

For husbands who work on daylight saving time and wives who run the home on standard time, Thomas Wolfe in the Washington Post suggested "His" and "Her" clocks so that both will have the "time of their lives."

The West Coast States of Oregon and Washington shift back to standard time on the fourth Sunday in September while most of the rest of the country stays on daylight saving time until the last Sunday in October. This 1-month period of a 4-hour time lag means that the business day on the west coast in these States is only half over when the east coast offices close their doors.

In Pennsylvania, State law requires that official business be conducted on eastern standard time. Yet in 1962 more than 600 Pennsylvania communities observed daylight saving time from April 20 to October 28. What needless confusion.

It's time for a change in our time changes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the legislation recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission has already been introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. It is S. 1033.

As my own contribution toward the solution of this problem, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which differs in many respects from the recommendation of the ICC.

Briefly, my bill would place the responsibility for setting the time zones and enforcing the act in the Department of Commerce, where all the commercial interests of the Nation can properly be focused on the problem.

Second, the ICC bill would effectively prevent any State or local community from determining for itself whether it wanted daylight saving time or not. The bill I present today would preserve this local option, but it would direct the Secretary of Commerce to use his considerable persuasive power to promote the adoption of uniform time.

It is my hope that the introduction of this bill will serve to further stimulate public awareness of the problems of clock confusion and lead to a quick, constructive solution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1195) to establish a system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to promote the uniform observance of such time standards for all purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT REGARDING GUARDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate the provision prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

Amendment of the act in this regard is, I believe, long overdue. The effect of the present provision in the statute is to prevent guards and watchmen from affiliating with unions of their own choice. They are compelled to form independent unions which, because of their usually small numbers, are unable effectively to represent guards and watchmen members in collective bargaining.

As far back as 1949 efforts were made in the Senate to enact legislation which would permit bargaining units of guards to affiliate with labor organizations of employees other than guards. Such legislation was passed by the Senate in 1949, but no action was taken on it in the House of Representatives. The late Senator Irving Ives, of New York, introduced similar amendments several times, and, during the last two Congresses, I have sponsored or cosponsored this measure.

It is time that the National Labor Relations Act recognized the importance to employees who are guards of being permitted to affiliate with established labor organizations. It should be noted that my amendment does not change in any way the present requirement under the act that a bargaining unit of guards cannot have in it employees who are not guards.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1199) to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the semicolon and the words: "but no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards".

RELIEF OF DR. JAMES T. MADDUX

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, I cosponsored with the senior Senator from Mississippi, S. 377, for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux. This bill was favorably recommended by the Judiciary Committee, with amendments, and was subsequently passed by the Senate on October 3, 1962. Due to the lateness in session, this measure did not receive consideration in the House.

My colleague and I now introduce this measure again, amended so as to conform to the committee's recommendations.

On July 1, 1961, Dr. Maddux was an employee of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, Philadelphia, Pa., and on that date became eligible for promotion from associate grade, Medical Service, to full grade, Medical Service. He met all proficiency ratings and other requirements and would have been promoted, except for the fact that the required certification from the personnel officer, which had been timely prepared and submitted, was misfiled. Dr. Maddux's promotion subsequently became effective on February 18, 1962.

Dr. Maddux was fully qualified and entitled to this promotion and would have been promoted to full grade, Medical Service, effective July 9, 1961, as conceded by the Veterans' Administration, had it not been for a purely clerical mistake. The denial of this promotion to a qualified and competent medical officer on this ground constitutes a grave injustice, Mr. President, and we now introduce this bill to rectify this mistake and authorize compensation for Dr. Maddux to which he is entitled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1201) for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux, introduced by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the Government's contribution.

This bill is designed to provide the same degree of equity in the case of retired Federal employees as S. 761, introduced by me on February 11, 1963, will provide for active employees with respect to the proportion of the total cost of the health benefits program to be paid by the Government.

It is my hope that this measure and S. 761 may be considered and acted upon at the same time in order that both our present and former employees receive equal justice in this important matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1205) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOBLE FRANK SMITH AND HIS WIFE, VIOLA SMITH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith, of Onarga, Ill.

Mr. President, Mr. Smith is a former U.S. marine and a survivor of the Bataan death march and 3½ years of prison-camp internment. He is now the operator of a small farm near Onarga in Iroquois County, Ill.

In Shanghai, China, just before World War II, young marine Noble Frank Smith married a Portuguese girl who is now Mrs. Viola Mary Smith. When war was declared, Smith's Marine unit was moved to the Philippines but Mrs. Smith was left behind. She was in the hospital where she soon gave birth to their son, Carl.

Subsequently, Shanghai was taken by the Japanese and soon thereafter, the Philippines were taken. Smith fought in Bataan and Corregidor, survived the infamous Bataan death march, and then endured 42 months of Japanese prison camps in Formosa, the Philippines, and Manchuria.

Mrs. Smith, meanwhile, was put in a camp run by the American Refugee Association in a former school. She lived there for about 2 years, until the Japanese took over the school building. Thereafter, she and the others lived as best they could, but were not permitted to earn a living. The American Government sent American dependents a small amount of relief through the Swiss consulate.

At irregular intervals in the years after the Smiths returned to the United States, they received bills of varying amounts from the Department of State which were said to represent the amount Mrs. Smith owed for the maintenance payments made to her during her involuntary refugee status in Shanghai. The Smiths were busy raising their five children and trying to recover from the economic deprivations of his long period of imprisonment in the service of his country. Veterans advisers counseled them to ignore the bills which were received with uncertain and inconsistent justification. Some of the bills, for example, stated an amount due for Mrs. Smith's transportation, but I now am advised that the military took care of this and repayment of transportation costs should not have been sought from the Smiths.

Finally, on February 28 of this year, the Smiths received a bill from the State Department Office of Finance demanding repayment within 30 days of $1,421.92, an amount said to represent maintenance payments to Mrs. Smith from July 2, 1943, to October 19, 1945. Mr. Marvin Craig, editor and publisher of the Onarga Leader Review, became interested and rallied the support of the community behind the belief of many that to make this demand against this Marine hero was unreasonable, punitive, and unjustified.

Mr. President, we all know that the exact letter of the law or what appears to be the exact letter is not always just and in accord with the spirit of the law. In this case, I believe the State Department acted within the letter of the law and probably had no choice but to request repayment. But I also believe, Mr. President, that enforcing this claim against the Smiths, who have a large family and who would have difficulty raising this sum, and who gave so much of their lives for this country, would be wholly outside the spirit of the law. And, Mr. President, if the many telephone calls and messages I have received, and the statements made to me Monday and Tuesday while I was in Illinois are at all representative, all of the people of Illinois, at least, share my opinion.

Therefore, I am introducing this bill to cancel this claim against the Smiths. I hope that the Congress will take quick action on it, and that the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget will quickly approve it.

By telephone I have been advised that in response to my request by telegram of March 26, the State Department has suspended its deadline for payment pending consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, in view of the nationwide interest in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory article by Georgie Anne Geyer, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of March 25, and an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 27, be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill also be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, article, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith, are hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,421.92, representing the amount of payments of advances for subsistence and medical expenses which the said Viola Smith received for herself and her infant son, Carl Smith, during their internment in Shanghai, China, from July, 1952, to October, 1945. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Noble Frank Smith and Viola Smith, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from them or either of them on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The article and editorial presented by Mr. DOUGLAS are as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 25, 1963]

BATAAN HERO GETS U.S. BILL FOR $1,421

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

ONARGA, ILL.—An ex-Marine survivor of the Bataan death march and 3½ years in prison camps has been billed for $1,421.92 by the State Department for emergency war relief given his wife and son.

Noble Frank Smith, 47, a good-looking man of few words who runs a 160-acre farm here, says: "I don't think they've got anything coming, and they ain't going to get it."

Smith's wife and son were stranded in China during World War II.

Smith got the bill on January 28. It gave him 30 days to pay.

The Smiths are worried. "The letter didn't say what they'd do after 30 days," Smith mused, sitting at his kitchen table over a crisp brown pork roast.

Mrs. Smith, a vivacious, handsome woman of 40, leaned across the table. "Maybe they won't try to collect it, hon'." she said.

"We don't know if they will or won't," he said, looking like a man who isn't about to be moved. "But I know one thing: I'm not gonna pay it."

Onarga, an Iroquois County community about 60 miles south of Chicago, and neighboring towns are upset about the Smith case. The local American Legion post has taken the case to the State commander. Other citizens are writing letters to Congressmen.

The Onarga Leader Review recounted the case in an editorial, asking: "Just how much does a soldier owe his country, especially when the circumstances are beyond his control?"

The Smith saga started just before World War II in Shanghai, China, when as a marine, Smith married the young Portuguese girl who is now Viola Mary Smith.

When war was declared on Japan December 7, 1941, the marines were moved to the Philippines. But Mrs. Smith was left behind. She was in a hospital giving birth to their son, Carl.

Shanghai was taken by the Japanese, the Philippines fell.

Smith went through Bataan and Corregidor, and barely survived 42 months of Japanese prison camps in Formosa, the Philippines and, finally, dreaded Manchuria.

"But we got $1 extra a day from the Government while we were in prison," he says wryly.

"Meanwhile, all of the Americans in China were put in a camp run by the American Refugee Association in the former American school in Shanghai," said Mrs. Smith.

"We lived there for about 2 years. Then the Japanese took over the building.

"From then on, we lived on our own, but we couldn't work. You couldn't work for the Japanese, for instance. So the American Government sent American dependents a certain amount of relief through the Swiss consulate.

"Every time I received the money, I signed papers," continued Mrs. Smith, "but they said it was just a formality. They said it was just to show where the money went.

"And when the bills from the Government started coming after the war, and I asked a Veterans' Administration lawyer what to do, he said to ignore them, and I did.

"They got bigger," added Mrs. Smith. "First they were just over $1,000. Then they went up to more than $1,400." The bills read "for subsistence and transportation, July 2, 1943, to October 19, 1945," and they were addressed to Mrs. Smith.

On January 28 came the last bill, giving them 30 days to pay.

"I don't want people to feel sorry for us," said Mrs. Smith. "But we just don't have that much money."

Their family now numbers five children—Carl, 22; Joann, 16; Donna May, 15; Stephanie, 9; and Elena, 6—and Mrs. Smith's mother.

"Well, the bills are in my name," said Mrs. Smith with a smile. "A stay in jail wouldn't be bad. I'd get a little rest."

Smith mused with a slight rakish smile, "I wonder what they'll do to you, mama."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 27, 1963]

The Press Is a Monitor

The case of the ex-marine from Illinois who has been dunned by the State Department for money extended his family while they were interned in Shanghai during World War II is an example of the power and value of a free press.

The ex-marine, Noble Frank Smith, now an Illinois farmer, was moved with his military unit from Shanghai to the Philippines when World War II began. Behind him, in Shanghai, he left his wife, who was expecting their first child.

While Smith was surviving the death march on Bataan and prison camps in the Philippines, Formosa, and Manchuria his wife eked out her stay in the Shanghai internment camp with sums of money made available by the Congress through neutral Swiss offices. Such sums of money are available to any stranded American citizen, even today. A State Department official familiar with the Smith case told the Sun-Times that these sums of money extended during wartime were spent for food, clothing, medicines, shelter or other reasons and that promissory notes were signed. The total amount given to Mrs. Smith was $1,421.92.

Smith is not going to be prosecuted by the United States for this debt. Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, Illinois, is introducing a bill to forgive the debt and Representative Leslie C. Arends, Republican, Illinois, has asked the Secretary of State to cancel out the debt. The State Department is embarrassed but has no recourse under the law but to bill Smith.

It is notable that when Smith found himself faced with what he conceived to be an injustice he turned to a newspaper for relief. Marvin Craig, editor and publisher of the Onarga (Ill.) Leader Review rallied the support of his community behind Smith.

It is the function of a newspaper, no matter how large or small it may be, to monitor government and those who serve in government. This is the duty of a free press in a democracy—despite recent statements by some government spokesmen.

The Onarga Leader Review and its editor and publisher, Marvin Craig, have discharged their duty well.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT UNITED STATES–MEXICO NARCOTIC COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Kefauver, Lausche, Mechem, Ribicoff, Hruska, Keating, Kuchel, Goldwater, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexico Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this proposed legislation is necessary in order to overcome one aspect of a most serious problem which we face, not only as legislators, but also as citizens and parents concerned with the welfare of the youth of our Nation. I refer to the narcotics problem. We are concerned as legislators, because it is in large part the responsibility of the Federal Government to crack down, through legislation and law enforcement, on the illegal use of narcotics. We are concerned as citizens and as parents, because large numbers of our young people are already addicted to narcotics, and many more will face the ravages of addiction if the flow of illicit narcotics into the United States is not stopped.

Facing up to this problem has international implications, for the supply of illicit narcotics into the United States has its origin outside our borders, both in countries friendly and in countries hostile to us. Thus we must work in concert with the governments which are friendly toward us if we are to make inroads into this problem, and we must find ways to cut off the drug traffic from hostile sources.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, scores of witnesses have documented the inescapable fact that a major source of illicit narcotics coming into this country is our neighbor to the south, the Republic of Mexico.

Earlier this week, I returned from a 10-day visit to Mexico as a member of the Third Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Mexico. While I was there, I talked about this problem to members of the Mexican delegation to the Conference and, in particular, to Senorita Maria del Refugio Baez Santoyo, who represents in the Mexican Congress an area where the narcotics problem is widespread.

I found among these Mexican parliamentarians an awareness of the problem, and a desire to do something about it in concert with the United States.

There are many obstacles, in the form of long-entrenched local interests, which must be overcome. But I believe the climate is right for a joint assault on this drug menace, an assault directed by the highest government levels of both the United States and the Republic of Mexico; and I am introducing this resolution today because I feel that the time is right for action.

Despite the diligent efforts of the U.S. Customs Bureau, the flow of illicit narcotics continues to cross our southwestern border from Texas to California, for use by addicts, both young and old. With some 1,200 miles of border between the United States and Mexico, it is virtually impossible to patrol this entire area and apprehend smugglers of heroin, marihuana, and other dangerous drugs. Thus, the full cooperation of the Mexican Government is essential if we are to eliminate effectively this source of illicit narcotics.

Therefore, I intend to document the seriousness of this problem and the need for cooperative action on the part of the Government of Mexico, if we are to halt the river of narcotics, marijuana, and dangerous drugs which flows from Mexico into the United States.

The fact that Mexico is a source for narcotics, marihuana, and other dangerous drugs was attested to by many witnesses during the subcommittee's hearings. Mr. Lee E. Echols, former sheriff of Yuma County, Ariz., and a former agent of the U.S. customs agency service, testified that in the company of two subcommittee staff members he visited Culiacan, Sinaloa, Mexico, in March of 1962, and negotiated with major traffickers in narcotics, who readily supplied him with information concerning opium-producing poppy fields and heroin reducing plants located near Culiacan. Echols, in reporting a conversation he had with one of the traffickers, told the committee:

> The trafficker stated that because of cold weather in the mountains, the opium harvest was several weeks late this year and would not reach the Culiacan market for about 3 weeks. He said that there was more opium growing this year than at any previous time in the past 20 years. We told him that

we had heard the Mexican Government was destroying the crops, but he assured us that this was not so.

This opium trafficker also deals in the purchasing of mesquite which he makes into charcoal and sells to an American firm in Nogales, Ariz. He stated that in purchasing this mesquite he had been in the Badiraguato Mountains, northeast of Culiacan, where most of the opium in that state is grown, and that he had personally seen large fields of it growing this year. He told us that there were at least six heroin-reducing plants in Sinaloa and that crude opium would be available in ton lots when it arrived in Culiacan, Mocorito, and Guamuchil, probably within the next 3 weeks.

We were also told of an underground refining plant some 30 kilometers from Culiacan with a capacity of about 15 pounds of high-grade heroin a day.

After referring to other conversations with traffickers, Echols said:

I would say the information we received from widely different sources who were unknown to each other should certainly be given a great deal of credence.

Another witness, Sheriff Peter Pitchess, of Los Angeles County, Calif., testified regarding Mexico as a source of narcotics:

Our investigators have informed me of having seen poppy fields in great abundance in Mexico.

We are in a position where we could even spot them, together with other investigating agencies. We have had them located on maps by aerial reconnaissance.

I am firmly convinced from my information, which I consider reliable, that there are in existence not one but many such poppy-producing fields in Mexico, and not entirely contiguous to the California border, but inland from the border.

I could cite evidence from other responsible Federal, State, and municipal officials concerning their knowledge of Mexico as a source for illicit narcotics; but I feel that the preceding is sufficient to substantiate the fact that Mexico is a primary source of narcotics.

We have also been informed by several witnesses appearing before the subcommittee that the marijuana which enters our country illegally originates almost exclusively in Mexico.

Shipments of Mexican marihuana in 200-, 300-, and 400-pound lots have been traced from our southwestern border as far east as Chicago and New York. Thus, Mexican marihuana is a nationwide problem, and is not localized in our southwestern border States.

Mr. President, I believe that I should also mention, as a concomitant of the problem of drug addiction, the alarming increase in the misuse of the dangerous drugs—the amphetamines and barbiturates. Here, again, we find that a prime source of these dangerous drugs is our southern neighbor, Mexico. But the traffic pattern in dangerous drugs is different from that in narcotics and marihuana, because the dangerous drugs are produced here in the United States, and then are shipped to Mexico, for illegal reentry into the United States. Testimony of responsible witnesses has documented the increasing number of shipments of dangerous drugs to border towns which only too often are transshipping points for drugs destined for the illicit market in the United States.

Information in the files of the subcommittee indicates that a shipment of some 3 million amphetamine tablets was made to a single drugstore in Tijuana in early 1962. Further reports from two west coast drug firms indicate shipments totaling 4 million units of dangerous drugs from the one and 2,750,000 units from the other to Mexico over a period of time. These shipments were suspended by the firms after learning that the drugstore owner, one Senor Santa Cruz, allowed indiscriminate sale of these drugs to Americans, who in turn smuggled them into the United States.

I do not say that all shipments of dangerous drugs from the United States to Mexico are destined for the illicit reentry into our country, but information from many sources indicates that these drugs are readily available in Mexico and are being smuggled back into the United States. During the fiscal year 1962, at three border points of entry in California and Arizona, U.S. customs agents of the 14th Customs Agency District made some 65 seizures totaling 26,839 units of dangerous drugs. In addition to that, some 24,000 pills and 610 persons were turned over to local police for prosecution. In considering these figures, we must remember that according to the estimates of enforcement officials, only 10 percent at best of such contraband is ever seized.

What then, are the results of this unending flow of narcotics, marihuana, and other dangerous drugs from Mexico into the United States? I can assure the Senate that they are disheartening, and oftimes are tragic.

It is estimated that there are as many as 20,000 narcotic addicts in California; and it has been attested to by responsible Federal and State officials, including the Federal Bureau of Narcotics supervisor in charge of the Los Angeles area, that 75 to 85 percent of the illicit heroin in southern California has its origin in Mexico.

In May 1962, at the subcommittee hearing, Sheriff Pitchess, of Los Angeles County, compared the population increase in his county with the increase in crime and specifically narcotic offenses. Narcotic offenses show startling increases in California. He said:

In the 12-year period, 1948–60, the population policed by the sheriff of Los Angeles County increased by 90 percent. Part I criminal offenses increased 207 percent.

However, narcotics cases increased from 458 to some 3,521.

Gentlemen, this is a 669-percent increase in narcotic cases in a 12-year period.

The 11-year period 1949–60 indicates adults arrested for narcotic law violations climbed from 663 to some 2,934 or an increase of 343 percent.

Juveniles arrested or investigated for the period 1949–60 reflect a startling increase. The first 5 years reflect an average of 76 juvenile narcotic offenders per year. The next 5-year average jumps to 213 per year.

When we reflect upon these figures in terms of lives ruined and money expended both by the addicts for drugs and by law-enforcement agencies in combatting drug abuse, they become more staggering and exasperating. We can reach no other conclusion than that the flow of narcotics into the United States must be stopped.

When we examine the figures relating to dangerous drug violations, we once again find an alarming pattern of increasing misuse among juveniles.

Capt. Walter C. Colwell, of the Los Angeles Police Department's narcotic division, cited the following dangerous drug statistics:

In 1961 complaints were obtained against 874 adults. In the current year, 1962, complaints are averaging 121 per month, an increase of 60 percent over the year 1961.

He went on to cite juvenile arrest statistics:

Juvenile arrests for possession and sale of dangerous drugs reflect the same rise as adult arrests. Juvenile arrests have risen from a total of 35 during 1957 to 426 during 1961. Until late in 1960 only 10 percent of juveniles arrested for violations of the broad field of narcotic enforcement were using dangerous drugs. In September 1960 a sharp increase was noted which in 1961 resulted in a 103-percent increase over 1960, and represented 63 percent of the total juvenile narcotic arrests.

Mr. President, such testimony is evidence of the seriousness of the increasing dangerous drug problem, especially among the youth of our Nation. And here I would like to repeat that such drugs, while produced in the United States and then shipped to Mexico legally, are being smuggled back into the United States for illegal consumption.

The tragic results of this dangerous situation were brought to my attention when, within the week of our hearings in Los Angeles, there was a brutal stabbing of a cab driver by two youths under the influence of drugs. In another tragic case a mother was fatally shot in the course of a struggle between her husband and drug-addicted son. The father had purchased the weapon to protect himself from his own son, who had developed a violent streak as the result of drug use.

Drug-induced crimes such as these cannot be tolerated; and if we are to meet with any success in our endeavor to eradicate addiction, the sources of illicit dangerous drugs must be stamped out.

I feel that the existence of the opium-producing poppy fields and the heroin reducing plants in Mexico has been established in testimony before the subcommittee, and that such activity has been going on for a number of years. It is further substantiated to my satisfaction that Mexico is a source for dangerous drugs illegally shipped into the United States.

Therefore, I question the attitude of both the Mexican and United States Governments with regard to suppressing this scandalous flow of narcotics, marihuana, and dangerous drugs into the United States. It has been going on for too many years to be explained away as a problem that is too difficult to settle or by saying that we must not offend the Mexican Government by taking a firm stand. It has been going on for 30 years, and will go on for 30 more if we do not act now.

The facts that complete cooperation of Mexican officials in suppressing the narcotics traffic is lacking goes virtually unquestioned. Witness after witness testifying before the subcommittee indicated that the efforts of U.S. narcotic enforcement officials have not been uniformly, enthusiastically supported by Mexican officials responsible for the suppression of this flow of narcotics. No real efforts have been made on the part of the Mexican Government to locate and destroy poppy fields. Half-hearted attempts have at times been made in cooperation with U.S. narcotic enforcement officials, but they have been only token attempts.

I do not make such statements lightly, without thorough reflection on the testimony which I have received as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. The pattern of testimony of witness after witness after witness is only too convincing.

I can best expose this lack of cooperation by including at this point a résumé of testimony by witnesses which shows there has been a yearly increase in poppy production since 1935. Customs agent Rae V. Vader told the subcommittee, regarding opium-producing poppy fields in Mexico:

> I would say in our work in Mexico, we work with Mexican officials. I have worked with them for 25 years. I have seen poppy fields in Mexico.
>
> I saw them as early as 1937. That is when I believe they began, in 1935 to 1937.
>
> I can recall two instances when officers of my organization went into Mexico with Mexican officials and we furnished the money and the equipment to destroy poppy plants in the field.

In commenting on the results of this endeavor, Vader said:

> They were destroyed. However, one field or two fields were destroyed where we knew they were, but we didn't know what was over the next mountain, and we didn't go; they didn't like us.

Aaron Quick, a California State senator, and a former U.S. customs agency officer, told of the situation 10 years later:

> Fifteen years ago Customs Service undertook to work with the Mexican officials and this was arranged with the top officials to destroy or discourage and discontinue the growing of opium poppy in Mexico. Lots of money was spent on this project. It worked for 3 or 4 years but the Mexican Government—I am not critical of the Mexican people; I have a lot of friends that are Mexican and I am very proud of them. They realize they have a problem. But their answer to me is, "You have the know-how, your Government, you have the money. We need your assistance in coping with this situation in Mexico."

Senator Quick further informed the subcommittee that the U.S. Government had offered money and equipment to the Mexican Government to aid in the eradication of the poppyfields, but that nothing concrete resulted and nothing was done.

In 1960, Commissioner of Narcotics Harry J. Anslinger testified before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, and submitted a statement which he gave before the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs in 1947. In it he said, in part:

> I have received information from the representative of the United States who accompanied the Mexican officials engaged in making an aerial survey in Mexico last spring that the cultivation of the opium poppy in Mexico covers a large area and is increasing year after year. It is estimated on the basis of observations and photographs of an area of about 1,000 square miles that the poppyfields now number close to 10,000, averaging one-half hectare (1¼ acres) or more per field. The total area is between 4,000 and 5,000 hectares (10,000 and 12,500 acres), producing from 32 to 40 metric tons of opium. The principal opium producing area is roughly 6,000 square miles in extent. It forms a rectangle east of Badiraguato, Sinaloa. It extends in a northwesterly direction with the eastern boundary on the western slopes of the Sierra Madre.
>
> The aerial survey I have mentioned was made northeast of Badiraguato. In this limited area of approximately 1,000 square miles, 1,500 to 1,700 fields were observed. Outside of the 1,000-square-mile main area an additional 3,000 fields were observed.
>
> For various reasons, notably the change in the administration, a misconception of the extent of the task, and the lack of manpower and finances, the 1947 opium poppy destruction campaign conducted by the Attorney General achieved poor results. Approximately 200 poppy fields were destroyed by a ground expedition.
>
> The cultivation of the opium poppy in Mexico, although prohibited by Mexican law, appears to be tolerated by the state and local authorities in the producing areas, with the possible exception of the State of Sonora.

In discussing the then current activities of his agents in Mexico, he told the subcommittee:

> I can tell you right now at this particular time there are about six narcotic and customs agents working on a certain case, and to show the vast areas, and the inaccessible areas when the time came to make the delivery, they were advised, and our men accepted the advice not to go into that territory, they would all be killed, so we couldn't make a case. That was just yesterday.

"Just yesterday," Mr. President, was January 21, 1960. "Just yesterday," neither the Mexican police, nor the U.S. authorities, nor anyone but the criminals who control the opium traffic in Mexico could touch these poppy fields.

In March of 1962, committee investigators were told "there was more opium being grown this year than at any previous time in the past 20 years."

These poppy fields must be sought out and eradicated. We can and we must initiate measures immediately to bring about this end. Our willingness to begin negotiations toward alleviation of this problem should be made known by no less an authority than the President of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce this joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexico Commission to investigate and recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the two countries.

Mr. President, I hope the joint resolution will receive favorable consideration by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Whereas Mexico is the primary source of supply for narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs brought into the southwestern part of the United States; and
>
> Whereas these narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs are subsequently distributed throughout the United States; and
>
> Whereas one hundred per centum of the marihuana seized by the enforcement officials in the southwestern part of the United States comes from Mexico; and
>
> Whereas the smuggling of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs into the United States poses the largest single problem for the collectors of the customs and for the Federal courts in the southwestern part of the United States; and
>
> Whereas the use of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs by juveniles has greatly increased due to the easy accessibility of such drugs from Mexico: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is requested to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between said countries.

Mr. **KEATING.** Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Connecticut in offering this joint resolution. Both Senator Dodd and I have heard testimony given before the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee on this problem. We learned last May, for example, that 75 percent of the heroin sold in California—the State with the second highest addict population in the country—and 100 percent of the brick marihuana comes from Mexico. There has also been an accelerated influx of amphetamines and barbiturates, the so-called dangerous drugs, from Mexico. The attorney general of California testified that most of the marihuana is grown on the west coast of the Mexican mainland. Opium poppies are also grown on the mainland and heroin processing plants are located in many areas there.

In addition to the hazard presented by the drugs which originate in Mexico, Henry L. Giordano, the Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, informed me last week of a new aspect of the problem. "The Cuban drug traffickers," he said, "are taking advantage of Mexico in their effort. Apparently the freedom of movement between Havana and Mexico City assists them in this traffic." He asserted that Castro's cocaine pushers were using Mexico to funnel this poison into the United States.

The Mexican Government has indicated its desire to cooperate with law enforcement agencies in this country to stamp out the sources of narcotics below the border, and to assist in curbing illegal smuggling activities. A joint effort could go a long way toward establishing effective controls on this common problem. We therefore urge the President to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico in order that a joint United States-Mexican Commission can be established to study this situation. Addiction has become a national health and law enforcement problem which can be alleviated to some extent by this kind of international cooperation. If we are ever to wipe out this menace we must be willing to treat the individual, to enforce vigorously State and Federal laws, and to cooperate with other nations. Unless we attack on all three levels, we are not even trying.

RESOLUTION TO INVITE 1968 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES TO LAKE PLACID

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympics Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States at Lake Placid, N.Y.

This joint resolution is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and, very fortunately, also by the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has taken a great interest in this matter and has been one of the most eloquent advocates of increased U.S. interest in Olympic sports.

This resolution is similar to one passed by the Congress in 1959, inviting the International Olympics Committee to hold the regular Olympic games in Detroit.

Last fall the American Olympics Committee selected Lake Placid as the single U.S. contender for the winter gamesite for 1968. In other words, there is no other U.S. site that is competing for the winter games. The only question to be settled now is whether the games will be held in the United States—which means at Lake Placid—or in some other country.

All Americans would be pleased and honored if the winter Olympics, held with such success in Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960 could again be held in the United States. There are few places in the world with the fine winter facilities and excellent skiing offered by Lake Placid, one of the oldest and best-loved ski resorts of the East.

The committee of local officials which has been formed at Lake Placid to work on this project has done a most impressive job and deserves the support of the country. Nothing could be more in tune with the rising emphasis on physical fitness and the national interest in international athletic competition than prompt congressional action expressing the support and backing of the Congress of the United States for the Lake Placid site. The final presentation to the International Committee is due April 15.

Finally, let me point out, Mr. President, that Lake Placid is located in a region of considerable unemployment. If it should be chosen as the international winter Olympic site, the resulting development would provide new jobs, new opportunities throughout the area—in the long run, it would also encourage the overall economic growth of the State and the Nation and bring foreign tourists and currencies into the United States.

Mr. President, I am very happy to introduce, for myself, for my colleague [Fr. JAVITS], and for the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has been one of the most eloquent advocates of increased U.S. interest in Olympic sports, this joint resolution and to ask that it be appropriately referred for favorable Senate action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 67) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a Senate concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 1,500 additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the 1963 Economic Report of the President.

As the Senate is aware, there is widespread interest in the publications of the Joint Economic Committee among Members of the Congress, business, labor, and especially the universities. It is the practice of the committee to supply single copies of its hearings on request. This year the hearings were printed in two parts but because of the size of part 1 the committee received only 1,800 copies. This supply has now become exhausted and we still have about 1,200 individual requests which we are unable to fill. We continue to receive additional orders each day. Most of these are from professors and college libraries. Our committee tries to provide copies of its publications for the reference shelves of university libraries and is requesting this additional supply of the hearings to meet this need.

The resolution authorizing the printing of 1,500 additional copies will, we hope, take care of all or most of the requests. We are not asking for an excessive number, just enough copies to take care of the current and anticipated requests.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee fifteen hundred additional copies of part 1 of its hearings on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, current Congress.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] be added as a cosponsor to S. 626, to increase the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban projects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be added as a cosponsor of S. 702, relating to domestically produced fishery products, on the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor of my bill, S. 1100, to prohibit the importation into the United States of flat-glass products manufactured in Communist countries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] added at its next printing as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 116, relating to the Select Committee on Consumers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CURB OF MONOPOLISTIC CONTROL OF PROFESSIONAL BOXING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, introduced by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and that certain remarks of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] on the subject of professional boxing, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Senator ENGLE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE

In the death of former featherweight champion Davey Moore, the Nation and the world have witnessed a requiem for a boxer. It may be that we are also witnessing the requiem for boxing itself.

This fighter's death is another piece of evidence in the growing case against professional boxing.

The sport is on trial. The charge is legalized manslaughter and corruption. And the odds-on favorite, I would say, is the prosecution. Unless something is done in a hurry, chances for acquittal are slight.

We are faced with two alternatives.

We can allow the evidence to mount. We can remain in our ringside seats or in our armchairs before our television sets—but always a safe distance from the mayhem—and watch tragedy follow on the heels of tragedy.

Then, one day there will be no boxing. The sensibilities and sensitivities of too many will have been violated. Professional boxing will take the full 10. It will be knocked out of contention once and for all.

Or we can reform boxing.

The Congress of the United States can step into the ring and provide the machinery and the statutory authority to clean up this sport—while people still call it a sport.

Some may ask, Is Federal regulation necessary?

Yes, it is necessary. The States cannot handle this sport properly. I do not want to leave the impression that the States and their boxing commissions have not tried to clean up boxing. They have made valiant attempts to do so. But their efforts have usually terminated in a dead end.

They can get nowhere in these efforts because they are stymied by the interstate aspects of the business. Subpena powers of local commissioners stop at State borders. A boxer not permitted to fight in one city can pull up stakes and go into another city in another State. And television beams across State lines. The television cameras alone make boxing an interstate business and as such it should be subject to Federal regulation.

Where do we start?

First, I think we must ask ourselves whether or not boxing is worth cleaning up. Perhaps it would be better for all concerned—for fan and fighter—to outlaw boxing. Some important and influential people hold this belief. The pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, for one; the Governor of my State, for another.

I am of another opinion. I share their distaste for needless death and sadistic beatings and crime and corruption which have—unfortunately but undeniably—accompanied the sport in recent years. But it need not have been this way. And, certainly, there is still time to correct the situation.

While Davey Moore lay dying in a California hospital, I was beset by the frequent thought that this image does reflect the state of boxing today: A picture of violence and crimson and resin sprinkled on a rope-framed canvas, while thugs stand on the sidelines, always one step ahead of the law.

This picture can be changed. It is our job to change it. I have heard no one in this body call for the abolition of boxing. I can only conclude that we agree that boxing is worth keeping, that it is worth saving. We have no choice, therefore, but to get the reform machinery moving.

It is all there in the National Boxing Commissioner Act. I first sponsored this bill, with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, 2 years ago. Benny Paret was still alive then. Davey Moore was, too. I am tempted to be Monday morning's quarterback and ask: Would these men have been spared if the act had been passed and put into effect?

Would these men have died if there had been a national boxing commissioner—a czar who would set up nationwide health standards and mandatory, modern, and thorough checkups and enforce them vigorously?

This is not idle speculation. It may be speculation—but it is not idle. A man may die in the ring tonight because he went in with undetected brain injuries, suffered in a previous match. Is it idle to wonder how many fighters will die because no action was taken to raise boxing's health standards?

A man may throw a fight tonight because regulation of boxing, the policing and enforcing processes of the States, cannot cope with nationwide syndicates. Is it idle speculation to wonder how much bribery takes place, how many fights are fixed?

It is necessary, I strongly believe, that a Federal law regulating boxing be enacted. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I do not want to see boxing die. But at present its course is clearly headed for destruction. Without the National Boxing Commissioner Act, boxing will be outlawed in this country.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 19, 1963:

S. 1121. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (P.L. 87–658): Mr. Cannon, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of March 21, 1963:

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes: Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Bible.

S. 1163. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. 1170. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes: Mr. Engle, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Long of Missouri.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 63 AND S. 1057 RELATING TO REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 9, 10, and 11, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 63, a bill to provide for representation of indigent defendants, and S. 1057, a bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address by the President of the United States delivered at a civic luncheon in Chicago, Ill., on March 23, 1963.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

Address entitled "Our Naval Shipyards in Times of Challenge," delivered by Senator McIntire before the East Coast District of Metal Trades Council, at Washington, D.C., on March 11, 1963.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address by Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota, accepting, on behalf of Arrow, Inc., paintings presented by Abbott Laboratories depicting the practice of medicine by American Indians, in Washington, D.C., on March 6, 1963.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address entitled "Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government," delivered recently over the Manion Radio Forum, of South Bend, Ind.

Article entitled "Minority Rights Ad Absurdum," written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1963, dealing with the U.S. Supreme Court ruling regarding a noncompulsory New York school prayer; also a statement prepared by himself on the same subject.

FARM EXPORTS AND THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor of March 26, there appears an article entitled "U.S. Trigger? Farm Exports and EEC." In the article it is stated that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] "warns that a shutout of American farm products from the countries of the European Economic Community could, and probably would, trigger a depression here."

Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is not only an expert in the field of farm economics, but also is an expert in the field of foreign policy; and when he makes statements I believe they should be studied carefully.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Josephine Ripley, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Trigger?—Farm Exports and EEC

(By Josephine Ripley)

Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, warns that a shutout of American farm products from the countries of the European Economic Community (EEC or Common Market) could, and probably would, trigger a depression here.

Agriculture ministers of the six Common Market countries are now meeting in Brussels to discuss a common level for agricultural prices within the market.

If the level is a high one, as anticipated, it will mean a high protective tariff, possibly high enough to curtail if not exclude American imports.

American farmers now sell more than a billion dollars' worth of their produce a year to Europe. Largest exports are wheat and poultry.

POULTRY IMPORT DUTIES JACKED UP

Poultry raisers are already in trouble. The import duty and other levies on chickens have already been jacked up to the point where poultry exports have slumped sharply.

It could be really serious if the same thing happened to wheat, Senator AIKEN told the Christian Science Monitor.

He feels that President de Gaulle's purpose in blackballing Great Britain for the Common Market was to keep France in a position to control the agricultural, as well as the petroleum market.

As far as this country is concerned, wheat is the farm product most dependent on exports. More than 700 million bushels of wheat were exported last year, compared to only about 100 million bushels in exports 10 years or more ago.

"Consider the crushing effect if all this wheat were suddenly excluded from Europe and came pouring into the domestic market," said the Senator.

"Prices would come crashing down. The Government would be forced to spend billions in price support, and would have to crack down with compulsory controls on production."

NATIONWIDE IMPACT SEEN

The whole country would feel the impact—in a farm-led depression, in his opinion. There is no question but what "our people would be hard hit" by loss of farm export markets, he said.

He does not say this is going to happen. In the first place, it is not going to be easy for the Common Market countries to come to agreement on so controversial an issue.

Also, the United States is not going to stand by while its export markets are taken away.

It has the power of "retaliatory action," although authorities prefer the milder term, "compensatory withdrawals."

In other words, what the Common Market does "we can do, too." If the Common Market adopts policies which shut out American farm products, this country can refuse to cooperate on industrial tariffs important to Common Market trade.

Under international trade agreements, the United States can appeal what it feels to be unfair trade restrictions. That is, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Or, the President now has broad authority under the authority given him in last year's trade bill to strike tough tariff bargains, if he sees fit.

CASE PENDING ON FROZEN CHICKEN

The United States has already registered a protest in the case of poultry, contending import restrictions are inconsistent with GATT obligations.

This is considered a prime "test case" and is still pending.

American frozen poultry exports to Western Europe had been built up over the past 4 years to a $50 million business. U.S. production methods were so efficient and economical that American chicken was at one time underselling the local product in West Germany.

Import duties in 1962 were jumped from 4½ cents a pound to 12½ cents. The levy in West Germany rose from 4.8 cents to 13 cents a pound.

The result has been a slump in American poultry exports to $12,600,000 in the 4-month period ending November 30, as compared with $20,300,000 in the same period in 1961.

WHEAT SUPPORT PRICE DEBATED

With respect to wheat, Common Market countries face this problem: Where to peg the Common Market price.

France now has a price-support level of about $2.30 a bushel (as against the $1.82 price support in the United States). West Germany supports wheat at $3.15 a bushel.

The expectation is that President de Gaulle will push for the higher West German price support to make France "Europe's granary."

France grows more than three times as much wheat as West Germany. This production would be still further stimulated by the higher price, Senator AIKEN says.

Under these conditions, with France stepping up its production and American wheat shut out by Common Market tariff bars, the French could "virtually wipe out our business," as the Senator put it.

But this has not yet happened and such a catastrophe may be avoided, but it is at present a very threatening cloud on the international horizon.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN INSPECTIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, according to reports from Geneva, the Soviet delegate, Ambassador Semyon K. Tsarapkin, has renewed his accusation that it was the United States, not the Soviet Union, which originally offered to settle for three inspections a year. The Soviet delegate states flatly that former Delegate Arthur Dean and President Kennedy's science and technology adviser, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, told him that three inspections a year would be acceptable to the United States.

If this is true and if the Soviet delegate is not misquoting our people, then I say they have placed us in an untenable position on the matter of the nuclear test-ban inspections we shall undertake each year.

Some 4 years ago the Soviets offered this three-a-year inspection gambit. At that time it was rejected as absolutely unacceptable to the United States. Despite the claims of advances in the art of detection—so far unproved—the bald fact remains that we must have constant or near-constant on-the-spot inspections if we are to protect our national security.

If what the Soviet delegate says is true, our delegates have made a dangerous and potentially disastrous retreat.

I submit that we should not be disarming the United States; and I would suggest that before we pull any missiles out of Turkey and Italy, we lay down as a condition thereto that the Russian Communists leave Cuba completely.

DISTRIBUTION OF RAILROAD CARS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, several days ago, I joined with the senior Senator from Washington and other Senators in the introduction of Senate bill 1063, which seeks equity in the distribution of the available supply of railroad cars throughout the United States. As was pointed out at the time of the introduction of the bill, the distribution of the supply of railroad cars becomes more serious each year, because the total car supply dwindles from year to year.

The situation in my State of Nebraska continues to be very acute. Orders for the shipment of grain far exceed the supply of cars which can be spotted at loading points throughout my State. I recognize that in these acute situations, it is not possible to afford immediate and complete relief. Also, I compliment those in our railroad industry who, I am sure, are making diligent effort to give equitable treatment to the problem throughout the Middle West.

However, the situation is one which cannot improve until the Congress authorizes a more realistic solution to the existing problem. In the face of a dwindling car supply, we cannot permit railroads which are unwilling to build an adequate supply of cars to practice a type of expropriation which, while currently legal, is also completely lacking in morality. A reasonable per diem rate is merited, so that roads which are willing to meet their needs can have their rolling stock when needed. So that we can avoid a repetition of this acute situation, which seems to recur each year with an increasing tempo, I urge the enactment at the earliest feasible time of Senate bill 1063, to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply.

I ask unanimous consent that I may include a telegram addressed to all Interstate Commerce Commissioners by Mr. H. C. Murphy, president, Burlington Lines, 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Burlington's shortage of boxcars for grain loading is worst in history. This morning we had cumulative orders for 12,620 cars for such loading with only 833 available, and cumulative daily system shortage has exceeded 10,000 cars for several weeks.
>
> Many shippers in Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas are complaining bitterly with sound justification, but we are helpless because we have on line less than 65 percent of our equivalent plain box ownership. Stated otherwise, if all Burlington-owned boxcars were available for our use, we would have at least 7,000 more such cars. Contrast this with conditions on some eastern roads. Three eastern roads alone on February 15 had on their lines over 28,000 more boxcars than they own. In our view, this maldistribution of boxcars at expense of Burlington and its shippers is confiscatory, intolerable, and cannot be justified. If but three eastern lines were ordered to deliver daily to us only 3 percent of boxcars in excess of their ownership, we would receive at least 850 cars daily. Burlington could load 1,800 cars of grain daily contrasted with recently daily loadings of about 600 cars.
>
> Urgently request immediate entry of ICC orders directing such deliveries to us until our equivalent ownership on line reaches 90 percent or until their equivalent ownership on line is reduced to 100 percent.
>
> In addition, and until conditions improve, request ICC order directing that all Burlington-owned boxcars be withheld from distribution east of Mississippi River and returned empty to us at nearest junctions and that existing AAR boxcar orders be continued in effect.
>
> Drastic action required in part because our total boxcar loads offline currently exceeds loads received from connections and empty received under AAR orders do not begin to offset this attrition.
>
> Please advise action taken.

GRAIN SURPLUS AND SMOG

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a few days ago, I introduced into the RECORD a news story concerning research about which it is contended that an alcohol blend in our motor fuels could reduce substantially the matters released by exhaust fumes which create smog in many of the metropolitan areas throughout the country.

On March 19, 1963, there appeared in the Omaha World Herald an editorial, applauding this research, and expressing the hope that this news might be the forerunner of efforts to control smog. I am pleased to request that this editorial from the Omaha World Herald be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN SURPLUS AND SMOG

That was a mighty hopeful bit of news which Bob Considine reported from the Southwest Research Institute at San Antonio, Tex. Mr. Considine said the early results of experimentation show that a blend of alcohol in the fuel of automobiles can reduce smog by as much as 50 percent.

Moreover, said Mr. Considine, the Southwest researchers have come up with a new concept in motors which would increase compression and efficiency by 50 percent by the use of an alcohol-gasoline blend.

The research project is subsidized by the Nebraska Department of Agriculture under its program to find industrial uses for farm crops. It was proposed by J. Leroy Welsh, of Omaha, who headed President Eisenhower's Commission which studied industrial uses.

The superior qualities of alcohol as a motor fuel have long been recognized. It is used extensively in racing cars. Its cost has prevented more extensive use.

If an alcohol mix can decrease smog, which is becoming an increasingly serious health problem, and if motors can be developed to burn it more efficiently, the search for ways to cope with economic barriers is going to be stimulated considerably. Considerable promise along that line is offered by the prospect of developing supplementary industrial uses of the residue of grain after its starch has been removed to manufacture alcohol.

A blend of 25 percent alcohol—which the Southwest researchers have been testing—in the fluid which flows from America's gasoline pumps every day would solve the Nation's grain surplus in a hurry.

THE CLOTURE RULE AND DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that General Orders 1, 2, 3, and 4—Senate Resolutions 9, 10, 80, and 81—on the Calendar of Business of Thursday, March 28, on page 7, be taken off the "General orders," under rule VIII, and be placed on page 13, under "Subjects on the table."

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STUDY BY SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Public Law 87-196 authorizes and directs the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations.

The study was intended to be a comprehensive one. For this reason Congress authorized the SEC to select a special staff of 65 members and appropriated nearly $1 million to support this staff during its 18-month intensive study of the securities industry.

I have been advised that the SEC will submit the first installment of its two-phase report to Congress on April 3 of this year. The full report, I understand will deal with topics such as qualifications, training, and supervision of salesmen, requirements for entry into the securities business, reporting requirements for companies with over-the-counter securities, selling practices of broker-dealers and investment companies, the role of specialists, floor traders, and odd lot dealers on the exchanges, investment advisers, and margin requirements.

The report will, of necessity, be a long one. Its subject matter will be extremely delicate. Some of its recommendations may well be controversial.

Although I have not read the report, I have been very impressed by the judicious manner in which the study has been conducted. Fortunately for the investing public, the Securities and Exchange Commission appears to have been more concerned with the search for meaningful information than with sensational headlines in the press.

I am taking this opportunity to urge the securities industry, the press, investors, and the general public to accept the forthcoming report in an equally responsible and mature manner. I hope that all interested parties will read the report carefully and consider it thoroughly before criticizing, condemning, or lauding it, in whole or in part. The temptation to rush to press with a dramatic or colorful catchphrase or headlines should be avoided. Shooting from the hip is no substitute for careful analysis.

The argument for a responsible and mature approach to the Commission's findings carries special weight when one considers the volatility of the stock market. It would be indeed unfortunate if hasty, ill-conceived comments should cause a substantial drop in the market. This is the time for calmness and deliberation.

I expect the report to be one of the most important and informative industry studies of many years. Certainly in the securities field, there has been nothing remotely resembling it in breadth and comprehensiveness since the early 1930's.

I anticipate that the report will provide a great deal of new information about the securities business, information which may give us many new insights into the entire financial structure of the United States. The securities business, like every other, must be judged by its results. How well does it serve as a channel for funds from investors of one sort or another to industrial and commercial organizations needing capital in order to participate in the growth and development of the country?

We all recognize that our domestic happiness and our security in the free world both depend upon the continued growth and development of American commerce and industry.

As chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I intend to make a broad study and to hold hearings inquiring into the role of the securities industry as a financial intermediary with particular emphasis upon its relationship to our economic growth and development. The public interest requires not only the protection of our Nation's investors but also the encouragement of investment in our Nation.

Such a study, carefully and responsibly made, might, I think, make it possible for us to view the securities business in the proper setting, and to see if anything is needed to enable it to perform its vital role even more effectively.

I should like to conclude by reemphasizing my concern and my hope that the forthcoming report of the SEC will be received and considered by all concerned—by the industry, by the press, by investors, and by the general public—in a mature and sober manner, with careful reflection and thorough analysis.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, on Monday next it is intended to take up the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Consideration of that bill will be followed by consideration of the nominations of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

It is hoped that action on those nominations will be followed by consideration of the bill relating to youth employment opportunities.

Obviously this schedule will require the Members' attendance and participation. Senators should be on notice that we anticipate a full and heavy workload next week, and should make their plans accordingly.

As of the present moment, Senators need not anticipate an Easter recess because the Senate has some business to transact, and it is behind in its work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When I queried the majority leader previously about an Easter recess, he was of the opinion that such a recess might start on the evening of Good Friday and continue until Monday next after Easter, which falls on April 14. At that time I asked whether there was any hope, comfort, or expectation. He very politely but firmly suggested that there was no hope, no comfort, and no expectation.

I wonder whether, in the intervening days, some grace, sweetness, and charity has come to our distinguished majority leader, and whether he could assure Senators that there might be an additional day or two added to the Easter recess, particularly since another body will start an Easter recess on April 11, and by 3-day stages continue it until April 22.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is hard to withstand the eloquent plea of the distinguished minority leader, with whom it is a pleasure to work. But, unfortunately, I can give no succor, no hope, and no comfort at the present time. The Senate has really done nothing in the way of lawmaking this year. It has been in session since January 9. It has wasted a great deal of time. The selection of our committees was late. We must attend to the business of the Nation. The Easter season is a good time to show that we are men of good will, good hope, and, we trust, good business sense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I assume, then, that it is the fervent hope of the majority leader that there may be one or two Easter eggs in the administration basket before that great day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Easter eggs will be acceptable; others will not.

SHE WAS A GOOD SHIP AND MEN WILL MISS HER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the great and good ship *Bear* sank on the night of March 19, 260 miles east of Boston and 90 miles south of Cape Sable, Nova Scotia.

Her loss will sadden all Alaskans who remember her 40 years of service in Alaskan waters as the Coast Guard cutter *Bear*. She was America's first icebreaker and her record was a long and proud one.

The *Bear* was launched 88 years ago in 1875 at Greenock, Scotland.

For the first 8 years of her life the *Bear* was operated out of St. Johns, Newfoundland, making annual trips to the sealing grounds of the North Atlantic.

The U.S. Government purchased the ship in 1883 to assist in the rescue of an expedition trapped on Ellesmere Island—the northernmost part of Canada which stretches farther into the Artic Ocean than even Greenland.

This was but the first of many rescues, the first of many lives saved in the *Bear's* long history.

The *Bear* was sent first to Alaskan waters by the U.S. Revenue Marine, the precursor of the Coast Guard. As the original ice cutter, the *Bear* patrolled the Bering Sea and carried everything from mail to missionaries to the far northern communities of Alaska. Many of our State's first settlers were dependent upon the *Bear* for transportation and supplies.

In 1898, the year of the Yukon gold rush, the *Bear* rescued 500 whalers icebound in their boats off Point Barrow.

Retired after 40 years in Alaska waters, the *Bear* was given to the city of Oakland as a marine museum.

Admiral Byrd, on his expedition to Antarctica in 1933 especially asked for the *Bear* to go with him. The ship was as valuable in south polar waters as she was in the north.

Called back on duty in World War II, the *Bear* patrolled the North Atlantic. She was sold at the end of the war to a Nova Scotia shipping company, for which she sailed until this year.

The last men to sail her were Percy Coffin and Henry Dingle, of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

The *Bear* was a barkentine. The dictionary tells me a barkentine is "a three-masted vessel having the foremast square rigged and the others fore-and-aft rigged."

There cannot be many of them left.

She was a good ship and men will miss her.

I ask unanimous consent that an article recording the sinking of the *Bear*, from the Associated Press wire of March 20, may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, Mar. 20, 1963]

SEA CLAIMS "BEAR" ON FINAL TRIP IN ATLANTIC—FAMOUS PATROL SHIP GOES DOWN IN STORMY SEAS WHILE BEING TOWED TO PHILADELPHIA TO BECOME RESTAURANT

NEW YORK, March 20.—The stalwart old sailing ship *Bear*, veteran of Adm. Richard E. Byrd's Antarctic explorations and a rescuer of hundreds of whaling men off Alaska, sank last night in stormy seas she so long defied.

The three-master went down 260 miles east of Boston while under tow from Halifax, Nova Scotia, to Philadelphia to become a combined restaurant and commercial museum.

Two men aboard the 198-foot vessel made it safely in a liferaft to the towboat, the *Irving Birch*.

The Coast Guard said the tug reported that the *Bear*, a barkentine, sank after her foremast broke off. A barkentine is square rigged on the foremast with fore-and-aft rigging on her other masts.

SEAL FISHER

The *Bear* was built in 1874 in Greenock, Scotland, as a seal fishing vessel. The U.S. Government bought her in 1884 and assigned her to the Revenue Cutter Service, later the Coast Guard.

For 40 years, she sailed out of Oakland, Calif., making 45 voyages to the Arctic.

Her most notable feat came during the winter of 1897–98. An early freeze trapped whaling men off the Yukon and left them in danger of starvation.

The *Bear*, with a wooden hull so tough she could serve as an icebreaker, approached as near as possible to the men. Then her crew, using dogsleds and driving reindeer, reached the trapped whalers.

On her stormy last voyage, it became apparent that age had taken its toll and that her days were numbered. A Coast Guard aircraft dropped a rubber liferaft to the *Birch*, which floated it over to the barkentine to enable the two men aboard to paddle to safety.

The Coast Guard said the *Irving Birch* was not able to get a lifeboat to the *Bear*. A Coast Guard spokesman said wind-whipped Atlantic waves would have made it quite treacherous to jump over the side of the sailing ship into the wooden lifeboat, which could have broken up against the side of the larger vessel.

Her square-rigged foremast trailing over the side, listing to starboard and down at the bow, the *Bear* had struggled through the night.

TOOK WORST

Showing the same sturdiness that won the admiration of Adm. Richard E. Byrd 30 years ago, the 90-year-old *Bear* took the worst the raging Atlantic could give.

Tug Capt. W. C. Chisholm had reported at one point seas had moderated during the night, but because of darkness and distance he could not tell how the gallant old ship was making out.

The saga of the *Bear*'s latest battle began yesterday morning when she broke loose from a towline to the *Birch*. She was on her way to Philadelphia, to be preserved as a historic relic.

The 198-foot *Bear* was built to crunch through thick ice floes on the North Atlantic sailing grounds. She was purchased by the United States after 11 years of sailing out of St. Johns, Newfoundland.

Her first mission took her to Ellesmere Island in the Arctic on a rescue expedition. Then she shifted to Alaskan waters.

In the winter of 1897–98, the *Bear* stirred the imagination of all seafarers by rescuing some 500 whaling men trapped in the ice floe off Point Barrow.

The Bering Sea patrol occupied her for some 40 years and then came retirement in 1929. She was taken to Oakland, Calif., where she became part of a marine museum.

Byrd found her there and put her back in service for his 1933 expedition to the Arctic.

In World War II she was sent to Europe for patrol.

Next followed fur-sealing for a few years. Her new owners, Alfred M. Johnston of Villanova, Pa., found her on a Nova Scotia beach.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have gathered some articles from the newspapers and some information from the Coast Guard detailing the record of the *Bear*. I ask unanimous consent that articles from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, the Boston Globe, and the Baltimore Evening Sun, as well as a press release issued by the Coast Guard be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner]

RATHER SHE SANK THAN BE MUSEUM

SEATTLE, March 20.—A retired rear admiral who served aboard the aged barkentine *Bear*, which sank last night in the stormy Atlantic off Boston, says he would rather she sank than be turned into a museum-restaurant.

"I'd rather have her sink than do the job she was going to do. It's far beneath her," said Rear Adm. F. A. Zeusler, of Seattle, a retired Coast Guard officer, who served on the *Bear* in 1914–16.

That was while the venerable vessel belonged to the Coast Guard and was patrolling the Bering Sea.

"She was coated with iron," Zeusler recalled, "and would withstand just about anything we put her to."

The wooden ship was used as an icebreaker, and Zeusler said, "We had to maneuver from the crow's nest while working through the ice. The snap from the impact was terrific up there.

"We'd be on patrol from April to November. We always were the first ship into Nome each spring. We'd check the ice layout and pass the information along to other ships anxious to get into the harbor."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Mar. 19, 1963]

POLAR VETERAN: FAMED CUTTER "BEAR" SINKING, TWO ABOARD

The former Coast Guard cutter *Bear*, which took part in many polar expeditions with Adm. Richard E. Byrd is sinking today with two men aboard, 90 miles south of Nova Scotia below Cape Sable.

The local Coast Guard, including aircraft from Salem and the cutter *Barataria* from Portland, Maine, is standing by, and said there is no danger of loss of life.

The men aboard the *Bear* were Percy Coffin and Henry Dingle of Darthmouth, Nova Scotia.

The *Bear* was sold in the 1940's to a Nova Scotia sealing firm and several weeks ago was beached at Dartmouth, Novia Scotia, across the bay from Hailfax.

The tug *Irving Birch* was towing the famed three-masted vessel to New York when it began to sink this morning. The 198-foot ship was launched 88 years ago in Greenock, Scotland.

The ship was being towed from Halifax to Philadelphia where it was to be converted into a floating restaurant and museum.

The Royal Canadian Air Force and the U.S. Coast Guard said the old vessel, the United States first icebreaker, was taking water. It was listing heavily to starboard, its foremast was broken, and its towrope parted.

Operating out of St. John's, Newfoundland, the *Bear* made 11 annual trips to the icy sealing grounds of the North Atlantic.

The United States bought the vessel for $100,000 in 1883, to be used on a mission on Ellesmere Island to rescue an expedition.

The U.S. Revenue Marine, a forerunner of the Coast Guard, later sent the *Bear* to Alaskan waters where she became a legend, delivering mail, supplies, missionaries, and teachers to the northern outposts.

The *Bear* made many heroic rescues in Alaska.

Veteran mariners have described the *Bear* as one of the oldest, toughest and most colorful ships ever to sail under the American flag. One of the ship's most memorable exploits was the rescue of 500 whalers who were trapped in their ships by ice off Point Barrow, Alaska, in 1898—the year of the Yukon gold rush.

After 40 years on the Bering Sea patrol the *Bear* was decommissioned and given to the city of Oakland, Calif., as a marine museum.

But Admiral Byrd discovered the *Bear* and took it on his 1933 Antarctic expedition.

After Admiral Byrd's expedition, the *Bear* was again retired. When World War II began all able ships were called to duty and the *Bear* patrolled the Atlantic.

Once she towed a captured German supply ship into Boston.

Later the *Bear* was sold to the Shaw Steamship Ltd. of Halifax and only several weeks ago she was put on the beach at Dartmouth—her sailing days apparently over.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Mar. 20, 1963]

SHIP OF HEROIC POLAR EXPLOITS SINKS AT SEA

BOSTON, March 20.—The barkentine *Bear*, a vessel famed for heroic exploits at the North and South Poles, went down last night in stormy seas 260 miles east of Boston and 90 miles south of Cape Sable, Nova Scotia.

The Coast Guard received word of the craft's death plunge from the tug *Irving Birch* which had been towing the vessel from Halifax to New York. The towline parted yesterday.

The *Birch* did not report whether the craft had broken up or had settled slowly at 8:15 p.m. beneath the waves that reached 12-foot swells.

TWO ABOARD ARE RESCUED

The two men aboard the *Bear* were taken off yesterday.

A Coast Guard aircraft dropped a rubber liferaft to the *Irving Birch*, which floated it over to the barkentine *Bear* to enable its two crewmen to paddle to safety.

The tug radioed the Coast Guard that the ship sank after its foremast broke off. The other mast had been in poor shape.

The *Bear* formerly was a Coast Guard ship, and did iceberg patrol duty for many years.

The Coast Guard said the *Irving Birch* did not send its own lifeboat to the *Bear* because wind-whipped waves would have made it quite treacherous to jump over the side of the sailing ship into a wooden lifeboat, which could have broken up against the side of the larger vessel.

STRUGGLES THROUGH NIGHT

Listing to starboard and down at the bow, and with her square-rigged foremast trailing over the side, the *Bear* had struggled through the night.

Showing the same sturdiness that won the admiration of Adm. Richard E. Byrd 30 years ago, the 90-year-old *Bear* took the worst the raging Atlantic could give.

A REQUIEM FOR THE "BEAR"

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 22.—The famous old Coast Guard cutter *Bear*, veteran of nearly 90 years' service in the far north and participant in some of the most thrilling sea rescues of our time, has come to the end of her last voyage in the turbulent waters of the North Atlantic. On Tuesday, March 19, 1963, the gallant old ship went down off the coast of Nova Scotia under the vicious assault of an Atlantic storm. Time and elements have finally done what northern ice and snow failed to do.

If the *Bear* could have chosen her final resting place, it would probably have been the North Atlantic where she had sailed so often. It was here that she came in 1874, shortly after her launching in 1873 at the old Scottish shipyard of Dundee & Son. She spent the first 10 years of her life getting her sea legs with a sealing fleet operating off Newfoundland.

Worldwide fame came to the *Bear* in the early 1880's shortly after the historic Greely expedition to the Arctic came to a disastrous end. The expedition, under the command of the then Lt. Adolphus Washington Greely, was one of two groups dispatched to the Arctic to set up a series of observation stations. Despite elaborately made plans, a series of misfortunes left Greely and his party stranded in the pitiless arctic winter without adequate food and clothing.

To assist the Greely party, the United States organized a rescue fleet of three ships, consisting of the *Bear*, *Thetis*, and *Alert*. On June 22, 1884, less than 2 months after her departure, the *Bear* sighted the pitiful remnants of the expedition. For months they had been surviving on rock moss, leather sledding equipment, and whatever small game they could find. Many of the group had either died or gone mad from privation. Those who had survived resembled skeletons. The surgeon accompanying the expedition had committed suicide.

For a while it looked as though the *Bear's* career was over. Not long after her return from the Greely rescue, she was declared unfit for further service by the Navy. Then in 1885, she was transferred to the Treasury Department for use in Alaskan waters and the Arctic Ocean. That was the beginning of a 41-year career on the Alaskan patrol which has yet to be surpassed.

Her first skipper on patrol, was colorful "Hell Roarin'" Mike Healy, a dynamo of a man with an unpredictable temper. But Healy was a good skipper, and he commanded the *Bear* for more than 9 years, longer than any other. In time, Healy and his ship became legend in the lusty, brawling territory of Alaska.

The *Bear's* duties on the Alaskan patrol were many. She carried mail which had accumulated at Seattle during the winter, as well as Government agents and supplies. On her trip south from Alaska, she transported Federal prisoners and other questionable characters whose presence in Alaska was undesirable.

The deck of the *Bear* often served as a court where justice was dispensed swiftly but fairly. The *Bear* also conducted investigations, undertook crime prevention and law enforcement. She and other cutters like her were often the only law in that turbulent part of the world. The *Bear* also conducted soundings to improve charts of Alaskan waters, and her surgeon furnished medical attention and surgery to natives, prospectors, missionaries, and whalers. These duties are still part of today's Bering Sea patrol.

Not the least of Healy's accomplishments was the importation of reindeer from Siberia to provide food for the natives who were never free of the threat of famine. As Healy reasoned it, the reindeer would also be an excellent source of clothing and transportation. The wisdom of this measure was dramatically proved a few years later during the famous overland trek to save marooned whalers near Point Barrow.

Of all the *Bear's* exploits, none has captured the public imagination more than her overland rescue of 1897. It was in the fall of that year that Captain Tuttle, the *Bear's* new commander, learned that 8 whaling vessels and their crews, totaling about 275 men, were trapped in the icepack off remote Point Barrow, Alaska.

The *Bear* had only recently returned from her patrol duties, but at the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, she prepared to go to the rescue. This was the first time that an Arctic voyage was attempted during the winter season.

By December 14, 1897, it was clear that the *Bear* had come as far north as she could go. Approximately 85 miles off Cape Nome, the ice was so thick that she was forced to turn back. But before she returned, the *Bear* landed an overland party on Nelson Island, near Cape Vancouver. It consisted of 1st Lt. D. H. Jarvis, 2d Lt. E. P. Berthold, and Surgeon S. J. Call, all of the Revenue Cutter Service.

Equipped with dog teams, sleds, and guides, Jarvis and his companions set out for Point Barrow. Before them lay a 1,600 mile journey through frozen, trackless wilderness. But the "overland expedition for the relief of the whalers in the Arctic Ocean" as it was ponderously called, became one of the great epics of the north.

During the exhausting journey, Jarvis and Call collected a herd of nearly 450 reindeer. Driving the herd ahead of them in the face of icy winds the party reached Point Barrow about 3½ months after being put ashore by the *Bear*. To the despairing whalers, the arrival of the relief party was nothing short of a miracle. Healy's foresight had paid off.

The *Bear* which had been read out of service in 1885 was still around in 1917 when the United States entered World War I. For the duration of the war she served with the U.S. Navy. This, however, did not change her routine patrol of Alaskan waters.

In 1929 the *Bear* was decommissioned and turned over to the city of Oakland, Calif., for use as a maritime museum. It was at this time that she served as the set for the filming of Jack London's "Sea Wolf."

The *Bear* was getting on now, but there was still some great moments ahead for the stout old ship. In the early 1930's, the famed Arctic explorer, Adm. Richard E. Byrd, was looking for a vessel suitable for operating in the ice in his second Antarctic expedition. Hearing that the *Bear* was available, he opened negotiations with officials of the City of Oakland, Calif., where the vesel had been serving as a marine museum. The bargain was concluded for the incredibly low price of $1,050—one of the best buys in history. An entry in her log for June 19, 1932, reveals that she was en route to Boston for overhaul and refitting with a volunteer crew aboard.

Refitting completed, the *Bear*, on September 25, 1933 left Boston under the command of Lt. (jg.) Robert A. J. English, U.S. Navy. After a rugged trip, she reached the Bay of Whales and Little America in the latter part of January 1934.

Once again in the U.S. Antarctic expedition of 1939–41, Admiral Byrd called upon the Bear's services. This time, however, her boiler and engine were taken out and a modern diesel drive installed. Her auxiliary equipment was electrified. By May 16, 1941, she had completed her work in the Antarctic and was back at Boston.

By this time, the shadow of World War II was already stretching over the United States. In 1941, shortly after her return from the Antarctic, the *Bear* was assigned to the Greenland Patrol operated by the U.S. Coast Guard. She took part in the capture of the Norweigian trawler *Buskoe* which had been fitted out by the Germans to transmit weather reports and information on Allied ship movements.

The *Bear's* days of active service were now drawing rapidly to a close. In June, 1944 she was stricken from the Navy list of active vessels and turned over to the Maritime Commission for sale.

A Canadian steamship company purchased her in 1948 with the intention of converting her to her former role as a sealing vessel. But before this could be accomplished, the price of seal oil and skins dropped, and all work on her was stopped.

For a while it seemed as though the *Bear* were doomed to end her days in obscurity on a Nova Scotia beach. She was spared this fate by Mr. Alfred M. Johnston of Villanova, Pa., who purchased her for eventual use as a commercial museum and restaurant near Philadelphia, Pa. The end came for the *Bear* as she was being towed to Philadelphia. Apparently, her old timbers were no longer strong enough to withstand the vicious battering of the North Atlantic.

Now the *Bear* lies in her final resting place at the bottom of the Atlantic. After a legendary career, spanning several generations, she has at last found peace. But to all men who are interested in the lore of the sea, she will remain a shining symbol of courage. Her story will continue to be told as long as men sail the seas.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PURCHASES OF A PROSPECTIVE 13- TO 41-YEAR SUPPLY OF ELECTRIC LAMPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the question is often asked how it is that dealers handling surplus Government material always seem to have an adequate supply.

The answer is very simple. The procurement officers of the Defense Department and certain other agencies of the Government, either through stupidity or indifference to the cost of the taxpayers, make no effort to relate their purchases to the actual needs of the Government.

The Comptroller General has on repeated occasions called our attention to specific examples or overprocurement, and now in another report to the Congress dated March 21, he cites another glaring example. While the dollar volume in this specific example is not as large as in some of the others, nevertheless the pattern is the same.

In this report he calls attention to the fact that the Defense Department had purchased 670,000 electric lamps over and above its requirements. In some instances this represented a prospective 41-year supply. He also cites that the supply management costs of this excess inventory could be reduced by $1.2 million annually and that the inventory could be reduced by at least $5.5 million by the simple process of those responsible exercising some good commonsense in procurement.

The specific examples cited in this report were as follows:

First. In the Engineer Maintenance Center—EMC—Columbus, Ohio, this depot had on hand 63,662 incandescent lamps with a unit price of 22 cents each, or a total value of $14,006. Based on the use for fiscal year 1961 this quantity represented a 14-year supply for a lamp which was available for procurement in the local area on 3-day delivery.

Second. At the Yards and Docks Supply Office—YDSO—Port Hueneme, Calif., this depot had on hand 312,119 lamps with a unit price of 8 cents each, or a total value of $25,000. Based on the use of this particular lamp in fiscal 1961 this inventory represented a 13-year supply. In December 1961 the depot records showed they had declared 94,044 of these lamps as surplus. This particular bulb was easily available in the local area on a notice of a couple of days.

Third. Rome Air Materiel Area—Roama—Rome, N.Y., this depot had 21,400 incandescent lamps with a unit price of $3.15 each, or a total value of $67,410. Their records showed all these lamps to be excess to established retention levels. Based on their fiscal year 1961 use this represented a 41-year supply for a lamp which was readily available for delivery in the area within 1 to 30 days. The General Accounting Office reported that some of this excess material had been donated for various public activities and that some were being offered to the various States in order to get rid of them.

When the General Accounting Office called this to the attention of the Defense Department it gave its usual shopworn answer, "We will do better the next time." But for 16 years it has been my experience that the next time never arrives.

I suggest that the Secretary of Defense take the same action toward these incompetent procurement officers that he would take were he in private industry and the same situation were to develop; namely, replace them.

THE FRIARS: RHODE ISLAND'S GREATEST EXPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, America loves clean sport. The whole land loves physical fitness. Couple this with the expertness tested in the team competition of dazzling basketball—and no wonder the Nation adores the healthy rivalry of college against college.

The State of Rhode Island loves that type of basketball with a fervor that is practically a fever. And Providence College and its basketball team can be blamed—or blessed—for much of that love affair.

Last Saturday, March 23, 1963, a great part of Rhode Island moved into New York City, crowded into Madison Square Garden, until the count of 18,499 spectators made a sold-out record, first in the history of the National Invitation Tournament matinee games.

The Rhode Islanders who could not get in—and the Rhode Islanders who had to stay home—moved closer to their television sets as the clock crept around to 4 in the afternoon. Millions of eyes were on the alert in every corner of the country.

Providence College basketball was on the air.

This was the Providence College team that last played in the Garden on January 31. The day they beat Dayton. From that date they moved on with nary a loss—15 straight victories.

Not in all its history has a team piled up such a record on the way to the National Invitation Tournament Championship.

Providence crowned it all with this final triumph over Canisius—valiant, splendid Canisius—a worthy foe.

The tournaments reveal no record superior to that of Providence College—champion twice, finalist three times, semifinalist once in this 5-year stretch.

Three times in the past 4 years, the team has carried away the award for the most valuable player.

In 1960, it was Len Wilkens. Today you see him with St. Louis Hawks. In 1961 it was little Vin Ernst, then a sophomore and a 5-foot-8 ball of fire. This year it was Ray Flynn, captain of the Friars.

"Friars" is the affectionate title of these boys who play for Providence College in the time they are not in classes under the Dominican Fathers. The very title is a tribute to the Order of Preachers whose goal is a soul of character in sound mind and sound body.

It is a tribute to the school and scholars and players that the people of Rhode Island have taken them into their hearts. This is not so much for the scores—as for the sportsmanship. It is not so much for the "wins" as for the winning ways of these young Americans giving their finest and their fairest in their teamwork for their common cause.

Sunday afternoon the team came home. Rhode Island moved out to the State line to meet them. It is not far from our capital to "Little Rhody's" State line—but it was just 20 miles of terrific welcome.

For miles along the highway the festive cars were waiting, parked bumper to bumper. For the college bus they formed one happy escort to Providence City Hall where thousands had waited for hours to see their favorite flashers "in the flesh."

Retreating to the college campus, the scene defied description.

Here was home.

There would be a trace of a tear to reflect that this was the end of triumph trail for Vinnie Ernst and Ray Fynnn. But let the future take care of itself. This was the proud present and the buildings of Providence College rocked and reechoed with that pride.

One did not have to belong to Providence College to possess it. For the moment, Providence College belonged to everyone. In just those terms of appreciation spoke the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., president of Providence College, with a pride equal to that of Coach Joe Mullaney, to whom goes so much of the credit for the team's performance year after year. By the way, Joe Mullaney was named "Coach of the Year" in the major college division by the Basketball Writers Association of Boston. They echo the praise of the press of the country.

Naturally Rhode Island sports writers went all out for this fantastic team and its sensational season. The pages of pictures and stories will be treasured heirlooms in Rhode Island homes; but I would like to select the after-game dressing room glimpse by John Hanlon of the Providence Journal to sum up the drama of a day to be remembered.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATEST RHODE ISLAND EXPORT RIGHT NOW: THE FRIARS

(By John Hanlon)

NEW YORK.—Coach Joe Mullaney, the National Invitation Tournament's trophy cradled under his arm, was first back to the Providence College dressing room.

Alone for a few moments, awaiting his champions' entrance, he paced the floor speaking words such as "fantastic," or, "wonderful," and also a couple of exhausted "Oh, boys." Then he put it all in one sentence.

"We played great," he said, "because we had five most valuable players out there."

That, precisely, was the gist of it yesterday afternoon, here at a soldout Madison Square Garden, against Canisius in the National Invitation Tournament final. Five invaluable young men welded into one great team.

As such, the Friars chopped down Canisius, 81 to 66, with, for them, unaccustomed ease and now have another National Invitation Tournament championship banner to go on the wall at Alumni Hall. It will look better with two. The present one puts the hall out of balance.

The formal and official most valuable player honor went, of course, to Capt. Ray Flynn, and it was completely deserved. But he would be the first to agree with his coach that the other four owned a piece of it, as well.

There was Vinnie Ernst, making those knife-like passes, setting up the scores. There was John Thompson, hauling in the rebounds, maneuvering the ball on attack. There was Bob Kovalski, sinking vital points in the first half when the usual shooters were off, rebounding like an octopus in the second half when he was switched under the basket on defense. And the amazing Jim Stone.

"We give Jim the ball," said Mullaney, "and he creates his own plays."

"Stone," Barney Madden remarked after Jim had twisted one in, "should volunteer for the submarine corps. There's no one who can accomplish so much in so small a space."

These were the five, and they had the title put away almost from the start. For a time, it seemed they couldn't break the four-point barrier. But near the end of the first half, the machine got going and, by midpoint in the second period, it was a venture decided. With some 2 minutes to play, Mullaney even permitted himself to lean back on the bench and enjoy what was happening.

"A short game for you, compared to some," a man remarked to the coach.

"Yes," Joe said, "but earlier I almost fainted."

Mullaney took out the first team with some 90 seconds remaining. When Thompson got to the bench, he clasped Ernst in a great bear hug and lifted him off the floor. When Vinnie got down, he gave Mullaney's head a congratulatory rub. Friar students chanted, "We're No. 1," and there were few doubters.

When the winners got to their quarters, they behaved with championship calm. Pleased, proud—yes. But it was obvious it came as no great surprise.

"Was this team," a man asked Flynn, "as good as the one you won here with in your sophomore year?"

"This team," Ray said with emphasis, "is the best team in the country."

Reporters took down the words, but Ray had more.

"Is there any way you can arrange for us to play Cincinnati?" he asked, half smiling now. "If you can, we'd fill the place, and I'd sell the tickets myself."

He would have a good thing going for him, for the 1962–63 Friars have accomplished much and this was the climax.

And more, overall.

In five tournaments, three finals—two championships—three most valuable players—biggest afternoon crowd in 26 years—the loudest, happiest rooters.

Right now, the Friars are Rhode Island's greatest export.

AID TO BRAZIL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there came to my desk today a communication issued by Mr. D. E. Bell of the Department of State. In it Mr. Bell recites the correspondence which took place between the Brazilian Government and our Government in connection with the search for aid made by Brazil.

We have pledged our support, in the form of aid for Brazil, in the sum of $398.5 million. Certain conditions, supposedly, are to be attached to the giving of that aid. I should like to list some of them.

First. The Brazilian Government has committed itself to the adoption of a tax reform program which will increase revenues by about 25 percent and which will provide the foundation for important administrative improvements in tax collections. We are to give nearly $400 million to Brazil under the condition that Brazil will increase its revenues by increasing its taxes. In the United States we contemplate improving our tax system by increasing spending and reduced taxing. I cannot see how the two courses are compatible.

Second. The Brazilian Government promised the elimination of subsidies on wheat and petroleum products, so as to reduce the cash deficit of the treasury and free resources for development purposes. We have exacted from Brazil the commitment that it will reduce subsidies. In the United States we are to enter into a subsidy program on mass transportation which will cost at least $5 billion in the next 10 years.

Third. The Brazilian Government suffered the exaction of the promise that there be an increase imposed by the Government on railroad freight and passenger rates, with the view of reducing operating deficits. In the United States the Federal Government, working in collaboration with a transit system in Massachusetts, has sent $3.6 million to the transit board in Massachusetts, which, matched with $1.8 million of Massachusetts money, is to be used to subsidize passengers so as to take them off the highways and put them in the trains.

I was shocked the other day when in testimony it was revealed that the Boston & Maine Railroad reduced passenger rates from $1.99 to $1.10 a person.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes, Mr. President?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator. With that reduction of 89 cents in the fare charged by the Boston & Maine, 7,000 more passengers used the Boston & Maine Railroad, allegedly leaving their automobiles at home. But then it was disclosed that, in order to induce those 7,000 persons to use the train, the Government had to pay a dollar of subsidy on each ticket. The fare was reduced from $1.99 to $1.10. With such a reduction, of course, there was an increased number of passengers.

So again we have a paradox: In Brazil we tell them, "increase your freight and passenger rates"; in the United States the Federal Government is beginning to contribute money for the purpose of reducing rates so as to induce people to leave the highways and ride the trains. Other conditions have been imposed, allegedly insuring that Brazil will stabilize its currency and thus be able to maintain its own economy.

A few days ago Mr. Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund, made a speech about the growth in the Common Market nations of Europe and Japan. We in the United States are complaining because our economic growth is not adequate. Mr. Jacobsson made this statement:

> Looking back through history, the countries who have maintained relatively stable monetary conditions, so that people know they are dealing with a sound currency, have derived distinct advantages from such an achievement. Confidence in currency is a plant of slow growth.

Mr. Jacobsson further went on to point out that Japan and West Germany were the first to enjoy a resurrection of their economy. West Germany and Japan were the first to adopt sound fiscal and monetary policies. Subsequently Italy followed, and then France, trying to live within their budgets. And they are now enjoying unprecedented growth.

What we are telling the people of the world to do—and now this applies especially to Brazil—we are not doing back home. Federal expenditures have risen by $17 billion in 3 years. The budget this year will be in deficiency by $10,800 million, if all works out to the best advantage. If it does not, the deficit is likely to rise $15 billion.

So I say when we tell Brazil and other nations what to do concerning their monetary and fiscal policies, we had better take a look in the mirror and see what our image is and see whether or not we should not follow what we are telling others to do.

HUNGARIAN LIBERATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 21 it was learned that Premier Kadar had issued an amnesty order in Hungary covering a wide variety of political crimes. It is reported that amnesty will be given to those who took part in the Hungarian revolution of 1956. Persons convicted of espionage or treason do not come under the amnesty, and they will be required to apply individually.

While this order may raise some degree of hope, there remains considerable apprehension among the enslaved nations that the extremely serious reverses which occurred under the effects of Stalin's personality during and after World War II may be repeated under Khrushchev's personality.

Mr. President, in the brief remarks that I made on the floor of the Senate on August 11, 1962, I expressed my grave fear that the Hungarian problem would not be given full consideration at the 17th General Assembly of the United Nations. The fear expressed at that time has now become a fact.

As for the United States, the final abandonment of American efforts even to seek justice for Hungary through the United Nations would constitute a long step toward the fulfillment of Khrushchev's main purpose, which is to conquer the West by destroying faith in the steadfastness of the United States.

The Hungarian problem should be a must for full consideration by the United Nations General Assembly, which will convene in its 18th session September 16, 1963. The main orders issued by the United Nations in 1956 and 1957 have not been fulfilled and it now appears they will not be.

Mr. President, on December 31, 1962, the Committee for Hungarian Liberation issued a memorandum signed by its executive vice president, Gen. Julius Kovacs, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIAN LIBERATION, INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1962.

It is with understandable disappointment that the Hungarians living in the free world received knowledge of the fact that the United States made the recommendation to revoke the authority vested in Sir Leslie Munro in the matter of the "question of Hungary." It becomes even more difficult to understand this recommendation when it is considered that Moscow and the Moscow-run government of Budapest have done nothing to satisfy the resolutions passed by the United Nations in 1956 and later. It is absolutely certain that it is the Russian Red army which kept the Kadar puppet government in power in Hungary. As a result, human rights and national independence do not exist as far as the Hungarian people are concerned. The only change which has taken place in Hungary is the improvement of the Communist propaganda techniques aimed at the free west and elsewhere.

The Hungarian people the world over clearly see the consequence of the revocation of the authority of Sir Leslie Munro. There will be no more discussions in the United Nations concerning the brutal and colonialistic suppression of the Hungarian people. It appears to many as the final burial of the international significance of the Hungarian question. The Hungarian freedom fight is no longer a moral and political weapon in the hands of the free nations. It will appear to eastern and central Europe and the Balkans and the suppressed nationalities of the Soviet Union as proof that individual rights and national independence from 1962 forward, will be measured in terms of double standards. It further appears as a silent acceptance of the status quo.

In view of the above, hope for the liberation of the enslaved nations will diminish. At the same time the power of the Soviet Union and its puppet governments will be increased. In the eyes of the enslaved nations there has been decline in the moral reputation of the western peoples. Furthermore, this recommendation will in no way improve the spirit of resistance to Communist slavery among the enslaved peoples.

It is understandable that the enslaved nations are deeply disturbed because the champion of freedom, the United States, made the recommendation, and the protector of small nations, the United Nations, accepted it. The explanation made by U.S. Representative Rowan has not alleviated the unfortunate impression. The transfer of the Hungarian question to the personal authority of the U.N. Secretary General is not comforting, since specific instructions were not provided.

Small nations under these circumstances again are experiencing two great powers taking steps toward agreements without raising the Iron Curtain. The struggles toward liberation and freedom of the small nations which have fallen into an unfortunate sphere of influence became nothing more than sacrificial offerings. Yet, these peoples have been required to sacrifice immeasurably as a result of arrangements made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Not only did they lose human rights and national liberties, unnumbered millions have lived through the anguish of elimination of free speech, fear, want, and death by torture.

The enslaved nations and the Hungarian people would like to believe that this step was taken as a tactical necessity. They would like to believe that the free west has not abandoned those principles which form the foundation of individual and national existence in the free world. For these reasons we respectfully ask you:

1. That the free nations do not support any action to minimize the significance of the U.N. resolution concerning Hungary, or that these resolutions be stricken from the record with their silent consent.

2. That the free nations refuse to recognize the representative of the Russian puppet government of Hungary, Kadar's government.

3. That the United States of America give recognition to the Russian colonial rulers in Budapest as being the legitimate Government of Hungary by establishing diplomatic relations with it.

4. That the free nations exercise in the United Nations the same energy and sincerity for demanding the disintegration and abolition of the eastern slave empire, as the United States of America have exercised in demanding the freedom of the Asian and African colonies.

The people living under international or national communism still consider communism as an institution which does not recognize moral codes or political boundaries and an international menace just as under Stalin. They draw these conclusions from personal experience. Today as well as under Stalin, they are living under a complete dictatorship. Behind this dictatorship stands the powerful Red army. The happy and free nations living at a safe distance are in no position to clearly understand the true nature of that slave system.

The enslaved peoples cannot share the optimistic views which were implied in a talk given by Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant on December 2, 1962, or by Mr. Ball, Under Secretary of State, in New York on December 13, 1962. In the service of a principle, it does not make much of a difference who the individual is and who holds the flag. There is no difference in the purpose of office whether it is filled by Stalin or Khrushchev.

The experienced people of the enslaved nations watched the Cuban developments with critical awareness. The result of the Cuban situation was not one of victory of the principles of the free West over that of communism, because this never developed into an issue. It was primarily a victory of the United States of America over the Soviet Union in the area of power politics. The Communist ideology and the way of life it represents never was threatened during the critical period.

There is considerable apprehension among the enslaved nations that the extremely serious reverses which occurred under the effects of Stalin's personality during and after World War II will be repeated now under Khrushchev's personality. Because of an error in the interpretations of Stalin's intentions, very grievous errors were made with reference to the small nations and consequently to the entire world. Not only over 200 million people were tossed into slavery, but the present cold war is a direct consequence.

Authorized by the member and cooperating organizations, societies, groups, and branches in the United States of America, Canada, South America, and Europe.

JULIUS KOVACS,
Executive Vice President.

GREEK EMBARGO ON SHIPMENTS TO CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Embassy of Greece in Washington on March 16, 1963, announced that a royal decree out of Athens has banned all vessels under the Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports.

Under the order one exception was made protecting the agreements executed by the shipowners under time-charter contracts prior to the issuance of the March 16 order.

The decree issued by the royal Government of Greece is reflective of the ancient purpose of the Greek people to stand by the cause of freedom.

The Greeks, in banning all vessels under the Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports, have taken a position indicating their purpose to serve freedom by giving to and not taking from it. The industry of the Greek mercantile marine, by abiding to the royal decree banning all vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports, has demonstrated its unselfish purpose to occupy a position in the vanguard of people fighting communism.

Little Greece is trying to tell the great United States that we should be firm, unyielding in the purpose of removing communism from Central and Southern America. It knows the methods of communism because of painful experience.

We rose to our greatest heights last October 22 when the President of the United States declared firmly our purpose not to tolerate communism in the Americas. We have fallen basely to dishonorable levels since October 22 by the toleration in Cuba and in other Western American countries of Communist subversion, infiltration, and sabotage.

Our Nation should enlist the aid of every country possible—especially those to which we have been generous in granting aid—to impose sanctions on international water carriers which carry cargoes either into or out of Cuba, banning them the right to enter the ports of the sanctioning nations.

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for comment on this same subject discussed by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio just mentioned shipping to Cuba. Since January, and even since last fall, I have been putting in the RECORD, week by week, as I get the reports, a list of the ships that call at Communist Cuba. The RECORD shows the information I have placed in it. I have the latest figures available.

I mentioned the Greek order last week. It was a courageous order on the part of Greece, but it had an escape clause in it in which they suggested they would have no control over ships carrying the Greek flag which were chartered. The Greek Government went as far as it could. I appreciate that. We are hopeful all free nations will go even further.

In view of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, with which I thoroughly agree, and in keeping with my practice to advise the Senate of free world shipping to Communist Cuba, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that during a 2-week period from March 3, 1963, through March 22, 1963, 11 free world ships, totaling 84,920 gross tons called in Cuban ports delivering supplies to bulwark the intrusion of communism in this hemisphere. Combined tanker tonnage of 40,684 gross tons in ships flying British and Italian flags delivered more badly wanted petroleum products. The names of the ships, their flag of registry, and tonnage are as follows:

Athelduke (tanker), British, 9,089.
Athelsultan (tanker), British, 9,149.
Bytom, Polish, 5,967.
Benny Viking, Norwegian, 3,857.
Castillo Ampudia, Spanish, 3,566.
Himmerland, Danish, 8,774.
Linda Giovanna (tanker), Italian, 9,985.
North Empress, Greek, 10,904.
Pamit, Greek, 3,929.
San Nicola (tanker), Italian, 12,461.
Seirios, Greek, 7,239.

Mr. President, if we look at the RECORD for January 9 it will be found that the real offenders in this matter have been the British and the Greeks; but the Greeks have taken some moves to do something about it. I do not know what the British have done.

I have a list of the ships before me. Here is a British tanker. Another British tanker. A Norwegian ship of 3,800 tons. A Polish ship. Of course, we expect the Communist bloc ships to go to Cuba. Here is a new one, a Spanish-flag ship. A Danish ship. An Italian ship. A Greek ship. A Greek ship. A Greek ship——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What have Yugoslavia and Poland done?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yugoslav shipping was quite prominent in all the reports I placed in the RECORD. I put that information in the RECORD. But as of June or August last, before all the trouble happened, Yugoslavia sent five ships on seven trips to Cuba. The percentages of ships going into Cuba at that time were 25 percent Greek, 13 percent British, 12 percent German, 9 percent Norwegian, and approximately 4 percent Yugoslav.

The West Germans first issued a strict order, following the Cuban crisis, and have lived up to it so far as we have been informed. The Norwegians have said they will cooperate as best they can, but that they have no control over their chartered ships. The Greeks have taken a move. I am hopeful the British Government will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The situation the Senator has referred to covered the period before October 22. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have put in the RECORD a list relating to prior to the October incident, and I have been putting information in the RECORD approximately every 2 weeks right up to date.

I have here the names of the ships that were involved between March 8 and March 22 of this year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad that the Senator has contributed that information in connection with the remarks I made, because we are in agreement that our allies throughout the world, as well as Yugoslavia and Poland, whose Communist governments are the recipients of our aid and our charity, ought at this point to recognize that they owe something to us and not be giving sustenance to Cuba. I appreciate the Senator's remark.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In all fairness I should say that although many of these countries do not have a merchant fleet comparable in size with those of the countries about which we have been reading, so far as I can ascertain, since October there have been practically no South American countries involved, although there have been some pan-American ships, or ships flying the Panamanian flag. I do not know of any country that is more deserving of our friendship, and whose problems we should view sympathetically, than Panama. Some of these ships have been to Communist Chinese ports. Of course, all of them pass through the Panama Canal. This list is dropping steadily. However, I do believe that we ought to applaud Greece for attempting to do something about it.

A PROPOSED RULE OF GERMANENESS AND OTHER PROPOSALS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 89 was submitted to the Senate on February 19, 1963, by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. This resolution would amend rule 8 of the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide that a rule of germaneness be applied during the 4-hour period after the morning hour is concluded. When this resolution was presented to the Senate, the principal author, the Senator from Rhode Island, yielded the floor to me and I stated at that time that I would like to be a cosponsor. However, I find that this request was not acknowledged by the Chair at that time, and I am not now listed as one of the 30 coauthors of this very important and desirable proposal. Therefore, at this time I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

This resolution, Senate Resolution 89, has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Among its most enthusiastic supporters are several members of the ad hoc Committee for the Expeditious Handling of Senate Business. This committee was appointed by the majority leader, acting as chairman of the Democratic conference, on January 9, the opening day of this session. It has since held a number of informal conferences and has met with representatives of a similar ad hoc committee appointed at a meeting of the Republican conference on opening day.

The discussions which have been held during these past few weeks have clearly emphasized the need for immediate action on Senate Resolution 89, and also for consideration as soon as possible of another resolution, Senate Resolution 111, which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] submitted on March 14. Joining Senator CHURCH as coauthors of Senate Resolution 111 were Senators ANDERSON, MCGEE, PASTORE, and myself. It would amend rule 15 of the standing rules of the Senate, which now prohibits meetings of standing committees of the Senate while the Senate is in session, without special leave. It proposes to amend that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on which rule 15 is based. A committee would then require special leave of the Senate only in those instances when it desires to sit after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business.

All of us are well aware of the increasing volume of critical commentaries regarding the present pace of congressional activities. Much of the criticism along this line has been unjustified. I am convinced that Members of the Senate are working harder than they have ever worked before. The start of committee work was delayed this year by the debate on the proposed change of rule 22, but since that matter was disposed of, committee work has accelerated.

The two resolutions to which I have referred would permit an immediate acceleration of work on the floor of the Senate at a time when an overwhelming workload lies ahead.

The ad hoc committee named by the Democratic conference held one joint session with its equivalent group from the Republican conference. The joint group reached a consensus on a holiday recess schedule which was adopted insofar as Lincoln's Birthday and Washington's Birthday were concerned. According to the consensus, forthcoming recess schedules would be along these general lines:

First. Easter: Recess Thursday, April 11, through Friday, April 19.

Second. Memorial Day: Recess Monday, May 27, through Friday, May 31.

Third. July 4: Recess Wednesday, July 3, through Friday, July 5.

The ad hoc committee, in keeping with the instructions of the majority leader at the time it was organized, has also taken affirmative action concerning a proposed summer recess starting at the close of business Friday, August 16, and extending through Monday, September 2. The members of the ad hoc committee reported on these matters to Senator MANSFIELD on March 5 with the suggestion that the leadership of the Senate consult with the leaders of the House of Representatives in an effort to firm up a program of work for both Houses during the last 2 weeks of August. Many Members of both the Senate and the House have advocated the 2-week recess in August in the belief that an overall improvement in attendance and in the rate of legislative activity would result. Several Members favoring this late summer recess want to have an opportunity to return home for that period in order to consult with their constituents before the final crucial weeks of the session. Others see the recess as an opportunity to enjoy vacations with their school-age children, who in past years have been back in the classroom before sine die adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the pros and cons of the summer recess will have to be considered eventually from the standpoint of the amount of work which we are able to complete during the immediate months ahead. Now is the time for us to do something about this scheduling problem if we are to avoid another long and wearying extension of our work into the autumn or beyond. The people of the United States, by and large, cannot understand why it is necessary for the sessions of Congress to grow longer and longer. When the Legislative Reorganization was passed in 1946, the Congress went on record as saying that its work should be completed no later than July 31 each year. The Members who passed that bill were convinced that their mission could be accomplished each year before July 31. More and more, Members of Congress, in my opinion, are becoming concerned with our present scheduling. The July 31 deadline seemed reasonable in 1946. Have our problems and our responsibilities become so much more difficult and complex that we must now stay in session into the autumn or later? Are we unwilling to face up to the possibility that millions of Americans do not believe we are moving as fast as we should?

In 1945 and 1946, the Congress, through honest and diligent discussion, agreed upon changes in procedure which have made it possible for us to deal with the more complex problems of government in an era when the course of human events constantly grows in diversity and complexity.

Simple tools are available to us now to increase our horsepower to give us a faster getaway. The ad hoc Committee on the Expeditious Handling of Senate Business has three principal objectives.

First. To schedule as far in advance as possible the periods when no votes of record will occur, so that we can avoid the random and uncertain holiday recess practices which have worked hardships on the Members of the Senate in the past. Stated recess schedules limiting the duration of these periods when Members can schedule conferences and speeches in their home States and be absent from Washington will work to the benefit of all Members and can expedite Senate action, as well. Too often in the past important votes have been delayed through the absence of one or two Members. Too often these absences resulted from ambiguity and misunderstandings regarding the schedule of work here on the floor. If we are to improve our scheduling, we must necessarily adopt the policy of refusing to delay votes due to individual absences. This will be fair when recess and holiday schedules are clearly stated and clearly understood in advance by the Members.

Second. The rule of germaneness, as Senator PASTORE has pointed out, would enable Senators to know that for 4 hours after the conclusion of the morning hour the subject matter under discussion on the floor of the Senate would be germane to the pending business. It is that simple. At all other times, both before the period of germaneness and afterward, Senators would have ample time to discuss any and all topics. We will be able to talk early and to talk late, but we would reserve the middle of our legislative day for the specific business at hand.

Third. Senate Resolution 111 should have a fair trial. It likewise will do no violence to the existing privileges of all Senators. It would revise rule 15 to permit committees to continue working through the morning hour if they so desire. It would keep in force the present rule which requires unanimous consent for committees to meet once the morning hour is concluded.

The ad hoc committee urgently seeks expeditious consideration of this proposal, along with the recommended rule of germaneness. We are all fully aware of the very heavy burdens now carried by Senators. Most of us are faced with an increasing volume of legislation and other work. Adoption of these two rules changes, perhaps on an experimental basis, will demonstrate our willingness to undertake our additional workloads and our additional responsibilities in a positive and constructive and timely manner.

PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the consideration last year of the appropriation bill for independent offices, the subcommittee inaugurated a rule which we hoped would be helpful, if not almost mandatory, to some of the departments and agencies in stopping the rise of employment in the departmental divisions of the Government. The administration can do much in this field. One proposal was made which was used to some advantage to the Committee on Appropriations and, I believe, to the departments and independent offices in the administration.

We found that when an employee retired, at one end of the ladder—we do not know for certain how many persons will retire in a given year—the agency used that amount of money to hire two employees in the lower grades. This added to the employment and, of course, demonstrated what Dr. Parkinson has long held, and which has become known as Parkinson's law. This proposal received some publicity, and some departments and independent agencies have been carrying it out.

Last December 4, the Wenatchee, Wash., Daily World published an editorial entitled "Parkinson's Law—Little Known But Easily Believed." The editorial resulted in a letter being sent to me by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. The letter reads:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, WATER RESOURCES DIVISION, SURFACE WATER BRANCH.
Tacoma, Wash., February 4, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I thought you may not have seen the Wenatchee Daily World editorial of December 4, 1962, concerning some statements attributed to you on the subject of Federal employees and payrolls. A print of it is enclosed.

Some other agencies may do as you say but the Geological Survey would seem to me to be an exception. According to my 38 years of experience I am confident that, generally speaking, one retirement in our agency results in the promotion of several lower employees and the hiring of only one new person. I thought you might find this information helpful.

Sincerely yours,

F. M. Veatch,
District Engineer.

I say to Mr. Veatch: It is not only helpful, but also refreshing, to Congress and the administration to learn that such a practice is not followed in the Geological Survey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the editorial of December 4, 1962, which was published in the Wenatchee Daily World.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Parkinson's Law—Little Known But Easily Believed

At a committee hearing this fall, Senator Magnuson discussed a fact of Government employment that most people probably didn't know about, but won't have much trouble believing.

It was something known as Parkinson's law—that each time a Government employee quits or retires, two others are hired to replace him.

Magnuson explained it this way:

A $14,000 a year career employee retires. The man below him moves into his job. Now, there's an unexpended appropriation that had been budgeted for the man who retired.

No Government bureau ever likes to end its year without spending all the money made available to it, for fear the next time its full request won't be met. So, instead of hiring one man at the bottom and moving the rest up, the bureau has enough unexpended funds from the retirement to hire two or three new beginners.

This it does. These three men ultimately work up to higher salaries, eventually retire, and nine new beginners are hired. So it goes.

Magnuson pointed out that 50,000 career Government employees retire each year. But instead of the total payroll remaining the same, it constantly grows.

The Senator recommended that only one man should be hired to replace an employee who had retired, and that reviews be conducted in all Government agencies after retirements to be sure that it does.

ATTEMPT BY SOVIET RUSSIA TO CONTROL THE OCEANS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, 3 years ago I stated that Soviet Russia, in her thirst to dominate the world, avidly is seeking to control the oceans.

Dominion over the oceans would give the Sino-Soviet bloc control of 90 percent of the earth's surface and enable Russia to imperil the remaining 10 percent with missiles fired from submarines hovering along the Continental Shelf.

Control of the oceans would permit Russia to fragmentize the free world alliance, cut the lifelines to the United States, and block the supply lines from the United States to our oversea allies.

At the time these remarks were made Soviet Russia's maritime activities were only beginning to be widely known and aroused little concern, possibly because of doubt they would be sustained. The popular concept then was—and to some extent still is—that Russia, traditionally a land power, would always so remain.

With the exception of Cuba, Communist land expansion during the past 3 years has been contained. Communist advances on the high seas, however, have continued almost unchallenged, and are constantly being accelerated.

This expansion of Soviet sea power is the theme of a forceful editorial in the March 1963 issue of Navy, official publication of the Navy League of the United States.

This editorial summarizes the four methods by which Russia is seeking to rule the waves and outlines Russia's tactical objectives and quotes both Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, and Fleet Adm. S. G. Gorshkov, of the Soviet Navy.

Mr. President, while we proceed with our program for the scientific conquest of space, we had better look to it also that our country is secure from ocean-based attack.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial entitled "The Growing Challenge at Sea," from the March issue of Navy, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Growing Challenge at Sea

There's a message—you may have seen it in this space before—that is now being read by an increasingly broader, but not yet decisive, section of Washington officialdom. It is this:

The Soviet Union has recognized, more than any other Russian regime in history, the importance of sea power and is daily doing more and more to build the force it needs to achieve a true breakout from its traditional continental fortress in Eurasia.

This Soviet interest in the world's oceans is a broad one. It covers the commercial (fishing and trade); the scientific (oceanography and Arctic and Antarctic exploration); the military (an increasingly powerful navy); and the diplomatic (the drive to obtain lodgments or friendly governments in strategic areas).

Curiously enough, the top uniformed men of the United States and Soviet Navies addressed themselves recently to the Red fleet and its growing importance. Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, sounded this warning in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee:

"I recognize that the Cuban situation was but one facet of an overall challenge which most assuredly will become greater in the future. We must improve our capability to meet it. If we do not do so, our country will be placed in jeopardy because of the rapidly increasing ability of our most formidable adversary to operate with greater intensity, purpose, and scope on the high seas.

"The U.S.S.R. is belatedly recognizing the importance of the seas and seaways. She obviously has come to understand that the extension of empire can be effective only if control of the seas is assured. Some of her more recent roilings of the waters are in areas which traditionally have been of great strategic importance in the maritime sense: in Cuba and Latin America, for instance, which cover the approaches to the Panama Canal; in Indonesia, the route between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific; and in Egypt, Yemen, and the Middle East, which control Suez and the Red Sea.

"These actions, when combined with the rapid expansion of her merchant fleet, the remarkable increase in the scope of the activities of her fishing fleet and her most effective use of oceanographic ships and trawlers in exploring the oceans and gathering intelligence, give us pause for reflection."

We would like to add to the CNO's warning and mention the increasing boldness of Soviet oceangoing submarines and long-range jet bombers which now have taken to buzzing (with impunity, sad to relate) our aircraft carriers in the Atlantic and Pacific.

We would mention, too, that the Red submarine fleet does not only carry a threat to our cities and bases in the United States—it reportedly has rockets with larger warheads than Polaris which can be fired 700 or more miles today and in time will reach out much farther. The Reds have armed some of their more than 400 submarines with deadly antiship rockets, which have ranges up to 200 miles. The threat these weapons pose for our surface fleet is self-evident.

Admiral of the Fleet S. G. Gorshkov, in an article in the publication, Red Star (see "Soviet Naval Notes" elsewhere in this issue for a translation) [not printed in Record], makes it clear that the Soviet Navy is winning increasing favor from the bosses in the Kremlin and that it is being given a greater role in the military plans of the U.S.S.R.

The Russians may exaggerate and even lie about certain aspects of their military prowess. But they have formidable scientific and technological resources and have shown on more than one occasion that they can produce some spectacular things when they concentrate their efforts. Their plumbing may not work well, their postage stamps may not stick, and perhaps they cannot produce enough shoes for their peasants. But they have built huge nuclear warheads and the rockets with which to deliver them. They have built atomic submarines and excellent surface-to-air missiles. And, of course, they produced their first atomic and first hydrogen bombs long before American experts said they would. Accordingly, when they make a claim in the military field, particularly if we have already demonstrated that we can do it, simple prudence would seem to dictate that we not rush to dispute it.

But we are more interested here in the statements made by Admiral Gorshkov in the Red Star article, after he told of "the radical rearmament of our navy and its equipment with qualitatively new submarine and surface ships armed with powerful and long-range rocket-nuclear weapons." He declared:

"By the creation of our new navy which is based on a nuclear power supply, rocket technology, and radioelectronics, an end has been put to the unchallenged domination of the oceans by the traditional maritime powers.

"Transoceanic strategists only have illusions when they hope that their communications and, what is more, their shores will be inaccessible to our navy in case of war. Today there are no invulnerable objectives on the continent just as there were no areas in the seas of the world where, in the course of combat operations, the enemy's ships would not be subject to the threat of destruction."

Discount the boasts and bombast in the Gorshkov article and you are still left with some sobering conclusions. One which seems particularly clear, when combined with what Admiral Anderson told the House committee, is this:

The Soviet Navy is bent upon challenging the U.S. Navy for control of the seas. We, as a nation, had better see about this and soon.

DAIRY RESEARCH IN STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement with respect to the vigorous dairy research which is taking place in many States of the Nation, especially in the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Washington has been exceptionally vigorous in dairy research, reflecting the importance of dairying to the State's agriculture. In 1960, for example, the dairy industry provided an $82 million income for Washington dairymen. This represented 14 percent of all the cash receipts from farm marketings that year.

The State of Washington has a long history of productive work on dairy feeding problems, and did much of the early pioneering work relating carotene in feed to vitamin A in milk. The new J. C. Knott Dairy Research Laboratory at Pullman should speed research along even further with its specialized laboratories and equipment for research and demonstration * * * modern facilities for 500 head of cattle * * * and up-to-date milking parlor. This half-million-dollar plant will certainly play a key role in keeping Washington one of the top dairy States in the Nation.

Currently, USDA and several States are investigating a wide variety of problems facing dairy farmers, processors, and marketers. Some of the research areas being investigated include:

Studies on physiology of reproduction and lactation and various aspects of artificial insemination—breeding studies to improve the performance of cattle so they will yield more and better quality milk, reproduce more efficiently, and live longer; nutritional studies of dairy animals to determine their needs for growth, reproduction, and lactation; methods of improving quality and shelf life of milk and dairy products; work to develop new kinds of dairy foods and new nonfood uses for milk constituents. And I have mentioned only a few.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN M. HURLEY BY LEGISLATURE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an extraordinary tribute recently paid to one of Washington's outstanding citizens. On the 6th of March, the Senate of the State of Washington unanimously adopted a resolution extending "sincere thanks, best wishes, and recognition of his fine services" to Mr. John M. Hurley. On the following day, a similar resolution was unanimously adopted by the Washington State House of Representatives.

John M. Hurley, known to many Washingtonians as "Jack," has been a friend to and servant of the people of his State and their representatives for many years. His efforts in behalf of better government and the promotion of the undying principles of Thomas Jefferson have been tireless. The honesty and dedication with which he has approached his tasks are examples to us all.

I know of no man who has been similarly honored by a seat on the rostum of the house of representatives of our State. And few men have received the standing ovation or the expression of good wishes which Mr. Hurley was given at that time.

Therefore, in recognition of the high esteem in which Jack Hurley is held by all of us who have worked for the State of Washington, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolutions honoring him be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Olympia, Wash., March 8, 1963.

Mr. JOHN M. HURLEY,
Olympia, Wash.

DEAR JACK: It is an honor and a privilege for me to transmit the enclosed resolution, unanimously adopted by the house today.

I might add that as far back as I can remember you are the first member of the third house to ever be accorded the honor of a seat of honor on the rostrum, and the standing ovation you received came from the hearts of every member of the house, I know.

With best wishes to you always,

Sincerely,

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF WASHINGTON

(Resolution by Representatives Norman B. Ackley, Alfred O. Adams, H. Maurice Ahlquist, James A. Andersen, Eric O. Anderson, Henry Backstrom, C. W. "Red" Beck, W. J. (Joe) Beierlein, Duane L. Berentson, Arnie Bergh, John Bigley, Horace W. Bozarth, Robert F. Brachtenbach, Eric D. Braun, Frank Buster Brouillet, Jack L. Burtch, Keith H. Campbell, Damon R. Canfield, William "Bill" Chatalas, Cecil C. Clark, Pat Comfort, Paul H. Conner, Thomas L. Copeland, William S. Day, Arlie U. DeJarnatt, Jack Dootson, Robert G. Earley, Robert D. Eberle, Don Eldridge, Daniel J. Evans, S. E. (Sid) Flanagan, Morrill F. Folsom, P. J. Gallagher, Avery Garrett, Mrs. Marian C. Gleason, Robert F. Goldsworthy, Slade Gorton, Gary Grant, H. D. "Herb" Hadley, Edward F. Harris, Joe D. Haussler, Dwight S. Hawley, Mildred E. Henry, Gordon Herr, Jack C. Hood, Elmer C. Huntley, Mrs. Joseph E. Hurley, Elmer E. Johnston, Dan Jolly, Helmut L. Jueling, Chet King, Dick J. Kink, Mrs. Douglas (Gladys) Kirk, William C. Klein, Alfred E. Leland, Harry B. Lewis, Charles E. Lind, Mark Litchman, Gus Lybecker, Marjorie Lynch, Audley F. Mahaffey, Fred R. Mast, William J. S. May, Mary Ellen McCaffree, W. L. "Bill" McCormick, Bob McDougall, Drennan "Mac" McElroy, James L. McFadden, Jack Metcalf, Don Miles, Charles Moon, Donald W. Moos, Richard W. Morphis, Edward M. Morrissey, Roy Mundy, Charles E. Newschwander, John L. O'Brien, W. J. O'Connell, Mike E. Odell, Ann T. O'Donnell, Ray Olsen, Robert A. Perry, Joel M. Pritchard, Walt Reese, Jack H. Rogers, K. O. Rosenberg, Charles R. Savage, Leonard A. Sawyer, Robert M. Schaefer, Harry A. Siler, Samuel J. Smith, Mrs. Frances G. Swayze, Richard "Dick" Taylor, Wes C. Uhlman, Arnold S. Wang, Max Wedekind, (Miss) Ella Wintler, C. G. Witherbee, and William E. Young)

Whereas John M. Hurley, affectionately called "Jack" has long been an admirer of Thomas Jefferson and has been a student of his life and his profound utterances; and

Whereas the said Jack Hurley has served the State of Washington in the department of fisheries and has capably and ably been a representative of the railroad industry in many legislative sessions now past; and

Whereas he has acquired a reputation of being reliable and honest in all of his representations to the members of the House and Senate, both in committee and in private conversations; and

Whereas in his own way he has tried to advance and advocate the principles of Thomas Jefferson in government; and

Whereas he has presented each member of the house and senate and members of the press with copies of the book, "Thomas Jefferson, the Giant"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend to him our sincere thanks, best wishes and recognition of his fine services in the espousal of these principles, in striving to retain these concepts in the government of the State of Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be enrolled and presented to John M. Hurley.

Attest:

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 1963-19

(Resolution by Senators Perry B. Woodall, Marshall A. Neill, Edward F. Riley, and Al Henry)

Whereas John M. Hurley, affectionately called "Jack" has long been an admirer of Thomas Jefferson and has been a student of his life and his profound utterances; and

Whereas the said Jack Hurley has served the State of Washington both in the capacity as chief technician of the Department of Fisheries and has capably and ably been a representative of the railroad industry in many legislative sessions now past; and

Whereas he has acquired a reputation of being reliable and honest in all of his representations to the members of the house and senate, both in committee and in private conversations; and

Whereas in his own way he has tried to advance and advocate the principles of Thomas Jefferson in government; and

Whereas he has presented each member of the house and senate and members of the press with copies of the book, "Thomas Jefferson, the Giant": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend to him our sincere thanks, best wishes, and recognition of his fine services in the espousal of these principles, in striving to retain these concepts in the government of the state of Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be enrolled and presented to John M. Hurley.

Attest:

WARD BOWDEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

DEATH OF DALE SWENSON, PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER LEADER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Dale Swenson, of Amery, Wis., a Peace Corps volunteer, was killed in an automobile accident in Brazil. Dale Swenson was an idealistic, dedicated, intelligent, young man, the best kind of American. He had been in Brazil for some time and had done outstanding work as a member of the Peace Corps. He had been successful in establishing a school where there had been no school.

His death is a serious loss for our State and for the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "We Miss Him," relating to Dale Swenson, and published in the Peace Corps Volunteer of February 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MISS HIM

Life with the Peace Corps during its first year in Brazil has not been all cheering reports and heartwarming vignettes, pouring forth the enthusiasm and triumphs of the volunteers.

Tragedy has cast its shadow, too, for on December 6 came the news that Dale Swenson, volunteer leader of Brazil I (4–S club project) had been killed while making the rounds of the volunteers under his charge.

Dale, 26, of Amery, Wis., joined the Peace Corps in January 1962. After training at the National 4-H Club Foundation in Washington, at the Peace Corps training center in Puerto Rico, and as a language student at Rural University near Rio de Janeiro, Dale had distinguished himself by his work with the 4-S clubs around Ponte Nova, a small city in the interior of Minas Gerais state.

From June until November, Dale assisted 17 youth clubs to improve their farm and animal projects, demonstrating to the farm youth such practical steps as how to construct a seed bed, when and how to apply fertilizer, how to turn the soil to obtain higher crop yields.

To entice more young people to participate in 4-S work, Dale with his Brazilian colleagues worked out a program of games, dances, and sports to add moments of sheer pleasure to the club's more serious business.

Always desirous that his youth program at Ponte Nova continue after his Peace Corps service, Dale concentrated on attracting and training adult leaders to guide the club in day-to-day activities.

In this he was successful. His efforts stimulated a keen sense of responsibility among parents and neighbors for the future of their youth. And one project which he stimulated raised funds through a community fair to help establish a primary school where none had been before.

Contacts with parents about 4-S work led to close friendship. Dale's warm smile, intense purpose, and quickness to sense the humor in frustrating situations gained him acceptance.

With the expansion of the Peace Corps 4-S program in Brazil, Dale was singled out to became a volunteer leader. Fearful that by accepting the job his work in Ponte Nova would cease, Dale approved only after being assured that a volunteer team would take his place.

He moved to Vitoria, capital of Espirito Santo, in November and set out almost immediately to visit the volunteers. His territory was farflung, encompassing the states of Goias, Rio de Janeiro, Espirito Santo and part of Minas Gerais.

Dale had returned from visiting volunteer teams in frontier towns in Goias and was making his way home from Rio to Vitoria when his jeep met an oncoming truck on a curve.

His example as a helping American and as an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer is inspiring. As a fellow volunteer said of Dale, "His greatest contribution, perhaps, was living a life of practical idealism through his day-to-day activities."

We honor him and miss him.

KILLIAN CALLS FOR RECOGNITION OF CRISIS IN CIVILIAN RESEARCH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is a difference of opinion in the Senate and in the country as to how our serious economic problems should be solved. However, I think all of us agree that we need urgently to improve and step up our research.

Recently, Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., who certainly is an outstanding expert in this field, and a former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, wrote an article entitled "The Crisis in Research," which was published in the Atlantic Monthly. In his article, Dr. Killian points out the urgent national need to increase the number of scientists and engineers who will study for their doctor's degrees. Dr. Killian states that there are hundreds of thousands of scientists and engineers whose skills have become obsolete and who, with additional training, could contribute immensely to research. He concludes his article by saying:

> I do feel, given present rates of growth, that we face crucial decisions about the future size of the effort, especially the level of our space effort and our capability to carry through present space commitments with success and without unnecessary waste and failures. These decisions must be made with an acute awareness of our manpower resources and of the vital needs of the private, commercial sector of our economy, the engine of our economic growth.

Dr. Killian says that the private sector of our economy may suffer seriously if our emphasis on space and defense research continues to dwarf industrial and commercial effort. While space and defense are necessary areas of research, and should be encouraged, we must recognize the price we are paying for our one-sided emphasis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Dr. Killian be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Crisis in Research

(By James R. Killian, Jr.)

(The expenditure of Federal funds for scientific research and development has had an enormous impact on Government projects, on private industry, and on our economy. For an elucidation of the issues involved in our accelerated scientific program, we turn to James R. Killian, Jr., former president of MIT, Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1957 to 1959, and currently chairman of the corporation of MIT.)

Since World War II, the United States has witnessed an astonishing growth in scientific research and development. Now, with national policy supporting a rapidly growing program in space technology, notably that required for a race to the moon, we see a further buildup of total national effort, especially in development and technology as distinct from basic research and science.

Inherent in this growth of our development commitments is a multitude of problems that call for public understanding and debate. The issues are profoundly important not only to our national security and world position but also to the Nation's general welfare, its economic growth, the utilization of its human resources, and the integrity and strength of its system of higher education. In this article I should like to highlight some of these issues which need more public discussion than they have so far received, giving special attention to the impact of Federal funds for research and development, including those allotted to the space race, on the future strength of American industry and our economy.

Let me list some of the salient and striking facts about our current effort:

Our annual rate of expenditure in the United States for scientific research and development is approximately $17 billion—about 3 percent of our gross national product.

There has been more than a threefold increase in annual dollar outlay for research and development in the last decade, and whereas 10 years ago the Federal Government supplied less than half the funds for this effort, today it finances about two-thirds of it.

Out of the $12.4 billion the Government is spending in the current fiscal year for research and development, about 65 percent will be spent by industry under contract. Private industry itself is expected to finance another $5 billion for research. Three quarters of all research and development in the United States is performed in industrial laboratories.

Obviously, with some two-thirds of the country's research and development effort being paid for by Federal funds, and with its great procurement contracts, the Government has become directly or indirectly the employer of 60 to 70 percent of the Nation's scientists and engineers.

Dollar expenditure, including public and private, for research and development is rising about 15 percent each year, but our pool of technical manpower is growing only 6 percent a year. With growth in available personnel not keeping pace with the Nation's expanding research expenditures, we may eventually face the possibility of a decline in research productivity and quality of performance. Already the talent squeeze, coupled with the rising cost of instrumentation and other factors, has forced the cost of research to increase by nearly 50 percent since 1954, and this cost will probably double before the end of this decade.

In research that involves the most advanced science and technology—and much of the research financed by the Government is of this kind—the demand for top-grade talent educated to the Ph.D. level is far greater than the supply, and the gap seems to be widening.

Projections of research and development outlays to 1970 yield some startling figures. Given present trends, including the very rapid expansion of our space program, total national expenditures for research and development could exceed $40 billion by 1970, with the Government's share of the bill growing greater and industry's becoming smaller. Some projections (which assume, perhaps wrongly, that a large military space program will inevitably be added to the rapidly growing NASA program) place the Government's own expenditure at this figure or higher by 1970.

This basket of facts and future possibilities holds an array of issues that must command the attention of thoughtful people in Government, industry, and the universities. Private industry, especially, is confronted with some profoundly difficult questions.

For example, there is a tendency for Government funds applied to space and weapons research and development to retard the growth of privately financed industrial research and development. As Dr. Jerome Wiesner commented in recent testimony before a congressional committee, there is danger that this growing Federal research will price private research out of existence. The ease of getting military and space contracts may tempt private companies to neglect research financed by themselves and directed at competitive commercial objectives. The high salaries frequently associated with Government contracts tend also to draw high-quality talent away from other fields of industrial research.

Because of the kind of large-scale, sophisticated research currently needed by the Government, the industrial research it sponsors tends to be concentrated in a small number of companies. In a few industries this concentration may lead to a weakening of the technological capability and the competitive strength of other industries and of small companies at a time when these industries and companies need strengthening if our economy is to grow.

The argument is advanced, especially by protagonists of an expanding man-in-space program, that military and space research have commercial potentialities sufficient to offset these effects and to insure our continued economic growth. Certainly they have important byproducts, especially in furthering the development of advanced technology important to all industry, but I have not yet seen convincing evidence to support the view that our military and space programs can attain their objectives and at the same time feed the civilian economy with enough new technology to warrant any letup in the growth of privately financed research. Industry has a very great responsibility diligently to seek out the byproducts of the military-space research and development programs that have commercial application and at the same time to maintain an adequate growth of privately supported research and development oriented toward new products and processes. Industry should not take the easy course and let its own research and development effort become deemphasized by a growing volume of research sponsored by the Federal Government. This is not unlike the requirement faced by our universities to maintain an adequate level of privately supported basic research, uncommitted to any objective but advancing knowledge.

Despite all the funds we pour into research annually, the percentage of our gross national product that we devote to civilian-commercial research and basic research could be surpassed in the next few years by competing industrial nations, such as Japan and certain members of the European Common Market, which do not have military and space expenditures as heavy as those borne by the United States. Privately financed industrial research has made an immense contribution to our welfare and prosperity in the past, and we depend on it to do so in the future.

If our vast research and development effort in defense and space works, even for the short term, to curtail productivity and economic growth in the United States, the results will damage not only the civilian sector but the space and military sectors as well; our national goals of all kinds, and certainly our defense, depend upon rising productivity and upon our maintaining a sound rate of economic growth. Both depend in part upon the inventiveness and initiative of the civilian sector of our economy and upon an adequate effort in uncommitted basic research, in contrast with applied research and development. While I doubt whether we yet know very much about how economic forces are affected by the distribution of effort between civilian-commercial research and development on the one hand and military space research on the other, wo do hear, increasingly, concern expressed that the growing military and space research programs may be retarding innovation in consumer products and shortchanging the consumer sector of our economy.

This is why some of us feel that we cannot charge ahead with additional space and other large technological Government programs without being mindful of the possible adverse effects on our civilian economy and of the importance of weighing them along with the good effects. I note this in full recognition of the economic assistance our expanding space program is providing many industries and communities.

The way our technical personnel distributes itself and is utilized is more important than the way we allot our research and development dollar, although the two, of course, are linked. While we may not yet face an absolute shortage of technical personnel in the United States, unquestionably we do face an acute shortage of exceptional talent possessing that level of education in science and engineering which enables it to master and use effectively the new and advanced technologies.

As I have noted, the impact of Government funds has been to draw to Government-supported research a high proportion of this up-to-date talent, with the result that industry, in its nonspace and nonmilitary work, has found it increasingly difficult to get enough men to do the high-quality work it requires. The glamour of space research has drawn high-quality industrial personnel away from missile and other weapons programs that militarily are as urgent as ever but now seem relatively old hat. Indeed, there is an increasing number of informed people who are worried about a possible dropoff in the advances the United States has been making in military technology.

The future of the Nation requires that we continue to maintain superiority in military technology (including space technology legitimately important to military strength); in the dangerous world in which we live, this goal must have top priority in the use of our scientific and technological resources. One gains the impression that our military research and development, aside from evolutionary improvements in atomic weapons and from advances in space technology in the last 5 years or so, may have lost innovative vigor. We need to try to understand the influences which may be producing this effect, if indeed it has happened, just as we need to be sensitive to conditions that may be reducing the ingenuity, inventiveness, and advance that have long characterized our nonmilitary, nonspace industrial technology.

These undesirable effects can occur, despite a steadily growing expenditure for research and development, if that expenditure is not carefully managed to encourage innovation and the increase of productivity and if we fail to recognize that fundamental advances in research depend upon brilliant, creative minds and not on numbers or dollars.

Science and technology are both advancing so rapidly, and so much in the direction of greater complexity, that we do not have enough highly educated personnel to carry out well all the tasks we have set for ourselves and at the same time to master and exploit new fields. As we consider further major national programs involving large-scale research and development, we must consider our manpower budget as well as our dollar budget most carefully, both in the executive branch and in Congress.

If we are to have the personnel who can master these advanced technologies, we must accept the necessity of doing two things:

First, we must increase the number of scientists and engineers educated by our universities and institutes of technology. We must urgently try to increase the number of young people who are educated to the level of the doctor's degree or its equivalent in science and related fields. In a recent study (the Gilliland report) issued by the President, his Science Advisory Committee recommends, as a minimum, that the number of doctor's degrees awarded each year in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences combined be increased from the 3,000 presently given to 7,500 in 1970. Such an unprecedented increase could be achieved only by a large increase in Federal aid for financing graduate education.

And, second, we must devise ways to upgrade technical personnel already at work in industry. There are probably several hundred thousand engineers in the United States whose skills are obsolete in terms of the new technologies and the current requirements of science-based industries. We need to find a way, as one of our leading industrialists has already proposed, whereby this great pool of engineers can be afforded an opportunity to develop new competence in depth in mathematics, science, and engineering, so that their usefulness will be enhanced and their obsolescence docked. We thus face the need for one of the largest and most professionally advanced adult-education programs in history, a program which, to be successful, will require participation by the most advanced and science-rich universities and engineering schools. It cannot be a minor effort or handled by amateurs if we are to continue to lead in our industrial technology. A few leading companies and institutions are now experimenting in the development of strong programs.

What Admiral Rickover recently emphasized in speaking of industrial deficiencies in nuclear-reactor technology, informed scientists and engineers have long been pointing out about inadequate industrial mastery of many new and emerging technologies. It is of the utmost importance to our commercial competitive position, as well as to our security and national prestige, that our private industry achieve unmatched competence in putting our advanced technology to work. The universities and institutes of technology share with industry the possibility for achieving this mastery; it requires the finest and most modern education of our talent, along with a quality of management to match the competence of our technology. A number of American companies have a technological competence and brilliance unmatched anywhere else in the world, but we need many more as good as the best we now have.

Fundamental, also, is more efficient utilization of the personnel now in service. This involves many factors, including better management of our Government research and development programs and the improvement of contracting procedures, so as to eliminate incentives to waste or misuse manpower. At the request of the President's Science Advisory Committee and with the endorsement of the President, the National Academy of Sciences has appointed a committee comprising outstanding industrial, educational, and other leaders to undertake what is undoubtedly the first comprehensive review of the utilization of technical manpower in the United States.

The Federal Government faces a desperate struggle to recruit and hold competent technical supervisory and managerial talent. In fact, it is suffering a dangerous weakening of its management strength largely because its pay scales and personnel policies have not been adequately competitive with those in industry and other private institutions. The recent Federal pay increases authorized by Congress are a first step in remedying this weakness.

High competence is required in Government if we are to make the enormous research and development contracting system work well, preserving the desirable features of Government laboratories, private industry, and nonprofit institutions. We need managers in Government, as well as in industry, who are sensitive to the problems of national balance in the research and development effort, who combine a mastery of both technology and management, and who can minimize the poor judgment that often results in faulty plans and requirements, excessive failures, unnecessary technological complexity, or the launching of projects not practically attainable. The President's Science Advisory Committee has continually emphasized these requirements and accomplished much in initiating measures to meet them, thus proving itself increasingly helpful to the President and to the strengthening of the Government's resources for planning and managing research.

These matters need increased public attention as we adapt ourselves to the greatest research and development effort in history. We are, in fact, becoming a research-oriented society, a condition that has arrived so fast that, quite understandably, we are encountering growing pains. I do not feel that the present magnitude of our Government research effort is too large, even though it may be lacking in balance. I do feel, given present rates of growth, that we face crucial decisions about the future size of the effort, especially the level of our space effort and our capability to carry through present space commitments with success and without unnecessary waste and failures. These decisions must be made with an acute awareness of our manpower resources and of the vital needs of the private, commercial sector of our economy, the engine of our economic growth. Privately financed research, both in industry and in the universities, needs to be steadily increased.

As a research-oriented society, we have the possibility of—in fact, we may now be in the midst of—a great creative thrust in which the energies of our people will find a new measure of release and our power as a nation will be raised to a new level of benignity. This renaissance through research, especially corporate sponsored research, can afford a flowering of individual skills and new avenues of individual fulfillment that will draw out as never before the latent talents and the sense of joyous exploration in increasing numbers of our people. Such is the promise of research if we deploy our funds and creative talent wisely.

WHY ARE NEARLY 5 MILLION AMERICANS JOBLESS?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the April 1 issue of Newsweek contains an excellent article entitled "Unemployment in America." It is one of the most comprehensive, perceptive, and thoughtful articles I have read on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that an abbreviated version of the article in Newsweek be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA—IN THE BEST OF TIMES, WHY ARE 4.9 MILLION IDLE?

Poverty in the midst of plenty—that is the bitter, baffling anomaly of unemployment in the United States today.

Americans unquestionably earn more, spend more, and enjoy more material wealth than any other people in the history of the world, and the figures keep going up. The Affluent Society has become a happy statistical cliché:

Americans this year will earn an incredible $452.5 billion, $23.5 billion more than last year.

They will spend the staggering sum of $240 billion.

Their total assets are approaching $1.1 trillion—equal to more than $5,800 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Yet within these glittering statistics lies a bitter paradox: 4.9 million people are jobless; on a seasonally adjusted basis, 6.1 percent of the labor force is unemployed.

At least one in every five persons in the U.S. labor force, what's more, will be unemployed at some time this year. At least another 2.6 million workers will be restricted to part-time employment because a full-time job is unavailable. At least 1 in every 11 workers in the Nation's 30 biggest cities will continue to tramp the streets in search of a job that isn't there. And nowhere will the paradox be more pronounced than in the hard core of unemployment, where there will be at least 5 million persons jobless for 15 weeks and quite probably more, about half of them the breadwinners in their families.

All this adds up to what President Kennedy calls our No. 1 economic problem—and the problem has been growing steadily worse. After the first postwar slump of 1948–49, the Nation's unemployment rate fell to 2.7 percent in the recovery that accompanied the Korean war (compared with the 3 percent level that U.S. Government economists consider full employment). Then came the recession of 1953–54, followed by an upturn during which joblessness never fell below 4.2 percent. The unemployment floor has moved progressively higher in the succeeding recessions (chart, p. 62) [not printed in the RECORD]. In fact, the Nation hasn't achieved what the administration now calls the interim goal toward full employment—4 percent jobless—during any single month since 1957; the Nation has suffered 5 years of what Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz calls intolerably high unemployment. Causes of the problem:

The economy hasn't been growing nearly fast enough. The U.S. growth rate since 1957 has averaged only 3 percent a year versus 5 percent for Western Europe (though, of course, Europe started with a greater potential for expansion—a lower overall economy and war devastation to be repaired). New workers have swelled the labor force by 21 percent since World War II versus a 17-percent increase in jobs. And the work force is increasing more rapidly now. Two years ago, 2.6 million Americans reached the age of 18; 2 years from now, the number reaching that age will be 3.8 million.

Automation is eliminating an estimated 1.5 million jobs a year.

Through the rose-colored glasses of the affluent masses, however, the unemployed are almost invisible. "Much of the unemployment is scattered," says Wirtz, "and many who are without jobs are not in a desperate state. This is part of the problem of getting people to care about it."

Furthermore, there are many who challenge the figures—even though a panel of academic experts last year studied the Government's unemployment surveys and pronounced them valid in concept and execution. The president of a big Chicago department store, for one, questions the accuracy of unemployment data; he would like to see a qualitative analysis to show how many of the jobless are in fact employable.

Some Americans are, indeed, fatalistic about joblessness. A successful San Francisco importer says: "Chronic unemployment has been with us in the past. It is with us now. Unemployment is going to stay, and we are going to have to live with it."

Other Americans believe the unemployed are shiftless. A hard-nosed businessman in West Virginia says: "Cut off their relief payments and they'll have to go to work. Give them a deadline and then nothing more."

In truth, unemployment is not as bad as it once was. One need look no further for a striking comparison than the great depression of the thirties—when 12.8 million workers, fully 25 percent of the labor force, were unemployed. Unable to pay rent, unable to meet their mortgage payments, millions of Americans were evicted. Whole families lived—and died—in tarpaper shacks and tin-lined caves and scavenged for food. Many, who could not beg or borrow enough to feed their hungry children, stole what they could. Many others turned their children out to fend for themselves. Before the worst was over, violence and unrest swept the land, and there was open talk of revolution.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SENATOR NELSON'S MAIDEN SPEECH ON CONSERVING OUR WATER SUPPLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my distinguished junior colleague and former Governor of Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] delivered his maiden speech in the Senate on Monday. Unfortunately, I could not be present. Senator NELSON's speech was concise, eloquent, persuasive. It was on a subject on which he is an outstanding national expert; namely, conservation.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin spoke in support of the Neuberger bill, to end the serious threat of detergents to our water supply. GAYLORD NELSON is recognized in Wisconsin as a truly outstanding authority on conservation. He has made the greatest contribution in that field that any Wisconsin Governor has made.. This is demonstrated by the fact that he was responsible for the conception and the enactment of his magnificent $50 million conservation program for Wisconsin, the finest conservation program in America.

PASSOVER MATZOTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heretofore protested the denial by the Soviet authorities of matzoth, the sacred wafer used to celebrate the Passover, which is very dear to the religious observance of Jews throughout the world, including those in the Soviet Union.

Three protests have now been made, in addition to my own; namely, by the New York Board of Rabbis, by the chief rabbi of Great Britain, Rabbi Israel Brodie; and also the protests made in the hearing before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which is now in session in Geneva.

Mr. President, the action of the Soviet authorities for the second consecutive year in prohibiting state bakeries from providing matzoth for the celebration of Passover and in rejecting all attempts to import matzoth from other countries can be interpreted in only one way. This is more than another Communist antireligious measure, and it cannot be separated from the entire series of anti-Jewish acts taken by the Communist Government of the U.S.S.R. The total ban on importing or baking matzoth, which for thousands of years has been part of the Jewish religious observance of Passover, is inexcusable, and the chorus of protests from the people of the free world should be loud enough to penetrate the walls of the Kremlin. We know that Chairman Khrushchev and the Soviet authorities are sensitive to the charge of anti-Semitism, and they should know that this is the way the world regards their actions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three news reports of appeals to the United Nations and to Moscow to permit the baking of matzoth. The appeals were made by the New York Board of Rabbis and by the chief rabbi of Great Britain, Israel Brodie. I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of hearings on anti-Semitism by the Soviet Union. The hearings were held by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. These dispatches were transmitted on March 25 by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

There being no objection, the dispatches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New York Rabbis Appeal to U.N. To Intervene With Russia for Matzoth

NEW YORK, March 24.—An appeal to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, requesting intervention with the authorities of the Soviet Union for permission to Russian Jews to bake matzoth or to import matzoth from this country, was sent today by the New York Board of Rabbis. The board, comprised of Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative spiritual leaders in New York, is the largest rabbinical body in the world. Signed by Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, president of the board, and other ranking officers of the organization, the cable stated:

"The New York Board of Rabbis is deeply distressed by the Russian Government's total ban on the public baking and sale of matzoth for the large number of Soviet Jews, thus depriving them of a religious article indispensable for the proper observance of Passover, which begins on the evening of April 8. We, the board's officers, speaking for the entire membership, plead with the Commission that it direct an urgent appeal to the Soviet Government for the revocation of that ban. If facilities are unavailable in Russia, we are prepared to provide matzoth if permitted to do so."

British Chief Rabbi Appeals to Moscow To Permit Matzoth Baking

LONDON, March 24.—British Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie appealed to Soviet authorities today "in the name of Anglo-Jewry" to permit Soviet Jews to have matzoths for Passover next month.

The statement cited the announcement in the Moscow Central Synagogue on March 16 that, as happened in 1962, the state bakeries would not provide matzoth this year. The congregants had been advised to do their best to bake matzoth in their homes.

The chief rabbi cited the difficulties for Soviet Jews in such home baking and noted that any Jewish family which was able to bake more than it needs and sought to dispose of the excess to other families might well be arrested for speculation. The appeal urged the Soviet officials "even at this late hour" to reconsider the decision "and permit this basic religious requirement to be performed in an adequate and satisfactory manner."

U.N. Body To Discuss Soviet Discrimination Against Jews

GENEVA, March 24.—Soviet suppression of Jewish religion and culture will come under scrutiny here before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which is now in session here. The session is drafting a U.N. declaration and a U.N. convention to ban religious discrimination in all countries.

The Human Rights Commission meanwhile heard preliminary attacks against Soviet anti-Semitism from governmental and nongovernmental representatives this weekend. Under its rules of procedure the Commission does not permit the names of countries involved to be mentioned, but representatives of Jewish organizations, of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and of several Latin American member-states, pointedly directed their remarks against the U.S.S.R.

A NOOSE AROUND THE NATION'S FUEL NEEDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and I have joined in sending to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, a letter in which we seriously question the adequacy of the revised fuel oil quota system. It is our conclusion that the announced revision of the quota system falls short by at least 80,000 barrels a day of meeting our needs.

We find it difficult to reconcile the 7-percent increase in the allocation to the 24 authorized importers in our State with the 68-percent increase given to the two authorized importers in the State of Florida.

The letter to Secretary of the Interior Udall is a serious document, dealing with grave problems and demanding a full answer: an answer of facts and action. We have looked behind the ballyhoo of the administration announcement of a revised quota system to go into effect on April 1, 1963. And we have seen the old, bland wink, telling those who want nothing done that their wishes are being fulfilled and that the fireworks are for public consumption.

The administration announcement of March 15 says that "the new program takes into account increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers." Actually, it represents a reduction of imports from last year in terms of consumer needs and leaves us short by more than 80,000 barrels a day. What do we do for this short fall? Why does not the administration just tell us that it has decreed that the U.S. consumer will use coal, not fuel oil?

The administration announcement of March 15 says that "procedures for granting allocations to individual importers have been revised to enhance competition in the residual fuel oil market." Actually, the program gives no indication that suppliers will receive enough oil to meet their commitments to consumers, that suppliers—old and new—can bid against each other for customers, or that public utilities can with confidence enter into contracts for supplies with distributors of their choice. What do we do about such distribution shortages? Why does not the administration just tell us that it has decreed an increase in fuel prices?

In a memorandum to the President, dated February 13, 1963, the Office of Emergency Planning recommended a "relaxation of controls consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security." Actually, the new import quotas and their allocation contribute little if anything to the national security interest in having a hemispheric energy supply system and in having economically strong and politically stable partners in Latin America. What do we do with our American oil producing neighbors whose economic development has such high priority with us? Why does not the administration just tell us that it has decreed the national security and the coal interests to be one and the same, and that the Alliance for Progress objectives will be financed out of the pocket of the U.S. taxpayer, instead of by trade, too?

Mr. President, I ask that our letter to Secretary Udall be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint Letter From Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, and Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall

MARCH 27, 1963.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We refer to the changes in the residual fuel oil import quota system announced by the Department of the Interior on March 15, 1963.

Two broad questions arise in connection with these changes:

1. Do they reflect the recommendation of the February 13, 1963, memorandum for the President from the Office of Emergency Planning (OEP) that there be "a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls" on residual fuel oil imports?
2. To what extent are they consistent with the announcement's stated intention "to enhance competition in the residual fuel oil market?"

We wish to ascertain the answers to these broad questions by requesting a full report from you on the following major questions:

A

In May 1961 the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Branch of Petroleum Economics, issued a "Forecast of Residual Fuel Oil Supply and Demand." Has this forecast been updated to serve as the basis for next year's quota and has adequate allowance been made to rebuild stocks? What assumptions were made as to the actual and projected levels of east coast nonbonded stocks on March 31, 1963, and March 31, 1964, respectively? If a forecast has been made, is it available to be consulted in the same detail as the last one?

B

How does the 50,000 barrels a day (b/d) increase in import allocations affect "the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security," cited in the OEP memorandum? Does the new system of granting allocations assure continued reliance on Western Hemisphere sources for residual fuel oil—and to what extent? How does it reflect our economic and political goals within this hemisphere?

C

The announcement on March 15, 1963, assumes residual fuel oil imports to district I during the current year at a level of 525,000 b/d; an increase of 64,000 b/d over the previous year. The announced level of 575,000 b/d for the coming year, beginning April 1, was described, therefore, as an increase of 50,000 b/d, as compared with the current year. According to the publication, Oil Daily, 15,000 b/d of this 50,000 b/d allocation increase are intended to rebuild inventories drawn down in the current year. Therefore, in tacit recognition of the fact that the import level for the current year was too low by 15,000 b/d, the import level should be considered to have been 540,000 b/d, instead of 525,000 b/d. Had the import allocation for the current year been 540,000 b/d, the import level for the coming year would be 560,000 b/d (575,000 b/d minus 15,000 b/d). Thus, the current year's increase over last year would have been 79,000 b/d (64,000 b/d plus 15,000 b/d), instead of 64,000 b/d. This increase would then be compared to an effective increase for the coming year of 20,000 b/d (560,000 b/d versus 540,000 b/d) instead of the announced 50,000 b/d. The discrepancy between effective and announced increases is further accentuated by the emergency advance drawdowns against the coming fuel year which are being permitted to the extent of some 3,000 b/d. These draw-downs mean that the import allocations of the current fuel year should be considered to have been increased by that amount, making the appropriate level for the current year 543,000 b/d. Thus, because of the draw-downs, the level for the coming year, should be considered to be only 557,000 b/d, for an effective increase of 14,000 b/d as compared to an 82,000 b/d increase for the current year over the last year. This figure of 14,000 b/d properly would reflect the effective increase in the import allocations for the coming fuel year against which to measure the adequacy of the overall import level for the coming year. It is this figure which is of significance for consumers.

Actually, the case may well be more severe. It is reputably reported that it will be necessary to rebuild stocks to the extent of some 30,000 b/d. This would indicate that the current year's allocation should be considered to have been 555,000 b/d instead of 525,000 b/d, and that next year's allocation for consumer use should be considered to be only 545,000 b/d instead of 575,000 b/d. Thus, next year's actual import quota allocation would represent an effective reduction of 10,000 b/d from the current year's, unless the present desperate inventory situation is allowed to continue. This inventory situation is unfortunate both from the standpoint of marketing and of national security. It is also reputably estimated that a 55,000 b/d increase in demand for residual fuel oil by power plants and nonutility consumers on the east coast is to be expected during the next fuel year, while availability from domestic sources is expected to decline by at least 15,000 b/d. Under this latter set of estimates—a 10,000 b/d reduction of the effective import quota allocation, plus a 55,000 b/d increase in demand plus a 15,000 b/d decline in domestic availability—the announced revision of the quota system falls short of meeting our needs by at least 80,000 b/d.

In the light of either of the assumptions above, how can the new program be reconciled with the statement attributed to you in the March 15 announcement, that it "takes into account the increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers"?

D

Two new plants in New York (Con-Edison and Long Island Light) will require a total of 25,000 b/d in additional supplies. In addition, there is a normal estimated 6 percent annual increase in consumption demand by powerplants and another 3 percent by nonutility users. The 24 authorized importers for the whole New York area have received an increased allocation of 25,518 b/d. How will all of these demands be met by increased allocations which just about satisfy the new users in the area—even if the problems raised by paragraph (c) are not brought to bear?

Further, as Senators from New York we find it difficult to reconcile the 7 percent increase in the allocation to 24 authorized importers in our State with the 68 percent (5,807 b/d) increase given to the 2 authorized importers in the State of Florida.

E

By what means will the revised procedures for granting allocations to individual importers enhance competition in the residual fuel oil market? Will they permit these importers to obtain a sufficient number of import tickets to fulfill their contractual commitments to consumers? How are they designed to allow utilities and other users freely to choose their suppliers?

Mr. Secretary, we have looked into these questions and have found no answer to them either in the March 15 release of the Department of the Interior nor in any other governmental report. We have noted stories in the press that the recommendations of the OEP memorandum would be ignored and that 15,000 barrels a day of the 50,000 barrel increase in the import allocations are admittedly to be used for stock rebuilding; and we have seen no quoted source or reply as to these allegations.

The questions we raise are based on a serious concern with our national security energy requirements, the success of our foreign policy (especially with respect to the goals of the Alliance for Progress which requires the opening, insofar as possible, not the restriction, of U.S. markets for the products of our hemispheric neighbors), our Nation's continued economic growth under a competitive and free system of private enterprise which calls for free choice of fuels and suppliers, and the welfare of the consuming public. We believe that these questions must be answered, either by a report which clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of the revised quota system in meeting the problems which concern us and many others or by "meaningful" relaxation of controls and a "careful" revision of the means for allocating such quotas as may remain.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning for their comment as well.

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits.
Kenneth B. Keating.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. Javits] addressed himself to the problem of the revision of the fuel oil quota.

Several weeks ago the Secretary of the Interior anounced a revised fuel oil quota system to come into effect April 1, 1963. Theoretically, the objective of this system is to insure adequate residual fuel oil supplies for the requirements of eastern users.

In actual fact, the new allotment permitted by the Secretary of the Interior represents an increase of only 50,000 barrels a day over last year's allotment, which is less than the 56,000 barrels a day increase of last year's over the previous year. The meager addition appears to fly directly in the face of a top-level memorandum prepared in the Office of Emergency Planning which called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports.

"Too little and too late" is the reaction of many eastern users of residual fuel, who will be obliged to pay more and who will face continued uncertainty in the future as to the adequacy of oil supplies.

Mr. President, it is unfortunately all too clear that this decision was made to satisfy the interests of a very small factor in our economy at the expense of national growth and progress.

One of the principal announced goals of our Government has been to stimulate national economic growth, to get the country moving again, as the slogan went. Yet, the latest action of the Interior Department, in restricting residual fuel oil imports, has effectively put a stranglehold on the fuel supply of east coast industries and a higher price tag on the needs of east coast consumers. You don't have to be an economist to know that low-cost fuel is essential to economic development. Therefore, we must not countenance putting powerful special interests above the national interest in economic progress, in creating more jobs and in promoting free competition.

It is instructive and alarming to compare this attitude on the part of our Government, in which national security, trade considerations, consumer benefits and economic growth seem to be subordinated to a minority lobbying influence, with the very determined fuel policies that the Soviet Union has adopted. The Soviets have deliberately and skillfully used their oil to undermine Western markets and create a wedge of influence and power in free world countries. While we in effect are pouring down the drain one of the most precious resources of the Western Hemisphere, in order to protect the entrenched interests of coal producing areas, the Soviets are working night and day to find new markets for their products.

It is time to put the national interest first. It is time to consider the right of American enterprises freely and competitively to seek their most economical fuel sources. It is time to build new industries, new jobs for the future, new opportunities for the Nation. To prevent the import of residual fuel oils necessary for the economic demands of the east coast is like restricting sales of automobiles to protect the interests of horse and buggy drivers. It is no way to meet the pressing 20th century demand for jobs and economic progress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record the text of an editorial which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 16, which is equally critical of the position taken by our Government in this matter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Skidding on Oil

Caught between the devil of domestic politics and the deep blue Caribbean Sea, the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy. It is seeking to please everybody. During the Eisenhower administration, this country unwisely began placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States. And what has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry.

A month ago, a top-level White House memorandum called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports. The outcry from coal producers and from the refining branch of the oil industry was prompt and predictable—and apparently the outcry was heard. As this newspaper forecast, the administration yesterday announced the smallest possible increase in residual quotas—50,000 barrels a day which would make the daily quota 567,000 barrels.

The figures are slippery, and by artful presentation it may be possible to argue that something is being done for the embattled democracy of Venezuela. But can it be seriously argued that the wafer-thin increase is in any sense "meaningful"? That was the phrase used by the White House memorandum—a phrase, be it noted, that was approved by every department involved except the Labor Department. Last year, without benefit of a White House report, residual quotas were increased by 56,000 barrels a day.

Let it be acknowledged that the dilemma is real. But this administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism. It surely might entail some difficulties with coal State Senators if a genuinely "meaningful" relaxation of residual oil imports were put into effect April 1. But then it would entail infinitely more difficulties if the regime of President Betancourt should be overwhelmed by the totalitarian enemies who find comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela.

LET'S MAKE THE WORDS "FHA INSURED" MEAN WHAT THEY SAY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is time to make sure that the written word means what it says.

What do the words "FHA insured" mean, for instance?

The homebuyer assumes those two words give him protection when he secures a home with an FHA mortgage. Until late spring of last year, I shared that belief. Now I know better, as do some 50 homeowners in the Anchorage, Alaska, area, and hundreds more in other portions of the United States, and as will many hundreds more should they discover serious defects in the construction of their homes.

I hope they will not find that the construction of their homes is defective. However, too many homeowners have been misled by the term "FHA insured."

It means only that the repayment of the mortgage is insured. It does not guarantee that the quality of the homes will meet minimum construction standards when the homes are ultimately conveyed to the homebuyer—even though there have been faulty FHA inspections, such as occurred on the materials used in home construction in my State.

Last year I introduced legislation which would give validity to the words "FHA insured." A number of cosponsors endorsed the intent of the legislation; and the then Federal Housing Commissioner, Neal J. Hardy, endorsed the proposed FHA policy change. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks a news story, by William Steif, published in the Washington Daily News of June 25, 1962, setting forth Mr. Hardy's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GRUENING. My attention was directed to the need for reform when a number of Alaskans living in Eagle River, just outside Anchorage, wrote to complain that their FHA insured homes were substandard in many ways.

When I first discussed their plight on the floor of the Senate, I detailed the complaints. That true story appears in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 8, pages 11290–11294. The owners of the prefabricated homes listed such distressing problems as lost heat through the roofs, ice formations on the interior living room and bedroom walls, cracked and warped cabinets, floors, and walls, uneven ceilings, loose and buckling wall paneling, improperly installed storm doors and windows, and used, rather than new, plumbing concealed in the walls.

These new FHA-approved homes were constructed by Modern Homes, Inc. The FHA case, 60–008464, takes up many files in my office and many more files at the Federal Housing Administration. The Alaska story had a satisfactory ending, because the homeowners complained to the Alaska congressional delegation. The FHA—to its credit—moved swiftly, and required the contractor, Modern Homes, Inc., and Centrex Construction Co., to correct the defective features. Not all home owners with FHA insured mortgages are so fortunate.

Under existing law, there is no obligation on the part of the FHA to make good the losses incurred by homeowners. Since introduction of the legislation in the 87th Congress, numerous cases of complaint, such as occurred in Alaska, have been called to my attention. They have occurred across the country, not in one area. The problem is national. For example, recently similar complaints which occurred in the Reno, Nev., area were called to my attention. I ask unanimous consent that nine news stories concerning the recent complaints in Reno be reprinted in the Record at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. GRUENING. I therefore introduce, on behalf of myself and 12 colleagues, a bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by FHA-insured mortgages, and to require indemnification in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages.

I am pleased to be joined in the introduction of this bill by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until the close of business on April 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. So that other Senators may have an opportunity to read the text of the bill I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1200) to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR STRUCTURAL OR OTHER MAJOR DEFECTS IN MORTGAGED PROPERTIES

"Sec. 517. The mortgagor under any mortgage covering a one-to-four family dwelling heretofore or hereafter insured under this Act may file with the Commissioner a claim, within three years after the insurance of such mortgage, for the reasonable costs of correcting structural or other major defects which exist in such dwelling and which require correction in order to bring the dwelling into substantial conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Commissioner or in order to render the dwellings safe and habitable. The Commissioner shall have final and conclusive authority to pass upon the validity and amount of any claim filed in accordance with the provisions of this section, and such claims shall be paid by him on the basis of such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"INDEMNIFICATION BONDS

"Sec. 518. (a) The Commissioner is authorized and directed to require, in connection with any property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for not more than a four-family residence and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, that the builder, seller, or such other person as the Commissioner may require, post a bond in such amount as the Commissioner shall require providing indemnification to the Commissioner in the event the Commissioner is required, under section 517 of this title, to pay to the mortgagor of such property the reasonable costs of correcting structural or other defects in the dwelling in order to bring it into substantial conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Commissioner and upon which the Commissioner based his valuation of the property.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall apply to any such property covered by a mortgage insured by the Commissioner after the effective date of this section, unless such mortgage is insured pursuant to a commitment therefor made prior to such date."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the need for legislation such as is proposed in this bill has drawn comment in a number of newspapers. An excellent story appeared in the Monday, March 25, 1963, edition of the Baltimore, Md., Sun. The article was written by Mr. Howard Norton, of the Sun's Washington bureau. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Norton's story be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL URGES BROADER FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURANCE—MEASURE AIMS TO HELP HOME BUYERS AS WELL AS PROTECT LENDERS

(By Howard Norton)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Congress this week is to get a revolutionary bill that would, for the first time, require that the term "FHA-insured" give protection to the home buyer and not merely to the bank that lends the mortgage money.

The measure would order the Federal Housing Administration to correct any major defects that show up in an FHA-insured house within 3 years of its completion.

FHA BLESSING SEEN

The idea is being put forward by Senator GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, and his bill is expected to have at least a dozen cosponsors among Members from both parties.

It is also expected to have the official blessing of the FHA.

Heretofore, "FHA-insured" has meant only that the lending bank is assured by the FHA that it will get its money back in case the borrower defaults.

There is nothing in the current Federal housing laws or regulations to protect the home buyer against shoddy construction that does not comply with FHA standards.

And there is nothing in the law that puts any responsibility on the FHA if its inspectors fail to screen FHA construction jobs properly.

Under the Gruening bill, builders of one- to four-family dwellings insured by the FHA would be required to post bond to cover the costs of correcting major structural and other defects that appear after the house is completed.

The bond would insure that the FHA is reimbursed for the cost of making such corrections.

It also would make unnecessary any increase in the current FHA insurance premium to cover this new risk.

BILL WAS TOO LATE

Under the present law, the insurance premium is paid by the home buyer, but the lending bank gets all the benefits of the insurance.

A similar bill was introduced late in the last session of Congress by the Senator from Alaska, but there was not enough time to have it processed through the Senate Housing Subcommittee before the session ended.

That bill (S. 3460) was cosponsored by an even dozen other Senators from States scattered across the country.

And it was indorsed by Neal J. Hardy, who resigned as FHA Commissioner to take a post with the Ford Foundation in January.

GRUENING expects to get his bill into the hands of the housing subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Finance Committee in plenty of time to have it considered when the subcommittee opens its public hearings on operations of the FHA, probably about mid-April.

"The FHA maintains construction standards for homes the mortgages on which it will insure," he pointed out today. "But it does not guarantee that the quality of the homes will meet the standards—even though there have been faulty FHA inspections, such as occurred recently in home construction in Alaska.

"MISLEADING," HE SAYS

"Under the existing law, therefore," he added, "the term 'FHA-insured' is misleading, for it means only that repayment of the mortgage is insured."

The Gruening bill does not define what it means by a "major defect," but a member of the Senator's staff said the Senator hopes the committee will fix a definite dollar amount, so there will be no difficulty in determining whether any particular defect comes within the law.

The bill is the direct outgrowth of the loud complaints registered last year by 50 Anchorage (Alaska) families who claimed they had been bilked in buying FHA-insured homes.

The 50 homes were prefabricated in Indiana and put together in Anchorage, where they were sold at prices ranging from $24,000 to $26,000.

In both Indiana and Alaska the construction work was inspected and approved by FHA inspectors, the Senator relates.

DIFFICULTIES FOLLOW

But shortly after they moved in, he said, the families found that in Alaska's −30-degree weather, ice formed on the living room and bedroom walls; they lost heat through the roofs; cabinets, floors, and walls were warped and cracked badly, and in some of them, plumbing was found already to have been used in other buildings.

Since there is nothing in the FHA law to require that agency to make corrections, however, the homeowners were obliged to file suits against the builders.

In the face of the mass of suits, the builders agreed to make some of the corrections demanded.

And the FHA director in Anchorage was fired, because of this case, after having two separate hearings.

Reports of shoddy work and laxity of inspection on FHA-insured projects have been received by housing authorities from many States, especially from Nevada, California, Florida, New York, and New Jersey.

"The housing and home finance agency has agreed with the principle that some relief should be available to homeowners under such circumstances," Hardy wrote in his endorsement of last year's Gruening bill.

This year's bill is to be virtually identical.

Mr. GRUENING. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the action of the FHA in the Alaska cases. It did what some other Federal agencies at times fail to do; namely, to do everything within their power to uphold the faith and good name of the Government of the United States, in the consciousness of the people of the United States. Some other Federal agencies, I regret to say, often disclaim responsibility for the actions of their personnel. When this happens, the faith and confidence of the American people in their Government is impaired and destroyed. The action of the FHA in the Alaska cases is all the more praiseworthy in that it had no obligation, legal or specifically mandatory, to move to rectify the malperformance of the builders. The FHA, however, felt that it had a moral obligation, and acted accordingly.

In so doing, it established a principle, a high standard, and a record deserving of the highest commendation. All honor to it and to its officials. They have demonstrated that they are in the fullest and the best sense of the word public servants.

I wish I could list the names of all the persons who worked to help correct the problems which had plagued the purchasers of the Alaskan homes, but unfortunately I do not know them all. I am familiar with the excellent work of then Commissioner Hardy; Mr. Thomas Gray, FHA Zone Operations Commissioner for the Far West, who devoted many long hours to settle the matter with the homeowners; Administrator Robert C. Weaver, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, who gave these men his full support; and Mr. Elmer Gagnon, the Alaska FHA director who worked closely with Mr. Gray.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 25, 1962]

AFTER SHODDY CONSTRUCTION COMPLAINTS, HARDY BACKS NEW FHA POLICY

(By William Steif)

Federal Housing Commissioner Neal J. Hardy today endorsed a proposed FHA policy change calling for the Government to accept some responsibility when buyers of FHA-insured homes are stuck with shoddy construction.

The proposed change results from 50 Alaska families' complaints that they were bilked in buying FHA-insured homes.

Until now FHA has insured only the mortgages of homes, staying out of insuring the homes and officially letting home buyers and sellers fight it out if the buyers don't think the homes come up to specifications.

REQUEST

Because of this year's experience outside Anchorage, Alaska, Mr. Hardy wants FHA authorization to:

Force contractors to bring homes up to adequate standards.

Use FHA money to bring homes up to standard if the contractors fail to live up to their agreements.

Mr. Hardy indorsed "the large idea" of a bill introduced to these ends by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska. The FHA boss disagreed on some details of Senator GRUENING'S bill, introduced Thursday, and said he is "studying its administrative feasibility." But he admitted original FHA error in insuring the $24,000 to $26,000 prefab homes, produced at Carlisle, Ind.

Senator GRUENING first started to hear from constituents at Eagle River, Alaska, just outside Anchorage and near two big Air Force bases, last winter.

SUBSTANCE

The substance of their complaints was that in Alaska's 30-below-zero weather their homes:

Lost heat through the roofs.

Ice formed on living room and bedroom walls.

Cabinets, floors, and walls were cracked and warped badly.

The contractor, Modern Homes, Inc., a subsidiary of Centex Construction Co., owned by Clint and John Murchison, was not making good on its 1-year warranty.

FHA said it sent an investigation team to Alaska and confirmed Senator GRUENING'S information. A report now is being made to Robert Weaver, Chief of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. On the basis of the report, Mr. Weaver either will support Senator GRUENING'S bill with slight amendments or draft a separate bill embodying ideas in Senator GRUENING'S bill.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 5, 1963]

FHA WILL INSPECT HOMES—PAINTERS' UNION COMPLAINT HEARD

The Federal Housing Administration agreed today to reinspect new homes in the Reno-Sparks area after hearing complaints that "every tract" subdivision "is in one way or another below FHA standards."

The complaints against alleged inadequate home construction were made by Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local 567, and Al Solari & Sons, Inc., a member of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter.

Contractors denied the charges when they were first put in a protest letter from Crumley to the FHA.

READY WITH PROOF

"We realize the seriousness of our accusation," Crumley told FHA Director Jay E. Baker and other FHA officials. "But we're willing to back the accusations up with any proof the FHA feel is necessary." The proof, he said, would include sworn statements from workers on the new subdivisions as well as field trip inspections.

"Anyone with 20–20 vision and commonsense" could see that "in one way or another the tracts don't meet FHA specifications," Crumley added. "It would hit them right in the face" if they looked, he said.

Tract builders, said Solari, "should recognize that they can't cut corners." Those who do cut corners, he said, "are throwing a bad light on all of us."

Crumley charged that some builders are "interested only in a fast buck. They come in here and then get out."

CAN'T BID JOBS

Solari said many long-time Reno area contractors can't bid on new homes jobs because the general contractors accept substandard bids from competitors. It is so bad, he said, many of the long-time contractors aren't even competing for the jobs.

Crumley illustrated this by charging that the "legitimate" contractors are "laughed at" by some general contractors because of their higher prices.

"So they (some general contractors) bring in their highbinders" to do the work at lower costs, Crumley charged.

Crumley added that legitimate contractors "turn their backs if they're honest" when they know the competitive bidding would require them to do substandard work.

"We're not on a witchhunt," Crumley said. "All we're trying to do is correct a serious situation."

"We're glad you made the effort to get down here," Baker replied to Crumley. "You should have come in a year ago."

"Who knew what would happen," Crumley replied. "But now legitimate contractors have to cut corners and John Q. Public pays the price."

Some general contractors have beat down painting contractors to the point it is impossible for them to bid, Solari added.

"Few (general contractors) do it," Solari added. "But the man who has been around a long time can't afford to do it."

LISTS COMPLAINTS

Crumley said specific complaints are: Painting done over bare wood surfaces; not enough coats of paint; not enough paint thickness; doors not sealed at the top and bottom; knotholes not sealed prior to painting; poor paint mixtures; doors are not flush with walls.

Crumley said the situation had worsened during the past 2 years' building boom and that the painters union had kept its eye fixed at what he said might soon be a catastrophe.

He said the union's attention was brought to the situation by new homeowners complaining of poor painting practices.

"The painters only do what their employers tell them to do and 9 percent of the employers do what the general contractors tell them," he said.

NO FINAL LOOK

Crumley said one area with 35 homes was not given a final FHA inspection before new home owners took occupancy. And, he said, homes that were not passed by the FHA 4 and 5 years ago now are given FHA inspectors' approval.

Baker said FHA loans cannot be closed out, however, unless there is a final inspection. But, he added, if home buyers take occupancy from the seller before the final inspection, the FHA can't control it.

Crumley volunteered to take those at the meeting to two subdivisions, which he called among the worst offenders.

Baker said FHA inspectors would take a look and report their findings to himself and other officials.

Crumley said the FHA should toughen its policy and thus raise the standards of those contractors which are not affected by the FHA, too.

"They may learn the hard way," Crumley said. But he added that if the FHA makes its inspections tougher, all the general contractors will react by policing their own operations better.

Solari called it an "educational program" for all concerned and added that the public knowledge of the situation would "ring bells and do a lot of good for the entire industry to correct" any malpractices.

Baker said because of the shortage of FHA inspectors—there are three in this area—it was impossible to maintain a constant check on the construction of all new homes.

Loren Fielder, the chief underwriter for the FHA, said new homes are provided with three or four inspections during the entire building stage and that the inspectors do not supervise the construction constantly.

"What it boils down to," Fielder said, "is the inspectors have to rely on inspections to see if there is adequate coverage in the finished application of the paint."

Lloyd Rider, the FHA's chief architect, said inspectors use a device to scratch the painted surface. If the bare wood shows through, it is evident that there wasn't enough paint put on.

Crumley said it was nearly impossible in some cases to tell if an inferior painting had been done on a house but that on occasion he had taken examples of the paint to the University of Nevada for testing. On at least one occasion, he said, he found the quality of the paint inferior.

FHA officials said that about 40 percent of the new homes in the area aren't under FHA loans and therefore the FHA has no control over what contractors in those areas do.

Baker added that while the FHA does as thorough a job as it can, it is the responsibility of the home buyer, too, to look into the quality of the product he buys.

Baker said the FHA wanted to know any evidence anyone had as to new homes not meeting the specifications and called for the public as well as workers in the field to report such instances.

He said it would be best to catch any malpractices on a day-to-day basis through spot inspections.

Solari said the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter, would look into the situation further at its next meeting.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 6, 1963]

CHARGES CHECKED—HOMES INSPECTED BY FHA

Federal Housing Administration Director Jay E. Baker said today if his inspectors find new homes in the Reno-Sparks area not built according to FHA standards, "There is no way we could do much about it," other than "blacklist" contractors.

He said inspectors began rechecking the homes under FHA loans today following complaints aired Tuesday which charged "every tract is in one way or another below FHA standards."

COMPLAINT MADE

That complaint was made by Gene Crumley, business representative of the Painters Local 567. Other complaints against general contracting in some areas of Reno and Sparks were made by Al Solari, of Solari and Sons, Inc., a member of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter.

Contractors denied the charges.

Baker said two inspectors would report their findings to the FHA office and then he and other officials would make followup spot checks. But he said it would take time because of other pressing problems faced by the FHA.

"We are going to check into some of these charges," Baker said. "But you can't expect us to drop everything and just jump on this.

WANTS REPORTS

"We would like to await some of the reports of the inspectors before we go out, too," he added. "Then we'll spot check their findings, if anything. I'm sure they'll find something."

Baker said if the inspectors find substandard work in homes less than a year old—still under the 1-year warranty—"we'll ask them (the contractors) do the work over again."

"If he (the contractor) persists in not doing it, we could put him on a blacklist and refuse to do business with him," Baker said.

COULD SUGGEST

If substandard work is found in homes over a year old—the 1-year warranty being expired—"We could suggest the contractor do the work over again," he said, "but there is no way we could do much about it."

"If we find a whole bunch (of substandard houses) with one contractor, we'd hesitate to want to do more work with him," he added.

"If such a contractor was blacklisted, it would mean he wouldn't be able to get FHA loans for buyers of his houses in Nevada, Arizona, California, Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, Oregon, or Hawaii," Baker said.

Baker said he has received calls from contractors defending FHA inspections since protests were lodged earlier this week in a letter from Crumley.

"Only two homeowners have called to inquire about the ruckus," he added.

"We anticipate we'll probably get some more calls, however," he said.

Les Bergin, who built Bergin Garden Apartments at 295 Grove Street, defended the FHA as doing a thorough job of inspections as well as making recommendations during the construction.

He said he installed an office at the construction site for use of FHA inspectors, who looked over the project at least three times a week.

"When we had problems, we'd call the FHA and they'd send over an inspector to give advice," Bergin added.

[From the Nevada State Journal, Feb. 6, 1963]

Reinspection Ordered by State FHA Director for Reno-Sparks Homes

Jay E. Baker, Federal Housing Administration director for Nevada, yesterday said his agency will reinspect new homes in the Reno-Sparks in the wake of statements that many tract homes are "in one way or another below FHA standards."

Making the complaints have been Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local No. 597, and Albert Solari, of C. Solari and Sons, Inc., Reno painting contractor and a member of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter.

Local contractors have denied the charges which were first presented by Crumley in a letter to the FHA.

Crumley said he realized his accusations are serious, but added: "We're willing to back the accusations up with any proof the FHA feels is necessary." That, he said, could include sworn statements from workers on the new subdivisions, as well as field trip inspections.

The labor leader charged some builders are "interested only in a fast buck. They come in here and then get out.

"Anyone with 20-20 vision and commonsense," he charged, could see that "in one way or another the tracts don't meet FHA specifications. It would hit them right in the face if they looked."

Solari, who is a partner in a local development corporation aside from his paint contracting work, said tract builders "should recognize that they can't cut corners." Those who do, he said, "are throwing a bad light on all of us."

Solari said many longtime Reno area contractors can't bid on new homes jobs because the general contractors accept substandard bids from competitors. It is so bad, he said, many of the longtime contractors aren't even competing for the jobs.

Crumley illustrated this by charging that the "legitimate" contractors are "laughed at" by some general contractors because of their higher prices.

"So they (some general contractors) bring in their highbinders" to do the work at lower costs, Crumley charged.

Crumley added that "legitimate" contractors "turn their backs if they're honest" when they know the competitive bidding would require them to do substandard work.

"We're not on a witchhunt," Crumley said. "All we're trying to do is correct a serious situation."

"We're glad you made the effort to get down here," Baker replied to Crumley. "You should have come in a year ago."

"Who knew what would happen," Crumley replied. "But now legitimate contractors have to cut corners and John Q. Public pays the price."

Some general contractors "have beat down" painting contractors to the point it is impossible for them to bid, Solari added.

"Few (general contractors) do it," Solari added. "But the man who has been around a long time can't afford to do it."

Crumley said specific complaints are: Painting done over bare wood surfaces; not enough coats of paint; not enough paint thickness; doors not sealed at the top and bottom; knotholes not sealed prior to painting; poor paint mixtures; doors are not flush with walls.

Crumley said the situation had worsened during the past 2 years' building boom and that the painters union had kept its eye fixed on what he said might soon be a "catastrophe."

He said the union's attention was brought to the situation by new homeowners complaining of poor painting practices.

"The painters only do what their employers tell them to do and 99 percent of the employers do what the general contractors tell them," he said.

Crumley said 1 area with 35 homes was not given a final FHA inspection before new homeowners took occupancy. And, he said, homes that were not passed by the FHA 4 or 5 years ago now are given FHA inspectors' approval.

Baker said FHA loans cannot be closed out, however, unless there is a final inspection. But, he added, if homebuyers take occupancy from the seller before the final inspection, the FHA can't control it.

Crumley volunteered to take those at the meeting to two subdivisions, which he called among the "worst offenders."

Baker said FHA inspectors would take a look and report their findings to himself and other officials.

Crumley said the FHA should toughen its policy and thus raise the standards of those contractors which are not affected by the FHA, too.

"They may learn the hard way," Crumley said. But he added that if the FHA makes its inspections tougher, all the general contractors will react by policing their own operations better.

Solari called it an educational program for all concerned and added that the public knowledge of the situation would "ring bells and do a lot of good for the entire industry to correct" any malpractices.

Baker said because of the shortage of FHA inspectors—there are three in this area—it was impossible to maintain a constant check on the construction of all new homes.

Loren Fielder, the chief underwriter for the FHA, said new homes are provided with three or four inspections during the entire building stage and that the inspectors do not supervise the construction constantly.

"What it boils down to," Fielder said, "is the inspectors have to rely on inspections to see if there is adequate coverage in the finished application of the paint."

Lloyd Rider, the FHA's chief architect, said inspectors use a device to scratch the painted surface. If the bare wood shows through, it is evident that there wasn't enough paint put on.

Crumley said it was nearly impossible in some cases to tell if an inferior painting had been done on a house but that on occasion he had taken examples of the paint to the University of Nevada for testing. On at least one occasion, he said, he found the quality of the paint inferior.

FHA officials said that about 40 percent of the new homes in the area aren't under FHA loans and therefore the FHA has no control over what contractors in those areas do.

Baker added that while the FHA does as thorough a job as it can, it is the responsibility of the home buyer, too, to look into the quality of the product he buys.

Baker said the FHA wanted to know any evidence anyone had as to new homes not meeting the specifications and called for the public as well as workers in the field to report such instances.

He said it would be best to catch any malpractices on a day-to-day basis through spot inspections.

Solari said the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno Chapter, would look into the situation further at its next meeting.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 7, 1963]

RESULTS OF CHECK TO BE WITHHELD—FHA OFFICIAL HOPES CORRECTIONS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED QUIETLY

Public disclosure will not be made in most instances if Federal Housing Administration inspectors find new subdivisions in the Reno-Sparks area not built according to FHA standards.

"If we can get it corrected without too much publicity," said FHA Director Jay E. Baker, "we'll be a lot further ahead."

Public announcement of any violations discovered would hinder attempts to bring the construction up to FHA standards, he said.

"We'd like to keep it to ourselves and the contractors unless it's all out of shape, unless a violation is real bad," Baker said. "We don't mean to withhold legitimate news," he added, "but our aim is to correct."

Baker ordered more inspections of new homes after Gene Crumbley, business representative of Painters Local 567, and Al Solari, of Solari & Sons, Inc., painting contractor, appeared at an FHA meeting to protest certain painting practices they alleged were done at new subdivisions.

"We're trying to do what we think are first things first to stop the practices, if they do exist," said Baker. "We can't change those that already have been painted. But we can change those that are being painted now."

Baker said the inspections have been on homes under construction rather than those, say, over 1 year old.

"The only way we can tell is to look at the ones in the process of being painted," he explained. "Those that are finished, it's pretty hard for anyone to tell.

CONCERNED

"We are concerned about those, if there are some, that haven't stood up," Baker continued, "but we'll try to catch that later on.

"I don't think we can be expected to catch every house in the community," he said. "We just don't have the people to do it with."

Baker said inspectors visited four subdivisions to make spot checks Wednesday and more inspections were planned. What they found, he didn't say.

"We want to reserve our judgment to get enough cases to really make a conclusion," he said. "We want to have a chance to look and give people who are doing the substandard work, if they are doing it, a chance to correct it," he added.

TEMPEST

The controversy, which was started earlier in the week by a letter sent from Crumley to the FHA protesting painting practices, was described as a "tempest in a teapot" by Bob Robertson, secretary-manager of the Northern Nevada Home Builders Association.

"I don't consider Reno and Sparks to be a teapot," retorted Crumley. "And I don't consider the complaints of the homeowners a tempest."

Robertson said the homebuilders police their own industry and didn't need Crumley's advice, calling it union interference.

"Mr. Crumley has chosen this allegation, which I consider to be without basis in fact, as a sounding board for more than just this case," Robertson said. "Even if Mr. Crumley sincerely believes his charges, he certainly could not have chosen a more inappropriate way to seek a quick solution," Robertson continued.

"If he were genuinely interested in solving this problem, he would have gone about it quietly," he added. "He has, instead, only been antagonistic."

Crumley replied: "We have found through our investigation that others tried following the quiet route to a solution and found blank walls. As far as I'm concerned, the solution will be found when the public is aware of what the facts are and what their rights are."

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 8, 1963]

SOME PAINTING BELOW STANDARD—TOP FHA OFFICIAL REVEALS DEFICIENCIES FOUND HERE

Some contractors are doing substandard painting work on new homes in the Reno-Sparks area even though they are financed by Federal Housing Administration loans, FHA Director Jay E. Baker revealed today.

The work not meeting FHA requirements was found when Baker ordered a reinspection of new homes after Gene Crumbley, business representative for Painters Local 567, charged "every tract is in one way or another below FHA standards."

Contractors doing the substandard work were called into the FHA office Thursday and more were called in today, Baker said.

"We have found some deficiencies and called in some contractors to straighten things out," he said. "There is every reason to believe they'll come in on invitations because they're aware if they don't it would mean admission of guilt on their part."

Bob Robertson of the Northern Nevada Home Builders Association, who earlier described the controversy as a "tempest in a teapot," said today he still believes the "situation has been blown out of proportion."

"If there are any deficiencies," Robertson added, "they are of a very minor nature."

SIX SUBDIVISIONS

Baker, who said his inspectors have covered six subdivisions so far, did not reveal how many contractors have been doing substandard work, how many have been called into his office, or the number of homes where deficiencies were discovered.

Baker also did not name the contractors doing the substandard work because he said it would "make it tougher to solve the problem." He said any publicity, in fact, would hamper efforts to straighten out the situation.

"We didn't figure we were going to bring the whole thing out because we hadn't had a chance to cover it all," he said. "And I don't see that any service will be made if we identify everything we find.

"The fact that we've found some deficiencies is sufficient knowledge," Baker added. "We're trying to correct them as we find them."

Baker said the contractors he'd called in have shown surprise when told their work was substandard.

WILL CORRECT THEM

"Once they're convinced they don't meet their own requirements or our minimums," he added, "they have assured me they will correct them." He said it wasn't difficult to convince the contractors.

Baker said some contractors need to review the requirements.

"It's just like going to school—you think you know the answers to everything, but unless you're refreshed you're not cognizant of it."

Aside from calling in contractors doing substandard work, Baker said, the FHA has plans to set up a clinic to review the requirements with all contractors.

Crumley, who started the controversy with a letter of protest to the FHA over inadequate painting practices allegedly done at new homes, said he will appeal to the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, at a meeting this weekend in Las Vegas. He said he would ask the national union leaders to bring pressure on the FHA in Washington to force contractors to do standard work.

POLLS PAINTERS

Al Solari of Solari & Sons, Inc., painting contractor, said he polled several members of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno Chapter, and it was their feeling that the entire industry should work together to improve the situation.

Of Crumley's bringing up the complaints, Solari commented:

"He has done a service, but now we've got to do something about it, not fight about it."

Solari said the organization would discuss the controversy at its meeting next week.

Solari, who met with FHA officials earlier in the week, issued a statement today, saying:

"To my knowledge no painting contractor has inspected any tract or other job site. It is considered unethical to go on a competitor's job.

"The original charges were made by Mr. Crumley, which he has a right to do. My position as a contractor was to defend the legitimate painting contractor, general contractor, public-at-large, and the conscientious painter journeyman.

"My charges were against the few contractors and practices causing this controversy.

"WHAT IS RIGHT

"As an industry, we must face what is right and what is wrong. I sincerely believe a running controversy in the manner it has been carried out will only damage further relations. All concerned must now work together to correct the situation.

"Mr. Baker assured all concerned that if these charges exist they will be corrected properly. Mr. Baker has offered to furnish a representative for review on the correct interpretation of the FHA regulations which the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada will welcome.

"The main interest of any legitimate painting contractor is to maintain and improve on the existing high standards and not to let a few deteriorate the standards."

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 9, 1963]

DEFICIENCIES FOUND IN MOST—FHA CHECK OF TRACTS FINISHED

The director of the Reno office of the Federal Housing Administration said today that FHA inspectors checking local subdivisions for substandard painting have found some deficiencies "in most of them."

And although claims were still being made that the controversy has been blown out of proportion, no exact figures on how many houses are involved—or how extensive the deficiencies are—have been released.

Jay Baker, FHA Director, said his inspectors have finished checking the majority of new housing tracts, "and I'd say we've found some deficiencies in most of them."

And, Baker says, "we don't consider all these deficiencies to be just oversights."

COMPLAINT

The inspection of housing tracts was ordered after Gene Crumley, business representative for Painters Local 567, complained that every tract was in some way or another below FHA standards.

Baker says that where substandard work has been found, the contractors have been—or will be—called into his office and told to correct the job. "All those we've talked with have agreed to bring their work up to our requirements," he said.

Numerous homeowners have complained to the FHA in the past week about the poor quality of the paint jobs on their houses, he said. "We're hearing from them every day," Baker said.

To help with the inspections of these complaints, Baker says he asked for the loan of another man to help his two regular inspectors.

OUT OF PROPORTION

Baker explained his reluctance to name names or be specific about just how many contractors are involved by saying he's trying to get the situation corrected as quickly as possible. "I think the thing's been blown all out of proportion," he said.

"The thing that bothers me," Baker said, "is that the press is trying to put us into the position as watchdog over the contractors, when actually it's also up to the unions and other workers as well. They have standards too."

In instances where substandard painting has been discovered, Baker says he's instructed his inspectors to check other aspects of the house as well.

"We'll be looking at all of the homes more closely," Baker said. "I've cautioned my inspectors to be very careful."

Baker feels "it's unfortunate this thing had to get out into the public like it has. It's destroyed the public's confidence." He says if persons interested in purchasing a new home in the area will check with his office, "we'll steer them in the right direction."

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 12, 1963]

SHOULD STANDARDS ON PAINTING BE PART OF CODES?

Reno and Sparks building inspectors say painting requirements should be added to city building codes to combat substandard painting. But Washoe County's building inspector disagrees.

None of the inspectors can legally enforce painting standards at present because their respective building codes list no painting requirements.

"We should have them, but we don't," said Wayne Humphreys, Sparks building inspector.

Painting requirements in city building codes would make enforcement of painting easier, commented Ronald Coleman, Reno building inspector, "because we'd have minimum requirements and they could go the minimums or better."

PUBLIC'S JOB

But, Ralph Stoltz, Washoe County building inspector, said it was the responsibility of the house-buying public—not the local governments—to insure that painting is done properly.

The building inspectors comments on their inability to legally enforce good painting followed charges by Gene Crumley, business representative of painters local 567, that painting was being done below Federal Housing Administration standards in some areas.

Crumley's charges prompted FHA Director Jay E. Baker to order his inspectors to recheck new homes in the Reno-Sparks area which are under FHA loans. Baker said the inspectors found there was substandard work in most subdivisions.

Coleman, who said Monday substandard painting was widespread in the area, commented that if the city had tight painting requirements it would serve as an aid to the FHA in cracking down on substandard work.

NO HELP

"They're lone wolves," he said. "They have no help" in inspecting the painting. He added that the FHA is doing "an excellent job."

But, Coleman said, lack of rigid specifications probably was the cause for substandard painting. To remedy this, he said, the city code should have tight specifications.

Humphreys, who said he hadn't found any "really bad jobs" during his inspections, commented that without city code painting requirements, Sparks can't demand any specific amount of paint on new houses.

Humphreys said, however, his department's two inspectors have been looking over paint jobs on new houses even though they can't enforce anything legally.

"We've been pulling a bluff," Humphreys said. "If we find anything that's bad we demand that it be patched up and made to look good. Part of our code says things have to be done in a neat and workmanlike manner." So, we interpret it to include painting.

Both Humphreys and Coleman said if painting requirements were put into city codes by ordinances, they would need more manpower to conduct the inspections.

Humphreys' inspectors make a total of 12 checks on new houses and Coleman's 4 inspectors make from 15 to 20 checks per house.

Sparks would need another inspector to enforce the painting requirements, if they were put in the building code, Humphreys said.

"It means you'd have to hire more personnel," commented Coleman, who said he needs another four inspectors for his normal operation even without official paint checks.

URGES IMPROVEMENT

Stoltz said that when his two inspectors find houses poorly painted, he urges contractors to improve the work even though he has no legal means to force them to do so.

"I know there's lots of jobs inadequately painted," he said. "We tell them 'you've got a heck of a poor job here.' "

"We ride them all the time," he added, "but we couldn't turn the house down because of inadequate painting."

"We don't have any minimum standards on painting," he said. "As far as we're concerned, a house wouldn't even have to be painted" to be given a building permit.

But Stoltz said he didn't feel the county should have the responsibility of inspecting the painting because by the nature of the work the public could do the checking.

"We're interested in what the public can't see," he said, explaining that his inspectors check the portions of a new house which are covered by other materials.

Stoltz recommended that home buyers who aren't familiar with painting have professionals look over the work to advise them as to its quality.

"I would say painting is something the buyer should see and inspect for himself," he added.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 13, 1963]

NEW TURN IN PROBE OF HOUSES—SUBCONTRACTORS FALLING SHORT, REPORTS FHA

A detailed investigation of new home painting in the Reno-Sparks area has revealed that few subdivision contractors were violating Federal Housing Administration minimum requirements but most were not meeting their own specifications, Jay E. Baker, FHA director, announced today.

"The general contractor's specifications weren't being met by painting subcontractors," Baker said in a statement on the results of the investigation.

"Wherever violations were found," he added, "we have notified the heads of the various subdivisions of the deficiencies and told them we expected immediate conformance to their own specifications."

AROUSED

Baker said public knowledge of the painting situation in the area, which was aroused through charges of poor painting practices by union and public officials and defense by contractors, has provided a service for the home buyer.

The controversy started when Gene Crumley, business representative for Painters Local 567, filed a letter of protest and then met with FHA officials to charge that every subdivision was in one way or another below FHA standards.

"There's no doubt that it (the controversy) pointed out to us that there were violations of specifications," Baker said. "But I don't feel it will be of any value to keep the pot boiling. We've looked, found violations and corrected them.

WEEK AGO

"This whole controversy started a week ago with the assertion that the FHA was not enforcing its minimum requirements. At that time, there was no dobut in my mind that this office did intend to enforce FHA minimum requirements," he said. "However, there was some doubt as to whether or not the minimum requirements were being achieved in the field.

"During the past week, I have personally checked seven subdivisions in the Reno-Sparks area. I have found very few violations of our minimum requirements," Baker said. "I have found, however, that most of the subdivisions were not meeting their own paint specifications which were better than FHA minimum requirements.

"The general contractor's specifications weren't being met by the painting sub-contractors," he added. "In each case where the subdivisions were put on notice, they were very agreeable to make any changes and assured me that they will make every effort to achieve the results which they specified.

MAKE TRIP

"I would like to suggest that if there is any doubt as to whether or not FHA intends to enforce as minimum requirements, all the doubtful party has to do is make a trip into the field of the various subdivisions and ask the subdivision superintendent.

"The question could also be asked, 'Did FHA representatives inspect your subdivision and did they insist that painting specifications be observed?'

"The FHA intends to make continuous optional inspections on all subdivisions doing business with the FHA to assure itself that the painting specifications and minimum requirements are being achieved," he added.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 16, 1963]

PAINTING GROUP: INFRACTIONS EXIST "TO SOME DEGREE"

The Painting & Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Inc., Reno Chapter, issued a statement today giving the view of its members on a controversy over substandard painting in new homes in the Reno-Sparks area.

The statement, issued following several hours of discussion by the association, said "to some degree" the infractions charged by Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local 567, exist.

The controversy touched off an investigation by the Federal Housing Administration, FHA Director Jay E. Baker said after the investigation few contractors were doing work below FHA standards but several were not maintaining their own painting requirements.

The Painting & Decorating Contractors statement follows:

Several members of the Reno Chapter of the PDCA have been approached by reporters to determine if there is truth in the charges made by Mr. Crumley in denouncing the office of the FHA for its laxness in enforcing the minimum painting specifications required under FHA, particular reference being made to tract homes.

After much discussion in the February 13 meeting, the members decided to take a broad and comprehensive view of all the conditions in question. We do not wish to become someone's scapegoat nor are we looking for one. Neither do we condone efforts by any individual or group who may have or will in the future pick out single infractions to promote themselves or their group.

We feel that to some degree the infractions as stated by Mr. Crumley do exist. However, we would like the general public of the Reno-Sparks area to know that similar conditions have existed for several years, further these conditions are no better and no worse than exist in any other metropolitan area on the West Coast from Los Angeles to Seattle.

Most permanent builders in any given area are interested in making an honest living by giving their customers a "fair shake for their money" and in return he expects and deserves like treatment. Reno is endowed with many builders of this caliber. However, Reno like most western cities has and will continue to have "growing pains." This in turn creates a demand beyond the capacity of most conventional builders.

To supply the demand several groups have organized to build in volume. These builders get the job done but their interest is primarily profit. Few of these groups are of local origin, though they are now residents and may intend to make this area their home. In some cases, when the project is completed or the saturation point is imminent, others may move out in search of "greener pastures."

When these builders move out, the new homeowner may swear at him for infractions and complain to the FHA. At the same time he may appreciate that mass production and volume buying power has enabled him to purchase a more spacious home with the most modern conveniences at a price several hundred if not thousands of dollars less than a similar individually built home would have cost him.

The demand for mass production of homes across our Nation since World War II created an immediate demand from labor to get the job done. These carpenters, plumbers, plasterers, electricians, painters, masons, tile layers, etc., could not be developed overnight. This inexperienced labor corps working at established labor scales did involuntarily cause labor cost to magnify.

Add the same increase "caused by the same reasons" to the materials and it is inevitable that the cost of the finished product would necessarily skyrocket. For these same reasons it is also inevitable that the quality of the finished product would suffer.

Quite probably officers in the FHA are aware of these and many other conditions responsible for the criticisms they have received and shall continue to receive until a normal adjustment is reached in supply and demand. These conditions are in no sense limited to the building trades. They are prevalent in some form in every industry and every business.

These 20 years of urgent demand should have produced competent mechanics—it is doubtful in some cases that labor has met its full responsibility for a fair production average and acceptable workmanship for a fair wage received.

The home buyer by virtue of paying one-half of 1 percent for FHA home insurance has a right to expect quality FHA inspections. The FHA in turn has an obligation to render good inspections. We now feel that the local FHA office is trying to furnish this service.

Let no one think the painting contractor is robbing the public. He is getting paid for a job as specified by the builder in some cases, not FHA specifications. If the specifications were FHA and performed as required, undoubtedly an additional cost would be reflected in the sales price to the home buyer.

Will the market afford this increase? Should the FHA specifications for tracts be lowered? In some cases the public is not getting FHA minimums, however, with increase of and better FHA inspections this condition will be gradually eliminated.

In one article, mention was made as to the quality of the paint. In most instances the painting contractor must guarantee his work and material for 1 year. It is not uncommon for nationally known manufacturers of paint to market competitive materials used on tracts. Most of these materials are designed to meet required limits well beyond 1 or 2 years. Some failures are due to overthinning by the journeyman on the job and is usually done without the knowledge or approval of the painting contractor.

In regard to one suggestion that a city code be set up for minimum painting specifications, we are wondering how it would be enforced and who would pay for the policing? The homeowner would indirectly pay for this additional cost as he now pays for any other public service.

Tracts may be one problem but this association feels that most people who have enough money to hire work done have enough judgment to get the job they are paying for. An easy way to be sure is to go to a reputable contractor.

Our closing thought, whether we are painters, auto mechanics, store clerks, union representatives, inspectors, or what, if we keep as sharp an eye on our own responsibilities as we are prone to watch others, then self-improvement in each individual will improve the whole.

THE CHINESE AND PHILIPPINE REPUBLICS: TWO BASTIONS OF FREEDOM IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Virgil Pinkley, editor and publisher of the Indio Daily News and several other southern California newspapers, is one of our country's most respected newspaper editors and publishers and news commentators. Beyond that, I am proud to call him my friend.

Recently, he visited some of the most important, but often overlooked, areas of the Far East. He has given his readers an informative, firsthand, and up-to-date view of the Philippines and the Republic of China on Quemoy and Formosa.

I ask unanimous consent that four significant articles by Mr. Pinkley be printed at this point in the RECORD. I commend them to Senators.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Jan. 29, 1963]

PHILIPPINES WOOING FOREIGN INVESTORS' CAPITAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following dispatch from Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley is the first of a series he is writing on his current aerial tour of the far Pacific and southeast Asia. These will feature interviews with presidents and high officials and eyewitness reports from major capitals and points of tension.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

MANILA.—Economic conditions highly favorable to the investment of foreign capital are being created in the Philippines, President Diosdado Macapagal told me in an exclusive interview granted in his office at the Malacanang Palace, or the White House of this progressive young Republic.

He said his administration has removed exchange controls and returned the nation's economy to a free basis. The controls, he said, "were one of the main sources of graft and corruption." Then he continued: "The system of controls which had been enforced for 12 years was impeding our economic growth."

In outlining the broad objectives of his program, the President said that emphasis was being placed on the following:

1. Weeding out graft and corruption.
2. Pushing a 5-year economic and recovery drive.
3. Creating conditions which attract foreign investments as well as domestic ones.
4. Pledging that there will be "no confiscation and no expropriation of foreign capital or business."
5. Assuring that "for foreign capital there will be freedom of repatriation of profits and even of capital by insuring a just treatment to foreign investors in this country."
6. Checking and turning back communism by raising living standards and eliminating distress which breeds communism.
7. Making essential changes in the SEATO organization necessitated by altered conditions.
8. Broadening and accelerating educational programs.
9. Keeping Filipino-American relations at their current excellent status.
10. Redoubling efforts to reduce corruption in the administration of Customs.
11. Restoring business now handled by the government to private enterprise whenever and wherever feasible.

Speaking about foreign capital, the youthful fifth President of this rapidly growing and promising nation said: "At the time we took over the Government a year ago, the conditions were about the worst imaginable. The Government was in a state of bankruptcy; the dollar reserves in our Central Bank were negative; there was cynicism on the part of the people, and so we had to roll up our sleeves and act decisively. Within 20 days after I took over, I changed the pattern of the economy from a controlled economy in order to restore and uphold free enterprise.

"It was a very delicate operation as all monetary and currency reforms are delicate but fortunately for us, we have succeeded in effecting this shift."

President Macapagal answered all my extemporaneous questions frankly, quickly, and positively.

Asked about efforts to root out graft and corruption, the liberal leader of the Philippines responded:

"One of the main tasks of our country today is to reduce and eradicate graft and corruption. And, of course, more important in the longrun, is to develop the country economically; to attain a sufficient rate of economic growth for the people.

"Now, on the first task which is the eradication of graft and corruption, we are satisfied that after 1 year in office we have contained and reduced to the minimum, graft and corruption, especially in the upper echelons of the public service.

"This we have been able to do by many measures among them the following: We removed exchange controls which was one of the main sources of graft and corruption. The President and the members of his Cabinet have set the example in honesty and integrity. Although not required by law, the President and every member of his Cabinet have made public their assets and liabilities and they will do so every year during our administration. This is a voluntary act upon the part of the leaders of the administration.

"We have given recognition to citizens who have performed exemplary acts of honesty; we have placed as the first qualification for key positions in the public service honesty, and integrity. I have personally watched the performance of all key officials and have taken immediate steps whenever necessary to insure that there is no deviation from our inflexible creed of honesty and integrity in the public service."

I then asked the Chief Executive of the Philippines how he is faring in efforts to improve the customs service and erasing graft which long has existed.

He replied frankly: "We have reduced corruption in the Customs, but we are still at work there. As a matter of fact, the Customs is practically the remaining office in the Government, unfortunately, in which we are not satisfied in the drive against venalities. But, in a few months, I am confident that we will be able to achieve our purpose of moral integrity in the enforcement of customs and tariff laws in the Customs."

The President received me wearing the traditional garb of the Philippines, a white *barong tagalog* which is thin, *exquisitely* woven shirt worn outside the trousers, and white linen pants. In this climate the barong tagalog is a practical dress. It was made highly popular even at the highest state occasion by the late and much beloved President Ramon Magsaysay.

COMMUNISM

Asked what the Philippines are doing to combat communism, the President replied: "In the Philippines we have handled communism by firmly restricting the inroads of local Communists in the various sectors of economic life such as the government, the schools, the labor unions, the newspapers, the offices of politicians. I am satisfied that we have reduced their infiltration to the minimum. But our most important step in meeting the problem of communism is to improve the life of our people through this vigorous economic growth that we are striving for under our 5-year socioeconomic government program. It is my conviction that the best defense against communism and the best measure against communism is to prove that democracy works. If we can prove in the Philippines that democracy works and that under democracy the common people, the masses of the people, can attain a higher level of living, then that is the best answer to communism. It is the best measure against communism. It is my understanding that the local Communists have become baffled by the success we are attaining in demonstrating that through our socioeconomic program, our masses can hope for a happier life in freedom and in democracy."

In view of the recent strained relations between the Philippines and the United States over the war claims bill, I asked the Chief Executive if there were any major problems between the two nations now. He said:

NO MAJOR PROBLEMS

"Problems, there are always the usual problems between nations. But major problems, it is may own view that there are no major problems to settle between the Philippines and the United States.

"The United States has been doing its best to assist us and while we would want that assistance perhaps to be more and more effective or more expeditious, we realize the global responsibilties of America. And there is one thing that characterizes present relations between the Philippines and the United States—the Philippines feels so bound in the pursuit of common ideals as well as in a happy historical association with the United States, that in any crisis, you can always depend on the Philippines to stand by the United States."

Commenting on education and the fact that the Philippines have 26 universities and are graduating thousands of doctors, nurses, engineers, and scientists not only for this country but those who go to neighboring countries in the far Pacific and southeast Asia, I asked how much of the national budget is spent on education.

"More than one-third of the total," Mr. Macapagal responded. He obviously is proud of this record.

A considerable portion of our conversation of 45 minutes was devoted to economic matters and investment of foreign capital. On this vital score the President declared:

WELCOME CAPITAL

"Foreign capital is welcomed. It is one of the principal features of our economic program. The work of developing our resources is so vast that we do not have the domestic capital needed in order to achieve it in the magnitude necessary to provide the needs of our people. Therefore, the answer is foreign investment, foreign capital, and especially from the United States with whose capital we are quite acquainted.

"And so, one of the things I have done in my administration is to provide a climate in order to welcome foreign capital into our country. And by making it clear that we welcome them; by assuring that there will be no confiscation and no expropriation, by assuring that there will be freedom of repatriation of profits and even of capital and by insuring a just treatment to foreign investors in this country."

Asked specifically about nationalization and confiscation of foreign capital, the President continued: "We are not going to indulge in any confiscation or expropriation. I believe that under our program, which I believe will be stabilized within the foreseeable future, our country with its rich natural resources, with many opportunities for profitable investment, and given the climate of freedom and political stability, I venture the statement that the Philippines are going to be one of the best investment fields in Asia if not in the world, within the next 20 years."

SEATO STATUS

Turning to military matters, I inquired as to how the President feels about SEATO.

He responded: "SEATO has been able to do a good job in stopping the advance of communism in this part of the world. Lately, however, it has tended to weaken.

"And so considering the performance of SEATO in the past, and considering the demonstrated utility of regional security arrangements among the free nations, it is my hope that we shall be able to do something to strengthen SEATO—to provide more solidarity among the members of SEATO. Specifically, to perhaps recast the machinery so that within the procedures prescribed, any number of nations within the SEATO could act in order to safeguard the security of the area."

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Feb. 4, 1963]

CHIANG KAI-SHEK BELIEVES TIME RIGHT FOR FREEING OF MAINLAND

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is another in the series of exclusive interviews by Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley, obtained during his tour of the Far East.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—President Chiang Kai-shek believes that conditions are more auspicious for his Nationalist government to return to the Chinese mainland now than at any time since the Communist seized China.

The determined, resolute leader of Free China told me during an interview of 1 hour and 16 minutes that the timing currently is right to free some 600 to 700 million Chinese from the bondage of communism.

In this connection he feels that the United States should review the mutual pact of assistance between his nation and the United States in view of changed and changing conditions.

Asked what he would like from the United States, the 75-year-old soldier-statesman said: "First, we want and need the spiritual and moral support of America. This is most essential. From this base will come the other strengths and support we require.

"Second, we need continued material assistance from the United States in the form of military hardware.

"DOMESTIC MATTER

"We do not want or need American troops. This return to the homeland, which must come, is a domestic matter for the Chinese inside and outside the China mainland. For American men ever to hit the shores of China proper would be used by the Reds for immense propaganda. They would be described as foreign invaders.

"But when we return—as we shall—and as we have every right to do as a sovereign nation, we must be as Chinese delivering Chinese from Communist slavery. We are the only duly constituted and legal government of China."

The teatime audience granted by the President was attended by Madame Chiang, easily one of the world's most beautiful and talented ladies. I found the President and Madame looking extremely well. The chief executive appeared even more vigorous and upright than when I last visited the famous couple nearly 7 years ago near Kaohsiung in southern Formosa, or Taiwan.

When I commented on the obvious good health of the President, Madame Chiang said, "He's put on about 10 pounds, and looks better for the extra weight."

He was wearing a dark green tunic soldier uniform devoid of any ribbons, medals, or military insignia. His handshake was long and firm. During our talk he smiled frequently, spoke in a soft, smooth voice except when he discussed returning to the mainland or commented about Mao Tse-tung.

GLINT IN HIS EYES

Then there was a glint in his eyes, he gestured and the firmness of his hands and jaw showed the resolve in his heart and mind.

Asked if his forces possess the necessary military power to carry on a successful return (invasion is never used here and the word is frowned upon), the President replied: "Yes, our forces are sufficient to carry out the mission which I must lead with God's help."

"The air force is small but the quality of men, planes and morale is the highest. Our army of 600,000 is well trained, splendidly equipped for the task at hand, and dedicated. Our naval forces are excellent and growing strong constantly. Our guerrilla and ranger-type troops are ready and eager."

Other subjects reviewed by President Chiang during an unusually frank interview, with some of his statements enclosed in direct quotation markes, included:

The split between the Communist parties of Russia and Red China is probably as wide now as it will become so long as Chinese Communist and Soviet relations and organizations exist approximately as they are currently. "Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung both want each other eliminated as the leader of their respective groups, but Khrushchev wants Mao removed by the Chinese Communist themselves."

FOOD SITUATION WORSE

Food conditions have become worse in China and have gone backward for 3 years despite large purchases of wheat from Canada and Australia. Rations of rice to the Red army have been cut from 24 ounces to 16 ounces daily per man and the pay of Red troops has been reduced too. "Food shortages and famines in China have always led to eruptions and revolutions."

Opposition to communes in China grows—"Recently the entire governmental and party setup in eight provinces had to be changed from top to bottom."

When the Nationalists return to the mainland "Khrushchev will not come to the aid of Mao Tse-tung. But if Russia, however, were ever to become engaged in a nuclear global war with the United States, Red China would go to the assistance of Khrushchev."

The Communists have not succeeded after a dozen years in winning over the millions of China to their cause.

Some top Communist leaders have been "liquidated in recent months, or at least they and a few others have disappeared."

There are growing signs of defections from the Red army and the party. This should not be taken to mean, however, that the regime has lost control of the military or the civil service administration.

Chinese on the mainland give evidences of wanting to leave the country and escape the growing Red oppression.

WANTS U.S. BLESSING

Requested to explain in more detail his feelings about relations with the United States, the President replied: "When we return home I hope it is with the blessings or approval of the United States. We have every right to move as we deem best, but in view of our partnership and long ties with America, I want to see this friendship and alliance continue. Also, we want to keep your government fully informed.

"Our families and brothers and compatriots on the mainland look to us to return and free them. If the United States tries to block this movement, the people of China will blame America more than they will ourselves."

Discussing strategy in the Orient generally Chiang declared: "As long as the Communist regime continues in Peiping, all of southern Asia and the far Pacific are threatened by aggression. If we were not to conduct our campaign of liberation, in time, bits of southeast Asia would be infiltrated or overrun and taken over piece by piece by the Reds. Washington's policy obviously is to fight communism everywhere, including Asia. How better then, than to see Nationalist forces land on the mainland and win back our country to democracy and establish a truly great power in the Orient for the free world?"

Stressing timing and moving at the right moment, the President continued: "There are a number of international factors and domestic situations inside Communist-held China now which may not be duplicated for months or years. We must take advantage of such factors and turn them fully to account."

AT TAIPEI RESIDENCE

The audience granted me by the President and Madam Chiang occurred in the beautiful reception room of their Shihlin residence on the outskirts of Taipei. The room reflects the interior decorating tastes and skills of Madam.

There are three large round Chinese windows looking out on beds of purple azaleas and small yellow chrysanthemums. A fourth window contains a painting by Madam which is made to look as it too opens into a garden. All of the paintings except two in the room were painted by Madam Chiang, who was educated in the United States.

We sat before a cheerful fire with the President and Madam on either side of the fireplace and I was seated on the President's left. There were two small vases filled with daffodils. James C. H. Shen, director of the Government Information Office, served as the interpreter.

The President asked numerous questions about Thailand, Vietnam, and the United States, knowing that I had just visited or left these countries.

Shihlin is a modest, comfortable, and most attractive home located on the slopes of a botanical garden. Nearby is the chapel where the Chiangs pray and attend Methodist services. The President starts each day with prayers and then devotes a considerable time to meditation.

I came away from the interview knowing that the President will never agree to taking his battle-ready and impressive troops out of the rocky fortresses of Quemoy and Matsu which are just a few thousand yards off the mainland coast.

His thoughts are not defensive, but strictly offensive.

In fact, I think he is so determined to return that if necessary he will wade ashore alone. For more than half a century he has fought for and served China. It is the one great dedication of his life.

At this late hour he is determined to free China of communism.

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Feb. 6, 1963]

IN BATTLE WITH RED "DEVILS" SIMPLE, STRONG CREED AIDS QUEMOY MISSIONARY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following exclusive dispatch from Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley, written on the island fortress of Quemoy, tells something of the brutality of the Communists. It also relates what one God-fearing, determined human being can do to battle communism and help his fellow men.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

SACRED HEART OF MARY CHURCH, QUEMOY, KINMEN ISLANDS, CHINA.—There are many ways to fight communism.

I never cease to marvel at the battles being waged against communism even by individuals in this part of the world.

Father Druetto of the Franciscan Order is an example and an inspiration as he works, ministers, and heals people on this rocky battle station known as Quemoy. He, like the 48,000 civilians and thousands of military on this island only 2,400 yards off the Red Chinese mainland, works and lives under artillery fire and a perpetual Communist propaganda barrage.

The good father, born in Marseilles, France, 63 years ago, came to China in 1931. He is a medical missionary. He weighed 240 pounds when he came from France and it is important to remember this figure. By the time the Reds took over China he had 3,764 followers of the Catholic faith in his parish.

One afternoon 16 Communist police and soldiers with bayonets mounted came to arrest him. Because he spoke English he was charged with being a spy for "Wall Street imperialists and American capitalists." What happened to him then befell thousands of Catholic clergy and nuns and Protestant missionaries in Communist China.

PRESSURE APPLIED

Without any trial or defense he was charged and condemned to die within a week. His execution number was 58. Suddenly, nearly 50 soldiers and secret police removed him from the local jail and took him to the capital city of Changhsa. There he was placed in a cell 5 feet by 5 feet—much, much smaller than the space given a tiger in a cage. For 8 months he was not permitted to see anyone except his Communist captors and tormentors. He received one meager meal daily and developed a prolonged case of dysentery and a badly damaged stomach. He received no medical care or assistance. All kinds of propaganda and pressure of psychological warfare were applied to try and break him down and induce him to sign bogus confessions.

Finally his trial began. It went on for 28 hours in the most gruelling nonstop manner.

"Twenty thousand Chinese jammed the court and surrounding area demanding my release," the father relates with great pride in these people. "During the intervening months after my arrest the Communists could induce only 1 of my 3,764 beloved followers to testify against me. Many were arrested, however, and executed.

"As the trial wore on, I became faint and was near the breaking point. I prayed to God to give me strength. I did not want to let down these brave people who risked their lives to come and demonstrate for me. I thought of Cardinal Mindszenty and how he underwent 76 continuous hours of trial by Communist secret police."

POLICE TIRED

"At about the 24-hour mark, I noticed that the secret police trying me were tiring. They were repeating the same questions over and over. So I prayed and I held on.

"Finally, I was ordered released.

"Dozens and dozens of soldiers took me to the railway station for Canton. Before I left crowds of nearly 50,000 gathered to cheer and to give thanks. All the while the Communists were taunting them and hurling one propaganda charge after another against the United States. Loudspeakers were blaring in every direction. The people booed and shouted back.

"When I arrived in Canton people greeted me with every kindness, giving me food which I could not eat and money. When the Communists dumped me across the border at Lo Wu and into British territory in Hong Kong, I weighed 69 pounds. In the Hong Kong hospital I gained a pound a day for 68 days. Think of it, I weighed 240 pounds when I arrived in China and 69 pounds when I left. Today I weigh 148 pounds."

Asked about his days in the secret police jail of Changhsa which was jammed with 3,000 prisoners, Father Druetto said: "For days and days they would line 60 to 80 inmates up each morning and shoot them. They were pitched onto trucks and hauled away like cord wood. This dreadful ritual went on in the afternoons too. This was being done by Chinese to Chinese. From time to time I would learn of the execution of some brother or sister of mine in the church or of foreigners being shot down."

STRONG, SIMPLE CREED

When Father Druetto finally was discharged from the Hong Kong hospital the church wanted to send him back to Europe for a long rest. But he said no.

"The people of China gave me my life; so I want to devote the remainder of my life to serving them." His strong unbreakable creed is as simple as that.

He decided to go to Fu-Kuo Island off the mainland of South Vietnam where 80,000 Chinese had sought refuge after they fled China through Laos and Cambodia. From there he made his way to Formosa and then on here to Quemoy.

Twice during the heavy 44-day shelling of 1958 and again in 1960 when the Reds fired 180,000 rounds into all parts of Quemoy, Nationalist Chinese authorities sought to evacuate him back to Formosa. He refused. He wanted to remain with his people here, and he has.

BUILT TWO CHURCHES

As I drove up to the Sacred Heart of Mary Church and Mercy Home where he has 12 inpatients, the father was working to enlarge the church, its chapel and the hospital. His hands were skinned and bleeding from stone work he was conducting. He has built two churches on Quemoy entirely with his own hands. The other church is called the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Father Druetto who was christened Joseph Bernard M., can and does about everything.

In addition to being a priest and medical missionary, he teaches French, English, Italian, and Latin; he speaks several Chinese dialects; and he is a mechanic, electrician, carpenter, stonemason, plumber, farmer, and architect. He showed me blueprints he had just finished for a new church he will build soon on Little Quemoy.

With a delightful sense of humor he said: "I think I shall call it St. Michael's. Just as the Bible relates, it will fight the Devil too—those Red devils on the mainland."

Other plans he is now working on call for the construction of a hospital ward for infants, and a home for the aged. He hopes, also, to build a convent for nuns. There are about 1,600 members of his two churches.

In addition to the sick in his hospital, Father Druetto cares for 25 to 100 ill people in all parts of Quemoy. "I've worn out two jeeps thus far, and am now using my third jeep," he said. He drives an average of about 1,000 miles a week. Everywhere he goes he is greeted with warmth and affection. The people here appreciate that he undergoes their daily dangers and he lives among them.

NINE THOUSAND TREES

Father Druetto has planted more than 9,000 trees around each of his two churches.

Asked when he eats and sleeps, the Father replies with a smile:

"I eat and sleep when I am hungry and tired. I have one thing to thank the Communists for. They left my stomach in such a condition that I eat only once each 24 hours. This saves me time. I usually sleep from two to five hours sometime during the late night hours. There is so much work to be done here, but so little time."

When I visited Father Druetto he was wearing the fatigue uniform and field boots of a GI. He has a large beard which is streaked with gray. He smiles a great deal and has expressive brown eyes. He talks easily and quickly in English. When we switched into Italian he returned after a few sentences to English. Meanwhile, he answered questions addressed to him in Chinese.

"How long do you expect to remain here?" I asked.

"Here, or the Chinese mainland, until I die. It is much cheaper to die here than anywhere else," he said laughingly.

So even all the torture and hell of communism has not broken this wonderful man who works, prays, teaches, and serves. As a Protestant, I salute him.

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News of Feb. 7, 1963]

Symbol of Freedom: Quemoy—Rock Fort Off China's Coast

(Editor's Note.—Quemoy has become a symbol of resistance to communism in Asia. For that part of the world Quemoy has the same significance as Berlin in Europe. In the following exclusive dispatch direct from the island fortress, Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley relates daily life and something of the military nature of the island.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

Quemoy, Kinmen Islands, China.—This rocky fortress only 2,400 yards off the Chinese mainland is just as much a symbol in this part of the world as Berlin is in Europe.

Quemoy, and Matsu to the north, give hope to millions on the Chinese mainland that they will be liberated and freed from the slavery of communism. Indirectly they are beacons for much of southeast Asia and the Far Pacific. So long as the forces of Free China hold these islands, there is a strong will to resist. There is hope. And they are strategic in controlling the Formosian Straits.

Coming here as I just have from Taipei, one is impressed by many aspects of this strange and fantastic war which continues between the Red legions of Mao Tse-tung and the free forces of President Chiang Kai-shek. It is waged vigorously on propaganda and psychological fronts as much as on the military one, although people are killed in the exchanges of artillery fire which takes place frequently. It is a war which has been going on for 13 years.

One of the weird aspects of the conflict is the way many operations are conducted on timetable schedules.

If the Communist Chinese shell these islands of the Kinmen group, they do so only on even days of the month. Why? To save face, the Nationalists say.

The Reds usually send over a dozen to several hundred rounds of artillery, mortar, and howitzer shells in the afternoon and evening. If the Nationalists reply they do so the following morning when "the sun is in our favor." Last night the Reds lobbed 116 shells into Quemoy, most of them filled with propaganda material.

Propaganda balloons and bamboo rafts, bottles, and plastic containers loaded with propaganda material are released when winds or tides are in favor of the side sending them.

DUPLICATE BROADCASTS

For 18 hours a day Red Chinese loudspeakers blare out propaganda to the defending Nationalist forces. The free forces of China duplicate these broadcasts in counter-propaganda campaigns. I have just listened for nearly an hour and stood beside an attractive Chinese WAC as she broadcast over the narrow ribbon of water through huge loudspeakers. She tells the Reds how 16 of their fishermen who lost their way and came ashore in Formosa (Taiwan as the Chinese called the island) were received and treated before they were sent on their way home to the mainland with food, clothes and gifts. Then there are periods of classical, light and martial music and other material countering Peiping claims.

Perhaps I can best relate the status of this fabulous world spot known as Quemoy if I simply tell about my trip here and take you around this island to various spots as we go hand in hand, so to speak.

The Chinese Air Force flew me and a dozen other Americans and Chinese military personnel and their wives here from Taipei right on schedule, in 1 hour and 40 minutes. We took off in a Chinese C–47 air transport and flew along the western coast of Formosa which is 240 miles in length. We turned out to sea and flew across the Pescadores Island group, passing over the city of Ma-Kung. Under the mutual defense pact with Nationalist China the United States pledges to provide joint defense for Formosa, the Pescadores and "such other off-shore islands as the President of the United States may direct."

Until recently the Pescadores produced little food, except fish. But excellent work by the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction has changed the poor soil which existed formerly. Use of fertilizers, rotation of crops and improved irrigation enable crops of vegetables, peanuts, melons, sweet potatoes and rice. There are now even some exports of surpluses to Quemoy and Formosa.

As we leave the Pescadores and draw closer to the China mainland, the pilot takes us down on the "deck," just a short distance above the water. Although the straits are patrolled and controlled by the crack Nationalist Air Force, being down on the "deck" makes it far more difficult for a Communist jet to make a successful pass at even a propeller-driven transport.

LARGE ISLAND

As we approached Quemoy, I was surprised by the size of the island and to see half a dozen villages and towns, fields being worked by farmers—and even a golf course. The island is in the shape of a butterfly, or a large sausage which has been tied tightly in the middle. Quemoy is the main island of the Kinmens and is 13.5 miles in length and varies in width from 6.8 to 9.3 miles, except for the narrow waist which is only 2.5 miles wide. The island is rocky and hilly and the highest point is 863 feet above the sea.

Just before landing on the airstrip I noticed three ships in the harbor unloading supplies and equipment for the troops holding Quemoy and the 48,000 civilians who live on Big and Little Quemoy and the cluster of surrounding rocky islands.

We were met by General Wang and other top ranking officers after our plane was parked in a well concealed and protected revetment.

I was taken on a 3-hour tour of the island along fine paved and neatly kept roads, lined with small pines to give them protection from enemy observation. I was immediately and repeatedly impressed by the order, cleanliness, and efficiency of all operations on the island. Hedges and shrubs around deeply dug-in gun positions (including 105 to 155 Long Tom artillery pieces) were trimmed like I would like to see gardeners in southern California maintain lawns and gardens.

The soldiers on Quemoy themselves are fine looking troops, well trained and equipped and obviously with high morale. They are happy and proud to be here—and they want to go to the mainland which is less than a mile and a half away at the closest point.

We drove through long, deep, rock and concrete tunnels which are heavily stocked with ammunition, extra guns, shells, hand grenades, spare parts, food, medicines and uniforms and shoes. These tunnels through solid rock and several hundred feet beneath hills are bomb and artillery proof. Other than radiation effects, they undoubtedly would withstand atomic bombs.

CARVED IN ROCK

Around the edges of Quemoy I entered a number of deeply dug in gun positions. They are carved out of rock, heavily sandbagged and have concrete walls and floors. They house artillery, mortars, howitzers, antitank guns, recoilless rifles, and heavy and light machineguns. The fire power they can deliver is murderous. The guns and positions are so arranged that interlacing fire can be laid down at all angles and from various levels or heights. Trying to take this island would be mass suicide as the Communists discovered in 1949 and in 1950 when they attempted landings. In the first onslaught the Communists assigned 20,000 crack troops heavily supported by prelanding artillery. Twelve thousand of the invaders were killed and over 7,000 of the remaining 8,000 captured, many of them badly wounded. In those days the Nationalists had only a fraction of their present firepower and Quemoy was not fortified then as it is now.

Subsequently the Reds have confined their assaults against Quemoy and the surrounding islands, as against Matsu, to artillery and mortar bombardment. In 1950 the Communists shelled Quemoy for 44 continuous days, firing an average of 10,000 rounds daily. In 1960, just before former President Eisenhower visited Formosa, the Reds in an act of defiance pumped 180,000 shells into Quemoy over a period of several days. They killed 9 civilians and wounded 21 others.

Everywhere on the island there are slit trenches, dugouts, bomb shelters and sandbagged areas, even in villages and on farms where life goes on evenly despite the shellings. The local residents have learned to live with these conditions.

BEACHES MINED

The possible landing beaches are heavily mined and fortified. There are many antitank barriers. The underwater defenses against landing craft are murderous affairs of concrete and steel with vicious points and grappling hooks. The area would be tough—mighty tough—to assault and conquer.

In going down or up concrete or rock steps to reach gun positions one notes again how clean and orderly everything is kept. Soldiers manning the guns sleep, eat and bathe in adjacent tunnels or quarters hewn from rock. Their bunk beds are neatly made and from the foot of each hangs a clean, folded towel. Many of these redoubts have springs which run continuously so a fresh water supply is guaranteed.

Hospitals, communication centers, electrical plants, motor pools and maintenance and shop centers are all built deeply underground. The island is really dug in and operations are more heavily protected by guns, firepower, and depth than any I have seen elsewhere.

As I drove through villages and crisscrossed the island I saw some of the 27 elementary schools where nearly 7,000 youngsters attend classes daily.

Everywhere there is industry and a purpose.

After listening to the Nationalist Chinese propaganda broadcasts I went out to the furthermost strongpoint and observation post on the island facing the Communist-held islands and mainland. Using powerful binoculars I pulled up right before my eyes a huge Red observation post and a long-snouted artillery piece. My, but they appeared close and large. Actually, Communist positions ring Quemoy on three sides in a large sweeping semicircle. Red guns can lay down fire on every part of Quemoy.

At noon I was taken to the headquarters of the commanding general for an excellent five-course Chinese luncheon which featured fish, shrimp, vegetables, soup, rice and numerous toasts with Kaoliang wine, a locally produced "firewater" which is 180 percent proof—wow. There were placecards and napkins. The dining hall room with hundreds of feet of rock and earth above, is attractively decorated with large Chinese scrolls and paintings done in red and gold.

As it came time to leave Quemoy I found myself wishing I might remain longer. Of all the experiences I have had in much travel during recent years, the visit to this fortress of freedom and hope is one of the most impressive. I am grateful to have been able to come to Quemoy. Now I think I understand better the symbol which is Quemoy.

RATIFICATION OF THE ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY PENNSYLVANIA AND WISCONSIN

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which would eliminate the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting in a Federal election. This brings, I am happy to say, to 27 the number of States which have ratified thus far.

I am happy to announce, Mr. President, that the two new States which have ratified this important amendment to the Constitution are Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

I am informed that the senate of the Pennsylvania Legislature on Monday of this week, March 25, ratified the amendment by a unanimous vote of 50 to 0. This most pleasing action by the Pennsylvania Senate completed ratification by the Pennsylvania Legislature, the assembly having approved the amendment on March 6 by the overwhelming vote of 183 to 1.

I express my deepest appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT], both of whom supported my resolution proposing this amendment in the 87th Congress and since submission of the proposed amendment to the respective States, have aggressively directed their efforts toward early ratification by the legislature of their State.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for his kind words, which are equally applicable to my colleague [Mr. SCOTT], who was unable to be present in the Senate at this time. I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from Florida for the leadership he has taken in the constitutional amendment, which I was happy to support. I should like to point out also that the action in Pennsylvania was entirely bypartisan. As the Senator has indicated, the action was unanimous. Was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was unanimous in the senate and only one dissenting vote in the assembly.

Mr. CLARK. It would be interesting to know who was the dissenter. I suppose it shows a keener sense of individuality to be the only one who voted against the amendment. But there was a period, I regret to state, when, on a map showing the States which had ratified the amendment, Pennsylvania was shown in a different color, and was a little oasis—I guess more properly it should be designated a desert in a more fertile country—all the other States in our area having already ratified the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can assure my distinguished friend that it never occurred to the Senator from Florida to refer to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a desert.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend. We ourselves like to think of our State as an oasis. In any event, the Senator from Florida did call the subject to my attention a few weeks ago. My colleague and I took steps to urge both parties in the legislature to take appropriate action. I am glad to say that they have now done so, and thereby the day when the amendment will become a part of our Constitution has perhaps been speeded up a little. I thank my friend for his kind comment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his comment, again pointing up the fact that the support of the amendment has been wholly bipartisan, and even nonpartisan in a sense.

Mr. President, I also have been informed that the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin ratified this important amendment, which proposes the highly desirable improvement in our election machinery which I have mentioned earlier, on Tuesday on this week, March 26, by a vote of 30 to 0. The Wisconsin Assembly previously approved the amendment on February 28, 1963, by a vote of 93 to 0, the Wisconsin Senate's action of Tuesday thus completing ratification by that State. Mr. President, I am, indeed, delighted that the vote in both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature was unanimous as it has been in so many of the States which have ratified to date. I believe, including Wisconsin, the legislatures of 9 States have ratified the amendment unanimously, and either the senate or house of the legislatures of 12 other States have ratified without a dissenting vote.

I express my profound appreciation to my distinguished friends the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] who supported my resolution proposing the amendment in the 87th Congress, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], who, since he has become a Member of the Senate, also has worked diligently seeking ratification by his great State. Both Senators have given every measure of aggressive cooperation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I, too, commend the distinguished Senator from Florida. It is not often that a unanimous vote is obtained in either House of the Wisconsin Legislature on an issue of such significance and basic controversialism. We pride ourselves on our individuality. So the merits of the proposal by the Senator from Florida is particularly conspicuous.

I think it also must be pointed out that both Houses of the Wisconsin Legislature are under Republican control. So as a Democratic Senator, I think I can say that this measure is truly a bipartisan effort.

The very important point of the announcement today is that there are now 27 States, as I understand, that have ratified the proposed amendment. That is now more than half of the States. We are moving toward the three-quarter mark.

The Senator from Florida particularly deserves credit for having pushed this approach to a most serious problem, which, in view of predictable opposition in parts of the country, is extraordinarily difficult to accomplish. The fact that this bill is moving along so well, 27 States having now ratified the amendment as of today, suggests that there is a surprisingly good chance of its becoming a part of the Constitution. I earnestly hope it does so. If it does it will be a triumph for justice as well as the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. There is no lobby behind the effort. Not a nickel's worth of money from any source is pushing it. I am very happy to say that the activity and the aggressiveness of Senators have been effective in practically every one of the 27 States, including the State of Wisconsin, which have acted to date. I am increasingly grateful for the kind cooperation of my colleagues in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] for, I believe, one of the finest services in the field of civil rights that has been performed during my tenure in the Senate has been performed by him in connection with the poll tax amendment. As he knows, I am very proud of the fact that the State of Oregon was one of the early States that ratified the amendment. The Senator from Florida is deserving of the thanks of all of us who are very much concerned about the passage of much needed civil rights legislation. This was a very important step.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I wish to say that I appreciate deeply those more than generous comments.

I think the record already shows that I have expressed my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon and also to his junior colleague for their active and aggressive sponsorship of the ratification of this amendment by the Oregon Legislature, which occurred just over 2 months ago, on January 25, I believe. This is typical of the fact that supporters of this particular move have continued to follow it aggressively in such a way as to bring it impressively to the attention of their legislators, and, in many instances, to the attention of their Governors.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not on the floor when the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] spoke in regard to the anti-poll-tax amendment; but I have reported to him, and I am now glad to report to the Senate, for myself, that the Pennsylvania Legislature has ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment, and Pennsylvania has thereby become the 26th State to do so. When the amendment was ratified by the Pennsylvania Legislature, there was only one opposing vote in the house of representatives, and there was no opposing vote in the senate.

So I am very glad to report this development in connection with the drive to do away with the poll tax—a drive which I have supported ever since the original proposal of this constitutional amendment.

CHANGING DEMANDS ON EDUCATION AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I indicated recently, it is my intention to bring to the attention of Senators the most helpful information in the fields of educational legislation compiled under the distinguished leadership of Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer in the publication of the Committee for Support of the Public Schools report entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Implications."

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the chapters entitled "Education and Economics," "Education and Agricultural Productivity," "Education in the World Scene," and "Penalties of Educational Inequality" be printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

Adam Smith recognized that publicly supported education played a role in individual self-improvement and in wealth creation.[1] Other great economists, such as Ricardo, Mill, Marshall, and many more, gave attention to the economic value of education.[2] However, until recently, the consideration of the economic significance of education by economists has been incidental to their absorption in the roles of land, labor, and physical capital in achieving economic output.

Education and economic growth

Since World War II, economists have been giving increasing attention to factors involved in economic growth. This results from several developments, such as efforts to step up economic productivity in underdeveloped nations and to speed up the rate of economic growth in the United States—the latter having recently proceeded at a slower rate than that in a number of Western European countries and in the U.S.S.R.

Economists are developing scientific research techniques for measuring interrelations of education and economic growth.

---

[1] Vaizey, John. The Economics of Education. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962. Chapter 1, "What Economists Said About Education," pp. 15-25.

[2] Swearingen, Eugene L. "Education as an Investment." Financing the Changing School Program. (Compiled by National Education Association, Committee on Educational Finance.) Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1962, pp. 20-37.

They have only begun studies that will permit exact estimates of the economic returns from investment in education.[3] The techniques for studying the economic significance of investment in human beings are extremely complex.[4]

Although the fact of correlation between amount of education and individual earnings is generally recognized, it is extremely difficult to determine just how much the greater amount of education is responsible for higher earnings. Some cynically claim that "it's not what you know but who you know" that determines a person's success. Many factors are involved—native ability and drive, connections, and the degree to which an occupation is unionized, to name a few.[5]

Attempts are being made to measure both the direct economic returns on investments in education to the individual and the indirect returns from investment in education to the national economy. Studies of the former type will be reviewed first.

Returns to the individual

What is the rate of return to the individual solely from investment in education? One effort to answer this complex question was made by Gary S. Becker for the National Bureau of Economic Research. His study, still under way, has yielded preliminary findings. It compares the life earnings of college graduates with those of persons of less education and relates the differential to the educational investment of these people.

The difference in earnings of urban white males as a return from investment in college education was found to be, after taxes, about 12.5 percent in 1940 and about 10 percent in 1950. Another calculation, with allowance for the public's outlay, before taxes, arrives at 9 percent. Becker also estimates returns in investment in private business and investment in college education and concludes they are not far apart.[6]

Vaizey summarizes the findings of Becker as follows:

"Becker calculated that for white urban males with high school education the return on educational costs, including income foregone, was 14.3 percent in 1939, and 19.2 percent after adjusting the income data for mortality and unemployment. For college education, from 1940 to 1955, adjusted for race, ability, unemployment and mortality, the return was 12.5 percent before tax." [7]

Another economist, Sidney C. Sufrin, draws the following conclusion from Becker's study:

"In short, Becker finds that without regard to other than economic values, e.g., personal satisfactions and enjoyments deriving from college education, and without the consideration of indirect economic effect, e.g., technological improvements made possible by a more skilled and knowledgeable fraction of the population, college education payoff about equals business investment payoff." [8]

In addition to the direct cash value of an education to the individual, there are indirect or diffused economic returns associated with investment in education that are largely left out of consideration when only returns from individual investment in education are considered. As Groves states:

"Studies which start with the individual and the impetus which education gives to his earning power ignore entirely the effect which his education may have on everybody's earning power." [9]

Let us next consider efforts to estimate the effect that education has on everybody's earning power, that is, economic production and growth.

Economic input and output

The growth in gross national product of the United States has not been at a rate as rapid as that of some European countries since World War II. However, it has been substantial in amount, and this growth has been on a higher economic base than that of Europe.

Gross national product in the United States rose from $285 billion in 1950 to $519 billion in 1961, and to $552 billion in the second quarter of 1962. In constant figures, in 1954 dollars, the rise in billions was from $318 in 1950 to $448 in 1961, and to $471 in the second quarter of 1962.[10]

Economists have had some difficulty in accounting for rises in production in the United States on the basis of traditional economic calculations as to inputs of labor and physical capital.

Apparently, the inputs of labor and capital are considerably less than the outputs realized. The amount of this difference is beginning to attract the attention of economists who are studying quantitative and qualitative factors affecting the growth of the economy of the United States. Some conclusions are becoming available.[11]

A study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that between 1889 and 1957 the combined input index increased at an average rate of 1.9 percent per year, and the output index increased about 3.5 percent per year, leaving a residual increase of about 1.6 percent per year.[12]

While, according to economists, economic inputs need not necessarily equal outputs, the wide differences between the two as estimated above call for explanation.

Human capital

Theodore W. Schultz, former head of the Department of Economics of the University of Chicago, was one of the first to become interested in the wide differences between economic inputs and outputs. In his presidential address at the 1960 meeting of the American Economic Association, Schultz stated:

"Although it is obvious that people acquire useful skills and knowledge, it is not obvious that these skills and knowledge are a form of capital, that this capital is in substantial part a product of deliberate investment, that it has grown in Western societies at a much faster rate than conventional (nonhuman) capital, and that its growth may well be the most distinctive feature of the economic system. It has been widely observed that increases in national output have been large compared with increases of land, man-hours, and physical reproducible capital. Investment in human capital is probably the major explanation for this difference." [13]

Schultz's analysis explores "why economists have shied away from explicit analysis of investment in human capital" and concludes that this explains "many a puzzle about economic growth." [14] He then states:

"The failure to treat human resources explicitly as a form of capital fostered the retention of the classical notion of labor as a capacity to do manual work requiring little knowledge and skill, a capacity with which, according to this notion, laborers are endowed about equally. This notion of labor was wrong in the classical period and it is patently wrong now. Counting individuals who can and want to work and treating such a count as a measure of the quantity of an economic factor is no more meaningful than it would be to count the number of all manner of machines to determine their economic importance either as a stock of capital, or as a flow of production services." [15]

Later in his address, Schultz states that "investment in education * * * may well account for a substantial part of the otherwise unexplained rise in earnings." [16] On the basis of estimates that he offers, he concludes:

"On one set of assumptions, the unexplained part amounts to nearly three-fifths of the total increase between 1929 and 1956. How much of this unexplained increase in income represents a return to education in the labor force? A lower limit suggests that about three-tenths of it, and an upper limit does not rule out that more than one-half of it, came from this source. These estimates also imply that between 36 and 70 percent of the hitherto unexplained rise in the earnings of labor is explained by returns to the additional education of workers." [17]

Schultz gives this general conclusion: "Truly, the most distinctive feature of our economic system is the growth in human capital. Without it there would be only hard, manual work and poverty, except for those who have income from property." [18] He recognizes many complexities in arriving at scientific measures of the returns to an economy from investment in education. He also points out that, in improving our human capital, services other than education, such as those in the field of health, contribute to the stock of human capital.

Schultz suggests some tentative implications for social policy that arise from growing insight into the importance of investment in human capital. These include:

1. Removal of such hindrances to free choice of professions as racial and religious discrimination.
2. Long-term loans to students.
3. Larger investments in the health and education of disadvantaged Americans.
4. Retraining of workers displaced by technological changes.
5. Encouragement of able youths to invest in themselves, especially through higher education.

Among appraisals of recent studies of the economic importance of investment in education is that of Swearingen, dean of the College of Business of Oklahoma State University. He offers the following review:

"Many studies * * * show that the return on the investment in education pays economic dividends of approximately 10 percent with none of the costs allocated to consumption and with no consideration given to the cultural, political, and social benefits of education.

---

[3] Renshaw, Edward F. "Estimating the Returns to Education." Review of Economics and Statistics 42: 318–24; August 1960.

[4] Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 70, Supplement No. 5, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, October 1962. Copyright 1962 by the University of Chicago Press.

[5] Harris, Seymour E. More Resources for Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1960, pp. 71–72.

[6] Becker, Gary S., "Underinvestment in College Education." American Economic Review 50: 346–54; May 1960.

[7] Vaizey, op. cit., p. 43.

[8] Sufrin, Sidney C., "Issues in Federal Aid to Education." Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, Press, 1962, p. 29.

[9] Groves, Harold M., "Education and Economic Growth." Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1961, p. 36.

[10] Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System. Federal Reserve Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September 1962, p. 1230.

[11] Abramovitz, Moses. Resource and Output Trends in the United States Since 1870. Occasional Paper No. 52. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1956, 23 pp.

[12] Kendrick, John W. Productivity Trends in the United States. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961, p. 79. Copyright 1961 by Princeton University Press.

[13] Schultz, Theodore W. "Investment in Human Capital." American Economic Review 51: 1; March 1961.

[14] Ibid., p. 1.

[15] Ibid., p. 3.

[16] Ibid., p. 10.

[17] Ibid., p. 13.

[18] Ibid., p. 16.

"These studies, in my opinion, grossly underestimate the value to society of education. They place a value on only those qualities which affect the lifetime earnings of the individual. They overlook many factors which I believe to be very important. Just to list a few, what is the value to society of having: educated civic workers, educated mothers, educated neighbors, improved race relations (which seems to be related closely to education), reduction of poverty with consequent reduction in crime, mothers with some leisure time while their children are in school, the satisfaction which comes from developing one's talents during the educational process, an educated citizenry in the event of war, a citizenry that is literate, and a higher rate of economic growth for our society?[19]

"Note that any study which begins as an attempt to measure only those aspects of education which result in changes in the income of the individual will of necessity omit all of the foregoing benefits of education and many more. Nevertheless, even the studies which have focused only on the increased life earnings of the individual compared to the costs of education (both properly discounted) have shown that the return on the investment in education (human capital) is equal to or greater than the return on investment in physical capital."[20]

Although not exact in the scientific sense, there is empirical evidence concerning the returns from investment in education. Two areas of observation are considered in the next sections of this report—the growth in productivity of agriculture in the United States and the experience of nations, both those that are underdeveloped and those that are economically mature.

EDUCATION AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCTIVITY

The story of agricultural production in the United States is an amazing one. Agriculture has been the pace setter in productivity. The embarrassment of overproduction in the United States contrasts dramatically with the lack of sufficient food in many parts of the world.

Revolution on the farm

The greatest technological revolution in the United States has taken place on the farm. Along with remarkable gains in agricultural production have come such woes as what to do with our agricultural surplus and what to do with the rapidly displaced farm laborers who constitute a considerable part of the disadvantaged citizens in city slums.

"In 1870, more than half of the Nation's workers were engaged in agriculture. Today, only 1 worker in 12 makes his living from farming, either as a farm owner or as a laborer. The implications of this fact are enormous. Ninety years ago, the average farmer could supply food for only 6 people; in 1960, 1 farmer met the food needs of 26 people."[21]

Farm output, as measured against man-hours, increased 80 percent from 1948 to 1958. The annual cumulative rate of increase in productivity of agriculture was 6 percent as compared with 2.5 percent in the nonfarm sector.[22]

Such gains with continuing decreases in farm labor and acres cultivated are a remarkable economic achievement. Many factors have entered into it—new types of organization and machinery and, certainly, education.

In agriculture, there is probably the most comprehensive use of education found in any sector of the economy. Let us analyze some of the educational factors in the picture.

Literacy and general education

Although schools in rural regions lagged behind those in urban areas,[23] the typical U.S. farmer achieved literacy and some general education in the first half of the 19th century as a result of the battle fought and won in that period for free elementary education.

Education and agricultural research

In 1862, President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act providing for the establishment of institutions of higher education in all States, concerned with, but not limited to, the study of agricultural and mechanical arts.

These institutions had relatively little of a scientific nature to teach about agriculture. To remedy this situation, experimentation and research in agriculture were provided for by the Hatch Act of 1887. In 1914, provision was made for adult education, first in agriculture and home economics and later in other fields, under the Smith-Lever Act. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided, for high schools, vocational education in agriculture, trades and industries, and home economics.[24]

Education and agricultural productivity

In the foregoing legislation and subsequent acts extending education in these fields, one finds one of the most comprehensive programs for investment in human capital that history records. The farmers of the United States compose no ignorant or superstitious peasantry. For a century or more, they have enjoyed the benefits of—

1. Literacy and general education permitting access to written knowledge and the flexibility of mind which tends to welcome new knowledge.
2. Formal and specialized instruction beginning at the secondary level and continuing into the undergraduate and graduate levels of higher education.
3. Research and experimentation to provide a scientific basis for instruction and practice.
4. Provision for the rapid extension of new knowledge among those engaged in the industry.

Some economists have suggested that the reason that other major sectors of the economy have gained less rapidly in productivity than agriculture is that they have made less intensive use of the quartet of factors identified above.

Action for agriculture?

We might wish that our agricultural revolution had been wholly a matter of intelligent leadership and statesmanship. It appears, however, that it was largely the outcome of two factors: (1) war pressures (during which the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Vocational Education Act of 1917 were passed) and (2) certain rural political controls. Referring to the tremendous increases in agricultural production, Groves states:

"A plausible hypothesis is that here we had a politically favored area upon which were bestowed almost unlimited funds, both for research and dissemination of the results."[25]

One might wish that fortuitous circumstances had brought about equally effective use of education in the Nation's total development—economic and otherwise. Rather, several interests have blocked full use of the power of education in advancing the general cultural and economic growth of the United States.

The unfinished business in the agricultural sector is the rational action that its most rapid and most complete technological revolution demands. There must be use of, or limitation of, agricultural production and provisions for displaced workers.

Another type of empirical evidence bearing on the education-economic relationship comes from the correlation of investment in education and per capita production both in underdeveloped and in economically mature nations. The next section reviews evidence on this subject.

EDUCATION IN THE WORLD SCENE

The relation of education to economic growth is a matter of world-wide inquiry. It is of keen concern to the nations struggling to feed their hungry populations. The economically advanced nations are studying the role of education as a factor in stepping up the rate of economic growth. Some interesting facts are emerging.

Literacy and per capita income

There is high correlation in the nations of the world between literacy and economic productivity. One can approximately estimate the per capita income of a Nation by ascertaining the percentage of its population that is literate.

John Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India, has pointed out that popular enlightenment opens men's minds to new methods, new techniques, and new desires.

"Apart from its cultural role, popular literacy is a highly efficient thing. Needless to say, it is also the mainspring of popular aspiration. As such it adds strongly to the desire for development."[26]

To be sure, literacy is only one element in economic growth. But it is significant that no nation with an illiterate population has achieved high productivity. All nations with literate populations have high per capita incomes.

Natural resources, education, and productivity

The natural resources of a nation do not determine its economic status. Table I shows that some nations rich in natural resources are poverty stricken. Others, such as Denmark and Switzerland, have meager natural resources but high per capita incomes. Both of these latter countries have made highly effective use of education.

Education and economic growth

Western Nations

How much is the superior economic status of Western nations due to provision for the education of their people? Was industrialization achieved first, and did it make it possible to finance education, or was the sequence reversed?

Mrs. Alva Myrdal, Swedish Ambassador to India, in 1960 reported her observations of the relation of education to economic growth in several nations of the West, including Denmark, Sweden, Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States. In dealing with the relation of education to economic growth, she stated that "education has, in the nations that have advanced rapidly and firmly, been rather a precursor than a follower in the table of progress."

---

[19] Swearingen, Eugene L. "Education as an Investment." Financing the Changing School Program. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1962, pp. 34–35.

[20] Ibid., p. 35.

[21] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Outlook Handbook, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 16.

[22] Groves, Harold M., Education and Economic Growth. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1961, p. 19.

[23] This lag is one source of some of the most severe social problems associated with illiteracy, unemployment, and crime, dealt with earlier in this report.

[24] Norton, John K. "Federal Relations to Education." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (Edited by Chester W. Harris.) Third edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1960, pp. 522–523.

[25] Groves, op. cit., p. 20.

[26] Galbraith, John Kenneth. Economic Development in Perspective. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962, p. 13.

TABLE I.—*Natural resources, education, and income*

Nation	Natural resources	Educational development	Per capita income, average 1952–54
Brazil	High	Low	$230
Colombia	do	do	250
Denmark	Low	High	750
Mexico	High	Low	220
New Zealand	do	High	1,000
Switzerland	Low	do	1,010
United States	High	do	1,870

Source: For per capita income (net national product at factor cost): National Industrial Conference Board, the Economic Almanac, 1958, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958, p. 488. Source: For educational development: National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators, "Schools for a New World," 25th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1947, pp. 26–30.

She gave particular attention to Denmark, since it has few natural resources besides its land and its people. She pointed out that—

"The industrial revolution in Danish agriculture could only have been attained because the Danish population was already rather thoroughly prepared by education. No other country had so early and so comprehensively instituted compulsory schooling as Denmark. Thus, when the great decision had to be taken about changing the nation's economy, the challenge could be met by a people who had already behind it a generation of practically universal literacy." [27]

The quick recovery of the nations of Western Europe after World War II is in sharp contrast to the lagging economic progress of the less-developed countries. The former nations had a large stock of human capital in the form of educated and trained citizens as an important factor in speeding their recovery. Looking to the future, the Western nations are taking realistic account of the role of education as a means to further developing their manpower.[28]

The recent Policy Conference on Economic Growth and Investment in Education identified a number of the products of education that are essential for economic growth. The following excerpts from the report of this Conference are illustrative:

"The importance of education as part of national policy has never attracted as much attention and been as widely discussed as it is today—in Europe as well as in North America. Present trends—political, economic, social and technical—are all focusing attention on the role education should and could play in a modern community.[29]

"Education is also more and more widely recognized as a means to economic growth which, since the end of the war, has everywhere been a paramount aim of national policy. In the underdeveloped countries, economic growth is necessary to alleviate widespread poverty. In the more advanced countries, economic growth has become a matter of competition, a yardstick for appraising the ability of different political systems to solve economic and social problems." [30]

U.S.S.R.

The rapid economic development of Communist Russia was in part the result of one of the most dynamic educational programs of all history. George S. Counts, in his prize-winning book, "The Challenge of Soviet Education," points out that—

"The Bolshevik leaders from the first have regarded organized education with utter seriousness, far surpassing in this respect the leaders of any free society on earth. Without their vast system of educational agencies the Bolsheviks would not be standing in the position of power which they occupy in the world today." [31]

William Benton, former U.S. Senator from Connecticut, has made four trips to the U.S.S.R. since 1955 and has given special attention to Soviet education. After his 1962 trip he reported that "the disparity between Russian dedication to education and our own is so grave that I come home a deeply worried citizen." He reported that Russia is not only "stealing the American dream of providing every child an equal opportunity for an education" in the elementary and secondary schools "but in higher education as well." He states that the "Soviet Union's most potent weapon may very well be her quietest weapon, education." Senator Benton warns that the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States "is likely to turn on which society makes the best use of its potential educational resources." [32]

Asian Nations

Japan, with meager natural resources, nevertheless launched an educational program in the nineteenth century which, early in the twentieth century, resulted in a high level of literacy. Today, Japan has the highest per capita income of any Eastern nation.

The less-developed nations have yet to create the educated and trained human capital essential for high productivity. This lack is a major block to their economic growth.

India recognizes this fact. A. N. Khosla, a leading Indian engineer and member of India's influential Planning Commission, stated the situation thus:

"The wealth of a nation consists of its natural resources and the manpower to develop these resources. India has vast resources of land, water, and minerals. Its population will rise to 431 millions in 1961.

"This immense population is our biggest asset. It is also our biggest problem. Properly trained and directed, and employed with due sense of urgency, this manpower can work miracles in the economic development of this country. Neglected and unemployed or under-employed, it can bring about major social and political upheavals. The building up of the country's human resources is, therefore, our first task, and education has the most vital role to play in this task." [33]

Unmeasured products of education

It is probable that the most significant economic returns from investment in education are diffused and unmeasured qualities in the people of a nation, which in considerable degree are a product of nationwide education. Some of these are identified below.

Social and Political Stability

When the temper of a people is unstable and their decisions are frequently overturned by seizures of power, the climate for financial investment is not good. To the extent that education contributes to social and political stability, it provides an environment which encourages economic investment.

Achievement of Democratic Aims

The United States recognized early in its history that the development and maintenance of a free society require education for all. This factor was dealt with in the Policy Conference cited above as follows:

"Education has always been regarded as a vital factor in achieving the general aims of society, an instrument to make the democratic system more perfect. What is more recent—and has so far received less consideration—is the emergence of a concept of education as an important factor of economic policy." [34]

New Knowledge

New knowledge today is the stuff of progress and even of survival. Universities provide the highly educated personnel required for scientific inquiry. They are a major source of the fundamental research that is the basis of most applied research.

The Conference cited above stated that "there is one field in which investment in higher education is especially desirable: the highly profitable field of research." [35]

Scientific Outlook and Acceptance of Change

The citizens of a nation must understand the value of new knowledge and possess attitudes which permit it to be applied. If superstition and resistance to change stand in the way of applications of new knowledge to such fields as agriculture, industry, and health, progress is balked.

"One of the signs of a progressive economy is its ability to transfer a technical innovation, first from the laboratory to actual production, and then from one unit of production to another. The progress of underdeveloped and semideveloped countries is highly dependent on an acceleration of this transfer process. It is here that the role of education and the choice of the right kind of education can be so important." [36]

Highly Trained Specialists

General education and training throughout the whole population are essential ingredients of a modern society. But it is also of critical importance that there should be some who have specialized education of a high order.

"Education, and especially higher education, should aim at facilitating division of labor; it should prepare people to meet the demand for new specializations of function * * * specialization * * * means that people increasingly work in teams which contain complementary types of knowledge and skill. It is basic for such teamwork that the improved productivity of one member should increase the productivity of other members of the team." [37]

Leadership

Recent events have emphasized the importance of the role of scientific leadership. Modern nations, however, require first-rate leaders in many fields. For example, the importance of the trained entrepreneur is coming to be recognized. Men of insight and broad social understanding are required in government. In fact, advanced education is called for in nearly all fields. The quality and quantity of leaders are largely determined by the effectiveness of schools, colleges, universities, and other educational agencies.

---

[27] Norton, John K. "Education and Economic Development." Indian Journal of Educational Administration and Research 1: 13; Spring 1961.

[28] Vaizey, John. The Economics of Education. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962. Chapter 7, "Manpower," pp. 89–107.

[29] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. "Targets for Education in Europe in 1970." Policy Conference on Economic Growth and Investment in Education. Report II. Paris: the Organization, 1962. p. 15.

[30] Ibid., p. 16.

[31] Counts, George S. "The Challenge of Soviet Education." New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1957. pp. 306–307.

[32] Benton, William. "Big Red Threat: Education." New York World Telegram, September 10–13, 1962.

[33] Khosla, A. N. Address at a meeting of the Indian Panel of Education, August 8–9, 1960.

See also Norton, op. cit., p. 10.

[34] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, op. cit., p. 21.

[35] Ibid., p. 25.

[36] Ibid., p. 24.

[37] Ibid., pp. 24–25.

The ability to organize large numbers of workers for effective work is of growing importance in modern societies. The Conference cited above stated that "education at the leader level yields extra dividends all the way down the line."[38]

The Conference on Education in Relation to Economic Growth concluded that—

"Economic growth is generated not only by real capital in the form of tools and machinery, but also by men. And just as technological improvements increase the efficiency of machinery, so education increases the efficiency of manpower. Indeed, recent statistical investigations tend to show that the improvement in the "human factor" accounts for a major part of economic growth."[39]

Evidence is accumulating concerning positive effects of education in increasing production. There is also evidence that neglect of education has serious negative effects. The next section identifies some of the social and economic consequences of inadequate educational opportunity.

PENALTIES OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

It is a shocking fact that the United States, with equal opportunity as one of its ideals, has failed to provide educational opportunity for all children. This failure and its social penalties have been pointed out by a series of studies made since World War I.

A project sponsored by Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University pointed out that we were "squandering our human resource capital." This waste resulted from "the failure of our society to invest adequately in the development of its people, particularly its young people during their formative years."[40] This notable study took account of illiteracy as it was revealed in connection with military recruitment:

"World War II threw a searchlight on the deficiencies in the educational preparation of the young. Almost 2 million men out of the 18 million who were screened (1 out of every 9) were total or borderline illiterates.[41]

It was concluded that illiteracy remains a major national deficiency. When millions reach adulthood unable to read and write, it is obvious that there is gross denial of educational opportunity in some parts of the nation. Let us examine recent facts.

Illiteracy

According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, approximately 2.85 million persons in the United States in 1959 were unable to read or write at all.[42] The U.S. Commissioner of Education, testifying in the 1962 Hearings of the House of Representatives regarding adult illiteracy, stated:

"Much of our adult illiteracy exists in States that find difficulty in supporting an adequate program of education for children and youth. In fact, States with the lowest level of support for general education tend markedly to show the largest number of educationally deprived adults. However, illiteracy is found throughout the Nation, which means that in some States it is imported, while in others it is home-grown. In the former, illiteracy is due to a failure at the adult education level; in the latter, it represents a failure to provide educational opportunity at the elementary and secondary levels. In either case, it is a condition which should not be tolerated in a democracy. It becomes, therefore, a national problem * * * illiteracy reflects one of two conditions. Either the individual has not had an opportunity to attend school, or he attended a poor school for a short period of time.

"According to a 1958–59 Office of Education survey * * * of 15,200 school systems studied, only 4,840 reported any type of adult education programs; and of these 4,840, only 160, or 3.3 per cent, offered instruction in basic literacy education to 47,500 adult illiterates."[43]

In addition to those who cannot read and write, there are millions who are designated as "functionally illiterate," who have completed less than 5 years of schooling and usually lack ability to make effective use of reading and writing.

According to the 1960 Census of Population, some 8.3 million persons aged 25 and over—more than 8 percent of the adult population—had completed less than 5 years of schooling. Of this number, 4.5 million were men, and 3.8 million were women.[44] These do not reside exclusively in one region. New York has 800,000 in this group; California, 505,000; and Illinois, 365,000. The corresponding numbers in each of the States of Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, and Ohio exceed 200,000. Many persons in such States, with less than 5 years of schooling, are migrants from areas with poor school systems. Among Negroes in the United States, the illiteracy rate is four times as high as among white people.

Many of our citizens fall far short of completing 6 years of schooling:

"In 1960 there were approximately 115 million persons in the 18-year-and-over age group * * * of these 11,350,000, or 10 per cent, had completed less than 6 years of schooling."[45]

In some cases, illiteracy results from lack of educational opportunity. But in many cases it is due to inadequate schooling resulting largely from nonenforcement of school attendance laws; oversized classes in which little attention is given to individual pupil needs; lack of remedial reading classes; and lack of special provisions for children of minority groups, migrant laborers, and other disadvantaged Americans.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education, testifying before a Congressional Hearing in 1962, reported that "it is now increasingly rare for children to avoid school completely," and that what happens is that some attend "a poor school for a short period of time." He stated:

"In seeking the major cause of continuing illiteracy, attention must henceforth be directed not so much to a lack of opportunity for any schooling but to a lack of adequate schooling."[46]

Social liabilities

Lack of schooling is associated with lower earning capacity, higher rates of unemployment, higher rejections from military service, and more dependence on public aid.[47]

Lower Earning Capacity

Employed workers with an 8th grade education or less have 65 percent of the incomes between $1,000 and $1,500 and 61 percent of the incomes between $1,500 and $2,500.[48]

Unemployment

Unskilled workers have the highest rates of unemployment and the lowest average level of education. A U.S. Department of Labor study of March 1959 showed an unemployment rate of 10 percent for workers with under 5 years completed, a rate of 9.8 percent for those with 5 to 7 years schooling, 4.8 percent for high school graduates, and 1.8 percent for college graduates.

When technological changes displace workers, those workers with little education are the most difficult to retrain for new jobs. Lacking educational background, they have less promise of benefiting from vocational education. They are likely to increase the already overcrowded ranks of casual labor or of the unemployed. Unemployment for long periods of time tends to make a person unemployable.

Rejection From Military Service

In World War II, some 400,000 illiterates were accepted for military service. The Armed Forces provided these men with the educational fundamentals necessary for useful service. Another 300,000 illiterates—equal to 20 army divisions—were rejected completely.

During the Korean war, 19 percent of all recruits were rejected from military service on grounds of educational deficiencies. From July 1950 to September 1961, over 900,000 draft registrants of 6 million examined were rejected on the basis of a mental test alone. This number was almost as great as the number of registrants disqualified on medical grounds. Low educational attainment was the largest single reason for rejection.[49]

Relief Rolls and Public Assistance

The U.S. Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testifying before a congressional hearing in 1962, stated:

"There are 7¼ million persons in our affluent society receiving welfare payments today. Total annual Federal, State, and local expenditures for this purpose exceed $4.5 billion. Forty-five percent of all families with less than $2,000 annual income have a head of the family with less than an eighth-grade education. These families, in turn, constitute the source from which the public welfare rolls develop, when an individual becomes unemployed or sick or some other hazard occurs to him."[50]

Many studies show that recipients of public assistance are likely to be persons of low educational attainment. A 1957 study in New York, for example, revealed that almost one-fifth of the mothers on the aid to dependent children (ADC) rolls had not gone beyond the fifth grade. This study further showed that among families receiving general assistance, one-half of the family heads had completed no more than 6 years of schooling. Illinois reported in 1960 that one-fifth of the ADC mothers had not gone beyond the sixth grade. In Louisiana, in 1954, one-half of the ADC mothers and three-fourths of the fathers in the home had received only a fifth grade education or less.[51]

A recent Chicago study pinpointed the relation between lack of education and dependency on relief. The study tested a representative sample of relief recipients in Chicago. It found that 50.7 percent of those studied could not pass reading and vocabulary tests at the fifth grade achievement level. The conclusion was that the problems of public welfare stem from unemployment and economic and technological displacement and, most important, from relief recipients' lack of basic educational skills which are essential to compete in our modern society.

---

[38] Ibid., p. 25.

[39] Ibid., pp. 23–24.

[40] Ginzberg, Eli. Human Resources: The Wealth of the Nation. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958, p. 53.

[41] Ibid., p. 54.

[42] Cohen, Wilbur J., "Adult Basic Education Act of 1962: Hearings Before the Committee on Education and Labor." U.S. 87th Congress, 2d session, House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, February 1962, p. 9.

[43] McMurrin, Sterling M., "Adult Basic Education Act of 1962," pp. 17–19.

[44] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Health, Education, and Welfare Indicators." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1962, p. v.

[45] Cohen, op. cit.

[46] McMurrin, op. cit., p. 20.

[47] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, op. cit., p. vi.

[48] Ibid., p. ix.

[49] Cohen, op cit, p. 12.

[50] Cohen, op. cit., p. 11.

[51] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, op cit., p. IX.

On the basis of the sample studied, it was concluded that more than one-half of the 225,000 able-bodied relief recipients of Cook County, Ill., were functionally illiterate. This county's relief bill for 282,000 recipients including the ill and the aged, is $16.5 million. According to Raymond M. Hilliard, director of Cook County Department of Public Aid:

"The cost of the community in dollars and wasted human resources will be disastrous if basic literacy education and job training are not provided." [52]

Social cost of inadequate schooling

The evidence is compelling that lack of schooling and poor schooling are associated with such social problems as low earning capacity, unemployment, rejection from military service, and dependence upon public relief in its various forms. This is not to claim that education alone can completely eliminate such major social liabilities. However, it appears that one of the priorities that must be included in a realistic program to eliminate, or at least sharply reduce, the mounting numbers on relief rolls is adequate educational opportunity for every child in the United States. This requires that there be a first-rate school available to every child, with a program fitted to his needs and capacity. There must also be strict enforcement of school attendance laws so that such factors as race, parental indifference, and social and economic status do not result in inadequate schooling.

Educational action to these ends is fully justified solely on the basis of our commitment to equality of opportunity. There is the additional fiscal consideration that it will probably cost less to provide adequate schooling for all than to pay for the rising relief expenditures, which are at least in part due to lack of such schooling.

It is not enough merely to achieve functional literacy in the elementary school. Far too many of those who reach the high school become dropouts before they receive the education and training required for employment and self-reliant citizenship. The next section deals with this problem.

FINANCING OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Director of the College and University Administration Branch of the Division of Higher Education of the Office of Education last November had published in the Sooner magazine an article covering the financing of collegiate education.

In view of the factual material contained in the article, in my judgment, Senators will find it most helpful as they consider education legislation in the 88th Congress.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCING YOUR CHILD IN COLLEGE—AN EDUCATIONAL EXPERT OFFERS ADVICE TO PARENTS WITH COLLEGE IN THEIR FUTURE

(By Ernest V. Hollis)

What does it cost to attend college? And where will the money come from? Perhaps you have read that it can cost anywhere from $500 to $5,000 a year to send a child to college these days. Do you wonder why there is this great range—and where you would get, say, $8,000 for the 4-year education of each of your children? If your children are young, are you alarmed at predictions that college costs will increase markedly in 5 years, and may actually double in 10 or 15?

The facts are sobering enough. But they should not produce the jitters or cause parents to panic. Through careful planning, a family can prepare to meet college expenses as easily as it prepares to buy a house, an automobile, or a major home appliance.

While it is safe to predict that all costs of attending college will increase each year between now and 1965, 1970, and 1975, all of the economic trends indicates that family income for most of us will increase proportionately. Although families will be paying more dollars each year toward the costs of a college education, in most cases they will not be paying an increasing proportion of the educational costs or devoting a larger fraction of their income to these purposes.

There is nothing mysterious about the costs of attending college. They break down into two segments. Educational costs, which are minor, are set by the college. But living costs, which are major, can be controlled to a large extent by the student and his family.

If we examine the two segments separately, we can then put them together to show total costs. But before we do, let it be clearly understood that all the comments below on costs and on sources of funds are limited to single, fulltime, resident, undergraduate college students. In public colleges, we will further restrict ourselves to costs for students who are residents of the State in which the institutions are located and who, therefore, do not pay the higher tuition charged to nonresidents. The story would be too complicated, and both costs and sources of funds would lose focus, if we included commuting and part-time students, married students, or those attending graduate or professional schools.

Educational costs—tuition, fees, books, educational equipment and supplies—are not the major part of the total expense of going to college. At public-supported colleges, educational costs average only one-sixth of the total that each student spends. At private colleges, where tuition is higher, these expenses will average only about one-third of the total. The student pays for only a portion of what it really costs his college—public or private—to provide his education. And, as a result, his educational expenses remain relatively low.

Although educational costs have risen from 6 to 9 percent each year since World War II—and 75 percent in the last decade—they began at a very low level indeed. And, despite some instances of very high tuition, the averages are still low enough to be within the reach of nearly everyone.

There are State universities where annual tuition and fees have reached $800 per student. Yet the average is still under $275.

And at 10 outstanding public universities, including California, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Texas, educational costs are still under $200 for State residents.

At private colleges, the student pays a larger share of what it costs the college to provide his educational program. But only at the less well managed institutions does he pay more than 60 percent of the actual educational cost. The rest is made up by each college from its endowment and current gifts. The average charge for tuition and fees at the superior private colleges was $768 in 1961–62, and the middle half of them charged from $565 to $980.

MOST PARENTS PREFER LESS HIGH LIVING AND MORE HIGH THINKING

What makes financing 4 years in college truly burdensome is the high cost of living—and, sometimes, the cost of high living. On a national average, living costs make up five-sixths of students expenses at public colleges, and two-thirds at private colleges. While most parents would prefer less high living and more high thinking, they do want their children housed comfortably, fed well, and provided with wholesome recreation, medical care, and other student services. All of this costs money. The truth is, we prefer it to the plain living of yesteryear.

Both the college and the student make decisions which determine the cost of living. Auxiliary facilities and services provided by the college, many of which contribute to education as well as to comfort and well-being, largely determine whether an institution has an atmosphere of relative austerity or of a country club. But living costs at any given institution are also governed by what the student and his family consider a reasonable budget.

A student on a luxury budget often spends three or four times as much as one on an economy budget. At the University of Illinois, for example, single undergraduate students spent in 1960 anywhere from $850 to $3,400, averaging $1,744. Only $376 of this was for tuition, fees, and other educational costs.

If we look just at the totals for tuition, fees, room, and board, omitting other incidental expenses for the moment, the 1961-62 figures ranged from a low of $600 in 67 public and 24 private colleges to a high of $2,000 in 6 public and 125 private colleges. The average of costs in 493 accredited public colleges was $913. In 886 private colleges, it was $1,392.

All these figures support the view that the essential costs of going to college are still within the reach of most families.

A superior undergraduate college education can cost a lot or a little today, and the same is likely to be true in the future. Let's take a look at how students and their parents are meeting these costs, and suggest some new ways for meeting them.

The man was right who said the easiest way to finance a college education is to choose parents who are in the upper income brackets or grandparents who established a trust fund for the purpose.

Less fortunate but more enterprising persons cut college expenses by choosing a superior college in a section of the country where costs are low. At least 300,000 undergraduates who do this are saving up to 30 percent of the total cost of attending college. A public or private college in New England or the Middle Atlantic States, for example, will cost much more than an institution of the same high standards in the South or Middle West. High school and college counselors can give leads to such information. The enterprising family can save hundreds of dollars by following them.

If a student does not choose to go where superior education is least expensive, another sure way of saving cash outlay is to stay home and become a commuting student. At least half of the undergraduates in the country live close enough to a college to save money in this way. But by doing so, they would lose the social growth inherent in a residential college. This and other decisions leading to the choice of a college cannot be made lightly, of course.

While the amount of money required for 4 years in college varies with such factors, the pattern of who provides it does not vary greatly. Parents of commuting students, for example, pay less in cash and more in kind; but they nevertheless provide about the same proportion of the student's total budget as do all other parents.

The most recent comprehensive report of where the money comes from was my study for 1952-53 (U.S. Office of Education Bulletin No. 9, 1957). Recent smaller studies indicate the patterns have not changed much since then. That study included 16,000 single undergraduate students in 110 public and private colleges in 41 States. It showed that 41 percent of the money came from the family and relatives, 26 percent from student earnings, 20 percent from assets (savings, etc.), 10 percent from scholarships, 1 percent from loans, and 2 percent from miscellaneous sources.

---

[52] New York Times, "Study of Relief Cites Illiteracy." New York Times, September 22, 1962, p. 27. Copyright by the New York Times. Reprinted by permission.

These figures are average, and they do not mean that all students received income from all of these sources. In fact, the studies show that only about 20 percent of all students receive any funds from scholarship sources, and that nearly 25 percent do not receive any funds from parents or other relatives. On the other hand, two-thirds of the men and half the women had income from work during the school year or the preceding summer.

The number of students who borrow money has increased markedly since Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act in 1958. For the school year 1960–61, under this act alone, 151,115 students borrowed $71 million. What's more, the liberal terms of the act regarding the making and repayment of loans have had an important influence on other student loan funds. At least 21 States now have substantial loan funds. Long-term, low-interest loans are also available from religious, labor, service, and philanthropic organizations. Banks and insurance companies are making commercial loans to students in increasing numbers, usually through parents or other adults. In 1961, banks alone reported making 13,000 educational loans amounting to $37.3 million.

But parents still provide a major portion of the money for college expenses, as they always have. Let us look at the factors which influence how much parents contribute, and how they manage to do so.

Lower income families tend to send their children to low-cost institutions, where they provide as large a portion of the total budget as a wealthier family contributes at a high-cost college. Too often this puts a B–plus student from a D–plus economic family into a C–minus college. The obvious immediate remedy is to let the student attend a superior college, contribute the same number of dollars, and let the student and the college makeup the balance through work opportunities, loans, and scholarships. The long-range remedy calls for a family investment plan that begins when the child enters elementary school, or before.

It is a greater error of judgment to send one's child to a shoddy college in order to save a few hundred dollars on a lifetime investment than it is to save a few dollars on a short-term investment in shoddy clothes. Yet parents are more prone to make the first than the second mistake. We tend to forget that during the first five of his productive years a student usually earns the difference in what it costs to attend a college that gives a superior education.

Once a student has been admitted to a college suited to his needs and capacities, the family contribution to his budget is determined by some combination of the following six factors, listed in the order of their importance: (1) family income, (2) parents' level of education, (3) the breadwinner's occupation, (4) sex of child, (5) the number of brothers or sisters now in college or who have recently been graduated, and (6) the number who may later attend college.

Level of income is obviously the most important of the six factors, but it does not operate alone. The parents' own education or occupation usually influence both how much money is earned and for what purposes it is spent.

A 1960–61 study of student economics by Prof. L. J. Lins at the University of Wisconsin explored some of the relationships of family income to the amounts spent for college. The study revealed a remarkable difference at each income level between the total college expenditures of in-State and out-of-State students. It also confirmed the fact that parents spend more to send daughters to the University of Wisconsin than to send sons. And it showed that student budgets rise gradually from austerity to luxury with family income.

TOO MANY B-PLUS STUDENTS ARE BEING PUT IN C-MINUS COLLEGES

The median college expenditures for students from Wisconsin families with incomes under $4,000 were $1,250 for men and $1,267 for women. At the other extreme, men students from Wisconsin families with incomes over $20,000 spent an average of $1,651, and women students $1,919. Men from out-of-State families in this bracket spent $2,270, and women $2,564.

Other studies show that the education and occupation of parents, especially at lower income levels, help determine whether qualified children will go to college, and how much of the family income will be used to assist them. In general, the more education parents have and the more culturally significant their occupations, the greater is their willingness to make sacrifices in order to help finance their children's college education.

How much parents pay toward college expenses depends also on how many children they have at about college age. Fewer than one-fifth of the couples with one child in college have one or more other children attending college at the same time. About one-third have older children who have previously attended college. But half of the families have younger children who are potential college students.

The average student with no brothers or sisters spends more than students who have them. In the University of Wisconsin study, for example, students with no brothers or sisters had budgets that averaged $1,775, and those with four or more siblings spent $1,390. The presence of one additional child to be put through college tends to reduce the average annual budget of a student by $100; of two children, by $175; three children, $250; and four or more additional children by at least an average of $350.

Parents provide two-fifths of the expenses of single undergraduate students. And most of them do so now on a sporadic, catch-as-catch-can basis—most frequently by cutting down on current family expenditures. About one-fourth of the parents say they make all their contributions from normal current income.

About half the students who enter college get 10 to 15 percent of their freshman and sophomore budgets from gifts and inheritances or from other family capital.

Parents can take on extra work to provide the necessary funds. The father can secure a second job, or the mother can take one on, or both. Thirty percent of parents report that part of the family contribution to college expenses comes from extra earnings by some family member other than the student.

More and more of those parents whose children are not yet of college age are committing themselves to comprehensive plans for saving money systematically for the college education of their children. Yet the number who are saving in a realistic way is still alarmingly low.

A Ford Foundation-sponsored survey made in 1959 showed about three-fifths of the parents whose children are not yet of college age have no plan at all to provide money for college expenses. According to this survey, 24 percent of parents have insurance programs to save money over a 10- to 15-year period before their children are of college age; 11 percent have savings in bank accounts; 6 percent have Government bonds; 4 percent have common stocks; and 4 percent have other types of plans.

But those who need such savings plans most are least likely to have them. Some 58 percent of parents in high income brackets have savings plans, averaging about $670 a year. Only 38 and 28 percent of those in average and below-average income brackets are saving about $130 and $100 a year, respectively, for college expenses. The average family with one child saves $140 per year for this purpose; with two children, $150; and with three or more children, $180.

Compare these figures with those given above for college costs, and you will see that families are not accumulating enough funds to meet two-fifths of the cost of 4 years in college (the current average family contribution), much less this portion of the increased costs expected by 1970 or 1975. There is an urgent need for those who are saving for college attendance to double the amount they now set aside. And there is an even more urgent need for the 60 percent not currently saving to devise plans.

As indicated above, parents who have savings plans rely largely on lending their money and accumulating interest. When asked in the Ford Foundation survey why they chose the plans they did, parents who are using insurance policies said they liked the regular forced payments, the protection in case of death, the fact that cashing the policies is discouraged, and the fact that payments are extended over a long period. Those using savings accounts reported they did so because this type of investment is easier, can be used for other things, pays a higher interest rate, and is safe. Those who prefer investing in Government bonds like them for reasons of safety, high interest, payroll deductions, patriotism, and because the money isn't readily available to be spent for other things.

Savings and loan associations, which now pay 4 to 4.75 percent and which guarantee deposits up to $10,000 through an agency of the Federal Government, provide another sound but relatively little-used method for long-term investment by those who put safety of principal above the risks of investing directly in the private enterprise system.

Those who invest in the economy directly to accumulate funds for college attendance, through common stocks or otherwise, do so primarily in the expectation of a higher return on the investment, and as a hedge against inflation. Because saving for college is a long-term investment, they believe it is not endangered by the short-range vagaries of the stock market. They say they prefer to invest in economy themselves, rather than to lend their money to someone else who will do so to his own profit.

One of the newer plans for saving to meet college costs is investment in the shares of mutual funds. This arrangement enables one to put his money in shares of a variety of portfolios of common stocks or of preferred stocks and bonds, and leave the management to qualified investors. There are some 250 mutual funds operating in the United States. They range all the way from funds emphasizing growth stocks, which may pay low dividends but may increase greatly in value in a few years, to funds based on portfolios of preferred stocks or bonds that produce relatively high dividends but have low growth potential.

It costs a lot to go to college today, and of course, it will cost more tomorrow. Yet parents who look realistically at college costs need not be alarmed. Student budgets are flexible, and they can be controlled to a remarkable extent by family desires and family circumstances. Nearly everyone can afford to invest in a college education, with careful planning in advance.

Such planning should lead to a systematic program of saving for the future college expenses of our children. Yet too few parents have such savings programs, and many of those who do are not saving enough.

Every parent owes it to his children to consider early where the money for college will come from. Few families in the Nation can see their children through college without sacrifice of some sort—either long-term or short. But the rewards are great, and of lifelong duration.

TAXES FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE BOY OR FOR THE IGNORANCE OF THE MAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Education, on March 8, at a meeting in Chapel Hill, N.C., of the North Carolina Citizens Committee for Better Schools, set forth sincerely and eloquently the case for the President's comprehensive education bill. In doing so, he paid great tribute to the farseeing legislators of that State, who shared the convictions of many of us who seek enactment of sound educational legislation.

I was particularly struck by one quotation from North Carolina State Superintendent Charles Carroll which, in my judgment, cuts to the very heart of the case. Dr. Carroll said, in the course of his testimony before a legislative committee of the North Carolina Legislature in 1961:

> Every generation must decide whether it shall levy upon itself taxes to pay for the education of the boy or for the ignorance of the man.

This succinctly states the issue for it is our belief that through education lies our best hope in a technological age of reducing the social costs of unemployment for the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dean Keppel's speech to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS KEPPEL, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Governor Sanford, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is my first official trip out of the Federal sanctuary as a representative of the administration, duly and properly confirmed in my appointment by the Senate. It is a pleasure and honor to be able to make this visit to a State which ranks among the leaders today for its commitment to education. No one has been more dedicated or more vigorous in advancing North Carolina in this field than Governor Sanford, and I believe that his warm reception by the assembled school superintendents of the country at their Atlantic City convention late in February showed both his ability to communicate this dedication and the fact that his reputation stretches beyond the boundaries of his own State.

We are equally grateful for another of your citizens who now serves with distinction as President Kennedy's Secretary of Commerce—Luther Hodges, the founder of your citizens committee, and in the Department I serve, Dr. Ellen Winston is the newly appointed Commissioner of Welfare. These are but a few of a long list of outstanding leaders from North Carolina.

Over half a century ago, one of the great champions of public education in this State phrased your concern and your convictions: "We are prospering as never before—our wealth increases, our industries multiply, our commerce extends, and among the owners of this wealth, this multiplying industry, this extending commerce, I have found no man who is unwilling to make the State stronger and better by liberal aid to the cause of education."

These were the words of Gov. Charles B. Aycock, the man who led North Carolina through one of its most stimulating periods of educational achievement. It is not extravagant to call Governor Aycock's era at the turn of the century a true renaissance of education in this State. It was a period which laid the foundation for the continuing progress which extends right into 1963.

The leadership of Governor Aycock is unquestioned; he followed a long tradition of laymen and educators who combined forces throughout the history of this State on behalf of all children. I could not begin to do justice in a short time to the many teachers and humanitarians back through the years who worked to bring this State to the forefront in education. But I cannot resist touching on three highlights which to me are significant in that they indicate the conviction and dedication of North Carolinians from colonial days onward.

In 1745, the citizens of Edenton acted through their assembly to authorize the erection of a public schoolhouse. A few years later, the assembly appropriated 6,000 pounds for "founding and endowing" a public school in the province.

This story does not have a happy ending, but it does perhaps contain a moral. The funds were shortly borrowed, but they were used for building forts in western Carolina and for paying troops to fight in the French and Indian wars. The question of priorities must have perplexed your ancestors, even as similar questions perplex us today.

The second landmark came in 1766, when citizens of New Bern enacted a law imposing a tax of one penny a gallon on all rum and other spiritous liquors imported into the Neuse River for a fund to pay for the education of 10 poor children annually and for a salary of 20 pounds a year to the master of the school. The tide was running early for tax-supported public education for the children of the new land.

Finally, article XLI of the State constitution, adopted in 1776, made clear beyond any doubt the determination of this State to provide for its youth. It provided: "That a school or schools shall be established by the legislature for the convenient instruction of youth, with such salaries to the masters, paid by the public, as may enable them to instruct at low prices; and all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities."

In singling out these three events I do not mean to overlook the scores of related developments and educational victories which were won during the years—the rise of the private academies, the establishment of the State university system—nor do I wish to slight the heroic endeavors and vision of such men as Judge Archibald Murphey, who is justly called the father of the common schools, and Charles McIver and James Joyner, who worked so valiantly in the Aycock period to develop broad support for the schools and to revolutionize teacher education in the State.

Perhaps Superintendent Joyner captured the historical spirit of this State as well as anyone. In 1904, he observed that: "Mighty revolutions are always noiseless and must be wrought first in the minds and hearts and wills of the masses. I believe that such a revolution upon this question of the education of all the people is well underway in North Carolina."

The facts prove Mr. Joyner an excellent prophet. Within a 10-year period at the start of the new century, more than 1,200 schools were built in North Carolina—an average of one a day during the entire Aycock administration. Public school expenditures and the value of school property tripled; a month was added to the school year; teachers' salaries increased more than 50 percent; the sources of tax support were broadened.

Unfortunately, like any crusade, this one was bound to lose momentum; it could not be sustained at such a high level of activity. While there have inevitably been peaks and valleys in financial support for the schools, it is significant that in depression years, from 1931 to 1933, the State appropriations for public schools was not reduced, even though the collection of revenues fell some $22 million below estimates.

Through the intervening years, progress has been made in North Carolina and around the Nation. It has been heartening progress, but it has been irregular and not rapid enough to meet the demands of our time.

Your State superintendent, Charles Carroll, who follows the tradition of your State's leadership, recognizes the challenge of "unfinished business" and dealt with it in his speech last March to the North Carolina Education Association.

While paying just tribute to the achievements of legislators and educators in the past year, Superintendent Carroll felt constrained to describe major unsolved problems North Carolina faces. Among these he mentioned the dropout problem—the steady attrition of students from the first grade on, illiteracy, weaknesses in some areas of the curriculum, inadequate texts and related instructional materials. Finally, he cited the need for broadening the scope of public education to provide opportunities for all the diverse abilities and talents of children.

I do not mean to imply that Dr. Carroll was enveloped in gloom. You know him better than to suspect that. But his experience and wisdom have taught him to assess the situation on a realistic basis and to plan accordingly. He himself described the proposition much better than I can when he said to a legislative committee in 1961: "Every generation must decide whether it shall levy upon itself taxes to pay for the education of the boy or for the ignorance of the man."

This is exactly the question I shall raise with you today. Are we as citizens—joined in a worldwide struggle against man's traditional enemies of fear, hunger, confusion, and ignorance—prepared to unite in another crusade on behalf of a new generation?

Some 20 years ago Dr. Conant summarized his thoughts about the purpose of American education in a report to the Harvard Board of Overseers. I find his prescription eminently acceptable today. He said that the primary concern of American education was "to cultivate in the largest possible number of our future citizens an appreciation of both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are Americans and are free."

Ideally, each new generation in America is offered an opportunity for a fresh start, unencumbered by ties to the past, by inhibitions or restrictions of family or circumstances. Realistically, this doesn't always work out, as we so well know. Dr. Conant's latest study on the problems of slums and suburbs deals dramatically with some of the reasons why. For a number of complex reasons, the force of the locality exerts a discernible influence on the curriculum of many schools in the country and directly on the students themselves.

There is little doubt that pupils bring into the classroom with them more attitudes drawn from their homes and neighborhoods than they learn in school. These attitudes toward life and learning probably do more toward setting academic standards than the combined efforts of teachers, testing organizations, and publishers, or actions by regional or national educational agencies.

There is an extreme variety of attitudes, ranging from those of the underprivileged urban centers to those of the wealthy suburban compounds. There is the sheer preoccupation with survival in sections of the big cities. There is the tenseness and the drive for status among the professional families. And there are all the shades of attitudes and pressures in between.

Unfortunately, despite these variances, there is still a widespread tendency to think of our schools as more or less interchangeable from one community to the next and to feel that they can be measured by a fixed standard—like the percentage who go on to college, for instance. Rather, we should be seeking a moving standard of progress toward goals set by the needs of the individual, the domestic economy, and international demands facing the Nation—a standard moving toward even higher goals of quality.

Last year, over a million children were in overcrowded classrooms, and some 2 million others were studying under grossly substandard health and safety conditions. These are national problems which cross State boundaries and deserve national attention. Our population is highly mobile, with 1 family out of 5 moving each year, often across State lines.

As you have recognized so clearly in North Carolina, the problems of education cannot be dealt with on a piecemeal or isolated basis but must be considered in the whole, from the kindergarten through the graduate school. And they must be viewed in the context of the whole economy, whether it be statewide or nationwide. Just as you seek to advance and improve the quality and quantity of your system here, so we seek to advance the educational enterprise on a national scale.

About a year and a half ago, Governor Sanford pointed out that "if we neglect education, we block our growth economically and industrially; through education we open ways to agricultural, economic and industrial advancement that will improve our standard of living." Certainly your State is matching its plans with action, under the leadership of Governor Sanford and the State department of public instruction, in cooperation with leaders of secondary and higher education around the State. The new system of industrial education centers is an example of your progress, as is the movement to expand and diversify your whole higher education structure.

Earlier this year, President Kennedy, in his education message, reiterated similar concerns when he said: "For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being."

A growing body of evidence indicates that the development of human capital—particularly investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital. Education contributes directly to economic growth because it improves the quality of the labor force; it contributes indirectly but significantly because it is the source of the research scientists and engineers responsible for much of our technological advance.

It has been estimated, in fact, that in recent years our investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity. It is an investment which results in higher wages and greater purchasing power for the worker and in the new products and techniques which come from trained minds.

In our cooperative search for quality and expanded opportunities in education, we are at once confronted with the problem of numbers. It is a problem that persists at all levels. Our elementary and secondary schools are overcrowded; our colleges and universities are expecting a new wave of applications; our graduate and professional schools will face similar challenges shortly. During 1962, nearly 50 million were enrolled in our schools and colleges—over a fourth of the Nation. By the end of this decade, college enrollments are expected to double, and secondary schools will have a 50-percent growth.

The forces I have mentioned will have increasing influence on our planning. The population explosion will continue to have its effect on all levels of education throughout much of the remainder of the century. The mobility of this growing population will be of special import to States and localities facing also the usual problems of taxation and schoolhousing, not to mention the concomitant questions of finding and retaining qualified teachers, who themselves are subject to move under the pressures of money, standards, and opportunities for professional improvement.

Forces other than growth and mobility challenge us as well. In an age of space exploration and travel, vastly improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and strength. We have, in recent years, witnessed a literal explosion of knowledge—in the physical sciences, in mathematics, in discoveries on the earth's surface and in the seas around us. For the schools to assimilate and pass on this new storehouse of knowledge is in itself a sobering task, and we will need additional numbers of highly skilled teachers, along with new aids and materials to do the job.

Scientific developments, along with the complexities of modern life, have changed and are changing the whole structure of vocational education in this country, a structure which has, of course, been revised and extended since the basic Federal-State partnership was established in 1917. Familiar jobs and occupations have declined or disappeared, and new ones are emerging, requiring new or different preparation and large numbers of skilled workers.

We hear frequent reference to the problems of college preparation. No less urgent are the problems of providing adequate training opportunities for the 21 million young people now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree in the 1960's. We must provide for these young people the kind of education and training opportunities suited to the changing times. We must also be planning for the training and retraining of additional millions of workers whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated, as well as those whose jobs may well disappear because of automation and economic change.

Implicit in much of what I have said thus far is the assumption that as individuals and as a nation we must be moving ahead to improve our educational system. I believe with conviction that there is an important and substantial role for the Federal Government in American education. This role has been evident since before the adoption of the Constitution, and, while it has been modified, clarified, amplified, and diversified, it has never been denied—not by the States which have joined the Federal Government in an effective partnership and not by the millions of Americans who have benefited from such programs as the Land Grant College Act, the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

A variety of experiences in a number of individual and institutional grants, subsidy, and research programs through the years has amply demonstrated that the Federal Government quite properly assists educational progress and growth without Federal control. Federal participation should continue to be selective, stimulative, and, where possible, transitional.

With these principles in mind, and confronted with massive evidence of shortages and weaknesses facing education today, the Kennedy administration has recently proposed to the Congress a comprehensive and interrelated program of aid—a program which recognizes that the chain of education in our society must be strong in all of its links. I would like to sketch in the highlights of this program for you.

H.R. 3000, the proposed legislation on which a number of hearings have already been conducted by the House Committee on Education and Labor, is entitled the "National Education Improvement Act," and that is a rather accurate description of its intent.

It is a comprehensive program to meet selected and urgent needs of education at all levels, to promote quality education, expand opportunities, and to increase the capacity of our educational institutions, with the overall aim of providing for the Nation's needs in skilled manpower, national growth, and national security.

The bill seeks to provide new opportunities for individuals in higher education by expanding and extending the student loan and graduate fellowship programs of the NDEA. Additional funds would be made available under the loan program, which has helped bring about major changes in concepts of student financial aid and has opened up new opportunities for thousands of students. A new dimension would be added to the use of credit in meeting higher education costs by providing Federal Government insurance of long-term loans to students from families of moderate means. A considerable increase is proposed in the number of graduate fellowships available to help encourage and sustain those studying for advanced degrees in science and the humanities. Finally, the well established concept of encouraging our youth to help themselves would be supported by a proposal to provide additional, educationally related, work study opportunities for college students.

The bill would help institutions of higher education to expand and improve through loans for academic facility construction and grants for libraries, graduate school development and programs of technical education. Aid would be provided for the construction of public community and junior colleges—a matter of considerable interest to you at the moment in North Carolina.

Most of us would agree, I think, that the most significant factor in the learning process, next to the aptitude of the learner, is the quality of instruction. The bill is concerned with the essence of quality—the preparation and continued improvement of teachers. It seeks to broaden and improve programs of teacher preparation and in-service training, with special emphasis on the subjects to be taught or being taught. In addition, the bill would provide expanded and accelerated educational research and demonstration efforts.

Improved research and teacher training, however, are not enough if good teachers do not choose to enter or remain in the profession. We have heard much of salary problems, lack of incentives, and industry competition. We know that each year valued professional teachers leave the schools never to return.

The bill includes a cooperative approach to some of the key problems of public elementary and secondary education, including those of the teacher. Provisions are made to assist the States in undertaking, through their own State plans, selective and urgent improvements in the public schools. These would include substantial increases in the salaries of career teachers, increases in starting salaries that are exceedingly low, and increases in the salaries of teachers in economically disadvantaged districts; constructing classrooms in areas of critical and dangerous shortage; and initiating pilot, experimental, or demonstration projects to meet special educational problems, particularly in slums and depressed rural and urban areas.

In vocational education, the bill is designed to help alleviate and anticipate some of the situations arising from the changes in our industry and technology. By expanding the scope and level of vocational education programs now in effect, and by adding specialized grants-in-aid, I believe that the new proposals will strengthen the State and local efforts to train and retrain individuals in skills to fit them for our changing technology.

The bill also provides funds for preparing teachers of the handicapped and for research projects in the special education of such children.

Finally, the bill deals with the problems of providing education and library service for those who seek or require these beyond the regular formal years of schooling. It has become increasingly apparent that education does not and should not end, whether it be with a high school diploma or a master's degree. Many of our citizens, with different levels of formal education, now seek and need opportunities for continuing education in various fields. An estimated 8 million Americans 25 years of age and older have less than 5 years of schooling, and almost 23 million have less than an 8th grade education.

In order to help provide much greater opportunities for learning by adults, the new legislation would authorize grants to States for the expansion of university extension centers and would make additional grants to aid States in adult basic education programs. Special grants (in amendments to the existing Library Services Act) would enable States to expand facilities and services in both urban and rural libraries.

Today the demands of national security and economic growth have joined our traditional concern for equality of opportunity for the individual—a concern which you have cherished in North Carolina since the earliest days. We are, I think, experiencing a complete reassessment of the key role of education in our society because it serves not only the individual—it is essential to our way of our life and our security.

The schools and colleges and universities, the libraries and the laboratories that have served us so well in the past must be greatly strengthened and expanded to meet their future responsibilities. We rightly take pride in the freedom and independence of these institutions. The policy of the Federal Government, in planning its part in the effort we must make as a nation, must be such that, at the end of any program, the institutions are stronger and freer than they were at the start. I am profoundly convinced that independent institutions and freedom of learning and teaching are the fundamental basis of our society.

Educators themselves must be prepared to reassess positions that were taken under different circumstances. We are faced today by new facts that call for new solutions to old problems. As I see the situation, national security and economic growth now change the need for a Federal program in education from a desirable domestic goal to a deadly serious necessity. We have waited too long; we are face to face with a problem that must be solved at once or our national future will be in jeopardy.

Under such circumstances, the house of education must not be divided. Educators are citizens, and in our tradition we should voluntarily and gladly subordinate our particular interests to the larger good. We must be prepared to sacrifice long-standing hopes as well as long-standing hostilities. We must face up to economic and political realities. If we as a society are to make the forward leap in education that the times demand, he who trips us as we come to the place of the jump must have the national well-being on his conscience.

The administration's program as presented to the Congress is designed to combine the forces of education for their common task and to strengthen them for the heavy responsibilities they must bear. No one of us in the administration, I am sure, would claim that the interrelated proposals are so well formed that improvements are impossible. On the contrary, we actively seek criticism and will give the most serious consideration to proposals for change. But we do insist that the time has come in our history to face the whole problem, from preschool through adult education.

The proposed program, in my judgment, is more susceptible to the criticism of being too small rather than to the criticism of being too large. It takes political and economic reality into account. It is concerned with the undeniable facts of the needs of the economy and of the students and educational institutions. It was designed to deal with the equally undeniable facts of current opinions and judgments on sensitive areas of public policy. It calls upon many groups to sacrifice hopes of long standing; it asks of others that they accept policies on the form in which funds are provided or the categories of institutions to which they are limited, which they may regard as inadequate or even unfair.

Yet in elementary and secondary education I believe that there is substantial consensus among educators as well as the lay public that children in the public schools should be taught in safe and healthy surroundings, that their teachers should be well selected and well trained, that those teachers of high quality who wish to make teaching their lifelong career be provided with salaries high enough to make such a career possible and competitive with other professions, and that the shocking problem of slum schools in city or county should be solved at once.

The administration's program for the schools is aimed at these problems. It is based on a diagnosis of our educational health and prescribes medicines specific to the diseases that must be cured. On these matters it is reasonable to insist that all the forces of education have an obligation to unite—public and private, schools and colleges, humanists, and scientists alike.

I am proud as an educator to report to you that the clear majority of the members of my profession who have testified in recent weeks before the House Committee on Education and Labor have taken the larger view. They have subordinated their special interests and organizational policies to the greater good. We have, I believe, never had such harmony from the orchestra of education.

I am not so naive as to think that educators alone can create good legislation or have enough political power to pass it. This is as it should be. The common good requires a broader view than any one profession can expect to have, and the ultimate judgment is in the wisdom of the people and their elected representatives. Yet in a democracy it is clearly the privilege and the duty of the educator as a citizen to take an active part in bringing about public understanding of the relation of education to the society it serves.

If the educators are either silent or divided in their counsel, in the face of the difficulties besetting any legislation on education, it is not reasonable to expect that the public will take the necessary action. Educators cannot pass good legislation, but by their action or inaction they can keep it from passing. Let it not be said of our generation that we failed in our public duty.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the busy round of our daily duties, sometimes I fear we neglect to pay tribute to the fine work which is being done by the Library of Congress. Senators, I know, share my appreciation for the splendid service which that community of scholars provides to us. Without it, in many instances we would find ourselves handicapped by lack of information we badly need both in our work on the floor and for our constituents.

Sometimes, however, we forget that the Library as a scholastic enterprise services not only the Congress but the Nation. Key to this service is the dedicated work of many men and women who are experts in almost every area of human endeavor. The Library stands as one of the great symbols of the culture of our country.

Mr. President, I was moved to address the Senate on this subject today because I find that the Library of Congress is deeply appreciated by men and women back home who also avail themselves of this storehouse of knowledge. Mr. William H. Carlson, director of libraries at Oregon State University, paid tribute to the Library of Congress in a publication last February of an article entitled "Almost a Book." Because of the warmth of this tribute which, in my judgment, is sincerely deserved, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Almost a Book

I range myself, completely and without equivocation, among the admirers of the Library of Congress. While this great Library is far, very far from gathering and organizing in usable form all man's recorded knowledge it comes closer, probably, to doing this than any other library in the world. It now has 12 million books on its more than 300 miles of shelves and is heading, likety-split, toward 13 million. It has, in addition, over 3 million photographic prints and negatives, well over 2 million pieces of music and is about to have 3 million maps. The collection and control of the recorded products of the human mind, in quantity, as carried on by the Library requires a staff of between 2,000 and 3,000 people and a budget surpassing that of our entire university. Managing all this is an administrative and intellectual problem complex in the extreme.

How and why has this Library grown great beyond other national libraries and how has it been able to achieve, largely within this present century, substantial stature beyond and above the sum of all its parts? There is the Congress of the United States, of course, which has made the necessary dollars available, adequately but never generously. Money has, of course, been an absolute essential. The Library, however, has not grown great merely by spending money and accumulating more and more books. Over and above this, as is always true of superior enterprises, has been the intelligence, gifts, insights and devotion of those at the controls and among the troops. We, as a nation, have been blessed and doubly blessed in the persons who have directed this great and growing enterprise down through the years.

It is significant that most people joining the staff of this Library in key positions and who have built the woof and warf and coloration, too, of its being, have remained with the Library on a lifelong career basis. In the earlier years this was at salaries which were woefully low, below even the low going rates of those years in the major university and public libraries of the land. Why did so many of these able people, best typified by Herbert Putnam, long time librarian, remain with the Library when they could easily have moved out at much greater salaries? Prestige perhaps was a factor, but if so it was a thing which they themselves were creating and of which they were the embodiment. Mostly, I would think, it must have been, and continues to be a sense of being constructively and fruitfully creative in the evolution of our modern voluminously articulate culture. Obviously with less imaginative and dedicated leadership the Library of Congress could never have attained its present high eminence, no matter how generous the budget. It could, indeed, under less able leadership, have become a chaotic intellectual jungleland.

Among the many wise and constructive things which the Library has done is to appoint, as honorary consultants, persons who have attained outstanding eminence in varied fields of culture. One such person has been our genius poet Robert Frost, currently recuperating from surgery and for whom we must all wish a complete and speedy recovery. It was with obvious pride and pleasure that Librarian Quincy Mumford last May set aside a Robert Frost Week in the Library during which he announced that Mr. Frost had accepted his invitation to serve a second 3-year term as Honorary Consultant in the Humanities. More than 600 people came, at the highlight of the week, to sit, quite literally, at the feet of the poet. Overflowing the available seats in Coolidge Auditorium, more than 50 of them were sitting on the floor.

The poet responded to this occasion with sincerity and characteristic charm of expression. His consultantship, he said, had been "one of the great things in my life." Through it he had become a friend of our now President John F. Kennedy. Replying to the audience applause which greeted the announcement of his reappointment Mr. Frost said: "This all started between Mr. Mumford and me as a sort of joke. I came down (as Consultant in Poetry) expecting to have nothing to do with the city—I came down to be one of the poets who tell other poets how not to write poetry * * * but I rebelled—I said I had come under a misunderstanding: I'd thought I was to be a poetry consultant in everything. But I got all mixed up in the Government, so somebody called me, the other day, a statesman. I've become a part of the Library, haven't I? Almost a book. If I act a little foolish tonight, pay no attention. It's just statesmanship."

Mr. Frost received a standing ovation when he entered and again when he had concluded reading from his poetry. Here with books all about in the wings, millions upon millions, this man, creator of some of the best ones, who felt himself to be a part of it all and "almost a book" was bringing dignity and the warm human touch to an enterprise which might well grow cold, possibly even surfeited and cynical, in the logistics of never ceasing annual consumption of square footage by mile after mile of books, of classification schemes, ever more complicated, of growing millions of catalog cards, of indexes upon indexes. How fortunate that those who manage this, the greatest library of them all, continue to invite gifted and learned men, Robert Frost and many others, to share their wisdom and contribute their insights not only to making the Library great but to keeping it warmly human.

WM. H. CARLSON,
Director of Libraries.

AWARD OF $10,000 BY INTERNATIONAL NICKEL CO. TO REED COLLEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, upon my return from Foreign Relations Committee assignments, I was pleased to find on my desk a letter under date of March 18, 1963, from Mr. Richard A. Cabell, vice president of the International Nickel Co., Inc., which stated:

> I think you will be interested to know that International Nickel has made a grant of $10,000 to Reed College in Portland, Oreg. Under the terms of the grant the authorities at Reed College are free to use the money for any educational project which they regard as worthy.
>
> This gift is a part of our continuing program of contributing to the support of leading private educational institutions.

This morning I wish to commend the International Nickel Co. and other great American corporations which have the forethought to give tangible evidence of the concern of their management for the colleges and universities of our Nation.

In my judgment, corporations such as the International Nickel Co. point the way to the Congress for meeting the needs of our schools at all levels. I congratulate Reed College upon receiving this unrestricted gift. I also congratulate the International Nickel Co. for having adopted this farsighted policy of educational support.

CATTLE PRICE DROP ON WESTERN MARKETS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on March 14 I brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate the fact that the price of fat cattle at western meatpacking houses had fallen drastically in the last 90 days. At that time I made known my intention to conduct an investigation into the causes behind that price drop to make sure that both the beef producer and the beef consumer were not being victimized by unfair or illegal price practices.

I have today some information which I would like to present as a first chapter in this investigation. This information is very enlightening, and I think will demonstrate some obvious reasons for additional investigation in this pricing area.

The people of my State have written to me, Mr. President, to indicate their concern that the price drop may have been caused by increasing imports of fresh and frozen meats. My investigation shows that the price of fat steers in the week of December 10 to 17 in the Denver market—which I am here using as a market very typical of the other markets in the area—was $29.50 per hundredweight and on January 17 that price had dropped to $25 per hundredweight. Yet during this time the importance of fresh and frozen beef dropped from 77,600,000 pounds to 52,200,000 pounds. Thus, we can see that the blame for this precipitate drop does not lie with the imports from foreign producers. Furthermore, I would point out that fresh and frozen meat does not compete with most of our fresh meat, but is rather used in the specialty lines such as hot dogs and processed meats.

I mentioned that on January 17 the price had fallen to $25 and by March 8 in the same Denver market the price was $22.50, so that over 90 days the price had fallen $7 a hundredweight.

During this same time, Mr. President, the price to the packer from the retailer for dressed beef had dropped from $45.50 per hundredweight to $38. And yet the retail price in a certain supermarket chain in this area did not drop at all, but remained at its average price of $68 per hundredweight. Taking into consideration the fact that from the average 1,000 pound steer the retailer will receive 480 pounds of dressed meat, the gross price spread between packer and retailer was $52.40 in the week December 10 to 17 and increased to $98.40 on March 8, which is an increase of $46 per animal. In other words, Mr. President, from every animal the western stockman sent to market he received $70 less at the end of this 90-day period while the chainstore was receiving $46 more from the sale of that same animal to the consuming public.

I have received word that just recently the retail price of beef is beginning to decrease slightly, but this reaction, it seems to me, is considerably delayed after the decrease in price to the beef producer.

And, Mr. President, when one considers that this chainstore had been using 3,000 head of cattle a week during this period, one will see that, multiplying the $46 per head by the number of cattle used, this chainstore increased its profit $138,000 each week while the farmer suffered a decrease in profit and and the consumer's price was not changed. And also, Mr. President, we must consider the facts of the vertical operation of some of these chainstores in controlling beef from the raising of the animal to the slaughtering to retailing which thus gives them a potent lever to affect the beef market as a whole. This same Denver chainstore at the beginning of this period, when prices were running from $29.50 to $30 per hundredweight, was buying on the open market 20 to 24 animals per week, but when the price started falling their purchases started increasing until at the point when prices had reached their lowest point they bought 1,250 head in a single week for slaughter. And since there was no sizable change in consumer demand, we can assume that to keep their meat counters from overflowing they must have withheld their own animals from slaughter.

It may be, Mr. President, that all these facts are a series of coincidences, but the fact that this change in the price of beef brought a $160,000 profit in the month of February alone to a single segment of the complete industry, while neither the producer nor the consumer shares in this trend, and that it took 16 months for the price to reach its December level and only 3 for it to drastically drop from that level, calls for a hard look at the facts behind these prices.

Ours is a free economy, Mr. President, with certain restraints, and these restraints were instituted over the years by the Congress to prevent abuses of our free enterprise system by those who would use positions of power or monopoly to take unfair advantage of those independent operators who have not the size or power to protect themselves.

The facts I have unearthed in this initial investigation, Mr. President, have convinced me beyond a doubt that a full-scale investigation into the origins of this price fluctuation should be conducted immediately. I have written to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to ask that such an investigation, with all the legal powers that organization possesses, be begun at once. I would also call to the attention of the appropriate committees in the Congress this set of rather incriminating facts and strongly urge that they begin an investigation immediately.

The public has a right to know whether these practices do or do not constitute a restraint of trade and an unfair use of power in our free marketplace. These may be strong charges, but I believe they are warranted by the facts presented so far. And I shall continue to use all the resources at my command to make sure that the producer and the consumer are receiving fair treatment in the marketplace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD after my remarks two letters which I have written. The first is to Mr. Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the second to the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, senior Senator from Louisiana and chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 28, 1963.

MR. RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RAND: As you well know, the price of fat cattle has fallen the past few months to such a degree that the situation which now prevails is most alarming. Prices which it took several months to build up to a degree of profitability for the producer have fallen so that all gains, as well as additional losses, have been sustained in a few short weeks. That this condition exists is to me outrageous and most shocking.

Our producers are consistently being told that it is imports of fresh and frozen meat products from abroad which cause this situation. I find this difficult to believe, however, since the month of the biggest drop in cattle prices—January 1963—was also the month that imports from abroad were reduced approximately 30 percent.

From my investigation of this matter, it certainly appears to me that the marketing practices of some of the large chainstores are to blame. The price of fat cattle has dropped $8 per hundredweight and yet there is no evidence to show that the retail price of meat at the stores has dropped at all. Parenthetically, to show how the chainstores have profited, the packers have also received greatly reduced prices for carcass beef. In order to assure not only the producer, but the public as well, of getting a fair deal from the price fluctuations, I feel the Federal Trade Commission should conduct a full-scale investigation into the marketing practices of the meat industry. This should include all phases of the industry, but greatest emphasis should be placed upon the vertical integration of the meat industry by some of the largest chain stores.

My recommendations would include full field investigations, the subpenaing of records, and the questioning of witnesses by your most highly trained investigators.

The time has come, in fact is long past due, when all the cards should be laid on the table. The public, because of its unfamiliarity with the subject matter, blames the producer for high prices; the producer tends to blame imports; packers are often caught in a squeeze between the two, and nothing is done to put the whole question in its proper perspective.

I hope the Commission will agree with me that this is a most serious matter which requires immediate attention and that you will launch a full scale investigation into the subject.

You can be sure that I shall cooperate in every way by bringing to your attention what information is available to me and the facilities of my office will be readily available to assist in anyway that we can.

Sincerely yours,
GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 28, 1963.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALLEN: You will recall my questioning of officials of the Agriculture Marketing Service, which includes the Packers and Stockyards Division, when they came before the Appropriations Subcommittee last Monday.

You can appreciate, I know, the problems facing the public as a whole, as well as the livestock producer, in this very serious question of disastrously falling livestock prices when the public receives no benefits therefrom.

In a letter today I have called upon the Federal Trade Commission to launch a full-scale investigation into this matter and since your committee has jurisdiction over the subject, it would be my hope you would take whatever steps you feel are compatible to bring this matter to light.

It seems disgraceful to me that when the price of a product continues to fall for months and months that the chain stores do nothing to pass the benefits on to the consumer.

In order to fully explore the subject matter, to determine whether or not the law as written is sufficient to handle the problems which arise, I feel congressional hearings are warranted. I hope you and the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee can agree with me and I shall be very happy to work with you in any way to bring about full knowledge and I hope corrective action on what I consider to be unfair practices.

Sincerely yours,
GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senator.

CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL'S VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, President Kennedy's Consumer Advisory Council has taken a close look at some of the consumer legislation currently before Congress and on Monday, March 25, issued its views and recommendations.

The Advisory Council has provided a valuable service in providing the American consumer with a voice in national affairs. I should like to elaborate on those services, but I realize that my enthusiasm might be a little suspect at this particular point, because the Council's latest report speaks approvingly of proposed legislation that I have introduced.

So, without further comment, I ask unanimous consent that the Advisory Council's March 15 report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, D.C.

The Consumer Advisory Council, at its meeting on March 20–21, expressed its support of the principles and purposes of the Douglas truth-in-lending bill (S. 750) and recommended additional research into the manner in which families use credit and into the causes of their overextended use of credit lending to bankruptcy and debt adjustment; endorsed the principles and purposes of the Hart truth-in-packaging bill (S. 387); commended Government departments and agencies for the recent experiment in promoting the sale of consumer publications through selected post offices and recommended the extension of this program on a national scale.

The statements follow:

A. The Consumer Advisory Council supports the principles and purposes of the Douglas truth-in-lending bill (S. 750).

1. Such legislation will: (a) promote the right of consumers to have the facts they need to make rational, informed choices regarding credit usage; (b) protect the ethical and efficient businessman who wishes to fully disclose credit charges from those competitors whose charges are deceptively concealed; (c) reinvigorate price competition in the consumer credit market, and thereby contribute to the free enterprise system; (d) introduce a stabilizing, countercyclical element into the Nation's economy by making consumers aware of rising credit costs in boom times and declining credit costs during recessions; and (e) encourage consumers to shop for cheaper credit, thereby releasing funds for purchasing goods and services, thus buttressing the economy and consumer purchasing power.

2. The Council recognizes that excellent data on the use of credit in relation to the family life cycle and other family characteristics are available. There is, however, inadequate information about families' future needs and their techniques for assessing future needs so they can wisely use savings or credit. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the Secretaries of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and others, undertake additional research into factors associated with families making informed assessments of future needs in relation to their savings and credit decisions.

3. The Council recommends that research be undertaken to develop hypotheses as to the causes of families' economic distress as a result of overextensive use of credit so as to formulate remedial and preventive measures, and for critical study of the means available through Government and private agencies by which consumers may secure relief from economic distress, and that research in this area be encouraged by the Departments of Justice, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Council of Economic Advisers, and others.

B. The Consumer Advisory Council endorses the principles and purposes of the Hart truth-in-packaging bill (S. 387).

1. We believe that legislation to bring order into the field of packaging is necessary at the present time, in the interest of both consumers and honest producers, and in

order to promote the effective, rational functioning of the American enterprise system. The need for such legislation has been made abundantly apparent by the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and our own experience fully confirms the evidence there presented. Present legislation is inadequate to cope with the confusion and deception which has come to characterize the packaging of a large proportion of the goods sold to American consumers.

2. It is true that existing means of eliminating deceptive packaging are not being fully used. If manufacturers and distributors chose to use the simplified practice and commercial standards procedures of the Department of Commerce, they could eliminate much of the confusion in packaging by voluntary agreement, as was done with respect to many industrial products under the simplification and standardization program introduced by Herbert Hoover as Secretary of Commerce 40 years ago. But manufacturers and distributors have not taken advantage of this machinery and have, rather, continued to proliferate unnecessary variety and forms of packaging which impede intelligent consumer choice.

3. If the Food and Drug Administration had a larger budget, it might pursue more cases that could be identified as misbranding. The Federal Trade Commission, in the interest of fair competition, might institute cease and desist proceedings in additional cases involving packaging. But many practices which are quite legal at present contribute to the pattern of confusion and deception. And what is needed to break the pattern is a broad-scale attack on the problem as a whole, not merely a case-by-case pursuit of individual practicers of deception.

4. We endorse the bill's requirements with respect to the kinds of information which must be clearly and prominently displayed on the label and the prohibition of misleading words, phrases, illustrations, or price statements. We also endorse the authorization for the promulgation of regulations relating to permissible sizes and shapes of packages, standards for the designation of sizes and net quantity, and information as to ingredients and composition of commodities.

5. The proposed legislation is in line with the historic exercise of Government responsibility to provide a framework within which the American economy can operate rationally, in terms of honest competition and intelligent consumer choice. It is designed to meet the conditions of today, when the package has become the salesman for the vast multitude of complex goods. It carries out the well-established principles reflected in Government's establishment of weights and measures, protection of the public against fraud, promotion of fair competitive practices, establishment of standards of identity and quality, and requirements of labeling under the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act. The Standard Container Acts of 1916 and 1928, and the Alcoholic Beverages Administration Act of 1936 have applied the kind of regulation proposed by this bill to the packaging of fruits and vegetables and of alcoholic beverages.

The bill authorizes the kind of regulations which other countries have found necessary and conducive to the proper functioning of their economies. Great Britain for 35 years has limited the packages of many standard foods to multiples of 2 ounces up to half a pound and multiples of 4 ounces up to 2 pounds. Canada's labeling requirements for foods, recently revised with the support of industry, correspond to the kinds of labeling requirements proposed by this bill.

6. We would like to see the bill strengthened in two respects: (a) We believe that regulations with respect to sizes and shapes of containers and related matters should be mandatory under the law with respect to items basic to the family budget and not left to the discretion of the Secretary of HEW or the Federal Trade Commission in their respective jurisdictions to determine whether they are necessary. The labeling provisions of the bill are mandatory, but it is precisely the multiplicity and irregularity of packages that prevent rational consumer choice and have brought the need for this legislation; (b) we believe that the bill should apply to as wide a range of consumer commodities as possible and therefore that the coverage should be broadened. In particular, we do not think that meat and meat products and materials used for the maintenance and repair of housing and home furnishings should be excluded.

7. With respect to enforcement, we think that the method of enforcement and the penalties should be the same for all commodities which come under the act regardless of which agency is responsible for them. The Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have different procedures, neither of which wholly fits the needs of this bill. We believe that this bill should provide uniform, rapid and strong enforcement procedures, to be applied by both agencies with respect to the commodities in their respective fields.

C. The Consumer Advisory Council commends Government departments and agencies for the recent experiment in promoting the sale of consumer publications through selected post offices and recommends the extension of this program.

1. We commend the Government Printing Office and the Post Office and the numerous Federal departments and agencies involved in this notable experiment in making Government publications of interest to consumers more widely known and more easily available. We appreciate the fact that much effort and time went into this pilot project involving the preparation of a special list of 67 publications, an order form, displays in 100 post offices, and sale of documentary coupons in the post offices.

2. We note that at the end of the 90-day period of the pilot project the 100 post offices had distributed 225,483 of the price lists and order blanks. We think that this in itself is a worthwhile thing to have done. We assume that many persons were thereby informed for the first time of the availability of these publications.

3. We are not able to discern the effectiveness, in terms of selling more publications, of publicity which accompanied the displays in some of the cities. However, we believe that this publicity was useful in calling attention to the publications. From information supplied to us, we are not able to tell how the pattern of orders may vary by size of place, region, or type of post office.

4. While it is not possible to trace all of the orders arising out of this project, we note that the orders and sales directly attributable to it were as follows: The Government Printing Office received 4,066 orders with remittances and 746 returns which included no remittance, and sales of publications arising directly out of this program amounted to $6,066.33. (At an estimated average of 15 cents apiece, this is about 40,000 separate documents.) We note that this amount would, if projected to the 35,000 post offices, total over $2 million.

5. We recommend that, in the fall of 1963, this pilot-project be followed by a nationwide effort to make consumer publications more widely known, more easily available, utilizing most of the 35,000 post offices. We would expect that with national publicity these publications would be brought to the attention of millions of consumers.

6. We urge the Government Printing Office to issue on a regular schedule special lists of available Government publications of interest to consumers and to include order blanks and instructions which will simplify the ordering process to the greatest possible extent. We especially urge them to use the post offices to display and otherwise call attention to these publications.

7. We commend the Government Printing Office for its expanding campaign to make lists of publications available through public libraries, and urge them to facilitate displays of consumer publications in libraries, with particular emphasis on National Library Week, April 22–27.

8. The Consumer Advisory Council would be pleased to cooperate with the Government Printing Office by suggesting organizations with a mailing list which would be appropriate for promoting the sale of consumer publications.

9. We believe that one of the principal lessons to be learned from the pilot project is the lack of uniformity in the quality of publications and lack of coverage of many problem areas of interest to consumers. To improve the quality and coverage of topics we recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture explore the possibility of gaining wider distribution of cooperative extension bulletins of interest to all consumers in urban as well as in rural areas and that an effort be made by departments and agencies to: (a) produce more consumer publications each year; and (b) to fill the gaps in subject matter areas covered—for example, there are virtually no publications in the areas of household budgeting, insurance, consumer durable goods purchasing, or consumer credit.

THE NATION'S SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Friday night Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed the National Rocket Club dinner here on the Nation's space program. I had the pleasure of hearing this fine speech as did hundreds of others in the audience.

As Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, Vice President Johnson has been doing a remarkable job of helping guide our space program toward its objectives. As he pointed out in his speech, which was very well received, we have achieved a number of important successes in space but continued success will require continued public support. He cautioned that this year will be one of "concentrated development" and that the year may bring Soviet space spectaculars. He urged "that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years."

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the National Rocket Club Dinner, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, March 22, 1963

In recent weeks, others of the Marine Corps and of the administration have been engaging in the pastime of hiking together. Your honor guest and I have refrained from such hazardous practices. Instead, we have indulged in the pastime of eating together.

I assure you it is the colonel—and not the calories—that brings me here tonight. Certainly, one of the most pleasant—although unofficial—duties of the office I hold has been the privilege over the past year of speaking at banquets honoring John Glenn. I am not sure whether he regards this as a pleasure, also. I understand the colonel has suggested that an extra tube of food be put aboard the capsule to the moon as a precaution against the possibility that when the first meal is being eaten there, the Vice President might show up to make a presentation.

Tonight—at this Goddard memorial dinner—it is appropriate for us to concern ourselves with the fundamental issues of our national space effort: the matter of public support for our public policy in this field.

This is an audience of experts—experts on the meaning and potential of the space age and on the needs of the space program of our country. Individually and collectively, you appreciate what a dynamic force the space program is for our economy. You know it means improved technology, greater security, a rising level of business activity, a higher standard of living for our people. Above all, you understand the essential fact that if the United States is to be a source of leadership for freedom tomorrow as it is today, we must succeed in our space efforts now during this decade.

In all realms of specialized knowledge, there is the ever-present danger of parochialism. Many of my scientist friends think that the most narrow and parochial men they know are engineers. Nearly all engineers I know think the same of scientists. But both scientists and engineers agree on one thing: nobody is more parochial and narrow and shortsighted than politicians.

I hardly need to say that some of my best friends are politicians. I can say of them that what you think of them, they in turn think of you. That is precisely the point to which my remarks tonight are addressed.

We are at a point in our national history in which the future capabilities of our country—and the future of our country's role as a leader of freedom—depend decisively upon both mutual understanding and mutual trust, as well as mutual comprehension, between the community of technology and the community of public affairs.

To say this—and to weigh the merits of each side—does not automatically lead to the conclusion that one side or the other is the right side. The concern of the space scientists for maintaining the schedule of space projects is right and proper—beyond dispute. The concerns of the political community for the implications of supporting those programs are no less right and proper—beyond dispute.

Between these viewpoints—each responsible, each prudent, each sincere and conscientious—there exists what we must frankly acknowledge to be a dollar gap. Those charged with responsibility for public policy know that the total space program has cost us about 20 cents a week per capita. They also know that in the near future the program may cost as much as 60 cents a week per capita. On the other hand, those in the technological community know that as a Nation we are spending more on cigarettes, alcohol or recreation than we do on space. Last year alone, Americans bet more on horse races than on space.

Personally, I believe—as I am sure you believe—that we must be concerned with where America finishes in the space race—and I am not content to bet on America merely to place or show—and certainly not to finish out of the money altogether.

In either case—from either viewpoint—the present period of preoccupation with the dollar aspects of space is symptomatic of a failure to bridge the gap of understanding between the two communities which are jointly responsible for our national success or failure in mankind's age of space. In the long term, dollars alone will not be the decisive factor of either our success or our failure. We shall succeed only in proportion to our understanding of what is at stake and of how the stakes of space relate to those qualities of our society and our heritage to which no dollar value can be attached.

Of those qualities, none is more priceless than the fact that in our representative democracy public policy must be an expression of the public's will and support. The technological community which understands the stakes of space has a responsibility, therefore, for helping the public to understand those stakes. Unless and until this is done, the technological community cannot justifiably be impatient with those who are chosen to represent and express the public's own will.

Throughout our national history, America has moved forward on waves of new invention. The individual inventors of 50 and 60 years ago have been uniquely honored as virtual national heroes in this century. They have become a part of our folklore—not to mention of our textbooks and motion pictures, as well. But we can only wonder what would have happened if Thomas Edison or Samuel Morse or Alexander Graham Bell had come to Congress and to the people and had asked for funds with which to invent an electric light bulb or a telegraph or a telephone.

We can imagine that the response would have been somewhat less than enthusiastic.

Today, the age of space is an infinitely more inventive age for America—and the world—than the era at the beginning of this century. Our national space program already has produced more than 3,000 new products and processes of private commercial potential. These achievements already are being put to work. Today's inventor is working on a much surer course—with a much greater certainty of what will be accomplished—than were the men who changed history by tinkering in their bicycle shops not so long ago.

Experimentation is still present in our efforts now but the factor of uncertainty has never been so small. We know what we are likely to do. We can be more certain of what our efforts are likely to produce. If there is a consistent pattern of error, it is error on the side of underestimation—not overestimation.

This simply means that we are able to tell the people more of where we are going and more of why we should go there. If we fail to do this, if we fail to utilize this greater capacity, then the responsibility for lack of public support will fall upon those who had the knowledge but failed to impart it to the people.

Along with the knowledge of our own capabilities and directions, we are also possessed of knowledge about the capabilities and directions of our principal competitors in the space adventure. I believe it is a part of our responsibility to keep the public better informed about the relative progress and capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let us look at a few basic comparisons:

1. Rocket power: Today the Soviets have in operation more powerful rockets than do we. We are trying to catch up. We have under development much more powerful rockets than the Soviets now have in operation. But we must assume that the Soviets are likewise working to improve the power of their own rockets.

2. Number of successes: At the end of 1962, the United States had successfully orbited 120 payloads in space. This means that we have put about four times as many payloads into earth orbit as have the Soviets. But at the same time the smaller number of Soviet payloads have weighted substantially more than the total of our larger number of payloads.

3. Ratio of failures: We can say with reasonable assurance that the Soviets have had a ratio of successes to failures comparable to our own. Our failures as well as our successes are known to the world. The Soviets have announced their successes and concealed their failures. But the basic fact is that in both nations the reliability of launching vehicles has shown a remarkable and comparable increase. For example, through 1960, the United States had about one failure for each success. In 1961, the ratio of successes was 3 to 1. In 1962, the ratio reached 5 to 1.

4. Space applications: In utilizing space technology, to improve mankind's lot on earth, the United States is well ahead. Weather satellites, communication satellites, navigation satellites, and many other activities are measures of this. In this realm, the Soviet Union—despite the potential of its technology—is not choosing to compete.

5. Scientific information: Comparisons between the nations as to which has obtained the most useful scientific data cannot be exact. Both nations have done remarkably well. The United States is sharing much of its information with the world scientific community. The Soviet is more selective and secretive.

6. Manned flights: Soviet cosmonauts have put in more flying time than our astronauts. Certainly the U.S.S.R. is ahead in the total knowledge obtained from manned space flight.

7. Guidance and control: Both countries have made rapid progress in this technology. Last year's dual near-rendezvous launch by the Soviets is the outstanding single accomplishment by either nation, thus far. However, the United States has shown remarkable progress particularly in the Mariner shot and the Schirra flight.

We can say that competency is growing in the space programs of each nation. What space gap exists is not due to a lack of ability or resources on our part but exists because we started later and do not have a surplus of time.

The year of 1962 was a rewarding year for the United States in its space efforts. We demonstrated convincingly through both showcase successes and supporting scientific progress our ability to translate sound decisions into significant accomplishments. A gratifying number of historic successes were achieved by our efforts last year.

In this year of 1963, our program will be passing through a year of concentrated development. Concentrated development does not always produce spectacular events, and it is possible that our efforts may be overshadowed by Soviet space shots. I urge, therefore, that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years.

The United States is, at all times, cognizant of the fact of competition in the development of space technology. At the same time, neither the pattern nor the purposes of our program are controlled by other than our own national purposes to develop the peaceful uses of outer space. We do what we do in space because of our national faith, not our national fears. We proceed on the program scheduled because of our confidence, not because we are seeking to copy or duplicate what others have done or may do.

In the long prospect of the space age, our national efforts to this point are to the future as a minute is to a millennium. We cannot measure our continuing advance by the calendar. We are compressing generations of progress into month or even weeks of time.

This very speed at which the U.S. effort is moving makes it imperative that we not form tomorrow's goals on yesterday's thinking. It is also imperative that we not set our purposes by the narrow horizons of a dollar debate.

There would be no reason for us to be concerned with space at all except for the clear and compelling implications of space to those values of our system and our society for which no price is too great. Freedom is a sturdy plant, but it cannot grow and flower on this earth if the universe which envelops us is poisoned and contaminated by tyranny.

If we are to be successful in freedom's cause, we must, as I have said, concern ourselves with bridging the gap between space science and political science. Nowhere else has science served freedom as nobly and abundantly as under our system. Likewise, nowhere else has the political system supported scientific inquiry and achievement more effectively or more understandingly. Our achievements of the past 5 years dramatically demonstrate both of these points.

Americans now are able to be infinitely more confident about the future than in the first anxious days after Sputnik I in 1957. We can say now that on our present course there is no danger of a default by our Nation in space. We can also say with equal confidence that there is a growing prospect of decisive success of our free society in the competition to preserve the realms of space for the peaceful benefits of mankind in this century.

In a day when machines can talk to each other and work with each other, it is neither too much to ask—nor too much to hope—that responsible men of the technological community and the political community can and will find their way to mutual understanding to assure our greater success in achieving the goals essential for our freedom.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JAMES L. McDEVITT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is with great personal sadness that I speak today of the passing of James L. McDevitt, director of the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education. I knew Jim McDevitt over a span of many years. He was an able and devoted expert in the political field of the workingman. Under his guidance, COPE programs for the political education of the union membership resulted in a sharpened awareness of the responsibilities of citizenship.

Jim came up through the ranks of labor from humble beginnings as a plasterer. He never lost his down-to-earth understanding of the workingman's problems. He served his country in the Army in France in World War I and was always active in civic affairs, such as the Community Chest, the Red Cross, and various organizations to combat intolerance.

In 1948, the U.S. Labor Department called on his talents for international goals and he was designated to represent American workers at a World Safety Conference in Geneva.

These many tireless efforts kept Jim McDevitt constantly in harness. It is characteristic that death overtook him while he was hard at work at Oklahoma City in the midst of COPE's annual spring political tour of major cities from coast to coast.

I will miss Jim McDevitt as a friend and as a supporter. The labor movement will miss him. And in the broader sense, for his untiring efforts in his field, the Nation will miss him.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN THE TENNESSEE REAPPORTIONMENT CASE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 26, was the first anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's historic decision in Baker against Carr, the Tennessee reapportionment case.

Very few of us could have imagined 1 year ago the immediate and widespread effect that this decision would have. Prior to this decision, the General Assembly of Tennessee had not been apportioned for 60 years, although the Constitution of the State of Tennessee provided that the legislature should be reapportioned every 10 years. As a consequence, the political influence of the growing urban areas lessened in proportion to the rural areas in Tennessee and in most areas of the Nation.

In a sense, however, this was counterbalanced by the extraordinary weight that a big city resident's vote often had regarding the election of a President. As Senator John F. Kennedy pointed out in the electoral college debate of 1956, the present unit system, whereby all of the electoral votes of a State go to the presidential candidate who carries that State, gives the "big city States," an inordinate voice in the nomination and election of presidential candidates.

For instance, a presidential candidate could theoretically win an election by carrying only 12 key States, and with a smaller popular vote than his opponent as has been the case in three elections. Prior to the recent reapportionment actions, this could be construed as a means to counterbalance the advantage that the rural voters had in the State legislatures.

Mr. President, on the first anniversary of the Tennessee reapportionment case, we find that this equilibrium between the urban and rural voters is rapidly changing. The urban voters are obtaining a greater voice in the selection of the members of State legislatures. Reapportionment cases have been filed in 36 States. Preliminary or final court actions have been handed down in 25 of these States. Cases are still pending in 31 States. And reapportionment plans have been passed by the legislatures of 15 States, with 11 additional States expecting early passage of new reapportionment acts.

In my own State of Tennessee, a special session of the legislature passed a reapportionment act last May, which was subsequently declared inadequate and unconstitutional by a Federal court. But a new reapportionment act was passed last week and, regardless of whether or not this act is upheld by the courts, it is only a matter of time until all the States reach a legislative apportionment which is satisfactory to the courts.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, nothing has been done to reform the archaic electoral college system, which gives such power to the heavily urbanized States in the election of a President.

As far as I know, neither President Kennedy nor anyone from his administration has spoken with regard to this matter since the Baker against Carr decision. I do not know whether he feels that the reapportionment of the State legislatures has proceeded to the point where adjustments should be made in the electoral college unit vote system.

But it seems to be apparent that reapportionment is causing a rapid and dramatic shift in the balance of power in most State legislatures, to the benefit of the urban voters. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I had scheduled hearings for Tuesday, April 9, to look into the extent of reapportionment in the various States, and the political effects to date. However, because of a meeting of the full committee on that date another date will be set later. We will try to project this reapportionment activity into the future, in order to determine if action should be taken to reform the electoral college system, so that a fair equilibrium will be maintained between our rural and urban citizens.

Finally, Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments plans to take immediate action to consider the six electoral college reform proposals which are now pending before it, so that a suitable proposal will be brought before the Senate for consideration during this session of the Congress.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A PRIVATE CORPORATION TO DEVELOP A SUPERSONIC JET LINER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was shocked by a front page article in the Washington Post of Monday, March 25, which stated that the Federal Aviation Agency was considering the establishment of a private corporation to develop a supersonic jetliner. This report indicated that the FAA was investigating the use of a corporation similar to the Communications Satellite Corp. for the project.

The development of a supersonic jet airliner will involve a huge expense, probably well over $1 billion, and all or much of this expense will have to be borne by the Federal Government. The airlines and the aircraft manufacturers themselves have said that the Government must bear most of the cost, since the plane would, in a sense, be a national prestige item.

There is little doubt in my mind—though I know some others have a different opinion—that a jet airliner capable of flying at 3 times the speed of sound would eventually have valuable commercial uses, once developed. I am strongly in favor of our going ahead with the development, but I want to be sure that the interests of the Government will be fully protected.

Last year the ill-advised communications satellite bill established a private monopoly to operate the Nations' worldwide satellite communications system. The argument was made that a private corporation was needed at once if we were to keep pace with the Soviet Union, and that private capital would replace

Government expenditures in the development of communications satellites. The recent hearings before the Commerce and Space Committees have demonstrated the fallacy of this argument. The incorporators of the Space Satellite Corporation have come in to ask the Congress for many millions more in Government funds to finance research and development for the private firm, while a substantial part of the small amount of capital obtained from private sources will go to pay high salaries to the corporation's newly employed officers. Furthermore, it is now admitted that the development of a satellite system will be considerably farther in the future than Congress was led to believe.

I point out this sorry spectacle of the Satellite Corporation, which only confirms the fears expressed by the group of Senators who opposed the Satellite bill, because of indications that we may be headed for an even worse situation with supersonic jet airliners. Because of my concern lest we be confronted with another huge giveaway, accomplished through the creation of still another private monopoly, I called Mr. Najeeb Halaby, FAA Administrator, and discussed the matter with him. Mr. Halaby said that the newspaper story did not originate with him or anyone at the FAA. He said further that he, personally, was not committed to this particular way of developing the supersonic jet.

I was glad to gain the impression that Mr. Halaby thought a satellite type of corporation would not be recommended.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very happy to yield now to the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's concern over the possibility of a corporate organization which would be supported by a vast amount of Federal research on the supersonic transport proposal. I read the story in the Washington Post, as the Senator did, and immediately checked on it with Mr. Halaby, the FAA Administrator. It is only one of the many ideas which must be examined to try to produce a united effort to avoid being left behind in the supersonic transport development.

As the Senator knows, France and England have formed a consortium to pool most of the aviation resources of the two great countries; and they plan to develop a supersonic transport which will fly at two times the speed of sound. Our research tentatively shows that three times the speed of sound will be the ideal speed for such an aircraft; that there is less air turbulence at that speed, and that less power is required; but such a development presents many problems that we have never experienced before. Mach 2 aircraft can be aluminum and utilize much the same type of construction as has been used in aircraft of speeds of mach 1, and up to mach 2. When we get into speeds of mach 3, there steel construction with honeycombed panels will be required, which will permit icy air in the substratosphere to cool such aircraft and make it possible for human beings to remain in the fuselage. Therefore, rather perplexing problems are presented.

We have been providing appropriations to enable the Federal Aviation Agency do preliminary work. We have appropriated several million dollars to enable the Agency, first, to ascertain the possibilities of such a supersonic aircraft; second, the type of materials to be required; third, to study the means by which we can pool our vast know-how in order to ascertain the means of developing an aircraft that will be the pace setter of transcontinental and transoceanic aviation of the future. It is a problem, because it will cost from $1 to $2 billion to produce the first supersonic transport with a mach 3 speed.

I do not believe, nor does Mr. Halaby, that this distinguished group of financiers are merely looking for ways and means to obtain Government help to build the aircraft.

As the Senator knows, the 707 jet airliner was developed as a result of the KC-135, the Air Force tanker. Most of our great planes have been developed largely as a result of Government contracts. The RS-70 being built by North American Aviation will provide much information, but it is not likely to be the super transport we want. We need new information on engines. This phase alone may cost $500 million to develop.

So there is involved a staggering cost that goes beyond the capability of an air frame manufacturer or any individual aviation engine manufacturer. If we could gear such a development to the needs of the Defense Department so that it could be developed as a part of our defense activities, the problem would be simple. But I am sure that the problem is much more complex.

I assure the Senator that the Federal Aviation Agency is not committed to a private corporation financed in large part by Government research. We are trying our best to find some agency of Government or means to bring about the research required to move forward with this vast project. We are going to find it a difficult task. The space satellite system will probably enrich the private corporation, because it has no long lines to maintain. It has no wires except those connected with the ground stations. While that space satellite system, from where it is at this time, may cost $10 million, $1 billion or more will have to be spent on the supersonic transport. It will be sold for about $25 million. Those who have studied the subject doubt whether there will be a market for more than 75 to 100 aircraft of the range and speed of a mach 3 plane, which will not be good for short distances. Therefore, a corporation organized to build this aircraft would be in difficulty, because it would not have any source of revenue after it had spent the necessary amount for the development of the aircraft.

The Aviation Subcommittee will certainly be glad to advise with the Senator if we reach the point of development where the proposed financing would be supported by research and development through an existing agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the able Senator from Oklahoma, who is an authority on aviation, for the explanation of what is involved and for his assurance that we are not going to be "taken for a ride" again, as we were in giving away the communications satellite to a private corporation, and having that private corportion call on the Government for continued money for research, when the proponents of the satellite bill said the private satellite corporation would do the research.

I ask the Senator if it is not true that the incorporators of the communications satellite corporation, are now asking the U.S. Government for a continued outlay for research; and did they not so testify before the Commerce Committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is not quite exactly in point. The senior Senator from Oklahoma questioned them, on confirmation, as to when they would be ready to put money up for research. Their answers were vague because they have not yet issued stock. I raised the point on the basis that the money they would make would be in connection with the secrets that research would unlock.

The incorporators, who are merely beginning the enterprise, do not know exactly when the system will be underway. Most of the research done has been done for governmental purposes, although the original communications satellite, the A.T. & T. satellite, was built without cost to the Government. The launching expense was paid for by A.T. & T. The Relay satellite, which is now in orbit, was a product of RCA. It will cost the space agency about $10 million.

Other space communications expenditures and programs have been sponsored. Most of those, however—for example, the so-called stationary or synchronous satellite—have been experiments primarily in satellite launching, and not so much in communications, since the stationary satellite had a very elementary communications beeper which would not transmit the type of signals—TV programs—that were obtained via Telstar.

The charge which I think should be made—and I am not so sure but that we should insist on its being carried as a debt of the communications corporation is in connection with the research programs that develop the communications part of the satellite. They should pay for the launching costs. The cost of the science of rocketry, however, is not related to communications alone.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The testimony may not have been taken before the Commerce Committee, but it was before the Space Committee, to the effect that the

Government was expected to put up the money.

In any event, as to the supersonic jetliner, the reporter who wrote the article is a competent and careful man, and he must have had something to go on.

An advisory group has been appointed by Mr. Halaby to investigate the problem and is expected to report its findings and recommendations to the FAA later this month. The members include a New York investment broker, a vice president of a large New York bank, an executive of a large manufacturing corporation, and the lawyer who drafted the corporate documents for the Communications Satellite Corp. In addition, there are representatives of three major airlines, two aircraft manufacturers, one airport, and an aeronautical laboratory. They are prominent and highly respected citizens and businessmen but I feel that it is unfortunate that the advisory group which Mr. Halaby designated does not represent a wider range of interests. There is a noticeable shortage of members who would normally be expected to represent the public interest in such an important matter. Mr. Halaby has assured me that he had to persuade these men to serve on this committee and that he would be glad to enlarge it with members who might have different points of view. I expect to recommend some.

The point is that we must stop assigning and giving away important interests of the U.S. Government, whether they be in the form of NASA patents or in the form of a communications satellite, or research on jetliners, to a private cartel type of arrangement which is immune from antitrust laws, and with respect to which no competition can be expected or would result. As a result, the private corporation would get the profits, and the taxpayers of the Nation would be putting up the money.

That is what happened in connection with the communications satellite. That is what is about to occur in NASA, in giving away NASA patents, which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is trying to stop.

That must have been in someone's mind in connection with the jet airliner; otherwise this competent reporter would not have written an article of this kind.

I am glad to have Mr. Halaby's word that this is not in his mind, but we shall have to wait and see.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is there some prospect, in the Senator's opinion, that the administration is going ahead and organizing another giant monopoly consortium similar to that which was set up by the Satellite Communications Act?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is what I was fearful of when I saw the article on the front page of the Washington Post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I called Mr. Halaby and suggested that he might wish to come to the Antitrust Subcommittee and talk about this proposed giveaway. He assured me that he was not committed to the giveaway principle, as I explained.

However, I was very much alarmed, because that seems to be the kind of thing that is referred to in this article, so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator have any knowledge as to the amount of money that we have spent in developing the space satellite communications after we were led to believe that a Government-created private monopoly was to carry on and foot all expenses in connection with satellite communications?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not have in mind the amount. Perhaps the Senator knows the exact amount. I know it amounts to several millions of dollars.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would rather not guess at it, but I believe it is many millions of dollars already. Does the Senator have any information which would lead him to the conclusion that the great haste that was shown in rushing through the establishment of the satellite communications monopoly has expedited space communication?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. It has unquestionably retarded the development of space communications, because the corporation is not a going concern. The Government has not been able to carry on its work as expeditiously as it otherwise could have, and we are further behind because of the giveaway we perpetrated last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Government is still paying, if I understand correctly, even though all the benefits will go to a private corporation at such time as something of benefit materializes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct. We do not want that to happen again if we can possibly help it.

The longstanding traditions of our antitrust laws have played a vital role in the development of our economy. We cannot afford to abandon our belief in competitive principles and adopt a philosophy which favors Government-sponsored monopoly under the delusion that the desire for scientific advance leaves us no alternative. While I was pleased to hear that Mr. Halaby did not feel that he and the FAA are committed to the idea of a Government-subsidized private corporation to develop the supersonic jetliner, I cannot avoid a feeling of deep concern in this matter. We need a strong affirmation of faith in a free enterprise society that can survive without the necessity of giveaway programs which are intended to turn over large portions of the public domain to private interests. I am certain that a great many Senators, not only those who opposed the Satellite bill originally, but also its supporters who have been disillusioned so quickly by the operation of the Satellite Corp., will follow the course of this supersonic jet project with great interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of the members of the advisory group which I received from Mr. Halaby's office by printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MEMBERS, SST ADVISORY GROUP (FAA)

Chairman: Gen. O. R. Cook, USAF retired, 510 Crosswoods Drive, Falls Church, Va., CL 6–4249.

Secretaries: Col. Dale D. Davis and Maj. D. I. Hackney, FAA employees, Washington, D.C., 112–2645.

Members: R. N. Duck, Trans World Airlines, 157 Brightwood Avenue, Westfield, N.J., AD 3–5078; F. T Fox, Los Angeles International Airport, 1 Roadway, Los Angeles 45, Calif., 646–6250; Charles Froesch, Eastern Air Lines, Eastern Air Lines Building, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N.Y., YU 6–4500; W. B. Harding, Smith-Barney & Co., Inc., 20 Broad Street, New York 5, N.Y., DI 4–9600; William Littlewood, American Airlines, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., EX 3–2080; J. P. Mitchell, First Chase Manhattan Bank, First Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York 15, N.Y., LI 2–3774; T. T. Wright, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, 510 Hanshaw Road, Ithica, N.Y., AR 3–1082, Cornell, NF 2–7500; *Lloyd Cutler, attorney at law, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Transportation Building, Room 616, 815 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., 737–7474; *Charles B. Stauffacher, executive vice president, Continental Can Co., 633 Third Avenue, New York, 551–7000.

PROMISES AND PERFORMANCES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are now in the third year of the Kennedy administration and it might be well to look at the record of disparity between promise and performance of the administration.

I shall not dwell at length on the fiscal situation as compared with the last year of the Eisenhower administration, but do want to dwell at some length on the ever-increasing growth of Federal employment.

Speaking of the Eisenhower administration, on November 4, 1960, in Virginia, President Kennedy stated:

> This administration—

Meaning the Eisenhower administration—

> This administration was elected in 1952, on a commitment to reduce Federal spending to $60 billion a year; it is $73 billion. It has never been close to $60 billion. They have spent 46 percent more than Harry Truman spent. They have added 106,000 new Federal employees. I think it is about time the American people knew.

This additional 106,000 new Federal employees came into the Government over an 8-year period. Now we have had 127,000 additional employees added in the last 2 years.

---

*Accepted invitations to join the advisory group as of Mar. 26, 1963. Official letters of acceptance not yet received.

Let us look at the record of the present administration. It has been one long on promise and short on performance.

In the President's budget message submitted to Congress this year, we find the largest peacetime budget proposed in our Nation's history, reaching the astronomical figure of $98.8 billion, and in this message the President proclaimed a vigorous Federal job economy program.

I shall not dwell on the domestic and international expenditures as proposed in the budget but to state that they far exceed last year's appropriations and carry with them a planned deficit of $11.9 billion. This planned deficit will greatly exceed this figure if Congress votes the new programs proposed by the President and approves his proposals for a tax reduction—and could reach the astronomical figure of $14 to $16 billion on June 30, 1964.

The President in his message proclaimed a vigorous Federal job economy program, but a study of the budget calls for the addition of 36,500 more Government jobs during the next fiscal year. This 36,500 would be added on top of the 127,000 added since June 1961, when the present administration assumed full fiscal year control.

Since the Kennedy administration took took office, nearly 1 million Federal civilian employees have been hired. This figure includes the large number—over 400,000—hired to replace those who leave Federal employment every year, plus new Federal jobs made possible by increased spending programs.

According to the Civil Service Commission, the 1961 Federal civilian employee separation rate was 20.93 percent. See appendix I. Any statement on Federal employment trends must take this factor into consideration.

Average annual Federal civilian employment for 1960 was 2,430,000, including 36,000 temporary census workers. Using 18 percent as the separation rate—to avoid exaggeration and take transfers into account—at least 437,400 replacement employees had to be hired in 1961 just to maintain the 1960 Federal employment level. Thus, the administration not only managed to keep all positions filled, but increased annual employment by 11,000 to a total of 2,441,000. In 1962, just to stay even, 439,380 replacements had to be hired. The administration not only hired 439,380 replacements, but an additional 64,000 to raise the 1962 employment rate to 2,505,000. This is the highest annual employment figure since the Korean war period.

Thus, simply on the basis of annual employment averages, hiring under the Kennedy administration—that is, the combination of 876,780 replacements and 75,000 new positions—for 1961 and 1962 totaled at least 951,780. I refer Senators to appendix II—table of Federal employment statistics.

One way of curbing the Federal budget is to control Federal payrolls by a policy of not replacing every one of the 400,000 or more who leave Federal employment each year.

I think President Kennedy had this in mind when, on October 26, 1961, he issued the following directive to Cabinet officers and agency heads:

> I am also especially desirous that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency, to use better techniques of management and production, and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. (Office of the White House, press secretary, Oct. 26, 1961.)

The Civil Service Commission and Budget Bureau were reported to be considering such a move last year, according to Joseph Young's "Federal Spotlight" column in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., September 17, 1962.

> The Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau feel that by better management and better work production programs, agencies can get along with less employees.
>
> CSC and Budget officials feel that this can be done without firing anyone. They feel that merely by not filling some of the numerous vacancies in Government that occur each year through regular turnover, a substantial reduction in jobs can be achieved.

A comparison of Federal civilian employment as of January 31, 1961, and January 31, 1963, shows an increase of 127,000. The fiscal 1964 budget provides for 36,500 new nondefense positions.

These facts and figures show that instead of reducing Government payrolls, the Kennedy administration has not only added thousands of employees to the payroll, but increased total payroll costs from 1960 from $13,242 million to $14,861 million in 1962.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD appendixes I and II to which I have heretofore referred.

There being no objection, the appendixes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX I

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1962.

Mr. DAVID S. TEEPLE,
Secretary and Staff Director, Republican Policy Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEEPLE: In reply to your letter of August 17, 1962, the annual separation rate for the U.S. Government during the fiscal year 1962 in the United States was 20.93 percent. This includes all types of separations from Federal agencies. If we eliminate transfers between agencies, terminations of temporary or excepted appointments and leave without pay, the rate would be 11.74 percent.

Rates for the component types of separations are:

Quits	8.24
Transfers	1.53
Discharge	.58
Reduction-in-force	.66
Termination	6.09
Displacement	.02
Extended leave without pay	1.57
Death, retirement, disability	2.24

Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Deputy Executive Director.

APPENDIX II

Statistics on Federal civilian employment

A. AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT, 1959–62

Year	Total	Total payroll	Executive branch	Total payroll
	Thousands		*Thousands*	
1959	[1] 2,393	$12,541,000,000	2,366	$12,358,000,000
1960	[2] 2,430	13,242,000,000	[2] 2,403	13,052,000,000
1961	2,441	14,074,231,000	2,412	13,871,000,000
1962	2,505	14,861,000,000	2,475	14,647,000,000

[1] Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency figures excluded 1959 on.

[2] Includes 12-month average of 36,000 census positions.

Source: Civil Service Commission.

B. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT BY MONTH, JAN. 31, 1961–JAN. 31, 1963

Month	1961	1962	1963
January	2,368,800	2,445,600	2,495,400
February	2,374,200	2,453,800	
March	2,381,300	2,458,900	
April	2,394,000	2,471,100	
May	2,402,200	2,478,800	
June	2,435,800	2,514,200	
July	2,452,500	2,528,700	
August	2,461,900	2,530,100	
September	2,443,900	2,503,000	
October	2,446.400	2,500,700	
November	2,454,500	2,516,100	
December	2,672,900	2,659,600	

Source: Civil Service Commission.

C. SIGNIFICANT INCREASES AMONG DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Department or agency	Employment as of—			Increase 1963 over 1961
	Jan. 31, 1961	Jan. 31, 1962	Jan. 31, 1963	
Defense	1,032,905	1,060,063	1,064,110	31,205
Agriculture	86,716	91,312	101,017	14,301
Health, Education, and Welfare	65,433	73,347	77,521	12,088
Interior	50,909	54,026	61,595	10,686
Post Office	568,146	580,433	583,991	15,845
State	37,782	39,011	41,214	3,432
Treasury	77,027	80,763	85,073	8,046
FAA	40,038	43,315	45,256	5,218
NASA	16,212	19,796	26,210	9,998
TVA	14,831	18,429	17,608	2,777

Source: Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

RUMORS RELATING TO DOW AIR FORCE BASE, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on January 10, 1963, I received an inquiry from Miss Nellie Penley of the Bangor, Maine, Daily News with regard to rumors that the 341st Air Refueling Squadron at Dow Air Force Base would be deactivated in 1963 and that the 71st Air Refueling Squadron would be converted into a KC–135 unit in January 1964. Miss Penley asked that I determine for her from the Air Force whether the rumors were accurate or not and any information pertinent to the rumors.

On January 15, 1963, I received a letter from the Air Force substantially confirming the rumors but placing the restricted status of "Confidential" on the letter and forbidding me from disclosing the information.

Over 2 months later, on March 27, 1963, I received a letter from the Air Force notifying me that this information would be given to the press that day and thus removing the "Confidential" and restricted status.

In these times when there is so much talk about "managed news" and "news leaks" in violation of security, I rather marvel that such a secret could be officially kept for over 2 months. It does illustrate that there is some congressional sense of security and restraint—that some members do not release information and make announcements in violation of administrative security as was the case in August 1962 on a nuclear submarine award to the Kittery Naval Shipyard.

But I am really perplexed as to how security was really involved in the matter of the 341st Air Refueling Squadron when the information was given covertly to the press by the Air Force in Bangor and yet withheld from the press for 2 months by the Air Force in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters of January 15, 1963, and March 27, 1963, from the Air Force to me be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1963.
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Knowing of your personal interest in Dow Air Force Base, Maine, the Secretary has asked me to furnish you the following information.

For several years we have been engaged in a phased program of inactivating B-47 medium bomber units and their associated KC-97 air refuelers. The exact time schedule has been established considering the availability of newer weapon systems including the intercontinental ballistic missile force. During fiscal year 1963 we are inactivating some five B-47 wings and a number of KC-97 squadrons.

We now plan to inactivate the 341st Air Refueling Squadron at Dow Air Force Base in September 1963, reducing the base personnel strength by approximately 672 military and reducing the base aircraft complement by 20 KC-97 tankers. Other units at Dow are not affected by this action. These include the 6th Air Division Headquarters, the 71st Air Refueling Squadron, the 397th Bombardment Wing, the 75th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, the 30th Air Defense Missile Squadron (Bomarc) and the Maine National Guard Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

Shortly after this letter has been delivered to your office, we plan to make the above information available to the news media. If further facts would be useful to you, please let us know.

Sincerely,
THOMAS G. CORBIN,
Colonel, USAF,
Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison.

[CONFIDENTIAL]

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1963.
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: This is in response to your inquiry in regard to the utilization of Dow Air Force Base, Maine.

For some time we have had a program to modernize the Strategic Air Command air refueling squadrons by replacing the propeller driven KC-97 aircraft with the KC-135 jet tanker. Our plans currently contemplate the reorganization of the 71st Air Refueling Squadron in April 1964 with the KC-135, and to deactivate the 341st squadron in September of 1963.

It is our normal practice to inform members of Congress on such actions as far in advance as possible and we plan to formalize an announcement on these units in the near future. Until this can be done, we request that you consider this information only on a classified basis.

We regret that speculation and rumor on the subject are occurring prior to our normal announcement process.

Sincerely,
PERRY M. HOISINGTON II,
Major General, USAF,
Director, Legislative Liaison.

MIKE AWARD FOR 1963 PRESENTED TO STATION WSB, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last month radio station WSB, at Atlanta, the pioneer radio station of Georgia and the South, received one of the highest awards that can be attained in the broadcasting industry—the Mike Award for 1963, presented by the national chapter of Broadcast Pioneers.

WSB has recorded a notable list of firsts throughout its history of 40 years. These include the South's first broadcast of an on-the-spot news event; the first daily reports on farm information, market news, and weather. WSB pioneered the first broadcast of baseball games, and offered the first nationally known opera and concert artists on live broadcasts. WSB presented the Nation's first diskjockey and the first broadcast of a complete, unedited church service. That program has continued throughout the life of the station.

WSB originated the musical chime device for station identification. This station gave the Nation its first marathon charity show and raised thousands of dollars for a worthwhile project.

It was on WSB that Henry Ford made his first radio appearance and metropolitan opera star, Rosa Ponselle, sang her first radio aria.

Since 1939, the remarkable progress and reputation for the highest standards of broadcasting belonging to WSB has been directed by J. Leonard Reinsch—Mr. Broadcasting in the South, indeed, the Nation.

As executive director of WSB and of other Cox Radio-TV properties, the genius of Leonard Reinsch has been recognized by not only the members of his industry but also by the highest leaders of our country.

He is now communications adviser to President Kennedy, and served in a similar capacity under President Truman. He is a loyal Democrat and has been called upon to coordinate and direct the vast communications network necessary for the national conventions of the Democratic Party.

I salute not only Leonard Reinsch but also all of the talented staff of radio station WSB, the Voice of the South, upon their signal honor and I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, the speech delivered by Arthur Simon, president of Broadcasters Foundation, in presenting the award.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION REMARKS BY ARTHUR SIMON, PRESIDENT, BROADCASTERS' FOUNDATION

I wish each of you could experience my gratification as president of the Broadcasters' Foundation. Your generosity, your enthusiasm, and your loyal support of the foundation has made each of us associated with it grateful to have had the opportunity to serve. Without you—and the many others who could not be here, but whose contributions we have received—the foundation could not exist. It is heartening to see this response. What we are doing for those less fortunate than we truly enhances our image as an industry dedicated to serving humanity off the air as well as on.

I cannot express adequately my deep sense of appreciation for the constant, untiring, and brillant leadership of Ward Quaal. He has been unbelievably generous—not only financially, but of his time and himself. To me it has been a rare privilege to have been able to work so closely with him.

I must give thanks also to Chet Huntley for his graciousness in appearing here tonight.

Another reward for my work with the foundation is the pleasure and honor in presenting the annual Mike Award. At your leisure take a look at your program which contains the story of its background. It does not confine itself to a single area of broadcasting accomplishment over the calendar year. The Mike Award goes to a station which has made enduring contributions in every phase of its operation over its entire lifespan.

WSB of Atlanta is just such a station. If you want overwhelming proof of this fact, then take a trip to Georgia—and the destination doesn't necessarily have to be Atlanta.

It can be Gainesville or Athens or Rabun Gap, because WSB's influence is far reaching throughout the entire State. People there remember when WSB went on the air in 1922 as the "Voice of the South." Some of them will tell you about the intervening years of expanding radio, and that upstart, television. And most of them will talk about the significant presence of WSB today. In short, the listeners and viewers of Georgia are impressed by the always current service WSB offers them.

One thing strikes me as most intriguing. Many of you who do business with WSB know this—it is the station's wonderfully gracious hospitality. The motif so artistically expressed by the white columns on your program is symbolic. I'm not telling you that on a sunny day in Georgia you'll find all the WSB people lolling on the spacious front porch of white columns sippin' mint juleps and a-calling out to Beauregard, the hound dog. Anybody who has that mental picture of business in booming Atlanta obviously hasn't been there in this century. What I referred to is the hospitality of the operation. It's an admirable spirit of good will toward all—a spirit I devoutly wish would spread throughout this Nation.

The high aims of WSB are carried out by effective and efficient leadership. Later you will meet key members of the of the WSB organization. Also under the Cox management are stations WHIO-AM-FM-TV in Dayton; WSOC-AM-FM-TV in Charlotte; WIOD-AM-FM-TV in Miami, along with the Atlanta stations. It is, in every sense of the word, one of the Nation's finest broadcasting groups.

The man in charge of the distinguished Cox group is James M. Cox, Jr., chairman of the board of these broadcasting properties and their other enterprises which include newspaper and community television. Mr.

Cox has advanced the outstanding broadcast associations begun by his father, the late Governor Cox of Ohio. The progress under Jim Cox's leadership is familiar to many of you. Certainly WSB has every right to be proud of its outstanding administration and management.

And now, I call on James M. Cox to come forward. [Pause.] The inscription on the award reads:

"For distinguished contribution to the art of broadcasting and in recognition of dedicated adherence to quality, integrity and responsibility in programing and management, inspiring industry leadership, pioneering in the art, the science, and in the service to the public. Made this 25th day of February 1963."

On behalf of the Broadcast Pioneers and the Broadcasters' Foundation, I take great pleasure in presenting to WSB this 1963 Mike Award.

THE DEPLORABLE CRIME RATE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the deplorable crime rate in the District of Columbia may become worse unless the Congress acts promptly to amend the law relating to voluntary admissions and confessions as laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Mallory case.

On March 7, Senator Ervin, of North Carolina, with five cosponsors, introduced a bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia. That bill is S. 1012.

A very similar measure was passed by both the House and the Senate in 1958 but at 4 a.m. on the morning that Congress adjourned on August 24, 1958, the conference report on the bill was killed by an objection raised by Senator Carroll, of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement outlining the history of that legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.R. 11477, 85th Congress, 2d Session

A special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on *Mallory* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 449, on July 19, 25, August 1, 2, 22, and October 28, 1957.

On March 18, 1958, Congressman Willis, of Louisiana introduced H.R. 11477. The bill, as amended, would have added the following section to chapter 223, title 18, of the United States Code:

"3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.

* * * * *

"§3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.

"(a) Evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible, shall not be inadmissible solely because of [Senate Judiciary inserted the word "reasonable"] delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

"(b) No statement, including confession, made by an arrested person during an interrogation by a law-enforcement officer shall be admissible unless prior to such interrogation the arrested person had been advised that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him." [The conference committee inserted the provision: "*Provided*, That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions."]

H.R. 11477 was reported by the House Judiciary Committee, without amendment (H. Rept. 1815), on May 27, 1958. It was considered by the House on June 30 and passed, without amendment, on July 2, 1958.

On July 17 and 30 a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings on H.R. 11477. The full committee reported the bill on August 8 (S. Rept. 2525) with the amendment that the word "reasonable" be inserted before the word "delay." The Senate passed H.R. 11477, as amended, on August 19.

The conference report was adopted by the House on August 23 (H. Rept. 2702). This report added to subsection (b) the phrase, "*Provided*, That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions."

The Senate, however, failed to adopt the conference report. Senator Carroll (at 4 a.m. on August 24, the morning Congress adjourned) objected to the bill, as amended, on the ground that the proviso represented new matter and, therefore, should not have been inserted by the conference committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the first eight pages of the House report on H.R. 11477. Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate, will expedite action on this important aid to the Metropolitan Police to stem the mounting crime wave in our Nation's Capital which is a source of humiliation to decent citizens at home, and a just ground for condemnation by our foreign enemies.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1815) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for a statutory rule of evidence for the admissibility of statements and confessions in criminal proceedings in the courts of the United States, and to require a warning to an arrested person by law-enforcement officers prior to an interrogation. Such warning is made a condition precedent for the admission of statements or confessions into evidence. Accordingly, the bill amends the appropriate chapter, namely, chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, by adding at the end thereof a new section designated as section 3501.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in the last session of this Congress constituted a special subcommittee to study recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, including, among other things, decisions relating to the enforcement of Federal criminal laws. Among the decisions selected by the subcommittee for study and analysis was the decision rendered on June 24, 1957, in the case of *Mallory* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 449).

The subcommittee conducted lengthy hearings on the impact and ramification of the Court's ruling in the Mallory case. Witnesses included representatives of the Department of Justice and other Federal law-enforcement officers, such as the heads of the Park Police, Bureau of the Chief Postal Inspector, Post Office Department, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, chief of the Metropolitan Police Department for the District of Columbia, members of the bar of the District of Columbia, representatives of the National Association of Attorneys General, and Members of Congress who had introduced legislation designed to affect the decision of the Mallory case.

As part of its study, the subcommittee, while not having legislative jurisdiction over particular bills which had been introduced on this subject, nevertheless took into consideration various legislation proposed as a solution to the problem under study.

These bills and their authors are as follows:

H.R. 8521: Mr. Alexander.
H.R. 8596: Mr. Cramer.
H.R. 8600: Mr. Keating.
H.R. 8624: Mr. Poff.
H.R. 10775: Mr. Colmer.

These hearings were conducted during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the subcommittee then considered the evidence submitted to it during the course of the hearings and the above-mentioned legislative proposals. The subcommittee reached the conclusion that legislation was necessary to clarify the problem raised by the Mallory decision. It further decided on a specific legislative proposal which, in effect, overruled the holding in the Mallory case and in addition provided new safeguards to protect the rights of an arrested person. Its purpose in making such recommendation was to balance the rights of the individual with the rights of society itself in the field of law enforcement.

The subcommittee directed its chairman to make such a report to the full committee, which was done. The full committee accepted the report of the subcommittee and directed the subcommittee chairman to introduce a bill carrying out the legislative recommendation of the Special Subcommittee To Study Supreme Court Decisions. A bill was introduced, which is reported here by the subcommittee chairman. At the same time, a number of identical bills were introduced as follows:

H.R. 11467: Mr. Cramer.
H.R. 11468: Mr. Dowdy.
H.R. 11473: Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
H.R. 11481: Mr. Miller of New York.
H.R. 11483: Mr. Moore.
H.R. 11498: Mr. Forrester.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Prior to 1943, the Supreme Court of the United States had adhered to a long-established rule of evidence that a confession was admissible in evidence as long as it was freely and voluntarily given. In that year, however, in the cases of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332), *Anderson* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 350), the Court ruled that confessions obtained by police from a person unlawfully kept in custody could not be used against him at his trial. At that time there were on the statute books Federal laws requiring various Federal law-enforcement officers to bring arrested persons immediately or forthwith before an authorized committing magistrate or commissioner. The Supreme Court later, in the case of *United States* v. *Mitchell* (322 U.S. 65 (1944)), qualified its ruling in the McNabb case by holding that illegal detention did not justify the [rejection] of confessions unless they were the fruits of the illegal detention. In this latter case, the confession was admitted.

Following the McNabb decision, a series of bills somewhat similar to the bill herein reported were introduced in various Congresses. Finally, the House of Representatives passed a bill but it died in the Senate.

In 1948, in *Upshaw* v. *United States* (335 U.S. 410), the Supreme Court ruled inadmissible a confession and reversed the conviction based thereon because the defendant had confessed after being held for 30 hours without having been taken before a committing magistrate as required by rule 5(a) of the

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It is that same rule 5(a) that is involved in the Mallory decision.

In the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, preliminary draft, submitted May 3, 1943, to the Supreme Court, there was included a rule 5(b). However, there was strenuous opposition to the inclusion of the rule 5(b) and it was subsequently abandoned as unworkable, unnecessary, and inappropriate.

Rule 5(a) is as follows:

"Appearance before the Commissioner: An officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint or any person making an arrest without a warrant shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. When a person arrested without a warrant is brought before a commissioner or other officer, a complaint shall be filed forthwith."

The proposed but rejected rule 5(b) purported to codify the so-called McNabb rule. It said that no statement by a defendant in response to interrogation by an officer or agent of the Government shall be admissible in evidence against him if the interrogation occurs while the defendant is held in custody in violation of the rule calling for arraignment without unnecessary delay.

The important question involved in *Mallory* v. *United States* was the interpretation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and in particular rule 5(a).

The facts in the Mallory case were very simple ones. The defendant had been charged with rape which had occurred at 6 p.m. in the basement of an apartment house inhabited by the victim. There were no witnesses to the criminal attack and the perpetrator took the added precaution of attempting to disguise himself. Shortly after the commission of this crime, the defendant and one of his nephews disappeared from the apartment house wherein they resided and in which the crime had been committed. The defendant was apprehended the following day between 2 and 2:30 p.m. and was brought to headquarters, along with two nephews who were also suspects. Interrogation by police officers followed for approximately 30 to 45 minutes. All the suspects were held there until about 4 p.m. when they were asked to submit to a lie detector test and they agreed. The defendant was questioned shortly after 8 p.m. for almost 1½ hours of continuous interrogation. He subsequently admitted his guilt. At 10 p.m. he repeated his confession to other police officers who attempted to reach a U.S. commissioner in order to arraign him. Their efforts were fruitless. The defendant consented to a physical examination by a coroner who found no indication of physical or psychological coercion. After being confronted with the complaining witness the defendant again repeated his confession and at approximately midnight dictated it to a typist. He signed the confession and was arraigned the following morning.

The defendant was subsequently found guilty of the rape and his conviction was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (236 F. 2d. 701). That affirmance was reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States and the case was remanded to the District court where subsequently the indictment was dimissed and the defendant released.

In its opinion, the Supreme Court said:

"The scheme for initiating a Federal prosecution is plainly defined. The police may not arrest upon mere suspicion but only on probable cause." The next step in the proceeding is to arraign the arrested person before a judicial officer as quickly as possible so that he may be advised of his rights and so that the issue of probable cause may be promptly determined. The arrested person may, of course, be 'booked' by the police. But he is not to be taken to police headquarters in order to carry out a process of inquiry that lends itself, even if not so designed, to eliciting damaging statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt.

"The duty enjoined upon arresting officers to arraign 'without unnecessary delay' indicated that the command does not call for mechanical or automatic obedience. Circumstances may justify a brief delay between arrest and arraignment, as for instance, where the story volunteered by the accused is susceptible of quick verification through third parties. But the delay must not be of a nature to give opportunity for the extraction of a confession."

It is to be noted here that in the cases wherein the Supreme Court ruled these confessions inadmissible, it did so without reaching the constitutional question of the individual's constitutional rights.

In the Mallory case, the Court said:

"In order adequately to enforce the congressional requirement of prompt arraignment, it was deemed necessary to render inadmissible incriminating statements elicited from defendants during a period of unlawful detention."

The Court then cited the Upshaw case. Since the ruling in the Mallory case, the lower courts, and the court of appeals particularly in the District of Columbia, have had occasions to apply the rule in various cases. The District of Columbia has felt the greatest impact of the Mallory ruling. That is because of the nature of the common law crimes over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction within the confines of the District of Columbia. Those crimes are usually handled in the States by the local law enforcement agencies.

It is these common law crimes whose general nature lend themselves to the problem by which law enforcement officials are confronted by the Mallory decision. Crimes such as robbery, rape, even murder, are planned in secret and committed under circumstances which do not lend themselves to evidence of perpetration. These criminals take all precaution to avoid identification by their victims or other eye witnesses in order to avoid conviction for the crime. All too often in such cases there is no evidence for the police except a recounting of the event by the complaining witness. If the police as indicated by the Mallory decision are, in effect, prevented from conducting a proper and reasonable interrogation of suspects, law enforcement is faced with a serious challenge.

Law enforcement officials informed the committee that under the Mallory ruling as it has been applied in the lower courts, they are faced with serious obstacles in meeting their responsibility of enforcing the criminal laws. It is understandable that such officials should be concerned in the light of the broad general sweeping language employed by the Court in that case. It is indeed unfortunate that the Court left no guideposts or standards in its opinion as to the meaning of the phrase "unnecessary delay." It made reference to "booking" by the police but it added language as follows:

"He is not to be taken to police headquarters in order to carry out a process of inquiry that lends itself, even if not so designed, to eliciting damaging statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt."

The Court continued to say that this did not mean a command for mechanical or automatic obedience. It pointed out that circumstances might permit a brief delay in order to quickly verify a voluntary story by the accused, but then it added: "* * * the delay must not be of a nature to give opportunity for the extraction of a confession."

Such quotations are ample justification for the dilemma in which the police find themselves. There are many instances in the course of law enforcement when proper interrogation has resulted in clearing an accused person of a crime. The human frailty involved in the identification of a suspect is well known to all prosecutors and demands caution and substantiation: false accusations motivated by any one of many causes such as jealousy, spite, or hatred may result in an innocent person being falsely accused of a crime. There is also the problem raised by "the alibi." Interrogation in all there instances is necessary either to strike down or verify or substantiate them in order that the suspect be either charged with the crime or exonerated in accordance with the facts ascertained by the police. All of these instances involve justified delay and must entail reasonable interrogation. Yet, if the Mallory decision is permitted to stand, proper police procedure cannot be followed and criminals may go free while innocent people go to jail.

The passage of time between arrest and arraignment varies from case to case. Your committee is mindful of the dangers inherent in a long delay during that period of detention. It is, indeed, a time when the rights of an individual are very important to him and should be protected. Third-degree methods cannot be too strenuously condemned as they have been for many years and are today. All promises, threats, or intimidations which in any way render a confession on the part of an accused involuntarily are and should be condemned. Coercion, be it mental or physical, vitiates any confession since such a confession is not testimonially truthworthy which principle is basic and fundamental to the rule of evidence governing the admission of confession. In the Mallory case there is not a single scintilla of evidence of any coercion; Mallory confessed his crime freely and voluntarily and, moreover, he told the truth. He was and is guilty, but nevertheless he was not convicted because of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Such a condition, indeed, should not be permitted to continue, and it is the opinion of your committee that a statute to the effect that mere delay would not render inadmissible a confession or statement otherwise admissible is necessary and salutary in the field of Federal law enforcement. Such a provision does not take from the individual accused any rights whatsoever and, yet, at the same time it provides a reasonable and adequate safeguard to society itself against criminals.

The committee is cognizant of the fact that the concept of "unnecessary delay" is one that must be flexible, if it is to be adequate for the protection of both the accused and of society. It is the balance of these two conflicting interests that raises the most serious aspect of the overall problem. For that reason, by providing the added precaution in subsection (b) of the proposed bill, a proper balance, in the opinion of the committee, is achieved. The requisite of a warning by the police to the arrested person that anything he may say may be used against him and that he may not say anything if he so desires, adequately protects the individual's rights and places a restraint upon police procedure, a restraint that is reasonable; reasonable, because it adequately protects the arrested person's right and at the same time does not shackle proper law-enforcement techniques.

There are some individuals who would add to that subsection the right to counsel. However, your subcommittee considered such a proposal and rejected it. The right to the assignment of counsel in Federal courts does not appear to extend to proceedings at the stage of police interrogation or proceedings preliminary to indictment. Moreover, merely to advise a person as to his right to counsel would be an empty gesture if counsel was not provided for. The presence of counsel at that stage of the proceedings would entail the very same problem that has already plagued the police in attempting to locate proper officials in order to arraign the accused without unnecessary delay. It is the opinion of your committee, also, that the presence of counsel at that stage of the proceeding would provide other obstacles to proper law enforcement. The police would be confronted by the problem of having arrested one person, at the same time knowing and looking for three other suspects they would be compelled to sit idly by until counsel appeared. Obviously, such a condition could not be tolerated.

A Justice of the Supreme Court, namely Justice Jackson, once referred to the protections afforded by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights by saying: "* * * [they] represent the maximum restriction upon the power of organized society over the individual that are compatible with the maintenance or organized society itself."

He then said: "I doubt very much if they [these restrictions] require us to hold that the State may not take into custody and question one suspected reasonably of an unwitnessed murder. If it [the law] does, the people of this country must discipline themselves to seeing their police stand by helplessly while those suspected of murder prowl about unmolested. Is it a necessary price to pay for the fairness which we know as due process of law? And if not a necessary one, should it be demanded by this Court? I do not know the ultimate answers to these questions; but, for the present, I should not increase the handicap on society."

That quotation clearly reflects the attitude of the committee on this problem and its proposed solution. The solution is a fair one. It enhances the protection of both the State and the individual. It detracts nothing from the constitutional rights of the individual but on the contrary provides further safeguards for those rights by placing restriction on law-enforcing officials. At the same time, however, it accepts the rules of evidence that have governed criminal trials in this country for many years and which have proved themselves fair and just both to the people and to the individual defendants.

At its latest meeting, the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia adopted a resolution approving the principles contained in the bill H.R. 11477.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The bill adds a new section to chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide a statutory rule for the admission of evidence—statements and confessions.

Subsection (a) of the new section states that evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible under the rules of evidence in a criminal proceeding in any court of the United States shall not be ruled inadmissible merely because there had been a delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

The effect of the language of this subsection is to restore the rules of evidence for the admission of statements and confessions into evidence. Prior to the McNabb-Mallory doctrine, confessions which were free and voluntary were admitted into evidence. However, as previously stated, that doctrine has altered the rule which the proposed legislation would restore. The language proposed would still permit a delay between arrest and arraignment to be a factor to be considered by both judge and jury as a standard to determine whether or not such statement or confession was free and voluntary. On the other hand, the mere passage of time in and of itself would not automatically cause a rejection of the statement or confession.

It is, of course, possible for coercion to be either mental or physical, and your committee realizes that. Therefore, it permits the judge and jury to consider the time element as a factor to be considered in determining the free and voluntary nature of a confession. It is believed that this provision is consistent with the underlying principle governing the admission of confessions in criminal cases; namely, is such evidence testimonially trustworthy, so as to aid the jury in determining the truth?

Subsection (b) of the new section provides that no statement, including a confession which has been made by an arrested person during the course of interrogation by a law-enforcement official, can be admitted into evidence in a criminal case unless two prior requisites have been fulfilled. The first requisite is that the arrested person, prior to interrogation, shall be advised by the law-enforcement officer that he is not required to make any statement. The second is that the law-enforcement officer must also state to the arrested person that he is not required to make a statement and if he does so, it may be used against him in a subsequent criminal prosecution.

The purpose of subsection (b) is to provide adequate safeguards for the rights of the arrested individual. Under this provision the burden would be on the Government to prove that these requirements have been fulfilled before any statement or confession otherwise admissible could be admitted into evidence in a criminal case. This provision, of course, would not change the rule of evidence as provided for in subsection (a), namely, that free and voluntary confessions otherwise admissible should be admitted and not rejected solely because of the delay in arrangement.

Section (b) of the bill is a technical amendment providing for the proper insertion of the title of the new section in the chapter analysis of chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the committee recommends that the bill do pass.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, there is printed below in roman type without brackets existing law in which no change is proposed by the bill; new provisions proposed to be inserted are shown in black brackets:

"Chapter 223.—Witnesses and evidence

"Sec.

* * * * *

["3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.]

* * * * *

["§ 3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.]

["(a) Evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible, shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

["(b) No statement, including a confession, made by an arrested person during an interrogation by a law-enforcement officer shall be admissible unless prior to such interrogation the arrested person had been advised that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him.]

THE HOUSE OF GOOD TASTE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the goal of aiding the American people in their quest for more comfortable American living, which always has been in the forefront of the planning and work of the Congress, can be stimulated by providing the opportunity for people to see for themselves outstanding examples of tasteful home living.

As chairmen of the Senate and House Banking and Currency Subcommittees on Housing, Mr. RAINS and I believe this objective will be furthered by the New York World's Fair "House of Good Taste" exhibit for which we broke ground here yesterday.

We believe that, in light of the national concept embodied in this projected three-home community, it is fitting that the Nation's Capital should be the scene of its introduction.

This national concept is reflected by the fact that some 200 business firms from all sections of the country and their artisans are joining with 3 of the Nation's foremost architects to build this exhibit.

The millions of people who will visit these beautifully designed and furnished homes will recognize that, through the combined creativity of American industry and labor, the aspiration of every person for attractive home surroundings can be realized.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have great respect and admiration for Gen. Lucius Clay. I thoroughly agree with his statement with respect to foreign aid, quoted by the Associated Press in a weekend interview, as follows:

> I feel a lot of money has been wasted. It's got to be tightened up. To continue to give economic assistance to countries that have done little or nothing to help themselves is throwing money away.

The Clay Committee submitted a list of countries and territories which are now receiving U.S. foreign aid. The number is 95.

Since July 1, 1945, when this foreign aid started, the United States has expended a gross total of more than $100 billion. This huge sum has contributed to the tremendous increase in our public debt and the $10 billion a year in interest which it is costing us.

There is an old saying that friendship can not be bought with money; and this is well demonstrated by the fact that France, which has accepted more of our foreign aid money than any other country—$9.4 billion—recently has shown a lack of friendship to both the United States and Great Britain. The French veto of British participation in the Common Market will have serious consequences.

The time has come for the United States to reassess our entire program of foreign aid expenditures throughout the world. We have been acting as policeman, Santa Claus, and banker for the free world for nearly 20 years. This can not be kept up without disaster.

The time has come when other free world nations must assume their share of this burden.

One example is the fact that we have nearly 800,000 troops abroad, at an average per capita cost of about $8,000. As a delegate to the November North Atlantic Treaty Organization meeting in Paris, I asked what nations had met their NATO troop quotas. The answer was the United States and Canada.

This is but one of many instances where the burden of protecting the free world is being carried unequally by the United States.

FOOD STAMP PLAN IN ILLINOIS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through its Agricultural Marketing Service, is operating part of its experimental food stamp program in Franklin County, Ill. I am very pleased to report that this program has been very successful, and I present a report on the program's details for the information of the Senate, which will soon be considering the continuance, and I hope, expansion of the food stamp program. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

To: Mabel Snyder, Office of the Secretary.
From: Roy W. Lennartson, Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.
Subject: Information on food stamp program in Illinois.

At the present time, the food stamp program is operating only in Franklin County although a number of other areas in the State have expressed great interest in the program.

In January 1963, some 3,500 people participated in the food stamp program in Franklin County. They purchased over $56,000 in food coupons and received an additional $22,000 in supplemental or bonus coupons free of charge. The average value of the bonus coupons per person was $6.18 to assist those participating in obtaining a more nutritious diet.

Since the opening of the program in July of 1961—Franklin County was one of the original eight pilot areas—participating families have purchased a total of $1,182,000 worth of food coupons and have received an additional $642,000 in coupons free of charge. This has meant a net additional cash inflow of $642,000 to the county's retail food stores. Also, it has meant improved diets for families participating in the program. A survey of sales in a sample of retail food stores, before and after the program went into effect in Franklin County, showed an increase of almost 14 percent in sales of meat under the food stamp program.

A survey of household food consumption in two of the original pilot areas before and after the food stamp program became operative indicated that over 80 percent of the increased food purchasing power was spent for perishable, highly nutritious items such as meat, poultry, fish, milk, eggs, and fruits and vegetables.

Recipients of food coupons have better diets than similar low-income families not participating in the program. But they still do not eat as well as higher income groups.

Retail food store sales, measured in dollars, increased after the inauguration of the program—an average of 8 percent in the sample of stores surveyed.

In a survey of attitudes toward the program, more than 90 percent of the participating families expressed approval of the program, primarily because it offered a greater variety of food. Families of moderate and higher income not eligible for the program felt that low-income families should be enabled to obtain more and better food and approved of the food coupon approach; virtually all the retailers liked the program; so did the majority of local welfare workers and administrators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been impressed with the benefits the program has brought to participants in Franklin County, and on January 22, 1963, I wrote the director of the Food Distribution Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, asking if Saline, Gallatin, and Pope Counties might participate in the program.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of my letter and the Department of Agriculture's reply of January 28, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point to emphasize the fact that the program is still in the experimental stage.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1963.

Mr. HOWARD P. DAVIS,
Director, Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I am very anxious to learn if Saline, Gallatin, and Pope Counties may participate in the food stamp plan. The unemployment figures in these counties are substantially higher than the national unemployment percentage and these counties are listed by the Area Redevelopment Administration as 5(a).

I would also appreciate learning the status of the pilot program throughout the United States. I believe it is doing a marvelous job of fulfilling its goals, and I am very anxious that Illinois participate to a greater degree in its operation.

With best wishes.
Faithfully,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This will reply to your letter of January 22 to Mr. Howard P. Davis, Director, Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, requesting that consideration be given to including the counties of Saline, Gallatin, and Pope in the pilot food stamp program.

The program appears to be moving smoothly and effectively in those areas where it is in operation. As you know, President Kennedy in his budget message proposed the passage of legislation to continue the food stamp program and to finance it in fiscal year 1964 at the current level.

At the present time, the program is still in the experimental stage and we do not anticipate any further expansion during the pilot phase.

If the program is continued and if it is possible to make it available to additional areas, the counties you mentioned will be given serious consideration.

Although we do not yet have the results of the additional research being conducted on the program's acceptability and effectiveness, I am enclosing several publications you may find interesting as to what we learned in the course of the earlier research efforts.

Sincerely yours,
ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Associate Administrator.

FACTS WITH RESPECT TO FORTHCOMING WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in Columbia, Mo., recently 35 farmers, businessmen, and clergymen organized a Missouri Citizens Committee to present to the farm people of my State the facts with respect to the wheat referendum that will be held in May.

In this connection, and with the thought that other Senators might be interested in this effort, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of March 9 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI GROUP FORMED TO URGE WHEAT PLAN OK

COLUMBIA, MO.—Thirty-three farmers and businessmen and two clergymen have organized a Missouri Citizens Wheat Committee to press for passage of wheat production controls at a referendum in May. The date for the referendum has not been set.

The committee, which was formed at a meeting here yesterday, warned that wheat prices would fall to $1 a bushel if controls are defeated. It said the wheat program guarantees a national average price of $2 a bushel.

Miller Hern, Rocheport farmer, Production Credit Association board member, and former county agricultural stabilization and conservation committee chairman, was named chairman of the wheat committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Members of the executive committee are: Dorr Ewing, Maryville, attorney and wheat producer; Gene Hutchison, Bolivar, wheat producer; James A. Schooling, Concordia, National Farmers Organization State legislative director and past president of the State Soil Districts Association.

Phil Smith, Williamsburg, livestock and grain farmer and former ASC Committee member; Howard Taylor, Essex, farmer and State Soil Districts Commission member; and James VanHouten, Clarence, grain farmer.

Committee members warned that rejection of the wheat program would bring an increase in production and a "ruinous low price" for the crop.

COMMITTEE'S JOB

"The wheat program, if adopted by the farmers in the May referendum, will maintain farm income, reduce the cost of the farm program and will cut the Government's wheat surplus," the committee said.

Members pointed out the committee's job is to make information on the alternatives to controls available to farmers and help them to determine how their individual farms would be affected.

"In our opinion, it is foolish and disastrous to increase the wheat acreage and production at a time when the Government now owns more than 1 billion bushels of wheat—the equivalent of a year's supply," the committee declared. The statement continued:

"We can only assume that any farmer that votes against the wheat referendum is doing so because he wants to seed more acres of wheat. The market, at the present time, does not justify an increase in wheat acreage. In addition, a defeat of the wheat program would adversely affect our entire feed grain program.

PRICE OF WHEAT IN BREAD

"Orderly production and marketing is essential for strong farm operation, be it large or small.

"The price of wheat is insignificant when considered in relation to the cost of bread to consumers. It has been said, for example, that the wrapper in some cases, might cost more than the wheat in a loaf of bread. This program will protect farm prices without increasing costs to consumers.

"The issue is one that concerns the pocketbook of farmers. We urge each farmer to make his decision on the basis of what it does to his individual farm."

Other members of the committee are: Tom Briggs, Macon, newspaper publisher and farmer; Glen Briscoe, New London, wheat producer, Garth Clinkscales, Boonville, rural banker; Robert Cullers, Trenton, banker and farmer.

L. A. Bockenstette, Pleasant Hill, wheat producer; Jim Briscoe, Tipton, livestock and grain farmer; John A. Childers, McFall, member, State committee, Farmers Home Administration, and past president, State Soil Districts Association; John Daugherty, Mound City, wheat producer.

MONSIGNOR HILDNER

Floyd Gander, Butler, general farmer; Harry Handley, Houstonia, wheat producer; William D. Hibler, Jr., Brunswick, member, State legislature and farmer; Msgr. George J. Hildner, Villa Ridge, rural priest and recipient of numerous soil conservation awards; Calvin Hollaway, Roscoe, farmer and former member, State ASC Committee, and former member, State legislature; H. F. (Hoot) Holland, Sheridan, farmer, member, State legislature, and oil distributor.

Alvin Huff, Reeds, farmer and former ASC committee member; Charles Lahr, PCA director and farm operator; Charles M. Massie, Hopkins, livestock and grain farmer and Farm Bureau member; Arthur Neuenschwander, Deepwater, general farmer and Missouri Farmers Association director.

Gene Nitch, Jackson, wheat producer; Gene Poirot, Golden City, conservationist; Luther Robertson, Lamar, general farmer; C. W. Sheppard, Warrensburg, wheat farmer and former member, State ASC Committee; Mace Smith, Sweet Springs, farmer; Rev. James Spainhower, Marshall, minister and member, State legislature.

Preston V. Walker, Clarence, farmer and vice chairman, State Soil District Commission; Owen Wise, McCredie, farmer and implement dealer; Elvis Besand, Perryville, general farmer and wheat producer, and Charles Walton, Qulin, wheat producer.

REIMBURSEMENT TO CERTAIN CITIES FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NEAR ARMY RESERVE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on February 4, 1963, I introduced S. 654, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse certain cities in the United States for expenses incurred by such cities in the construction of streets, sidewalks, and other public improvements adjacent to U.S. Army Reserve installations.

As part of my remarks beginning on page 1687 of the RECORD for that date, I included a list of cities to which this bill would apply. At that time, I noted that the list, supplied me by the Department of the Army, was in error in at least one instance; that I had asked the Department to verify the list.

On March 26 I received a letter and another up-to-date list from Col. R. E. Vollendorff in the Office of Legislative Liaison. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the letter, dated March 22, and the attached list be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 22, 1963.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: On January 3, 1963, a list of Army Reserve center locations requiring offsite improvements was forwarded to you per your request.

Subsequent to that date it was indicated that the requirement for improvements at some specific locations were questionable. As a result field agencies were requested to make another survey so that the list could be checked for accuracy and brought up to date. This has been done and a revised list is forwarded herewith.

Attention is invited to the fact that while the improvements indicated are desirable, only those locations indicated by an asterisk have local community plans for improvements.

Sincerely,

R. E. VOLLENDORFF,
Colonel, GS Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Army Reserve centers off-site improvements

Army area	Location	Off-site improvements	Estimated cost
1st	Penn-Yan, N.Y	Sidewalk and drainage	$2,492
2d	Baltimore No. 1, Md	Sidewalk	1,690
	Riverdale, Md	Sidewalk improvement	1,000
	Wilmington, Del	Sidewalks	1,040
	Seaford, Del	Curbs, sidewalks	2,500
	Ripley, W. Va[1]	400 feet of 20-foot-wide blacktop	1,500
	Fairmont, W. Va.[1]	900 feet of 20-foot-wide blacktop	7,000
	Mansfield, Ohio	240 feet of 24-foot-wide blacktop	3,200
	St. Marys, Ohio	530 feet of 20-foot-wide blacktop	5,890
	Bethlehem, Pa	Curbs and sidewalks	2,932
	Harrisburg, Pa	do	6,405
	Philadelphia (No. 1), Pa.[1]	do	3,582
	Reading, Pa	do	3,990
	Scranton, Pa.[1]	do	4,202
3d	Chattanooga, Tenn	Installation of sidewalk, curb, and gutters.	2,200
4th	Harrison, Ark	Improvements to streets abutting USAR-constructed centers.	4,000
	Ada, Okla	do	11,000
	McAlester, Okla.[1]	do	17,592
	Las Cruces, N. Mex	do	4,608
	Silver City, N. Mex	do	4,800
	Harlingen, Tex	do	7,800
	Amarillo, Tex.[1]	Improvements to streets abutting USAR constructed centers and storm sewer.	3,633
6th	Douglas, Ariz. (1973)	Curb, gutters, street paving	2,700
	Tucson, Ariz.[1]	Street paving, curbs, underground drainage.	3,900
	Phoenix, Ariz. (1973)	Curbs, gutters, and sidewalks	7,000
	Bakersfield, Calif	Street paving and curbs	1,100
	Chico, Calif	Sidewalk and drainage	3,500
	Fresno, Calif., (1973)	Curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and street paving.	2,000
	Modesto, Calif	do	8,000
	San Jose, Calif	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving, and underground drainage.	10,000
	San Pablo, Calif	Sidewalk and drainage	9,200
6th	Santa Cruz, Calif	Sidewalk	$2,000
	Mountain View, Calif	Curb, gutter	2,000
	Vallejo, Calif	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	5,000
	Pasadena, Calif	Curb, gutter, and sidewalk	1,200
	Van Nuys, Calif	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	8,500
	Rexburg, Idaho [1]	do	5,700
	Glasgow, Mont	do	7,200
	Helena, Mont	do	6,000
	Las Vegas, Nev.[1]	do	10,100
	Reno, Nev.[1]	Sidewalk and street paving	6,000
	Corvallis, Oreg	Sidewalk, curb, street paving, and drainage.	5,400
	Eugene, Oreg	Sidewalk, street improvement	3,700
	Medford, Oreg	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving, and underground drainage.	27,000
	Portland (South), Oreg	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving.	9,100
	Portland (West), Oreg	Street improvements and drainage	4,900
	Salem, Oreg	Curb, gutter, street paving, and drainage.	6,000
	Ogden, Utah	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	8,200
	Provo, Utah [1]	Street paving	1,900
	Salt Lake City No. 1	Sidewalk	1,100
	Everett, Wash	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving, and drainage.	5,100
	Seattle, Wash.[1]	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	5,300
	Spokane, Wash	Sidewalk	800
	Tacoma, Wash	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	6,000
	Wenatchee, Wash	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street-paving, and drainage.	14,700
	Total estimated cost for United States.		303,356

---

[1] Projects with plans for improvements.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES B. BIGGS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, good men choose many professions in which to spend their lives in service of their fellow men.

No profession is more demanding than the healing art of medicine, and none calls for greater talent, or greater sacrifice. It is heroic work that beckons heroic men to the selfless life of caring for the needs of old and young—ill and healthy—and sharing with them the sorrows and joys that are inherent in human lives. And within the medical profession, this is nowhere seen in greater degree than it is with the general practitioner—the smalltown and country doctor.

Such a man has served my hometown and his birthplace of Bowling Green for half a century. This week, Dr. James B. Biggs celebrates 50 years as a country doctor. Bowling Green and Pike County celebrate the anniversary with him. His fellow doctors are honoring him this week at the 105th annual meeting of the Missouri State Medical Association at Kansas City. These are well-deserved tributes to a professional career that spans more years than the entire lifetime of many here in the Senate today. They are also fitting testimonials to his ability and dedication that have been given to his neighbors for the years from the horse and buggy to the supersonic jet.

It is often said, Mr. President, that the country doctor is a symbol of what America is, and I submit, Dr. Jim Biggs is symbolic of the finest in the great profession of medicine.

TIPRO STATES ITS POSITION ON PROPOSED CHANGES IN OIL AND GAS TAX POLICY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association has compiled a thorough and highly significant report on the effects of proposed changes in U.S. oil and gas producers and land and mineral interest holders, and presented in behalf of 5,500 members of TIPRO.

The report includes charts which cannot be reproduced in the RECORD, but the explanation of these charts is included herein. This report, which was submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means, concerns a vital segment of the American economy, and one which should not be weakened by any unwise legislation. I urge that this report be given careful study.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C., IN RE PROPOSED CHANGES IN OIL AND GAS TAX POLICY, TEXAS INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS AND ROYALTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION, AUSTIN, TEX., MARCH 27, 1963

I. INTRODUCTION

Our appearance here is limited strictly to a presentation of the results of our study and evaluation as to the effects of the proposed changes in U.S. oil and gas tax policy upon nonintegrated domestic independent oil and gas producers and land and mineral interest holders. We speak on behalf of the approximate 5,500 members of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association.

While all four of the changes proposed in U.S. tax policy relating to oil and gas production have been given careful study, our testimony concentrates primarily upon those proposals on which we are able to provide firsthand evaluation as to probable effects upon a typical cross section of domestic independent producers and royalty owners. For obvious reasons we shall not attempt to duplicate the extensive testimony of others involving the history and justification of the principles upon which oil and gas production tax policy is based. Nor do we take a position on aspects of these hearings which do not directly affect domestic independent producers, realizing that other industry segments will concentrate largely on those provisions directly affecting them.

Before discussing the specific proposals, we believe it is important that we stress to the committee that such tax proposals must be weighed in full view of the seriously-depressed condition in which the domestic producing industry currently finds itself. For that purpose we have offered here some representative indices of oil and gas producing industry health, in order to underscore the basic presumption that there is a demonstrated need for increasing exploratory drilling if America is to maintain a safe relationship between proved reserves and domestic consumption in war or peace.

Insofar as the domestic producing segment of our industry is concerned, there is absolutely no doubt that any adverse change in tax policy at this time would prove particularly damaging to the nonintegrated domestic independent and directly contrary to the objectives cited by the administration both for this tax program and the mandatory oil import program.

Our survey indicates clearly that two of the tax changes as proposed would fall disproportionately upon the domestic independent producers and further accelerate the downward trend in exploration and drilling programs. Further, we believe our study provides evidence for the assumption that these proposals in particular would result in less rather than more Government revenue, while at the same time doing perhaps irreparable damage to the home-producing industry.

You may be sure that we have taken cognizance of the objectives which administration spokesmen have cited for the proposed changes in oil and gas tax policy. In particular we refer to the Treasury Department's published letter to Congressman BRUCE ALGER stating that the tax proposals are "designed to protect and, in important ways, to strengthen the position of the small producers," and that the recommendations concerning foreign operations and aggregation of properties "are limited almost exclusively to the very large oil companies receiving unintended benefits." We therefore feel certain that the President will not wish to insist upon proposals which evidence indicates to be inconsistent with stated objectives and which inevitably would depress further the search for new oil and gas reserves within this Nation.

In order to evaluate the effect of such proposals upon "the independent producer," it may be desirable to review the fundamental characteristics which distinguish the domestic independent producer from other industry segments and to define his particular role or function in the industry and the economy.

A. The independent producer and new tax burdens

The backbone of the industry's crude oil exploration and production is the independent producer and his royalty owners. But more than that, the independent—collectively large in numbers though individually small in size—preserves a competitive, free enterprise background for the whole industry.

While there are fewer than 50 large integrated major oil companies, there are thousands of independents and hundreds of thousands of royalty owners. In Texas alone there are approximately 6,000 producers and well over 200,000 owners of royalty interests in oil production.

What fundamental characteristics distinguish the particular role of the independent producer in the oil and gas industry?

The independent is the real "wildcatter" in the industry; he drills three-fourths of the Nation's wells. Since he is relatively small, maneuverable, and not bound by corporate policy—and, more important, is willing to assume heavy risk—the independent consistently finds oil where major companies declare there is none.

The independent is unintegrated; thus he is denied any opportunity to recoup losses—resulting either from inadequate crude prices or inadequate markets—through profits in transportation, refining, marketing, or importing.

The independent has no real say in determining the prices of his crude or the share of the market available to him. Unlike most goods, crude oil sells at purchaser posted prices and the producer must sell or be drained. Likewise, the volume of his sales depends upon purchaser nominations for crude in his area, which nominations constitute the dominant factor in determining market demand.

The independent is custodian of most of the country's marginal and stripper wells. Inasmuch as these wells constitute America's crowning achievement in conservation, and represent approximately 25 percent of proved U.S. reserves, these relatively uneconomic operations must be preserved; their abandonment would represent permanent loss of an irreplaceable natural resource.

Recognizing the vital role played by the domestic independent, then, it is next in order to determine whether he is currently in a position to absorb additional tax burden without impairing his vital function.

For this purpose, we call attention to accompanying charts I, II, and III which reflect a serious decline in representative indexes of producing industry health. A review of these industry indexes of deterioration would seem to establish an urgent need for providing additional incentives to the domestic independent producer, rather than consideration of any proposals which might adversely affect his tax status.

The economic plight of the domestic independent is particularly bad in Texas, a State struggling to maintain approximately two-thirds of the Nation's defense-vital reserve producing capacity and almost half the Nation's proved oil reserves. The rate of decline during the past 6 years results in large part from the fact that the oil import program has failed and is presently failing to limit the growth of imports to a stable ratio with the growth of either U.S. demand or U.S. oil production. Oil imports are currently at an alltime high, well in excess of levels prevailing last year when another record was set—current increases occurring in the face of a new Presidential proclamation which many characterized as an improvement over previous ones in terms of stabilizing import growth. In order to make room for the disproportionate growth of imports, Texas as a prorating State has been compelled to reduce its production by some 466,000 barrels daily since 1956.

Crude oil prices, described by officials in the leading oil purchasing companies in 1957 as still too low, are substantially lower today. In this connection the last general crude oil price increase was in early 1957, and before that the last one was in 1953. When the approximate 30-cents per barrel increase was posted by the leading companies in 1957, top officials of those companies stated the urgent need for increasing, crude oil prices in the United States.[1] Yet, since 1957, there has been a steady erosion of crude oil prices in the United States—despite a steady rise in costs to producers accounted for in part that the number of wells drilled for each million barrels added to crude oil reserves has increased sharply.

Coincident with the drop in allowable production and declining crude prices were numerous other adverse developments which could have grave consequences for the future. The annual total of wells drilled in Texas has dropped since 1956 by 10,445, or 40.9 percent. Likewise the average number of rotary rigs in operation has decreased 381, or 40.1 percent, while crude oil well completions are down 36.6 percent.

Along with these reductions in activity have come numerous other State problems attributable to it, including a drop in oil and gas production employment by some 9.6 percent in the past 5 years. State tax revenue from this source has dropped $30 million annually, a cut of 19.3 percent.

While the injury is perhaps most dramatically reflected in Texas, the national scope of producing industry deterioration is readily apparent from the charts presented here.

It becomes unmistakably clear, therefore, that the domestic oil producing industry is in no position to absorb any additional tax burdens if the domestic independent is to fulfill his obligations to the national economy and security.

Along with Texas' indices already reviewed, chart I [not printed in RECORD] portrays several trends of decline in nationwide domestic producing industry operations. Since 1957, for example, U.S. crude prices have dropped 20 cents per barrel while costs of operations have continuously increased. In recent weeks some purchasing companies have initiated rounds of crude price cutting across the country.

Caught in an economic squeeze, the domestic producer has no alternative but to slash vital exploration activity. Since 1956 the annual drilling of wildcat wells has dropped steadily from 13,034 to 9,003 wells. Total wells drilled has decreased from 58,160 to 46,179 in 1962, and only 45,459 are projected for this year. These reductions have led to a drop in rotary drillings rigs in use from 2,648 to 1,636 which, in turn, means less industry capacity in the future to explore for domestic reserves.

This sharp reduction in exploration and drilling activity is already adversely affecting the volume of U.S. new oil discoveries. In 1962 new discoveries totaled 296 million barrels as compared with 467 million barrels in 1956.

Chart II [not printed in the RECORD] illustrates some of the direct employment problems resulting from the trends of deterioration shown in chart I. Hard-to-replace exploration and producing skills are being lost at alarming rates. Texas data indicates the Nation has already lost 1 out of every 15 domestic independent producers; more significantly, countless others have discontinued exploration activity.

Since 1957 at least one out of three seismographic crews which are required for oil and gas exploration have disbanded. The development of future professional and technical personnel needed to find and develop domestic oil has been slashed, as evidenced by a 50-percent drop in engineering students and a comparable drop in petroleum geologist trainees.

Rotary drilling contractors together with their highly trained and specialized drilling crews are also disappearing rapidly. More than one of four have left the business since 1956.

Counting all categories, more than 38,000 personnel have left the U.S. oil and gas producing industry since 1957.

Chart III [not printed in RECORD], pointing up the production-growth advantage enjoyed by American companies with foreign oil production, underscores the need for a policy of tax neutrality or equality as between foreign and domestic production.

While U.S. importers have expanded their oil production significantly since 1956, their strictly domestic producting competitors, particularly in Texas, have been denied any real share of U.S. market growth.

Major source areas for U.S. imports have enjoyed rapid production increase, ranging from 30 percent in Venezuela, to 42 percent in Canada, to 79 percent in the Mideast. By contrast, the United States as a whole is now only 2 percent above 1956 production levels, while Texas is more than 15 percent below.

Even if the import program had stabilized the growth of oil imports in relation to U.S. production growth, competitive advantages would remain for international companies. Restoring tax equality as between foreign and domestic production, therefore, appears both logical and necessary to preservation of a role for domestic oil independent producers.

II. EVALUATION OF THE SPECIFIC CHANGES PROPOSED IN OIL AND GAS TAX POLICY

Of the four specific proposals affecting the tax policy for oil and gas producers, our study supports the conclusion that the domestic independent producer would bear a disproportionately heavy share of the burden imposed through proposal No. 1, relating to intangible drilling and development expense, and proposal No. 2, relating to proceeds from mineral property sales. Following is a discussion of each of the four proposals, together with specific case references as to their application.

Proposal No. 1: Intangible drilling and dedevelopment expense

For reasons which follow, we strongly oppose the proposal to require that producers carry over intangible drilling and development costs in excess of gross income during the year of discovery for the purpose of computing the 50 percent of net income limitation.

This proposal, in its practical effect, is in conflict with the objectives stated by the administration and is contrary to the accepted purpose and principle of the percentage depletion provision.

It would have a particularly damaging impact upon the domestic independent producer, and would force a further sharp curtailment in domestic exploration and development activity.

The preservation of marginal and stripper well properties, which represent the crowning achievement of petroleum industry conservation, would be severely damaged.

Smaller independent producers are concentrated primarily in exploration activity and in the operation of relatively marginal or "stripper" producing properties. It is upon these two areas that the impact of this proposal would fall heaviest, for reasons we shall detail. The conclusion is inescapable, therefore, that proposal No. 1 is inconsistent with the Treasury Department's stated objective "to protect and, in important ways, to strengthen the position of small producers." This conclusion is reinforced when consideration is given the fact that the more prolific producing properties both in the United States and abroad would be relatively unaffected.

In this regard, attention is called to the administration's recommendation for an overall study of percentage depletion. In line with this, the administration recommended no direct change in the 27½-percent rate for oil and gas pending conclusion of such study. Inasmuch as its proposal No. 1 would have the effect of reducing the percentage realized—particularly by independent producers who are already well below the average depletion realization for the industry as a whole—we feel that changes in the intangible expense factor should likewise await the comprehensive study.

We submit that these conclusions will be fully supported by any comprehensive study of the tax program as it affects the petroleum industry. We, therefore, respectfully urge that no change in tax policy respecting intangible drilling and development expensing be adopted.

This association has always welcomed any responsible study of percentage depletion. We are certain that such a study will amply support tax provisions as they apply to domestic independent producers, and in some respects may well show a need for liberalization; an example could be the need to eliminate the 50 percent income limit on marginal well operation.

In other words, proposal No. 1 should be evaluated in relation to the later overall study of percentage depletion, and not made in advance of such study—since it directly relates to the percentage depletion

---

[1] Following excerpts from testimony before the O'Mahoney antitrust subcommittee in 1957 reflect the prevailing view of the top executives of leading oil purchasing companies at that time:

M. J. Rathbone, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey: "Until the crude oil price increase of a few weeks ago, there had been no general increase in the price for almost 4 years. Meanwhile the per-barrel cost of finding and developing oil reserves in the United States had continued to rise. By last year they had reached a point where, in the judgment of many experienced oilmen, the price at which a barrel of crude was being sold was no longer adequate to meet the cost of replacing that barrel through new exploration and discovery. * * * The price of crude oil is important not only from the viewpoint of the consumer, the independent oil producer, and the integrated company, but also from the viewpoint of the national interest. If the price is not sufficient to encourage continued adequate exploration and development, America's economic health and security can be hurt."

W. K. Whiteford, president of Gulf Oil Corp., testified in part: "Gulf did not immediately meet the first crude price increase which was effective Jan. 3, 1957, although we had felt for months that a crude price increase was inevitable and justified."

B. Brewster Jennings, chairman of Socony-Mobil Oil Co., Inc., testified: "The price of crude oil must be at a level to encourage greater exploration, or the ratio is certain to decline further. The problem of costs has hit oil producers from several angles. I think this can be summarized by stating that oil producers have to drill an increasing number of wells to a greater average depth at higher cost per foot to find the same amount of oil. * * * Against this background a crude oil price advance had been inevitable for some time."

realized particularly for the smaller independents operating marginal domestic properties. Let us emphasize that domestic independents are concentrated in the two areas of industry operation which would be hardest hit by this proposal: domestic exploration and high cost marginal operations. Therefore, a disproportionate share of the $200 million anticipated new revenue from this proposal would be expected from that segment of the industry which the administration said was not the intended target. It should likewise be stressed that the effect would not be limited to imposing hardship on producers, but would inevitably show up in reduced domestic exploration and drilling in premature abandonment of high-cost marginal well properties and in loss of reserves and productive potential.

When the current rate for percentage depletion was first entered in the law, it more nearly covered the replacement costs of oil reserves than it does today. Replacement cost per barrel of domestic reserves now approximates $1.25, based on current sales of oil in the ground, whereas percentage depletion per barrel is at most 80 cents. Many companies today find the cost of replacing reserves through exploration to be much higher than this figure, which in itself accounts for the growing frequency of reserve purchases by major companies in preference to acquiring them by more drilling. This gap should be narrowed considerably if percentage depletion is to perform its tax purpose of adequately recognizing the producer's depletion of capital holdings.

Further evidence that independent producers as a group are hit hardest by this proposal lies in the fact that they already experience a much lower percentage depletion rate than do large, integrated companies with foreign operations as a result of the 50 percent net income limitation. The Treasury Department's own survey shows that the larger companies with worldwide operations average far closer to the full 27½ percent in their depletion rate than does the industry as a whole. Obviously, then, the reason the total producing industry averages approximately 23 percent is that most independent producers average perhaps less than 20 percent in their effective rate.

There is applicable here an arithmetic rule which states that when total expenses of operating a property exceed 45 percent of its gross income, the effective percentage depletion rate is reduced below 27½ percent as the result of applying the 50 percent of net income limit. This means that generally high cost marginal operations do not receive the full depletion rate. Consequently, neither do the independent producers who, as reflected by a recent study of the interstate oil compact, historically wind up with such marginal operations with high per-barrel production costs.

Table 1 illustrates this problem with data applying to a typical independent producer in this association's membership, herein referred to as producer A.

TABLE 1.—*Actual percentage of allowable depletion experienced by producer A, 1961*

Total properties	145.0
Number marginal properties[1]	73
Total average depletion taken (all properties) (percent)	[2] 22.8
Weighted average depletion taken on six typical marginal properties (percent)	15.4

[1] Defined as properties with expenses equal to 45 percent or more of gross income.

[2] Compares with 22.7 percent in 1958, 21.4 percent in 1959, and 20.7 percent in 1960.

In 27 years of operation, producer A in any one year has never been able to take the full statutory depletion allowance of 27½ percent on all its properties. This is directly due to the 50-percent net income limit. Since he, like most independent producers, has a large number of properties subject to this limit, he will feel the full brunt of any proposal that in effect lowers further the net income limit. The administration's proposal assures that the independent producer will have to reduce his exploration activity because he has no other course.

In his own words producer A sums up his problem as follows:

"The marginal income properties can least afford to be burdened with additional expenses, yet they make up a very large share of mine and other independent operators oil and gas interests. It looks to us, then, that rather than correcting an inequity, the proposed treatment of intangibles creates two inequities.

"First, it results in less income for drilling and exploration and second, it provides for a disproportionate amount of increased taxes from marginal income properties. As a corollary to the second item, premature abandonment of marginal income properties could be triggered. This would be directly opposed to conservation principles."

Producer B provides another typical illustration of how vulnerable the independent producer is to application of the administration's first proposal. He operates over 700 leases, several of which are located in 40 waterflood (secondary recovery) projects. Effective statutory depletion on income from all leases, including royalty income, is 16.39 percent. Among the 39 waterflood projects with normal production characteristics, the depletion average was only 12.7 percent for the producer's fiscal year ended September 30, 1962.

Finally, data applying to producer C in table 2 below supports directly the contention that producers concentrated primarily in Texas and other domestic producing areas suffering from depressed production allowables are hit the hardest by the net income proposal. The more depressed production levels become, the lower the rate of depletion realized by the producer. This is due to the fact that operating and fixed expenses do not drop in proportion to decrease in production. In other words, it costs about the same to produce 8 days a month as it would to produce 10, 18, or 30 days. Consequently, 50 percent of net income drops lower and lower, causing reduction in allowable depletion. The administration's proposal aggravates this situation. Furthermore, it would apply to more properties—even those capable of high production and a better net income picture—than would be the case in producing areas that do not restrict production output.

TABLE 2.—*Amount of allowable depletion taken by producer C on approximately 70 leases, 1957–61*

Year	Gross income	Amount depletion taken	Percent of gross income
1957	$1,016,854	$247,354	24.3
1958	691,270	168,595	24.4
1959	821,868	196,094	23.9
1960	652,816	154,020	23.6
1961	472,125	95,403	20.2

As a result, the domestic producing industry in Texas and the other key producing States which are shouldering almost entirely the defense-vital burden of reserve producing capacity would be hardest hit by this proposal. At the same time, the very heart of the Nation's exploration effort, which is conducted mostly by independent producers, would be placed in serious jeopardy.

It is for these many reasons that this association respectfully opposes proposal No. 1 in the tax bill.

Proposal No. 2: Taxation of proceeds from mineral property sales

The administration's second proposal applying to the oil and gas industry would convert from capital gain to ordinary income that portion of the proceeds from sale of mineral property equivalent to depletion taken up to total cost and intangible drilling expense.

Our study shows that, as in proposal No. 1, it is the typical independent producer who would become the primary target of this change.

Historically, domestic independent producers are the wildcatters who have discovered some three-fourths of the Nation's oil. They customarily then sell their interests in new oil and gas discoveries, in order to finance their future exploration. The motivation for this method of operation is simple—they must have risk capital to search for "the big discovery." This they cannot do if their assets and credit at the bank are tied up in developing discovered fields.

In effect, therefore, independents are in the business of capital appreciation, constantly finding and providing new capital in the form of reserves. Even though this is recognized to be a vital process in the maintenance of domestic reserves, and even though it is in serious need today of further stimulation, proposal No. 2 threatens the most serious injury to the role of the independent wildcatter.

States Wallace W. Wilson, vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago and a previous witness before this committee:

"It is important to note that [this proposal] primarily would affect independent producers, since they constitute the principal sellers of oil and gas properties. [Operators] of this type are concerned principally with growth, and continuously reinvest the bulk of their available cash flow in exploration and the development of new properties. Their maximum potential gain is from the eventual sale of all or part of their developed production. Such sales normally are made after significant changes in opportunity, management, growth rate or economic health. The availability of a ready market for their producing properties provides a strong incentive for such companies to undertake programs involving substantial risk which, in the past, have added materially to this Nation's reserves and producing capacity. Any legislation which would hinder the ability of a producer to sell his assets on a basis consistent with present conditions will have far-reaching consequences deleterious to the industry as a whole."

Table 3 below illustrates a typical oil property sale by independent producers. The data indicates that this administration proposal would increase taxation of the sale by approximately 88 percent. This extra burden would guarantee a sharp reduction of such sales in the future, which in turn would further curtail exploration activity by independent producers, leading in turn to a decrease in future Government revenue.

The effect of this proposal would not be limited to reducing both future and present tax revenues, but it would also serve to further encourage mergers. Mergers, already at an alltime high, generally serve to narrow the competitive atmosphere of the domestic producing industry.

TABLE 3.—*Comparative computation of Federal income tax on sale of an oil or gas property under present rules and under the administration's proposal*

ASSUMED FACTS

Lease bonus	$16,000
Capitalized exploration cost	$4,000
Cost of the property	$20,000
Intangible drilling costs	$300,000
Equipment costs	$150,000
Depletion allowed to date of sale	$340,000
Depreciation allowed to date of sale	$125,000
Assumed effective rate of income tax on ordinary income (percent)	65
Selling price of property	$500,000

COMPUTATION OF TAX, PRESENT BASIS

	Equipment	Minerals	Total
Selling price	$75,000	$425,000	$500,000
Less cost basis	25,000		25,000
Total gain	50,000	425,000	475,000
Ordinary income items: Depreciation to date of sale	50,000		50,000
Capital gain		425,000	425,000
Tax on ordinary income at 65 percent	32,500		32,500
Tax on capital gains at 25 percent		106,250	106,250
Total tax on sale, present basis			138,750

COMPUTATION OF TAX, PROPOSED BASIS

	Equipment	Minerals	Total
Selling price	$75,000	$425,000	$500,000
Less cost basis	25,000		25,000
Total gain	50,000	425,000	475,000
Ordinary income items:			
Depreciation to date of sale	$50,000		$50,000
Intangible drilling costs previously deducted		$300,000	300,000
Depletion deducted to extent of basis		20,000	20,000
Total ordinary income	50,000	320,000	370,000
Balance, capital gain		105,000	105,000
Tax on ordinary income at 65 percent	32,500	208,000	240,500
Tax on capital gain at 19.5 percent (65 percent of 30 percent of gain)		20,475	20,475
Total tax on sale, proposed basis	32,500	228,475	260,975
Total tax, present basis			138,750
Total increase under President's proposed rules			122,225
Percent increase in tax liability			88.1

Proponents of the capital gain conversion measure have noted that this new burden could be avoided by the stock transfer method of sale. Easily negotiable securities, however, are a characteristic of large, incorporated companies. Independent producers are primarily organized as individuals or partnerships and, therefore, would have no opportunity to avail themselves of this solution.

Yet another problem in this proposal affecting independent producers directly and causing the possible loss of oil reserves is that its provisions proportionately hit hardest the sale of high cost, marginal properties. One typical independent producer member describes it this way:

"Major companies with marginal properties involving high overhead and operating expenses at present often sell them to independent operators rather than plug the wells and shut down the field. The small operators can, by drastic economies and hard work, afford to continue to produce such properties which provide additional barrels of oil that would otherwise never be recovered.

"Turning to the specific effect of this proposal on such sales, assume company X owns a lease with a leasehold cost of $100,000 which has been entirely recovered through depletion. Assume further that it had an intangible development cost of $1 million. The lease has dropped to marginal production of 300 to 500 barrels per month and is no longer profitable to company X to operate. If this property were sold under the provisions of this proposal, company X would probably have no cost left in either the leasehold or the equipment and the total consideration which it might receive would be ordinary income, and, therefore, subject to ordinary income tax rates.

"This could easily result in premature abandonment and the loss of reserves which might be otherwise recovered, since the recovery and use of the equipment might result in an economic gain to the producer over what he would have realized had he sold the property and paid ordinary income tax thereon. Therefore, the natural consequence in many cases would be for company X to plug the wells and abandon the lease. As a result, the final 5 percent or so of recoverable reserves remain forever lost."

While our testimony deals primarily to the four administration tax proposals applying directly to the oil and gas producing industry, we wish to point out the combined adverse effect of the capital gain and the estate/gift tax proposals on the independent producer. The latter proposal by the administration would tax at long-term capital gain rates the net gains accrued on capital assets at the time of transfer at death or by gift. This constitutes an original attempt to tax unrealized income, which independent producers estimate usually amounts to 90 percent of their holdings.

If the new estate tax were put in effect, most independent producers would have to liquidate their reserve holdings prior to death to prevent severe erosion of their estate. This forced sale, however, would confront the producer with the provisions of the capital gains proposal, and he would be caught in a squeeze. Either way, the independent producer would be severely penalized for being in the business of capital appreciation or, in other words, the exploration for new oil and gas reserves.

For these reasons, this association strongly opposes the administration's proposal to convert portions of proceeds from mineral property sales from capital gain to ordinary income. As is the case in proposal No. 1, this proposal would most seriously injure the independent producer and his capacity to explore for domestic oil and gas reserves. Because this provision, in its practical effect, would prove contrary to the stated objectives of the measure before you, we submit that it should be eliminated from any bill which precedes the comprehensive study recommended. We have no doubt that a responsible overall study will show that this proposal as offered is contrary to the objectives of preserving a defense-vital domestic oil and gas producing industry.

Proposal No. 3: Aggregation of properties for percentage depletion purposes

Having reviewed the administration's proposal to require oil and gas producers to maintain individual producing properties on a separate accounting basis for purposes of computing allowable depletion and finding that its membership would remain virtually unaffected, this association takes no stand for or against the proposal.

Proposal No. 4: Tax changes applying to oil and gas produced abroad by American companies

The administration's fourth proposal relates to changes in tax treatment accorded American companies with foreign production.

Inasmuch as this association represents only domestic independent producers, our study was limited to effects of the tax proposals on domestic operations. Our concern, therefore, is with the need to restore equity in U.S. tax policy as between foreign and domestic producers. Treasury Secretary Dillon has emphasized that these changes are proposed as a matter of equity for domestic producers, to make sure that excess deductions on foreign operations are not carried back to lower taxes by companies which operate both here and abroad.

President Kennedy, in an earlier budget message recognizing that inequality does currently exist, called for "revision of the tax treatment of foreign income to serve the overall objective of tax neutrality between domestic and foreign operations."

We believe that "tax neutrality between domestic and foreign operation" is not only logical but absolutely essential if the domestic independent is to preserve his role in the U.S. oil and gas producing industry.

Inasmuch as action to restore tax equality could take several forms, it is not our purpose here to evaluate these administration proposals in relation to that objective. Our studies indicate that tax equality could be substantially achieved by according domestic independent producers treatment similar to the foreign tax credit now accorded foreign operations of American companies—including for example a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for all income and production taxes paid to State governments, ad valorem and other taxes paid local authorities, and for overriding royalties. Such tax credits, in practical effect, would correspond to the current tax-credit interpretation given payments by American oil companies to foreign countries.

Consequently, we take no position respecting proposal No. 4 specifically, but we do most strongly support appropriate steps to achieve tax equality as between foreign and domestic production.

AMBASSADOR TELLES CONTINUES TO WIN ACCOLADES FOR GOOD WORK IN COSTA RICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the highly successful visit of President Kennedy to Central America continues to draw attention to the outstanding work in Costa Rica of Ambassador Raymond Telles, who was formerly mayor of the city of El Paso.

One newsman who was in Costa Rica, Robert E. Baskin, chief of the Washington bureau of the Dallas News, interviewed Ambassador Telles in Costa Rica while President Kennedy was there.

Ambassador Telles continues to reflect great credit not only on his country but on the Democratic administration that appointed him to this responsible post in which he so ably serves.

In his article, Mr. Baskin describes some of the work of Ambassador Telles in Costa Rica prior to the March gathering of seven Presidents.

Mr. Baskin wrote:

> "There was a picture of him in the paper the other day," an associate reports, "showing him wearing a serape and riding a horse in a rainstorm in the back country. He was just out to visit some more villagers."

As an example of how one American ambassador serves his country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Sunday, March 24, article by Mr. Baskin captioned "Kennedy's University Visit Triumph for Tireless Texan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 24, 1963]

Texan in Washington—Kennedy's University Visit Triumph for Tireless Texan

(By Robert E. Baskin)

Washington.—"Occasionally," President Kennedy said last week at the University of Costa Rica, "universities are regarded as dangerous places for presidents, and we are grateful to you for your warm welcome."

Kennedy was the first American President ever to address a Latin American student body, and at the Costa Rican university he was cheered enthusiastically.

In other lands it might have been different. Latin American universities also too often provide the spark for violence and revolution, and an American president might have been in grave danger before students of many of them.

The man who proposed that Kennedy appear at the University of Costa Rica was a 47-year-old Texan of Latin American descent who is generally conceded to be doing a splendid job as our Ambassador to that friendly Republic.

He is Raymond L. Telles, former mayor of El Paso, an unpretentious, friendly man whose popularity in Costa Rica has increased our longstanding friendship there.

Telles' proposal for the appearance at the university met some strong opposition, however. There were fears that it might be the one occasion on the President's visit where at least minor disorders might occur.

But Telles knew the Costa Ricans, and he realized that such an appearance would provide a model of good behavior to other universities in the hemisphere. He was insistent, the visit was arranged, and the reception was a great success.

Student leaders, in a dignified little ceremony, presented the President with a letter outlining their views on inter-American relations. It was a measured, thoughful document, devoid of emotionalism, and generally it supported the hemispheric policies of the United States. Kennedy received it with gratitude.

"I felt the visit was one of the most important things the President could do while he was here," Telles said just after seeing the President leave for home.

"The future leaders of this country will come from the university, and it was good for them to get to hear the President."

For Telles, the presidential visit meant lots of hard work, making preparations for the throng of people who poured into San Jose for the Central American Conference.

Things went off with few hitches, and the trip is clearly the most successful one the President has made abroad.

Telles, who speaks excellent Spanish, has made it his policy to get well acquainted with as many of the 1,300,000 Costa Ricans as he possibly can.

"I've been all over the country," he said, "and everyone has been friendly to me."

Associates say this is an understatement. The fact is, they say, that Telles has been in every nook and cranny of the republic and has received tumultuous cheers in many places.

"There was a picture of him in the paper the other day," an associate reports, "showing him wearing a serape and riding a horse in a rainstorm in the back country. He was just out to visit some more villagers."

Costa Rica has been in the forefront of hemisphere nations who demonstrate their friendship for the United States with deeds. Last fall Costa Rica led the way in the Organization of American States to set the stage for the American quarantine of Cuba.

Telles' job has been to maintain and improve the excellent relations between the two countries, and his role in San Jose is an important one to all Latin America.

His appointment—an American of Latin American descent assigned to a Latin American nation—was regarded in some State Department circles as an experiment. If it was an experiment, it has been successful one.

Telles was born in El Paso, September 5, 1915, and was graduated from International College in 1936 and attended Texas Western College in 1938.

He entered Government work in 1934, serving until 1941 as accountant with the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and again from 1947 to 1948 as an accountant.

In between, he enlisted in the Air Force in World War II and was named chief of Air Force lend-lease for Latin America. Later in the war he was on the special USAF mission to the Mexican air force.

Telles began his political career in 1948 when he was elected El Paso county clerk and held the office until 1957 when he won a race for mayor of El Paso, the job he held when he was named ambassador in 1961.

As an Air Force reservist, he keeps up his training, going down to Panama for Reserve schooling whenever he can break away from his ambassadorial duties.

Telles is married to the former Delfina Navarro and has two daughters, Cynthia Ann and Patricia Eugenia. The family has entered into Costa Rican life fully.

YOUNG OKLAHOMANS INTERESTED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, the Oklahoma Farmers Union is sponsoring trips to Washington and New York for several exceptional young Oklahomans interested in agriculture. These young people have won State recognition for service with their respective organizations and delivered their championship speeches at the Farmers Union national convention in New York.

These outstanding young Oklahomans will provide the leadership of tomorrow, and I would like to have the speeches of three of them inserted in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 4–H Clubs and the Community

(By Linda Kay Mittelstet, Aline, Okla.)

From the quiet villages of the old to the modern cities of the new, people—regardless of color, race, or creed—are striving to promote good community living.

Sharing responsibility for community improvement is 1 of the 10 guideposts in 4–H Club work.

The emblem of the 4–H Club is the four-leaf clover which has long been considered a symbol of good luck and achievement. On each leaf of the clover there is a white H. The 4–H pledge expresses objectives and explains the ideals of the 4–H movement. The pledge is: I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living for my club, my community, and my country.

Four–H Club members work under the guidance of agricultural extension workers and local volunteer leaders of the community. Programs are based on needs and interest related to the home and communities. Each 4–H Club member performs such activities as growing livestock and crops or food preparation, and sewing, using the newer and better methods developed by the agricultural colleges. Generally these practices are adopted by the parents, thereby strengthening the ties between the parents and child by mutual interest.

More and more, the 4–H Club program stresses good citizenship. Through special projects, 4–H members study problems and are accepting the responsibility of increasing their usefulness to the community. Boys and girls learn through their club how democracy works. Each club is run democratically and decisions are made by majority rule.

A club member is interested in school work, home life, and strives to be a good family member. Belonging to a family means that there are things we must do for others as well as having things done for us. The family is most important because it reflects the home. The community is made up of homes, so if we want to have a better community, each home must teach by example. As we share in community activities and responsibilities, we become interested in other organizations and we are not too selfish to work with other groups, because we realize the importance of teamwork.

The kind of community life we have depends upon the activities, ideals and beliefs of the people who live in the community. We also know that every community has needs that are vital to the welfare of the group. These needs may be physical, such as property; social needs, such as school; or family organizations, such as the Oklahoma Farmers Union.

Our 4–H pledge emphasizes participation in whatever the community needs. Examples of such activities are landscaping the grounds of city parks, mental health drives, installing road markers to guide and welcome tourists to farm community areas or historical landmarks.

The sincerity of the purpose of 4–H and its progress in building character and citizenship points very definitely to the influence of 4-H training and its contribution to good community living.

To help lift the burden,
Point the better way,
Give vision to toil
And the hope of a better day.
To teach the larger life,
Encourage a soul
To still greater tasks,
A still higher goal;
To look beyond the plow,
Teach a man's full part
In community and town,
In assembly and mart,
Club work is training
Of greatest value, when
Its goal of achievement
Is the inspiration—The making of men.

MY ORGANIZATION, THE FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA, AND HOW IT PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

(By Myron L. Semrad, Waukomis, Okla.)

"I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us through the struggle of former years."

I have just quoted to you from our FFA creed; a creed that each member subscribes to when he starts his FFA work. As you can see, we are not a group of young men living in the past, but with our eyes to the future as indicated by our FFA motto, and I quote:

"Learning To Do,
Doing To Learn,
Earning To Live,
Living To Serve."

These four short lines express the desire of each FFA members to learn more about his vocation, responsibility, and citizenship. We, as young leaders of tomorrow, realize that all these are essential in this day of sputniks and intercontinental missiles.

Just how, you might ask, does the FFA promote good community living? There are many ways that my organization promotes good community living.

First, let me show you the close relationship between the efforts of the FFA and the Farmers Union. Our organization was formed in the year 1928 to fill the need of a group of young farm boys. Let me repeat, to fill the need of a group of young farm boys, just as the Farmers Union was organized to promote good community living. So from the very beginning we feel that we have something in common with your organization.

Now, I would like to discuss with you the efforts of the FFA in promoting good community living.

Last year I was fortunate enough to be a member of the first place FFA stubble mulch judging team which represented my school in Waukomis, Okla. I participated in the stubble mulch program again this year. Through this program, we FFA members are learning better ways to conserve the soil. These new and highly improved soil conservation programs are the steppingstones of good community living.

Just think for a moment. Where would we be without the educated farmer? The answer is, we could not exist. How could we, without food? Therefore, the better conservation practices we present, the better our communities will be.

The very purpose of our FFA program of work each year, to develop cooperation, leadership, knowledge, and recreational activities, is the foundation for good community living. You members of the Farmers Union who have lived in your home communities for many years know the value of all these qualities I have just mentioned.

A new menace to the development of good community living is the fact that many of our prospective farm leaders of tomorrow are being lured away from a career in agriculture. This has been brought about by the glamorous role that has been developed around the field of science. We feel that this movement can be carried to such landslide proportions that the loss in this leadership may result in a serious setback for agriculture.

I cannot help but wonder what kind of world will I be living in 10 years from now? What will my home, farm, and community be, my job and my family? Will I have a place in this world of spaceships and missiles?

We, the Future Farmers of America, have been given a great challenge. We must meet this challenge if we are to preserve good community living and the security and happiness it stands for.

In conclusion, my friends, let us never forget that we, the Future Farmers of America, are considered the breadbasket of the world. Nations will look to us for leadership and food. Let us never forget the value of community life in this scientific age. Trips to the moon may be commonplace in a few years. Satellites will continue to circle our globe. But, community life must be preserved.

Yes, I am very proud, and feel that I have high standards to uphold when I don the blue and gold jacket of the FFA.

Let us seek divine guidance and knowledge, as we join hands with the Farmers Union to promote and preserve our American way of community living.

HOW THE RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES PROMOTE GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

(By Dan Butler, Drummond, Okla.)

Let us go back 100 years ago. A candle is burning. That candle grows brighter and brighter. Look again. You see that this candle is a kerosene lamp. A lamp like many of our parents and grandparents grew up with, and that light grows brighter. And, as you look once more into time you see Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is 1933. Roosevelt is creating the Rural Electrification Administration to serve the farmers of this Nation. Now that lamp changes into a socket, a socket with a light bulb. But that light is dim for you see only 10 percent of the Nation's farmers have electricity. The cost is prohibitive.

Thus, with the signing of that executive order, the Rural Electrification Cooperatives, one of the greatest do-it-yourself programs in the history of the world, is started.

Our farmers help stretch those electric lines across our Nation. And today that light bulb glows brighter for now 95 percent of our farmers have electricity.

Who own these electric cooperatives? Is it a Government agency? These and many similar questions are asked daily.

In answer to these questions I reply, first, that the people who purchase electricity own the cooperatives. And, to the second; no, it is not a Government agency but the purest form of democratic free enterprise.

While the cooperative board of directors has borrowed thousands of dollars from the REA to provide you with good electric service, they have to pay it back with interest.

Imagine, if you can, what life would be like today without electricity. Imagine a world without refrigerators, radio, television, food mixers, and the hundreds of other electric items around the home.

Imagine, also, trying to perform the numerous farm chores without the help of electric water pumps, bunk feeders, welders, or grinders—just to mention a few. Practically every phase of farming is affected by electricity. It works in a thousand and one different ways to make your life easier and more enjoyable.

Electricity is beginning to cut farm labor costs. But the surface is barely scratched. New processes, equipment, and techniques need to be developed to reduce labor requirements and improve the quality of farm products.

When this is done, consumers as well as farmers will benefit. Modern agriculture will then be able to hold or reduce consumer costs of food and fiber and give extra quality as a bonus.

The Farmers Union organization has been one of the strongest supporters of the rural electrification program, and it is through their political help as well as their work with the farmers that the REC has made such tremendous progress during the last 28 years.

First a candle, then a lamp, now a light bulb. But look again. That light has become a torch. A torch of liberty.

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, 1 month ago last Tuesday the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, opened its hearing on the controversial TFX plane contract award. For a time the legitimate aims of this inquiry were in danger of being lost in a sea of mutual recriminations. This week, however, there has been a healthy change in attitude on the part of all concerned, and I am certain that the inquiry will move ahead with dispatch under able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee, Senator McCLELLAN.

I call to my colleagues' attention the excellent article in this issue by the respected columnist Max Freedman, which appeared in the February 27 issue of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

(By Max Freedman)

It is a strange sensation to move from the charges and accusations that have rolled through the press, in the dispute over the TFX contract, to the actual hearings of the Senate Investigating Committee.

As one studies the records of the hearings, it becomes very clear that the bitterness and anger which have marked this inquiry have greatly surprised the committee.

Nor can any observer, with no personal stake in this controversy, avoid the conclusion that the gage of battle was flung down by the Defense Department.

In the end Mr. McNamara may convince everyone that his decision is fully justified. But the merits of his case do not excuse the way it has been presented to the public. In its various public statements the Defense Department has been fretful, inconsistent, and provocative. It was not until it was stung that the committee struck back in self-defense. No one familiar with congressional committees could have expected it to do anything else.

There seems to be a general public impression that the committee is trying to discredit or destroy Mr. McNamara's usefulness as Defense Secretary. Those who hold this view would find it very hard indeed to point to a single sentence in the published record to justify such a charge against the committee.

In fact Senator McCLELLAN spoke for the whole committee when he said the final report might well be a complete endorsement of Mr. McNamara's judgment in awarding the contract to General Dynamics instead of to Boeing.

At one point in his testimony Mr. Gilpatric, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, said "we were not misled, we were not entrapped, and we have no complaint in any sense over the conduct of this proceeding by the committee." Still later, in reply to Senator CURTIS' question, Mr. Gilpatric agreed that the committee had never called even one witness who could be described as a critic of Mr. McNamara.

Nor is there very much substance to the charge that Mr. McNamara's authority as civilian head of the Defense Department has been challenged and compromised. No one on the committee, or in Congress for that matter, questions the principle of civilian control.

On this particular point in the controversy Mr. Gilpatric has testified in these words: "I do not believe that this issue is a civilian-military issue.

"I don't think this is a question where the civilian authorities in the Pentagon and in the Department of Defense are at odds with the military. There were certain facets where we don't agree but it is not a civilian-military issue and therefore there isn't any basis for criticism of Mr. McNamara by the military in my judgment."

In the four evaluations which preceded Mr. McNamara's decision a total of 275,000 man-hours had been spent on the two proposals. These evaluations resulted in a clear and repeated preference for Boeing. Mr. McNamara reversed these recommendations for what seemed to him to be emphatic and sufficient reasons. Now he is explaining and defending that decision before a committee of the Senate that has been empowered to conduct such investigations. It should be added that on the evidence thus far the committee has learned that General Dynamics, which gained the contract, was given the preference by the Air Force on only three "performance criteria" while Boeing had the preference on 16 or 17 items. The committee has been unfairly criticized for an arbitrary interference with the Defense Department.

It would indeed have been open to censure if it had failed to start an investigation once these facts came to its notice.

Above all, it should always be remembered that many witnesses have yet to be heard, with some of the evidence dealing with classified matters. The best thing is to drop the invective on all sides and let the inquiry proceed fairly and fearlessly.

CITATIONS PRESENTED TO MAY CRAIG AND DON LARRABEE BY AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 13, the American Legion delegation from Maine presented citations for outstanding service to two veteran Maine journalists, May Craig who represents the Gannett papers of Maine, and Donald Larrabee, Washington correspondent of the Bangor Daily News.

I concur fully with the Legion's judgment that Mrs. Craig and Mr. Larrabee have made significant contributions in interpreting Washington events for the citizens of Maine clearly and factually.

Their job is difficult. They must cover all three branches of the Federal Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. But, they know Washington. They have had many years of experience. They know how to develop facts, how to write informative stories. Moreover, their reports are always fair and accurate. They do their job competently without either favoritism or prejudice.

I take pleasure in calling the attention of my colleagues to the Maine Legion's citations commending these two dedicated Maine journalists.

I ask unanimous consent that the two citations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION TO DON LARRABEE FROM MAINE AMERICAN LEGION AT THE STATLER HOTEL, MARCH 13, 1963

The American Legion to Don Larrabee in grateful appreciation and recognition for his outstanding service in the field of journalism, this citation is awarded this 13th day of March, 1963, in Washington, D.C.

W. J. ROGERS,
National Executive Committeeman.
JAMES L. BOYLE,
Department Adjutant,
Department of Maine.
BERTRAND LAGUEUX,
Department Commander,
Department of Maine.

CITATION TO MAY CRAIG FROM MAINE AMERICAN LEGION AT THE STATLER HOTEL, MARCH 13, 1963

The American Legion to May Craig in grateful appreciation and recognition for her outstanding service in the field of journalism, this citation is awarded this 13th day of March, 1963, in Washington, D.C.

W. J. ROGERS,
National Executive Committeeman.
JAMES L. BOYLE,
Department Adjutant,
Department of Maine.
BERTRAND LAGUEUX,
Department Commander,
Department of Maine.

COMMUNITY COOPERATION IN OLEAN, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the city of Olean, N.Y., is fast becoming a symbol, in my State, for community cooperation. Because a group of citizens in Olean are determined to meet and overcome the challenge presented by decreasing job opportunities, they have banded together, at great personal sacrifice, to save an industry in their city.

Six weeks ago, the management of the Fibre Forming Co., in Olean announced a financial crisis and an inability to meet the payroll due at the end of the week. The 120 employees of the company were informed of this disheartening situation and presented with a plan to defer their pay envelopes temporarily. No one was laid off. The choice of whether or not to leave was left up to the individual workers themselves. Their response was anything but disheartening.

Only 5 of the 120 men and women left the company to look for other employment or to collect unemployment insurance. Fully 115 decided to stay on, virtually without pay, working to save their jobs and to keep this industry in Olean.

According to Robert W. Easley, president of local 22 of the American Federation of Grain Millers, the response has been overwhelming. Newspapers from all over America, from Sweden, Turkey, France, and Barbados carried the story. Employees painted their philosophy in large white letters on the outside wall of the factory. "We won't quit," they told the world. "Olean can't afford to let another plant close."

For 6 weeks they have held on to keep the company going. Although weekly cash receipts are divided up among the workers, this payment has averaged only about $15 a week—hardly even enough to get to work. The Grain Millers Union, which has organized the plant, is cooperating fully in the endeavor, and has declared a moratorium on dues and induction fees. Mr. Easley has devoted 10 weeks without pay to this plant because he and other members of the local have been so pleased by the fine labor-management relations which have always existed there. "This company," said Mr. Easley, "has the best ethnic principles of any company I know. Each man is hired and promoted without regard to his race, creed, or color, and we want to see this continue."

Although, as weeks have elapsed, some workers have been forced, because of family responsibilities, to leave the plant and apply for assistance or other jobs, dozens have remained. They are living on their savings and on hope—hope that loyalty, determination, and the American spirit of cooperation in time of trouble will pull them through. I salute these fine men and women of Olean, and assure them that all America admires their action and shares their hope.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleague in what he has said about the company at Olean, N.Y., Mr. Easley, who has been an absolutely remarkable union leader in that regard, the town, the town people, and the managers of this company, which has been a model for small business in the United States in its intrepidity and determination to drive hard for a constructive economic measure for Olean. I have been there. I have seen the plant. I have seen the workers. I have addressed them, as I am sure my colleague [Mr. KEATING] has. This action is a great source of gratification to me, as it is to my colleague.

We extend to them not only our felicitations for their tremendous courage, but our help and cooperation, which we have already given, and which I know we will give in any measure that is humanly possible to help in such fine determination as they have shown.

RESPONSE OF NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD TO CUBAN CRISIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the midst of continuing tensions in the Caribbean area, it is noteworthy, I think, to point out that the measures taken by the U.S. Government to alert our military forces to the exigencies of the situation have had their counterpart in equally swift and decisive actions taken by civilian agencies which support our Armed Forces.

I refer specifically to those agencies which deal with the welfare of men and women in uniform, and the additional pressures which the Cuban crisis has put on their programs. A report delivered to me from the National Jewish Welfare Board is typical of the way on which these organizations have rallied to the service of soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who were redeployed to various areas of the country as the crisis developed. The National Jewish Welfare Board is the government-authorized agency for religious and morale services to Jewish personnel in our Armed Forces and their dependents, and it recruits, endorses, and serves Jewish Chaplains for the Military Establishment. It conducts a vast recreation and cultural leisure-time program for servicemen and their families and is a member of United Service Organizations, Inc.—USO. It also serves people of all ages in the civilian community as the national association of YM-YWHA's and Jewish Community Centers.

With the announcement by the President of the naval and air quarantine of Cuba, the National Jewish Welfare Board took a series of steps designed to ease the problems of servicemen and their dependents who were affected by the sudden shifting of military forces. The organization made an on-the-spot study of Jewish communities in the Southeastern United States to determine what local facilities were available to those coming into the area. The organization's affiliated Jewish Community Centers and other institutions such as synagogues were briefed on the possible needs which would arise.

The National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy contacted all civilian rabbis in the area who serve as auxiliary Jewish chaplains, outlining the probable additional religious and morale activities which would be required.

The organization's director in Balboa, Canal Zone, made a swing around Jewish communities in the Caribbean where the National Jewish Welfare Board has religious and morale programs for the military, to strengthen the potential in these communities.

Emergency services were supplied, including the finding of housing and other necessities, for families of Navy and Marine Corps personnel hurriedly evacuated by air from Guantanamo Bay on the eve of the announcement of the quarantine.

This reaction to a national need is nothing new in the history of the National Jewish Welfare Board, which was established early during World War I at the request of our Government for just this kind of service. Through two World Wars, Korea, and similar crises, this organization has established a memorable tradition for rising to emergency situations and for day-by-day constructive activity on behalf of the young men and women in our Armed Forces.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WELFARE SITUATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us who have a deep concern for the District of Columbia are aware of its many problems and interested in working to solve them. Crime, discrimination, and unemployment loom large in the distressing picture. As a member of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have had firsthand knowledge in these areas, and know that many improvements can be made. I have, for example, recently cosponsored a bill offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to provide fair employment legislation for the District. I intend to join in pressing for early enactment of that bill since I believe it is a meaningful first step in helping District residents to help themselves.

No one would deny, however, that one of the primary manifestations of Washington's malaise is the situation existing in the field of public welfare. A subject of continuing concern among experts is how to prevent a permanent welfare class. No one would abandon those who require the assistance of the community to meet their basic needs. At the same time there is a growing feeling that welfare aid in the District has not been administered in a manner which helps its beneficiaries to become self-sufficient. A permanent welfare class is not in keeping with human dignity or the traditions of our society. We must help those in need, but we must help them in a way which aids and encourages them to reconstruct their lives so they may become self-sufficient and self-supporting.

This problem is the subject of a recent comprehensive report prepared by the Public Welfare Crisis Committee of the Washington chapter, National Association of Social Workers under the direction of Dr. Daniel Thursz of Catholic University. I know that other Members of this body will be interested in the study since we are, in effect, the City Council of the District of Columbia, charged with governing a voteless citizenry. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, a summary of the committee's recommendations and an editorial from the Washington Post dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON CHAPTER, SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Public Welfare Crisis Committee, on behalf of the Metropolitan Washington Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, recommends:

(a) Assistance grants: A complete upward revision of the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare budget, based on current cost-of-living indexes, with a built-in clause to allow for increasing the total grant when there is a rise in the cost of living.

Elimination of the reduced allowance clause for families with four or more children. Since the grant schedules are too low to begin with, we see no need to cut them further.

Development of a program for emergency counseling and relief to take care of temporary situations of financial stress.

(b) The employable mother: A revision in the regulations so that each mother will have the right to determine whether the welfare of her children will best be served by her remaining at home or by taking employment. The mother who remains at home to give care to her children needs also to feel that she is a worthwhile citizen.

Regulations that facilitate temporary, part-time, or even full-time employment, but the initiative should come from the mother. In some cases, mothers will be able to assume limited employment. This initiative should be encouraged rather than penalized by reduction in grants. Coverage for costs due to employment should be allowed, including expenses for the care of children.

School age should not be regarded as a stage in development that frees a child from the need of parental control. Older children, including adolescents, require supervision—not in the same fashion, but to the same extent—as preschool children.

A revision of the regulations so as to emphasize the right of a child to his own parents in his own home. We believe that all resources of the community should be used to make this possible. Only as the parents themselves feel incompetent or the court finds them so, should placement away from home be considered a desirable plan for any child.

A completely new public assistance statement about the employability of mothers is needed. The basic philosophy on which the current regulations were made needs close reexamination. Current costs of adequate financial help should be measured against the potential cost to the community if adequate services are not provided now.

(c) The man-in-the-house rule: The abandonment of the 34 special eligibility factors which determine whether a man has a continuing relationship with a woman and her children. The presence or absence of the man, other than the legal husband, should not be a consideration in establishing eligibility for aid to dependent children. Rather, the important factor should be whether or not a family is able to meet its needs as determined by the public assistance budget.

When it is established that "the mother has a continuing association with a man, similar to that of husband and wife"—that the Department of Public Welfare provide financial grants to those of the mother's children who are not being supported by their natural fathers and who are not the children of the man in the house, unless he is willing and able to support them. The nonhusband living continuously as the family head should be responsible for the support of the mother and his children by her. The legal requirement that an absent father continue to have financial responsibility for his own children should be enforced.

To determine if the male head of the house is able to support the family, the Department of Public Welfare investigate and see how much he can earn and contribute with regularity. If it is determined that he is not able to provide full support for his children, then the Department should supplement the family's income to make it compatible with the aid to dependent children standard living scale.

That all financial resources of the family on public assistance be investigated periodically by the Department.

That the Department continuously ask for verification of the man's employment status. The Department has the right to expect the man to make all attempts to secure employment.

(d) Implementation of the national program in the District of Columbia: [A review of selected 1962 public welfare amendments affecting the administration of the aid to families of dependent children program has shown that the District of Columbia has not taken advantage of several provisions of Federal legislation which would be beneficial to the District and would strengthen the aid to dependent children program. For most of the changes in the Federal law, the District of Columbia already has the legal authority necessary to make them a part of the District's Public Assistance Program, and the Department of Public Welfare could put them into effect by administrative action.]

The following programs could be implemented by administrative action:

Extend the aid to dependent children program to children who are deprived of parental support and care because of the unemployment of a parent.

Extend social services to all aid to dependent children families by decreasing caseloads to the maximum of 60 recommended by the Federal Government, and by developing a program that would make possible frequent home visits and the working out of a case plan for each child that would give consideration to the family's needs in such aspects of life as health, housing, child care, management of limited funds, job training, education, etc. To be eligible for the 75 percent Federal financial participation, the Welfare Department must provide this minimum package of services by July 1, 1963.

Help to better prepare its staff to provide the social services described in the preceding recommendation through an organized program of in-service training and enabling staff to get the necessary technical and professional education while on educational leave from the agency. If plans for an organized training program are developed by July 1, 1963, the Welfare Department will be eligible for 75 percent Federal financial participation for the program.

Continue assistance under the aid to dependent children program to children who are removed from their homes by the courts because of the unsuitability of the home. This assistance could continue if children are placed in a foster home or in certain licensed, nonprofit, child-caring institutions.

Plan a program to provide day care for children who are not able to be under parental supervision during the day or for part of the day. With such a plan the District will be able to apply for Federal funds under the child welfare grant program. Funds are expected to be made available as part of a supplemental appropriation of Congress this year and the Welfare Department does not need further legislation to take advantage of this provision.

[The following recommendation would require congressional action to make it possible for the District to participate]: It is recommended that Congress give the District of Columbia legal authority to institute a community work and training program designed to increase the work skills of unemployed parents and to prepare children over 18 years of age in aid-to-dependent-children families for gainful employment.

(c) Staff and other services: Every Public Assistance Division worker be given a formal period of in-service training and orientation in a unit staffed by professional people. This course of study should be geared to instruct the workers in concepts of services to clients based on sound social work principles. While the committee feels that every Public Assistance Division worker would be best equipped to handle his difficult and complex job by acquiring a master's degree in social work, it recognizes that this is neither feasible nor practical at this stage.

Every effort be made by the Department to take advantage of available Federal funds to provide for the further training of workers in schools of social work so that the Department will have a larger number of workers with the master's degree in social work.

The agency develop differentiation in salaries and job responsibilities based on education and experience in order to provide workers with further incentives to additional learning.

The Department of Public Welfare and the schools of social work in the Washington area consider the development of courses and institutes specifically designed for the welfare worker during summers or evenings when workers may participate.

The National Association of Social Workers explores ways by which it can be useful in helping the welfare worker who does not have professional training become more closely aware of the profession's goals and principles.

(e) Staff and other services—Division of responsibilities: That the most qualified staff be assigned to intake services. We wish to emphasize the crucial nature of the intake service where the client for the first time meets a reaction to his request for aid. Here are needed the best trained and most experienced staff members whose jobs must include the following: (i) provide help to clients to secure the necessary documentation to determine eligibility; (ii) refer ineligible clients to alternative community resources; (iii) assign accepted clients to appropriate unit with continued care section.

That the caseload be reviewed in the continued care section in order to select special kinds of cases for intensive casework services and that these special cases be handled by the most qualified workers. The newer workers could begin with those clients needing a minimum of help in maintaining themselves and solving their problems.

That all supervisors in the Public Assistance Division should have professional training.

That investigators be used at the request of and be responsible to the caseworker when the caseworker sees the need for this type of help in determining certain kinds of facts. The committee cannot emphasize too strongly that investigators cannot in any way perform the rehabilitative function of the social workers. When caseloads are reduced to meet the standards of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and when the staff is training either in schools of social work or in programs within the Department, then fraud can be reduced.

The committee believes that the experience of other cities has proven the usefulness of other skills and disciplines to the client. These should include social group work, community organization, day care specialists, family planners, home economists, etc.

That the Department assume the responsibility to provide literacy and vocational training and guidance to the head of the household to enable him to become self-supporting, and a constructive example to his children.

(e) Staff and other services—Organization of the Department: the committee recommends the following steps to improve both the efficiency of the total agency and its rehabilitative function:

Integration of the categories of public assistance and child welfare so that one worker would be responsible for one family, its financial needs, and its related problems. This integration would assist in providing professional leadership for the Public Assistance Division.

Decentralization of the Department into small neighborhood units so that the worker would have his office in the area where his client lives. With this kind of opportunity to know his family, his way of life, the worker would better understand his needs. The present facilities used by the Department are totally inadequate for this type of service.

Limit the amount of administrative detail now handled by the welfare workers and increase the use of machines so that the workers can be released for the tasks for which they have been hired.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

THE 46 SCANDALS

The great strength of the Crisis Committee's report on the Welfare Department lies in its collection of the stories of 46 families that this city abandoned to hunger because they could not meet the departmental regulations. It is a portrait drawn from life.

Here we have the mother of two small children who is denied relief as employable under a definition that shrugs off the impossibility of finding a job for her, or of finding care during the day for the children. The committee comments: "Whim rather than welfare can readily dictate the fate of children in a public assistance family, so long as the current policy is used as a base for practice."

Here we find the mother who was cut off relief because her landlord was a bachelor. Here also is the mother of 11 children who lost her relief because an adolescent daughter had an illegitimate baby. They were both victims of the man-in-the-house rule. That will be remembered as the rule permitting a mother on relief to have any number of affairs as long as they are kept completely transient, but prohibiting her from living with her husband. That rule has already generated an accumulation of degradation and misery for which this city will be doing penance for decades to come, but a morally careless city continues to enforce it.

The Crisis Committee was established by the local chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, under Dr. Thursz, of Catholic University, and provides a more professional analysis of the Department's errors than we have previously seen. It provides a deeply disquieting view into the Department itself. First among the causes of staff inefficiency and turnover, it cites the departmental policies that require case workers "to administer restrictive and unjust regulations, and to award below-minimum grants to clients, causing clients to enter into illicit ways of supplementing grants and concealing facts about the family situation." Last summer Senator BYRD of West Virginia ordered the Department to reduce its relief rolls by eliminating the very large number of cases there by fraud. Since the Department's staff is neither large enough nor experienced enough to weed out the illegal recipients, it is reducing the rolls by seizing any excuse, no matter how trivial, to deny help to impoverished families. "At this point," the Crisis Committee states, "the job is seen more as trying to see who should not receive assistance rather than seeing how it is possible to help those who need it. There is a 70-percent rejection rate here as opposed to 30 percent nationwide."

The Crisis Committee has accomplished the salutary purpose of prodding the city's conscience. The question is whether the city's conscience has not grown so flabby, by lack of exercise, that even these 46 cases of scandal can no longer rouse it from its normaly recumbent position.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ALLOTMENT AND RESTORATION OF COTTON TO FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for too many years now, the American cotton producers and the American cotton textile manufacturers have been suffering under the handicap of a ruinous two-price system for cotton that is threatening to destroy an important segment of our national economy.

Our cotton textile industry—in the mills and on the farms—cannot much longer endure unless the Congress takes action to restore American cotton and American textiles to a competitive position in the marketplace of the world.

It is for this reason that I am today introducing new and badly needed legislation that will end this iniquitous two-price system—that will remove acreage restrictions from the cotton farmer—reduce costly warehouse surpluses—and enable our domestic mills once again to buy our own cotton as cheap as we sell it to foreign mills.

The bill, entitled the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act," is designed to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of the consumers and of those engaged and employed in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and to encourage the exportation of cotton.

My purpose is to strike the shackles of acreage controls from the American cotton farmer, to free him to sell his product on a world market that can seek its own levels under the law of supply and demand, and yet to give him the protection of price support on the cotton grown for domestic consumption.

My purpose is to wipe out the 8½ cents a pound premium, the $42.50 a bale price differential American mills are forced to pay for American cotton over and above the price paid for American cotton by foreign mills.

This intolerable situation cries out for a remedy while the textile mills and the cotton farmers of the United States struggle for survival in a fierce world trade competition in which our own rules work against our own people.

Under the two-price system, American mills must pay 8½ cents a pound more for cotton than buyers overseas. This price differential for raw cotton, plus the advantage of cheap labor in foreign mills, is rapidly pricing the American cotton textile industry out of business.

With overseas mills able to buy cotton at $42.50 a bale less than American mills pay, the advantage is obvious. They are able to send their products into our markets and displace products made in the United States from American cotton.

Japanese and other foreign manufacturers have been able to turn U.S. cotton into textiles, ship them back to the United States, pay the tariff, and undersell American textiles.

Inevitably, the loss of a market for domestically made cotton textile products results in a loss of a market for American-grown cotton.

The cotton farmer suffers, the textile mill suffers, the textile worker suffers, and the Nation's economy suffers.

Already we see the disastrous results of this unjust, senseless situation. Imports of cotton products into this country have doubled since 1958, despite agreements negotiated with Japan and some other countries to restrain their textile shipments to the United States.

Hundreds of American mills have shut down, throwing thousands of workers out of jobs. Many other mills who have managed to stay in operation are turning more and more to the use of synthetic fibers.

Textile jobs in this country have fallen from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to less than 840,000 last year.

In those mills which are still operating, the production of rayon and other manmade fibers has substantially increased under prices highly attractive in relation to the price of cotton.

Another result is that cotton surpluses are piling up in the warehouses. In spite of a national 1962 acreage allotment of 400,000 acres lower than 1961, a larger crop was produced, and the carryover next August will be up by about 2 million bales.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's cotton inventory went from $245 million at the end of 1961 to $811 million at the end of 1962. In addition, $706 million in cotton was under loan on December 31, 1962.

If no action is taken soon, some farm officials fear the stocks acquired under the price support program may rise to more than 8 million bales at the end of the marketing year, August 1, up from 4.7 million a year earlier.

This is what happens when the domestic manufacturers step up the use of manmade fibers, and foreign fabric makers buy larger and larger quantities of lower priced cotton produced in Africa and Asia.

What does this unhappy situation mean to the cotton farmers in this country? It means that under the national acreage allocation now in effect, which is the lowest ever established pursuant to the 1938 act, gross cotton returns to farmers are expected to be some $175 million less than those for the 1962 crop.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 2 million cotton producers in the United States on 1.5 million farms. Today the number of producers receiving cotton allotments is down to about 900,000; and we expect cotton to be planted this year on not more than 650,000 farms.

In an attempt to help the ailing cotton-textile industry, the Secretary of Agriculture requested the Tariff Commission to seek a solution to the problem, through the imposition of an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on the cotton content of textile imports, to offset the 8½-cent export subsidy.

The Tariff Commission rejected this proposal, however; and the inequitable two-price system continues to be a heavy burden upon the American textile industry.

One proposal has been to make payments to the American mills or cotton handlers in an amount sufficient to offset the 8½ cents a pound export subsidy. But for a long-range program this is not the answer, because it would add to the costs of the already burdened American taxpayer. Each 1-cent per pound payment would cost the Treasury another $45 million a year. Even the mills, themselves, do not seek it.

There is great merit in what William H. Ruffin, of Durham, N.C., president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, said recently when he declared:

> We ask only that American mills be enabled to buy American cotton at the same price paid by our foreign competitors. We have never sought a Government subsidy. We do not seek one now.
>
> A Government-created injustice exists, and its continuance is doing great harm to almost 2 million Americans who are employed by the textile and apparel industries, to cotton farmers, and to consumers.
>
> The injustice is the 8½ cents a pound difference between what American mills and foreign mills pay for U.S. cotton. This injustice cannot be remedied by halfway measures.

Mr. President, I concur in the sentiments expressed by the president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute; and in the legislation I propose, this injustice will be remedied.

In order to help the American cotton farmer, the textile worker, the mill owner, the merchant, the consumer, and the taxpayer—in short, the national economy—I shall propose what I believe to be legislation best suited for our cotton industry from farm to mill to store to customer.

Mr. President, for many years—as a farmer, as Governor of my State, as a Member of this body, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture—I have given the problems of cotton long and serious study.

It is my carefully considered judgment that the plan I shall propose is the program that will work best for all. I welcome my colleagues' support for it, and I welcome the support of all segments of the cotton industry.

Before going into details of the bill, I should like to give my colleagues some of the history and the background of the acreage controls which I seek to eliminate with this legislation, and the reasons such action is needed.

Cotton acreage controls were first imposed on the 1938 crop, and were continued for each crop through 1943. Allotments were suspended during the war and postwar years until the 1950 crop, when they were imposed again. The 1951, 1952, and 1953 crops were free of allotments. Beginning with the 1954 crop, acreage controls have been imposed on each crop up to the present. Thus, in this period of 25 years, acreage controls were applied to 16 crops of cotton.

The national allotments have varied all the way from 16 million acres, as presently in effect, to more than 26 million acres. This is a spread of some 10 million acres. The changes in the national allotment vary from one crop to another. Some of them have been very sharp changes, and are highly frustrating to farmers. Many farmers cannot soundly plan their crops until very late in the planting season until they know what their allotments will finally be after reapportionment of released allotments. The investment which farmers have in machinery, labor, and other expenses necessary to the production of a cotton crop is tremendous.

The farmers are entitled to a program that is more stable than has been the acreage-allotment program. They should have freer latitude in using their investments than is provided under acreage controls.

Under the acreage-allotment plan, we have seen the carryover of cotton reach a record high of 14.5 million bales. This record high was reached on August 1,

1956. A number of legislative and administrative piecemeal programs have been put into effect, in a desperate attempt to keep supplies in line with offtake. These, we well know, have been very expensive operations.

We strongly believe that if farmers are provided a program such as that contained in the bill I am introducing today, cotton producers can do a much better job of planning their operations from year to year, and better cultural methods will be employed to reduce production costs. The quality of our product will be improved.

In recent years, and again this year, I have introduced general farm legislation based on the principles of letting the farmer farm and taking the Government out of the business of buying, transporting, storing, and selling farm commodities. Under the present program the Government actually acts as a pawnbroker who deals in farm commodities.

The cotton bill which I am introducing today would eliminate acreage control and, instead, would assign to each farmer a farm domestic allotment expressed in terms of pounds or bales of cotton. Such allotment would represent the farm's fair share of estimated domestic consumption requirements. The bill would enable the Secretary to carry out a program under which the farmer would be permitted to market all of the cotton he produced and receive payments in cash or in kind for the cotton marketed within his domestic allotment. The payment would be equal to the difference between the price he received for such cotton and a percent of parity, determined by the Secretary, within ranges which would run from 70 to 90 percent of parity, and would vary according to the quantity of cotton marketed.

But the farmer would be free to produce and sell as much as he pleased, over and above his domestic quota, at world prices.

The ills and problems of cotton are so unique as to require separate legislation based on the same broad principle of my general farm legislation.

Such an approach for cotton, as well as for other commodities, would be simple and eliminate much redtape. It would eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls. For example, the need for measuring the acreage of cotton on almost three-quarters of a million farms would be eliminated. Also, each farmer would no longer be required to carry a marketing card for use in identification of his own cotton.

Such an approach would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases and to whom he pleases. It would lead to the elimination of surpluses that glut the markets and stagnate the economy.

Such an approach would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American cotton, both raw and processed, back on the world markets at competitive prices. In short, it would restore cotton to the free enterprise system.

Yet, it would give the farmers protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and right to collective bargaining, and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

Such an approach would mark a new and fresh start, which would release cotton from the bonds of past mistakes and abortive laws.

Here then, Mr. President, is this new approach that I propose in my Cotton Domestic Allotment Act of 1963:

The principal provisions of the bill are as follows:

First. Beginning with the 1964 crop, the Secretary of Agriculture would establish each year a national domestic allotment for cotton in a number of bales equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the year in which the crop is produced.

Second. The national domestic allotment would be apportioned to the States, counties, and farms on a different basis for each of the first few years of the program. The general objective, however, would be to provide for such apportionment to be made as close as possible to the apportionment now in effect for acreage allotments, so as to maintain the same relationship between States, counties, and farms as exist under the present acreage allotment program.

Third. Beginning with the 1968 crop, the national allotment would be apportioned to States, counties and farms primarily on the basis of the average production within the respective allotments for the 3 preceding years.

Fourth. The State and county committees would be authorized to establish State and county reserves to the same extent and for the same purposes for which such reserves are established under the present cotton acreage allotment program. The bill would authorize the release of farm allotments to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments in the county, and if such allotments could not be used in the county, they could be released to the State committee for use in other counties in the State. The State, county, and farm from which allotments are released would receive credit for the production of such released allotments for purposes of establishing future allotments for eligible old cotton farms.

Fifth. The bill would authorize price support for all cotton at a level between 50 and 60 percent of parity. On the basis of the current parity price, this would mean a level of support of between 20 and 24 cents per pound for all cotton produced in the United States.

Sixth. The bill provides a higher level of price support for cotton produced within the farm domestic allotment. The level of support on such cotton would be on 3 production intervals, and the Secretary would prescribe a level for that part of the production in each interval within the following ranges: 15 bales and less, not less than 80 or more than 90 percent of the parity price.

At the present parity level that would amount to 32 to 36 cents a pound. Sixteen to thirty bales, inclusive, not less than 75 or more than 85 percent of the parity price. And at the present parity level that would amount to 30 to 34 cents a pound. More than 30 bales, not less than 70 or more than 80 percent of the parity price. And at the present parity level that would amount to 28 to 32 cents a pound.

The price support on domestic allotment cotton could be made available through loans, purchases or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind to producers.

Seventh. Beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be authorized to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current support price available for all cotton—50 to 60 percent of parity—plus reasonable carrying charges.

Eighth. In the transition period of placing this act in operation, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized and directed for the first year, ending July 31, 1964, as an emergency measure, to make payments-in-kind from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to persons other than producers in amounts sufficient to remove the inequities of the two-price system to the domestic mills.

Mr. President, this is a brief statement of the principal provisions of the bill, but I shall submit a more lengthy analysis of the bill for those who would like more details.

I would now like to carefully compare this proposed Cotton Domestic Allotment Act with the present cotton program.

Today, the whole cotton industry, from the farm on which it is grown to the local gin, to the compress, to the final spinning of cotton in either domestic or foreign mill, is dominated by the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Domestic Allotment Act would restore the freedom of farmers to plant cotton, as they choose.

This is dramatically illustrated by the fact that under this bill there would be no need for farmers collectively to bind themselves in a referendum to mutual restrictions on their freedom to plant cotton.

Cotton buyers would be free to buy cotton. Cotton merchants would be free to merchandise cotton. Cotton warehousemen would compete freely for the business of storing privately owned cotton. Exporters would be free to export—without subsidy or other assistance and certainly without any hindrance from Government. Even the cotton exchanges in New Orleans and New York, almost forgotten in the kind of market we have had in the last few years, would come to life again.

Under the provisions of the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture last October was forced to reduce the national acreage allotment to the legal minimum for 1963. This will reduce farm income from cotton. The great cotton areas of the Mississippi delta, the high plains of Texas, and the three Western States will be particularly hurt by the sharp reduction in cotton acreage.

Price support for 1963 has been announced at a level unchanged from last year. However, under the present act, it is not likely that present levels of price support can be maintained indefinitely. Thus, under present legislation, farm income from cotton would decline further in the years ahead. True, the 1949 act provides for price support from 65 to 90 percent of parity. But with cotton consumption steadily declining at current price relationships with synthetic fibers, 90 percent of parity under the existing law is a complete fiction. Even 80 percent of parity is a fiction under this act. Over the next few years, I doubt if a uniform level of price support as high as 75 percent could be maintained.

The Cotton Domestic Allotment Act would maintain gross farm income and do so indefinitely. It would certainly increase net farm income. It would provide for price support on the domestic allotment of from 70 to 90 percent of parity and from 80 to 90 percent of parity for the majority of growers; those who produce 15 bales or less. Under this bill, 90 percent of parity could be a reality rather than a fiction.

It would allow each producer to choose for himself whether he wishes to grow more cotton at a lower average return per bale or grow less cotton at a higher unit return. Each producer would be free to plant as much acreage to cotton as he likes. He would, however, know in advance that he would receive a specified level of price support on a specific number of bales. He would decide for himself how much cotton he wants to produce and how he wants to produce it.

It would not be necessary for him to devise elaborate and expensive skip-row schemes for producing his crop. He would not be forced to use his best land year after year without rotation. Having once decided how much cotton he wished to produce, he would then be free to produce his cotton in a way that for him would be most economical.

Under the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act, cotton spinning mills would once again spin cotton. Workers presently employed would go back on a full-time basis and workers now laid off would be reemployed. The whole textile industry would be revitalized by the renewed opportunity to compete with foreign textile mills on an even basis.

Mr. President, I welcome the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this proposed legislation. I hope it will be passed by the Senate, approved also in the other body, and thus enacted by the Congress and signed into law by the President. I am confident it will save our cotton industry and restore cotton to its rightful position of competitive, free enterprise prosperity.

It is with this hope, Mr. President, that I herewith introduce my bill, and ask unanimous consent that it be read twice and appropriately referred, and that the text of the bill and the accompanying detailed analysis of it be printed in the RECORD at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1190) to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act."

SEC. 2. This Act shall be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except sections 301(a), 373, 375 and the provisions of Subtitle F of Title III thereof, shall not be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop.

DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT

SEC. 3(a). The Secretary shall proclaim, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, a national domestic allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year of a number of bales of cotton which is estimated to result in the production of cotton within such allotment equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year.

(b) (1) For the 1964 and 1965 crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States for which a 1963 State acreage allotment was established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, on the basis of the number of bales of cotton determined for each State by converting such 1963 State acreage allotment (including the State's share of the national reserve) to a number of bales based on the average yield per acre of cotton for the State.

(2) For the 1966 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, multiply by two, and (ii) the State production base for the 1964 crop of cotton. For purposes of this section, the "State production base" shall be the smaller of the State domestic allotment for the crop or the production within such State domestic allotment, adjusted for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings and yields of cotton and adjusted for farms regarded as having produced cotton. For purposes of this section, "farms regarded as having produced cotton" shall be farms deemed to have cotton planted or produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, and farms on which 75 per centum or more of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (d)(3) and subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the entire farm allotment, and farms on which less than 75 per centum of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the average of the farm allotment and the production (actual and regarded as produced) on the farm.

(3) For the 1967 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, and (ii) the sum of the 1964 and 1965 State production bases.

(4) For the 1968 and subsequent crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average of the State production bases for the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national domestic allotment is proclaimed.

(c) The State domestic allotment less any State reserve shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsection (b) of this section: *Provided,* That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of the State allotment which shall be used to make adjustments in county domestic allotments for trends in cotton production, for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments, and to prevent hardship.

(d) (1) For the 1964 crop of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the 1963 farm acreage allotment converted into production of cotton by multiplying such acreage allotment by the farm average yield: *Provided,* That if less than 75 percent of such acreage allotment was actually planted (or regarded as planted under the Soil Bank Act, the Great Plains program and the release and reapportionment provisions of subsection (m) (2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the farm production base for 1963 shall be the production based on the average of the 1963 farm allotment and the acreage so planted or regarded as planted.

(2) For the 1965 and subsequent crops of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the farm domestic allotment established for the preceding crop of cotton: *Provided,* That if less than 75 percent of such farm domestic allotment was produced or regarded as produced, the farm production base shall be the production based on the average of such farm domestic allotment and the production (including any production regarded as produced) of cotton on the farm.

(3) The farm production base shall not be adjusted under this subsection if the Secretary determines that failure to plant or produce, as the case may be, at least 75 percent of the farm domestic allotment, or the farm acreage allotment for 1963, was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm. Old cotton farm means a farm on which cotton has been produced (or regarded as planted to cotton or produced under any other provision of law except subsection (f) of this section and the provisions of subsection (m)(2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) pursuant to a farm allotment in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which a farm allotment is established.

(e) The county committee may reserve not to exceed 15 percent of the county domestic allotment which shall be used to make adjustments for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(f) The farm operator with the concurrence of the farm owner who is also a producer of cotton may release any part of the farm domestic allotment to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments on other farms in the county. The county committee shall reapportion any such released allotment in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. If released allotment is not reapportioned in the county, the county committee shall transfer such allotment to the State committee for further transfer to other counties in the State. Any allotment released from a farm shall be regarded for purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm allotments as having been produced on the farm and in the county where the release was made except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was released considered as having cotton production during the three year period for eligibility as an old cotton farm.

Sec. 4(a). For the purposes of this Act, the following terms are defined as follows:

(1) "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

(2) "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) "Person" means an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any agency of a State.

(5) "Bale of cotton" means a standard bale of five hundred pounds gross weight.

(6) "Marketing year" means the period beginning August 1 and ending July 31.

(7) "State average yield", "county average yield" and "farm average yield" shall be the average yield per acre of cotton for the State, county, or farm, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield is determined.

(8) "Farm" means such land as the Secretary prescribes by regulation to be constituted as a farm.

PRICE SUPPORT

Sec. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended effective with the 1964 crop of upland cotton to read as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act:

(a) Price support for each crop of upland cotton shall be made available to producers through loans, purchases, or other operations at such level not less than 50 per centum or more than 60 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act and the price of cotton in world markets.

(b) Price support in addition to that provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be made available to producers of each crop of upland cotton through loans, purchases, or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind, on a quantity of cotton of such crop produced on each farm equal to the farm's domestic allotment for such crop established under the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. The levels of price support on such cotton shall be determined by the Secretary within the ranges prescribed in the schedule below after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

Production intervals in terms of bales (standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight)	Level of support
15 bales and less	Not less than 80 or more than 90 per centum of the parity price.
16 to 30 bales, inclusive	Not less than 75 or more than 85 per centum of the parity price.
More than 30 bales	Not less than 70 per centum or more than 80 per centum of the parity price.

If a portion of the price support for any upland cotton is made available through payments to producers, the rate of payment shall be in an amount per pound of cotton which, when added to the average spot market price of middling one-inch cotton for the calendar week preceding the date of the marketing of the cotton with respect to which payment is made, as determined by the Secretary, or the level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) for such crop under subsection (a), whichever is higher, will provide a return to the producer equal to the applicable level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) under the schedule set out above. The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under this section.

Sec. 6. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first proviso in the third sentence thereof the following proviso:

"*Provided further,* That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current support price established under section 103 (a) of this Act for upland cotton plus reasonable carrying charges."

Sec. 7. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than the producers of such cotton, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton, including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the conclusion of business next Wednesday, in order that any Members of the Senate who desire may cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The analysis presented by Mr. Talmadge is as follows:

Analysis of a Proposed Bill To Enact the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act

This bill would provide a program for establishing National, State, county, and farm domestic allotments for the 1964 and subsequent crops of upland cotton in terms of bales rather than acres of cotton. The amount of the national domestic allotment would approximate the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the year in which the crop is produced. The bill would also authorize price support on all cotton at a low level (50 to 60 percent of parity) which on the basis of the current parity price would probably range between 20 and 24 cents per pound of cotton. However, a higher level of support would be authorized on the farm domestic allotment and such support could be made available by payments in cash or in kind to producers.

The provisions of the bill provide as follows:

1. Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act."

2. Section 2 provides that the act is applicable to upland cotton beginning with 1964 crop. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which provides for the present program of acreage allotments and marketing quotas for cotton would not be applicable except for certain sections relating to administration of the program. It should be noted that the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, remain applicable to marketing quotas and acreage allotments for extra long staple cotton.

3. Section 3 of the bill would provide different methods for apportioning the national domestic allotment to States, counties and farms for the first few years that the program was in effect. The purpose would be to provide for such apportionment to be made as close to the apportionment now in effect for acreage allotments so as to maintain the same relationship between States, counties, and farms as exists at the present time. Section 3(a) provides for the proclamation by the Secretary, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, of a national domestic allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year of a number of bales of cotton (standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight) estimated to be produced within such allotment equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Marketing year is the period beginning August 1 and ending July 31.

4. Section 3(b)(1) provides for apportionment of the national allotment to the States for the 1964 and 1965 crops of cotton on the basis of the 1963 State acreage allotment. This is accomplished for each State by converting the 1963 State acreage allotment (including the State's share of the national reserve) established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to a number of bales based on the average yield per acre of cotton for the State. The State average yield would be the average yield per acre of cotton for the State, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield was determined.

5. Section 3(b)(2) provides for apportionment of the national allotment to the States for the 1966 crop of cotton partly on the basis of the apportionment used for the 1964 crop of cotton and partly on the basis of the 1964 State production of cotton within the 1964 State allotment including production regarded as produced on farms releasing allotment and farms in the conservation reserve program, the Great Plains program, and the land use adjustment program. This is accomplished on the basis of the average number of bales contained by dividing by 3 the sum of the 1964 base used in section 3(b)(1) given a weight of 2, and the 1964 State production base. The State production base would be the smaller of the State domestic allotment or the production of such allotment, adjusted for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings and yields of cotton and for farms regarded as having produced cotton (includes farms in the conservation reserve program, Great Plains program, land use adjustment program under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and farms releasing allotments under section 3(f) of this act.)

6. Section 3(b)(3) provides for apportionment of the national allotment to the States for the 1967 crop of cotton partly on the basis of the apportionment used for the 1964 crop of cotton and partly on the basis of the 1965 and 1966 State bases. This is accomplished on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing by 3 the sum of the 1964 base used in section 3(b)(1) and the 1965 and 1966 State production bases.

7. Section 3(b)(4) provides for apportionment of the national domestic allotments to the States for the 1968 and subsequent crops of cotton on the basis of the average of the State production bases for the 3 years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the allotment is proclaimed.

8. Section 3(c) provides for apportionment of the State domestic allotment less any State reserve to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as would be applicable to the State in the apportionment of the national allotment. The county average yield would be the average yield per acre of cotton for the county, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield was determined. The State committee could reserve not to exceed 10 percent of the State allotment in order to adjust county allotments for trends in cotton production, for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

9. Section 3(d) provides for apportionment of the county allotment to farms by use of the 1963 farm acreage allotment for the 1964 crop converted to a production base, and for the 1965 and succeeding crops on the basis of the farm allotment for the preceding crop. The farm base would be reduced for failure to produce or release at least 75 percent of the farm allotment each year. Section 3(d)(1) provides for apportionment of the county domestic allotment to old cotton farms for the 1964 crop on the basis of the 1963 farm acreage allotment converted into production by multiplying such acreage by the farm average yield. Farm average yield would be determined in the same way as the State and county average yields. The farm production base so determined would be reduced to the average of the 1963 farm acreage allotment and the acreage actually planted or regarded as planted (under the Soil Bank Act, Great Plains program or release and reapportionment) if less than 75 percent of the 1963 farm acreage allotment was so planted or regarded as planted to cotton.

10. Section 3(d)(2) provides for apportionment of the county domestic allotment to old cotton farms for the 1965 and succeeding crops of cotton on the basis of the farm domestic allotment established for the preceding crop of cotton. The farm production base so determined would be reduced if less than 75 percent of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as produced (under any other provision of law and the release provisions in section 3(f)) to the average of the farm allotment and the production (actual plus regarded as produced) of cotton on the farm.

11. Section 3(d)(3) provides that the Secretary would determine whether the failure to plant or produce at least 75 percent of the farm allotment was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm and if so, the farm production base would not be reduced for such failure. An old cotton farm would be a farm on which cotton has been produced (or regarded as planted or produced under any other provision of law except the release provisions of section 3(f)) pursuant to a farm allotment in any one of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which a farm allotment was established.

12. Section 3(e) provides that the county committee could reserve not to exceed 15 percent of the county allotment for use on new farms and to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

13. Section 3(f) provides for release of farm allotments to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments on other farms in the county in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary. Unused released allotments in the county would be surrendered to the State committee for use in other counties in the State. The State, county, and farm from which allotment was released would receive credit for the producton of such released allotment for purposes of establishing future allotments except that release of allotment would not operate to establish eligibility as an old cotton farm.

14. Section 4 contains general definitions applicable to the act.

15. Section 5 provides for price support for upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop by amending section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The level of price support for all cotton of a crop would be established by the Secretary at not less than 50 percent or more than 60 percent of the parity price therefor. The Secretary would take into consideration the price of cotton in world markets and the factors in section 401(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in establishing such level of support. Additional price support would be made available on the cotton produced within the farm domestic allotment. The levels of support on such cotton would be on three production intervals and the Secretary would prescribe a level for each interval within the following ranges: 15 bales and less, not less than 80 or more than 90 percent of the parity price; 16 to 30 bales, inclusive, not less than 75 or more than 85 percent of the parity price; more than 30 bales, not less than 70 or more than 80 percent of the parity price.

Such additional price support could be made available through loans, purchases or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind. If a portion of the price support were made available through payments to producers, the rate of payment would be an amount which, when added to the average spot market price of Middling 1-inch cotton for the calendar week preceding the date of marketing or the level of regular price support converted to a Middling 1-inch basis, whichever was higher, would provide a return to the producer equal to the applicable level of support listed in the ranges above. The Secretary would be required to provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers in payments under this provision.

16. Section 6 provides in an amendment to section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, a grant of authority beginning August 1, 1964 to the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current support price available for all cotton plus reasonable carrying charges.

17. Section 7 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe rules and regulations under which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make payments in kind to persons, other than producers, to eliminate the inequities in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users. These payments are authorized from the date of enactment of this bill until July 31, 1964 in such amounts and under such terms as the Secretary may prescribe.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the presentation of this proposal by the Senator from Georgia. It is difficult, of course, to measure every item in it from merely listening to the proposal, but I wish to say that it seems to me the Senator has presented new thinking in a field in which it is badly needed. I earnestly hope the proposed legislation will be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and that some program can be worked out.

I am of the opinion that the Senator certainly has given a very fine suggestion as to the line along which a program may be worked out. I commend him and congratulate him.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am grateful indeed for the remarks of my esteemed friend and colleague from Alabama. He and I have discussed the problems of the cotton farmers and the textile industry on many occasions. I know of no other Member of the Senate who has worked harder, more conscientiously, or more sincerely in the effort to do something about the grave problems confronting the cotton industry.

In my judgment, if we are to save cotton as a commodity for our farmers, if we are to save our textile employees, and the remainder of our textile industry, we must have a cotton program which, first, will let our farmers farm; second, will assure our farmers who produce cotton a fair share of the national income; and, third, will put our own commodities back on the world market at competitive prices.

I have checked the production figures on cotton. Thirty years ago the United States of America produced half the world's cotton. Now we produce 20 percent of the world's cotton. The reason is obvious. We have held a price umbrella over the rest of the world, and by imposing restrictions we have put our own cotton farmers—particularly the small farmers in the Southeastern States—out of business. While we have been reducing our production other nations have been expanding theirs. Now. the same thing is happening to textile employees and the textile industry. If Congress does not take some action to remedy the situation soon, cotton will rapidly become a thing of the past for our country.

I welcome the constructive thinking and support of my distinguished colleague.

I yield now to the distinguished and able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the informative and provocative speech which the junior Senator from Georgia has made. I wonder if his bill would make any distinction in treatment of the small homestead farmer, to which the Senator has referred, and the large corporate farming operations in the area of irrigation which can operate profitably at a much smaller price than can the individual farmer.

Mr. TALMADGE. In reply, yes, the bill does make the distinction.

First let me say that if this bill becomes law, instead of having a cotton allotment in acres, as we now have, there will be an allocation in bales or pounds. As the able Senator from Tennessee knows, when an acre of cotton is alloted, it can mean 250 pounds of lint cotton in one section of the country or 1,500 pounds of lint cotton in another section of the country. This depends largely on whether irrigation is used, the fertility of the soil, the amount of fertilizer used, cultivation practices, and many other factors.

Under the proposed program we would allocate 10 million bales of cotton, based on a historic production basis, and the support price for the first 15 bales of production would be from 80 to 90 percent of parity, which, at the present party level, would be 32 to 36 cents a pound.

The second support category would fall within 16 to 30 bales, and the support price would be from 75 to 85 percent of parity, which, at present levels, would be 30 to 34 cents a pound.

Each farmer who produced over 30 bales, within the domestic allocation, would receive a support price of 28 to 32 cents a pound.

Then, any farmer who wanted to produce cotton for export over and above the domestic allocation program, could plant as much as he wanted to produce, any number of bales, and his support price would be approximately the world market price, which is about 20 to 24 cents a pound at the present time.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator omits, for the purpose of my question, the differentiation between the large and the homestead producer, is the Senator able to draw an analogy, contrast, or comparison in the bill which he proposes with respect to cotton and the legislation, the legal program, now in existence for sugar production in the United States?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes. It is identically the same. It is a compensatory payment plan to the producer. We have it for the sugar producers. We have it for the wool producers. As the Senator knows, these programs have been extended time after time, and the majority of Senators on both sides of the aisle have no objection to them. In fact, we passed the Wool Act in the Senate a time or two without even a record vote, just by voice vote, because of the popularity of the program.

The reason it works so well is that the Government does not get in the business of acting as a pawnbroker for this commodity. Under present programs when the farmer fails to redeem the commodities, the Government finds itself in the possession of them. At the present time there are $8 billion worth of agricultural commodities in Government warehouses. The Government must not only warehouse them but must ship and sell the commodities, with all the attendant high cost. The disposal of surpluses in the warehouses is one of the most expensive items of running the Government. Last time I checked, the storage cost was about $1 billion a year. That is what brought on the Billie Sol Estes scandal. My proposal would get the Government out of all these attendant expenses and businesses.

I think the only justification there is for a price support program is the desire to put more money in the pockets of the farmers. When a program puts the farmers out of business, ruins the commodities which the Government is seeking to help, places employees in an untenable position, or liquidates many industries, with the attendant high cost to the taxpayers, I think it is about time to consider a better farm program.

I have talked with the Senator from Tennessee about this proposal. I know of his great interest in it, and I welcome his constructive interest.

A CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM WORTHY OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle have taken the floor in order to introduce various measures. I shall take the floor now to do likewise, and I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor to my colleagues, for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. First I wish to read a joint statement of eight Senators who are participating today in the introduction of a series of civil rights bills based upon the legislative recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The statement reads as follows:

> The Civil Rights Commission was created to advise Congress and the President regarding the need for legislation to enforce constitutional guarantees. In accordance with its mandate, the Commission in its 1961 comprehensive reports made 27 recommendations for additional legislation in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. Its reports on these subjects were thorough and objective, and its members spoke with a remarkable degree of unanimity.
>
> We regret that the President in his special message on civil rights last month—his first civil rights message in 2 years—did not implement the Commission's recommendations. The administration's proposals, while noteworthy since for the first time they go beyond the field of voting, fall far short of the Commission's recommendations and both national party platforms. This year of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation merits a more comprehensive program. If the President will not assume the leadership in getting through Congress urgently needed civil rights measures, we in Congress must take the initiative.
>
> The measures which we are today introducing are based upon the Commission's recommendations but are supplemented by strengthening provisions. We consider these proposals necessary to meet the ever-growing and fully justified demand of a substantial group of citizens that they be accorded all the privileges of first-class citizenship.

The eight Republican Senators who have joined in this statement are Senators Case of New Jersey, Fong of Hawaii, myself, my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating], Kuchel of California, Scott of Pennsylvania, Saltonstall of Massachusetts, and Beall of Maryland.

Summaries of the bills to be introduced are as follows:

I. EDUCATION

Senator Kuchel is the principal sponsor of the education bill. This bill requires every school board which has failed to achieve desegregation of all public schools to adopt and file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within 180 days a desegregation plan providing for at least first-step compliance commencing with the following school year. The Attorney General is authorized to institute a civil action for injunctive relief against a school board which violates the act, to protect all persons involved in school desegregation, and, in accordance with the part III provision deleted from the Civil Rights Act of 1957, to redress all deprivations of constitutional rights. Other provisions authorize financial and technical assistance to desegregating school districts; create a clearinghouse for information concerning desegregation and an advisory and conciliation service; apportion Federal aid to education in accordance with progress in desegregation, especially in impacted areas; and remove the separate-but-equal language from the Morrill Land Grant College Acts.

II. EMPLOYMENT

Senator Case is the principal sponsor of the employment bills. The first would establish a Federal Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment to prohibit, in interstate commerce, discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. Another bill would authorize the Commission to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment and employment under Government contracts and subcontracts, applicable to both employers and labor organizations; to withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship and worker retraining programs and from State employment service which deny individuals an equal opportunity to participate on account of race, color, or creed; and to authorize the National Labor Relations Board to set aside representation elections in which appeals to race prejudice are made. The third bill would establish a Commission on Fair Employment Practices in the District of Columbia.

III. HOUSING

Senator Scott is the principal sponsor of the bills dealing with housing. The November 1962 Executive order to prohibit discrimination in housing failed to cover housing loans and mortgages handled by federally regulated financial institutions or FHA- and VA-financed housing constructed prior to issues of the order. Since such antidiscriminatory action was recommended by the Commission, the first bill calls for a study to determine what further executive or legislative action should be taken in this area and in the administration of the existing urban renewal program. A second bill would amend the provision enacted in 1962 in order to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to all eligible persons displaced by the Federal highway program, further implementing the Commission's recommendations.

IV. VOTING RIGHTS

Senator Keating is the principal sponsor of the bill dealing with voting rights. The bill establishes voter qualifications for State and Federal elections which would exclude practices and standards which the Commission has found are used to discriminate against Negro voters. It permits States to maintain literacy as a qualification but provides that 6 years of schooling shall satisfy such requirements. It prohibits any arbitrary standards, practices, and procedures in connection with registration and voting, specifically including arbitrary inaction where there is a duty to act. It also contains provisions for the appointment of temporary voting referees in voting rights cases and for the expedition of such cases. A final section provides for the collection of reliable statistical information with regard to voting patterns.

V. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

I am the principal sponsor of two measures to strengthen the laws on the administration of justice. In the first bill, more effective remedies are provided for penalizing unconstitutional official violence; local governmental units are made jointly liable with their officers who are found liable in police brutality cases under existing Federal law; protections now limited to certain Federal officers and members of the Armed Forces in the discharge of their duties are extended to cover additional Federal officers and all uniformed servicemen. The Attorney General is authorized to institute civil proceedings for injunctive relief to prevent exclusion of persons from jury service on account of race, color, or national origin and, in accordance with the part III provision deleted from the Civil Rights Act of 1957, to redress all deprivations of constitutional rights. The second bill would provide a Federal matching grant-in-aid program, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the Attorney General, to assist in the improvement of training, recruitment, and education of local and State police officers.

VI. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

I am also the principal sponsor of bills relating to public accommodations. The first bill would prohibit discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin in any hotel, motel, or public place engaged in furnishing lodging, whose business affects interstate commerce. Violation of the act would be a misdemeanor, injured persons could bring civil actions for damages or for injunctive or other relief, and the Attorney General would be authorized to bring injunctive actions on behalf of the injured person. A second bill would eliminate the separate-but-equal provision from the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act.

VII. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Senator SALTONSTALL is the principal sponsor and Senator FONG is the principal cosponsor of the bill to make the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government and to broaden the scope of its duties. The bill would enable the Commission to serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and to provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, public accommodations, transportation, and the administration of justice.

I now yield, under the unanimous-consent request, to my colleague the deputy minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

EQUALITY OF EDUCATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the 1960 Republican Platform correctly recognized:

> Equality under law promises more than the equal right to vote and transcends mere relief from discrimination by Government. It becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity, without distinction of race, religion, color or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education and employment.

Our party and those of us who have joined together on the various measures which we have introduced today believe in this principle. By our actions and by our work we seek to make this promise a reality.

I salute the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and his colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and other Senators on this side of the aisle, and I hope Senators from the other side as well, who join in sponsoring this series of bills.

Discrimination is not limited to one area of our land. It must be faced alike in the North, South, East, and West. Nor is discrimination confined to members of the Negro race. In some parts of America it is against citizens of Mexican descent, or of Latin American descent, in other parts it is against the Indians. Discrimination is based not merely on race, but on religion and national origin as well. No matter in what invidious form it appears it affects those of white skin as well as those of dark skin, and irreparably harms our national conscience in the process. Basic to our constitutional heritage is a belief in equal protection of the laws. Basic to both the revolutionary spirit of the founding of our Republic as well as the founding of the Republican Party is a deep commitment to the equality of opportunity for all our citizens.

Equality of opportunity for education is a part of the law of this land. Segregated schools are illegal. Yet in America the law is being violated and flouted. Unequal opportunity for American youth in education continues in many places.

There can be no equality of opportunity without equality of education. In 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States acknowledged this truth in its historic desegregation decision, Brown against Board of Education of Topeka, when it stated:

> In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education.

The Court recognized this fact. Both political parties recognize this fact. I am convinced that the American people recognize this fact. Yet much progress remains to be done if we are to yet achieve the goal which the Court set almost a decade ago. That goal was "to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system, with all deliberate speed."

At the end of the Eisenhower administration desegregation suits were pending which involved at least 39 school districts. But the pace has been slow often because the Government of the United States has not been clothed with either the program or the necessary legal alternatives to encourage progress in this difficult and controversial area.

Extensive hearings on education were held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights which was established under President Eisenhower and continued under President Kennedy. This Commission reported its findings and recommendations in its 1961 report. It is largely those recommendations which my colleagues and I have offered in legislative form today.

The program which we suggest was specifically pledged in the 1960 Republican platform. There, members of my party pledged themselves first, to "propose legislation to authorize the Attorney General to bring actions for school desegregation in the name of the United States in appropriate cases, as when economic coercion or threat of physical harm is used to deter persons from going to court to establish their rights"; and second, to continue support of President Eisenhower's proposal "to extend Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempted to desegregate." Recognizing that civil rights is a responsibility not only of our States and communities, but is a national problem and responsibility as well, we stated that "the Federal Government should take the initiative in promoting intergroup conferences among those who, in their communities, are earnestly seeking solutions of the complex problems of desegregation—to the end that closed channels of communication may be opened, tensions eased, and a cooperative solution of local problems may be sought."

The Federal Equality of Education Act of 1963 which we present today would provide that following its enactment, all nondesegregated public school districts would have 180 days to file a desegregation plan with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This plan would include a specific timetable whereby with all deliberate speed each class, grade, school, and district within the jurisdiction of a particular school board would be desegregated. First-step compliance would have to be taken by the beginning of the first school year after the plan was submitted.

If the school board violated its obligations in carrying out this plan which they themselves had established, the Attorney General would be authorized to go into the local Federal district court and institute a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction in order to secure compliance. The Federal district court, in turn, would have the power to require the school board to adopt and implement the plan submitted under this act, implement another plan if the court thought that appropriate, or issue other orders to "most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed."

I do not believe in this difficult area that it is enough merely to compel enforcement of the law of the land. Equally important, there must be a program to encourage compliance and to show how compliance can be most effectively attained. Thus, our legislation would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon application by the local school board, to make grants for a period of not more than 5 years so that specialists in desegregation problems could be employed, inservice training programs to deal with these problems established, and an improvement occur in the quality of teaching which has been affected by either inferior training or a lack of educational opportunity. Programs to identify talented and able students would also be possible.

School boards and local governments which were not subject to filing desegregation plans would also be eligible if such programs would carry forward the purpose of this legislation. In either case, such grants would have to be matched on a 50-50 basis. A $40 million authorization is provided.

For up to 5 years, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could assist school boards and local non-profit organizations in the training of school personnel and community leaders in techniques which are useful in solving desegregation problems.

In those cases, where a State or local government has withdrawn funds from a school district which is attempting to desegregate and financial assistance is not available from private institutions, it would be possible to secure a Federal loan which would be repaid once funds again became available.

Provision is also made in the bill to authorize the Commission on Civil Rights to collect and disseminate information on desegregation programs and procedures and to establish advisory and conciliation services which would assist local school officials in developing desegregation plans. So that the necessary statistical information be available, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be empowered to determine and publish annually the number and ethnic classification, by State and district, of all those enrolled in public educational institutions.

The various Federal grant-in-aid programs applicable to elementary and secondary education would be reduced if segregation was practiced. The amounts granted under the impacted area programs, which are operated under Public Laws 815 and 874, would be reduced in similar circumstances. Federal grants and loans to institutions of higher education could not be made if discrimination was practiced in enrolling students. A strong prohibition is provided against Federal intervention in the curriculum, administration, or personnel selection of an educational system.

In addition, the Attorney General would be authorized to take such action to protect those officials, parents, children, and others involved in such plans from physical injury, harassment, intimidation, or reprisal. Upon receipt of a signed complaint that an individual is being deprived or about to be deprived of equal protection of the laws and after a determination that commencement of litigation by the individual would either endanger or create danger of economic sanctions against the complainant, his family, counsel, or others, the Attorney General could institute a civil action on behalf of the United States.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that during the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, several of us fought vigorously to retain an effective part III in that act which would give the Attorney General the power to institute the type of civil action for preventive relief which I have just described. We were defeated on that occasion by a vote of 52 to 38. I am proud to recall that a majority of my party—25 Senators, in fact—supported a strong part III. While the 1961 Commission report does not recommend specifically the use of part III authority in the education field, I, and my colleagues who have joined me on this occasion, believe that such authority is essential if any progress is to be made.

In 1961, the Commission on Civil Rights reported that between 1954 and 1961—a period of 7 years—only 775 of 2,837 biracial school districts in the 17 Southern States that required racial segregation in public schools when the Brown decision was rendered, had taken any action to abolish racial segregation. By November 1962, 972 out of 3,058 districts in these 17 States had made a start; 10.5 million white children were in school in this area; 3.3 million Negro children were enrolled, but only 255,367 or 7.8 percent of them were enrolled in schools with white children as of last November.

There seems to be much deliberation and little speed. In the meantime, many in a generation of young Americans continue to suffer. In some areas, the public schools have long been closed. In still others, the confusion and tension which exists is equally intolerable.

America cannot afford the waste of uneducated youth as we enter an era of automation where the jobs will go to those who have completed at least a high school education. It is this situation which we seek to rectify in the legislation we propose today.

If we enact this measure—and I hope we will, and I believe we can—we shall have demonstrated to the entire world that we practice what we preach, and that equal treatment under law and equal opportunity for any young American, regardless of whether he is black or white, Christian or Jew, are constitutional guarantees which the representatives of the American people in Congress intend to see are observed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the full text of the bill and the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights pertaining to education.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1209) to establish a procedure for adoption and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools; to provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools; to restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kuchel (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Equality of Education Act of 1963".

TITLE I—DESEGREGATION PLANS

Sec. 101. For purposes of this title and titles II, III, and IV of this Act—

(a) The term "desegregation" means the assignment of all students to public schools irrespective of their race or color. No assignment system in which race or color is a factor in the initial assignment of students to particular public schools shall be deemed to have achieved desegregation even though placement or other tests or transfers or other options may be available to change such assignment.

(b) The term "public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) The term "school board" means any agency or agencies, the members, agents, and employees thereof, and any other person or persons, authorized to determine, control, or direct the institutions, structures, or places at which particular students are assigned to or attend public school.

(d) The term "first-step compliance" means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of a school board.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sec. 102. Every school board which, on the date of the enactment of this Act, has failed to achieve desegregation of all public schools within its jurisdiction, shall adopt a desegregation plan as provided in section 103 and shall file such plan, within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, with the Secretary.

Sec. 103. Every desegregation plan required under section 102 shall—

(1) provide for achieving desegregation of all public schools within the jurisdiction of the school board with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school, and district within the jurisdiction of the school board involved; and

(2) provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the first school year which begins after the submission of such plan.

Sec. 104. Every school board required to adopt a desegregation plan pursuant to section 102 shall forthwith implement the same in accordance with its terms immediately upon its adoption and thereafter continue its implementation in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in all public schools within its jurisdiction.

SEC. 105. Whenever any school board subject to the requirements of this title loses or relinquishes any of its authority over public schools formerly within its jurisdiction or its authority to assign students to schools within its jurisdiction, the duties prescribed in this title shall immediately devolve upon the person or persons to whom such authority has been transferred or relinquished.

SEC. 106. Wherever, because of overlapping or complementary jurisdiction, more than one school board is subject to the requirements of this title with respect to the same schools or students, the boards concerned shall exercise their obligations hereunder jointly.

SEC. 107. The requirements of this title shall not apply with respect to any public school which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for such public school.

SEC. 108 (a) In the event that a school board, or its successor as provided in section 105, subject to the requirements of this title has violated any of the obligations prescribed herein, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States in the United States district court for the district wherein such school board or its successor is located or meets, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction or other order, against such school board or its successor. The court in which such action is instituted is authorized, upon finding that there has been a violation of this title, without limitation upon the grant of such other relief as may be appropriate under the circumstances, to require the school board or its successor (1) to adopt and implement a plan of school desegregation pursuant to the requirements of this title, (2) to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the requirements of this title, or (3) to issue such other orders and grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed in the public schools under the jurisdiction of the school board or its successor.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted under subsection (a), and shall exercise the same without regard to whether any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law shall have been exhausted, and in a manner calculated to achieve desegregation in accordance with the requirements of this title.

(c) The limitations provided in section 123(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 shall not be applicable to any civil action or other proceeding brought under the provisions of this section.

TITLE II—GRANTS TO SCHOOL BOARDS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 201. Whenever the Secretary determines that a desegregation plan submitted to him by a school board pursuant to section 102 meets the requirements of title I he is authorized, for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of any such desegregation plan and upon receipt of application therefor, to make grants to such school board, or to the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board, to assist in meeting the costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for—

(1) employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation, and providing other assistance to develop understanding by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public of desegregation in order to reduce the possibility of community hostility or resistance to desegregation;

(2) providing in-service training to teachers, guidance counselors, and other school personnel for dealing with problems incident to desegregation; and

(3) establishing programs designed to identify and assist teachers who are handicapped in their professional endeavors as a result of inferior training or educational opportunity, and to identify and assist talented and able students who are handicapped in their scholastic efforts as a result of inferior educational opportunity.

SEC. 202. The Secretary is further authorized, for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of desegregation in accordance with any desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, or of carrying out desegregation by any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, to make grants to school boards, and local governments, to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the purposes enumerated in section 201.

SEC. 203. Each application made for a grant under this title shall provide such detailed breakdown of the measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Each grant under this title shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, except that a grant may be made only on condition that the applicant will, during the period for which the grant is made, expend for the same purpose or purposes for which the grant is made an amount of its own funds equal to the amount of the grant. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this title and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 204. Payments of grants under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals as the Secretary may determine. No payment of a grant shall be made to any school board, or to the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board, after the expiration of five years from the date of which a desegregation plan was submitted by such school board under section 102, or, in the case of a school board subject to a desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, after the expiration of five years from the date on which the court provided or approved such desegregation plan, or, in the case of any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a program of desegregation was begun by such school board.

SEC. 205. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year in process on the date of the enactment of this Act and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums, not exceeding $40,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary for making grants under the provisions of this title.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE WITH RESPECT TO DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, upon receipt of application therefor, to give technical assistance to school boards eligible for assistance under title II, and to local nonprofit organizations in the communities served by such school boards, in training school personnel and community leaders in techniques useful in solving desegregation problems, including training and other assistance in establishing home study programs for academically and culturally handicapped students. Such technical assistance may be given to any such school board, or local nonprofit organization, whether or not such school board or the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board has applied for or received a grant under title II.

SEC. 302. Technical assistance authorized by section 301 may be given by the Secretary by such means as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of such section. No technical assistance shall be given to any school board, or to any local nonprofit organization in the community served by such school board, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a desegregation plan was submitted by such school board under section 102, or, in the case of a school board subject to a desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, after the expiration of five years from the date on which the court provided or approved such desegregation plan, or, in the case of any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a program of desegregation was begun by such school board.

TITLE IV—LOANS TO SCHOOL BOARDS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, upon receipt of application therefor, to make loans—

(1) to any school board, if he finds that—

(A) part or all of the funds which would otherwise be available to such school board have been withheld or withdrawn by action of the State or local government because of the desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board; and

(B) such school board has authority to receive and expend the proceeds of such loan; or

(2) to any local government within the jurisdiction of which any school board operates, if he finds that—

(A) part or all of the funds of such local government which would otherwise be available to such school board have been withheld or withdrawn by action of the State because of the desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board; and

(B) such local government has authority to receive such loan and to make the proceeds thereof available for the use of such school board.

SEC. 402. (a) Loans may be made by the Secretary under section 401 to any school board or local government only if he is satisfied that the proceeds of such loans will be used for the same purposes for which the funds withheld or withdrawn would otherwise be used, and that such purposes are necessary for the operation and maintenance of the school system under the jurisdiction of such school board.

(b) Loans may be made by the Secretary under section 401 to any school board or local government only if he is satisfied that funds cannot be borrowed by such school board or local government, as the case may be, from private financial institutions.

SEC. 403. Any loan under section 401 shall be made upon such terms and conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as the Secretary deems appropriate. Any such loan shall be repaid within such time as the Secretary prescribes after the funds withheld or withdrawn are restored to the school board or local government concerned, or after funds are available to such school board or local government by borrowing from private financial institutions.

Sec. 404. There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for making loans under the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—ASSISTANCE BY COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

Sec. 501. Part I of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by inserting after section 104 the following new section:

"ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 104A. In addition to the duties imposed by section 104(a), the Commission is authorized—

"(1) to collect and disseminate information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts in the various States to achieve an organization and operation of their schools in accordance with constitional requirements, including data as to the known effects of such programs and procedures on the quality of education and to the costs of such programs and procedures; and

"(2) to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing desegregation plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions, and to attempt to mediate and conciliate disputes between school officials and school patrons, upon the request of either, relating to desegregation of schools, including proposed plans for desegregation and the implementation of desegregation plans already in operation."

TITLE VI—RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR SEGREGATED PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES

Sec. 601. (a) In the case of any program providing Federal grants-in-aid to the States for elementary or secondary education in public schools, the amount of such grant-in-aid for any fiscal year to any State shall be reduced in accordance with the provisions of this section if the head of the Federal department or agency administering such program determines, at the time of determining the amount of such grant-in-aid for such year, that the public elementary or secondary schools of any local educational agency in such State are operated in such a manner as to segregate pupils of any race or color. If the head of such department or agency determines at such time that all local educational agencies in such State practice such segregation in the operation of such schools, then such grant-in-aid shall only be 50 per centum of the amount it would have been but for the provisions of this section. If the head of such department or agency determines at such time that one or more local educational agencies in such State have initiated a program of desegregation, or do not practice segregation, in the operation of such schools, then such grant-in-aid shall be 50 per centum of the amount it would have been but for the provisions of this section, plus such proportion of the remaining 50 per centum as the number of pupils enrolled in the public elementary and secondary schools of all the local educational agencies which have initiated a program of desegregation, or do not practice segregation, bears to the number of pupils enrolled in all the public elementary and secondary schools in such State.

(b) For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and

(2) enrollments shall be determined on the basis of the latest reliable figures available to the department or agency head concerned.

Sec. 602. Whenever the Commissioner of Education finds (1) that Federal financial assistance is provided to any local educational agency for free public education, or the construction of school facilities for the provision of such education, under the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress; 20 U.S.C. 631–645), or the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress; 20 U.S.C. 236–244), and (2) that any public elementary or secondary school of any such local educational agency is operated in such a manner as to segregate pupils of any race or color, and such local educational agency has not initiated a program of desegregation in the operation of such schools, the Commissioner shall withhold 50 per centum of the amount of financial assistance such local educational agency would have received but for the provisions of this section.

Sec. 603. (a) The first section of the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417; 7 U.S.C. 322, 323), relating to college aid for agricultural and mechanical colleges, is amended by striking out all that follows "students" in the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period: *Provided,* That any institution which was entitled to receive the benefits of such Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, shall be entitled to the benefits of such Act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the Act of July 2, 1862.

(b) Sections 2, 3, and 4 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 324–326), are each amended by striking out ", or the institution for colored students,", "or other institutions", and ", or of institutions for colored students," each place those terms appear.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to appropriations made under the Act of August 30, 1890, for fiscal years which begin after June 30, 1963.

Sec. 604. No Federal department or agency shall make any grant or loan to any publicly controlled college or university unless satisfactory proof is submitted to the head of such department or agency that such college or university does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in accepting students for enrollment.

Sec. 605. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

TITLE VII—PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS FROM BODILY HARM

Sec. 701. The Attorney General is authorized to take such action as may be necessary to protect—

(1) the members of any school board having under its jurisdiction one or more public schools which are desegregated or in which desegregation has been commenced;

(2) the officials, teachers, and other employees of any public school which is desegregated or in which desegregation has been commenced, or of any public school system of which any such public school is a part;

(3) children attending any such public school and the parents of such children; and

(4) any other individual assisting any such member, any such official, teacher, or other employee, or any such child or parent,

from physical injury and from harassment, intimidation, or reprisal by any person or group of persons.

TITLE VIII—ANNUAL SCHOOL SURVEYS

Sec. 801. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct an annual survey to determine the number and ethnic classification of students enrolled in all public educational institutions in the United States. The Secretary shall prepare and publish each year data obtained from each annual survey setting forth the number and ethnic classification of students enrolled—

(1) in all public educational institutions in each State,

(2) in each elementary and secondary public educational institution in each school district, and the totals for each school district, and

(3) in each public institution of higher education in each State.

TITLE IX—PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS SEEKING RELIEF FROM DEPRIVATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS

Sec. 901. Part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 123. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person is being deprived of, or is about to be deprived of, the equal protection of the laws, and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, commencement of litigation by such person (1) may create the danger of injury to the person, family, or property of the complainant or of any other person with standing to bring such litigation, or of any counsel retained for purposes of such litigation, or (2) may create the danger of economic sanctions against the complainant or any other person named in (1), the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order.

"(b) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General in the name of the United States may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto if he certifies that, in his judgment, the maintenance of the action may result in any of the injuries or economic sanctions set forth in subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

"(d) In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law."

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 1001. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair any remedies already existing for the protection or enforcement of rights guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States, nor to prevent any individual or private organization from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right in any manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

Sec. 1002. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 1003. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Civil Rights Commission's Findings and Recommendations on Education

FINDINGS

Need for Federal action to speed desegregation

1. Seven years after the Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases (May 17, 1954) only 775 of 2,837 biracial school

districts in the 17 Southern States that required racial segregation in the public schools on that date had taken any action to abolish racial segregation. The school districts in which racial segregation is still maintained include all those in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina, all but one in Florida and but one in Louisiana, and a large percentage of those in Arkansas, North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas.

2. In many of the school districts where some start has been made, actual desegregation is minimal. In fact only 7 percent of all Negroes enrolled in the public schools in the 17 Southern States attended school with white pupils in 1960–61, whereas 27 percent of the school districts have made some start toward compliance with constitutional requirements.

3. The trend observed in 1957–59 toward desegregation by court order rather than by voluntary action has continued. In 1959–61, 44 school districts initiated desegregation plans; 13 of those acted under court order and another 15 were at least pressured into action by pending suits or orders that could be extended to them.

4. In the Little Rock case the Supreme Court emphasized the duty of all school boards to abolish compulsory segregation in the public schools under their jurisdiction. The adoption of a desegregation plan is a necessary preliminary step. Nevertheless, in recent years such action has depended increasingly upon court orders.

5. Congressional specification of a time limit on the making and implementation of segregation plans would remove all doubt as to the duty of school boards to abolish segregation in their schools even in the absence of a court order and should speed the desegregation process. It would also make clear that enforcement of the commands of the Constitution is the concern not only of the judiciary, but of every branch of Government.

6. Federal funds in support of educational programs are granted to public-school systems which operate schools in a manner that denies pupils equal protection of the laws on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

7. Allotting to each State only 50 percent of any authorized grants-in-aid and prorating the remaining 50 percent in proportion to the percentage of pupils in desegregated school districts are compared to the total school population, would recognize the efforts of some States to bring the operation of their school systems into compliance with constitutional requirements and should spur other States to follow the same path. Under a proration formula proportionate effort would be recognized and wholly resistant States would not be totally penalized for their intransigence, since they would receive 50 percent of all authorized funds.

8. In the typical public-school case, several years elapse between the initial court decision and actual admission of Negro pupils on a nondiscriminatory basis. For example, in the following cases where admission was realized in September 1960 the first court decision came on the dates indicated: Houston, September 1958; New Orleans, February 1956; and in cases where admission has been ordered for September 1961; Atlanta, May 1958; Dallas, September 1955.

Need for Federal assistance

9. Even able Negro pupils entering a formerly white school from a segregated school may have problems of adjustment. Desegregation has focused attention on the gap between the scholastic achievement of the average white and the average Negro student of the same age and grade level.

10. Programs have been devised by public school systems and private organizations in northern, western and border States to afford minority group members a fairer chance to compete and to encourage them to aspire to and achieve higher scholastic levels. For the most part such programs have been developed with private financial aid. They have demonstrated that minority group members can achieve higher performance if the educational opportunity offered them is fitted to their particular needs.

11. Most of the programs studied by the Commission stress the minority group child's need for special counseling and guidance, remedial instruction, and stimulus to overcome the effect of past deprivations.

12. School systems might be more willing to undertake desegregation if Federal funds and technical assistance were available to provide the programs needed to close the cultural and academic gap.

13. The Legislature of Louisiana met in extraordinary and regular session almost continually during the school year 1960–61 in an attempt to prevent the desegregation of the New Orleans schools pursuant to the order of a Federal court. Its temporarily successful attempts to deny State funds to Orleans Parish School District, to cut off the salaries of teachers in the desegregated schools, and to prevent the school board from borrowing from the usual commercial sources, although later invalidated by a Federal court, greatly hampered, embarrassed and tended to demoralize the school officials, teachers and other personnel in carrying out their assigned duties throughout the school year.

14. The experience of Orleans Parish School District in 1960–61 shows the need of temporary outside financial assistance when a State attempts to cut off financial aid and credit to a school system trying to desegregate its schools in compliance with a Federal court order. Two other States (Arkansas and South Carolina) have laws for cutting off State aid to desegregating school districts and South Carolina has authorized two counties to cut off local funds.

15. Public education available to all children in all States, and compulsory school attendance for a minimal period averaging age 7 to 16 years, have contributed to the strength and unity of the Nation. The closing of public schools even temporarily, the diversion of State and local funds to tuition grants for private schooling, and the repeal of compulsory school attendance laws, threaten public education and the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

16. No Federal agency is charged with the duty of: disseminating information concerning desegregation plans, problems, and possible solutions; assisting local school officials in formulating plans to meet local conditions and constitutional requirements; or of using its good offices to mediate and conciliate disputes.

Need for Federal protection

17. The Attorney General of the United States in the period 1959–61 diligently sought to forestall nullification of constitutional principles by State actions; to prevent evasion of Federal court orders; and to provide protection to Negro children assigned to formerly white schools. Nevertheless, disorder accompanied desegregation in New Orleans and white people supporting Federal law and order were not adequately protected by the Federal Government. No member of the rioting crowds in New Orleans was prosecuted for attempting by threats or force to prevent, obstruct, impede, or interfere with the performance of duties under the Federal court order to desegregate the New Orleans schools. (See the Civil Rights Act of 1960.)

18. In New Orleans white pupils attempting to attend desegregated schools and their parents were exposed to threats, loss of employment, harrassment, and persecution. They received no direct aid from the Federal Government and no protection was available to citizens groups working to keep the public schools open even if desegregated. In such situations Federal protection is needed to prevent private or official harassment and reprisals.

Education of dependents of military personnel

19. Many dependents of military personnel assigned to duty in Southern States have had to attend racially segregated public schools particularly in Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina where there are very few on-base schools.

20. No consistent overall policy as to the responsibility of the United States for the education of the children of military personnel in a manner consistent with constitutional principles appears to have been established by the executive branch. In a few places in the last 2 years agreement was reached with local school authorities to admit such children to offbase schools without regard to race; in many more places they still attend racially segregated schools. In one instance Negro plaintiffs had to bring suit in a Federal court to secure admission of their children to a school located on a military base.

21. Congress has recognized that the Federal Government has a particular responsibility to provide suitable education for the children of military personnel on active duty. Racially segregated public schools are in violation of the Constitution and, therefore, are unsuitable for the education of children of military personnel.

Financial aid to public libraries

22. Some public libraries in the 17 Southern States that receive Federal aid under the Library Services Act of 1956 serve whites but not Negroes; in others the segregated services for Negroes are greatly inferior to those for whites.

23. The Library Services Act of 1956 requires that all participating libraries shall provide free service to all residents of the communities they serve and also directs the Commissioner of Education to withhold Federal funds if he find that the administration of a State plan fails to comply with the requirements of the act.

Alleviation of academic handicaps

24. The deprivations that school segregation imposes on minority-group members tend to be perpetuated through inferior segregated colleges, devoted primarily to training graduates for teaching careers for the most part in segregated public schools. These deprivations raise problems not only in connection with the desegregation of school systems (see findings 9 to 11 supra), but in limiting the opportunities of individual minority-group students and teachers.

25. Educational programs as the precollege and graduate levels designed to identify and assist students and teachers of native talent could help to overcome the cumulative deprivations of the past; and would benefit the education system of the Nation.

Higher education

26. Federal support of higher educational institutions that do not comply with constitutional principles is unconscionable and should be terminated. There is no justification for delay in compliance with constitutional requirements in institutions of higher education.

School census by ethnic classification

27. A comprehensive nationwide study of equal protection of the laws in public education requires complete and accurate factual information as to the schools attended by all major ethnic groups, including, for example, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans, as well as racial groups, such as Negroes and Orientals. An annual headcount in school districts, colleges, and universities

that would not be part of the permanent record of individual students would provide the data needed for evaluation of equal protection in educational institutions without exposing students to the risk of discrimination.

28. The New Rochelle case, affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and other lower court decisions, make it clear that denial of equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment does not depend solely upon assignment to school by race. Information about racial segregation in northern schools, viewed in the light of the New Rochelle case and other decisions, indicates that denial of equal protection in public schools on the ground of race is a national, not regional problem.

29. Reliable data showing the ethnic composition of individual public schools and higher educational institutions would be helpful in studying practices in Northern, Western, and border States that may constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Federal action to speed desegregation

Recommendation 1: That the Congress enact legislation making it the duty of every local school board which maintains any public school from which pupils are excluded on the basis of race, to file a plan for desegregation with a designated Federal agency within 6 months after the adoption of such legislation, said plan to call for at least a first step toward full compliance with the Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases at the beginning of the following school year, and complete desegregation as soon as practicable thereafter. Further, that Congress direct the Attorney General to take appropriate action to enforce this obligation.

Recommendation 2: That the Congress provide that any and all Federal grants-in-aid to the various States for educational programs in elementary and secondary public schools be allocated so that States wherein all school districts are operated on a nondiscriminatory basis shall receive the full amount computed under the applicable statutory formula; that States wherein no school districts are so operated shall receive only 50 percent of such funds; that States wherein school districts have initiated desegregation programs shall receive 50 percent of such sum plus the same proportion of the remaining 50 percent as the number of pupils enrolled in all school districts in the State which have initiated a program of desegregation bears to the total number of pupils enrolled in all school districts in the particular State which have a biracial school population.

Dissent to recommendation 2 by Commissioner Rankin

Although this recommendation does not provide for the withholding of all funds from public schools, its purpose is similar to that of the Powell amendment and its net effect might be punitive. I do not believe that schoolchildren should be made to suffer for the errors of their elders.

Recommendations requiring the withholding of funds from States which are not completely desegregated would warrant serious consideration only if there were no other way to achieve conformity with the Constitution without penalizing students. Many of the other recommendations in this report are designed to bring about desegregation without harming education.

Thus I dissent from recommendation 2 because I believe it to be unnecessary and potentially punitive.

Recommendation 3: That Congress consider the advisability of adopting measures to expedite the hearing and final determination of actions brought in Federal courts to secure admission to publicly controlled educational institutions without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.[1]

Federal assistance to desegregating school districts

Recommendation 4: That the Congress enact legislation authorizing a Federal agency, upon request, to provide technical or financial assistance to local school systems at any time within 5 years after the initiation of a desegregation program, or to local citizens' groups attempting to help solve problems arising from such desegregation, in any of the following ways: (1) financial aid to school districts on a 50–50 matching basis for the employment of social workers, or specialists in desegregation problems, or for inservice training programs for teachers or guidance counselors; (2) technical assistance to school districts or citizens' groups to train school personnel or community leaders in techniques useful in solving desegregation problems, including the establishment of home study programs for the academically and culturally handicapped; provided, however, that the desegregation program and its execution shall have been found by the agency administering the program to meet constitutional requirements.

Recommendation 5: That the Congress enact legislation authorizing loans to local school districts from which State or local financial aid has been withdrawn as a result of desegregation, or whose ability to borrow funds from commercial sources has been cut off by State or local action, said loans to be repayable by the borrower upon the receipt of the State or local aid withheld or the restoration of commercial credit.

Recommendation 6: (a) That the President direct, or the Congress enact legislation authorizing, the Commission on Civil Rights, if extended, to serve as a clearinghouse to collect and disseminate information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts to achieve an organization and operation of their schools in accordance with constitutional principles, including data as to the known effects of such programs on the quality of education and the cost thereof; (b) That the Commission further be authorized to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions, and to attempt to mediate and conciliate disputes between school officials and school patrons, upon the request of either, as to desegregation of schools—proposed plans for desegregation, or the implementation of plans already in operation. The Commission agrees that the use of such an advisory and conciliation service should not be a prerequisite to the bringing of legal action in a Federal court nor a ground for delay in the prosecution of a pending action; that its purpose is to obviate the necessity of legal action where possible and, in the case of pending suits, to speed, not delay, a final determination.[2]

Federal protection to school officials and citizens

Recommendation 7: That the President or the Congress direct the Attorney General to take such action as may be appropriate in any case where a school system is operating under a plan to bring it into conformance with the requirements of the 14th amendment, to protect the school board members carrying out such plan, supervisory officials and teachers in school systems executing the orders of such school boards, school children of both races attempting to attend schools affected by the plan and their parents, and citizens helping such children or their parents, from bodily harm, harassment, intimidation, and/or reprisal by officials or private persons.

Education of dependents of military personnel

Recommendation 8: That the President direct the Department of Defense to make a complete survey of the segregated-desegregated status of public schools attended by dependents of military personnel living on-base or in the absence of sufficient housing on-base, living in the vicinity of a base, and report its findings to him. Further, that insofar as such dependents are found to be attending compulsory racially segregated schools, the President instruct the Commissioner of Education to make suitable arrangements for their education in public schools or on-base schools open to all such dependents without discrimination because of color or race.

Aid to public libraries under Library Services Act

Recommendation 9: That the President direct the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make a survey of the practices of all public libraries receiving Federal financial aid under the Library Services Act of 1956 to determine whether or not they are offering free service to all residents of the community as required by the terms of that law and by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment of the Constitution. Further, that the Commissioner, as provided in the law granting such Federal aid, withhold Federal funds from States which include under the State plan libraries not serving all residents of the community or not serving all of them in a manner consonant with constitutional principles.

Alleviation of academic handicaps

Recommendation 10: That the Federal Government sponsor in the several States, upon their application therefor, educational programs designed to identify and assist teachers and students of native talent and ability who are handicapped professionally or scholastically as a result of inferior training or educational opportunity.[3]

Higher education

Recommendation 11: That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take such measures as may be required to assure that funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education are disbursed only to such publicly-controlled institutions of higher education as do not discriminate on grounds of race, color, religion or national origin.

The Commission agrees that in any such Federal action taken it should be stipulated that no Federal agency or official shall be given power to direct, supervise or control the administration, curricula or personnel of an institution operated and maintained by a State or a political subdivision thereof.[4]

---

[1] Recommendation 3 reaffirms in principle one made by the Commission in its Higher Education Report. At that time the Commission suggested the use of three-judge courts to expedite final determinations in desegregation cases at the college level. Since there are additional ways that desegregation cases may be expedited, the Commission has now framed its recommendation in general terms and expanded it to include desegregation cases at the elementary and secondary school levels as well.

[2] Recommendation 6 is similar to a recommendation made by the Commission in its 1959 report.

[3] Recommendation 10 reaffirms a recommendation made by the Commission in its higher education report.

[4] Recommendation II reaffirms without change one made in the Higher Education Report. Four Commissioners believe, however, that as a matter of sound public policy the same principle should be extended to privately controlled institutions.

School census by ethnic classification

Recommendation 12: That the President or the Congress direct a Federal agency or agencies to conduct an annual school survey to determine the number and ethnic classification of all students enrolled in all public educational institutions in the United States and compile such data by States, by school districts, by individual schools, and by individual institutions of higher education within each State.[5]

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 7 calendar days, so that Senators who desire to cosponsor it may join with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator from California for his stirring, vital presentation of this very critical—indeed, dangerous—problem which confronts our Nation. I fear that people have heard about it for so long that they take too much for granted. The stirring words of the Senator from California will, I hope, arouse many persons from their self-delusion that this problem can continue year after year without the thorough attention which the proposed legislation seeks to give it. I am grateful to the Senator from California for his association in this very great cause.

Mr. President, under the reservation earlier agreed to, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. I join with him in an expression of appreciation to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], one of the group of Senators who have joined in this effort. The eloquence of the Senator from California and his sincere fervor are extremely inspiring. We all share equally the concern which he has expressed with regard to education and in regard to the other areas of discrimination, prejudice, and segregation in American life, with which we are dealing collectively this afternoon.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and several other Senators, I introduce three bills which aim at the elimination of discrimination in another of these areas—employment.

Survey after survey has confirmed what has long been obvious. The nonwhite is the last hired and the first fired. The recent Manpower Report of the President contains some telling figures on this point.

According to the report:

> In 1962 nonwhites (nine-tenths of whom are Negroes) made up 11 percent of the labor force and 22 percent of the unemployed. On the average, there were 900,000 nonwhite workers without jobs in 1962, with an unemployment rate of 11 percent, more than twice that for white workers.

The difference is even more striking among adult men. The unemployment rate for the nonwhite adult was 2½ times—9.4 percent—higher than the rate—3.6 percent—for the white worker.

Some of the difference is undoubtedly due to the fact that Negroes are concentrated in occupations—unskilled farm and nonfarm labor, semiskilled production and service jobs—which are especially vulnerable to unemployment.

Limited education and training are also a factor. Discrimination in the educational opportunities available to the nonwhite handicaps him for life, putting him at the bottom of the ladder in the job world. Small wonder that the achievement of equal educational opportunities is a matter of overriding concern to our Negro citizens as is evidenced by our inclusion of this area in the package of proposed legislation which we are introducing this afternoon. But, while it is difficult to overestimate the urgency of rectifying this basic injustice, better educational opportunities are not the whole answer to the problem. With all due allowance for lesser education and training, the fact remains that all too often the Negro finds the door to employment closed to him simply because he is a Negro.

It is at this situation that the three bills I now introduce are aimed.

The first bill would prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry and would establish a Federal Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment.

The second bill would establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity in Federal employment and employment under Government contracts and subcontracts, applicable to both employers and labor organizations. It would also withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship and worker training programs which deny individuals equal opportunity to participate therein and from State employment services which are operated on a segregated basis. Finally, it would authorize the National Labor Relations Board to set aside representation elections in which resort is made to appeals to race prejudice by either management or labor.

The third bill would establish a Commission on Fair Employment Practices in the District of Columbia.

The need for each of these measures has been fully demonstrated. They are generally in accord with the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, as are a great majority of the provisions of the bills which we have joined in introducing this afternoon, recommendations based on painstaking investigation and hearings in virtually every section of the country. They would provide a statutory basis for action long overdue, not to speak of the vindication of the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic political parties.

I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on employment and the text of my bills be printed in full in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, and that the bills be permitted to lie at the desk through the close of business on Thursday, April 7, in order to permit other Senators who may wish to cosponsor these measures to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills, findings, and recommendations will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1210. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation, the practice of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

"(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

"(c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this Act are necessary for the following purposes:

"(1) To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

"(2) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States.

"(3) To advance toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof.

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ fifty or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, other than a labor organization.

---

[5] Recommendation 12 reaffirms a similar recommendation made by the Commission in its 1959 report. The Commission reemphasizes its position that this recommendation does not contemplate the establishment of school records by race or ethnic classification. The trend toward the elimination of such identification on student records should, in fact, be accelerated.

"(c) The term 'employment agency' means any person undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees or opportunities to work for an employer; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(d) The term 'labor organization' means any organization, having fifty or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

"(e) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession; or between points in the same State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession but through any point outside thereof.

"(f) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(g) The term 'Commission' means the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

"EXEMPTION

"SEC. 4. This Act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

"UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

"SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

"(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry;

"(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to properly classify or refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because of his race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

"(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual or any employer because of the race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry of any individual;

"(2) to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

"(d) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, employment agency, or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

"THE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, which shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, one for a term of five years, one for a term of six years, and one for a term of seven years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

"(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noted.

"(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ and the moneys it has disbursed; and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

"(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year.

"(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as defined in title 28, United States Code, chapter 3, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

"(g) The Commission shall have power—

"(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court;

"(2) to cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies;

"(3) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act or any order issued thereunder;

"(4) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

"(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

"(6) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this Act, and the Commission may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and concilation councils shall be composed of representative citizens resident of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportaton and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C., sec. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance. The Commission may, to the extent it deems it necessary, provide by regulation for exemption of such persons from the operation of title 18 United States Code, sections 281, 283, 284, and 434. Such regulation may be issued without prior notice and hearing.

"PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"SEC. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided,* That an agreement between or among an employer or employers and a labor organization or labor organizations pertaining to discrimination in employment shall be enforcible in accordance with applicable law, but nothing contained therein shall be construed or permitted to foreclose the jurisdiction over any practice or occurrence granted the Commission by this Act: *Provided further,* That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession or local government, to cede, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed, to such agency jurisdiction over any cases or class of cases, if such agency, in the judgment of the Commission, has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in such cases.

"(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall enedavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

"(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, the Commission shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon any person charged with the commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter called the 'respondent') a complaint stating the charges in that respect, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such complaint. No complaint shall issue based upon any unlawful employment practice occurring more than one year prior to the filing of the charge with the Commission and the service of a copy thereof upon the respondent, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of military service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such complaint and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any complaint, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

"(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

"(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof.

"(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision and copies thereof shall be served upon the parties. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

"(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

"(j) If, upon the preponderance of the evidence, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination), as will effectuate the policies of this Act: *Provided,* That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require such respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order dismissing the complaint.

"(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"Sec. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(d) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(e) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

"(f) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(g) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(i) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(j) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"(k) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Commission, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

"(l) Petitions filed under this Act shall be heard expeditiously.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"Sec. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary of such evidence may be required from any place in the Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(b) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, any district court within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(d) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

"(e) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"(f) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(g) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(h) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Commission, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Commission.

"ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

"SEC. 10. (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this Act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this Act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

"(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, which contract requires the employment of at least fifty individuals. Such rules and regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

"NOTICES TO BE POSTED

"SEC. 11. (a) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of this Act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

"(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

"VETERANS' PREFERENCE

"SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 13. (a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) If at any time after the issuance of any such regulation or any amendment or rescission thereof, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that the Congress disapproves such regulation, amendment, or rescission, such disapproved regulation, amendment, or rescission shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution.

"FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 14. The provisions of section 111, title 18, United States Code, shall apply to officers, agents, and employees of the Commission in the performance of their official duties.

"SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

"SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 16. This Act shall become effective sixty days after enactment, except that subsections 7 (c) to (l), inclusive, and section 8 shall become effective six months after enactment."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1211. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment, in employment under Government contracts, and in employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid; and for other purposes:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the 'Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1963.'

"TITLE I—COMMISSION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

"Establishment of the Commission

"SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity (hereafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commission').

"Membership

"SEC. 102. The Commission shall be composed of—

"(1) the Vice President of the United States, who shall serve as Chairman;

"(2) the Secretary of Labor, who shall serve as Vice Chairman; and

"(3) not to exceed nine additional members who shall be appointed by, and serve at the pleasure of, the President.

Not less than one-half of the members appointed under paragraph (3) shall be appointed from private life.

"Organization

"SEC. 103. (a) The Chairman shall preside at meetings of the Commission. The Vice Chairman shall have general supervision and direction of the work of the Commission and of the execution and implementation of the policies adopted by the Commission and of its orders and recommendations made pursuant thereto.

"(b) A quorum of the Commission shall consist of a majority of the members serving at any time.

"(c) The Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairman and at such other times as may be provided by its rules and regulations.

"(d) The Commission shall adopt such rules and regulations as it determines necessary to govern its proceedings.

"(e) Each member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the Government in addition to serving as a member of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation. Each member of the Commission appointed from private life shall receive $75 a day when engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

"General duties

"SEC. 104. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

"(1) to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity for employment in the civilian service of the Government and of equal opportunity for service in the Armed Forces of the United States, including all reserve components thereof; of equal opportunity for employment under Government contracts; and of equal opportunity for employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed, in whole or in part, by grants-in-aid made by the Government;

"(2) to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity in the availability of, and the administration of, all training programs and recruitment and placement services provided by the Government or provided with funds or services furnished, in whole or in part, by the Government;

"(3) to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity for membership in, and participation in the activities of, labor organizations, insofar as such membership or participation affects equal opportunity for employment, and terms and conditions of employment with the Government, with employers under Government contracts or under grants-in-aid made by the Government;

"(4) to encourage and promote educational programs by employer, labor, civic, educational, religious, and other nongovernmental groups in order to eliminate or reduce the basic causes of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin;

"(5) to perform the duties and functions imposed on it by the provisions of this Act;

"(6) to submit, not later than February 1 of each year, a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its activities during the preceding calendar year and its recommendations, if any, for executive or legislative action, and to submit such special reports as the President or Congress may request or the Commission deems necessary; and

"(7) to perform such other duties and functions as may be prescribed, or delegated to it, by the President.

"Staff

"Sec. 105. (a) There shall be an Executive Vice Chairman of the Commission who shall be appointed by the President and who shall be ex officio a member of the Commission. The Executive Vice Chairman shall assist the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and the members of the Commission and shall be responsible for carrying out the orders and recommendations of the Commission and for performing such other functions as the Commission may direct. The Executive Vice Chairman shall receive compensation at a rate prescribed by the President, but not in excess of the scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS-18 in the Classification Act of 1949.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel as is necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and is authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 a day.

"(c) The Commission may procure, by contract or otherwise, the services of public and private organizations and institutions.

"Powers

"Sec. 106. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable, and impose sanctions and penalties as set forth below. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

"(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued under subsection (a), any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

"(c) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions and duties. Each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or the Vice Chairman, and to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish it such assistance as it may require in carrying out its functions and duties.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to delegate to any officer, agency, or employee in the executive branch of the Government any function of the Commission under this Act, except the authority to promulgate rules and regulations of a general nature.

"(e) The Commission shall adopt such rules and regulations and issue such orders as it deems necessary and appropriate to achieve the purposes of this Act.

"TITLE II—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

"General

"Sec. 201. It shall be unlawful for any department or agency of the Federal Government to discriminate against any Federal employee or applicant for Federal employment, in the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Any such person who is aggrieved as a result of discrimination in violation of this section may file a complaint with such department or agency, or with the Commission.

"Enforcement and sanctions

"Sec. 202. (a) Each department and agency shall be primarily responsible for complying with the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission with respect to nondiscrimination in employment. Each department and agency shall cooperate with the Commission, and furnish the Commission such information and assistance as it may require in the performance of its functions under this title. Each department and agency shall appoint or designate, from among its personnel, an officer or officers to be responsible for assuring equal employment opportunities.

"(b) The Commission may receive and cause to be investigated complaints by employees or prospective employees of a Government department or agency, which allege discrimination contrary to the provisions of this title or the rules and regulations issued hereunder. The appropriate department or agency shall report to the Commission what action has been taken or is recommended with regard to such complaints.

"(c) If the Commission so directs, the Department or agency shall cease or desist discriminatory employment practices and take such affirmative action as in the judgment of the Commission shall effectuate the purposes of this Act, including, but not limited to, hiring, reinstatement, or upgrading of employees or the extension of nondiscriminatory terms, conditions, and privileges of employment.

"TITLE III—EMPLOYMENT UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"Contract provisions

"Sec. 301. Except in the case of contracts exempted in accordance with section 302, all Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract entered into after the effective date of this Act such provisions as the Commission deems necessary and advisable to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"Exemptions

"Sec. 302. The Commission may, when it deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions prescribed under section 301 in any specific contract, subcontract, or purchase order. The Commission may, by rule or regulation, also exempt certain classes of contracts, subcontracts, or purchase orders (a) where work is to be or has been performed outside the United States and no recruitment of workers within the limits of the United States is involved; (b) for standard commercial supplies or raw materials; or (c) involving less than specified amounts of money or specified numbers of workers.

"Compliance reports

"Sec. 303. (a) Each contractor having a contract containing the provisions prescribed under section 301 shall file, and shall cause each of its subcontractors to file, compliance reports with the contracting agency, which will be subject to review by the Commission upon its request. Compliance reports shall be filed within such times and shall contain such information as to the practices, policies, programs, and employment statistics of the contractor and each subcontractor, and shall be in such form, as the Commission may prescribe.

"(b) Bidders or prospective contractors or subcontractors may be required to state whether they have participated in any previous contract subject to the provisions of this title, and in that event to submit, on behalf of themselves and their proposed subcontractors, compliance reports prior to or as an initial part of their bid or negotiation of a contract.

"(c) Whenever the contractor or subcontractor has a collective bargaining agreement or other contract or understanding with a labor union or other representative of workers, the compliance report shall include such information as to the labor union's or other representative's practices and policies affecting compliance as the Commission may prescribe. To the extent such information is within the exclusive possession of a labor union or other workers' representative and the labor union or representative refuses to furnish such information to the contractor, the contractor shall so certify to the contracting agency as part of its compliance report and shall set forth what efforts he has made to obtain such information.

"(d) The Commission may direct that any bidder or prospective contractor or subcontractor shall submit, as part of his compliance report, a statement in writing, signed by an authorized officer or agent of any labor union or other workers' representative with which the bidder or prospective contractor deals, together with supporting information, to the effect that such labor union's or representative's practices and policies do not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin, and that the labor union or representative either will affirmatively cooperate, within the limits of its legal and contractual authority, in the implementation of the policy and provisions of this title or that it consents and agrees that recruitment, employment, and the terms and conditions of employment under the proposed contract shall be in accordance with the purposes and provisions of this title. In the event that the union or representative refuses to execute such a statement, the compliance report shall so certify and set forth what efforts have been made to secure such a statement.

"Labor unions

"Sec. 304. (a) The Commission shall use its best efforts, directly and through contracting agencies, contractors, State, and local officials and public and private agencies, and all other available instrumentalities, to cause any labor union, recruiting agency, or other representative of workers which is or may be engaged in work under Government contracts to cooperate with, and to comply in the implementation of, the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Commission may, to effectuate the purposes of subsection (a), hold hearings, public, or private, with respect to the practices and policies of any such labor organization. It shall from time to time submit special reports to the President concerning discriminatory practices and policies of any such labor organization, and may recommend remedial action if, in its judgment, such action is necessary or appropriate. It may also notify any Federal, State, or local agency of its conclusions and recommendations with respect to any such labor organization which in its judgment has failed to cooperate with the Commission, contracting agencies, contractors, or subcontractors in carrying out the purposes of this title.

“Enforcement

“SEC. 305. (a) Each contracting agency shall be primarily responsible for obtaining compliance with the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission with respect to contracts entered into by such agency or its contractors. All contracting agencies shall comply with the Commission's rules in discharging their primary responsibility for securing compliance with the provisions of contracts and otherwise with the terms of this title and of the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission. Each such agency shall cooperate with the Commission, and furnish the Commission such information and assistance as it may require in the performance of its functions under this title. Each such agency shall appoint or designate, from among the agency's personnel, compliance officers. It shall be the duty of such officers to seek compliance with the objectives of this title by conference, conciliation, mediation, or persuasion.

“(b) The Commission may itself investigate the employment practices of any Government contractor or subcontractor, or initiate such investigation by the appropriate contracting agency or through the Secretary of Labor, to determine whether or not the contract provisions prescribed under section 301 have been violated. Such investigation shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures established by the Commission, and the investigating agency shall report to the Commission any action taken or recommended.

“(c) The Commission may receive and cause to be investigated complaints by employees or prospective employees of a Government contractor or subcontractor which allege discrimination contrary to the contract provisions prescribed under section 301. The appropriate contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor, as the case may be, shall report to the Commission what action has been taken or is recommended with regard to such complaints.

“Sanctions and penalties

“SEC. 306. (a) In accordance with such rules, regulations, or orders as the Commission may adopt, the Commission or the appropriate contracting agency may:

“(1) Publish, or cause to be published, the names of contractors or unions which it has concluded have complied or have failed to comply with the provisions of this title or of the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission.

“(2) Recommend to the Department of Justice that, in cases where there is substantial or material violation or the threat of substantial or material violation of the contract provisions prescribed under section 301, appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce those provisions, including the enjoining, within the limitations of applicable law, of organizations, indviduals, or groups who prevent directly or indirectly, or seek to prevent directly or indirectly, compliance with such provisions.

“(3) Recommend to the Department of Justice that criminal proceedings be brought for the furnishing of false information to any contracting agency or to the Commission, as the case may be.

“(4) Terminate, or cause to be terminated, any contract, or any portion or portions thereof, for failure of the contractor or subcontractor to comply with the nondiscrimination provisions of the contract. Contracts may be terminated absolutely or continuance of contracts may be conditioned upon a program for future compliance approved by the contracting agency.

“(5) Provide that any contracting agency shall refrain from entering into further contracts, or extensions or other modifications of existing contracts, with any noncomplying contractor, until such contractor has satisfied the Commission that he has established and will carry out personnel and employment policies in compliance with the provisions of this title.

“(b) Under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission, each contracting agency shall make reasonable efforts within a reasonable time limitation to secure compliance with the contract provisions prescribed under section 301 by methods of conference, conciliation, mediation, and persuasion before proceedings shall be instituted under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section or before a contract shall be terminated in whole or in part under paragraph (4) of such subsection for failure of a contractor or subcontractor to comply with the contract provisions prescribed under section 301. No order shall be made under paragraph (5) of such subsection debarring a contractor from further Government contracts except after notice and hearing.

“(c) Any contracting agency taking any action authorized by subsection (a) of this section, whether on its own motion, or as directed by the Commission, or under the Commission's rules and regulations, shall promptly notify the Commission of such action or reasons for not acting. Where the Commission itself makes a determination under this section, it shall promptly notify the appropriate contracting agency of the action recommended. The agency shall take such action and shall report the results thereof to the Commission within such time as the Commission shall provide.

“(d) If the Commission so directs, contracting agencies shall not enter into contracts with any bidder or prospective contractor unless the bidder or prospective contractor has satisfactorily complied with the provisions of this title or submits a program for compliance acceptable to the Commission or, if the Commission so authorizes, to the contracting agency.

“(e) Whenever a contracting agency terminates a contract, or whenever a contractor has been debarred from further Government contracts, because of noncompliance with the contract provisions with regard to nondiscrimination, the Commission, or the contracting agency involved, shall promptly notify the Comptroller General of the United States.

“Certificates of merit

“SEC. 307. (a) The Commission may provide for issuance of a United States Government Certificate of Merit to employers or employee organizations which are or may hereafter be engaged in work under Government contracts, if the Commission is satisfied that the personnel and employment practices of the employer, or that the personnel, training, apprenticeship, membership, grievance and representation, upgrading and other practices and policies of the employee organization, conform to the purposes and provisions of this title.

“(b) Any Certificate of Merit may at any time be suspended or revoked by the Commission if the holder thereof, in the judgment of the Commission, has failed to comply with the provisions of this title.

“(c) The Commission may provide for the exemption of any employer or employee organization from any requirement for furnishing information as to compliance with the provisions of this title, if such employer or employee organization has been awarded a Certificate of Merit which has not been suspended or revoked.

“TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT UNDER GOVERNMENT GRANTS

“Authority for Commission action

“SEC. 401. The Commission is authorized to provide, by rules and regulations, for the application of the provisions of title III of this Act, or as many of such provisions as it deems proper to carry out the purposes of this Act, to recipients of Federal grants-in-aid with respect to employment in programs created or supported or in facilities constructed, in whole or in part, by such grants-in-aid.

“TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACTS

“Amendment to Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

“SEC. 501. Section 101(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 411(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“ ‘(6) PROTECTION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.—No labor organization shall refuse membership to, segregate, expel, or otherwise discriminate in terms or conditions of membership against any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.’

“Amendments to Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947

“SEC. 502. (a) Section 9 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 159), is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end of subsection (c) thereof:

“ ‘(6) In any election where the Board finds that an employer, a labor organization or its agents, or an employee or group of employees appeals to prejudice on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin in order to influence the result of such election, the Board is authorized to deny certification of the results thereof.’

“(b) Section 9 of such Act is further amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end of subsection (e) thereof:

“ ‘(3) The Board is authorized to deny certification of the results of any election conducted pursuant to this subsection if the Board finds that an employer, a labor organization or its agents, or an employee or group of employees appeals to prejudice on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin in order to influence the result of such election.’

“TITLE VI—WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL SUPPORT AND APPROVAL FROM STATE APPRENTICESHIP, WORKER RETRAINING, AND PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WHICH ARE OPERATED AS TO DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF RACE, RELIGION, COLOR, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN

“Apprenticeship programs

“SEC. 601. The Act entitled ‘An Act to enable the Department of Labor to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices and to cooperate with the States in the promotion of such standards’, approved August 16, 1937 (29 U.S.C. 50–50b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“ ‘SEC. 5. Where an apprenticeship program is so organized or operated in any State as to discriminate in admission or participation on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin, the Secretary of Labor shall not—

“ ‘(1) formulate or promote, or cooperate with a State agency of such State or public or private enterprise or association in such State in the formulation or promotion, of any labor standards under the first section of this Act with respect to such apprenticeship program,

“ ‘(2) issue any special certificate under section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214), with respect to an apprentice in such apprenticeship program,

“ ‘(3) allow any variation, tolerance, or exemption to or from any of the provisions of the first section of the Walsh-Healey Act (41 U.S.C. 35), with respect to an apprentice in such apprenticeship program, or

"'(4) consider any laborer or mechanic as being in a class of workers in an apprenticeship program and eligible for wage payments as an apprentice, under the first section of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276a).'

"Worker retraining programs

"SEC. 602. (a) Whenever the head of any Federal department or agency administering a program of Federal support to the States with respect to occupational retraining programs in the States finds that any such State program is so organized or operated as to discriminate against any unemployed or underemployed person on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin, the head of the Federal department or agency administering such program of Federal support shall withhold all such Federal support from such State program.

"(b) In the administration of any law which provides Federal retraining programs for unemployed or underemployed persons and which authorizes the utilization of State agencies or programs in carrying out the Federal program, no State agency or program shall be so utilized if the head of the Federal department or agency administering such law finds that such State agency discriminates against any unemployed or underemployed person on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin, or that such State program is so organized or operated as to discriminate against any unemployed or underemployed person on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin.

"Public employment programs

"SEC. 603. Section 5 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes', approved June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U.S.C. 49d), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(c) Whenever the Secretary shall find that any public employment office of a State is operated in such a manner (1) as to discriminate against any person because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, or (2) as to accept or process employment orders which are discriminatory on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Secretary shall not issue any certificate to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State for the administration of its public employment offices.'

"TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Appropriations

"SEC. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Effect on State laws

"SEC. 702. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to exempt or relieve any person from any liability, duty, penalty, or punishment provided by any present or future law of any State or political subdivision of a State, other than any such law which purports to require or permit the doing of any act prohibited by this Act.

"(b) Where there is a State or local agency which has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in cases covered by this Act, and the Commission determines the agency is effectively exercising such power, the Commission shall seek written agreements with the State or local agency under which the Commission shall refrain from bringing a civil action in any cases or class of cases referred to in such agreement. The Commission shall rescind any such agreement when it determines such agency no longer has such power, or is no longer effectively exercising such power.

"Effective date

"SEC. 703. This Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment."

To the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1212. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Fair Employment Practices Act'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that denial of, or discrimination in, employment on account of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American ideal of equality of opportunity for all and is a major contributing cause to the unemployment of certain youth in the District of Columbia; and the Congress further finds that the alleviation of youth unemployment in the District of Columbia will materially reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crime therein.

"(b) The Congress declares that the succeeding provisions of this Act are necessary to prevent denial of, or discrimination in, employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, and thereby to afford all youth equality of opportunity for employment in the District of Columbia.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person having in his employ ten or more individuals; but shall not include any religious, sectarian, charitable, fraternal, social, or educational organization, other than a labor organization, if no part of the net earnings of such organization inures to the benefit of any individual or of any organization not excluded by this subsection.

"(c) The term 'employment agency' means any person undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees or opportunities to work for an employer; but shall not include any religious, sectarian, charitable, fraternal, social, or educational organization, if no part of the net earnings of such organization inures to the benefit of any individual or of any organization not excluded by this subsection.

"(d) The term 'labor organization' means any organization, having ten or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

"(e) The term 'Commission' means the District of Columbia Fair Employment Practices Commission created by section 5 hereof.

"UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for an employer to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for an employment agency to fail, or to refuse, to classify properly or refer for employment any individual because of his race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for a labor organization to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against any individual in violation of this Act.

"(d) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for any employer, employment agency, or labor organization to refuse to hire, to discharge, to expel, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

"THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created as an independent agency of the government of the District of Columbia a commission to be known as the District of Columbia Fair Employment Practices Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(b) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noted.

"(c) The Commission shall, at the close of each fiscal year, submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for transmission by them to the Congress and to the President a report concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ; and the moneys it has disbursed. The Commission may, from time to time, make such further reports on the causes of, and the means of eliminating, discrimination, and such recommendations for further legislation, as may appear desirable.

"(d) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary of $18,500 a year. Each other member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $18,000 a year.

"(e) The Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, have power to appoint such officers, agents, and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court.

"PROCEEDINGS BEFORE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any individual believes that any employer, employment agency, or labor organization in the District of Columbia has engaged in any unlawful employment practice under this Act with respect to that individual, he may file a sworn written charge with the Commission in such manner and containing such information as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall by regulation prescribe. No charge based upon an unlawful employment practice occurring more than one year prior to the filing thereof shall be received by the Commission under this Act, unless the individual aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of such service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed pursuant to this Act, the Commission shall investigate the alleged unlawful employment practice; and if the Commission shall determine that probable cause exists for crediting the written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate such practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

"(c) If the Commission, acting pursuant to subsection (b), fails to eliminate an alleged unlawful employment practice under this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, the Commission shall issue and cause to be served upon any person charged with the Commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter in this section called the respondent) a complaint stating the practice charged. The respondent shall have the right, within ten days after service of the complaint, to file with the Commission a sworn written answer thereto.

"(d) The Commission shall, upon reasonable notice to the individual aggrieved by an alleged unlawful employment practice and to the respondent, holding a hearing on each complaint at a time not less than thirty days after the service of the complaint upon the respondent. The hearing may, at the direction of the Commission, be conducted by a single member thereof. The individual aggrieved and the respondent shall have the right to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and to present evidence, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. All testimony shall be taken under oath. Any member of the Commission may administer such oath and may examine any witness.

"(e) The Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any hearing under this Act. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, upon application by the Commission, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, or before any single member thereof conducting a hearing under this Act, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the hearing.

"(f) At the conclusion of a hearing conducted by a single member of the Commission, the members shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his findings of fact and recommendations for disposition of the charge. The Commission, before taking final action on such findings and recommendations, shall afford the individual aggrieved and the respondent an opportunity to be heard thereon at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

"(g) If the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on the respondent an order requiring the respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including the hiring or reinstatement of the individual discriminated against, as may be necessary to eliminate the practice. Any person reinstated pursuant to this subsection may, in the discretion of the Commission, be awarded backpay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination): *Provided,* That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the individual discriminated against shall operate to reduce the backpay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require the respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on the individual who filed the charge an order dismissing the complaint.

"(h) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Commission, or of any member thereof, may be served either personally or by registered or certified mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual making service, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of service; and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt, when service is by registered or certified mail or by telegraph, shall be proof of service. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, or any member thereof, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(i) At any time prior to the issuance of an order by the Commission under subsection (g), a proceeding under this section may be terminated by agreement between the individual aggrieved and the respondent, with the approval of the Commission.

"(j) All proceedings held pursuant to this section shall conform with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for the enforcement of a final order to the Commission and for appropriate temporary relief, and shall in conjunction therewith file in the court a certified transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon the filing of such a petition the court shall cause a copy thereof to be served upon the person to whom the final order of the Commission was issued, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant such temporary relief as it deems just and proper and to make and enter an order enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(b) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. Upon the filing of such a petition the court shall cause a copy thereof to be served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall file in the court a certified transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon the filing of the entire record, the court shall have jurisdiction to grant such temporary relief as it deems just and proper and to make and enter an order enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(c) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(d) If either party to any proceeding under this section shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, or any member thereof, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission or member and to be made a part of the transcript. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed; and it shall file with the court such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(e) All actions taken by the courts under this Act shall conform with section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act. When granting appropriate temporary relief or making and entering an order as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (U.S.C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

"NOTICES TO BE POSTED

"SEC. 8. (a) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of this Act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

"(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 9. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have authority to issue from time to time such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"VETERANS' PREFERENCE

"SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any law of the District of Columbia or any law of the United States creating special rights or preference for veterans.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 11. This Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment."

The findings and recommendations presented by Mr. CASE are as follows:

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT NO. 3, 1961, ON EMPLOYMENT

FINDINGS

General

1. Although the occupational levels attained by Negroes have risen sharply during the past 20 years, Negro workers are still disproportionately concentrated in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled in both private and public employment. They are also disproportionately represented among the unemployed because of their concentration in unskilled and semiskilled jobs—those most severely affected by both cyclical and structural unemployment—and because Negro workers often have relatively low seniority. These difficulties are due in some degree to present or past discrimination in employment practices, in educational and training opportunities, or both.

2. Directly or indirectly, Federal funds create employment opportunities for millions in the civilian and military establishments of the Federal Government and in employment by Government contractors and grant-in-aid recipients. In addition, Federal funds provide training opportunities and placement services that directly affect employment opportunities. A policy of equal opportunity for all regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin has been declared with respect to some programs in each of these areas of Federal involvement in employment,

but that policy has yet to be made consistent or thoroughly effective.

Enforcement of Federal policy of equal employment opportunity

3. The principal enforcement agency for Federal policy in this field is the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This Committee has already taken steps to overcome obstacles encountered by the former Committee on Government Employment Policy and the Committee on Government Contracts in administering past programs of nondiscriminatory employment. Among projects which could contribute substantially to the effectuation of the Federal nondiscrimination program are the following:

(a) Regular surveys of all Federal employment, in both the civilian and military establishments (including members of Reserve components), to show current patterns of minority group employment, participation in training programs, and methods used to recruit for, and fill, jobs;

(b) Appointment of full-time employment policy officers in all executive departments and major agencies, and the appointment of full-time contracts compliance officers in the principal contracting agencies, all to be thoroughly trained. by or under the supervision of the President's Committee, in the objectives, problems, and techniques for effectuating the Federal policy of nondiscriminatory employment. (In the largest agencies with substantial field establishments, the appointment of specially trained regional deputy employment policy officers and deputy contracts compliance officers may also be required.)

(c) Expansion of the program of the former Committee on Government Employment Policy of conducting conferences in various locations with local administrators, deputy employment policy officers, and line supervisers to explain the Federal program of nondiscriminatory employment and discuss the problems involved and the techniques for overcoming them;

(d) Establishing and maintaining a centralized list of current Government contractors and circulating it regularly to State employment offices;

(e) Reaffirming that, when Government contractors completely delegate to labor organizations the power of hiring, or of determining admission to apprenticeship training programs or other terms and conditions of employment, they will be held responsible for the discriminatory acts of the unions;

(f) Requesting the Secretary of Labor to require State employment offices to report to the Committee all discriminatory job orders placed by Federal agencies and Government contractors.

4. The Committee's potential effectiveness is, however, limited. Established only by Executive action, it is necessarily limited in budget and legal authority. Its jurisdiction over labor unions is indirect and tenuous. Its authority over employment created by grants-in-aid and over federally assisted training programs and recruitment services is not clearly defined.

Employment created by grants-in-aid

5. Grants-in-aid and contracts are similar in all pertinent respects, yet there is no uniform Federal policy requiring nondiscrimination in employment created by grant programs. Where such requirements are imposed, they have been undertaken on an agency-by-agency basis with little or no publicity or enforcement machinery.

6. In the absence of a uniform policy imposed from above, agency administrators, concerned primarily with carrying out the substance of their programs, give little consideration to the matter of nondiscriminatory employment. Many agencies are reluctant to take the initiative for fear of jeopardizing their appropriations.

7. It is not clear that unemployment under grants-in-aid is within the scope of Executive Order 10925, which established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and specifically prohibits discrimination in employment under Government contracts.

Armed Forces

8. Although the Armed Forces Reserves are theoretically subject to Executive Order 9981, providing for equality of opportunity in the armed services, there continue to be segregated Reserve units in some States and units in other States which completely exclude Negroes.

9. In some States, Negroes are excluded from National Guard units; in others segregated units are maintained.

10. Although the National Guard is financed principally with Federal funds and trains under the direction of the Department of Defense, the Federal Government has taken no action to require desegregation of National Guard units.

11. Current statistics regarding the representation of minority groups in the Armed Forces, the National Guard and the Reserves are not generally available. Since 1955 the Department of Defense has taken the position that integration in the military is an accomplished fact and that no public interest can be served by future reports on the subject.

Training and recruitment

12. When new opportunities in training or employment are made available to Negroes, there is often a dearth of qualified Negro applicants. Part of the problem is a lack of applicants resulting from the unwillingness of many Negroes to apply for jobs that have traditionally been closed to them or a lack of knowledge of such new openings. Another facet of the problem is a lack of adequately trained Negroes resulting from a shortage of training opportunities or lack of motivation on the part of Negroes to take training for jobs that may not be available to them.

13. Through the grant of substantial funds, the Federal Government participates in many training and recruitment programs. No program designed to eliminate discrimination in employment can be completely effective unless it includes efforts to eliminate discrimination in recruitment and training facilities.

14. Vocational training received through the public schools, and made possible by Federal grant funds, is the principal means of acquiring many of the basic industrial skills. The ability of Negroes to obtain employment in skilled jobs is often determined by the availability of these training programs.

15. Current policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, conditioning admission to vocational classes on an applicant's "chances of securing employment," tends to perpetuate discriminatory employment practices and is economically wasteful. Training opportunities for Negroes, limited to training for jobs currently available in the community rather than for future employment opportunities or opportunities in other communities, may be determined to a large extent by discriminatory hiring and referral practices of local employers and labor unions. Moreover, the jobs traditionally open to Negroes are generally the ones in which there is a growing surplus of labor. In the newer technical skills, on the other hand, where training is not generally available to Negroes, openings for qualified applicants are constantly increasing.

16. Distributive and part-time education are often denied to Negroes because they cannot obtain the employment required for these programs. Here again, discriminatory employment practices determine the availability of federally supported training.

17. Apprenticeship training could be an important means of fulfilling the increasing demand for skilled workmen and of helping minority groups emerge from their traditionally low economic status. However, present apprenticeship training programs are not training even enough craftsmen to replace those who retire, and Negroes constitute a disproportionately small minority of the inadequate number of workers being trained.

18. The nationwide paucity of participation by Negroes in apprenticeship training programs is caused by lack of qualified applicants and also by discriminatory practices of both labor organizations and employers, who control admission to such programs.

19. To overcome the lack of qualified minority group applicants when new job opportunities are opened, affirmative action is often necessary to encourage them to take the necessary training, to inform them of training and employment opportunities, and, by appointing or employing them in nontraditional jobs, to demonstrate that employment opportunities do exist.

20. Although the Federal Government bears the entire cost of administering State employment offices, it has done little to assure that the policies of the program—to encourage merit employment and to discourage employment discrimination—are being effectuated.

21. Federal money is being used to perpetuate discrimination in many State employment offices where segregated offices or services are maintained, employment office personnel are hired on a discriminatory basis, and where discriminatory job orders are accepted and filled or where nondiscriminatory orders are processed on a discriminatory basis.

22. Present methods of determining State employment office budgets, based primarily on the number of job placements made, encourage employment discrimination and discourage the "selling" of merit employment.

Labor organizations

23. The practices and policies of labor organizations are often vital to equality of employment opportunity. Internal union policies, governing membership and job referrals, are particularly important to the skilled craft unions, especially in the building trades, where membership is usually a condition of employment and a large proportion of hiring is done directly through the unions. External policies, expressed in collective bargaining, affect equal opportunity through the unions' power to negotiate terms and conditions of employment.

24. Membership and job referral practices of craft unions and hiring practices in the building and construction trades have hampered the effectiveness of the Government-contract nondiscrimination policy with respect to construction work undertaken for the Federal Government.

25. As the craft unions generally control admission to apprenticeship training programs, racial discrimination policies also operate to exclude Negroes from these programs.

26. Existing civil rights machinery within the AFL–CIO has not eliminated discriminatory practices and policies of some local unions.

27. Existing Federal law has little impact on the discriminatory practices of labor organizations. No law specifically prohibits unions from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in determining membership qualifications or job referrals.

28. Federal law does impose a duty of fair representation upon unions and presently proscribes discrimination in initial employment based on membership or nonmembership in a union. The NLRB, however, the Federal agency authorized to administer these provisions, has not effectively enforced

the duty of fair representation nor has it had a significant impact on the hiring and referral practices in the building and construction trades.

29. Although the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity has authority to deal with union discrimination, it lacks direct jurisdiction over labor organizations and the authority it has is limited to trade union practices affecting employment on Government contracts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

General

Recommendation 1: That Congress grant statutory authority to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity or establish a similar agency—

(a) To encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in all Federal employment, both civilian and military, and all employment created or supported by Government contracts and Federal grant funds.

(b) To promote and enforce a policy of equality of opportunity in the availability and administration of all federally assisted training programs and recruitment services.

(c) To encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity with respect to membership in or activities of labor organizations affecting equal employment opportunity or terms and conditions of employment with employers operating under Government contracts or Federal grants-in-aid.

Armed Forces

Recommendation 2: That the President issue an Executive order providing for equality of treatment and opportunity, without segregation or other barriers, for all applicants for or members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard and student training programs, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin; and directing that an immediate survey, and report thereon, be made regarding Negro membership in the Armed Forces, the Armed Forces Reserves, the National Guard, and student training programs, including data, where appropriate, on branch of service, rank, type of job or assignment, years of service, and rates of pay.

Employment under grant-in-aid projects

Recommendation 3: That the President issue an Executive order making clear that employment supported by Federal grant funds is subject to the same nondiscrimination policy and the same requirements as those set forth in Executive order 10925 applicable to employment by Government contractors.

Training and recruitment

Recommendation 4: That Congress and the President take appropriate measures to encourage the fullest utilization of the Nation's manpower resources and to eliminate the waste of human resources inherent in the discriminatory denial of training and employment opportunities to minority group members by—

(a) Expanding and supplementing existing programs of Federal assistance to vocational education and apprenticeship training.

(b) Providing for retraining as well as training and for funds to enable jobless workers to move to areas where jobs are available and their skills are in demand.

(c) Providing that, as a condition of Federal assistance, all such programs be administered on a nondiscriminatory, nonsegregated basis; and

(d) Amending present regulations regarding admission to vocational classes to provide that admission be based on present and probable future national occupational needs rather than, as presently interpreted, on traditional and local needs and opportunities.

Recommendation 5: That, in order to encourage the fullest utilization of the Nation's manpower resources, Congress enact legislation to provide equality of training and employment opportunities for youths (aged 16 to 21), and particularly minority group youths, to assist them in obtaining employment and completing their education—

(a) Through a system of federally subsidized employment and training made available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

(b) Through the provision of funds for special placement services in the schools in connection with part-time and cooperative vocational education programs.

Recommendation 6: That the President direct that appropriate measures be taken for the conduct, on a continuing basis, of an affirmative program of dissemination of information—

(a) To make known the availability on a nondiscriminatory basis of jobs in the Federal Government and with Government contractors.

(b) To encourage all individuals to train for and apply for such jobs, and particularly those jobs where there is currently a shortage of qualified applicants.

Recommendation 7: That steps be taken, either by Executive or congressional action, to reaffirm and strengthen the Bureau of Employment Security policy, in rendering recruitment and placement services, of encouraging merit employment and assisting minority group members in overcoming obstacles to employment and in obtaining equal job opportunities. In this connection, consideration should be given to changing the method utilized to determine Federal appropriations to State employment offices, presently keyed primarily to the number of job placements made, to reflect other factors (such as the greater degree of difficulty and time involved in placing qualified minority group workers), so that the budgetary formula used will encourage rather than discourage referral on a nondiscriminatory basis. In addition, regulations and statements of policy with respect to the operation of State employment offices should be reexamined to insure that such regulations and statements conform to the overall USES policy of discouraging employment discrimination and encouraging merit employment.

Recommendation 8: That the President direct the Secretary of Labor to grant Federal funds for the operation of State employment offices only to those offices which offer their services to all, on a nonsegregated basis, and which refuse to accept and/or process discriminatory job orders.

Labor organizations

Recommendation 9: That Congress amend the Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959 to include in title I thereof a provision that no labor organization shall refuse membership to, segregate, or expel any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Jersey for his magnificent and sincere speech. I value greatly our partnership in this most important effort. I know of no one who has spoken to this issue with the sincerity and the depth of almost religious conviction that the Senator from New Jersey has. Ever since he and I served in the House of Representatives—going back to 1947—it has been my great pleasure and personal honor to be associated with him in this civil rights struggle, about which—unfortunately—both of us have seen so little done during all these years.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from New York. I warmly reciprocate what he has said about our association. I certainly hope that, as he has stated, what we now urge will not be the subject of inaction, as has occurred so often in the past.

Mr. JAVITS. The fact that eight Senators have joined and the fact that many Members of the other body will be joining in the administration's bills constitute a good augury in regard to what will occur. So I believe we now have the answer; and I believe it is now more a matter of implementation, rather than of discovering the key which will unlock this door—and more so now than ever before. I am especially grateful to the Senator from New Jersey for our long and honorable association in connection with this matter.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], who will speak on the same measures.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I rise to introduce, on behalf of Senators CASE, FONG, JAVITS, KEATING, KUCHEL, BEALL, and myself, two bills dealing with civil rights in the field of housing.

I am happy to report that since early 1962, when I introduced legislation to implement the Civil Rights Commission's report on housing, several steps have been taken to reduce discrimination in housing and to provide relocation assistance to low-income families displaced by the operation of the Federal highway program. However, the scope of these measures has been limited; and my present proposals are meant to correct this.

In November 1962, the President issued an Executive order prohibiting discrimination in housing built, purchased, or financed with Federal assistance. This was a step in the right direction, but the step was too short, I fear. The order failed to cover loans and mortgages handled by federally regulated financial institutions. My first bill calls for a 1-year study by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to determine the need for further antidiscrimination legislation or Executive action in this area and in the administration of the existing urban renewal program.

In 1961 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights called on Federal supervisory agencies to exert their full authority in guaranteeing equal access to home mortgage credit. However, as of today, the four Federal agencies which supervise financial institutions—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—have not required that the financial institutions they supervise incorporate in their policies explicit nondiscrimination clauses. Similarly, the Urban Renewal Administration has not effectively insisted upon nondiscrimination in connection with the program it administers.

The present administration's approach to the problem of housing discrimination has been too much a piecemeal operation. What is needed is an implementation of all the Civil Rights Commission's recommendations.

My second bill deals with the Federal highway program, which has been displacing a large number of low-income families. These families need relocation assistance, but there are indications that the assistance they are getting is inadequate. Since March 1962, when I first pointed out this inequity, a bill was passed to authorize payments to individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced by land acquisitions under Federal highway programs. But more than this is needed. The present program gives no assurance that decent, safe, and sanitary housing will be available.

I recommend that Congress consider amending the Highway Act of 1956 so that this program include assurance of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to all eligible persons.

I ask, Mr. President, that the legislation that I am introducing today be printed and made part of the Record; that the two bills lie on the table for 1 week, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors; and that the findings and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission dealing with Federal supervision of mortgage lending institutions, urban renewal, and the Federal highway program be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and resolution, findings, recommendations, and program will be printed in the Record, and the bill and resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1213) to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to families displaced by construction of highways forming a part of the Interstate System, introduced by Mr. Scott (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 133 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of subsection (b) thereof the following new section:

"(c) Each agreement entered into under section 110 after the date of the enactment of this section between the Secretary and a State highway department for the construction of a project on the Interstate System shall contain clauses providing that the State shall

"(1) assure that there are, or are being provided, in areas within the locality of such project not generally less desirable than the area of such project in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of individuals and families displaced by the construction of such project, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings, equal in number to the number of such displaced individuals and families, which are available to such displaced individuals and families and are reasonably accessible to their places of employment;

"(2) make relocation payments to eligible persons displaced by the construction of such project for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to fulfill his obligations under agreements entered into under section 110 to reimburse the States for relocation payments to displaced eligible individuals made pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (2) of subsection (c)".

(b) Subsection (c) of Section 133 is hereby relettered subsection (d) and is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary shall approve such relocation payments as may be made by a State highway department, or a local public agency acting as an agent for the State highway department for this purpose, to eligible persons for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired for such project and shall reimburse the State for the full costs of relocation payments made pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (2) of subsection (c)".

(c) Subsections (d) and (c) of Section 133 are hereby relettered subsections "(e)" and "(f)" respectively.

The resolution (S. Res. 118) submitted by Mr. Scott (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining—

(1) the feasibility and desirability of legislation requiring those financial institutions which are engaged in making real estate loans secured by residential property, and which are regulated or supervised by a Federal agency or instrumentality with respect to their lending practices, to make such loans in a manner which does not deny home mortgage credit to any person solely because of his race, creed, or color; and

(2) the need for additional legislation to insure the existence of decent, safe, and sanitary housing adequate to meet the needs of families displaced from urban renewal projects, and to facilitate the relocation of such families into such housing.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The findings, recommendations, and program were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FINDINGS OF U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HOUSING

Federal supervision of mortgage lending institutions

14. Among the four Federal agencies that supervise financial institutions, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System acknowledge—at least implicitly—that racial and religious discrimination in mortgage lending does occur among the institutions they supervise. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation disclaim any knowledge of such discrimination.

15. All four of these Federal agencies appear to agree that outright discrimination—the denial of mortgage credit on the basis of race or religion alone—is improper.

16. All four of these Federal agencies enjoy prestige among the institutions they supervise, and much of their supervisory authority is exerted effectively through essentially informal means.

17. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is the only one of these four Federal agencies that has adopted a policy opposing discrimination. It has indicated that its examiners will inquire into possible discrimination on the part of member savings and loan associations, and that where discrimination is found, countermeasures will be taken. There appears to be no good reason why the other three agencies should not take similar action.

18. None of these four agencies has attempted to require nondiscriminatory mortgage loan policies on the part of the financial institutions they supervise. There is a great need for these Federal supervisory agencies to exert their full authority to secure equal access to home mortgage credit, without which homeownership is virtually impossible.

19. The voluntary home mortgage credit program, a unique Government-private enterprise arrangement, constitutes recognition on the part of the mortgage lending community and the Federal Government that many minority group members suffer discrimination in the mortgage credit market. The program is an attempt to encourage equal treatment through essentially private means. Its successes are a tribute to the good faith of the private lending industry. But its failures are a sober reminder of the fundamental limitations of reliance upon good faith alone.

Urban renewal

20. The Urban Renewal Administration has not effectively insisted upon nondiscrimination in connection with the program it administers. In the urban renewal planning stage there is evidence that minority group members—those most often uprooted and displaced—are sometimes not represented in a meaningful way; that their representatives are relegated to subcommittees on minority housing problems and are not permitted to participate fully in planning the future of the communities of which they are a part.

21. In many instances Negroes and other minority group members are denied access to the housing built on urban renewal project areas—housing built with the assistance of substantial governmental subsidies.

22. The most significant failure of urban renewal has been in the matter of relocation. Negroes, facing the presently insurmountable obstacle of a restricted housing market, comprise a majority of urban renewal displacees. Present provisions have been inadequate to secure their relocation in decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Frequently one

blighted area is removed only to be replaced by another.

23. There are indications that the urban renewal program, designed to revitalize our cities, has actually diminished, by reason of failure to provide housing that is accessible to those who are displaced, the total housing inventory available to minority group members.

24. New programs of rehabilitation and conservation with emphasis on the preservation of existing housing rather than clearance and dislocation hold future promise of stability to central city residents, many of whom are Negroes and members of other minority groups.

Federal highway program

25. The federally financed interstate highway program is displacing large numbers of low-income families. Like urban renewal displacees, these families require relocation assistance. But unlike urban renewal displacees, they are not receiving it.

26. This Federal program does not presently require the assurance of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to persons so displaced, nor is there any provision for aid to displaced families in order to facilitate their movement to new homes. FHA section 221 housing available to all persons displaced by governmental action (as well as to low- and moderate-income families) does not meet these needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HOUSING

Federal supervision of mortgage lending institutions

Recommendation 3: That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require all financial institutions engaged in a mortgage loan business that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to direct all relevant Federal agencies to devise reasonable and effective implementing procedures.

Urban renewal

Recommendation 4: That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require communities as a prerequisite to receiving Federal urban renewal assistance: (a) to assure that there is a supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for displacees in fact adequate to the needs of the families displaced; and (b) to provide sufficient relocation facilities to assure the relocation of such displacees into decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings.

Recommendation 5: That the President direct the Urban Renewal Administration to require that each contract entered into between local public authorities and redevelopers contain a provision assuring access to reuse housing to all applicants regardless of race, creed, or color.

Federal highway program

Recommendation 6: That Congress amend the Highway Act of 1956 to require that in the administration of the interstate highway program, States assure decent, safe and sanitary housing to persons displaced by highway clearance; that in those localities where there are agencies administering relocation programs, such agencies be made responsible for the relocation of persons displaced by highway construction; and that Congress provide also for financial aid to displaced families in order to facilitate their movement to new homes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, with whom I have also been associated for about the same length of time of my association with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The profound political skill and the idealism which the Senator from Pennsylvania brings to this task honor us all, and particularly honor the cause. I am deeply gratified by our association. As I have stated, for 17 years, all of us have been very closely associated in this effort; and now it is high time that, finally, we become able to drive something effective through.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, by way of reminiscence, let me say to the senior Senator from New York that about 17 years ago the four Senators who have spoken most recently in this Chamber, and also the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who is about to address the Senate, began their service in the other body; and, from the very beginning of that service, we have introduced a series of civil rights bills, during various administrations. We have met with both success and failure. We have continued without diminishing our efforts, and also without inconsistency, which is a parlous and difficult thing in the Congress.

I believe it worth noting here that first the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] moved from the House to the Senate, and he was followed by the two Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and by me. I hope that development justifies the inference that the people of our States have not disapproved of the fact that we have been in advance of and beyond the times and the general sentiment with the result that we have been permitted, by the grace of our constituents, to extend our services in the two bodies.

I believe that is worth noting, because from the moment that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] came to the Senate, I suspect it was the ambition of the remaining three of us to come over here to keep him company. We did not want the Senator from New Jersey to be alone in his pronounced and determined efforts in this regard. I am glad that today we have been able to report that at times 28, at other times 18, at still other times 23 and 26 Republicans of our rather small number have supported with sincerity and with great diligence the entire civil rights program.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague. I thank him very much.

Mr. President, I have the great honor and pleasure in yielding now to my junior colleague [Mr. KEATING].

(At this point Mr. BREWSTER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

EQUALITY IN VOTING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today those of us who are interested in a program of strengthening the civil rights of our citizens are renewing an effort which was made last year to bring before the Congress for consideration and action all of the legislative recommendations made by the Commission on Civil Rights in its reports on voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice.

The Commission was established to advise the President and Congress on measures needed to protect Americans against all forms of unlawful and unconstitutional discrimination. Its life should be extended indefinitely, as is proposed in the measure introduced by our colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], so that it can proceed with its important work without the uncertainty and harassment which accompanies each of its extensions. It has done its job well despite the many obstacles in its path, and there is no justification for ignoring its important work.

The Commission, with a remarkable degree of unanimity, has exposed a wide gulf between many of our daily practices and the magnificent promises of our Constitution. We would not be keeping faith with the American people or the distinguished men who have contributed their time and wisdom to these problems if we failed to give the Commission's recommendations our full consideration.

In no sense is anyone bound by the Commission's recommendations. There are some measures which I favor, such as the proposal to give the Attorney General authority to bring civil injunctive suits in all cases involving deprivation of constitutional rights, which the Commission has not expressly endorsed. In this regard it may be appropriate to go beyond what the Commission has recommended, while in other respects we may wish to modify what the Commission has recommended. But in no case can we afford to ignore the proposals advanced by the Commission.

The bill of which I am principal sponsor, and of which Senators CASE, FONG, JAVITS, BEALL, KUCHEL, and SCOTT are cosponsors, deals with voting rights, but this is a joint effort, and I shall also cosponsor the bills being offered today by several of my colleagues on other phases of civil rights.

The exercise of the franchise has been called the key to civil rights progress, but in truth every one of the measures we are proposing is needed to help remove the barriers to equal opportunity and equal protection which now exists.

It is difficult to believe that anyone at this late date in our history would challenge the principle that no American should be denied the right to vote because of his race. Nevertheless, the Commission on Civil Rights has documented in its hearings and reports a shameful record of discrimination at the polls in many areas of our Nation. Its report chronicles numerous instances of economic reprisals, discriminatory purges, restrictive voter qualification laws and arbitrary registration procedures still used in a number of States to deny Negroes first-class citizenship.

There is no necessity at this time to review in detail the facts discussed in the Commission's reports on voting. Their impact is summarized extremely well in a speech by Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame and a distinguished member of the Commission, which is quoted in last year's hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights:

Father Hesburgh said:

> There wasn't a man of us—

Speaking of the members of the Commission—

who did not recognize that there were literally millions of people qualified to vote who were not able to vote and probably would not be able to vote for the next President of the United States, much less for their Senators, Congressmen and State officials. We had seen some of these people. These weren't units to us. They were flesh and blood people. Some of them were veterans with long months of oversea duty and decorations for valor in service. Some of the people were ministers. Some of them were college teachers. Some of them were lawyers, doctors. All of them were taxpayers. Some were mothers of families who were hard pressed to tell their children what it is to be a good American citizen when they could not vote themselves. All of them were decent, intelligent American people, and yet they could not cast their ballots for the President of the United States.

Some had gone through incredible hardships in attempting to register and had been subjected to incredible indignities. I don't know if any of you in this room have had to go through this experience, but even vicariously we had to go through it in listening to their tales. They would go to a courthouse and instead of going in where the white people registered, they would have to go to a room in the back where they would stand in line from 6 in the morning until 2 in the afternoon, since only two were let in at a time. Then people with Ph. D.'s and master's degrees and high intelligence would sit down and copy like a schoolchild the first article or the second article of the Constitution. Then they would be asked the usual questions, make out the usual questionnaire, hand in a self-addressed envelope and hear nothing for 3 months. And then they would go back and do it over again, some of them five, six, or seven times, some of them standing in line 2 or 3 days until their turn came.

To deal with these shocking conditions the Commission recommended legislation to prohibit discriminatory qualifications for voting, establish an objective standard of literacy in States which imposed literacy tests as a qualification, outlaw interference with the right to vote, and obtain accurate statistics on voting patterns. These recommendations were reflected in a bill (S. 2979), which I introduced on March 13 of last year and which was cosponsored by Senators Douglas, Clark, Javits, Hart, Scott, Humphrey, Long of Missouri, Case, Dirksen, Morse, Bush, Kuchel, Proxmire, and Williams of New Jersey. This bill was the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights during which some constructive amendments were suggested. Some of these amendments are reflected in the bill being introduced today, but it should be made clear that we would be receptive to other amendments to improve the effectiveness of this measure.

We have also attempted to reflect in the voting rights bill we are today introducing some of the recommendations made by the President in his Special Message on Civil Rights. These include provisions for the appointment of temporary voting referees under certain conditions, expedited treatment of voting rights suits, and a prohibition against the application of different standards or procedures to prospective voters. We have not included the President's recommendations on literacy tests because in our view the proposals of the Commission on this subject are entirely constitutional and would be much more effective.

We offer this bill in the firm belief that every possible legal step should be taken to curb abuses in the voting field. At the same time it must be recognized that these problems will not be solved simply by the passage of new laws. Vigorous enforcement of this measure and others already on the statute books will be as important as the terms of the law. The areas in which these provisions will have their greatest impact are also the areas in which the most flagrant cases of intimidation, repression, and reprisals have occurred. The Federal Government must extend full protection to the citizens in these areas if these measures are ever to serve a meaningful purpose. It will take more than either eloquent words or laws to cope with the cruel tactics of those who would deny their fellow Americans the most sacred privilege of any free person, the right to participate in the selection of his representatives.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that voting is only one of the several areas in which the Commission has made specific recommendations for executive and legislative action. It has not given this subject any higher priority than education, employment, housing or the administration of justice. In my judgment, all of these areas deserve a high priority in our legislative program, and all should be the basis for action during this session of Congress. We have been moving slowly and reluctantly in this field for too many years. The time for bold and effective action is long overdue and should not be further postponed.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Case, Fong, Javits, Beall, Kuchel, and Scott, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 1 week, so that other Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on voting be printed in the Record following the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested, and the bill and findings and recommendations of the Commission will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1214) to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Voting Rights Act of 1963".

FINDINGS

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds—

(a) that qualifications prescribed by State laws for voting, or registering to vote, in Federal and State elections, other than qualifications based upon age, residence, freedom from confinement, freedom from conviction of a crime, mental competency, and loyalty, are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny citizens the right to vote, because of their race or color;

(b) that standards, practices and procedures applied to individuals of a race or color, which are different from the standards, practices, and procedures applied to individuals of another race or color, have been used to deny citizens the right to vote because of their race or color; and

(c) that the enactment of this Act by the Congress is necessary and proper to carry out the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States, and in particular by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

VOTER QUALIFICATIONS; LITERACY TESTS

Sec. 3. Subsection (a) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971(a)), is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the right of citizens of the United States to vote, to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have their vote counted in any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for elective office established by or under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State shall not be denied, abridged or interfered with by the United States or by any State for any cause except for the following reasons, uniformly applied within the State and its political subdivisions to all persons:

"(A) inability to meet reasonable age requirements;

"(B) inability to meet reasonable requirements as to length of residence within the State and its political subdivisions;

"(C) legal confinement at the time of the election or registration;

"(D) conviction of a felony;

"(E) judgment of mental incompetency; and

"(F) refusal to subscribe to an oath of loyalty to the United States.

"(3) In any case in which under the laws of any State any examination, whether for literacy or otherwise, is administered in order to determine whether a person is qualified to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted in any general, special or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for elective office established by or under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of such State, the successful completion of six or more grades of formal education at any public or accredited private school by such person, unless he has been adjudged mentally incompetent, shall satisfy all the requirements of any such examination. In the administration of any such examination, no standards, practices, or procedures shall be applied to any person which are different from the standards, practices or procedures which are applied to any other person to whom such examination is administered."

PROTECTION AGAINST ARBITRARY STANDARDS, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES

Sec. 4. (a) Subsection (b) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971(b)), is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall, in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted in any election described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, apply, or threaten to apply, any standard, practice, or procedure which is different from the standards, practices, or procedures applied to any other individual. Nor shall any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, deny, abridge, or interfere with, or threaten to deny, abridge, or interfere with, the right of any individual to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted in any election described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, because of any error or omission in any records or papers required by section 301 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to be retained and preserved, if such error of omission is not material in determining whether or not such individual is qualified under State law to vote, or to register to vote, or to have his vote counted in such election.

"(3) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall by arbitrary action, or by arbitrary inaction (where there is a duty to act), deny, abridge, or interfere with, or threaten to deny, abridge, or interfere with, the right of any individual to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted, in any election described in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971 (e)), is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" each place it appears in the first and last paragraphs thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (b)".

INTERIM COURT ORDERS OF ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE

SEC. 5. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971), is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) (1) After a proceeding has been instituted under subsection (c), upon request of the Attorney General and after notice to each party, the court may appoint a temporary voting referee if it finds that less than 15 per centum of the eligible persons within the affected area with respect to whom such proceeding was instituted under subsection (c) are registered to vote. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions in subsection (e) of this section with regard to voting referees shall be applicable to such temporary voting referees.

"(2) An order issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be effective until a judgment in the proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) becomes final, but the court may at any stage of the proceeding modify or amend such order to effectuate the purposes of this section.

"(3) When used in this subsection, the terms 'vote' and 'affected area' have the meanings assigned to them by the last paragraph of subsection (e)."

PRECEDENCE FOR VOTING RIGHTS CASES

SEC. 6. (a) Chapter 111 of title 28 of the United States Code (general provisions relating to procedure) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1657. Precedence for voting rights cases

"The courts of the United States shall give precedence to, and shall assign for a hearing at the earliest practicable day, civil actions to recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of the right to vote."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1657. Precedence of voting rights cases."

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF REGISTRATION AND VOTING STATISTICS

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 3 of title 13 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 104. Registration and voting statistics

"(a) The Secretary shall collect and publish comprehensive information and statistics relating to the registration of voters in each State and the number of registered voters in each State who vote in elections held in such State. Insofar as it is possible to ascertain, such statistics shall include—

"(1) the number of persons of voting age in each State, classified by race, color, and national origin, who are eligible and registered to vote; and

"(2) the number of persons of each such classification who have voted in any election since January 1, 1960.

"(b) The information and statistics referred to in subsection (a) shall be collected at the same time as the taking of the census under section 141 of this title, except that the first collection shall be made as soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this section.

"(c) No person, other than an officer or employee of a State or political subdivision thereof acting in his official capacity, shall be compelled to give any information or answer any question for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to collect the information and statistics referred to in subsection (a). The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 7 of this title shall not apply with respect to the collection of information and statistics under this section."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"104. Registration and voting statistics."

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 1961 REPORT ON VOTING OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

FINDINGS

General

1. There are reasonable grounds to believe that substantial numbers of Negro citizens are, or recently have been, denied the right to vote on grounds of race or color in about 100 counties in 8 Southern States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Some denials of the right to vote occur by reason of discriminatory application of laws setting qualifications for voters. Other denials result from arbitrary and discriminatory procedures for the registration of voters; still others occur by reason of threats and intimidation, or the fear of retaliation.

2. Some States have given encouragement to such discriminatory denials of the right to vote. The Legislature of Louisiana, for instance, has fostered discrimination against Negro voters by the enactment of restrictive voter qualification laws and by the activities of its joint legislative committee working in cooperation with the Association of Citizens Councils of Louisiana. Mississippi has amended its voter qualification laws in such fashion as to permit, if not encourage, discrimination against the would-be Negro voter. The Alabama Legislature has tried unsuccessfully to eliminate Negro voters from the city of Tuskegee.

3. The U.S. Department of Justice has acted with vigor to apply the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 to prevent racial discrimination in the franchise. As of August 4, 1961, it had brought suits to protect the right to vote in 15 counties in 5 States. Three of the cases had been successfully concluded, one case had been partially determined, and a fifth had been tried but was awaiting decision. The remainder were awaiting trial. In addition, as of August 1, 1961, the Department of Justice had made demands for the inspection of records under title III of the 1960 Civil Rights Act in 26 counties in 6 States.

4. On the basis of one suit which has been finally determined, it appears that the 1957 act provides as effective remedy in cases involving discriminatory purges of voters from the registration rolls. Decrees have also been obtained in suits involving discriminatory registration procedures.

5. The voting-referee provision of title VI of the 1960 Civil Rights Act has not yet been used as a remedy; but it appears that the mere availability of the remedy may have contributed to the effectiveness of the decrees actually entered by the courts in at least two cases.

6. Subsection (b) of 42 U.S.C. section 1971 (part of the 1957 Civil Rights Act) has not yet been fully tested. However, it appears to provide an effective means for dealing with economic reprisals to interfere with the efforts of Negroes to register and vote.

7. Title III of the 1960 act, the records-inspection provision, appears to be an extremely important investigative device for gathering information regarding some kinds of discriminatory denials of the right to vote.

8. Although the provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts are useful, however, they are necessarily limited means for removing racial discrimination from the franchise. Suits must proceed a single county at a time, and they are time-consuming, expensive, and difficult. Broader measures are required if denials of constitutional rights in this area are to be quickly eliminated.

Qualification of voters

9. A common technique of discriminating against would-be voters on racial grounds involves the discriminatory application of legal qualifications for voters. Among the qualifications used in this fashion are requirements that the voter be able to read and write; that he be able to give a satisfactory interpretation of the Constitution; that he be able to calculate his age to the day; and that he be of good character.

10. The U.S. Constitution leaves to the States the power to set the qualifications for voters in Federal, as well as State, elections. This power is not, however, unlimited. The 15th amendment prohibits the States from denying the right to vote to any citizen on grounds of race or color, and empowers the Congress to enforce this prohibition by appropriate legislation. Therefore, if Congress found that particular voter qualifications were applied by States in a manner that denied the right to vote on grounds of race, it would appear to have the power under the 15th amendment to enact legislation prohibiting the use of such qualifications. Section 5 of the 14th amendment similarly empowers Congress to enact appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of that amendment. One of these provisions is section 2 of the 14th amendment, which authorizes Congress to reduce the congressional representation of any State in proportion as citizens of that State are denied the right to vote on any grounds other than age or conviction of a crime. The effect of these provisions of the 14th amendment may be to empower Congress to prohibit the use of any voter qualifications other than those specified.

Arbitrary interference with the right to vote

11. The right to vote is denied in some places not only by the discriminatory application of legal qualifications for voters (see finding 9), but in addition by the arbitrary or discriminatory application of various registration procedures, such as the following:

(a) The requirement of a specified number of registered voters as vouchers to identify would-be voters. This practice is particularly effective in disfranchising Negroes when there are no Negroes already registered, and no white will vouch for Negroes; or where a rule is enforced limiting the number of times a given voter may vouch for another.

(b) The imposition of other unduly technical requirements for identification of would-be voters.

(c) The rejection of applicants for registration, or the removal of voters from the rolls, on grounds of minor technical errors in the completion of required forms.

(d) Refusing or failing to notify registrants whether or not they have been registered.

(e) Imposing various forms of delay in the registration process.

(f) Applying any or all of the above to some would-be voters but not to others, or applying them differently to different persons.

(g) Providing assistance to some would-be voters but declining to provide it for others.

12. Practices of these sorts, used for the purpose of denying the right to vote on grounds of race, violate the 15th amendment and specific Federal law, and can be reached by suits brought by the U.S. Department of Justice. For such suits to be successful, however, it must be proven that the practices involve discrimination on racial grounds, and the very nature of the practices may sometimes make this proof difficult. Whether or not they are clearly racially discriminatory, such practices are arbitrary, and unjustifiably prevent some citizens from exercising the right to vote.

13. Similarly arbitrary practices, which may or may not be beyond the reach of existing legislation, may occur in places with permanent voter registration where, as a result of lawsuits or changes in policy, overtly discriminatory practices are abandoned, but extremely strict registration standards and procedures are applied to all new registrants. Even though there is no racial discrimination in the prospective application of such stringent standards, the effect of such a change in practice may be to perpetuate discrimination which has previously occurred: For if virtually all the eligible whites have already been registered, but Negroes have been discriminatorily kept from registering, then Negroes will bear the brunt of the difficulties imposed by the new and stringent registration requirements.

14. As regards Federal elections, Congress has the power to prohibit arbitrary as well as racially discriminatory practices which prevent citizens from exercising the right to vote.

Dilution of the right to vote

15. The malapportioned condition of State and congressional voting districts throughout the United States dilutes the right to vote of many citizens; in some States malapportionment of voting districts is compounded by the effect of discriminatory denials of the right to vote. Malapportionment, especially where it is exaggerated by racial disfranchisement, afflicts the very democratic process through which a reform of these conditions may be attained.

16. Although the courts in many cases are the only effective resort for remedying such malapportionment, Federal courts have expressed, on equitable grounds, extreme reluctance to provide a remedy.

17. Congress has in the past required that electoral districts for congressional elections be substantially equal in poplation. Insofar as inequalities in such districts deny equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment, Congress could impose a similar requirement as to State elections.

Statistical information

18. Statistics showing registration and voting by race are of considerable value, not only in studying the electoral process in general, but as a starting point in examining problems of discrimination. In some cases these statistics may simply provide grounds for further investigation; in others, they may themselves be strong evidence of discrimination. This is the case, for instance, where Negroes constitute a majority of the population and yet none at all are registered to vote.

19. Registration statistics by race indicate that in 13 counties where Negroes are the majority of the population, none of them are registered to vote: Alabama (2 counties), Georgia (2 counties), Louisiana (4 counties), and Mississippi (5 counties).

20. Registration statistics by race are incomplete, unofficial, or unavailable for many States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Qualification of voters

Recommendation 1: That Congress, acting under section 2 of the 15th amendment and sections 2 and 5 of the 14th amendment, (a) declare that voter qualifications other than age, residence, confinement, and conviction of a crime are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny the right to vote on grounds of race and color; and (b) enact legislation providing that all citizens of the United States shall have a right to vote in Federal or State elections which shall not be denied or in any way abridged or interfered with by the United States or by any State for any cause except for inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all presons within a State, legal confinement at the time of registration or election, or conviction of a felony; such right to vote to include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

Dissent to recommendation 1 by Vice Chairman Storey

As pointed out in the 1959 report of this Commission, I strongly believe in the right of every qualified citizen of the United States, irrespective of his color, race, religion, or national origin, to register, vote, and have his vote counted. Full protection of these rights of suffrage by both State and Federal Governments is necessary and proper. However, I cannot join in so sweeping a recommendation as this.

Proposals to alter longstanding Federal-State relationships such as that incorporated in the Federal Constitution, declaring that the qualifications of electors shall be left to the several States, should not be made unless there is no alternative method to correct an existing evil. Such is not the case today.

The Federal Government has sufficient authority under the Constitution and the existing framework of laws to enable it effectively to deal with denials of the right to vote by reason of race, color, religion, and national origin.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 authorized the Attorney General to institute civil suit in the Federal courts to prevent the denial of voting rights. The Civil Rights Act of 1960 provides that if in any such suit the court makes a finding that the denial of voting rights is pursuant to a pattern or practice, the court may appoint voting referees to register qualified persons denied this right by local election officials. The further denial of the right to vote to these persons so registered by the court-appointed voting referees constitutes contempt of court and is punishable accordingly. The vigor with which these Civil Rights Acts are applied will significantly affect the extent to which voting denial practices will be discontinued.

Many States have voting requirements more extensive than age or length of residence, incarceration, or felony convictions. These qualifications, having nothing to do with race, religion, or national origin, are an important element in preserving the sanctity of the ballot. They are specific disqualifications which are felt justifiable for the good of the State. Disqualifications of persons whose mental condition makes it impossible for them competently to exercise the discrimination necessary in voting has long been accepted. Many States disqualify paupers supported by municipal or county officials on the theory that these people are too easily exploitable by such officials for their own purposes. The security and purity of the ballot can be destroyed by permitting illiterates to vote. And as the English language is still the official language of the United States, there is good justification for States requiring that voters have at least a rudimentary knowledge of this language.

Dissent to recommendation 1 by Commissioner Rankin

I join in the dissenting statement of Vice Chairman Storey, but would add the following personal comment.

The 15th amendment has been a part of our Constitution for almost a century, and Congress has never interpreted it as a mandate to usurp the power of each State to determine the qualifications of electors.

In 1957 and again in 1960, Congress did enact legislation to provide protection of the right to register and vote without discrimination on grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It may be that further legislation will be required to reinforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment and of the 1957 and 1960 laws. But such measures should be kept within the well-recognized bounds of our Constitution and laws.

Our object must be compliance with the Constitution, not punishment, and for that reason I do not deem it wise to upset the balance of our Federal system to reach a result which can be achieved through less drastic means.

Recommendation 2.—That Congress enact legislation providing that in all elections in which, under State law, a literacy test, an understanding or interpretation test, or an educational test is administered to determine the qualifications of electors, it shall be sufficient for qualification that the elector have completed at least six grades of formal education.

Interference with the right to vote

Recommendation 3: That Congress amend subsection (b) of 42 U.S.C. 1971 to prohibit any arbitrary action or (where there is a duty to act) arbitrary inaction, which deprives or threatens to deprive any person of the right to register, vote, and have that vote counted in any Federal election.

Dilution of the right to vote

Recommendation 4: That Congress consider the advisability of enacting legislation (a) requiring that where voting districts are established within a State, for either Federal elections or State elections to any house of a State legislature which is elected on the basis of population, they shall be substantially equal in population; and (b) specifically granting the Federal courts jurisdiction of suits to enforce the requirements of the Constitution and of Federal law with regard to such electoral districts; but explicitly providing that such jurisdiction should not be deemed to preclude the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce rights provided under State law regarding such districts.

Statistical information

Recommendation 5: That Congress direct the Bureau of the Census promptly to initiate a nationwide compilation of registration and voting statistics, to include a count of persons of voting age in every State and territory by race, color, and national origin, who are registered to vote, and a determination of the extent to which such persons have voted since January 1, 1960; and requiring that the Bureau of the Census compile such information in each next succeeding decennial census, and at such other time or times as the Congress may direct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have a very special feeling about the participation of my colleague [Mr. Keating] in our total civil rights effort. He is a member of the Judiciary Committee, which will have in its care a number of these measures, which are as critically important as any proposed.

The Judiciary Committee has been, traditionally, the graveyard of civil rights measures. It is often frustrating and terribly difficult even to discuss or raise a civil rights matter in that committee. My colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] has, not only throughout his House service, where I served with him, but here as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, represented us all in the deliberations of that committee, in respect to measures which often induce so frigid and cold an atmosphere, in such a way as to make us very proud of him for rendering what in my opinion is such signal service to the country and to the minorities who are concerned in relation to legislation of this character.

Our struggle is hardly in midcourse, let alone successful. Signaled by this group of bills which we are introducing now, I look forward again to almost heroic service of my colleague [Mr. Keating] together with our other colleagues, both on our side and on the Democratic side, who are interested in this legislation, to see that, notwithstanding almost insuperable obstacles, something does happen, whether it actually comes out of committee, or whether the basis for legislation is created outside the committee.

I take great satisfaction for what he said this morning, and what he said when we held the press conference on this matter, that he expects that we shall at least have some hearings on the measures and that he himself is a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, where we have the best opportunity toward that end.

The majority leader, it will be recalled, only a relatively few days ago pledged himself to the same end. I believe that the country is tremendously fortunate that my colleague, the junior Senator from New York, has a place on this key committee and on its key Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I look forward to the heroic service in this field which has been so characteristic of him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague from New York for his very kind remarks. I consider myself fortunate to be a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, which has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

In my judgment, the members of that committee, as reconstituted in this Congress, are more favorable to action in this field than in the past. I anticipate that the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Ervin], although he might individually be opposed to these measures, will be fair to the members of the subcommittee, and if a request for hearings was made and supported by a majority of the subcommittee, we would have hearings.

My colleague has been very generous in his remarks. We have been engaged in this fight together ever since we were elected to the other body in January, 1947. Even during the 2-year period when my colleague was out of Congress, and served as the Attorney General of New York State, we have collaborated and worked together in this field. I am proud to again be associated with my colleague and the others who have joined us today in renewing these efforts for equal protection and equal opportunity for all our citizens.

He is, as everyone knows, a stanch fighter for constitutional rights and a leader in this field.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague very much. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like merely to say that what the Senator from New York has said about our colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], is completely true. It is important to this cause that the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. As he has gained seniority and, therefore, greater standing and a stronger voice on this committee, his presence there is all the more important. I wish I could foresee the time when the presence of a man like him on that key committee, dealing in this area, would not be important, but I cannot. I hope that for this session and for many years to come his stalwart and ever stronger voice will be available to us in this most important and strategic area of the Senate's machinery.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from New Jersey, and I associate myself fully with his remarks and his evaluation of the critical importance of Senator Keating's service and his remaining a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which deals with this issue.

Mr. KEATING. I do not wish to interfere with the progress of the remarks of my colleagues, but I must thank my dear friend, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, for his kind remarks. He, like the senior Senator from New York, has been in this fight perhaps longer than either of us. His service extends over a somewhat longer period. Everyone in this country knows of his devotion to this cause, and knows that when he gets his teeth into a subject like this he does not let go of it. He has his teeth in it now and they are in there, and we all hope that this fact will have the most effective results in producing legislation in this session of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank both Senators. I do not wish to detain the Senate very long, but I do wish to make a few observations upon this whole situation and on the bills which I am introducing and the bills which other Senators have introduced today.

EQUALITY IN ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

The group of Republican Senators who are introducing civil rights measures today rely principally upon the findings and recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The revisions, as required by later developments, are not too major in character. The essential factor is that we are benefiting from and basing our case on the proven findings of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, whose members, notwithstanding an even division between the North and South—3 and 3, are remarkably unanimous in most of their findings. I believe that sustains strongly the justice and equity of our position. I believe it confounds those who would brand our effort as politics.

I have said before and I say again that an examination of the voting records in my State, in my own reelection in 1962, will show practically no difference in the districts heavily populated by Negroes with respect to the vote that I received; whereas, I hazard the opinion that in many Southern States, because of what we see in these campaigns and what has been argued back and forth, this is the predominant issue. So I respectfully submit that those who would claim that we are serving only the dictates of politics should look to their own glass houses before they throw stones, and should note that we are fully sustained on the merits and the facts by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

It will be recalled that last year a similar series of measures was introduced by a bipartisan group of Senators. I would be less than frank if I did not say that I am very unhappy about the fact that this year, unlike last year, we were unsuccessful in bringing about bipartisan sponsorship of this group of measures. While I understand that the President's special message on civil rights last month may have made some difference to our Democratic colleagues who introduced these measures with us before, I nonetheless wish that we could have had bipartisan sponsorship this year too, for the bipartisan tradition is very strong in civil rights. I have every expectation, however, that we will close ranks as civil rights measures come before us and indeed that some of the bills which are being introduced today by Republican Senators and which will remain on the desk for a week may be cosponsored by our Democratic colleagues, just as a number of us have already cosponsored the administration bill which has been introduced by Democratic Senators.

The President's special message on civil rights last month, his first after 2 years in office, was eloquent and valuable because its source alone underscored dramatically for the Nation and the world the importance of the civil rights struggle. It also coincides, appropriately, with a time of reassessment in that struggle, the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation.

But, when matched against the record of that 100 years, which no unbiased observer could view with satisfaction, a helpful spirit and tone, by themselves, even emanating from the White House, clearly do not suffice. What is needed is a strong program, calling for meaningful legislative and executive action, and given the highest priority, which up to now the President has reserved for his tax cut program. I deeply believe that, as important to our Nation's well-being as is the tax cut, a truly effective civil rights program is equally vital to our national well-being. Matched against the recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and even the platforms of both parties in 1960, the President's special message does not represent either the strong program or the high priority.

I believe that the administration knows what is at stake here. In an article in the Saturday Evening Post last year, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, reporting on a world tour, described the importance of our Nation's civil rights record to our position in a restless world. He said:

> We cannot successfully portray ourselves as believing in the Constitution and freedom if at home we treat a portion of our population as inferiors.

The President repeated that thought in his special message. At my request the Council of Economic Advisers estimated last year that racial discrimination in its various forms costs our Nation $13 to $17 million annually. The cost in moral value and world repute is inestimably greater. And there are other losses and risks. A recent powerful work, "The Fire Next Time," by James Baldwin, describes with chilling effectiveness the extraordinary self-restraint that the Negro community in the United States has imposed upon itself during these last 100 years and the danger that, without a legal escape valve, the pressure of frustration may soon be unendurable and may explode in violence. The appeal of the Black Muslim movement should not be underestimated. Up to now about the only violence has come from whites; but there is no guarantee that this will remain the case.

Although the administration recognizes these losses and risks, it does not reflect its understanding of them by pressing for a substantial enough legislative program. The reluctance of the first 2 years has, happily, been tempered somewhat with the issuance of the Executive order on housing and the special message requesting more than the previous single voting bill. But the change has been made far less significant than it should be by the failure of Democratic leadership in the Senate to bring about reform of the cloture rule and the inadequacy of the President's legislative requests on civil rights.

I believe the President has been far too much inhibited by the fact that Members of the Senate from the South are the chairmen of 11 of the 17 standing committees of the Senate.

It is my hope that the action of the Republican Senators who are today introducing what we consider to be a meaningful civil rights legislative program will spur the administration to a meaningful response. The President's special message concludes by stating that:

> Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

My view of the role of the administration in the field of civil rights is far more than that passive. It is my hope that these measures will be more than commented on favorably and not vetoed, but that in this Emancipation Proclamation Centennial year, they will be pressed for enactment by a bipartisan effort under strong Presidential leadership, which gives this program the priority it deserves.

During the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, only one concrete legislative proposal was developed—the literacy test bill; emphasis was instead placed on executive action. During 1961 the administration asked for no civil rights legislation whatever, except the technical measure of extending the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The recommended 2-year extension, itself the bare minimum proposal, was brought up as an amendment to an appropriation bill so that a two-thirds vote was required to suspend the rule against enacting legislation in a money measure, and attempts to lengthen the period or strengthen the Commission's powers were tabled on the motion of the leadership, just as were numerous other attempts during the year to pass civil rights measures in the only manner open to proponents, as amendments to other bills pending on the floor. The reason for scuttling all such attempts, either expressed or implied, was always that the filibuster would make such attempts futile and time consuming and lead nowhere.

At the end of 1961, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission issued a comprehensive series of 6 reports in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, and administration of justice, which included specific findings of fact as to deprivations of constitutional rights in each of these fields and which set forth 27 recommendations for congressional action, as well as numerous other recommendations for additional executive action. Yet in 1962, the administration relented from its position against legislation only to the extent of two measures relating to voting, the sixth grade literacy test bill and elimination of the poll tax. These modest proposals were only two of five recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in the voting field alone, and since the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts had dealt with voting almost exclusively, they actually constituted only supplementary amendments to existing law. Yet even the literacy test measure failed of passage and was set aside after a desultory filibuster. The only "successful" action was approval of a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax in the four States in which it remains; attempts to do this by legislation, which is what the U.S. Civil Rights Commission recommended, were brushed aside, and the amendment remains to be ratified, although half the States have already acted. Those citizens of the four poll-tax States who otherwise would have voted in November 1962, were unable to do so despite congressional action because it was on a constitutional amendment not a law.

This brings the account to the present session of Congress, the beginning of the administration's third year. What intervened in those 2 years in the way of social change and the urgent need for meaningful civil rights legislation can be appraised by simply listing the high points of the news: months of tension and violence in Albany, Ga., were occasioned by peaceful demonstrations of Negroes who demanded only that the public facilities paid for in part by their own taxes be made available to them on an equal opportunity basis; some dozens of destitute Negro families were heartlessly induced to migrate to the North by segregationists who offered them the fare and suggested that jobs would be waiting for them there; and two persons were killed and others injured when James Meredith became, under court order, the first Negro to be enrolled in the University of Mississippi, the campus of which is still under Federal Guard.

At the beginning of the 88th Congress this year, the administration was presented with its first opportunity to bring its moral pressure to bear in the fight to change the filibuster rule, rule XXII of the Senate. It did not do so, I believe it is fair to say, although the President had exerted his influence to bring about a change in the size of the House Rules Committee, similarily a matter of the internal operations of a House of the Congress. It did not do so, although the Democratic Party platform in 1960 called for improved congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule, just as the Republican Party platform called for a change in rule XXII and other congressional procedures. The rules-change fight in the Senate failed despite the fact that a majority of 54 Senators signified in writing that they would have voted for a liberalization of the rule if they had been given an opportunity to vote on it; and despite the fact that a majority—though not two-thirds—voted to shut off the filibuster which blocked the rule change.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean to indicate for the RECORD that he believes the two parties in putting these planks into their platforms intended that the Executive should assert himself in the legislative branch, to the extent of attempting to influence the legislative branch to adopt rules different from those established in accordance with its own convictions and its own beliefs as to what would be proper?

Mr. JAVITS. I only believe that the President is the leader of his party, that he ran on the platform of the Democratic Party, that he was elected on that platform, that it is his duty to do everything within his power to make good the pledges contained in that platform, and that, as a result, he should do everything within his power to get a majority of the Members of this body to follow those pledges.

I am not enough of a psychologist to be able to determine whether Senators' actual beliefs and intentions are correctly indicated by their votes; but I assume that they are.

I point out that the President was successful when he intervened in the rules fight in the House of Representatives; but I also point out that the President did not choose to take action in connection with the rules fight in the Senate. I believe the President was sincere in his efforts in connection with the rules fight in the House, of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield again to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, I see a great deal of difference between a situation in which the Executive leads in an attempt to carry out a platform pledge to which his party is committed—namely, a pledge to attempt to carry out a certain program—and an attempt by the President to interfere with the functioning of the legislative branch. The Constitution makes very clear that each House shall formulate its own rules and shall provide for the governance of itself.

After having watched for a good many years the formulation of the platform of at least one party, I do not believe it has ever been contemplated that the President would exert undue influence on the congressional members of his party, so as to require them to reenact or change or modify the rules of either House of Congress in a way which would differ from its own convictions.

I believe that the members of that party in each House who are strictly following their party's platform have some obligations on themselves; but, in my opinion, that is very different from an attempt by the Executive to break down the line of delineation between the legislative branch and the executive branch by asserting himself so as to attempt to have established rules for the conduct of the internal business of either House or of both Houses of the legislative branch, as to comply either with his own convictions or with a party declaration which is binding on him in the conduct of his executive duties; but, I think, this does nothing at all to change the very fine line of distinction, laid down in the Constitution, between executive duties and functions and those which pertain entirely to the legislative branch, such as the formulation of rules.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad to have yielded to the Senator from Florida, because he has helped me point up what I believe to be a very fundamental matter.

First of all, I did not write this plank into the platform of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party wrote it into its platform; and that plank calls for changes in these procedures.

The President, as the head of his party, appealed to the minorities in this country—and all of us heard him do it—on the basis of the platform on which he was running. Therefore, in my opinion, we have both a right and a duty to call him to account.

In addition, the President did intervene directly in the House rules fight; and it seems to me that precedent makes very clear that he failed—and failed very definitely—to do anything about the rules fight in the Senate.

Second, the President himself intervened in the rules fight in the House; and the President must account for the fact that, although he intervened there, he did not intervene or do anything in connection with the rules fight in the Senate.

I think that is the best evidence. With all due respect to the Senator from Florida, that is the best evidence of what is called for from the President.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York in having the greatest of respect and affection for the Senator from Florida. However, I must point out that I think the logic of his position is rather weak. I think his argument proves too much.

It is true that the Constitution states that each House shall make its own rules. Certainly, the Constitution also states that each House shall pass upon proposed legislation. Yet, Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida agrees that it is appropriate for the President to exercise leadership, as the head of his party, in the enactment of legislation to which his party is committed by its national platform, then it must equally be true that in connection with other matters which are within the province of each branch of the legislative establishment—I refer to the formulation of rules—the same principle must apply.

For myself, I believe the President has an obligation, both as the leader of his party and as President—but now we are speaking particularly about the obligation he has as the leader of his party—to carry out, or to attempt to carry out, by his leadership of the executive branch and in the legislative branch his party's commitments, both in regard to substantive legislation and also in regard to what in the long run is much more important in this area, namely, the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield once more to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I do not believe that either party in formulating its platform—as Senators know, I have belonged to only one party, and I have attended the conferences of only one party—has ever included in its platform anything which indicated in the slightest that it wished to break down the fine separation, provided for in the Constitution, between the executive and the legislative branches. Yet that is exactly what is implied in the criticism being made by the distinguished Senator from New York, because if the Executive—not with direct reference to legislation, but with reference to the internal governance of the Senate—seeks to impress his own views and convictions and interpretations of what his party's platform means upon the members of his party who serve in the Senate, I think he would be doing just that, namely, breaking down the lines of separation, so clearly established by the Constitution, between the executive and the legislative branches.

In regard to the point which has been ably made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, let me call attention to the fact that in the field of legislation the President has a definite responsibility. The Constitution requires him to communicate to Congress, at the beginning of each Congress, a message in regard to the state of the Nation. Under that custom and its implications, the President recommends legislation. He is required to pass upon legislation, namely, by deciding whether he will approve it or will veto it. If he vetoes it, the importance of his role is so great that a two-thirds vote by the Members of each House is required in order to override his veto. So the President is a full partner of the Congress in many ways in connection with legislation.

However, I know of no provision of the Constitution which in the slightest gives the President any right to prescribe for either House what should be the rules for the governance of the internal business of that House.

If such a provision existed, it would be a distinct departure from the lines of differentiation between legislative and executive branches, whether the Executive be a Republican or a Democrat. As I recall, the immediate predecessor of President Kennedy was also committed—if the adoption of such a platform as we are talking about would constitute such a commitment—to some changes in the rules, and he did not, as I recall it, attempt to exercise any such prerogative, if indeed, he had one. He would have been wrong if he had. I think it would be very wrong for any President ever to try to dictate to either House what its rules should be. It is the function of each House to determine how it shall transact its business. I differentiate completely, and I believe the Constitution differentiates completely, between the matter of making rules and regulations governing internal conduct and the matter of legislation, in which the Chief Executive has a very direct responsibility, as I have said. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

I point out, first, that President Eisenhower had no such platform pledge on which to run. That pledge was made in 1960 in the Republican platform, and the candidate was defeated. The Democratic candidate won on that platform, and he was pledged to improve the congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule.

Second, I point out—a point which I think the Senator from Florida has not answered—that the President is the leader of his party. We all understand that. It is generally acknowledged. I point out particularly that every argument the Senator has made was equally applicable to the House rules fight, and the President certainly participated in that.

Finally, we are not living in a dream world. We know that rule XXII has the most direct and effective effect upon proposed legislation in the Senate Chamber, including the very measures with respect to which the President recently sent a message to Congress. It was a very important message. If the President is really sincere and serious about his message, he had better be sincere and serious about being the leader of his party and bringing about a change in rule XXII, because very little will happen as a result of his message unless there is some effective change in that rule or unless enough Senators will rally—as they have not previously done—to impose cloture after many weeks of debate on a civil rights measure.

That brings me to the point that whatever else I say today, I hope I may impress my colleagues and the country with the conviction that the most important civil rights vote to be cast between now and election day in 1964, perhaps thereafter, too, but certainly in that period, is a vote on cloture.

Let no one mistake that or be confused about it. Senators can vote any way they please on a dozen civil rights measures if we can ever get to a vote on them. It is the vote on cloture that counts. That statement applies to the vote which was cast in the Senate a few weeks ago, and it will apply to similar votes which I hope will be cast in the days ahead. I hope the people of the country who are interested in the issue will note that well. We are now speaking of the filibuster rule. The votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting are required to close debate. We cannot reach a vote on any meaningful civil rights measure unless the measure is cut and trimmed to suit Senators who are filibustering unless the proponents can muster a two-thirds majority. There will not be such a vote unless the people of the country understand that that is the key to civil rights legislation and that there is no other. This is the most important single civil rights vote that any Senator can cast.

With this background, the impact of the President's special message can be best evaluated. Switching its position at least in part the administration now expands its legislative requests: the President's 1963 message includes seven legislative proposals, apart from the routine extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, which this time the administration requests for a period of 4, not 2, years, but also not permanently, though it was part of the Democratic national platform in 1960. Of the remaining seven proposals, four are again in the nature of supplementary amendments to the 1957 and 1960 acts. The literacy test proposal is offered once more; hopefully a more forceful case will be pressed by the administration so that doubts as to the constitutional basis for the provision, which were permitted to serve as a rallying point for the opposition, will not again becloud what is an excellent legal case. This time the administration adds to this request provisions generally making nondiscriminatory all standards for voting, whether of literacy or otherwise; granting preference on the court dockets to voting cases brought under the 1957 and 1960 acts; and providing for the interim appointment of voting referees during the pendency of such cases.

These additional refinements of the existing law are indeed welcome and helpful. But they are mighty small when matched against the total effort, certainly considering the rough course toward passage which any civil rights bill is likely to encounter.

The gross inadequacy of the statutory remedies at the disposal of the Department of Justice is best illustrated by what happens when Negroes attempt to register and vote even today, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, 6 years afer passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act, and almost 3 after the 1960 Civil Rights Act. Among other forms of terror and harassment, gunfire is directed at them, yet State authorities take no action whatever to prevent the incidents or punish the culprits. The most recent reported incidents, part of a long string of such incidents, began on the night of February 28, 1963, in Leflore County, Miss., when it is charged that white men from a moving car shot and seriously wounded a young Negro vote registration worker; since then a building used by registration workers has been burned; 2 nights ago the home of a registration worker as well as of an applicant to the University of Mississippi, was shot at; and only yesterday the violence erupted into a clash between a group of Negroes and local law enforcement officers.

In February I inquired of the Attorney General as to the suit which had been filed against the United States for an order directing the Department of Justice and other agencies of the Federal Government to take action against State law enforcement officials who interfere with Negro voter registration and voting in Mississippi. The Attorney General replied that "the Department of Justice is presently employing all the powers and authority available to it under Federal law to prevent interference with Negro voter registration activity and voting." The Attorney General then described 11 cases the Department has begun under the 1957 act in Mississippi; in one the Government was successful in enjoining the State from prosecuting a young registration worker in Walthall County for disturbing the peace; he had been hit over the head with a gun by the county registrar of voters when he brought local Negroes in to attempt registration. A second suit, in Greene County, was dismissed and is pending on appeal; a Negro school teacher, who had been a witness for the Government in a pending voting case, was dismissed from her teaching position because of it. The remaining nine cases, it is to be assumed, will go on—perhaps for years.

The administration's recommendations on voting, where their proposals are strongest, do not look heroic when set against the fact of the continued stubborn effort to deny Negroes the voting right in certain Southern States. A majority of the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 voting report recommended legislation providing that all citizens shall have the right to register, vote, and have their votes counted, unabridged for any cause except inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied, legal confinement, or conviction of a felony. The Commission unanimously recommended, in addition to substitution of the sixth-grade literacy test for voter registration in lieu of readily misapplied subjective tests, amendment of the 1957 act to prohibit any arbitrary action or, where there is a duty to act, inaction, which deprives anyone of the right to vote; and legislation directing the Bureau of the Census to making a nationwide survey of voting statistics; it also called for a congressional study of apportionment of legislative districting, which the Supreme Court ultimately dealt with in the landmark decision of Baker against Carr, another telling instance of the judiciary being forced into a policy area by the press of history in this field which the Congress seems almost totally unable to reflect. This much remains unadopted by the administration despite the fact that the Civil Rights Commission, charged by law with the duty to make such recommendations to the President and the Congress, has recommended them and despite the emphasis of both party platforms, and of the President's message,on the primacy of the right to vote.

A final word about Executive action in the voting field is in order. A conference held in February of this year at Notre Dame University by distinguished legal authorities outlined the obstructions used by a number of Southern communities to deny the vote to Negroes and described them as "massive intimidation calculated to induce acute personal insecurity." The group concluded that the courts now have ample power to deal with this, with which I and the Civil Rights Commission and the President and many others disagree, but I note that the group also concluded that:

> The Department of Justice must more urgently seek to bring its cases to trial, even over the reluctance of busy or unenthusiastic Federal judges. * * * The Government must seek not merely to unlock the doors of the voting booth for Negro citizens, but to open the doors as clearly as they were previously closed to Negro applicants. * * * Finally, the time has come for Federal recognition of power and obligation to assist by affirmative support the enfranchisement of Negro citizens.

The three remaining legislative proposals in the President's special message relate basically to education, and it is with much satisfaction that I found at last proposals in the President's message not only outside the area of voting but particularly in this area, which I have long felt to be the bedrock test of equal opportunity. I think it was most appropriate that, of all the discriminatory uses of public funds which might have been attacked first, it was in the area of public school desegregation that the new era of civil rights really began in 1954 with the Brown against Board of Education decision. But, ironically, here the pace of Federal action has been most sluggish. The only civil rights statutes since the Civil War, the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, dealt with the right to vote; the President's Committee on

Equal Employment Opportunity first established by Executive order in 1953 was a first step in the employment area; the Executive order in housing last October began the Federal effort in housing; the old Civil Rights Acts of the Civil War period, inadequate as they are, were a first step in the administration of justice field. But in education, which is the key to all the rest, the effort has been almost wholly left at the Federal level to private suits brought one at a time, with the limited resources of parents backed by funds collected by the legal defense fund of the NAACP.

The Civil Rights Commission's 1961 report stated that:

> Seven years after the Supreme Court's decision only 775 of 2,837 biracial school districts in the 17 Southern States that required racial segregation in the public schools on that date had taken any action to abolish racial segregation.

It also found that:

> In many of the school districts where some start has been made, actual desegregation is minimal. In fact only 7 percent of all Negroes enrolled in the public schools in the 17 Southern States attended school with white pupils in 1960-61, whereas 27 percent of the school districts have made some start toward compliance with constitutional requirements.

In its more recent report "Civil Rights U.S.A.—Public School Southern States, 1962," the Commission amends its findings to add that desegregation is limited "to 25 percent of the Negro pupils enrolled in the school districts which, 8 years after the Supreme Court decision of 1954, have commenced desegregation of their school system or announced policies to that effect." Now the pattern has changed somewhat:

> The initial shock is over; school buildings are no longer dynamited; National Guardsmen no longer use bayonets to bar children from schools; and State legislatures no longer meet in special session to pour pounds of massive resistance into State statute books. Initial assignment of pupils by race, using pupil placement laws, dual school zone maps, and other means, and transfer provisions tied to race characterize the present trend.

The administration's reaction to this is a three-part proposal: technical and financial aid to school districts in the process of desegregating; elimination of the separate-but-equal language which shockingly remains on the books in the Morrill Land Grant College Acts; and expansion of the Civil Rights Commission so that it can act as a clearinghouse for information, advice, and technical assistance to any agency public or private which requests it. The last of these proposals is not limited in the special message to education, although in the 1961 Commission report on education it was a concomitant of the proposal to offer technical and financial assistance to desegregating school districts, where it will be most useful.

These proposals ignore the bulk of the Civil Rights Commission recommendations in this area. The key proposal of the Commission—and of the Democratic platform of 1960—was a requirement that every local school board which maintains any public school from which pupils are excluded on the basis of race, must file a plan for desegregation with a designated Federal agency within 6 months after the adoption of the legislation, the plan to call for at least a first step toward compliance with the Brown decision at the beginning of the following school year, and complete desegregation as soon as practicable thereafter. In their reports on similar legislation in 1962 both the Departments of Justice and of Health, Education, and Welfare favored such provisions.

The second vital recommendation in the Commission report and the Democratic platform which is ignored is the granting of power to the Attorney General to enforce the desegregation decision by appropriate civil actions in the Federal courts. Broadened to include enforcement of all constitutional rights, this was the famous part III of the 1957 act which was deleted under threat of filibuster. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the Commission report recommended that 50 percent of Federal financial aid to elementary and secondary schools should be withheld where no desegregation has taken place and that a smaller proportion should be withheld where a program of desegregation has been initiated until it has been completed. Here the President recommended only elimination of the "separate-but-equal" clause in the Morrill Land Grant College Acts; but in the remaining and even more significant problems of Federal aid to segregated educational facilities—in impacted areas, particularly those in which children of military personnel are required to attend segregated public schools—the administration continues to rely on executive action. Yet just last year when testifying before a House of Representatives subcommittee, the then-Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said that executive action was necessarily limited when Congress had not spoken: "if meaningful changes are to occur," he said, "if new, affirmative steps are to be taken, Congress must take legislative action." I agree. The proposed executive action is understood to involve having integrated school facilities built onbase for military dependents while leaving the segregated facilities offbase where they are. Criticism against this scheme, which has already been registered by civil rights groups, is not unwarranted, in my judgment. The question then remains, why has the administration not heeded its own position last year and the Civil Rights Commission recommendation and asked for meaningful legislation for this purpose? Or, if it now believes that executive action short of legislation is appropriate, why not adopt the Commission's recommendation by cutting down the Federal assistance in proportion to compliance with the Brown decision?

In regard to the part III power, the special message glosses over the Prince Edward County case, which has for the past 3 years presented the spectacle of a populous county adjacent to the Nation's Capital without a system of public education in order to frustrate the school desegregation order of the U.S. Supreme Court directed to this very county in the Brown case. When the schools were closed, the Justice Department attempted to assert an inherent right to intervene as a part in the suit brought privately; it failed in the district court and did not appeal. At this point the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has permitted the Attorney General to appear as amicus curiae, or friend of the court. The President described this as having "intervened." The difference may appear technical to the layman but it is an important one. As a friend of the court the Attorney General's powers and responsibilities are limited to advising the court; he cannot call witnesses and marshal the evidence; the expense of prosecuting the case to the Supreme Court if necessary, which is estimated at $15,000 per pupil, is still the responsibility of the private plaintiff. There are too many segregated school districts, none of which will consider the decision in any other district's case binding upon it, for this haphazard and costly procedure.

This exhausts the administration's legislative proposals in this 100th year of emancipation. Apart from the shortfall in the voting area and particularly in the education field, there remain the subjects of employment, housing, administration of justice and public facilities. Many of these subjects were mentioned in the special message; none were deemed to warrant legislative proposals.

Yet, the Civil Rights Commission report in 1961 found that:

> Negro workers are still disproportionately concentrated in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled in both private and public employment. They are also disproportionately represented among the unemployed.

Since then the unemployment rate has risen to such alarming heights that the President has, quite properly, made economic measures to combat it the highest priority in his legislative program. The 1960 Democratic platform called for creation of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, which would, according to legislation introduced in the Senate, cover all employment affected by interstate commerce and would have enforcement power in the Federal courts. The Civil Rights Commission recommended a statutory base for the existing President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which would cover employment by the Federal Government, by those who contract with the Federal Government, in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid, or by affected labor organizations. Instead of taking either of these courses, the President made much of the record of the existing Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which is created by Executive order and has no power of subpena or real corrective power. But that record has been seriously questioned within the last year.

At one point there were reports in the press of conflicts of philosophies and personalities which were reputed to be impairing the effectiveness of the Committee. It was reported that the "plans for progress" program, a campaign of voluntary compliance which one of the

Committee members undertook to create, was giving employers an excuse for not complying in reality with the Executive order requiring nondiscrimination in hiring and promotion, and was in fact operating as a weakening substitute for the enforcement activities of the Committee itself. Since then both the member involved and the Staff Director have resigned. The merits of the situation are important as showing the need for Federal legislation, for either a full-scale FEPC or at least a statutory base defining the powers and duties of the President's Committee.

The Southern Regional Council made a survey of the plans for progress program in Atlanta, Ga., where 24 of the original 52 signers of the plans for progress had plants, offices or regional headquarters. The result of the survey, published in January, 1963, is that "the plans for progress were, for the regional office in Atlanta, largely meaningless." The report states:

> For every company which wants to keep its promise to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, there are several which view the plans lightly—or who somehow believe that the program does not affect their Deep South operations. * * * To sum up, indications are that the interpretation of the voluntary and affirmative provisions of the program is being left to the individual signers themselves.

Even organizations, such as the AFL–CIO, which do not view the experience of the Committee's last 2 years as negatively as this judgment would indicate, nonetheless recommend that a Federal fair employment practices law is vitally needed and should be enacted.

Meanwhile questions have also been raised about other uses of Federal funds relating to employment. Apprenticeship training programs, the public employment offices established in the various States under Federal law; and now the new Manpower Training Act program have all been questioned as to whether equal opportunity has been, or in the case of the last, will be afforded. In a report to the President in August 1961, by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the apprenticeship training and employment service programs were identified as denying equal opportunity. The Civil Rights Commission report of 1961 contained a finding as to all Federal funds for training and placement that a policy of equal opportunity "has yet to be made consistent or thoroughly effective." None of these programs was mentioned in the President's special message.

One final word should be said about the emphasis in the special message upon the drive to have the National Labor Relations Board take action against racial discrimination in unions as an unfair labor practice under existing law. The plan is an excellent one, but it should not delude anyone into believing that it is a substitute for a fair employment practices law; the great majority of employees in the United States, even in interstate commerce, is still nonunion, and the reach of the proposed drive is simply too short. In addition, the effect of such proceedings upon employers is still unknown.

The Executive order barring discrimination in Housing, issued by the "stroke of the pen" after almost 2 years of delay, fell far short of the Civil Rights Commission recommendation that it direct "all Federal agencies concerned with housing and with home mortgage credit to shape their policies and practices to make the maximum contribution" to the achievement of equal opportunity in housing. The Commission had found as a fact that:

> Of the many Federal agencies concerned with housing and home mortgage credit, none has attempted to exert more than a semblance of its authority to secure equal access to the housing benefits it administers, or to insure equal treatment from the mortgage lenders it supports and supervises.

The Executive order failed to reach: first, all housing constructed under contracts entered into prior to November 20, 1962, including public housing, FHA- and VA-insured housing, housing on urban renewal sites, and housing for the elderly and urban renewal projects whose preliminary contracts but not final loan and grant contracts were executed prior to November 20, 1962; and second, conventional mortgage loans not directly insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government, but made by institutions which operate under Federal supervision, such as those whose deposits are insured by FDIC or FSLIC. The areas covered by the order—FHA- and VA-insured mortgages—account for only approximately 25 percent of the total volume of residential financing.

The exclusion of these large areas in housing from the nondiscrimination order was not dictated by legal or constitutional incapacity. The 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution bar the discriminatory use of Federal revenues for any purpose, including housing; and a constitutional mandate does not require an Executive order to make itself effective and therefore is not limited to prospective application, as would be legislation which affected previously incurred contract obligations.

I believe that the narrowness of the Executive order will not avoid difficulty, as the administration apparently hoped, but will instead, bring on further difficulty. Already there are reports in the press of a new development to open to Negroes housing not covered by the order, "dwell-ins" parallel to the sit-ins which have been so widely used in the lunch counter cases. The first efforts are planned for the North, because as one Negro leader says, "There are so many things in the South that take precedence over housing."

In addition, a Civil Rights Commission report issued last year called for special action in the field of housing in the District of Columbia, in addition to the general Executive order.

The final report of the 1961 series by the Civil Rights Commission concerned the administration of justice, which cuts across many of the other areas of civil rights because local police authorities are the principal contact between citizens, both Negro and white, and the legal structure of their communities. To this extent constitutional protections in the administration of justice are the concern of all citizens in all parts of the country. In those States in the South where that political and social structure is devoted to maintaining a system of segregation, it is the local police who principally sustain the State's policy. Where, for example, there is intimidation against Negroes who organize to attempt to register and vote, it is the local police who most effectively create and maintain the climate of fear, either affirmatively, by harassing arrests on trivial or unfounded charges or passively, by failing to prosecute private persons who commit acts of violence.

The recent sharp report by the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, consisting of citizens of Mississippi, both white and Negro, stated that:

> In all important areas of citizenship, a Negro in Mississippi receives substantially less than his due consideration as an American and as a Mississippian.

After listing a number of areas which bear this out, including hospitals, schools, jobs, voting, and even cemeteries, the committee devoted its entire report to police brutality, describing it as "a subject that has implications even more damaging to the principles of the American way of life than denial of the right to vote." The Committee said that what they found in their own State regarding police brutality was "a profound shock" to them. Even their factfinding efforts were, in their own words, "actively opposed by agents and instrumentalities of the State Government." The cases they describe are indeed shocking. As a result of their investigation the Committee recommended that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission hold hearings in Mississippi on a regular, periodic basis, that the Commission recommend additional legislation to the Congress, and that the President direct the Department of Justice to investigate every allegation of physical abuse of authority by State or local officials in that State "and institute criminal proceedings in all cases in which such action appears to be warranted, regardless of the prospects for convictions."

The President's message referred to incidents of harassment in discussing the right to vote; presumably his recommendations to amend the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts are intended to deal with these problems as if they all related to the right to vote. Yet the Civil Rights Commission devoted an entire volume in its 1961 reports to this subject and made four legislative recommendations: A grant-in-aid program to increase the professional quality of State and local police forces; amendment of the old Civil Rights Act provision, which made deprivation of another's civil rights a misdemeanor, so that it is effective; amendment of the provision which afforded a right of action so that it makes the local governmental entity whose employee is responsible for the deprivation of rights jointly liable, with the employee; and the granting of part III power to the Attorney General to prevent the exclusion of Negroes from jury service. The

President's proposals ignored these recommendations entirely.

A sixth area of Federal concern which has not been dealt with formally by any one Civil Rights Commission report to date, although I am advised that the Commission is looking into it, is public accommodations, which embraces both facilities supported in whole or in part by Federal or State funds, and facilities which are entirely privately supported and operated but which fall within the ambit of Federal jurisdiction over interstate commerce. Federal and State-supported facilities have been discussed in part in the education, employment, and housing areas. The issue arises in connection with each new Federal or State program as it becomes law. One additional aspect should be mentioned since it does not fall readily within any of those areas: The Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act contains the only other explicit segregation provision—separate but equal—apart from the already mentioned provision in the Morrill Land Grant College Acts. Why the President recommended the elimination of the latter provision but not the former is difficult for me to understand. The fact that the NAACP has brought suit in two hospital segregation cases does not offer a satisfactory distinction since the many suits in the education field would present an equal opportunity to avoid requesting legislation.

The special message devotes an entire section to public accommodations and describes a number of instances of real progress. It fails to note, however, that the desegregation of interstate bus and rail terminals was achieved under nondiscrimination clauses in existing law and that desegregation of airports was achieved only after repeated assaults were made by me on the Senate floor on appropriations for the airport terminal construction program. Racial incidents in national parks, forests, and other federally supported recreation areas are continually reported, I regret to note.

Problems continue to arise in connection with members of the armed services and their dependents. The issue of segregated schools has been discussed earlier. But the use of other public facilities, those financed by tax revenues and those simply open to the general public, remains an unsolved problem. A report issued this month by the South Dakota Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission describes an ugly situation which developed in Rapid City as to servicemen from nearby Ellsworth Air Force Base. The committee found that most people in Rapid City, including its responsible leaders and officials, are against discriminatory practices, but it said concerted community action would be needed to head off the "forces of self-interest, ignorance, and bigotry." I am pleased to note that, since publication of the report, South Dakota has enacted a public accommodations antidiscrimination law.

The President last year appointed a Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and the Civil Rights Commission has tackled the job of investigating the entire problem. It is my fervent hope that segregation in National Guard units throughout the South, another startling anachronism, will at last be ended.

But a greater problem is glossed over altogether, that of public facilities generally, in interstate commerce, including hotels, motels, and other such places providing lodging and services to travelers across State lines. The President notes, quite rightly, that:

> No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightly resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

But he offers no hope of a solution to that problem beyond banning segregation in the immediate bus, train and plane facilities, the national parks and forests, and space leased in Government buildings.

What about hotels and restaurants? Must we wait for repetitions of the incidents within the past 2 years of a high Federal official who is Negro being denied a room in a Texas hotel, or foreign diplomats being barred from entering restaurants along an interstate highway, constructed with 90 percent Federal funds? And if diplomats who are Negroes are to be protected by State Department "persuasion," how explain not protecting U.S. citizens who happen to be Negroes?

A recent very interesting article in the Hotel Monthly surveys racial and religious discrimination in the hotel industry and concludes, quite properly, that the "evolution" which is the result of State Department efforts regarding diplomats, the antidiscrimination public accommodation laws in effect in half the States, the trend toward attracting conventions, and the pressure of economics, is a slow process and that, unless the industry itself decides to do something about it, the Negro organizations may well make a strong public issue of it to the economic detriment of the industry. To me this is a healthy position for a trade journal to take. But it is also a powerful indictment of the subordinate and reluctant position of the Federal Government in the drive to achieve rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

In my view, while identifying the problem, the President should also have recommended legislation to reach those facilities which are affected by interstate commerce. The National Labor Relations Board already applies the Federal labor laws to hotels which have substantial income from interstate commerce, so that the constitutional reach of Federal power is well established. That the statutory rights of employers and employees in such facilities should be more diligently protected than the constitutional rights of all American citizens to use those facilities is wholly unsupportable.

I therefore believe that advocates of civil rights legislation must wage a campaign throughout this year in order to build up support for a full-dress civil rights effort at the next opportunity, probably when the extension of the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, which expires this year, comes to the Senate floor. The crucial test will then come on cloture motions requiring a two-thirds vote to close debate on substantive civil rights amendments. Let no one in the United States mistake this fact: The most important civil rights vote cast by any Senator in 1963 and 1964 has been and will be his vote on a motion to close debate on a civil rights measure.

The first victory on a cloture motion on such a civil rights measure is the key which will unlock the iron gate which has for so long barred really important civil rights legislation. It will have brought the whole field of civil rights legislation into the second half of the 20th century, and we would then see really effective action in this field such as the national situation so much demands. I believe the best evidence of this prediction is the unprecedented desperation of the opposition to a rule XXII change by opponents of civil rights legislation at the opening of this session.

We on the other side advocate some really intensive and vigorous Presidential leadership. The President will go to the country again in 1964. He will appeal to the same groups which have heretofore supported him. They have supported him to a far greater extent than they have supported Republican candidates.

He owes them something in real American terms. It is our duty, at the very least, to see that if he is to seek their franchise, he should be brought face to face with what must be delivered as a result of it.

Let us remember that this does not involve only the President. It also involves the majority in the Congress. It involves the very committees which pass upon the very bills about which we are talking, which have Democratic Party majorities. A party obtains big things in our country when it wins a national election. At least it ought to give something in return, especially to those who are electing the members of that party in terms of national policy.

I have attempted to outline both the background and the possibilities which faced the President when he delivered his special message, and I have attempted to match against both the background and the possibilities the legislative measures which the President there proposed. I believe the conclusion inescapably to be drawn from that comparison is that the President has seriously neglected the most substantial part of the unanimous recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and of his own party's platform. I do not question his good faith in what he has proposed, nor have I ever done so; nor do I question the importance of actions taken and to be taken in the executive department by the Attorney General and the President. But I deeply believe that the President has asked for so much less than those in a position of great responsibility—the members of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—have proposed with great soberness and forethought; that his program is gravely inadequate to the need.

I say this particularly because this is the centennial of the Emancipation

Proclamation. The President's program does not measure up to what this event symbolizes: a great crusade for what common human decency has not yet provided, what a great Civil War has not yet provided, and what a century since then has not yet provided—equality of opportunity for Negroes in voting, education, employment, housing, the administration of justice, and public accommodations. I am proud to be among this group of Republicans who today introduce a series of bills based upon the Civil Rights Commission recommendations, which we believe to be a program which is worthy of the Emancipation Proclamation centennial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce out of order, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BEALL, CASE, FONG, KEATING, KUCHEL, and SCOTT, bills relating to the administration of justice; a bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful violence, and for other purposes; and a bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, along with the findings and recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1215. A bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the 'Improvement of State and Local Justice Act'.

"Protection Against Violence Under Color of Law.

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately before 'Whoever', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation or custom knowingly performs any of the following acts depriving another person of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both:

"'(1) Subjecting any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose;

"'(2) Subjecting any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody;

"'(3) Subjecting any person to violence or maliciously subjecting such person to unlawful restraint in the course of eliciting a confession to a crime or any other information;

"'(4) Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint for the purpose of obtaining anything of value;

"'(5) Refusing to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place; or

"'(6) Aiding or assisting private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.'

"(b) The enactment of this section shall not be construed as indicating an intent on the part of the Congress to prevent any State, any possession or Commonwealth of the United States, or the District of Columbia, from exercising jurisdiction over any offense over which they would have jurisdiction in the absence of the enactment of this section.

"FEDERAL CIVIL REMEDIES FOR UNLAWFUL OFFICIAL VIOLENCE

"SEC. 3. Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 1979.', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) Every city, county, or political subdivision of a State or territory which has in its employ a person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of such State, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress to the same extent as the person employed is liable to the party injured.'

"PROTECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS AND UNIFORMED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES FROM INJURY AND THREATS

"SEC. 4. (a) Chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following new section:

"'§ 1510. Injuring or threatening to injure officers of the United States

"'Whoever, by force, intimidation, or threat, prevents or attempts to prevent any person from accepting or holding any office, trust, or place of confidence under the United States, or attempts to induce by like means any officer of the United States to leave the place where his duties as an officer are required to be performed; or whoever injures or attempts to injure or threatens to injure any such person or the property of such person on account of the lawful discharge of the duties of his office, or while such person is engaged in the lawful discharge thereof; or whoever injures or attempts to injure or threatens to injure the property of any such person so as to molest, interrupt, hinder, or impede such person in the discharge of his official duties shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than six years, or both.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 73, immediately preceding section 1501 of title 18 of the United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'1510. Injuring or threatening to injure officers of the United States.'

"(c) Section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard' and inserting in lieu thereof 'uniformed member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.'

"EXCLUSION OF MINORITY GROUP MEMBERS FROM JURY SERVICE

"SEC. 5(a) The Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or political subdivision thereof, exclude any person or groups of persons from grand or petit jury service on account of their race, color, or national origin.

"(b) As used in subsection (a), the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"SUITS BY UNITED STATES TO ENFORCE EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS

"SEC. 6. Part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 123. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person is being deprived of, or is about to be deprived of, the equal protection of the laws, and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, commencement of litigation by such person (1) may create the danger of injury to the person, family, or property of the complainant or of any other person with standing to bring such litigation, or of any counsel retained for purposes of such litigation, or (2) may create the danger of economic sanctions against the complainant or any other person named in (1), the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order.

"'(b) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General in the name of the United States may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto if he certifies that, in his judgment, the maintenance of the action may result in any of the injuries or economic sanctions set forth in subsection (a).

"'(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

"'(d) In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.'"

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1216. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the 'State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Act'.

"SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in improving the professional competence of State and local police forces, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants for projects to develop or demonstrate techniques and practices which in his judgment will substantially contribute to the effectiveness of State and local law enforcement agencies, including (but not limited to) techniques and practices relating to law enforcement administration, the recruitment, training, and education of police officers, and improved cooperation among the various law enforcement agencies in the United States and between State and local law enforcement agencies and other public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

"(b) Such grants may be made to any State, local, or other public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution; and to the extent he deems it appropriate, the

Secretary shall require the recipient of any grant to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant was made.

"(c) The Secretary is further authorized to enter into contracts for any such projects with public or other agencies, organizations, or institutions, and with individuals.

"(d) The full amount (as determined by the Secretary) of any grant for a project made under this section shall be reserved from the appropriation for the fiscal year in which the grant is made; and payments on account of such grant in that and subsequent fiscal years may be made only from the amount so reserved.

"(e) Payments under this section may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"Sec. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the organization, administration, or personnel of any State or local police force or other law enforcement agency.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish a Federal Advisory Committee on Police Procedures, Selection, and Training to advise him on the administration of this program. The Committee may elect officers and meet at the order of its Chairman. But its decisions will not bind the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on any matter.

"(b) Members of such Committee not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending meetings of the Committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Sec. 4. As used in this Act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The findings and recommendations presented by Mr. Javits are as follows:

U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

FINDINGS

Unlawful official violence

1. The actions of most policemen demonstrate that effective law enforcement is possible without the use of unlawful violence.

2. Nonetheless, police brutality by some State and local officers presents a serious and continuing problem in many parts of the United States. Both whites and Negroes are the victims, but Negroes are the victims of such brutality far more, proportionately, than any other group in American society.

3. While police connivance in violence by private persons is becoming less of a problem than in the past, such denials of equal protection still occur.

4. American citizens in some places live in fear of police violence and of mob violence with police connivance.

5. State and local officials—police commanders, prosecutors, and others in positions of authority—who have the immediate responsibility and most effective means for preventing such abuses sometimes do not use their powers. Police commanders at times take a protective attitude toward miscreant officers, and local prosecutors rarely bring criminal actions against them.

The professional quality of State and local police forces

6. The most effective "remedies" for illegal official violence are those that tend to prevent such misconduct rather than those which provide sanctions after the fact. The application of professional standards to the selection and training of policemen is one such preventive measure.

7. Complaints rarely are made against Federal police agents, in part because these officers have had professional training and have been selected according to professional standards.

8. The professional level is high in some State and local police forces also, but in many others it is low due to low pay, ineffective recruit selection standards and ineffective training programs.

9. The establishment of professional standards for police forces can be aided by such positive programs as good pay, high recruit selection standards, and training in scientific crime detection, in human relations, and in police administration. These programs would be encouraged by Federal financial assistance to police departments that seek the development of more effective selection standards and training courses.

Federal criminal remedies for unlawful official violence

10. Although many acts of violence by policemen are violations of constitutional rights and of Federal statutes, the Federal criminal sanctions for such misconduct have not proved to be effective remedies. This is due to difficulties inherent in the cases such as the problem of proof; to the policies and procedures of the Department of Justice; and to weaknesses of the statutes.

11. Among the policies and procedures of the Department of Justice that have hampered Federal criminal prosecutions for unlawful official violence have been excessive reliance on signed complaints from aggrieved individuals despite the fact that many victims of police misconduct are unaware of their rights, or fearful to press them; and tendency to close some cases without complete investigation; and deference to State authorities which results in withholding any investigation pending State action even at the risk of allowing evidence to grow stale.

12. FBI agents, charged with the duty of Civil Rights Acts investigations, are sometimes placed in a difficult position when they must investigate allegations of misconduct against local policemen. The cooperation of local officers is essential to the FBI in investigating and apprehending those who violate Federal criminal statutes not related to civil rights. Moreover, victims and witnesses of police misconduct are sometimes hesitant to give information to Federal authorities because of the cooperative relationship between the FBI and local policemen.

13. Since section 242, the principal criminal Federal Civil Rights Act defines only a misdemeanor, prosecution can be instituted by information (a sworn statement setting out the specific charges against the defendant) as well as by grand jury indictment. The former method avoids the delay and the hazard of one more hostile jury, involved in a presentment to a grand jury, and allows the facts to be brought to the attention of the affected community in a public trial. An information has been used by the Department of Justice only once and then successfully.

14. Difficulties also arise from the language of section 242, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Screws* v. *United States*. The requirement of "specific intent"—as opposed to the usual general criminal intent—for conviction under the statute severely limits the statute's applicability. Moreover, there is confusion among judges, jurors, and lawyers as to the meaning of specific intent. Some Federal trial judges have issued instructions to juries which seem to interpret specific intent more narrowly than is required by the Screws decision.

15. A more specific statute supplementary to section 242 spelling out certain conduct proscribed by the 14th amendment would more effectively protect the constitutional right to security of the person against official misconduct.

Federal civil remedies for unlawful official violence

16. The Federal civil rights acts providing civil liability for unlawful official violence have not proved to be effective remedies. Relatively few suits are filed under the principal civil statute, section 1983, which allows suits by the victims of police brutality against officers for monetary damages. Successful suits are rare.

17. One deterrent to the filing of civil suits is the fact that even if a victim of official violence sues successfully, few police officers are able to satisfy a substantial money judgment. This can be corrected by an amendment to section 1983 which would render counties, cities, and other local governmental entities liable for the misconduct of their policemen.[1]

Discriminatory exclusion of minority groups from jury service

18. The practice of excluding Negroes from juries on account of their race still persists in a few States. The burden of combating such racial exclusion from juries now rests entirely on private persons—almost invariably defendants in criminal trials.

19. Only criminal remedies are available to the Federal Government to combat unconstitutional jury exclusion. The Federal Government has successfully invoked a criminal statute only once, in the late 1870's.

20. Civil actions instituted in the name of the United States would constitute a more effective method of preventing discriminatory exclusion from juries.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The professional quality of State and local police forces

Recommendation 1: That Congress consider the advisability of enacting a program of grants-in-aid to assist State and local governments, upon their request, to increase the professional quality of their police forces. Such grants-in-aid might apply to the development and maintenance of (1) recruit selection tests and standards; (2) training programs in scientific crime detection; (3) training programs in constitutional rights and human relations; (4) college level schools of police administration; and (5) scholarship programs that assist policemen to receive training in schools of police administration.

Federal criminal remedies for unlawful official violence

Recommendation 2: That Congress consider the advisability of enacting a companion provision to section 242 of the U.S. Criminal Code which would make the penalties of that statute applicable to those who maliciously perform, under color of law, certain described acts including the following:

---

[1] *Lincoln County* v. *Luning*, 133 U.S. 529 (1890); *Hopkins* v. *Clemson Agricultural College*, 221 U.S. 636 (1911); *Frame* v. *City of New York*, 34 F. Supp. 194 (S.D. N.Y., 1940). Some States have statutes providing that the victims of mobs may sue the State in local courts for damages so incurred. An example is Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 38, secs. 512–517 (1959). It is doubtful if liability could be extended by congressional action to State governments. *Hans* v. *Louisiana*, 134 U.S. 1 (1890); *Palmer* v. *Ohio*, 248 U.S. 32, 34 (1918); *In re State of New York*, 256 U.S. 490, 497 (1920); *Monaco* v. *Mississippi*, 292 U.S. 313, 328–30 (1934).

1. Subjecting any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose.

2. Subjecting any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody.

3. Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint in the course of eliciting a confession to a crime or any other information.

4. Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint for the purpose of obtaining anything of value.

5. Refusing to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place.

6. Aiding or assisting private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.

Federal civil remedies for unlawful official violence

Recommendation 3: That Congress consider the advisability of amending section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code to make any county government, city government, or other local governmental entity that employs officers who deprive persons of rights protected by that section, jointly liable with the officers to victims of such officers' misconduct.

Exclusion of minority group members from jury service

Recommendation 4: That Congress consider the advisability of empowering the Attorney General to bring civil proceedings to prevent the exclusion of persons from jury service on account of race, color, or national origin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce out of order, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BEALL, CASE, FONG, KEATING, KUCHEL, and SCOTT, bills relating to public accommodations: a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce; and a bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; and I also ask unanimous consent that these bills may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1217. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) all persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, privileges, services, and facilities of any hotel, motel, or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging, the business of which affects interstate commerce, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(b) Whoever, being a proprietor, manager, or employee of any hotel, motel, or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging, the business of which affects interstate commerce, denies or attempts to deny to any person the full and equal enjoyment of any accommodation, advantage, privilege, service, or facility of such hotel, motel, or other public place, except for reasons applicable alike to persons of every race, color, religion, or national origin, or whoever incites or otherwise participates in such denial or attempt, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Any such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 and the following), or the United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or territorial court of competent jurisdiction. Any such suit or proceeding for preventive or declaratory relief may be brought by the Attorney General for the United States, or in the name of the United States, but for the benefit of the real party in interest.

"(c) When used in this Act, the term "interstate commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any territory of the United States and any State or other territory, or between any foreign country and any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1218. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (f) of section 622 of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"That the State plan shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for the people residing in a State, without discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color, and shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for persons unable to pay therefor. Such regulation shall require that before approval of any application for a hospital or addition to a hospital is recommended by a State agency, assurance shall be received by the State from the applicant that (1) such hospital or addition to a hospital will be made available to all persons residing in the territorial area of the applicant, without discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color; and (2) there will be made available in each such hospital or addition to a hospital a reasonable volume of hospital services to persons unable to pay therefor, but exception shall be made if such a requirement is not feasible from a financial standpoint."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order to make the record consistent and complete for us all, I ask unanimous consent that all of the civil rights bills introduced today may lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors; and that they may all be printed in the RECORD at the time received and referred, along with the appropriate findings and recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

If I were to attempt to express adequately my appreciation for the leadership which the Senator from New York has given in this particular episode in our long and continued efforts, I would take longer than all of us have taken already in the development of our particular parts of this program.

I must say that in this, as in all other efforts of this sort, his persistence, his skill, his inexorable pursuit of the right and justice of this cause have been to me an inspiration and a great comfort as a Member of this body, as a close colleague of his, and most of all as an American. He has held the feet of all of us who are in positions of responsibility to the fire. He has made us face the situation again and again, much as many of us would like to turn away from it and much as perhaps the majority of the people of this country would like to turn away from it.

The Senator mentioned the article by Mr. Baldwin, now a book, I think. Who could read such a document without a deep stirring of conscience? Who could not at least appreciate faintly what the matter of discrimination and prejudice in the United States has meant to individual lives by the millions? Who could fail to feel a sense of responsibility for the destruction of the personalities, and oftentimes the lives, of millions of human beings by the system of segregation and discrimination which we have permitted to exist and which we in the Senate in many cases actively have helped to continue to exist?

For all the practical reasons the Senator from New York has cited, and above all for the great moral reason to which he has also given clear expression, we must make headway in this program.

The contribution by the senior Senator from New York today on the floor of the Senate in the development of this particular package of legislation and in the forward movement in this whole cause is an inspiration to all of his colleagues. I thank him for it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from the depths of my heart for his generosity.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my colleague for a most eloquent and moving argument. I join with the Senator from New Jersey in gratitude for the leadership he has taken in this cause.

I wish to reinforce in the strongest possible language, Mr. President, the very valid point which my colleague has made—that the most important vote in the past as well as in the future in this Congress will be on the subject of cloture, on the subject of limiting debate. In my judgment, on the merits of most if not all of these civil rights measures there is a majority—and there are perhaps votes to spare—as to the merits. There are certainly no votes to spare on the subject of terminating debate after some reasonable length of days.

That will be the crucial test. No one can escape it. No one can contend that he is a supporter of meaningful civil rights legislation if he is unwilling, after some reasonable length of time, to terminate the debate so that we can get on to a vote, as to which I express confidence—and I am sure my colleague agrees—there is sufficient strength to enact legislation. We just never can get to the vote, due to the obstructionist tactics of the opponents of any such legislation.

Therefore, the pinpoint of this argument is very important. My colleague has made a very effective address. He has effectively answered, conclusively and beyond any question of doubt, the questions raised with regard to his position during this debate. I commend him and I am proud to be joined shoulder to shoulder with him in this fight.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleagues for their generosity and their kindness.

THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Fong, Kuchel, Beall, Case, Cooper, Javits, Keating, Scott, and Pearson I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government. This bill would also broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission.

Granting permanent status to the Commission would provide a sound and efficient basis for its continued operation. In the difficult field of civil rights, the value of a permanent public agency entrusted with the responsibility for reporting the facts objectively is obvious. There is too much misinformation and misunderstanding in this important area. The Commission's work helps to reduce tensions and to promote responsible solutions when difficult problems arise. As an investigating and factfinding agency, the Civil Rights Commission performs many useful functions not duplicated by any other agency of the Federal Government. Its reports and studies have provided a basis for remedial action in cases involving action in civil rights, and have served to keep our citizens aware both of the progress made in this area and the problems which remain.

While my bill would give permanent status to the Commission, the Congress would retain the opportunity for regular review of its activities because the Commission would be coming before the Congress annually for appropriations.

This bill would enable the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national clearinghouse for information and to provide advice and technical assistance to government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

The national clearinghouse function would permit groups to benefit from the experience of the Commission and from the information it has accumulated about how these problems have been solved in the past.

The Civil Rights Commission has made important contributions in promoting mutual understanding in the area of race relations since it was first organized in 1957. Unless action is taken the Commission will go out of existence November 8 of this year. That would be most unfortunate. I hope very much that the Congress will enact my bill so that the Commission can continue to render meaningful service to the country.

I ask that the bill be held at the desk until the end of business Thursday, April 4, so that other Senators who may wish to join in its sponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will be held at the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1219) to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1963".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975) is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, and the administration of justice."

(b) Section 104(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1975(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commission shall, not later than January 31 of each year, submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its activities and findings during the preceding calendar year and its recommendations with respect thereto. The Commission may submit such other reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as the Commission and the President deem advisable."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 104 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1975 (c)) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d) as amended by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d (h)) is amended by adding a new subsection at the end to read as follows:

"(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to state that there is such a commission in Massachusetts. I believe the law relating to it was enacted when I was Governor. It has worked out very satisfactorily. I believe the time has now come to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent body in the Federal Government.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very proud to be a principal cosponsor with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts of a bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and to broaden the scope and function of the Commission.

The Civil Rights Commission, an independent Federal agency, is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. Its life has been extended twice, in 1959, and again in 1961. Our bill proposes to extend its existence indefinitely.

Since its establishment by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Commission has fulfilled its functions with great distinction. Through hearings, and through the issuance of periodic reports, it has helped to create across the Nation a climate of understanding and moderation. It has spotlighted and thus pointed up the many critical areas of civil rights which must yet be secured to all Americans.

Investigating deprivations of the right to vote, and denials of equal protection of the laws, in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice, the Commission has pursued with diligence the areas in American life in which there exist practices inconsistent with the principles of democracy. It has issued reports and recommendations which have served as an effective guide for remedial action, both by the Congress and the Executive.

Our bill broadens the scope of the Commission's function by enabling the agency to serve as a clearing house for civil rights data. The Commission may offer its advice and technical assistance to anyone desiring an experienced and sympathetic forum. The Commission may then give its expert guidance in devising workable solutions and creating an atmosphere of understanding indispensable to peaceful and orderly progress.

But there remain many areas of unfinished business—areas of civil rights yet to be fully and adequately investigated. Because of this, our bill extends the life of the Commission indefinitely. There are at least three additional reasons to justify the Commission's more permanent and stable basis.

First, as an investigating and factfinding agency, the Commission performs a useful function not duplicated by another Federal department or agency. For example, it was on the basis of facts divulged during the Commission's 1958 hearings on voting rights that led to three constructive results: First, the enactment of the Civl Rights Act of 1960; Second, a bill which I have cosponsored with Senators Cooper and Dodd to protect the right of every American to vote; Three, a number of voting lawsuits initiated by the Justice Department.

Second, the value of the Commission's work, however, does not lie only in legislation, lawsuits or sanctions which may insue from its reports and recommendations. A public agency with continuing responsibility for bringing to light the facts is an absolute necessity. In no other area does misinformation and misunderstanding so quickly breed fear and confusion. The Commission's work helps reduce tensions and promote calm, reasonable solutions.

Third, an indefinite extension of the Commission would provide a sound and efficient basis for its continued operation, while leaving it subject to proper scrutiny by Congress. Clearly, there remain in the future many problem areas in civil rights which will require careful investigation and thoughtful recommendations. There can be no doubt that the Commission will have a continuing national function.

Yet, Congress will not lose any control over the agency by extending it indefinitely. The Commission will still be subject to a yearly review of its operations when it comes to Congress seeking appropriations. And, of course, even under an indefinite extension, Congress could still terminate the Commission's operations at any time.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has repeatedly demonstrated its utility and effectiveness. It has established itself in our body politic as an expert agency, with the experience, capability and competence to contribute significantly in securing our constitutional guarantees to all Americans, regardless of nationality, race, or religion. I commend this bill to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. To say anything further, Mr. President, would only depreciate the validity—in which I deeply believe—of what has already been said.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senate for its indulgence. I yield the floor.

FAY VERSUS NOIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Friday, March 15, I submitted, for myself and for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], Senate Resolution 114 which, if adopted, would require that at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall have had at least 10 years of prior judicial service.

At that time, in discussing this resolution on the floor of the Senate, I stressed the necessity for sound judicial self-restraint which could be insured only by judicial experience attained by long years of painstaking study, research, and analysis. I pointed out then that the Conference of the Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, in a resolution adopted August 23, 1958, had urged that the Supreme court "in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of National and State powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the Federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government."

I subscribed to that admonition then. I endorse it even more fervently today.

For, on March 18—just 3 days after I spoke—the Supreme Court handed down its decision in Fay against Noia—a decision which Mr. Justice Clark, in his dissenting opinion, accurately described as a "staggering blow" to the effective administration of criminal justice in State courts. As Mr. Justice Harlan stated, in his separate dissenting opinion, in which he was joined by both Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Stewart:

> This decision, both in its abrupt break with the past and in its consequences for the future, is one of the most disquieting that the Court has rendered in a long time.

I must admit that, on the facts, this was a hard case and that it perhaps forcefully illustrates the truth of the adage that "hard cases make bad law."

The facts were these: In 1942, Noia, with two others, was convicted of murder in Kings County, N.Y. The sole evidence against each defendant was his signed confession. His two codefendants appealed their convictions to the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court but Noia did not. While the appeals were unsuccessful, subsequent legal proceedings resulted in the release of Noia's codefendants on the ground that their confessions had been coerced and, therefore, their confessions were violative of the 14th amendment. The coercive nature of Noia's confession was conceded but, although aware of his right to appeal, he failed to exercise it. He thus remained in custody although his codefendants had long since been released and are now at liberty.

Thus, I make no complaint over the mere fact that Noia has now been granted his freedom. Perhaps a sound and meritorious case for executive clemency was presented. However, as a lawyer and as a firm believer in the reserved rights of the States, I am gravely disturbed by the "bad law" which the Court felt constrained to hand down—law which finds virtually no support from the prior decisions of the Court.

The case reached the Supreme Court as a result of Federal habeas corpus proceedings filed by Noia in the U.S. district court. That court denied relief because it failed to appear that Noia had exhausted the remedies available to him in the State courts. The circuit court of appeals reversed and the Supreme Court granted certiorari. The Court, in affirming the court of appeals, held: one, Federal courts have the power to grant habeas corpus relief despite Noia's failure to appeal; two, Noia's failure to appeal was not a failure to exhaust available State remedies since the appeal was no longer open to him when he filed his application for habeas corpus; and three, Noia's failure to appeal was not under the circumstances an intelligent and understanding waiver of his right of appeal which would justify the withholding of Federal habeas corpus relief.

To the layman, the implications of this decision may appear harmless. To the lawyer, and particularly to those charged with the administration of criminal justice in State courts, the implications assume enormous proportions. As was so well said by Mr. Justice Clark, the decision disrupts "the delicate balance of federalism so foremost in the minds of the Founding Fathers and so uniquely important in the field of law enforcement."

The situation in this case was that Noia was being detained as a result of a judgment of conviction in a Court having jurisdiction—a judgment which imparted verity. He had the procedural right of appeal to review his conviction—a right which he knowingly left unasserted. The judgment of conviction had long since become final. The judgment of detention was based upon an adequate and independent state ground, which, under all prior decisions, the Federal courts were required to respect. Finally, Noia had adequate opportunity to raise all Federal constitutional claims and to have them presented to and passed upon by the Federal courts if the relief sought was not obtained in the State court.

It is my considered opinion that the decision in question does not further law and order and the proper administration of justice. On the contrary, it undermines them because it interjects an uncertainty and instability into State criminal procedure which did not heretofore exist. Stripped of its legal verbiage, the decision simply means that regardless of the legality of an original conviction, regardless of the neglect of an available right of appeal, regardless of the constitutional safeguards provided by State procedures, a State judgment of conviction is never final but can be attacked collaterally and successfully a score or more years later by Federal habeas corpus proceedings.

Expressed another way, it means that after these many years the State court itself can be brought in and put on trial before the Supreme Court of the United States merely by the granting of the writ of certiorari. After the witnesses are no longer available, after the officials of the court are no longer available, at some indefinite future time, 10 or 25 years, the case is tried over and the court that tried the case is therefore put on trial.

This is but the latest of a long series of judicial steps which have chipped away at the reserved rights of the States and undermined the once sound concept of Federal-State judicial relations. The States surely have a vital stake in the administration of criminal justice and the right to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures, provided that they assure due process of law. Those rights, if not entirely destroyed, were certainly substantially curtailed by this decision.

I fear that we have once again witnessed a case involving the State-Federal system where the decision has been based on that which a majority of the Court has deemed desirable rather than on recognition of and respect for that which the Constitution prescribes or per*mits—a case, in short, in which judicial self-restraint* went unexercised.

This case seriously disturbs the orderly disposition of State prosecutions and jeopardizes the finality of State convictions in utter disregard of procedural safeguards provided by the States *which, until this decision, had been* respected by the Federal courts.

This is another illustration of a departure from what we have always known as constitutional government and constitutional procedures.

Convicted criminals will be encouraged to say—when faced with a trial court conviction and long prison sentence—"Never mind the appeal. It will be futile. Just wait a few years and after a few key State witnesses have died and the trial is cold, I'll proceed in Federal court under habeas corpus."

The decision of March 18 creates a new procedure. It invites, in fact encourages, the substitution of habeas corpus in Federal court for an appeal in State courts.

It is a delayed-action bomb. Who is to know when a decision is final? Under Fay against Noia, no decision is ever final—it is always open to collateral attack in the Federal courts.

It creates an additional loophole making it even more difficult for the forces of law and order to prevail.

Any man is entitled to his day in court, but the phrase is singular, and not plural. Once a decision has been rendered and his right of appeal exhausted or ignored, the judgment is final.

If he chooses not to appeal, that is his decision. Many times this is a real advantage to him. In this case, a confessed murderer consciously decided not to appeal his life sentence. He was afraid—and for good reason—that a retrial might gain him a seat in the electric chair.

Mr. President, cases of this kind are not unusual. In my own practice and experience in court I have known many such cases.

But what do we have instead? The Supreme Court has handed him, and all convicted criminals who did not appeal their cases for similar reasons, another day in court, inviting an endless number of habeas corpus proceedings to clutter the already crowded docket of the Federal courts. And we have another severe and lasting blow to constitutional government and the enforcement of our State criminal laws.

That is the real tragedy of this holding.

One sentence of the dissenting opinion of Justice Clark stands out:

> Beyond question the Federal courts until today have had no power to release a prisoner in respondent Noia's predicament, there being no basis for such power in either the Constitution or the statute.

That is not my argument. That is not the argument that anyone is making. That is the voice of one justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, who exercised his responsibility in reaching a conclusion in this particular case. He says there is no basis for such power in either the Constitution or the statute. He says there is no basis for such power.

What gave the Court the power to render its decision "today" if it did not have the power yesterday? Was a constitutional amendment adopted overnight. Did Congress meet and hurriedly enact a statute? Neither of these things happened. I submit, Mr. President, that *there is only one explanation. A majority* of the Court decided to reach a certain result, because of special facts, and proceeded accordingly, in spite of longstanding precedents.

A hard case indeed makes "bad" law, *and this case will surely rise to haunt* the Court many times in the months and years to come.

I am not indifferent, of course, to individual, and personal justice in any case. This doubtless could have been a proper basis for executive clemency even after this party had decided to take his chances on the route that he had taken. Assuming there is some merit to his appeal for clemency, it was executive clemency that was indicated. This decision upsets long standing constitutional principles which have been followed heretofore.

If we assume for the purpose of discussion that Noia was erroneously convicted and entitled to freedom, we must remember that the authority for executive clemency was created to take care of situations where the courts are powerless to prevent a miscarriage of justice. This enables the governor of a State to act when he feels that there are overriding considerations demanding clemency.

It is not difficult to foresee the time, if the present trend continues, when a final decision of a State court—even the supreme court of a State—is given only passing notice and no more weight than the decision of a justice of the peace. A trial de novo under the guise of a habeas corpus proceeding in the Federal courts will be the rule rather than the exception.

In all candor, Mr. President, I say that not only does this decision present one more compelling reason for the adoption of S. Res. 114, but it makes it urgently necessary that the Congress enact remedial legislation to restore Federal habeas corpus proceedings to their proper place in our judicial system. On at least three occasions such legislation has been passed by the House of Representatives but has not been acted upon by the Senate. I am preparing a bill for presentation to the Senate and will introduce it in a few days.

In closing, Mr. President, I join with Mr. Justice Harlan in asserting the belief that, in Fay against Noia, "the Court has turned its back on history and struck a heavy blow at the foundations of our Federal system."

Mr. President, I close by adding only and repeating that far more is involved here than the merits of the case that was then before the Court. Far more is involved than merely one precedent of the Supreme Court. This involves more than a century of precedents. It involves a great principle of constitutional law and constitutional government. It strikes, in a manner, at the very vitals and the very foundations of our form of gov*ernment under the constitutional provisions.*

I have mentioned the possibility of passing a statute. Unless something is done to restore the stability of what Justice Harlan has called the foundations of our Federal system in this respect, *then, as I pointed out heretofore,* this precedent established here can run wild. I therefore predict that something will be done, and I say that something must be done, to restore the stability of the system that has served so well in the past *and, in fact, is necessary under our form* of government.

THE CLAY COMMITTEE REPORT ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak today on the subject of foreign aid, and I shall comment upon the report of the committee appointed by the President of the United States known as the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by a distinguished American, Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The report was made public last Saturday. On Thursday, March 21, I submitted in the Senate a concurrent resolution dealing with the subject of foreign aid.

After reading the report of the Clay Committee, I believe that the concurrent resolution which I submitted has even greater relevance to a strong foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I have supported the foreign aid program during my service in the Senate. Nevertheless, during the past several years I have voted for the foreign aid program with some reservations. My reservations do not arise from any change in my views regarding the necessity of a foreign aid program. I believe it is an important arm of our foreign policy. I believe it is necessary in our self-interest to open the avenues of association and trade with the developing countries, for we have had little association with many of them in our relatively short history as a Nation. In the harshest self-interest it is essential that we do not abandon the field to the Soviet Union—in countries which are desperately seeking aid. Looking around us today, and to the future, it is in our interest and the interest of those countries we assist that these nations shall remain free—free in the sense of being independent, sovereign nations, and free in holding democratic values.

Also, I have voted for aid because I believe our country—with all its troubles, yet rich among the countries of the world—has a humanitarian and spiritual duty to help those less favored.

My reservations and my doubts—and I think they are shared by many—on the foreign aid bill have arisen because of known facts and many doubts that the money we appropriate is not being as effectively used as it should and could be used. I believe the people of our country would feel better about foreign aid appropriations if they had assurance that they were being used as effectively as possible.

The report of the Clay Committee sustains the importance of a continuing program of foreign aid. I quote from the closing paragraph:

> Our examination of U.S. foreign assistance programs and consideration of them in this report has been based upon the sharp criterion of their value to the security of our country and of the free world. We would not express ourselves adequately, however, if we failed to note the further interests of our country and of our people in the purpose and effect of these programs. For this reason, we would point out that the need for development assistance and a U.S. interest in providing it would continue even if the cold war and all our outstanding political differences with the Communists were to be resolved tomorrow. This is so not merely because it is part of the American tradition to be concerned with the plight of those less fortunate than ourselves. This is so not merely because it is in our national self-interest to assure expanding markets for our production and reliable sources of supply of necessary raw materials. It is because the people of the United States hope to see a world which is prosperous and at peace that we believe those nations which are seriously striving to promote their own development should be helped by us and by our partners to create and maintain the conditions conducive to steady economic progress and improved social well-being within the framework of political freedom.
>
> Respectfully submitted.
>
> Lucius D. Clay, Chairman; Robert B. Anderson, Eugene R. Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert A. Lovett, Edward S. Mason, L. F. McCollum, Herman Phleger, Howard A. Rusk, M.D.

I particularly note the name of Hon. Eugene R. Black, former president of the World Bank, a man who has had vast experience in the field of foreign aid.

I believe the immediate result of this report will be a substantial reduction in the request made by the administration for its foreign aid program for fiscal year 1964. I believe also that it is probable that reductions will be made in future years unless the administration provides Congress and the country with information looking to the effectiveness of our program in each country—and I emphasize "each country"—because I do not believe that good programs in some countries, or the total program, should be undermined because of failures in some countries. I understand this to be the position of the Clay committee.

With this purpose in mind, I submitted to the Senate last week a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress, in substance, that the President should appoint small committees to assess in depth the foreign aid program in each of the countries which receives our aid. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE BY JOHN SHERMAN COOPER ON MARCH 21, 1963

Whereas the United States has been engaged since World War II in programs of economic aid to other countries; and

Whereas an essential purpose of the United States in carrying out these programs has been to assist free countries in developing as quickly and effectively as possible, to the end that such countries may be able to raise the living standards of their peoples, achieve economic stability, and maintain and strengthen free institutions; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated approximately 66 billion dollars to the fulfillment of these objectives; and

Whereas the Congress does not have available to it the necessary information to enable it to evaluate the effectiveness of the aid extended by the United States to specific countries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should appoint as quickly as possible a committee for each country receiving economic aid from the United States, composed of at least five members, including representatives of the public, to review and evaluate the development program of such country and to report to the President and to the Congress not later than January 1, 1964, their findings with respect to the following—

(1) whether the recipient country (a) has a practical national development program which affords a reasonable expectation that the objectives of such program will be attained, taking into consideration the human and natural resources and capabilities of the country, (b) is providing the maximum amount of self-help within its capabilities, and (c) has adopted the fiscal, administrative, and social reforms necessary to the success of such program;

(2) whether the specific projects to which United States aid is allocated will contribute materially to the fulfillment of the primary needs of the recipient country's development program, and to the purpose of the United States to assist in raising the standards of living of the people of the country; and

(3) such other matters as in their opinion will be useful to the Congress in its consideration of legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for financing foreign aid programs for 1965 and subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of Congress that such committees should be appointed first to review the development programs for the following countries, which have received approximately one-third of the assistance extended by the United States under foreign aid programs: Korea, India, Japan, China, Greece, Vietnam, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Philippines, and Iran; and that legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for carrying out these programs for 1965 and subsequent fiscal years should not be enacted until the Congress has received and considered the reports referred to in this resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last year, when the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 was before the Senate, I submitted a similar proposal in the form of an amendment. It was adopted by the Senate. The amendment expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint small committees to assess the foreign aid program in each country receiving aid from the United States. In the House-Senate conference, the amendment was stricken.

Also, in a speech I delivered in the Senate in 1960, I made a similar proposal, although I did not incorporate it in the form of an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. On March 22, 1961, again speaking in the Senate, I made this statement:

> The administration should secure the assistance of the World Bank and other institutions to work with countries we aid in the formulation of the best developed plans. President Kennedy now has his greatest opportunity—one he may not have later—to work with recipient countries during the development of plans which have the greatest promise of success. We should not commit substantial sums for aid until such plans are developed.

So the proposal I have made in the concurrent resolution is not a new concept on my part. I have talked with officials in the Administration, and with members of the Clay Committee, outlining the purpose of the resolution which I have suggested should be adopted by Congress. If it is not adopted as a concurrent resolution, it should be considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and be incorporated in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

I am very hopeful that the President, in the formulation of his message to Congress on foreign aid, will consider the proposal which is the substance of the resolution. It may be asked—and it should be asked—What is the substance of the resolution? What is its purpose? As I have said, the committee headed by General Clay has performed distinguished and creative work in a very short time in examining the basis and operation of our foreign aid program, pointing out both its values and its necessity, and also its defects. It is my judgment that if the defects are not corrected, and corrected quickly, we shall see a continuing effort in this country and in Congress to strike down the concept of foreign aid—indeed, to end the foreign aid program.

Reductions will be made, and ought to be made, until Congress has before it specific information regarding the foreign aid program in each country which receives aid. I have studied reports submitted by the various agencies which have administered foreign aid. I cannot even state the number of those agencies. I read yesterday that there have been 11 administrators of foreign aid since the inception of the program. Before I submitted my resolution, I looked through some of the reports to see if it was possible to ascertain any definite or clear information about the success or failure of the foreign aid program in any specifiic country. I must say that I do not believe the information can be found.

The purpose of my resolution is to secure needed information so that the aid program may achieve maximum effectiveness and survive. The information can be secured by small committees appraising in depth the foreign aid program in each country and reporting their findings to the President and to Congress by January 1, 1964. Some may say that reports cannot be made by January 1, 1964. In answer, let me say that the Clay committee has been working for only a few months, and I am sure it has not been in session all the time. But its members are men of ability, and knowing how to obtain information have been able to present to the country an important and effective report on the entire foreign aid program. If the Clay committee can make a survey of the complete foreign aid program in a few months, I believe that small committees, composed of able men, can report on the effectiveness of our foreign aid program in each country. This can be done, in respect to some countries, in 3 or 4 months. I believe the total job can be finished by January 1, 1964.

What would those committees be charged with determining? My resolution points out some of the questions which ought to be answered.

The committees would determine whether the development program of the country is suited to its capabilities and resources. If it is not, the program could not have any great chance of success, and our aid serves no effective purpose.

Further, the committees should determine whether the countries are providing maximum self-help, and are undertaking the administrative, fiscal, and social reforms without which it is doubtful that any foreign-aid program would succeed.

I know we cannot expect perfection; but certainly it is important to know whether these basic conditions are being met. I believe the report of the Clay committee sustains my contention that these questions should be answered and these conditions should be met.

I should like to refer to the section of the Clay Committee's report called "Country Planning." First, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Country Planning

> There is a difference between sound, forward-looking national budgeting in economic and social terms on the one hand and theoretical long-term national development planning as it is often encountered. Extrapolations of mathematical models based on questionable statistics for debatable base periods seem to have a way of going wrong, even when it is possible to find economists who agree with each other. Furthermore, these long-term projections have been of little or doubtful value and frequently have proved harmful by directing attention to the theory of economic development at the expense of its practical implementation. Sound governmental planning consists of establishing intelligent priorities for the public investment program and formulating a sensible and consistent set of public policies to encourage growth in the private sector. U.S. governmental officials and programs should strive for such utility and realism in the development planning they support and in which they cooperate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the paragraph on country planning makes the same point—that the developing countries ought to formulate programs adapted to their resources and capabilities.

The Clay Commission report also states:

> The United States should be increasingly more specific on the self-help and reforms it seeks and do so on a country-by-country basis.

I do not believe we can ascertain whether our foreign aid program is successful in totals unless we know whether it is successful country by country.

Another purpose of the committees would be to look at the use of our foreign aid funds in each country.

The committees would assess the programs and the projects to which our funds are applied. I know, as is known by others of the Congress who have visited countries which we aid, that there is a tendency to establish American programs and projects which, although many of them have value, do not contribute substantially to the basic development of the country. Too many people are put to work on unnecessary projects. The committees could determine whether our aid is applied to projects that are substantially helpful to the basic development of the country, and if not, they could make recommendations to abolish unneeded programs and unneeded personnel. They could in a very positive way, make recommendations for the establishment of needed programs which would contribute substantially to the development of the country.

To give an illustration, I would say the basic need of any newly developing country is agriculture—to feed and to clothe its people. However, some countries, which naturally are seeking industrial development, fail to place sufficient importance on agriculture and its necessary development to supply food and clothing to the people. This is one type of determination which the committee could make.

Mr. President, last year, when I offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, embodying my present proposals, members of the Foreign Relations Committee who were on the floor at the time were kind enough to say—and I remember statements by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]—that they considered it an amendment with a valuable purpose. However, they raised questions concerning the cost of maintaining country committees and whether it would be possible to secure the number of members from private life who would be required for such committees.

As to the cost, it is possible that it might amount to half a million dollars, or perhaps a million dollars. But such a cost would be a minimal amount compared to the total our country spends each year on economic assistance—approximately $3 billion. And when considered in terms of the purpose of our foreign aid—to provide effective assistance to other free countries—the cost would be small indeed. Furthermore, it could be paid from the allocations made for each country.

As to the availability of personnel, each of the 25 to 40 committees I have suggested could be composed of, let us say, three men from the Federal Government and at least two men from private life. I would say that if 50 to 100 men in private life cannot be found to undertake this work for a few months, then our country is poor indeed.

Mr. President, there are precedents for my proposition. When the Marshall plan was enacted, the Congress wrote into the act a provision requiring a continuing examination of the programs in each country by a watchdog committee composed of Members of Congress. Representatives of the public and, I believe, representatives of the executive branch, had previously studied European foreign aid requirements. Last year, the Senate adopted an amendment similar to the resolution I now propose.

In 1959, the then Senator Kennedy and I introduced a joint resolution, which was passed by both Houses, providing for a review of our foreign aid programs in India and in Pakistan. As a result of the joint resolution, the State Department requested the World Bank to send three representatives to India and Pakistan. The World Bank sent Mr. Hermann J. Abs, of Germany, Sir Oliver Franks, of the United Kingdom, and the Honorable Joseph M. Dodge, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, of the United States. This Committee went to India and Pakistan, studied the programs there, and made recommendations. A very important result came from their recommendations—the formation of a consortium of several countries which have since contributed aid to the two countries, thereby helping India and Pakistan and sharing with the United States the total aid required.

Mr. President, let me say, in summary, that effective and distinguished as is the Committee headed by General Clay—which is composed of some of the country's ablest citizens—and effective as will be its reports on the subject of foreign aid, I do not believe we can have accurate information about the totality of our foreign aid program or its effectiveness in any country unless we have an assessment in depth for each country we aid. I suggest we start with the 11 countries that have received about one-third of the total of $66 billion which has been appropriated for economic aid.

These suggestions may not be liked by some of the newly developing countries, for they are jealous—and rightfully so—of their political and economic independence. But the countries we aid will respect us for insisting upon these conditions—for they will be benefited, and without loss of any independence. The administration and the Congress owe the duty to our people who support the foreign aid program, and to the people of the countries we aid, to see to it that our funds are used effectively and without waste—for the purpose of our aid program is to assist countries to achieve economic and social stability, to achieve better standards of living for their people, and to strengthen free institutions and democratic values.

It might be argued that some countries will go to the Soviet Union for aid. But many go to the Soviet Union anyway. I think the best answer to such countries is: "After consultation—going over your country's programs at the highest level—the United States has made the best decision possible concerning the extent and object of our aid. If the Soviet Union will help you further, that is a matter for your decision."

I am very happy that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] have asked to join me as cosponsors of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that their names be joined as cosponsors of my concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. I shall certainly be glad to have other Senators consider the resolution and join as sponsors. It will be at the desk until April 1.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. When the distinguished Senator from Kentucky submitted his resolution, he very generously, I believe, provided that it remain on the table until April 1 for cosponsors. I have asked that my name be added. I commend my colleague for the leadership which he has taken in that important field. I well remember the substance of the resolution which he offered as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. I was gratified that the amendment was adopted, and regretted that in conference it was eliminated. It seems to me that it is a very constructive approach to the problem.

As the Senator from Kentucky knows, I, like him, have been a consistent supporter of the foreign aid program over the years.

Sometimes there have been provisions of programs, and programs themselves, which have not been popular. But I have felt that, although mistakes have been made, generally the foreign aid program has served a constructive purpose. At this time there is increasing pressure for a more careful evaluation and for tightening up on some of the provisions of the program. I think the Clay Committee has performed a worthwhile service. One need not agree with every sentence in the report to make that statement. The members of the Committee are distinguished men. Many of them have had much experience in government and much experience with programs of foreign aid. The Committee is headed by one of the great Americans of our time, General Clay.

The Senator from Kentucky has sounded the right note in saying that the people themselves are insistent that the program be more carefully evaluated. The number of countries getting economic aid is being increased. In some countries the program has been very effective. In others it has not. When the money comes out of the pockets and the pay envelopes of Americans and is being sent to other nations, it is very important that the recipient countries themselves tighten up on their own finances, enact social reforms, and improve their taxation policies.

I am hopeful that the resolution of the distinguished Senator may receive early attention in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I express to the Senator my gratitude for the fine leadership which he has shown in this crucial area. I hope that if the resolution does not receive favorable action in committee, the Senator will offer it as an amendment when we consider the foreign assistance program. I feel it would be very helpful.

I would think that those in charge of the foreign aid program would welcome this constructive assistance from the Senator from Kentucky in the administration of the act, because it emanates, as we know, from an experienced man of good will and a supporter of the program. Therefore it is entitled, it seems to me, to great respect and great weight.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I will offer the measure in the form of an amendment, if it is not considered as a resolution. It is, of course, possible that the Clay Committee itself may be instituting a country-by-country assessment. I have written to General Clay. I hope that the committee will favorably consider my resolution.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] in the remarks he just made with respect to the resolution submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and to add that I, too, think that the resolution would be a helpful type of legislation and needed legislation. It seems to me that the Clay Committee has rendered an outstanding service to our country. But, unfortunately, due to the amount of time that the committee had to work on its report, it could not possibly go into each and every country which is receiving foreign aid from the United States to the degree that is necessary in order to particularize its recommendations. The Senator from Kentucky now seeks to fill that gap. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if I might be privileged to join with him as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. I would appreciate very much if the distinguished Senator from Iowa would join with me and the Senators from New York in the prosecution of the resolution.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. Should the resolution, standing by itself, for some reason not receive the attention in the committee that it should receive, I will be more than happy to join with the Senator in supporting the resolution as an amendment at an appropriate time on the floor.

INCREASING FARM EFFICIENCY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 14 and 15, in Des Moines, Iowa, was held the annual National Farm Institute sponsored by the Agriculture Committee of the Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce. The National Farm Institute has become world renowned for its quality, because of the recommendations it frequently produces.

One of the outstanding papers at the recent institute was presented by Mr. Donald R. Kaldor of Iowa State University, on the subject of "Rising Farming Efficiency." This is a very useful paper, in that it discusses the makeup of farming efficiency and traces its development down through the past several years.

For example, Mr. Kaldor points out:

> After 1940, total output per unit of total input in farming increased at an average rate of 1.75 percent per year. Few, if any, countries of the world have experienced a higher or more persistent rate of increase in farming efficiency.

Another observation made by Mr. Kaldor is that "the amount of labor used per unit of output has declined by nearly 70 percent since 1940. Capital input per unit of output, however, has increased about 30 percent. While real labor cost per unit of output has declined, real capital cost per unit of output has increased. But total real cost per unit of output has diminished which is another way of saying that physical efficiency has increased" substantially, as his statistics point out. Another observation made by Mr. Kaldor is that:

> Nearly 90 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency and about 10 percent can be attributed to a larger total input of resources. Output in the total private economy more than doubled in this same period. However, only about 55 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency.

Finally, Mr. President, Mr. Kaldor states:

> Associated with rising farming efficiency has been a large increase in the output of farm products. In fact, rising efficiency has been reflected almost wholly in increases in output rather than in decreases in total input.

This accounts for the fact that there has been a declining farm population—a very substantial one, I might add, Mr. President, running to a total of almost 1.3 million people moving off the farms in only the past 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this splendid address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RISING FARMING EFFICIENCY

(By Donald R. Kaldor, Iowa State University)

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the theme—"Agriculture in a Growing Economy"—selected for this the 25th annual National Farm Institute is a highly significant one. The farm industry's problems of economic imbalance have been created largely by forces associated with rapid economic growth. Greater understanding of the nature of economic development, the contribution of agriculture and the effects of growth on the farm industry is essential if we are to have consistent public policies that will help to solve our farm problems and foster economic progress. The understanding of economic growth needs to be deeper, more penetrating, and more specific, also more widely distributed among farmers, urban people, and local and national leaders. Public policies, in the end, can be no better than the knowledge and understanding of the people who make them. In a democracy, this is a lot of people.

My assignment is to discuss rising farming efficiency. This is the complex process of discovery and application of scientific principles to the more and more intricate mechanisms for producing food and fiber. It is also the tedious and sometimes unpleasant process of reorganizing farms, changing the number of farms, shifting the location of production, adjusting the economies of rural communities and even changing the makeup of distant industries. There are many more known parts to the process but they are not all clearly understood yet.

In the time available, I will try to provide some answers to four main questions: (1) How much increase in efficiency has there been in farming? (2) How does the rise in farming efficiency compare with the efficiency gains in the rest of the economy? (3) What have been the principal sources of increased efficiency in farming? (4) What have been some of the consequences of rising farming efficiency for agriculture and for national economic growth? Before focusing on these questions, however, let us briefly consider what efficiency is and how it is measured.

MEANING OF EFFICIENCY

The dictionary says that efficiency is output divided by input, i.e., output per unit of input. Some of the measures of efficiency commonly used in the farm business are output per acre, milk production per cow, eggs per hen, and pigs raised per sow. In each case, some measure of output is divided by some measure of input to give output per unit of input.

But all of these measures and many more like them take account of only one kind of input. While they are useful for certain purposes, they are not reliable indicators of the efficiency of the whole production process. For example, output per acre takes account of land input only. If one wants to evaluate the efficiency of the corn enterprise, one must take account of not only the input of land but also the input of labor, power and machinery, fertilizer, seed, and so forth. Likewise, if one wants to evaluate the efficiency of production on a whole farm, one must take into account all of the outputs of products and all of the inputs of resources.

Since we are interested in the efficiency of the entire farm industry, the best measure of this will be one that takes account of the total output of farm products and the total input of land, labor, and capital used in farm production. Until quite recently, most of the figures on efficiency in various industries were based only on labor input. As a result of several recent studies, however, data are now available for both farm and nonfarm industries which take into account most of the measurable inputs and most of the measurable outputs. While these estimates have some limitations, they are quite adequate for indicating broad trends in efficiency.

TRENDS IN FARMING EFFICIENCY

The evidence indicates that during the past century there has been a large increase in efficiency in farming. Between 1870 and 1961, total output per unit of total input increased more than 120 percent or at a compound rate of slightly more than eight-tenths of 1 percent per year. In the same period, total output rose more than 440 percent or at an annual rate of nearly 1.9 percent. Total input of land, labor and capital increased about 146 percent or at a yearly rate of about 1 percent. Nearly 55 percent of the increase in total output over this period can be attributed to the larger volume of input and about 45 percent can be attributed to the rise in physical efficiency.

While the long-run trend in farming efficiency has been upward, the rate of increase has been changing. The data show that the rise in farming efficiency has picked up momentum in recent decades. From 1870 to 1911, total output per unit of total input increased at an annual rate of less than seven-tenths of 1 percent. During the following decade, which includes the period of World War I, efficiency in the farm industry actually declined. Although total output continued to rise, total input rose more than in proportion to the increase in output. Between 1920 and 1939, which included the period of the great depression, efficiency increased nearly nine-tenths of 1 percent per year. But in the next two decades, the rate almost doubled. After 1940, total output per unit of total input in farming increased at an average rate of 1.75 percent per year. Few, if any, countries of the world have experienced a higher or more persistent rate of increase in farming efficiency.

The upward trend in the rate of increase in farming efficiency is reflected in the changing role of increases in input in the expansion of farm output. In the period from 1870 to 1911, nearly 72 percent of the increase in farm output can be attributed to increases in total input of land, labor, and capital. Only 28 percent can be attributed to rising efficiency. But in the period since 1940, about 80 percent of the increase in output can be accounted for by rising efficiency, while only 20 percent can be accounted for by increases in total input. Between 1950 and 1961, farm output rose nearly 23 percent. Total input remained stable. So in the past decade, all of the increase in output can be accounted for by increases in physical efficiency and perhaps better than average weather.

The upward trend in efficiency has been accompanied by a striking change in the makeup of total input in farming. Since World War I, labor input has declined by almost 60 percent. Nearly three-fourths of this decline occurred after 1940. On the other hand, the input of capital items, largely purchased from other sectors of the economy, has increased greatly. Since 1920, input of mechanical power and machinery has risen over 200 percent. Use of fertilizer and lime has increased nearly 750 percent. And input of feed, seed, and livestock has expanded 350 percent. In sharp contrast to the big changes in labor and capital inputs, there has been only a slight increase in input of land and buildings since 1920. In recent years, cropland input has actually declined because of land retirement programs and competition from nonfarm uses.

In the early 1920's, nearly two-thirds of the total input of resources in farming consisted of labor. By 1957, this figure had dropped to less than a third. Capital items made up about a fourth of total input in 1920. In 1957, the capital share stood at more than 50 percent. On the other hand, the relative share of land and buildings in total input increased little, if any, during this period.

At the same time that land use has become more capital intensive it has become less labor intensive. Because of these offsetting changes, there has been little net effect on total input of labor and capital per unit of land. But the amount of labor used per unit of output has declined by nearly 70 percent since 1940. Capital input per unit of output, however, has increased about 30 percent. While real labor cost per unit of output has declined, real capital cost per unit of output has increased. But total real cost per unit of output has diminished which is another way of saying that physical efficiency has increased.

COMPARISON OF EFFICIENCY TRENDS IN FARMING AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

Although the trend in efficiency in farming has been upward, the rate of increase has not been as high as that in other industries making up the private (non-Government) economy. The margin of difference, however, seems to have been getting smaller as a result of the acceleration in farming efficiency in recent decades.

Over the period of nearly 70 years from 1889 to 1957, total output per unit of total input in the private economy, including the farm industry, rose at an average rate of about 1.7 percent per year. In the same period, efficiency in farming increased at an average rate of slightly less than 0.8 of 1 percent per year. Since farming is included in the private economy, the rate of increase for nonfarm industries must have been greater than 1.7 percent per year. Thus, the rate of increase in farming was less than 45 percent of the rate of increase in nonfarm industries. It appears that only a few nonfarm industries experienced a smaller rise in efficiency than farming in this period. Among these were coal mining, lumbering and leather manufacture.

When the 1889–1957 period is broken down into subperiods, the figures indicate that the differences between the rates of increase in farming and those in nonfarm industries have been getting smaller with the passage of time. In the period from 1889 to 1919, efficiency in the total private economy increased at an average rate of 1.3 percent per year, whereas that in farming rose not quite 0.3 of 1 percent per year. In this period, the rate of increase in farming was about 20 percent of the rate of increase in the total private economy.

In the 1919–1957 period, the average rate of increase in farming rose to about 0.7 of 1 percent per year, while that in the total private economy advanced to 1.9 percent per year. For this period, the rate of increase in farming was 37 percent of the rate of increase in the total private economy. From 1940 to 1957, the average rate of increase in farming rose to 1.6 percent per year, whereas that in the total private economy advanced to 2.3 percent per year. In this period, the rate of increase in farming was about 70 percent of the rate of increase in the total private economy. So although the rate of increase in efficiency has been smaller in farming than in nonfarm industries, the difference has been diminishing as efficiency in farming has accelerated in relation to that in nonfarm industries.

During the past two decades, rising efficiency has been a more important source of output expansion in the farm industry than in nonfarm industries. Between 1940 and 1957, farm output rose about 39 percent. Nearly 90 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency and about 10 percent can be attributed to a larger total input of resources. Output in the total private economy more than doubled in this same period. However, only about 55 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency. About 45 percent can be attributed to a larger total input, mostly of labor and capital.

The figures on output per unit of labor, in contrast to those on output per unit of total input, tell quite a different story, however. They show that the average product of labor has risen more in farming than in nonfarm industries. Between 1927 and 1957, output per man-hour in farming increased at an average rate of about 4.3 percent per year, whereas that in nonfarm industries rose less than 2.6 percent per year. The difference was even larger in the 1945–57 period, when output per man-hour rose over 6.5 percent per year in farming and less than 2.5 percent per year in nonfarm industries. While output has been rising in both farming and nonfarm industries, labor input has been declining rapidly in farming but it has been increasing in nonfarm industries. Part of the reason for the increase in labor input in nonfarm industries is that people have been leaving agriculture for nonfarm jobs.

In farming, the increase in output per man-hour has been accompanied by a decrease in output per unit of capital input as capital has been substituted for labor. As a result, overall efficiency in farming has not increased nearly as much as labor efficiency. For example, output per man-hour rose at an average rate of 6.5 percent per year in the 1945–57 period, but output per unit of total input increased only 1.8 percent per year. As noted later, the decline in labor input has been an essential part of the process of increasing farming efficiency.

SOURCES OF RISING FARMING EFFICIENCY

The rise in farming efficiency has been the result of numerous factors interacting within a general environment which has been favorable to change. It has been closely interrelated with advance in efficiency in the total economy. In fact, most of the forces that have been operating to increase efficiency in farming also have been working to boost efficiency in nonfarm industries.

Underlying the advance in efficiency has been a strong desire of Americans generally for the income gains which rising efficiency makes possible. Because of the strong desire for higher incomes in the American culture, we have done many things which have encouraged greater farming efficiency.

For one thing, large public and private investments have been made in activities which directly or indirectly increase efficiency. As a people, we have placed a high value on truth and knowledge, partly because we have found that these things are important means to achieving a better life. As a result, large amounts of resources have been expended on the discovery of new knowledge and on the dissemination of existing knowledge. A substantial proportion of these resources have been devoted to agricultural research and educational activities.

In the public sector, these activities have been lodged largely in the land-grant universities and in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These institutions have been doing basic research in the sciences and have been applying the results to the development of improved farming techniques. At the same time, our educational institutions have been busy raising the general level of knowledge of young people who enter farming, training more agricultural scientists and extending knowledge about farm technology and management to farm operators.

In the private sector, firms supplying farmers with power, machinery, fertilizer, feed, insecticides and other capital inputs also have been investing large sums in research and development activities. These investments have lead to more productive forms of capital and better methods of farming. In addition, these firms, together with farm magazines, newspapers and radio and TV stations, also have been engaged in the dissemination of information of farm technology and management.

These private and public activities have raised the quality of labor-management input in farming and have made it more productive. Since changes in quality are not taken into account in the measurement of total input, the results are reflected in an increase in efficiency. These activities also have set the stage for increases in the level of farm technology by making available more productive forms of capital inputs and information on improved farming practices.

Before the results of agricultural research and extension can be reflected in increased efficiency, however, the ideas and improved forms of capital must be actually utilized by farmers. If this is to happen, there must be an incentive to use the better technology. And in the many instances where adoption requires increased investment, there must be capital available to finance the use of improved practices. The incentive has been provided by a strong desire on the part of farm people to improve their incomes. For the individual farmer, better technology offers an opportunity for higher income by permitting output to rise in relation to total costs, thereby reducing costs per unit of output. For the early adopters, the use of better technology will increase income. For the late adopters, there may or may not be income improvement, depending on what happens to farm prices. Even if there is no income improvement for late adopters, they have an incentive to use the better technology to maintain their competitive position within the farm industry. In most rural communities, there have been some farmers who have been willing to assume the extra risk that frequently accompanies the early use of new farm practices. These early adopters have played an important role in the diffusion of new technology in the farm industry.

The funds to finance the introduction of better technology have come partly from farm families and partly from private and public credit institutions. The long-run improvement in farm family incomes has permitted greater savings and investment in the farm business. Much of this investment has flowed into new forms of capital input associated with advances in technology. The development of public and private financial institutions has made credit readily available on reasonable terms to finance the introduction of new technology requiring heavy outlays of capital. Partly because of the heavy dependence of farm investment on the level of farm family income, the rate of introduction of better technology has fluctuated with changes in the level of farm income. It was much lower during the depression years of the 1930's than during the prosperous years immediately following World War II.

Many of the advances in farm technology have had output increasing effects. This has been true for mechanical power and equipment, improved seed varieties and fertilizers, better feeding rations and improved cultural practices. While some of these have involved significant increases in total input, they have increased output more than in proportion to the increase in input so that efficiency has risen.

The expanded use of mechanical power and equipment has had important effects on both output and input. Nearly 90 million acres of cropland have been shifted from the production of farm produced power in the form of horses and mules to the production of crops for human consumption. This has had significant effects on market supplies and prices. Although mechanization has increased both gross farm output and net farm output, the increase in net farm output has been much larger. Net farm output is used in the measurement of efficiency. But the effect on efficiency has been partially offset by the increase in power and equipment. However, only a part of the increase in power and equipment has been reflected in an increase in total input because of laborsaving effects. On balance, total output has gone up more than total input with the result that efficiency has risen.

Increases in farming efficiency also have been stimulated by a growing division of labor and specialization within the farm industry. The increase in specialization has been of two main kinds: (1) greater product specialization among farms and (2) greater functional specialization between the farm sector and the nonfarm sectors of the economy. The first has involved the trend for most farms to produce fewer products but a larger volume of each. For example, at one time most farms in the Midwest had at least a few milk cows to provide a monthly cream check and milk for the farm family. Nowadays many of these farms have no milk cows and the families, along with urban families, get their milk from farms with perhaps 50 or more cows.

The second kind of specialization has involved the shift of functions once performed on farms to nonfarm industries. For example, before the introduction of the tractor, the farm industry produced all its own power. Now most of the power used on farms is produced by the farm equipment industry, the petroleum industry and the electric utility industry. Both kinds of specialization have been stimulated in part by technological progress. The increase in specialization has resulted in cost economics. Because of differences in resource characteristics and technology, costs of production vary among firms. By having products produced where they can be turned out at the lowest cost, fewer resources are needed to produce a given volume of output. In this way, specialization has contributed to rising physical efficiency.

Similarly, there have been important cost economies associated with changes in the resource mix used in the farm industry. Advances in farm technology have raised the productivity of capital inputs relative to the productivity of labor. At the same time, the price of labor has risen relative to the prices of capital inputs. In response to these developments, the industry has been adjusting its resource mix by using less labor input and more capital input. This adjustment has reduced production costs per unit of output because the industry is now using a smaller amount of the relatively less productive and more expensive input and a larger amount of the relatively more productive and cheaper input. As a result, total output per unit of total input has increased. As labor input has declined, output per man-hour has risen.

The shift in the labor-capital mix has been accompanied by other adjustments that have helped to increase efficiency. To reap the full economies of modern power and equipment, many farmers have needed more land. But in recent decades, the total amount of land in farms has been highly stable. With a stable amount of land, an increase in land per farm requires a reduction in the number of farms. And, of course, this is what has been happening. Farms have been consolidated and the land base per farm has been rising.

Land for farm consolidation has been made available by the normal processes of death and retirement and by operators who have decided to quit farming and take nonfarm jobs. Farmers wanting to increase their land base have competed among themselves and with beginning operators for this land. In the past decade, there has been a rapid increase in farm consolidations. This has been encouraged by a reduction in the number of new operators entering farming and by an increase in the number of operators who have quit to take nonfarm jobs. These changes, in turn, have been stimulated by a growing number of jobs at rising wages in nonfarm industries and by a decline in income earning opportunities in farming.

Recent studies indicate that efficiency increases when farms are consolidated. The units that disappear tend to be taken over by better managers using more up-to-date technology. Moreover, consolidation results in important cost economies, particularly in the use of machinery and labor. Generally, the amounts of these inputs used on the consolidated unit are less than the sum of the amounts used on the separate units before consolidation. While the inputs of some capital items such as fertilizer and commercial feed tend to rise, typically the net effect is a reduction in labor and capital input and an increase in output.

The main sources of rising farming efficiency may be summarized as follows: (1) an increase in the quality of labor-management input in farming, (2) improvements in production methods, (3) use of more productive forms of capital input, (4) a shift in the resource mix involving more capital and less labor, and (5) increased specialization.

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF RISING PHYSICAL EFFICIENCY

The rise in farming efficiency has made a large contribution to national economic growth and progress. But it has not been an unmixed blessing, particularly for rural people. As farmers have utilized the opportunities to increase efficiency generated largely by advances in technology and by developments affecting the form, quality and relative scarcity of production inputs, the characteristics of the farm industry and rural communities have been transformed. Farm output has increased and this has influenced prices and incomes. Farm population has declined. Strong adjustment pressures and serious problems of adaptation have been created. The consequences have been felt by people on farms and in villages, towns and cities throughout the Nation.

Associated with rising farming efficiency has been a large increase in the output of farm products. In fact, rising efficiency has been reflected almost wholly in increases in output rather than in decreases in total input. While there has been a large shift in the input mix—more capital and less labor, the total input of resources continued to grow until the early 1950's. Since 1952, total input appears to have declined slightly. Undoubtedly, part of this decline has been related to the land retirement programs.

When the individual farmer increases his efficiency by (say) adopting an improved cultural practice, he also will increase his net income. This may not be true when all farmers adopt the practice and total output increases, however. Unless conditions are just right, growing output can create some serious problems for the farm industry. Unless the demand for farm products rises sufficiently to absorb the increases in output at prices which cover the lower per unit costs made possible by rising efficiency, an output imbalance problem will be created and pressures will develop to transfer resources from farming to other industries.

Because consumer buying does not respond much to changes in farm prices, increases in output result in farm price declines which are proportionally greater than the increases in output. Consequently, gross income from the sale of the larger output falls. If labor and capital earnings in farming happened to be in line with those in other industries before the increase in output, they now will be lower. And there will be pressures on farm people to shift their labor and capital to nonfarm employments where earning opportunities are better.

A persistent tendency for farm output to push ahead of demand creates a transfer problem. This involves the shift of resources from farm production to other kinds of production which people want more of as indicated by the way they spend their incomes. Until this transfer problem disappears because of increases in farm demand, or is solved by a sufficient shift of resources, farm people will experience a decline in income and the contribution of rising farming efficiency to national income growth will not be fully realized.

In part, this is what has been happening in the farm industry, especially in the past decade. At times, farm output has grown more rapidly than the demand for farm products and this has exerted strong downward pressure on prices and incomes in farming. These pressures have been largely responsible for the origin and continuation of Government support programs. Since 1948, these programs have had a large tempering effect on farm prices and incomes.

Why is it that efficiency has been rising more rapidly in nonfarm industries than in farming and yet the problems of surpluses and low earnings generally have not been as large or as persistent in these industries? While many factors are involved in the answer to this question, there is one that stands out in relation to all others. This has to do with the changes in the structure of demand that occur when a rich country experiences economic progress or rising per capita income.

When people get richer, the proportion of income spent on different goods and services changes. The result is that demands grow at different rates in different industries. As Adam Smith remarked back in 1776, "The desire for food is limited in every man by the narrow capacity of the human stomach; but the desire for the conveniences and ornaments of building, dress, equipage and household furniture seems to have no certain boundary."

In general, when a rich country gets richer, the demand for farm products grows very slowly while the demand for most nonfarm goods and services increases much more rapidly. Numerous studies have shown this to be true. Thus, the increases in output that accompany rising efficiency can be much larger in most nonfarm industries than in farming before downward pressure is exerted on prices. Moreover, if a problem of excess capacity develops, rising demands will correct the problem sooner in most nonfarm industries than in farming.

Nevertheless, nonfarm industries have not been free of adjustment problems induced by rising efficiency. For example, mechanization, currently called automation, has created serious labor transfer problems in many nonfarm industries also. Frequently, these problems have given rise to major issues in labor-management disputes.

The main force behind the increase in the demand for farm products in the United States has been population growth. Growth of population has greatly reduced the size of the surplus and transfer problems created by rising farming efficiency. But it has not eliminated them and it is not likely to do so in the foreseeable future. It is worth noting that if population were to grow rapidly enough to eliminate these problems, the potential contribution of greater efficiency to higher incomes per capita also would disappear. It would mean that the income gains which greater farming efficiency makes possible would be used up in supporting more people rather than in raising incomes per person. If rising efficiency is to do the latter, excess resources in farming must find productive employment in other industries. For this to happen, there must be employment opportunities available in these industries.

Human resources have felt the brunt of the farm to nonfarm adjustment pressures created by rising farming efficiency. While the tendency for output to grow more rapidly than demand has exerted adjustment pressures on both labor and capital, the strength of these pressures has been greatly reduced by Government support programs. However, this has not been true of the pressures exerted by widespread use of labor-saving power and machinery. The substitution of capital for labor in farm production has exerted strong reallocation pressure on human resources. Developments associated with rising efficiency have greatly diminished income-earning opportunities for labor in farming. At the same time, opportunities in nonfarm industries have been expanding. The push and pull of these forces have induced a large decline in the input of both operator and family labor and hired labor.

The decline in the input of labor in farming has been reflected in a large drop in farm population, a rise in the number of farm operators holding nonfarm jobs and an increase in gainful employment of farm wives. In some rural communities, labor demands in nonfarm industries have risen so that some farm people have found jobs within commuting distance of the home farm. Owner-operators, usually on small farms, have continued to reside on the farm and have either carried on a part-time farming operation or rented out their land.

In many rural communities, however, labor demands in nonfarm industries have not expanded rapidly enough to absorb the natural increase in labor force and to provide jobs for people released from farming. As a result, people have moved to areas of more attractive employment opportunities. Some of these communities have experienced heavy losses of population. This has produced serious adjustment problems for local business firms, schools, churches and other private and public institutions. While demands for public services in these communities have declined, costs have frequently not come down in the same proportion so that the tax burden has increased.

While the communities losing population have been confronted with the most difficult adjustment problems, receiving communities also have felt the effects of the transfer of labor from farm to nonfarm employments. The receiving communities typically have been those experiencing rapid industrialization which has provided a growing number of attractive job opportunities. They frequently have been areas already showing the stresses and strains of rapid economic expansion and population growth. Demands have been rising for public services. Religious groups have found church facilities inadequate for growing memberships. Similar pressures have been exerted on business and social organizations. The influx of people from farms have added to these demands and pressures, although most of the population increase in these communities usually has come from natural increases and from the inmigration of nonfarm people.

While rising farming efficiency has created serious adjustment problems for rural people and communities, it also has made a large contribution to the general improvement in real incomes and levels of living in the United States. A rise in efficiency implies that less resources are needed to produce a given amount of output. By saving resources in farm production, rising farming efficiency has increased the total production potential of the economy. The real income gain has been taken partly in the form of a larger output of farm products, partly in the form of a larger output of nonfarm goods and services and partly in the form of more leisure time. American consumers have experienced an abundance and quality of food unprecedented in the history of man.

At times, however, too much of the income gain has been taken in the form of more farm output to give a well-balanced farm industry. As a result, surplus problems have arisen with depressing effects on the earnings of labor and capital in farming. And the increase in national income has not been as large as it could have been.

A few figures will help to illustrate the size of the savings in resources associated with rising farming efficiency. If the farm output of 1957 had been produced with the 1910 level of efficiency, it would have required roughly 50 percent more resources in farming than was actually used in 1957. With inputs valued at 1957 rates of return, the value of resources saved in 1957 amounted to over $16 billion. Without the gain in efficiency between 1910 and 1957, the total resource cost of the 1957 output of farm products would have been about $47 billion instead of only $31 billion. Because fewer resources were needed in farm production, more resources were available for nonfarm production. Therefore, total production in the economy was increased and there were more goods and services for everybody.

Despite surplus problems, the rise in farming efficiency has not prevented farm people from participating in the longrun growth in real national income. During the past half century, real farm income per family worker has more than doubled. This has been reflected in a large increase in the level of living of people on farms. There has been a reduction in the length of the average farm work day and much of the drudgery has been taken out of farming.

Several years ago, a study was made of the returns to labor-management and investment on some of Iowa's best organized farms. It indicated that under the price conditions induced by support programs during the mid-1950's returns of these top farms compared quite favorably with those in selected nonfarm employments. However, only a small proportion of Iowa's farms would fit this category. The study also showed that if prices had been at estimated free market levels during that period returns on these top farms would have been substantially below those in selected nonfarm employments.

The increase in farming efficiency has been spread very unevenly over the Nation's farms. Some farms and areas have experienced large increases in output per unit of input. Others have fallen behind. Some have lagged badly. Farms and areas with the largest increases in efficiency also have had the largest increases in farm family income. Because of the variation in efficiency gains, there has been wide variation in income growth. In some sections of the country, whole farming communities have failed to participate substantially in the longrun improvement in farm family income.

As a society, we have been far more ingenious in developing opportunities for increasing efficiency than in dealing with the adjustment problems which inevitably accompany the exploitation of these opportunities. Our economy has been geared up to produce efficiency increasing opportunities at a fast pace. Yet, we have largely assumed that the adjustment problems would take care of themselves. But they have not. As a result, people generally have failed to reap all of the income gains which these opportunities permit. Moreover, some individuals and groups have borne a disproportionate share of the costs associated with rising efficiency. While the benefits of rising efficiency are usually widely diffused over the population, the costs tend to be concentrated.

In the absence of effective social mechanisms for bringing costs and benefits into better balance, groups have developed their own protective schemes, sometimes with and sometimes without the help of government. While these provide some security for the groups concerned, they generally prevent or fail to encourage adjustments that are needed to realize the income gains from rising efficiency. Featherbedding type problems have not been limited to the railroad industry.

These efforts to minimize the costs of rising efficiency reflect a deep seated desire for stability and order in a rapidly changing economy. But man's desire for stability and order must be reconciled with his desire for income improvement. Sometimes it is possible to have more of both but not always. When it is not possible, a difficult choice has to be made.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star for March 25, 1963, there appeared an article written Sylvia Porter entitled "Many Forfeit Benefits of Social Security."

This is a helpful article, because it points out to some people the fact that they may be eligible for Social Security benefits for which they did not realize they were eligible. It is also helpful in another respect.

Many people wonder why our social security system is threatened with bankruptcy, as is true of our Civil Service Retirement System, which the Civil Service Commission people have told us is threatened with bankruptcy by 1980. So, too, the social security system is threatened with bankruptcy because as of now it is more than $350 billion unfunded.

One wonders how it could be that our social security system could be in such bad shape. Sylvia Porter makes some comments which point up the reason.

She points out:

> While the social security tax has nearly doubled since the program began in 1937—climbing from a planned maximum employee contribution of $90 a year to the present maximum tax of $174 a year—in the same period the value of every benefit has tripled.

She also points to a case of a worker who has paid the maximum tax since the program began, who retired in January 1963 at the age of 65.

> This worker will have paid taxes of $1,584, his employer will have contributed an equal amount, bringing the total of social security taxes paid to $3,168. Against this tax contribution, consider that this worker and his 65-year-old wife—assuming normal life expectancy—can anticipate collecting $32,339 in benefits.

Mr. President, this is another reason why the Kennedy program for medicare financed by social security is, I believe, unsound. The social security system already is in a grievous enough situation without adding to the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY FORFEIT BENEFITS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Sylvia Porter)

Thousands of Americans are today forfeiting a big bargain—their own paid-up social security benefits, pensions to which they are entitled but for which they have neglected to apply.

The Social Security Administration, at its Baltimore headquarters, is conducting a nationwide search for these individuals. It's actually trying to track down 1 million persons who are 65 or over who have not applied for their pensions. Of course, not all will be found to be eligible, but surveys to date indicate hundreds of thousands are.

This surprising statistic warrants nationwide publicity, for among this huge group are surely many who desperately need their benefits. There also is no doubt that benefits due to a worker who has retired recently or who retires now far exceed the amount of money he has paid in social security taxes.

While the social security tax has nearly doubled since the program began in 1937—climbing from a planned maximum employee contribution of $90 a year to the present maximum tax of $174 a year—in the same period the value of every benefit has tripled.

BENEFIT HAS JUMPED

The minimum monthly benefit for a worker retired at 65 has jumped from $10 to $40. The maximum has increased from $85 to as much as $254 for the family of a retired, deceased or disabled worker.

Consider a worker who paid the maximum tax since the program began and retired in January 1963, at 65. This worker will have paid taxes of $1,584, his employer will have contributed an equal amount, bringing the total of social security taxes paid to $3,168. Against this tax contribution, consider that this worker and his 65-year-old wife—assuming normal life expectancy—can anticipate collecting $32,339 in benefits.

SIGNIFICANT QUESTION

What are the reasons so many Americans are passing up the benefits? Social security officials figure there are five.

1. Many who have continued to work beyond the age of 65 and to earn fair amounts think they are not eligible to collect any benefits. This is not true. Under new, liberalized rules, they well may be able to draw at least part of the benefits which they would get if they quit. As an illustration, a man retired at 65 might receive $100 a month; if he continued to work instead, he could earn up to $2,600 a year and still get part of that $100. A man and wife at 65 can earn up to $3,260 a year and still get some benefits.

2. Many who have been turned down for benefits in the past because they didn't have enough work credits to qualify aren't aware that because of recent reductions in the amount of coverage needed to qualify, they may now be eligible. Under the new rules, a man born in 1892 or before needs only six quarters of coverage to be insured. For every year after 1892, he needs only one additional quarter. (If he was born in 1893, he would need seven quarters; in 1894, eight quarters, etc.) A woman born in 1895 or before also needs only six quarters of coverage to be insured and only one additional quarter for each year after 1895. The quarters can be earned at any time between January 1, 1937, and now.

WEALTH IS NO TEST

3. Many believe a person must be in need to get benefits. This is not true. You can be wealthy and still collect, for only earned income counts. Investment income, annuities, private pensions, dividends, interest, holdings of real estate—none of this counts.

4. Many who deducted a few years from their age when they originally took out their social security cards are now afraid they will be prosecuted or penalized if they confess their true age in order to collect their benefits. This fear is baseless. There is no penalty for giving a false age. If these individuals can present reasonable evidence of their true age—a birth certificate, voting or school record, insurance policy—they can collect.

5. Many disabled workers of any age and survivors of workers who died before reaching 65 are unaware that they may be entitled to lifetime benefits. These could amount to more than $50,000.

THE POSSIBILTY OF DEVALUATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the American Institute for Economic Research in its weekly research report for March 18 has a lead article entitled "How Close Are We to Devaluation?"

This excellent article calls attention to the fact that President Kennedy stated in his first state of the Union message that the United Sates would not "distort the value of the dollar in any fashion," and to emphasize this he added, "That is a commitment."

The article points out that while the President may very well have intended that no Executive action would be taken by him to devalue the dollar, other actions by the Congress and by the administrative branch of the Government could result in what is called devaluation de facto.

For example, we know that there is less than $16 billion in gold in our reserves. We know also that $12 billion of this is required to back up our currency. So there is less than $4 billion in gold available to meet commitments in case foreign creditors call for payment in gold rather than in dollars.

Unfortunately, foreign creditors own about $20 billion in credits against this gold. If only one-fifth of them called upon us for payment in gold rather than dollars, we would be in a very bad way.

The article points this out and indicates that if enough of these creditors called upon the United States for payment in gold and we were not able to deliver in gold, the result would be that the value of the American dollar would fall on the international exchange, and thus the dollar would be devalued de facto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CLOSE ARE WE TO DEVALUATION?

The question whether the United States will (or should) devalue the dollar received renewed attention early in March during a meeting in Washington of bankers, businessmen, and economists that was sponsored by the American Bankers Association. Four prominent economists suggested various measures that they believed would solve the problem of slow economic growth. According to Newsweek, the disagreement among them "would have been almost comic" if the problem had been less important.

It was Professor Samuelson, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who brought devaluation into the discussion. After stating that "militantly cheap and easy money," would solve the problem but that this could accelerate the flow of funds to foreign countries, he suggested that devaluation of the dollar be considered. "If the dollar is overvalued," he said, "running a sluggish, slow-growth economy is a remedy worse than the disease."

The significance of this revelation of Professor Samuelson' opinion hardly can be overestimated. During the past 2 years the administration's fiscal policies have reflected his ideas.. From time to time news reports reveal that he has been consulted by the President. Moreover, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Walter Heller, was recommended for that post by Professor Samuelson, we understand. Dr. Heller as well as his asssociates among the President's Council of Economic Advisers apparently are in full accord and have long been in accord with Professor Samuelson.

Although President Kennedy has followed Dr. Heller's recommendation for increased spending, tax cuts, and large deficits, he has repeatedly opposed devaluation. In his first state of the Union message he flatly promised that the United States would not "distort the value of the dollar in any fashion." And to emphasize this he added, "That is a commitment." (In the prepared text of his speech the word "pledge" had been used.)

We do not doubt the President's word, but we doubt that he realized the magnitude of the Nation's balance of payments problem and the consequent threat to its gold stock or the nature of the task ahead. Now, 2 years later, with the dollar in even greater jeopardy, neither the President nor his economic advisers have shown any interest in measures that would permanently strengthen the dollar. On the contrary, they urge that the Government spend more and tax less, and reveal unconcern for huge and continuous deficits.

What the President may not have realized is that devaluation need not be a direct action on the part of the Executive or of Congress. As extravagant fiscal policies increase doubts abroad that the value of the dollar will be maintained, all that stands between us and devaluation is our gold stock, three-fourths of which is required as the basis of our domestic money-credit system. Any impediment placed in the way of a free outflow of gold to foreign governments and central banks, no matter how much or how little of our gold they might be demanding, would immediately cause claims on dollars to depreciate in foreign exchange markets throughout the world. The price of gold in terms of U.S. currency would rise, probably markedly, from its present parity of $35 an ounce; and thus the dollar would be devalued de facto.

We should like to hope that the history of devaluations had placed the President on guard against advice that if taken could lead to another one. (The United States devalued the dollar by about 40 percent in 1933–34.) Apparently it has not. That history is a sorry story of broken promises. Inevitably, it seems, finance ministers and chiefs of state feel obliged to deny the possibility of devaluation until almost the moment that it occurs. Two instances, from the many that could be cited, will illustrate this.

In September 1931, just before England went off the gold standard and the pound sterling lost about a fourth of its value overnight, the Governor of the Bank of England denied the possibility of such action. According to Benjamin M. Anderson: "On Friday, September 18, Doctor Vissering, head of the Netherlands Bank, phoned Montagu Norman of the Bank of England to inquire if it were safe for him to continue to hold sterling, and received unqualified assurance that England would remain on the gold standard. He held his sterling * * *. On Sunday, September 20, the announcement was made that England would abandon the gold standard * * * "[1] How many other such assurances were given at that time by bank and Government officials no one can know.

This technique of denial was used publicly on a grand scale by Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the British Exchequer, prior to a further devaluation of the pound, by 30 percent, on September 18, 1949. On at least 12 occasions prior to the time of the devaluation he made statements such as the following: "There will be no devaluation of the pound sterling." "Devaluation is neither advisable nor even possible in present conditions." "No one need fear devaluation of our currency in any circumstances." "The Government has not the slightest intention of devaluing the pound."[2]

How near or far off devaluation of the U.S. dollar may be, or whether it ever will occur, can only be conjectured. Short-run palliatives and expedients can delay it, and a return to sound fiscal and monetary policies could prevent it. That Professor Samuelson, whose views on Government finance have directly or indirectly influenced the President's thinking, should suggest devaluation as a measure deliberately to be considered, is cause for serious concern.

TWO MAJOR NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the same weekly research report of the American Institute for Economic Research is an article entitled "Two Major National Problems in Perspective."

The article points to two problems which the institute considers to be our major national problems. One is the inequality of opportunity for our people. The other, to which the article refers as the most pressing problem, is that of getting money-credit affairs in order.

The article refers to the subtle deteriorating effects of prolonged inflation and gradual depreciation of a nation's monetary unit.

Mr. President, I think the article is very timely, because we know that we are in the midst of a creeping inflation. We know that during the past 2 years, while we were going into debt some $14 billion more, the American people's money lost $14 billion in purchasing power due to inflation. I agree that this is, indeed, our most pressing problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO MAJOR NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

Perhaps the most important problem confronting the Nation over the longer run is that resulting from inequality of opportunity attributable to special privileges for some and the effective disinheritance of others. Fortunately, technological advances are providing new frontiers for industry similar in their leavening effects to the easy availability of free land during the first century of the Nation's existence.

We in the United States never experienced to a marked degree the degrading and deteriorating influences that were the lot of the underprivileged in Europe, for example, in the England of Dickens' time. Our free land in the West was a far more effective ameliorating influence than were the more distant areas of Canada and Australia for the English masses. Effectively disinherited from the land by the successive Enclosure Acts and forced into the cities as a resourceless proletariat, England's sons of sturdy yeomen became willing converts to socialism. That we shall be faced with pressing problems of this nature in the not too distant future seems probable; but, for the time being, the frontiers opened by scientific advances are postponing for us the need to grapple with that problem.

The most pressing problem confronting the United States today, as many of our readers are well aware, is that of getting its money-credit affairs in order. The Nation is well along on the path that France followed for five decades. The subtle deteriorating effects of prolonged inflation and gradual depreciation of a nation's monetary unit become striking when viewed in the perspective of decades rather than years. When the Federal Reserve System was formed in 1914, there was clear evidence in the congressional debates and elsewhere that the basic principles of sound commercial banking were recognized. A century of experience in England with the gold standard and sound banking had revealed lessons that were heeded when our central banking system was established. However, the deficit financing of two world wars, a New Deal, and of administrations since World War II have disregarded those principles and created a vast inflation, the effects of which already have been far reaching.

The problem of restoring a sound currency and shifting the economy from its present condition of marked inflation to a situation where sound commercial banking were the rule instead of the exception is one of great complexity and magnitude. If a beginning were made by a return to sound fiscal policies and by measures that would restore the complete gold standard, with fulfillment of the Government's promise to pay on demand as printed on each piece of currency, we should at last be moving in the right direction.

---

[1] "Economics and the Public Welfare," D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York, 1949, pp. 246–247.

[2] Henry Hazlitt, "What You Should Know About Inflation," D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York, 1960, pp. 22–23.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in line with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 noon on Monday, April 1.

The motion was agreed to; and, under the previous order, at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 28, 1963:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

Bureau of Customs

Alfred C. Dumouchel, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R.I.

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Allison, Adolphus R., Jr.
Anctil, Arthur O., Jr.
Arness, John A.
Baird, Robert M.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, William J.
Bason, William M.
Beach, Thomas B.
Beeby, James L.
Benoit, Fred L., III
Betts, Gorcon D.
Biemer, James J.
Biser, Christopher H.
Bishop, Robert P.
Boname, John R.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Boring, Robert S.
Boucher, Wesley W.
Bouterie, Ronald L.
Brayton, John R., Jr.
Brighton, Carl T.
Broadley, Paul H.
Brooks, Herbert E.
Burr, John B.
Cagle, Donald R.
Cameron, Ronald R.
Chappelka, Alfred R., Jr.
Christian, Maynard S.
Coil, Edmonston F.
Collier, Terry M.
Comer, Ralph D.
Corbett, John R.
Cosgrove, Theodore J.
Cremona, Frederick J.
Cureton, Richard K.
Curtin, Thomas L.
Curtis, John W.
Damato, Nicholas A.
Davis, John W.
Davis, John S., Jr.
Deflebre, Bruce K., Jr.
Defries, Hugh O.
Dewey, Albert W., Jr.
Dolan, Michael F.
Dubeau, Ray A.
Durrance, Frederick Y., Jr.
Elliott, Robert C.
Evans, Fred S.
Fouty, William J.
Fresh, James W.
Gallent, James H.
Garcia, Nicholas A., III
Gard, Howard E.
Gilbert, Allyn E.
Gilson, Benjamin J.
Greaves, Edward D.
Hansbarger, Luther C.
Hansen, James E.
Harmeling, James G.
Harmon, Stanley D.
Haswell, John N.
Hauler, Donald R.
Hauser, Roger G.
Hayes, Jude R.
Hebert, James E.
Hicks, Jim F.
Hill, John B.
Hillis, Jon K.
Hoekzema, Arnold D.
Hoeffler, Dennis F.
Humbert, George F., Jr.
Inman, Charles E.
Irons, Howard S.
Jacobson, William A.
James, Stephen H.
Johnson, Bernett L., Jr.
Kasheta, John P., Jr.
Kendra, Stephen J.
Kent, Tommy S.
Kinkel, Donald M.
Klein, Edward W.
Knapp, Robert W.
Knox, Henry D.
Krepps, Arthur C., II
Langevin, Jack A.
Lansinger, Donald T.
Larcoque, Normand P.
Lee, Joseph D.
Livingston, William O.
Loew, Albert G., Jr.
MacCarty, Denton E.
Maddox, Spencer F., Jr.
Majure, Oscar L., Jr.
Martin, Richard W.
McCree, Douglas G.
McHale, James J., Jr.
McLear, William Z., III
McMahon, George J.
Meehan, William L.
Meredith, Robert C.
Merrill, Raymond E.
Metz, George E.
Mills, Dennis E.
Miner, Walter F.
Mitts, Murray G.
Modell, Jerome H.
Moquin, Ross B.
Morgan, Jacob R.
Mukomela, Arthur E.
Myers, Robert C.
Nieberding, Paul H.
Norton, Robert K.
Oldershaw, John B.
Olesijuk, Andrew
O'Neal, David M.
O'Neill, James F.
Onofrio, Burton M.
Oriordan, Joseph P.
Orr, Rex
Phillips, Donald M.
Phillips, Darwin D.
Pine, Harry L.
Poley, Richard W.
Posatko, Robert J.
Potvin, Louis E.
Powers, Samuel A.
Rack, William A.
Rogers, Richard L.
Rolen, Alvin C., Jr.
Rossi, Roscoe A.
Rust, Wilbur C.
Ryan, Richard R.
Sacks, Ellsworth J., Jr.
Saglio, Jack W.
Sand, Richard E.
Schaefer, David F.
Schaffer, Donald E.
Schmetz, Frank J., Jr.
Sexter, Mark S.
Shaffer, Bertrand N.
Sims, Norman L.
Sirois, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Jose C. S.
Smith, Ronald W.
Southworth, Alvin J.
Soybel, William M.
Spence, Kenneth F., Jr.
Steffenson, John L.
Steyn, Rolf W.
Stout, Bill D.
Strange, Robert E.
Svendsen, Fred J.
Sweeney, Lawrence
Theros, Elias P. G.
Thomason, Thomas L.
Thorp, James H. M.
Tolchin, Sidney
Torsney, Philip J., Jr.
Van Peenen, Peter F. D.
Voiss, Daniel V.
Walker, Robert E.
Wayne, Donald M.
Weibel, David C.
Weinshelbaum, Albert
Weitzman, Gerald
Williams, David L.
Woody, Ronald H., Jr.
York, Lowell T.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Joseph P.
Alderman, Charles B.
Allinder, Joe A., Jr.
Almen, Richard E.
Ashton, Merton E., Jr.
Avary, James L.
Badger, George R.
Barr, Robert S.
Bates, Robert L.
Bell, John L., Jr.
Bledsoe, William M.
Bogorowski, Robert J.
Breit, James A.
Briggs, Irving G.
Brown, Boyd F., Jr.
Brown, Russell M.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bunker, Donald J.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Carberry, Raymund G., Jr.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Carpenter, Charles F., Sr.
Causey, Bruce M., Jr.
Christensen, Harvey J.
Christopher, Robert N.
Clark, Roger S.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Collicott, Purnel L.
Connelly, Charles T.
Conner, Walter E.
Corn, James R.
Curtis, Richard E.
Davidson, William I.
Davis, Raymond P.
Davis, William W.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Derby, Francis A.
Donzell, Richard J.
Drabek, Stephen J.
Earl, Robert J.
Eastwood, William O., Jr.
Ebert, Scott W.
Faust, Delbert L.
Fiske, Leon S., Jr.
Floild, Robert E.
Flores, Joseph L.
Freese, Ralph F.
French, Robert C.
Gaddis, Glenn L.
Gallagher, Robert F.
Gapp, John J.
Garabedian, Edward J.
Giagni, Vincent J.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Girod, Roy O.
Goodwin, Earl E.
Gray, Jack E.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Gunther, Roy W.
Hendrickson, Richard
Hennessy, William J.
Henry, Gerald R.
Hodges, William J.
Hohenstein, Charles R.
Hopgood, Roy E.
Howe, Donald K., Jr.
Hubbard, Charles C.
Jacobs, Frank S.
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, Lloyd R.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
Kemper, Darrell G.
Kenealy, William E., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kling, Fred A.
Knox, Arthur F., Jr.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kreutzinger, Donald R.
Krukin, Lawrence E.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Lane, Anthony D.
Larson, Nelson S.
Larson, Rodney E.
Lashley, Ralph E., Jr.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lazarus, Steven
Lemly, William D.
Lemma, Paul A.
Lenz, Allen J.
Lindsay, William E.
Livermore, Robert E.
Long, Charles W.
Lovell, Donald E.
Lovell, "W" "B"
Lyons, John J.
Maldonado, Teodosio
McCandless, Claude C., Jr.
McCrabb, Donald E.
McGee, James E.
McGillivary, Duncan P.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercer, Dean S.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Merrick, Walter F.
Moore, Guy T.
Morehouse, Charles W.
Moyer, William R.
Nast, William E.
Newman, John F.
Normand, Robert L.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
O'Neil, Raymond L.
Ott, Matthew J.
Palmer, Donald R.
Paul, John W.
Perry, Robert P.
Petrie, Roland A.
Pomponio, Bruno A.
Rady, William J., Jr.
Ranken, John T., Jr.
Recher, Bernard L.
Ross, Orrin B.
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rothenberger, Donald J.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sansone, Joseph S., Jr.
Saukas, Augustine G.
Schanz, Thomas L.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Schucker, Robert M.
Snyder, Earl L.
Steeg, Elvin H.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, George W., III
Stumbaugh, David C.
Taylor, Bayard A., Jr.
Taylor, James M.
Taylor, John B.
Temte, Knute P.
Tilton, Robert L.
Trimble, Philip
Vogel, Ralph H.
Vollmer, Merle J.
Waid, Stanley B.
Waldvogel, Henry J.
Walker, Elbridge, III
Weber, Robert J.
Weisend, John G.
White, Frank L.
Williams, Raymond L.
Williams, Rex M.
Wong, Ronald M.
Wood, Lee, Jr.
Woolley, Herbert T.
Young, Charles W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Andress, Gene B.
Baker, Marvin D.
Beck, John T.
Bigler, Robert L.
Boreczky, John V.
Carpenter, Elbert N.
Chambliss, Carroll R.
Clardy, William J.
Clifford, William J.
Cortney, Kevin J.
Dodson, Leonard W., Jr.
Doyle, James F.
Dwyer, Richard K.
Fedje, Earl W.
Fitzgerald, Owen R.
Gillis, Edward F.
Goss, Hubert S., Jr.
Greenwood, Charles L.
Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Keenon, John C.
Kinlaw, Dennis C.
Kopp, George P., Jr.
League, William C.
McAlister, Fred R., Jr.
Miller, Stanley D.
Murphy, Milton G.
Newton, John G.
O'Connor, William B.
O'Gorman, Charles F.
Ondo, Michael A.
Ota, Peter I.
Phillips, Harold E.
Plank, David P. W.
Propst, Roy A., Jr.
Reagan, Ernest M., Jr.
Schneider, Otto
Seim, James E.
Snyder, Marvin E., Jr.
Stevenson, Neil M.
Swenson, William R.
Thornberry, Roy V., Jr.
Urbano, Francis J.
VanBeck, Alfred F.
Vanlaningham, Maurice R., Jr.
Vest, William T.
Warren, Robert H.
Wuebbens, Everett P.
Zemites, Joseph F.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Roy L.
Anderson, Warren H.
Barber, Horace M.
Belton, Edward H.
Billet, Donald F.
Bischof, Ernest J.
Blough, Loney L.
Bowers, Richard A.
Burger, Henry K.
Burns, William J., Jr.
Callahan, Edward F., Jr.
Carioti, Bruno M.
Cottingham, Edward L.
Crockett, Billy G.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Daniel, William F., Jr.
Deady, Ralph E.
Demidio, Joseph A.
Doyle, Thomas J.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Erickson, James A.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gates, Charles W.
Hartell, William K.
Haynes, Howard H.
Haynes, Robert C.
Hines, John C.
Houghton, Robert J.
Hrnjez, Nicholas C.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Johnson, Durrell A.
Jones, Thomas K.
Lake, George
Lapolla, Joseph
Lawson, Leroy D.
Lewis, Frank H., Jr.
Mangan, Thomas J., Jr.
Mathews, Charles J.
Merica, Charles A.
Mitchell, Thomas J.
O'Brien, Thomas J.
O'Leary, John F.
Parrish, Oscar F., Jr.
Paulsen, Raymond E.
Pinch, William C.

Plante, George E.
Reese, Joseph L., Jr.
Reeves, Ronald B.
Robinson, Charles F.
Schellhardt, Richard H.
Scherer, Clark H., Jr.
Sherrod, Henry C., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Stewart, Stanley P., Jr.
Stultz, Bobby E.
Toliver, Jack M.
Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
Tyhurst, James E.
Uhe, James L.
Verdi, Stanley N.
Wear, John R.
White, Robert K.
Wilson, Dean G.
Witkowski, John A., Jr.
Wolf, Robert B.
Yoshihara, Takeshi

DENTAL CORPS

Ackley, George W., Jr.
Allen, Robert W.
Barlow, Doil E.
Bodine, Theodore A., Jr.
Bodner, Joseph A., Jr.
Bottomley, William K.
Bradford, Paul L. J.
Bush, Richard D.
Carrothers, Richard L.
Charles, James H., Jr.
Christian, James T.
Cummings, Matthew R.
Cunningham, Charles J.
Davis, Malcolm S.
Dodds, Ronald N.
Driscoll, John M.
Edwards, Richard C.
Fenster, Robert K.
Firtell, David N.
Gibson, William V., Jr.
Gomer, Ronald M.
Good, Richard J.
Grimsley, William A., Jr.
Grove, David M.
Hale, William F.
Hanson, Richard K.
Hedge, Herbert R.
Herr, Albert
Kitzmiller, John S., Jr.
Landes, Robert P.
Lindsay, John S.
Mark, Leonard E.
Martin, William R.
McCann, Thomas, F.
Messer, Eugene J.
Miller, James E.
Moore, Robert E.
Muldrow, Lewis M.
Neagley, Ross L., Jr.
Petruccelli, Francis
Plump, Ellsworth H.
Selby, Vernice B.
Semler, Harry E., Jr.
Stanton, George A., Jr.
Stout, William A.
Strange, Charles G., Jr.
Stump, Thomas E.
Sugg, William E., Jr.
Tibbetts, Van R.
Trusz, Edward J.
Voyles, Wesley L.
Watson, William J.
Wilkie, Noel D.
Williams, Frederick B.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr.
Arns, William E.
Ash, Lloyd M.
Bailey, Jack S.
Bauerschmidt, Alan D.
Becker, David E.
Beckwith, Joan M.
Campbell, Howard B.
Cook, Paul E.
Deberry, Patricia
Degrotte, Henry C., Jr.
Diener, Richard V.
Dobbs, George I.
Dunbar, Edward S.
Feith, Joseph
Furrey, William R.
George, Robert E.
Gilbert, Richard S.
Howard, John E.
Howard, Vaughn
Inman, Elmer E., Jr.
Jones, Philip E.
Jordan, Ray D.
Kelley, Donald R.
Nyman, George A.
Pribnow, James F.
Roach, Leon M.
Roller, Billie
Rowell, Dalton A.
Smith, Bill J.
Smith, Robert L.
Storms, Jack R.
Turner, David H.
Wagner, Carl M.
Wetzel, Orval B.
Wimberly, Clyde O.

NURSE CORPS

Alexiou, Grace E.
Allgaier, Hilda L.
Barry, Dorothy M.
Belair, Danya A.
Berkman, Virginia O.
Brannack, Elinor M.
Brogan, Mary A. M.
Burke, Lois E.
Burns, Patricia J.
Callahan, Dorothy H.
Cunningham, Alice T.
Daniels, Marvelle L.
Dewig, Winona M.
Dihl, Joann
Dowding, Dorothy P.
Durkin, Veronica A.
Fehmer, Delores A.
Ferguson, Miriam M.
Fischer, Eunice A.
Fisher, Mildred K.
Green, Dorothy J.
Halkowitz, Margaret M.
Harris, Vera
Helligso, Margaret A.
Hettinger, Jeanette M.
Hockenberger, Charlotte E.
Howard, Katherine A.
Job, Lucy A.
Kolongis, Dorothea C.
Lalley, Mary G.
Lane, Grace A.
Laning, Alice T.
Livirrie, Althea A.
Lorch, Elizabeth A.
Max, Helen R.
Maynard, Mary E.
McGinn, Mary A.
Middleton, Charlene
Miller, Grace E.
Motomatsu, Toshiko
Peterson, Eleanor V.
Peterson, Lee
Pinto, Marie L.
Porrello, Josephine B.
Rancourt, Beatrice A.
Redgate, Janet M.
Roberts, Catherine V.
Robichaud, Pauline H.
Ryan, Dorothy F.
Ryder, Dorothy J.
Schlosser, Joan M.
Schmaus, Stella M.
Shelton, Mildred L.
Slater, Beverly J.
Smith, Helen F.
Smith, Margaret A.
Staab, Patricia L.
Stack, Patricia J.
Toth, Jolene L.
Velker, Phyllis M.
Walker, Helen J.
Walsh, Elizabeth A.
Warren, Ellen G.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Peter D.
Abdalla, Peter G.
Aber, John W., Jr.
Abercrombie, Gordon E.
Ackley, Frederick R., Jr.
Adam, Richard W.
Adams, Homer
Adams, Lloyd H.
Adamson, Frank M., Jr.
Adcock, John M., Jr.
Akens, Jerry D.
Alberghine, Peter
Albrecht, Carl J.
Alden, Michael G.
Alexander, Edward E., Jr.
Allen, Bobby D.
Allen, Earl A.
Allen, Kenneth H.
Allgood, Dempsey E.
Amesse, Arthur P.
Amidon, David M.
Amis, William B.
Anckonie, Alex, III
Anderson, Olaf C., Jr.
Anderson, Donald R.
Andrews, Dennis A.
Anton, Anthony A., Jr.
Arch, Wilbur R.
Armbruster, William A.
Armstrong, Roger W.
Armstrong, James K.
Arnold, James J., Jr.
Art, Raymond J.
Asafaylo, Richard J.
Ascher, David C.
Ashby, Robert D.
Asher, William M. L.
Assell, William L.
Atkins, Donald S.
Atkins, James L.
Atwood, Lewis H.
Auchy, George B.
Austin, Jack B.
Babcock, Donald D.
Bacon, Herbert C.
Bacon, Roger F., Sr.
Bagley, Aaron M.
Bagley, James E.
Bailey, Eric P.
Bailey, Ralph G.
Bainbridge, John K.
Baker, Edward B., Jr.
Baker, Herbert D.
Baker, Hobart R.
Baker, Leland W.
Baker, Robert E., Jr.
Bakewell, Wesley E.
Bakko, Douglas E.
Baldwin, Richard L.
Ball, Ronald F.
Ball, Stuart F.
Ballard, Duane C.
Ballard, Wallace L., Jr.
Banasky, Albert J.
Barber, Clyde C.
Bardtman, Robert J.
Barker, Donald R.
Barker, Fred J.
Barkman, William D.
Barnes, Charles L.
Barnes, John O.
Barnum, Gary L.
Barrett, Lewis E.
Bartleson, James T.
Bartlett, William D.
Baskin, Walter H.
Bassett, Melvin E.
Bast, James L.
Batchelor, Jon D.
Bates, Wilmer I.
Battaglini, Arnold R.
Battaglia, Carmen C.
Battenburg, John A.
Batts, William H., Jr.
Bauer, George J., Jr.
Bauer, Lawrence D.
Beachy, Lloyd H.
Beadle, Lee C.
Beam, James L.
Bearden, William F.
Bearden, Jay L.
Beasley, Robert H., Jr.
Beaton, Robert R.
Beatty, Arthur, Jr.
Beaudin, Francis X.
Beddard, John R.
Bednarek, Norbert H.
Beggs, Richard K.
Bell, Jack G.
Bell, Joe L.
Bell, John M.
Belsheim, Douglas W.
Belson, Douglas A.
Bender, Willis D.
Benevento, Eugene A.
Benninger, James E.
Benson, Kenneth R.
Berke, Lewis W.
Berkowitz, Howard V.
Berniklau, Vladimir V.
Bessire, Robert P.
Betts, Richard J.
Biard, Andrew C., Jr.
Bibler, Douglas R.
Biddle, Maxwell D., Jr.
Binkerd, Dale A.
Bishop, David K.
Bishop, Robert P.
Black, Donald L.
Black, Leroy G., II
Bladh, James C.
Blair, John E.
Bland, Joe R.
Blank, Clifton H.
Blasi, Donald T.
Blevins, Edward A.
Blevins, Richard S.
Blizzard, William E.
Bloch, Vernon C.
Blose, Larry E.
Blount, Charles W.
Boberg, Lloyd A.
Boehnke, Donald F.
Boissenin, William C.
Bolin, Norman C.
Bollenberg, Elmer F.
Bond, Douglas E.
Bond, Thomas H.
Booher, Timothy
Booth, Robert M.
Borde, Paul P.
Borkert, Robert L.
Boshoven, Robert L.
Bostwick, Sally L.
Boswell, Lexie B.
Bothwell, Michael P.
Bovey, Robert L.
Bowers, John M., Jr.
Bowley, George A.
Boyd, David H.
Boyd, Leo H.
Boyd, Roy H.
Boyle, Alonzo R.
Bozzo, Peter R.
Brackin, Charles A.
Bradley, Marlon D.
Bradshaw, Joe L.
Bradshaw, William F.
Brady, John R.
Brainerd, George E.
Branch, Daniel B., Jr.
Brandon, William R.
Brandt, Hans E., Jr.
Bransom, Frank H.
Brantuas, Joseph A.
Breeding, Donald C.
Bresch, Berton E.
Brewer, Ralph P.
Brewton, Burt
Brezina, Dennis W.
Bridges, Jack H.
Brien, George L., Jr.
Briggs, Robert P.
Brinkley, Otis H., Jr.
Britt, Joel H.
Broderick, William F.
Brodigan, Harold V.
Brolin, Edson C.
Bromwell, Kent S.
Brons, John C.
Brooks, Linton F.
Brooks, Thomas A.
Brown, Alan R.
Brown, Donald H.
Brown, Donald P.
Brown, Elmer
Brown, John J.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Michael J.
Brown, Thomas V.
Browne, Russell C., Jr.
Bruce, Jack
Bruce, Malvin D.
Bryan, Edward L. G.
Bryan, George B.
Buchanan, John C.
Buckel, Jerome
Buckley, Daniel L., Jr.
Buel, Roy D.
Bundarin, John P., Jr.
Bunte, Louis F.
Burau, Charles E.
Burchett, Jerome V.
Burgess, William S.
Burke, Lauren D.
Burke, Nolan R.
Burkett, Wayne C.
Burns, John M., Jr.
Burns, Thomas M., Jr.
Burns, William C.
Burroughs, Joseph G.
Burston, Robert
Bussell, Delmer H.
Butterfield, John A.
Buxton, Richard L.
Byng, Robert H.
Bynum, James A.
Byrne, Edward J.
Cade, John C.
Cadow, William S., Jr.
Cain, William T.
Cajthaml, Frank
Calder, James H.
Caldwell, James A.
Calhoon, Theodore H.
Callsen, Christian E.
Camilleri, Terrence J.
Campbell, Donald R.
Campbell, Wayne R.
Campbell, Ernest R.
Campbell, Hubert R.
Cant, Geoffrey D.
Caprio, Gabriel P.
Carlson, William C.
Carlson, Edgar L.
Carlson, Jack J.
Carpenter, Robert N.
Carr, Denham L.
Carr, John F.
Carr, John C.
Carr, Leo F.
Carr, Paul W.
Carter, Clyde A. L.
Carter, Frederick W., Jr.
Carter, James W.
Cartwright, James P.
Carwin, James P.
Casciato, Anthony C.
Case, Arnold J.
Castro, Alexander, Jr.
Catalano, Peter R.
Catcher, Charles W.
Cather, Edward W., II
Cave, George P.
Ceres, Robert L.
Chadwick, William H.
Chalecki, Stanley J.
Chamberlin, Philip R.
Chambers, John L., Sr.
Chance, John M.
Chandler, Thomas R.
Chandler, Ralph W.
Chapman, Michael K.
Chase, Donald A.
Cheek, William H.
Cheston, Daniel M., IV
Chew, William C.
Chidsey, John W.
Childress, Howard R.
Chipparoni, Elmer A.
Choate, Stephen L.
Christensen, Keith L.
Christenson, Edward O.
Christian, Richard A.
Christian, Ernest F.
Christopher, John R.
Christy, Ralph W.
Chulick, Joseph, Jr.
Ciboci, John W.
Claar, Harry L.
Clancy, Robert J.
Clapper, Gean P.
Clark, Donald H.
Clark, Halbert G.
Clark, Jackson S.
Clark, James C.
Clark, Kent R.
Clark, Maurice E.
Clark, Roger M.
Clark, William S.
Clausen, Carl C.
Clautice, William G.
Clayton, Thomas M., Jr.
Clement, Russell L.
Clement, Robert M.
Clements, Wilton R.
Clerico, Leo F.
Clift, Thomas A.
Cline, Donald L.
Cloninger, John W.
Clontz, Clarence E.
Coates, Dannie R.
Coats, Jack T.
Coats, Richard L.
Cobb, Loren H.
Cobb, Stanley M., Jr.
Cochran, Melvin A.
Cockley, Richard M.
Code, Ronald B.
Coffin, Robert H., Jr.
Cole, Okey, Jr.
Cole, William L.
Coleman, "M" "R"
Colias, George. C.
Collins, John F.
Collins, James E.
Columbo, Michael A., Jr.

Commons, Patrick, M.
Conger, William L.
Connolly, Raymond T.
Converse, Paul T.
Converse, Joseph I., Jr.
Cook, Morgan
Cooper, Finis E., Jr.,
Cooper, Michael B.
Copeland, Walter E.
Coppersmith, John D.
Copple, Jerald A.
Corbaley, Leonard H.
Corcoran, William R.
Cordy, Dallice W.
Corey, James W., Jr.
Cormack, James P.
Cornell, Henri V.
Cornett, Richard R.
Cornett, Charles R.
Corse, Carl D., Jr.
Cosky, Charles E.
Cossey, James D.
Costello, William G.
Cottom, Robert V.
Courtney, John J., Jr.
Coussens, Paul H.
Cover, Donald L.
Cowell, James P.
Cox, David L.
Cox, James A.
Cradit, Raymond H.
Crandall, Joel L., Jr.
Crawford, Jack
Crawford, Franklin E.
Crockett, William J.
Crowe, Norman H.
Crumpacker, John P.
Cuddy, John V.
Culbertson, Richard W.
Cullen, Richard C.
Culliton, James J.
Cummings, Francis L.
Cummings, James E.
Cummins, Melvin B.
Cunningham, Robert S.
Cunningham, William M.
Cunningham, Derwood D.
Curran, Thomas E.
Currie, Robert E.
Curtin, James M.
Curtis, Charles D.
Curtis, Guy H., III
Curtis, Ronald R.
Cusick, Roland R.
Cutler, Lee M.
Dachos, John
Daidone, Henry F.
Dale, Kenneth L.
Dalgliesh, William J. M.
Dalton, Dick N.
Daly, Bruce D.
Damm, Thomas P.
Damon, Richard W. H.
Danals, Dick A.
Danitschek, Carl N.
Darby, Robert M.
Dau, Ralph W.
Davis, Alden A.
Davis, Carl E.
Davis, Grady W., Jr.
Davis, Hugh M., Jr.
Davis, James T.
Davis, Joseph F.
Davis, Lawrence D.
Davis, Lloyd C.
Davis, Oscar B., Jr.
Davis, Richard S.
Davis, Robert J.
Davis, Wade L.
Dawdy, John R.
Dean, Francis J.
Dean, Robert J., Jr.
Dean, William L.
Deangelo, Joseph J.
Debuhr, Milton D.
Decesare, Armand G.
Defrancesco, John B., Jr.
Delaney, Carl R.
Delaura, John
Dellagiacoma, John
Delpercio, Michael, Jr.
Demarke, Joseph, III
Demoret, Russell W.
Deniston, David A.
Denotter, Clifford R.
Denton, William E.
Depaul, Anthony W., Jr.
Depew, John N.
Derickson, Richard B., III
Dickinson, Joshua C., III
Dilloway, Joseph E.
Dimpsey, Carbon P.
Dionne, Edgar W.
Dirvianskis, Arunas
Dobbs, Charles P.
Dodge, John F.
Doelger, David P.
Donovan, David A.
Donovan, Francis R.
Dornberg, Paul G.
Dortch, Edwin B.
Dorwart, Frederic G., Jr.
Dougard, Peter F.
Doyle, Ronald J.
Doyle, William J.
Drake, Terry C.
Drake, William B., Jr.
Drotleff, William C., Jr.
Drummond, Glen N., Jr.
Dube, Robert A.
Duffy, Michael D.
Dugas, Henry J.
Dunlop, James M.
Dunn, Donald R.
Dunn, James V.
Dupler, Larry N.
Durham, Hollis M.
Dutrow, Arthur N.
Dyke, David W.
Dziedzic, Walter T., Jr.
Dzurko, Thomas A.
Earner, Stephen J.
Eason, Middleton
Ecoff, James H.
Economides, Lester J.
Edgar, Richard B.
Edgerton, Everett W., Jr.
Edgerton, Robert L.
Edmisten, Edgar H.
Edmonds, James L.
Edwards, John A.
Edwards, "Z" "T"
Edwards, Linier L.
Effron, Herbert M.
Egan, Gerald E.
Eggleston, William W.
Ehlers, Ernest J.
Eichenlaub, Leon E.
Eidson, Clyde D.
Ekleberry, William D.
Ekstrom, John S.
Eldredge, Howard S.
Elliott, George M.
Ellis, Floyd W.
Ellis, Gary H.
Ellis, John C.
Ellison, Melvin R.
Embry, John H.
Emerich, Wilbur P.
Emerson, Fred C.
Engel, Nathaniel J.
Engel, Richard L.
Enochs, Jack M.
Eparvier, Norbert C.
Ericksen, Grover G.
Erickson, George E., Jr.
Ertl, Albert R.
Eskildsen, Leo A.
Estes, Clifford D.
Estes, Eugene H.
Estes, John A.
Evans, Lucian C.
Evans, Ralph E.
Evans, Stuart D.
Evans, Thomas W.
Evans, Victor C., Jr.
Everett, William H., III
Everette, Oliver G.
Evers, Richard E.
Eyman, Dale W.
Fagan, Christopher B.
Fagan, Christopher M.
Fahlstrom, Edward J.
Faith, Larry E.
Fallone, Paul R., Jr.
Fantasia, Biagio E.
Farley, Harold C., Jr.
Farrell, William T.
Featherstone, James F.
Fee, Milton O.
Feldthouse, Harry W.
Fendorf, Dale N.
Fernow, William F.
Ferraro, David B.
Ferris, Charles L.
Fey, Edwin C.
Field, Tylor, II
Fields, Walter S., III
Fiene, James R.
Fife, Robert R.
Finch, Jerry L.
Finerty, Martin J., Jr.
Finlen, James R.
Finley, Thomas M., Jr.
Finney, Ivan K.
Fischer, George J.
Fitzgerald, Michael E.
Fitzpatrick, Eugene E.
Flanagan, Walter B.
Flaningam, James D.
Flannery, William F.
Flikeid, Jack R.
Florence, Scott A.
Flynn, Martin R.
Flynn, Noel S.
Fogarty, Eugene P.
Fogle, William J.
Forbes, Raymond L., Jr.
Ford, John F.
Ford, Joseph P. P.
Forde, Jerome B.
Forsythe, Daniel H.
Fouts, Alan A.
Fowler, Charles B., Jr.
Fox, Dale
Fox, Loyd O., Jr.
Fox, Vern H., Jr.
Foxworth, Thomas G.
Franck, Homer L.
Frankhauser, Charles G.
Franklin, Larry B.
Frazier, Ross A.
Freckmann, Fred H.
Fredricksen, George J.
Freeborn, Guy H.
Freymann David G.
Fritsche, Kenneth W.
Fritz, Charles J.
Frye, David B.
Fryman, Wayne E.
Fuchs, Robert E.
Fulbright, Robert H.
Fuller, Edward M., III
Fuqua, James R., Jr.
Gabrielson, Robert L.
Gainer, Thomas H., Jr.
Gaither, John L.
Galyon, Thurlow A.
Gardner, Frank M., Jr
Garner, David L.
Garrett, Donald F.
Garrett, William B.
Garrigan, Kenneth J.
Garton, George B., Jr.
Garverick, Charles M.
Gates, Joseph D.
Gath, Bernard S.
Gaudet, John F.
Gavin, William H., Jr.
Gay, Joseph V.
Geddes, Donald R.
Geiger, Bernard R.
Geist, Gary Q.
Geitz, Melvin L.
Getz, Sidney L.
Gibson, Eugene E.
Gibson, Harry O., Jr.
Giddens, Robert G.
Gideons, Linwood
Gilbert, Charles W.
Gilhuly, John F.
Gillespie, Owen L.
Gillette, Raymond N.
Gilliam, Warren P.
Gilliland, Richard E.
Gilmer, David S.
Gingles, Donald D.
Gladieux, Bernard L., Jr.
Glaeser, John S.
Glaser, Francis E.
Glendon, Bernard P.
Glenn, Robert L.
Goans, George P.
Goggin, Ronald L.
Goldsmith, Norman E.
Goldsmith, Albert L., Jr.
Goldsmith, James B.
Golt, Ralph S.
Gomez, Alvaro R.
Goodman, Jess T.
Goodman, James C., Jr.
Gordon, Barry L.
Gordon, Milford I.
Gordon, Robert C.
Gordon, Samuel J.
Gorham, Milton R., Jr.
Gosen, Lawrence D.
Goslin, Ellis
Gosnell, James B.
Grace, John P.
Graham, Donald R.
Graham, James B.
Gray, John R., Jr.
Green, Baxter D., Jr.
Green, David L.
Green, Floyd A.
Green, John G.
Green, Patrick T.
Green, Raymond M.
Green, Robert B.
Grienenberger, John G.
Griffin, John R.
Griffin, John R., Jr.
Griffith, John G.
Griffith, Richard K.
Griffith, Nelson L.
Griggs, Otis, Jr.
Grise, James E.
Gromyko, Alexander F.
Gross, Paul E.
Gross, Robert B.
Grounds, Sylvester Q.
Groves, Frank
Guay, Paul E.
Guest, Frederick H.
Guilbault, Roland G.
Gurnon, Paul J.
Guthrie, Robert E., Jr.
Guthrie, Richard J.
Gwinn, Cornelius B., Jr.
Harbermas, Thomas W.
Haffey, James M.
Hafford, David A.
Hager, Raymond D., Jr.
Hagins, James M.
Hailey, Russell E.
Haines, Donald A.
Haizlip, Jack
Hakenewerth, Herbert P.
Hale, Thomas M., Jr.
Haley, Wayne J.
Haley, Willie E.
Hall, Arthur E.
Hall, Charles E.
Hall, Eugene M.
Hall, Kenneth T., Jr.
Hall, Lawrence J.
Hallahan, Richard A.
Halton, Nicholas H.
Hamel, Albert A.
Hamilton, Allan J.
Hamilton, Griffin F.
Hamilton, William E.
Hamilton, Maynard L.
Hamilton, Donald A.
Hammer, Robert W.
Hammond, Warren G. F. X.
Hammond, Carl W.
Hammond, Flaye M., III
Hamner, Robert C.
Haney, Donald E.
Hanford, James M.
Hanggeli, William H.
Hannan, Victor R.
Hansen, Lyle F.
Hansen, Ronald L.
Hanson, Martin P.
Harbin, Harry W.
Harbin, William W.
Hardie, James S.
Hardy, Brenton P.
Hardy, Earl L.
Hark, Donald L.
Harker, William P.
Harmuth, Robert K.
Harney, Walter J.
Harper, Raymond H.
Harper, William L.
Harris, Lloyd T., Jr.
Harris, Rex H.
Harrison, Robert G.
Hart, David A.
Harvey, Robert F.
Hassler, Thomas A.
Hatton, Samuel F.
Haukereid, Arvin L.
Havey, John J.
Hawkins, William J.
Hawkins, Henry B.
Hawthorne, John W.
Hayden, Robert P.
Hazelwood, James R.
Hearn, James J.
Heavey, James L.
Heckart, Harold
Heebner, Newell G.
Heegeman, James W.
Heiges, John M.
Held, William E., Jr.
Helms, Charles P.
Henderson, Harvey H.
Henderson, Joseph C.
Henderson, Thomas G.
Henderson, Keith A.
Henderson, Harold J., Jr.
Hendon, Charles R.
Hendrickson, Daniel L.
Hendry, David M.
Henry, Hugh L.
Hepner, Fred D.
Herman, John M., Jr.
Herman, William A.
Hernon, Donald M.
Hershey, Clair R.
Hewett, Marle D.
Heyden, Hanley E.
Hibler, John F.
Hicks, Jack D.
Hicks, William F.
Higbee, Gerald M.
Higginbotham, John D.
Hight, Jim T.
Higman, Darrell E.
Hildebrand, Wayne T.
Hill, Charles E.
Hill, Edward R.
Hill, Hassel, Jr.
Hill, Nordean T.
Hill, Oscar A.
Hilt, John W.
Hitchcock, Donald R.
Hoeft, Max D.
Hoever, Milton H.
Hoey, John H.
Hoff, Richard W.
Hoffman, Jesse W.
Holcomb, Charles E.
Holcomb, William D.
Holds, James H.
Hollandsworth, Robert D.
Holloway, Charles A.
Holmes, Donald D.
Holmes, James F.
Holsclaw, Charlie B.
Holt, Ben F., Jr.
Holt, Vaughn E.
Holts, Philip P.
Honadle, William J.
Honcharuk, John P.
Honsaker, Herschel M.
Hopkins, Granville J.
Hopkins, Richard G.
Horacek, Jerry L.
Horna, Gerald F.
Hotchkiss, James M.
Hougland, Charles A.
Houley, William P.
Howie, Charles E.
Hudacko, Charles T.
Hudgins, Christopher L.
Hudson, Robert D.
Huebner, Richard F.
Huetter, Harvey P.
Hufner, Frederick G., Jr.
Hughes, Audra L.
Hughes, Charles L., Jr.
Hughey, John L.
Humes, Charles B.
Hunt, William B.
Hunter, Richard W.
Hurd, Robert C.
Hurley, Michael J., Jr.
Hurst, Milton T.
Hutcheison, Henry L.
Hutchison, Charles H.
Hydinger, Robert M.
Ihly, Richard L.
Iler, Jack L.
Ingram, Earl L.
Inman, Walter E.
Israelson, Leroy D.
Isreal, Livingston B.
Ittner, Robert H.
Ives, Charles O.
Ivie, Francis M.
Jacanin, James M.
Jackmond, Arnold D.
Jacob, Jerry J.
Jacobson, Jerome B.
Jacoby, Cliffton G.
Jagoditsch, Harold L.
James, Johnny L.
James, Jon G.
James, Thomas M.
Janas, Edward S.
Jarvis, Thomas C.
Jaseph, Robert L.
Jazwienski, Theodore
Jenik, Allan R.
Jenner, Robert F.
Jesberg, Ronald H.
Jessen, Werner H.
Jewell, Charles W.
Jockel, Joseph A., Jr.
Johanson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Robert D.
Johnson, Ralph H.
Johnson, Peter A.
Johnson, Arlo J.
Johnson, Dennis L.
Johnson, Richard W.
Johnson, Roland R.

Johnson, Charles O.
Johnson, Raymond L.
Johnson, Garth W.
Johnson, Armer W.
Johnson, Manley L.
Johnston; Rodney K.
Johnston, George D., Jr.
Johnston, Silas G., Jr.
Jolley, "R" "V"
Jones, Cecil E., Jr.
Jones, Delbert C.
Jones, Frank, Jr.
Jones, George B.
Jones, Howard R., Jr.
Jones, Joseph F.
Jones, Orville D.
Jones, Roger E.
Jones, William R.
Joplin, Dock W.
Jordan, Floyd R.
Joynt, Patrick D.
Juber, Clarence W.
Juby, William S., Jr.
Junker, Delvin W.
Kallstrom, Lawrence W.
Kaluza, Theodore A.
Kambeitz, Raymond A.
Kanuch, John S.
Kapphahn, Gary J.
Karnes, Allen O.
Karr, Odie L.
Kass, Matthew A.
Kaszycki, Charles J.
Katz, Alfred C.
Katz, Donald L.
Kearns, Daniel W.
Kearns, James F.
Keats, Lawrence R.
Keay, Karl L.
Keck, Abner W., Jr.
Keegan, Joseph J.
Keeley, Joseph
Keene, Maurice E., Jr.
Keener, Thomas V.
Kehr, John H.
Kelley, John J., Jr.
Kelley, Thomas D.
Kelly, David S.
Kelly, Robert J.
Kelly, Thomas
Kelly, William H.
Kelton, Allan H.
Keske, Carl D.
Ketts, Harry C., III
Keyes, Bradley N.
Kight, James R.
Kight, Otis G.
Kihune, Robert K. U.
Kiland, Ingolf N., Jr.
Kimble, Charles D.
Kimmons, Carl E.
Kinch, Judson M.
King, Charles T.
King, John J.
King, John B.
King, Joseph F.
King, Maclellan E., Jr.
King, Philip M.
Kinnier, John W.
Kirchner, Robert A., Jr
Kirk, Robert G.
Kiss, John W.
Kitts, William F.
Klapp, Anthony J.
Klappenbach, Edward W.
Klein, Donald G.
Klementz, Robert W.
Kline, Frank E.
Kline, Norman S.
Kling, Edwin R., Jr.
Kloepfer, Ronald M.
Klopfenstein, Ervin J.
Klorig, William N.
Klosky, Lowell H.
Kloster, Orville D.
Knachel, Robert E.
Knapp, Charles E.
Kneibert, Frederick D.
Knepp, Henry W., Jr.
Knox, Joe B.
Knox, Samuel J., Jr.
Kohler, Donald L.
Koke, Herbert E.
Kooistra, Robert W.
Kopp, Walter H. O.
Korrell, Harry J. F., Jr.
Koruga, Paul M.
Kowalski, August C. B.
Kozlowski, Charles C.
Kraft, Raymond A.
Krasts, Ilmars
Kreher, William J.
Krieger, Charles B.
Krieger, Elmer H. J.
Krischker, Allen L. J.
Krol, John A.
Krol, Richard M.
Kronberger, Robert S.
Krug, Charles D.
Krumm, Theodore G., Jr.
Kruzic, Victor C.
Kshimetski, John J.
Kubik, Bruce W.
Kubilus, Edward J.
Kuebler, Richard J.
Kuenzli, Joseph R.
Kuhn, Edward R.
Kuiper, Lammert, Jr.
Kull, John N., Jr.
Kurrus, John B.
Kurtz, Clarence L.
Kyle, Alan M.
Lacagnina, David H.
Lackey, James B.
Laferty, John D.
Lair, Graham P.
Lambert, Richard E.
Lampert, Donald W.
Lancaster, Jack
Lancaster, Edward A.
Landon, Walter E.
Langemo, James C.
Langenbach, Ross K., III
Langford, John A., Jr.
Langland, Jay E.
Laning, Clifford L.
Larch, Lynns J.
Larkin, Robert L., Jr.
Larose, Elliott F.
Larrabee, Walter I.
Larsen, John T.
Larson, Arvid G.
Larson, Donovan C.
Larson, Robert L.
Lathrop, Mitchell L.
Lauer, Dudley S.
Laufer, William H.
Law, Wilburn P.
Lawhead, Walter
Lawler, John T.
Lawrence, Albert M.
Lawson, John W.
Lazarchick, Frank T.
Leder, John F.
Lee, Arthur R.
Lee, Richard H.
Lee, Robert R.
Lee, Rodney B.
Leeds, John M.
Leeper, James R.
Lehmberg, George R., Jr.
Lekstrom, Lennart C.
Leon, Hayden L., Jr.
Leonard, James F.
Leshon, Angelo, Jr.
Lester, Robert F.
Levesque, Bertrand H.
Lewis, Harry E.
Lewis, Michael H.
Lewis, William F.
Lewis, William
Leyden, John J.
Liebmann, John E.
Liles, Don K.
Linderman, David R.
Lindgren, Carl L.
Lindsey, Billie F.
Link, Kent A.
Links, William E.
Linsley, Richard G.
Liss, Richard S.
Littlefield, Gordon M.
Lloyd, Charles H.
Lloyd, George T.
Lockwood, Wayne P.
Logalbo, Salvatore E.
Logan, Bartlett W.
Logan, Russell A., Jr.
Logan, Wallis M.
Logie, Robert W.
London, "J" Phillip
Long, Harry R.
Long, Thomas A., Jr.
Longfellow, William J., Jr.
Longtin, Frank J.
Lopes, Stanley P.
Lorang, Alphonse J.
Lovejoy, John E.
Loveless, Jerry M.
Lovell, Jack W.
Lovett, Irvin E.
Lowe, James R.
Lowey, Michael E.
Lowry, "J" "E"
Lozano, Johnnie B., Jr.
Luebke, Robert W.
Lukish, Thomas J.
Luna, Fred A.
Lund, Paul A.
Lutes, Charles W.
Lyon, Fred M.
Lysne, Howard C.
MacDonald, Bridgman A.
MacDougall, Donald B.
Mace, James A.
MacFarlane, Byron N.
MacGillivray, Kenneth A.
Mack, Norman
MacNeil, William R.
MacVean, Charles R.
Mahaffey, Joseph D.
Mahne, Lloyd J.
Main, Elwin N.
Malfer, Mario A.
Malloy, Bernard A.
Malone, Herbert L.
Manly, Harold P., Jr.
Mann, Timothy J.
Manning, Sidney E.
Mansfield, William D.
Maran, Anthony J.
Marbach, Louis R.
Marckfeld, William E.
Mardigian, Richard
Marinello, Anthony J.
Maris, Alan H.
Markowski, David L.
Marler, Marvin R.
Marlin, Melvin C.
Marsh, William B., Jr.
Marshall, Bruce C.
Marshall, Walter W.
Martin, James E.
Martin, Johnny N., Jr.
Martin, Richard L.
Martin, Robert L.
Martin, Robert H.
Martin, William P.
Martinovich, Frank J.
Marvin, Timothy H.
Marx, William D.
Mascali, John H.
Maschinski, Bernard A.
Mason, Albert T.
Mason, Frank V.
Mason, James B.
Massie, Branch R.
Masterbone, Joseph A., Jr.
Masters, David R.
Matthews, Duran H.
Matthews, James R.
Matticks, Basil F.
Maulin, William H.
Mauz, Henry H., Jr.
Mawhinney, Robert C.
Maxwell, Jasper M.
Maxwell, James E.
Maxwell, Wayne P.
May, Kenneth E.
Maynard, Michael D.
Mayo, Norman A.
McAnulty, John F.
McAree, William B., II
McBride, William F.
McCabe John J.
McCabe, William D., Jr.
McCann, Gerald L.
McCann, William E., Jr.
McCarthy, Edward H., Jr.
McCarthy, William J.
McClain, "J" "L"
McCleary, Paul E.
McClendon, James F. Jr.
McClurg, Theodore H., Jr.
McCord, Howard E., Jr.
McCoy, Raymond H.
McCubbins, Marvin B.
McDaniel, Jerry P.
McElhenny, James P., Jr.
McElroy, Robert W.
McEvers, James E.
McFarling, Robert M., Jr.
McGanka, Steven W.
McGann, Robert G.
McGlynn, Gerald J.
McGowen, William R.
McGrath, James G.
McGuire, Robert J.
McIntosh, William D. Jr.
McIntyre, Fred P.
McKenna, Peter D.
McKinney, Henry C.
McKinney, William E.
McKinney, Robert F.
McLarney, Edward F., Jr.
McLaughlin, Thomas E.
McLeod, Robert H.
McLoon, Charles A.
McMasters, James A.
McMichael, James G.
McMurry, Jerry C.
McNamara, John R.
McNamara, Thomas F., Jr.
McReynolds, Thomas P.
McVey, Charles J.
Meadows, Elliott O.
Meeks, Harman T.
Meiers, George C., Jr.
Melville, Karl W.
Mendel, Daniel L., Jr.
Menzies, Lawrence R.
Meredith, Francis M., II
Merz, Arthur
Messegee, James A.
Metzger, John M.
Meyers, Clement R., Jr.
Meyers, Robert O.
Michael, Robert D.
Michelsen, Lane R.
Mihelic, Toney
Milanowski, Edward J.
Milas, Forrest M.
Milhorn, Harvey H.
Miller, Alan C.
Miller, Charles P., III
Miller, Carl V., Jr.
Milligan, Richard D.
Millikan, Keith E.
Milner, Robert L.
Milwee, William I., Jr.
Miner, Dale L.
Minton, Joseph A.
Mitchell, Howard D.
Mitchell, John S., Jr.
Mitchell, Glenn H.
Mitchell, Herbert W.
Mixon, Tracy R.
Mixson, Riley D.
Moe, Richard B.
Moellmer, Karl A.
Mogol, Louis M.
Moncilovich, Milan
Monroe, Ira T.
Montgomery, Morris
Moon, Lester C.
Moons, Joseph F.
Moore, Gerald R.
Moore, Richard J.
Moore, Temple C., Jr.
Morgan, Alva E.
Morgan, Harry E., Jr.
Morgan, Henry A., Jr.
Morgan, Robert V.
Morisset, Herbert D.
Morrison, Alan B.
Morrison, George H.
Morrissey, James R., Jr.
Morrow, Benjamin H.
Morse, John P.
Morse, Raymond M.
Moses, Albert O.
Moynahan, Dennis M.
Mulkern, Kevin M.
Mullen, Lawrence G.
Mullvain, Harold E.
Mulrooney, Robert M.
Mundy, Jerome J.
Murphy, John R.
Murphy, James E.
Murphy, James A.
Murphy, James M. P.
Murray, Francis W.
Murray, John F.
Murray, William F., Jr.
Mustain, Kenneth A.
Myers, Karl
Nadeau, Joseph R. D.
Naef, Frederick E., Jr.
Nagel, Howard A.
Nagy, Joseph F.
Nash, John E.
Nave, Lincoln D., Jr.
Naylor, Howard W.
Neese, John F.
Neish, John F.
Nells, Patrick J.
Nelson, Charles T.
Nelson, George A.
Nelson, Grady L.
Nelson, John P.
Nelson, Paul C.
Nelson, Robert A.
Newland, James E.
Newland, Kenneth T.
Newman, Errett D.
Newman, Irwin G.
Newquist, William A.
Newton, Carlos F.
Newton, Marple
Nicholls, Stanley K.
Nicholson, Daniel A.
Nicholson, John W.
Nickerson, Ellis L.
Nield, Van K.
Nielsen, Emanuel K.
Nisonger, Bliss E.
Nissler, Charles L.
Nobile, Liborio W.
Noble, Richard A.
Nolan, Charles G.
Nolan, Michael H.
Nolan, Thomas E.
Noland, Paul F.
Nole, Leonard J.
Nordwall, Bruce D.
Noreika, Richard J.
Norman, William F.
Norris, John T.
Norwood, David F.
Nourie, John R.
Nowatzki, Richard J.
Nunn, Silas O., III
Obsitnik, Vincent
O'Connell, Philip J., Jr.
O'Dell, Delbert W.
O'Hara, Charles W.
O'Hearn, David W., Jr.
Oistad, Byron J.
O'Keefe, Thomas A.
Olds, Frederick A.
Olita, Julius A.
Oliver, Robert G.
Olsen, James E.
Olson, Carl G.
Olson, Gerald D.
Olson, William A.
O'Malley, William J.
O'Neal, Herbert E.
O'Neil, William F.
Oneto, John C.
Orbovich, Michael M.
Orlovich, Peter
Orr, Francis A.
Osburn, David L.
Osburn, Marvin R.
Osgood, Franklin B.
Osswald, William C.
Oswald, Thomas H., Jr.
Ottino, William A.
Overman, Everett F., Jr.
Ovre, Leslie H.
Ovrom, Allan A., Jr.
Owen, Ernest E.
Owen, William E.
Owenby, Lester S.
Owens, Robert H.
Page, David A.
Page, Gilbert G.
Pagnillo, Richard J.
Paine, John A., Jr.
Paladino, Vincent T.
Palmer, Leslie N.
Palmer, Michael W.
Pampel, Alban, III
Parker, Robert C., Jr.
Parks, Tom H., Jr.
Parsons, Guy C., Jr.
Patten, John R.
Patterson, Larry L.
Paulsen, Paul H.
Pease, Charles C.
Pechauer, John N.
Peck, Roger L.
Peckham, Stanley D.
Pelkey, Frank D.
Peloquin, Alfred E.
Penman, Paul D.
Pennington, Donald E.
Perkins, Thomas M.
Perkins, Robert C., Jr.
Permenter, Lawrence F.
Perry, Albert H.
Perry, Chester A.
Person, James S., Jr.
Peters, Billy P.
Peters, Earl H.
Petersen, Jack E.
Peterson, Gerald L.
Peterson, Charles E.
Peterson, James A.
Petitt, Robert A.
Pfeifer, Robert D.
Phelps, Byron D.
Phelps, Leeman H.
Pheris, William E., IV
Pick, James D.
Pickle, Roy F.

Pierce, James C.
Pietras, Fred J.
Pizinger, Lawrence C.
Plantz, Ernest V.
Polson, "C" "L"
Poole, James K.
Poole, Richard W.
Poole, William W., Jr.
Popp, Irwin W.
Posner, Ernest G.
Potente, Estelito N.
Pound, Don P.
Powell, Bernard N.
Powell, Richard A.
Powers, Philip H.
Praetorius, Hugh M.
Prendergast, Robert L.
Prescott, Ronald G.
Previto, Leonard R.
Prevost, Stephen M.
Priest, John T.
Pringle, Stuart H., Jr.
Printup, Lloyd E.
Putnam, William M.
Pye, Horace L.
Pyle, Jackie C.
Quarles, Clifford E.
Quinley, Charles W.
Radecki, Richard A.
Rager, Philip J., Jr.
Rager, Richard R.
Rahming, John C.
Raines, William A.
Ramborger, James K.
Ramsay, Robert W., Jr.
Ramsey, James E.
Randolph, David E.
Rappolt, James F.
Raunig, Donald J.
Ray, Charles R.
Ray, Courtney D.
Read, Dennis E.
Reagan, Stanley D.
Reagan, Virgil B.
Reason, James E.
Recktenwald, John C.
Redburn, Billie H.
Redden, Edward G.
Reed, John H.
Reed, Travis B.
Reeder, John A.
Reefe, Clarence E.
Rees, Elbert G.
Rees, Gayle H.
Rees, Robert L.
Reeves, Roy M.
Regan, James D.
Reimann, Lyle F.
Remillard, Raymond A.
Render, Ronald W.
Renner, Ernest A.
Reppert, Thomas C.
Resare, Ronald A.
Reynolds, James G.
Reynolds, Philip W.
Reynolds, Frederick W., Jr.
Rheinhart, Eugene O.
Rhodes, Hugh W.
Rice, Leonard
Rice, Roy J.
Richard, Raymond
Richard, Harry S.
Richardson, Daniel C.
Richardson, William E.
Richardson, Arthur O
Richardson, Albert J.
Richmond, Elvin T.
Richmond, Norman W.
Richter, Herbert B.
Rickman, Wayne E.
Rickover, Robert J.
Rickwald, Ronald R.
Riddell, Robert A.
Riddle, Homer C.
Ridens, Jack M.
Riess, Daniel M.
Riley, Larry M.
Riley, Michael W.
Rine, Charles A.
Risch, Philip A., Jr.
Ritchie, Doyle E.
Rivers, Laroyce F., Jr.
Rivest, Omer E.
Robert, James R.
Roberts, Jack A.
Roberts, William E.
Roberts, Paul J.
Roberts, James N.
Roberts, George A.
Roberts, Thomas M.
Robertson, James
Robertson, John S.
Robinson, Richard L.
Robinson, Wayne
Robinson, Lesley T.
Rochholz, Lyle D.
Rodriguez, Ronald J.
Rodrigues, Laurentino
Roensch, Hans M., Jr.
Rogero, Berchman E., Jr.
Rogers, David N.
Rogers, Kenneth E.
Rogers, Will, Jr.
Rollins, Robert L.
Roper, John D.
Rosander, Roger E.
Roscoe, David R.
Rose, Clifford A., Jr.
Rose, Guy M.
Rosenberger, Glenn C.
Ross, Benjamin A.
Ross, Lawrence T.
Rossi, Louis F.
Rothermel, Kenneth W.
Rottgering, Charles D.
Rouse, Charles F., Jr.
Rowe, Robert E.
Rowland, Gilford G., Jr.
Royalty, Reed L.
Rucker, James B., Jr.
Runyan, James H.
Russell, Richard D.
Ruth, Allen R.
Ryan, Robert M.
Ryan, William C., Jr.
Sajdera, Robert M.
Sakuda, Paul S.
Salem, Edward R.
Salerni, Paul N.
Salrin, Orvis D., Jr.
Sampson, William J.
Sanders, Sheldon M.
Saner, Donald E.
Santos, Alfred J., Jr.
Savage, Robert L.
Savel, John J., Jr.
Savio, Leo J.
Sawhook, James L.
Saxton, Harold E.
Scent, Raymond J.
Schaper, Darwin E.
Schenfisch, Albert V.
Scherrer, Roy S.
Schexnayder, Bodin R.
Schiavone, Angelo A.
Schick, Bruce J.
Schiffner, Robert C.
Schlegel, Kurt A.
Schmidt, William R.
Schmidt, Frederick D.
Schnauffer, Patrick M., Jr.
Schneck, Don O.
Schneider, Jack L. C.
Schoneman, Elmer C.
Schrag, Larry P.
Schultz, John J.
Schultz, Philip D.
Schuyler, Paul G.
Schwartz, William G.
Scott, Albert T.
Scott, John P.
Scott, Lawrence S.
Scott, William M., Jr.
Scruggs, James M.
Sears, David F.
Seaton, Billy L.
Sedoris, Louis M.
Seeley, James R.
Seeley, Orland C., Jr.
Selland, Omar M.
Sellers, Gurley N., Jr.
Sells, John E.
Seltzer, James L.
Seredynski, John F.
Sessions, John F.
Seykowski, Donald W.
Shafer, Clark B.
Shafer, Lee E.
Sharp, James E.
Sharp, John J.
Sharples, Charles T.
Shealy, Paul L.
Shealy, Tirey D.
Shelton, Donald
Shenton, Scott S.
Sheppard, Furman L., Jr.
Sherman, Albert A.
Sheya, Lawrence J.
Shinn, Allen M., Jr.
Shiverdecker, David K.
Siebeking, Paul F., Jr.
Siembieda, John
Sigmund, Samuel W.
Sikes, Arthur D.
Sikes, John B.
Simmons, Dean M.
Simmons, George T.
Simon, James W.
Sims, James A.
Siple, Terrence E.
Skelton, Luther W., III
Skewes, Frank A.
Skinner, Melvyn R.
Slaven, John K.
Sledge, Villard C.
Slemp, Frederick A.
Slocum, "L" Wilson
Small, Fenwick R.
Smith, Arthur K., Jr.
Smith, Archie D.
Smith, Arthur J., Jr.
Smith, Arthur H.
Smith, Bradley N.
Smith, Clarence T.
Smith, Gary T.
Smith, Gibson P.
Smith, Gordon M.
Smith, James F.
Smith, James A., Jr.
Smith, John S.
Smith, Joseph T.
Smith, John G.
Smith, Philip G.
Smith, Rayburn R.
Smith, Richard D.
Smith, Robert L.
Smith, Robert P.
Smith, Stanley R.
Smith, William P.
Smoak, Robert M.
Smoot, William T.
Snipes, Stephen G.
Snyder, Stephen V.
Soals, Woodrow W.
Sole, James W.
Solms, William R.
Solomon, Donald L.
Somes, Timothy E.
Sopko, John R.
Sorensen, Thomas S.
Sorrie, James
Spille, Samuel J.
Sprecher, Herbert E., Jr.
Springer, Nelson C.
Spruell, Alfred, H., Jr.
Stafford, Earl A.
Stahel, Rudolf S.
Stanfield, Marcus K.
Stanford, David L.
Stanley, Walter L.
Stanton, Courtney W.
Staples, Henry E., Jr.
Starck, Robin L.
Starnes, Charles M.
Staszak, Richard S.
Steckler, Charles T.
Steed, Tom B.
Stephens, Daniel P.
Stephens, Kensel E.
Stewart, Francis J.
Stickelberger, Robert W.
Stiehm, Bruce G.
Stierwalt, Charles A.
Stillwell, William H.
Stimpson, Mark A.
Stitzel, David H., II
Stobbs, Emmett E.
Stoessl, Leslie
Stokoe, James H.
Storms, Robert B.
Stout, James C.
Stout, Peter C.
Strachwitz, Hubert J.
Straight, Donald O.
Stratton, Sylvan D.
Straub, John H.
Strickland, Robert L.
Strohsahl, George H., Jr.
Strommer, Frederick A.
Strysick, Richard B.
Sturtevant, Richard E.
Stutzer, William T.
Styles, Harold J.
Sudholz, Herman O.
Sullivan, Hamilton R.
Sullivan, David D.
Sullivan, John L.
Sullivan, Francis J.
Summerlin, Benjamin F.
Summerson, Richard B.
Summey, James W., III
Supersano, Raphael T.
Susag, Gary R.
Sutton, Troy J.
Swafford, William T.
Swaney, John L.
Swann, Oscar
Swazey, John M.
Szczypinski, Walter S., Jr.
Taber, David C.
Taft, James R.
Tahamont, David
Talbert, Lee R.
Tamony, Joseph M.
Tarpgaard, Peter T., Jr.
Taylor, Bruce A., Jr.
Taylor, Forrest T.
Taylor, James R.
Taylor, Richard I.
Temple, John W.
Temple, James W.
Templeton, Felix E.
Tenkhoff, Philip A.
Thompson, Fred E.
Thompson, James M.
Thompson, Stanley P.
Thompson, David R.
Threadgill, Carl G.
Thresher, Alfred A., II
Thursby, Cecil H.
Tibbetts, John W.
Tidd, James F.
Tiedmann, Hollie J., Jr.
Tighe, Jack L.
Tiller, Richard J.
Tilton, Allan P.
Timby, William H.
Tindall, Samuel J., Jr.
Tingle, Andrew J.
Tobin, James D.
Tobin, Wallace E., III
Todd, Bennett E., Jr.
Tomajczyk, Charles F., Jr.
Tomlinson, Rodney G.
Tonelli, Video V.
Tosloskie, John J.
Touchstone, Frederick F., Jr.
Touhey, Robert J.
Tracy, Leslie R.
Tremblay, Victor J.
Trimbach, Charles G.
Trimbur, Arthur F.
Trollope, Richard G.
Trossbach, Ronald C.
Troyer, David D.
Truax, Daniel M.
Truly, Richard H.
Tschida, Robert M.
Tuchscherer, Richard D.
Tucker, Henry C., III
Tuggle, Ralph E.
Turkington, William W., III
Turner, Gale N.
Turner, John W.
Turner, Tom D.
Tussing, Jearold A.
Tuthill, Donald L.
Udebrock, Jack H.
Umsted, Truxtun
Underwood, Arloff V.
Uriell, Harlan F.
Ussery, James D.
Valenti, Patrick C.
VanAllen, William M. D.
Vance, Earl D.
Vance, John W., III
VanCuran, Russell F.
VanDiver, William C.
Vangemert, Richard J.
VanNort, Peter S.
VanVeen, Francis A.
Varni, Gerard F.
Vasey, Robert C., III
Vasques, Ramon
Vaughan, Joseph S.
Vaughan, John S.
Vaughan, Ishamel W.
Vaughn, Carl E.
Vaughn, Thurman H.
Veazey, Sidney E.
Vedral, Charles, Jr.
Verheijen, Gerrit J., Jr.
Vincent, Charles D.
Vogt, John F.
Vogt, Larry G.
Volgenau, Douglas
Vollaire, Robert L.
Wagner, Robert C.
Waidley, William E.
Wainwright, Howard E.
Wainwright, Jonathan M.
Waldrup, James C.
Walker, Harry C.
Walker, Harley E., Jr.
Walker, John W.
Walker, Lee H.
Walker, Leo F.
Wall, Paul E.
Wallace, Michael W.
Wallace, Donald J. H.
Wallace, Eddie H.
Waller, James W.
Walls, Harold D., II
Walters, Arthur K., Jr.
Walters, Jimmy C.
Walton, Martin H.
Ward, John P.
Ward, Randall W.
Ward, Richard F.
Ward, Samuel R.
Wardlow, Louis B.
Ware, Downey M.
Ware, James R., Jr.
Warmunde, Aubrey H., Jr.
Warner, Calvin R.
Warson, Toby G.
Wasmund, Thomas L.
Watkins, William R.
Watson, Robert F.
Watt, John M., Jr.
Wayland, Henry P., Jr.
Weaver, Larry S.
Weaver, Woodrow W.
Webb, Obil J., Jr.
Webster, Edward C.
Wehner, Charles W.
Weikert, John P.
Wellborn, Raymond B.
Welsh, Joseph W.
Wermecke, John D.
Wesley, Terrell C., III
West, Norris R.
West, Terence H.
West, Ward L.
Westfahl, Richard K.
Weston, Robert M., Jr.
Weyhing, Edward J.
Wheatley, Gary F.
Wheaton, William C.
Wheeland, Paul P.
Wheeler, Herbert C.
Wheeler, James R.
Wheeler, Wayne H.
Whipps, Russell E.
Whitaker, Edson
White, Arlie R.
White, Bob P.
White, Henry M., Jr.
White, Robert E.
Whitehead, Verne B.
Whitemore, William F.
Whitt, Darnell M., II
Whitworth, Charles A.
Wice, Leroy P.
Wienandt, Melvin W.
Wigen, Richard A.
Wiggin, Charles C.
Wilcox, Arden J.
Wilderman, Alvin L.
Wile, Alan R., Jr.
Wiley, Bill B.
Wiley, Robert C.
Wilhelm, George C.
Wilkins, Perry
Wilkinson, Charles J.
Will, Raymond M.
Williams, Chester W., Jr.
Williams, Douglas D., Jr.
Williams, Gerald F.
Williams, James M.
Williams, John H., Jr.
Williams, John R.
Williams, Ralph Z.
Williams, Robert A.
Williams, Ronald E.
Williams, Thomas O., Jr.
Williams, Wayne N.
Williams, Windell V.
Williamson, James R.
Williamson, Mark H.
Williamson, Varnadore M.
Willihnganz, Paul W.
Willingham, Robert J., Jr.
Wilson, Alger L.
Wilson, Charles M., Jr.
Wilson, Clyde C.
Wilson, Eugene J.
Wilson, Herbert C.
Wilson, James P.
Wilson, Paul L.
Wilson, William R.
Winter, Richard F.
Winthrop, Griffith J.
Wireman, Paul H.
Wirth, Gerard H.
Wirth, William T.
Wiseman, Aaron D., Jr.

Wishchuk, John L.
Withers, John H.
Witt, Charles D.
Witzke, Bernard W.
Wixom, Barney D.
Wofford, Thomas M.
Wolfe, Don C.
Wolynies, Jon G.
Wommack, Roland R.
Wondolowski, Alexander A.
Wood, Avery G., Jr.
Woolley, William J.
Worley, Kenneth C., Jr.
Wortman, George E.
Wright, Perry W.
Wu, Theodore W., Jr.
Wynn, Walter P., Jr.
Yaworsky, William J.
Yeaman, Myrl A.
Yeaple, Donald S.
Yenchko, Raymond A.
Yerkes, George M.
Yoder, Max N.
York, Milton W.
Youmans, Grenville
Young, Carroll J.
Young, David S.
Young, Howard L., Jr.
Young, James T.
Young, Vernon O.
Youngmann, Kenneth C.
Zachary, William H., Jr.
Zanoni, Angelo J.
Zanzot, Warren L.
Zapalac, James C.
Zimmerman, Joseph G.
Zimmerman, Francis H.
Zimmerman, Harold W.
*Axtell, Lawrence H:
*Botkin, Harry L.
*Cauvet, Kenneth B.
*Chandler, David F.
*Clarke, Ronald E.
*Fox, James C.
*Fox, Richard A.
*Franks, Richard N.
*Gladding, Thomas, Jr.
*Haenze, Leroy R.
*Luce, Ralph W., III
*Martinez, James R.
*McAtee, Donald E.
*Michl, Daniel J.
*Miller, George A.
*Mink, Leon M.
*Mullin, George C.
*Parrish, Thomas D.
*Peters, Donald L.
*Pidgeon, Edward T., Jr.
*Ring, William R.
*Ruby, Scott M.
*Sandke, William K.
*Sawdey, Phillip G.
*Smith, Leon T.
*Stevick, Jerold C., Jr.
*Verney, George M.
*Wilson, Dennis K.
*Kirkpatrick, Milton W., Jr.
*Baker, Henry T.
*Blades, William R.
*Driscoll, Charles F.
*Durgin, Herbert P.
*Grosenbach, Glen R.
*Hutchison, William B.
*Kennedy, Richard
*Klotzner, Virgil M.
*Mitchell, Hillary M.
*Savage, Billy B.
*Smith, Henry B.
*Snyder, Carl L.
*Sorrell, Frederick L.
*Stith, Charles E.
*Tew, Louis M.
*Turner, Frank M.
*VonGenk, Henry E., Jr.
*Welk, Emil J., Jr.
*Wollard, Paul L.
*Arbuckle, William S.
*Cameron, Ronald D.
*Clarity, Michael G.
*Clegg, William L.
*Dafoe, James L.
*Forst, Ronald J.
*Foster, Robert G.
*Fullerton, George E., Jr.
*Furminger, Harry C.
*Hinkell, John W.
*Hodge, Don W.
*Hoene, Edward R.
*Hogan, Thomas W.
*Hope, Lawrence A., Jr.
*Iverson, Dale A.
*Kirk, Daniel K., Jr.
*Lavender, Carlos F.
*Luter, Thomas H.
*Maier, Peter T.
*Mangol, Frederick N.
*McCue, Jerome E.
*Messervy, Harold V.
*Moore, William B. Jr.
*Mosher, Norman G.
*Parker, Richard L.
*Pries, Robert E.
*Sherman, John M.
*Springer, Judson H.
*Sweeney, Charles J., Jr.
*Thomas, James P. L.
*Thorne, Charles E.
*Vaden, Thomas R.
*Webber, George E.
*Whitby, Ralph E., Jr.
*Alverson, William R.
*Applegate, Thomas M.
*Blake, Donald T.
*Boyle, Robert D.
*Bryson, William M.
*Chambers, Frank T.
*Dion, Malcolm C.
*Freeman, Melvin C.
*Haney, William C.
*Hargon, John B.
*Hylton, Robert M.
*Johnston, Joshua T. S.
*Katusha, David F.
*Kelley, Alfred S.
*Koontz, Albert P.
*Ledbetter, Elmer A.
*Lewis, Harry G.
*Loomis, Eugene O.
*Lowther, Donald E.
*Mars, Robert C.
*McGinnis, Fon C., Jr.
*Minteer, Glenn L.
*Montgomery, Robert G.
*Oliff, Graham K.
*Renwick, John M.
*Taylor, David E.
*Theodorides, Theodore
*Zietzke, William L.
*Briggs, Roger C.
*Collis, Charles D.
*Crowninshield, George W.
*Donnellan, Robert I.
*Dowd, John E., Jr.
*Fleming, James J.
*Foss, Donald M.
*Goodwin, Robert L., Jr.
*Hodge, Byron F.
*Hoech, Donald G.
*Hulson, Roger P.
*King, William K.
*Martin, David A.
*McCormick, Gerald J.
*McFerren, Robert W.
*Mendenhall, Carlos C., Jr.
*O'Neil, James M.
*Perrotti, Manuel V.
*Pottratz, Richard K.
*Sinclair, Donald L., Jr.
*Strong, Bruce W.
*Toia, Thomas J., Jr.
*Truax, Robert C.
*VanAtta, Jerry L.
*Venter, David G.
*VonEssen, William A.
*Anthony, Leland C.
*Badger, Patrick M., Jr.
*Bieber, Gene L.
*Crawford, Arthur G.
*Doane, Milton S.
*Greve, William H.
*Harding, Robert C.
*Houck, Jack C.
*Johnson, Bernie F.
*Lanam, Jackson M.
*Minick, William E.
*Selberg, Leroy P.
*Trigg, Beldon H.
*Wynn, Fulton R.
*Bishop, William J.
*Carpenter, John E.
*Edwards, Robert L.
*Gocke, Thomas A.
*Hacker, Benjamin T.
*Ives, David W.
*Johnson, Buddy C.
*Moreland, Robert D.
*Pinson, Firman L.
*Porter, Richard B.
*Shea, John J.
*Shelby, Lawrence T.
*Sisley, Dale L.
*Boltz, Norman D.
*Boone, Harold L.
*Brodie, Judson M., Jr.
*Carter, Burnett W.
*Conklin, Harold R.
*Graul, Julius G.
*Hansen, Philip V.
*Hibbs, Benjamin C.
*Inman, Willard D.
*Jensen, Russell J.
*Jones, Frank L.
*McDaniel, James G.
*Skjod, Chester J.
*Sobieck, Gerard A.
*Twyman, Dale E.
*Youngberg, Guy M.
*Andres, Charles G.
*Bailey, Fred W.
*Bair, James R.
*Bell, Billy C.
*Bishop, John W.
*Bleynat, Edward L.
*Bock, Karl F.
*Brown, Dale S., Jr.
*Carlson, Gilman R., Jr.
*Culbertson, Wylie J.
*Dougherty, "J" Alvin
*Driver, Ace C., Jr.
*Forman, William S.
*Fox, Sharon L.
*Galavotti, Edward L.
*Gracy, Ronald A.
*Jordan, Donald H.
*Kirsch, Walter J., III
*Kopec, Thad L.
*LeBlanc, Richard A.
*MacKinnon, Richard A.
*Maguire, John E.
*Mascola, Richard F., Jr.
*Mayden, Earl L.
*McCall, Ralph B.
*McClendon, Leigh A., III
*Meeker, Charles M.
*Moore, Craig B.
*Nelson, Donald E.
*Norris, Elliott W.
*Owen, John F.
*Petersen, Halvor N.
*Pippenger, William W.
*Richard, Roy A.
*Roach, Ronald G.
*Robinette, Hillary M.
*Schluntz, Frank R.
*Schweizer, Otto A., Jr.
*Stout, Richard D.
*Troncalli, Donald L.
*Warmbir, Kenneth M.
*Wright, William A.
*Brown, Boyd A.
*Laterza, Louis M.
*Glenn, Robert L.
*Hahn, Donald L.
*Lamer, Wayne L.
*Quigley, Joseph M.
*Sharpe, Phillip W.
*Wilcox, Guy I.
*Begg, Robert A.
*Bell, Jack L.
*Bender, Harold G.
*Bowlby, Carl A.
*Boyles, Allen D.
*Broomhead, Kenneth H.
*Diggs, Bernard W., Jr.
*Fries, William
*Holland, Richard P.
*Huntley, Herbert E.
*Jacobs, Eldon E.
*Joe, Lawrence P.
*Jones, William O.
*Lyman, Relle L.
*Milana, Philip A.
*Murphy, Arthur R.
*Runyon, Malcolm T., Jr.
*Smallwood, Roger C.
*Soohoo, Moo T.
*Sparkman, Delous R.
*Stuart, Frederick B.
*Tate, Kenneth P.
*Uber, William J.
*Wilkerson, John M.
*Been, John T., II
*Blanch, Robert F.
*Branchflower, Norman H., Jr.
*Davidson, Donald D.
*Franklin, Ernest C.
*Hall, Michael R.
*Hawes, John K.
*Kelley, Robert D.
*Milanytch, Nickolas I.
*Moore, Davil W.
*Nichols, James R.
*Poff, David E.
*Templeton, Robert N.
*Todaro, Fred M.
*Waters, Irving A., Jr.
*Wrightman, Carl A.
*Anderson, Harland D.
*Aspenwall, Albert M.
*Bland, Charles W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Armour, Robert C.
Arnold, James L.
Ashbacher, Allen F.
Austin, Robert R.
Avilesalfaro, Bolivar, Jr.
Awada, James G.
Bailer, Carl A.
Ballard, William H., Jr.
Bayles, Ronald S.
Beck, Martin L.
Bell, Ronald M.
Bender, James L.
Bian, John W.
Billings, Thomas H.
Biver, David A.
Blackburn, Albert E.
Blackwell, Lind B.
Bloom, Jardine C.
Bohensky, Donald F.
Boltz, Jacob
Borders, Deforrest, Jr.
Bowman, Arnold R.
Branson, William H.
Brassington, Abram A.
Bray, John J., Jr.
Brinkerhoff, Clifford N.
Brock, Harry J., Jr.
Burden, David G.
Burnett, Chester I., Jr.
Bush, William J.
Byrd, James J.
Carter, William A.
Casasanto, Joseph
Chase, Thane "B"
Christensen, Thomas W.
Clemente, Vincent F.
Coenen, Walter D. E.
Cole, Peter S.
Cook, Bennie W.
Cooper, Donald R.
Corbett, Vergle E.
Cox, Marion H.
Crabtree, William H.
Crooks, Robert E., Jr.
Crosby, Alexander C.
Culbertson, Morris D.
Cullen, Donald D.
Cummings, Samuel R., III
Cunningham, John J., Jr.
Custis, John P.
Dare, Joseph C.
Davis, James M.
Dean, Claire T., Jr.
Dean, Robert W.
Dempsey, Edward J.
Denney, Jay R.
Desmarais, Normand D.
Ditmore, Carl A., Jr.
Drinnon, James W., Jr.
Dyches, James W.
Ebey, John R.
Edmondson, Aaron D.
Ellermeier, Joel D.
Endzel, Edward W.
Erickson, Roger C.
Evans, Albert F.
Evans, Steven H.
Farley, Arthur G.
Faul, David C.
Fedora, John
Felt, John D.
Fenwick, Charles L.
Flammger, Jerome T.
Foster, Thomas L.
Fournier, Alexander F., III
Francis, Thomas M.
Freeburg, Gene R.
Frizzell, Frank L., Jr.
Gantt, Lynn M.
Garner, Fred S.
Gau, Lawrence G.
Goodman, Jack R.
Gregorich, Kenneth J.
Groom, Robert W.
Grossman, Stephen Z.
Hadbavny, John W.
Halstead, Clyde R., Jr.
Hamlin, Rudolph B.
Hampton, Phillip W.
Hardin, Jonathon J., Jr.
Harris, Neal L.
Hay, Vernon M.
Heidelbaugh, Warren R.
Henion, Alan M.
Hessler, Blair
Hickey, Daniel F., Jr.
Higgins, Richard L.
Hollingshead, Richard A.
Howard, Robert L., Jr.
Hudalla, Anthony E.
Huddleston, Roy L.
Hulan, Milton T.
Hults, James A.
Inman, James E.
Jackson, Edward M.
Jackson, Leon A.
Jacroux, Paul E.
James, Robert C.
Jaminet, John A.
Jewett, Grey R., Jr.
Johnson, Edward M., Jr.
Jones, Bobby J.
Jones, Everett L., III
Jones, Ramon W.
Jones, Richard W.
Jordan, James C., Jr.
Julian, Gerald P.
Keiser, James A.
Keller, James G.
Kelly, James A.
Kenin, David
Kenly, William R.
Kennedy, Albert J.
Kenney, Thomas R.
Kitts, Willis M.
Knapp, Emmett J.
Koczur, Eugene
Koncar, William R.
Krakower, Matthew A.
Kraus, Joseph
Kreig, William C.
Krummel, John C.
Kruse, Marlin L.
Kubasch, Donley D.
Kwolek, John R.
Lamphear, Steven C.
Leber, Theodore T., Jr.
Leduc, Arthur R.
Ledwig, Donald E.
Lee, Richard H.
Leeson, Donald D.
Leisenring, Richard P.
Ligon, Samuel J., Jr.
Lindberg, Warren E.
Lokey, Leonard N., Jr.
Longshore, Richard E.
Lynam, Edward J.
Lytle, James A.
Machesky, John M.
Manly, Robert L.
Marble, Alfred C., Jr.
March, Frederick W.
Marshall, Solomon W., Jr.
Mazurek, Stanley F.
McAdams, William M.
McAllister, Dudley S., Jr.
McCarthy, Harold J.
McClure, Robert A.
McClurkin, David K.
McDowell, Charles I. T.
McGarvey, Richard L.
McGee, Bernard J.
McLeod, Billy L.
McWhorter, Fred O.
Meany, John P., Jr.
Medlin, James W.
Meginnis, Donald L.
Meier, John D.
Mezzio, George H.
Moore, John A.
Morrison, Roger T.
Murphy, Henry T., Jr.
Napier, William L.
Naughton, Robert E.

Neidel, John A.
Nettles, Lawrence J.
Newton, William A., Jr.
Noble, Francis E.
O'Brien, Daniel A.
O'Donnell, John P.
Ott, Thomas S.
Overman, Douglas R.
Parker, Charles E.
Parker, Donald W.
Parsons, Frank W.
Parsons, Stanley S.
Peck, Leo J.
Peters, Donald T.
Powell, William E., Jr.
Poxon, Howard W., Jr.
Prehodka, Theodore H.
Ransdell, Maurice G.
Ray, Harold P.
Ray, Harold L., Jr.
Reed, David A.
Reuscher, Edward J.
Riplog, Duane T.
Robie, Ralph L., Jr.
Ross, Edward A.
Roth, Jon B.
Rumpf, Robert L.
Rush, William G.
Salmon, Robert C.
Schleck, Peter J.
Schlenker, Robert L.
Schneider, Richard D.
Scruggs, Claude P.
Seeburger, John E., Jr.
Selgelid, Larry C.
Serafin, John R.
Sharron, Richard O.
Shaw, Jerry W.
Sherman, Byron G.
Sherwood, William C.
Shiels, John M.
Shorrock, Charles M.
Sleeth, Sterlen S., Jr.
Smellow, Edwin N.
Smith, Billy G.
Smith, William E.
Spage, Basil A.
Spearman, Wayne C.
Staats, Charles T.
Starbuck, George A.
Stauffer, John L.
Stehly, Frederick R.
Steidle, Robert E.
Stewart, Robert B.
Stigliano, Carmen N.
Stofanak, Matthew A.
Stone, William W.
Sturges, Michael S.
Sturhahn, David P.
Talbot, Cecil "J"
Tallant, Arnold
Thiss, Hoyt B., Jr.
Thompson, Donald D.
Thurn, Charles W.
Tribbie, Arthur S.
Ubbink, Joseph T.
Vandoren, Harry K.
Vaughan, George F.
Verplaetse, Ronald A.
Vevoda, George L.
Villella, Conrad L.
Wadsworth, William T.
Walker, Samuel J.
Waller, Billy G.
Walther, Harrison N.
Webb, Robert D.
Weinsteger, Robert R.
Weiss, Frederick B.
Welsh, Gerald H.
Willen, Michael D.
Willett, Roy
Williams, John P.
Willis, Gerald W.
Wilmoth, James P., III
Wolcott, John N.
Wolff, Norman D.
Wood, Allen
Wood, Leonard L.
Wright, Joe B.
Yeager, Howard B.
Young, Adrian R.
Young, Emmett N.
Zscheile, Richard E.
Zuntag, Alexander E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Annable, Weldon G., III
Austin, Donald R.
Barker, Walter R.
Bawden, Gordon W.
Bell, Warren M.
Bonham, Paul W., Jr.
Boothe, Allen P.
Bottger, George C.
Bottorff, David E.
Brabston, William N.
Bundy, Melvin D.
Butler, David E.
Currie, Wayne L.
Davis, Gene
Davis, Harry P., Jr.
Dettbarn, John L.
Doughty, Edward E.
Eaton, Clarence V.
Emsley, Thomas H.
Fauver, Edwin M., Jr.
Fogle, Fredric D.
Fraunces, George D.
Gill, David A.
Gunther, John A.
Hayes, Robert C.
Hendrick, Larry F.
Herig, William E., Jr.
Ives, Jon R.
Ivie, William M., Jr.
Jacobsen, John R.
Kau, Julian M. F.
Kelly, Clinton W., III
Kolar, Ronald E.
Lafond, John A.
Laton, Richard W.
Lewis, Quentin E. D.
Majure, Leyon M.
Martin, Roger G.
Marts, George A.
Matthews, William G.
McCorvey, Donald L., Jr.
McGee, George D.
Metz, Theodore D.
Mintun, James H., Jr.
Monarch, Delmont J., Jr.
Muir, Michael D.
Myers, Theodore S.
Naegele, Frederich D.
Osborn, James H.
Parisius, Philip J.
Patterson, Joe T., Jr.
Podbielski, Victor
Poole, Arthur S., Jr.
Preston, Robert L.
Scrabis, Joseph R.
Shackelford, Robert H., Jr.
Short, Roy E.
Sifferman, Donald J.
Smart, Robert D.
Smith, Theodore A.
Sporhase, George L. D.
Stangl, Herbert E. A.
Swistock, John R.
Tack, Curtis A.
Thornton, Paul A.
Tibbitts, Jonathan C., Jr.
Truesdell, Richard C.
Updegrove, Loyal R.
Wagner, David R.
Weiss, Ralph C.
Wells, Howard A., Jr.
Westdyke, Robert G.
Wisenbaker, Richard Y.
Wood, William L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anderson, Francis G., Jr.
Auton, William J.
Bagnall, Donald L.
Blake, John P.
Bleh, Harry W.
Boyle, John A., Jr.
Bristow, Bertram W.
Brugman, Arthur P.
Butler, Robert C.
Clayton, Walter H.
Cole, Charles C.
Conover, Fredric G.
Darr, Kenneth L.
Delaney, Thomas J.
Demo, James R.
Dewey, William A.
Egan, David J.
Erickson, Carl E.
Faherty, Francis X.
Fallers, Harry R., Jr.
Ferguson, Donald R.
Fitts, Marvin L.
Geiger, Robert E.
Godfrey, Walter A., Jr.
Graves, Joseph L.
Grice, Ruddle L.
Hammett, Gene L.
Harris, George S.
Harrison, Don C., Jr.
Hassey, Jasper T.
Hensle, Harold R.
Hinds, Robert B.
Hines, Kenneth F.
Hourihan, Catherine P.
Johnson, Ralph W.
Jones, Bob A., Jr.
Kenlon, Robert R.
Krollman, Richard W.
Laliberty, George W.
Lawson, Charles W.
Liming, John W., Jr.
Martin, Melton L.
McCullagh, Robert F.
Meitl, Eugene F.
Menges, Robert P.
Moran, Robert F.
Mountain, Charles R.
Mulrennan, John A., Jr.
Nelson, Jack A.
Pavlick, John E.
Pritchard, Glenn E.
Reeves, Donald E.
Reynolds, Joseph L.
Richardson, Fredric M.
Richardson, Langston E., Jr.
Roper, Charles A.
Schroeder, William H.
Scott, Jimmie D.
Spiegler, Joel B.
Spurgeon, Troy L.
Steil, James J.
Teague, Francis A., Jr.
Thompson, James C.
Tiller, Charles E.
Weidner, Wilfred L.
Wentworth, Richard L.
Wire, George W.
Wright, Donald N.
Zimmerman, Lonnie V.

NURSE CORPS

Arthur, Margaret J.
Baker, Mary E.
Dunn, Julie J.
Fillmore, Elizabeth J.
Kowaski, Gloria M. A.
Lockwood, Lavon R.
Lyter, Eleanor M.
Mann, Elizabeth M.
O'Brien, Carol E.
O'Neal, Eleanor D.
Ottoson, Joan
Peters, Edna L.
Schalz, Alice F.
Scott, Janet
Stravinsky, Joan F.
Warner, Patricia A.
Zatzariny, Tanya

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander, Line

*Aghassian, Lillian A.
*Casey, Eleanor M.
*Dalier, Beatrice E.
*Streeter, Ruth M.

Commander, Supply Corps

*Aplin, Mary J.

Lieutenant Commander, Line

*Bradford, Alice V.
Brown, Mary L.
*Bryant, Bessie C.
*Ebeling, Mary S.
*Frawley, Mildred J.
*Hill, Betty J.
Hoy, Barbara J.
Hunn, Eleanor K.
*Koestline, Sarah E.
Mandt, Maxine A.
*McQuesten, Ruth B.
Way, Evelyn D.
*Whitfield, Ruth V.
Williamson, Mary L.

Lieutenant Commander, Supply Corps

*Tomsuden, Ruth M.

Lieutenant, Line

Allen, Barbara L.
Armstrong, Jan V.
Belanger, Walterine M.
Bole, Barbara
Bostwick, Sally L.
Duffy, Mary D.
Dupes, Yvonne M.
Hamil, Martha M.
Harris, Patricia A. N.
Kelly, Barbara J.
Kraemer, Barbara J.
Lips, Martha N.
Mooney, Kathryn M.
Moulton, Betty M.
Peterson, Doris A.
Roan, Berntelle
Roberts, Suzanne
Satow, Hiroko
Sherwood, Carol A.
Underwood, Shirley J.
Vail, Doris R.
Walters, Angalene F.
Williams, Greta A.
Yeoman, Marjorie A.

Edward P. Stone, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

Edward P. Stone, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of ensign.

Lt. (junior grade) Joseph H. Luallen, Jr., and Lt. (junior grade) Robert B. Young for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law. Both officers have been issued ad interim appointments.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

James C. Goodman
Stuart A. Merriken

Haywood H. Harrell, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Robert A. Dropp, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Roger A. Anderson
Charles C. Barcus
James C. Goodman
Cecil E. Myers, Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Roger A. Anderson
Charles C. Barcus
Kevin R. Keating
Cecil E. Myers, Jr.
Beverly S. Pankey
Leonard W. Schulz
Joseph M. Sullivan
James J. Wallace

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Richard P. Doctor
Dennis J. Fitzgerald, Jr.
John J. Gallen, Jr.
Thomas D. Murtaugh

Robert A. Dropp, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Binaghi, Joanne T.
Botzum, Diane
Bowden, Marilyn F.
Cate, Diana J.
Catlin, June M.
Coye, Beth F.
Delarot, Anna M.
Derrough, Lois A.
Emmett, Virginia A.
Fallon, Margaret A.
Gallagher, Kathleen O.
Hazard, Roberta L.
Hersley, Janet L.
Heustis, Rita J.
Hoag, Jean W.
Horton, Ethel L.
Huber, Katherine B.
Hurlbut, Bonny A.
Jones, Patricia
Metcalf, Maryjane H.
Mohorich, Helen M.
Ragan, Mary E.
Ragozzine, Carolyn M.
Rindlaub, Beverly M.
Rouse, Kay E.
Shea, Cynthia M.
Sherman, Linda K.
Smith, Karol A.
Staehlin, Marlene J.
Steffer, Barbara A.
Taylor, Mary E.
Watlington, Sarah J.
Ablowich, Dean A.
Adler, Alan B.
Affourtit, Daniel J., Jr.
Aldrich, William L.
Allen, Bert L.
Allen, James W.
Allen, Larry D.
Allen, Robert J.
Allison, Charles P., Jr.
Allison, Robert E.
Alrick, Richard D.
Amend, Robert J.
Ames, Albert M.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, Charles E.
Anderson, Thomas M.
Anderson, Roger A.
Anderson, Robert E.
Anderson, Ira B.
Anderson, Dean T.
Anderson, Lewis G.
Anderson, James W.
Anthony, John A., III
Antonio, Robert J.
Aragona, Francis J.
Armes, Donald S.
Arms, Philip B., Jr.
Arrasmith, Thomas M., III

Ashbaugh, Charles I.
Ashley, Roger T.
Askren, Merlin G.
Atkinson, David E.
Aurell, Donald L.
Ausley, Paul C., Jr.
Averna, Vincent S.
Avore, Malcolm A.
Aycock, Charles B.
Ayers, John P.
Babcock, Ronald C.
Babcock, William L.
Babiash, William E.
Bacon, Daniel K.
Baesman, Richard F.
Bailey, Charles E., Jr.
Bailey, Edward W.
Bailey, Grover C., III
Bailey, Stanley J., Jr.
Baker, Arthur J., III
Baker, Joseph G.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, Robert P.
Bales, Edward W.
Ball, Richard A.
Ballamy, William C.
Ballard, Gary D.
Ballard, James O., Jr.
Ballard, William C.
Ballinger, Roy G.
Ballou, Charles L.
Bancroft, William P.
Banister, Richard M.
Banks, Peter M.
Banks, Richard
Banner, David R.
Barber, Stephen W.
Barclay, William A.
Barcus, Charles C.
Bard, Stephen A.
Barell, John F.
Barnes, Harley H., Jr.
Barnes, James R.
Barney, Thomas McN.
Barns, David W.
Barnum, Daniel B
Barr, Charles T.
Barrett, Robert W.
Barringer, Larry E.
Barry, Kenneth R.
Bartels, Albert L.
Bartlett, William W.
Bartolett, Frank S., III
Barton, Glenn L.
Bartsch, Thomas J.
Bartusek, Marion E.
Bass, William F.
Bassett, James R.
Batchellor, John K., Jr.
Bates, Barry T.
Bates, George E., Jr.
Bates, Henry W.
Baublitz, John E.
Bauer, Roger A.
Baxley, Jarman G.
Bayley, Christopher T.
Beam, Henry H.
Beam, James C.
Beardshall, Elmer W., Jr.
Beatty, Thomas J.
Bee, Fred A.
Beebe, Bruce A.
Beguin, Stephen D.
Bell, Charles F.
Bell, Gary E.
Bell, Nolie L.
Bell, Robert W., Jr.
Benedict, George A.
Benge, Albert H.
Bengston, Robert G.
Bennett, Henry M.
Bennett, Roger L.
Binnigson, Lawrence A.
Benson, Jerome E.
Benson, Leo, III
Benson, Perry S.
Berberich, William D.
Berg, George W., Jr.
Berger, Walter E., III
Bergert, James W.
Berkowitz, Ross
Berreman, Robert C.
Berube, Raymond E., Jr.
Betterton, Don M.
Beveridge, Jerry D.
Beyers, Stephen J.
Bicknell, James N.
Bickum, Gilbert W.
Bidwell, Charles B.
Billings, Robert A.
Billings, David J.
Binder, Donald
Birchett, John A. K. III
Birtwistle, Richard, III
Bissell, Allen M.
Bittenbender, Karl C.
Black, Phillip R.
Black, Rudolph R.
Blacker, Richard W.
Blackford, Peter B.
Blair, Charles R.
Blanding, Richard L.
Blanke, Warren J., Jr.
Blankmeyer, Richard J.
Bliss, Robert B., II
Blockinger, Alvin F., Jr.
Blome, Dennis J.
Bloom, Norman C.
Bloore, John L.
Bobay, Gary J.
Bodenner, George E.
Bodie, Michael W.
Boecker, Donald V.
Boggs, Dallas B.
Bogle, Robert J.
Bolden, David R.
Bolinger, Charles W.
Bonnel, Gordon A.
Bonneville, Joseph E., Jr.
Bocher, David M.
Booth, Ronald J.
Boquist, Edwin R.
Bornemann, Alfred
Bos, Peter G.
Boswell, Freddie L., Jr.,
Bourke, Robert H.
Bowen, Dennis P.
Bowling, Weldon J.
Bowman, Peter B.
Bowman, Robert J.
Bowser, John V.
Boyer, Larry A.
Boyle, Francis J.
Braden, Morse S.
Bradley, Ronnie A.
Brady, John B.
Brandel, Roland E.
Brandon, John R.
Brandquist, Roland
Branson, Harry W., Jr.
Braun, Frank B.
Breckenridge, Donald R.
Breeding, Donald C.
Brenton, Robert J.
Brewer, Shelby T.
Bringhurst, William, Jr.
Briselden, Don J.
Broach, John C.
Broadfield, Donald E.
Broadwell, William R.
Broadwell, Ronald E.
Brockman, John L., Jr.
Brockway, Edwards L.
Broemser, Gary M.
Broerman, Neal J.
Brower, Robert L.
Brown, Charles K.
Brown, Clyde E.
Brown Elbert L., Jr.
Brown, Floyd W.
Brown, James M.
Brown, Marion L.
Brown, Ralph B.
Bruce, Estel E.
Bruce James W., Jr.
Bruntlett, Carl E.
Brust, Philip J.
Bryan, Timothy E.
Bryant, Cordis C.
Bubeck, Robert C.
Buchart, John R.
Buehler, Roy R.
Buenz, Peter R.
Bullock, James P.
Bundy, Jerry L.
Burdge, Ronald E.
Burhoe, John T.
Burke, Robert D.
Burnham, Robert C.
Burns, Daniel R.
Burns, David F.
Burns, Walter W., Jr.
Burroughs, Eugene S., III
Burton, Robert E.
Bush, Thomas O.
Butler, David E.
Butler, Harry P.
Butler, Marvin B.
Bybee, Raymon A.
Byrne, Barry J.
Byrne, Robert A.
Cadwell, George M., Jr.
Cain, Douglas M., III
Callahan, Thomas J.
Callaway, William E., Jr.
Calvert, Jack D.
Calvert, William R.
Cameron, Allan W.
Cameron, James J.
Carey, William F.
Carl, Robert B.
Carleton, Gerald B.
Carlson, Frederick P.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, John A.
Carlson, Patrick J.
Carlson, William R.
Carpenter, John D., Jr.
Carr, Robert E.
Carson, Richard L.
Carter, Frederick T.
Carwin, Paul L.
Case, Calvin W.
Casey, Stephen H.
Caswell, Gordon C.
Cecil, John P.
Chabot, Peter G.
Chain, David A.
Chalifour, Clark L.
Chancy, Eugene J.
Chapman, Jay W.
Chenard, John H.
Chevalier, Paul E.
Chew, David G.
Chiles, Henry G., Jr.
Christopher, Charles E.
Ciocca, Michael A.
Claman, John S.
Clark, Daniel B.
Clark, Joseph A.
Clark, Kenneth G.
Clark, Theodore L.
Cler, Alfred J., Jr.
Cleveland, Spencer
Clexton, Edward W., Jr.
Clover, Glen E.
Cofer, Horace G.
Cogdell, Gary B.
Cogdill, Thomas J.
Colburn, Richard E.
Cole, Joseph D.
Colegrove, Robert J.
Coleman, Glenn W.
Colley, Michael C.
Collicott, Charles R.
Collier, Wilmer G., Jr.
Collins, Michael L.
Collins, Paul L., Jr.
Collins, Richard B., Jr.
Combemale, Jeanloup R.
Comeau, Charles R.
Conner, William T., Jr.
Connors, Charles W. B.
Cook, Charles I.
Coolican, Donald J.
Cooper, Jerry A.
Cooper, Paul W., Jr.
Corbeille, Reginald C.
Cordell, Glen D.
Correll, Robert A.
Correll, Robert D.
Cotterman, Andrew G.
Cottom, Robert V.
Coughlen, Thomas D.
Coughlin, Daniel T., Jr.
Counsil, William G.
Cover, Donald L.
Cowles, David E.
Cox, Charles J.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Lynn O.
Cox, Paul L.
Cox, Thaddeus C.
Crane, Jay V.
Craver, William D.
Crawford, John W.
Crawford, John C.
Crawford, Denis H.
Creutz, Charles
Crigler, Charles H.
Criste, David M.
Cromack, Dan
Cronfel, Ramsey L.
Crow, Hugh E.
Crowder, Thomas E.
Crowley, Daniel H., Jr.
Cumella, Walter S.
Cummings, Vincent P., Jr.
Cunningham, Glenn J.
Curtis, Grant R.
Curtis, Jon E.
Curtis, Thomas G.
Curtiss, Daniel J.
Dahlem, Francis E.
Dahlgren, Charles E.
Daily, Roger M.
Dalessio, Robert M.
Dalton, John B., Jr.
Damon, David W.
Danforth, William L.
Daschbach, Joseph F.
David, Robert T.
Davidson, William G., III
Davidson, Dennis M.
Davidson, Harry A.
Davies, Robert L.
Davis, Francis J.
Davis, George W.
Davis, John H.
Davis, Richard B.
Davis, Vibert H.
Decker, John P.
Dehaemer, Michael J.
Dehler, Richard F.
Delp, George D.
Delude, Howard D.
Dempsey, Richard E.
Dempster, Duncan F.
Denberger, Jerome N.
Denn, George E., Jr.
Derr, Thomas A.
Devine, Thomas W.
Dewerff, Duane L.
Diaz, David M., Jr.
Diemenderfer, John P.
Dietrich, Lawrence H.
Dietsch, Karl F.
Dillon, Martin C.
Dimitry, Theodore G.
Dimsdale, William
Dineen, James J.
Dirksen, John V.
Dix, Donald W.
Dobes, Joseph C.
Dobrosky, John
Dodson, Richard E.
Dodt, Robert W.
Doege, Arthur G.
Dolan, Peter B.
Dole, Burton A., Jr.
Donahue, Thomas M.
Donlan, Michael F.
Dorman, Leroy M.
Dostal, Ronald J.
Dougher, James B.
Dowell, George W., III
Draughon, Harry C., Jr.
Drummond, William K.
Drury, Bruce R.
Dudley, James I., Jr.
Duffy, Francis K.
Duffy, James F.
Duggan, Edward H., Jr.
Dunbar, Bartlett S.
Duncan, Angus F.
Dunn, James M.
Dunne, Lawrence E.
Durocher, Joseph W.
Dutton, Bruce M.
Earl, Frank S.
Earle, Ronald L., Jr.
Eayre, Dean C.
Eberlein, Bernard E.
Eddins, William R.
Edgerton, Justin R.
Eighme, Dean W.
Eilertsen, James T.
Ellett, Frank T.
Ellis, Martin A.
Embry, Hugh C.
Ericson, James A.
Ervin, James C., Jr.
Esslinger, Jon H.
Estes, Robert F.
Etchells, Edward J.
Evans, Homer D.
Evans, James R.
Evans, John E.
Evans, William R.
Everman, Leon E.
Falk, Dennis J.
Fallin, Thomas B.
Fang, George W.
Fay, Frederick O., Jr.
Febel, Joel W.
Fee, Jerome J.
Fell, David B., Jr.
Fenn, Michael R.
Fethke, Walter P., Jr.
Fetterman, Leroy W.
Fields, Floyd H., Jr.
Finkelstein, Milton M.
Finn, Harold B., III
Fischer, Charles F., II
Fisher, Robert A.
Fitzgerald, Thomas J.
Fitzgerald, Raymond N.
Fitzgerald, James F.
Flanigan, Alan H.
Flath, Eugene J.
Fleming, Charles H. Jr.
Fleming, Michael J.
Flesch, Robert W.
Fletcher, Thomas E.
Flint, James C.
Florence, Earle S.
Flynn, Edward J., Jr.
Flynn, Gerrish C.
Flynn, Henry M., Jr.
Foery, Donald G.
Foley, William H., Jr.
Folta, Kenneth D.
Folts, Roger H.
Foster, George H., Jr.
Foster, William L., Jr.
Fowler, Richard C.
Fox, Henry W.
Fox, James B., III
France, Donald J.
Frank, Robert A.
Franklin, David C.
Franklin, William N.
Freedman, Leonard A.
Freehill, Robert L.
Freeman, Michael H.
Freeman, Thomas G., Jr.
Freiberg, Harold M.
Friedlander, Robert L.
Friedmann, Alfred R.
Frost, Norman C., Jr.
Fussell, William R., Jr.
Gabbard, Thomas H.
Gage, Robert W.
Gage, Paul R.
Gagliardo, James E.
Gaines, Andrew L.
Gallagher, Michael T.
Galletti, Francis P.
Galloway, Earl W.
Gamba, Robert V.
Gans, Thomas G.
Gardner, Glenn D.
Gardner, Helsey E.
Garfield, Peter J.
Garman, Clair E.
Garver, Bruce M.
Gasser, Robert E.
Gassett, Will H.
Gast, Ronald E.
Gaut, Joseph W.
Gauthier, David P.
Gavlak, Michael W.
Gaydos, Cyril M.
Geer, David W.
Gehman, Thomas E.
Geiling, Terry L.
Geller, John B.
Geronime, Lee J.
Gershon, Jon J.
Gerth, Vernon W., Jr.
Geudtner, Richard A.
Gieseke, William D.
Gilbreath, David S.
Gillespie, William M.
Gillett, Lewis C., Jr.
Gilstrap, James R. L.
Gingles, William G.
Gingold, Joel E.
Gneckow, Gerald E.
Gniffke, Bruce A.
Godbold, Wilford D.
Godwin, Gordon T.
Gohara, Roy S.
Golden, Mark M.
Gonsalves, David
Goode, Sanchez
Goodrich, Walker R., Jr.
Gordon, Bradley W.
Gordon, Max H.
Gost, William J.
Gould, Daniel H.
Grafton, Donald L.
Grafton, Jay T.
Graham, William B.
Grant, Carroll D.
Gray, Peter H.
Green, Albert W., Jr.
Green, Conrad G.
Green, Lorin D.
Greenberg, Samuel J.
Gretter, Gary J.
Gridley, Robert H.
Griffin, Robert N.
Grisemer, Alan N.
Grossman, George S., III
Groth, John F.
Gulick, Roger K.
Gwinn, Richard H.
Hagelbarger, Ralph S.
Hagen, John M.
Hale, Frederick G.
Hall, Harry M., Jr.

Halloran, Stephen M.
Hallowell, Benjamin H., Jr.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hamm, Roger G.
Hammond, Charles M., Jr.
Hamon, Richard W.
Hancock, James E.
Hand, David R.
Hankins, Jack T.
Hansen, Elgil L., Jr.
Hansen, Kirby W., Jr.
Hanson Ralph E., Jr.
Harden, Jon D.
Hardin, Bruce H.
Hardister, Rex J.
Hardt, William A.
Hargrave, Paul E.
Harkey, Erskine L., Jr.
Harlett, John C.
Harper, Richard T.
Harris, Carl E., Jr.
Harris, Henry F., Jr.
Harris, Richard A.
Harrison, William D.
Harrison, William L.
Hart, Irving H., III
Haskell, Richard D.
Hastie, William J.
Haubold, Samuel A.
Hauck, Kenneth H., Jr.
Haughton, David E.
Hauser, Gene W.
Hawkins, Robert I.
Hayes, James W.
Hays, John B.
Hays, Leonard C.
Hays, Russell O.
Hazucha, Paul C.
Heacock, Louis W.
Head, Thomas A.
Healy, Patrick R.
Heasley, Allen D.
Heath, David M.
Heckman, Ronald W.
Heger, Wayne F.
Hegg, Daniel R.
Heilpern, Roger F.
Helmann, Jack E.
Helmick, Edwin B.
Helms, David F.
Helms, Lawrence S.
Henderson, Boyd A.
Hennessey, John T.
Henning, Harold E.
Henry, James J., Jr.
Hepburn, Raymond G.
Herbein, John G.
Herkert, Richard H. H.
Herring, J. Michael
Hershdorfer, Gary A.
Hervey, John C., Jr.
Heuberger, Nathan A.
Heuser, Herman F.
Hewitt, John K.
Hickey, Dennis J., IV
Hicks, Robert W.
Hight, Bernice B., Jr.
Hilder, Lewis E.
Hill, Charles W., Jr.
Hill, James D.
Himmelein, Norman T.
Hinely, Elliott P.
Hinkel, Jay E.
Hixson, Harry F., Jr.
Hixson, John D.
Hoch, Robert G., Jr.
Hoecker, Richard G.
Hoffman, Drake A.
Hoffman, Joseph F., Jr.
Hogan, Robert T.
Hoke, John R., II
Holloway, Richard E.
Holmes, Walter M., Jr.
Holt, Albert C., II
Holtz, Robert S.
Hood, William S., Jr.
Hoppin, Thomas B.
Horn, Frank G.
Hornaday, Gregg W.
Hornsby, Michael D.
Horsch, Arthur R.
Hort, John A.
Horton, Jack O., Jr.
Horve, Leslie A.
Houghtlin, Robert G., Jr.
Houk, Donald R.
Hover, Fred B.
Howard, Albert O., Jr.
Howard, James R.
Howell, Norman B.
Hubbard, Charles W., Jr.
Hubbard, Terrence C.
Huber, Dan R.
Huber, Peter J.
Huberman, Benjamin
Hughes, Royston C.
Huhn, John H.
Hull, Charles E.
Hulvershorn, Frederick W.
Hungate, Joseph W.
Hunt, Frank M., Jr.
Hunt, George W., Jr.
Hunter, Raymond B.
Huntzinger, Kent S.
Hurlburt, Joseph S.
Husta, William
Hutchins, James R.
Hutchinson, Bruce R.
Hutt, Thomas E., Jr.
Hutton, Patrick H.
Hyde, Thomas A.
Ianucci, Robert J.
Ide, Charles H.
Ide, Henry C.
Ieuter, Fredric E.
Ilg, Raymond P.
Inderlied, William T., III
Ingram, David L.
Irons, Gary S.
Ivy, Richard G.
Jaap, Joseph D.
Jackson, Gerald W.
James, John D.
Jaye, James M., Jr.
Jeffreys, Robert E.
Jeffries, Henry C., Jr.
Jenkins, Dale A.
Jenkins, Wendal, L.
Jensen, James L., Jr.
Jensen, Robert E.
Jerding, Frederick N.
Johannesen, Robert E.
Johnsen, Donald C.
Johnson, Alfred E.
Johnson, Albert P., Jr.
Johnson, Clinton B.
Johnson, Donn R.
Johnson, Eugene H., Jr.
Johnson, Frederick B.
Johnson, Larry D.
Johnson, Michael O.
Johnson, Ronald E.
Johnson, Ronald B.
Johnston, Douglas M., Jr.
Johnston, James R.
Johnston, Lawrence H., Jr.
Jones, Carroll E.
Jones, David H.
Jones, Gordon S.
Jones, Jerry S.
Jones, Keith S.
Jones, Neil W.
Jones, Raymond G., Jr.
Jones, Ronald L.
Jones, Wallace E.
Jones, Walter R.
Joost, Rodney E.
Jordan, Alexander J., Jr.
Jordan, John L., Jr.
Judd, Deane D.
Juergens, Kenneth C.
Julian, Ronald H.
Justice, Billy D.
Kaelin, James N.
Kaeser, Harold G.
Kagy, Virgil C.
Kahler, Robert C.
Kalb, David G.
Kanady, Garland H., Jr.
Karampelas, Angelo N.
Karsten, Peter J.
Kau, Melvin E. M. K.
Kauffman, Lawrence B.
Kaufmann, Ed
Kay, Francis D.
Keck, Daniel N.
Kee, William D., Jr.
Kehm, William C.
Keister, Jamieson C.
Keithline, William W.
Keliikoa, Edward N.
Kelleher, Dermod
Keltner, Jackie L.
Kennedy, Eugene M.
Kenney, John M.
Kerlin, Roger L.
Kesler, Gene P.
Kessel, Glenn R.
Key, Paul L., II
Khoury, Charles R., Jr.
Killinger, Edwin E.
King, George H., Jr.
King, Jerry C.
King, Kenneth P.
Kinney, James R.
Kishel, Gene F.
Kistler, Michael W., Jr.
Knauer, Frederic S.
Knebel, Jack G.
Knippa, Larry D.
Knopf, Peter W.
Knorr, David J.
Knouse, Phillip K.
Knowles, Charles E.
Koberg, John A.
Koch, Charles E., II
Koener, Ronald S.
Koh, Barry
Kohlmeyer, Charles F.
Kohut, Joseph J.
Koon, Norman C.
Koontz, Ronald L.
Kopp, Elmer M., Jr.
Korte, Joseph N.
Kowall, Robert J.
Kramer, Harvey F.
Kreassig, Richard M.
Krese, Robert A.
Kristensen, Gail A.
Kromer, Ronald C.
Kroyer, George P.
Krulisch, Alan H.
Kubishen, Michael A.
Kujawa, Gail S.
Kunkle, Robert E.
Lafferty, Patrick J.
LaFrance, Marcus G.
Lake, John T.
Lamb, Jay W.
Lamb, Rufus, N., Jr.
Lammers, Lennis L.
Lamontagne, Richard R.
Land, Walter R.
Lane, John W.
Lane, Samuel D.
Lang, James R.
Lang, Joseph M., Jr.
Langdon, Stewart D.
Langen, Joseph H.
Lanham, Michael S.
Lansdowne, Alan E.
Lantz, Phillip E.
Larkin, Eugene F., Jr.
Larsen, Tom B.
Latimer, Peyton R.
Laudig, Larry B.
Laufer, William H.
Lavelle, John M.
Lavery, Richard J., III
Lawinski, Henry A.
Lawrence, Henry L. H., Jr.
Leader, John C.
Leahy, John F., III
Leathem, Douglas B.
Leduc, Ernest R.
Lee, Jerald K.
Lees, Michael J.
Legare, Thomas C. R., Jr.
Lehn, Richard M.
Leimonas, Sigitas
Leipold, Frederick J.
Lettington, Thomas F.
Levine, Emil H.
Levine, Jules I.
Levy, Edwin, Jr.
Lew, Girard T.
Lewis, Harry C.
Lewis, Porter, Jr.
Lewis, Roy T., Jr.
Lewis, William E., Jr.
Lindsey, James A.
Lineberger, William F.
Lippold, Walter J.
Little, Robert R.
Littlefield, James W.
Livingston, James M.
Lloyd, Roger M.
Lloyd, Roger W.
Lloyd, William B., Jr.
Logan, Alexander S.
Loiselle, Valmore J., Jr.
Long, Gaeton A., Jr.
Longaker, Harold L.
Longdon, Robert S.
Longmire, Thomas W.
Longton, Edward B.
Loveland, Kenneth W.
Lowe, Robert W.
Lowsley, Ivon H., Jr.
Loy, Donald L.
Ludwigsen, Charles M.
Lund, Frederick M.
Lunny, Robert M.
Luschen, Henry L.
Lusignan, John M.
Lynch, John F., Jr.
Lyons, Daniel B.
Macaulay, Andrew J.
Mace, James A.
MacKay, George W.
Macke, Richard C.
Mackey, Philip E.
Mackinnon, William B.
MacLeod, Kenneth L., III
Magnussen, Norman J.
Mahoney, Danno F.
Maines, Robert L.
Makovic, George S.
Malmberg, Norman R.
Malone, Harry P.
Malone, John P.
Manlove, James C.
Mann, Harry P.
Manning, William S.
Manser, Robert J.
Manuel, John F.
Marburger, George G., Jr.
Mares, David L.
Mariano, Gilbert T., Jr.
Markee, Neil D.
Marker, William J.
Markley, James L.
Marquis, David R.
Marr, George M.
Marsh, Fredrick G.
Marsh, James E., Jr.
Marsh, Lawrence E.
Marshall, John R.
Marshall, Ronald P.
Marti, Thomas J.
Martin, Clifford I.
Martin, Gay G., Jr.
Martin, Joseph R. R.
Martin, Robert E.
Martin, William B.
Maskell, Charles M.
Mason, Charles C.
Mason, Ronald R.
Mathews, Robert D.
Matouk, George F.
Matsushita, Tatsuo
Matthews, Robert S.
Matulka, Robert D.
Maxfield, Jack M.
Maxham, Lawrence A.
Maxson, Myrel L.
Maynard, Theodore W.
Mayo, John B., Jr.
Mazzan, Carl A., Jr.
McAfee, Robert E.
McAfee, Robert S.
McCabe, Michael J.
McCallum, Carl P.
McCartney, Roy S., Jr.
McCaskill, Charles E., Jr.
McClanahan, Ted
McClarren, Ralph G.
McCloskey, Terry J.
McClure, Thomas W.
McConnell, Robert C.
McConnell, James M.
McCormack, Harry A.
McCormick, William B.
McCormick, Walter S., Jr.
McCoourtney, Theo H., Jr.
McCoy, Jimmy H.
McCracken, William P.
McCracken, Robert F.
McCrork, John C., Jr.
McCullough, Robert P.
McCullough, Michael S.
McCullough, Larry D.
McCune, George B.
McDonald, Lee R.
McDonald, William M.
McDonnell, Lawrence J.
McDonough, Thomas F.
McDowell, Thomas N.
McDowell, Brian J.
McGargill, Mark
McGlasson, Ross
McGlathery, Monte N.
McGonegal, William F.
McHenry, Milton R.
McKean, Robert A., III
McKeown, Edward J., Jr.
McKinley, Douglas E.
McKinna, Michael D.
McKinney, Kenneth W.
McKinney, James B.
McKnight, Franklin D.
McLaurin, Leroy E., Jr.
McLean, James R., Jr.
McManus, Arthur T.
McNabb, John M.
McNaughton, William E.
McNeill, James B.
McQuiddy, David N., Jr.
McShea, Michael J.
McSurely, Hugh B.
Meagher, Maurice F., Jr.
Medaris, William W.
Mehl, Henry T.
Mehl, Wayne J.
Mehldau, Alan P.
Meinicke, Thomas A.
Meislahn, Harry P.
Mendelis, John C.
Mendenhall, Robert L.
Mengason, James
Menikheim, Douglas K.
Mercer, Benjamin F. III
Meredith, Richard B.
Merikangas, James R.
Merrick, Martin P.
Merrill, Michael H.
Mervine, Lowrie R.
Meyer, Robert A.
Meyer, William F.
Michael, Glen R.
Michel, Alan E.
Midas, Michael T., Jr.
Miles, Samuel A., II
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, George E.
Miller, Melvin D.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William E., Jr.
Milligan, Frank T.
Mills, Richard B.
Mims, Norman W., Jr.
Mitchell, William T.
Moerschel, David C.
Mongan, Thomas R.
Montague, Gerald F.
Montanaro, Joseph A.
Montgomery, David R.
Moore, David K.
Moore, Dennis A.
Moore, James O., III
Moore, Richard M., Jr.
Moore, Theodore C., Jr.
Moorehead, William S.
Morales, Alfonso H.
Moran, John P.
Moran, Maurice J.
Moran, Robert D.
Morey, Richard S.
Moroney, Charles C.
Morrissey, Jon E.
Morrow, Frederic I.
Moss, Ambler H., Jr.
Mott, Carleton E.
Mrazik, Albert
Mucha, Marvin F.
Mullin, William S.
Munger, Francis X.
Murray, Allan W.
Murray, John J.
Musolino, Joseph R.
Myers, Cecil E., Jr.
Myers, George C., Jr.
Naab, Geoffrey
Nagel, David J.
Neal, James J.
Neef, James V.
Neher, John D.
Nelson, Gerald A.
Nelson, Philip A.
Nelson, Roger E.
Nelson, Roger W.
Newhouse, Alan R.
Newman, Donald W.
Newman, Jack G.
Newton, Winston P.
Nitschke, Richard N.
Nixon, Murray C.
Noland, Robert F.
Norbeck, Carl S.
Norton, Paul S.
Nystrom, Robert E.
Oates, Kenneth L.
Oberlander, Clifford C.
O'Brien, George D., Jr.
O'Brien, Thomas
O'Brien, Thomas P.
O'Brien, Ward J.
O'Connell, Patrick G.
O'Connell, Robert T.
O'Farrell, James T.
Oldfather, Daniel O.

Olds, David D.
Olsen, William P.
Oney, James B.
Onken, Gene A.
Ortengren, Ralph W. Jr.
Ostrom, Kenneth R.
O'Sullivan, Paul K.
Otis, John W.
Otness, Phillip C.
Ott, Keith M.
Overly, Thomas L.
Overstreet, Macy E.
Overstrom, Ronald G.
Owens, Bruce H.
Owens, David C.
Pace, Joseph L.
Paletta, Joseph, Jr.,
Palmer, Walla R., Jr.
Pankratz, John M.
Panshin, Daniel A.
Papa, Henry W.
Parcells, Paul W.
Pariseau, Richard R.
Parker, Allen H.
Parker, Charles S.
Parkinson, David L.
Parlette, William T.
Parr, Clayton J.
Parry, Ira E., Jr.
Parsons, Edwin F., Jr.
Paskowitz, Selwyn S.
Pateas, Theodore N.
Paterson, Robert W.
Patterson, John W.
Patton, James H., Jr.
Paul, Michael F.
Paules, Granville E., III
Paulsen, Thomas D.
Pauole, Alvin H.
Peace, William H., III
Pearce, Robert G.
Peden, George B.
Peebles, Robert H.
Peek, Joseph H.
Peeples, Marshall A.
Pekala, Carl J.
Pendleton, Reid, Jr.
Penley, Dennis R.
Penman, James A.
Penn, Paul E.
Pepper, John E., Jr.
Pereira, Ronald M.
Perkins Richard A.
Perkins, Willis B., III
Perry, Lyman S. A.
Peters, Donald L.
Petersen, Peter M.
Petersen, Ted M.
Peterson, Harold A.
Peterson, Charles H.
Pethick, John A., II
Petty, Benny M.
Pezet, Walter A., III
Pfouts, John P.
Phelan, James E.
Phemister, Larry L.
Philbrick, James W., Jr.
Philhower, Peter P.
Phillipes, Peter M.
Phillippi, Frederick, Jr.
Phillips, Stephen L.
Phillips, Grady H.
Phillips, Henry L., Jr.
Phillips, Glen R.
Phipps, Rodney G.
Pieper, John W.
Pike, Robert P., Jr.
Pimm, Russell S.
Pingenot, Edward R.
Piritz, Ronald B.
Pitt, William M.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
Ploeger, Paul H., III
Plummer, Grant W.
Poindexter, Chris H.
Polk, Jack O., II
Pomrehn, Hugo P.
Poor, James S.
Porter, Jack R.
Porter, William M.
Potter, Roderick H.
Potterveld, Jan P.
Powell, George A.
Powell, William L., Jr.
Powers, Byron L., Jr.
Powers, Robert C.
Powers, Robert J.
Powers, Thomas J.
Prather, James T.
Pratt, Joel S.
Pratt, Michael W.
Prebola, George J.
Press, William A.
Previte, Francis I., Jr.
Price, Gary J.
Price, Harold R.
Pringle, Vernon E., Jr.
Proffitt, Norman A., Jr.
Provine, John C.
Prueske, Elmer W.
Przybylski, Raymond M.
Pugh, John S.
Pullen, Leonard A.
Quarterman, Joseph L., Jr.
Quasius, Robert F.
Queen, William E.
Ramsey, James B.
Ramsey, William F.
Rand, Kenneth R., Jr.
Ransom, Edward A.
Rathbun, Dennis K.
Raup, Thomas C.
Ravetta, Richard C.
Raymond, David A.
Raymond, Robert W.
Raymond, Robert L.
Raymond, William J.
Reece, James W.
Reed, Ross M.
Reeder, Hugh A.
Rees, Richard J.
Reese, Evan P.
Reese, Ronald M.
Reichle, Philip S.
Reid, William G.
Reinstra, Llewellyn R.
Reisenleiter, Vernon A., Jr.
Reitsch, Arthur G.
Renner, Robert R.
Rentfro, Russell, Jr.
Repp, John T.
Ressler, Paul M.
Reutelhuber, Jack C.
Reuter, Stewart E.
Reynolds, James C.
Rhinebeck, George C.
Rhoades, William W.
Rhodes, Forrest T.
Rhodes, Melton E., Jr.
Rhodes, Robert M.
Rice, William R.
Rich, William M.
Richardson, John M., Jr.
Richardson, John R.
Richey, Howard L.
Rickelman, John H.
Ridder, Wendell C.
Riddle, Peter E.
Riehm, Charles E., Jr.
Rietzke, Jon T.
Riley, Harold P.
Riley, John T.
Riley, Roy G.
Ringer, Warren C.
Rinnert, Henry J.
Roark, William M.
Roberts, Charles K.
Roberts, Ernest P.
Roberts, Rex G.
Robinson, Richard H.
Roche, James G.
Roeder, Bernard F., Jr.
Roemish, Eric M.
Rogers, George R.
Rogers, John E.
Rogers, John L.
Rogers, Raymond H.
Rogers, Roy L.
Rognlien, Robert P.
Rogus, Edward F.
Rohr, Robert C.
Romig, Phillip R., Jr.
Ronneberg, Earl F., Jr.
Roop, Charles W.
Rorem, John A.
Rosengren, Joseph R.
Ross, Jack W., III
Ross, Robert W.
Ross, William M., Jr.
Roth, Daniel M.
Rothschild, Stephen G.
Roudebush, Jackie L.
Rowley, James E.
Ruckersfeldt, George E.
Rudy, George H., III
Ruhsenberger, John F.
Rullman, Donald H.
Russell, Clifford S.
Russell, James H.
Russell, Jerry T.
Russo, John V.
Rutherford, Robert R.
Rutigliano, Louis J.
Ryan, Kevin T.
Ryan, Larry E.
Ryder, Albert
Saari, Colin H.
Sanders, Donald W.
Sanders, Loren L.
Sangster, Robert P.
Sarno, Lawrence F.
Sarnowski, Thomas J.
Saunders, Franklin H.
Savage, Kenneth D.
Scalf, Fred R., Jr.
Scarborough, John R., Jr.
Schaaf, Ronald L.
Schaefer, Joseph F., Jr.
Scheffer, Stephen J.
Schlicht, Donald L.
Schmer, Conrad J., Jr.
Schmidt, John A.
Schnabel, Walter F.
Schneeberger, Donald G.
Schneider, George T.
Schneider, Joseph D.
Schriefer, Luther F.
Schroeder, William A., III
Schroeder, Raymond C., Jr.
Schult, Richard W.
Schulz, Robert J.
Schweizer, Earle G., Jr.
Schwer, Frederick A., Jr.
Scoboria, Clarence P., III
Scott, John R.
Scott, Peter D.
Scoville, Frederick W.
Scruggs, Sidney L., III
Seabring, Robert C.
Seale, Eugene B.
Seaman, Stewart R.
Seaver, George A.
Seebirt, James E.
Seeley, Howard G.
Seitz, Howard G.
Seitz, Roger M.
Senhen, Linus A.
Senterfitt, John E.
Sessions, Thomas F. II
Sestric, Joseph L.
Seyler, Lloyd E., Jr.
Shade, Walter R., III
Shaffer, John G.
Shanahan, Robert M.
Shanley, Peter A.
Shanck, Michael E.
Sharp, Grant A.
Sharp, John B., Jr.
Shaw, Joe L.
Shaw, John F.
Shawkey, Richard S.
Shea, Brian M.
Shellenbarger, Michael E.
Shepard, Charles E.
Sheppard, Albert W., Jr.
Sherman, John M.
Shilling, Gordon L.
Shipp, Jimmie S.
Shiveley, Murle W.
Shoemaker, Hugh L.
Short, Richard H.
Shreckengaust, James A.
Shuell, Thomas J.
Shuler, Curtis R.
Shumway, Louis A.
Siebers, Karl J.
Silcox, Gordon B.
Silliman, Edwin L., Jr.
Simkins, John E., Jr.
Simon, Henry J.
Simpson, Frank T.
Siple, Terrence E.
Sipple, Howard L., Jr.
Skidgel, Gerald T.
Skillman, John W.
Slack, Charles E., III
Slezak, Norman L.
Smith, David W.
Smith, Edward H., Jr.
Smith, Hugh J., Jr.
Smith, James A. D.
Smith, John F.
Smith, Larry L.
Smith, Lawrence J.
Smith, Norman H.
Smith, Peter H.
Smith, Peter D.
Smith, Regis R.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Ronald C.
Smith, Roy C., IV
Smith, Thomas D.
Smith, Vance G.
Smithson, Alva P.
Smits, Walter I.
Snell Wendell D.
Sokolowski, Steven
Sollberger, Melvin H.
Sortor, James B.
Souval, Paul T.
Sovey, Paul L.
Space, Theodore M.
Sparks, Paul W.
Spearman, William R.
Spencer, Dan T., Jr.
Spencer, Edmund B.
Sperling, Harris
Staes, James P.
Stampfle, Richard A., Jr.
Stanley, Howard C.
Stanley, William M.
Stasko, Nicholas J.
Steele, Robert L.
Stephens, Laurence A.
Stevens, Rowland St., II
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, Kelsey S.
Stewart, William J.
Stites, John, Jr.
Stoakley, Richard H.
Stone, David L.
Stratton, Russell E.
Stratton, Bobbie E.
Straus, Melville
Strawbridge, David A.
Stromberg, David P.
Strother, James F.
Stumbo, Stanley C.
Sturm, Edward J.
Sturm, Harold F., Jr.
Suddath, Jewel J., Jr.
Sullivan, Patrick H.
Sullivan, James E., Jr.
Super, Richard N.
Sur, Richard R.
Surles, Elzie R.
Surratt, Jon E.
Sutcliffe, William G.
Sutliff, Robert C., Jr.
Sutor, John K.
Swearengin, David E.
Syck, James M.
Tackney, Peter M.
Tadlock, James D.
Taff, Dennis V.
Tague, James R., Jr.
Tait, David N.
Tait, John H.
Tait, Thomas M.
Tallman, James R.
Taulbee, William H.
Taylor, Donald E.
Taylor, Frederick R.
Taylor, Nelson D.
Taylor, Paul D.
Taylor, Raynor A. K.
Taylor, Robert G.
Taylor, Thomas W.
Taylor, Turner W.
Taylor, William E.
Teal, Thomas H., III
Teemley, Ronald P.
Teigland, Stanley M.
Temple, Nicholas B.
Terry, Charles L.
Terry, Dennis H.
Terry, John R.
Terry, Thomas J., Jr.
Thames, Lewis H., Jr.
Thomas, Christopher R.
Thomas, Frank A.
Thomas, Grove N.
Thomas, Larry D.
Thomas, William E.
Thompson, Clifford K., Jr.
Thompson, Alton K.
Thorderson, John R.
Thorgerson, Eric J.
Tickle, Tommy R.
Tobin, Daniel J.
Tobin, Kiefer A.
Tolderlund, Douglas S.
Tollaksen, Duane M.
Tonkyro, Ronald H.
Tool, Stephen R.
Topham, Jonathan A.
Topp, David P.
Towle, Robert L.
Townsend, William J.
Traister, Robert E.
Tranchini, Joseph
Trandahl, Orlin E.
Treacy, Michael F.
Trebour, David A.
Treseder, Richard M.
Trimble, David C.
Troyer, Thomas L.
Truesdell, William M.
Trulli, Harry B.
Tucker, Robert E., Jr.
Tupaz, Jesus B.
Turner, Donald L.
Turner, Ellis L.
Twigg, David W.
Tyler, Donald K.
Ugoretz, Richard J.
Uhrhane, Francis J.
Underwood, Arloff V.
Vandenbroeck, Thomas A.
Vandiver, William C.
Vanness, Peter R.
Varady, Paul D.
Veazey, Richard F., Jr.
Verona, Francis M.
Verwers, Robert A.
Vied, Dennis H.
Violette, Jerome C.
Vogels, Richard H.
Vonfischer, Eduard L., III
Vonkleeck, John S., Jr.
Vonkolnitz, Henry Jr.
Vought, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wade, Joseph W., Jr.
Wagner, Edward F.
Walker, Arthur J.
Walker, Carl R.
Walker, Edward T., Jr.
Walker, Richard L.
Walker, Wilburn O.
Wallace, Richard W.
Walsh, Anthony L., Jr.
Walters, Robert M.
Wangeman, Charles E., Jr.
Ward, Sibley L., III
Wardle, Norval L.
Ware, Paul N.
Waterman, Larry W.
Watkins, Donald E.
Watrous, David
Watson, John W.
Watson, Judson D., Jr.
Watson, Louis H.
Watts, John H., III
Wax, Gary N.
Way, Thomas C.
Weaver, Milton W.
Webb, Lowell E.
Webb, Paul H.
Weber, Daniel D.
Weeks, George R., Jr.
Wegner, Arthur E.
Weinhardt, William J.
Wells, Rodney G.
Wendholt, Gregory W.
Wentzel, Richard D.
Wert, Peter K. W.
Wertheimer, Albert L.
Westbrook, John F.
Westerman, John P.
Westman, John A., Jr.
Whalen, Joseph M., II
Whalen, Thomas E.
Wheeler, Donald R.
Whelan, John F., Jr.
White, Charles E.
White, Lawrence W.
White, Stuart C.
White, Terence M.
White, Thomas L., Jr.
Whitely, John E., Jr.
Wichmann, Jay E.
Widergren, Robert D.
Wiegley, James R.
Wienandt, Melvin W.
Wigfall, George H., Jr.
Wiggins, David S.
Wilbur, Paul J.
Wilcox, Wayland E.
Wilgenbusch, Ronald C.
Willenbucher, Marshall R.
Willey, Marshall L.
Williams, John C.
Williams, Hugh T.
Williams, John R.
Williams, Peter L.
Williams, Morris B.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, John D.
Willsey, John M.
Wilsen, William A.
Wilson, Donald M.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, James R.
Wilson, John O.
Wilson, Richard E.
Wilson, Richard V.
Wilson, Thomas E., Jr.
Wilson, William O.
Wiltgen, Robert M.
Wing, Thomas E.
Winter, Lloyd H., II

Wishart, Thomas T.
Witcher, Murray H., Jr.
Wolf, Thomas M.
Woodard, John S.
Woodbury, David E.
Woodward, John D.
Woolley, Dan A.
Worley, Edmond V., Jr.
Worley, William F.
Worthington, James T.
Wren, Robert P.
Wright, Hendon O.
Wynn, Hugh J.
Yeske, Lanny A.
Young, John R.
Young, Richard K.
Zeilinger, Ronald F.
Zeller, Raymond G.
Zierden, William E.
Zmorzenski, Frank P.
Zwick, Martin

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderle, "A" Donald
Anderson, Bruce R., Jr.
Antolini, Richard C.
Arendell, Russell W.
Armstrong, William G.
Aron, Daniel B.
Bachelder, Champe O.
Bailey, Edwin H.
Bain, William D.
Barber, John E.
Bathrick, Leeland M.
Baum, Kenneth A.
Beal, John S., Jr.
Beeman, Ray N., Jr.
Bennett, Donovan E.
Bentley, Richard G.
Bergman, Richard H.
Berkopec, Robert N.
Bessenger, Frank L., Jr.
Bickerstaff, David R.
Bierbaum, Dennis R.
Bingemer, Charles E.
Bloxom, Donald A.
Booth, William L.
Bosco, Joseph J.
Bosworth, Paul R.
Boyette, James B.
Brennan, Anthony C.
Bryant, James N.
Budill, Edward J., Jr.
Cameron, Edward L.
Carlson, John O.
Cartwright, William E., Jr.
Charlesworth, Stephen
Chavez, Jose
Christopherson, Duane A.
Ciccone, Thomas A., Jr.
Clark, Richard M.
Cleaver, Laird C.
Coombs, Frank A.
Coombs, Russell M.
Cooper, Robert A.
Cordle, Thomas L., Jr.
Cornett, Kenneth H.
Covington, Lawrence V.
Cox, Bobby W.
Cox, Ross L.
Craig, Glenn C.
Crawford, Robert L.
Crites, Robert C.
Cromer, David W.
Dachman, George W.
Demaio, Robert M.
Dent, George F.
Deters, William J.
Dieterle, Edward R.
Difilippo, Angelo E.
Doersch, Kirt D.
Doggett, John R., III
Dolina, John R.
Dowell, Richard E.
Draughon, Clyde O., Jr.
Dropp, Robert A.
Eason, David G.
Eckelberger, James E.
Eldridge, Robert M.
Emge, Neil K.
England, Forrest R.
Faistl, Frank R.
Fickling, Thomas N., Jr.
Fillmore, Norman B., Jr.
Finden, Paul S.
Fitzsimmons, Ted R.
Francois, Shirley J.
Fraser, Robert B.
Frasher, Burton K., III
Freeman, Donald S., Jr.
Frost, Don J.
Fry, Vance H.
Fulkerson, Melvin A.
Fulton, John H.
Ganz, James G.
Gear, James R.
Gerritz, Ellsworth K.
Gilchrist, Kenneth W.
Gillies, Tearle A.
Godbey, Donald E.
Goldsmith, Sydney
Goldtrap, Arthur C., Jr.
Gould, George A., III
Graf, Jon H.
Gramins, Thomas R.
Greenhalgh, John E.
Griffin, William L.
Griffith, Charles C.
Gunn, Robert H., Jr.
Hannan, James T., Jr.
Harris, Henry W. D.
Haugner, Alan R.
Hayes, Alan G., Jr.
Herndon, David L.
Hickey, William P.
Hinckley, William L.
Hodgdon, Paul L.
Horton, William E.
Howard, Richard N.
Huey, David A.
Kasputys, Joseph E.
Kiger, Charles R.
Kittock, Kenneth E.
Koerner, Wendell E., Jr.
Kuopus, Karl J.
Larson, Peter N.
Lary, Douglas J.
Latzer, Richard N.
Lavely, Lawrence W.
Lewis, Trevor C., Jr.
Liakos, Sotir
Lingle, Terry K.
Loustaunou, John C.
Lovett, Heyward M., Jr.
Nabie, Marshall L.
Maguder, Henry J.
Mahelona, George L. P.
Marshall, Clyde M.
Matais, Joseph A.
Matthews, Phillip D.
McEachen, John G.
McVadon, Milner W.
McWhorter, Roy G.
Michael, Leslie W.
Mitchell, Willis A.
Mitchell, William J.
Mitman, Clifford, Jr.
Moore, James C., Jr.
Moroney, Charles B.
Moscoe, Donald E.
Mossman, Herbert J. A.
Muenster, William S.
Murphy, Robert A.
Nagano, Paul T.
Nicholson, Edwin F.
Nissalke, Alan J.
Nopper, Donald N.
Nordgren, Richard E.
Norman, Robert A.
Oakley, David W.
Osmon, Robert E.
Price, Robert E.
Raish, Richard C.
Reeves, Malcolm C., II
Richardson, Jon N.
Riddell, William B.
Robinson, James E.
Roesch, Frederick A.
Romney, Bruce S.
Sadtler, David R.
Santucci, John J.
Sargent, Dan W.
Sargent, John C.
Schaen, Frederic W.
Schmidt, John A.
Schroeder, James A.
Scott, Carl D.
Shedd, James F.
Shima, Larry J.
Shotton, Francis T., Jr.
Shoup, Stefan P.
Showley, Larry G.
Shughart, James N.
Simcox, John D.
Simmons, Charles J.
Smith, Andrew D.
Smith, Charles T.
Spratt, Robert E.
Spratt, Thomas J.
Sprenkle, Charles A.
Stallings, Paul E.
Stevens, Steven K.
Stevenson, Bill B.
Stewart, Robert W.
Stichter, Philip W.
Stilgebouer, Larry R.
Stone, Donald E.
Stone, Edward P.
Svagdys, Paul F.
Swan, Rodger A.
Swanson, John L.
Taylor, James H.
Uhles, James L.
VanHouten, George W.
VanPatten, David G.
Varner, Richard H.
Walker, Robert C.
Walsh, Martin J.
Weatherson, Harvey D.
Weber, Warren G.
White, Brents R.
Wild, Thomas R.
Williams, Royce S.
Withrow, Edward W., Jr.
Wolf, Ronald C.
Zagrosky, Joseph P.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Arcuni, Albert A.
Balloun, James S.
Blanchar, James H.
Bradford, Donald R.
Call, David A.
Campbell, Richard B.
Diamond, Stephen A.
Dittman, William H.
Doebler, James C.
Eber, Richard D.
Falk, Norman D.
Fasig, Edgar W., Jr.
Forney, David L.
Frankel, John A.
Frazier, William F.
Ginn, George H.
Greenwald, James M.
Groves, Stephen S., II
Hertzog, Larry R.
Jackson, Robert T., III
Jones, Robert S.
Kennedy, Robert J.
Kiefer, John C.
Kieffer, Alonzo R., III
Killen, William M.
Kurtz, David C.
Lewis, Herbert H., Jr.
Lowrey, Billy B.
McCurdy, Glen P.
Metzler, Jay C.
Mostoller, George M.
Mumford, Gerald W.
Norton, Richard E.
Parker, Robert D.
Peechatka, Farley
Pflugh, Willis C., Jr.
Porter, Michael D.
Purinton, Lucian B., II
Ramos, Joseph R.
Rathbone, John
Reynolds, Ralph R.
Ripa, Carl V.
Sahlman, Claire G.
Schaeffer, Richard A.
Shank, George E.
Sitnik, William A.
Smith, Myron E., Jr.
Ster, John W.
Tucker, Tracy C.
Vaughn, Kenneth A.
Vogel, Lawrence W.
Wells, James L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Acord, Loren D.
Bacon Norman F., Sr.
Baumhofer, Anne H.
Bogdan, Raymond R.
Bromann, William H., Jr.
Cicero, Joseph D.
Craig, Donald R.
Despiegler, Gary D.
Dietlein, Donald R.
Erie, James R.
Foster, Harlan D.
Hagstrom, Verne W.
Lovin, Aubin H.
Metcalf, Lawrence P.
Ray, Paul T.
Reid, Donald H.
Robertson, James M.
Ruppe, James R.
Stalnaker, Mervin L.
Stewart, Shannon D.
Weems, Bailey E.

NURSE CORPS

Hvizdo, Barbara A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-2) subject to completion of service in grade as prescribed by law:

Bailey, Howard L.
Fortney, Doyle W.
Gohrband, Howard F., Jr.
Hardin, Billie R.
Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
Kitch, Dale
Landon, Stewart N.
McKinley, Robert N.
Pursel, John J.
Schardein, Edgar A.
Terry, Donald L.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Chief warrant officer, W-4

Bartow, Howard G.
Bateman, George E.
Bauer, Carl L.
Bernard, Charles B., III
Bowen, William D.
Breeding, Marion
Chambliss, Herbert P.
Chuckta, Samuel C.
Clark, Frederick E.
Collette, Wesley O.
Cooper, Andrew B.
Cornelison, Charles H.
Corpuz, Damaso
Coultas, Wilbur D.
Cruce, James E.
Daniels, Harold M.
Dickey, Joseph B.
Ebersole, Victor L.
Eggeling, Harvey B.
Emerson, Terrence H.
Epperson, Robert B.
Farrell, John M.
Field, Vernor
Felton, Donald A.
Ferguson, Marvin J.
Giuliani, Victor C.
Greene, Charles H.
Gronvold, Phillip S.
Hans, William E.
Hansen, Merwin G.
Hanseroth, Robert F.
Hofman, William H.
Holte, Ralph W.
Hunter, George J., Jr.
Jackson, Howard J.
Johnson, George W.
Klecky, Rudolph
Kurtz, Frank J.
Leech, Max L.
Lepard, John R.
Malone, Hal L.
Mason, Harold L.
McCarty, Garland M.
McLaughlin, Harold E.
Miller, Frank B.
Miller, Rudolph T.
Moriarty, Joseph E.
Olhausen, Milo J.
Pappano, Robert A. N.
Parker, Roy E.
Pasvogel, Lee
Pfeifer, Harold M.
Pressel, Frederick F.
Reed, Max B.
Roberts, Jack W.
Robinson, Herschel E.
Rodes, Henry A.
Rossitto, Salvator P.
Russo, Louis
Sadler, William H.
Santos, Joao C.
Schoenfelder, Elmer O.
Senkus, Stanley W., Jr.
Severance, Lewis C.
Simanowicz, Edmund
Smith, Daniel W.
Spence, William G.
Still, Harold L.
Teche, George P.
Thomas, Henry O.
Tindall, Glenice B.
Tresback, Roy E.
Truelove, Wesley J.
Ward, Robert H.
Winn, Victor F.
Wootton, Robert H.
Worthington, Foster
Yates, Henry C.

Chief warrant officer, W-3

Bodine, Allen D.
Bonnette, George R.
Brehm, Carl L.
Cagle, Otis H.
Coleman, Arthur J.
Cyr, Norman B.
Mastantuno, Joseph C.
Mendenhall, Bill
Pinto, Joseph A.
Rhodes, Donald M.
Robbins, Earl B.
Robinson, Eugene
SanFelippo, John J.
Schuler, Russell L.

Chief warrant officer, W-2

Agidius, Theodore H.
Allen, Raymond S.
Anderson, James C., Jr.
Arnett, William C.
Baca, Raymond W.
Bacha, Michael
Barratt, James F.
Bartholomew, Cornelius R.
Bates, Arthur H.
Beckley, Wendell
Beverly, Lynwood A.
Bilderback, William J.
Billodeau, John D.
Bishop, John F.
Blankman, Ernest R., Jr.
Block, Marvin G.
Bodge, George R.
Boesenhofer, Karl, Jr.
Bolling, Frederick M.
Booth, Thomas G.
Bostick, Daniel C.
Brockman, Edward B.
Brown, Albert L., Jr.
Budrevich, John P.
Bull, Charles H.
Burgett, Bernard E.
Burns, John C.
Butler, Henry C.
Butler, Kelly, Jr.
Carl, Charles L., Jr.
Carlson, Kenneth L., Jr.
Carr, Robert G.
Cassie, Lawrence
Cedarstaff, Carl A.
Chandler, Neil B.
Chastain, Edward C.
Clark, "J" "B"
Cochrane, James E.
Cote, Roland F.
Dick, Gene R.
Durland, Ray M.
Durren, Richard L.
Dyer, William J.
Early, George, Jr.
Erdner, Homer F.
Evans, Lockwood F.
Ferguson, John R.
Fickett, Lawrence E.
Friel, Joseph A., Jr.
Gall, Ernest R.
Ganey, Walter F.
Glass, William W.
Gonzalez, Ernest G.
Gray, James E.
Greenfield, William G.
Hafslund, Robert H.
Hagen, James E.
Haldeman, Leonard D.
Hendricks, Jack M.
Hillhouse, William C.
Hohe, Joseph D.
Holdridge, Oscar A.
Hogle, Walter D.
Huffman, James W.
Hughes, John C.
Hutchins, Elmer S., Jr.
Hyatt, Gerald C.
Isebrands, Arthur B.

James, Albert N.
James, Howard L.
Jensen, Dana C.
Johnson, Charles J.
Johnson, Roland L.
Jones, Willard E.
Julius, Paul A., Jr.
Kellner, Edward J.
King, Alfred E.
Kliem, Arnold W.
Kraft, James R.
Kubovsak, Joseph E.
Kulik, Charles A.
Kunold, Gerald J.
Lacy, Gene H.
Lamb, Gerald M.
Largent, Gilbert M.
Larrin, John A.
Lash, Don L.
Leduc, Donald E.
Lindholm, Garth F.
Malley, James O.
Mann, Arthur M., Jr.
Markward, George T.
Martin, Robert J.
McDonough, Francis J.
McLeod, John B.
Minard, Glenn F., Jr.
Minor, Robert G.
Mitchell, Robert F.
Munger, Robert H.
Murphy, William J.
Nadal, Jaime B.
Neely, Benjamin C.
Neil, Richard C.
Nelson, Warren H.
Newton, Killraine, Jr.
Nicholas, Robert H.
Nichols, William E.
Noble, Robert W.
Orr, Charles P.
Pace, James C., Jr.
Parrish, Solomon A.
Patton, Kuemen B.
Peak, Claude F.
Pehosh, Nicholas
Pendleton, Edmund P., Jr.
Peragine, Joseph V.
Perry, Roy L.
Peters, Randolph
Petersen, Donald L.
Porter, Stanley
Powell, Claudious A., Jr.
Powell, Morrison, Jr.
Preston, William J.
Price, Byron H.
Proctor, Marlow
Roberts, Alvin E.
Robinett, Homer E.
Robinson, Paul
Rodrigues, Leo L.
Rolland, William F.
Ross, Ralph
Saffell, Charles R.
Scarlett, Bernard
Schmidt, Christopher G., Jr.
Schneider, James M.
Schuman, Daniel D.
Shaffer, Charles T.
Shultz, Robert C.
Sluss, Charles S.
Smith, Charles S.
Smith, George D.
Stanton, Robert E.
Steadman, Joseph D.
Stowers, Bernard L.
Surber, Robert J.
Talley, Richard M.
Tarkington, Dewey A.
Taylor, Harley V.
Teagle, Fred J.
Teal, Roy A.
Tenerowicz, Walter J.
Thornley, Robert, Jr.
Turetz, Richard
Van Artsdalen, John P.
Vautier, Byron C.
Voelp, George J.
Wagner, Charles P., Jr.
Waller, James R.
Wheeler, Norman E.
Whitcomb, Winfield J.
Wilkes, Roy W.
Wilson, Joseph M.
Witte, Ernest R.
Woods, Kenneth W.
Wright, Benjamin W.
Yoder, Von C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Battaglia, Carmen C.
Brooks, Thomas A.
Browne, Russell C., Jr.
Duffy, Michael D.
Dunlop, James M.
Effron, Herbert M.
Haines, Donald A.
Herman, William A.
Hill, Nordean T.
Jacanin, James M.
Jewell, Charles W.
Kappahahn, Gary J.
Leeper, James R.
McKinney, William E.
Parker, Robert C., Jr.
Ramsay, Robert W., Jr.
Siebeking, Paul F., Jr.
Storms, Robert B.
Wile, Alan R., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Rumpf, Robert L.
Starbuck, George A.
Wilmoth, James P., III.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Van Eaton, Clarence.

* Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305:

To be colonels

Ackner, Ned E., O32452.
Adams, Burr E., O80359.
Akers, Norman E., O51673.
Albert, George E., O32279.
Alfrey, John, O19859.
Allen, Arthur W., Jr., O22034.
Arnold, Wilfred, Jr., O84539.
Arthur, John E., O32468.
Astrella, Theodore F., O42656.
Babcock, Bernard E., O44018.
Bacharach, Gustav M., O79694.
Bachman, Roger M., O22226.
Balish, Harry, O22218.
Balliett, Howard D., O22684.
Bane, John C., O21897.
Barber, Homer G., O22130.
Barker, Walter E., O22717.
Barnett, Tom W., O44164.
Barry, Robert B., Jr., O22674.
Barten, George A., O32605.
Baskin, John S., O22634.
Baum, John W., O38997.
Bayard, Robert F., O44169.
Beck, Donald C., O31329.
Beckedorff, Lawrence LeR., O21781.
Becker, Alexander, O32392.
Bedford, William H., O43926.
Bell, William W., O79737.
Billups, James S., Jr., O21932.
Bishop, James F., O22231.
Black, George W., O32192.
Boles, John K., Jr., O22025.
Booth, Cornell D., O52271.
Boswell, Charles B., O38976.
Bowen, Elba W., O32634.
Bowie, Richard T., O21921.
Bowman, James W., O38813.
Boy, Pierre D., O32297.
Boyce, Beryl L., O32400.
Boye, Frederic W., Jr., O21891.
Bradley, William T., O21768.
Brinker, Walter E., O21776.
Bristol, Matt C. C., Jr., O22027.
Brooks, Robert L., Jr., O44054.
Brown, Bevelle T., O32469.
Brown, Virgil G., O40398.
Brownfield, Albert R., Jr., O21905.
Brownfield, Page H., O40395.
Brubaker, William E., Jr., O32497.
Bruce, Thomas R., Jr., O32423.
Bruehl, Paul E., O32270.
Bruyere, Walter R., 3d, O22644.
Buckley, Thomas, O52429.
Buerkle, Bill, O52399.
Buntyn, James R., O83563.
Byrne, John D., O21837.
Calvert, George N., O43053.
Cameron, Harry F., Jr., O79698.
Camp, Robert H., O21798.
Campbell, Charles T., O32180.
Campbell, Guy L., O32616.
Campbell, Jim A., O52417.
Cannon, C. Craig, O39008.
Cannon, Linden K., Jr., O32509.
Cantrell, Charles, O22682.
Cantrell, James L., O21758.
Case, Charles C., Jr., O43824.
Cassaday, George C., O32658.
Cassidy, Robert F., O21783.
Chamblin, Francis A., O32255.
Chaney, Christopher W., O32496.
Chapla, Benjamin C., O22170.
Chapman, Warren C., O21939.
Cheek, Andrew R., O32306.
Chloupek, Laurence E., O44094.
Christy, John J., O44023.
Cleverly, Richard deF., O21862.
Clifford, Paul T., O22135.
Clowes, George C., O32367.
Collins, Charles E., Jr., O84043.
Collins, James L., Jr., O21788.
Collins, Kenneth W., O22169.
Conner, Haskett L., Jr., O21855.
Contole, William S., O79777.
Copeland, Kenneth W., O40177.
Corcoran, Charles A., O31721.
Cox, Amel L., O43971.
Coyne, Christopher C., O21879.
Crawford, Alfred H., Jr., O32229.
Crawford, Thomas M., O21983.
Cross, Leslie H., O22232.
Crossman, Raymond S., O32583.
Crouch, Robert L., Jr., O43777.
Cumming, William F., O79701.
Dameron, Ernest C., O32376.
Dantzker, Morris, O43992.
Davidson, Henry E., Jr., O32295.
Davidson, Phillip B., Jr., O21969.
Davis, Donald M., O52410.
Davis, Thomas W., 3d, O22059.
Davison, Michael S., O22051.
Dawley, Jay P., O21750.
D'Elosua, Ramon F., O43713.
Devore, Leland S., Jr., O32404.
Dewey, George C., O22191.
Dickson, Donald D., O32531.
Dietz, Carroll W., O21836.
Dill, Robert M., O32626.
Dillard, David S., O22175.
Dillender, Clyde M., Jr., O32671.
Dobson, John W., O21851.
Dodson, Minot B., O32660.
Dolvin, Welborn G., O21980.
Donaldson, William R., O22198.
Dougan, Murray D., O22221.
Downey, Stephen W., Jr., O22649.
Doyle, George K., O44000.
Drye, Clarence W., O52413.
Duckworth, George H., O32621.
Duffy, James R., O52428.
Duke, Charles M., O21753.
Dunloy, Deane A., O38825.
Dunn, Robert T., O32612.
Durbin, Paul J., O52110.
Durgin, Chesley F., O32363.
Dziuban, Stanley W., O21738.
Eason, Roderick D., O52420.
Eckland, Kenneth E., O32334.
Eifler, Charles W., O32614.
Eitt, Herbert E., O32477.
Erb, Herbert B., O40379.
Erickson, John L., O32434.
Etka, Dale L., O43898.
Ewell, Julian J., O21791.
Fairchild, Clarence G., O40396.
Fallen, Arthur J., Jr., O79705.
Farmer, Herman M., O44158.
Farrell, Norman, O21759.
Farren, James H., O32670.
Fisher, Norman E., O32435.
Florance, Charles W., Jr., O22119.
Fondren, William M., O32481.
Foster, Ralph L., O22669.
Fralish, John C., O32668.
Frasher, Ross P., O40401.
Fredericks, Charles G., O22092.
Freeman, Harlan M., O32409.
Friedman, Arthur L., O32474.
Frink, Albert W., O22192.
Gall, William O., O22664.
Gallagher, Edward J., O21775.
Gallagher, James D., O43958.
Geary, Edward M., O21887.
Gee, William C., O44027.
Genetti, Albert J., O22194.
George, William C., O21913.
Gettys, Charles M., O44181.
Gibbons, Ulrich G., O21874.
Gilbert, Vernon G., O21850.
Goodpaster, Andrew J., O21739.
Goodwin, David B., O21914.
Goodwin, Walton, 3d, O79706.
Gorn, John W., O22200.
Grace, William Van N., O40365.
Graeves, Raymond B., Jr., O32563.
Graham, Thomas A., Jr., O32231.
Grant, Walter H., O22093.
Gray, Norman, O40387.
Guenther, Edgar T., O32206.
Haberer, Walter J., O52278.
Hackett, Charles J., O21954.
Hailey, Clem G., O40409.
Hale, William H., O22184.
Hamele, Louis F., O32610.
Hamlin, Joseph H., O52312.
Hanchin, Ralph J., O21895.
Hannum, Calvin S., O32428.
Hanson, Ellwood F., O52281.
Hargus, Lowell U., O30315.
Harper, Armistead R., O22738.
Harris, Robert C., O30529.
Harrold, Arthur K., O32417.
Hartman, Frank E., O21346.
Hartman, Henry M., Jr., O44177.
Hasselback, Frederick W., O22673.
Hassett, Burrell C., Jr., O38987.
Hastings, William H., O22658.
Hatchell, Henry C., O32200.
Hawkins, Wilson M., O22737.
Hayes, John J., O32309.

Heasty, Charles F., Jr., O22665.
Heiser, Joseph M., Jr., O43773.
Hennessey, James T., O32274.
Henry, William J., O21928.
Higgins, Walter M., Jr., O21987.
Hill, Hudson C., O32560.
Hill, Raymond D., O22645.
Hill, Robert J., Jr., O21933.
Hillis, William T., O40369.
Hilton, Wilbur S., O32643.
Hinternhoff, William A., O21844.
Hodges, Carroll B., O43751.
Hodges, Richard, O44065.
Hollis, Charles H., O38981.
Hollis, Joel McC., O22728.
Holmes, Sterling C., O22655.
Holmes, William W., O32247.
Hooper, Philip L., O32662.
Hoover, Lawrence M., O22193.
Hoskins, Harry D., Jr., O43846.
Hudgins, Seth F., O21947.
Hughes, William McC., O32322.
Husman, Donald L., O32431.
Hussey, William J. A., O22205.
Hutchinson, William S., Jr., O32611.
Hutson, Richard K., O32212.
Innes, William H., O43867.
Irby, Richard L., O22678.
Jacks, Fred W., Jr., O32407.
Janowski, Raymond A., O21869.
Jean, James N., O22632.
Jefferds, Jerome S., O52283.
Jeffrey, Paul R., O40358.
Johnson, Benjamin W., O52351.
Johnson, Harold O., O22635.
Johnson, James M., O52276.
Johnson, Jesse M., O51797.
Johnson, John G., O21929.
Johnson, Sterling R., O21873.
Jones, Gordon C., O32320.
Jones, James T., O32595.
Jordahn, Erik W., O44060.
Jordan, Ralph E., O21911.
Juskalian, George, O32371.
Kail, Samuel G., O22072.
Kaiser, William F., O52323.
Kaufman, Lee S., O32388.
Keisler, David S., O32657.
Keller, Fred B., Jr., O84540.
Keller, James H., O21871.
Kemp, Roger W., O83567.
Kenan, Thomas A., O22670.
Kendrick, Wallace McK., O32615.
Kent, Richard F., O22676.
Kerwin, Walter T., Jr., O21963.
Kinnard, Harry W. O., O21990.
Kinnison, Paul, O32581.
Kinsella, Harry F., O31424.
Kirby-Smith, Edmund, O21745.
Kitto, George L., O79709.
Kling, Carl V., O40366.
Knight, Darce R., O43887.
Kostanski, Henry S., O43755.
Kramer, Lyndon P., O40413.
Kreighbaum, Eugene C., O43883.
Krisman, Michael J., O21880.
Kulp, John C., Jr., O43768.
Kunzig, Louis A., Jr., O21741.
Kurtz, Josiah S., O22171.
Kyckelhahn, Russell H., O32467.
Laing, James A., O43929.
Lake, Gerald A., O43901.
La Mee, William S., 3d, O32364.
Lane, Barton G., Jr., O21876.
Larsen, Stanley R., O22094.
Lasche, Ernest P., O22073.
Lear, Frank L., O39007.
Lee, John G., O79631.
Lemmon, Johnson G., O22653.
Leonard, John W., O44056.
Lerette, Earle L., O22133.
Lerner, Gerald P., O32199.
Lerner, Jack L., O44103.
Lewis, Vernon L., O42628.
Liebmann, Ernst F., O44091.
Lilly, Roger M., O21924.
Lollis, Shelton E., O32575.
Long, Floyd K., O43778.
Long, Maurice E., O40422.
Luczak, Bernard R., O22196.
Lyle, James B., O32348.
MacDonald, Aleck F., O22685.
MacLeod, James F., O44026.
Mann, Thomas L., O22663.
Marlin, Raymond B., O21899.
Marlowe, Lon D., Jr., O32459.
Marsden, Henry H., Jr., O43643.
Marshall, John F., O32648.
Marshall, Oliver K., O22219.
Martens, Howard W., O32324.
Martin, Sidney T., O21772.
Martin, Talbert I., O43893.
Masters, Avery W., O22666.
Matteson, Victor E., O83569.
Mautz, Matthew C., O22729.
Maxwell, John B., 2d, O21942.
McCaffrey, William J., O22065.
McChristian, Joseph A., O21966.
McClellan, Harry W., O22173.
McConnell, Edward T., O21996.
McConnell, William J., O22052.
McCord, Max, O52355.
McCutchen, George, O40341.
McCutchen, Wilmot R., O21744.
McDaniel, Wallace A., O80363.
McGrath, Donald B., O32548.
McIntyre, William J., Jr., O44171.
McKnight, John T.. O32439.
McMahon, Robert E., O22137.
McQuail, Robert P., O22651.
McWhinney, William W., O32450.
Medinnis, Charles L., O22023.
Merrill, Claude J., O22241.
Merritt, Harrison J., O32492.
Merritt, Hiram M., O32638.
Meyer, John H., O22179.
Micheau, Charles G., O32429.
Mildren, Frank T., O21992.
Miletich, Milton M., O32546.
Miller, Donald B., O22018.
Miller, Raymond O., O40404.
Mills, Francis B., O32544.
Mitchell, Arlo W., O43772.
Molloy, Robert W., O32526.
Montgomery, Morris B., O44163.
Moon, James W., O32540.
Moore, Louis R., Jr., O22662.
Morton, George C., O39010.
Mosheim, Emil L., O32272.
Mount, Charles McN., Jr., O21849.
Muir, James I., Jr., O21802.
Mulcahy, Patrick D., O22015.
Murray, Harry L., Jr., O22140.
Nanney, David Y., O21866.
Nestlerode, Howard E., Jr., O32282.
Newcomer, Francis K., Jr., O21898.
Nolan, Daniel A., Jr., O21988.
Norris, Jack K., O21865.
O'Brien, Francis W., O32196.
Olson, John E., O22125.
Page, Benjamin N., O32530.
Painter, Dean E., O22720.
Papa, Anthony E., O52294.
Pardue, Norman C., O40354.
Parsons, Charles J., Jr., O22183.
Patterson, William G., O32278.
Patterson, William H., O22110.
Paul, Thurston T., Jr., O32243.
Pavey, Kenneth G., O22207.
Pavick, John J., O21780.
Peacock, Earl G., O43873.
Penly, William J., O22300.
Perpich, Tony F., O32552.
Pershall, William R., O43825.
Pertl, Martin C., O40349.
Peterson, Carl A., O52344.
Petrilli, Frank J., O32433.
Pickett, George E., O21938.
Pierre, George H., Jr., O32258.
Pille, Roy F., O52311.
Pitney, Max L., O22721.
Pitts, Ogene, O44126.
Ploger, Robert R., O21760.
Pope, Lemuel E., O22646.
Powell, Maurice G., O40259.
Powers, James W., O83571.
Pray, John I., O22214.
Preiss, Hollis J., O81880.
Price, Hayden J., O39013.
Price, John W., O83572.
Price, William H., Jr., O21903.
Queenin, Hugh F., O40367.
Radtke, Kurt G., O22203.
Ragsdale, Gerald H., O22217.
Ralf, Earl W., O44037.
Redman, Charles L., Jr., O32311.
Reed, Arthur W., O21878.
Reese, Arthur W., O43818.
Reeves, Charles P., Jr., O43996.
Reeves, Charles W., O22223.
Reeves, Joseph R., O21820.
Register, William F., O43757.
Renaud, William E., O44131.
Requarth, Jack A., O22189.
Rhatigan, Edwin T., O52412.
Richards, Ira B., Jr., O22639.
Richardson, Richard L., O44002.
Richardson, Robert E., O80365.
Rippert, Jacob K., O22115.
Risley, Richard G., O32516.
Robbins, Edward S., O32636.
Robertson, Charles E., Jr., O51756.
Rodgers, Thomas A., O44010.
Rogers, James Le R., O22076.
Rollins, Albert F., O21823.
Roosa, James A., O22138.
Rosa, Robert J., O33078.
Roseborough, Morgan G., O22681.
Rousek, Charles, O44030.
Rundquist, Eric A., O43843.
Russell, Clyde R., O32478.
St. Clair, Howard B., O22017.
Samson, Charles P., O22204.
Sasse, Emil D., O32421.
Sawicki, Stanley J., O40215.
Saxe, Robert K., O43790.
Scannon, Anthony J., O32393.
Schellman, Robert H., O22002.
Schmidt, Herman A., O52322.
Schooley, Carl T., O22225.
Schrader, John R., Jr., O21818.
Schroeder, Edgar W., O22166.
Schwenk, James T. L., O22106.
Scott, John B., O32213.
Scroggs, John P., O21863.
Seaburn, Eugene T., O32314.
Seekins, Earl I., O32362.
Shacter, Jacob, O22724.
Shepard, Claude L., Jr., O21931.
Shepherd, James McM., O21868.
Shepherd, Joe R., O40380.
Sherrod, Lilbourne W., O40403.
Shigley, James N., O22222.
Shoemaker, Samuel E., O22661.
Showalter, Wilbur E., O21794.
Shultz, Vester M., O21974.
Simmerman, James S., O40376.
Simon, Lincoln A., O21961.
Skees, Hugh S., O79998.
Skillman, Charles S., O38989.
Slaughter, Donald F., O22202.
Sleeker, Elbert M., O22716.
Smith, Charles B., O22113.
Smith, Edward P., O22063.
Smith, Harry T., O22001.
Smith, Matthew C., O22038.
Smith, Richard S., O32305.
Smith, William C., O32572.
Snow, John R., O22659.
Spragins, Robert B., O22080.
Springer, Louis F., O79717.
Stark, Kenneth B., O32633.
Steckla, Paul R., O32366.
Steinkrauss, Albert M., O51843.
Stone, Laurence A., O40414.
Stover, William J., O31381.
Strickland, Arthur T., O44085.
Strong, Cecil H., O22725.
Studer, Robert W., O21786.
Sturm, Frederick A., O40185.
Sullivan, Robert E., O43745.
Surdyk, Eugene E., O80367.
Swatta, Frank A., O22237.
Tam, Donald R., O43933.
Taranto, Salvador F., O40372.
Taylor, James C., O30616.
Taylor, John F., O44143.
Taylor, Livingston N., Jr., O21853.
Teeters, Bernard G., O22081.
Thomason, Joel F., O21867.
Thompson, Harry M., O44098.
Thomte, Hubert D., O22633.
Trahan, Eugene A., O21967.
Trauger, Walter M., O44095.
Turner, David C., O43965.

Tutin, Bill J., O32381.
Tuttle, Paul V., O21896.
Ulans, Roman I., O52302.
Van Harlingen, William M., Jr., O22016.
Van Sickle, Clifford J., O32505.
Vann, Walter, MacR., O21822.
Von Rohr, Arthur D., O43774.
Walker, John W., O22011.
Walker, Leonard F., O31344.
Wallach, Marshall, O21977.
Walsh, Alyosius J., O51792.
Walsworth, William A., O32565.
Walton, Robert L., O22734.
Ward, Albert, N., Jr., O32491.
Wardrop, Raymond J., O44698.
Warner, George P., O32462.
Wasson, Frank J., Jr., O39011.
Waterman, Glen S., O22239.
Watson, Patrick B., O22727.
Watt, John, O21901.
Way, David W., O32341.
Webster, Montgomery, L., O21751.
Weigand, Jack L., O32315.
Welde, Glenn A., O40402.
Wendt, Walter W., O32190.
Werngren, Martin S., O39006.
West, William W., 3d, O21922.
Whiting, Roger, O32577.
Whitton, Joseph F., O51825.
Wickboldt, Walter C., O22047.
Wilcox, Leslie R., O32251.
Wilder, Samuel D., O44104.
Wilkins, James C., O44009.
Williams, Robert C., O40352.
Williams, Robert C., Jr., O22091.
Williams, Robert M., O22206.
Williams, Robert M., O21801.
Wilson, Harold G., O32370.
Wilson, Jasper J., O21829.
Wilson, Lawrence M., O38978.
Wilson, Woodrow W., O21755.
Winegar, Walter L., O21764.
Winton, George P., Jr., O21819.
Wisdom, Wiley B., O21985.
Witherspoon, William O., Jr., O40378.
Wolfe, Richard D., O21743.
Wolff, Paul B., O32645.
Wood, John E., Jr., O22210.
Woodward, Walden F., O22190.
Wyles, Eben R., O79719.
Yarnall, Kenneth L., O21864.
Zecca, Mario J., O32396.

To be colonels, Chaplain

Adams, Rowland C., O76783.
Chmielewski, Joseph S., O84139.
Donovan, Harold F., O26442.
Graves, Ned R., O43164.
Helm, Donald W., O79680.
Murphy, James B., O84235.
Pawlowicz, Theodore C., O92112.
Sugg, Walton G., Jr., O24358.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Blair, Joseph R., O52007.
Campbell, Donald, O31122.
Cooch, Joseph W., O63707.
Cressler, John C., O25157.
Edwards, Walton M., O24377.
Giesecke, Carl G., O63469.
Goldstein, Joseph D., O62894.
Harris, John F., O58751.
Jennings, Hal B., Jr., O26995.
King, Everett G., O61170.
Miller, Sidney, O60015.
Moore, Bernard J., O58685.
Moring, John B., O25424.
Mulholland, Richard F., O31124.
Neiman, Watson E., O31072.
Noel, Philip J., Jr., O25164.
Plum, John B., O61929.
Ratcliffe, Harold E., O56840.
Scoles, Peter S., O63705.
Steele, Lowell R., O25167.
Tackett, Orville H., O58683.
Timmerman, Frederick W., O63210.
Weeks, Bertram A., O26368.
Ziperman, H. Haskell, O63149.
Zuelzer, Wilhelm A., O60730.

To be colonels, Dental Corps

Augsburger, Russell H., O24376.
Bascom, Perry W., O25171.
Bunnell, James B., Jr., O31074.
Burnett, George W., O39499.
Frank, Ogden M., O31101.
Irby, William B., O31035.
Lafitte, Herbert B., O43150.
Lister, Franklin S., O22747.
Madden, Raymond H., O30950.
McNelly, Justin E., O31026.
Montgomery, Lee E., O30958.
Olsen, Edmunds S., Jr., O31071.

To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Allison, Aaron F., O31016.
Manges, Joseph D., O31055.
Sunderville, Edwin J., O23335.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Adams, Harry J., O43191.
Anderson, Edward J., Jr., O31256.
Austin, Paul F., O43213.
Beeson, Walter L., O31143.
Brooks, Roy E., O31238.
Carilia, Thomas A., O40115.
Czaja, Rudolph P., O31267.
Davis, Chester H., O31182.
Hoover, Chris D., O37408.
LeMoon, Ralph G., O31264.
Miller, James B., O84031.
Roerig, Richard N., O43180.
Taro, Alfred L., O56882.
Thompson, Joseph C., O31250.
Wright, Elwood M., O31192.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304:

To be colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Ross, Edna E., N194.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be lieutenant colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Morse, Mary F., N1417.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Okamura, Thomas N., O89568.
Van Amburg, Gordon D., O90569.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Bacher, Robert M., O51045.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Berry, Alice E., N1882.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be colonel

Bush, Chester K. (MSC), O79643.

To be majors

Buto, Junichi (MSC), O80287.
Quigley, Calvin C. (MSC), O80318.
Rogers, O. B. (MSC), O80322.
Wagner, Donald L. (MSC), O84835.

To be captain

Forest, Philip E. (MSC), O75357.

To be first lieutenant

Lampe, Christian F., Jr. (MSC), O88415.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Godwin, Ralph R., O965353.
Padgett, Oscar M., Jr., O22062 2.

To be captains

Black, Vernon R., O1879936.
Booz, Donald V., II, O1937828.
Buckley, Paul R., O4009529.
Culpepper, Grady A., O1873133.
Filbert, Frederic J., O4046670.
George, Ellsworth P., Jr., O2262542.
Herlihy, Francis P., O4010652.
Johnson, David L., O4026552.
Lawson, James C., O1937379.
Lenzi, Anthony F., O4025313.
Majikas, Donald J., O2014638.
McMahon, Richard J., O1874291.
Mahler, Paul P., O4074304.
Messer, Louis A., O4010982.
O'Malley, Robert M., O976055.
Pace, Daun A., O4059147.
Peterson, Franklin G., O4048286.
Pino, Amedeo R., O1927329.
Quinn, Joseph, O4074317.
Scales, David E., O4009302.
Snow, Don F., O4010994.
Stryker, Harm, O4063790.
Von Dach, Robert F., O1874516.
Walker, Alvin E., O4024999.

To be first lieutenants

Beckett, Jack A., O5205546.
Benson, Roy, Jr., O5307435.
Blue, Charles L., O5404024.
Boes, Richard W., O5302759.
Bower, Robert M., O5002891.
Carter, Bobby J., O5206613.
Garcia, Raymond J., O5207784.
McGrede, Aubrey J., O5402977.
Moller, Carl M., Jr., O4085225.
Payne, James C., O5405157.
Rogers, Robert C., O5704917.
Sellentin, Jerry L., O5509650.
Shachnow, Sidney, O5307530.
Sheldon, Thomas K., O5210217.
Sloan, Jimmy B., O5308536.
Smayda, William A., O5000266.
Spence, James, O5203822.
Stuart, James E. B., Jr., O5205125.
Sturdivant, Thurman O., III, O5302543.
Tunnell, William R., O5304390.
Warvi, Martin M., O5503917.
Watson, Charles W., O5303926.

To be second lieutenants

Burton, Lance J., O5212359.
Canarina, Arnold R., O5006405.
Davis, David L., O5315075.
Dzinich, Kurt S., O5513195.
Flatley, Thomas M., O5512322.
Hartley, Benjamin W., O5008841.
Johnston, Robert C., O5215205.
Jolley, Bobby L., O5312430.
King, Thomas R., O5511730.
Kope, Kermit G., Jr.
Kraemer, Robert P., O5217047.
Mahr, Walter C., O4065893.
McCarthy, William J., O5311573.
McGee, William J., O5007278.
Meyer, Richard A., O5315127.
Nartsissov, George, O5311380.
Orlov, William S., O5400191.
Ouellette, Robert J., O5007232.
Rizer, Gene C., O5511223.
Talmadge, Roger S., O5875256.
Thompson, Louis M., Jr., O5513938.
Valvo, Paul V., O5007758.
Walker, Larry T., O5311632.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Rakas, Albert S., O1332864.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Kingsley, Marthanne, N902331.

To be captains, Chaplain

Hoogland, John J., O5500527.
Ostrovsky, Jack, O2274685.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Cutner, Lawrence P., O3010407.
Goodman, Noel C., O4037566.

Harrison, Hollister S., NGO2298675.
Nelson, Darl D., O4041645.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Leven, Fred, Jr., O997953.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Dahlinger, Richard K., O2307792.
DePaul, Anthony K., O5208144.
Johnson, Bruce R. S., O5512447.
Murray, Robert E., O2306969.
Myers, Walter K., O2307791.
Nicewicz, Walter A., O5004656.
Stovall, James T., III, O2303738.
Tolman, Gareth W., O5403223.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Riddell, John R., O2305572.
Stumbo, Barney A., O5412307.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Bean, Samuel F., O2309220.
Binion, Gerald R., O5402212.
Brown, James H., O5304557.
Cook, Thomas L., O2309453.
DeLos Santos, Manuel T., O2305383.
Dierdorff, Edwin P., O5501821.
Dotin, Larry N., O2309186.
Gardner, Richard L., O5408291.
Harkins, Paul D., O5209776.
Hickman, Lynn E., O2309165.
Houston, Samuel D., O5400406.
Kilgus, Andrew H., O2309212.
Lewis, Charles W., O2305355.
Reinbold, Ronald G., O2309168.
Slahorek, George J., O5505882.
Vavrin, Charles R., O2309259.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Baker, Harlan H., Jr., O5404744.
Graydon, Donald M., O2299414.
Quillin, Robert M., O2297924.
Tatam, William M., O2289797.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Klainer, Joyce I., L2304975.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Daniel, Donna L., N5411508.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Capps, Joseph H., O5310197.
Harman, Richard B., O5511787.
Lemmers, Dean P., O5511643.
Spiker, James E., Jr., O2302488.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Scribner, Elizabeth E., L5302047.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bauer, Frank L.
Fobbs, Benjamin F.
Gessner, Donald R.
McCleary, Patrick J.
Ortolano, Alexander J.
Provost, John M.
Simpson, Arthur E.
Simpson, Gordon T.
Wold, Cordell O.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Alden, William M.
Allen, Richard F.
Andrews, William R., Jr.
Archie, Robert
Armstrong, Lester F.
Asplen, George H.
Augsburger, Grayson T.
Ayers, Robert S.
Baker, Carter G.
Barnett, William B.
Barron, Nicholas
Barron, William M.
Barrow, Joseph M.
Bashore, John F.
Bassett, Sterling P.
Batts, William M., III
Beechley, Bruce C.
Benavides, Gustavo O., Jr.
Bezner, Robert Z.
Blackstone, Jon C.
Bloch, Samuel A., Jr.
Boberg, Walter W.
Bode, Donald D., Jr.
Boling, Robert H., Jr.
Bolon, George
Bowles, Dallas L.
Bowman, Thomas E.
Bragg, Thomas B.
Braun, Sidney J.
Brennan, Thomas P.
Brokovich, Michael J.
Broussard, Allen
Brown, Gerald A.
Bryant, Thomas
Burke, Peter P.
Cannon, Hoyt E., Jr.
Carey, Roland
Castleberry, Pierce C., Jr.
Cawyer, Telefus B., II
Chambers, James E.
Christian, Stephen T., Jr.
Cibik, Dennis M.
Ciz-Madia, Joseph
Cochran, Larry W.
Collins, Jon D.
Comee, William C., Jr.
Cooke, David P.
Cooper, David E. K.
Couch, Jacob B., Jr.
Dalton, Thomas W., Jr.
Bardis, John J.
Darling, Roger L.
Dasher, Marcus, Jr.
Davidson, Edward L.
Dexter, Richard A.
Dishaw, John D.
Donchez, Alan L.
Donnell, Victor L.
Duerr, Hans
Dunn, Robert A.
Duplessis, Troy L., Jr.
Dwyer, Raymond M.
Eason, Michael G.
Erickson, Richard
Fabian, David R.
Fallis, Stanley R.
Finkleman, David
Fitzpatrick, Henry H.
Fogle, Philip R.
Foster, James H., Jr.
Frederick, Jonathan E.
Froehle, Harold A.
Garlock, Larry W.
Garrison, Stuart E.
Gary, Harley J.
Gasdek, Walter F.
Gavin, Laurence W.
Gentry, Mark O.
Gideon, Wilburn C.
Gilbert, Edwin J.
Gill, Vernon S.
Giovanola, John T.
Godfrey, Albert B.
Goodwin, Bobby A.
Gordon, Henry
Gosnell, Robert A.
Gray, Nicholas H.
Gray, Sam A.
Guest, Robert K.
Haisten, Robert W.
Hall, John Q.
Hammett, Jimmy S.
Harris, Alma F.
Hart, John L.
Hastings, John H.
Hatten, Larry P.
Herman, John D.
Hicks, Larry W.
Holland, William E.
Holtry, Anthony K.
Hoover, Glenn D., Jr.
Howard, Ralph E.
Hudgens, George T.
Hughes, Miles A., Jr.
Hulbert, Garlan A.
Ibanez, Armando
Inks, Thomas E.
Iwasaki, Robert H.
Jay, James R.
Jencks, Harlan W.
Jensen, Craig L.
John, Roger M.
Johnson, Leslie E.
Johnson, Roger A.
Johnston, Frederick W., III
Johnston, Robert E.
Jungbauer, David E.
Kaplan, Harvey T.
Kawaguchi, Stanley K.
Keller, Theodore W.
Keller, Tillman J., III
Kettlewell, Richard J.
Kirila, Michael R.
Kirkland, Joseph M.
Kleberg, John R.
Klein, Frank W., Jr.
Knake, Walter P.
Knight, Joseph A.
Koepp, David R.
Kress, James P.
Lange, Charles W., Jr.
Lasusky, Joseph J.
Lecky, William R., III
Lee, Paul A.
Lehmann, Lynn W.
Leideritz, James D.
Leishner, Stanley L.
Leonard, George R.
Leonard, Orth S.
Lerch, Paul S.
Leshanski, George P.
Lewis, Clarence I., Jr.
Lewis, Joe A.
Lingenfelter, Duane F.
Lister, Paul R.
Little, Douglas W.
Loesch, Herbert W., Jr.
Long, Samuel G., Jr.
Mahaffy, Paul D.
Maino, Michael M.
Major, James S.
Mann, Jay I.
Mann, Robert E.
Manning, James G., Jr.
Marlow, Willard E.
McCauley, William A.
McMillin, Stephen B.
McLennan, Norman J.
Meredith, Richard L.
Mills, Charles L.
Mix, Henry L.
Morey, Donald E.
Murphy, Edward H.
Nelson, Harold M.
Neuschwanger, David M.
Nibert, Lewis R.
Nicol, Alan B.
Noxon, Elwood R.
Odom, Robert A.
Paseman, Lloyd W.
Pedroza, Gregorio C.
Perrin, Richard T.
Personale, Robert E.
Pignato, John C.
Powers, Frank, Jr.
Prieto, Harry P., Jr.
Pruitt, Ronald O.
Redman, Michael C.
Reese, Arvel C.
Robinson, Crawford M.
Rothstein, Terry A.
Rye, Stephen T.
Saffron, Joseph P.
Salley, Hammond M.
Schofield, Dale W.
Seay, Thomas P.
Shangreaux, John D.
Shanholtz, James E.
Sharp, Frank W., Jr.
Shearer, Robert L.
Shirey, Wilbur C.
Shoffner, Amos G.
Shumaker, David I.
Singer, George D.
Smith, Paul M.
Smith, Warren A., Jr.
Smith, Wilbur L.
Spangler, Andrew M.
Spight, Thomas, Jr.
Stamey, Victor E.
Steadman, Kenneth A.
Strommer, Mathias A.
Szymanowicz, Philip B.
Taylor, Edwin L.
Taylor, William P.
Terrill, Joel B.
Terry, Elbridge W.
Tipka, Alan W.
Valentine, Kit J.
Vaughn, Ronald K.
Walsh, Cecil L.
Walz, Arthur H., Jr.
Weishaupt, Robert M.
Wells, Robert D., Jr.
White, Condell S.
Williams, Budge E.
Williams, Charles L.
Williams, John H.
Wilson, Daniel B.
Wilson, William C.
Wright, Alexander S., III
Yonts, Robert B., Jr.
Young, Ronald E.
Zumbro, Hugh M.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, March 28, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Virgil Gunlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very distressed to return home this past weekend and learn of the death of one of Chicago's most distinguished civic leaders, Mr. Virgil Gunlock, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority. He was a man whose work for his city covered numerous public improvement projects and many other worthwhile efforts that truly made Chicago a better city in which to live.

Among his many services to the city of Chicago and its citizens were direction of the operations of Chicago's mass transportation system, prominent roles in such major programs as the digging of the two downtown Chicago subways, the construction of the system of expressways, and the development of the O'Hare International Airport. He was a most active member of the Chicago Planning Commission; and he also found time to participate in his neighborhood community groups, such as the Lincoln Park Community Conservation Association.

Virgil Gunlock was born May 18, 1905, on a farm near New Canton, Pike County, Ill. In 1927 he was graduated from the University of Illinois with high scholastic honors and a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering. While at the university, he was a member of the Big Ten championship wrestling team in 1926 and 1927. His first job after graduation was with the Chicago Sanitary District, where he worked for more than 10 years as an engineer. In 1938, when the city of Chicago started construction of the State Street subway, Gunlock was appointed resident engineer on the first subway contract. He advanced quickly to the position of chief subway engineer, and in 1945 was appointed commissioner of subways and superhighways and then become commissioner of public works in 1952.

Mr. Gunlock was named to the Chicago Transit Authority board in June 1954, by the late Mayor Martin H. Kennelly to replace the late Ralph Budd, who had retired as transit authority chairman. Mayor Daley named Mr. Gunlock to a full 7-year term on the Chicago Transit Authority board in 1959.

It was in the latter capacity that Mr. Gunlock made frequent trips to Washington to testify before House and Senate committees as an expert on mass transportation and its relationship to our big city problems. It was my pleasure last year to invite him to appear before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a member, when we were considering the Mass Transportation Act. Mr. Gunlock impressed the committee with his grasp of the problems confronting all big cities in grappling with the chaos and confusion in transporting our rapidly growing population in and out of large metropolitan areas every day. He was a man to get his ideas across and also to carry them out. I learned much from him in our discussions of the problems Chicago faced in this era of tremendous growth.

Every citizen of Chicago whether he knew Mr. Gunlock personally or not will feel the absence of him because he gave so much of his superior time and effort to help make Chicago a better city.

Acceptance Remarks by Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota, Vice President of Arrow, Inc., Acknowledging the Abbott Laboratories Gift of Paintings Depicting the Practice of Medicine by American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Abbott Laboratories presented to Arrow, Inc., on March 6, 1963, a collection of 36 original paintings which effectively portray in the form of an art the pressing human problem of health and its maintenance among the American Indians. The Honorable BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, my own distinguished Representative, delivered the acceptance address on behalf of Arrow, Inc., which is an organization working on behalf of the American Indian—health, education, housing, welfare, development, and crafts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled "Acceptance Remarks by Congressman BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, vice president of Arrow, Inc."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN BEN REIFEL, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, VICE PRESIDENT OF ARROW, INC.

It is with both extreme pleasure and profound gratitude that I accept, on behalf of Arrow, this striking collection of paintings. It is refreshing to note that a pharmaceutical company such as Abbott is not only in the business of developing medicine for saving lives but, through its program of fine art, also enriches our lives.

I think it must be obvious to everyone here, on seeing the thrilling works of the four very talented artists commissioned by the Abbott Laboratories, that the results represent not only a significant contribution to the art world, but also to the enhancement of a better understanding of the American Indian in general and his health and medical problems in particular.

In fact, it was the development of a more realistic understanding which the people of Abbott were striving for when, 14 years ago, they sent their writer-artist teams across 20,000 miles of Indian reservation lands to portray Indian life as it then existed. Looking at these paintings today, there's little doubt that they have helped to achieve a better understanding, for the progress in Indian health care, a progress which could only have come about with increased understanding, has been striking.

Let me give you a few illustrations. In 1950, when these paintings were first reproduced in the Abbott Laboratories' magazine, What's New, the accompanying text revealed some shocking medical statistics. The death rate among Indians due to tuberculosis was then 10 times higher than it was for the non-Indian population. Today, that figure has been reduced to less than four times, and TB, no longer the scourge it was 14 years ago, now ranks ninth among causes of Indian deaths.

The same article also told of a tragically unbelievable infant mortality rate. Out of every 1,000 Indian babies born, 89 died. Today, that death rate has been reduced by more than half. And this, despite the fact that the Indian population is increasing more rapidly than the general population.

With disease rife and medical care at a minimum, how long could the American Indian so vividly portrayed in these paintings expect to live? This is a quotation from a Papago report cited in the article of 14 years ago: "Of approximately 260 infants born each year, one-fourth die within 12 months; at the age of 6 there are only 160 left; at the age of 18, only 125. The life expectancy of a Papago infant is 17 years."

Today, that Papago can expect to live 42 years.

Unquestionably, there has been tremendous progress in the medical and health care of the Indian, and today he can aspire to a life more nearly comparable to that of his fellow Americans. These paintings have contributed to that progress. So have many of you here this afternoon, and I would not wish to let this opportunity go by without acknowledging and commending the efforts of such Government agencies as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, and the Division of Indian Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The cooperation of many private organizations working in the field of Indian welfare has provided a step up the ladder toward acceptable health standards. Much advancement is due to a sympathetic and farsighted Congress which saw and understood the need, and appropriated the funds necessary to make achievement possible. Perhaps most deserving of commendation are the Indians themselves who have struggled to bring about understanding, cooperation, and advancement among their own people.

We can look at these paintings today and feel justifiably proud of our progress. But we cannot look at them and feel complacent. Much still remains to be done.

It is true that the Indian infant mortality rate has been cut in half, but it is still twice that of the non-Indian population.

It is true that TB is no longer the leading cause of death among Indians, but the overall Indian death rate remains frighteningly higher than the death rate for the general population.

It is true that the Indian can expect to live longer, but his life expectancy still falls 20 years short of yours.

As you look at the colorful and articulate brush work in these paintings, you will read a story at once heartening and discouraging. It is a story of the great improvements that have been achieved, and the progress that is yet to be made. It is a story that must be told, and we hope to use these paintings in such a way that it will be.

They will remain displayed here tomorrow and we ask that you invite your friends to view them. Later, during the 1964 New York World's Fair, the works will be housed in the American Indian pavilion where they will bring their message to millions of Americans. What their specific future use beyond the fair will be, we do not yet know, but we would welcome suggestions from any of you here today which would assure that the story they have to tell remains prominent. For we of Arrow, along with all of you, I'm sure, look forward to the time when the true value of these paintings will be measured not by their portrayal of the work that remains to be done, but only by their creative beauty and their symbolization of a history of suffering that has passed.

We are indeed highly honored to be made permanent custodians of this valuable and unique collection. Thank you.

The Rise of Secularism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I I have been impressed by many columns written by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones who is a syndicated columnist for the Washington Evening Star. The March 25, 1963, issue of the Star contains one of Mr. Jones' most outstanding columns entitled "Minority Rights Ad Absurdum: If Court Bars Baltimore School Prayer, How Far Can An 'Intolerant' Few Go?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a newsletter I recently prepared on this subject be printed with this column in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Minority Rights Ad Absurdum—If Court Bars Baltimore School Prayer, How Far Can an Intolerant Few Go?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The U.S. Supreme Court now has under advisement another school prayer case, and if it hasn't learned anything since its decision on the New York regents prayer last fall it is likely to come up with another dizzy ruling.

The new suit came out of Baltimore, where a mother who is an avowed atheist sued the Baltimore School Board because a passage from the Old Testament and the Lord's Prayer were part of the daily opening exercises at her son's school.

When she complained in the lower court the school board promptly offered to let her son be excused from hearing the offensive words. But now the mother claims that this sets her son apart and subjects him to ridicule and abuse. She has demanded that no Bible readings or prayers be made in the hearing of any Maryland child while in public school.

Now some day the majority are going to get tired of being pushed around by the minority. Because we have moved into an era where the minority is demanding satisfaction for itself even where it interferes with the satisfaction of the majority. This can get absurd.

The overwhelming majority of Marylanders are not atheists and they think it is a good idea if their children listen to a few preachments. The Communists think so, too. They smother Russian and Chinese children with preachments, most of them from their pickled god, Lenin. Well, the Bible contains preachments. So do the Koran, the Zend Avesta and the sacred books of Budda—all filled with good advice to youth. But all but a handful of Americans subscribe to religious bodies that venerate the Old Testament.

Yet the angry lady in Baltimore holds that even though it is OK with the majority of Marylanders that her son duck out when the Bible is opened, his "rights" are being outraged. They will only be satisfied if all Marylanders agree to conform to her taboos. Otherwise, Maryland shall be damned as "intolerant."

Is it possible for the minority to be intolerant, too?

Both Houses of Congress open with prayer. Isn't this an affront to atheist citizens? Let's fire the chaplains.

On most of the coins and bills we carry there is the legend, "In God We Trust." Aren't we being cruel to sincere atheists in forcing them to purchase their groceries with this pious money?

The school assembly salutes the flag. The students stand with their hands over their hearts intoning the words—"this Nation under God * * *." Surely the cops should be called and the principal arrested.

School lunches offer meat. Meat is an abomination to honest vegetarians. Shall we, therefore, feed our children pea soup and yogurt?

Last December, three public schools in Sharon, Mass., removed all Christmas trees and Christmas decorations from their classrooms on the theory that they were an affront to Jewish students. Bye-bye Santa Claus, because St. Nicholas was a Christian saint. However, the Russians have shown us how we can still get our presents. We welcome Grandfather Frost. Merry Present-Giving Day.

And bye-bye to all the school Easter Bunnies. Easter is a Christian festival in which the resurrection of living things from the death of winter is symbolized by observance of the story of Christ's resurrection, which you may or may not believe. This has got to go. But on the other hand, the millinery business, the garment industry and the candymakers need something like Easter. So let's train our children to look forward to New-Hat-New-Dress-Chocolate-Egg Day.

We've got to clean up Thanksgiving, too. These silhouettes of obviously Protestant Pilgrim Fathers that we have the kindergarten kids cutting out are an insult to all other sects and religions. And the whole business is a slam at our atheists. For Thanksgiving means giving thanks to God. What shall we substitute? The United Nations?

American Negroes have properly battled for the right to live where they choose and go to school where they live. In some places the reluctant majority have had to be spanked. These rights have long been guaranteed there.

Yet, at the urging of the NAACP, Negroes are boycotting a school in northern New Jersey because 90 percent of the students are colored. Why? Because white families exercised what Negroes have been demanding, namely the right to move where they pleased. And they moved out of the neighborhood. So the Negroes are demanding that white children be driven back into that school.

It is one thing to insist that the majority accord a minority the rights the majority enjoys. This is justice. But it is another thing to chase the majority around the block with a stick, demanding that it behave in a way decreed by the minority.

We're getting close to that point. The tragedy is that a growing public consciousness of minority rights is likely to be soured by the arrogance of some minority leaders. This could set us back—way back.

The majority will stand just so much kicking.

Strom Thurmond Reports to the People—the Rise of Secularism

On February 17, 1962, Dr. Billy Graham warned our Nation that "there is a movement gathering momentum in America to to take the traditional concept of God out of our national life."

Since that time we have witnessed a steady advance of progress being made in this country by the forces of secularism, those who would take God out of our national life. The most notable victory for the secularists came on June 25, 1962, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled out a noncompulsory New York school prayer which merely acknowledged dependence upon Almighty God and requested His blessings on the children, their teachers, and their country. The prayer was found to be an attempt to establish a religion in conflict with the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Millions of Americans protested the decision, and for a while it appeared that the Congress would be forced to overrule the decision, even if it meant amending the Constitution. The forces of secularism were quick, however, to counter the mass of public opposition through the propaganda devices of the so-called liberal news media and also with the blessings of many national leaders who hailed the decision as a victory for religious freedom. It was a victory of sorts for freedom, but a victory for freedom from religion rather than freedom of religion.

Since that decision, the secularists have scored new gains in their fight to eradicate public recognition of a Supreme Being. The singing of Christmas carols has been ended in some schools. During the past Christmas season, a group of secularists in New England were able to pressure some school principals into abolishing the Christmas tree from their schoolrooms. On January 5, 1963, two Protestant leaders, in an article in the Washington Post, called for acceptance of the establishment in America of a new religion, which they called secularism, Mr. Martin Marty called secularism "the fastest growing group in America."

Now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court are two cases which could give the secularists their greatest victory to date. Both are concerned with the right of a local school to permit its students to engage, without any compulsion, in the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in morning exercises. One case is from Maryland and the other is from Pennsylvania. Many other States permit their schools to have such exercises, including South Carolina, where most schools have a similar program.

The principal argument being made by the secularists is that their liberty is being compromised. Many of the same people who have done the most to destroy liberty in this country through support of centralization of power and softness toward the enemy are the most vocal in defense of absolute liberty in some areas. For instance, we are told that academic freedom is fostered when we permit communism to be taught in some of our institutions and also when Communists are invited to lecture on the campuses of America. Now we are being told that we must remove acknowledgement of God from our national life in order to appease secularists or atheists, who are not required to participate in these public school acknowledgments. These arguments overlook the important truth that, as our Constitution and other important national documents state, we derive our blessings of liberty from God, whether we call Him by the term of "Jehovah," "God," or "Divine Providence." When we scratch the Giver and Provider of our liberties from our national life, we likewise imperil those remaining vestiges of liberty and turn our Nation to secularism or even national atheism, as is required in Communist societies today.

I am repulsed by the false notion that we should destroy the pillars on which our liberties rest in order to advance some cause in the name of liberty. Such actions constitute a fraud and sham not only on God, but also on liberty itself and the people of America.

Address by Congressman Ross Bass at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am delighted to insert in the Record an address by our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass]. This address was delivered at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, at the Statler Hilton Hotel here in Washington, D.C.

The address follows:

Address by Congressman Ross Bass at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Thank you very much. I'm happy to be with you at the National Limestone Institute.

I was introduced as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. I left the committee recently, but, as I leave I take with me an abiding and a keen interest in the affairs of agriculture because I represent a rural district in Tennessee, made up of 16 counties. We have a direct interest in almost every phase of agriculture in the United States that exists without either the use of extreme irrigation or tropical weather. Our agriculture is diversified, and for that reason, over a period of years, I have made an intense study of its programing and planning. Thus leaving the Committee on Agriculture is not due to my lack of interest. To the contrary, I felt that I could broaden the service that I have done in the Congress, and at the same time, still work with agriculture.

I was billed today as a speaker on conservation matters. I am not going to stick to that script entirely. Instead, I'm going to talk in the general field of agriculture, somewhat in the vein of a farewell address, or parting advice to my friends who make up the official family in the world of agriculture. I do not consider myself being a member of that official family any longer.

The 88th Congress has started its usual course of arguing over various facets of our organization and rules. Following the usual pattern, Congress got off to a slow start. This year the primary fight in the House of Representatives was on the Rules Committee. In the Senate, they are fighting about their rules, not the Rules Committee. The surprising thing that I have learned since I have been in Congress, is that there are so many experts in the lay field on the organization, and makeup of the Congress. The late, great and beloved Sam Rayburn, for whom I had the highest regard of any man in public life, told me in the last year of his life, "Ross, no man ever gets to know the rules of the House of Representatives. Therefore, regardless of who is Speaker of the House, he must have a good parliamentarian." Being familiar with the organization and the internal affairs of the Congress does not come without long experience and study. My surprise came about this year when I received advice from my constituents instructing me how I should vote on the size of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. And I don't believe that 1 out of 10,000 of them even knows what the Rules Committee in the House does. Having voted to enlarge the Rules Committee, will not have any effect on your everyday living. I think it was something that was important in the internal affairs, the domestic makeup of the House of Representatives, and I am glad we succeeded.

This year, we had two vacancies on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. For the first time in more than 25 years this became another internal fight in the House. I was a candidate for the Committee on Ways and Means. I had long wanted to serve on that committee. A gentleman from the State of Georgia, a gentleman from Virginia, and I were candidates for the Ways and Means Committee. Instead of it being worked out as it has been over a period of years where there was only one candidate for one vacancy or two candidates for two vacancies, we had a little fight among ourselves. It developed that I was fortunate enough to be elected; and, for that reason, I have left the Committee on Agriculture.

Being a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall say to you that I have not been there long enough to become an expert on taxes. Therefore, I shall not attempt to make a speech about taxes. The President is sending a message to Congress Thursday, the 24th, which will deal with his tax program for this Congress. He has recommended in his state of the Union message that we have a tax decrease. I am glad that I have become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the year when we can expect a tax cut instead of a tax raise. So, I will say that, in all probability, there will be some revisions, some adjustment downward in the taxing situation in the United States this year. Just how it will affect your interests, your industry, I cannot say. The President has recommended a decrease in the corporate taxes so that, as he stated, "The Federal Government would not be the major partner of corporations." Some of you men are in the larger corporations and some in the smaller ones, but you can expect a tax cut, I think, in both areas.

I cannot speak to you as an authority on agriculture; I cannot speak with authority on taxes. Having been on the Committee on Agriculture for the past 8 years I have never seen an expert on agriculture. In the 8 years I have been in the Congress, I do not believe there is a single man in the world who has the answer to the multiple problems that confront American agriculture. I have served under two Secretaries of Agriculture. I think they are both outstanding men. They are high-type, well-informed Americans, but I do not believe that the Great Man who walked on the shores of Galilee Himself could be the Secretary of Agriculture and please even a majority of the people involved in agriculture.

Therefore, as I leave the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to use this forum to make a few pertinent remarks relating to the agriculture situation in the United States at this time. Operating as you do on the fringe of agriculture, and being interested in the conservation programs of agriculture, I know you are interested in the overall picture and the influence agriculture has in the United States.

Conservation is a word that might well be used today in trying to cure some of the ills of agriculture. In my opinion, this is a great oasis that has gone dry. Only a few years ago agriculture constituted the greatest part of American industry, of the American economy. At the same time, it constituted a great part of the political influence in the United States. But, three things have happened in recent history which have caused agriculture to decline, both in its influence and its interest, as far as Americans are concerned.

I think the basic reason for the plight of agriculture today and particularly agriculture legislation can be found on Capitol Hill, in the House of Representatives. While making this statement, I want you to know that I am making the statement about myself because I was a part of this very situation. In my opinion, the influence of the Committee on Agriculture has declined immeasurably in the past 8 years. We say this in no uncertain terms recently. Let me illustrate. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I also become a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees. We completed the committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House this week.

When I was elected to Congress in 1954, it was my immediate concern and desire to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Committees at that time was the late Mr. Jere Cooper from Tennessee, who was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The fact that my State happened to chair the committee was, I think, the reason I was able to secure a seat on the Agriculture Committee. We had, I think, five vacancies in the 84th Congress, January 1955, and we had about 30 applicants for the Committee on Agriculture. Many of them gave this as their first choice in committee assignments in that Congress. Last week when we met to give our committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House, there were six vacancies on the Committee on Agriculture—one Member of the Congress made this his primary choice and this was only because he could not get his colleague from the same State to go on the committee. He didn't really want to become a member, but he felt it was important to have a member from his State on agriculture. This means that the Committee on Agriculture 8 years ago had 5 vacancies and about 30 applicants and this time it wound up with 6 vacancies and 1 application.

This is a sad commentary on American agriculture. What has brought it about? First of all, the Committee on Agriculture, of which I was a part, is the most partisan group in the Congress. It is the most strongly divided committee on party lines that I have had the opportunity to observe during my service in the Congress. If Secretary Benson proposed something, then I would say that more than 90 percent of the members on the Democratic side were immediately against it, and the same situation in reverse exists with Secretary Freeman. If he proposes something, immediately the Republican side of the committee opposes it. So what happens? Last year in Congress, we ran a bill through the House of Representatives twice; watered it down both times; finally had to take everybody's views in the form of a compromise; and then we called it a great victory. This is how difficult it has become to legislate in the field of agriculture. Now, gentlemen, there are some reasons for this. The two reasons listed below are partially responsible for the one I just gave you.

The second reason for the decline in the field of agriculture is farm organizations. I am not going to term your organization a farm organization. I am talking about the major farm organizations that deal specifically with farmers, have farmers, or pretend to have farmers only, for their membership, and try to deal specifically in farm interests and farm legislation. I'm not talking about any one of them; I'm talking about all of them. I have never in all of my "put togethers," as we would say down in Tennessee, seen organizations that are as biased, so narrow, so prejudiced, and so selfish in my life. They are interested only in the following questions: Is this program mine? Did I get it through the Congress? Did I recommend it to the Secretary? Will it get me more members? Can I go back and tell our membership that we got this program through, good or bad, regardless of what it does or does not do? I think the greatest thing that could happen to agriculture today is to have a summit meeting of farm organizations, but I believe it would be easier for Charles de Gaulle, John F. Kennedy, and Mr. Khrushchev to sit down and agree on foreign policy than it would be for the heads of these organizations to get together on farm legislation.

I'm saying some things that sound depressing. They sound tragic. But from my observations, they are the truth. My advice to the official family of agriculture is to try to have some sort of an organization of organizations that would sincerely make an attempt to work out a program that all members could endorse before they recommend it to the Congress. They might lose some members next year; they might not have so much to go back and tell about "our program" or what "our President" said to the Committee on Agriculture, they might not even need a great statesman who could make speeches on things other than agriculture. You read more edicts today from the presidents of farm organizations on things like taxes, foreign aid, education, roadbuilding, and everything else than you do agriculture. This is partially responsible for the first reason I gave you.

Of course, the third reason is the decline in the political influence of the farmer on

American life. There was a time, when I was a very young man, when 50 percent of the American population derived their income directly from the soil. Today only 9 percent of the American population actually work and make a living from agriculture, and part of them are composed of hobby farmers. Therefore, it only follows that the decline in the political influence is sensed in the Halls of Congress.

I just read where one of my good friends, who is a Senator and a Democrat, made a speech the other day on the farm situation. He said that all farm subsidies, all farm programs, should be wiped out. Last year we had an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives, which would have cancelled the conservation programs, all payments; and, if I'm not mistaken, it received more than 100 votes. I am not sure how long it is going to be before that amendment would receive the necessary votes to pass and become law. So, as I have stated, I am a party to all of this. I am not telling you this to castigate anyone or try to condemn any particular part of American agriculture. I am telling you what situation exists in the Congress and in the country today. I'm telling you this only through the hope that you gentlemen who have influence on the fringes of agriculture can try to do something about the dilemma.

In parting, let me commend you and your organization on the work you have done. Certainly conservation, agriculture conservation, in which you play a great part, is of vital interest to us in the United States. We are damned with the greatest blessing in the world, surplus amounts of food and fiber. Where 9 percent of our population work in agriculture, we produce enough food and fiber to feed not only our country, but many, many other countries and much of the population of the rest of the world. To the contrary, in many countries, up to 85 percent of the population work on the farm today and they can't produce enough to feed and clothe their own people. We are blessed with ability to produce and your interests have been a part of this. So, I say to you, keep up the good work. Keep agriculture well supplied with the ingredients of conservation to keep damning us with this great blessing, because I hope I never see the day when we do not have enough food and fiber.

I thank you very much for the privilege of being with you.

Statement of Representative Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, on H.R. 4663 and 4664 Before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 26, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, ON H.R. 4663 AND 4664 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman, you know that I am deeply grateful to you and your subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to testify on H.R. 4663 and 4664, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, these two bills are identical to those introduced by Representative HARRIS, the honorable chairman of your full committee. All of our bills have the full endorsement of the present administration.

H.R. 4663 would authorize grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research in mental retardation and related aspects of human development, to assist in means of finding causes thereof and the means of prevention or means of ameliorating its effects. The bill would authorize $8 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–66 and $4 million for 1967 and for 1968 for this purpose. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service would administer the program and approve or disapprove applications for grants which could not exceed 75 percent of the necessary cost of construction.

H.R. 4663 would also authorize grants to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded, including facilities connected with college and university hospitals or other appropriate parts of colleges or universities under State plans approved by the Surgeon General upon the basis of population, the extent of the need for the facilities and the financial needs of the respective States. Under the bill, $5 million would be appropriated for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965 and $10 million for each of the next 4 years.

Title I of H.R. 4664 would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make allotments to States on the basis of approved plans for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress beginning with the year ending June 30, 1965. The primary factors which the Secretary would take into account are population, the extent of the need for such centers in each State, and the financial needs of the respective States. Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants to public or nonprofit institutions to which a grant was made under title I to meet the cost of the initial staffing of community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress. Any such grant may not exceed 75 percent of the staffing cost during the first 15 months, 60 percent for the next year, 45 and 30 percent, respectively, for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, Congress recognized this problem during World War II. During the war I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which made a study of the problems and needs with respect to mental illness and mental ill-health in the United States. That subcommittee held a number of hearings on the health needs of our veterans and our civilian population. In January 1945 the subcommittee issued its Interim Report No. 3 in which the staggering extent of mental illness was first disclosed. For example, the report pointed out that of 4,212,000 young men 18 to 37 years of age who were rejected for military duty by the selective service as of June 1, 1944, 1,282,800 or over 25 percent of the total rejected were for mental diseases and deficiencies. The report stated:

"It has long been known that approximately two-thirds of the illness encountered in general medical practice is essentially neuropsychiatric in origin and that half of the patients in hospitals at any one time are there because of serious mental disorders. Indeed, one may safely predict that in any group of 15-year-olds 1 out of 22 will some day be committed to a mental institution."

Our subcommittee recommended the establishment of community psychiatric clinics, hospitals in planned medical centers and for the training and education of professional personnel. It said:

"From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child-guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments."

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1946 the chairman of your full committee then, the late Hon. Percy Priest, Representative from Tennessee, sponsored H.R. 4512, and I sponsored in the Senate S. 1160. These two bills were merged into Public Law 487 of the 79th Congress which authorized the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health at Bethesda, a broad national program of research into the causes and prevention of mental ill-health, training of personnel in the treatment of psychiatric disorders with some experimental research in community mental health centers.

This act gave the impetus to Congress for a rapid growth in the appropriations for a national mental health program. This growth is reflected in the following figures of Federal funds provided in 1946, 1950, and 1963: 1946, $66,000; 1950, $10,019,000; and 1963, $143,599,000.

In 1949 Florida had only one State mental health hospital at Chattahoochee. It was 540 miles from Miami. It had at that time only 3,000 beds and 6,000 patients. Many patients from south Florida had to spend their time in Tampa jails during their travel to the hospital at Chattahoochee.

In the Miami area, there was only one nonpublic institution. It had no psychiatrist and no neurologist.

At the present time there are in addition to the State mental hospital at Chattahoochee, the South Florida Mental Hospital in West Hollywood just outside of Dade County, the Northeast State Hospital and the George Pierce Wood Memorial Hospital.

Dade County now has facilities at the Jackson Memorial Hospital, the above mentioned South Florida State Mental Hospital, a new day-care center at the Veterans' Facility at Coral Cables, a mental health department within the Dade County Health Department, and the Dade County Child Guidance Clinic.

But the record clearly shows that these facilities in Florida are wholly inadequate to meet the pressing needs in the field of mental health. The Florida Association for Mental Health pointed out in December, 1962:

"At Chattahoochee many patients are housed in substandard, unsafe, old buildings. It would be preferable to eliminate the need for these buildings than to replace them." The association recommended that facilities be provided for mentally retarded patients and special facilities for older nonpsychotic offenders.

The South Florida Mental Hospital at West Hollywood in December, 1962 had about 430 geriatric patients, one-third of the total. Of the 430, about one half are not really mentally ill, although they do suffer from mental lapses which are concomitant with old age. In addition 70 percent of those on the hospital's waiting list are in this category.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the mental health appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, made by Congress, $4,200,000 was included to assist the States in developing broad State mental health care programs. The State of Florida has taken advantage of this appropriation by making use of a Federal grant thereunder for the development of a comprehensive program of mental health care in Florida.

Moreover, the American Psychiatric Association with the assistance of the State and local mental health groups made a survey and held hearings in Miami on July

I was introduced as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. I left the committee recently, but, as I leave I take with me an abiding and a keen interest in the affairs of agriculture because I represent a rural district in Tennessee, made up of 16 counties. We have a direct interest in almost every phase of agriculture in the United States that exists without either the use of extreme irrigation or tropical weather. Our agriculture is diversified, and for that reason, over a period of years, I have made an intense study of its programing and planning. Thus leaving the Committee on Agriculture is not due to my lack of interest. To the contrary, I felt that I could broaden the service that I have done in the Congress, and at the same time, still work with agriculture.

I was billed today as a speaker on conservation matters. I am not going to stick to that script entirely. Instead, I'm going to talk in the general field of agriculture, somewhat in the vein of a farewell address, or parting advice to my friends who make up the official family in the world of agriculture. I do not consider myself being a member of that official family any longer.

The 88th Congress has started its usual course of arguing over various facets of our organization and rules. Following the usual pattern, Congress got off to a slow start. This year the primary fight in the House of Representatives was on the Rules Committee. In the Senate, they are fighting about their rules, not the Rules Committee. The surprising thing that I have learned since I have been in Congress, is that there are so many experts in the lay field on the organization, and makeup of the Congress. The late, great and beloved Sam Rayburn, for whom I had the highest regard of any man in public life, told me in the last year of his life, "Ross, no man ever gets to know the rules of the House of Representatives. Therefore, regardless of who is Speaker of the House, he must have a good parliamentarian." Being familiar with the organization and the internal affairs of the Congress does not come without long experience and study. My surprise came about this year when I received advice from my constituents instructing me how I should vote on the size of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. And I don't believe that 1 out of 10,000 of them even knows what the Rules Committee in the House does. Having voted to enlarge the Rules Committee, will not have any effect on your everyday living. I think it was something that was important in the internal affairs, the domestic makeup of the House of Representatives, and I am glad we succeeded.

This year, we had two vacancies on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. For the first time in more than 25 years this became another internal fight in the House. I was a candidate for the Committee on Ways and Means. I had long wanted to serve on that committee. A gentleman from the State of Georgia, a gentleman from Virginia, and I were candidates for the Ways and Means Committee. Instead of it being worked out as it has been over a period of years where there was only one candidate for one vacancy or two candidates for two vacancies, we had a little fight among ourselves. It developed that I was fortunate enough to be elected; and, for that reason, I have left the Committee on Agriculture.

Being a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall say to you that I have not been there long enough to become an expert on taxes. Therefore, I shall not attempt to make a speech about taxes. The President is sending a message to Congress Thursday, the 24th, which will deal with his tax program for this Congress. He has recommended in his state of the Union message that we have a tax decrease. I am glad that I have become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the year when we can expect a tax cut instead of a tax raise. So, I will say that, in all probability, there will be some revisions, some adjustment downward in the taxing situation in the United States this year. Just how it will affect your interests, your industry, I cannot say. The President has recommended a decrease in the corporate taxes so that, as he stated, "The Federal Government would not be the major partner of corporations." Some of you men are in the larger corporations and some in the smaller ones, but you can expect a tax cut, I think, in both areas.

I cannot speak to you as an authority on agriculture; I cannot speak with authority on taxes. Having been on the Committee on Agriculture for the past 8 years I have never seen an expert on agriculture. In the 8 years I have been in the Congress, I do not believe there is a single man in the world who has the answer to the multiple problems that confront American agriculture. I have served under two Secretaries of Agriculture. I think they are both outstanding men. They are high-type, well-informed Americans, but I do not believe that the Great Man who walked on the shores of Galilee Himself could be the Secretary of Agriculture and please even a majority of the people involved in agriculture.

Therefore, as I leave the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to use this forum to make a few pertinent remarks relating to the agriculture situation in the United States at this time. Operating as you do on the fringe of agriculture, and being interested in the conservation programs of agriculture, I know you are interested in the overall picture and the influence agriculture has in the United States.

Conservation is a word that might well be used today in trying to cure some of the ills of agriculture. In my opinion, this is a great oasis that has gone dry. Only a few years ago agriculture constituted the greatest part of American industry, of the American economy. At the same time, it constituted a great part of the political influence in the United States. But, three things have happened in recent history which have caused agriculture to decline, both in its influence and its interest, as far as Americans are concerned.

I think the basic reason for the plight of agriculture today and particularly agriculture legislation can be found on Capitol Hill, in the House of Representatives. While making this statement, I want you to know that I am making the statement about myself because I was a part of this very situation. In my opinion, the influence of the Committee on Agriculture has declined immeasurably in the past 8 years. We say this in no uncertain terms recently. Let me illustrate. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I also become a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees. We completed the committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House this week.

When I was elected to Congress in 1954, it was my immediate concern and desire to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Committees at that time was the late Mr. Jere Cooper from Tennessee, who was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The fact that my State happened to chair the committee was, I think, the reason I was able to secure a seat on the Agriculture Committee. We had, I think, five vacancies in the 84th Congress, January 1955, and we had about 30 applicants for the Committee on Agriculture. Many of them gave this as their first choice in committee assignments in that Congress. Last week when we met to give our committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House, there were six vacancies on the Committee on Agriculture—one Member of the Congress made this his primary choice and this was only because he could not get his colleague from the same State to go on the committee. He didn't really want to become a member, but he felt it was important to have a member from his State on agriculture. This means that the Committee on Agriculture 8 years ago had 5 vacancies and about 30 applicants and this time it wound up with 6 vacancies and 1 application.

This is a sad commentary on American agriculture. What has brought it about? First of all, the Committee on Agriculture, of which I was a part, is the most partisan group in the Congress. It is the most strongly divided committee on party lines that I have had the opportunity to observe during my service in the Congress. If Secretary Benson proposed something, then I would say that more than 90 percent of the members on the Democratic side were immediately against it, and the same situation in reverse exists with Secretary Freeman. If he proposes something, immediately the Republican side of the committee opposes it. So what happens? Last year in Congress, we ran a bill through the House of Representatives twice; watered it down both times; finally had to take everybody's views in the form of a compromise; and then we called it a great victory. This is how difficult it has become to legislate in the field of agriculture. Now, gentlemen, there are some reasons for this. The two reasons listed below are partially responsible for the one I just gave you.

The second reason for the decline in the field of agriculture is farm organizations. I am not going to term your organization a farm organization. I am talking about the major farm organizations that deal specifically with farmers, have farmers, or pretend to have farmers only, for their membership, and try to deal specifically in farm interests and farm legislation. I'm not talking about any one of them; I'm talking about all of them. I have never in all of my "put togethers," as we would say down in Tennessee, seen organizations that are as biased, so narrow, so prejudiced, and so selfish in my life. They are interested only in the following questions: Is this program mine? Did I get it through the Congress? Did I recommend it to the Secretary? Will it get me more members? Can I go back and tell our membership that we got this program through, good or bad, regardless of what it does or does not do? I think the greatest thing that could happen to agriculture today is to have a summit meeting of farm organizations, but I believe it would be easier for Charles de Gaulle, John F. Kennedy, and Mr. Khrushchev to sit down and agree on foreign policy than it would be for the heads of these organizations to get together on farm legislation.

I'm saying some things that sound depressing. They sound tragic. But from my observations, they are the truth. My advice to the official family of agriculture is to try to have some sort of an organization of organizations that would sincerely make an attempt to work out a program that all members could endorse before they recommend it to the Congress. They might lose some members next year; they might not have so much to go back and tell about "our program" or what "our President" said to the Committee on Agriculture, they might not even need a great statesman who could make speeches on things other than agriculture. You read more edicts today from the presidents of farm organizations on things like taxes, foreign aid, education, roadbuilding, and everything else than you do agriculture. This is partially responsible for the first reason I gave you.

Of course, the third reason is the decline in the political influence of the farmer on

American life. There was a time, when I was a very young man, when 50 percent of the American population derived their income directly from the soil. Today only 9 percent of the American population actually work and make a living from agriculture, and part of them are composed of hobby farmers. Therefore, it only follows that the decline in the political influence is sensed in the Halls of Congress.

I just read where one of my good friends, who is a Senator and a Democrat, made a speech the other day on the farm situation. He said that all farm subsidies, all farm programs, should be wiped out. Last year we had an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives, which would have cancelled the conservation programs, all payments; and, if I'm not mistaken, it received more than 100 votes. I am not sure how long it is going to be before that amendment would receive the necessary votes to pass and become law. So, as I have stated, I am a party to all of this. I am not telling you this to castigate anyone or try to condemn any particular part of American agriculture. I am telling you what situation exists in the Congress and in the country today. I'm telling you this only through the hope that you gentlemen who have influence on the fringes of agriculture can try to do something about the dilemma.

In parting, let me commend you and your organization on the work you have done. Certainly conservation, agriculture conservation, in which you play a great part, is of vital interest to us in the United States. We are damned with the greatest blessing in the world, surplus amounts of food and fiber. Where 9 percent of our population work in agriculture, we produce enough food and fiber to feed not only our country, but many, many other countries and much of the population of the rest of the world. To the contrary, in many countries, up to 85 percent of the population work on the farm today and they can't produce enough to feed and clothe their own people. We are blessed with ability to produce and your interests have been a part of this. So, I say to you, keep up the good work. Keep agriculture well supplied with the ingredients of conservation to keep damning us with this great blessing, because I hope I never see the day when we do not have enough food and fiber.

I thank you very much for the privilege of being with you.

Statement of Representative Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, on H.R. 4663 and 4664 Before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 26, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, ON H.R. 4663 AND 4664 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman, you know that I am deeply grateful to you and your subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to testify on H.R. 4663 and 4664, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, these two bills are identical to those introduced by Representative HARRIS, the honorable chairman of your full committee. All of our bills have the full endorsement of the present administration.

H.R. 4663 would authorize grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research in mental retardation and related aspects of human development, to assist in means of finding causes thereof and the means of prevention or means of ameliorating its effects. The bill would authorize $8 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–66 and $4 million for 1967 and for 1968 for this purpose. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service would administer the program and approve or disapprove applications for grants which could not exceed 75 percent of the necessary cost of construction.

H.R. 4663 would also authorize grants to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded, including facilities connected with college and university hospitals or other appropriate parts of colleges or universities under State plans approved by the Surgeon General upon the basis of population, the extent of the need for the facilities and the financial needs of the respective States. Under the bill, $5 million would be appropriated for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965 and $10 million for each of the next 4 years.

Title I of H.R. 4664 would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make allotments to States on the basis of approved plans for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress beginning with the year ending June 30, 1965. The primary factors which the Secretary would take into account are population, the extent of the need for such centers in each State, and the financial needs of the respective States. Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants to public or nonprofit institutions to which a grant was made under title I to meet the cost of the initial staffing of community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress. Any such grant may not exceed 75 percent of the staffing cost during the first 15 months, 60 percent for the next year, 45 and 30 percent, respectively, for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, Congress recognized this problem during World War II. During the war I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which made a study of the problems and needs with respect to mental illness and mental ill-health in the United States. That subcommittee held a number of hearings on the health needs of our veterans and our civilian population. In January 1945 the subcommittee issued its Interim Report No. 3 in which the staggering extent of mental illness was first disclosed. For example, the report pointed out that of 4,212,000 young men 18 to 37 years of age who were rejected for military duty by the selective service as of June 1, 1944, 1,282,800 or over 25 percent of the total rejected were for mental diseases and deficiencies. The report stated:

"It has long been known that approximately two-thirds of the illness encountered in general medical practice is essentially neuropsychiatric in origin and that half of the patients in hospitals at any one time are there because of serious mental disorders. Indeed, one may safely predict that in any group of 15-year-olds 1 out of 22 will some day be committed to a mental institution."

Our subcommittee recommended the establishment of community psychiatric clinics, hospitals in planned medical centers and for the training and education of professional personnel. It said:

"From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child-guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments."

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1946 the chairman of your full committee then, the late Hon. Percy Priest, Representative from Tennessee, sponsored H.R. 4512, and I sponsored in the Senate S. 1160. These two bills were merged into Public Law 487 of the 79th Congress which authorized the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health at Bethesda, a broad national program of research into the causes and prevention of mental ill-health, training of personnel in the treatment of psychiatric disorders with some experimental research in community mental health centers.

This act gave the impetus to Congress for a rapid growth in the appropriations for a national mental health program. This growth is reflected in the following figures of Federal funds provided in 1946, 1950, and 1963: 1946, $66,000; 1950, $10,019,000; and 1963, $143,599,000.

In 1949 Florida had only one State mental health hospital at Chattahoochee. It was 540 miles from Miami. It had at that time only 3,000 beds and 6,000 patients. Many patients from south Florida had to spend their time in Tampa jails during their travel to the hospital at Chattahoochee.

In the Miami area, there was only one nonpublic institution. It had no psychiatrist and no neurologist.

At the present time there are in addition to the State mental hospital at Chattahoochee, the South Florida Mental Hospital in West Hollywood just outside of Dade County, the Northeast State Hospital and the George Pierce Wood Memorial Hospital.

Dade County now has facilities at the Jackson Memorial Hospital, the above mentioned South Florida State Mental Hospital, a new day-care center at the Veterans' Facility at Coral Cables, a mental health department within the Dade County Health Department, and the Dade County Child Guidance Clinic.

But the record clearly shows that these facilities in Florida are wholly inadequate to meet the pressing needs in the field of mental health. The Florida Association for Mental Health pointed out in December, 1962:

"At Chattahoochee many patients are housed in substandard, unsafe, old buildings. It would be preferable to eliminate the need for these buildings than to replace them." The association recommended that facilities be provided for mentally retarded patients and special facilities for older nonpsychotic offenders.

The South Florida Mental Hospital at West Hollywood in December, 1962 had about 430 geriatric patients, one-third of the total. Of the 430, about one half are not really mentally ill, although they do suffer from mental lapses which are concomitant with old age. In addition 70 percent of those on the hospital's waiting list are in this category.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the mental health appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, made by Congress, $4,200,000 was included to assist the States in developing broad State mental health care programs. The State of Florida has taken advantage of this appropriation by making use of a Federal grant thereunder for the development of a comprehensive program of mental health care in Florida.

Moreover, the American Psychiatric Association with the assistance of the State and local mental health groups made a survey and held hearings in Miami on July

25–27, 1962, and other hearings in Pensacola, Tallahassee, Jacksonville, Orlando, and Tampa. This survey was summarized in the October 1962 monthly bulletin of the Mental Health Society of Greater Miami expressing the need as follows:

"Facilities and services for the mentally ill and seriously disturbed children, more and better services for the patient coming out of the mental hospitals, low cost clinics, psychiatric services in general hospitals, day and night hospitals, more and better facilities for the senior citizen, psychiatric services in the courts, jails and stockades and probation services, better legal definitions of sane and insane, and more appropriations for training and research."

It also recommended that the seven different State units which now deal with mental illness should be combined into one State department of mental health, regional treatment centers for children, and community mental health centers. Similar recommendations have been made by the Florida Association for Mental Health.

Mr. Chairman, Florida, and particularly south Florida lacks the proper facilities for the proper care of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. Federal facilities for all practical purposes do not exist in Florida. Almost all of the seriously mental sick veterans must be sent to the Veterans' hospitals at Augusta and Atlanta, Ga., and at Gulfport, Miss. These hospitals have long waiting lists.

In the 2-year period 1959–61 the following data shows that Florida expended less than 2 percent of the total State expenditures for the care and treatment of mentally ill persons. In the United States the comparable figure was about 3 percent.

The table at the end of my testimony with respect to all Florida State mental health hospitals and the South Florida Hospital clearly shows the inadequacy of mental health facilities in Florida.

The State of Florida and all the communities therein now spend per capita, respectively, $2.60 and 21 cents in 1960 in comparison with $5.19 and 36 cents for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I need not relate the details or the data published by the Joint Information Services of the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association of Mental Health in its 1962 edition of 15 indices of mental health. These data show clearly the great need for expanded community health centers, for the staffing of these centers with highly trained professional personnel, and for the construction and servicing of facilities for the mentally retarded. Florida in these respects is highly deficient. It is my belief that the quicker Congress passes the legislation now before your subcommittee, the faster the comprehensive mental health programs will be able to get under way. Dade County needs it, Florida requires it, the national health and safety and defense demands it. We must move forward to conquer the great emergency created by existing mental ill health and the lack of facilities for treatment and prevention. I urge you strongly to report these bills out favorably at the earliest possible moment.

Data on Florida and south Florida State mental hospitals

	1959-61 budget	Number of patients	Patient-days	Cost per diem
Florida	$28, 923, 198	9, 466	6, 919, 039	$4. 180
South Florida	5, 209, 700	1, 018	743, 581	7. 006

	Estimated 1961–63 budget	Estimated number of patients	Estimated days	Estimated cost per diem
Florida	$38, 630, 483	10, 166	1, 638, 790	$5. 21
South Florida	7, 158, 206	1, 423	7, 420, 815	6. 89

Montoya Scores Smash Hit at Parliamentary Conference With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the congressional delegation appointed to represent our Congress in meetings with members of the Mexican Congress has returned from the Parliamentary conference. Much good was accomplished. The fruits of better understanding were cultivated. Those of us who had the privilege and responsibility of representing our Congress in this series of meetings are certain that they were mutually beneficial. We feel that they have resulted in a better understanding among leaders of the Mexican Government of our position and our policy in certain very vital areas.

By any standard of measurement, one of the highlights of the entire conference was the forceful and stirring address delivered by our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, at the final plenary session. Speaking in flawless Spanish, Congressman MONTOYA undeniably made a deep impression upon our hosts. In relatively few words, he presented our Nation's position, identifying it with the legitimate aims and aspirations of the Mexican people and pointing out the identity of interest we have in presenting in this hemisphere a strong and united front against the spread of communism. His remarks were enthusiastically applauded.

Since Congressman MONTOYA's address was heard not only by many leaders of the Mexican Government but also by a great number of interested citizens including professors and students from the University of Guanajuato who attended the final plenary session, it undoubtedly accomplished a great deal by way of developing a sympathetic understanding appreciation of the U.S. position. Under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in submitting herewith the English translation of this moving address:

LIBERTY CONCEIVED IN BLOOD

As we return to this great Republic for this the Third Parliamentary Conference between representatives of our respective Congresses, I cannot help but avail myself of the great honor and exalted privilege which attaches to one whose name is heir to a revolution such as yours here in Mexico. This great honor is further punctuated by the God-endowed opportunity to address you in the Spanish language which I first learned in the arms of my mother and which was emitted to my understanding by the palpitating caresses of my mother's heart and heritage.

I am proud to be an American and my heritage makes me appreciate with complete comprehension the great patriotism and heritage which adorns the liberty-loving people of this Republic—a nation consecrated by the blood of your patriots so that the winds of freedom and dignity would permeate the atmosphere to shelter your libertarian existence.

Abraham Lincoln gave sustenance to liberty in my country as Father Hidalgo and Benito Juarez forged the rivers of adversity and colonialism in order to mold a new life in yours.

Guanajuato was the altar from which Juarez presided over the liquidation of foreign rule—from which he infused new blood into the constricted and hungry veins of your determined people.

Liberty conceived in blood can endure only when it is dedicated to elevating the dignity of man. Only a people grateful for its sustenance and shelter can perpetuate it. Without this vital element, it would perish. Today, as we dedicate ourselves in the open fields of endeavor to promote the well-being of our compatriots, we are threatened by the empty propaganda of the Communist ideology. We have heard the utopian, yet hollow claims of communism. Its proponents have extolled the virtues of communism, yet if communism is so great, why must it be maintained by the bayonet? If it is so sacrosanct, why have 250,000 liberty-loving people abandoned Cuba? Why the Berlin wall? Why Hungary?

These are not the crops of freedom. These are not the bills of liberty. These are not the shelters of dignity. This is why your country and mine are on the frontline in our determination to eradicate this cancer from our midst. Our attack upon this disease must be both remedial and preventative.

The Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress symbolize the dedication of this hemisphere to eradicate this menace to our liberties. In this struggle, our efforts must never cease, rather, they shall continue.

Freedom, preciously won, must not and shall not be buried in the graveyard of complacency. The lamp of liberty must burn to light the hopes of men everywhere. Our esteemed President, John F. Kennedy, and your great leader, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, are predestined to protect the legacy we have inherited from Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt in my country and from Benito Juarez in yours.

In our effort to nurture a better way of life, my country's people bear a heavy burden. Your people also shoulder a great responsibility. Since 1946, my country has extended the total sum of $1 billion in loans and grants to yours. That this was done within the framework of the good neighbor policy and reciprocal advantage no one can deny, but it is an accomplished fact.

Today, under the leadership of our great President, John F. Kennedy, and your great Chief Executive, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, we in this hemisphere are marching upon the road toward our mutual goals.

The Alliance for Progress has united the liberty-loving peoples of this hemisphere as brothers, proud to carry the torch of freedom to the tops of our mountains, led on by the rhythmic tones of the freedom bells which were tolled by Jefferson and Washington, and by Hidalgo and Juarez and the other great liberators of our glorious history. Our common effort and great sacrifice are destined and dedicated to insure the greater dignity of our peoples and the economic development of our sister nations in this hemisphere.

The Alianza is the soul of this movement. Its vital components are agrarian reform and internal fiscal responsibility. In this respect your country mirrors a great example of compliance. Much remains to be done and I am certain that we shall continue in our dedication to this task.

We will not allow our high purpose to be threatened from within or from without by those who would subvert our freedoms. Our people are still in mourning because of the blood spilled to insure that government is a servant of the people and not the master. With this lesson we cannot permit communism to become the master and oppressor of the people.

I compliment your great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, who leads you in this worthy struggle. I commend you, the great Representatives and Senators of this Republic, for your constructive efforts and high sense of duty.

On behalf of the American delegation, I thank you, your most able Governor, Juan Jose Landa, and the people of Mexico for the gracious hospitality which has insured the success of our joint endeavors.

Major Domestic Problems in the 1960's—Address by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on last Saturday, March 23, the people of the city of Chicago were privileged to have as their guest the President of the United States. President Kennedy attended the dedication of Chicago's O'Hare International Airport and later addressed a civic luncheon. His remarks were an excellent discussion of the major domestic problems we face in the 1960's, and they deserve the study of every American. I ask unanimous consent that President Kennedy's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT A CIVIC LUNCHEON, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Mayor, your eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best, that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business, labor, the civic groups, and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

As Mr. Smith said, "All these things do not just happen; they are made to happen." And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize, which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the mayor has said after a great Chicagoan, who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth, and I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's; the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depression, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity. The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find work.

The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions, but also during periods of prosperity; and there are three reasons why I regard this as the number one problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago, Ill., and across the country. There are three reasons for it: First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now 1 farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans; compared to only seven at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the man-hours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year; comparable to the population of the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half million, while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated that disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year 3,800,000 will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed. Last year, the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained are declining, in factories, mines, farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society, even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school, but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those who come out of high school. But unfortuantely, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly 2½ million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises to 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years, the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3 percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly 2 million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermarkers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farm Home Administration of the U.S. Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard-driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion work days, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse, after each recession, and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of the manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession. Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downward.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten million dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the work week, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work.

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington, depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at their head, and my fervent hope is that the United States of America in meeting the needs of this decade will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities." Thank you.

San Francisco's Registered Voters Express Opinions in Congressman Mailliard's Survey on Controversial Legislative Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, some 18,000 of my San Francisco constituents have responded to my annual questionnaire mailed last month to every household containing one or more persons who registered for last November's election in California's Sixth Congressional District.

The following tabulation of the replies may interest my colleagues:

I. TAX REDUCTION AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

With an estimated budget deficit of $8.8 billion, the President has recommended tax reduction and reform programs estimated to create a budget deficit of $11.9 billion next year. These measures are intended to stimulate the economy to produce greater revenues in future years. Some of the most important questions to be decided follow. Do you want to:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Maintain existing tax rates and expenditure patterns?	19	66	15
B. Maintain existing expenditure patterns but enact tax reduction and reform measures including—			
1. Reduction of individual income tax rates from the present 20 to 91-percent range to 14 to 65 percent, decreasing revenues by $11,000,000,000?	55	33	12
2. Limiting itemized deductions, including charitable contributions, to those in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income?	34	52	14
3. Reduction of corporation tax rates from 52 percent to 47 percent, decreasing revenues by $2,600,000,000?	43	43	14
4. Elimination of $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividends?	23	60	17
C. Reduce the budget deficit by *cutting expenditures for*—			
1. Foreign aid to America's allies and underdeveloped countries?	66	26	8
2. American farm price supports and surplus storage?	80	13	7
3. Other domestic programs, i.e., welfare benefits and low-income housing?	50	40	10

II. MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Two basic plans will probably be considered by the 88th Congress. Do you favor a plan—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Managed by privately owned insurance companies with the Government paying the premiums of those who could not afford to pay themselves?	47	39	14
B. Managed by the Government and financed by greater social security taxes?	38	51	11

III. LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Recent strikes in the defense, maritime, and publishing industries have cast doubt on the effectiveness of present labor laws. Would you favor new laws to—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Compel Government arbitration with a decision binding to both parties in disputes declared by the President to endanger national welfare?	64	27	9
B. Subject labor unions to antitrust legislation on the same basis as corporations?	80	14	6

IV. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Do you favor Federal aid to—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. College and postgraduate education?	51	42	7
B. Grade and high school education:			
1. For general operations including teachers' salaries?	31	60	9
2. For classrooms and equipment only?	32	53	15

Our Naval Shipyards in Time of Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire and I both represent the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, one of the most outstanding naval facilities in the United States. The skilled craftsmanship of Portsmouth shipbuilders has been a joint Maine-New Hampshire tradition since Revolutionary times. The Polaris missile bearing submarines *Abraham Lincoln, John Adams,* and *Nathaniel Greene* either have been or are being constucted at the Portsmouth yard.

Because of the role of the naval shipyard in safeguarding our Nation's security, I am pleased to call your attention to the junior Senator from New Hampshire's remarks before the East Coast District Metal Trades Council on March 11, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator McINTYRE's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NAVAL SHIPYARDS IN TIMES OF CHALLENGE

(An address by U.S. Senator TOM McINTYRE, of New Hampshire, to the East Coast District Metal Trades Council, Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and members of the East Coast District Metal Trades Council, I am delighted to be with you today to discuss naval shipyards and their importance in keeping America strong. This Nation's response to the military and economic challenges of the Communist empire is an effort of unparalleled complexity and scope. The greatest military machine in the history of the world is poised in constant readiness to meet any test at any time. We have designed an electronic web to scan the earth from outer space and to penetrate under the sea. We are this moment designing weapon systems to counter military threats whose nature cannot yet be predicted with certainty.

Across the face of the world our technical and aid missions are challenging the forces of superstition and neglect, trying at the same time to outrace glib Communist promises of quick industrialization and easy progress. More than a million Americans are serving overseas on military duty, Peace Corps projects, volunteer health services, religious missions, and in other ways. This effort—beyond compare in the history of mankind—requires the utmost in resourcefulness, endurance, and imagination from Americans.

This Government's efforts on behalf of freedom involve many high-priority industrial, construction and research efforts. One of these I would like to mention by way of introduction to the problems of public policy confronting the naval shipyards. The greatest project of its kind ever undertaken in the United States is the construction of missile and rocket launch facilities. The preparation of sites for Atlas, Titan and Minuteman missiles involves 100,000 square miles of land. More than 400,000 people are actively engaged in this gigantic effort, which will cost more than $700 million in this fiscal year alone. At the same time, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is building huge static test facilities, and the enormous launch complex at Cape Canaveral. Testing and launching of the Saturn, Nova and Apollo rocket systems will be accomplished on facilities for which Congress appropriated some $500 million in the current fiscal year. These projects are urgent. They are important to our national security. Delay cannot be tolerated. The cooperation of industry, Government and most particularly labor has been essential.

Two years ago, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, of which I have since become a member, disclosed startling facts about strikes and work stoppages on the national missile sites. Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the subcommittee, called some of the practices which were uncovered both reprehensible and astounding. The conflicts between labor and management, aggravated by jurisdictional disputes, seriously crippled the all-important aerospace efforts of the Defense Department and the space agency. What was needed most urgently in this troubled situation? It was a spirit of cooperation and the active interest of all parties in achieving the No. 1 objective—the security of the United States of America.

In May of 1961, President Kennedy created the Missile Sites Labor Commission. Under the effective guidance of the Department of Labor, and with the splendid cooperation of George Meany and Walter Reuther, the number of days lost due to strikes on missile sites began a steady decline. The 1960 figure was 1 day lost out of 96. In 1961 the loss was 1 day out of 1,100. And by 1962, only 1 day was lost out of 2,200. The sense of responsibility and discipline which we associate with national security, combined with the outstanding record of cooperation among all parties, led to gratifying results. It is precisely this combination of responsibility to our national security objectives and sound labor-management relations that is so important to our naval shipyards. It is about the need of national security and the problems which may be created by labor unrest that I want to speak today.

While the missile and space program occupies the headlines, it must not be forgotten that our navy yards are vitally important for the Nation's security and would be overlooked at our peril. It is true today as it has been down through history that there can be no substitute for seapower. But in this nuclear age the seas have changed. No longer are they a barrier behind which we can feel safe from the intrusion of foreign aggressors. The seas have become highways which knit the world together, and it is therefore essential that we protect our national interests everywhere on the waters, from Antarctica to the North Pacific.

Our need for the Navy, our dependence, upon it, is clear. The pressing question is how best we can maintain it at full strength and combat readiness. We have been successful in times past of world conflict, having had time to tool up before entering World War I or reaching full strength in World War II. But in Korea there was no time. Our ability to put 600 ships to sea quickly was a decisive element in our strength. Those ships had to be there on the spot which they were needed. And now the need for speed is with us even more. Our Navy must be ever ready, and it is our naval shipyards that guarantee our readiness. The yards and their loyal and devoted workers stand today among the sentinels of our liberty.

The naval shipyards are basic to our strength for other reasons. They are subject to unified command with the fleets they serve. They maintain facilities and capabilities which, while they might not be economical in a profit-type organization, permit the Navy to take on any job with adequate reserves. Naval shipyards carry an extensive inventory of spare parts and shipboard equipment. You, as experienced shipyarders, are well aware of the importance of our readiness to our Navy.

A second element that makes the shipyards so important from the standpoint of national security, is their status as home ports for ships in the fleet. Naval bases provide ship's personnel opportunities for training, recreation, medical and dental care and other needed services. Above all, they give the men an opportunity to have a home life. The morale of our sailors is greatly heightened by the knowledge that they can keep their families near home ports. No one will argue with the right of these men who are serving our Nation, to have a home. It is a right we must recognize and preserve.

Still a third important contribution made by the naval shipyards arises from their close connection with the naval laboratories operated by the Bureau of Ships. As I study the achievements of today's Navy, I am amazed by their complexity. For instance, I learned that aboard a Polaris submarine there are upwards of 50 computers, of some 20 different types. The development of High Point and other water-skimming hydrofoils of immense speeds indicates the shape our Navy may take in the years ahead. I have come to realize the importance of uniting ship repair and construction with advanced research under common management.

There is yet another way, perhaps somewhat more intangible, in which shipyards contribute significantly to our national safety. As a representative of the State of New Hampshire, I am indeed proud of the long and distinguished history of the Portsmouth Shipyard which was authorized by Congress in an appropriation act of 1799. The first warship to fly the flag of the United States—the *Ranger* commanded by John Paul Jones—was built at Portsmouth. This tradition is ever in the minds of our shipyard workers. The exceptional morale of the Navy yards, their proven ability to meet the needs of the Nation again and again, and their tradition of excellence are factors of great importance in keeping existing organizations strong. A tradition this deep and real is precious to our American heritage.

But it is not the shipyards alone. The tremendous force that keeps the yards strong is the workers. Government workers, of course, are denied the right to strike. In a way this prohibition increases the reliability of the shipyards. But I would like to discuss the positive side of Government's employee-management relations. The employee who is denied the right to strike, I believe, certainly has a right to have just as great a voice in discussing working conditions as he would have otherwise. He ought not to be penalized because he is using his craft to help build the instruments of our security.

For years the chaotic procedures governing employee-management relations have been the Achilles heel of the Federal service, denying to the people the efficiency and improvement they have every right to expect. The voice of the Government worker must be heard, and it must be heeded to the greatest possible degree.

President Kennedy in June of 1961 instructed the Secretary of Labor to head a task force to work out new arrangements for employee relations in the Federal service. The President's Executive order of January 17, 1962 recognized for the first time the Federal employee's right to seek exclusive recognition through a unit to represent him in actual negotiations. This right to negotiate, is now extended where a unit achieves majority recognition. An organization receiving 30-percent recognition is entitled to be consulted on matters of interest to employees. The public interest in this field of improving employee-management relations is strong. The need is acute, I am gratified that we have begun to meet the need.

The Federal employee has not won the right to strike or the right to seek wage increases, other than by congressional action. But negotiations may now take place in such areas as working conditions, promotion standards, grievance procedures, transfers and demotions.

Let us not forget that the Executive order is still very new and much remains to be worked out. For example, it may take some time to work out guidelines for unit recognition. It would not be realistic, for instance, to insist that no unit smaller than an entire installation could be recognized. I think the last few months have witnessed more and more flexibility on the part of the Defense Department and other Federal agencies in encouraging the recognition of smaller groups within installations.

Of course, the first decision has yet to come down from an arbitrator at the top level of appeal in the Labor Department. Once we have a series of decisions, discussions on this point can be renewed if necessary. Meanwhile, like most other Members of Congress, I will wait with interest to see what policies emerge.

The organization of labor unions in our naval shipyards stretches back to the beginning of the last century. You must be very proud of that tradition and the vital part played by your members in meeting the challenges of their jobs. The new voice given your organizations by the Executive order will, I am certain, lead to many improvements in shipyard work. And it will yet be another source of strength. It will serve the national security interest and the Government's obligations to its employees. The Kennedy administration has in my estimation taken a long step forward in the direction of the finest type of relations with the Federal employee.

The most important point I could make here today would be to emphasize the combination of national security and sound labor organization in our naval shipyards. You are all aware, I am sure, that a campaign is underway to discredit the naval shipyards. The commercial yards are eagerly seeking a greater share of naval ship-repair work. It is their claim that tax-financed navy yards are driving them out of business by taking an undue share of repair work. Let's examine their claims in some detail—particularly from the standpoint of labor, peace, and the national security.

First, there can be no doubt that the assets which make the naval shipyards so important to the Nation are largely lacking in the commercial yards. Moving a ship from yard to yard denies it a home port, with the related important facilities we discussed earlier. The commercial yards are not integrated with naval command and lack the resulting readiness so vital in these troubled times. And the commercial yards are subject to delays arising from labor-management difficulties.

The agreements under which the shipbuilding and repair unions are now operating were concluded in 1960. The 3-year agreements expire this year, and we have yet to see whether harmful and dangerous interruptions to naval construction and repair will occur. But let us take a look at a few examples of what has happened during the life of the present agreements.

In 1960 strikes at one leading east coast commercial yard tied up work on 10 Navy ships.

In 1961 12 strikes involving 6,900 workers resulted in 124,000 idle man-days in the shipbuilding and repair industry.

In 1962 a strike in an eastern shipyard delayed the Polaris program for 10 days, despite the urgent priorities of putting nuclear submarines to sea.

This is not to criticize the labor record of our commercial yards, which in many respects has been excellent. But the danger of work stoppage is one the Secretary of the Navy must have the authority to weigh in assigning urgent modernization work. It is shocking to realize, in this year of contract expiration that efforts are underway to tie his hands, to deny the Navy the flexibility and discretion it must have in dealing with the uncertainties of schedules in commercial yards.

In fact, if the Navy did not have the ability to allocate its work after a day-to-day assessment of the labor situation, the strike threat in the commercial shipyards could well increase. As it is now, labor, management, and the Government have an equal interest in steady working conditions and the speedy settlement of difficulties in commercial yards. This balance should not be upset by hasty action dictated by short-term self-interest.

It is the natural and legitimate aim of the commercial yards to seek business. But where the national security is involved, and the good name of our naval shipyards is involved, the public has a right to the truth. Naval shipyards are not unfair competition. The Navy is not the enemy of private business. In fact, before a decision in 1951 to send a definite amount of repair work to private yards, the commercial shipyards did not have any share in modernization and repair. And, of course the private yards always have had the lion's share of initial construction.

More recently, one-quarter of repair and modernization—amounting to $159 million in the last fiscal year—has been allocated to the commercial yards. Thirty-seven private firms have participated in a construction and conversion program worth more than $4 billion since the end of World War II.

But this has not satisfied the commercial yards. They want to cut deeper and deeper into the share of work now being done so efficiently and expertly by the naval shipyards. Two bills now before the House Armed Services Committee would give the private yards a whopping 75 percent of the Navy's conversion and repair work. These bills, introduced by Representatives William Colmer, of Mississippi, and Alvin O'Konski, of Wisconsin, present a real threat to the naval shipyards and the job they are doing to aid in the Nation's defense.

The history of last year's military appropriation bill bears ample evidence of just how real is the danger to the naval shipyards. In April of 1962, the House Appropriations Committee reported out a bill directing that no more than 65 percent of the repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels be carried out at naval shipyards—although close to 75 percent was then being done at these Government installations.

Chairman Carl Vinson, a seasoned and astute student of our military needs, led the floor fight against the restriction. This provision could have led to a reduction of 5,000 workers in the naval yards, as well as weakening the management ability of the Secretary of the Navy. On April 18, Chairman Vinson offered an amendment to strike out the 65 to 35 provision. This amendment was defeated in the House by a standing vote of 130 to 64.

In the Senate, where the bill was reported June 8, the committee took the teeth out of the 35-percent requirement by permitting the President to disregard the requirement if he determined it "to be inconsistent with the public interest, based on urgency * * * capability and economy." In conference between the House and Senate, the Secretary of Defense was authorized to ignore the 35-percent requirement if it imposed delays or additional expense. It was by this narrow margin, then, that the attack on the naval shipyards was in part defeated. But this attack has not subsided. Those who would damage the whole structure of our naval shipyards are still at work.

One of the least publicized but more obvious reasons for the campaign of the private shipyards has been the decline in commercial shipbuilding and repair. Private yard employment on Navy work has increased from 26,000 in 1957 to more than 50,000 today, while overall employment in those yards decreased from 127,000 to 117,000 over the same period. It is the decline in commercial work, and not any weakness in the Navy's program, that has provoked the attack on the naval shipyards. This is important to remember in our fight to keep the naval shipyards operating at full force.

There was a time when 90 percent of our American exports and imports were carried in American merchantmen. But our early failure to build steel ships, inept Government management of the commercial fleet after World War I, and an off-and-on mail subsidy weakened the commercial fleet. By 1938, 90 percent of our fleet was thought to be obsolete.

The 1936 Shipping Act regulations for subsidized operations are so restrictive, that few shipowners have participated. The losses of American Export Lines on the construction of the *Independence* and the *Constitution* did little to raise the confidence of American operators. The construction subsidy has not helped the American yards as much as it might due to Government mismanagement and restrictive regulations. The remedy for these very real problems lies with the Maritime Administration and the Shipping Act—not in attacks on the navy yards.

World trade grew by 6 percent last year, and there are many opportunities for American ships. I am more than willing to work for the future of the merchant fleet, once the leading industry in my own State of New Hampshire.

But it is short-sighted in the extreme to attempt to cure the ills of this industry by threatening the very foundations of the naval shipyards whose history is interwoven with the growth and security of this Nation. I shall devote my energies as a Member of the U.S. Senate to promoting this country's security and honoring the inspiring traditions of its naval shipyards.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest I should like to publish a portion of my newsletter which was released today:

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Thousands of fifth district constituents responded to my recent poll requesting their opinions on some of the issues to come before Congress this year. It was extremely gratifying that almost 18,000 people took the trouble to reply. Many sent letters expanding on the answers they had given in the form, which included some 17 questions.

The replies indicate a 17 percent response, since I sent the questionnaire to just over 100,000 homes. Of those responding, 63 percent were listed as registered Republicans, 5 percent were Democrats, and 32 percent were Independents. I plan later to release the responses by party breakdown. The following is the final total tabulation without respect to party affiliation:

QUESTIONNAIRE, 1963

Do you favor:

1. Reducing Federal income taxes: (a) Geared to reduction in Federal expenditures, 83 percent; (b) Without a reduction in Federal expenditures, 11 percent; (c) No response (presumably against a tax cut), 6 percent.

		Percent		
		Yes	No	No opinion
2. Increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65?		35	58	7
3. Federal aid for construction of—				
A. Public primary and secondary school facilities?		49	43	8
B. Private primary and secondary school facilities?		12	75	13
C. College academic facilities?		42	46	12
4. Federal aid for public school teachers' salaries?		22	72	6
5. Federal scholarships for higher education?		55	38	7
6. Legislation providing tax credits for parents paying college tuition		70	25	5
7. Legislation requiring secret ballot of union members before strike can be called		93	3	4
8. Federal aid for commuter railroads		39	47	14
9. Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs		22	58	20
10. Establishment of Domestic Peace Corps		35	50	15
11. Increased pay for military personnel		42	37	21
12. Increased pay for Members of Congress		17	62	21
13. Optional nondenominational religious activities (prayers, bible reading, etc.) in public schools		79	14	7
14. A strong United Nations fully supported by all member nations		85	9	6
15. Aid to underdeveloped countries that are—				
A. Pro-Western?		72	16	12
B. Nonalined (neutral)?		34	44	22
16. Do you prefer the services provided by the Federal Government to—	*Percent*			
Be increased	10			
Be decreased	53			
Remain at present level	31			
No response	6			
If your answer favors increased services, are you willing to pay increased Federal taxes to obtain them?		63	30	7
17. What is your opinion of the President's record on—				
A. Domestic matters:	*Percent*			
Good	18			
Fair	44			
Poor	34			
No response	4			
B. Foreign affairs:				
Good	24			
Fair	41			
Poor	31			
No response	4			

Connecticut Shares in Important Anniversary of Greek Orthodox Church of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a great stirring in the interest of unity among Christians throughout the world, I believe that it is appropriate for this House to take notice of an anniversary which is a significant one for an important part of the church of Christ.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Seminary of the Greek Orthodox Church of the United States. I am proud to say that my own State of Connecticut shares in this anniversary in an important way, because it was in Pomfret, Conn., that the seminary was established. This is the wellspring from which have come the American-trained clergy to serve the faithful of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America.

In 1947 the seminary was transferred from Connecticut to Brookline, Mass., where presently it has a student body of 80 young men, with a faculty of 20.

Until the founding of the seminary, the million and a quarter persons who comprise the Greek Archdiocese depended on the Patriarchal Seminary of Constantinople and on the Theological School of the University of Athens for their clergymen.

The need for American-trained Orthodox clergymen became increasingly acute, until, in 1937, a tract of land and buildings were acquired in Pomfret, under the leadership of the then Archbishop Athenagoras of North and South America, now ecumenical patriarch of the Greek-Eastern Orthodox Church and first recognized among all equals of the rank at Istanbul, Turkey. The first dean appointed was another Athenagoras, the late Athenagoras Cavvadas, bishop of Boston and later archbishop of England and central Europe.

In its 25 years of service to God, the seminary has graduated 264 students, of whom 225 have been ordained as priests of the Greek Orthodox Church, and are now serving the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. More than one-third of the graduates have received further degrees from colleges, universities and theological schools.

The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, which they serve, has 380 churches in its jurisdiction, in nearly all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. There are 14 churches of the archdiocese in my own State of Connecticut.

The zeal and the pioneer spirit in education, religion, and in patriotism, of the two holy men who were the founders of the Greek Orthodox Seminary, and all of those who were associated with them and who assisted them through the past quarter of a century have made possible a rich contribution to the religious and cultural life of the people in our own State and in our own country as well as all of the Western World.

JEC Holds Defense Procurement Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee began 3 days of hearings into the economic impact of military procurement and supply. These hearings, scheduled for today, Friday, and Monday, will help move forward the job of the Joint Economic Committee of giving insight into our Nation's economy and the factors of importance to it. I believe it is important that all of the Members of Congress know of the existence and purpose of this study.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, who chairs this subcommittee, recently issued a press release on the scope of the background papers that have been prepared for the hearing and the scope of the hearing itself. To give a better idea of the areas into which the subcommittee will be looking, the Joint Economic Committee press release follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
March 25, 1963.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, today released a committee print entitled "Background Materials on Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply," March 1963. This updates a similar publication of the subcommittee that came out in February 1960.

These materials have been prepared for the subcommittee hearings which were announced March 21 and are scheduled for March 28, 29, and April 1, 1963.

Among the materials are:

MAGNITUDE OF OPERATIONS

Military real and personal property holdings have increased from $155 billion at the end of fiscal year 1960 to $165 billion at the end of fiscal 1962, an increase of $10 billion.

Personal property holdings have increased about $7 billion in that time, to $128 billion.

Expenditures for Department of Defense military functions were 8.7 percent of the gross national product at the end of fiscal 1962 compared to 8.5 percent the year prior.

From June 30, 1959 to June 30, 1962, the number of civilian personnel had decreased by 3,127, but with a payroll increase of $523 million.

The Department of Defense supply systems had unissued stores inventories costing $41 billion at the end of fiscal 1962. Eleven billion dollars (27 percent) of this was in the mobilization reserves.

The net value of military procurements during fiscal 1962 was $27.8 billion—up $3.5 billion from the previous year.

One State (California) had 23.9 percent of procurement actions and 27 States had less than 1 percent each.

The 100 largest prime contractors had 72.3 percent of the military prime contract awards (fiscal 1962).

Negotiated procurement amounted to 86.7 percent in fiscal 1962 compared to 86.9 percent in the fiscal year 1961.

Savings of 25 percent result when items can be "broken out" from more complex equipment and bought competitively.

There are $13 billion of excess and long stocks in military inventories.

The total surplus property disposals dropped from $6.791 billion in fiscal 1961 to $4.061 billion in fiscal 1962. The percent of total gross proceeds to acquisition cost was 3.87.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS—GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (GAO)

An index and digest of 207 GAO reports to Congress on the militiary procurement, supply and related subjects.

A report by the GAO on "Uneconomical Procurement of Certain Aircraft Engine Bearings by the Navy."

OTHER REPORTS

A progress report on organization, accomplishments, and programs of the Defense Supply Agency.

A statement by Secretary McNamara on the Department of Defense's 5-year cost reduction program.

Two case studies (one from GAO) dealing with the mobilization reserves.

Legal background and agreements affecting the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense relationships.

Oglethorpe University Basketball Team Places Third in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my alma mater, Oglethorpe University, near Atlanta, Ga., has recently appeared in some favorable headlines. Its basketball team, under the expert direction of Coach Garland Pinholster, finished third in the Nation in the NCAA small college division. Oglethorpe University, with just 400 students, was the smallest of all small colleges competing for the national championship.

Coach Pinholster, long recognized as one of the finest young coaches in the United States and author of three best-selling books on basketball, was selected as head coach of the Small College All-Stars for the Pan-American Games' playoffs next week in Kansas City. He was chosen over more than 700 other coaches in the NCAA and over more than 700 in the NAIA.

Coach Pinholster, who also serves as athletic director of Oglethorpe, has been named "Coach of the Year" in Georgia four times during his 7-year college career. His teams have been to two national tournaments and have won five other regional or conference championships.

At the same time, Oglethorpe University players have maintained an excellent scholastic record, averaging in the eighties as a team. This is a remarkable achievement in a college noted foremost for its academic standards.

Coach Pinholster and Oglethorpe University were featured on a national television program last year commemorating the 75th anniversary of basketball.

Coach Pinholster and Oglethorpe's "Stormy Petrels" have earned their places in the sun.

They have proved that victory need not come at the expense of high educational standards.

Cotton Industry in Life-and-Death Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing problems confronting our economy today is a solution of the cotton problem. The House Committee on Agriculture has been working on cotton legislation and our Subcommittee on Cotton started hearings back in December of last year, to bring out legislation that would have applied to this crop year. Our efforts to make the legislation effective in 1963 have not been successful up to this time; the difficulties facing the cotton industry have not been resolved.

Recently, on March 22, the distinguished chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, Representative Harold D. Cooley, was the principal speaker before the annual convention of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, and the address he presented to that group of mill owners and operators and textile manufacturers outlines the scope of our studies and the differences still existing before we can hope to bring legislation to the floor. Mr. Cooley outlined the history of the problem, explained the position of the committee, and concludes with his own personal suggestions for a solution.

I believe that Members will find the entire speech enlightening and informative, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Chairman Cooley's remarks delivered on that occasion:

Remarks of Hon. Harold D. Cooley, of North Carolina, Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Before the Convention of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Hollywood, Fla., March 22, 1963

COTTON INDUSTRY IN LIFE AND DEATH STRUGGLE

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I acknowledge with great gratitude the kind and gracious remarks of my friend Charlie Cannon. He has presented me to this great audience in fine fashion and in complimentary terms. Mr. Cannon has been referred to as "Cotton Cannon." In my opinion he is worth his weight in gold to the cotton industry of America. In the cotton industry he has always stood like the Rock of Gibraltar, and has been a beacon light.

I am delighted to be here with many close personal friends, and to have the privilege of meeting so many nice people. Bill Ruffin, your distinguished president, whom I have known since childhood and whose friendship I have cherished through the years, was very kind to invite me to this convention, and to arrange for me to have a part on this program. I am also very happy to be here with my friends Bob Stevens, Gordon McCabe, Bob Jackson, Charlie Myers, Rea Blake, Bob Coker, and others, all of whom are devoted to the institutions of freedom. They are courageous men of vision—they are not cry babies. When Charlie Cannon, Bob Stevens, Charlie Myers admit that they are in trouble, it is time for all of us to take notice.

Yesterday I heard with great interest the speeches delivered by Bill Ruffin, and our great Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon. With their permission, I shall insert in the Congressional Record, to perpetuate for posterity, the wisdom of their remarks. I shall also insert in the Congressional Record Bob Stevens' acknowledgment which emphasizes the fact that "Rome is burning."

I am grateful to all of you for the warmth and cordiality of the welcome accorded us and the hospitality and many courtesies extended to us during our sojourn here. I am very happy to have the privilege of discussing with you some of the problems in which all of us have a community of interest.

BIG BUSINESS

Agriculture is the biggest business in America in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry is the biggest part of American agriculture. Perhaps more than 10 million persons—almost one-sixth of the Nation's labor force—is engaged in the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

Cotton is competing with synthetic fibers. I do not like synthetics in cotton anymore than I do synthetics in tobacco. I do not want synthetic socks, shirts or shorts and I certainly do not want synthetic sheets, towels, or pillow cases. Neither do I want alfalfa to take the place of tobacco. Personally, I do not like filter-tip cigarettes. I agree with Edward R. Murrow—a chain smoker—when he said that to smoke a filter cigarette was like kissing a beautiful girl through a nylon veil.

Cotton maintained the financial integrity of the United States before the world for perhaps a century or more prior to World War I. The white fleece from southern fields up into this century accounted for approximately one-third of all U.S. exports, of crops and industrial products combined.

Cotton still comprises about 20 percent of all our agricultural exports and 5 percent of the total shipments abroad from agriculture and industry.

No one crop has had such an intimate relationship to the well-being and, indeed, the culture of so many Americans.

Cotton relates directly, through exports, to the flow of dollars back to the United States, amounting in years past to around $1 billion a year—dollars returning to the United States to balance against the huge sums we provide in foreign aid and in payment for imports of goods from abroad.

Thus it is plain to see: Government policy relating to cotton goes far beyond the immediate interests of the cotton farmer—it goes far, far beyond the immediate interests of you cotton manufacturers.

THE CRISIS

Gentlemen, I have opened these remarks in a way intended to impress upon you the importance of cotton—in terms of the Nation's economy, in terms of our Nation's balance of payments and financial strength in the world, and in terms of the well-being of millions of our citizens.

We are here in a serious purpose, a very serious and critical purpose.

Cotton is now in a life or death struggle.

Cotton is assailed, and is losing ground, on two fronts:

1. A flood of cheap textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry.

2. Synthetic fibers make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged.

Generally, these losing battles for cotton are explained, though oversimplified, by blaming the imports upon the two-price system—one price for our own mills and a lesser price for competing mills abroad; and by a high price for cotton here at home, in relationship to the lower competing price of rayon.

We have been aware of this approaching struggle for a number of years. Some of us in and out of Congress have tried to do something to forestall and avoid the crisis that is now upon us. But our efforts have been subjected to pressures, strains, and warps.

THE DESTINY OF COTTON

I shall not need to dwell at any length upon the fix we are in. You people are painfully aware of this. So are the people who produce the cotton that you spin.

A quarter of a century ago, U.S. cotton was the dominant factor in the world fiber market. This is no longer true. U.S. cotton faces competition from foreign-grown cotton and a host of man-made fibers.

Thirty years ago, if we exclude wool, silk, and linen, which do not directly compete with cotton on a price basis, cotton enjoyed about 93 percent of the total fiber market, with rayon and acetate accounting for the remainder. In 1961, the latest year for which comparable information is available, cotton had only 66.5 percent. In other words, cotton holds only two-thirds of the market in which it competes directly.

In the last 12 years, cotton has dropped from 30 pounds consumed annually by each individual in the United States to 22 pounds. Man-made fibers today account for over one-third of this market.

Seven years ago we were faced with the virtual loss of our export markets. U.S. cotton stocks on August 1, 1956, were at the record level of 14½ million bales. Our exports were only 2¼ million bales in 1955. Foreign cotton and rayon producers were taking over our markets by moving their products into consumption at prices lower than ours. From 1948 to 1955, cotton acreage in the free foreign world increased more than 60 percent. Foreign rayon production rose 2½ times.

We met this with our export program in 1956 that made American cotton available for export at competitive world prices. From 1956 through 1960 the rise in foreign cotton acreage and foreign rayon production were practically halted. Our exports during the last 7 years have averaged to about 6 million bales annually.

We are now faced with the identical situation in our domestic markets that we confronted in our export markets.

Between December 1960 and December 1962 cotton has suffered a total competitive loss of 1,150,000 bales. Over this period consumption of rayon in cotton-type spinning mills rose 63 percent. Consumption of dacron and similar-type fibers rose 118 percent. For the past 14 months, cotton's share of the fiber consumed on the cotton spinning system has declined every single month.

Rayon's price advantage to the textile mill over cotton was about 6 cents a pound in early 1960. Cotton's superior quality overcame this disadvantage. In its competitive fight with rayon, cotton was making gains. In the first half of 1960, the rayon industry cut the price of rayon staple fiber 4 cents per pound. On the other hand the price support for U.S. cotton was raised in February 1961. This resulted in a 3½-cent rise in prices from January to October of that year. Rayon's net mill cost advantage over cotton rose to about 14 cents per pound.

Cotton textile imports have increased sharply. In 1962, they reached a record 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton compared with 100,000 bales in 1954. Imports of cotton textile products over the past 4 years have had an average annual increase of 100,000 bales.

The deteriorating cotton situation is sharply increasing Government costs. Two years ago, CCC's investment was about $300 million. Today it has increased to over $1½ billion.

It is plain to all of us that American cotton is rapidly losing markets—both at home and abroad. Domestic consumption and exports during the current season are estimated at the lowest level since the 1958–59 season. This will be the third straight year of decline.

The Department of Agriculture currently is forecasting a carryover of around 10 million bales on August 1, 1964, up about 2¼ million bales from last year.

AN ADMONITION

This is the sad and sorry situation as of now.

The responsibility lies in many directions and rests upon many people. The House Committee on Agriculture and I, personally have worked long and hard to avoid the crisis now at hand. We may not have done always the right thing at the right time. But we have worked against very great odds, being ever handicapped by the lack of unity among farm organizations, among farmers themselves, and in the textile industry generally, as to the direction we should pursue.

All of us no doubt must bear some of the blame. I suggest that you in the manufacturing end of the cotton examine what you might have done, or now can do, differently.

Right here I want to speak to you frankly.

I am deeply disturbed by your headlong rush into the use of synthetic fibers.

I believe you are playing with a time bomb. You may get hurt. You may get hurt badly.

Is it not significant to you that the greatest increase in competitive imports of cotton goods has occurred simultaneously with your increases in blends of rayon with cotton and your presentation of these blends and mixtures into markets where consumers have preferred and asked only for cotton? Maybe you might say you are blending to compete pricewise with cheap cotton goods from abroad. But is there not a valid question as to whether foreign goods are moving, or will move into and take over our markets for quality cotton goods, as these markets are abandoned by you here who favor various blends, mixtures, and adulterations?

Let me admonish you that you—the textile industry of this country—may rue the day if ever the American consumer gets the idea that she must look for a foreign trademark, from Europe or from Asia, to be assured of getting a sheet, a towel, a piece of fabric, or a shirt, made of pure, unblended, unmixed and unadulterated cotton.

I submit that this is something for you to think upon.

A NEW START

The cotton industry—all of us—farmer and the miller—must make a new start. We must commence from where we are and from where we stand.

I want a cotton program to accomplish these things:

1. Fair and stable income for the cotton farmer;

2. Protection of the livelihood of the millions of workers associated with cotton;

3. A healthy cotton trade and merchandising system;

4. An efficient and prosperous cotton textile industry, and

5. A fair share of the world cotton market.

I fully understand these objectives can only be accomplished by a return to a one-price system for cotton. I know that otherwise cotton's markets will deteriorate unless we move in this direction and I know a competitive position for the cotton fiber will expand markets and put cotton back where it should be. Now, I have said all along that it is useless for me to consider this matter further until the textile industry, the producers and the administration can get together.

I realize that the textile industry has taken a firm position for an immediate return to one price for cotton. As you well know, this was also my position and was embodied in my bill, H.R. 2000. However, as we all know, subsequent developments have made it impossible to secure enactment of this legislation. In recent weeks I have spent a great deal of time conferring with the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates in the Department, leaders of cotton producer groups and other branches of the industry, in an effort to find a practicable approach that would get the job done and upon which general agreement might be reached. At this time I would like to suggest for your consideration and the consideration of all others involved what seems to me to be the best solution to this problem. Here are my specific proposals:

(1) Effective upon the enactment of legislation and until August 1, 1964, the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to make payments in kind that would move as far as possible toward a one-price system for cotton within the budgetary limitations already prescribed. In order to prevent market disruption, this payment would also be made on raw cotton in consuming establishments on date of enactment.

(2) Beginning August 1, 1964, and thereafter U.S. cotton would be made available to American mills at the same price as it is made available to foreign mills under existing law.

(3) Beginning with the 1964 crop the national marketing quota would be not less than the average off-take (domestic consumption and exports) for the 5 cotton-marketing years immediately preceding the year for which the determination is being made. It is only logical that our minimum production goal for a given year should be related to a historical average of consumption rather than estimates of potential off-take on a year-to-year basis. Under this provision our minimum acreage allotment for 1964 would be approximately 17 million acres.

If additional consumption indicates a production above the minimum, this should be equitably apportioned between an increase in the national allotment and an acreage reserved for producers who desire to grow cotton above their individual share of the national allotment for the world market at world prices.

(4) Immediately upon enactment of this legislation the Commodity Credit Corporation should be directed to make available to the Agricultural Research Service of the Department not less than $10 million annually to be devoted to research designed to reduce the cost of producing cotton. This section of the legislation should also provide that as unit costs of producing cotton are reduced the price support would be lowered accordingly, thereby reducing the cost to the Government without impairing farmers' net incomes.

I want to emphasize the extreme importance of this matter of research to reduce our production costs and also I wish to emphasize the fact that we do have extremely promising opportunities to actually reduce cost of producing cotton. We have documented testimony before our cotton subcommittee by the Director of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department, the director of research for numerous State experiment stations and private industry that cost reductions in excess of 10 cents per pound are feasible and can be attained in a reasonable number of years. The plain fact is that research offers the only permanent solution to the problem.

Unless everybody gives a little there will be no legislation and up to this point I have not seen any sign of anybody giving, but if this is not done our markets will deteriorate.

As you no doubt are aware, the House committee is divided sharply along political lines, and unless Democrats on the committee are in virtually unanimous agreement, it is not likely that we shall have any legislation at all.

CONGRESS OUR LAST HOPE

Congress is our last hope, and this is our situation. Not only in our Committee on Agriculture, but in the House, there is not one Republican vote we can count for sure, on legislation now being proposed to deal with our desperate problems.

We have exhausted every other recourse.

We first tried through the Office of Emergency Planning to bring into action the emergency powers of the President to stem the flow of foreign textiles into this country. Everybody admits it is an outrage that foreign mills can buy our cotton at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than our own mills, and then send unlimited amounts of their cheap cotton goods into our markets. But we failed to get action.

We went before the Tariff Commission seeking import quotas and import fees to check this rising flow of foreign textiles. But again we failed.

We went the route of an 18-nation agreement, to bring within reason the shipment of foreign textiles into our markets. But this has been far from effective.

Thus rejected, we have turned again to the Congress.

We in the Committee on Agriculture recognized the urgency of the situation, and our Cotton Subcommittee began work last fall to have legislation ready for action immediately upon the convening of the 88th Congress in January. Meanwhile, the Advisory Committee on Cotton appointed by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was working to find a meeting of minds among cotton producers. People in the textile industry were putting their heads together, for the same purpose.

This concerted effort was an inspiration full of promise.

I soon got the impression that everyone was agreed, from Houston and California to Boston, on the proposition that we would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments-in-kind, in a way to erase and remove the two-price cotton system as a burden upon our own textile industry.

When the new Congress was only a few days old, I introduced H.R. 2000, to provide payments-in-kind in such a manner as to remove the 8½-cents-a-pound advantage to foreign mills, gained through the export subsidy, and to assure our industry a fair competitive position.

Moreover, by reducing the price to our mills to the world price of cotton, I expected that cotton would be freed of the competitive disadvantages that now so strongly favor the synthetic fibers and pose such a great threat to the total production and use of cotton in our domestic markets.

But I found later to my amazement that the administration was not willing to pay the 8½ cents to completely equalize the price situation, but would support payments-in-kind only to the extent of 4 to 6 cents a pound.

Meanwhile, in a bill introduced by Chairman E. C. GATHINGS of the Cotton Subcommittee, and by amendments offered in our committee, we had before us a proposal for overplanting of cotton by farmers who were willing to take the world price for cotton on acreage they tilled above their allotments. We had also a proposal for a far-reaching program of research into ways and means of bringing down the cost of producing cotton, with the long-term view of reducing the price of cotton to place this fiber in a fairer competitive position with synthetics.

Confronting a stalemate, I had prepared by the committee staff and was ready to introduce a bill, containing the overplant and research provisions, but giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion in determining the level of the payments-in-kind—instead of insisting upon the full payments of 8½ cents per pound.

I very soon learned that this was unacceptable to the textile industry—that is, to you people here.

THE SITUATION TODAY

You are a discriminating, and a brilliant audience. In full consideration of this, I had hoped to bring to you more than an exercise in language. I wanted to lay before you a program for the good of all of us—a program that the Congress could enact swiftly, so that we could get on with the job of putting cotton back where it should be. However, all is yet confusion.

Nevertheless there are two things I have said that I want to repeat here in this forum. I implore you to listen carefully.

When I found on February 21 that the textile manufacturing industry would not support legislation that provided anything less than a full subsidy representing the difference between the domestic price and the world price for cotton, I issued a statement to the press, and I quote from that statement:

"I have decided not to introduce a new bill until all segments of the cotton industry and the administration can reach an agreement and indicate a willingness to support legislation to carry the agreement into effect."

That is my position today.

In a public appearance on March 9, I said this:

"There is danger that the Nation's farm program will collapse, setting off a severe depression in the general economy. Great difficulties now confront the House Committee on Agriculture in writing legislation to deal with an urgency in cotton resulting from the flood of foreign textiles moving into our markets and from the severe competition of synthetic fibers for markets formerly held entirely by cotton. This effort to remove the inequity suffered by the textile industry has been blocked by partisan politics and by the opposition of one farm organization. However, I expect a cotton bill will be taken to the House floor for a vote.

"I think that if this effort to do justice to our textile industry and to cotton farmers is defeated, no other farm legislation will be forthcoming at this session of the Congress. This would be the beginning of the end for farm programs."

That is the situation today.

Let me say to this distinguished group that to end farm price and production adjustment programs would bring on a terrible farm depression. This would be reflected quickly in a downturn for the entire economy.

Certainly the collapse of the farm program would mean cheaper cotton, at least for a while. But if you younger men in textiles think that in itself is good, I suggest you consult with some of your older colleagues, on what a mess they were in when cotton was 5 cents a pound.

In these circumstances, and in all the confusion on cotton policy, I can leave with you but one message, and this is the message: You must insist upon, and there must be, a meeting of minds. There must be agreement upon policy. Whatever it takes to bring together the views and the positions of honorable men, this must be done. Cotton legislation must come out of this Congress.

The consequences of failure are too dismal to contemplate.

In parting, I assure you I shall be pleased to work with you in your own self-interest, and in the interest of our farmers, and in the interest of the millions of other people who are bound to cotton for their well-being, and for the health of our economy and for the power of our country. I wish you Godspeed.

The Challenges of Tomorrow's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1963, the Diocesan Labor College, Buffalo, N.Y., celebrated a quarter century of education in the field of labor-management relations. On this silver jubilee celebration, the bishop award ceremonies were incorporated.

The opening remarks, made by Very Rev. Msgr. Stanley A. Kulpinski, diocesan director of the Labor College follow:

THE CHALLENGES OF TOMORROW'S INDUSTRIAL LIFE

The faculty, the alumni and graduates of the diocesan labor schools graciously welcome your presence at the silver jubilee graduation and bishop's award ceremonies.

A silver jubilee is a special occasion. It reflects a quarter of a century of cooperation and efforts of various fields of endeavor.

At a moment like this, our first impulse is to send a great prayer of gratitude to God Almighty through St. Joseph, the patron saint of the working people. It is only through the power of Almighty God, guiding us, inspiring, illuminating our minds, protecting us, leading us ever on, unswervingly, toward proper goals, filling us with divine courage and strength and tenacity and perseverance that we are able to stand before you today having you share with us the joy of this jubilee.

At a time like this we must also bring to our grateful recollection the persons who initiated this divine work. First on the list is His Excellency the late Most Reverend John A. Duffy, who gave permission and encouraged Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Boland to establish the labor college. Monsignor Boland must be given credit not only for founding this college, but also for his prophetic vision, where he foresaw the service and the need such a unique institution will fulfill for the community of western New York. Then came a succession of bishops who personally nourished the continuation of this work; viz, His Eminence the late Cardinal O'Hara and of recent beloved memory, His Excellency Bishop Joseph A. Burke and now present with us His Excellency Most Rev. Leo R. Smith.

Hundreds of persons went through the portals of this school, some to learn and others to teach. Time does not permit us to mention by name those on the previous teaching staffs who gave of their time and efforts and money, whose self-dedication was an inspiration to their students. We bow our heads in reverent memory to those amongst us on the faculty who have already passed to their eternal reward. Their names and their self-dedicated teaching will live on in the hearts of their living students. Just to mention a few, the late Jack Cassidy—a sales executive from Alleghany Ludlum, the late Henry Manka—on the grievance committee of United Rubber Workers Local 135, the late Congressman Radwan—all made self-sacrificing contributions to this cause.

Ours is a unique institution, perhaps even regarded as peculiar in the minds of some. It is not accredited, that is, it does not give college credit. It does not create specialists for any particular profession as such. It does not give any homework to its students. It holds no examinations.

Yet as the graduates who will come to get their diplomas will prove it attracts persons from all walks of industrial life, from the president of a company to the lowest classified factory laborer.

The secret is that this diocesan labor college teaches an industrial way of life that has been verified to be successful not only for the last 25 years but for the last 70 years.

The students are taught in such a manner that what they learn on Monday evening at the college they can immediately put into practical use next day on the factory floor, business conference room, or a union meeting.

To be more specific this school insists that it is not enough to know the technicalities of industrial relations but that in order to bring harmonious and just relations between labor and management and the community the whole man, the complete man must be educated with special emphasis on his heart, his conscience, his immortal soul. That is why one subject is always compulsory to all, that is, Industrial Ethics; this subject is based on the Pope's Encyclicals especially now on the latest Encyclical of Pope John XXIII, "Mater Et Magistra," which Encyclicals in turn are based on the Ten Commandments of God—acceptable to Catholic, Protestant, and Jew.

We believe that the answer to the challenges of tomorrow's industrial life will be found, not so much on the field of technical scientific programs, but on the bedrock moral principles as found in Pope John's Encyclical "Christianity and Social Progress."

As Pope John puts it, "The recognition and respect of a moral order that is valid for all, which recognizes its foundation in God, the protector and defender, distributor of goods, riches, and mercy, and the terrible avenger of injustice and inequality from Whom no one can flee."

The following awards were then presented:

The Bishop's Plaque, the highest honor that the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College can bestow, was awarded Sunday to three Buffalo men at the college's 25th anniversary dinner.

They are: William J. Ryan, assistant executive director, United Fund of Buffalo and Erie County, for his leadership among labor groups in support of the fund;

Martin A. Wersing, mediator in the State Mediation Board's Buffalo District office, for promoting labor-management peace;

J. Edmund Kelly, Jr., Buffalo Evening News labor reporter, for consistently excellent and unbiased reporting.

Special silver jubilee plaques went to Joseph A. Beirne, Chevy Chase, Md., international president of the Communications Workers of America (AFL–CIO), for enlightened labor leadership.

COURSES PROVIDED

Edgar F. Kaiser, president, Kaiser Industries Corp., Oakland, Calif., for promoting labor-management peace and for inaugurating a sharing-of-savings plan. His administrative assistant, Norman E. Nicholson, accepted his award.

Mr. Kelly's citation read:

For serious guardianship of the code of journalistic ethics; for skill, courage, and prudence in positive reporting of the total industrial picture—an example of correctness in truth and justice.

Mr. Wersing's read:

For contributions in achieving the prospect of labor and management working together for the benefit of both in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

CONTRIBUTIONS NOTED

Mr. Ryan's read:

For a distinguished and outstanding service to the industrial community of Erie County and dedicated stewardship to the common man.

Mr. Kaiser's read:

For his contributions to the changing American economy in the cherished traditions of the free enterprise system and free collective bargaining—his effort to eliminate the need for long negotiations or strikes and sharing with the workers the gains from new processes—for a full generation of personal achievement as an outstanding, intrepid American.

Mr. Beirne's read:

For his inspiring, enlightened leadership in the American labor movement, in promoting the social principles of justice and charity—for his more than 25 years' devotion to organized labor—for his militancy in preserving the democratic way of life based on the dignity of man—for his unending campaign to unite all segments of society for the common welfare of all.

PRAISE FOR CITIZENS

In accepting the plaque, Mr. Kelly said:

I shall cherish this award not only for its own significance but also for the memories which attach to it.

It will remind me of the many fine, decent, conscientious people whom it has been my pleasure to meet in the unions, companies, and government services in the Buffalo area.

It will remind me, too, of the great newspaper I am privileged to represent—a newspaper which, in the highest traditions of journalism, has always permitted me freely to report local labor-management news as objectively as possible and which has always gladly given me the broadest possible freedom in commenting upon the labor-management scene in my signed column.

ADULT COURSES PROVIDED

Finally, and importantly, this award will remind me always of the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College—an institution whose efforts in behalf of order and justice ennoble our community.

For this award then, and for the memories it will mean, I am humbly and sincerely grateful.

The college provides adults educational courses in labor-management relations, labor history, industrial ethics, collective bargaining, job evaluation, and public speaking.

The Most Reverend Leo R. Smith, administrator, Catholic diocese of Buffalo, who presented the bishop's plaque, said in the world of automation there is danger man may forget about God.

There is danger to religion that methods of technology may make truth unimportant.

URGES ABSOLUTE STANDARDS

It is up to not only the church but every one interested in humanity to devote some thought to the problem. The longer we live in a technological world, the longer we realize the limits of human knowledge.

The bishop concluded with a plea for absolute standards of good and evil for men to live by.

TWO JOIN IN TRIBUTES

Mayor Kowal presented keys to the City of Buffalo to Mr. Beirne and to Mr. Nicholson for Mr. Kaiser, Common Council Majority Leader Stanley A. Makowski presented an engrossed resolution passed by the council in commemoration of the anniversary to Monsignor Kulpinski.

Mr. Nicholson said the plan to share savings will result in payments to workers even though the Kaiser Co. is losing money this year. He noted its basic premise is that no one should lose his job as a result of any laborsaving devices installed.

DISCARDS SPEECH

New-product manufacture and retraining will be utilized in an effort to employ workers on new jobs, he said. Difficulties in the plan will be worked out through negotiation.

Mr. Beirne discarded a prepared speech to stress his conviction the American worker's strength lies in his belief in God, in the family and in our Nation. He said the greatest enemy is communism.

The Communications Workers' president predicted that, while the laws and economies of our democracy and the Communist nations might draw closer together, there is one unbridgeable gap—belief in God and in human kind.

Mr. Beirne noted that the world is changing and labor and management cannot cling to the views they held in the 1930's.

HAILS ENCOURAGEMENTS

He said the fact labor leaders did not strike to win "does not mean we have become soft or that we have sold out."

He warned against compulsory arbitration, advising that a third party also might be called in to regulate profits and production.

Mr. Beirne concluded with a tribute to the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College for encouraging adults to think for themselves in fields where there was an opportunity to provide justice.

Erie County executive, Edward A. Rath, expressed his felicitations which follow:

May I extend the official greetings of the county of Erie and my own personal greetings to you on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebration of the Diocesan Labor College.

This dinner tonight with the attendance here of people representing every segment of our community testifies to the high regard that all of us have for the excellent work in this very vital area of human relations which you have done in the 25 years since your founding. Twenty-five years ago the labor movement in this country was making an excellent beginning in bringing into the ranks of organized labor millions of people including those in the unskilled classes. The aims and objectives of this movement designed as they were to bring about better and safer working conditions, improved wage scales, and all those things which are consonant with the inherent dignity of man had and have the overwhelming support of enlightened persons everywhere. But with the increasing membership of unions, it was imperative that some individuals or organization should be ready to train persons in the movement to their new responsibilities and opportunities. It was this purpose that the Diocesan Labor College has fulfilled so ably and well in our own particular community. Yours has been an excellent record. You have our hearty congratulations and best wishes for an even greater future.

Thank you.

It was my pleasure to pay high tribute to the college for its outstanding work and its contributions to the labor-management relations in the Niagara Frontier.

I would like to include a telegram sent by President John F. Kennedy to Monsignor Kulpinski on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebration.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Very Rev. Msgr. STANLEY A. KULPINSKI,
Buffalo Diocesan Labor College,
Silver Jubilee Banquet,
Lafayette Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.:

I am very pleased to extend congratulations and warm best wishes to the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. I would also like to commend you for the contribution you are making to labor-management affairs by awarding such a distinguished member of the business community as Edgar Kaiser your Bishop's Plaque for industrial statesmanship. Too often, attention is focused on failure in labor-management relations rather than achievement.

In honoring Edgar Kaiser, you acknowledge the achievement of one whose industrial leadership benefits the entire community, whose confidence in the process of collective bargaining has strengthened it, and whose vision has yielded programs for meeting the challenges of technological change.

To Monsignor Kulpinski, Edgar Kaiser, and to all participating in the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College silver jubilee go my very best wishes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The program began with the advancement of colors by the Adam Plewacki American Legion Post, Buffalo; the National Anthem was sung by Mr. James Wolford, business agent; and the invocation was given by Rev. Gerald R. Forton, associate director of the college.

The master of ceremonies was Mr. Edward J. Kanowski, director of public relations, Diocesan Labor College, United Fund.

His Excellency, Bishop Leo R. Smith, was introduced by Mr. Henry J. Osinski, and the benediction was given by Rev. William Grau, director, Lackawanna Labor School, Lackawanna, N.Y.

On March 9, 1963, an editorial appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., commenting on one of the recipients of an award. The editorial follows:

MERITED AWARD

J. Edmund Kelly, Jr., labor reporter of the Buffalo Evening News, will receive one of four plaques for outstanding contributions to labor at the silver jubilee dinner of the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College tomorrow evening.

He is cited for "consistently excellent and unbiased reporting in the field of labor-management relations." He has been on the labor "beat" for 12 years and his column "Ed Kelly's Comment on Labor" appears in the weekend edition of the News. Coming as it does from the Labor College—a unique institution dedicated to promoting ethical conduct and moral values in relationship between management and employees—the award is extremely gratifying to the News and a merited tribute to a fine reporter.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

MARCH 1963.

DEAR FRIEND: March was a busy legislative month, with the House taking action on several important bills. I voted for the defense authorization bill, including an extra appropriation for greater development of the manned supersonic bomber. The manned bomber will play a vital part in our defense structure for many years. With the new defense appropriations, our country stands stronger than ever before, on land, sea, and in the air. In line with this, I also voted to extend the military draft another 4 years. For our internal security against the spread of communism, I voted for an appropriation to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Federal money poured into the Sixth District during March, with $144,440 going to Altus for a new National Guard armory, $64,000 for Mangum's new water system, and $10,571 to Riverside Indian School at Anadarko for remodeling of the fieldhouse.

It was a pleasure to assist cotton farmers, gins, cottonseed oil mills, and compresses in my district by protesting any change in policy in storing Government cotton. I hope that the present policy of negotiating rates will be in effect for a long time. It will benefit the local cotton interests.

Although the proposed Deep Fork project in central Oklahoma is not in my district, I joined the other members of the Oklahoma delegation in support of the project at a hearing in Oklahoma City. When the project is completed, Oklahoma's greatest dreams will be realities.

A prominent resident of the Sixth District, Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn of Sentinel, was honored in Washington in March for her contributions to the Outdoor Advertising Association's film, "In More Ways Than One."

In order to keep residents better informed on matters affecting their interests, I am presenting a series of monthly 5-minute radio and television programs featuring interviews with prominent Washington officials in Government. Response to the first two programs has been very good. Interviews have been held with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and former Under Secretary of State, now Ambassador to West Germany, George McGhee. My April program will feature an interview with Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, who will discuss the present status of proposed Bureau of Reclamation water projects in my district.

It was a privilege to help secure permission from the Government for district court at Mangum to use the Federal district courtroom. For some time, the district courtroom has been unusable and the graciousness of the Government in allowing a State court to use the courtroom is appreciated.

My award for "letter of the month" goes to a woman who wrote me, "About 20 years ago you asked me if I knew of anyone who might be interested in going to the U.S. Naval Academy and these many years later I am answering you." I am always glad to help constituents, even if it takes 20 years just to get the request.

If I may be of service to you at any time, just phone, wire, or write.

Cordially your friend,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, World War I provided an opportunity for the suppressed nationals under czarist Russian control to strive for national identity. One of these ethnic groups, the Byelorussians, had never before experienced sovereignty. As a part of Lithuania, they had formed a powerful unit within the empire, extending their influence to such an extent that the Lithuanians used the Byelorussian tongue as the official language of their court. When joined with Poland to form the greater Lithuanian-Polish empire, Polish supplanted Byelorussian as the official idiom. With its dominance diminished, the Province became only a name.

In its expansion westward, Russia was able to annex the territory in 1795 and changed its name to the northwestern territory. The spirit of nationalism was not extinguished, though, by this apparent move to obliterate all which was not Russian. In 1906 the first Byelorussian weekly appeared, but was immediately suppressed. Not until the World War and the fall of the czarist government did the Byelorussian people achieve their hopes and ambitions. Although occupied by the German troops in 1915, nationalist fervor soon reached overwhelming proportions. Permitted to establish their own local government, the National Council proclaimed, on March 25, 1918, an independent republic.

With the collapse and retreat of the German Army, the newly sovereign nation was left to the mercy of the Soviet forces. Proclaiming on January 1, 1919, a Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Red army soon occupied all the land belonging to the stricken state. But Polish troops attacked and conquered almost half of the contested territory. As in war, so was it partitioned in peace. In March 1921, Soviet Russia and Poland divided what was once the independent republic.

Today, the Soviet Union controls the entire area, having reconquered the Polish western half during World War II. There is a Byelorussian Republic in existence, a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was even a charter member of the United Nations. Yet it is a sovereign state in name only. Control emanates directly from the Soviet Government in Moscow.

We in the United States, who are the champions of democracy and freedom, honor the Byelorussians who fled from persecution and terror by saluting on March 25, the 45th anniversary of the true independence of their country, and hope that the Byelorussians will once more be able to enjoy democratic rights and privileges under an independent and sovereign government of their own creation.

Medicare for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from one of my constituents a copy of a notice which he had received from his insurance company informing him that, due to his age, his quarterly rates for health insurance were to be nearly doubled—from $12.48 to $23.93.

The text of the notice from the insurance company follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Re health insurance policy No. —. (Anniversary date April 10, 1963.)

DEAR POLICYHOLDER: You are aware that medical costs have increased considerably during the past few years and there is every indication they will continue to do so.

During this time we have not had a general rate increase to policyholders because we have maintained our operating costs at the lowest possible level commensurate with efficiency.

We are now paying out more in benefits and expenses than we are collecting in premium. This makes it necessary to increase our rates generally in accordance with the attained age of each policyholder. Because of this fact, beginning with the above anniversary date of your policy, the premium will be the amount shown below. You will be pleased to know that we have not reduced any of your benefits.

We regret the necessity of this action and solicit your understanding.

Very truly yours,

——— ———,

Chief Underwriter, Group Health Insurance Department.

Quarterly $23.93.

The policyholder receiving this notice was 64 years of age and his main source of income was a $89.90 monthly social security check.

I cite this case because it is typical of the situation faced every day by a growing number of Americans who find at a period in their life when they are most in need of medical benefits that they are least able to pay for these benefits. This case is but another that points to the system. The enactment of such a program of medical assistance to the elderly financed through the social security system. The enactment of such a program would enable all Americans to pay the cost of their future medical care during their working years when they are best able to meet these costs.

Latin Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, my distinguished colleague, Representative DANTE FASCELL, of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, and myself conducted hearings in Miami at our own expense on March 14 and 15 with regard to the problems created in our county by the absorption of Cuban refugees fleeing Castro and communism.

Many suggestions were made at the hearings about approaches to solving the problems which are created by the absorption of many thousands of these fine people.

Paramount in the minds of many of our local people, who have earned a Nation's gratitude for extending open arms to these people, is the need for increased resettlement of the overflow to many other parts of the Nation. This has been the key phrase used, so far as I can determine, in regard to resettlement—"to other parts of the Nation."

I should like to invite attention of the House to a proposal I have made to the Honorable John Thomas, Director of the Cuban refugee program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I respectfully invite my colleagues to explore with me a new approach which could have a tremendous impact in combating the efforts of Castro and Moscow to "brainwash" our good friends in other Latin American nations:

MARCH 28, 1963.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
Director, Cuban Refugee Program, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: You are aware of course, of the growing public sentiment in Miami for increased emphasis on relocation of refugees from Castro's communism to other parts of the United States to relieve the pressure on our area which has been caused by the absorption of so many of these fine people.

I am aware, of course, that the Department has done a commendable job to date in transferring more than 50,000 of the refugees to other parts of the Nation. It was pointed out at our Miami hearings, you will recall, that many of the refugees return to Miami because of its geographic location to Cuba; because of the climate and because of the desire to be close to people of their own tongue and social customs. A strong underlying motive, of course, has been the compelling desire by these people to do something actively to rid the hemisphere of Castro and to free their homeland. To a large extent, they are frustrated in this area because of limitations on their activity.

It occurred to me that we might develop an original program to put the energies of these active people to work in an all-out psychological and intellectual "cold war" against Castro and communism. These people, many, many of them, could be our first line of offense in building public opinion throughout the Latin American and South American countries against Castro's current effort to export communism to those countries and infect other nations with the long-range plan by Moscow to infiltrate and bring about the downfall of these nations.

The President's outstanding Peace Corps program has done much to help the people of Latin America, as it has throughout the world, and to let the people of many nations see democracy in action.

I want to explore with you a plan for creation of a Latin Peace Corps under the Cuban refugee program with the following objectives:

1. To provide a program under which Cuban refugees could volunteer for assignment to Latin American nations to tell the story as eyewitnesses about what has happened and what is happening in Cuba.
2. The program should be devised so that their skills can be used according to their occupations in such fields as teaching, medicine, law, writing, and engineering.
3. Those volunteering under the Latin Peace Corps program would receive benefits comparable to those they now qualify for as refugees while on assignment.

It seems to me that this approach would have a strong appeal to thousands of these people who want to do something actively to fight Castro and communism. This approach to "resettlement" is one that should have considerable appeal to the refugee colony in Miami, and an approach which could be useful to our country.

I respect your experience as an expert in the field of resettlement activities based on your 18-year career, and solicit your opinion, and suggestions with regard to the creation of a Latin Peace Corps as described above.

Kindest regards, and
Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

Preservation of Birthplace of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 4963, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds the site of the Jacob Graff House in Philadelphia for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park. The city, State, and various patriotic groups, including the Philadelphia Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, are supporting efforts to restore this famous house where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Independence National Historical Park, still in process of improvement and completion, has been described by the Park Service as "the greatest concentration of historic buildings and sites in the United States." The annual number of visitors to this shrine of our Nation and its founders is in the millions. The principal section of the park covers a one-block-wide area extending from Sixth to Second Streets. The adjacent site of the Graff House at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets is strategically located for addition to this basic area.

This bill which I have introduced will have, I hope, the wholehearted support of Congress and of Americans throughout our country. The preservation and development of a site of such nationwide historic significance in the establishment of the American Republic transcends local boundaries. The birthplace of the Declaration of Independence may well be termed one of the basic cornerstones of such a national shrine.

Address of the Honorable Wayne Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of our distinguished colleague in the other body, the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE.

The commonsense of Senator MORSE in evaluating foreign affairs strikes me as of value to all of us. His remarks about our relationship to our European allies are applicable to the other nations of the world also. In a recent speech before the annual dinner of Bnai Zion, Ambassador Philip Klutznick came to virtually the same conclusions about what that relationship should be: a working together of friends. We are not interested in supporting Europe or any other entity if they do not want our assistance and we do not want their cooperation if they are unwilling to give it.

Senator MORSE's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, OF OREGON, U.S. SENATE, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

On January 16, I spoke here about some of the original purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and why I believe those original purposes have largely been achieved. It was, and is, my contention that if NATO is to continue to be worthwhile to the United States, it must be forged into a new alliance with new purposes. Yet at this turning point, a loud and very important objection to a broadening of the Atlantic alliance is being heard from France, one of its principal members.

Since my earlier remarks were prepared and delivered before President de Gaulle's press conference was available for study, I would like to add some further reflections on what I think our situation is, judged from the attitudes expressed by President de Gaulle.

CONTENTION THAT UNITED STATES MAY NOT DEFEND EUROPE

One of his major contentions is that Western Europe cannot depend upon the United States to come to her aid with nuclear weapons, and that therefore Europe must have her own nuclear arsenal and France in particular needs a nuclear arsenal under her exclusive control.

Yet in the history of the 20th century, France has not been able to defend herself, much less anyone else. The United States and Britain have twice in my lifetime gone to France to defend her against an invader; the last time, France was liberated by these British and Americans who she now claims cannot be relied on.

Another fact of the history of Europe in the 20th century has been that if any one nation is going to dominate Western Europe, it is probably going to be Germany, and not France at all. Indeed, had France been left to her own devices in the last 20 years, or 50 years, she would very likely be a province of Germany, along with much of the rest of Europe.

It is my personal opinion that De Gaulle and France are kidding themselves if they think the hegemony of a Western European entity would remain very long in France.

And what of current history? It is a fact that there are more than twice as many U.S. ground troops under the common defense command of NATO right now than there are French forces. France is today the chief delinquent in the common defense of Western Europe. As I have already pointed out, the $9.4 billion in American aid which she has received since the end of World War II is the largest sum we have furnished any country and is in large part responsible for the economic and military strength which now enables President de Gaulle to flex his muscles.

In short, it is France and not the United States that has yet to make good on its existing pledges to participate in the common defense of Europe. I frankly see nothing in the recent past, the present, or the future which supports any contention that the United States is unreliable, compared to France, in its willingness to use its strength to defend and protect the freedom of others.

CONTENTION THAT AMERICANIZATION OF EUROPE IS UNDESIRABLE

A second contention widely attributed to De Gaulle as a reason for his feeling that Europe should exclude the United States from its political, military, and economic organization is a dread of the Americanization of Europe.

To him, this is said to imply mass production, mass marketing, and perhaps a loss of the sense of individuality and the loss of a sense of history.

But the United States became the richest and most powerful nation in the world by virtue of its vast unified market and the use of mass techniques in the production and distribution of goods.

And the Common Market of Europe was itself created to bring the same advantages to Europe. That is what the Common Market is for. It, too, will have a vast and even more populous market than exists in the United States. If it serves the purpose for which it was created, it, too, will expand its mass production and mass marketing techniques.

President de Gaulle and those who share his view cannot avoid this trend by keeping either Britain or the United States out of Europe. They can only avoid it by breaking up the Common Market and retaining their small, family-sized business operations serving a small local market.

REAL OBJECTIVE IS POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

To my mind, at least, these allegations offered in explanation of De Gaulle's policy are excuses, not reasons. They do not withstand the light of reason. They are excuses De Gaulle is offering in the hope of convincing others to accept his real objective, and that is to achieve for France the political leadership of Western Europe.

Perhaps some nations which would reject so bald a statement of the French objective are gullible enough to accept one of the other arguments put forward by France and by individuals in other nations who support her position.

WHERE WE GO FROM HERE IS PRIMARILY UP TO EUROPE

The future degree of closeness in relations between the United States and Western Europe now turns not upon a U.S. decision but upon a European decision. Our intentions and our objectives are clear. They have been supported by American blood and by more than $41 billion in American money. Our disinclination to dominate Europe is evidenced by the fact that we could easily have done so in 1945, but we did not.

Instead, it was our policy to make Europe strong, free, and independent. To carry out that policy we instituted the Marshall plan and later participated to the hilt in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Thanks in no small part to these instruments, Western Europe is now in a position to select her own future course of action.

It does not seem to me that there is anything we can offer Europe that we have not already delivered, or offered. Europe has the choice of welding itself into a new community, either with the United States and Britain, or without them. If it is without them, such a community will presumably be under French-German hegemony.

Either way, the United States will be able to take care of itself. I shall not repeat the many advantages that would flow to us from a loosening of our ties with Europe, if that is her choice. The financial advantage alone would be substantial.

NO REASON TO TRY TO OUTBID FRANCE

Above all, I am not interested in any American policy of trying to outbid France for the leadership of Europe. Our only interest in that continent is that she be free of Communist domination, just as that is our interest in nations elsewhere in the world. If Europe can now do that for herself without further help from us, so much the better for the United States.

A "third force" in Europe would suit this policy adequately, even though we might prefer a closer relationship in which our partners would carry a full share of the financial and military load.

The main point of American interest, in my opinion, is simply that European cooperation is not so important to us that we must go on paying for it forever. If Portugal and Spain, for example, now want to raise the price on American bases in their lands, we are better off to withdraw and let those countries submit their demands to De Gaulle, instead.

When our Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric goes to Spain, I hope that he will include on his agenda a study of how quickly we could close our air bases in Spain, and a review of possible alternative sites for basing Polaris submarines in the Mediterranean area.

A future for America free from further special obligations to Europe does not frighten me at all. The prospect of a military withdrawal on our part, and the withdrawal of our military privileges in Europe on its part, does not frighten me at all. Our defenses there are for the protection of Europe, not of the United States. If she no longer wants or needs that protection, I see no reason whatever for us to stay.

This is primarily a European decision, too, because the major confrontation with the Soviet Union is in Europe. If Europeans have more confidence in leaders of their own nations in the reaching of political decisions with Russia to the extent of excluding American leaders, then I have no objection to that, either. Berlin and the two Germanys, which are the main points of conflict, are, after all, in Europe and not in the United States. If Europeans want to handle that problem themselves, I see no reason for the United States to object to letting them handle it.

There are already being heard the voices of timidity which counsel a policy of staying on in Europe by ignoring the French challenge and trying to work around De Gaulle. They warn against any hint that U.S. aid, U.S. trade, and U.S. forces in Europe are in any way affected by the talk of a third force, apparently on the assumption that if we ignore it and offer enough to the other nations of Europe, they will choose us rather than France.

I reject such an approach entirely. For my part, I am emphatically opposed to keeping American forces in Europe if they are not wanted, not needed, and not matched. I am emphatically opposed to further financial aid to nations that seek to exclude the United States from the economic, military, and political life of Western nations.

It is nonsense to say that discussion of a U.S. withdrawal would be a threat on our part, or that it would tend to prove that De Gaulle is right and that we cannot be depended upon. We have already proved that we can be depended upon. It is no threat to say that if De Gaulle's concept is accepted, then the United States will have no further business in Europe. Our withdrawal in such a case is not a threat; it is more of a fact.

SAME FACTORS APPLY TO CANADA

In many ways, we find ourselves in the same situation with regard to Canada.

Here again, you hear counsels of timidity, and warnings that our relations with Canada must be left to the diplomats. I could not disagree more. That advice is an insult to the free people of Canada and to the free people of the United States.

As the political campaign in Canada proceeds, I very much hope there will be a great deal of discussion of her past, present, and future relations with this country. In both countries, our governments are but servants of our people. An alliance between diplomats only, is worse than no alliance at all, where democratic nations are concerned.

American politicians and American voters have a deep interest in our relations with Canada and we should talk about them. The same goes for Canadian voters and Canadian politicians and even more so, now that they are embarked on an election campaign.

To pass judgment on the future of their country, Canadians have to know what Americans think, just as we have to know what they think. I do not fear any Canadian election result that follows a full discussion of our relations on both sides of the border. I do fear a decision that may flow from ignorance of U.S. views.

NEED FOR WIDE PUBLIC DISCUSSION

The same is true of all the Atlantic allies.

Let us face up to the fact that we are all at a turning point. Our NATO alliance has, in my opinion, served its original purposes and served them well. The Atlantic countries have more than recovered from World War II; in the material sense, we are all better off than we were before the war, despite its horrors and its terrible destruction.

We have done very well working together for one common purpose. But none of us is quite sure whether we want to continue the partnership in pursuit of new purposes.

This is a time for wide public discussion of foreign policy within every nation of the Atlantic alliance. I would like to see a lot more of it here. I hope it will be a key issue in the Canadian election. I would like to hear more opinions from West Germany, from Britain, and from France, as well as from the other members of NATO.

This is not a matter that can be left to diplomats, nor to a few insiders in each country. This is a time for each of us to air our complaints, to explain our changing interests, and our hopes for the future. It is a time for getting grievances off our chests, and for exploring each other's interests to see whether—and how—they can be accommodated.

I think we need to do that, and to do it in public, if we are to know whether there is still a community of interest among the Atlantic nations that can form the basis for a new alliance.

Just as war is too important to leave to the generals, so a major alliance is too important to leave to the diplomats. Let neither the generals nor the diplomats ever forget that they are dealing with self-governing people in these nations. In Norway, in Italy, in Belgium, in Canada, in the United States, and each other member nation, the people must understand and support the general objectives of an alliance.

The American people have the right to know whether any further investment in the defenses of Europe, and further reliance on joint defenses with Canada, are going to be matched and shared by Europeans and Canadians. If not, then we must get busy revamping our military and economic policies accordingly.

Homes To Be on Exhibit in New York World Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that a prominent feature of the New York World Fair should be housing. This week it was my pleasure to assist in a groundbreaking ceremony for three homes which are to be built at the fair as an American showcase for the construction industry, for the home furnishing industry, and for countless related industries upon which home ownership and home maintenance are dependent.

As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I joined with my friend and colleague, Senator John Sparkman, who is chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, to break ground for the construction of these fair homes. They will be known as "The House of Good Taste" exhibit and millions of people will view them as examples of how Americans live as a result of the initiative of a free enterprise system and a democratic form of government.

I understand that over 200 business firms are represented in these homes and the many products which this exhibit will display should be a stimulus to better housing and better living for all who view them.

I believe that the "House of Good Taste" will be a highlight of next year's great exposition and I hope that all of us in Congress will have an opportunity to visit it.

Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate's highly respected and distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] has recently made a very eloquent and sound radio address over the "Manion Forum" which is broadcast over hundreds of radio stations across this country. I have just received a transcript of the Senator's address, which is entitled "Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government." I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

Dean Manion. Did you ever see a dream walking—or a nightmare galloping around your bedroom? For your health's sake I hope not. But to simulate this experience, you need only to listen to some officials of the Kennedy administration who have been testifying before congressional committees in favor of the President's tax and spending proposals.

If you close your eyes while you are listening you may well believe that you have been lifted into the fantastic "Ministry of Truth" which is used to make fact out of fiction in George Orwell's horrible fantasy "1984." You may remember that the book "1984" is Orwell's grim and ghastly picture of our world when all of it has been reduced to the complete control of Communist dictatorship.

A basic ingredient of this Red establishment is the official reversal of every elemental concept of fact and truth that civilized people have accepted since the beginning of recorded time. In "1984," this reversal is enforced by the promulgation of a complete new Red vocabulary in which "war" is called "peace." "Truth" is regarded as "falsehood" and "slavery" is translated as "freedom."

In "1984," the end result of this transformation of language and ideas is called "newspeak" and this dictionary of the diabolical dictatorship is a horrible thing to behold. Nevertheless, the recent testimony of administration officials is definitely suggestive of a "newspeak" arithmetic which Congress is now being asked to buy, believe, and adopt.

For instance, these witnesses have testified that it is a good thing for the Federal Government to spend more than it takes in. They predict that the resultive debts and deficits will be a blessing to our economy in the form of full and profitable employment for the American people. Their solution for our business troubles is sweet and simple; namely, reduce Federal taxes and increase Federal spending. In the light of all that we have previously learned about addition, subtraction, profit and loss, this testimony presents a deeply moving picture of Alice in Orwell's bureaucratic Wonderland of 1984.

But these witnesses hold high and important positions in our Government. They are serious, dedicated, and determined. Their testimony is backed up by the immeasurable force and pervasive pressures of the presidential administration which has demonstrated its ability to bring congressional votes into the administration lineup—commonsense and simple arithmetic to the contrary notwithstanding.

For a Congressman or a Senator to stand up and be counted against the full power of the Presidential Office requires moral and political courage of the very highest order. Measure therefore if you can the character and integrity of a Senator who is a distinguished leader of the President's political party but who, nevertheless, takes the leadership against administration policy when that policy violates that Senator's solid conception of fiscal responsibility and the best interests of this country.

When you have done that you will have taken the measure of a truly great American statesman, HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. Senator BYRD, welcome back to the "Manion Forum."

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Dean Manion, for the kind personal remarks in your gracious introduction.

You have asked me to discuss briefly expenditures and taxes and expenditure control and tax reduction. I don't know a better place to start than with the attitude of the new Federal Budget Director, Mr. Kermit Gordon, who has been testifying at the Capitol.

In effect, Mr. Gordon told a congressional committee that a balanced budget would lead to increased unemployment and general economic decline. He said this would happen whether we reduced Federal expenditures to meet tax collections or increase taxes to meet expenditures.

I submit that a man who thinks a balanced budget would be a catastrophe does not have the frame of mind to direct the budget of the United States. He should be removed from his office.

A budget director's function is to balance our fiscal affairs in the Federal budget—and defend it—not destroy it. It seems that Mr. Gordon has fallen for the fallacies of too many of the so-called economists who are counseling Government officials. They say that balancing the budget is still a goal, but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And, to make us richer faster, they think the Government should create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

Such ideas as these, which are being expressed by Mr. Gordon and other Government economists, sound like John Maynard Keynes and Gunnar Myrdal rolled into one. They don't sound like men looking for new frontiers—they sound like Rip van Winkle. They must have been taking a long nap.

We all know the Federal Government has run a deficit in 26 of the last 32 years. If Federal deficits would provide work and make us rich, everyone should have been employed and rich before now. Instead, we still have unemployed and we have a $305 billion debt—and the administration says it must go higher. If we don't get crackpot economists out of Federal fiscal positions and get sound men in them, the American system will be lost.

So much for the academic theories and prognostications of the self-styled economists—I'll just talk in terms of simple facts. Federal taxes are high—too high—as every taxpayer knows, and, they should be reduced.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, nothing would give me more pleasure than to report a bill for responsible tax reduction. But, as we all know, the basic reason for Federal taxes is to meet Federal expenditures. If Federal taxes are too high—and they are—it is basically because Federal expenditures are too high.

It is true that Federal tax collections totaling 80-odd billion dollars are at their alltime peak. But Federal expenditures, which will exceed $100 billion next year, are higher.

This simpy means that we are going further into debt each year by the amount that expenditures exceed tax reduction. We now owe in Federal debt alone more than $300 billion, and this debt is costing us $10 billion a year in interest.

By simple arithmetic we know that 4 percent interest on debt, compounded semiannually, doubles the principal in 17½ years. For the sake of our children, responsible people must begin to think of reducing this burden of debt we are leaving to them.

ONLY YOU—THROUGH CONGRESS—CAN CUT EXPENDITURES

But, the administration in Washington proposes to cut taxes and raise expenditures while we are already running a deficit. This simply means that we would go another dollar deeper in debt for every dollar we take in tax reduction. Short of grave national emergency, this would be sheer fiscal irresponsibility and most of us, deep down in our hearts, know it.

Yet, a sound and responsible tax cut could be made possible by first cutting out unnecessary Federal expenditures. Admittedly, this is made more difficult by the fact that the President says that Federal expenditures must and will rise.

This leaves it up to Congress to cut expenditures without assistance from the executive branch, if not against its opposition. If Congress is to cut expenditures under these circumstances, it will need both the demand and active support of everyone in this audience and more effective procedures in its actions on appropriation measures.

I shall conclude with some remarks concerning public demand and support for reduction in expenditures. But, first let me report that I have introduced what is known as the Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to limit expenditures.

Congress now acts on appropriations but it does not limit annual expenditures where money is available for more than 1 year. Under the resolution an annual expenditure limit would be fixed on every expenditure including "back door" items.

Congress now acts on appropriations in a dozen or more bills over a period of months, never seeing the whole at any one time. Under the resolution every expenditure would be brought under one cover and limited.

Under this procedure the expenditures allowed could be added up at the end of the bill and checked against estimated revenues. By this direct expenditure control Congress can make deficit financing illegal or unlawful.

With or without tax reduction, direct expenditure control has become an obvious and urgent need. I hope the resolution will be adopted, or that the objective of the resolution will be accomplished otherwise. Public demand can bring this about. And, public demand and support for expenditure reduction can bring that about, too.

CONGRESS WILL ACCEDE TO YOUR DEMANDS

The principles and fundamentals which have made this a great Nation have been dangerously undermined in the past 30 years. But, great power still resides in the people. If you exert that power for sound government, the government will be made sound. If the people in this audience want sound and responsible tax reduction, you must use your power for expenditure reduction first.

As a Member of the Senate for 30 years, I can tell you that your Representatives and Senators will respond to your demand. Most Members of Congress want to vote for sound government. What is lacking too often is your support.

Sound and responsible tax reduction is an issue affecting every citizen. It can be had if expenditures are cut accordingly. If the public demands and supports sufficient expenditures reduction first, sound tax reduction will surely follow.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity of being on this program.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.

I am sure that this convincing appeal for popular support in your fight for commonsense in the fiscal management of our Federal Government will bring an enthusiastic response from this audience.

I and millions of your fellow Americans are deeply grateful to you, sir, for your courageous and scholarly leadership in the truly desperate cause of a sound and solvent Government for the United States. Let me assure you that what you have said here today will be reprinted and repeated thousands of times throughout this country during this crucial congressional debate.

My friends, passage of Senator BYRD's pending Senate Resolution 12 will frustrate the economic "Pied Pipers of the Washington Wonderland" and nail down the solvency of this country once and for all. Remember what this distinguished and experienced Senator has said; namely, "If you exert your power for sound government the Government will be made sound."

Literally, this puts upon you and me and each of us a frightful but inescapable personal responsibility. In substance, Senator BYRD has said that, in the last analysis you are the director of the budget for the United States.

You hold the key to the U.S. Treasury. You can sell this country down the river of debts and deficits or you can save the solvency of the United States by making proper use of this great speech by Senator BYRD, now. This is the time for decision; what are you going to do about it?

Mrs. Martha Frances Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to salute a gracious and talented journalist from the Fifth District of Georgia. Mrs.

Martha Frances Brown has distinguished herself in the field of journalism. As editor of the weekly newspapers, the Tri-County Graphic and the North De Kalb Record, Mrs. Brown has been the recipient of numerous awards.

Her latest award was presented by the Georgia Conference of Social Welware "in appreciation of Mrs. Brown's interest and concern for a local social problem and in recognition of her outstanding service in writing a series of articles in her community weekly newspaper." Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall, chairman of the conference journalism awards, made the presentation.

Mrs. Brown, who was cited in 1961 by the Dixie Business magazine for "public service in reporting," recently authored a series of articles dealing with the needs of Lynwood Park, an area in De Kalb County.

Mrs. Brown is a native of Atlanta and a graduate of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism of the University of Georgia. She has been editor of the North De Kalb Record since 1948.

Other series written by Mrs. Brown deal with traffic and zoning problems, the need for accurate registration lists in various communities, the need for citizen participation in civic affairs, and many others directed at helping the communities served by her newspaper.

This recent series of stories written by Mrs. Brown is a fine example of the vitality of the weekly newspaper, the dedication of weekly editors, and the service that weeklies can perform.

Tribute to Prince Jonah Kalanianaole, of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, March 26, marked the 92d anniversary of the birth of Prince Jonah Kalanianaole who served as Delegate to the Congress of the United States from the Territory of Hawaii for nine successive terms from 1903 to 1922.

Prince Kuhio, as he was generally known, was not only an influential leader of his Hawaiian people but he was also a most effective representative of our new Pacific territory in its early and formative years. The Prince was a link with Hawaii's past; he had been a loyal supporter of the Hawaiian monarchy during the revolutionary troubles of the 1890's. It is greatly to his credit and his sense of statesmanship that he was able to translate his loyalty to an independent nation, the Kingdom of Hawaii, into long and effective representation of the new Territory of Hawaii in the Congress of the United States. Prince Kuhio was a link with the past, but he was also a prophet of the future; it was Kuhio in 1919 who introduced the first Hawaii statehood bill in the Congress.

In Hawaii Kuhio's memory is still bright, particularly among the older citizens—the kamaainas, if you will. One of the brightest accomplishments of Kuhio, in the memory of many, was his introduction and passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. For years Kuhio had led the fight to put Hawaii's people back on the land that had been theirs to use in the ancient days. The Prince recognized the need, under modern Western society, for the independent freeholder. To own a bit of land on which to raise your family or from which to draw your sustenance, is a basic building block of the free American society.

Perhaps history will record that one of the tragic ironies of Prince Kuhio's political career was that he died before he could see his Hawaiian Homes Act put into effect. I am afraid history will also record that his crowning effort has not been used in the manner which he must have desired. Perhaps history will record that Kuhio's opponents, the large land users, have in the years since his death exercised influence over the administration of the law is such a way as to render its programs relatively ineffective. Kuhio's dream lives on, but its execution has lagged.

Now, in Hawaii, in the new State that Prince Kuhio envisioned, we live in a day removed from many of the political forces and tactics of 1920; yet many of the same problems still remain. The need for the freeholder is still with us in Hawaii. I hope that those of us in Hawaii who revere the memory of Prince Kuhio will apply his vision to the present day Hawaii and work all the harder to insure that all of Hawaii's people—and there are many more of them now—will be given their free American right to own the land on which their homes rest, and to make their way in a free and fluid economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to digress for a moment from the mainstream of these remarks to note an action of this House today which relates in a very real way to the problem of land ownership in Hawaii, and in a very substantial way to the freeholder problem which bedeviled Prince Kuhio during much of his public life.

On this day the House has given final approval to H.R. 1597, sponsored by Congressman FRIEDEL. Certainly the Friedel bill has an indirect but definite effect on the unique and widespread leaseholding system in Hawaii. If the State of Hawaii passes a lease-redemption law similar to that in existence in the State of Maryland, H.R. 1597 will allow many residential leaseholders in Hawaii the right to deduct their lease payments in the same manner as they now deduct interest on a mortgage.

The passage of H.R. 1597 today gives great impetus to the passage of the Maryland-type ground rent law now before the Legislature of the State of Hawaii. Passage of this law will give the ever-growing number of residential leaseholders the option, enforced by statute, to buy the land on which their homes are built. It is not a radical measure; it provides for a slow, evolutionary development of fee-simple ownership of houselots; it adequately protects the rights of the large holders and will insure their receipt of compensation which in many cases will be hundreds of times what the land cost them in the first place.

The timing of the final passage of this bill in the first session of the House since the anniversary of Prince Kuhio's birth is both coincidental and fortuitous. History does not record how the Prince might have voted on this measure today, had he been able to vote. But history is replete with his many efforts to open the lands of Hawaii to homesteaders and to keep large tracts from being concentrated in the hands of those who would keep the people from owning and using the land. Kuhio's action in 1908 and 1910 in backing changes in the Hawaii Organic Act to facilitate homesteading, and his opposition to the appointment in 1911 of Governor Frear because of alleged maladministration of these homestead laws, are strong indications of his real concern for the fate of the freeholder of the need for the small man to own a portion of his native soil.

There have been many misuses in the history of our Territory and State of the memory of Prince Kuhio and the things for which he stood. Often the trustees of some of the large landholding entities have attempted to use the name of the native Hawaiians and the memory of their early leaders, such as Kuhio, to protect the narrow and selfish financial control that monopolistic landownership gives them. I do not want to be party to the misuse of Kuhio's memory today. However I do feel that in the context of history the Prince, were he living today, would applaud the passage of the Friedel measure and the encouragement it will give to the ownership of land by the small homeowner in his native Hawaii.

Thank you for an opportunity to pay homage to a great Hawaiian and a great leader of the Territory of Hawaii.

Administration and Other Comments on Obscene Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the membership of the Congress will find of interest an exchange of correspondence in regard to the great problem in this country of controlling the pornographic and obscene material, especially as it pertains to young people.

A few days ago I had occasion to write to the President and to urge him to exert the great leadership which he has at his command in order to assist the many citizens and Government officials who are working in this area. A copy of my letter of March 7 follows and the reply from the administration is also printed.

Following this exchange of correspondence, I will include a copy of the latest report from Operation Yorkville, which is a communitywide nondenominational civic endeavor in New York City, which is aimed at stopping the flow of obscene literature. I would mention to my colleagues that Operation Yorkville and other similar groups across the country are very concerned about this problem, and they have pressed endorsement of two of the major bills in this field which I have had the privilege of sponsoring, H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

March 7, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am sure your office has been increasingly aware in recent months of the concern which Americans—especially parents—feel over the obscene material which passes through the mail or is distributed over and under the counter and which finds its way into the hands of our youth.

Indeed, your Attorney General just a few days ago met with leaders of one group which is dedicated to action in this field, Operation Yorkville, from New York City. I know there is concern within official circles over this problem.

As a member of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee and its ranking minority member for three Congresses, I am well aware of the work of the Post Office Department, Bureau of Customs, and Department of Justice. Unfortunately, there is a limit as to what can be accomplished by the most sincere and dedicated official, be he local, State or Federal. That limit is drawn by court decisions as to what constitutes obscene material. Increasingly in recent years, court decisions have allowed greater laxity and license in printed matter. I do not need to mention recent "literature" which has been held not obscene and thus mailable.

This problem is an acute one. Leading experts have testified that there is a direct causal relationship between obscene material and the startling increase in sex crimes and juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover has said, "We know that an overwhelmingly large number of sex crimes is associated with pornography. We know that sex criminals read it, are clearly influenced by it * * *. I believe that if we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex-crime rate."

The late Dr. Benjamin Karpman, chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeths Hospital, left no doubt as to his conclusions: "There is a very direct relationship between juvenile delinquency, sex crimes, and pornographic literature."

And finally, I refer to an appearance before the Postal Operations Subcommittee by Dr. Nicholas G. Frignito, medical director and chief neuropsychiatrist, county court of Philadelphia, in late 1961. He said: "In too many instances the increase in sexual offenses was traced to the persistent and constant exposure to obscenity in all media of communication. The reading of erotica is not a harmless psychological aphrodisiac; it is a serious danger and threat to morality."

These authorities are certainly competent enough to convince me that the control of obscene material will be a significant factor in the control of juvenile crime.

Thus the problem is that much material is allowed in the mails and on the newsstands legally, even though it offends the morals and sense of decency of nearly everyone. However, there is a remedy, and it is simply public opinion.

No publisher will stay in business, nor will his filthy wares be distributed or displayed when public opinon runs strongly against him. Committees of both Houses of Congress have cooperated with such groups as the Citizens for Decent Literature, church leaders, community groups such as Operation Yorkville, and anyone else who is willing to lend leadership in this fight.

I think that a strong statement by you, Mr. President, would be a vital part of this fight. As a parent, as a man of Christian training and background, as one who encourages the good literature of which we have an abundance available, and as the President of the United States, you have the opportunity available to no one else to encourage those who emphasize the good in literature and condemn the filth to the trash pile, to encourage the youth to ignore the peddlers of such filthy matter, and to set a climate which will encourage the courts to recognize the existing moral climate in this country is considerably higher than some rulings have seemed to indicate.

I believe it most appropriate to suggest that you send a special message to the Congress on this matter, encompassing legislative recommendations and calling attention to the scope of the problem, recommending at the least urgent study at all levels of government. In the event they will be of some use to you in this regard, I enclose copies of two bills I have sponsored in this field. The Commission approach is one which a number of Members of both Houses have favored, while the approach in H.R. 319 is one which grew out of hearings in the Postal Operations Subcommittee.

I appeal to you to examine this issue through your personal staff and through the departments of government, but to give serious thought to personal participation in the nationwide effort to end this traffic in filth. It has been said that pornographic material in the hands of the young is as dangerous as dope; one attacks the body, the other the mind.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
Glenn Cunningham,
Member of Congress.

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. Glenn Cunningham,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cunningham: This is in reply to your letter of March 7, 1963, to the President concerning the distribution of obscene material to young people.

As you recognize, the President and this administration have shared in the widespread awareness of the problem your letter deals with. Interested executive branch agencies are in the process of reviewing legislative proposals to deal with noxious and obscene material preparatory to reporting to the congressional committees concerned.

There are substantial differences of view, however, as to what organized efforts—governmental or private—should be undertaken to cope with the problem. This situation undoubtedly stems in part from the wide diffusion of responsibility for dealing with the problem; it is at once a matter of concern for families, community organizations and churches, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. In part, too, the differences grow out of the wide range of views as to what is "obscene and noxious," with questions of free speech, censorship, and civil liberties involved.

These concerns are, of course, as basic to our Nation and our society as the matters dealt with in your letter, and the continuing search for effective methods of dealing with the problem of obscenity must be carried on without jeopardy to our free institutions.

Thank you for your thoughtful views on this important subject.
Sincerely yours,
Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Operation Yorkville,
New York, N.Y.

Operation Yorkville, the fast-paced New York City community campaign organized to combat the $2 billion "cesspool publication" racket, this week received the endorsement of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

In a letter to Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., cofounder of the movement along with Dr. Julius Neumann, rabbi of the Congregation Zichron Moshe, and Rev. Robert E. Wiltenburg, pastor of Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, Governor Rockefeller said: "My sincere compliments to you and to all others engaged in the laudable purpose of Operation Yorkville. The vending of obscene literature is odious in the eyes of all civilized people and about as low an occupation as human greed can undertake. You are to be commended for your plan to conduct a campaign of moral suasion to remind citizens and storekeepers alike of their responsibilities to youth and parents of the vicinity."

New York City Police Commissioner Murphy also expressed interest in Operation Yorkville this week. At his invitation, a member of the executive committee of Operation Yorkville, attended a 1-hour meeting with the commissioner and his staff, at which they discussed the enforcement of existing antiobscenity laws.

Latest to offer Operation Yorkville cooperation is the New York County American Legion. Mr. Peter Massimino, chairman of the Americanism committee, said this week that his goal is to bring a resolution to the national convention of the American Legion, enlisting the support of over 3 million Legionnaires throughout the Nation.

Operation Yorkville's "Petition the President for Action" campaign, begun March 4 at a meeting of area community leaders, continues to gain in momentum. To date, thousands of letters and wires have been sent to the President, expressing shock at the massive waves of pornographic literature flooding America, informing him of the dangerous effects it is having on the physical and mental fitness of our youth, and the resultant anxiety of parents, and finally, urging him to action.

Latest to sign group telegrams were people attending Operation Yorkville meetings at Cornell Medical Center and Hunter College.

Mrs. Maude Greenwell Faris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House the passing of one of the fine citizens of my home city in Ogden—Mrs. Maude Greenwell Faris.

Mrs. Faris died quietly at something after 2 o'clock Thursday morning, March 21, 1963. On February 24, friends and acquaintances had observed her 85th birthday. Her husband, the late Philip Arthur Faris, passed away in Ogden on February 24, 1954. As an Ogden businessman, he was well known to many.

In this day and age, I think we may be inclined to pass by over lightly the lesson and example to us all in the lives of such as Maude Greenwell Faris. Hers was not the eventful sort of earthly existence that moves quickly into the history books; instead, it was the quiet resolve of her life to live well with friends and neighbors, to be true mother to her family and abiding helpmate to her husband. At an early age, she was trained in music and for it and the rich bounties of her church she was always deeply grateful.

Her family—and particularly her mother—dared and faced much to make their home in Ogden, Utah. And I think it well to recall that the life span of Maude Greenwell Faris and her father covered a period of a century and a quarter.

Ambrose Greenwell was born September 29, 1838, in Dunton-Bassett, Leicestershire, England where generations of Greenwells had lived before him. His wife—Elizabeth Brinkley Hill, was born July 29, 1835, at Wolverhampton, not far distant. At Walsall in Staffordshire he was baptized at the age of 19 into the Church of Latter-day Saints—the Mormon Church. In 1855 he was ordained an elder. His wife had been baptized at an earlier age—14. They were married in 1853.

In 1854 the young couple came to the United States and for 4½ years lived in Philadelphia. There they met two Utah emissaries, William H. Wright and Carl G. Maeser, who were instrumental in their moving West.

At White Cloud, Mo., a son was born to Elizabeth Hill Greenwell. Four weeks later, their party started west across the plains to Utah—under direction of Capt. James "Big Jim" Brown. Carrying her child and with her 3-year-old son at her side, she walked the entire distance—900 miles—arriving with her husband and party in Salt Lake City on August 28, 1859.

Her husband—Ambrose Greenwell—was a familiar figure in Ogden business circles thereafter for nearly 40 years. He opened a meat market there in 1860. His business prospered and in 1869 he built a two-story brick business building, the Greenwell Market. He died on October 27, 1898, and is buried at Ogden.

Of their children, Maude Greenwell was born February 24, 1878. She attended local schools. Soon after her 20th birthday, on May 3, 1898, she married Philip Arthur Faris, an Idaho Falls, Idaho, businessman. After their marriage she went to live for a time in Idaho Falls where Mr. Faris was in the employ of the banking and general merchandise firm of Anderson Brothers. Thereafter, the couple removed to Ogden. Mr. Faris, as a buyer for the firm of Taylor-Wright, in Ogden, was well known for his attentive, businesslike and gentle ways. He had many friends.

Mr. Faris' people had long been residents of the United States. He himself was born at Time in Pike County, Ill., July 13, 1873, a son of Elijah Faris—who served in an Illinois regiment with Union forces later prominent in the siege of Vicksburg, Miss. Elijah Faris was born near Georgetown, Brown County, Ohio, an area in which members of his family had been resident since before 1778 when that region was a portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Philip Arthur and Maude Greenwell Faris were blessed with many children and grandchildren. To them all I have expressed the sympathy—in their most recent loss—of this House.

Among the surviving children is Mrs. Leonard Davidson of 560 24th Street, Ogden, Utah. Mr. and Mrs. Davidson have been outstanding members of my hometown. Mr. Davidson was a conscientious member of the Ogden Board of Education for many years, during which time great strides forward were made in building new schools and in the improvement of teaching. He also has been and is now very active in the Weber County Safety Committee, which has done much to promote good safety practices in our area.

Among the recent staff employees of the U.S. Senate is a member of Mrs. Faris' family. George W. Seidl, who formerly served on the staff of Senator Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, is the husband of Louise Hoggan Seidl, whose mother—Mrs. Ellis R. Hoggan, of 1324 Walcott Street, Ogden, Utah—is the former Marjorie J. Faris, a daughter of Philip Arthur and Maude Greenwell Faris.

Bishop Oxnam: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, America recently lost one of its most eminent clergymen, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. His death creates a void in the ranks of the progressive churchmen of this Nation. No one will be able to match the dedication with which he worked for the highest principles of Christian brotherhood and social reform.

A complete list of Bishop Oxnam's interests, activities, and honors would probably fill an entire page in this RECORD. Therefore, I shall only briefly outline some of his major accomplishments. He was a native Californian, studied at the University of Southern California, and was ordained in 1916. Shortly thereafter, he founded the Church of All Nations in Los Angeles and was its pastor and director for 10 years. During this time he taught at his alma mater and later at Boston University. He became president of De Pauw University in 1928 and served in that capacity for 8 years. In 1936 he became the youngest bishop in the Methodist Church, at 44. He was successively bishop in Omaha, Boston, New York, and Washington.

During his 8 years in Washington, Bishop Oxnam performed some of his finest services to his church. He took a special interest in American University and it made some of its greatest strides under his leadership. At his urging, the School of International Service was established and the Westminster (Md.) Theological Seminary relocated on the campus of the university, where it is now known as Wesley Seminary. In recognition of Bishop Oxnam's work in its behalf, the chapel of the seminary is named for him.

The bishop devoted his life to the goals of the Methodist Church and played an important role in many of the organizations which advanced them. He served as president of the World Council of Churches, vice president of the National Council of Churches, and president of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Despite being engaged in a wide range of activities, Bishop Oxnam never lost touch with the human problems of his congregation. His concern with these matters and the energy with which he tackled them are shown by the fact that during his first 2 years as bishop in Washington he visited each of the 1,700 ministers in the Middle Atlantic States area.

Bishop Oxnam was a fearless and forthright advocate for the causes in which he believed. He was a stanch defender of individual freedom. As such, he was an ardent foe of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He was attacked by the committee and demanded a hearing to refute the charges against him. This hearing was held on July 21, 1953, and lasted far into the night. In his statement, Bishop Oxnam pointed out that the committee, by issuing unverified and unevaluated releases and then refusing to accept responsibility for the accuracy of these statements violated basic principles of honesty and fair dealing. He also objected to the false and biased manner in which the information concerning him had been compiled.

One of Bishop Oxnam's friends related a story to me about his appearance before the committee which illustrates how this man imbued all those around him with his righteousness and zeal. When the committee recessed for dinner, the bishop took a taxi to a nearby restaurant. When he left the restaurant a short while later, the same taxi was waiting to return him to the hearing. When Bishop Oxnam asked the driver why he had waited for him, the driver replied that he knew that the bishop was testifying before the committee and thought that he might need some support. He said that since the bishop was speaking for him and millions of others, he felt that this was the least he could do. The driver refused to accept any payment for the ride back to the hearing.

Bishop Oxnam completely cleared himself of every charge against him and finally, at 12:20 the next morning, on motion of my recently deceased colleague, Congressman Doyle, the committee voted unanimously that its records show that Bishop Oxnam "has no record of any Communist Party membership or affiliation."

After 44 years of service, Bishop Oxnam retired in 1960. I can find no more fitting summation of his life and work than the words of his successor in Washington, Bishop John Wesley Lord. He said that Bishop Oxnam was "one of the 'summit souls' with whom God on occasion blesses mankind."

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion concerning the news policy of this administration. Many of us are convinced the American public has been misled by spokesmen for this administration in repeated efforts to present the most favorable image through a tightly managed news policy.

The gentleman from Kansas, Hon. WILLIAM AVERY, discussed managed news, completely and objectively, at a recent meeting of the Kansas Federation of Collegiate Young Republicans, March 2, at Hutchinson, Kans. I submit his remarks for the benefit of those who may be interested in the right to know:

MANAGED NEWS

Each mistake the Kennedy administration has made could very well be the subject matter of a full-length speech and would further provide enough topics for a speech every day for the remainder of the New Frontier—January 1965. I can tell you for sure that there are quite a number of Republicans in Washington, and I think across the Nation, who intend to point out these blunders to the voters and taxpayers of America. It is always the responsibility of the minority to point out policy differences and philosophical diversities from the majority party. This is not just to be partisan for the sake of being partisan, but to give the voters in a democracy a clear choice on issues.

In the last few months of the Kennedy administration, this responsibility becomes almost awesome because of the almost successful attempt of the Kennedy administration to manage and sometimes misrepresent the news. This operation of news management did not suddenly commence, as it was initially just a projection of the magnificent job of public relations and selling that was done on candidate Kennedy himself in the 1960 election. With the services of some most intelligent and resourceful public relations representatives, the Kennedy family image was projected widely and favorably to the people of this Nation. The campaign managers did not overlook one small opportunity, all the way from Caroline's admittedly attractive appearance, even to the President's appearing forceful in a rocking chair. The latter accomplishment, I assure you, required a great deal of skill.

This very cozy and admittedly effective public relations presentation of the New Frontiersmen suddenly lost some luster after the Cuban invasion but took a different turn during the tense moments last fall during the Cuban crisis. On October 30, Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, told reporters that "news flowing from actions taken by the Government is part of the weaponry." Reducing this combination of words down to an understandable premise means that the Kennedy family had decided it is quite all right for them to use the dignity and the official news media from the White House to portray or to indicate a favorable result or conclusion as justified in the interests of national security.

Now at the outset, I think we will all recognize that certainly it is not in the best interest of our Nation during an emergency to make all information and intelligence known to news sources and thereby to our adversaries. This is just as axiomatic as not revealing a bridge hand to your opponents. But you don't want a bridge partner who indicates he was dealt aces when they were indeed only "jacks." In times of war or even during international bargaining, it is obviously necessary to reveal only as much information as can be helpful in obtaining the objective that is being sought. This is a much different context, however, than misrepresenting what now appear to have been well-known facts, not only to our adversaries, but to the American people themselves.

It is perhaps more dignified to refer to this manipulation as "managed" news, but managed news in many instances is misrepresented news. If the question has presented itself as to what I am referring, there are quite a number of known instances of so-called managed news, and it appears that each day there is being revealed another basic incident associated with the Cuban crisis whereby the American people were not told the truth.

You will recall the controversy over the air cover that was alleged to have been promised the Cuban invaders on their ill-fated mission at the Bay of Pigs. The official Pentagon news sources were rather vague as to whether or not air cover had been promised, and who called it off at the critical hour. Then recently, Attorney General Robert Kennedy took it upon himself to announce to the Nation that no air cover had been promised. A careful review of all the incidents revealed that he was trying to misrepresent the whole incident by a play on words. "Air cover" for the invading troops apparently had not been assured, but at least two air strikes preceding the invasion to disable Castro's aircraft had been promised. One was made. It is the opinion of most observers in Washington that the effect of calling off the second air strike permitted Castro's small air force to riddle the invaders as they attempted to land on the beach.

And then you have learned just this week, not from the White House, not from the Pentagon, or not from any official source, but from Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader of the Senate, that four American pilots were killed in this poorly managed operation. Again, the New Frontier made no mention of American citizens being involved until this announcement was made, and then it was confirmed by Majority Leader MANSFIELD.

You are generally familiar with the successive allegations by Senator KEATING last fall and again this month over the extent of the Communist military strength in Castro's Cuba. It can be categorically stated that Senator KEATING's charges were immediately denied by White House sources, but then subsequently admitted to be generally true. I do not believe that our official intelligence sources, either the Central Intelligence Agency or any branch of the service, is so inefficient or so incapable of performance that this same information would not have been known to the administration spokesmen. If our military intelligence is so inept, it needs a complete reorganization. It is a sad state of affairs when information that finally affects our very national security must be obtained from voluntary and unofficial sources, and we are told that these facts were not known to the military or to the policymakers in the administration.

This list could be added onto almost indefinitely. But the important point that I want to make is that now responsible people in the Washington press corps, as well as a large number of Members of the House and of the Senate, are not sure how to interpret any official administration announcement. This should not be interpreted as being only a partisan point of view, and I am the first to confess that I personally hope it is a conclusion that has been reached by many persons with no political affiliation. It has been commented upon by one very close to the Kennedy family themselves.

Arthur Krock was chief of the Washington bureau for the New York Times for 21 years. Mr. Krock is the recipient of two Pulitzer prizes and a citation that is equivalent to a third. He described himself as "absolutely personally fond of President Kennedy and a long-time friend of the entire Kennedy family." Despite this personal attachment to the Kennedys, his professional ethics prompted him to speak out last week. In a cynical statement, he denounced the attempt to manage news by President John F. Kennedy and his associates. The Associated Press quoted him as saying "that the weapon of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba." Mr. Krock further accuses Mr. Kennedy of creating a false impression last fall that a balanced budget was in prospect. He charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which Krock says is "visibly growing worse."

Mr. Krock is critical of the working press themselves for being overwhelmed by this unorthodox operation. He completed his criticism by saying that "for any degree to which this project has been successful, the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

These are very serious indictments indeed, and similar charges were apparently brushed off by most persons as the usual political criticism until the cryptic article by the senior New York Times reporter. This had caused quite a lot of reflection on the part of Members of Congress, and I think the working Washington press corps.

This criticism, supplemented by a Republican comment, has not taken place without results. The first printed report was that a retreat had been arranged by White House Secretary Pierre Salinger and representatives of the working press and organizations representing the various news media. This so-called retreat is to take place next week, and I understand that this is an attempt on the part of White House policymakers to either explain or apologize to the press for the apparent arrogance of White House and administration spokesmen. I thought there was an amusing note in the press release. Although we have a committee in the House known as the Moss "Right To Know Committee," the administration wants these representatives of all news media gathered for a briefing session, for which, it was announced, "No news coverage permitted." In other words, if the administration has a confession to make, they want to make it on a classified basis and not confess their mistakes to the public.

When I left Washington, the last episode in this rather sordid tale was an answer from the assistant White House press secretary to a question if Mr. Kennedy had any expletives to announce after reading the Arthur Krock story. The press secretary's reply was "Yes, but I wouldn't want to pass them on to you." The word expletive was a new one to me, but its meaning was rather clear from the way it was employed in this story. To confirm my interpretation of it, I did refer to the dictionary. As you might imagine, the explanation was an "oath" or "exclamation." In other words, the President was not favorably impressed by the comments made about his administration's responsibility in the news, even from a personal friend.

There is one further facet to this entire matter that I think should be mentioned in connection with the management of news. You have read for the past several weeks of the objection of administration spokesmen to the criticism of responsible Republicans on the handling of the Cuban debacle, the breakdown of the Common Market negotiations, and the obvious meddling of Mr. Kennedy in the affairs of our neighbor Canada. You have read that the Republicans are urged not to be critical of the foreign policy of this administration and to adhere to the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy that allegedly has been the practice since World War II.

Now in theory, this sounds rather commendable indeed, as we would like to believe the old axiom that our political differences in this country stop "at the water's edge." This would certainly be an ideal situation, if it could be attained, and under certain circumstances it could become a reality. On every major foreign policy decision during the Eisenhower administration, responsible leaders of the Democratic Party were briefed and consulted with before a decision had been finally reached or an announcement had been finally made. Under such a procedure, there would be a bipartisan or a nonpartisan foreign policy, because the minority would have had some responsibility in developing this policy. Just because the leaders of the House and Senate are called down to the White House to be advised of a major foreign policy action a few minutes before it is given to the press, does not make it a bipartisan foreign policy in any sense of the word, but only a slight consideration in deference to their position for information.

Since the development and administration of foreign policy is the prerogative of the Executive under the Constitution, I can find no fault with the present practice of this administration. But if it is to be made solely by the majority party, then the majority party and its leaders must take full responsibility and not expect to be immune to criticisms for blunders.

And I wonder how long are the memories of some Democrats. You might get the impression from reading news releases from Washington that criticism of the Kennedy mistakes in the field of foreign policy is something entirely new in national politics. If our memories were no longer than theirs, we might initially feel that we had become overly partisan and that our criticism was not in good taste nor in the public interest. Just let me comment that the mighty elephant was not chosen for our party simply by more accident. Elephants are reputed to have long and accurate memories, and so it is the Republicans who recognize them as their emblems. With this capacity to remember, I would like to submit to you some examples of Democratic bipartisan support of foreign policy previous to and during the 1960 election campaign. Here are just a few:

1. Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee, May 5, 1957: "The Eisenhower-Dulles administration of our foreign affairs has substituted improvisations for policy, appeasement for leadership, posturing for deeds and advertising slogans for information."

2. John F. Kennedy, New York, October 20, 1960: "* * * under Republican leadership our prestige has fallen so low that our Latin American allies are no longer willing to follow our leadership in the fight against communism in this hemisphere."

3. Adlai Stevenson, May 20, 1960, to a Cook County Democratic Committee dinner: "But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either."

4. Chicago Tribune, shortly after the U-2 incident, quoted Senator Fulbright:

"The American Government's 'attitude of smug self-righteousness,' following disclosure of the U-2 episode, in Fulbright's opinion, 'must have been unbearably provocative to the Soviet Government and contributed substantially to the violent and intemperate bad manners of Khrushchev in Paris.' "

And I have documentation of many other such examples.

Although this is obviously a political meeting and this is a political speech, I want to summarize as an American citizen.

The danger to American institutions has not historically come from a political campaign nor a political wrangling that takes place during any administration. This has been the history of our democratic system since it was founded almost 200 years ago. The real danger that I see from the distortion and management of news that has become a symbol of this administration is that such manipulation could very easily mark the beginning to the end of a constitutional guarantee, the freedom of the press. It is a fine line indeed that separates suppression of news, management of the news, and official propaganda doctrine. I would hope and I feel confident that the ethical and moral responsibility of the working press will restore reliable and free news reporting to all the conventional news media and that one of the great institutions of America, freedom of the press, will be restored to its rightful position in the conscience of this Nation.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3518–3544.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Record:

March 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We would like it to be on record that we strongly urge you to submit to your committee and vote in favor of the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14). The captive nations that are enslaved under Russia certainly could use any support from our country.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would be invaluable.

Please give the Flood resolution your support.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
American-Ukrainian Citizens Club.
Stamford, Conn.

Hartford, Conn., *March 12, 1963.*

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: I am taking the liberty in urging you to submit the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee.

A Committee on Captive Nations will play an important role to counteract Soviet propaganda in regard to equality of human and religious rights of nations now oppressed by Russian imperialism.

Guided by the importance of such a committee, may I ask for your favorable support to the Flood resolution.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Myron W. Zielyk, Ph. D.

March 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: In the interest of the Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes, I earnestly ask you to favorably consider the Flood Resolution (House Resolution 14). A Committee on Captive Nations is very important for us, Americans, at the present time, when everywhere Communistic Russia has been calling for "national liberation" in Africa and Asia. We, as a democratic power, have not done everything in our ability to aid the enslaved non-Russian nations in their fight for greater freedom.

A Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would indeed help to supply much needed information concerning the status and want of independence among the captive nations. Added sources of knowledge have proven to be of great value in this particular branch of work.

Therefore, we once again urge you, Congressman Smith, to consider and support the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Julian Bachynsky,
Secretary, Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.
Michael Kuchar,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.

St. Louis, Mo., *February 14, 1963.*
Congressman Daniel Flood,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I would like to receive from you information re Permanent Captive Nations Committee and a résumé, if possible, of any action (effective action) which has been taken to free these slaves of the international Communist conspiracy, almost one billion of them.

What is the present status of the Permanent Captive Nations Committee? Who are the members?

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

D. Grant.

St. Paul, Minn., *March 15, 1963.*
Hon. Howard Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: I am writing to you in regards to the House Resolution 14, presented by Congressman Daniel J. Flood. I strongly urge you to present this resolution before your committee with your favorable comment.

We know that Soviet Russia is our enemy. In order to combat the enemy, we must know him, his weaknesses especially. Recent information and statements emanating from our State Department showed such an abysmal ignorance in this respect that it is simply appalling. We cannot win the cold war with such a knowledge of our enemy.

An objective and impartial study conducted by the Congressional Committee on Captive Nations will supply the sorely needed information which will be of a great help to our State Department in forming a dynamic and winning foreign policy.

I sincerely urge you, dear Congressman Smith, to submit the House Resolution 14 to vote in your committee with your favorable support.

Sincerely yours,

Myrna H. Haydak.

Dear Congressman Flood: I think that all who understand the actual situation in Eastern Europe, deeply appreciate your interest in the question of captive nations. The only way to avoid becoming a "captive nation" ourselves is to study the questions and to form a real winning policy.

Most sincerely,

M. H. Haydak.

Hartford, Conn., *March 11, 1963.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: In the name of our 250 members we are taking liberty to urge you to submit the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee and to give it your favorable opinion.

Your qualified support to the Flood resolution, Mr. Chairman, will be most gratefully appreciated. We thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Ukrainian American Citizen Club in Hartford.

Pittsfield, Mass., *March 18, 1693.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: A Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would give our people—our country—the unbiased truth on the submerged nations, which will be of enormous aid in carrying out foreign and worldwide policy, in turn to make this world a better place to live in.

We, the undersigned, urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Ukrainian National Association Brotherhood No. 150: Walter J. Huska, *President;* John Tormesosky, *Secretary;* Wierj Saurij, Stanley Smichesko, John Nipordnt, Stephen Nekorhuk, Mrs. Anna Smichesko, Thomas Kinnas, Rev. G. Ans Whaj, Michael W. Janewyy, Walter W. Kopychak.

March 19, 1963.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dan: Thank you so much for sending me the booklet on the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence, and I surely will make every effort to be on the floor on March 27 when you discuss the resolutions proposing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

D. R. Matthews,
Member of Congress.

Philanthropic Contributions by One American Corporation, the Polish National Alliance, Have Benefited American Education in the Amount of More Than $5 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed among the people of our Nation that our greatest single resource for the continuance of democracy is the intellectual capacity of our Nation's citizens.

We Americans have developed institutions of higher learning which not only manifest the culture of America but also are a source of inspiration throughout the world.

I am very proud to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish-American fraternal organization in the world, which has its headquarters in Chicago but which has local chapters in virtually every community of the United States, has contributed more than $5 million to Alliance College, which is supported by the Polish National Alliance, in Cambridge Springs, Pa.

This vast contribution by the Polish National Alliance to maintain an excellent institution of higher learning should be a source of satisfaction to all Americans. Through its efforts to help Alliance College, the Polish National Alliance manifests an abiding desire to help maintain educational standards in the United States unequaled anywhere in the world. These impressive contributions by the Polish National Alliance reflect again what a tremendous impact this imposing organization has exerted on the development of our Nation.

The Polish National Alliance stands as a beacon for Americans of Polish descent to help guide them to those attributes which have made America a citadel of hope for people throughout the world.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, and Mr. Edward Kozmor, censor of this fine fraternal organization, have worked arduously toward helping Alliance College become one of the finest institutions of higher learning in America. The entire membership of the Polish National Alliance joins these two dedicated officers in helping provide young Americans these impressive educational opportunities in a setting just south of Erie, Pa., which inspires great appreciation of nature's beauty.

Alliance College lies in a lovely valley of the Allegheny Mountains. Before World War II the free Government of Poland sent thousands of evergreen saplings which have grown into giant trees and transform the entire Alliance College campus into a virtual wonderland. It is in this beautiful setting blessed by nature that students pursue their intellectual curiosities.

Alliance College stands today as a living monument to the high ideals espoused by the Polish National Alliance and its membership. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the early Polish settlers who landed with Captain Smith in Jamestown in 1608 would have found great pride in knowing that some day their successors on the American Continent would make such an impressive contribution to the educational and cultural growth of America.

Following is a list of contributions made by the Polish National Alliance to Alliance College. From the time the college was founded until 1929, the Polish National Alliance had given the college $1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter amounted to:

1930	119,985.78
1931	124,496.28
1932	124,377.04
1933	116,149.70
1934	116,995.60
1935	110,946.34
1936	133,449.21
1937	126,229.58
1938	129,032.77
1939	122,814.03
1940	82,240.37
1941	76,497.72
1942	76,143.68
1943	80,511.33
1944	81,486.93
1945	83,894.03
1946	85,588.14
1947	83,816.48
1948	135,208.75
1949	78,650.07
1950	80,515.73
1951	92,249.08
1952	123,079.46
1953	119,069.70
1954	119,161.12
1955	115,732.92
1956	164,026.69
1957	113,713.40
1958	108,363.24
1959	109,360.24
1960	128,765.08
1961	126,244.50
1962	143,027.05
Total from 1912 through Dec. 31, 1962	5,227,012.62

This impressive list of contributions clearly demonstrates how one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, contributed to America's educational needs. I trust we can all agree that so long as private corporations such as the Polish National Alliance continue contributing toward the educational needs of this country, our future is secure. Only through intellectual achievement can Americans demonstrate to the people of the world that indeed our system of government offers the greatest degree of hope for mankind.

Deepest Regret and a Great Loss Is Felt by All Veterans and Members of the American Legion in the Passing of a Truly Great American, "Brad" Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved to learn of the sudden death of Bradley R. Taylor, of Rhinelander, Wis., who during his lifetime probably contributed more than any other Legionnaire to the success and influence of the American Legion. It has been my extreme good fortune to have known and have the wonderful opportunity to be associated with this outstanding American for more than the 20 years that I have been in Congress.

Throughout our association I developed a great affection, a great respect, and a great admiration for him as a leader and champion of our American way of life. He was one of the most unselfish human beings I have ever known, and he worked hard at his private business for twofold purpose: to take care of the financial needs of his family, and next to provide for his expenses involved in devoting a great deal of time and effort to helping the American Legion and thereby being extremely beneficial in assisting all veterans in their many and varied problems. His work with the Legion was one of dedication. It was his main interest and actually his whole life.

He traveled constantly, anywhere and everywhere, in all parts of the United States to further the American Legion and served on many of its most important committees.

He was one of the most modest and generous persons I have ever known, never wanting anything for himself but always wanting to further the work of the American Legion and the veterans of the United States. He was held in the highest esteem by his fellow Legionnaires not only in Wisconsin but throughout the United States. Among those with whom he was closely associated in Legion Work was Col. Roscoe Turner, one of the most famous fliers of all times, Hon. Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense, Hon. Monroe Johnson, former Chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, Gen. Louis Renfrow, Hon. Earl Cocke, past national commander, now a member of the World Bank as U.S. representative, former Congressman Tom Miller, of Reno, Nev., and countless other Legion officials and great Americans.

While he was always doing something for someone, working unceasingly for the American Legion, he was made an honorary colonel and honorary citizen by the Governors of the States of Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Texas, Indiana, and Louisiana. In Wisconsin, he was a member of the Wisconsin Aeronautics Board, a member of several governmental boards, and a delegate in 1958 to the White House Conference on National Security.

Brad Taylor was born in Rhinelander, Wis., in 1895 and attended public schools there, following which he attended the University of Kansas and the University of Wisconsin. His high sense of patriotism and love for his country was clearly demonstrated when with only one semester remaining to obtain his college degree, he left college and volunteered in the Army in World War I ending up with a very distinguished and outstanding record. Throughout his life this attribute characterized his every official act in public and private life.

Where the United States or the American Legion was involved, no job was too small or too large for Brad Taylor to attempt. Some of his accomplishments were not only outstanding but amazing and when he thought he was right, he had the tenacity of a bulldog to fight his way to an ultimate and successful conclusion.

The American Legion, Rhinelander, Wis., and the United States will miss Brad Taylor as well as many of my colleagues who knew him intimately. We will all miss him, his inspiration, his love of life, his devotion to his family and friends, his courage, his integrity, his effervescent personality, and his diligent efforts in behalf of the American Legion, the organization which he truly loved.

When I attended his funeral recently in Rhinelander, Wis., he was mourned by hundreds of his townspeople and his many colleagues with whom he was associated in the Congregational Church, the Masonic Lodge, the Elks, the Rotary Club, the American Legion, the Disabled Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mrs. Morrison and I extend to his lovely and devoted wife, his 2 sons and daughter, and his 11 grandchildren our deepest sympathy with a feeling that the many wonderful memories of Brad Taylor will live on forever and be a constant source of comfort to them in the days to come.

Having the friendship of Brad Taylor not only has been a great inspiration that has made me a better Congressman than I would have been, but his friendship over the years had a great influence on me, made me a better man. I know that he has affected so many in the same respect. As I look back over his life, and realize the great love and devotion for his family, his amazing capacity for friendship for so many people, and his years of unselfish devotion and work for the American Legion, I feel that he has certainly earned the title of not only a great American, but justifiably could be given the title of "Mr. American Legion."

Of him and others like Brad Taylor a poet once said:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

Nothing More Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the longstanding events in connection with the annual St. Patrick's Day observance in Cleveland, Ohio, is the civic luncheon given under the auspices of the Irish Good Fellowship Club. It was my pleasure to address that gathering of outstanding Cleveland citizens on March 17.

Under leave previously granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address I delivered on that occasion:

It is the custom of the Irish, when in clan encamped, to speak with candor and frankness, to examine the state of Irish affairs, and to recognize the dangers to the commonweal.

We are now in clan encamped. A happy St. Patrick's Day is the password and I pass it to all here gathered, sons of the clan and their friends.

The state of Irish affairs in the American encampment reflects a steady advancement of our welfare, of our opportunities, and of our hopes. With this goes a corresponding increase in our responsibilities for all those things that have made our life in the United States such a full and happy one. We accept those increased responsibilities in the same spirit that we accept the many blessings of life in the United States. We Irish have learned well that the good life must be earned and it cannot be maintained without a willingness to sacrifice and to participate actively in the conduct of our public affairs.

It is timely to recall that the Irish began to participate in our public affairs at the earliest point in the history of our Nation. A quick look at the Revolutionary War period will reveal that at least one-third of Washington's Army was composed of Irish volunteers.

The Irish have always had an unbreakable attachment to the cause of human freedom. The teachings of St. Patrick left upon them the strongest marks of Christian tradition and it was only natural that their feelings about the rights of all men to be free should be foremost in their attitude towards all things. The Irish came to the United States to secure freedom, denied them in their homeland by an alien occupier. They were quick to identify themselves with freedom's cause in the United States where opportunity was given to them and to all others to exercise it. This they recognized as the greatest asset of our country and their dedication to it has been complete in each generation. And the Irish contribution to our Nation has been noteworthy in peace as well as war.

Life in the United States was not always ideal for the Irish. When the heaviest waves of Irish immigrants reached our shores, a wave of discrimination and exploitation broke out against them. On the whole, they were improverished people—many were illiterate, having been denied the opportunity of learning by the alien occupier of their homeland. This made them objects of exploitation. At the peak of this particular period, employment opportunities of the Irish were limited by a campaign of prejudice. This took the form of public notices known as NINA—meaning—no Irish need apply.

Under these adverse circumstances the Irish did not call out for legislation to remove this prejudice. They did not ask to be recognized as a martyred minority. They did not cry out discrimination at every turn, rather, they set out to prove their worth to the Nation. They wove their worth into the fabric of our Nation and they won by the sweat of their brows the right of equal opportunity, which is all any real Irishman ever asked for because that was all he ever needed.

The harder the Irish were pressed or abused—yes, persecuted, the greater became their mark on any country to which they emigrated, and the countries are many. The United States is no exception to their truism of history.

Those who contemplate an attack or assault upon the Irish because of their heritage would do well to remember this lesson of history, and let us, as Irish, never forget that if we grow soft and too contented with our lot, unmindful of our public responsibilities, that assault will surely follow.

Human freedom, so dear to the heart of the Irish, is in serious jeopardy throughout the world today. Indeed we are witnessing a world crisis in which the forces of organized paganism are seeking to overthrow all civilized life and to turn back the pages of history to the age of barbarians. This threat emanates from Moscow, the historic seat of despotism which has threatened the existence of Christian Europe for over five centuries.

The world of our times moves from crisis to crisis. First it is Greece and Turkey, then Berlin, then it is Korea, then it is Vietnam, and now it is Cuba. The United States has been called upon to defend the cause of freedom on farflung fronts. Until recent years that struggle seemed a long way from our shores. There was a tranquility and a comfort of peace in the Western Hemisphere which no other part of the world enjoyed. Now that peace and tranquility has been broken by the Russian occupation of Cuba and the direct threat which this poses to all the nations in the Western Hemisphere.

Let us make no mistake about this problem—Cuba is a threat to the security of the United States. The Russians have now established a military, political, espionage, and propaganda beachhead on all the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. That threat can not long be tolerated.

When the Russians were caught redhanded in Cuba, President Kennedy met this challenge head on. A sea and air blockade of Cuba accompanied his demand that the Russians forthwith withdraw from their Cuban beachhead. The United States was fully prepared to face any consequences resulting from this action and President Kennedy warned the Russians that any attempt on their part to use their Cuban missiles against the United States or any nation of the Western Hemisphere would be met with a full retaliatory response on the Soviet Union. It is no exaggeration to say the President's stand thoroughly frightened the Russians whose only real strength is bluff and blackmail. That is why they lost no time in admitting their treacherous act and in promising to withdraw their military equipment and forces from Cuba under open, onsite inspection. It was clear in a matter of 48 hours that the United States had won a decisive victory over the Russians, that the Russian bluff could not be backed up, that their bluster of rattling atomic bombs was as phony as all their other claims.

When the victory was won, when we should have picked up all the marbles, the voices of accommodation, of weakness, and of fainthearted men, argued that the door should be left open for the Russians to make a face-saving retreat. Those voices prevailed in the councils of Government and the victory won slipped away as the Russians used the door, opened for their graceful retreat, as a means of solidifying their position in Cuba and to default on their promises made when all the chips were down.

Two weeks ago former President Truman made this astute observation about the manner in which President Kennedy handled the Cuban crisis. I quote: "It again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy." The Russian empire is weak. It is shot through with internal tensions. Ninety million Russians are sitting atop an empire which is a powder keg ready to explode from the human force of the several hundred million non-Russian captives within it.

The Russian pagans try desperately to hide their vulnerabilities from Western eyes. That is why they carry on a massive propaganda program of bluff and buster. That propaganda program is devoted to war, the threat of war and the specter of thermonuclear desolation. The Russians believe they can frighten the councils of free men, that they can impose upon our Nation a political paralysis marked by indecision, fear to take risks and a willingness to accept accommodation with evil. In my judgment the dangers of political paralysis of freemen are far more serious than the dangers of a nuclear war. Today we possess what has been demonstrated to be a frightening superiority over the Russian pagans. But we have yet to demonstrate our willingness to use this power as a shield for political action calculated to ignite the human powder keg on which the Russian empire rests.

President Kennedy is not only confronted by the Russian druids in the Kremlin, he is also confronted with a beachhead of Russian druids in our State Department. The Russian druids in Washington have openly defended the right of the Russian pagans to persecute the Christian nations of eastern Europe. They have denied, as a matter of policy, the right of national self-determination to many great eastern European Christian nations now in Russian bondage. Specifically, I refer to Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia. Concurrently, these same druids of American foreign policy are asking that the great Christian nations of central Europe such as captive Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and others seek an accommodation with the evil forces of communism through what is known as the policy of political evolution. Those druids of high policy believe the Russian barbarians are the untouchables of international life.

How different was the approach of St. Patrick in his contest with the Druids of Ireland. He too was confronted with the pagan philosophy of might makes right and to the victor belongs the spoils. The Druids of Ireland were the high priests of that philosophy. Patrick did not seek accommodation with them. His purpose was to expose them as fakers and to convince their followers that Christianity was the way of their salvation. St. Patrick walked this dangerous course alone, with but a handful of faithful followers. He knew not fear—he feared no man or men. He was supremely confident in the purpose of his high mission. The Druids once exposed fell from favor and the door was opened for St. Patrick to lead the Irish race out of the wilderness of pagan life.

The spirit of St. Patrick is needed today if we are to turn back and ultimately to defeat the hordes of paganism which now threaten the ramparts of all civilization. Nothing less can save us from war or political paralysis, but nothing more is needed to prevent war and to win a universal peace worthy of the name.

Dillon and Stevens Address Textile Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute held its annual meeting last week at Hollywood Beach, Fla. Among the distinguished persons to address the textile manufacturers were the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Robert T. Stevens, president, J. P. Stevens, Inc., a former Secretary of the Army and one of the foremost men in textiles.

Secretary Dillon presented a clear and concise discussion of tax reform, and Mr. Stevens responded with forceful references to the present difficulties of the textile industry resulting from cotton pricing policies. With the consent of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Dillon and excerpts from the remarks of Mr. Stevens:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Last month nearly 5 million Americans who were actively seeking jobs could not find them. More than 6 percent of our labor force was unemployed. Those are dark statistics, and they cast a long shadow over our future—as was made quite clear in the recent testimony of President W. P. Gullander of the National Association of Manufacturers before the House Ways and Means Committee. President Gullander pointed out that, should our economy create new jobs no faster than it has over the past 5 years, then by 1970 our unemployment rate would climb to a shocking 12.7 percent.

This would be the terrible cost, in human terms, of our lagging growth rate—to say nothing of the cost in idle plant capacity, lower Government revenues, and unrealized business profits.

Such a situation would inevitably create irresistible pressures for the Federal Government to play an increasingly larger role in our economy to compensate for the failure of the private sector to meet the basic needs of our people. That prospect, I can assure you, is no more attractive to those of us in Government than it is to you in private industry. Therefore, the President has proposed a major overhaul of our outmoded tax system designed to get our free enterprise system back on the track at full speed so that it can provide more jobs, increased productive capacity, and higher profits.

The President's proposal for a broad, top-to-bottom cut in our tax rates has met with a remarkably favorable response. There is a growing national consensus that our economy must be released from the shackles of an income tax structure that, having outlived its usefulness in restraining the inflationary tendencies of wartime, is now stifling our growth. For example, during the month-long public hearings on the President's tax proposals before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington not one single witness has so far disagreed with the need for significant rate cuts. Since the testimony has been primarily concerned with the important details of the tax program, such as the manner in which the forthcoming rate reduction should be applied or the difficulties involved in various suggestions for structural reform, the remarkable and equally important unanimity of support for significant rate reductions has sometimes been obscured. As you know, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute joins in this consensus. Such support greatly eases the always difficult and time-consuming task of tax reform.

Tax reform is a matter of deep concern to this administration. One of its very first acts was to recommend a tax credit for new investment designed to stimulate business modernization and expansion—a credit that would help to give American businessmen the same sort of tax incentives long enjoyed by many of their foreign competitors. You will recall the surprising difficulties we encountered in obtaining acceptance of this concept, which was new to our tax system, but had well proved its worth to our competitors overseas. Your support was crucial in writing the investment credit into law.

Coming from an enterprising and forward looking industry such as yours, support for a new concept was no surprise. The vitality of the textile industry has been amply demonstrated during the past year by its quick reaction to depreciation reform and the investment credit. You will recall that the Treasury, in accordance with the President's desire to give special attention to your difficult problems, put more liberal depreciation rates into effect for the textile industry in the fall of 1961, 9 months before the promulgation of the overall reform.

Your response was dramatic. Your expenditures during 1962 on new plant and equipment, excluding apparel, were $110 million, or 22 percent higher than in the previous year, whereas in the Nation's manufacturing industries as a whole expenditures increased by only 7 percent. And for the current quarter, your estimates of capital expenditures total $150 million—15 percent or $20 million higher than your actual expenditures in the first quarter of last year, again compared to a 7-percent increase for all manufacturing industries.

And now, following your lead, manufacturing industries as a whole are beginning to respond to depreciation reform and the investment credit. Corporate appropriations and new orders for all types of plant and equipment are mounting, foreshadowing an early and substantial increase in overall plant and equipment expenditures.

But important as they are, and will continue to be, depreciation reform and the investment credit were only a significant first step in the administration's efforts to achieve a free market economy that could perform more nearly and more consistently at capacity levels.

Consider, for a moment, the direct effect of the President's tax program on the incentives for business investment: The combined effect of the 7-percent investment credit and depreciation reform was to lower business tax liabilities by a total of $2.5 billion. President Kennedy's proposal to lower the corporate tax rate from 52 to 47 percent by 1965 will reduce those liabilities by another $2.5 billion. This total reduction of $5 billion a year in business tax liabilities will not only increase cash flow, but will also increase the profitability of business, hence offering a strong double stimulus to the incentives for investment that are the very foundation of our market economy.

But business will benefit perhaps even more from other measures in the tax program. The reductions in personal rates will lower the taxes of millions of small firms which operate as individual proprietorships or partnerships, thus providing these businesses with additional internally generated funds to finance their expansion and modernization. In addition, the reductions in individual rates will raise the incentives for increased personal effort and risk-taking and will enlarge outside sources of money for business investment—directly through the stock purchases of individuals, and indirectly through their savings deposits and insurance policies.

The proposed reductions in the personal income tax would also greatly increase consumer demand which is the basic justification for any steady and long-range rise in business output. As leaders of an industry which depends heavily upon consumer demand, you are particularly well aware of how strongly business investment decisions turn upon present sales volumes and future sales prospects. Several weeks ago in Philadelphia, the president of Botany Industries predicted that if the proposed tax cuts become effective by July 1 of this year they could well result in a boom year for consumer goods industries. In fact, if as a result of the proposed tax program our economy approaches estimated levels of full employment output, then by the first quarter of 1966 we could expect annual personal consumption expenditures for clothing and shoes to be $2 to $2.5 billion, or some 7 percent higher than it would otherwise be.

But to describe separately the impact of rate reductions upon consumer demand and investment incentives ignores the fact that, in our complex economy, these reductions would interact continually upon each other. Increased consumer demand creates greater investment which, in turn, creates additional jobs and profits and further demand for both consumer goods and investment. Through this kind of interaction the President's tax program would release within the economy its own inherent powers for expansion and would reinvigorate the marketplace—the prime mover in our economic growth.

Our economy is undeniably growing, and we have made genuine progress over the past 2 years. But we are gaining far too little ground toward our goal of a full employment economy at near capacity levels. Last year, for example, we set new records in nearly every area of aggregate economic activity. Yet, in effect, we marked time in our rates of employment and capacity utilization.

Our record of five postwar recessions—two within the past 5 years—should drive home the fact that we cannot continue indefinitely at our present rate of growth without increasing the risk of recession and magnifying its impact should it occur. Certainly no one would predict a recession in the near future. But it would be a foolhardy man indeed who would rashly refuse to provide against its occurrence. Such provision is inherent in the President's tax program by the very fact that it offers a strong and permanent stimulus to the forces for growth within the economy.

For that reason, also, the President's tax program offers us an essential element of any long-range, realistic answer to the problem of Federal deficits. For, if we have learned anything from our postwar economic record, we have learned that our deficits result more from underproduction by the economy than from spending by the Government. In fiscal 1959, to cite an extreme example, an anticipated budget surplus of $466 million became, as a result of a recession, an actual deficit of $12.4 billion.

The lesson is clear: With our heavy burden of free world leadership in the cold war—a war that only last fall threatened to grow very hot indeed—we simply cannot hope to achieve balanced budgets unless our economy operates at full capacity. Paradoxical as it may seem to some, lower tax rates can bring us larger Government revenues from an economy operating at full speed, than can our present repressive rate structure from an economy that is prevented by that very rate structure from ever reaching its full potential. That is why today true fiscal responsibility demands a reduction in our tax burden.

Certainly no one welcomes the prospect of a deficit in this fiscal year and the next. The administration had hoped to present its tax program in conjunction with a balanced budget. But the growth of our economy has simply not kept pace with our increased national needs, and particularly with the needs forced upon us by considerations of national security. It can easily be demonstrated that if our economy had operated at relatively full capacity since 1957, the past 5 years would have shown an overall budget surplus, rather than the $30 billion deficit we have actually incurred.

The administration has presented its tax reduction program together with a budget for fiscal year 1964 in which civilian programs were stringently held below the levels of the current fiscal year. The entire budget increase was in response to the demands of defense, space, and interest on the national debt—demands which have accounted for nearly 73 percent of the total expenditure increases that have occurred during this administration. The President has also accompanied his tax proposals with a firm commitment that, as the tax cut becomes effective and the economy expands in response, a substantial part of the resulting revenue increases must go toward eliminating budgetary deficits until balance is once more achieved.

This program of expenditure control is an integral part of the President's tax recommendations. It is a practical program to seek out and eliminate soft spots in the budget. This is the responsible way to cut spending. It contrasts sharply with the extravagant claims we have recently been hearing so much of—claims that meat ax budget cuts are possible; claims that have a habit of vanishing into thin air when the time for action comes.

The President is making good on his pledge. He is already translating it into action. Since the submission of his 1964 budget only 2 months ago, he has sent to the Congress revisions which reduce his fiscal year 1964 requests by $126 million, and his 1963 requests by $236 million, or a total reduction of $362 million. These substantial cuts stand in sharp contrast to the recent action of the House of Representatives in increasing the authorization for defense expenditures over and above the President's recommendations.

Built into the tax program itself are two vital safeguards again an excessive budgetary impact: the phasing of the program over a 3-year period, and the revenue-raising reforms. As a result of these two measures—and particularly the reforms—the tax program is able to offer rate reductions far larger than would otherwise be acceptable.

The way to achieve the largest possible rate cuts—and thus the greatest economic stimulus—within the limits of fiscal responsibility, is to combine them with base-broadening tax reforms. And that is exactly what the President's program will do. The only fiscally responsible alternative—as I pointed out to the House Ways and Means Committee, and as was so clearly recognized in the recommendations submitted on your behalf by Mr. C. E. Connelly, chairman of your tax committee—would be a substantially smaller reduction in rates than the President has recommended. Whether at the bottom of the scale, at the top, in the middle, or all along, tax rates simply could not come down as much as we had hoped.

While talking of structural reforms, I should also point out that many of the reforms—those, for example, that involve income-averaging, deductibility of moving expenses, more favorable tax treatment of expenditures on equipment used in research and development—would either relieve hardship or encourage economic growth.

In addition, when we consider tax revision we cannot lightly dismiss the ever-present need for equity and simplicity. A number of the provisions in our current tax code are justified primarily by our oppressively high rate structure. Since lower rates would remove the main reason for their existence, we have recommended that they be modified or repealed.

The President's program represents a fair balance between the goals of revenue, growth, equity, and simplicity. It does not satisfy those who have long recommended far-reaching reforms that would radically alter the nature of our tax system. Neither does it satisfy those who have cried for a "quickie" tax cut with no consideration for anything else. The President's program is a rounded program, a moderate program. Coupled with firm but realistic expenditure control, it can generate a strong upward lift throughout our economy, while still adhering to the requirements of fiscal responsibility.

Through a balanced combination of increased incentives to invest, and increased consumer demand, it will permit our citizens to produce more, earn more, buy more, and invest more. In this way it can set us well on the way toward achieving our major long-range economic aim: a free market economy which utilizes all of its abundant resources of men, money, and machines, and which offers to every American the incentives and the opportunities to prosper in accordance with his capacities.

Excerpts From Remarks by Robert T. Stevens

Mr. Secretary, permit me to say once more how honored we are to have you with us and we know, certainly I know, and appreciate your efforts looking toward a more dynamic American economy in the overall picture of the world situation as being in the final analysis the best defense not only of the United States but also of the free world.

I would like if I may to make an observation in regard to your remarks which I have heard for the first time as you made them in their reference to the commitment of the President to budgetary and fiscal policy. I like them and believe in them exactly as you have said them for us.

I think, however, in this presence it is not out of order in the most respectful manner, Mr. Secretary, to say and express the hope that you will carry back with you the fact that there are Presidential commitments in respect to the problems of this industry. Personally I am deeply satisfied the President intends to carry these out, but many others in this room will join me in feeling that it is surprising, if not astonishing, that the Chief Executive Officer of our great country, the President of the United States, has been unable for one reason or another, to carry out up to this time, the commitments which he made in good faith and which he stands behind today and which are now approaching the 2-year-old mark. So that I sincerely hope, Mr. Secretary, you can carry back with you the respectful, the constructive and the sincere thinking of this group of people in the textile business that we do have the faith. We know he will discharge this obligation. But, frankly, Rome is burning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 50: 7: *The Lord God will help us, therefore we shall not be confounded.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we rejoice that Thou art always willing and able to aid the vast multitudes who feel that they are victims in the relentless grip of a conspiracy of wicked circumstances.

We earnestly beseech Thee to give Thy strength to those who are bearing heavy burdens and Thy sympathy to hearts that are throbbing with an aching loneliness.

Grant that we also may help mankind cultivate faith and fortitude in order that the strain and stress of life may be more tolerable for them.

May we aspire to make a worthy contribution to the moral and spiritual welfare of our beloved country, enabling it to be triumphant in these days of trouble and confusion.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 28, 1963, was read and approved.

SANCTUARY FOR CUBAN PATRIOTS

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to me that the United States is taking measures to prevent Cuban patriots from taking sanctuary in any area of the Carribbean after launching attacks upon the Communist regime in Cuba.

Are we to be in the fantastic position of not only eliminating the possibility of invading Cuba ourselves, but also of insuring that the Cuban patriots will not be allowed to liberate themselves?

Are we to abandon permanently the freedom-craving people of Cuba?

The United States accepted the principle of sanctuary when we allowed the Red Chinese to attack us from across the Yalu River in Korea. We accept the principle of sanctuary in South Vietnam when we allow the Communists to escape across the border into North Vietnam. The aggressors in Angola were permitted to escape across the Congo River into the Congo Republic. When France was locked in conflict in Algeria, they permitted the revolutionaries sanctuary in Tunisia. And, finally, Cuba has been established as the Communist sanctuary from which to subvert all of South and Central America.

What a double standard we have.

JUDICIAL REFORM

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the 87th Congress there was enacted as section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962 a provision permitting a deduction under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code for contributions made after December 31, 1961, to nonprofit organizations supporting or opposing the reorganization of the State judiciary in referendums to be held during the calendar year 1962. The purpose of the legislation was to permit the deduction of contributions to nonprofit organizations which had been established in Illinois and other States seeking to reorganize and improve their judicial systems. Since it was not deemed necessary for the provision to be made a permanent part of the Internal Revenue Code, its effect was limited to referendums taking place in the calendar year 1962.

A similar organization, known as the Ohio Citizens Better Courts Committee, Inc., has been incorporated to promote a program of judicial reform in the State of Ohio. Insofar as I know, the situation is in all respects similar to that which led to the enactment of the provision last year. In order that the judicial reform movement might have the same treatment in the State of Ohio, I am introducing a bill to extend the amendment embodied in section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962, to referendums occurring during the calendar year 1963. I am advised that in addition to Ohio, there are also several other States where similar programs are under consideration. The amendment would likewise be helpful to the movement in those States.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for calling the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEAFNESS IN BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "having only light perception," each place it appears therein the following: "or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has long maintained a system of statutory awards for compensating veterans who have specified service-connected disabilities, the award being in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran who has lost an arm above the elbow could be rated at 80 percent resulting in the monthly payment of basic compensation in the amount of $170. In addition to this amount he would receive as a result of the statutory award law $47, making his total monthly compensation $217.

Under the current schedule for rating disabilities total deafness is ratable at 80-percent disabling, which results in compensation for wartime cases of $170 monthly. This present 80-percent rate is a reduction ordered by the Administrator from the previous 100-percent rating. This action was taken some months ago. The passage of this legislation would result in the veteran who suffers from total deafness receiving $170 monthly for his wartime disability plus $47 to make a total of $217.

The committee believes total deafness should be rated as totally disabling and takes this means of at least partially rectifying what it considers to be an error.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 1,200 cases who would be eligible for this statutory award at a minimum additional cost of $666,000 the first year. There would be a slight increase each year for the succeeding 4 years.

An identical purpose bill passed the House in the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses but failed of approval in the other body.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.:

There are some 1,200 veterans suffering from total deafness of both ears as a result of their service-incurred disabilities, but are rated less than total. H.R. 199 will correct this inequity. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges favorable consideration and approval by House of H.R. 199.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 199 which will provide a statutory award of $47 monthly to veterans for the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 199. This bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would provide an additional payment of $47 monthly for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears. Monthly rates of compensation for service connected disabilities are paid in accordance with a fixed schedule. The fixed rating schedule is based on 10 levels of disability ranging from 10 to 100 percent. In addition, the Congress has provided special statutory awards of certain seriously disabling conditions, usually involving loss of use of an extremity or a body function. For example, an amputation in the upper third of the thigh enjoys a rating of 80 percent under the basic schedule. This entitles the veteran to payments of $170 monthly. In such cases, however, a special statutory award entitles veterans so disabled to an additional $47 monthly.

Heretofore the veteran who was afflicted with a complete loss of hearing in both ears received only the compensation payment resulting from 80-percent disability. This bill will provide an additional statutory award of $47 monthly for veterans who are thus disabled. Because this is a serious disability and because it imposes a severe handicap both economically and socially upon those afflicted, it merits the favorable consideration of this body. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that there are 1,200 cases at a minimum additional cost of $666,000 the first fiscal year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on the previous bill as well as on this proposed legislation I wish to call to the attention of the House that the President's Bureau of the Budget specifically recommended against the enactment of both proposals. These two bills have been on the Consent Calendar for a number of weeks. They have been passed over heretofore in 1963. I have on several occasions asked that they be passed over.

I feel that the House should know that if these bills are permitted to go through and be enacted by the House that they are being considered and approved contrary to the recommendation of the President and his Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Veterans' Affairs Committee constantly finds itself between the Bureau of the Budget and veterans' organizations. The request of the Veterans' Administration is generally for nothing in the way of legislation which involves any substantial cost, be it under a Republican administration or a Democratic administration. On the other hand the requests of veterans' groups run into billions. Our committee makes a very serious and honest attempt to screen these bills and bring to the floor only those bills that a great majority of the House will consider to be deserving. Our committee tries desperately not to bring politics into the veterans' programs; and I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consider it necessarily the duty of the committee either to rubberstamp or to disagree with what the executive branch says it wants in the way of legislation. I think further our committee has made an honest and sincere attempt to bring only meritorious legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the current Veterans' Administration schedule for rating disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia—loss of speech—with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total amount of $250 a month. H.R. 214 provides that the statutory award rate—$47—now applicable for other appropriate disabilities for a specific loss shall be added to the total rate. This $47 a month allowance would mean that the veteran would receive $297 monthly if this bill is enacted into law. The Veterans' Administration indicates there are only 20 known cases meeting the criteria of this bill. The annual cost would be approximately $11,000. An identical bill passed the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress but failed in the other body. I urge its passage today.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say as one who has formerly asked that this bill and the previous bill be passed over without prejudice, that it was without any thought of personalities whatsoever. We recognize that the Veterans' Affairs Committee and its distinguished chairman give these matters very serious consideration, but we as official objectors are guided by certain rules that have been set up. In that connection we do so not in the capacity of judges of the merits of the legislation or its wisdom, or the wisdom of the committee in reporting it out, but rather to see that the safeguards set up are observed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I certainly do not want to be interpreted as dealing in personalities. I realize that the official objectors are governed by rules and that their objections are not based on personal considerations.

Mr. PELLY. I am sure I speak for all on this side of the aisle when I say that we have great respect for the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Veterans Affairs, and in that capacity we appreciate that he has problems and we want to help him if we can.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the gentleman and my good friend from Texas well knows, I have traditionally and consistently supported him on the top controversial issues that he himself has had to tackle in connection with veterans' legislation. I intend in the future to be guided substantially by his good judgment and sound reasoning on such legislation.

I only brought up what the Bureau of the Budget has recommended in these two cases, and in others, because in recent weeks I personally have received communications from people all over the country inferring that I and several others on the objectors committee, were the only roadblocks to the enactment of this legislation. The truth is that the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration have both recommended against enactment of the two bills I specifically mentioned. We on the objectors committee, under our rules and regulations, do have policies that we are supposed to follow.

In defense of these policies it is fair to point out from time to time what the attitude of the administration is on specific legislative matters. There are other bills that will probably go through today where the administration has recommended against enactment. We have tried to prevent them from enactment under the Consent Calendar process, but we are realistic now that they are scheduled under suspension of the rules.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague].

How much money are we talking about annually in connection with this H.R. 214?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Eleven thousand two hundred and eighty dollars a year involving 20 known cases.

Mr. FOREMAN. How much were we talking about on H.R. 199? I know we passed that. But can the gentleman give me a figure on that?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Twelve hundred cases, and probably about $666,000 a year.

Mr. FOREMAN. The point I wish to bring out here is that, as pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], this is above and beyond the requested budget of the administration. I am proud to be a friend of the veterans and the various fine veterans' organizations, but I believe that we are all concerned about our deficit spending and our continuing growing debt. We are adding to this tremendous unprecedented budget by adding these continually growing costs to our Government. I very much question the advisability of continuing this sort of thing, adding to a budget that we pretty well all agree on is too high as it is now. I think it would be a good idea to bring out as these bills come along how much additional money we are talking about above what the President has requested.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There will be a statement in the Record on each bill telling the exact number of cases and the cost as estimated by the VA. I sincerely hope my good friend from Texas, as we go down the road in this Congress and we get bills involving billions, will take the same attitude he is taking on a little bill like this.

Mr. FOREMAN. The gentleman may rest assured that, whether it runs into the billions or the thousands of dollars, I am just frugal and conservative enough to be concerned over an additional dollar in our budget as I am of millions of dollars, and that is why I am so concerned about these bills here today that are being proposed to be passed and adding to our budget deficit. I question very much the advisability of this House approving these bills. Many of my best friends are members of the VFW, American Legion, Veterans of World War I and other such organizations and they, like me, are more than passively concerned about our growing tax rate and increased Government spending programs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will take a little trip over to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and look at the bills we have and look at the requests we have and see what we report, I think he will give the committee credit for doing a pretty good job. Last year we passed a total of 39 bills, involving perhaps as much as $200 million—the compensation bill alone amounted to $98 million. Yet the American Legion and other veterans groups said that the Congress did nothing that we could be proud of or take credit for as far as legislation is concerned. That is the kind of thing we run into.

Mr. FOREMAN. I commend the committee for holding down as many as they have; I think they have done a fine job here, substantially 95 percent pure, but we wish it could be 100 percent pure, so to speak, and to cut out all that are not absolutely necessary. I accept the decision of the committee here. I think the committee has endeavored to judiciously look out for the best interests of our veterans and I commend them on the job they are doing. I am just pointing out that I question very much the advisability of the committee to bring out bills, whether they have requests for a million or a billion dollars or any percentage of that, if it is above and beyond that which the President has requested and if they are not absolutely necessary.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There were 39 bills enacted into law last year and nearly all passed unanimously. Any Member could have stood up and objected to any of those bills on the Consent Calendar. When we bring up bills on the Consent Calendar, all you have to do to stop consideration is to object.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "having only light perception," each place it appears the following: "or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech,".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the current schedule for rating disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia—loss of speech—with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total amount of $250 a month. This bill provides that the statutory award rate—$47—now applicable for other appropriate disabilities for a specific loss shall be added to the total rate. This $47 a month allowance would mean that the veteran would receive $297 monthly if this bill is enacted into law.

Hearings on a similar proposal, somewhat broader, were held before the Compensation and Pension Subcommittee in the first session of the 87th Congress.

The Veterans' Administration indicates that there are only 20 known cases involving complete organic aphonia meeting the criteria of this bill, which means that the annual cost would be $11,280.

An identical bill passed the House in the 87th Congress, but failed of approval in the other body.

Washington, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

Olin E. Teague,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Some 20 veterans have permanent loss of vocal cords and speech. H.R. 214 will provide additional compensation for this most deserving group with very deserving service-incurred conditions. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges speedy passage of this bill.

Francis W. Stover,
Director, National Legislative Service.

April 1, 1963.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 214 which will provide a statutory award of $47 monthly to those veterans suffering the service-connected loss or loss of use of both vocal chords, with resulting complete aphonia and constant inability to communicate by speech. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

Charles L. Huber,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MODIFIED LIFE PLAN FOR NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE POLICYHOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 220) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That effective January 1, 1964, section 704 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Insurance"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate a policy of participating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and (3) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium.

"(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, a policy of nonparticipating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except that (1) term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have been issued under section 723(b) of this title; and (2) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium. Any person eligible for insurance under section 722(a) of this title may be granted a modified life insurance policy under this subsection which, subject to exception (2) above, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions specified in section 722(a).

"(d) Any insured whose modified life insurance policy is in force by payment or waiver of premiums on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday may upon written application and payment of premiums made before such birthday be granted National Service Life Insurance, on an ordinary life plan, without physical examination, in an amount of not less than $500, in multiples of $250, but not in excess of one-half of the face amount of the modified life insurance policy in force on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be effective on the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. The premium rate, cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values on the ordinary life insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality tables and interest rates as the insurance issued under the modified life policy. Settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality or annuity tables and interest rates as such settlements on the modified life policy. If the insured is totally disabled on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday and premiums on his modified life insurance policy are being waived under section 712 of this title or he is entitled on that date to waiver under such section he shall be automatically granted the maximum amount of insurance authorized under this subsection and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill, effective January 1, 1964, seeks to provide a new plan of national service life insurance, generally designated as a modified life plan, which would be offered primarily to World War II term policyholders as a substitute for their present term policies. It provides for the same amount of protection as they have today, with two modifications—the amount of the premium would not increase each 5 years as is true of all national service life insurance term contracts, and at age 65 the value of the policy would be reduced in half. However, the policyholder at age 65 would have the option, if he desired and elected to do so, to maintain the other half of the policy which he would otherwise lose by paying for the insurance at the premium rate for the attained age and without medical examination.

The bill is favored by the Veterans' Administration.

The effect of this insurance, insofar as premiums are concerned, is shown in the table reproduced below:

Age	Annual premium for the modified life plan	Annual premium present rates		Level premium after age 65	
		5-year level premium term	Ordinary life	If 50-percent face continued	If 100-percent face continued
30	$9.83	$8.41	$18.47	$9.83	$43.22
35	11.72	9.00	21.31	11.72	45.11
40	14.09	10.06	25.10	14.09	47.48
45	17.17	11.72	30.07	17.17	50.56
50	20.84	15.04	36.94	20.84	54.23
55	25.22	20.95	46.53	25.22	58.61
65		47.00	78.97		

This bill is the culmination of a continuing interest on the part of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Veterans' Administration in preventing World War II policyholders from suffering the same fate of their World War I brothers in the term insurance field. The rates of premium chargeable today on term policies of World War I or World War II veterans whose ages are in the late sixties and seventies are so high as to make the maintenance of the policies almost prohibitive, and certainly uneconomical. As an example, the committee had recently called to its attention the case of a veteran age 78, who is paying $1,200 annual premium on a $10,000 policy. He had already exceeded in premiums paid the face value of the policy, but he needs the protection for his wife in the event of his death and thus had no alternative except to continue the payment of premiums.

The Veterans' Administration has indicated that the total first 5-year administrative cost of this legislation would be $846,000; the first-year administrative cost would be $206,000.

An identical purpose bill passed the House in the 86th Congress, but an amendment of the Senate was not finally resolved. In the 87th Congress an identical bill passed the House but became involved in the other, in an unrelated controversial matter which prevented ultimate approval.

April 1, 1963.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 220 which will permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

Charles L. Huber,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

Washington, D.C., *April 1, 1963.*

Olin E. Teague,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars supports H.R. 220 which will provide a new national service life insurance plan. Three million veterans still holding term policies will have added inducement and opportunity to convert to permanent plan thus preventing possible hardship in later years. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges speedy approval of H.R. 220.

Francis W. Stover,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AT VETERANS' AFFAIRS INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chief of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of another Member, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is a gentleman who is very knowledgeable concerning this bill that could not be here today who asked that it be not taken up, and if it is so proper, I ask unanimous consent that it be taken from the suspension calendar also.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to call it up.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 243) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or one or more creative organs, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j), or subsection (s), of this section but in no event to exceed $340 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or one or more creative organs, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $525 per month;".

SEC. 2. Any increased compensation authorized by the amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective as of the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, existing law authorizes basic rates of compensation which are paid according to degree of disability. For example, in wartime cases basic rates range from $20 for a 10-percent disability to $250 monthly for total disability. In addition, certain statutory awards are authorized for specific disabilities. Among such awards is the payment of an allowance of $47 per month—in wartime cases—in addition to the basic rate applicable, where the veteran has lost the use of a hand, a foot, both buttocks, an eye, or creative organ. However, unless the veteran has a combination of disabilities for which a specific award of $340—or higher but not exceeding $525—is payable, he may receive only one additional allowance of $47 for the mentioned specific losses even though he may have more than one such loss.

This bill would authorize the payment of the additional allowance for each such loss, in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran with the loss of an eye and a hand may now receive only one allowance of $47 in addition to the basic rate of compensation based on the combined degree of disability. Enactment of the bill will authorize in such a case an allowance of $94—2 times $47—in addition to the basic rate. Under the amended bill, however, the total payment in any case may not exceed $340 and the loss of more than one creative organ would, for this purpose, be considered a single "loss." In peacetime cases the rates are 80 percent of the above-mentioned rates.

The VA estimates that about 440 veterans would benefit from the bill's enactment at a cost of about $225,000 for each of the first 5 years.

An identical purpose bill was reported by the committee in the 83d Congress and in the 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses, passed the House but failed passage in the Senate.

APRIL 1, 1963.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 243 which will provide a statutory award of $47 monthly to those veterans suffering the service-connected for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, *D.C.*
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Certain blind veterans who have also suffered the loss of a lower extremity will be provided assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under H.R. 243. An estimated 50 veterans with this combination of service-incurred disabilities will be the beneficiaries of this bill. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges speedy passage of this most meritorious legislation.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARAPLEGIC HOUSING PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 248) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 801 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", and such permanent and total disability is such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair," and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to expand the paraplegic housing program—the program which provides for a $10,000 grant for severely disabled veterans in acquiring specially equipped homes made necessary because of their peculiar difficulties.

At the present time veterans with service-connected disabilities of all wars and peacetime are eligible if they meet the following criteria: They are permanently and totally disabled due first, to the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or wheelchairs; or second, blind in both eyes, having only light perception, plus loss or loss of use of one lower extremity, and in such condition as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair.

The bill deletes the requirement in category 2 mentioned above so as to permit a blind veteran to obtain this grant even though he is able to move about without the aid of a wheelchair.

The law provides that payment shall not exceed $10,000 in any event and permits payment of 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of a home for special fixtures or movable facilities.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are less than 50 veterans now on the compensation rolls with a disability of blindness and loss or loss of use of one lower extremity. An unknown number of these, whose disabilities are such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair, have been granted, or are eligible for, assistance under existing law. The balance would become eligible under the provisions of H.R. 248. It is improbable that all of these would apply and qualify for this benefit in the first year. Therefore the total benefit cost of the bill, if enacted, would be substantially less than $500,000 the first year. Additional cost for later years would be quite small because new cases with the prescribed disabilities would be rare.

An identical bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but failed of approval in the other body.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITALIZATION IN PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 249) to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the

Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone if the bill provides for the purchase of hospital supplies or medicines for this hospital in the Philippines?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It permits them to buy some medicines and permits them to exchange medicines subject to a contract being negotiated between the two Governments.

Mr. GROSS. This facility is used for the care of patients who are not service-connected cases?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, I shall be happy to answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. In other words the Federal Government of this country then, and the taxpayers, will be buying medicines for private citizens of the Philippines, is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. They can only buy medicines for service-connected patients—Commonwealth army and U.S. veterans. It is true that the hospital may treat the few, and I will say very few, private cases.

Mr. GROSS. Will they differentiate between the use of medical supplies and equipment as between former servicemen and private patients?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The legislation specifies that this medicine which is bought pursuant to the contract will only be used for service-connected patients.

Mr. GROSS. And, when does the gentleman think that the Federal Government of this country will discontinue appropriating for this purpose?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As the gentleman from Iowa knows, the gentleman from Texas has not been a strong supporter of the foreign aid program. But to have a nicely going, efficiently run, fine hospital in that part of the world that can be used as a medical center that in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas is about as good foreign aid as could be participated in by this country. I am for this program and very much so.

Mr. GROSS. We gave the Philippines some $73 million last year, and we gave them close to $500 million at the end of the war. It seems to me we have been doing a pretty good job by way of foreign aid to that country.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that this involves a cost not expected to exceed $2 million for 5 years and not more than $500,000 in any one fiscal year. This bill is an extension of 5 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 632 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "five consecutive fiscal years", and inserting in lieu thereof "ten consecutive fiscal years,"; and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence "ending before July 1, 1963, nor $500,000 for any one fiscal year beginning on or after such date".

With the following committee amendment:

Add the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SEC. 2. Section 632 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Such agreement may also provide that during the contract period specified in paragraph (1) of this section, payments for hospital care and for medical services provided to Commonwealth Army veterans or to United States veterans may consist in whole or in part of available medicines, medical supplies and equipment furnished by the Administrator to the Veterans Memorial Hospital at valuations therefor as determined by the Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to furnish through the revolving supply fund, pursuant to section 5011 of this title, such medicines, medical supplies and equipment as necessary for this purpose and to use therefor, as applicable, appropriations available for such payments.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to extend for another 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization for service-connected veterans of the Commonwealth Army who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. It would, at the same time, extend the program for outpatient care for this same group of service-connected veterans of that Commonwealth Army. The present program expires on June 30, 1963, and the existing law contains a $2 million ceiling for any one fiscal year on payments covering hospitalization and related travel.

This bill places a $500,000 ceiling on hospital payments for any fiscal year after 1963. The cost would not exceed $350,000 for fiscal year 1963, and the entire cost for the additional full 5 years would probably be less than $2 million.

The committee amendment would permit payments for hospital and medical services provided for Commonwealth Army service-connected veterans or U.S. service-connected veterans partly in the form of medicines and medical supplies. However, this arrangement would require an agreement between the two Governments and is by no means a mandate that this procedure must be followed.

The Veterans' Administration recommends favorable action on the proposal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bills just passed which have come from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN WATER SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 131) to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon request of the other party to any long-term contract for municipal, domestic, or industrial water supply hereafter entered into under clause (2) in the proviso to the first sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1195, 43 U.S.C. 485h), include provision for renewal thereof subject to renegotiation of (1) the charges set forth in the contract in the light of circumstances prevailing at the time of renewal and (2) any other matters with respect to which the right to renegotiate is reserved in the contract. Any right of renewal shall be exercised within such reasonable time prior to the expiration of the contract as the parties shall have agreed upon and set forth therein.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall also, upon like request, provide in any such long-term contract or in any contract entered into under clause (1) of the proviso aforesaid that the other party to the contract shall, during the term of the contract and of any renewal thereof and subject to fulfillment of all obligations thereunder, have a first right (to which right the holders of any other type of contract for municipal, domestic, or industrial water supply shall be subordinate) to a stated share or quantity of the project's available water supply for beneficial use for the purposes stated in the contract.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate amendments to existing contracts entered into pursuant to the first sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to conform said contracts to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term "long-term contract" means any contract the term of which is more than ten years.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, after the words "first right" insert "for the purposes stated in the contract".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "available water supply for beneficial use for the purposes stated in the contract." and insert in lieu thereof "water supply available for municipal, domestic, or industrial use."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "authorized" insert ", upon request by the other party,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CADMIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 307) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PRICE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 1089, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately two million pounds of cadmium now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

Mr. **BROOMFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BROOMFIELD**. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 307, I would very much like to praise the House Armed Services Committee and its Subcommittee No. 2 for its prompt action in bringing this bill to the floor for our consideration today.

Members of this committee realized the emergency faced in the metal-plating industry because of the shortage of this important metal, and have moved quickly and thoroughly to release adequate amounts from our overstocked Federal stockpiles so that the current shortage can be eased.

The cadmium situation in private industry has been going from bad to worse over the past few months, and only prompt action by our Federal Government can cure the situation.

Last May, a number of small firms in the Detroit, Mich., area called to my attention the difficulty they had experienced in obtaining an adequate supply of this essential metal.

Cadmium is a necessity in certain types of metal plating. It does not take large amounts to adequately protect metal parts from rust, but this little bit is essential.

For instance, our automobiles have a great deal of cadmium plating on important parts. Because of this plating, your automobiles will last longer, run better and cost you less in the long run in the months and years ahead.

To a great degree, this plating process is carried on by small businesses which employ between 30 and 100 people. In some cases, small firms have their own plating plants which they use to treat the parts and components they supply to industry. In other cases, firms specialize only in plating. They are totally dependent upon an adequate supply of cadmium. If they do not have the raw materials to do the job, they go out of business.

A year or so ago, the price of cadmium per pound ranged from about $1.60 to $1.80. In the space of a few short months, the price rose to $2.50 to $3.50 a pound. Some firms could not obtain an adequate supply at any price. Others have been able to obtain only a small fraction of their needs.

These firms have been forced to work on a day-to-day basis, depending upon the supply of the metal they were able to obtain. Some have had to lay off employees and curtail production.

Last June, I introduced H.R. 11972, which was referred to the House Armed Services Committee for consideration. The chairman of the committee requested reports from interested Federal agencies. However, these reports—even though they were favorable—were not received by the committee until after the House Armed Services Committee had finished its business for the year and Members of Congress were concluding their legislative work so that they could attempt to come back to Congress this year.

On the 1st day of this 1st session of the 88th Congress, I introduced H.R. 307, a bill identical to H.R. 11972 of last year. Further, I requested the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to hold hearings at an early date.

The chairman, Mr. VINSON, and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. PHILBIN, have been more than cooperative. Prompt action was taken in holding hearings, and both the subcommittee and the full committee agreed that the bill should stand as it was originally written.

Favorable reports were forthcoming from both the General Services Administration and the Office of Emergency Planning, and the Bureau of the the Budget stated that it had no objections to the submission of the favorable reports.

I might say that these reports, along with favorable subcommittee and committee consideration, were forthcoming in record time, for which industry is greatly appreciative.

Further, the Senate recently took action by passing S. 1089, a bill identical to H.R. 307.

There is little doubt in anyone's mind, I am sure, of the desperate situation in which cadmium users find themselves throughout our Nation. Further, there is little doubt that Federal stockpiles are exceedingly excessive.

As of January 1, 1963, the Federal Government held 10,829,640 pounds in the national stockpile and another 7,448,989 pounds in the supplemental barter stockpile. This totals a tremendous 18,278,629 pounds.

Our maximum objective for cadmium under the terms of the strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) is 6,500,000 pounds. This means that the amount of cadmium our Federal Government has in excess of its needs, in case of a 3-year war, is 11,778,629 pounds.

The President has often urged the Congress to assist in getting this Nation moving again. I submit that one of the anchors around the neck of economic progress is a cadmium anchor of no small proportions.

Supplies of goods essential to industry and our Nation's economic growth are being held up because of a shortage of cadmium caused by a near Federal monopoly on the supply available.

In some cases, manufacturers have been forced to turn to more expensive or less satisfactory means of plating metal products, which has resulted in a sometimes inferior end product at a higher price for the consumer.

Since the introduction of my bills on this subject, I have received a number of letters from firms engaged in the metal plating industry.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a few short statements in these letters.

Mr. W. K. Lomason, president, Douglas & Lomason Co., Detroit, Mich., wrote me:

> We use approximately 1,000 pounds of the metal per month in our Detroit plant. On the face of it, this does not seem like a large amount. However, it is used to protect metals from corrosion, and the parts plated generally become parts of larger assemblies and, therefore, without the cadmium, the entire assembly is held up.
>
> We find the premium between the $1.60 normal price and the $2.50 gray market price represents a significant item in our pricing of these assemblies. Employment is also important. If the cadmium situation is not relieved, it threatens the jobs of approximately 15 people directly in this plant.

Another from Mr. J. H. Butcher, president, Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa., states:

> May I offer my congratulations to you on submitting your bill for some sort of action on the ridiculous situation in the cadmium market.
>
> When a user such as we must go all the way to British Columbia, Canada, to secure cadmium anodes, there is something fundamentally wrong. This letter is written as an operator of a captive plating operation used to plate our own products, most of which go into the automobile and parts manufacture in your own State.

And I might add in the automobiles which you and your constituents purchase.

Letters such as these are repeated many times, not only in my own mail but in the mail of many Members of Congress.

Rather than improving, the cadmium supply situation is getting worse. The only hope we have of keeping these small businessmen in operation is for the Federal Government to turn loose at least a portion of the supplies it now has on hand over and above its anticipated needs in case of war. Release of some of this metal will ease a desperate need. After all, it will do no good to have this metal in stockpile and then find we have killed off the industry which can turn it into finished goods.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 307, a bill to release 2 million pounds of cadmium from the Government stockpile. Cadmium has been in serious short supply for many months now, and as a result has caused a real hardship to metal finishers in the United States. In January of 1962 I have been informed that cadmium could be purchased for the going market price of $1.10 a pound. Recently, the price had been pushed as high as $2.10 a pound, and in some instances, an extensive gray market for this important commodity had developed, and it was being quoted at prices as high as $3.75 per pound.

The significance of these inflated prices lies in the fact that the metal finishers and manufacturers who use cadmium have been unable to pass along this added cost to their customers. This, in turn, has made it very difficult for many of these manufacturers, including a number of small businessmen, to remain competitive in what is a very competitive market.

In my district are a number of companies who manufacture screws, builder's hardware, and a wide variety of fasteners. All of these concerns have informed me that a shortage of cadmium has produced great hardship.

It is my understanding that the Federal Government has more than 10 million pounds of Cadmium in excess of its stockpile requirements. There is, therefore, no reason in my opinion why this bill should not receive the enthusiastic endorsement of every Member of the House. I think that the situation which I have described is further evidence of the fact that while it is quite proper and necessary for the Government to maintain a stockpile reserve of critical and strategic materials this program needs close scrutiny and periodic review to avoid piling up unwarranted surpluses.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge every Member of the House to consider favorably this piece of legislation. Our failure to concur in the passage of this bill would simply mean a continuation of the present black market in this important item with a resultant unfortunate effect on manufacturers, businessmen, and ultimately the consuming public itself.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 307, was laid on the table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make certain that action upon this legislation, just concluded, is clearly understood to be in accordance with the legislative history made on this floor on March 18, 1963.

At pages 4397 and 4398 of the Congressional Record for that date, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] made it clear that this is not pilot legislation to establish a pattern for future stockpile disposals.

The gentleman from Illinois also assured Members of this body that the Armed Services Committee is determined to see that definite guidelines are followed as set forth in the committee report, and those guidelines were made a part of the Record on March 18.

With this record clearly established as a safeguard for our domestic minerals industry, we can proceed to authorization of this cadmium disposal with assurance and confidence that it will not be disruptive of our domestic minerals economy. I deeply appreciate the committee's foresight in this direction.

RELEASING THE RIGHT IN CERTAIN STREETS IN HEYBURN, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1087) to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to streets that were dedicated upon the filing of the townsite plat for Heyburn, Idaho, a reclamation townsite established pursuant to the Act of April 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 116), as amended, and that adjoin lands which have been sold, which streets have been vacated, or any street that may hereafter be vacated within the original townsite of Heyburn, Idaho, is hereby released and quitclaimed to the adjoining owners by the United States.

Sec. 2. The clause included in patent numbered 1048499, issued by the United States to the village of Heyburn on July 27, 1931, providing for reversion of title to the United States is hereby repealed, and any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to Lincoln Boulevard or any street hereafter to be vacated within said townsite adjoining the lands described in said patent is hereby released.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 3 to 9, inclusive, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following language:

"Sec. 2. The clause included in patent numbered 1048499, issued by the United States to the village of Heyburn on July 27, 1931, providing for reversion of title to the United States is hereby repealed, and any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to Lincoln Boulevard is hereby released to the adjoining landowners. If any street is hereafter vacated within said townsite, title to said street shall revert to the adjoining landowners."

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Harding: On page 2, line 13, after the word "repealed" change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the committee amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, has this amendment been agreed to by the committee?

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan, the amendment has been agreed to by the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. FORD. There is no conflict in the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Idaho and the committee amendment?

Mr. HARDING. There is no conflict.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Harding: Page 2, lines 1 and 2, after the word "released", strike out "and quitclaimed to the adjoining owners by the United States."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I should like to ask, has this amendment also been cleared with the minority?

Mr. HARDING. This amendment has also been cleared with the minority.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. These amendments have been cleared by those members of the committee who had any question about the legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS—TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1988) to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note on page 5 of the report that the United Nations, that Tower of Babel in New York, takes an interest in matter of the payment to these people in the Pacific; they apparently have been prodding the U.S. taxpayers to take care of this item more expeditiously. I wonder if that polyglot organization in New York will apply the same pressure for expedition among its own members to pay for the Emergency Force in the Congo and the Emergency Force in the Middle East, as well as regular assessments for support of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I think members of the United Nations would be in much better business if, instead of prodding the Government of the United States and the taxpayers of the United States to pay for the damages to these people in the Pacific, they attended to their own business and let us run the financial business of this Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby assumes compassionate responsibility to compensate inhabitants of the Rongelap Atoll, in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for radiation exposures sustained by them as a result of a thermonuclear detonation at Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands on March 1, 1954.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for such purpose out of the Treasury of the United States the sum of $950,000 to remain available until expended under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") for the general benefit of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap. The Secretary may segregate a portion of the sum for each affected individual, and hold it in trust for the individual or his heirs or legatees (hereinafter referred to as the "beneficiary" or "beneficiaries"), subject to the provisions of this Act. The amounts segregated and held by the Secretary in trust for individual beneficiaries, and the unsegregated balance, shall, if invested by him, be invested in a manner that in his judgment is prudent.

SEC. 3. (a) The interest or dividends earned from each trust held for an individual beneficiary shall be paid at least annually by the Secretary to such beneficiary. When, in the opinion of the Secretary, there appears to be a substantial benefit to be derived therefrom by any beneficiary, the Secretary may, upon request of the beneficiary, and under such conditions as he may deem appropriate, make the principal sum, or any part thereof, available for expenditure by such beneficiary. Any payment under this subsection may be made directly to a beneficiary who is twenty-one years of age or older. In the case of a beneficiary who is less than twenty-one years of age or who is, in the opinion of the Secretary, mentally incompetent, payment may be made in the discretion of the Secretary to the beneficiary, a parent, relative, other person, or institution for his benefit.

(b) The principal, interest, and dividends from funds held for the general benefit of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap shall be used for such purposes as the Secretary deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. A trust for an individual beneficiary created pursuant to this Act may be terminated by the Secretary at any time, and if after reasonable search the beneficiary cannot be located, the principal and accumulated interest and dividends may be added to the unsegregated balance of the funds held for the general benefit of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to pay reasonable attorney fees for legal services rendered on behalf of a beneficiary, or beneficiaries, prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Such fees shall be paid out of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 2 of this Act, but the total of such fees paid shall not exceed 5 per centum of the appropriated funds.

SEC. 6. The decisions of the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be final and not subject to review.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND IN TRUST FOR THE OGLALA SIOUX INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 844) to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

To declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 5,422.68 acres of land in South Dakota that have been used for the benefit of the Oglala Community School and have been determined excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, together with the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Such land is described as follows:

(a) 1,040 acres; northeast quarter section 15; west half section 16; south half and the northeast quarter and the south half northwest quarter section 17, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(b) 180.47 acres; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 20, and lot 4, section 21, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(c) 80 acres; south half northeast quarter section 15, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(d) 36.32 acres; lot 3, section 21, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(e) 602.57 acres; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, east half west half, southeast quarter section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 19, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(f) 683.81 acres; south half, northeast quarter section 13; lots 1 and 2, section 23; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 24, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(g) 960 acres; all section 8; southwest quarter section 9, north half northwest quarter section 17, east half northeast quarter section 18, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(h) 266.79 acres; southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter section 14, east half southeast quarter, section 15; lot 1 section 22; lot 4 section 23, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(i) 760 acres; east half section 10; west half section 11; northwest quarter northwest quarter section 14; north half northeast quarter section 15, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(j) 153.62 acres; east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter section 14, lot 3, section 23, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(k) 160 acres; southeast quarter section 14, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(l) 339.10 acres; east half northwest, east half southwest, west half southeast, section 15, lots 2, 3, and 4, section 22, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(m) 160 acres; southwest quarter, section 17, township 35 north, range 41 west, sixth principal meridian.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, strike out the word "determined" and insert "determine".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND IN TRUST FOR THE OGLALA SIOUX TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 845) to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the land described herein and heretofore used as a site for the Wakpamni Lake Day School on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota which has been determined excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, together with the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation. The land is described as the east half northeast quarter northeast quarter, section 9 and the west half northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 10, township 35 north, range 41 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT MOJAVE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2635) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended (25 U.S.C. 415), is hereby further amended by deleting the words "and on" and inserting in lieu thereof the words, ", the Fort Mojave Reservation, and".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended (25 U.S.C. 415), is hereby further amended by inserting the words 'the Fort Mojave Reservation,' after the words 'the Southern Ute Reservation,'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4423) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending completion of a repayment contract or the enactment of other legislation providing for the furnishing of water to lands of the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, the Secretary is authorized to continue to furnish water to the lands in such division, during calendar year 1963, as under the provisions of section 9, subsection (d) (1), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195; 43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) but without regard to the time limitation therein specified. Water shall be furnished upon individual applications accompanied by payments of $4 per acre for the first three acre-feet per acre with water in excess of that amount at $2 per acre-foot. The portion of the operation and maintenance costs in excess of the total of such payments is hereby declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, April 1, 1963, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill for 1964.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION reserved all points of order on the bill.

DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4555) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87–346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964".

(b) By striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLS REGARDING VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 220. H.R. 220 will permit the conversion or exchange of term policies of national service life insurance to a new modified plan. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has long been interested in perfecting a formula that would prevent the World War II term policyholder from experiencing the same difficulty as World War I veterans in the term insurance field. Term insurance sold by the Government to veterans is 5-year level premium term—that is, every 5 years it must be renewed with the premium being based on the then attained age.

The gradually increasing rates under this insurance make the cost of maintaining a policy extremely prohibitive as a veteran advances in years. For example, a World War I veteran who renews his term insurance at age 65 must pay an annual premium of $467.80 on a $10,000 policy. At age 70 the premium jumps to $727.70 annually. To prevent in the case of World War II veterans what has already taken place with respect to the term insurance for World War I veterans, the committee has reported H.R. 220. It will provide a new plan of national service life insurance to be offered to World War II term policyholders as a substitute for their present term policies. The premium on the new insurance would remain at the same level throughout the life of the insured. At age 65, however, the face value of the policy would be reduced in half. At age 65 the policyholder would, if he so desired, continue in force that half of the policy which he would otherwise lose by paying the premium rate for his then attained age without medical examination.

To demonstrate how the new plan would work let us compare the premium rates for a World War II veteran at age 45. At the present time, holding his $10,000 term insurance policy, he pays an annual premium of $117.20. At age 50 the insurance is renewable for 5 more years at an annual premium of $150.40. At age 55 the cost is $209.50 for the next 5 years. At age 60 the premium becomes $307.80 annually and at age 65, $470 annually. At age 70 the premium jumps to $731.60 annually.

Under the modified life plan we are considering today, this same veteran at age 45 would convert his insurance to the new plan and pay $171.70 annually for the rest of his life. Upon reaching age 65 the face value of the policy would be reduced to $5,000. If he so desired, the veteran could elect to retain the full $10,000 policy at an annual premium of $505.60 for the rest of his life.

The Veterans' Administration has estimated that there are about 3 million national service life insurance policyholders who are continuing their insurance on the term plan. The enactment of H.R. 220 will alleviate the problem for these men as they attain the advanced ages where term premium rates become progressively more burdensome with each renewal. In addition, it will provide permanent plan insurance at a lower premium rate than existing permanent plans of insurance. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the administrative cost of this proposal for the first year at $206,000. The first 5-year total cost is estimated at $846,000.

Similar legislation passed the House in the 86th and 87th Congresses. The insurance provided by this bill would become available January 1, 1964.

H.R. 243

H.R. 243 would authorize the Veterans' Administration to pay a statutory award for each service-connected loss, or loss of use, of a limb.

Under existing law the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay statutory awards in varying amounts for different combinations of anatomical loss or loss of use of extremities, creative organs, buttocks, or eyes. Because of the language of the statute, a group of approximately 440 veterans who have suffered two of these disabilities are paid a statutory award for only one.

For example, the veteran who suffers the loss of an eye or an arm or a leg is entitled to a $47 monthly award. If he has lost both an arm and leg he is entitled to a statutory award which, in effect, compensates him for each such loss. If he suffered the loss of all three, an arm, a leg, and an eye, he would receive a greater statutory award compensating him for this combination of disabilities. If he had the peculiar misfortune to suffer the loss of an eye in combination with an arm or a leg the statutory award would only compensate him for one of these conditions. To further illustrate this disparity in the law, take the case of three veterans, one having lost an eye, one having lost a leg, and the third having lost an eye and a leg. All three of these veterans would be entitled to the same statutory award of $47 monthly because of the language contained in the statute. There are approximately 440 veterans affected. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that this disparity in the law can be corrected at an annual cost of $225,000 for the first 5 years. I believe the bill has merit and urge its passage.

H.R. 248

H.R. 248 will amend that portion of the law which authorizes a $10,000 grant for severely disabled veterans in acquiring specially equipped homes made necessary because of the nature of their disability.

At the present time, veterans with service-connected disabilities are eligible for this grant if they are permanently and totally disabled due to the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or wheelchairs, or are blind in both eyes and have lost or lost the use of one lower extremity and are in such condition to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair.

H.R. 248 would delete the requirement that blind veterans who have lost a lower extremity be confined to a wheelchair to qualify for this benefit. This group has suffered severe disabilities, and they encounter difficulty in the manipulation of their artificial limbs beyond that encountered by sighted veterans, because they are not able to direct their steps with the accuracy which vision permits. The Veterans' Administration estimates there are less than 50 veterans now on the compensation rolls who have sustained this peculiar combination of disabilities. An unknown number of these are confined to wheelchairs and have been granted or are eligible for assistance under existing law. The cost estimate is substantially less than $500,000 the first year. The cost later would be quite small, because new cases with this combination of disabilities would be rare.

I urge its favorable consideration.

INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 211) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 411(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "$28".

SEC. 2. Section 413 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$70" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "$77";

(2) by striking out "$100" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "$110";

(3) by striking out "$130" in paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "$143"; and

(4) by striking out "25" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "$28".

SEC. 3. Section 414 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$25" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$28";

(2) by striking out "$70" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$77"; and

(3) by striking out "$35" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$39".

SEC. 4. (a) Column II of the table contained in subsection (b) of section 415 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$75" and inserting in lieu thereof "$83"; by striking out "$60" and inserting in lieu thereof "$66"; by striking out "$45" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50"; by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$33"; and by striking out "$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "$17".

(b) Column II of the tables contained in subsections (c) and (d) of such section 415 are each amended by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$55"; by striking out "$40" and inserting in lieu thereof "$44"; by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$33"; by striking out "$20" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22"; and by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11".

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases by 10 percent—with fractions rounded off to next higher dollar—the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

The President in his budget message indicated general support for legislation of this type.

The effect of this legislation is as shown in the tables below—italic indicates rates in H.R. 211:

Rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows, children, and parents for service-connected death occurring on or after Jan. 1, 1957 [1] [2]

Widows [3] and children	Children, no widow
Widow alone: $112 per month, plus 12 per centum of basic pay of deceased husband, with total amount adjusted to next highest dollar. Rates range from $122 in an E–1 case with less than 2 years' service to $316 in case of an O–10 with over 30 years' service. If deceased was serving as Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, regardless of cumulative years of service the widow's rate is $337.	Children under age 18: 1 child, $70 (*$77*). 2 children, $100 (*$110*) (equally divided). 3 children, $130 (*$143*) (equally divided), plus $25 (*$28*) for each child in excess of 3 (equally divided).
Widow and 1 child under age 18: Same as amount payable to widow alone	Child age 18 or above who became permanently incapable of self-support prior to that age: $95 (*$105*) (basic $70 (*$77*) rate increased by $25 (*$28*); total rate with $25 (*$28*) supplement variable where there are other children).
Widow and 2 or more children under age 18: Same rate as that payable to widow alone with following exception: Where total amount payable under the Railroad Retirement Act or Social Security Act, or under sec. 412 of title 38, U.S.C. (veterans' benefits), based upon an assumed fully and currently insured status, is less than $128, the compensation payable to widow by VA increased by $25 (*$28*) for each child in excess of 1, but the total increase may not exceed the difference between the amounts payable under the above and $128.	Child or children ages 18 to 21 attending school: Same as basic rate payable to children under age 18 where there is no widow. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)
Widow and child or children age 18 and above permanently incapable of self-support where incapacity began under age 18: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $70 (*$77*) for each such child payable to child.	
Widow and child or children age 18 but under 21 attending school: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $35 (*$39*) payable to each such child. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)	

See footnotes at end of table.

1 PARENT ONLY

Total annual income		Monthly rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$75 (*$85*)
$750	$1,000	60 (*66*)
$1,000	$1,250	45 (*50*)
$1,250	$1,500	30 (*33*)
$1,500	$1,750	15 (*17*)
$1,750		0

2 PARENTS LIVING TOGETHER [4]

Combined annual income		Monthly rate to each
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$50 (*$55*)
$1,000	$1,350	40 (*44*)
$1,350	$1,700	30 (*33*)
$1,700	$2,050	20 (*22*)
$2,050	$2,400	10 (*11*)
$2,400		0

2 PARENTS NOT LIVING TOGETHER

Total annual income of parent		Individual rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$50 (*$55*)
$750	$1,000	40 (*44*)
$1,000	$1,250	30 (*33*)
$1,250	$1,500	20 (*22*)
$1,500	$1,750	10 (*11*)
$1,750		0

---

[1] Persons eligible for death compensation based on death occurring before Jan. 1, 1957, may, under certain conditions, apply for and receive dependency and indemnity compensation.

[2] Except in certain missing persons cases the dependents of veterans who die on or after May 1, 1957, while their life-insurance premiums are waived pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 724 (formerly sec. 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended) are not eligible to receive dependency and indemnity compensation but may be paid death compensation notwithstanding the fact the death occurred after Dec. 31, 1956.

[3] The term "widow" includes the widower of any female veteran if such widower is incapable of self-maintenance and was permanently incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability at the time of the veteran's death.

[4] Applies also to remarried parent living with spouse, with income of spouse counted.

The VA estimates that the bill would benefit the first year 44,900 children at a cost of $3,082,000—sections 2 and 3—and 30,900 parents at a cost of $1,743,000—section 4. Data on which to base the first year's estimate of cost of section 1 of the bill are not readily available but it is estimated it would not exceed $209,000. The total first year's additional cost of the bill would thus be approximately $5 million. It is believed that the additional cost will decrease slightly for the next 4 years.

The VA favors the bill. There has been no increase for this group since January 1, 1957.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 211 which will provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

Washington, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chief, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars urges favorable consideration of H.R. 211, which will increase rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans. Estimated 45,000 children and 31,000 parents have not received compensation increase since 1957, although cost of living has increased more than 11 percent. This group is long overdue for this increase. Urge immediate passage of H.R. 211.

FRANCES W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 211. This bill will increase the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for parents and children of veterans dying from service-connected causes. Dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows is geared to basic active service pay. Whenever military pay is increased the rate of dependency and indemnity for widows is automatically increased. This is based upon the formula of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the deceased husband. Other classes of survivors, specifically children and parents, do not participate in this automatic adjustment. Instead, they receive a flat payment established by law.

Military pay was last increased on June 1, 1958. The widows' rates, of course, were adjusted at that time. The Armed Services Committee, as I understand it, is presently considering legislation to increase the basic pay of the military. Widows of veterans dying from service-connected causes will, of course, participate in any increase enacted into law.

Parents and children of deceased service-connected veterans, however, are not so fortunate. If their rate of compensation is to be increased, it must be accomplished directly by congressional action. H.R. 211 proposes to do exactly that. The rate of payment for these groups has remained constant since the Serviceman's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act became effective on January 1, 1957. The Consumer Price Index, reflecting the increased cost of living, has risen 11.3 percent since the Survivor Benefits Act became law. This bill will increase by 10 percent the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for these groups not geared to military pay. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the first year cost of the bill at approximately $5 million with a slight decrease in this figure for each of the next 4 years. I believe this legislation is justified and urge that it be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 211?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CUBAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

If my message actually reaches the President's desk I hope he will give it the thoughtful and respectful consideration its authorship deserves.

I say this because my telegram, in its entirety, is a verbatim quotation of a public statement made in Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960, by Democratic Presidential Nominee John F. Kennedy.

Now that the Kennedy administration has, over the past weekend, imposed completely unprecedented restrictions on the Cuban exiles, where do we—or they—go from here?

Will the next logical step be imposition by the United States of a total blockade of Cuban exile forces and a complete ban on any Cuban liberation activities "launched, manned or equipped" from any Western Hemisphere base?

Are we preparing to enforce the Communist "peace" of Castro and the Soviet Union in Cuba—by armed might, if necessary?

Where is our "peace at any price" policy leading us?

Is the President's statement of September 13, 1962, "We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that Nation's future return to freedom," now a dead letter?

I call attention of the House to the irony of an Associated Press report from Havana appearing in the morning newspapers. It quotes Castro as saying that it will take only "a few more weeks" to wipe out remaining rebels operating on Cuban territory.

And I also include, without comment, the following page 1 editorial from the March 24, 1963, issue of the Worker, official organ of the Communist Party U.S.A.

KILLERS ON THE LOOSE

The outlaws responsible for the murderous hit-and-run attacks on Cuba see such forays as paving the way for invasion of U.S. Armed Forces.

In such a war the corpses of American boys would pave the road to restoring exploitation in Cuba.

The State Department has repudiated the attacks as "irresponsible" and "ineffective." But there is reason to believe that there are forces within the Pentagon who are supporting such incursions.

There is only one way to end once and for all the threat of war in the Caribbean. That is for the President to declare unequivocally that, whatever the official view of the Government of the United States is with respect to socialism, it desires to live in peace with Cuba. The Cuban Government has often declared that it wants peaceful relations with the United States.

Such a declaration by the Kennedy administration, and its enforcement within the Pentagon and the CIA, would have the overwhelming support of the American people.

It would expose the war hawks as betrayers of our lives and our security, and would prevent our land being used as the base for Batista-type killers who want to drown the new Cuba in blood, and to restore the old exploitation.

THE WHEAT FARMERS' REFERENDUM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, an apparent, and unfortunate, misunderstanding of a major action by the 87th Congress has recently come to my attention. A deliberate effort is being made to lead farmers to believe the Congress was not serious when it passed the wheat program as part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. It is being implied that the Congress will enact new legislation on wheat in the event the wheat referendum is turned down.

It was the intent and purpose of the 87th Congress to make the 1964 wheat program a permanent and continuing program. It was passed on that basis. The law provides for a referendum again in 1964, and in subsequent years.

In any referendum, there is always the possibility that one-third or more of the voting farmers will vote against production restrictions, even at the expense of assured higher prices. For 25 years Congress has recognized this possibility and has always provided for a stopgap program to prevent complete price and production disaster.

In the case of the 1964 wheat program, this stopgap is 50 percent of parity price supports—$1.25 per bushel—providing the individual farmer complies with the same acreage restrictions that he would have under the original program.

If one-third or more of the voting farmers vote "no" on May 21, then this alternative stopgap provision automatically goes into effect for 1964. A rejection does not mean the program has been repealed.

Another national wheat referendum will then be called in 1964 to decide what the program will be for 1965.

In all the discussion and deliberation in committees and on the floor of both Houses prior to the passage of this program in the 87th Congress, it was clearly and unmistakably the intent and purpose of Congress that this program shall remain in continuing effect and that no further legislation would be needed and that none should be expected. The decision from here on out would be left entirely to wheatgrowers.

The 1964 wheat program provides wheatgrowers with clear and unmistakable economic choices in this referendum. They should make their decision on this basis, and no other. They could be sorely disappointed if they went to the referendum polls on May 21 with unfounded hopes that Congress would or could pass new wheat legislation in time for the 1964 crop year if they vote "no" on the attractive income and production stabilization provisions of this program.

Wheatgrowers should understand that no individual—in or out of Congress—has the power or authority to deliver on irresponsible statements. The wheat farmers have a choice under the law, and in my judgment the Congress will take them at their word. I am convinced that there will be no new wheat legislation this year.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader which has sort of political connotations, let me say. I want to predict right here and now that if and when the wheat referendum is voted down, the Members of the majority party in the Congress and its leadership will fall all over themselves to enact wheat legislation before this session of the Congress adjourns.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I trust the gentleman is not referring to the majority leader as the House of Representatives in his last statement?

Mr. HOEVEN. That remains to be seen. I have heard a lot of talk about what will happen if the wheat referendum is voted down. This is nothing but a lot of political propaganda to force a favorable vote in the referendum. I still stand by my prediction that the majority leadership in this House and the majority party in general are not going to permit Congress to adjourn without enacting suitable and necessary wheat legislation, if the referendum fails. The Democrats are too smart politicians to let this happen. Let us be honest about it and not fool the wheat farmers.

A REGIONAL RESEARCH CENTER FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a regional research center for rural development. My bill proposes that the center be established at Richfield, Utah. Our rural areas need attention and we need some scientific, objective information, concerning rural problems if we are to provide 20th century answers for them.

The center would conduct studies of unemployment and underemployment in rural communities. One of the important functions of this center would be to prepare and analyze data on manpower, agricultural, natural, and other resources in selected rural communities to determine the extent to which these resources are being utilized. The entire program would be geared to the search for new economic opportunities for rural America.

We need to study and evaluate the migration from farm to city. Today more than 36 percent of all farm families have incomes of less than $2,000 per year, and 75 percent of them have less than $5,000.

In Utah for example, 13 of our 29 counties have lost population in the last 10 years while the State's population as a whole has increased more than 30 percent. These 13 counties are all rural and together comprise nearly half the land area of Utah.

Important resources are often overlooked—that is the low-production farm areas often have underdeveloped recreational resources and tourism which have a potential for employing large numbers of persons within the area.

An inventory must be made of the present and potential labor force in an area. The search for new industrial and service opportunities must be geared to the composition of the local labor force.

Richfield, Utah, is an ideal location for such a center. This city of 4,412 population is located in the heart of central Utah, being near the geographical center of the State. But, also, this is the approximate center of the 11 western continental States of the United States.

In addition to the geographical location of Richfield, it is also within easy reach of four colleges in southern and central Utah—Carbon College at Price; Snow College at Ephraim; the College of Southern Utah at Cedar City; and Dixie College at St. George. And not far distant is Brigham Young University, the largest university in the intermountain West.

The details of staffing such a research center can be worked out in consultation with the Extension Service and with the Office of Rural Areas Development of the Department of Agriculture.

It is my conviction that a research center for rural development would serve a vital purpose in ascertaining the specific causes in a scientific manner of the decline of our rural counties. But, more important, it would serve to discover means for reinvigorating our rural communities, which are the backbone of our Nation.

A center could be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, under broad powers given him for administration of research programs. Or it could be established by congressional action. I am introducing my bill so as to open up both possible avenues of approach.

ENLARGING KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to add the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas to Kings Canyon National Park.

The two areas now are portions of the Sequoia and the Sierra National Forests extending like fingers into Kings Canyon Park. Cedar Grove is on the South Fork of the Kings River in the main Kings Canyon. Tehipite Valley lies on the Middle Fork of the Kings River.

Althought the areas have outstanding scenic and recreational value, worthy of preservation as portions of the park, they were excluded when Kings Canyon National Park was created in 1940 because at that time the Kings River had not been developed for control of floods and conservation of irrigation water and Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley were considered potential reservoir sites.

I think it was entirely proper in 1940 to exclude these areas from the park, because they should be devoted to their highest beneficial use and, as it then appeared, this could well have been flood control and water storage reservoirs.

However, construction of Pine Flat Dam was authorized in 1944 and it has been built and is in operation. In recent years additional water storage has been provided by reservoirs constructed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. We also have Millerton and power reservoirs on the San Joaquin River and Terminus and Success Dams on the Kaweah and Tule Rivers, all contributing to a solution of the flood problem in the valley areas where their waters intermingle.

The time has come when we should take a new look at the present and future use of the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas in light of river development since 1940 and greatly increased national park and recreation needs and my bill would bring the subject into the open for full discussion and decision.

I feel there is a great deal of evidence supporting the view that more water storage on the Kings River is not economically justified for irrigation needs. While it is true some electric power could be generated, such use could well be incompatible with primary operation of the river to provide maximum satisfaction of irrigation requirements. In any event, there are alternate sources of electric power, so that we do not need to sacrifice the scenic and recreational values of these areas because of power requirements which could not be otherwise met. All of these considerations have led me to the view that the highest use of Tehipite and Cedar Grove lies in now adding them to the national park of which they are logical, natural and essential parts.

Our population increase and explosive demand for outdoor recreation in California have generated two difficult problems in the conservation field. We must protect and preserve adequate wilderness areas and regions which, because of their scenic grandeur, have been set aside as national parks. At the same time, we must provide safe roads and sufficient public facilities for the millions of citizens who want to enjoy our parks and the more limited number able to reach wilderness areas.

Cedar Grove is the actual heart of Kings Canyon National Park. It is the only portion of the great canyon which can be reached by highway and it lies surrounded by the majestic ramparts, peaks and cliffs which inspired creation of the park. It is so inescapably a part of the park and so artificially a part of the Sequoia National Forest that the National Park Service and the Forest Service long since agreed that even under its present forest status, it would be administered by the park service. Similarly, the magnificent Tehipite Valley, under forest jurisdiction, is a relatively unprotected "sore thumb" projected into the grand sweep of high ranges, peaks and domes justifying the northern portion of the park.

It is the uncertainty of ultimate jurisdiction over these valleys that is preventing their urgently needed development for public use. The National Park Service cannot inaugurate any program for permanent protection and regulated use of Cedar Grove until it is a part of the park. Thus, visitors now traverse the long and beautiful road into Kings Canyon to find virtually no provision for their accommodation when they reach what they believe to be the heart of the park. Tehipite Valley is neither fish nor fowl, kept in suspended animation by indecision. It is my belief, we need to take earliest action to protect and provide permissible use of these scenic and recreational national resources.

I well realize there are sincere persons with dedicated interest in the welfare and problems of our valley and mountains who may disagree with my views. Establishing the highest use of our natural resources is always a matter of judgment and is properly a matter of discussion, for we must weigh the facts and the relative values involved. In a sense, all these values are "selfish" because one use, such as that embraced in preservation of our parks for the enjoyment and inspiration of present and future generations, may well be incompatible with other possible uses to provide essential services to the public, such as water to provide food, power for our people, lumber for housing or minerals we need. I have little patience with those who dismiss as "selfish" all interests except their own.

It is my intention to ask for committee hearings on my proposal as early as necessary reports and recommendations can be obtained. All interested persons should be provided opportunity to present their views, and it will be up to the committee and the Congress to arrive at a considered judgment. Naturally, I hope this will provide for the addition of these beautiful and essential areas to Kings Canyon National Park.

AMEND HIGHWAY-USE TAX

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the highway-use tax provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. This act of 1956 imposed a tax on the use of certain highway motor vehicles having a taxable gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds. The tax levied is at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight. The Internal Revenue Code Amendments of 1961 increased this rate to $3 a year for each 1,000 pounds gross weight. Consequently, the owner of a truck with a gross weight of 26,000 pounds or more must pay a minimum of $78 in taxes per year. This tax liability is incurred even though the owner of the vehicle does not use it as an indispensable part of his primary business and it also applies to those who may seldom operate the vehicle on a federally aided highway on such primary hauls as from farm to market or from logging camp to sawmill.

The bill which I am introducing, Mr. Speaker, would provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway-use tax in the case of a motor vehicle used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from place of production to a market or processing point.

Many of the small truckers have brought to my attention the heavy burden which falls upon them when they find that now they must pay highway-use back taxes from July 1, 1956, to the present. Many of these small operators were unaware that this highway-use tax existed. Small operators that they are, they usually do not hold memberships in an association which would bring this information to their attention. Furthermore, the Internal Revenue Service in the past had no direct contact with these operators so that they might bring this tax liability to their attention. The result is that many of these small loggers and farmers are faced with delinquent tax claims plus penalty and interest for a tax they knew nothing about. It is true that ignorance of the law is no excuse, but in this case, the sufficiency of the public information apparently can be questioned.

For the past year or so, the Internal Revenue Service has been conducting a broad-scale enforcement check and instances have arisen where a small trucker has been assessed a total of over $3,000 in back taxes together with 25-percent penalties and 6-percent interest. Waiving the penalty and interest on these assessments where ignorance and lack of sufficient notification by the Internal Revenue Service and no wrongful intention are involved would be the just thing to do, especially since enforcement of the tax payment was apparently neglected for a considerable period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of this situation certainly requires that my proposal be given favorable consideration by the Congress at the earliest possible time. Following is the text of my bill as introduced today:

H.R. 5343

A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no penalty (including interest, additions to the penalty, and additional amounts) shall be assessed or collected, under section 6601 or 6672 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or under any other provision of law, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act on account of the failure of any person to pay the tax imposed by section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the use of any highway motor vehicle for any taxable period beginning on or after July 1, 1956, and ending before July 1, 1963, if such person or his duly authorized representative, within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, submits to the Secretary or his delegate—

(1) a sworn statement that he was unaware of, and did not willfully evade, such tax; and

(2) satisfactory proof that during the taxable period or periods involved at least 80 per cent of the use of such vehicle consisted of—

(A) transportation of unprocessed and raw farm products from the place of production to market, where such transportation constituted the first haul of such products, or

(B) transportation of logs, pulpwood, or other raw and unfinished forest products from the place of production to an assembly yard, railhead, or mill, where such transportation constituted the first haul of such products, or

(C) a combination of transportation described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

If any such penalty has been assessed and not collected prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or is assessed on or after such date, the assessment shall be abated; and if such penalty is collected by the United States on or after such date the amount so collected shall be paid back as a penalty collected without authority.

BILLION-DOLLAR-A-WEEK CLUB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last a preliminary release was put out on these remarks that I am making today. After reviewing this over the weekend, I saw fit to make a few changes and, therefore, I am putting out a revised release today.

Mr. Speaker, the "Billion-Dollar-a-Week Club" in the Pentagon has poured another $560,000 down the drain. Today I am going to detail for you how it was done. This is the latest in a long series of cases I have developed that prove the waste in defense spending. It is also more evidence that legislation such as my H.R. 4409 and H.R. 5258 should be reported by the proper committees and acted upon by this House.

During this session of Congress, I have presented many simple cases of waste. This has been done in an effort to acquaint Members with just a few of the complicated details that surround military procurement. Today's case, however, is different. It took over 4 months to develop, involved many hours of study, investigation, and interrogation, and is more fully and completely documented by industry by the Air Force and by an arm of Congress.

I want to say to my colleagues that if I had ordered a case tailor made to fit my legislative recommendations, I doubt that I could find one contract that embodies more of the abuses that have needlessly skyrocketed our defense budget past $55 billion a year.

I have nicknamed the chairborne bureaucrats in the Pentagon who spend all this money "The-Billion-Dollar-a-Week Club" because they spend that much and more in the name of national defense and consistently waste 25 percent and more of all the money they disburse.

Here, in one Air Force contract for $2,948,680, is the personification of the ways in which this profligate waste comes about. Here can be found profit-padding of the rankest variety; incredibly bad contract administration by the military; development of a unit by a manufacturer at a purported loss so that it could "lock up" future contracts at fat profits and finally, a new twist—revival, in effect, of the totally discredited cost-plus contract. Also involved in this case is pressure of the most subtle sort, insidiously exerted in an effort to have me drop it. This pressure came from people in, as well as out of, Government.

This story started to unfold October 5, 1962, after I drew the attention of the House to two Air Force contracts awarded to Craig Systems, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass. Both contracts were for production of units of the MRN-12, a small airport control tower on wheels. In my remarks on the floor, I called attention to the great difference in unit price between the first contract and the second. I suggested this was another illustration of the penalties to taxpayers that stemmed from sole-source purchasing. I noted that these two contracts might well be audited by the General Accounting Office, which has been of invaluable assistance to my entire procurement study.

After my presentation, an unusual occurrence took place. A firm came to me personally and took exception to my findings. I was told that criticism of the contrast in these two contracts was a mistake. On the earlier contract, the explanation went, the Government furnished virtually all electronic equipment that went inside the shelter van. On the second contract, Craig Systems had to buy and install all this equipment. Thus, on the first purchase Craig merely supplied the shell, while on the second, so I was told, it supplied everything. This accounted for the difference in price of $24,000 per unit for the first purchase and $121,000 each for the second.

This contention caused me great concern. A Member of this House can speak to the Nation from the floor. He can do great good, has the power to do unintentional harm, and has the responsibility to be right. Therefore, if Craig Systems was right in its contention, then I had wronged the company and owed it an apology. In this spirit I began an intensive study into all facets of these two purchases, particularly the last one, where the Air Force is paying $121,000 each for the units.

At the same time, at the firm's request, I decided to delay asking the General Accounting Office to audit the contracts. Today, after scores of hours of work, my reexamination is complete.

Mr. Speaker, I was in error last October—but not in the manner I feared. I have found far more wrong with these contracts than I ever suspected. Craig Systems' main contention that the unit cost difference between the two contracts was due almost entirely to the fact that equipment was purchased on the second buy which had been furnished by the Government on the first, is simply not true. My facts show that the Air Force has allowed itself and the taxpayers to be overcharged by as much as 19 percent for this second contract. My facts show:

First, that in buying equipment that was formerly Government-furnished, Craig frequently paid prices well above what the Government was itself paying for the identical equipment at the same time in other military procurements. This tactic not only increased the total contract cost, but also raised the figure against which Craig's percentage of profit was to be figured, thus increasing direct profits.

That situation makes this nothing less than a cost-plus contract in the thinnest of disguises. When a contractor is told to go out and spend what is needed to build an item, is permitted to pay exorbitant prices and then is allowed to add his profits and other charges on top of all that, I say it is the old cost-plus-a-percentage-of-profit deal from A to Z. And in case any colleague may have forgotten, this type of contract has been strictly prohibited since July 1, 1949. But, Mr. Speaker, this cost-plus-contract phenomenon is only the beginning. "You ain't seen nothin yet," as Al Jolson used to say.

Second, a total of 43 components, formerly Government furnished, was purchased by Craig on the second contract. Virtually every one of these 43 was substantially marked up—this to arrive at a "unit price" charged the Government for these components. Thus, these components were bought at higher prices than the Government was paying, and then an additional percentage was added on.

Third, after accomplishing this twofold inflation, there was now applied to these components another set of percentages for engineering, manufacturing and labor burden, and a burden for production. Thus the cost took another big step upward.

Fourth, Craig was next permitted to levy a healthy 16 percent to the costs already amassed in steps 1 through 3. This 16 percent was to cover so-called general and administrative expenses.

Fifth, the final step that topped off this towering pyramid of profit was a 6.5 percent of profit on items purchased and a 10-percent profit on direct costs to Craig. This was all computed on the basis of the total of the inflated purchase prices plus all the percentages mentioned in steps 1 through 4.

It is incredible that Air Force procurement officials would have allowed this to happen, but, as I will soon show, they actually encourage such goings on.

They have, themselves, made my case that it is time for a special joint committee of this Congress to ride herd on sole-source and negotiated contracts.

In very brief form, Mr. Speaker, I have revealed what my 4-month study of this procurement has uncovered. I have complied with a request for courtesy by the firm involved, but the delays are at an end. I am now forwarding a request for a full-scale audit to the Comptroller General. The facts are so apparent that an audit is plainly mandatory.

But far more than an audit is needed. The Air Force should be ordered to make a full examination and explanation of the circumstances surrounding this contract. The Congress and the American people have a right to know if our top Defense Department officials realize and condone this sort of procurement procedure. Whether they do or not, it is time for Congress to clean house of those who allow this waste to continue and to change administrative procedures and regulations under which this criminal waste goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I am today also forwarding my file on this case to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that the FBI investigate the entire matter, including relationships between Craig Systems and certain personnel at Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N.Y., who originated and administered this procurement. There has to be a reason for all the wrongs I have uncovered in my study of this procurement, and this reason must be exposed. If this sounds strong, I hope you will now bear with me as I cite in detail the incredible developments that have led me to request this sort of action.

Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1962, Craig Systems supplied me with prices it charged the Government for each of the 43 components that had formerly been Government furnished. Later it supplied me with copies of purchase orders for each component and a tabulation of what was actually paid suppliers for them.

Comparison showed that while Craig charged the Government $68,705, it paid only $57,056 for the same components, an average markup of 20.4 percent. It also showed individual markups as high as 200 percent.

Next, I made a random spotcheck on more than one-fourth of the 43 components Craig bought. Vocally and in writing the company had told me that while prices for these items might seem high, this was unavoidable since much of "the equipment had not been produced since approximately 1954." This made it necessary for many of the suppliers to tool up especially to produce the relatively small quantity Craig required, I was told.

Mr. Speaker, this representation was as full of holes as a swiss cheese. My random spotcheck covered 12 of 43 components. In 11 of those cases the equipment was in production for the Government during the very period Craig was lining up suppliers. A twelfth item was in ample supply in Government warehouses. In those 11 cases, Government records prove Craig paid an average of 31 percent more for the equipment than the Government was paying at the same time. Mark that percentage—31 percent.

Now, what does this means in dollars and cents

Craig Systems paid $10,281.92 for those 11 components. They could have been obtained from other suppliers already building the same equipment for the Government for $6,875.92. Projecting that 31 percent possible savings against a total of $57,056 a unit paid for the 43 components by Craig reveals that the equipment could have been bought for $39,010. In other words, Craig paid $18,046.81 per unit more for purchased components than necessary and then pyramided markups, burdens, charges, and profit margins on top.

Using a conservative approach, what should unit prices of this equipment have been, based on these projected figures? Well, 16 percent of the wasted $18,046.81 is $2,887.36—this general and administrative overcharge boosts the waste to $20,933. Taking 6.5 percent of that gives $1,360 per unit overcharge for Craig's profit on purchased parts. Added to the earlier figure, it totals $22,293, and that does not include "burdens" for engineering, labor, manufacturing, and production which would certainly raise the waste factor to at least $23,000 per unit for a unit priced at $121,000.

Keep in mind that this includes only profit computed at 6.5 percent. Craig charged 10-percent profit on some of the direct costs involved. Note also that Craig is still allowed its 20-percent markup.

What this means is simply that each unit of the MRN–12 cost the Air Force, and the taxpayer, 19 percent more than necessary by conservative estimate.

This contract was actually a two-part contract. One called for production of 14 MRN–12 units. The second part called for production of 20 "modification kits"—equipment consisting of some of the 43 components and other equipment needed to update earlier MRN–12 models produced by Craig.

Why modification kits costing $62,376 each were needed when the total cost of all 43 components was $68,705 is another question the GAO should resolve. However, since $49,353 of the modification kit cost of $62,376 is represented by subcontracted items, the percentage of waste involved here could be expected to be higher than the 19 percent for the full MRN–12. Projecting only the conservative 19 percent figure against these kits as well as against part 1 of the contract, it will be seen that of the $2,948,680 spent, approximately $560,249—or over half a million dollars—was wasted.

Calculating 6.5 percent profit permitted Craig on purchase parts, an excess profit of $36,416 will be uncovered. On this entire contract, Craig is taking profits of $155,270.92 on subcontracted or purchased parts alone. The correct profits should be $118,854, and the percentage of excess here totals 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, when costs are 19 percent too high and profits 30 percent too high, what can you call it but scalping the taxpayer in the name of national security? And what can you say about the department of government that tolerates this criminal abuse?

That is the essence of my study. Now to the explanations:

First, What was Craig's reaction when told that purchased components could have been bought 31 percent cheaper? Their Washington attorney, Mr. Charles Colson, answered in my office, "Hindsight is better than foresight." Quite an answer coming from an attorney representing a competent manufacturer of equipment for our Nation's defense.

Expanding, Mr. Colson said Craig had to "screen dozens of suppliers" in a hurry to find the best source, taking weeks of effort by Craig's full purchasing staff. Here again, the statement does not hold water. There are, according to Government records, just 31 suppliers used by Craig for the 43 components. The Air Force supplied Craig with a list naming these firms. So, much of the work was already done.

Much more important, in just 1 day with my limited resources, I was able to spotcheck the supplier situation on the 12 items chosen at random. Could not Craig have equaled this? Furthermore, the Army maintains an index system at its Fort Monmouth, N.J., Signal Corps installation containing data on every electronics item bought by the military. This system lists the name of the most recent producer or current producer and price paid. Similar indexes exist elsewhere. Craig had access to these.

Second, what about the 20.4-percent markup? Strictly normal was the answer. I was urged to take into account the "tremendous purchasing problems," work—never explained—that had to be done on these components once received, and the expense of installation. My question was and is, if that is what the markup is for, then why the charges for engineering, manufacturing, and production labor? And what does that 16 percent for general and administrative expense cover?

Third, what of the fact that the purchased parts comprise only $68,705 of the $97,000 difference between the first contract—$24,000 per unit—and the second—$121,000 per unit? The flimsiness of the answer to this is startling. Craig's contention repeated until this time is that it is losing money on this contract. Mr. Colson and another spokesman insisted that the cost of the shelter, plus the cost of components formerly Government furnished, plus the cost of new equipment replacing old, plus the various profit factors actually come to $137,000 per unit, while Craig gets only $121,000 each. Therefore, Craig claims it loses $16,000 a unit and the Government gets a bargain. Again, as full of holes as a swiss cheese.

Craig is actually getting less per unit for this equipment than it originally asked. But at the start of negotiations, its first offer, presumably including profit, was for $134,000 per unit, $3,000 less than the company now says it needs to break even.

Furthermore, $24,000 was paid for a complete MRN-12 in 1956, and that figure included all costs of engineering and the installing of equipment. Yet, when Craig purchases all components involved it says part of the cost differential includes the cost of engineering and installing the equipment—a differential already covered in the original $24,000 for this equipment.

Fourth, what of the excess profits this firm seems to be reaping? As I expected, the flag is waved to and fro—briskly—on this one. The tactic of explaining away inefficiency and incompetency on grounds of patriotism and national security is quickly adopted.

Here Craig told me that if it is making a profit—on one hand it says it is not, but on the other says it may be, after all, making money—it is only making up for losses it experienced on the development contracts.

This is a pattern that is followed throughout this sole source purchasing. They simply get the camel's nose under the tent through developing it, and they contend that they develop it at a loss. They contend that that is within the price quoted, and that they have a right to make up for that loss.

C. J. Kvasnak, formerly Craig's vice president in charge of Government contracts, said Craig lost money in the early 1950's on this equipment. Therefore, he said—expressing a view widely adhered to by military contractors and contract administrators—Craig was entitled to make up some of these losses through profits on future contracts.

Not only is this one of the most horrible fallacies of our time, but it is also a proposition to which the Defense Department often subscribes, and it costs billions each year. Secretary of Defense McNamara, the chairman of the board of the "Billion Dollar a Week Club," is a man who I sincerely believe is trying to cut defense purchasing costs. He proudly called attention to the fact that the Defense Department is with increasing frequency requiring contractors to spend their own money to develop military material, Mr. Speaker, this is false economy at its worst—the epitome of "penny wise and pound foolish."

American industry is entitled to be compensated for any product it develops. Uncle Sam cannot get and should not demand "something for nothing." The history of research and development contracts is unarguable. The firm that does the "R. & D." work inevitably gets the first production contract, and at a price that more than repays it for "R. & D." losses. But that is only the beginning.

In procurement after procurement I have studied, a first contract leads to a second, a third and more contracts based on all sorts of justifications. And, just as inevitably, when a future contract is forced into competitive bidding, the price tumbles to one-half, one-third, or less of the price charged by the developer.

Mr. Speaker, that is in keeping with a study which I made on dozens of other cases during the past 12 months. In practically every instance, when the item was procured by competitive bidding, the prices dropped from one-half to one-third. Even though the original producer had all the testing devices, had all the jigs, had the patterns and had the know-how, they still charged more than twice what was bid competitively.

I say it is time we started paying industry a fair price for R. & D., and it is time we stopped buying the whole cloth out of which the phony excuses for high profits on defense projects are cut—such as the one advanced in this case by Craig Systems.

Now, let us turn to the Air Force. Why was Craig Systems given a sole-source award when the MRN-12 was developed years ago and, in fact, was offered for competitive procurement before? Why was Craig ordered to purchase the 43 formerly Government-furnished components at what turned out to be exorbitant prices?

Col. W. B. Mann, Acting Deputy Commander of the Rome Air Materiel Area, Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N.Y., said the Air Force first checked its own inventories and current contracts and found it didn't have these components available. Then, the Air Force said, the project officer, Mr. John Guba, checked with the "Navy, Signal Corps, and Chemical Corps as to availability," but found none could meet the Air Force "urgent" delivery schedule.

That allegation is incredible in the light of my own spotcheck. It will be interesting to see what documentation the Air Force produces to back up its claim that interservice checks were made. If they were, indeed, made, how is it that a lone Congressman can determine who is producing what and where and for how much when the services themselves cannot find the same answers?

Next, it should be asked why the Air Force itself didn't handle procurement of the 43 components and ship them to Craig. Two reasons were given to me by the Air Force. First, it would have taken too much effort by Air Force personnel to handle the job—a ridiculous excuse.

That is laughable. Second, the Air Force explained, "We could not accommodate the risk of delivery slippages—from subcontractors—which had been experienced on Project Four Wheel"—the name given the first two purchases of the MRN-12.

The Air Force complained that on the earlier MRN-12 contracts "we suffered extreme delays attempting to acquire the components for that system through the appropriate military services." It listed eight ways in what it called a "thorough tabulation" in which delivery of the 43 components had been SNAFU'd when it tried to do the job the Air Force way. It concluded by saying that:

> Because of the lack of control, numerous delays, unavailability of necessary quantities of equipment and for many other reasons, it was the recommendation of all concerned to procure * * * any facilities with the contractor providing the equipment.

If you will read what I just said again, you can distill it down into one word—"INCOMPETENCE." In capital letters. Quite clearly, the Air Force is saying "we cannot do the job." I cannot tell you I take any pride in reporting that the Air Force while engaged in wasting $560,000 explains it could not handle the job in such a way that it could have saved the money because it was incompetent. As a matter of fact, I do not think the rest of the Air Force would subscribe to that reasoning, even though Griffiss states it as perfectly normal.

For example, in site construction and development of the Minuteman instant ICBM, the Air Force received and deserved national attention for a spectacular job of organization and coordination. It procured all the parts and the sites and got them all together in the right place at the right time. Yet, when a similar, though much smaller, problem confronts the chairborne pilots at Griffiss, they, in effect, plead incompetence and let the contractor do it, even if it costs the taxpayer an extra 19 percent.

Even more interesting was Air Force's reasoning for giving the contract sole source to Craig. Stripped of the boiler plate and gobbledygook, the reason for the sole-source award boils down to one word—urgency.

The Air Force said no other firm could meet the rigid schedule of delivery it set up—out of "necessity," of course. That "urgent" requirement meant a sole-source award in June 1962 for a basic need which was originally stated in April 1961.

Now, let us see how competent Craig was. The Air Force says it could not assemble different components because of urgent time factors so it left the job to Craig. Let us see what Craig's performance record was like.

That contract, signed June 5, 1962, specified first delivery of the contract items within 6 months. In short, the Air Force had to start getting these control centers in 6 months. That was the sole reason for the sole-source award—urgency.

Now, in March 1963, how is this "urgent requirement" being met?

I can tell you off the record that it is being met just like many other urgent sole-source requirements have been met. It was simply an excuse to give the contract to the right company.

By mid-March, according to the delivery schedule, Craig was supposed to have delivered 10 of 14 MRN-12's and 17 of 20 modification kits. According to a report to me dated March 14, 1963, and signed by Col. George E. Harrington, deputy commander of ROAMA, one MRN-12 was delivered in December and one was delivered in February. That shows how well Craig Systems has fulfilled the role laid out for it by the Air Force when it sole-sourced this contract.

Even this does not faze the peaceful paper pilots at Griffiss. In an explanation that does not explain a thing, Colonel Harrington says Craig Systems had funding difficulties beyond its control, but he assured me that despite the fact Craig is now months behind schedule, it will be only 30 days late in delivery of the total quantity. I hope Colonel Harrington's foresight is better now than when the contract was sole-sourced to Craig.

That, then, Mr. Speaker, is the case of the MRN-12 as my analysis developed it. But it is not all of the story, and I want the Members of this House to know the full story—page, chapter, verse, and line.

From the outset of its contact with my office, Craig was determined to head off an audit by GAO. Such an audit would disrupt their activities and place a needless expense on the Government, they said. They persisted in this line until early this month, when their tactics changed.

The new line was, "have us audited, if you will, but do not mention the case on the House floor until the GAO completes its audit." I cannot accept this course of action for the following reasons:

First, what I am turning over to GAO and Justice is fact, not opinion. I am not asking for a determination of conditions but a determination of the extent of conditions.

These facts are not at issue: First, other suppliers were in production with much of this equipment at lower prices at the same time Craig was setting up its purchases. These firms' contract delivery schedules and unit prices are clear and are being turned over to the proper authorities; second, Craig marked up prices on these components by 2 percent; third, Craig charged additional burdens for engineering, manufacturing, and production work; fourth, Craig was permitted to stick in a fat 16 percent for general and administrative costs; fifth, Craig reaped a 6.5-percent profit on purchased parts and a 10-percent profit on direct costs.

An audit by GAO will not diminish these facts nor the fact that Craig is now far behind in delivery schedules to meet a so-called urgent need.

Second, delaying publicity on this situation could harm the national interest since there are, in this one contract, illustrations of several widespread problems.

The Congress must make every effort to correct these problems through legislation which I shall soon discuss. Like audits, these remedies take time, and while that time is consumed, the taxpayers are being taken for billions of dollars a year.

At the same time, it is possible that focusing the spotlight of publicity and exposure on some of the more blatant examples of these abuses will act as a deterrent to others who engage in or tolerate such activity.

Finally, there is a third reason. It has been 6 months since Craig Systems was put on notice that its activity was under study. With 6 months to prepare for auditors, I feel it mandatory that the American public know the facts as they exist before the auditors step in.

I suggested earlier in my presentation that pressure has been forced on me to halt this inquiry. The approaches have been several. For months I was told that if I examined all the facts I would be satisfied the contracts were not unusual. This I did in painstaking fashion, as the file will show. I was not satisfied and said so. Then other pressures were applied.

Next it was suggested that it would be unfair to disclose the facts before a GAO audit could be completed. This was followed by the warning that a firm's good name might be hurt in a community where it is respected—a firm well known to industry and Government. While I acknowledge this firm is indeed well known, it has recently come to my attention that its reputation goes somewhat further than it has stated.

This firm, it develops, has an interesting history of problems with Government procurement and law enforcement agencies, particularly with the Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth. I am prepared to go into a complete discussion of that history if anyone so desires.

After the "good name" pressure had been applied, Mr. Colson, Craig's attorney, suggested I would be premature in attacking the contract since he contended the price of the June 1962 contract is "redeterminable" if the Air Force finds Craig's costs are too high. I wish I could report at one point in this presentation that something said by Mr. Colson was true, but, to put it politely, this was another misstatement. The Air Force says it is a fixed-price contract, not subject to negotiation.

Finally, after all of this had failed to deter me, Mr. Colson turned to veiled threats. It was suggested by him that because I had used volunteer assistance in this study, there was a "serious impropriety" involved. Though I believed this viewpoint to be patently ridiculous, I asked the Department of Justice during a conference for its opinion. The reaction of attorneys in the Department's Criminal Division was to laugh, literally. Of course, there was no impropriety, they said.

The chief assistance in this investigation was provided by Charles Nicodemus of the Chicago Daily News, the same newsman whose work led directly to the arrest and Federal indictment of two high-ranking Signal Corps civilian officials at Fort Monmouth, N.J., last year. For his part in this investigation, Mr. Nicodemus was personally and publicly commended by Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Incidentally, Mr. Nicodemus is still cooperating with the Department of Justice and certain agencies of Congress in continuing his newspaper's commendable interest in this field.

I, therefore, have welcomed his assistance and knowledge in this and other investigations. In this case, however, Mr. Nicodemus chose to use the "nom de plume" of Charles Nichols, a name he has used in radio work and freelance writing. This was done to make sure that he was free to work with Craig Systems personnel. When dealing with the Air Force and Justice Department, however, pains were taken to make it clear to Air Force congressional liaison officers just who Mr. Nicodemus was and the assistance he was providing.

Craig Systems has intimated it is unhappy that Mr. Nicodemus was permitted to participate in this analysis, perhaps because of his intimate knowledge of the procurement picture at Fort Monmouth. This does not surprise me, but I wish to state at this time that the Chicago Daily News never prints any information—confidential or otherwise—that comes to me during an investigation until it has first appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That, Craig Systems has been told, so there can be no question of confidences involved.

My presentation here today is an indication of what I think of all these pressures.

Again, I wish to stress that it is not my goal to present a critique of just one firm or person here today. Craig Systems was not operating in a vacuum.

It was playing the ball game under the rules set down by the military, with perhaps a few refinements of its own. Thus, if there is blame to be placed here, it must be borne principally by the Air Force. Its own regulations foster abuses such as those I have outlined here today, for example:

First, it is the Air Force which awarded the development contract for the MRN-12 to Craig Systems on which Craig says it lost money.

Second, it is the Air Force which handed out the latest sole-source contract on grounds of urgency and then defended the contractor when he fell behind schedule.

Third, it is the Air Force that permitted Craig to buy components formerly furnished by the Government at exorbitant prices.

Fourth, it is the Air Force, through a set of unrealistic "pricing objectives," which permitted wholesale waste in this latest procurement.

Fifth, it is the Air Force that permitted a 20-percent markup on prices of purchased components, plus imposition of additional burdens for engineering, manufacturing, labor, and production.

Sixth, it is the Air Force that permitted an incredible charge of 16 percent for administrative and general expenses, in addition to all the earlier charges.

Seventh, it is the Air Force that permitted profits of 6.532 percent and 10 percent on top of this whole wasteful pyramid.

Eighth, and I predict it will be the Air Force that defends Craig Systems' performance on this contract most aggressively.

Why do we have mistakes, incompetency, abuses such as these? Why do the Air Force and other services permit, indeed, encourage them?

Some mistakes are just that—matters of judgment where a procurement official errs. In such cases, however, the services must learn to admit their mistakes publicly and to right their wrongs. Continued protection of incompetent middle-grade military and civil servants by the top civilian and military brass creates a "guarantee of immunity" atmosphere that encourages some officials, and happily they are in the minority—to make mistakes that are not honest ones. And why should they not, when they know that their bosses all the way to the top will protect them? We all know the rule of the Pentagon—"Protect your own—right or wrong—he's one of you."

What are the inducements offered by contractors in return for services rendered by chairborne civil and military servants who actually control the massive majority of defense money spent by the "Billion Dollar a Week Club"? What do these men get, these men who make key technical and policy decisions that are rubber-stamped all the way to the top?

The rewards run from outright bribes, such as at Fort Monmouth, to offers of jobs in civilian life. They range from lavish 3-hour lunches and all-night dinners, with booze, and all the trimmings, to gratuities such as fur coats and deep freezes.

These are the pressures and influence, sub rosa, that result every day in negotiated and sole-source contracts handed out without any true justification at prices that penalize the taxpayer—abuses such as I have detailed today. It is because of the extent of these abuses in the case of the MRN-12 that I am asking the FBI to examine the relationships between contractor and Government officials involved in this case. And it is because of these abuses that I must request a full and complete audit by the General Accounting Office, as well as a full investigation by the Secretary of Defense of the Air Force personnel and policies involved.

Probably in the eyes of the Defense Department, this study will disclose nothing irregular in the administration or performance of these contracts. But if the waste and the abuses are not wrong in the eyes of the Air Force, and they clearly should be, then it is time we obtain legislation which clearly will correct the wrong.

Such legislation is embodied in two bills I have introduced. One would give the General Accounting Office the right to intervene in advance of the award of a negotiated contract when it is apparent the circumstances justifying a sole-source or negotiated award are not supported by the facts. This is the same power GAO now has in the realm of competitive bidding.

The second bill would among other things, create a joint "blue ribbon" committee of the Congress to act as a watchdog over negotiated contracts and recommend legislation to curb the abuses. Only such a nonpartisan committee, properly organized, can have the power to take hold of this situation, give it the cleansing publicity it merits and bring about needed changes in Defense procurement procedures. This, I am sure, would reduce markedly the number of sole-source contracts and save the taxpayer billions each year.

As a source of expert opinion on the benefit to be gained from cutting down on sole-source contracts, I go to the top man himself—Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. He said emphatically last year that if more competitive bidding can be introduced he could save 25 cents of every dollar spent for national defense. Mr. Speaker, on a Defense budget of $55 billion, that is over $13 billion.

In the face of an opportunity such as this, Congress will be delinquent if it fails to explore every possible legislative avenue for capitalizing on this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the first proposal of my two pieces of legislation is one with which many Members are familiar. It is part of what was known for years as the Hébert amendment, a revision of the Armed Forces Procurement Regulations sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Last session, after years of trying, the Hébert amendment was passed, but a very critical section was killed in the other body. That is the section I have introduced and intend to push for enactment.

On every hand, we hear "cut the budget," "cut expenditures," "tighten up the purse strings," but we might as well be fighting windmills unless we have the right tools. My version of the Hébert amendment, plus my H.R. 4409, will put some teeth into our part of the fight. If such legislation had been passed last year, we would be seeing results right now, and we would be having less of the abuses by middle-grade chair flyers in the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, the abuses I have spoken of today must be stopped, and I have introduced the legislation to stop them. It is up to the Congress now. If it truly wants to save money, here is the chance.

In conclusion, I wish to state I have documentation—much more lengthy than I have detailed here today—from industry, Air Force, GAO, and from other sources for every fact I have stated. I have names that are unnamed, and I will be happy to provide them if there is any question by any Member of this House at any time.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am very happy to be present at this forthright presentation on the part of my Indiana colleague. I compliment him. I know he has given many months of effort in his earnest desire to see that we get a good product at a proper cost for our Defense Department. I know he has brought to the attention not only of the House but of the whole American public, the necessity for closer surveillance and the correct application of the rules of proper procurement. I compliment him and thank him for his very able presentation.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Thank you.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Indiana on his very thorough and important study of procurement practices. As a Member of the Congress from the Chicago area, I have followed with a great deal of interest the work which you have done along with the reporter from the Chicago Daily News, Mr. Nicodemus. I want to assure you that I am pleased both as a Member of Congress and as a taxpayer to see you take this great interest in procurement practices and policies in an attempt to correct some of the abuses and errors that have been made in the past.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank you very kindly. If you recall, there was a contract finally arrived at with Webcor Co., of Chicago. Webcor is a very competent company and produced, on competitive bid, a product for less than 50 percent of what the Government was paying for it via sole source.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. I am aware of his fine work in the program of procurement for the Department of Defense. It certainly has been most appreciated by me. I have read many newspaper articles, magazine articles, and statements in the press, seen them on television, and heard them on radio, and I realize very fully the wonderful work he is doing. I think the effort by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], on this program has in the past, and will in the future, result in savings of millions of dollars to the American taxpayers. Certainly when we realize that this Nation is spending something over $50 billion each year in defense it is the responsibility of this Congress to carefully scrutinize all future contracts. So I congratulate my good friend and colleague from Indiana on his work.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

SURPLUS CREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government and American dairy farmers are being shamefully used by foreign nations which are currently dumping their surplus cream on the American market. These cream shipments which are highlighted in the press as a market development program by New Zealand are only serving to replace cream being produced by American farmers and which is in surplus. This loss of cream markets which has been taking place since early October forces American farmers to make their cream into butter for sale to Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program. Dairymen are losing approximately 15 cents per pound butterfat and the Government is purchasing the butter at a cost of about 60 cents per pound under the price support program.

Our present experience with cream imports is but one of many instances in recent years under similar circumstances. These imports, if not illegal, certainly run contrary to the intent and purpose of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which just last year was incorporated into the 1962 Trade Agreement Act as an expression of the U.S. Congress. Section 22 is intended to restrict imports of dairy products as an adjunct to the effective operation of the price support program.

Domestic dairy prices, even at present low levels, are far above prices at which surplus dairy products of other countries are sold in the world market. Without the effective application of section 22, the price support program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is adversely affected. Unless imports of dairy products are restricted, the U.S. Government will find itself buying the surplus not only of American farmers but of farmers throughout the world.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides the mechanism for restricting imports of dairy products so that the price levels maintained under the support program can effectively serve the interests of U.S. dairy farmers within minimum costs. Section 22 gives the Tariff Commission full authority to restrict the import of dairy products. The difficulty lies not only in a weak law but in lax administration of the law. The present problem of imported cream is no different than has plagued the dairy industry and USDA with respect to other products imported in circumvention of the law over a period of several years. In spite of repeated efforts to obtain full hearings and proper and timely rulings by the Tariff Commission, the amount of dairy-product imports has continued to mount. The needless importing of dairy products, already in surplus within the United States, is inconsistent with the intent of Congress as expressed by section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It is inconsistent with the intent of Congress as expressed by the Agricultural Act of 1949. And it is inconsistent with attempts to hold the cost of supporting U.S. agricultural prices to a minimum.

Certainly the Tariff Commission or the administration cannot be blind to the consequence of failure to properly restrict the imports of dairy products as intended by section 22.

If dairy product imports are necessary in the interests of international relations, let us say so and then provide a mechanism wherein they can enter through the front door rather than by circumvention of American law. If dairy product imports are necessary in the interests of international relations, let their costs be charged to international relations and not to the costs of supporting prices for American dairy farmers. If dairy products are to enter the country, even though we have more than enough, let them enter under regulations which are clear and which will afford opportunity for all of our foreign friends to participate on an equitable basis. The present importation of cream is an outright circumvention of U.S. law and should not be tolerated by the U.S. Government.

THE LOGAN FLOOD DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a gurgling roar outside Herman Lunsford's window warned him on the black, rainy night of March 11 that Buffalo Creek was on the rampage. He was just getting ready at 10 p.m. to drive to his job as chief electrician of the Island Creek Coal Co., in Amherstdale, W. Va.

Lunsford opened the door and gasped. Buffalo Creek was literally creeping toward his door. Mrs. Lunsford let out a sudden cry: "It is coming through on the floor." Hastily, Herman Lunsford tried to move the sofa and a few valuables upstairs.

"It may be worse than last year; it may even be as bad as 1957," he thought. It turned out to be much worse. The water relentlessly rose up the stairs.

At two minutes before midnight, the lights suddenly went out. Lunsford collected his family, waded through several feet of water to high ground where he had parked his car. It was the first of four nights the Lunsfords slept in their car.

Along with several other tributaries, Buffalo Creek empties into the Guyandotte River, and it was the main stem of the Guyandotte which rose up and struck Logan its most staggering blow.

Over in Stollings, just a couple of miles outside the county seat city of Logan, Leslie Browning's phone rang at 10:30 p.m. His next door neighbor was crying. "Will it be bad?" she asked. "I will see," he said, rushing out to where the river was rising. He drove a 6-foot stake into the ground to measure the rise of the river. In the brief span of 5 minutes, the water rose 21 inches on the stake, spelling danger. Browning serves as chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the Logan Chamber of Commerce. He felt what was coming. Hastily, he backed his truck up to the door, loaded in as much as he dared, then threw his wife over his shoulders and waded through the water. Slipping the fan belt off the motor, he barely chugged through before the thundering Guyandotte began to pick up houses, garages, gas pumps, drive-in restaurants, and telephone poles and toss them around like so many toothpicks.

TWO DEATHS RESULT

Others were not as fortunate as Lunsford and Browning. Over in the railroad center of Peach Creek, Walter Kendall struggled with some heavy furniture as he tried to help his neighbors move their belongings away from the flood waters. Kendall collapsed. A Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. engine and caboose rushed him to the hospital, but he had already passed away from a heart attack.

The receding floodwaters revealed the death of a 65-year-old Negro, Andrew Roberson, who was drowned in the Billy Goat Junction section of Mount Gay.

Countless others were rescued from second-story windows and the rooftops of their fast flooding homes. Hurry calls went out to Charleston and Point Pleasant to rush Army ducks to aid in the rescue efforts.

ALMOST 4 FEET AN HOUR

The Guyandotte River was meandering along at a depth of 5.1 feet at 7 p.m. on the evening of March 11. There had been a very hard rain all day, and by 9 p.m. the river had inched up to 6.5 feet. By the time most folks were getting ready for bed, it did not seem the danger would be great. "D.J.", WSAZ's weather girl, reported on the 11 p.m. weather out of Huntington that some tributary streams might overflow their banks, but the general tone of the report served to calm the people. After all, flood stage was 20 feet on the river. Still, the level leaped from 8.5 feet at 10 p.m. to 12.1 feet at 11 p.m.

Over in Man, the rising water in the hollow near Joe Manko's house washed over the road about 9 p.m., signaling the start of trouble. One of Joe Blair's men sent word he had been cut off by a slide. The phones started ringing everywhere, and people began streaming up to higher ground, clutching whatever they could carry. In Burgess Addition along Huff Creek the water struck with explosive force.

MAYOR CUDDEN TAKES THE REINS

Meanwhile, back in the city of Logan, a confident mayor and his wife had gone to bed. Dr. H. H. Cudden, 65-year-old osteopath, was looking forward to a good night of rest before the municipal primary election the next day. In a city which is about 4 to 1 registered Democratic, Mayor Cudden as a Republican was unopposed in the primary but was getting ready for another interesting race in the general election. "I guess it was about 12:30 or 1 o'clock in the morning when the telephone started ringing," Dr. Cudden said. Folks up in Wyoming County and in the vicinity of Logan began to sound the alarm. By 1 a.m. the river had reached flood stage, and Mayor Cudden was down at city hall, mobilizing the police, firemen, and rescue workers. The primary election was called off the next day; most polling places were flooded and inaccessible. Mayor Cudden stayed up all night to direct rescue efforts.

By daylight, the flood height of the 1957 flood had been surpassed and the rampaging river rolled on to crest at 31.7 feet—11.7 feet over flood stage—at 10 a.m. Downstream at Chapmanville and Big Creek, walls of water raced down the streets, tearing up houses from their foundations, buckling the floors, ruining bedding and furniture. Master Sergeant St. Clair, Army recruiting officer, telephoned his commanding officer in Beckley and said: "We have a job to do which is more important than getting people into the Army." Sergeant St. Clair's wife did not see her husband for days, as the hard driving noncommissioned officer set up rescue efforts in Chapmanville and became a one man Red Cross until regular disaster relief showed up on the scene. From Mallory to Sharples, from Omar to Verdunville, there were many heroes on Monday and Tuesday as people joined hands in the face of the cruelest disaster which has ever hit Logan County.

TREMENDOUS DESTRUCTION

By Tuesday afternoon, the waters started to fall, but not before they had taken a heavy toll in property damages. There was the White Tower Inn, owned by Rush Jeffrey, wiped out, and then Jeffrey's own home demolished when it crashed against the Henlawson Bridge. At Freeman's grocery and Staton's Grocery in Peach Creek, a thick, black, gummy, coal sludge rose 4 feet high and ruined everything on the shelves. Kroger's, A. & P., and many other groceries and supermarkets lost thousands of dollars' worth of food and provisions. Beautiful lawns in Mitchell Heights, Justice Addition, South Man, and in every residential section of the county were covered with several inches of slimy mud and debris. The grit and the grime ruined hundreds of automobiles, adding machines, and equipment all over town. Cleaning up his Logan News printing plant on the banks of the Guyandotte, Editor Roscoe Spence found it was like scraping cosmolene off a hundred Army rifles.

County Road Supt. Harold Hale and his State road commission men started right to work on the cleanup. The Civil Defense men under Jim Singleton did their part. The State police, Red Cross, Department of Welfare—ADCU workers—and other agencies did yeoman work. The water, gas, power, and telephone companies really had a job to do, and they responded tremendously.

CONTAMINATED WATER SYSTEM

In some areas like Logan, the water system became contaminated and milk trucks from Charleston and Huntington brought in water in gallon jugs. Huntington citizens and business houses donated several 40,000-pound truckloads of food and clothing; Huntingtonians had not forgotten their hour of misery in 1937, before they got the protection of a floodwall. From all over the area, assistance poured in.

Through the leadership of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, a group of Federal officials from the Corps of Engineers, Office of Emergency Planning, Community Facilities Administration and Small Business Administration visited Logan County the day after the flood. Along with Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and Governor W. W. Barron, various other emergency measures were instituted. Last Monday, the Small Business Administration set up an office to advance 3 percent loans up to 20 years to businesses and homeowners damaged by the flood.

THOSE GREAT WILDCATS

All the schools in Logan County were closed during the entire week of the flood. Many of the schools were being used as temporary shelters for those washed out of their homes. The Logan High School Wildcats, although they had started off the season with a losing streak, suddenly found themselves in the thick of the fight for the West Virginia class A basketball championship. With their schedules disrupted and little chance to rest or practice, the basketball team set off for Charleston on Friday and Saturday of the week of the flood. A thousand Logan fans forgot their troubles and went along. "It is about time we got back to more important things," they said. Logan High's basketball team upset Huntington East High School on Friday night and then went on to beat favored St. Albans handily on Saturday night, thus moving on to the finals of the State basketball tournament.

Three weeks ago today, Mr. Speaker, this grave disaster struck Logan County. We are now going into what is perhaps the most critical period in Logan's recovery. The disaster workers are withdrawing. People have stopped sending food and clothing. Most people have moved back into their damaged homes. Many have already shown the strength of Hercules in cleaning the Augean stables of Logan. As the outsiders and the sightseers go back home and leave Logan County to its own devices, great dangers lurk in the present apathy.

At this point let me back up a little and tell you about this great county which has already outstripped "the Free State of McDowell"—McDowell County—as the largest coal-producing county in the United States of America. Times were once very rich in Logan County, as the coal miners and the loggers and their employers did a booming business. Saturday night in Logan was a boisterous, roisterous affair which left the citizenry limp, but the merchants rich. When automation and the dieselization of the railroads cut deeply into mine payrolls, the older unemployed stalked the streets or eked out a meager existence in the small coal towns. The younger people started to leave the area in droves. Last Thursday, while down at Cape Canaveral for the fourth straight test flight of Saturn, I was amazed at the number of young Logan alumni who are working for the space and missile programs in Florida. Between 1950 and 1960, Logan County lost 10,000 of its people—mainly young people who did not have the ties or property commitments which might force them to stay.

A NEW CIVIC DETERMINATION

Yet in the last 2 years, there has been a great stirring in Logan, a civic determination to provide new economic opportunities for young people, a new spirit in the schools, and remarkable progress under the leadership of enlightened people. The Logan County Development Corp. was formed, and raised a quarter of a million dollars by popular subscription with the idea of bringing in a new industry. There was a tremendous campaign through the newspapers, over the radio, through the service clubs, and elsewhere. You could not resist that kind of enthusiasm, and one day while passing through Logan I put in $500 myself to buy stock in the new development corporation. With the stock subscriptions, they built a garment factory which now employs several hundred people. This is a wonderful story of local initiative at work.

Further illustrative of the spirit of Logan is the fact that in 1961 their Community Chest drive was oversubscribed by 6 percent—which is quite remarkable in an area where the average yearly personal income is $1,737. The combined efforts of the local citizenry, with a great boost from the State, resulted in the opening of the 3,082-acre Chief Logan Recreation Area. Spurred by the Woman's Club, a cleanup and beautification campaign resulted in designation of Logan as one of the first seven counties to pass the qualification tests in Governor Barron's statewide cleanup program.

THE TOP AWARD IN THE NATION

Capping the climax of these efforts, on June 28, 1962, the Logan Woman's Club was honored with the top award in the Nation—a $10,000 award by the General Federation of Woman's Clubs, for the most outstanding program of successful community improvement in the entire country.

Another evidence of the basic strength of Logan County is the caliber of the teaching in the public schools. Each summer, I sponsor a "Week in Washington" contest which enables a number of high school juniors to spend a week working in my Washington congressional office. We have had winners from Logan, Man, Chapmanville and Sharples High Schools in Logan County, and I am deeply impressed with the superior quality of these students, their good motivation, and their sound principles. In order to test a wider sample, and to get some idea of the nature of the teaching in Logan, I have visited a large number of schools—all the way from the one-room school in nearly-inaccessible Madison Creek, to the four high schools and all the junior high schools. I have also met with classes in several grade schools. I am deeply impressed with the teachers, and also with the good equipment which the board of education is trying to provide.

STUDENT BOOKS DESTROYED

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, Logan County was just experiencing an upswing economically and in other ways when the disastrous March 11 flood swept in, to use the words of one reporter, "like a giant greasy fist," which dealt a blow to the solar plexus. At Logan East End Junior High School, where the students have to purchase their own textbooks, close to $7,000 worth of books were destroyed in the lockers of the students. These are losses which neither the Red Cross, the State, the Federal Government, nor the school system can do anything about; it means that these students are just out of luck, out of pocket, out of an opportunity to wind up the school year with the books they bought with their hard-earned money. I certainly hope that I will be able to go out and pass the hat to raise some money to help these students buy their lost books, Mr. Speaker. If anyone feels in the mood, checks can be written to Thomas Orr, superintendent of schools, Logan, W. Va., and that might start the ball rolling. I hope if these words get to Logan County that the people of Logan realize that I am only asking for contributions from outside the county, since the people of Logan have been through enough already.

Aside from the losses in student books at Logan East End Junior High, where there was 7 or 8 feet of water, complete libraries and valuable reference books were lost in Logan East Grade School, Stollings, Switzer, Big Creek and Mount Gay Schools. The cost of replacing these losses runs to over $30,000. In addition, lots of valuable equipment was washed away or damaged beyond repair. Reimbursement will be made for some of this, but a crippling blow has been dealt to a progressive school system at a time in the school term when the schools can ill afford it. I do hope that friends of West Virginia can open their hearts and their pocketbooks sufficiently so that the Logan schools can at least get part way back to where they were before the flood. In my remarks, of course, I have not even mentioned buckled floors, structural damage, and other heavy damages to the schools for which we may still be able to qualify for assistance under Public Law 875.

WE NEED THE JUSTICE DAM

Now I come to perhaps the most important portion of my remarks, referring to the future. Last year, after some debate, the Congress authorized construction of the Justice Dam on the Guyandotte River, a $70 million structure. The authorization was not passed until late in the session, and I regret that Congress did not see fit to appropriate funds for the start of advance engineering and design. In January of this year, the President recommended $150,000 for advance engineering and design. I believe it is imperative to double that amount to equal the Corps of Engineers' capability of $300,000, thereby speeding up construction and completion of this essential dam by 1 year. It is vital to the lives and property of the people in the Guyandotte Valley that the Justice Dam be built at the earliest possible time. Col. Harrington Cochran, Huntington, district engineer, has stated that construction of the Justice Dam would have cut the flood crest 3 weeks ago by 11 or 12 feet—meaning that the damage would have been very minor, if at all. Fortunately, the Area Redevelopment Administration has advanced $10,000 to enable aerial photography and mapping to be completed this spring before the foliage comes out.

Mr. Speaker, I know my friends in Logan County will also be happy to know that I am urging a speedup in the two proposed dams on Twelvepole Creek at East Lynn and Beech Fork in Wayne County. Last year and this year, the flood waters of Twelvepole Creek caused extensive damage on the edge of Logan. I therefore hope that early action will be taken to complete the preconstruction planning on these two structures. The cost-benefit ratio on the East Lynn structure is 1.8 to 1, and on Beech Fork is 1.5 to 1, and the two dams can be completed for a total cost of $25 million—a good investment.

INTERIM MEASURES NEEDED

Yet even if we work at top speed and under the best possible circumstances, these projects cannot be completed before 1968. Therefore, it is necessary to take certain interim measures. I would hope that the Corps of Engineers can move forward with snagging, clearing and straightening the channels of the Guyandotte and its tributaries, and take such other measures as may be necessary to provide at least temporary protection prior to the construction of the Justice Dam.

Finally, I think the time has come to give some serious thought to the issue of Federally guaranteed flood or disaster insurance. These people should be given some opportunity to apply for low premium insurance, with the Federal Government helping to spread the risk.

THE GREATNESS OF THE PEOPLE OF LOGAN

In closing, Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to pay tribute to the people of Logan. They are the most wonderful people on God's green earth. The disaster which struck them also brought out the best in them. There was Chapmanville Councilman "Fishpond" Chambers, roaming the flooded streets of his town in an Army duck, carrying people to safety. There was Charlie Hylton of the Logan Banner, helping people and putting out a daily newspaper at the same time. Then there was Gene Smith, principal of the Man Junior High School, mobilizing his teachers and pupils to set up an emergency shelter at the school. Then there was Circuit Judge C. C. Chambers' wife, hard at work supervising disaster evacuees temporarily housed in the Logan Junior High on the hill. There were thousands more who proved that the greatest acts of unselfishness occur when human beings are in trouble.

But they also proved to me that the spirit of Logan will never be broken.

CUTTING THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the President's $100 billion budget and his planned Federal deficit there are those who hold differing views as to whether the Congress can prudently effect economies. On this subject I will start my remarks today by saying that traditionally Presidents defend their recommended budgets but who can say that Government agencies and departments do not invariably ask for more than is needed. When estimates are made up it is common practice to anticipate congressional cuts. The question is not as to whether Congress can cut appropriations; rather it is a question of how much reduction to make. It is a matter of where to cut and how much.

Here is a specific example of what I mean. Take the case of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. President Kennedy's proposed budget for this Agency was for $5.7 billion which represented a 60-percent increase in new spending authority.

When Mr. Webb, the director of this agency testified before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I asked him about the difference between this $5.7 billion request and the $5.2 billion which he said was one of the budget suggestions he has made to the President. Specifically I asked what effect the $500 million difference would have had on the overall space exploration program. His answer in so many words was that the lower amount would require a deacceleration of the manned space flight program. He said this slowdown could mean, for example, that the United States might not be able to land a man on the moon before 1970.

Mr. Speaker, if that is indeed what is involved, I would say we might well consider saving the $500 million. It seems to me the priority of justifying a tax cut by reduced spending comes before a speedup in reaching the moon, and let me emphasize I feel that a cut in spending is necessary in order to justify a cut in taxes. I think it essential to support a policy of reducing expenditures.

I do not intend to make a lot of loose statements about budget cutting. Actions, not words, are what is needed. But I fully support the Republican position that new spending authority asked by President Kennedy for such purposes as space, foreign aid and agriculture—just to name a few—can be reduced by several billions of dollars. Such economies in expending the taxpayers' money would substantially reduce the 1964 deficit. That to me is absolutely a must.

I am sure many of the Democratic Members of the House are just as alarmed as Republicans at the prospect of a staggering increase in the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about in the nature of reduced spending is not idle talk. As I announced previously, I shall try to obtain a record vote on each measure as it comes up having to do with expenditures and then the public can ascertain which Congressmen practiced economy and which ones voted to increase the deficit.

The President's budget can be cut substantially and thereby a tax reduction to stimulate and strengthen the economy can be made on a sound fiscally responsible basis.

Republicans have been challenged by the President to show where cuts in his budget can be made. I am willing, Mr. Speaker, to let the record of this Congress spell out the answer to this challenge and, of course, it will have to include many votes against newly proposed programs which entail increased Federal spending—spending of money, I might add, which we do not have in the Treasury and which I feel should not be added to the burden of debt we are placing on future generations of Americans.

With the growth in Government spending during the past 2 years it is time to hold the line. The administration said big Government and massive Federal spending on public works would get the economy on the move. It did not work. Now we are told with massive spending there should be a tax cut.

In my opinion the Government should cut 1964 spending by at least $5 billion and then reduce business taxes in a like amount. Under this formula I am sure a wave of confidence and prosperity would result, with a substantial net gain in revenue to the Federal Treasury and with long-range benefit to the national economy.

WASTE CAUSED BY INEFFECTIVE REPAIR PARTS SUPPORT FOR COMBAT-SUPPORT VEHICLES BY THE ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER AT DETROIT, MICH.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **McDOWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. **McDOWELL**. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army is wasting the taxpayers money as though it were chaff to be thrown to the winds. When I was advised of the Army's decision to close down the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center in Newark, Del., in 1961, I was really impressed at that time by what I thought were sincere and logical reasons and evaluations designed to save the taxpayers' dollars. I was always skeptical of the basic motives for moving the tank plant from Delaware to Detroit, Mich. to be operated by the same contractor, but I was convinced by the Army that efficiency was the prime motive.

Apparently, I was mistaken in my judgment in 1961, for now I find that this blackout of a going defense tank plant in Delaware and the transfer of its programs to Detroit has caused the taxpayers a loss of $500,000 in its first year of operation.

The Department of the Army closed down the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center, Newark, Del., and transferred its activities to the Army Tank-Automotive Center, at Detroit, Mich.

Members of Congress and its committees were assured these steps would result in increased efficiency and greater combat power and readiness.

Little consideration was given by the Army to the economic effects of these moves upon the employees, suppliers, and other business enterprises who had made the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., such an important defense facility.

The Comptroller General of the United States recently completed and this month submitted a report to the Congress regarding a review of the ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center at Detroit.

It would appear, from this report, that the Congress may have been oversold by the Department of the Army as to the benefits which would accrue from the transfer of the activities away from the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center.

Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General of the United States, in the covering letter of his report, which he sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army, said:

> March 14, 1963.
>
> *To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:*
>
> Enclosed is our report on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles, by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.
>
> Our review of repair parts support disclosed that lack of repair parts in the Army supply system contributed to the reduction in the combat readiness of certain of the Army's combat and combat-support vehicles. Furthermore, the lack of repair parts was the primary reason for the incurrence of unnecessary costs of at least $500,000 during fiscal year 1961 by emergency procurements of parts locally that are normally procured centrally at lower prices. The management deficiencies that we identified as factors primarily responsible for the lack of repair parts were (1) delays in awarding contracts after procurement decisions were made, (2) delays in determining whether to procure, and (3) delays in determining needs for parts.
>
> In commenting on the matters in this report, the Army appeared to minimize the significance of our findings, advising that the Army Tank-Automotive Center was managing 81,000 line items and at no time during the period June 30, 1959, through December 31, 1961, did the number of out-of-stock items exceed 1.24 percent. We found that there are only 12,500 active and critical line items controlled by the Center. Although these items should have received priority management attention, we found that as of December 31, 1961, 1,010, or 8 percent of these more essential items were out of stock.
>
> The Army agreed with our facts and advised us that corrective action was being taken in the deficient areas noted during our review. However, the effort of the Army to minimize the significance of the extent to which the Center was unable to provide a timely supply of parts for combat and combat-support vehicles suggests that the deficiencies we have identified may not receive appropriate management attention. These parts which can have a significant effect on material readiness and combat capability of Army forces deserve thorough administrative surveillance to insure adequate repair parts support. We plan to review the effectiveness of the actions taken by the Army in subsequent reviews of repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles.
>
> Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.
>
> Joseph Campbell,
> *Comptroller General of the United States.*

It would seem that the $500,000 in unnecessary costs during fiscal year 1961, which the General Accounting Office study disclosed, practically wiped out any savings which the Army promised to make by closing the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center.

But, of course, this is not the worst part of the matter, for the combat readiness of American forces was drastically reduced and at a very critical time during this cold war period.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the facts uncovered by the Comptroller General took place immediately prior to and during the crisis with Cuba when we were as close to a major war as we have been since the end of World War II.

I think it behooves everyone in this House, and the Senate, and especially members of the appropriate committees, to look into this situation and to hold the Department of the Army to account.

I include the following information from the March 1963 report of the Comptroller General of the United States as a part of my remarks:

1. GAO finding: The combat readiness of the Army's combat and combat support vehicles was reduced because of the lack of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: The lack of repair parts impaired the effectiveness of the Army's combat and combat support vehicles. The ordnance system was consistently out-of-stock on substantial quantities of active repair parts and this condition had directly contributed to deadlined vehicles at Army installations throughout the world.

3. GAO recommendation: (a) Steps be taken including the purification of usage data, to provide better assurance that supply control studies are made in a timely manner.

(b) Procedures be established for reviewing past supply and procurement actions for the purpose of determining why stocks of repair parts line items reached a critical level so that appropriate measures can be taken to minimize the recurrence of the same situations.

4. (a) Facts presented by GAO: (1) The report cites that GAO reviews during 1960 of six troop installations in the United States and the 8th U.S. Army in Korea disclosed that the lack of about 550 different repair part line items was deadlining about 600 vehicles. Examples are provided with respect to impaired equipment conditions which prevailed in Korea and at Ft. Bragg and Ft. Knox during the period from September 1959 to August 1960.

(2) Consistent with shortages noted at the troop installations, the review found that Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command was usually out-of-stock on a substantial number of the approximately 12,500 active repair part line items, at 30 June 1961, considered essential for the operation of combat and combat support vehicles. Over the period from mid-1959 to the end of 1961, the number of active out-of-stock items ranged from 268 to 1,010, a substantial portion of which were considered combat essential. Some outstanding orders had remained unfilled for more than a year, including those for two examples cited of items having application to combat and combat support vehicles. As of September 10, 1961, Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command had 15,662 orders outstanding for repair parts, 1,034 of which were for parts needed to remove vehicles from deadline.

(b) Additional facts:

(1) During and prior to fiscal year 1961, Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command lacked the manpower and operating funds to enable it to hold the number of out-of-stock items at or below 1 percent of its active line items. Not until fiscal year 1962 were additional personnel spaces and operating funds provided to assist toward accomplishment of this objective.

(2) In February 1960 the flow of Army stock fund money was interrupted by a reduction in the Army stock fund operating program because stock fund sales did not materialize at the level programed. The reduction resulted in a suspension of approximately $10 million in central procurement actions in various stages of completion, including opened and unopened bids and unfinalized negotiated actions. This also increased the leadtime for subsequent procurement actions by 90 days or more.

5. Department of the Army position:

(a) Concur in the findings as to the conditions which heretofore existed at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command and as to the conclusions regarding their adverse impact on the effectiveness of certain of the Army's equipment. Also concur in the recommendations.

(b) As mentioned in the report, there were 81,000 Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command repair parts line items in the Ordnance supply system with an inventory at nine CONUS depots and oversea installations valued at $861 million. An operation of this magnitude encounters many serious and complex problems even under ideal conditions and circumstances, not the least of which is the availability of adequate personnel and funds. The lack of adequate manpower and operating funds at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, together with the described temporary suspension of fund availability for Army stock fund procurements, were among the main factors which contributed to the out-of-stock position of many of the active repair parts line items and precluded the full accomplishment of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command and Army objective of providing timely support to troop units.

(c) Concurrently with the provision of increased personnel spaces and operating funds for supply management operations, early in fiscal year 1962 Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command effected internal transfers of additional personnel from other activities. Utilization of electronic data processing techniques was increased in supply studies involving the $1,000-$5,000 annual issue range and this has served to free supply analysts from considerable detail, thus providing more capability to improve the analyses of replenishment requirements. The assignment of additional analysts, for which spaces have been allocated, will further assist in improving the quality of the analysis function. Additionally, a study is in process as to the feasibility of increasing the use of electronic data processing for high dollar issue items in order to further free analysts from detail and thereby improve the quality of supply control studies.

(d) Some improvement has already been noted in the timely performance of supply control studies and it is considered that an even greater and more significant improvement will be realized during the current fiscal year. However, the anticipated loss of experienced personnel in fiscal year 1963 may adversely affect this effort.

(e) Procedures have been placed into effect at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command to implement the GAO recommendations. Quality of demand data available at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command having improved, instructions were issued requiring commodity analysts to use recurring demands for establishing the average quarterly demand. Effective September 23, 1961, each supply control study was to include a historical summary, basic for average quarterly demand. A procedure (task list No. 710-14-2, revision 1—Supply Control Summary and Analysis Records, dated October 20, 1961) was established to review this summary. To complete implementation of the first GAO recommendation, all high and medium dollar items had to be reviewed. At the time of the GAO study, such an immediate review was impractical. However, since each of the items is studied on a 6-month cycle, each has now been reviewed under the revised procedures and the GAO recommendation is now deemed implemented.

(f) The same procedure requires the compilation of the data covered by the second GAO recommendation. Forecasts of supply demands are now required to be routinely measured against actual supply demands in computation of average quarterly demand.

(g) We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO finding: Unnecessary procurement costs were incurred due to lack of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: Based on the results of its review at Red River Arsenal and its limited review at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, the GAO estimates that the Ordnance depots in the United States were incurring unnecessary procurement costs of more than $500,000 annually. It was concluded that these depot procurements were necessitated by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command's inability to provide required repair parts to the depots and troop installations in a timely manner for application to deadlined vehicles and to depot vehicle rebuild programs.

3. GAO recommendations:

a. Steps be taken, including the purification of usage data, to provide better assurance that supply control studies are made in a timely manner.

b. Procedures be established to insure that procurement action is promptly initiated when a control study indicates that such action is necessary.

c. Controls be established to insure that contracts for repair parts are awarded promptly and that, in those instances where procurement is urgent, the contracting procedures be expedited.

d. When procurement is not initiated at the time a control study shows the item to be in a critical supply position, the decision not to procure be fully documented and approved by a responsible official.

e. Procedures be established for reviewing past supply and procurement actions for the purpose of determining why stocks of repair parts line items reached a critical level so that appropriate measures can be taken to minimize the recurrence of the same situations.

4. Facts presented by GAO:

a. At least 6 of the 50 repair parts reviewed at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command had been procured by various depots at average prices ranging from 21 to 251 percent higher than the prices paid by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command for the same items. A summary of 49 separate procurements of these six items was provided to demonstrate increased cost of over $25,000, or 45 percent higher than prices available to Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command through volume procurement. Two additional examples are cited of items procured by two depots at prices ranging from 26 to 164 percent higher than those paid by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command.

b. Additionally, Red River Arsenal was selected for a test of the extent of the questioned practice. The review, which was limited to individual procurements in excess of $500, disclosed that during fiscal year 1961 the arsenal paid $113,000, or 46 percent, more than Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command would have paid for the same items through centralized procurement. On the basis of this test, plus the observation that Red River Arsenal activity represented only 15 percent of the procurements reviewed, the GAO estimated that the nine ordnance depots in the United States were incurring unnecessary costs of over $500,000 annually in their procurement of centrally procurable items.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings of fact. With regard to the GAO estimate that over $500,000 in unnecessary costs were incurred as a result of the lack of central procurement, it must be emphasized that this is merely an estimate based upon a limited review and that only a more comprehensive examination of local procurement at all the depots would verify the accuracy of this estimate. Concur in the recommendations.

b. The need for local procurement was a direct result of the out-of-stock position. Under the circumstances, existing at the time, it is considered that the need to keep combat and combat support vehicles operative and to reduce or avoid deadlining of this equipment warranted the increased costs.

c. Actions leading to more effective central supply management and procurement, as indicated in position statements on other GAO findings, will serve to reduce local procurement at higher costs.

d. We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO finding: Failure to award procurements in a timely manner was a contributing cause to the unavailability of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: Long unanticipated and largely avoidable delays, after procurements were initiated, contributed to the resulting out-of-stock position of hundreds of active items of supply.

3. GAO recommendations:

a. Procedures be established to insure that procurement action is promptly initiated when a control study indicates that such action is necessary.

b. Controls be established to insure that contracts for repair parts are awarded promptly and that, in those instances where procurement is urgent, the contracting procedures be expedited.

4. a. Facts presented by GAO:

(1) Test of 103 procurements disclosed that only 23, or 22 percent, were awarded within the administrative leadtime of 90 to 120 days established by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command. A review of 1869 procurement actions, other than small purchases, disclosed that, on 852 of these actions, over 120 days elapsed between the time procurement personnel were advised to initiate procurement action and the dates contracts were awarded.

(2) Test of 38 procurement requests disclosed it took an average of 27 days for supply personnel to advise procurement personnel to initiate procurement action.

(3) Test of about 50 repair parts showed that, in 9 instances involving 17 procurement actions, the actual time lapse between date of supply control study and date of contract far exceeded the administrative leadtime; one cited case involving 28 months. In 4 cases of successive contracts involving 12 procurement actions, the actual time lapse ranged from 68 to as much as 372 days. Only four of these procurement actions were accomplished within the established administrative lead time.

b. Additional facts:

(1) In several of the procurement actions, delays arose because of Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command efforts to reduce the volume of noncompetitive procurement. The use of competitive procurement on items previously bought from established producers calls for more exact technical data than previously needed. Inexperienced producers are prone to submit technically questionable bids which must be closely scrutinized to determine responsiveness. Delays thus encountered cannot be anticipated.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings presented, subject however to the mitigating circumstances described above as the underlying causes which existed in several of the cited instances of delay. Concur in the conclusion, except that, as explained, some of the delays were unavoidable. Concur in the recommendations.

b. Supply management procedures (Task List No. 710-45-2 (milstrip) Supply Control—High Dollar Supply Control Studies, dated June 29, 1962) now require forwarding of a procurement requisition within 14 days from the date of the supply study generating it.

c. Administrative lead times, as established, were merely target estimates rather than estimates of the actual time expected to be needed. Target estimate lead time is no longer used. Case-by-case estimates are now being based upon all known information regarding parts purchases and any troubles that can be anticipated. An additional 30 days has been added to cover supply management time and to provide a cushion against unexpected delay.

d. Out-of-stock items are now plainly marked and are walked through, as far as possible, on an expedited basis.

e. Since purchasing delays were mostly those which could not and cannot be anticipated, it is considered that the actions by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, in reducing the requisition forwarding time to 14 days and in providing adequate lead time for unexpected contingencies at the supply study point, will serve to effect timely awards of procurement and thus avoid depletion of stocks before contract deliveries are received.

f. We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO finding: Procurements not initiated when shown to be needed by supply control studies were a second contributing cause to the unavailability of repair parts.

a. GAO conclusion: When finally initiated, procurements were too late to prevent repair parts from going out of stock before replenishment could be obtained. This resulted in deadlined combat and combat support vehicles because of lack of repair parts.

3. GAO recommendations:

a. Procedures be established to insure that procurement action is promptly initiated when a control study indicates that such action is necessary.

b. When procurement is not initiated at the time a control study shows the item to be in a critical supply position, the decision not to procure be fully documented and approved by a responsible official.

4. a. Facts presented by GAO:

Of 395 supply control studies reviewed, 283, or 72 percent, showed procurements were necessary. However, only 126 of the studies resulted in procurement being initiated and almost half of these were initiated too late to prevent repair parts from going out of stock. Four examples were cited.

b. Additional facts:

(1) In February 1960 a program adjustment reduced ASF funding at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command which forced a temporary suspension of all replenishment procurement. Supply studies which had been made at that time could not be followed up by procurement requisitions until the program was reappraised.

(2) Supervisory personnel responsible for making procurement decisions were overloaded by having to guide 23 analysts each. The need for closer supervision was recognized by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command in November 1960 and corrective measures were instituted.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings and conclusion. Concur in the recommendations, in general, subject to qualification. There are circumstances under which procurement should not follow where a supply study indicates a need for stock replenishment. These include situations where requirements can be met by overhaul of unserviceable repairable assets; where recorded demands are questionable, until the questionable aspects have been resolved; and where cyclic studies show insignificant quantities are required.

b. The ASF program reduction compelled an immediate cutoff of central purchase, local purchase, and reimbursement for returns. This resulted in out-of-stock position of many critical items and adversely affected the combat readiness of combat and combat support equipment in troop units. No similar drastic program change has since been imposed.

c. The overloading of supervisors has been corrected and each supervisor is now responsible for only nine analyses. Current instructions at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command (task list No. 735-10-2 (milstrip)—supply control, dated June 29, 1962) require each supervisor to review each supply study and approve or disapprove action recommended by the respective commodity analysts.

d. It is considered that the reduction in ASF funding restrictions, the addition of more personnel as described in another finding hereunder and the formalized instructions have served to improve procurement results at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, illustrated by the fact that 26,000 lines having a value of $202 million were procured in fiscal year 1962, compared with 12,000 lines valued at $76 million procured in fiscal year 1961.

e. We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO findings: Reorder warning point was understated and represented a third contributing cause to the unavailability of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: The understatement of reorder warning point resulted in supply of repair parts becoming critical by the time they were studied and procurement action initiated.

3. GAO recommendation: None. The report acknowledged that, after GAO had advised Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command officials of the deficiencies noted, Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command promptly issued new procedures to be followed which, with adequate supervision, should minimize recurrence of the problem.

4. Facts presented by GAO: Of 61 reorder warning points computations reviewed on 22 repair parts, 26 computations affecting 13 repair parts were understated. Six examples were cited. In January 1961 GAO advised Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command supply officials of deficiencies stemming from the failure of supply analysts to furnish total procurement leadtime to the electronic data processing computer, and from the analysts' incorrect computation of requirements.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings and conclusion. There were no recommendations.

b. Revised procedures were placed in use in January 1961 and were later refined and incorporated into task list No. 735-10-3 (Milstrip)—financial inventory accounting, June 29, 1962. The electronic data processing computer now computes monthly demands and, using this data, automatically recalculates an updated reorder warning point each month.

c. It is considered that the computer calculation will eliminate errors of the type found in the review. Additionally, case-by-case estimates of administrative leadtime should further assist in assuring that supply studies will be made before a critical point is reached.

Mr. Speaker, one of the scant actions of this 88th Congress during the first 3 months of the 1st session, was the passage of H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. The House Armed Forces Committee added $134 million for nuclear submarines, and $363,700,000 for RS-70 planes. The House followed the recommendations of the committee, and the President's budget request was increased by $497,700,000. At the same time, a House Armed Services Subcommittee voted to increase the military pay bill by $500 million. What really concerns me is how we can ever reduce defense costs when our most conservative colleagues, who talk so loudly about budget cutting, vote to support the defense industry lobbyists who come before the Congress each year and cry so loudly for more and more billions. I know this bothers our able Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, who has been under heavy attack for his decisions which, if we support them, can save billions of dollars in defense costs. After one such attack recently he said, in a speech to a meeting of the Advertising Council in Washington, according to the Baltimore Sun of March 14, 1963:

> The man who made that attack yesterday is a member of the committee that added $1,100 million to the Defense budget. I don't think it is right when we have a man to support an irresponsible action in adding $1 billion to the budget that is not needed and then criticize the responsible official who took out the billion.

Mr. Speaker, the phased out Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., eliminated 500 highly skilled defense workers when it closed in 1961. This plant cost the taxpayers $5 million to build and equip. Today, the Federal Government has not yet been able to recover one nickel. Why? Well, for one reason, because the Army, representing the Government in this instance, does not own the ground on which the plant was built. I ask you, my colleagues, how would you like to build a $5 million house on ground that you do not own or even have a long-term lease for?

TOO BUSY TO RETIRE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Harding] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **HARDING**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HARDING**. Mr. Speaker, Idaho's first citizen in the minds of thousands of our citizens is U.S. District Judge Chase A. Clark.

Judge Clark started his law practice in Mackay, Idaho, in 1904 and went on to serve in both houses of the State legislature and as mayor of Idaho Falls. Later he became one of our most outstanding Governors. I know that in my short career in public life I have been greatly encouraged by the example set by this outstanding man, and have benefited from his counsel and advice.

Judge Clark is also the father-in-law of our distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. One of the more satisfying experiences I have received from serving in the Congress has been the close association that Mrs. Harding and I have enjoyed with Senator Frank Church and his lovely wife, Bethine, the daughter of this distinguished jurist and public servant.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to include at this point in the Record an article which was printed in the Boise, Idaho, Daily Statesman, on Friday, March 15, commenting on Judge Clark's 80th birthday and his life of accomplishment.

The article follows:

Too Busy To Retire—Judge Chase Clark Starts 21st Year on U.S. Bench; Recalls Appointment by Late President Roosevelt

When the Boise Federal Building personnel started arriving for work this morning, striding along was a spry and smiling young man of 80, showing up for his day's work. Greeted on all sides by coworkers and fellow-townsmen, Federal Judge Chase A. Clark was starting his 21st year on the Federal bench, stretching out a determination to keep busy rather than accept a deserved Federal retirement at a $22,500 salary.

The legal problem that confronted Judge Clark on his anniversary day had to do with an estate problem involving minor children. That kind of legal challenge will keep the venerable jurist busy for most of the morning. Every detail will receive careful attention. Judge Clark happens to be one of the kindest men ever to sit in any court. The children are in good hands.

His legal work out of the way, Judge Clark will have a heavy calendar as friends come by to congratulate him, not only for his long period of service, but for the great personal trait that has kept him in his assignment, monthly in the Boise court but in special work in Federal courts all over the Nation. Just last month Judge Clark was presiding judge in Federal court at Phoenix.

Asked why he continued working long after his retirement age 10 years ago when he was 70, Judge Clark said:

"I could have retired when I was 70. My salary would have come along just the same the rest of my life. I'm really working for nothing but I love my work.

"No one has suggested that I retire. A person is not able to judge himself correctly. I figure I have enough friends who, if they thought I was in my dotage, they'd come and tell me. They haven't."

Judge Clark is perhaps as well and favorably known as any other Idaho citizen. His Idaho career was climaxed by a term as Governor from 1940 to 1943. He has served in both Idaho legislative houses, and was mayor of Idaho Falls when he was elected the State's chief executive. He started his law career in Mackay in 1904 when he was 21. Later he practiced law at Hailey.

"How did I get this job?" Judge Clark was asked.

"I happened to be in Washington while I was Governor trying to get some Federal money into Idaho. I had an appointment with President Roosevelt. I was going to talk about getting the Navy into Pend Oreille. As I was going into the White House an Associated Press man came up and showed me a dispatch which said Judge Charles Cavanaugh had resigned as Idaho's Federal judge.

"I went in and talked to the President about the money matter and when I got up to leave I said 'Mr. President, I note that the Federal bench in Idaho is to be vacant. Why don't you give me that job?'

"The President replied: 'All right, Chase, you can have it.' "

I was appointed March 15, 1943. And I've been in this nice office ever since.

Some observations from the judge:

On being a legislator: "In the legislature in 1913 there weren't any problems at all. It was just a question of getting some money for Custer County. In 1932 in the senate it was different. Very strenuous. Relief for the unemployed was the problem."

On his daily life: "I'm busy here in my office. The work is most of my life. I get up at 7:30, earlier if I have a problem on my mind.

Most satisfying experience: "In 20 years on the bench I have admitted more than 2,000 citizens to citizenship. This is my biggest thrill. I am also satisfied by the fact that men who have been convicted in my court and placed on probation have made good a hundred percent. This is a great thing. It is forgotten they were ever in trouble."

Most interesting case: "Not one. Many. During the war a lot of men came into court to get their jobs back after fighting the war. We saw to it."

The lawyers obligation: "The lawyer must render public service. I believe lawyers give more service gratis than any other profession. I have found them very conscientious in their work."

About young people: "I urge young folks to seek the job they feel they would like. A paycheck isn't most important. Young folks are getting along as well today as they did when I was one of them."

Politics: "I have always been a Democrat. I believe all a person needs to be is a loyal American. Politics is no good if it goes over everything else."

Judge Clark's job has not only made him a familiar figure in Idaho. He is often assigned to sit in for judges in other States. Doing this he has traveled to Alaska, Hawaii, North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, and California.

The judge was married to Mrs. Clark, the former Jean Burnett, of Mackay, in Mackay 57 years ago.

"Our golden wedding anniversary," he said, "was a great day. Every day is a great day."

"Jean told me not to have my picture taken smoking a pipe so I didn't. Don't wear your glasses, either," she said.

"Which reminds me," he recollected. "I didn't have to put them on to pass my last driving test."

FISCAL SOCIALISM

Mr. **HARRISON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of the Wall Street Journal contains a very learned and perceptive analysis of the fiscal developments that have occurred during the time that the Kennedy administration took office in January 1961.

It will be recalled that during the course of the inaugural proceedings the American people were admonished to inquire what they could give to their Government rather than what Government could give to them. Those stirring, if not particularly original words received a very favorable public reaction indicating a willingness on the part of the American people to respond to leadership that would instill fiscal integrity and sound economics in programs and policies of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, that leadership has not been forthcoming and instead the American people have been subjected to a revival of the tired, unimaginative, and unworkable theories of the New Deal.

The Wall Street Journal article by Prof. Wilhelm Roepke constitutes a major contribution to the literature pertaining to America's fiscal policy. I have in the past repeatedly pointed out that Federal, State, and local taxes in our Nation take one-third of the total net national product. I have gone on to suggest that this statistic presents an alarming measurement of the extent to which we have gone in socializing the efforts of our citizens. Many people do not recognize that the social planners who have failed in their efforts to bring about socialism by political change have, to a very large extent in the last three decades, accomplished their purpose by fiscal policy that entails spiraling Government taxation, unrestrained budget expenditures and mounting public indebtness. The result of their successful endeavors has been to bring about a degree of fiscal socialism not generally recognized. Mr. Speaker, I will as a part of my remarks include Professor Roepke's article as contained in the Wall Street Journal.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 1, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S ECONOMICS: A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

(NOTE.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a long-time student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics of the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a "New Deal." "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If, today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the New Frontier has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unsolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payments deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtapositions of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepancies between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control, discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country "enjoying" a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital-poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achieve a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stopped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically feasible or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's "guidelines."

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis, which must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately solvable by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy, Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn Government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the "Keynesian" variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring "rounds" of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the international community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the "key currrency," cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry which will fall." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLAME UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the Americans in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that this hoped-for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too-precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and "repressed inflation." As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the "New Deal" and "New Frontier" finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of "big government" and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the Government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that government expenditures insure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well as in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it "takes off" like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of "high mass consumption." In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by "democratization" and "liberalization." This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forebearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accouterments of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most egregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE RICH GOT RICH

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudo-religion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

A BILL TO PERMIT THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALIST WOMEN AND THE ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN TO MERGE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will permit the Association of Universalist Women and the Alliance of Unitarian Women to merge. This action is made necessary by the previous merger of the Unitarian and Universalist churches. To avoid the necessity of obtaining judicial interpretations of past and present gifts and legacies, the two groups will consolidate and the property now owned by the two groups will, after merger, become the property of the new organization.

Congressional participation in this procedure is required because the Universalist group is incorporated in the District of Columbia. The Unitarian group is incorporated in Massachusetts, and similar action by the State legislature has already been initiated.

UNITED STATES SIDING WITH COMMUNISTS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, impossible as it may seem, it now appears likely that the United States will protect Castro from the Cuban exile armed attacks in their valiant efforts to free their beloved homeland and their enslaved fellow citizens.

The tortuous logic employed by the President and the State Department relies heavily on the President's contention that these armed attacks do not weaken Castro and communism's stranglehold on Cuba, but on the contrary, strengthen them. This reasoning, of course, is fallacious but by taking this position we are now in the position of doing these things. First, siding with Castro against the exiled Cuban patriots; second, alining ourselves with Castro-Khrushchev policies to the detriment of the enslaved people and the exiles, so much so that our policy may indeed be manipulated in the future by Khrushchev's dictation to Castro whose wishes are then relayed to us; third, a slowdown in our demands for demilitarization of Cuba, including the return of Russian soldiers and military arms; fourth, the recognition, if not invitation, for Russia to provide armed escorts for its vessels for shipping to Cuba.

In short, we are not only condoning the presence of internationally dominated communism under Khrushchev to maintain its beachhead in Cuba but are giving military protection to this base for subversion of the rest of Latin and South America. In all of this, we are crushing the hopes of the Cuban patriots without and within Cuba who seek to throw off the Communist tyrants, the puppet Castro and Big Boss Khrushchev.

This shameful and unbelievable situation is the result of watchful waiting, drifting, and a refusal to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, to blockade Cuba, and to free Cuba from the Communists, as the last and present administrations have promised to do.

How far the United States has fallen in its leadership, and uncompromising dedication to the preservation of liberty for all people.

The course of victory, freedom, preservation of U.S. sovereignty, and strengthening of the free world is not easy but is a course we must chart and follow now or surely fall under Communist domination. We must reimpose the Monore Doctrine. We must blockade Cuba. We must encourage Cuban patriots within and without Cuba to throw off their Communist leaders. We must do this now or Latin and South America will fall, country by country, until the United States stands alone in the Western Hemisphere. If the subversion of Latin and South America continues, God forbid, through our supine inactivity the day of fait accompli will be at hand and the ultimatum of Khrushchev leading world communism will be delivered when we stand alone in our Hemisphere. We dare not continue the present drift and lack of a firm aggressive policy. Time is short, but prompt action can save us and the other nations of this hemisphere.

CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM-COMMUNISM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the clash between capitalism and socialism will be resolved with only one system winning. The systems are incompatible. Fuzzy intellectuals as would-be scholars, do-gooders, one-worlders lose sight of basic principles, as does Khrushchev and fellow Communists. The Socialists and Communists lose sight of the most fundamental proposition—we are dealing with human beings, not animals or slaves, all philosophies to the contrary notwithstanding.

Human beings work best with incentives, for themselves, and their loved ones. This is happiness, and all men yearn for it. The ones who refuse to recognize this are the power-seeking would-be dictators, social planners, manipulators, tyrants, czars, and others wishing to control the masses. Capitalism will win because men and women will work harder for themselves and their loved ones than they will for government.

The United States has proven this. Other societies in other times have proved this. Socialistic experiments have all failed. Yet many in our enlightened era have not learned the obvious truths of a free society, whose economic system must be capitalism, the essence of freedom and accompanying human happiness. Freedom, happiness, prosperity, self-achievement, high standard of living, cultural development, all are inextricably interwoven and go together in the capitalistic system. The profit motive is good; it is human. Profits are the reward for effort in capitalism, and the profitmaker is happy in his success and freedom to achieve. The only achievement in socialism to be equated with happiness is the absence of punishment when one does as told to do by government order.

The simple truths of capitalism—freedom, the reward for effort, ingenuity, hustle, and sweat, are forgotten as social planners conceive more ideal societies. Their mistakes are in forgetting human nature and in trying to prescribe the activities of their fellow mortals as though in planning they are endowed with godlike wisdom, and that others will happily accept their orders instead of resenting them and refusing to perform as planned.

It is simple when viewed objectively. Human beings want to be free, want to do what they want, and resent being dictated to or forced to work for others not by their choice.

So the battle, still joined, will be solved, with or without many people knowing the nature of the struggle. It is my hope that my colleagues and our constituents will see the nature of the struggle and help assure the successful victory of capitalism instead of losing by default as Federal planners put it over on them. In this vein I want to include the study of "Capitalism and Communism" in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1963:

CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

MOSCOW.—"I suppose it could be said," a Russian cautiously declares at the end of a long dinner debate with an American here, "that our system is becoming more like yours and yours like ours."

Though it comes from a citizen of Khrushchev's Russia, this statement is remarkably similar to a sentiment increasingly heard in the West these days: That the differences between the Soviet and American systems are narrowing, and that the two will eventually blur into some sort of hybrid system.

Superficially, some developments on both sides of the Iron Curtain suggest a narrowing of the gap. The Russian above cites such things as social security in the United States and France's postwar experiments with economic planning. His American acquaintance counters by listing some recent Soviet developments.

First, there is the feud with Red China, in which the Russians have taken a more tolerant line toward the capitalist world. Second, there is Premier Nikita Khrushchev's recent injunction to his economic chiefs, to "learn from the capitalists" how to solve some of their problems. And there is the new economic ferment: Some soviet economists have advocated a partial decontrolling of the country's socialized industry and wider use of of the capitalistic profit motive to spur production.

DE GAULLE'S VISION

Whether or not Russia is moving toward capitalism—or only appearing to do so—is of importance. If a genuine evolution is under way, it would make possible real East-West coexistence instead of the present uneasy truce. But if the trends within Russia are only an illusion, they might cause the West to lower its guard prematurely. Even now, President Kennedy's grand design of a close-knit Atlantic community alined against Russia is threatened by French President de Gaulle's rival vision of an independent Europe, stretching ultimately "from the Atlantic to the Urals."

Underlying that vision is the general's belief that the Russians are gradually becoming Westernized. Reports of capitalistic or other liberalizing tendencies in the U.S.S.R. lend support to this theory. Moreover, the notion of an ultimate ideological compromise appeals to many European pacifists who think East-West differences have been exaggerated.

Nevertheless, a meeting of the two systems somewhere in between does not appear very likely—at least not as long as the present generation of Soviet rulers remains in power.

For one thing, most of the moving would have to be done by Russia and not by the West. Indeed, there is considerable doubt whether the West has moved in Russia's direction at all. The welfare state legislation of the American New Deal, for example, had it roots not in Bolshevik Russia but in the Germany of the 1880's, where ultraconservative Chancellor Bismarck pushed through a social security system to steal the thunder of the Social Democrats. As for the future, the United States is in no mood to go very far in the direction of Russia's 100-percent socialized economy. Nobody in the United States—not even the most extreme liberal—is talking of nationalizing anything.

Even in socialistic Western Europe, the big wave of nationalization is over. State takeovers to date have been limited mainly to basic industries producing a homogeneous product and relatively easy to administer—railroads, utilities, and banks. The economic planning that goes on in France is utterly different from Russia's. Carried out in a spirit of cooperation between government and private industry, it is limited to capital investment and is not strictly compulsory.

In short, there appears to be a sticking point beyond which the Western democracies will not go in any supposed "evolution" toward the Soviet model.

If the West is unlikely to "move" toward Russia, the latter seems equally disinclined to move toward the West. For the men in the Kremlin, too, there is a sticking point: Relaxation of control over every phase of Soviet life from poetry-writing to pig-farming. Unsure of popular support and intent on overtaking the United States, Russia's rulers cannot, in their own view, leave anything to chance. The economy is completely state controlled. Industry, trade, and agriculture, for all practical purposes, belong to the state as surely as the Army and Post Office Department belong to the U.S. Government.

Then what about those recent developments that suggest Russia is moving down the road toward capitalism?

The feud with Red China is the least convincing bit of evidence, for it centers more on the inevitability of war than on future internal developments in Russia. The fact that Mr. Khrushchev considers coexistence with the West necessary in an era of thermonuclear weapons has not dimmed his belief that capitalism will be buried through peaceful competition and subversion.

Mr. K's injunction to Russia's economic chiefs to learn from the capitalists is somewhat more intriguing. It indicates a new appreciation of areas in which Western practice is superior to Russia's, e.g., in standardizing components, eliminating the duplication of production facilities, and junking obsolete machinery. But this hardly means Mr. Khrushchev wants to remodel his economy extensively along capitalist lines.

Generally, when the Soviet Premier praises capitalist accomplishments, he is trying to goad his subordinates into outdoing the capitalists—but by socialist means. If private businessmen in the West do certain things well, he recently declared, "then the planned, socialist system can even more successfully use its inherent advantages to speed the technological progress of production, and to increase the output of products and improve their quality."

If this sounds like so much hot air, it nevertheless illustrates Mr. K's unwavering belief that socialism will prove superior in the long run. As far as he is concerned, Russia is not moving toward capitalism but further away from it, hopefully to "pure communism" sometime after 1980.

LIBERMAN'S PROPOSALS

Many in the West see a more hopeful sign of evolution in the new economic ferment in Russia. In particular, they cite the proposals of Y. G. Liberman, the Kharkov economics professor, to grant more powers to Russia's tightly reined factory directors and to let the pursuit of profits boost production and raise the quality of goods. The men in the Kremlin may think Russia is moving toward pure communism, these Western observers say, but it's more likely that they will be forced to make some "capitalistic" changes in their system long before 1980.

Unquestionably, Professor Liberman's proposals, if adopted, could mark a first step down the road toward some sort of Western-style market economy. The fact that his and other proposals have been printed at all shows that an important "thaw" is taking place in Soviet economic thinking. But there is no guarantee the Liberman scheme will ever be adopted. And even if it is, it would still leave the hard-core features of the Soviet system—state ownership of all production facilities, central planning, wage and price controls, and political dictatorship—intact.

Indeed, Professor Liberman's proposals are "capitalistic" only in the sense that the one rational direction in which Russia's system can go is toward increased delegation of power to the man on the spot. Yet despite their mildness, there's plenty of opposition. Even O. Antonov, the aircraft designer who has praised some of capitalism's features, warns self-righteously in a recent issue of Izvestia that profits, "taken by themselves" as an indicator of efficiency—as Professor Liberman proposes—"are, I would say, commercial and in practice sometimes mercenary."

There's a far more important objection. Some Western analysts—and probably many Russians—doubt the proposals would work without more decontrol than the Kharkov professor has called for. For example, price control and centrally planned distribution might have to be abolished or at least relaxed before factory directors would really get interested in maximizing profits. Otherwise, how could they shop around for raw materials or haggle over prices?

IMPLICATIONS FOR PARTY MEN

All this must raise fearsome implications for many Russians. For the various controls over the Soviet economy reinforce each other. Take some of them away, and the others are weakened. To some conservative Communists, any harmless-looking proposal to prune away red tape is really a bid by the economists and professional managers to take over. Since they might do a better job than is being done now, there would be less need for trouble-shooting by the local Communist Party officials who constantly look over their shoulders—and thus enable Moscow politicians to control Russia's economy.

Thus, few drastic changes are likely as long as Mr. Khrushchev rules Russia, short of a major economic catastrophe analogous to the 1929 stock market crash and subsequent depression in the United States. The men deemed most likely to succeed Mr. K. undoubtedly share his fear of introducing any real spontaneity into the system. Indeed, when the going gets rough the Soviet leaders are just as likely to tighten the screws as loosen them. The creation of a new Supreme Economic Council, announced last week, apparently will tighten control somewhat.

Even if some liberalization takes place later on—and this isn't precluded by the latest action—the sticking point would quickly be reached. In the arts, this seems to have happened already. Early this month Mr. Khrushchev told Russia's writers and artists, who have been increasingly bold of late, that they will not be allowed to create whatever they please.

Ultimately, perhaps when a new generation comes to power in Russia, true evolution toward capitalism may begin. But for the foreseeable future, barring a popular uprising which most observers consider unlikely, talk of the two systems "moving closer together" is largely wishful thinking.

CUBAN CAVES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former Ambassador to Mexico, the Honorable Robert C. Hill, sent me a copy of an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 30, 1963.

Entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba," the editorial comments on the possibility of "underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba."

The Honorable Robert C. Hill greatly distinguished himself as our Ambassador to the Mexican Republic. He made many friends for the United States.

While others were beguiled by Fidel Castro, Ambassador Hill was alert to the threat posed by the bearded demagog. He deserves recognition and appreciation by all Americans for his devoted service to our country.

The editorial follows:

The Secret Caves of Cuba

As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.

Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top Government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldiers, reportedly including Czechs.

What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerably activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access."

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspected cave locations. In view of the shortage of aboveground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relatively simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.

To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarine pens.

If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.

To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

FARM SUBSIDIES—FACT AND FICTION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, American farmers are often unfairly criticized by people in our urban areas who do not quite understand the problems of our agricultural population. This is often due to poor public relations and, hence, I am always pleased when someone comes up with the facts and truth about expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. A splendid article by Lauren Soth appeared recently in the Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register, and it is worthy of note and attention. I wish to include it herewith as part of my remarks:

FARM SUBSIDIES—FACT AND FICTION

(By Lauren Soth)

How much Federal subsidy does agriculture receive?

Those who oppose farm programs, price supports, and payments to farmers usually label as farm subsidy the entire U.S. Department of Agriculture budget, which recently has been running around $6 to $7 billion per year. And, by using a little arithmetic, such a figure can be made to seem outlandish Federal spending for farmers.

The last census showed 3.7 million farms in the United States. Divide that into $7 billion and you get nearly $2,000 of Fedral expenditure per farm.

If you eliminate the 1.6 million noncommercial farms (those with total sales less than $2,500), that leaves only about 2 million real farms and it appears that Uncle Sam is spending $3,500 for each one of them.

Farmers and their leaders have tried to explain that everything in the USDA budget is not of benefit to farmers. However, the exaggeration of farm subsidies still goes on.

Recently, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE (Democrat, of Georgia), got the Department of Agriculture to break down its proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning next July to identify expenditures which are not subsidies to farmers. This breakdown is shown in the accompanying table.

Only the $2,606 million shown in the last part of the table can be properly called farm subsidy.

It is true, of course, that the exports of food at cutrate prices and donations of food to foreign countries benefit agriculture. But foreign aid in money also benefits certain U.S. industries. The foreign recipients use the dollars to buy machinery and other goods in the United States. The food-for-peace program is foreign aid and should be classed as such in the Federal budget, just as other grants or loans to foreign countries are.

It is also true that food distribution programs, including the food stamp plan, are of some benefit to farmers, although in this case the benefit is very small. But the main benefit is to poor people in this country who receive balanced diets they could not otherwise obtain.

One of the biggest illusions of all is that the vast programs of agricultural research, education, and technical assistance are of primary advantage to the farmer.

These public efforts to stimulate more efficient farm production help the consumer directly by lowering the cost of food.

Individual farmers who adopt new methods first tend to gain a temporary benefit from them. But, in the long run, farmers as a group actually suffer a cut in income from this advance of productivity.

The reason for this is that, in a rich country, demand for food is highly inelastic. A 5-percent increase in total output of food in this country results in a 20-percent reduction in price. Thus, a larger supply sells for less gross revenue.

Programs which tend to stimulate more farm output, therefore, are not a subsidy to farmers but to consumers.

This is the basic reason why production controls, price supports, and other subsidies are necessary. In a sense, the expenditures in the last section of the accompanying table are a consequence of the expenditures for research and education just above them.

If the Government only spent money for farm research and education, the farmer's income would slide downhill rapidly. There is no way that the individual farmer can protect himself against the oversupply and low-price situation. What he does by himself has no effect on the market, so he must produce as much as he can at all times.

When farmers can work together to discipline themselves to restrain production and marketing, they can develop bargaining power to hold their own in an inelastic demand situation. Some small commodity groups do this with the help of Government marketing orders and agreements. The big sectors of farming, however, such as wheat, cotton, feed grains-livestock, have to rely on more direct Government action to either (1) offset the effects of lower market prices through subsidies or (2) help farmers keep production in check.

That the work of USDA is not entirely for the benefit of farmers is shown by a study prepared by Walter W. Wilcox, economist for the Library of Congress.

Wilcox calculated that food costs today are $4 to $6 billion a year less than they would be if prices of farm products had risen as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the last 8 years. This amounts to a saving of about $100 per family.

These savings may be compared with average costs of farm income-support programs of $1.9 billion per year in 1953–54 and $2.6 billion per year in 1961 and 1962.

It would appear from these figures that the U.S. consumer has been doing very well, on balance, between expenditures for farm subsidies and expenditures which reduce the cost of food. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture should be renamed the Department of Food and Agriculture.

It is as much a consumer's agency in the food field as a farmer's agency.

Proposed USDA budget

PROGRAMS WHICH BENEFIT GENERAL PUBLIC

	In millions
Food distribution programs:	
Purchase of surplus agricultural commodities	$164
Pilot food stamp plan	51
School lunch program	182
Special milk program	102
Total	499
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:	
Sales of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies	1,282
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	246
International wheat agreement	72
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	62
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services for milk and dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	40
Value of foreign currencies used by Defense Department for military housing and long-term supply contracts	284
Defense food stockpiling	30
Total	2,016
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment	448
Long-range programs for improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:	
Forest Service	311
Agricultural Research Service	195
Soil Conservation Service	195
Extension Service	77
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service	40
Agricultural Marketing Service, marketing research	43
Farmers Home Administration salaries and expenses	39
Expenses and staff offices for other agencies, including Rural Electrification Administration (REA), and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC)	94
	994
Total	3,957

PROGRAMS FOR STABILIZING FARM INCOME

Agricultural conservation program	214
Conservation reserve program	294
Land-use adjustment program	27
CCC price support, supply and related programs (less payments to VA and armed services for dairy products used in excess of normal requirements)	787
Grain acreage diversion payments	400
Grain price support payments	581
National Wool Act program	106
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses	115
Sugar Act program	84
Total	2, 608
Grand total	6, 565

CINCINNATUS' WORDS OF WISDOM AND CAUTION ON TOTALITARIAN DESPOTISM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Miss Taylor Caldwell, of Buffalo, N.Y., is an internationally famous American novelist, the author of many bestsellers.

She has a profound understanding of the philosophical, human and political fallacies and deceptions contained in the Soviet-directed Communist drive for the destruction of the free world. She is a dedicated defender of our liberties, an ardent Conservative, a true liberatarian.

Miss Caldwell recently wrote to me expressing her alarm over the tax reforms recommended in President Kennedy's budget message. Her letter was especially critical of the increased taxes that would be imposed upon the middle class of our citizens by the proposal to limit present deductible items for interest, charity, property and State taxes. In my answer, I expressed my opposition to the President's recommendations for these tax increases.

Miss Caldwell's letter enclosed portions of the speech of Cincinnatus, delivered in the Roman Senate, 300 B.C.

Cincinnatus perceived and eloquently stated that a free nation begins to perish when its citizens place their faith in men instead of in principles and laws. Today, there is a concerted effort being made to destroy the faith of our people in the U.S. Constitution and in the U.S. Congress. There is a subverting effort underway to condition the minds of our people for the acceptance of an all-planned, all-wise, all-powerful totalitarian Federal Government. The process is one of usurpation of power and misinterpretation of the purpose of the U.S. Constitution.

I believe that the words of wisdom and caution, contained in the following speech of Cincinnatus are especially applicable, today.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF CINCINNATUS, "FATHER OF HIS COUNTRY," DELIVERED TO THE ROMAN SENATE, 300 B.C., WHEN HE WAS CALLED UPON TO SAVE ROME FROM HER ENEMIES

My dear fellow countrymen, you have imposed upon me an honor and a terrible obligation and faith for which I am little fitted, for no man is worthy of the devotion of his people. Worthiness resides in no man, and let that nation beware which discovers itself regarding its temporal ruler as a divinity, fawning upon him, delighting in news of his comings and goings, reverencing him, listening to his words as though they rolled down from Olympus with the sound of thunder, ostracizing those who differ from him, raising up their voices like trumpets hailing all that he does, and deluding themselves that he is superior to those who have elevated him by vote or in the name of emergency.

For such a people have taken upon themselves the aspects of slaves. They have greatly injured their ruler by persuading him he is more than a man and that he does not possess their own evils and follies and weaknesses. If he becomes arrogant and oppressive this is the crime of his people, the crime above all other crimes, for they have endangered his stature as a man and have aroused in him base passions and have afflicted him with the wrath of God, who will have no rivals. Much has been written in history of the sufferings of nations under tyrants, but where does one read that the tyrant is the victim of his people and therefore more to be pitied? If, in your history, long after I am dust, you raise up a tyrant to destroy and enslave and terrify you, say not to him: "You have betrayed and imprisoned and tormented us beyond endurance." Say, rather to him: "Forgive us."

God, in His wisdom and knowledge and understanding has created infinite diversity among men, so that no man shall think or act or speak in the exact manner of his brother. This variety is our shield, our fortress, our wall, our immortal protection against despots, against error, against weakness, and evil. In argument, in difference, in dialog and in freedom of speech and in all liberty, the truth will emerge concerning man's duty and man's God. But let no ruler of mere flesh, unsanctified and in all ignorance no matter his learning, shout in your presence, "I alone am truth, and you shall believe it and speak no word against it." For truth comes only from God, the possessor of our days, the guardian of our nights, the ultimate receiver of our souls, the giver of our breath, the Light of our spirit.

No nation has ever perished until it has said, "My faith is in men, and he whom I have placed upon the throne which I have built with my own hands is the repository of wisdom and justice, and he I shall obey without question and with my heart's great loyalty and devotion. He is my law, and I delight in him, and bow my head before him." There are times of dire emergency when power is given to one man, but that time must be limited, and that man's days scanned sleeplessly lest he be devoured by ambition, and be a mischief.

You have called me from my peaceful fields and my household to save you. I shall, in the fear of God and in the wisdom with which He sees fit to endow me, serve you with courage and steadfastness and faith, and shall deliver you. But I implore you to let me go when my service has been rendered. For no man is worthy of the trust of his fellows, not even I, nor those who will come after me. For men are ambitious and their hearts are evil.

And now let us take up our duty and gird our strength and lift up our shields and our swords in defense of our country. Let us be men and not cowards. If death is our portion then we shall have died honorably and in the name of liberty, and we shall have delivered our children. War and struggle are indeed monstrous trials, but never must they be avoided for a year of uneasy peace or an era of compromise with evil. It is better to die on one's feet, fighting for freedom, than to live on one's knees as a slave. It is better to eat the dust than the bread of despotism. It is better to expire as a man.

Let us now to our arms, as freemen and Romans.

(Source: Vatican Library, Rome.)

NATIONAL BEAUTY CAREER DAYS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the National American Cosmetology Schools, for the third consecutive year, have designated the second week in April—April 7 through 13—as National Beauty Career Days. A constituent of mine, Mrs. Grace Talarico, of Cleveland, is the chairman of the National Beauty Career Days Committee. The purpose of this special week is to make teenagers and adults more aware of career opportunities in the beauty industry.

Twenty-four hundred beauty culture school owners work closely with vocational guidance counselors in junior high schools, high schools, and government agencies to assist the teenager in acquiring salable skills in today's complex labor market. During the week in April which has been set aside, an educational program will be conducted and an open invitation will be issued to high school counselors, teenage groups and parents to visit their community cosmetology schools, to inspect the facilities and gain first-hand information regarding the advantages of a career in cosmetology.

There are many people who do not realize the great impact which the beauty industry has on our national economy. It contributes well in excess of $1 billion a year to our gross national product. There are more than 200,000 beauty salons located in every State in the Union, employing more than a half million operators classified as cosmetologists, hairdressers, and beauticians. Each operator must comply with State board regulations which usually require from 1,000 to 2,500 hours of practical and academic training. In addition to the operators there are more than 1,500 beauty supply dealers and more than 2,400 beauty culture schools which supply and service the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the beauty industry is to be congratulated for their foresightedness in setting aside this week to call attention to the advantages to teenagers and others of acquiring this particular skill. Otherwise many of these young people would have the problem of facing the competitive labor market as unskilled workers.

PROBLEMS IN COMBATING USE OF THE MAILS BY DISTRIBUTORS OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the continued problem our Nation faces in our efforts to combat the use of the mails by distributors of pornographic material. Additional legislation is needed in this field, and I am hopeful that our committee will continue the necessary research to provide the Post Office Department with effective legal weapons with which to halt the purveyors of smut.

Filth peddling today produces billions of dollars a year in income to persons involved in its distribution, despite all efforts of the Post Office and local authorities to stamp it out. The suppression of traffic in obscenity is a tremendous and never-ending problem and the ill effects that it causes are tragically visible among thousands of children across the country.

The chief problem we on the committee have encountered in our investigations of this subject over many years is an overtolerance—amounting often to apathy—on the part of the public. Major effort, therefore, has been directed to developing a public awareness that smut and obscenity are a very real danger and can strike every home, even though an individual may have escaped thus far.

A second part of the problem is the adverse press that tends to block correct measures. Any public official, legislative group, or private organization risks the brand of "censor" or "professional do-gooder" in recommending positive legislation or administrative action.

A third handicap has been the very tolerant attitude of some courts—particularly in metropolitan areas where much smut originates—evidencing a serious miscalculation of the extent and the danger of smut peddling, as well as of the moral temper of the public.

Both Postmaster General Day and his predecessor, Postmaster General Summerfield, have cited the obscenity racket as a half-billion-dollar-a-year business.

Keeping smut out of the mails, even with stronger laws originated by our committee, demands an ever larger share of time, money, and manpower of the postal service each year. Incidentally, I wish to credit both Postmaster General Day and former Postmaster General Summerfield for their effective and determined efforts to combat the use of the mails by peddlers of smut.

I direct your attention to House Appropriation hearings on the postal budget for 1964 which highlights this condition. Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen testified—page 107:

> At the close of fiscal year 1962, the inspection service had a backlog of about 5,000 cases involving the transmittal of obscene matter in the mails. This is over and beyond the normal carryover and represents the equivalent of 18 man-years of work. It is apparent that at least five additional inspectors must be assigned to investigate the transmittal of obscene matter in the mails.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman Gary, of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and point to his comments—page 128—with respect to imports of smut:

> Frankly, I did not fully realize the importance of this program [of the postal service] until our recent trip to New York. * * * there is a pronounced effort to flood this country with communistic materials and also with pornographic materials from outside countries.
>
> We were told that one country has been collecting approximately $10 million a year from the pornographic material being shipped into this country.

The Post Office Department's General Counsel cited the difficulty in coping with purveyors of smut who, when they are about to be caught, change their names and addresses to circumvent prosecution.

He cited the dual attack of the postal service and the customs service on obscenity of domestic and foreign origin, and some of the effective steps being taken to combat the evil. His description of procedure—page 130—indicates how tedious and costly and how sometimes frustrating their best efforts are. Controlling obscene imports at New York alone requires 12 full-time postal employees, in addition to the customs officials.

The venue law, which permits prosecution of obscenity offenders at destination of their mailings, as well as at origin points, has been tremendously helpful, because the community moral attitudes where the material does its harm are considerably better than in some metropolitan points of origin. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee developed and wrote this legislation, and referred it to the Judiciary Committee, because it provides strong criminal penalties.

The chief postal inspector submitted a chart—page 133 of the hearings—showing fine progress in combating smut mailings, but the whole tenor of the hearings is that efforts must be redoubled to protect the public.

I also direct your attention to an interesting sidelight of the unified effort at Federal level—page 133—concerning arrangements between our postal service and the National Central Interpol Office in The Hague. Successful prosecution of foreign smut mailers under this arrangement, and under similar arrangements with nations which are members of the Universal Postal Union, should help keep foreign obscenity out.

Finally, the main operating problem is lack of adequate manpower. Cooperation by an informed citizenry can be a tremendous aid. Any citizen who finds obscenity moving through the mails should report it promptly to his local postmaster or law enforcement officials, just as he would report any other crime. If he does so, he may well be striking the first blow in defense of his own home and children—since many of the filth merchants direct their "pornography for profit" efforts at our children and young people.

However, we must realize that this issue is important and must be met, since it so adversely affects the lives of thousands of youngsters. Thousands and thousands of children throughout our country in the largest city and the smallest village are the targets of pornographic peddlers and their lives may be twisted and perverted if they become addicted to the clever little magazines and related material that reaches them through the mail or just as often available over the counter of local stores.

We have an obligation to cooperate through legislative enactment in providing the Post Office Department with weapons to effectively fight this battle in this field. We then have an additional responsibility to help arouse public opinion, which can be a vital force for good in halting this consistent attack on our moral standards. The family, the community, private groups and government must work together in this field to develop an effective, consistent antiobscenity program, and in turn, to develop additional leadership to expand the use of better reading materials, while eliminating the flow of filth from our Nation.

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great voices of America is the Saturday Evening Post. Its editorials have long expressed the interest and concern of a great number of our people. Such an editorial is that of the issue of March 30, 1963 entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba."

As this editorial so well points out, there are such caves and we do not know what is in them. However, we do know that for years Soviet Communists have been working on and in them with concrete. We also know that there have been shipped to Cuba all manner of military equipment. Finally, we know that wherever Communists are at work, they are not peddling sewing kits.

No longer is Cuba a question of laissez faire. Nor is our problem there confined to whether or not the "guestimates" of administration officials, that heavy missiles have been removed by the Russians, are so. Cuba in Communist hands is an acute threat to American security and survival on account of submarine bases alone, to say nothing of missiles or propaganda. Astride the whole Caribbean and strategically located on

America's soft underside we cannot and we must not tolerate Communist control of Cuba.

As the Saturday Evening Post editorial so well emphasizes, the U.S. Government, acting for our people, "now has an obligation to disprove—the claims that offensive weaponry is presently hidden in Cuban caves—by whatever means are necessary, including force."

This, I have urged for more than 3 years.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.

Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldiers, reportedly including Czechs.

What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access.

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspect cave locations. In view of the shortage of aboveground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relativley simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.

To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarine pens.

If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.

To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

BILL PROPOSED TO STRENGTHEN IMMIGRATION LAWS TO PREVENT U.S. CITIZENS FROM GOING TO CUBA FOR SUBVERSIVE PURPOSES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 weeks now I have waged an effort to prevail upon the Justice and State Departments to close the open door to subversion in the Americas through Mexico City to Cuba, but so far unsuccessfully.

I have called to the attention of the State Department and the House Un-American Activities Committee the fact that some 97 U.S. citizens, during a period of only 6 months during 1962, went to Cuba through Mexico, since the ban on such travel dated January 16, 1961, was issued by the State Department and I have turned these names over to the House Un-American Activities Committee, having been advised that this list has been denied the committee for reasons which I cannot understand.

The House Un-American Activities Committee advises that it is engaged in a full-scale investigation of the matter in that my cursory examination of the list indicated that a number of those going to Cuba have known Communist backgrounds and are continuing to participate in support of Communist-front organizations, including the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Medicine for Cuba Committee, and the July 26 movement.

I also have placed in the RECORD evidence that a number of those who have gone to Cuba have publicly advertised this fact in the Worker, with announcements of speechmaking programs about Cuba, the funds from which are to be used to finance the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Despite these public announcements, only one prosecution has taken place.

We are calling upon all nations in this hemisphere to try to close this open door of subversion and we look a little silly in so doing while at the same time permitting our own citizens not only to go to Cuba but to use information gained there to sell Castro's communism in the United States and to finance Communist-front organizations working for Castro in the United States.

I find this situation completely intolerable and I again call upon the Justice and State Departments to prosecute these Communist sympathizers who have openly and notoriously violated the law and to do all it can to close this door permanently.

I am today introducing a bill which I believe will tighten travel restrictions as they relate to persons, particularly U.S. citizens, who travel to or interrupt their journeys in transit through any country with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations, making this specifically a crime when the President of the United States has declared that such travel should be prohibited in the best interests of the United States. This latter limitation obviously would make it applicable to Cuba and would perhaps also help bring about clarification of rules and regulations relating to other countries whose governments we do not recognize.

The further purpose of this bill is hopefully to get this general issue before the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee so that amendments to the basic law can be considered while at the same time House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee consider the possible subversive impact of these visits within this country.

I am also placing in the RECORD for the first time the list of the number of people who have gone to Cuba from other countries during this same 6-month period in 1962. This list indicates the extent to which countries in the Americas permit the flow of people, numbers of them known subversives, to Cuba, and, again, I say I am confident this information is correct in that the basic source of the information comes from the manifests of the planes of Cubana Airlines. The list, which is self-explanatory, indicates a total of

3,447 have traveled to Cuba from other countries, including 265 from Russia and its satellites.

The list follows:

Canada	81
United States	99
Total	180
Argentina	229
Bolivia	51
Brazil	80
Colombia	15
Costa Rica	47
Cuba	435
Chile	126
Ecuador	67
El Salvador	70
Guatemala	78
Honduras	229
Mexico	443
Nicaragua	14
Panama	49
Paraguay	27
Dominican Republic	2
Uruguay	122
Venezuela	7
Total	2,135
From undetermined nationalities, total	646
Russia and satellites	265
Other countries outside of this hemisphere	221
Total	1,132
Grand total	3,447

I again call for the closing of this open door of subversion and call for early hearings and favorable action on legislation of this nature.

It will be my intention, your invitation of the Senate Internal Security Committee, to appear before that committee on Wednesday to present this evidence and other matters—this list of names having been denied even this committee by the executive branch to date.

OUR FISCAL PROBLEM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President, unintentionally I am sure, has placed our fiscal problem in the proper perspective when he referred to those who oppose his planned deficits as being possessed of a puritan ethic.

Dr. Elton Trueblood, of Earlham College in Indiana, recently defended those who do posses a "puritan ethic" very effectively in the publication Quaker Life, April 1963.

Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

THE PURITAN ETHIC

(By Elton Trueblood)

Walter Heller, chief economic adviser to President Kennedy, has given it out as his judgment that one of the chief barriers to be overcome is that of the puritan ethic. By this he means that adherence to the ethic of the days when America was young is wholly inapplicable in our time. It would, he thinks, be far easier to put across the idea of spending ourselves into prosperity if only an antiquated philosophy did not persist as an intellectual anachronism. Running a big deficit is the right thing to do, we are told, but some people are still so old fashioned that they do not know this. Among those of whom Heller speaks with such obvious condescension are a good many Quakers.

This approach would not be very disturbing if it came from a mere private citizen, for each person has a right to his opinion, but it is highly disturbing when it comes from those who are among the chief architects of national policy. We can be grateful to Heller in that he helps the public to understand the character of the challenge which the economic advisers are presenting. What we have on our hands is not mere economic theory, but rather a proposed alteration of our basic philosophy. We are foolish if we do not become aroused when the philosophy which helped to make our country great is spoken of with contempt.

The President says that his policy of cutting taxes by $10 billion, while expenses rise, is attacked on both the right and the left. What he needs to know is that it is deeply disturbing to some who do not belong to either the right or the left. We are not ashamed of the puritan ethic, which means trying to live within our income, and we refuse to feel out of date just because some man with access to the White House says so. I do not especially enjoy paying.

I am well aware of the argument given, to the effect that the alternative to a huge deficit is a depression, with the consequence of an even larger deficit. I am aware of this because this is what the President and his key advisers keep saying. Whether this is true or not I do not know, but I do know that an economy in which these are the only alternatives is terribly sick. Imagine the richest country of the world admitting that it cannot avoid a depression except by a deliberate plan of deficit financing, to burden its descendants. Already we pay $10 billion a year to finance our debt. As the debt rises, as is promised, this amount will increase greatly. One does not have to be very wise to envisage a time when the total debt will be fantastic. Certainly it will be if we add to it substantially in allegedly good times.

The danger is very great, a danger which any person ought to be able to see, even if he is a doctrinaire economist. Consider, for example, how a similar policy has practically ruined Brazil. Both reason and experience should warn us, but those who command the headlines seem impervious to both. Perhaps it is the desire to be popular and to stay in power that is really at work. People always love a gift, even if the source of the gift is their own money. The basic issue may not be primarily economic; it may be moral. The awful thought is that demagogues tend to win, particularly in the short run.

CLAY REPORT IS OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, throughout this great Nation of ours, the press and the people are discussing and studying the foreign aid report of the Clay committee, submitted by a 10-man committee named by President Kennedy and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. Let me say that I believe this study and report represents one of the finest actions taken since I have been a Member of the Congress.

I think President Kennedy should be commended for having named this committee of outstanding Americans to reassess our foreign aid program. It has long been my conviction that we needed to reassess the role we are playing in our foreign aid program, to seek out those areas where our funds are being wasted, and eliminate these, and where the goals of this Nation are being met, to bolster our programs.

The report aptly noted that even with due consideration for improvements, much remains to be accomplished, that we are attempting too much in too many places and that a higher quality of reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could produce more.

Particularly do I support the part of the report which stated that we cannot indefinitely continue commitments at the present rate to the 95 countries and territories which are now receiving our economic and military assistance. Substantial tightening up and sharpening of objectives in terms of national interest are necessary.

The point which impresses me most about the report is in calling for a definition of American objectives. We seek to aid those nations which seek to help themselves, to make the reforms which would make their lands productive and free for their peoples. In Latin America for example, we must insist that the leaders of these nations mobilize their internal forces to develop their economy, for promises are not enough, and failure to meet these commitments should be accompanied by reduction or complete elimination of aid to those nations which fail to meet these guidelines.

I think it should be particularly noted that we seek not enslavement, but freedom. Our aid programs should be designed to bolster the economies of nations which have the capacity and the determination to build a strong free economy of free men. For us to do less is sheer folly.

The Clay Report in my opinion is a great contribution. It brings into sharp focus for the American people the accomplishments and the failings of our aid programs over the past two decades. I think it should be carefully studied and considered, and that the Congress and the Administration should make a concerted effort to define our goals. We should call strongly on those other free world nations, which we have helped pull up by their bootstraps from the ravages of war and which are now self-sufficient, to pay their fair share of such programs which are vital to all of us. And finally, we should begin to cut the huge expenditures which this Nation has been making, in some cases unwisely, for foreign aid.

NASSER'S RAPALLO

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to the attention of the House the appalling situation in the Middle East where the Egyptian military and missile buildup has been supplemented through the past several years by the U.S.S.R. and is now being aided by West Germans. I add sadly that this buildup has been facilitated to a tremendous degree by our own economic assistance program favoring Dictator Nasser, which has made possible a diversion of Egypt's own resources to facilitate this offensive arms buildup.

I am particularly concerned over the flagrant irony of the apparent collaboration by the West German Government with the "Castro of the Nile," Colonel Nasser. I say irony because it is Nasser's own boast that he intends to obliterate the tiny state of Israel which has been the haven of hundred of thousands of Jews, victims of the tyranny of Hitler's Germany. The appalling thing to me is the condoning of the work of ex-Nazi rocket scientists and other Germans in Egypt by our Government through its "whitewash" of West Germany in this connection.

West Germany is our partner in the NATO Alliance. We certainly can speak out and demand responsible and moral behavior. The State Department has so far merely sought to minimize, excuse, and justify the notorious German role in Egypt.

If West Germany is truly devoted to freedom and is a trustworthy partner of America, it behooves our Government to intercede. Civilization can certainly expect the West Germans to heed in the light of the German allegations that they regret the barbarism of the Nazi era. If West Germany ignores the dictates of humanity on this issue, her role on other matters involving peace and security will bear closer scrutiny.

The world has forgotten neither the German-Russian Treaty of Rapallo nor the German-Soviet pact that followed. History could again be in the making and, in this connection, I wish to refer fellow Members to the following instructive editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

NASSER'S RAPALLO

Mrs. Golda Meir, the Israel Foreign Minister, is understandably concerned over the production of rockets by the United Arab Republic, because Israel is the prime target for the weapons if they are ever turned loose. However, her protest to the Bonn Government over the participation of German nationals in Arab rocket research isn't likely to be very effective. Bonn has known for years that Cairo was a haven for former Nazis; it has been aware of the financial rewards available there to scientists; it could not have been blind to the manufacture in Germany of precision parts destined for Egypt. Yet the only German ever censured for advising Cairo was fired as a matter of conflict of interest: Prof. Eugen Saenger had been director of a Bonn-financed research institute.

Bonn offers a reasonable explanation. Its citizens are free and have a right to seek employment where they wish. It is a flexible principle, because a West German who elected to accept an appointment in East German rocketry undoubtedly would be chalked up as a turncoat. But Cairo is not an enemy power, and Bonn has every wish to curry Arab favor. It will offer no offense to Nasser.

To the student of German history Mrs. Meir's complaint is nonetheless a challenge to review military developments of the 1920's. Then, under the Versailles Treaty, German rearmament was supposedly controlled, just as now there are limitations on German weapons under the more permissive Western European Union. The German-Russian Treaty of Rapallo, however, allowed German troops to train on Soviet soil. It may not have been significant in the later buildup of the Wehrmacht, but the opportunity to circumvent Versailles at least had been afforded. The Cairo research allows German scientists to operate with considerably more freedom than on German soil. A Germany suddenly disenchanted with the West could recall these men to the service of the fatherland. In Germany's present respectability the prospect is no threat, but it is a shadow on the horizon of history, perhaps no larger than a man's hand, but disturbing all the same.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hechler, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Sikes, for 15 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. Pelly, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Harding, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mrs. Green of Oregon), for 120 minutes, on Tuesday, April 9, 1963.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Harrison), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Hechler.

Mr. Teague of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois and to include related material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. White) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. Burke.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Waggonner.

Mr. Evins.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harrison) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Siler.

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Alger in two instances.

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Findley.

Mr. Moore.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, April 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $8,994,000 for the U.S. Information Agency (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

615. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

616. A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., transmitting a report covering operations of D.C. Transit System, Inc. for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public Law 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

617. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc., and its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to the request of the corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

618. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of excessive costs of a fire extinguisher replacement program in the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

619. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the uneconomical utilization and premature disposal of aircraft spark plugs by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

620. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the Post Office Department practice of furnishing utilities for certain vending machines operated by postal employee groups in Government owned or leased buildings; to the Committee on Government Operations.

621. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected aspects of certain Atomic Energy Commission negotiated fixed-price contracts for the procurement of virgin lithium from the American Lithium Chemicals, Inc., the Foote Mineral Co., and the Lithium Corp. of America, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

622. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

623. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the overpricing of spare parts and modification kits purchased from Hazeltine Corp., Little Neck, N.Y., by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., under Department of the Navy cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract NOas 56-987c; to the Committee on Government Operations.

624. A letter from the secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting the annual report of the National Trust for Historic Preservation for the year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 408, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

625. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the King Hill Irrigation District of Elmore County, Idaho, which has applied for a loan pertaining to a project proposal, pursuant to section 4(c) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

626. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the St. John Irrigating Co. of Malad, Idaho, which has applied for a loan pertaining to a project proposal, pursuant to section 4(c) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

627. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

628. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report showing grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to nonprofit institutions in calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3574. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5366. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5312. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5313. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5314. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 5316. A bill to amend section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962, relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for judicial reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 5317. A bill to provide for the establishment of a regional research center for rural redevelopment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5318. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5319. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 5320. A bill to amend section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 5321. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to provide the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 5324. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 5325. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5326. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5328. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time, overtime, and holidays in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5329. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5330. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5331. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB (by request):

H.R. 5332. A bill to permit certain retired military personnel to receive pension or compensation concurrently with the receipt of retired pay if they have attained the age of 72 and are not entitled to Social Security benefits based upon military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5333. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 5334. A bill to provide for the admission in evidence of certain confessions in the criminal cases in the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5335. A bill to authorize judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5337. A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5338. A bill to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5339. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5340. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5341. A bill to increase the supply of available investment capital for the financing of sales and rental housing by extending to certain corporate obligations Federal Housing Administration insurance benefits similar to those available for mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5342. A bill to authorize the Association of Universalist Women to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 5343. A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5344. A bill—Public Education Improvement Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5345. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5346. A bill to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5347. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 5349. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period during which certain agreements can be entered into relating to the regulation of advertising along rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 5366. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.J. Res. 361. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to prohibit the strip mining of coal in the Allegheny and other national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.J. Res. 364. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.J. Res. 365. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 366. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or justification by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution authorizing a summer recess for the first session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution saluting "Uncle Sam" Wilson of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol of "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 302. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to pending Federal legislation on gold mining development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to reconsideration of any plans for the relocation of the Denver Mint, and to consider expanding the present Denver Mint to meet the increased production requirements of the U.S. mint; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging early completion of spot bank stabilization and erosion control adjacent to the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to designate the impoundment created by Garrison Dam as Lake Sakakawea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the President of the United States to consider the need for another White House Conference on Education and that he consider requesting Congress to enact legislation providing for such Conference in 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting consideration of legislation for the construction of farm-to-market roads as an integral part of the reclamation project for the balance of the Columbia Basin development program, and to accept the financial responsibility therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H.R. 5350. A bill for the relief of Gizella Erenyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 5351. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease certain real property at Camp Atterbury, Ind.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James McAleese, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Samir Zoghby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Miss Katarzyna Szydziak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5356. A bill for the relief of Gabriel and Angelina D'Orsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Gomez Lipana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5358 A bill for the relief of Lona Rinehart Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5359. A bill for the relief of George Steve Eraklianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5360. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Gardiner Luce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Khurshed Bhumgara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayako Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5363. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Tyner Govatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5364. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5365. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sally Annette Solano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1962 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $156. E. (9) $282.07.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,520.67.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,975.16. E. (9) $1,975.16.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $12,414.34. E. (9) $12,414.34.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $853.10. E. (9) $1,498.73.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,522.72.

A. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,630.42. E. (9) $5,630.42.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,432. E. (9) $3,368.75.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $900.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $469.50. E. (9) $11,228.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $677.04.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 42-57 Parsons Boulevard, Flushing, N.Y.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $211.83.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John Arens, 500 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $616.58.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., 800 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $155.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $11.08.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,725. E. (9) $40.88.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,218.71.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Ayares, Mountain Avenue, Murray Hill, N.J.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $739.37.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, Esq., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Tunaboat Association, 1 Tuna Lane, San Diego, Calif.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $131.94.

A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $231. E. (9) $156.75.

A. Ralph O. Beck, 2801 Coconut Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.
B. Hawaiian Telephone Co., Post Office Box 2200, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, et al.
E. (9) $143.81.

A. C. Morgan Bissette, 3200 34th Street South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,626.55.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $579.90.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,942.34.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,015. E. (9) $1,015.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,334.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., Nausori, Suva, Fiji.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,875.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $146.85.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $102.16.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $15.40.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,230.76. E. (9) $323.08.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,452.16.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $749.06. E. (9) $749.06.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $548.50.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. R. R. Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. C-E-I-R, Inc., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $513.60.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carol MacI. Chrisney, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $386.05. E. (9) $40.75.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,551.59. E. (9) $300.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
D. (6) $8,971. E. (9) $14,358.06.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, 328 Long Beach Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. B. Rapaport & Son, Inc., Central Street, Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Henry J. Clay, Esq., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $17.04.

A. Paul G. Collins, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $42.15.

A. Committee for Export Expansion Through Subsidiaries Abroad, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,480.03. E. (9) $42,161.67.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, Labor Organization, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,101.61.

A. Don Costa, 3517 Brandon Avenue, Roanoke, Va.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington D.C.
E. (9) $883.36.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,315.63. E. (9) $25,315.63.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $619.92. E. (9) $619.92.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $527.50. E. (9) $527.50.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $79.32.

A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 2808 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $15.11.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $35.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $2,346.67. E. (9) $2,768.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 1917 11th Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,756.25. E. (9) $131.25.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, Post Office Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
E. (9) $113.61.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $2,312.18. E. (9) $512.18.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,325.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,314.66.

A. J. D. Durand, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $520. E. (9) $59.44.

A. Robert A. Durfee, Jr., 321 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, Calif.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,990. E. (9) $1,990.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404. E. (9) $752.95.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $901.17. E. (9) $29.05.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, General Manager, National Star Route Mail Carriers Assn., 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $762.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 411 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China, Chinese Government Procurement & Services Mission, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $88. E. (9) $118.28.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $300.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,365.40.

A. George R. Frankovich, Providence, R.I., and Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207-11 Sheraton-Biltmore,

Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,125. E. (9) $444.66.

A. Elizabeth S. Freret, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. C-E-I-R, Inc., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $480. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $314.45.

A. E. P. Gaines, Jr.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,273.74. E. (9) $355.73.

A. James W. Grady, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $991.74.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.01.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $13.67.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $72.05.

A. Lester R. Hill, 432 South Curson East, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $427.55.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) 228.75. E. (9) $12.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joe L. Howell, Jr., 3800 U.S. Highway 51 North, Jackson, Miss.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $888.64.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $576.05. E. (9) $23.30.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Fred G. Hussey, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, et al.
E. (9) $405.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. Institute of High Fidelity Manufacturers, Inc., 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,558.08.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,989.53.

A. Charles E. Jackson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fisheries Institute, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $735.40.

A. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Charles B. Jennings, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. William T. Jobe, 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $688.87. E. (9) $23.40.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James E. Jones, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Max H. Jordan, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $845.73. E. (9) $43.15.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Company, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributor & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $696.44.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Koch.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Ronald Korsan, 5343 Main Street, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,650.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,307.75. E. (9) $7,313.06.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,761.11.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 918 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,582. E. (9) $2,364.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $10.38.

A. Herrick K. Lidstone, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Colon Free Zone.
D. (6) $3,400. E. (9) $303.40.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Joseph M. Lovci, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,325.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,049.99. E. (9) $656.43.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Edward R. Luter, 805 North Washington, Wheaton, Ill.
B. Committee for Export Expansion Through Subsidiaries Abroad, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39.65.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $71.23.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.26. E. (9) $733.17.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,463.96. E. (9) $229.31.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $686.01.

A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,166.66. E. (9) $100.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,850. E. (9) $1,088.76.

A. Philip F. Maguire, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $562.33.

A. H. N. Mallon, 1522 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $68.05.

A. James D. Mann, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–11 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $28,910. E. (9) $1,573.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,899.98. E. (9) $665.93.

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $99.54.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of N.A., 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,530. E. (9) $375.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $218.12.

A. John R. Miles.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association, The Maytag Co., Theisen-Clemens Co., and Abitibi Power Paper Co.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,199.17.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $12.05.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $1,119.85.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Murphy, 808 North Third Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,568.93.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,440.64. E. (9) $1,710.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Service Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,413.85. E. (9) $2,460.87.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,135.69.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and

1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235. E. (9) $2,235.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $679.14. E. (9) $513.75.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,950.71. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,990. E. (9) $1,990.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $373,183.51. E. (9) $4,402.20.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $2,685.43.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62,000. E. (9) $58,294.52.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,000.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $422,937.90. E. (9) $2,598.29.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $121,937.23. E. (9) $14,925.73.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,071.85. E. (9) $15,071.85.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,137.85.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,163. E. (9) $2,163.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $812.47.

A. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,682.10. E. (9) $12,482.50.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,781.50. E. (9) $12,371.32.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $266. E. (9) $840.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,780.13. E. (9) $7,776.69.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,922.90.

A. National Small Business Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562. 52.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $54,323.14. E. (9) $2,336.81.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,886.09. E. (9) $6,950.37.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $23,347. E. (9) $3,565.91.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $489.53.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $686.88. E. (9) $482.23.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $353.50

A. Walter O. Noreen, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Iver M. Olson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $216.36.

A. Samuel Omasta.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $103.05.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,490.58.

A. Vaux Owen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692.04. E. (9) $2.90.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association.
E. (9) $315.

A. Edmund E. Pendleton, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. George C. Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Hart Perry, 10 MacDougal Alley, New York, N.Y.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $130.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $9,282.55. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $347.50. E. (9) $5.

A. Product Development International, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Product Development International, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 1211 South Brighton, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1.95.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
D. (6) $15,500. E. (9) $162.30.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $13,249.97. E. (9) $7,119.90.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $8.25. E. (9) $20.21.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Philip Alexander Ray, International Building, San Francisco, Calif.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Post Office Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $784.55. E. (9) $634.55.

A. Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $12,576.64.

A. Robert H. Reiter, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Kollsman Industries, Inc., 2005 North Hawthorne Avenue, Melrose Park, Ill.

E. (9) $51.05.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. Fred J. Scanlan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $350.

A. Ernest Schein, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Distribuidora de Azucares S.A., Ingenios Independientes Ltd., Compania Azucarera del Valle, Bogotá, Colombia.

D. (6) $25,196.97. E. (9) $196.97.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,380.02. E. (9) $416.62.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Delhi-Taylor Oil Corp., Fidelity Union Tower, Dallas, Tex.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. David Silvergleid, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,166.66. E. (9) $100.

A. Silverstein & Mullens, 1000 Bender Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Silverstein & Mullens, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Rossmoor Leisure World, Seal Beach, Calif.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

E. (9) $220.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $204.42.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,732.79. E. (9) $776.15.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington. D.C.

E. (9) $8.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, Esq., 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobilhome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $324.17.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) $819.98. E. (9) $1,085.43.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.

E. (9) $634.55.

A. Frank S. Steele, Box 1453, Valdosta, Ga.

B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $35. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $12.

A. Luther C. Steward, Jr., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,577.60. E. (9) $45.55.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,965.78. E. (9) $4,091.25.

A. Harry Stewart, 321 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, Calif.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, No. 11, 3-Chome, Denma-cho, Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of American Importers, Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., 30 Church Street, New York, N.Y.; Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 4 Albany Street, New York, N.Y.; Mitsubishi International Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Ajinomoto Co. of New York, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Okla.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $472. E. (9) $472.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $495. E. (9) $23.36.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,110.

A. Bert Tollefson, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $4,157.17.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $8,987.15. E. (9) $2,156.95.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gladys B. Uhl, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Joseph Napolitan Associates, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,674.59.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,354.02.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $2,300.

A. Arvin E. Upton, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Committee on Radiation Protection & Measurements, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,260.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $164.23.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 213 Slade Run Drive, Falls Church, Va.

B. Known heirs of Levi B. Gritts, deceased.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
D. (6) $441. E. (9) $452.26.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,321.81.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $455.79.

A. George E. Weaver, 530 East Elizabeth Street, Fort Collins, Colo.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $128.86.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $14,328.69. E. (9) $14.35.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,564.21. E. (9) $4,564.21.

A. Laurens Williams, Esq., 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Service Insurance Companies, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500.

A. Laurens Williams, Esq., 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $7.

A. Laurens Williams, Esq., 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Variable Annuity Life Insurance Company of America, Washington, D.C., and The Prudential Life Insurance Company of America, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $6.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. H. L. Wingate, Box 7, Pelham, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1962:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_______ <

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.<

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1<

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $--------TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ------------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures

9. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $--------TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

PAGE 2

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. J. Adduci, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,828. E. (9) $1,212.93.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,040.93. E. (9) $5,040.93.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 703 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $759.18.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $773.95.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,106.30. E. (9) $4,106.30.

A. George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $90.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A Edwin N. Altman.

B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $700.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,405.18.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Council for Technical Products, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $30,799. E. (9) $30,799.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

E (9) $39,625.47.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,987.39. E. (9) $14,641.19.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $11,559.10. E. (9) $6,331.18.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.

D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $184.13. E. (9) $29,218.42.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $263.80. E. (9) $58.50.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,400.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $7,945.63.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $27,565.77. E. (9) $4,933.45.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) $5,777.89. E. (9) $5,777.89.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $553.06. E. (9) $553.06.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,109.78. E. (9) $8,521.51.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York. N.Y.

D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $10,905.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $101,575.94. E. (9) $4,058.23.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,971.21. E. (9) $1,971.21.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Westfield, Mass.

D. (6) $14.88.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.

D. (6) $9,678.90. E. (9) $9,678.90.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,455. E. (9) $1,212.27.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Larry Andrews, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Antivivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

B. United States Trust Company of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

E. (9) $1.08.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,197.92.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,624.27. E. (9) $1,624.27.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,467.61. E. (9) $2,267.61.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $100.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $54.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers Express & Station Employees.

D. (6) $1,044.80. E. (9) $732.45.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $253.39.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $1,040.

A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $231. E. (9) $137.65.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $65.05.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Osmero L. Bartelli, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance Co. of North America, and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $154. E. (9) $36.30.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Becker & Greenwald, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Bulk Carriers, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $131.70.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $2,202. E. (9) $1,153.64.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $80.64.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $80.64.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $24.42.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5,440. E. (9) $314.40.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, et al.

E. (9) $1,431.65.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $55.11.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $126.39. E. (9) $57.02.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,081.25. E. (9) $592.72.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Benjamin W. Boley, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N,Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York World's Fair 1964–1965 Corp., Flushing Meadow Park, Post Office Box 1964, Flushing, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $375.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $135. E. (9) $1.01.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $238.78.

A. Richard Breed, 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.

B. American Council for Technical Products, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Fred T. Bridges, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperage Producers of America, Inc., 705 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo.

D. (6) $7,200. E. (9) $7,200.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George Bronz, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Coras Trachtala, Dublin, Ireland.

D. (6) $10,800. E. (9) $2.37.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $474.42.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,233.33. E. (9) $13.22.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $436.11.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $26.36.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $23.83.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $60.65.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Industrial Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $19,246.75. E. (9) $275.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $105.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $49.87.

A. William B. Burton, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13.82.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $60.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $408.55.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $177.60.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $829.45.

A. Clarence B. Carter, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 520 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $419.03.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $171.08.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associacion Mexicana de Empacadores de Fresa, AC., Venustiano Carranza 48-50 Piso, Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jeppesen and Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $26.84.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., P.O. Box 1189, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $12.16.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar S.A de C.V., Baldoras No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $45.56.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $237.72.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $27.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,423.98. E. (9) $3,478.15.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,551.59. E. (9) $300.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,374.26. E. (9) $10,912.57.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $299.20.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Henry J. Clay, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms Co., Westfield, Mass.
D. (6) $150.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $74.71.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Junius E. Cobean, Sr., 109 East Windsor Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $75.56.

A. Coles & Goartner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $204.36.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $13,901.45.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George W. Cooley, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $579. E. (9) $1,721.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,373.05.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,402.22.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $747.30. E. (9) $747.30.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $132.73. E. (9) $132.73.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $6.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ave-Templeton.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fourteen cement companies.
D. (6) $1,215.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution, 1955 Legislature, P.O. Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Cuban-American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Dyestuffs & Chemicals, Inc., 2307 North 11th Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Business Machines Corp., 590 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Raleigh Industries of America, Inc., 1168 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C., and National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $654.30.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Box 54, Gatun, Canal Zone.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone.
D. (6) $771.45. E. (9) $931.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. N. R. Danielian, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 1917 11th Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,438.93.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence A. Davis, 525 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $88. E. (9) $88.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Corp. of America, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Corp. of America, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $299.03.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cummins-Chicago Corp., 4740 Ravenswood Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Glenview State Bank, 1825 Glenview Road, Glenview, Ill.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $251.48.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $3,046.08. E. (9) $421.08.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, P.O. Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
D. (6) $17.82. E. (9) $17.82.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, P.O. Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,990.17. E. (9) $190.17.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,874.30.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,325.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $240.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,322.51. E. (9) $21,082.23.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $131.25. E. (9) $17.52.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $34.25.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,215.41. E. (9) $120.

A. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $675.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.16. E. (9) $172.67.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edward, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $3125.04. E. (9) $37.96.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $206. E. (9) $56.75.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404. E. (9) $296.87.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $59.50. E. (9) $5.94.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $364.57.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 600 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $307.70. E. (9) $36.40.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $22.60.

A. Clinton Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $174.91.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $966.93.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $49,946.43. E. (9) $25,033.38.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 411 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Federation of Regular Taxpayers, Route 4, Box 26, Hastings, Mich.
D. (6) $62. E. (9) $217.15.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3500. E. (9) $500.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $1,565.39.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., et al.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $69.55.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $300.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,800.

A. Fordyce, Mayne, Hartman, Renard & Stribling, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,025. E. (9) $3,873.38.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $149.02.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $81.

A. George R. Frankovich, Providence, R.I., and Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–11 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $737.

A. T. Paul Freeland, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.
D. (6) $600.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,372.64. E. (9) $6,575.22.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $230.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Port Louis, Mauritius.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Aubrey Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burnham Enersen, 351 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $40.73.

A. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,000.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,197.97. E. (9) $8,173.42.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,177.22. E. (9) $1,177.22.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8.48.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45. E. (9) $1.43.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Smelting & Refining Co., et al.
D. (6) $4,875. E. (9) $1,450.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $970.56.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $224.56.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 703 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 703 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Felt Manufacturers Council of the Northern Textile Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $157.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $54.55.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $377.49.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,853.25. E. (9) $349,23.

A. Walter H. Hasty, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. James L. Hatcher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,030.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays and Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $3,411.95. E. (9) $440.08.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $52.85.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $78.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.

E. (9) $269.92.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $72.66.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,918.25.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,338.30. E. (9) $213.30.

A. John K. Herbert, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $574.71.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $263.60. E. (9) $263.60.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $35.10.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $10,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) $17.20.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $109.80.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $496.25.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $50.55.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $22.15.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,425. E. (9) $569.01.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.

B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York N.Y.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $3,374.30.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2.40.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

B. Richard F. Bates, Edward S. Cohen, J. I. Meltzer, and James Kousen.

E. (9) $329.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2.40.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,525.20. E. (9) $6,525.20.

A. Evan S. Ingels, Oakwood Lane, Greenwich, Conn.

B. Time, Inc., Time & Life Building, Rockefeller Center, N.Y.

D. (6) $935. E. (9) $1,075.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.50.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,924.03.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,500.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2.65.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

E. (9) $835.96.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $35.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,681.96. E. (9) $32.15.

A. Mrs. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. S. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.

D. (6) $2,250.33. E. (9) $2.92.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 727 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $6,495.94.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.

B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $181.68. E. (9) $52.50.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,548.70. E. (9) $192.35.

A. Ned Johnston, 4309 Saul Road, Kensington, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. James E. Jones, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $10.52.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

D. (6) $50.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,375. (9) $754.40.

A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $300.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusets Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $281.45.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, P.O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern California Edison Co., P.O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,526.96. E. (9) $1,499.38.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $246.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $106.25.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $725.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 1100 Sixth Street SW., Washington, D.C., and 535 San Luis Road, Berkeley, Calif.

D. (6) $785. E. (9) $785.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $425.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $285. E. (9) $25.79.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $7.20.

A. A. W. Koehler, 3275 Beech Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, The Coronet, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $3,256.20.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $869.25.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,850.84. E. (9) $7,432.78.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $681.41. E. (9) $303.95.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

D. (6) $650.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $125. E. (9) $25.

A. Philip P. Leahy, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $40.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $29.38. E. (9) $134.18.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42. E. (9) $152.05.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $160.95.

A. Richard T. Leonard, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $411.

A. Lawrence S. Lesser, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alfred Hiebler, 654 Oakley Place, Oradell, N.J., et al.
D. (6) $333.34. E. (9) $14.79.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,175. E. (9) $19.65.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $841.40.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. Herrick K. Lidstone, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Colon Free Zone, Republic of Panama, Colon, Panama.
E. (9) $49.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,627.69. E. (9) $2,627.69.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $786.46.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $814.09.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $255. E. (9) $14.64.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $53.

A. Paul H. Long, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Encyclopedia Britannica, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue and 82d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph M. Lovci, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,325.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $19.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $12.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $6.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees.
D. (6) $3,054.10. E. (9) $37.60.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $141.48.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $190.04.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co's., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $260.42. E. (9) $233.95.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15.41. E. (9) $4.85.

A. William F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,150.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,249.88. E. (9) $532.96.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $81.25. E. (9) $2.46.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $206.32.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,487.50. E. (9) $657.52.

A. John H. MacVey, 803 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann, Post Office Box 16, Kyobashi Post Office, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $9,500. E. (9) $7,166.67.

A. Philip F. Maguire, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commission de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
E. (9) $10.35.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $145.15.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $537.50.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America Inc., 207–11 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $19,368. E. (9) $5,157.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,152.28. E. (9) $63.21.

—

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,052.

—

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

—

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

—

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $125.

—

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

—

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $252.62. E. (9) $316.42.

—

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $450. E. (9) $478.55.

—

A. Thomas A. Martin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,159. E. (9) $34.

—

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

—

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

—

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Building and Construction Trades Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,633.

—

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, and Mechanical Contractors Association.

—

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $256.39. E. (9) $205.61.

—

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $4.15.

—

A. Joe G. Matthews, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

—

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

—

A. J. D. Mayson, Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

—

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees.

D. (6) $2,152.50. E. (9) $7.90.

—

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $2,505.

—

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Mehler, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000.

—

A. Mehler, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Ferro Corp., et al.

—

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

E. (9) $1,505.22.

—

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

—

A. C. R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 930 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $50.

—

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.

D. (6) $1,500.

—

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.

D. (6) $2,625.

—

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,250.

—

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

D. (6) $3,000.

—

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $143.40.

—

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

—

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,875.

—

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $825.

—

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

—

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Baltimore and Charles Streets, Baltimore, Md.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $115.84.

—

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

—

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.

D. (6) $1,730. E. (9) $105.10.

—

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

—

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $70.

—

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $4,113.74.

—

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

D. (6) $2,730.

—

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $121.62.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray R. Murdock.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $13.25.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $609.20. E. (9) $7,929.09.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $8,845.73.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $565.85. E. (9) $565.85.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P.O. Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $7,305.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $440.22. E. (9) $465.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,899.80. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,068.78. E. (9) $10,068.78.

A. National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, Inc., 755 NADA Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,198.90.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600,747.98. E. (9) $6,812.84.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $451.91.

A. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Association, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,877.50.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,818.12. E. (9) $2,818.12.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $35.60. E. (9) $425.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,165.91. E. (9) $617.76.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,480.71. E. (9) $13,480.71.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,407.30. E. (9) $2,155.78.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Member Associations of the League.
D. (6) $5,207.34. E. (9) $2,490.32.

A. National Life and Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.
E. (9) $19.60.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $612. E. (9) $612.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $5,468.86. E. (9) $2,249.13.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,164.88. E. (9) $5,193.22.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,483.10. E. (9) $2,483.10.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $798.62.

A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,182. E. (9) $11,482.90.

A. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Walter R. Mayne, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,025. E. (9) $3,783.38.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $934.68. E. (9) $934.68.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $5,383.86.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.18. E. (9) $7,618.71.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $728.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62,828.67. E. (9) $4,885.39.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $40

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $735.64. E. (9) $1,093.41.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C
D. (6) $8,275. E. (9) $11,647.57

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,950.02. E. (9) $4,413.67.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md., et al.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $424.03.

A. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $469.55. E. (9) $469.55.

A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,528.15. E. (9) $1,352.81.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $305.28. E. (9) $310.71.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $476.47.

A. T. A. Nooner, Jr., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $4.90.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $40.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $353.15.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles O'Hara, Post Office Box 413, North Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $57.53.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Oliver & Donnally, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,267.50. E. (9) $149.71.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.40.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $165.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,076.95. E. (9) $32.05.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,415.25. E. (9) $1,611.30.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $37.72.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $127.40.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6)$3,515. E. (9) $3,515.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.67.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $825.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $200.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $42,444.62. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. James K. Polk, Esq., 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $200.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $347.50.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Company, 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
E. (9) $153.67.

A. L. C. Pyle, 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.
D. (6) $200.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $8,250.01. E. (9) $7,753.34.

A. Cushman S. Radebaugh, Box 1928, Orlando, Fla.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $81.01.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $117.65.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $44. E. (9) $61.69.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $44. E. (9) $61.69.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $42.70.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Company.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $1,188.38. E. (9) $1,038.38.

A. Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,299.97. E. (9) $4,942.42.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $639.10.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U.S., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63,462.41.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,964.60. E. (9) $9,424.17.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $423.56.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $194.06.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.03. E. (9) $333.37.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $58.75.

A. James F. Rill, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Aveue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,260.

A. T. J. Ross and Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $6,253.91.

A. C. C. Rouse, Jr., 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.
D. (6) $150.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port au Prince, Haiti.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $623.22. E. (9) $198.49.

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $8.95.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.36. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $257.19.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,600.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James D. Secrest, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Electronic Industries Association, 1721 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $480. E. (9) $48.70.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $32.30.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.

D. (6) $2,151.57. E. (9) $512.45.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $302.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $97.41.

A. David A. Shepard, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Richard C. Shipman.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,108.86. E. (9) $67.70.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 508 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $700.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $50. E. (9) $1,076.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $3,000.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

E. (9) $220.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $105.48.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $7.20.

A. Carleton D. Smith, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $112.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $4,650.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,671.41. E. (9) $2,349.05.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $61.88.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $275.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,716.34.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,316.25. E. (9) $2,549.55.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2.80.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $31,144.20. E. (9) $4,715.24.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Box 747, Durant, Okla.

E. (9) $1,038.38.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.

B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $830. E. (9) $147.15.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Tool and Fine Steel Industry Committee, Reading, Pa.

D. (6) $375.

A. Frank S. Steele, Box 1453, Valdosta, Ga.

B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Mrs. C. Q. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $70. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $90.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20,470.64. E. (9) $6,782.32.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $266.58.

A. O. R. Strackbein.

B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $923.08.

A. O. R. Strackbein.

B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 315 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,250.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 1000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,625.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Verne R. Sullivan, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Margaret K. Taylor, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $126.62.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $265.10.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capital Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $10,529.01. E. (9) $1,700.87.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $200. E. (9) $27.15.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $9.50.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $750.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.

E. (9) $6.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) $665.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $1,331.05.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $244,011.67. E. (9) $18,118.33.

A. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $28,659.72.

A. U.S. Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Universal Exchange, P.O. Box 2782, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) $690.44.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $15.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $82.12. E. (9) $6.30.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Voice of the People in Action, The Society of the People, Inc., 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.

B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.

E. (9) $634.65.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $119.50. E. (9) $0.06.

A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. F. S. Wardwell, 130 Holmes Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,891.44. E. (9) $2,206.31.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,310. E. (9) $10.06.

A. George E. Weaver, 530 East Elizabeth Street, Fort Collins, Colo.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $5.65.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $49.73.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,813.04. E. (9) $527.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $99.89.

A. Donald Francis White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,174.97. E. (9) $104.15.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $0.29.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $2.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sugar Producers Association of El Salvador, San Salvador.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.08.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,583.50. E. (9) $194.18.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $64.85.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,833. E. (9) $45.45.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $278.92.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,776.92.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $65.

A. H. L. Wingate, Box 7, Pelham, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.50.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $50.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Alexander W. Wuerker, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $542. E. (9) $65.80.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $144.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1962:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Allen, Murden & Nystrom, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, Post Office Box 47, Bremen, Germany, and New York Advisory Group, 29 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Louise S. Damiani, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.

B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

A. Michael B. Deans, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Taxpayers Association of Leland Township Summer Home Owners, Inc., Box 215, Leland, Mich.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6, Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3.

A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Jennings, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Stockyards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James B. Lennon, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph M. Lovci, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive, St. Louis, Mo.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Paige, 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

B. The Anderson Company, 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

A. Robert A. Peerless, 5501 Southwest 40th Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John L. Sullivan, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 1927 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

SENATE

Monday, April 1, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the United States, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we, Thy children, humbly bow and glorify Thy divine grace and offer our profound gratitude for the abundant blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America and her people.

We entreat Thee, our Saviour, to bless our beloved President, to strengthen and assist him in his endeavor for freedom all over the world. Bless our Vice President; grant courage and wisdom to the Members of the Senate, this temple of peace, freedom, and justice.

Eternal God and Redeemer, Thou hast instilled in our hearts at birth the desire to live as free human beings. We beseech Thee today, on the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Byelorussia, to lift Thy benevolent countenance on this enslaved nation, and to sustain them with hope of freedom from the brute, godless force, and tortures of the inhuman rulers.

Almighty God and Father of all nations, we pray to Thee that the Byelorussian nation and all other nations in captivity may have soon Thy blessed freedom, that they may assume their rightful place among the free nations of the world under Thy universal guidance, care, love, and righteousness.

We humbly bow our heads before Thee, our God and Saviour, and faithfully implore Thee: Accept this, our prayer; bless the United States of America and Byelorussia.

May Thy glorious name, our God and Father, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, in the unity of the Holy Ghost live, reign, and shine in our hearts and be blessed now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 28, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag";

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States;

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; and

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytic index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments.

The message further announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag":

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled 'Our Flag', published by the Office of Armed Services Information and Education, Department of Defense, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that three hundred thousand additional copies be printed, of which two hundred thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one hundred thousand shall be for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be compiled and printed fifty-nine thousand three hundred and fifty copies of a wall map of the United States, prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, showing information, including historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States, to be printed on a single sheet, approximately three and one-half feet by five and one-half feet, of which forty-three thousand nine hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifteen thousand four hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled 'How Our Laws Are Made', by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 136 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Sec. 2. There shall be printed thirty thousand nine hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is authorized to be printed as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, prepared by Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York, and that twenty-five thousand additional copies be printed, of which five thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the balance prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives."

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the executive calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL TO AMEND THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive D, 88th Congress, 1st session, a protocol to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed on September 15, 1962, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States; that the protocol and the message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on December 7, 1944. The protocol was approved at Rome on September 14, 1962, by the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization during its 14th session and signed by the President and the Secretary General of the Assembly on September 15, 1962.

The protocol, embodying a proposed amendment to article 48(a) of the Convention, increases the number of requests from contracting states required to convene an extraordinary meeting of the Assembly from 10 contracting States to not less than one-fifth of the total number of contracting states.

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State regarding the protocol.

John F. Kennedy.

April 1, 1963.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of the protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.)

CONVENTION ON EXTRADITION WITH ISRAEL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 88th Congress, 1st session, a convention on extradition with Israel, signed on December 10, 1962, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States; that the convention and the message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention on extradition between the Government of United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Washington December 10, 1962.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *April 1, 1963.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) convention of extradition between the United States and Israel, signed December 10, 1962.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, it was with a great feeling of personal satisfaction today that I joined with my colleagues in confirming the nomination to the Post Office Advisory Board of Mr. Fred Gates, of Minneapolis. Mr. Gates has been a valued and trusted counselor of both Senators from Minnesota for many years. His unselfish dedication to the public welfare, his generosity to those less fortunate, his strong sense of civic duty, and his absolute integrity have earned him the respect and friendship of all who know him. A strong family man and a pillar of his church, Mr. Gates exemplifies the type of American businessman who carries his ideals and principles into the everyday life of business. As secretary and one of the founders of the Minnesota Senatorial Businessmen's Advisory Committee, Mr. Gates has provided leadership to a group of more than 250 Minnesota businessmen who regularly meet with and make recommendations on public policy to Minnesota's two U.S. Senators.

The Lebanese-American community throughout America will also no doubt be pleased at the honor which has been given them by President Kennedy's choice of one of their most respected and beloved members.

Minnesota is deeply honored to have another of its sons serving on an important advisory board of the Federal Government, and I can assure you, Mr. President, that in Mr. Fred Gates, the Postmaster General has acquired an adviser who shares with him his strong interest in efficiency and economy. Indeed, over the period of two decades in which I have spent in the public service, I can honestly state that I know of no man who is more passionately devoted to the principle of economy nor more bitterly opposed to waste. Mr. Gates is a man of high standards, as much for himself as for his friends and colleagues, and I know that he will advise the authorities of the Post Office Department in as candid and fearless a manner as he has always been accustomed to do in other matters relating to the public welfare.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 70, Senate bill 1035.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is no opposition to the bill. It has been cleared on both sides and with all parties known to be interested.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 79) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would extend for 1 year (to April 3, 1964) the period during which the Federal Maritime Commission is required by the provisions of Public Law 87-346 to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify, existing dual rate contracts in use in the waterborne foreign commerce of the United States.

It would amend section 3 of the act by striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964", and by striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

REASON FOR THE BILL

Public Law 87-346, enacted on October 3, 1961, authorized ocean common carriers and conferences thereof serving the foreign commerce of the United States to enter into "effective and fair" dual rate contracts with shippers and consignees. To insure that the contracts would be fair to all concerned, Congress set a number of strict standards which these agreements must meet, and provided that all dual rate contracts in effect at the time of enactment would continue in effect, under certain conditions.

First, parties to the agreements were given 6 months, to April 3, 1962, to modify the existing agreements and bring them into compliance with the new standards established, and to submit the agreements as modified to the Federal Maritime Commission for approval. The act further provided that all such modified agreements submitted for approval would be lawful for a further period of not to exceed a year, within which period the Commission was directed to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify the agreements and amendments in accordance with the provisions of the act.

To a new Commission, which had been established less than 2 months previously and was still in the throes of organization, the assignment handed them was simply beyond the capacity of the limited staff available. The volume and diversity of comments from carriers and shippers in the necessary rulemaking procedures were enormous, and these all had to be considered in relation to previous practices and procedures of some 40 years standing.

Additionally, the act required that all common carriers affected by these changed standards must file tariffs of their rates, in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission, and the Commission was directed to disapprove any such rate upon a finding, after hearing, that such rate is so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States.

Public Law 87-254, enacted September 19, 1961, compounded the Commission's regulatory duties by providing for the licensing of ocean freight forwarders, necessitating further extensive rulemaking procedures.

During the fiscal year 1962, the first year of the Commission's operations, the average employment was 125. Recognition by the administration and by Congress that the Commission was inadequately staffed to perform the heavy regulatory duties entailed by Public Law 87-326 particularly, is evidenced by the record. Funds were provided for fiscal 1963 to permit an average employment of approximately 212 persons; and an average staff of 282, more than double the original figure, is requested in the budget for fiscal 1964.

The Department of Justice has advised orally that it is raising no objection to enactment.

The statement of the Federal Maritime Commission which accompanied the request for introduction of the bill follows:

"The bill would extend the period during which the Federal Maritime Commission shall approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify existing dual rate contracts in use in our waterborne foreign commerce for a period of 1 year.

"By Public Law 87-346 Congress imposed comprehensive requirements which must be included in dual rate contracts. Section 3 of Public Law 87-346 provides that all existing dual rate contracts which were lawful on the date that the law was enacted, if modified to comply with the requirements of Public Law 87-346 within 6 months (April 3, 1962), would remain lawful for a period not to exceed 1 year (April 3, 1963).

"The section provided that the Commission within such year approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify such contract in accordance with the new requirement contained in that Public Law.

"On or about April 3, 1962, amendments to some 60 dual rate contracts were filed with the Commission pursuant to the foregoing statutory provisions.

"As required by law, by appropriate notice in the Federal Register the Commission requested the views of interested persons. Comments were received from many interested parties, particularly shippers, exporters, and importers which raised objection to many of the amendments proposed, and requested an opportunity to be heard as provided by Public Law 87-346 before the Commission took action to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify the contracts.

"In accordance with the desires of Congress as expressed in the House and Senate committee reports on the bill which became Public Law 87-346, the Commission has also undertaken to a formal rulemaking proceeding to deal with certain matters which, to some extent, were left unsolved by the public law. This rulemaking proceeding must, of necessity, be closely coordinated with the 60 individual contract proceedings.

"In order to afford all persons the rights accorded to them under the procedures set out in Public Law 87-346 and in view of the many complex questions which unavoidably flow from the Commission's attempt to accord due weight to the many and diverse interests represented in these matters, additional time is needed to allow the Commission to discharge its responsibility in approving, disapproving, canceling, or modifying the amended contracts. The bill would extend until April 3, 1964, the time by which the Commission must pass upon the lawfulness of all current contracts; and, while it is our serious hope and intention that the matter will be disposed of short of that time, prudence suggests that the April 3, 1964, date would not be unreasonable."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87-346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

"(a) By striking the words 'of not to exceed one year after such filing' from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'but not beyond April 3, 1964.'

"(b) By striking the word 'year' from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'period'."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF CERTAIN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION NEGOTIATED FIXED-PRICE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected aspects of certain Atomic Energy Commission negotiated fixed-price contracts for the procurement of lithium hydroxide monohydrate, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF RECREATION AND OTHER SELECTED LAND-USE ACTIVITIES, FOREST SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of recreation and other selected land-use activities, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

COMMITMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS TO ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of this act of October 11, 1949, 63 Stat. 759, Ch. 672 (32 D.C.C. 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **VICE PRESIDENT**:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alabama (both houses thereof concurring therein), That this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 2. Three-fourths of the Justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

" 'SEC. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

" 'SEC. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

" 'SEC. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

" 'SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission;' be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"(Adopted by the house of representatives March 12, 1963. Concurred in and adopted by the senate March 13, 1963. Approved by the Governor March 18, 1963.)"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1963 EX-8

"Whereas continuing construction, projected to cost up to $60 million during the next 5 years, is planned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on additional irrigation blocks of the Columbia Basin project within Franklin County; and

"Whereas previous bond issues for farm-to-market roads in irrigation blocks within the county have been exhausted; and

"Whereas Franklin County is without financial resources or bonding capacity to meet new farm-to-market road costs in these new areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, be requested to consider the construction of farm-to-market roads as an integral part of the reclamation project for the balance of the Columbia Basin development program, and to accept the financial responsibility therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

REPORT ENTITLED "INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 84)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I have the privilege to file with the Senate the report of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 359 of the 87th Congress, 2d session.

In taking up its responsibility of investigating the intergovernmental relations between the United States and the States and municipalities, the subcommittee focused its attention on an ancient American problem. "How to achieve a more perfect Union" has been the oldest and most challenging of all the political questions that have tested the wisdom of American statesmen. Long before the establishment of our Republic and even before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, Americans were grappling with the problems of intergovernmental relations. Most of the American arguments that were raised between 1763 and 1775 in the heat of the debate with the mother country dealt with the overriding problem of imperial federalism. After the Revolution, the debate continued on this side of the Atlantic. The central question, however, remained one of intergovernmental relations. With the drafting and ratification of the U.S. Constitution, a satisfactory balance was struck between the need for central strength and regulation on the one hand, and the value of local freedom of action on the other. This rejection of the confederal and unitary extremes established federalism as the master principle in this field for all subsequent generations of Americans.

In hammering out the pragmatic decisions that gave rise to our Federal system, the Founding Fathers devised a new constitutional principle that was ultimately recognized as one of America's greatest contributions to the art of government. Since the establishment of our Federal Union, nearly all of our major domestic controversies have taken the form of disputes over the legitimate constitutional position or activities of the States or the National Government. This ever-present attempt to effect a new adjustment stems from the fact that yesterday's equilibrium may have become today's imbalance. Our habit of confining these debates to the framework of the U.S. Constitution highlights an unusual feature of our Federal system. In most other countries, such basic controversies would have produced philosophic tracts, rather than constitutional briefs. I am of the opinion that the history of these conflicts provides us with a valuable perspective with which to view our present Federal-State-local trouble spots.

What is most striking about the adversaries in these historic encounters is the flexibility with which they have adopted a nationalist position at one point in time and the so-called States rights position at another. The great geographic regions of our country, the major political parties—including the Federalists, both conservatives and liberals, and our great economic interest groups—have all failed to pursue consistent policies with respect to Federal-State relationships. Recognition of the remarkable ease with which groups have shifted their positions on this cardinal problem of domestic American politics dramatizes the dynamism of our Federal system and the essential neutrality of the Federal principle.

With reference to contemporary problems, I am confident that there would be less tendency to elevate the difficulties in our Federal-State-local relationships to the level of abstract slogans, if we were more aware that many of labor's centralizing arguments of today were those of business yesterday and that the liberals' States' rights positions of yesterday are the staples of the conservative case today. To put it differently, the pat ideological formulas for a more perfect Union that have been heard of late should be put aside and a sober consideration of the political proposals advanced by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the House and Senate Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations substituted. In the long run, meaningful action, not political polemics, will strengthen our Federal system.

With this realistic attitude in mind, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations began operations in September 1962, pursuant to Senate Resolution 357, 87th Congress, 2d session. Under this resolution, the subcommittee was authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and to review the legislative recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and other legislative proposals dealing with intergovernmental relations which are referred by the parent committee.

In meeting these broad responsibilities during its first 5 months of existence, the subcommittee addressed itself to the fundamental problem of determining what objectives should be sought in the field of intergovernmental relations that would best reflect the will of the American people. Two basic devices have been employed to identify these objectives. The subcommittee has held 3 days of hearings on general problems of Federal-State-local relations and on the role of the Federal Government in metropolitan areas. Using another technique, it has undertaken the widespread circulation of a questionnaire dealing with major intergovernmental problems. As a separate consideration, the subcommittee, acting for the full committee, has held 3 days of hearings on proposals for the disposition of Ellis Island in New York. Due to the subcommittee's late establishment, action on bills referred to it was impossible.

At this point, permit me to summarize the detailed account of activities contained in this report.

The first hearing of the subcommittee on September 18 was in the form of a panel discussion on intergovernmental relations problems, with participants representing major State and local business organizations. The purpose of this hearing was to get the views of these experts on what could be done to improve our Federal system. This was a preliminary exploration designed to serve as the basis for future extensive hearings, to be carried out in the field during the 88th Congress.

On September 26 the subcommittee held a preliminary hearing on five bills relating to the disposition and future utilization of Ellis Island. These bills were introduced by Senators Sparkman, Case, and Williams of New Jersey. Testimony was received from these Senators as well as from Senators Keating and Javits, and from representatives of the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On December 6 and 7 the subcommittee held public hearings in New York City, at which 27 witnesses testified on behalf of 10 different utilization proposals. The subcommittee now hopes to proceed to discuss possible congressional action on the subject.

On December 13 and 14, hearings were held on the role of the Federal Government in metropolitan areas. Witnesses were members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, representing all levels of government. A thoroughgoing examination was attempted of the complex intergovernmental relationships involved in governing our metropolitan areas. Special attention was given to bills pending before the Senate to improve the metropolitan area planning process. Considerable attention was given to possible steps that might be taken to increase the role of the States in metropolitan area planning and development.

In early fall, an extensive questionnaire was prepared, after consultation with experts. It was distributed to 6,000 State and local officials and other authorities in the field. This questionnaire touched on problems in the areas of grants-in-aid, taxation and revenue, metropolitan areas, and general issues of Federal-State-local involvement. About 300 returns had been received as of January 7, but preliminary evaluations reveal some attitudes and opinions which will be of considerable assistance to the subcommittee in its deliberations on the legislative proposals referred to it. Efforts to increase the returns are being carried out by followup contacts. As a result, over a hundred additional replies have been received. These are being tabulated and analyzed.

In examining intergovernmental relations, the subcommittee has attempted to maintain an objective viewpoint, and the report was written in this spirit. We are confident that the activities carried out by the subcommittee during the first 5 months of its existence will serve as the basis for invigorating our Federal system through legislation and investigations during the 88th Congress.

In order to give my colleagues an opportunity to review the highlights of the subcommittee report, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed and the press release covering the filing of the report be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Maine; and, without objection, the press release will be printed in the Record.

The press release presented by Mr. Muskie is as follows:

Washington, April 1.—A Senate subcommittee put a price tag today of between $11 and $14 billions annually on the combined cost of intergovernmental activities involving Federal, State, and local operations—a crazy quilt of relationships described by the chairman, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, as "the hidden dimension of government."

Declaring that much of its present shape and impact is wrapped in mystery, the Senate probers nonetheless gave a tentative but emphatic endorsement to the federalist concept as a continuing and effective system of government for the United States.

In its first interim report to the Senate for the full Committee on Government Operations, the new Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations pointed out that the "hidden dimension" makes a major impact on all Americans through its involvement in highways, housing, public assistance, hospitals, airports, public health, unemployment compensation, education, agricultural extension, and waste treatment facilities.

"Performing almost as a fourth branch of government in meeting the needs of our people," Senator Muskie said, "it nonetheless has no direct electorate, operates from no set perspective, is under no special control, and moves in no particular direction."

"The world of intergovernmental relations is represented by no policymaking body," he continued. "There is no executive, no judiciary, and no legislature." And it is significant to note, he said, that "no governmental authority is prepared to provide any specific data on the subject" although "a substantial amount of our governmental expenditures is involved in these programs every year." Because of its interim nature, the report does not attempt to break down or analyze today's cost estimate of $11 or $14 billion, however.

The subcommittee report—signed by the chairman and its four other members, Senators Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina, and Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, Democrats, and Senators Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota, and Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska, Republicans—further defines its continuing mission as the identification of the hidden dimension—"to understand what it is, what its potential is, and in what direction it is moving."

The Senate probers reveal they are concentrating first on four major areas: Federal grants-in-aid which alone, subcommittee figures estimate, will cost over $10 billion in $1964; taxation and revenues; metropolitan areas, and other general problems.

To supplement its relatively limited ability to amass vast detail through public hearings, the Muskie subcommittee will rely on the results of a massive questionnaire composed of more than 100 inquiries which has now been distributed to 400 State officials, 800 school boards, 1,900 county officials, 1,600 city managers, 900 mayors, and 400 professors and other experts on intergovernmental relations.

By the start of this year, subcommittee staff experts said, over 300 replies had already been elicited and partly tabulated. "The ultimate tabulation, analysis, and evaluation," Senator Muskie observed, "will yield a body of competent judgments never heretofore available and reflecting an expertise that will go light-years beyond the opinion sampling possible through the forum of the public hearing alone."

Some hint of things to come as the Muskie subcommittee pursues its mission can be found in its preliminary analysis of answers to the questionnaire already received. These indicate that:

A clear and surprising majority of respondents oppose any further concessions in the direction of making Federal grants-in-aid serve a greater equalizing function than they do now as between low- and high-income States.

There is a general lack of strong criticism of the Hatch Act or the merit system requirements associated with such grants.

There is an unanticipated consistency among State and local recipients indicating basic satisfaction with requirements imposed for aid grants.

There is overwhelming endorsement of periodic review of Federal grants-in-aid by Congress even where termination of some grants might be threatened, a large percentage holding that this procedure would either improve the grants' effectiveness or lead to strengthening revisions in meeting new problems.

There is a strong and continuing interest in efforts to readjust the total tax base among the several levels of government which has shifted in the past half century from a 63-percent aggregate levied by State and local governments to a 70-percent aggregate levied by the Federal Government.

Respondents to date favor by 2 to 1 a Federal tax credit for income levies paid to State and local governments and an equally strong 2-to-1 sentiment for reducing State limitations on the borrowing and taxing powers of local governments to an absolute minimum.

There is overwhelming 5-to-1 endorsement in principle of Federal payments in lieu of taxes for the encroachment of Federal buildings in local jurisdictions and an even greater, 6 to 1, vote urging continuation of the tax-exempt status of State and local debt obligations.

The Muskie subcommittee concluded by promising "to give close attention to all proposals dealing with a proper balance of functions and revenues between levels of government. But, at the same time, we recognize that in the present-day operations of the Federal system a better solution than the strict division of functions or revenue sources might be found in the improvement of cooperative devices designed to enable each level to share in the whole governmental activity involved to the extent that it is capable.

"While we recognize that our efforts to promote cooperation and coordination may not meet with immediate success in every case, nonetheless the subcommittee is optimistic about the future of federalism. It has shown remarkable resiliency as a governmental form despite the centralizing pressures which stem from technological progress as well as from competition from totalitarian systems of government. It is our belief that this system still best serves the needs of our country and will continue to enable the United States to balance the requirements of freedom and security in the most effective way."

REPORT ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 85)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 263, 87th Congress, 2d session, as amended, submitted a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1230. A bill for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a handicapped individual for expenses of transportation to and from work; to allow an additional exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1232. A bill to amend the Federal property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1233. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; and

S. 1234. A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1235. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to include street systems in rural communities in the Federal-aid secondary system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1237. A bill for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1239. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended; and

S. 1240. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1892 (27 Stat. 42), as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1241. A bill to require annual reports instead of quarterly reports under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. Curtis):

S. 1242. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup division, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1243. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1244. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in or adjacent to the International Peace Garden at Dunseith, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. Smith) (by request):

S. 1245. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1246. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity in connection therewith;

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of Konstantine N. Portaritis; and

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Markos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. Bayh):

S. 1249. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which allows income tax deductions and exemptions to handicapped individuals and to those who support such individuals.

My bill would aid handicapped persons in meeting expenses of transportation to and from work. Many persons who have lost the use of one or both legs, or both arms, or who suffer some other physical disability, can utilize the usual means of public transportation only with undue hardship and danger. Therefore, such persons must pay for special automobiles or other devices to perform their regular jobs. My bill would allow an income tax deduction to cover such expenses.

Secondly, the bill would give an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer who is a handicapped individual himself, or who has a handicapped spouse or dependent. This exemption would be applicable in cases where the disability prevented the individual from taking care of himself.

Mr. President, the provisions of my bill are not meant to be, in any sense, gratuities. I recognize that most handicapped individuals have faced their problems with courage that should be a source of inspiration and pride for us all. However, the hard luck they have had has its inevitable financial counterpart. By passing this bill Congress would help them to hold positions of responsibility in their communities, and would in some degree, compensate for the extra difficulties involved in pursuing a productive, useful occupation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1231) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a handicapped individual for expenses of transportation to and from work; to allow an additional exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to work; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

According to the Administrator, the primary purpose of the bill is to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered.

The bill also proposes certain less significant improvements in procurement. It would exclude the procurement of personal services from the operation of title III, which is essentially a property management code of procedures. It would make certain limitations of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—concerning fees of cost-type contracts, contingent fees, examination of records, et cetera—applicable to contracts negotiated by executive agencies under any law, not only those under title III.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated January 30, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1232) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is enclosed for consideration a draft bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

Section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 includes the provision that the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe for executive agencies policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and nonpersonal services. Section 205(c) of that act provides that he shall prescribe regulations he deems necessary to effectuate his functions under the act, and that the head of each executive agency shall issue orders and directives necessary to carry out such regulations.

The primary purpose of this legislative proposal is to make the procurement procedures specified in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable to executive agencies. Presently the use of all title III procedures is permissive with most executive agencies under a general delegation of authority to such agencies made by the Administrator of General Services on March 26, 1962 (27 F.R. 3017).

Procedures corresponding to those of title III already apply to procurement by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (10 U.S.C. 2303(a)). Accordingly, section 1 of the draft bill recognizes this existing authority as well as other authority of agencies to procure without regard to all or part of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as provided, for example, in section 602(d) of that act.

Title III represents a modernized code of procedures for procurement by the Government of property and nonpersonal services. It concerns such matters as advertising, negotiation, small business, antitrust laws, covenant against contingent fees, cost-plus and incentive-type contracting, examination of contractors' books and records, and advance payments. Chapter 137 of title 10 cf the United States Code (derived from the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947) provides a similar version of this code for the Armed Forces and NASA. For agencies which do not use title III procedures pursuant to the delegation of authority made by the Administrator of General Services, or which do not come within chapter 137 of title 10 of the code, the only general legislative procurement-procedure directive is section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Section 3709 merely requires formal advertising for procurement for the Government, except in certain specified cases. It is narrow and limited in application, and silent as to other important facets of procurement procedure, such as those provided in title III and chapter 137.

Section 302(a) of title III, as originally enacted in 1949, contained a rather circumscribed authorization to the Administrator of General Services to make delegations of title III authority to other executive agencies. This authorization was subject to a narrow construction, and under it but few delegations were made, which were, for the most part, of limited nature. However, Public Law 85–800, approved August 28, 1958, amended section 302(a) by liberalizing the authority of the Administrator to permit the use of title III by executive agencies, in order to promote uniformity and simplification in their procurement procedures. Accordingly, the Administrator on March 10, 1959 (F.R. Mar. 17, 1959, 24 F.R. 1921; reissued Mar. 26, 1962, 27 F.R. 3017, Mar. 30, 1962), issued a delegation of authority to executive agencies to use title III. This delegation of authority does not require executive agencies to use the procurement procedures under title III but leaves this use permissive. On the same date he established the Federal procurement regulations system (24 F.R. 1933), which is now codified in subtitle A of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A section-by-section analysis of the draft bill is attached hereto. For the reasons enumerated in this letter and in the attachment, GSA recommends early enactment of the proposed bill. Enactment of this proposed legislation would not affect the budgetary requirements of the General Services Administration or of any other agency.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Attachment

The first section of the enclosed bill extends title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377, 393; 41 U.S.C. 251 ff.) directly to all executive agencies, except the agencies and activities specified in title 10, United States Code, section 2303(a), and is, therefore, the logical extension of this law to complement what has already been achieved in systematizing Government procurement. It would thus provide a common legislative foundation for uniform procurement practices by agencies under regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Until such controlling regulations are issued by the Administrator on any given aspect, agencies would apply the statutory powers in accordance with their own proper interpretation.

In addition, the section makes clear that the limited exemptions specified in section 602(d) of the 1949 act, or in any other law, are not eliminated by this section, but provides that Revised Statutes section 3709 and 3710, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 8), shall remain applicable to such exempt procurements in the absence of authority to procure without advertising or without regard to said section 3709. Thus, an agency which properly exempts itself from all or any part of the act will not thereby obtain the right to negotiate contracts as distinguished from having to formally advertise although it may do so to the extent that it has negotiating authority under other law.

Section 2(a) of the draft bill deletes from paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the act the reference to "personal" services and would limit the negotiation authorization of the paragraph to the procurement of "nonpersonal" services. As more fully explained in connection with section 6 of the draft bill, this amendment would bring the paragraph in line with the policy of Congress in assigning property management responsibilities to the Administrator of General Services.

Section 2(b) of the bill would add "section 304 shall apply to such purchases and contracts" to paragraph (15) of section 302(c). The effect of this addition would be to make the restrictions of section 304, which are applicable to contracts negotiated under paragraphs (1) to (14) of section 302(c) similarly applicable to contracts negotiated under paragraph (15). The restrictions in section 304 pertain to limitations on the use of cost-type contracts, inclusion of a covenant against contingent fees, inclusion of an examination of records clause, etc. The amendment, therefore, would provide uniformity in the requirements applicable to negotiated contracts.

Section 3 of the draft bill would interpolate in section 307(a) of the act a reference to section 205(d) of the act. This is a technical amendment applying only to the Administrator of General Services. It is intended to make clear that his authority to delegate under title III does not include authority to delegate authority to issue policy regulations applicable to executive agencies. Accordingly, the "implementing regulations" of section 302(a) mentioned in section 1 of this draft bill, for example, could be issued only by the Administrator.

By section 4 of the bill, which is purely technical, the second sentence of section 307(b) of the act would be deleted. Presently, this sentence provides that the power of the Administrator to make the delegations and determinations specified in section 302 (a) shall be delegable only to the Deputy Administrator or to the chief official of any principal organizational unit of the General Services Administration. Deletion of this provision is appropriate because the proposed amendment of section 302(a), contained in section 1 of the draft bill, eliminates the references to delegation now contained in the text of section 302(a).

Section 5 of the bill, amending section 310 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, is likewise technical. It is ancillary to section 1 of the draft bill amending section 302(a).

The proposed amendment of section 310 provides that neither sections 3709 and 3710 nor section 3735 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to the procurement of property or nonpersonal services made by any executive agency pursuant to title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. Revised Statutes sections 3709 and 3710 are the General Statutes (dating from 1861 and 1868, respectively) requiring formal advertising for procurement of supplies and services for the Government, except in specified cases. Revised Statutes section 3735, dating from 1868, prohibits executive departments from making contracts for stationery or other supplies for a longer term than 1 year. Sections 3709 and 3735 are already, under the present text of section 310(a), made inapplicable to procurement by GSA and, within the scope of authority delegated by the Administrator, to any other executive agency. Similar provisions apply to the armed services, the Coast Guard, and NASA (10 U.S.C. 2314). The broadened application of title III, in particular, section 303, to executive agencies makes continued applicability of section 3710 superfluous.

The amendment would delete reference to two other statutory provisions now stated by section 310(a) to be inapplicable to procurement under title III; namely, sections 1 and 2 of the act of October 10, 1940, 54 Stat. 1109, as amended (41 U.S.C. 6 and 6a), which set forth certain exemptions from Revised Statutes, section 3709. Said section 1 has been repealed (section 1 (98)-(105), 65 Stat. 705, October 31, 1951). Under the terms of the amendments proposed by the bill, reference to section 2 is no longer necessary.

By virtue of section 310 as proposed for amendment in this bill, exemptions from the requirements of Revised Statutes, section 3709 (and 3710), heretofore given to agencies which are not exempt from the provisions of title III, whether or not these statutory authorizations expressly refer to section 3709 (and 3710), are preserved by constituting these as exceptions from the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) (and 303) of the act pursuant to section 302(c)(15), as proposed for amendment in section 2(b) of this bill.

Under this amendment, however, contracts negotiated under such exemptions are subject to the restrictions of section 304 of the act, made applicable by the proposed amendment to section 302(c)(15) unless exemption from section 304 is available and asserted pursuant to section 602(d) of this act or other law. The application of section 304, however, is considered primarily technical since agencies have generally observed most of the limitations contained therein either as a matter of policy or under GSA or agency regulations.

Section 6 of the bill would amend title III by inserting "nonpersonal" before "services" throughout the title. Section 1 of the bill already proposes such a change in section 302(a) of the act, section 2(a) in section 302(c)(4), and section 6 in section 310. The effect of these changes would be to conform the authority of the Administrator to the policy stated by Congress in section 2 of the act (to provide a system for the procurement and supply of personal property and "nonpersonal services") and to the responsibility vested in the Administrator by section 201(a) of the act (to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and "nonpersonal services").

With respect to services, it seems clear that the efficiency and economy sought to be accomplished through the regulatory activity of the Administrator can better be found in the field of nonpersonal services, more akin to property management, than in the field of personal services procurement. In connection with section 2(a) of the bill, it should be noted that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (item 4) will be available to executive agencies for procuring personal services by negotiated methods. The first sentence of section 304(b) of the act is explicitly not affected by section 7 of the bill in order to preserve for personal services contracts the 6 percent maximum fee limitation applicable to contracts for architectural and engineering services.

Section 7 of the draft bill would amend section 602(d) of the act to include references to the Postmaster General's present authority with respect to the leasing and acquisition of real property and the Secretary of the Interior's authority with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville power project. The bill thus recognizes and confirms the special and exceptional procurement authority over these matters which has hitherto been conferred by law (16 U.S.C. 832(a)(f); 39 U.S.C. 2102, 2103(a)(2), 2114). It is understood that administrative and housekeeping items are excluded from the term "program operations" and that, to the extent that these procurement programs would not be impaired by compliance with the Administrator's regulations, such regulations will be observed, as heretofore contemplated by the Congress and the President (H. Rept. 670, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 28; Presidential directive of July 1, 1949, 14 Fed. Reg. 3699).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CONTRACTS FOR INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

According to the Administrator, the purpose of this bill is to permit greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated March 1, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1233) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee is a draft bill prepared by the General Services Administration "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit greater economy, safety and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts necessary for the inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by the proposed legislation together with comments justifying enactment of the proposal are set forth in more detail in the attachment hereto.

With respect to the fiscal effects of the enactment of this proposal, it is believed that substantial savings would inure to the benefit of the Government. However, the extent of these savings cannot be measured at this time because long-term contracts for such services have not been consummated in the past.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

ATTACHMENT

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by this measure include heating, refrigeration, ventilation, air conditioning, electrical, vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchman, fuel and pneumatic tube systems installed in Federal buildings. Typical items common to these systems are the following: boilers, stokers, and oil burners; compressors, chillers, and cooling towers; fans, airhandlers, and induction units; transformers, motors, generators, high voltage switchgear, and interior distribution wiring; pumps, piping, and water tanks; fire alarms and watchman central recorders; fuel tanks, and lines; blowers and tube stations; and elevators and escalators. Such systems are relatively complex and costly and require continuous inspection, maintenance, and repair (when necessary) of such a character that they can be operated efficiently, with the greatest possible safety, with a minimum of service interruption, for the longest possible time economically justifiable.

A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment is subject to being performed for the Government by contracting with firms which specialize in the various aspects thereof. It would be very advantageous to the Government if more of this servicing could be contracted out. There are several reasons for this.

For one thing, the Government in many localities has been unable to employ, or to retain for any length of time those employed, the necessary number of specially trained skilled craftsmen, and supervisors with know-how, to perform the work because of local labor market conditions.

For another, by contracting for this work the Government is relieved of the added costs and difficulties inherent in purchasing, transporting and storing innumerable spare parts and other supplies which would otherwise be necessary, as well as arranging for the availability of such spare parts and other supplies promptly when and where needed in the many Federal buildings throughout the country, not infrequently on an emergency basis.

For a third, even assuming that the Government could obtain and retain the necessary skilled craftsmen at all locations, the amount of such service work required at any given time for any given Federal building varies to such an extent that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, in many small isolated locations, to schedule the work so that the skilled craftsmen employed by the Government would be fully employed on the one hand, or that, on the other hand, there are sufficient skilled craftsmen available to handle the work on other occasions when unpredictable and urgent heavy demands for their services may arise to service particular buildings.

For these reasons, and because of other problems, some of which are indicated hereinafter, the usual practice of private industry is to enter into long-term contracts with specialty firms for such services.

Under present law, Government contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment may be entered into for only 1 year. It is believed that authority to contract for a longer period will yield lower costs and more efficient and satisfactory service and operations.

It has been our experience that many contractors do not fully carry out their obligations under 1-year contracts with us for equipment inspection, maintenance and repair, as hidden deficiencies in such maintenance show up later, often after the contract has expired and a new contractor is on the job. Because of their inherently latent nature, it is most difficult to prove whether the deficiencies in performance under such contracts are attributable to one short-term contractor or to another, at least to the extent that the Government can obtain appropriate damages or other relief in a court of law, or before an administrative tribunal, for the failure of a contractor to properly perform such a maintenance contract. As one consequence, the Government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies. Another consequence has been that our equipment has not been operable, because of shutdown time for repairs, more frequently and for longer periods than it should be. Thus, we have been handicapped in properly protecting the Government's interests.

Another somewhat different type of situation which has confronted us is that, when a yearly contract for the servicing of new equipment is involved, a contractor will bid low and thus be awarded contracts seriatim for 2 or 3 years to service this new equipment. But, when the contractor decides that the time has come when his hidden neglect in maintenance no longer can be concealed, possibly about the third or fourth year of its life, he will refrain from bidding on future contracts. It is considered that authority to enter into contracts to service this equipment for a maximum of 5 years will do much to alleviate this type of situation, as most major defects in maintenance will show up in a 5-year period. Under a 5-year contract, the contractor will have a much greater incentive to perform proper maintenance during the early years of the life of equipment than under a 1-year contract. And, under a 5-year contract, even if a contractor neglects the maintenance during the early years, his neglect can much more easily be charged against him than it could be under a 1-year contract, as such a contractor could not sit back with the thought that the Government would have great difficulty in proving that he, rather than his successor contractor, was responsible therefor.

Another benefit to the Government which would flow from the grant of authority to enter into such 5-year contracts is that, in many cases, lower prices could be obtained under one contract for 5 years as contrasted with those obtainable under five contracts for 1 year each. Under the longer term contract, contractors would be able to arrange for longer range, bigger volume purchasing of supplies and spare parts, and otherwise more economical operations. An important fringe benefit would be the greater time a contractor's personnel would have to become acquainted with the characteristics of the particular pieces of equipment which were being serviced, including the relationship of such equipment to the structural and other characteristics of the buildings in which it is located, or in connection with which it is used, and the detailed nature of the circumstances under which it must be operated. Each new contractor under an annual contract arrangement has to organize for the job and train his employees for the particular tasks required by the contract, thus sacrificing to some extent the efficiency that results from experience in actually performing the work.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO THE CERTIFICATION OF CERTAIN FACTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The proposed legislation would amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by granting authority to certain Government officials to authorize the Administrator of General Services to certify to facts and make administrative determinations on the basis of information contained in records transferred from their agencies to the General Services Administration. The Administrator of General Services would be authorized to delegate and authorize redelegation of such authority under the provisions of subsection 205(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated March 4, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1234) to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The proposed legislation would amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by granting authority to certain Government officials to authorize the Administrator of General Services to certify to facts and make administrative determinations on the basis of information contained in records transferred from their agencies to the General Services Administration. The Administrator of General Services would be authorized to delegate and authorize redelegation of such authority under the provisions of subsection 205(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes any official of the Federal Government, who is authorized to certify to facts on the basis of records in his custody, to continue to certify to facts contained in records which have been transferred by him or his predecessors to the General Services Administration. Under the present law the Administrator of General Services has no authority to execute certifications contemplated by this proposal, but can only certify as to the literal terms of the original document.

Since the establishment of Federal records centers, large quantities of Federal records have been transferred to these centers. Federal records centers are established and maintained by General Services Administration under statutory authority (63 Stat. 583; 40 U.S.C. 395). These centers now hold over one-third of all Federal records. The volume of requests for certifications has increased correspondingly with the growth of the Federal records centers. Approximately 3 million inquiries regarding records in the custody of the Administrator of General Services are received at the Federal Records Centers annually. As a consequence, GSA has found it necessary to staff the centers with competent and professionally trained personnel, who have developed a knowledge and sense of responsibility comparable to that of the personnel of the agencies which created the records. In many instances, GSA personnel at the records centers may be more familiar with the records than currently employed personnel of the record-creating agency, since records center personnel are continuously servicing these records.

The present method of processing requests for certifications provides that records center personnel conduct a search for the records, prepare the legal certification for signature, and transmit the documentation to the designated official in the record-creating agency for signature. This procedure is obviously time consuming and cumbersome. The proposed legislation would permit the record-creating agency to delegate the certifying authority to the Administrator of General Services in those instances where it appears that such action is in the best interest of the United States. Enactment of the legislation would in most cases relieve Federal agencies of a routine and perfunctory function and would eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort.

As a matter of practice Federal records center personnel are the only individuals who have the necessary certifying knowledge with regard to facts contained in records of defunct agencies which have been transferred to the Federal records centers.

The enactment of the proposed legislation would not require the expenditures of additional Federal funds. In fact, it would reduce duplication of effort and its enactment should result in economies.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

DEDUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL FEES AND TUITION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable individuals to deduct educational expenses for themselves or their dependents up to the amount of $300 per person per taxable year.

Mr. President, for many years the Congress has had before it a wide variety of proposed legislation to grant some form of tax relief to those who must bear great cost and sacrifice in getting an education, both their own and for their children. Many such bills are again before the Congress this year. I am adding my own bill for consideration because of my very strong feeling that, from among all the measures advanced, there should be able to be devised a happy formula for tax relief—one that will prove capable of encouraging educational expenditure by lightening the financial sacrifices involved, yet not causing too severe a drain upon Treasury revenues, which is one of the considerations that has been at the source of Treasury Department opposition in the past. It is my belief that the bill I am offering hits upon the right formula.

A sound tax revision program, Mr. President, is a matter of high priority in the 88th Congress; I certainly regard it to be at or near the very top. The prime objective we are, or should be, striving for is a program capable of generating the long-term economic growth essential to our very national survival. The ingredients for growth stimulation are many. But, in my judgment, there is no more important ingredient than assuring that we bring out all the great potential capabilities of our people, especially our young people, for leading a productive and rewarding life.

Our society is changing fast. The skills of yesteryear are the liabilities of today. However, the educational opportunities open today are the touchstone of the more satisfying life of tomorrow. No effort should be spared, no policy device overlooked, to foster the investment in education that will multiply into dividends for our people and our Nation in the years ahead.

The Federal Government should encourage individuals to invest in education by permitting any taxpayer who makes educational outlays for himself, his children, or other dependents, to take a tax deduction for at least part of these expenses. I have limited the amount which may be deducted under the terms of this bill to $300 per individual. Personally, I favor a much larger figure. I recognize that good education does not come cheap, and that these days many indirect and associated costs of education can far exceed tuition and fees alone. However, if larger deductions were permitted, huge revenue losses to the Treasury would ensue. Bills proposing larger deductions, or even tax credits, for educational expenses, that are now pending in the Congress, I believe have little realistic chance of success from this standpoint. Therefore, I have felt compelled to restrict my proposal to a $300 deduction for direct expenditures for tuition and fees to an educational institution.

Any recognized educational institution to which such payments are made would qualify the taxpayer for the deduction. This would include not only colleges and universities, but also private schools, parochial schools, technical training schools, summer schools; in short, almost any place of learning. The deduction would not apply, however, in behalf of persons who receive direct grants from States or communities under State laws designed to evade or circumvent school desegregation.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to my bill, S. 792, in the 87th Congress. It is my firm belief that in this Congress, where tax legislation looms as the most important single issue, there is no excuse for not devoting earnest attention to the legitimate and widespread demand for some sort of relief for educational expenses. It is, at the very least, as important to consider as, for example, the proposed 5-percent floor plan under itemized deductions, which would have not a favorable, but an adverse, effect on educational investment by limiting the present full deductibility of taxpayer contributions to recognized institutions of learning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1236) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents, introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to educational institutions.

"Allowance of Deduction.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an educational institution for tuition and fees for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such educational institution.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Each individual.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees with respect to any one individual only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed $300.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(c) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Amounts paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned it by section 152(a).

"(2) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'educational institution' has the meaning assigned to it by section 151(e)(4).

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses).

"(2) INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING STATE OR LOCAL FINANCIAL AID TO AVOID DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid for any individual with respect to whom any payment is made by a State or local government under a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for children who attend private schools in the area of their residence, or who attend public or private schools away from the area of their residence, if it is determined that the purpose of the State or local law is to provide financial assistance—

"(A) for the education of children in an area where any public school is closed to avoid compliance with the decisions of the courts of the United States with respect to segregation in public schools, or

"(B) for the education of children in an area where public schools are open and have complied with such decisions (whether or not such compliance was pursuant to a specific order of a court of the United States) whose parents or guardians do not wish them to attend a school which is part of a school system in which any school has complied with such decisions.

For purposes of this paragraph, any State or local law granting concessions with respect to State or local taxes for amounts paid by parents or guardians in providing an education for children residing in an area described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for such children."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to educational institutions.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) TUITION AND FEES PAID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—The deduction allowed by section 217 (relating to tuition and fees paid to educational institutions)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY TO STATE AGENCIES FOR PUBLIC RECREATION, ETC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the donation of surplus Federal personal property to State agencies for public recreation, park, historic monuments, the promotion of fish and wildlife management, and development activities.

This bill amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to enable the Federal Government to donate surplus property to State park agencies. The Secretary of the Interior would be charged with implementing this expanded authority.

The thousands of State parks throughout the United States play a vital role in the outdoor recreation activities of our people. These activities are recognized as essential to the health and vitality of the Nation. As was recently noted in the document, "Outdoor Recreation for America":

> For at its best, outdoor activity, whether undertaken lightly or with the serious intent of the perfectionist, is essentially a "renewing" experience—a refreshing change from the workaday world.
>
> This is true no matter what an individual actually chooses to do in the outdoors. As long as the activity is freely chosen—because it is refreshing and interesting to do—then it serves the basic function of recreation—the task of re-creating human vitality. Latent energy is tapped, unused powers of the body, mind and spirit are employed, the imagination works on fresh material, and when all these things occur, the individual returns to his work with a sense of renewal.
>
> This use of leisure is important to the health of individuals and to the health of the Nation. The physical vigor of a nation is as much a part of its strength as good education.

In 1960 the States managed approximately 85 percent of the total number of recreation areas in the Nation. However, the Federal Government managed about 84 percent of the number of recreation acres. Further, visitations to State park areas were 254 million as compared to that of 79 million to the national parks. By correlating these figures it can be determined that State park areas have a density of use which is 14 times greater than that in national parks.

One of the major problems, one common to all States, is the matter of adequate financing. If the Congress would make State park agencies eligible to receive Federal surplus personal property, it would be a step in the right direction in allowing these agencies to stretch their already limited budgets. Thus, indirectly, enlarged and improved services could be rendered to the millions of visitors to the State parks throughout this Nation.

Even though several of the Federal executive agencies, by administrative action, have added other recipients than education, health, and civil defense as authorized by Congress, the State park agencies have never been given this privilege. My legislation would correct this situation.

I introduced similar legislation in the 87th Congress—S. 3581. In a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Comptroller General suggested several technical amendments to S. 3581. These suggestions have been incorporated in the present version.

The National Conference on State Parks has fully endorsed this legislation. Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD has introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives.

The pressure of the use of State parks continues to grow rapidly. This legislation provides one significant way in which the Federal Government can assist the States in meeting this surging demand for outdoor recreational facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk through April 8 for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1238) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting, immediately after the words "public health,", the words "public recreation, park, or historic monuments, the promotion of fish and wildlife management and development activities,"; and

(2) by striking out "or (4)", and inserting in lieu thereof "(4), or (5)".

(b) The third sentence of paragraph (2) of section 203(j) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "or paragraph (4)", and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the words "paragraph (4), or paragraph (5)".

(c) Section 203(j) of such Act is further amended as follows:

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) thereof as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of public recreation, park, or historic monuments or fish and wildlife management and development, including research, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to agencies or instrumentalities of that State or to political subdivisions thereof for use for public recreation, park, or historic monument purposes, or for fish and wildlife management and development purposes. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Secretary of the Interior has received from such State agency a certification that such property is usable and needed for public recreation, park, or historic monument purposes, or for fish and wildlife management and development purposes, within the State, and until the Secretary has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property."

(d) The paragraph redesignated by this section as paragraph (6) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" where it first appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma;

(2) by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Federal Civil Defense Administrator", a comma and the words "and the Secretary of the Interior"; and

(3) by striking out the words "or paragraph (4)", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "paragraph (4), or paragraph (5)".

Sec. 2. Subparagraph (2)(C) of section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(k)), is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "for the benefit of the public", a comma and the words "or for use for fish and wildlife management and development activities".

Sec. 3. Section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(n)), is amended—

(1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof, immediately after the words "the Federal Civil Defense Administrator,", the words "the Secretary of the Interior";

(2) by striking out in the first sentence thereof the words "either such officer", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any such officer";

(3) by striking out in the second sentence thereof the words "or the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, or the Secretary of the Interior,";

(4) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, pursuant to subsection (j)(3) or (j)(4) of this section,", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any purpose specified in paragraph (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (j)"; and

(5) by striking out the words "the Secretary or the Director" wherever they appear in the third and fourth sentences thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Secretary or Director concerned".

CONSUMER PROTECTION IS PROPOSED FOR HARDWOOD LABELING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect consumers of hardwood or simulated hardwood products.

On April 27, 1961, in the 87th Congress, 1st session, Mr. President, I introduced this bill as S. 1724. Hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Commerce August 10, 11, and 13, 1962, during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. At these hearings it was noted by the Federal Trade Commission that certain wording, phrasing, and other changes should be made. The bill, which I introduce today, I am pleased to state, has incorporated those suggestions which were made by the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. President, I originally introduced this bill because of many complaints I received regarding products, purported to be of wood, such as furniture, radio and television cabinets, and other cabinets, or decorative articles, which in reality were composed of composition material, plastic, wood fiber, or even metal. This situation still exists today.

These articles had been finished to look in color, grain, and beauty like decorative wood.

It is my understanding that the Federal Trade Commission, over the years, has also received complaints alleging deception in the sale of products finished to imitate decorative hardwood.

This bill, I hasten to point out, merely requires that such products be labeled to indicate the true common name of the tree that produced the wood and what finish is being imitated.

Mr. President, because other Senators have indicated interest in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks the bill be printed; and I also ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table until Thursday, April 11, 1963, so that other Members of the Senate may join in sponsoring it; and I ask that the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] be included as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1249) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and Mr. Bayh), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Decorative Wood and Simulated Wood Products Labeling Act."

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation association, business trust, or any organized group of any of the foregoing;

(b) the term "wood" means any timber product retaining its natural growth structure;

(c) the term "simulated wood product" means any product or part of a product made wholly or substantially of any material other than wood, including, but not restricted to, wood fiber, glass, vegetable fiber, plaster, plastic, metal, paper, film, and molded or extruded material, which in its finished, treated or processed state has the appearance or is in imitation of, or purports to be wood; and such term also includes products made of wood, the exposed surface of which has been printed or otherwise treated to provide the appearance of a figure pattern other than the natural growth structure;

(d) the term "decorative wood" means any wood or wood product whether in the form of veneer, plywood, flooring, lumber, manufactured product, or other form, the face of which has been varnished, shellacked, lacquered, stained, or otherwise finished or processed to display the natural wood grain, figure, or growth character;

(e) the term "exposed surface" or "exposed parts", as applied to a decorative wood or simulated wood product, means those parts of the product which are exposed to view when the product is installed or placed in normal position;

(f) the term "label" or "labeling" means any label, stamp, tag, mark, brand or other identification affixed to a decorative wood or simulated wood product or to the immediate packaging of such product;

(g) the term "invoice" means a written account, memorandum, list, catalog, sales slip, or invoice, which is issued in connection with any commercial dealing or transaction in decorative wood or simulated wood product transported or delivered to a purchaser, consignee, factor, bailee, correspondent, or agent;

(h) the term "Federal Trade Commission Act" means the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914, as amended; and

(i) the term "commerce" means commerce between any State, territory, or possession of the United States, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, possession, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any territory or possession, or Puerto Rico or the District of Columbia.

MISBRANDING, FALSE ADVERTISING, OR FALSE INVOICING DECLARED UNLAWFUL

Sec. 3. (a) The introduction or manufacture for introduction into commerce, or the sale, advertising, promoting or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any decorative wood or simulated wood product which is misbranded, or falsely or deceptively advertised, or falsely or deceptively invoiced (excepting sales slips or invoices issued by retail stores), within the meaning of this Act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8, is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation, or distribution, of any decorative wood or simulated wood product which has been shipped and received in commerce, and which is misbranded or falsely or deceptively advertised, or falsely or deceptively invoiced (excepting sales slips or invoices issued by retail stores), within the meaning of this Act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8, is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, it shall be unlawful to remove or mutilate, or cause or participate in the removal or mutilation of, prior to the time any decorative wood or simulated wood product is sold and thereafter delivered to the ultimate purchasing consumer, any label required by this Act to be affixed to such decorative wood or simulated wood product, and any person violating this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) Any person introducing, selling, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or processing for commerce, a decorative wood or simulated wood product, or any person selling, advertising, offering for sale, or processing a decorative wood or simulated wood product which has been shipped and received in commerce, may substitute for the label affixed to such product pursuant to section 4 of this Act, a label conforming to the requirements of such section. Any person substituting a label shall keep such records as will show the information set forth on the label that he removed and the name or names of the person or persons from whom such decorative wood or simulated wood product was received, and shall preserve such records for at least three years. Neglect or refusal to maintain and preserve such records is unlawful, and any person who shall fail to maintain and preserve such records shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each day of such failure, which shall accrue to the United States and be recoverable by a civil action. Any person substituting a label who shall fail to keep and preserve such records, or who shall by such substitution misbrand a decorative wood or simulated wood product, shall be guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(e) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to any common carrier, contract carrier, or freight forwarder with respect to a decorative wood or simulated wood product handled and shipped, transported, or delivered by it in commerce in the ordinary course of business.

MISBRANDING DECORATIVE WOOD AND SIMULATED WOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, a decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be deemed to be misbranded—

(1) if it is falsely or deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified, or if the label contains any form of misrepresentation or deception, directly or by implication, with respect to such decorative wood or simulated wood product, or is misleading in any respect; or

(2) if there is not affixed to such decorative wood or simulated wood product a label (flooring and moulding may be labeled by the bundle or package) showing in words and figures plainly legible the labeling information required by this Act, including the true common name of the wood actually contained in the exposed surfaces of the decorative wood product, or the true name or composition of the simulated wood product comprising the exposed surfaces of the product, provided that where the exposed surface is made of veneer, laminate or plywood construction, such exposed surface construction shall be clearly indicated by such additional words showing that it is veneer, laminate or of plywood construction, as the case may be, and provided that where the exposed surface has been printed or otherwise treated to reveal an artificial wood grain or figure pattern this fact shall be clearly indicated; or

(3) if the label contains the name or names of any wood or purported wood not contained in the product, unless accompanied by language clearly indicating that the figure pattern is simulated; or

(4) if the label does not show the name or the identification number issued and registered by the Commission of the person or persons who manufactured such decorative wood or simulated wood product.

FALSE ADVERTISING AND INVOICING OF DECORATIVE WOOD AND SIMULATED WOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this Act, a decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be deemed to be falsely or deceptively advertised if any advertisement, representation, public announcement, or notice which is intended to or does aid, promote, or assist, directly or indirectly in the sale or offering for sale or marketing of such decorative wood or simulated wood product (1) shows wood species names not actually present on the exposed surface of the decorative wood or simulated wood product, unless accompanied by language clearly indicating that the figure pattern is simulated, or (2) indicates either veneer or solid construction where such is not the case, or (3) shows other than the true name or names and true composition of the exposed parts of the simulated wood product, or (4) is false, deceptive or misleading in any respect.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, a decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be deemed to be falsely or deceptively invoiced (excepting sales slips or invoices issued by retail stores) if no invoice is issued, or if issued, such invoice (1) does not show the true name or names of the wood forming the exposed surface of the wood product, or (2) does not reveal that the exposed surfaces of such product are of veneer, laminate or plywood construction, or (3) does not reveal the true name or composition of the simulated wood product forming the exposed parts of the product or article, or (4) does not reveal the presence of any printed or otherwise processed artificial wood grain or figure pattern, or (5) is false, deceptive or misleading in any respect.

EXCLUSION OF MISBRANDED OR FALSELY INVOICED DECORATIVE WOOD AND SIMULATED WOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 6. (a) Decorative wood and simulated wood products imported into the United States shall be labeled so as not to be misbranded within the meaning of section 4 of this Act; and all invoices of such products required under title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall set forth, in addition to the matters therein specified, information conforming with the requirements of section 5(b) of this Act, which information shall be included in the invoices prior to their certification under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(b) The falsification of, or failure to set forth, said information in said invoices, or the falsification or perjury of the consignee's declaration provided for in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, insofar as it relates to said information, shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act; and any person who falsifies, or fails to set forth, said information in said invoices, or who falsifies or perjures said consignee's declaration insofar as it relates to said information, may thenceforth be prohibited by the Federal Trade Commission from importing, or participating in the importation of, any decorative wood or simulated wood product into the United States except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said product, and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of this section.

(c) A verified statement from the manufacturer, producer of, or dealer in, imported decorative wood or simulated wood products showing information required under the provisions of this Act may be required under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

DECORATIVE WOOD NAME GUIDE

SEC. 7. (a) The Federal Trade Commission shall, within nine months from the date of enactment of this Act, after holding public hearings, issue a register setting forth the names of decorative woods, which register shall be known as the Decorative Wood Name Guide. The names used shall be the true English names for the respective wood, except that in the absence of a true English name for a wood or where a wood has for at least twenty-five years been known generically in the market of the United States by a commercial or trade name, the Commission may use such name when deemed by the Commission to properly identify the wood in the United States, with or without qualifying or explanatory terms.

(b) The Commission may, from time to time, after holding public hearings, add to or delete from such register the name or names of any wood.

(c) When the name of any wood connotes a geographical origin or significance other than the true country or place of origin, the Commission may require that whenever the name is used such qualifying or explanatory words or statements as it may deem necessary be also used in order to prevent the likelihood of confusion or deception.

(d) The name or names of the decorative wood used in the label required under section 4 of this Act shall be such as are set forth in the Decorative Wood Name Guide provided for under this section.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT

SEC. 8. (a)(1) Except as otherwise specifically provided or required herein, the Act shall be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission under rules, regulations, and procedure provided for pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of sections 3, 4, 5, and 10(b) of this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act; and any such person violating any provision of said sections of this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in said Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of the said Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations governing the manner and form of disclosing information required by this Act, and such further rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for purposes of administration and enforcement of this Act. The Commission is authorized to exclude from the provisions of this Act any specific types or kinds of decorative wood or simulated wood products because of their being of such small size or inconsequential character as not of public interest or not necessary to be covered for protection of the purchasing public.

(c) The Commission is authorized (1) to cause inspections, analyses, tests, and examinations to be made of any decorative wood products or of any simulated wood products subject to this Act; and (2) to cooperate, on matters related to the purpose of this Act, with any department or agency of the Government; with any State, territory, Puerto Rico, or possession, or with the District of Columbia; or with any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof; or with any person.

(d)(1) Every manufacturer or importer of decorative wood products or simulated wood products shall maintain proper records showing the information required by this Act with respect to all decorative wood products and simulated wood products handled by him, and shall preserve such records for at least three years.

(2) The neglect or refusal to maintain and preserve such records is unlawful, and any such manufacturer or importer who neglects or refuses to maintain and preserve such records shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each day of such failure which shall accrue to the United States and be recoverable by a civil action.

CONDEMNATION AND INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 9. (a)(1) Any decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be liable to be proceeded against in the district court of the United States for the district in which found, and to be seized for confiscation by process of libel for condemnation, if the Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe such decorative wood or simulated wood product is being manufactured or held for shipment or shipped, or held for sale or exchange after shipment, in commerce, in violation of the provisions of this Act, and if after notice from the Commission the provisions of this Act with respect to such decorative wood or simulated wood product are not shown to be complied with. Proceedings in such libel cases shall conform as nearly as may be to suite in rem in admiralty, and may be brought by the Commission.

(2) If such decorative wood or simulated wood product is condemned by the court, it shall be disposed of, in the discretion of the court, by destruction, by sale, by delivery to the owner or claimant thereof upon payment of legal costs and charges and upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such product will not be disposed of until properly marked, advertised, and invoiced, as required under the provisions of this Act, or by such charitable disposition as the court may deem proper. If such decorative wood or simulated wood product is disposed of by sale, the proceeds, less legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that—

(1) any person is violating, or is about to violate, section 3, 4, 5, or 10(b) of this Act; and

(2) it would be in the public interest to enjoin such violation until complaint is issued by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act and such complaint dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, or until order to cease and desist made thereon by the Commission has become final within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Commission may bring suit in the district court of the United States for the district in which such person resides or transacts business, to enjoin such violation, and upon proper showing a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

GUARANTY

SEC. 10. (a) No person shall be guilty under section 3 if he establishes a guaranty received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the decorative wood or simulated wood product guaranteed was manufactured or by whom it was imported, that said product is not misbranded or that it is not falsely advertised or invoiced under the provisions of this Act. Such guaranty shall be either (1) a separate guaranty specifically designating the decorative wood or simulated wood product guaranteed, in which case it may be on the invoice or other paper relating to such decorative wood or simulated wood product; or (2) a continuing guaranty filed with the Commission applicable to any decorative wood or simulated wood product manufactured or imported by said guarantor, in such form as the Commission by rules and regulations may prescribe.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to furnish with respect to any decorative wood or simulated wood product, a false or deceptive guaranty (except a person relying upon a guaranty to the same effect received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the decorative wood or simulated wood product guaranteed was manufactured or by whom it was imported) with reason to believe the decorative wood or simulated wood product falsely or deceptively guaranteed may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce, and any person who violates the provisions of this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce, within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 11. (a) Any person who wilfully violates section 3, 4, 5, or 10(b) of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000, or be imprisoned not more than one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe any person is guilty of a misdemeanor under this section, it shall certify all pertinent facts to the Attorney General, whose duty it shall be to cause appropriate proceedings to be brought for the enforcement of the provisions of this section against such person.

APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 12. The provisions of this Act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other Act of Congress.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. This Act shall take effect one year after the date of its enactment.

MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly, to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment reported by Mr. MAGNUSON from the Committee on Commerce, in the nature of a substitute, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may extend the time for filing reports concerning last year's work to June 30, 1963.

There are three reports which involve, first, the Department of Agriculture handling of the pooled cotton allotments of Billie Sol Estes; second, the pyramiding of profits and costs in the missile procurement program; and third, the American Guild of Variety Artists. These reports have been drafted and will be submitted for study by the committee members in the immediate future.

On February 6 the Senate granted an extention of the time for filing these reports until April 1. It was believed then that this would be sufficient time to complete work on these reports. Since then, it has developed that additional time will be necessary in order that adequate study may be given by the committee members. Accordingly, I ask for this additional extention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be permitted to join as a cosponsor of the bill S. 829, introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through the establishment of acreage allotments. I feel that this bill represents a constructive approach to the problems faced by our potato producers, and I would urge most favorable action on the bill by the appropriate committee, namely, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 865, to establish a Foreign Service Academy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTION 13A OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 1161, to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill:

Authority of March 25, 1963:

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; Mr. Douglas, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Magnuson.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, to express the sense of Congress that the President appoint a committee to evaluate our foreign aid program in each country and report its finding to the President and Congress remain at the desk until April 5 for additional cosponsors. The concurrent resolution was originally ordered to lie on the desk until the close of business today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce the beginning of hearings on S. 1163, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The hearings will begin at 2 p.m. Monday, April 22, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building and will continue on the following days of that week in the morning.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Jonathan Lindley, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, and Roger Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

PRESS RELEASE OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a press release issued March 30 by the Committee on Foreign Relations announcing that on April 4 and 5 public hearings would begin on S. 865, a bill to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs.

Any individual or organization wishing to present testimony on S. 865 should contact the committee clerk, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, room S-116, the Capitol.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations

On April 4 and 5 the Committee on Foreign Relations plans to begin public hearings on S. 865, an administration bill to provide for the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which was introduced by Senator Symington on February 20, 1963.

Cosponsors of S. 865 are Senators Saltonstall, Bayh, Boggs, Byrd of West Virginia, Clark, Engle, Gruening, Humphrey, Inouye, Long of Missouri, Mansfield, McGee, Moss, Neuberger, Randolph, Ribicoff, Smathers, Williams of New Jersey, Yarborough, Monroney, Fong, Hart, McIntyre, Brewster, and Javits.

Any individual or organization wishing to present testimony on S. 865 should contact without delay the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, room S-116, the Capitol.

The hearings will be held in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10:30 a.m.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis M. Janelle, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney, district of New Hampshire, term of 4 years, vice William H. Craig, Jr., resigned.

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal, district of New Hampshire, term of 4 years, vice Royal Dion, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, April 8, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

CAPT. EDWARD J. DWIGHT, JR., FIRST NEGRO SELECTED AS TRAINEE FOR MANNED SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are proud that the first Negro to be selected as a trainee for the U.S. manned space program is from the great State of Kansas.

It is particularly pleasing in view of Kansas' early history. The issue in the Kansas statehood controversy was whether it was to be admitted as a free State or a slave State. For several years the issue was bitterly fought; and, in the final analysis, the people of Kansas, with their usual good judgment, insisted on human rights and human freedoms. As a result of this, our motto carries the Latin words "Ad Astra Per Aspera," which means "To the Stars Through Difficulty."

The Kansan selected as trainee for the manned space flight is Capt. Edward J. Dwight, Jr., of Kansas City, Kans. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Dwight, of Kansas City, Kans. Captain Dwight is stationed at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., is married, and has two children.

Captain Dwight received his education in the Kansas City, Kans., grade school, high school, and the Kansas City Junior College. He joined the Air Force in August 1953, and in 1955 was commissioned as a pilot at Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz. It was at this base he completed his college work—partly through night classes—at Arizona State University.

He served 2 years in Japan as a B-57 bomber pilot, followed by about 3½ years at Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif. Some months ago he was assigned to the test pilot school at Edwards Air Force Base.

Upon being notified of his selection as a trainee for the manned space program, Captain Dwight stated that he hoped some day to become an astronaut.

I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Capt. Edward J. Dwight, Jr., be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Full name: Capt. Edward J. Dwight, Jr.

Claim to fame: First Negro selected as trainee for manned space flight.

Home: Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

Birthday: 1934.

Education: Kansas City Junior College, graduated with honors in track in 1953. Earlier was track and football star at Ward High School in Kansas City, Kans. After joining Air Force and winning his wings at Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., in 1955, completed college training through night classes at Arizona State University in Tempe. Eight months ago, assigned to test pilot school at Edwards Air Force Base.

Jobs: B-57 bomber pilot.

Family: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Dwight, of Kansas City, Kans. Wife, Sue, and two children, Tina Sheree, 7 and Edward III, 5. Four sisters, one of whom is Sister Martin Mary, first Negro woman to become a Sister of Charity.

Hobbies: Besides flying, he is active in both the Knights of Columbus and the Holy Name Society. He is a devout Catholic and his wife is a convert.

Ambition: To become an astronaut.

THE CLAY COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the recent report to the President by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, the Lucius D. Clay Committee, has lately been the subject of much discussion. I think the Clay report lays down guidelines both for improving and for reducing the cost of our foreign aid program.

After a careful study, the Committee has indicated certain areas of our foreign aid program which should either be reduced or be terminated. I certainly endorse many of the Committee's observations, and I am hopeful that Congress will carefully consider its recommendations. I am gratified to find that one of these recommendations conforms with my efforts, during the last 2 years, to terminate further military assistance, on a grant basis, to the prosperous nations of Western Europe. The Committee says:

> Elsewhere in Europe, except in Greece and Turkey, there is no apparent need for further military or economic assistance other than for the fulfillment of existing commitments.

Mr. President, I hope Congress will support an amendment, which I intend to offer again this year to the Foreign Assistance Act, which would accomplish this purpose.

I have supported the foreign aid program as indispensable to our national survival in this precarious world. But the American people are becoming increasingly impatient with its shortcomings. As I said 2 years ago on the floor of the Senate:

> Their resentment today can lead to reaction tomorrow so widespread as to fill these Halls, and the White House as well, with men who would sever our world commitments and would withdraw the United States into a lingering, lethal, and last isolation.

The objective of the Clay report is to work such improvement in our foreign aid program as to assure its continuing public support.

In closing, I want to emphasize that I think the Clay report gives the foreign aid program—and the present administrators—a basic vote of confidence. Max Freedman's article in the Washington Post of March 25, 1963, analyzed the report, and the author carefully pointed out that the recommendations made were offered as an attempt to strengthen foreign aid, by establishing certain new standards, without hampering many established principles essential to an effective foreign aid program. Roscoe Drummond, writing for the same newspaper on March 28, 1963, also made a careful analysis of the real meaning and impact of the Clay report. Mr. Drummond, like Mr. Freedman, wrote that what the Committee really wants to accomplish is "an assistance program of reduced scope and thereby more concentrated where it will do the most good."

I think the articles by both of these writers help to correctly intrepret the Clay report. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 1963]

FOREIGN AID REPORT

(By Max Freedman)

In essence, the Committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay has given the foreign aid program a qualified vote of confidence. No doubt some critics will try to use some passages in the report to discredit the whole program, as George Meany has suggested in his interesting but largely irrelevant dissent; but they cannot succeed unless the Committee's analysis and recommendations are ignored or twisted. The Committee has tried to save and strengthen the program by setting up new standards without doing violence to many established principles which have guided foreign aid.

The Committee deserves praise for recognizing that some objections brought against foreign aid, in Congress and outside, are neither spiteful nor stupid but are wise and necessary. There is no concession, of course, to the extremists who deliver a root-and-branch attack on foreign aid as a major part of American policy.

But the Committee expresses the genuine public concern over the details of the program and the way in which aid has been administered in some countries. There will be particular agreement with the passages which suggest that far greater emphasis be given to the capacity of recipient governments to carry out reforms as the price of aid.

Equally welcome is the forthright recommendation that the United States should cancel or reduce aid without fear that such a change of policy would drive these nations into neutralism or communism.

This increased emphasis on American freedom of action, in areas where many governments have come to look upon American help almost as a matter of right, has already been foreshadowed in statements by the administration. But the Committee has made both explicit and challenging what has often been muffled in official declarations.

Like President Kennedy, but again with more urgent emphasis, the Committee has called upon the industrial nations of the Western World to carry a larger share of the burden of aid. Particularly important is its recommendation that these nations should pool some of their aid programs and administer them under international auspices. For this purpose a new agency might be created with membership limited to free nations so that no Communist veto or opposition could cut across agreed decisions.

This kind of economic purpose could give new meaning and direction to the NATO countries which, with nations like Japan and Australia, would inevitably sustain the heaviest commitment. It certainly is a suggestion worth exploring.

Very controversial but by no means unconvincing for that reason is the recommendation that the United States should limit itself to a marginal role in providing aid for Africa, leaving the bulk of the work to be done by Britain and France.

It is this part of the report which goes beyond the technical evaluation of foreign aid and touches basic issues in foreign policy. There is no evidence that the views of the State Department were given careful weight before this recommendation was advanced. At all events, the Department should have the chance to present its case in the context of the completed report before any new departure in African policy is authorized.

The members of the Committee refused to be drawn into a debate over whether India or Pakistan deserves the higher American priority. They wisely recognized that both are essential to Western security and therefore should be supported not only by the United States but by other governments opposed to Communist China's expansion in Asia.

The Committee might have spoken in even stronger terms in asking for a delayed judgment on the success of the Alliance for Progress. It is utterly unreasonable to expect swift triumphs in Latin America when the task of reform and progess has been attempted after years of wasteful neglect.

Within the restraints of courtesy and responsibility the Committee has spoken very plainly, even at the risk of offending some nations. But the real test will come in the way Administrator Bell and other officials of the aid program respond to these recommendations. It should therefore be noted that the Committee has expressed confidence in these men and has spoken in special praise of Mr. Bell.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

THE CLAY REPORT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The most constructive and controversial, the most massively misunderstood but still widely supported program of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations is foreign aid—military and economic.

Because foreign aid is complex, spread all over the world, and its fruits slow to appear, it is understandable that most people do not know how much is being spent where and why. It is, therefore, all the more significant that popular support for foreign aid, as found in the Gallup surveys, is higher today than at any time in the past 9 years.

But now a new factor is being added to the debate over military and development aid. This new factor of uncertain impact is the Clay report—a review, a reappraisal, and a series of recommendations by a Commission appointed by the President of 10 experienced private citizens and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

Did I refer to the "uncertain impact" of the Clay report? Well—

Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee on Appropriations, who wants to cut the heart out of the foreign aid program—and always has wanted to—thinks another star ought to be pinned on the general's shoulder.

President Kennedy, whose budget calls for a billion-dollar increase in foreign aid spending, says he is "grateful" to General Clay, is pleased with the report.

Let's look at the report, not merely at what others say about it.

The Clay Committee unanimously supports the principle of military and development aid, calls it essential.

It describes the foreign aid programs as of great value to the national interest and to national security.

It wants these programs continued substantially.

The report endorses the competence and approach of the new aid administrator, David Bell, former Director of the Budget.

The Clay Committee's central criticism is this:

"We believe that we are attempting too much for too many and that a higher quality and reduced quantity of our defense aid effort in certain countries could accomplish more."

The Committee wants an assistance program of reduced scope and thereby more concentrated where it will do the most good. It favors terminating aid to countries not ready to use it effectively or failing to do their part in their own development. It warns against aid for international political purposes.

General Clay and his blue-ribbon panel propose no meat-ax cuts in the appropriation. They propose no $1.5 billion reduction, as some have mistakenly reported. The report says that the present program can accomplish its purposes with a cut of a half-billion phased out over 3 years and that its discriminating guidelines should permit a trimming of the proposed $1 billion increase in the new budget.

This is sound and sensible. The Clay report is far nearer the President's position than it is to the anti-foreign-aid views of Representative PASSMAN.

COMPLETION OF 50TH YEAR OF SERVICE BY EVERARD H. SMITH, CLERK OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, 1 year ago today other members of the Appropriations Committee and I brought to the attention of the Senate the commencement of the 50th year of the most commendable service to that committee and to the country by Mr. Everard H. Smith.

That year now having come to a conclusion, I will not again attempt to state the nature and quality of the assistance he has rendered during these 50 years, the past 25 of which he has served as chief clerk of the committee. Rather, I wish simply—on behalf of all the committee members and myself as chairman—to express profound appreciation for the splendid association which we have enjoyed with Everard during many of these years, to congratulate him upon the attainment of such a distinguished record of public service during so long a period, and to convey to him our affectionate good wishes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today marks the 50th anniversary of Everard Smith as an employee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. As chief clerk of this important committee of the Congress, Everard, as he is fondly known to all of us who have been honored and privileged to work with him, has seen the work of the committee evolve from what might be described as a one-man staff operation to today's complex division of the staff work among many people. He has not only seen the Senate come to this more practical and effective professional staff approach to its work, but he has had a guiding hand in its formulation. As a result of this professional staff type approach, the Senate Appropriations Committee has been able to handle its work much more effectively.

If one were to attempt to single out the greatest attribute of this outstanding public servant, it would be his ability to quietly and effectively master legislative problems which are charged with legal difficulties and complicated by the personal pressures of opponents and proponents of these measures. Certainly no one carries in his mind a greater store of knowledge on appropriations matters and the many precedents which bear on them than Everard Smith.

Through the years Everard has been a tireless worker. His whole life has been given to his job. For this the Senate—and indeed the whole country—will always be indebted to him—a wise, effective, public servant, counsellor, and friend. I congratulate Everard on attaining this remarkable milestone in a life of public service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in relation to the service of Everard Smith.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the service of our friend, Everard Smith as a member of the Appropriations Committee staff, I should like to take the opportunity to add my voice in praise of this dedicated public servant. If one were to select all of the attributes that a professional staff man should have, Everard Smith would embody them all.

Everard became an employee of the Senate about a year after Chairman HAYDEN came to Congress. One-fifth of the present Members of the Senate had not yet been born. Since that time, he has rendered distinguished and efficient service to the Senate and has made a significant contribution to the effectiveness of the Appropriations Committee. Through the years he has served as teacher, counselor, and friend to all who have served in this body. He has been generous in spending time with new Members of the Senate and of the Appropriations Committee, as well as senior Members. All soon have come to recognize his intelligence, his calm judgment, and his deep feeling for the Senate as an institution. He has at his grasp a wealth of information on what is probably the most complicated subject in all of our legislative endeavors, the appropriations process.

Everard has been my good friend and adviser since I first became a member of the Appropriations Committee. I value our relationship highly and I am proud to pay tribute on this occasion to his many fine qualities and to his years of distinguished service to the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is an extreme pleasure for me to join in paying a well-deserved tribute to Everard H. Smith, who today celebrates his 50th year of service on Capitol Hill.

As clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee his responsibilities are heavy; yet he carries them with the same painstaking diligence that has characterized his entire career spanning a half century of service to this body.

Everard Smith entered the employ of the Senate as an assistant clerk of the Appropriations Committee on April 1, 1913. At that time the entire staff included, in addition to himself, a chief clerk and a typist. During the ensuing years Everard Smith has handled appropriations totaling many billions of dollars. His efficiency and his deep dedication to duty are hallmarks of this most remarkable man.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee who has had the opportunity to benefit from Everard Smith's knowledge and friendly cooperation, I am delighted to salute him on this notable occasion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleagues, with whom I am honored to serve on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in recognizing the half century of public service to the American people and to our committee which has been completed on this day by our chief clerk, Everard Smith. He is tireless and dedicated in his work. All of us, I am sure, are appreciative of this. I wish him many more years of effectiveness to the Senate and the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished chairman [Mr. HAYDEN] and other members of the Appropriations Committee in saluting the chief clerk of the committee, Everard Smith, on his golden anniversary of service to the committee, to the Senate, and to the Nation.

It is difficult to grasp the fact that there is only one member of the Senate still sitting in this body who was in the Congress when Everard Smith began his long and immensely useful career of public service. He has accumulated, through the years, an invaluable store of experience in dealing with the most complex and exacting legislation which comes before the Congress. It is out of this store of experience and out of his own intrinsic professional wisdom that Everard Smith has lightened the burdens and otherwise assisted, in every appropriate way, the work of many members of the committee through the decades. As the most junior member of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to join with the most senior and with others in between in recognition of Everard Smith's outstanding service to the Senate and to the public at this milestone in his distinguished career.

TORNADO

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, weather, good and bad, is a vital force affecting all of us. Most of the time we do not notice the weather. When we do, it is usually because weather is a cause of some discomfort.

But on occasion the weather, or the forces of nature which determine our weather, get out of hand. And we experience disastrous results.

In my part of the country—South Dakota—the weather "got out of hand" last May. We are located on the fringe area of tornado alley. But last May it seemed as if our State became the heart of this vast area subjected to the summer tornadoes which have been a source of much concern.

The story of what happened last May is reported in the April 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest. The author is Helen Rezatto, freelance writer and part-time English instructor at South Dakota State College.

I bring this article before the Senate as a matter of interest pertaining to a measure which I have introduced. This bill is S. 132 and its purpose is to establish a National Weather Council.

The late Senator Francis Case authored this measure in the last Congress. No action was taken on the bill and I have again introduced it.

A National Weather Council would promote programs of atmospheric, meteorological, and weather research to advance and expedite knowledge of the weather, its development and trends, as well as give thorough study to modification or control programs.

The spine-tingling narrative of Mrs. Rezatto demonstrates, I believe, just one of the problems of weather to which such a council could devote its study.

Through the work of such a council it might be possible someday to alleviate the fears of the people of the Midwest over tornadoes through the achievement of some program or some discovery which would stop such a storm before it started.

Experiments have already been made in this direction and I am confident that with the assistance of a council as outlined in my bill, S. 132, the impossible could very well become the possible in the area of weather control and modification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD at this point, the story by Mrs. Rezatto appearing in the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE WEEK OF HORROR ON THE GREAT PLAINS

(By Helen Rezatto)

(For days on end last May one tornado after another rampaged across South Dakota, spreading desolation.)

It was raining lightly on May 14, 1962, and spring showers are always welcome on the Great Plains. Farmer Emil Ziebart of Ethan, a town in southeastern South Dakota, glanced at the churning clouds massing in the southwest. He decided there was just time to plow another furrow before supper.

Nearing the end of the round, he checked the sky again. A grayish-black cloud wall about a half-mile wide loomed over his neighbor's grove. Below it hung a funnel-shaped mass, tapering toward the earth. Then suddenly, as he stared, horrified, the trees disappeared, flicked up as easily as a vacuum cleaner sucks up dust specks.

He jerked the plow from the earth and turned the tractor toward home. Behind him, advancing, the cavernous cloud mouth gaped hungrily.

He jumped from the tractor, raced toward the shelter belt on the west side of his farmyard, dived headfirst through the wire fence and grabbed the nearest tree trunk. There was a strange, ominous silence. Emil Ziebart gasped for breath in the weighted, Stygian air. He could hear only the pounding of his heart. Then there was a stupendous Niagara of sound and he felt a heavy blow on his back. He dug his face into the ground as the tornado roared over him.

Soon the black, omnivorous wall, the pressure, the horrendous noise were gone. Ziebart raised his head slowly. The top of the tree he was clutching was not there. Uprooted trees lay grotesquely like piles of rotting weeds, their roots hanging limp. Twisted, spiky pieces of tin, shattered lumber, an overturned corn picker, huge drifts of last year's cornstalks, dead chickens—all lay in chaotic heaps as far as he could see. Beside him was a naked pheasant, only its remaining neck plumage identifying the lifeless form.

Dazed, Ziebart stood up. He shook his head. Something was wrong. He must be confused about directions, he decided. Where were the barn, the silo, the granary, the chickenhouses—all his buildings? Gone. There was nothing standing, just mountains of debris.

Fearfully, he peered beyond for his house. He saw the remains of the front steps, leading up into empty space. Then he saw his home, completely lifted from the foundation, jammed against the tortured trees, roof fragments dangling pitifully like shattered human limbs. And his family?

He scrambled drunkenly over the littered mess. "Oh God. They're dead. It's taken everything. They're gone." It was the immemorial cry of man against nature's cruelty.

Emeline Ziebart had not turned on the radio or TV that May afternoon, and so did not hear the tornado warnings. While her freshly baked banana cake cooled on the kitchen table, she put several loaves of bread into the oven. She noticed it was sprinkling outside. Suddenly, an explosive crash startled her. The house shuddered convulsively; windows popped out.

"Tornado," she shouted. "Joey, Diane, run for the basement."

The three dashed wildly into the basement and crouched beneath the stairs, 7-year-old Joey between his mother and his sister, Diane, 17. Instinctively, Mrs. Ziebart pushed Joey down flat, she and Diane protecting his body with theirs. Superhuman powers pressed them viciously against the cement floor.

Then—was it 1 minute later, or 5—everything was quiet. The tornado had passed over them, its suction taking even their hiding place, the stairs. Above them was the open sky. Wreckage surrounded them—the washing machine, tubs, heavy pipes, severed electric cables, lumber—and mud everywhere. As they clambered out of the basement into the yard, fears flashed through Emeline Ziebart's mind: Where was Emil? Crushed beneath the tractor? Dashed to pieces in the field?

Suddenly she saw her husband—and he saw them at the same moment. He began to run, stumbling over the rubble. The four met and silently clung to one another. It was Diane who spoke first: "Thank God, we're all alive."

Solicitous neighbors drove the Ziebarts to the hospital where they were treated for shock and minor injuries. They spent a sleepless night with relatives.

Next morning the Ziebarts gazed stricken at the junkyard that once had been their well-kept farm. There was not even a fence; surviving cattle, frightened and injured, roamed for miles. In the topsy-turvy house, what furniture was left was broken and covered with filth; in the once shiny steel kitchen the electric stove lay on its side, spilling out the bread which had never baked. Strangely, the banana cake was gone; the pillager had gobbled it but left the pan.

Meanwhile, a few miles northeast, at the Anthony Schoenfelder farm, the same raging demon completely destroyed every outbuilding, but left the house on its foundation. During the attack, Schoenfelder had held the door closed against the mighty adversary until his wife and 12 children could escape to the basement. Mary Ann, the oldest girl, was planning a June wedding; her wedding dress was snatched from the living room floor, where it had been spread out for alterations, and torn to shreds. The scraps were found entangled in the silo wreckage.

The next day a second twister stalked into tiny Roswell, S. Dak., climaxing a wrathful 100-mile journey. Heralding its approach, hailstones, large as baseballs, pounded Joseph Hanson's trailer-home. Hanson, a filling-station operator, picked up his two children, Charles, 3, and Mark, 5, and set them on the couch beside his wife, 8 months pregnant. He tried to enfold them all in his arms. Then for an instant he felt weightless—suspended in space. The trailer seemed to flip over and over in slow motion. There was an explosion caused by the vacuum in the vortex of the twister. Everything blew out, including the four people.

Hanson picked himself from the sticky, littered ground. He saw a small human form rolling by like a tumbleweed; frantic, he reached for it. It was Charles, the 3-year-old. Hanson saw Mark, screaming, trying to stand up near a deadly powerline, coiled snakelike on the highway. "Don't move," the father shouted. He stood upright, holding one hysterical child. Their shoes were gone, their clothes shredded. His pregnant wife ran barefoot toward the older boy. The Hansons gathered their scattered family together. Unbelievably, they were all safe. Later, pieces of the trailer were found a mile away.

The Ziebarts, the Schoenfelders, the Hansons, plus many more, were victims of a series of giant punches which knocked out southeastern South Dakota during 1 week last May. This area is on the northwest edge of "tornado alley," the boundless reaches of the Great Plains stretching from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada. Here these violent revolving storms strike more frequently than anywhere else in the world.

A tornado is formed when cold dry air from the West or Northwest moves over warm, moist air from the South or Southwest. Under certain conditions this clashing of air masses causes the warm air to rise rapidly, sets up a revolving atmospheric motion (counterclockwise in the Northern Hemisphere). In the center of a tornado the low-pressure area is a partial vacuum. Inside the funnel-shaped cloud, the speed of the whirling wind is estimated to be between 200 and 500 miles per hour. The tornado cloud itself travels relatively slowly, from 20 to 45 miles an hour, usually from the southwest to the northeast.

Because of the extreme wind velocity, violent uprushing air currents, and the partial vacuum in the vortex, a tornado is capable of fantastic behavior. It can swerve in circles, go straight, U-turn, hop, skip, jump, or even suddenly disintegrate.

During the week of horror last May, the South Dakota tornadoes descended erratically every day, sometimes ravaging a wide area, sometimes only an isolated section. On May 21, exactly a week after the first disaster, Emil Ziebart, along with a poultry buyer and some helpers, was rounding up his remaining chickens. When hail and rain torrents slashed at them, Ziebart said, "Don't worry, a tornado never strikes the same place twice."

He was wrong. A funnel slithered toward them. "Let's go," Ziebart yelled. Jumping into their cars, the men headed north, then east, then back again west, outracing the writhing formation.

Afterward, they saw that the previously bashed-in combine had been flipped over again, and the 40-foot-long silo chute had disappeared. Ziebart said grimly, "Looks like that devil thought he forgot something."

There is no accounting for the vagaries of these diabolical horrors, ruthless, yet sometimes relenting. A trucker on Highway 47 near Gregory, S. Dak., driving ahead of a serpentine funnel, kept watch in his rearview mirror as the tornado slashed, hacked and chewed up a quarter mile of asphalt road right behind him—before it veered off into a field.

At Lake Andes, where five funnels were counted in 1 day, the savage foray clawed off part of the schoolhouse roof, crushed the school kitchen and dining room—after school hours. But a gelatin salad, not even quivering, was found intact. Ripping through the kitchen of another house, a twister swept eggs from the refrigerator, smashed them onto the floor, dumped mud inside the box, then slammed the door closed. In a beauty shop, the thief sucked bills from a cash-register drawer that had been closed; the money was found two rooms away—but the money drawer was found still closed.

The twisting terrors of the frightful week in May left many homeless, wrecked hundreds of buildings, tore up miles of telephone and powerlines, uprooted countless trees, killed many animals. Southeastern South Dakota was faced with a seemingly hopeless cleanup and rebuilding chore.

Teamwork helped. Food, shelter, clothing and money were provided for the storm victims. But the greatest comfort of all was the sympathy and kindness given by the fortunate to the less fortunate. When Mary Ann Schoenfelder, the girl who lost her wedding dress, was married last June, she wore a bridal gown presented to her by the townspeople of Ethan. Joseph Hanson, whose uninsured trailer blew apart, felt better when the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, neighbors and unknown benefactors gave his family money, clothes, food—even playthings for the two little boys—and paid the first month's rent on a new trailer. Best of all, healthy Miss Jo Ann arrived a month later, apparently unruffled by her prenatal experience.

Emil Ziebart sold his remaining livestock, bought a house trailer and moved his family back to the desolate scene of two tornadoes. His eyes blazed with the indomitable courage of the Dakota pioneer: "The crops look pretty good—and we're all thankful to the Almighty just to be alive."

After the week was over, many others felt the same way. A number of clergymen offered grateful thanks to a merciful God for what was an almost unbelievable blessing: Not one person was seriously injured; not one human life was lost.

GRAFTON, W. VA., ALL AMERICA CITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these times when local unemployment is such a pressing problem to our Nation, I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the city of Grafton, in my State of West Virginia, has just been given national recognition for setting an example of how a depressed community can pull itself up by its own bootstraps.

The honor has come in the form of an All America City Award, jointly conferred by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. Look has just informed me by letter that nationwide recognition of Grafton's achievement will be made in the April 23 issue of Look, appearing on the newsstands April 9.

Grafton is a small city that I know well. It is located in the rugged mining country of the Tygart River Valley. For the past several decades it has been struggling with the twin woes of waning industry and dwindling population. In 1930 this historic county seat had a population of 7,737. By 1940 it had dropped to 7,431. In 1950 it was down to 7,365. In 1958, following a series of economic setbacks, Grafton seemed on the verge of a catastrophic decline. The story of how this West Virginia city pulled itself back on its feet is a heartwarming one.

Grafton's crisis of 1958 was precipitated when the city's major industry, a glass plant, shut down, throwing nearly 500 men out of work. Then a large pottery manufacturer went out of business. Railway employment slumped badly. The citizens of Grafton could read the handwriting on the wall. Unless something was done about the declining economy, they might soon be living in a ghost town.

But they did do something about it. Responsible local citizens formed the Grafton Area Development Council, whose "Operation Survival" was dedicated to the task of attracting new industry to Grafton. Volunteer workers took an inventory of the labor skills available locally and $30,000 in voluntary subscriptions was raised for developing industrial sites. The city's physical appearance was improved with new paving of streets, modernization of buildings, and razing of slum areas.

The reward of all this civic endeavor is the presence today of two new major industries in Grafton, and the hope of a third one arriving soon. Unemployment has been reduced, and the community spirit is up. National recognition of this sturdy West Virginia fighting spirit has come now in the form of an All America Award for civic leadership. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter sent to me by Look magazine announcing the award printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK,
New York, N.Y., March 19, 1963.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: It is our pleasure to bring you the good news that a city in West Virginia—Grafton—has just been awarded the title of "All America City."

The award goes to Grafton for the vigorous action of its citizens in bringing about major civic improvements, and thus setting an example of good citizenship to the Nation.

The All America Cities Awards are given each year to 11 U.S. communities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League, which is the cosponsor with Look magazine of the annual awards competition. The All America City program is now in its 15th year.

The names of the winners have just been released to the press, and the story of the winning cities will appear in the April 23 issue of Look, on the newsstands April 9.

Look feels privileged to announce the names of this fine new team of All America Cities. I am enclosing a set of advance tear sheets of the Look article as I am sure you will be interested to know the basis of the award which has been conferred on another of the communities in your State.

Sincerely yours,

JANE DOUGLAS,
Coordinator of Civic Programs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS OF ARKANSAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, which adjourned recently, adopted a number of resolutions which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. The first is a house concurrent resolution, offered by Representative Bill Wells of Bradley County, petitioning the Congress to reject the proposed changes in capital gains treatment of timber sales.

A house resolution, offered by Representative C. B. Nance, Jr., of Crittenden County, urged that certain action be taken against foreign lumber imports in order to improve the competitive position of the domestic lumber industry.

A resolution, offered by Representative Ode Maddox of Montgomery County, asked that the Federal Government study the feasibility of providing certain idle Federal land to veterans for homebuilding purposes.

The general assembly also approved a house concurrent resolution, authored by Representative Hugh Hackler, urging the Congress to enact H.R. 2918, a bill introduced by my congressman, James W. Trimble, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to preserve the Wolf House in Baxter County, Ark., as a National Historic Site.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these measures be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutions and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30

Resolution petitioning Congress to reject the changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon

Whereas capital gains tax treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code has been the major factor responsible for the vast progress of Arkansas in forest management and the growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands would constitute the most severe setback in this generation to the growth of forest products; and

Whereas the jobs of thousands of employees and many hundreds of communities are affected by the forest industries of Arkansas and are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein:

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of Arkansas hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on February 6, 1963.

SEC. 2. The secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease and other causes; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

Whereas, lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary, to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Arkansas delegation to the Congress of the United States.

C. B. NANCE, Jr.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the Federal Government has many thousand acres of Federal lands which are lying idle and are not being used in connection with any existing Federal projects; and

Whereas many veterans are of limited means and do not have adequate funds for the purpose of acquiring lands and building a house thereupon for a home; and

Whereas it is believed that idle nonprofit Federal lands should be made available to veterans for the purpose of building homes: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Arkansas House of Representatives hereby requests the Federal Government to study the feasibility of granting idle nonprofit Federal lands to veterans for the purpose of building homes thereon; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption hereof a copy of this resolution shall be furnished, by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the U.S. Veterans' Administration in Washington, D.C., and to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

——— MADDOX.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 37

Resolution urging Congress to adopt pending legislation to preserve and designate the Wolf House at Norfolk, Ark., as the "Wolf House National Historic Site"

Whereas Maj. Jacob Wolf, territorial Indian agent of the United States, built a structure of square hewn logs more than 154 years ago on a beautiful site in the town of Norfork, Baxter County, Ark.; and

Whereas this 154-year-old structure still proudly overlooks the confluence of the Northfork and White Rivers and affords one of the most beautiful scenic views of the Ozarks; and

Whereas said building served as the first courthouse in north central Arkansas for many years when the area was a territory prior to 1836 when Arkansas became a State; and

Whereas the earliest histories of north central Arkansas trace back to meetings in this historic building; and

Whereas the Wolf House was a landmark at the northeast corner of the Cherokee Nation before Arkansas was admitted to the Union and said building was the meetingplace for Sam Houston, James Bowie, and other noted figures of territorial days; and

Whereas this historic house is deteriorating and is in need of restoration; and

Whereas Congressman JAMES W. TRIMBLE has introduced legislation, H.R. 2918, in the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate for preservation as the "Wolf House National Historic Site" and authorizes appropriation of funds for said purposes; and

Whereas the preservation of this famous historic site is vital and important not only to the residents and people of the great State of Arkansas, but also to people throughout the United States who visit the beautiful Ozarks and fish in the trout-laden, beautiful, crystal clear, cold waters of Northfork and White Rivers in the vicinity of this historic shrine—the Wolf House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of Arkansas hereby urges the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior to adopt the legislation authored by Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE to designate and preserve as "the Wolf House National Historic Site" at Norfork, Baxter County, Ark., together with such adoining property as the Secretary may determine necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Arkansas will cooperate in whatever manner possible with the United States to accomplish the establishment of this historic shrine.

SEC. 2. The secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and to each member of the Arkansas delegation in the U.S. Congress.

Approved March 20, 1963.

THE GROWTH OF FEDERAL POWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as my colleagues well know, I have repeatedly expressed my concern over the growth of Federal power. My concern has increased under the present administration because it has seemed to me that with the type of individuals now in charge of the various power agencies, the pace of expanding Federal power at the expense of private enterprise will be greatly increased.

My fears have not been without substantiation. Nevertheless, these individuals I am referring to are operating today with a subtlety and skill unmatched by their predecessors who also wanted to see the Federal Government dominant in the field of power. Because of this skill and subtlety I refer to, it has not always been apparent to the public just exactly how insidiously the growth of Federal power is being promoted today. These officials are guarded in their statements and talk in soothing terms about the need for cooperation, the need for public and private power working together and the need for utilizing all our resources in order to meet the country's power needs. They say, in effect, "we are not out to scuttle private power, we only want to work with them."

Well, Mr. President, I am not one of those who has been fooled by this soothing talk. And I imagine there are still a few others who are also acutely aware of the true nature of this campaign.

I have recently become familiar with a most remarkable document which I want to draw to the attention of my colleagues because in this document the objectives and intent of the administration with respect to Federal power stand clearly revealed. The document I refer to is the brief filed by the Department of Interior before the Federal Power Commission in the case of the High Mountain Sheep Dam on the Snake River in Idaho. In this case a Federal Power Commission Examiner last October 8 recommended the granting of a license to an investor-owned utility, the Pacific Northwest Power Co., for construction of this project. The brief by the Department of Interior takes exception to this action by the Federal Power Commission Examiner on the grounds that this project should be reserved for Federal construction. This brief can be freely summarized on one sentence: Investor-owned companies in the Pacific Northwest no longer have the right to build their own powerplants.

Let me give you a few quotes from this brief.

It states:

> In the past the Federal Columbia River power system has been the basic wholesaler of power in the region. * * * Now in the present case it is proposed that additional wholesalers be brought into the region * * *. These wholesalers propose to sell to customers presently buying Federal power. It is inconceivable that either one of the new wholesale power agencies could be licensed without further reducing the gross and net revenues of Bonneville Power Administration.
>
> If Bonneville Power Administration deficits continue the Federal system will find it increasingly difficult to fulfill its distinctive role of providing an ample power supply at lowest cost and with widespread availability * * *. The overall effect of further deterioration of the position of the Federal power system would ultimately be reflected in the productivity and general economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Later in the brief there are these comments:

> The cardinal principle which governs the operation of an electric power system is that all interconnected generating plants should be operated as if one utility owned the entire system. * * * If all the plants in the system belong to the United States, they can be operated to meet a common objective * * *. Operation of the project primarily for the benefit of its owners would be in inherent conflict with fully integrated system operation. Any further Balkanization of the Pacific Northwest power system will limit the economic growth of the region and decrease beneficial effects of any increment to the system. The disintegration of the system's ownership would hasten the ultimate disintegration of the system itself.

Mr. President, I cannot read into these statements any interpretation other than the one I have cited; namely, in the Pacific Northwest there is no longer room for private enterprise in the power field.

This brief is incredible in many respects. As my colleagues know, the Bonneville Power Administration has been losing money steadily for the last few years and expects to lose a good many million dollars more over the next few years. This Interior Department brief attributes these losses to the fact that the private utilities in the area have had the unmitigated gall to put in their own generating capacity instead of buying it from the Federal Government.

It has long been a favorite argument of the public power supporters to say that the Federal Government must build projects because there is a power shortage in this or that region. It does not matter what facts are produced to disprove this, they just keep saying power shortage over and over again like a cracked record. Well, let me tell you something. The only area of the United States where in recent years there has been a demonstrable power shortage was in the Pacific Northwest, where there is the biggest collection in the country of Federal and public power projects. Private enterprise built some projects that solved the question of the power shortage in that area and now comes the Department of Interior claiming that Bonneville is losing money because the private power companies put in some capacity of their own.

I wonder, Mr. President, if the Department of Interior will ever show the same concern for private companies if they should find themselves losing money because of the competition from subsidized Federal power.

It is no secret that I have opposed the unfair Government competition with our free enterprise system with all of the inequities of below-cost Government financing and freedom from taxation. I have also recognized the trend and danger of an ever-increasing Government role in the electric power business. Of course, I have known that the proponents of Government power have promoted its expansion and I have also known that these same people opposed investor-owned company development of our natural resources, although the benefits of such developments accrue to the public. But, Mr. President, I never thought that the Interior Department would be so bold as to openly state what many of us have known for a long time—that is, their objective is expansion of Federal power to the exclusion of investor-owned development. But here the Interior Department has come out in the open by publicly stating what it has long intended, but publicly denied, and that is that the Government and only the Government should be permitted to expand power production in the Pacific Northwest.

Interior seems to feel that investor-owned development of additional power in the Pacific Northwest is going to jeopardize the financial status of Government developments. The Bonneville Power Administration is selling power, and has been for years, at the cheapest rate of any place in the United States. In fact, its rate is nearly half the rate charged by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is held up as the outstanding adventure into the realm of socialism. Bonneville is selling power at about 2$\frac{3}{10}$ mills per kilowatt hour. In many sections of the country it costs about three times that amount just to produce power with fuel-fired plants. If Bonneville is losing money, and it certainly is, I wonder why the thought of increasing rates above the ridiculously low price it is now charging has never entered the minds of those charged with the responsibility of disposing of Government power in that area.

One thing that is of great concern today, Mr. President, is the utter disregard the Interior Department, under which the Bureau of Reclamation operates, shows toward the reclamation of lands. Oh, they favor the reclamation of lands if such reclamation appears to be a part of expanding the Federal power system, but reclamation is its secondary and not its primary consideration. There is a limit of money available to the West for Federal development and if this money is to be expended on power developments, where is the money for reclamation coming from? Although the revenues from the sale of electric power in the Pacific Northwest were to be used for assistance in financing reclamation developments in that area, if the Bonneville Power Administration is to continue losing money on its power operations, where is the help to reclamation coming from?

One of my great concerns is for the central Arizona project in my native State. We desperately need water for continuing development. It is going to be expensive to bring additional water into Arizona. That we all know. But where is the money coming from for that development if the Interior Department and Bureau are going to continue seeking huge appropriations from the Federal Treasury to construct power projects? The High Mountain Sheep development would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a power project, pure and simple—a power project that investor-owned electric companies are ready to build at no cost to the Federal Government. Construction by the investor-owned companies would provide every advantage to the area that Government construction would provide. Something we seem to forget is that consumers buying power from investor-financed companies are citizens of this country and are entitled to the same privileges as other citizens. If the investor-owned companies can provide an economical source of power, the benefits accrue to their consumers. Are their customers to be put into a second-class-citizen category?

Mr. President, the more I see of Interior's machinations in the electric power field, the more convinced I become that the people responsible for the operation of the Department are determined that the Government, with Interior, of course, playing the leading role, shall dominate the power industry in this country.

Mr. President, if we are willing to take off the blindfolds and look this question straight in the eye, I am sure that others will come to the same conclusion I have and also realize it is time for us to get this question straightened out. If it is the desire of the people of this country to socialize one of our basic industries, let us face the question squarely and not let a handful of bureaucrats lead us blindfolded into a situation that would destroy our free enterprise system.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in view of the widespread public interest in the subject of managed news, I wish to bring to the attention of Senators two articles of particular significance.

One appears in the April issue of the Atlantic Monthly. It is entitled "Managed News—Our Peacetime Censorship." The author is the distinguished military analyst of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin.

The other article is by the able analyst and columnist, Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Washington Post on March 29, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordred to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlantic Monthly magazine, April 1963]

MANAGED NEWS: OUR PEACETIME CENSORSHIP

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

(NOTE.—"The blatant methods used by the administration and its tampering with the news deserve considerably more criticism and discussion than they have received," says Hanson W. Baldwin, the military analyst for the New York Times. In the article which follows, Mr. Baldwin describes these methods and points out the danger of Government manipulation of the news.)

The problem of reconciling security and freedom is not new to the Kennedy administration. It existed when the Nation was young, and it has troubled every era of our history. But it has become acute only since the end of World War II, when the twin threats of the atomic age and the Communist conspiracy have posed the greatest dangers to national security in our history. There has been, in the last two decades, an inevitable growth of Government secrecy in an age when man has the power to destroy himself and in an era when an aggressive, expansionist communism poses hidden dangers, with its secret subversions, to the body politic. The pressure ever since 1945 has been clearly on the side of more secrecy.

This pressure has been greatly increased by the tremendously strengthened influence in Government of the Federal police power (the FBI and especially the Central Intelligence Agency) and of the "intelligence mentality," which tends to enshrine secrecy as an abstract good. A significant growth in the power of the Presidency and in the size, power, and centralization of the executive branch—checked only slightly during Eisenhower's administration by his concept of a Congress which proposed, a President who disposed—has strengthened the wall of secrecy which has gradually been built around Government.

The trend poses some long-term dangers. James Madison noted in the Virginia Convention of June 16, 1788: "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation." It is the "gradual and silent encroachments" upon many past concepts of press freedoms that have greatly troubled close observers of the Kennedy administration.

John F. Kennedy, during his first 2 years in office, has proved to be, in his press conferences and rocking chair chats, an articulate, winning, and persuasive President. He and his administration have been extremely sensitive to the public image of the man and the office as mirrored by the press and other public relations media.

Despite this sensitivity (or perhaps because of it), despite the President's highly articulate phrases, there is a major question about the methods employed in the administration's public relations policies, a doubt that the people are really being taken into the confidence of the President to the same degree that they were during World War II and Korea.

This vigorous and cocky young administration has provided the yeast of the New Frontier, which, mixed into the dangerous ferment of our times, has produced, in the opinion of many newsmen, some astonishing examples of news repression and distortion, management and control, and pressures and propaganda.

It should be emphasized that news management is not new with this administration. It has been attempted and sometimes practiced successfully in the past, often with a Madison Avenue flair and heavy overtones of propaganda, by various Presidents, by the individual armed services, and by other executive departments. It can even be argued that some degree of news management may be necessary in the last half of the 20th century, when nuclear weapons and Communist conquests pose unparalleled dangers to democracy. But the Kennedy administration has shown a sensitivity to criticism, a readiness to resent it, and a willingness to use unorthodox methods to meet it that have troubled many people. The elimination of the New York Herald Tribune, leading Republican critic of the New Frontier, from the list of papers subscribed to by the White House was but the surface symptom of a widespread administration attitude. The management and manipulation of news at the source have been publicly defended by a minor administration official who nevertheless was clearly voicing the views of the administration.

THE USE OF THE FBI

What form has this control and management and manipulation taken? The first and most dangerous form has been the freewheeling use of Federal police power to investigate leaks.

FBI agents have been employed in at least half a dozen separate instances in the past 2 years in investigations of the sources of news stories. Investigations of this sort are not new with the Kennedy regime. The Eisenhower administration several times used the Federal sleuths in attempts to detect the sources of stories published by various papers. But Mr. Kennedy has called upon the FBI far more frequently in cases of this sort than any prior President, and the methods used by the FBI in this administration, though sometimes repudiated or apologized for later, have smacked of totalitarianism rather than of democratic government.

Federal agents have visited the homes of reporters and newspaper employees in attempts to question them about their sources. Reporters say they have been shadowed in the corridors of the Pentagon, and many newspapermen, as well as military officers and Government officials, believe their phones have been tapped.

Newsmen who have experienced "the treatment" include some of the most highly respected reporters in Washington, men like Lloyd Norman of Newsweek, a thorough, careful, and discreet veteran of Pentagon coverage; John Richard Frykland, who covers the Pentagon, and Earl Voss, the State Department, for the Washington Evening Star; and many others.

In all these cases the newsmen concerned have told the FBI in effect that their sources were their business. But this has not prevented extensive, intimidating FBI investigations involving checks into the newsmen's contacts, friendships, and associations. These investigations have ranged throughout the Pentagon, the State Department, and other executive branches of Government, and far afield outside Government. And Mr. Kennedy has been the first President to send the FBI into the Pentagon, superseding the services' own investigative and internal security agencies.

FBI agents have questioned civilian officials and commissioned officers of all ranks, from the major junior rank to three- and four-star generals and admirals. The interrogations have been detailed and sometimes hectoring; junior officers have even been threatened with lie detector tests. To men who have devoted a lifetime of loyal service to their country and who, their commissions read, are worthy of "special trust and confidence," such treatment is demeaning and destructive of morale.

The administration says that these investigations are intended solely to plug leaks and to prevent disclosures inimical to the Nation's security, and are not directed in any way against a free press. Nor are they intended, it is claimed, to downgrade the status of the officer corps. Yet the stories which have produced FBI investigations have nearly always dealt with subjects and facts fully known to the Russians and to many others besides; few if any of these stories have harmed the Nation's security. Usually, however, they have been embarrassing to the administration for one reason or another; often newsmen have divulged information before the administration was ready to announce it. In several cases, official ire was aroused because many top-ranking Government officials who by intent or bureaucratic inefficiency had been left in outer darkness first learned the facts from published stories.

Regardless of the avowed intent or ostensible purpose of the FBI investigations, the methods used—visits of agents to the homes of newspaper employees, the chivying and tacit threatening of Government employees and officers, tapping of telephone lines, and shadowing of reporters—have had, as they almost certainly were intended to have, an intimidating and restricting effect. The kind, the amount, and the character of news, particularly military news, available to the public has been reduced.

THE PERSONAL APPROACH

The second method employed in the past 2 years to control or shape the news is the frequent use by high administration officials, including the President himself, of the personal reprimand, request, admonition, complaint, or compliment. The direct approach to working newsmen or to editors or publishers is not, of course, new with this administration, but the frequent participation of the President himself in such approaches is unusual. The President reads widely; quite often he picks up the telephone to chide, complain, or praise a reporter or editor for a story which has irked or pleased him.

The inclusion of correspondents, editors, publishers, and commentators on the President's appointment calendar or the White House guest list is another tacit form (a Washington status symbol) of attempting to influence the news. In this administration such favorites are expecting to be sympathetic, not too critical; otherwise they may be cast, along with the Herald Tribune, into outer darkness.

Some of the President's advisers, particularly the Attorney General, Theodore Sorensen, and Pierre Salinger, are even quicker on the trigger: they frequently complain or cajole; some say they have even tacitly threatened. In one instance, when a Washington newspaper published an editorial which declared that the facts available to it did not entirely agree with the President's public account of the incident, Salinger telephoned an executive of the paper and wanted to know whether the paper was calling the President a liar.

The President, the Attorney General, and others have frequently inveighed to visitors about criticism of the New Frontier, and the President has sometimes utilized Cabinet meetings as a forum for his complaints.

When Charles J. V. Murphy, respected and experienced Washington correspondent for Fortune magazine, published in the September 1961 Fortune a complete and thorough account of the Laotian and Bay of Pigs fiascoes, his article was denounced by the President personally at a press conference. General Maxwell D. Taylor was then sent to New York with a bill of complaints to see Henry Luce. He was politely received, but when he was all through, astonishment was expressed at the picayune nature of the objections. Later, Murphy, a colonel in the Air Force Reserve who for years has had a mobilization assignment in the office of the Air Chief of Staff, found that under pressure the Air Force had been compelled to shift him to a minor post elsewhere.

RESTRICTING THE NEWS

A most important method of controlling and restricting the news is the tremendous centralization of authority that has been effected by this administration. There has been a trend in this direction ever since World War II, but under Kennedy the process of centralizing and restricting authority for releasing news has gone very much further than it has ever gone in the past. Despite the global responsibilities of the Armed Forces and the tremendous size of our Government, an attempt, at least partially successful, has been made to control from Washington the nature, the kind, and even the details of news released in Saigon, Okinawa, Alaska, or Frankfurt. In the Pentagon the discretion and responsibility of the individual services and of the subordinate commands have been so greatly curtailed by restrictions that even the simplest kind of release requires clearance by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester. In the State Department the control is not so tight, but it is nevertheless less flexible than in the past.

Both Departments carry out the public relations policies and also the detailed instructions of the White House. The White House, in respect to news, does not really mean Pierre Salinger, the President's press secretary. Salinger is not one of the inner circle, and the basic policies are established by Sorensen, McGeorge Bundy, the Attorney General, or the President himself. The press and public affairs assistants in this administration have none of the concepts of their predecessors; they do not really represent the public's right to know, nor do they play any major role in the development of public relations policies. They are rather mouthpieces of the administration.

UNDER GUISE OF SECURITY

The Cuban crisis revealed still another means of controlling the flow of news vital to the people. This was achieved quite simply, under the guise of security, by blocking the press from access to the sources of news. Restrictions that exceeded those of World War II or Korea prevented the press, radio, and television from covering the "quarantine," or blockading, fleet or from visiting our beleaguered base at Guantanamo until the immediate crisis ended. Stringent rules were put into effect in the Pentagon and State Department, which funneled all official statements through a Pentagon or State Department spokesman.

In the Pentagon the secretaries of the individual services were bypassed, and Assistant Secretary Sylvester issued an order which required the presence of a third person during any interview with a news media representative, or, alternatively, the filing of a report by the person interviewed, summarizing the subjects discussed and identifying the interviewer. A similar though less drastic rule was applied in the State Department, but after strenuous objections from newspapermen, it has been lifted. As this is written, the Pentagon rule is still in effect. It has had, and was bound to have (as it was intended to), a restrictive effect upon the kind and character of news emanating from the Pentagon. This simple measure, with its implications of punitive action if someone treads on forbidden ground, has gone a long way toward restricting news to the "Poppa knows best" kind, to stories and data which the Government wants to release.

THE CALCULATED LEAK

Still another tactic used frequently by this administration in its attempts to shape the news and to achieve its ends is the calculated leak, the carefully disseminated canard or half-truth from someone close to the throne. This, too, is not new, but the crudity and the frequency of its use in recent years are exceptional. The account in the Saturday Evening Post by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett which purported to depict the alleged "softness" of Adlai Stevenson during the 1962 Cuban crisis was but the most recent of several such episodes.

All of them had the same earmarks: a favored reporter close to the President was given high-level background information for publication. The publication of this information did not commit the President, but in each instance it certainly weakened the position of the victim; in fact, it cut the ground from under his feet. Chester Bowles was the first to feel this snickersnee between his ribs; later the Joint Chiefs of Staff, collectively, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, its chairman, got somewhat less severe treatment. Then it was Stevenson's turn. The beauty of this gambit, the gambit of the calculated leak, is that the President, if he wants to, can disavow the article (he was loyal enough to Bartlett, his old friend, not to do so), but it will do its work nonetheless.

DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD

A corollary to the calculated leak is what might be called the policy of the open door. This was utilized to the maximum after the steel-price-rise controversy, and particularly after the successful termination of the Cuban crisis of 1962. The word is spread by the White House that the administration will be glad to open some doors to favored news media so that the full background story of the days of crisis can be told exclusively in the Blaptown Bugle.

After the October 1962 Cuban crisis, a rash of "now it can be told" stories, each purporting to give the inside story, each claiming an exclusive quality, appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, Time, Life, the Reader's Digest, Look, and a number of daily papers. A few writers were careful to state that this was an administration account, that the full story would have to await history.

This kind of shaping and manipulation of the news—utilizing the lure of inside information, the open door, exclusive interviews, and off-the-record appointments—is old hat to official Washington. But in degree and kind, and particularly in the slanting of the released information to enhance the image of the President, it is unusual in this administration.

There was a time when the word of the Government was its bond; the people could have faith, allowing for mistakes and erroneous interpretations, in what Washington told them. Public confidence has been severely shaken many times since World War II; the U-2 case exposed the dangers of governmental falsehood for all to see.

But the Kennedy administration does not appear to have learned from these past horrible examples. During the Cuban crisis and at other times, the successful restrictions upon news coverage and the centralization of authority for releasing news enabled various Government spokesmen, particularly those in the Pentagon, to withhold or slant at will, or in some cases, without expert advice, to make unintentional mistakes. Only later did some of the public come to realize that a picture had been painted differing from reality.

CUBA: PROPAGANDA VERSUS NEWS

During the Cuban crisis the details of what was going on were limited to brief generalizations from the White House and the reading of terse announcements by a "Pentagon spokesman." The Pentagon did not announce hailing of the first ship passing through the blockade until after it had been announced by a Congressman; the first photographs of the missile sites in Cuba were released in London. Pentagon spokesmen denied, at a time when the facts were in hand, any knowledge of the removal of 42 Soviet missiles from Cuba until it was announced on a television program a day later.

The crisis also produced from a civilian spokesman, unhindered by or disdaining military knowledge, statements which were grossly inaccurate. Some of these restrictions and mistakes can be extenuated on the grounds of crisis. Certainly the Nation's press, as it showed at the time of crisis, willingly withheld detailed news of military movements until the crisis had ended. But many of the news restrictions and much of the news management imposed by the Kennedy administration as ostensibly temporary measures remain in effect. Few Americans realize that Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was prior to the crisis; that there are still thousands of Soviet troops on the island, hundreds of tanks, scores of jet fighters, and many of the latest type of ground-to-air missiles. Castro and the Russians know the details of Russian military strength on Cuba; some of our allies know them; but for many weeks the American people were kept in darkness.

In other words, an aura of propaganda has surrounded the Government's public presentation of the Cuban situation since the beginning. The major political and psychological victory achieved by the Kennedy administration in its dramatic confrontation with Premier Khrushchev has not been balanced by a calm assessment of the negative aspects: the greatly increased military strength of the Communist-Castro regime; the possibility, even the probability, that some long-range missiles are still concealed in Cuba; the likelihood that Cuba, like the albatross in "The Ancient Mariner," will hang around the neck of U.S. foreign policy for an indefinite future.

CANCELLATION OF SKYBOLT

The Skybolt missile issue provided another example of distorted news handling. To hear Pentagon spokesmen talk one would gather, inaccurately, that the Skybolt development program was far behind schedule, that all of its initial tests had failed, that it was a technical dud. There was no reference to the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored continued development of the missile, that an air-launched ballistic missile coupled with a nuclear-powered aircraft and a navigational satellite to help fix the launching plane's exact position in space offered a growth potential of tremendous importance for the future, and that the missile's development program was approximately on schedule.

The cancellation of the Skybolt could be fairly defended and explained on a cost basis; it presented an addition to the Nation's nuclear-delivery armory, an armory that was already extensive and that had the capability of overkilling Soviet Russia many times. But the adverse political effects in Britain were discounted, and the strategic advantages and technical capabilities of the Skybolt were deliberately downgraded. The result was a distorted picture as far as official Government statements were concerned.

INFORMATION IS POWER

What does all this add up to? Is it merely, as some editors have maintained, the gripings of a lazy press, too slothful to penetrate the bureaucratic maze in Washington, too conscious of the newspaper's privileged place in American life, unaware of its own irresponsibility? Is it simply another chapter in the conflict between the President and the press?

This question is best answered in the words of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Mr. Sylvester executes policy; he does not set it. But his actions and his words are never lightly chosen; they represent administration and White House policy. If they did not, Mr. Sylvester would long ago have been sacrificed, as others in the Pentagon and elsewhere have been.

Mr. Sylvester has twice discussed publicly, once in an interview and once in a speech, his (the Government's) concept of the role of a free press in a democracy. He told the Associated Press some months ago that "news generated by the action of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has." He defended the Government's management, control and restriction of the flow of the news so that a free press might speak "in one voice to your adversary." Later, in a speech to the New York Chapter of the Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity, Mr. Sylvester declared, "It is the Government's inherent right to lie if necessary to save itself when faced with nuclear disaster; this is basic." He added that the Defense Department would continue to use news to further the aims of American foreign policy, because "information is power." This is strange language from a man with more than 20 years of newspaper experience, 16 years of it in Washington, D.C.

There are many familiar and foreboding nuances in Mr. Sylvester's phrases. They are a direct reflection of the "intelligence mentality," which has steadily increased in influence in Washington since the war, and which also holds that information is power and must therefore be hedged around with secrecy and safeguards.

His reference to news as a weapon echoes some of the old debates that heralded the permanent establishment as an arm of Government of the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency. The press expressed fears then that the participation of Government in the dissemination of news to foreign countries might well become, as indeed it was bound to become, the use of news to further American foreign policy; that is, the management, control, and direction of the news toward a specific purpose, the propaganda or the slant which a free press rightly fears. This same concept, then viewed as a support for our foreign policy, but for oversea export only, has now been, in Mr. Sylvester's words, applied to the domestic regulation of the news.

THE DANGERS OF SECRECY

What are the dangers and the adverse effects of such management, restriction, and manipulation of the news? One of them is internal. The mania for secrecy often prevents the right hand of government from knowing what the left hand is doing. The dissemination of information on a so-called "need to know" basis has led to the compartmentalization of facts and background, with consequent increased expense, loss of time, and sometimes inchoate government actions, which have cost us dearly. Undue secrecy not only makes for inefficient government; it protects inefficiency and hides corruption.

The second result is the adverse effect upon the morale of government employees and the armed services and their relatives. News about their doings, even though carefully sieved when necessary so as to reveal no vital information to a potential enemy, is not only conducive to morale, but it represents a right of the American people, whose sons are doing the fighting and sometimes the dying.

A corollary danger is that many of the carefully built-up channels of cooperation between press and Government established during and since World War II by careful selection and training of Government information officers are tending to break down. The concepts, finally established in World War II despite the objections and suspicions of the old order, that the "press is on our side, too," and that "honesty is the best policy" have been taught to successive generations of commanding officers, officials, and public information officers at service and civilian schools ever since the war. Recent governmental policies make a mockery of these tried and tested principles, and the centralization of authority, the close control over the release of news make many public information officers of great capability errand boys, parrots of administration mouthpieces.

The fundamental case against the kind of news management, restriction, control, and censorship which has been practiced recently is, quite simply, that it impairs the constitutional rights of a free press and hence poses a potential danger to our form of democratic and representative government. No people can be really free if its press is spoon-fed with government pap or if the news which provides a democracy with the rationale for its actions is so controlled, restricted, managed, or censored that it cannot be published.

The blatant methods used by the administration and its tampering with the news deserve considerably more criticism and discussion than they have received.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California, Democratic chairman of a special House Subcommitee on Government Information, who has been one of the critics, pointed out, quite correctly, that the Nation's press should lead the discussion. He viewed with some concern the restrictions imposed on the press on the coverage of underground nuclear tests in Nevada, secrecy about military space activities, a blackout of information about Soviet satellite efforts, and the manner and method of applying various news guidelines suggested by the administration during the Cuban crisis. "We have in the past few weeks," Mr. Moss said in late November, "experienced a degree of Government news management which is unique in peacetime."

Three newspaper organizations—the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and the National Editorial Association—have discussed the Government's restrictions and have warned against possible consequences: "We are concerned lest Government * * * look upon news of what the Government is doing, not as an honest report of what happened, but as a means to some desired end." The Nation will suffer "if it departs from its own tradition to imitate a totalitarian enemy, by regarding news not as news but as a weapon or other instrument of national policy."

The services and the technical press, which are familiar in detail with many of the military subjects that have been surrounded by a paper curtain in the Pentagon, have been particularly outspoken in their criticism. Their basic point is that the Government has withheld and is still withholding from the American people large amounts of pertinent information about which the Russian Government is fully informerd.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE PRESS

Is the press free from blame? Of course not. Too large a section of it, seduced by the friendship of the political high-and-mighty in Washington, by the blandishments of power or fame, or by the hope of scoops, color the news or pull their punches. Others, slothful by nature, have accepted the ease of the Government handout. And there are the reckless and irresponsible, who rush into print without first weighing the consequences of what they write in the balance of the national interest and on the scales of history. Yet none of these evils can be cured, save at a far greater cost, by restricting, managing, or controlling the news.

If we are to have a free press in a democracy, there are bound to be leaks; in fact, it is imperative that enterprising reporters continue to break through the wall of secrecy around government. When no leaks occur, I shall really begin to worry.

The fundamental obligation of a free press is to serve as a monitor of government. It must owe nothing, save fairness and truthfulness, to any administration. Its ultimate loyalty must not be to any government or any party in or out of office, but to the Nation, to the greatest good of the greatest number. In turn, the Government must recognize this higher loyalty and obligation and must understand that the American press has as great a stake in the welfare of the country and its security as the administration and that its responsibility for informing, for monitoring, for criticizing is paramount.

This does not mean, of course, that freedom is license. Time after time, in instance after instance, every responsible newspaper has withheld, temporarily or permanently, information that in its judgment would be inimical, if published, to the best interests of the Nation. But time after time newspapers have printed information that to the Pentagon or the State Department is classified. And sometimes the press has been wrong in its judgments.

Generalization about this issue is not possible. Each case has to be judged on its merits and the pros and cons weighed on the scales of the national interest. During World War II many of my articles were picked up by enemy propagandists and broadcast back to the United States or its fighting men in partial or distorted form. But critical articles which described the poor management and inefficiency of some of our replacement depots in Italy, the inadequacy of our tanks, and the perilous situation in the South Pacific during the early phases of the Guadalcanal campaign produced remedial action.

It can be argued, with some cogency, that things have changed since World War II and that in a world where nuclear suicide is possible, all information must be safeguarded. It is true that irresponsibility, sensationalism, and occasionally real breaches of security—all of them evils of a free press—may cause disproportionate damage in the atomic age. Yet it is also true that undue secrecy can pose greater perils.

Responsible newspapermen, for instance, will avoid, unless the Government approves it, the publication of detailed technical specifications of a new weapon, new radar, or other militarily useful devices if their publication would enable a potential enemy to crib from our developments. Yet even in such cases no clear line can be drawn in this scientific age, for scientific freedom and scientific development imply the free publication and exchange of virtually all scientific data. Normally, unless there are other counterbalancing considerations, the responsible reporter will avoid printing intelligence data with such exactitude and detail as to pinpoint the source of the information, unless that source is already known to a potential enemy or can be easily deduced. Similarly, commonsense requires the withholding—in areas of combat, like South Vietnam—of news of planned military operations before they actually occur. The responsible newspaperman may also withhold, in delicate and critical situations, detailed discussions of contingency plans or the exact status of secret negotiations.

To decide whether to print or not to print is never easy, for there is no general guideline save the common good. In the age of megaton bombs, secret intelligence apparatus, and Communist plots there is clearly an ill-defined no-man's-land, a fuzzy boundary between what is and is not fit to print. The Government, like the press, is bound to grope through the fog of insecurity in this technological age; both are bound to make mistakes. It is not the isolated mistake but the pattern of attempted news management and control in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration that is cause for concern.

There are two rules that can serve the Nation well. The first is that honesty, as full and complete as possible, is in the long run the best policy for governments as well as individuals. The second is that the artificial curbs and restrictions, the tacit censorship over the news that have existed should be removed. Contracts, official and unofficial, formal and informal, between government and press at all levels should be encouraged, not monitored or discouraged or limited.

If the ultimate power is to continue to rest in the people, the people's need to know must be filled by the press. Except in the case of formal military censorship in time of war, the press itself, with that great diversity of judgment which is the salvation of democracy, must decide what it will publish. Otherwise, its freedom, and ultimately the freedom of us all, is a mockery. Needless to say, this judgment should always be exercised—most of all in the atomic age—with a great sense of responsibility and dedication to the common good. News is not a commodity, but an inherent democratic right and a public trust.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 29, 1963]

DEFENSE VERSUS POLITICS: WHAT MCNAMARA COULD DO

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When the Federal Government takes $60 billion a year from the pockets of the American taxpayers for defense and space, it is imperative that the country and the Congress accept the integrity of the decisions which are being made as to how and where that money is being spent.

If there is any one arm of the Government, more than any other, which has to be as pure as Caesar's wife, above the very suspicion of scandal, free from politics, free from the appearance of politics, free from the smell of politics, it is the Department of Defense.

The long line of distinguished Secretaries of Defense—from James Forrestal, Robert Lovett, Gen. George Marshall to Neil McElroy, Thomas Gates, and Robert McNamara—shows that it is the intention that it should be this way.

There is no doubt in my mind that Secretary McNamara and his chief deputy, Roswell Gilpatric, are exercising objective and businesslike judgment in awarding the vast defense contracts regardless of who gets hurt or who get helped.

But are there no valid suspicions, no circumstances which at times suggest that politics, favoritism, and influence are busily at work?

There are such suspicions, there are such circumstances, and they can well reach a point where they will erode confidence in the integrity of the Defense Department's decision-making.

Secretary McNamara is himself partly to blame.

How can the Defense Department expect to persuade the country that it is not influenced by politics in letting contracts when it participates in the pernicious practice of giving advance information, mostly to Democratic Members of Congress, so that they can announce the contracts affecting their States and thus calculatedly create the impression that their political influence brought these Government contracts to their constituents?

There is every reason to count McNamara as a man of integrity as well as large ability. But he is recklessly throwing away some of the trust in his integrity by tolerating a practice which deliberately spreads the very impression he is most seeking to avoid.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY in Massachusetts and Gov. Edmund Brown in California are not the only Democrats who campaigned last fall on the promise that, with their party in power in Washington, they could do more for their States.

President Kennedy himself set the pattern. In West Virginia, urging the reelection of a Democratic Congressman, the President noted that the State was getting four times as much defense money as it was in 1960. In Pennsylvania, he stressed that prime-contract awards were up 50 percent and appealed for the election of Democratic gubernatorial candidate Richardson Dilworth so that this collaboration could continue.

Neither Mr. Kennedy nor other Democrats have any patent on this noxious practice of feeding advance news of defense contracts to politicians so they can use the information to misinform their constituents of how influential they are. It was done during the Eisenhower administration. It is one of the longstanding vices of Government.

But it's bad—and getting worse. If Secretary McNamara and others, who have the most say in awarding billions of dollars every year to Government contractors, do not put an end to it, they are going to erode the confidence in their integrity which is their most precious possession.

They simply can't preserve the substance of nonpolitical decisionmaking when they allow it to be poisoned by the appearance of political decisionmaking.

The President may be reluctant. The politicians will be annoyed. The most political minded in the White House will probably be furious. But McNamara could say, This must end—and get away with it. He needs to do so, I believe, if he is to escape a gathering and miasmic mess.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce another major convert to the cause of truth in lending, the bill which 20 members of the Senate have sponsored to require the full disclosure to consumers of the costs of personal credit.

On Friday, March 22 the American Banker, the leading trade newspaper for the commercial banking and finance industry, published an excellent article by their Washington editor strongly supporting the truth in lending bill.

Moreover, the American Banker article ably refutes the objections that the American Bankers Association has raised against the truth in lending bill. I certainly hope that this editorial foreshadows a reversal of the American Bankers Association's present opposition to the truth in lending bill. I know that the editorial in the American Banker newspaper reflects the sentiments of the many individual bankers who have privately expressed their support for this bill to me, and I now hope that the American Bankers Association will join the other leaders in the consumer lending industry—credit unions, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations—in supporting our efforts to enact the truth-in-lending bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the American Banker article be printed immediately folllowing my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Banker, Mar. 22, 1963]

TODAY: HONEST CREDIT DOLLAR—THE CASE FOR DISCLOSURE

(By Raoul D. Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—Through the ages, the question of interest has occupied a great part in the minds of men. Credit is a commodity—although the early Christians considered it, instead, an evil—and in most eras and ethics, within most ethical frameworks, credit has been considered to have its rightful place.

What that price should be has been debatable. In the earlier years of the industrial revolution, however, there gradually revolved a business oriented feeling that 6 percent was a normal justifiable rate for the then-standard business loan, of short-term orientation. There have been—and still are—times and places where rates go much higher. But in this country, at least 6 percent has become the effective, and in many cases the legal, ceiling.

This, however, came about during a period when the average man did not use credit, when the installment loan was unheard of. As newer types of loan came to the fore, it was discovered by lenders that the added risks and added work involved in such loans demanded higher rates.

Because of the belief that 6 percent was the justifiable maximum, lenders were forced to express new concepts in interest. The discount and add-on, revolving credit, and other types of interest expression have grown more dominant in recent years.

This, of course, creates problems. Many new users of credit are not sophisticated; they will not take the hard look at rates which the businessman will, and they are not able to solve the complex methods of interest rate expression that are current in much of the lending activity of the Nation. In some instances, these new users of credit are being imposed upon, especially on the retail level.

Taking a long, hard, second look at the "truth in lending" proposal of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, we are inclined to believe that this measure not only makes sense, but is in the interest of the commercial banking industry and the public.

Those who know that we support the dual banking system, and the careful system of checks and balances which comprises this Nation's safeguard against too-rigid or too-domineering controls of the National Government, may feel that this is a departure from the concept of States rights and thoughtful decentralization of controls.

Were the States doing the job Senator DOUGLAS intends his bill to do, we might go along with this; but the States are not doing that particular job, and we are inclined to think that Senator DOUGLAS is right in insisting the job must be done.

There is no valid reason for maintaining that a borrower should not have an accurate and understandable outline of what credit is costing him. Credit—the use of money—in a sense is a product, and today, when banks and other lenders are actively competing for customers who are relatively unsophisticated, it is proper that the person buying the use of money should know what it costs him.

Banks in general do a much better job of informing people as to these costs than do most lenders. Banks, at least, supply the borrower with the dollar amount of the interest charged, and they supply a rate accurate on the original balance.

But many other lenders not only present exceedingly complicated rate structures, but in many cases hid substantial portions of the interest costs in various types of charges. Furthermore, there are some credit sellers, notably in retail stores, who never give a breakdown as to what constitutes the cost of an item, and what constitutes the cost of credit.

Anyone who carefully hid, or refused to disclose, the cost of a product, would wind up going out of business. Why, then, should credit be any different?

The charge is leveled that the Douglas proposal, if approved, would create a new and vast OPA-style Federal supervisory body. Not so. The bill assigns to the Federal Reserve Board the task of writing regulations governing accurate reporting of interest, and delineation of guidelines. But the bill does not set up any machinery to administer, supervise, examine, or control. It specifically holds that the only recourse will be by action brought by an individual borrower in civil action in the courts.

The charge is further leveled that there will be a large expense to business, and to banking. Actually, most banks are geared to do this already. They, in most cases, do provide the actual interest figure, and rate books are in existence which would enable a bank to supply the average interest cost on the average unpaid balance, for any installment note. The same in large part is true of other lenders.

With regard to this, banks will be under far less pressure to change than will retail lenders, auto firms, and the like, many of which supply no adequate information of any sort. "Costs so much a month"—what part of what is the cost of money and what is the cost for the car?

There have been charges that this bill will prove inflexible and harmful to some industries. Yet the bill specifically gives the Fed the flexibility to write regulations which will fit each industry as regulated, and which will allow for unusual situations. It is not a rigid approach.

Finally we come to the States rights objection. In only one State is any specific requirement that true costs be disclosed part of the law; that is Wisconsin. Many States have excellent laws now, laws which protect the borrower. But these laws do not provide for any way in which unsophisticated borrowers—which is to say, the vast majority of borrowers—will be able to compare credit costs or even accurately know what they are.

And the bill, as written specifically disclaims any intent to change any law; it specifically states that neither a creditor nor a borrower may escape State law or responsibilities under a contract because of this law, with the sole exception that the creditor is subject to penalties if he is shown to have failed to disclose, accurately and fully, costs of credit. A civil court so holds.

The bill seems a good one, if it remains as written, with a valid objective, and without any features which will create any damage to the banking industry or to any honest grantor of credit. Indeed, to commercial banking, the bill might prove to have a positive advantage, since, as Senator DOUGLAS points out, bank rates compare quite favorably with those of most other lenders. Bankers know this now, but as rates are skillfully hidden today, the general public does not. Under full disclosure, the general public could not help but find this out, and banks all over the country could carry out to a greater degree their objective of "full service" banking to their communities.

TRAVELING ART EXHIBIT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last spring, working closely with Mr. John Walker, Director of the National Gallery of Art, I undertook an experiment in Rhode Island of bringing great art to our people. Because it has proved a very real success, I strongly recommend that a similar program be started on a nationwide basis.

Mr. Walker and Mr. Grose Evans, curator of the Index of American Design, prepared for me a collection of 16 collotype reproductions of great Renaissance paintings. These were shipped to Rhode Island where I arranged to have them exhibited in 19 city and town halls throughout the State for a period of 2 weeks each. They were deliberately scheduled in the city and town halls, because my purpose was not so much to attract art lovers to yet another exhibition, as it was to bring great art to the attention of thousands who might not otherwise make the effort to see it. I am happy to say that both of these purposes seem to have been accomplished.

On June 7, 1962, the traveling exhibition had its first opening in the city hall in Providence. There was broad press and television coverage which led to a large degree of popular interest. Since that day, the exhibit has traveled to 18 other cities and towns and I am proud to say has met with enthusiastic approval in virtually every community. I have received numerous telephone calls and letters praising the exhibit, both from public officials and from interested citizens. Many expressed the desire to purchase similar reproductions. Although it is of course difficult to pinpoint the exact number of people who viewed the exhibition, our unofficial estimate is upward of 15,000. To my mind, these facts serve as adequate testimony that the cause of art appreciation has been enriched. It is for this reason that I should like to see similar exhibitions inaugurated throughout the country.

There were naturally minor difficulties attendant upon a new program of this type. These have been called to the attention of the National Gallery, and I have been assured that they can be easily solved. The only problem that I would foresee in a national scheduling would be one of logistics. In my State, the paintings were driven from town hall to town hall in a station wagon. I can understand that the distinguished Senators from California or Illinois might have difficulty with this mode of transportation. But I am certain that some other financially reasonable method of transportation can be arranged in these larger States.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Walker and Mr. Evans whose wholehearted cooperation was vital to the success of Operation Traveling Art. I think that together we have rendered benefit to many citizens in Rhode Island. I believe it would be to the cultural and esthetic interest of the United States to render this benefit to all our citizens.

Following is the list of paintings included in the traveling exhibition in Rhode Island: Bellini, "Madonna and Child in a Landscape"; Botticelli, "The Adoration of the Magi"; Agnolo Bronzino, "A Young Woman and Her Little Boy"; Duccio Di Buoninsegoa, "The Calling of the Apostles"; Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, "Madonna of the Goldfinch", and "Apollo Pursuing Daphne"; Giorgione, "Adoration of the Shepherds"; Francesco Guardi, "View on the Cannaregio, Venice"; Pietro Perugino, "Crucifixion With Saints"; Ralphael, "Alba Madonna," "Saint George and the Dragon," and "The Small Cowper Madonna"; Canaletto, "Venice," "The Quay of the Piazetta," and "The Square of St. Mark's"; Ercole Roberti, "Giovanni II and Ginevera Bentivoglio"; Tintoretto, "Christ at the Sea of Galilee."

The following schedule was in effect: June 7–18, Providence City Hall; Pawtucket City Hall, June 20–July 3; Burnside Memorial Building, Bristol, July 6–20; Barrington Town Hall July 23–August 3; Westerly Town Council Chamber, August 6–20; Narragansett Library, August 22–September 5; Newport City Hall, September 7–21; Coventry Town House, September 24–October 8; East Greenwich Library, October 10–24; Warwick City Hall, October 26–November 9; West Warwick Town Tall, November 13–27; Johnston Town Hall, November 29–December 13; Scituate Town Hall, December 17–31; Cranston City Hall, January 3–17; East Providence City Hall, January 21–February 4; Central Falls City Hall, February 6–20; Cumberland Town Hall, February 23–March 8; Woonsocket City Hall, March 11–March 25; Cranston City Hall, March 27–April 10.

WILL CLAYTON, FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, WINS BROTHERHOOD AWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Houston, Tex., chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews has presented a brotherhood award to a distinguished American, Mr. W. L. Clayton.

Mr. Clayton, statesman, philanthropist, former public servant as Under Secretary of State, and a cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the subject of a fine biography, the chief architect of the Marshall plan, now has a prized interfaith award to add to his long list of honors.

I ask unanimous consent that the following news articles concerning the latest honor to come to Mr. Clayton be placed in the RECORD: An article entitled "Will Clayton Gets Interfaith Award," published in the Houston Post of March 15, 1963; and an article entitled "Clayton Receives Plaque at Brotherhood Gathering," published in the Houston Chronicle of March 15, 1963:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 15, 1963]

CLAYTON RECEIVES PLAQUE AT BROTHERHOOD GATHERING

(By Nelson Antosh)

William L. Clayton, an 83-year-old Houstonian who has long studied problems of the world and man, was honored Thursday night for his contributions to interfaith understanding.

District Judge Wilmer Hunt, a Catholic, presented a plaque to Clayton, a Protestant, before 850 persons attending the 14th annual Brotherhood Award dinner of the Houston Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the Shamrock Hilton Hotel.

The Houston chapter meets annually to honor Houstonians for their work in bringing people of different religions together.

"We pay tribute tonight to a man who has risen from the genteel poverty of a Mississippi cotton farm to the opulence of an international merchant, a man whose public life extends from a deputy court clerk to Under Secretary of State, and a man whose capacity for work brought him from a court reporter at 15 to the strong, fit, much-traveled world leader at 83 that he is today," Hunt said.

"Houston has been no stranger to his benevolence," Hunt added. He cited Clayton's work for churches, educational institutions, cultural societies, hospitals, and slum clearance.

"He has a real and continuing part in the great drama of our time," Hunt said. The plaque cited "distinguished service in the field of human relations."

Brooks Hays, former Arkansas Congressman and now special assistant to President Kennedy, was the guest speaker.

"Clayton is unique in that he symbolizes the concern for both sound domestic and international movements," Hays said.

He also said there "ought to be a wall between church and state. But a free commerce of ideas must be maintained across that wall.

"If we are to fulfill the hopes of the world, we must first fulfill our own faith," Hays said.

Clayton, of 5300 Caroline, is board chairman and a cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., world's largest cotton merchandising firm.

He was Assistant Secretary of Commerce from 1942-44, Assistant Secretary of State in 1944–45 and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in 1945–47. Clayton has also served the Government in a number of advisory capacities.

He is a member of the Common Market Committee of the Atlantic Institute and the National Export Expansion Council by appointment of President Kennedy.

Houston oilman, R. E. (Bob) Smith, Chevy Chase, was banquet chairman.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 15, 1963]

WILL CLAYTON GETS INTERFAITH AWARD

(By Bill Barron)

W. L. Clayton, the Mississippi farmboy who became an international merchant, received the Houston Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews' 14th annual Brotherhood Award Thursday night "for distinguished service in the field of human relations."

About 850 people gathered in the Emerald Room of the Shamrock Hilton for an interfaith dinner to pay tribute to the 83-year-old Houstonian, who is former Under Secretary of State and cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the world's largest merchandising firm.

"He has a real and continuing part in the great drama of our time," said District Judge Wilmer Hunt who presented the award to Clayton.

Judge Hunt said Clayton "has preached what is so difficult for us to understand—that our safe ways of life are in danger in a world which is capsuled both in time and space and where continued peace the world over is not possible unless every part of the world enjoys to a significant degree the benefits of its civilization and a share of its bounty."

The award is given annually by chapters of National Conference of Christians and Jews, which was founded in 1928 to promote understanding and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

Judge Hunt introduced Clayton, who received a long, standing ovation from those attending the dinner.

"There is much that is wrong in the world, and obviously perfect brotherhood, which means the elimination of all bigotry from the minds and hearts of men, is far in the future, but I believe we are on our way," Clayton said in accepting the award.

"I do not have to go back so far as my boyhood days to realize the great transformation which has come into the minds and hearts of the American people in this matter of brotherhood," he said.

He said the election of a Catholic President was evidence of this.

R. E. (Bob) Smith, Houston oilman, presided as program chairman at the dinner and Brooks Hays, special assistant to President Kennedy, was the guest speaker.

Hays, who is former president of the Southern Baptist Convention and a former Arkansas Congressman, told the group that "there must be openings in the wall of separation of church and State" to allow for more understanding.

"We must work hard," Hays said, "to see that minorities, racial and religious, feel at home."

He called Clayton "a great internationalist" and a symbol of the concern of leadership on international as well as domestic stability.

Clayton, a member of the Common Market Committee of the Atlantic Institute, was appointed to the National Export Expansion Council last year by President Kennedy.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION DOES FINE WORK IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been asked to have printed in the Record an address which I delivered at Malakoff, in Henderson County, Tex., last Saturday, March 30, at the Texas Clay Tile Co. dedication.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record to show the great achievements of the Area Redevelopment Administration in one section of our country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Area Redevelopment Administration Builds New Hope and New Jobs

(Speech by U.S. Senator Ralph W. Yarborough at the dedication ceremony of Texas Clay Tile, Inc., in Malakoff, Henderson County, at 10 a.m., Saturday, March 30, 1931)

Chairman Hawn, fellow Texans, fellow Henderson Countians, fellow Americans, friends, and neighbors, it is a great privilege to me to come back to my ancestral home county for this dedication of and to progress. In this county, I was born and reared and lived and voted until I was 24 years of age. These were the formative years of my life.

In participating in this dedication ceremony for this great industrial project here at Malakoff in Henderson County, I rejoice with you that my home county has trained its vision to the future. It is looking forward, not backward, in the determination of you people to grow with our State and Nation, in the mainstream of American life.

During the hearings in the 87th Congress on Senate bill 1, the principal author being that great Senator Paul Douglas from Illinois, and which I cosponsored and which created the Area Redevelopment Administration, I predicted that this bill would be one of the soundest examples of congressional action of recent times. Now, a little over a year and a half later, the fantastic ARA program in Texas proves the soundness of that earlier prediction. And this has happened in spite of the strongly organized opposition to the program. I can recall the organized opposition which called on many local chambers of commerce, urging every town and hamlet to stay away from that awful Federal program.

Coached hecklers directed out of Washington and New York, crawled into public meetings in east Texas in 1961 and 1962, to read prepared propaganda in the form of questions, which the opponents of A.R.A. hoped would embarrass the speakers who were attempting to tell the community leaders what tools the Federal Government had finally—under the Kennedy administration—made available to them, so that they could improve their economy and provide jobs for the thousands of unemployed and underemployed in east Texas. You will also recall the critical and violent editorials of one segment of the Texas press, fighting this beneficial law and its implementation.

It was during this struggle to get A.R.A. going in our State that I requested the Coordinator for Texas, Mr. Raymond C. Morrison, to meet me in my Austin office. He came late one night. It so happened that there was a small group even in Henderson County, my own home county, trying desperately to block the sincere efforts of our friends to make use of this Federal program.

Many here in Henderson County will remember that I called them at night between 10 o'clock and midnight, to tell them what was going on—that a small but powerful economic group was trying to take this great benefit away from them by organization and propaganda, and that unless east Texans got up and took an interest in the real development of their area, they would miss the best opportunity they had ever had to forge ahead economically through the establishment of new industries.

And these friends of mine did act—they crowded the courthouse at Athens at a later meeting and demanded that an organization be created to prepare an overall economic development plan for their county, our county. This county gave me my opportunity in life; I want to see it possible for it to offer opportunities to many other boys and girls, young men and women.

This new modern Texas Clay Tile plant is an example of area redevelopment in action. Built with a Federal loan of $422,500, a participating bank loan of a little over $100,000 by the National Bank of Commerce of Dallas, Tex., and with the rest of the funds raised here locally at Malakoff, to make up this $650,000 project, this new completed plant we dedicate today will give steady work to 60 more men. Much credit is due Dan Royall, Jr., and E. H. Gatlin, Jr., for their leadership in pushing all of this to completion.

Had they failed and had many others failed, there would be no modern $650,000 brick and tile plant in Malakoff—the finest in the world. And there would not be new jobs for more citizens of this area. There would be no expansion to the Norman Pottery Co. at Athens—there would be no synthetic marble plant and no southwest design office furniture plant in Jacksonville—no east Texas mineral survey by the bureau of economic geology of the University of Texas—no industrial park in Clarksville—no pickle plant in Detroit, Tex.—no Caddo Lake project which is destined to open up a whole new worldwide industry by making cattle feed and fertilizer out of algae that had gotten so thick the fishermen stopped fishing in what was once the most popular fishing spot in Texas. And had we not won the battle, there would be no possibility of an $11 million tire plant in Texarkana—no possibility of a $20 million steel plant in Cherokee County—or a $30 million Texas newsprint plant in Jasper County.

These are but a few of the great industries planning to come into east Texas. Some of the recently approved industrial projects, and many more being considered, will revolutionize traditional products. For example, the audioelectronics plant under construction at Crockett, Tex., will manufacture a training instrument that will enable common labor to perform semiskilled jobs. A new plant planning to move to Mount Vernon will revolutionize the old air-conditioning methods. The ARA pipeline is now full and within the near future new plants will spring up all over the designated areas of our State, east Texas, and the Rio Grande section.

One of the great leaders of east Texas is Arthur Temple, of Diboll, president of Southern Pine Lumber Co., who has said: "Those who want to sit or do nothing—get out of the way of the rest, as we are on the move. The way some of you talk, you would think our Government was controlled by the Russians." And so now the Temple interests are on the move with many new industries presently on the drawing board.

Fellow Texans, we are witnessing the industrial rebirth of east Texas, and the many other designated ARA areas. This is truly the renaissance of east Texas. I have said that ARA is the Magna Carta of the small town and this I believe you agree is true. I do not need to tell you that this vast area of east Texas has lost around 100,000 good citizens during the last 10 years. That is 10,000 people a year. Where did they go? They went to Dallas, Houston, or Beaumont, or other Texas cities. A few left the State, but for the most part, these former neighbors of yours added to the congestion of Texas cities, mainly Dallas and Houston.

My friends, the big towns have gotten bigger and the small towns have gotten smaller with resultant serious problems at both ends. No one has yet solved the problems of bumper-to-bumper traffic and juvenile delinquency—so common in our big urban centers. While this has been going on, the smaller towns and rural areas have witnessed the tragedy of no jobs and outmigration, boarded-up schools, closed churches, vacant stores and with it all despair and hopelessness. Look about you today. There is a different picture. There is hope and optimism with new job-creating industries. And this has happened in the short span of a little over a year and a half. This Malakoff area is in the middle of an Athens-to-Trinidad area that is growing in one industrial complex from the Trinity River to the heart of the county.

In my opinion, there is no more beautiful section of the United States than east Texas and every bit of it is accessible by some of the finest highways in the world. Soon there will be three magnificent new lakes built within some of the finest forests in the world; 600,000 acres of these timbered lands are within our well run national forests in Texas.

It is my conservative opinion that these forests and lakes, McGee Bend, Toledo Bend, and Livingston, will attract millions of tourists a year. Nearly 90 million tourists visited the national parks last year. It is because of this that ARA has approved a $700,000 motor hotel for Woodville and a $500,000 motel for Naples. These are being built with local community stock sales, bank loans, and a loan from ARA. The East Texas Tourist Association is organized to promote east Texas and the increase in tourism will demand more and more facilities of all sorts.

There will be magnificent resort hotels on these new lakes. These will contribute greatly to the economic uplift of all the counties. New and expanded cultural activities in the field of music, arts and crafts, sports and drama, will develop and these will bring thousands from the big cities to this playground of the Southwest. The balance of trade will be more favorable to east Texas.

For decades Henderson County has been building its own lakes, until we can now call our own home county "A land of lakes."

All this is happening despite opposition by those who gave way to groundless fears. If all our people will put away their fears and take counsel of their hopes and aims for progress and prosperity and full employment, think how much faster this vast improvement would come. If everybody worked at it, it would gallop home.

Under the ARA program, Federal money is loaned on a security to build private plants where the project is feasible, as in the case of this clay-tile plant. No U.S. money is given away to private plants. But in the field of public improvements, where the town or county is unable to build a water or sewage system or other public improvement, alone, then ARA, in event of feasibility, will make a matching grant, giving part of the money while the local town, city, county, or district puts up the matching money to build the badly needed public facility. It is a sound program.

I congratulate Henderson County in its leadership in area redevelopment. The Area Redevelopment Act was the first act of President John F. Kennedy's New Frontier for economic progress for whole areas of America. As I have stated, the Area Redevelopment Act provides for Federal repayable loans to private industries, and also matching grants to public authorities. These types of capital investment and industrial feasibility know-how, advanced by the Area Redevelopment Administration, will enable the east Texas counties to offer jobs at home attractive to the youth of east Texas. My native east Texas has a rich soil, ample rainfall, fast-growing forests, abundant supplies of the fuel minerals—oil, gas, and lignite.

Its labor is not surpassed in the whole world. All that was needed was the know-how and capital to bring all the rich resources, human and natural, into a productive combination, in order to halt the flight of the population, and build a rich economy at home. No longer will east Texas be an underdeveloped area, either in Texas or the Nation.

For more than a century, Henderson County has helped develop the farsighted leaders who have built Texas. Of the five statesmen of Texas history—Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, John H. Reagan, Jim Hogg, and O. M. Roberts, three got their governmental start and public push in Henderson County. John H. Reagan, "the old Roman," began here, as a surveyor, a young lawyer over at Old Buffalo on the Trinity, now a ghost town, and as a district judge. O. M. Roberts, "the old alcade," was elected district judge of this district and held court under an old oak tree on the courthouse square at Athens. Jim Hogg, "the great Commoner," won his first district office as district attorney with the help of a large Henderson County vote, and helped build his fame in the Athens courthouse, on the road to his immortal fame.

In this day, as in past generations, the forward-looking people of Henderson County are moving again. I am extremely proud of you.

Let me remind you that ARA with its attractive industrial financing program, has nearly $150 million in new potential industries for Texas. This means that the Federal program is speeding up the normal industrial expansion by many times. Through the efforts of the coordinator, investors, management and idea men, are getting together to build new plants with the ARA long-term, low-interest loans. The Texas ARA office is a beehive of activity. It is really a nerve center for one of the most significant total developments of any region in the world today. This is exciting and thrilling, for involved in this is the welfare of not only east Texans and Texans, but our whole country as well. And I believe that our area coordinator for Texas, Ray Morrison, is the ablest ARA coordinator in the Nation.

We are now engaged in building a new and modern industrial plant, capable of competing with any other in the world. Through this we will not only put our people to work, but we shall save our freedom.

We will make America strong by our acts and deeds and words. This last best hope of the earth must prosper, for the safety of freedom and liberty everywhere is at stake. America is more than a country, it is a faith and a hope and a dream. There has always been an unquestioned belief, that here in this new world, as the shackles and servitudes of the past were put away, there would arise a great and glorious society. You here are helping build that great and glorious society. Here mankind can reach up to a higher stone on the road of human progress. In that spirit and in that belief, we dedicate this plant.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET COULD AND SHOULD BE CUT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release prepared by me entitled "The Federal Budget Could and Should Be Cut."

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET COULD AND SHOULD BE CUT

If Congress does not cut the President's budget, as submitted January 17, Federal agencies in fiscal year 1964, beginning July 1, 1963, would be authorized to obligate and spend public money to a total of $195.1 billion.

This sum is almost beyond comprehension. But the facts are:

	Billions
The President requested new appropriations and other obligational authority (such as back-door spending) totaling	$107.9
This is in addition to unspent balances carried over in appropriations and other obligational authority (such as back-door spending) enacted in prior years totaling	87.2
Total available to obligate and spend	195.1

This authority to obligate and spend $195.1 billion in public money, as provided in the President's budget now pending in Congress, is shown by principal agencies and departments in the following table:

Authority to obligate and spend, fiscal year 1964, as proposed in President's January budget message

[In millions of dollars]

Departments and agencies	Unexpended balance, start of year	New obligational authority requested	Total availability
Executive Office of the President	2	33	35
Funds appropriated to the President (except for foreign aid)	782	24	806
Foreign aid	21,273	5,408	26,681
Military assistance	(2,360)	(1,480)	(3,840)
Economic and other assistance	(18,913)	(3,928)	(22,841)
Department of Agriculture	3,011	7,929	10,940
Department of Commerce	1,106	965	2,071
Department of Defense:			
Military functions	30,817	52,181	82,998
Civil functions	343	1,146	1,489
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2,280	7,158	9,438
Department of the Interior	519	1,279	1,798
Department of Justice	34	355	389
Department of Labor	335	527	862
Post Office Department	377	565	942
Department of State	98	362	460
Department of the Treasury	420	11,297	11,717
Atomic Energy Commission	1,469	2,893	4,362
Federal Aviation Agency	550	810	1,360
General Services Administration	620	659	1,279
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,497	829	13,326
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2,431	5,712	8,143
Veterans' Administration	888	5,580	6,468
National Science Foundation	303	589	892
Small Business Administration	325	215	540
Tennessee Valley Authority	562	44	606
Other executive branch	6,037	1,150	7,187
Legislative and judicial branches	77	218	295
Total	87,157	107,927	195,084

TO SPEND $98.8 BILLION

From this $195.1 billion total in authorizations to obligate and spend public money, the President in his budget message said Federal agencies during the coming year would actually spend, in terms of checks issued, $98.8 billion.

Of this $98.8 billion in actual spending, $42.4 billion would be spent out of old balances being carried over, and $56.4 billion would be spent from new 1964 appropriations and other authority to obligate and spend public money now pending before Congress.

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE CUTS

There are more than 800 budget accounts from which expenditures would be made in fiscal year 1964. They show funds requested in the new budget, balances carried over from prior years, or both.

Examination and evaluation of each of these accounts leads to the conclusion that (1) the President's budget requests for $107.9 billion in new appropriation and other spending authority could and should be reduced by at least $12 billion. This would reduce the total to not more than $95.9 billion, and (2) the President estimated that $98.8 billion actually would be spent in fiscal year 1964 from both the old balances and the new funds. This estimate could and should be reduced by at least $7.1 billion with actual expenditures held to not more than $91.7 billion.

These reductions in tabular form follow:

Summary of suggested reductions, fiscal year 1964

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget requests	Suggested reductions	Total, after reductions
Appropriations and other new obligational authority	107.9	12.0	95.9
Expenditures	98.8	7.1	91.7

SALE OF STOCKPILE EXCESSES

More than a year ago, in a news conference on January 31, 1962, the President expressed astonishment at the fact that the Government had overstockpiled so-called strategic and critical materials to the extent of $3.4 billion.

Since that time a special Senate committee has completed an investigation of the strategic and critical stockpile situation, and it is to be assumed that a special commission named by the President has made similar progress.

But these stockpile excesses to date have not been reduced. They are as large now as they were when the President brought the matter forcefully to public attention. They must be disposed of in a manner not to disrupt markets; but a start should be made.

The President in January this year estimated Federal revenue in the coming fiscal year at $89.6 billion, exclusive of proposed tax revisions and reductions. Proceeds from the sale of excess stockpile materials could and should be used to increase Treasury receipts.

If general fund receipts were increased by substantial sales of strategic and critical stockpile excesses, and expenditures were held to $91.7 billion or less as suggested, the Federal budget could be brought into virtual balance, without tax reduction.

APPROPRIATIONS

Neither war nor depression emergency confronts us at this time. The President, in his economic report to Congress, January 21, 1963, (p. XII) said: "I do not expect a fifth postwar recession to interrupt our progress in 1963." He repeated this view on March 21.

But his budget requests for the coming fiscal year, totaling $107.9 billion in new spending authority, are unprecedented in peace or depresssion—or any other time except in the peak of World War II. They contemplate no effort to balance the budget in the foreseeable future. The debt is climbing well above $300 billion.

Restoration of confidence in the Nation's fiscal position is sorely needed at home and abroad. At home 100-cent dollars (on the 1939 index) are now worth about 45 cents; and foreigners are continuing to withdraw our gold at a dangerous rate.

Substantial reduction in the budget requests, which are pending before Congress for action in the next few months, and efficient control of necessary Federal expenditures would be moves to serve the purpose of restoring confidence in Federal fiscal stability.

The reductions totaling $12 billion in new appropriations and other expenditure authorizations suggested in this statement should be regarded as the minimum to be desired. They are based on the following considerations:

1. Relative need for the program or objective involved.
2. Could and should the program or objective be eliminated or reduced in view of the deadening deficit and debt position of the Federal Government.
3. Specific policy laid down by Congress.
4. Unexpended balances already available in appropriations and other obligational authority enacted in prior years.

Appropriation reductions

Generally, the $12 billion of suggested reductions in budget requests for new appropriations and other authority for Federal agencies to obligate and spend public money may be summarized categorically as follows:

	Billions
Foreign aid (including payroll costs)	$3.3
Federal civilian payroll costs (excluding foreign aid)	1.4
Proposed new programs and projects	2.2
Waste, extravagance and inefficiency (along with nonessential and postponable programs, projects, construction, etc.)	5.1
Total, appropriation reductions	12.0

These reductions are the sum of those which would be made on an account-by-account basis throughout the budget. They are totaled by principal departments and agencies as follows:

Suggested appropriation reductions by departments and agencies

[In thousands of dollars]

Departments and agencies	Fiscal year 1962 actual	Fiscal year 1963 estimated	Fiscal year 1964 January request	Suggested reduction	Fiscal year 1964 after reduction
Executive Office of the President	26, 507	23, 608	32, 888	10, 403	22, 485
Funds appropriated to President (except foreign aid)	53, 350	929, 200	24, 100	75	24, 025
Foreign aid:					
Military assistance, funds appropriated to President	1, 577, 000	1, 325, 000	1, 480, 000	976, 800	503, 200
Economic assistance	2, 936, 809	7, 063, 225	3, 927, 932	2, 362, 547	1, 565, 385
Funds appropriated to President:					
Grants and loans	(2, 337, 600)	(2, 603, 722)	(3, 465, 025)	(2, 286, 917)	(1, 178, 108)
International financial institutions	(171, 656)	(2, 121, 656)	(111, 656)	(25, 000)	(86, 656)
Peace Corps	(30, 000)	(58, 550)	(108, 000)	(49, 450)	(58, 550)
Export-Import Bank	----------	(2, 000, 000)	----------	----------	----------
Other programs (Agriculture, Commerce, and State)	(397, 553)	(279, 297)	(243, 251)	(1, 180)	(242, 071)
Department of Agriculture	7, 013, 183	6, 502, 560	7, 929, 012	280, 338	7, 648, 674
Department of Commerce	827, 412	796, 888	964, 572	322, 647	641, 925
Department of Defense, military functions	48, 170, 275	49, 961, 119	52, 180, 637	2, 080, 447	50, 100, 190
Department of Defense, civil functions	1, 015, 784	1, 092, 517	1, 145, 629	129, 693	1, 015, 936
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	4, 628, 904	5, 392, 638	7, 157, 545	2, 431, 490	4, 726, 055
Department of Interior	928, 637	1, 129, 810	1, 278, 595	245, 828	1, 032, 767
Department of Justice	297, 156	318, 288	355, 306	60, 806	294, 500
Department of Labor	643, 645	351, 292	527, 220	226, 432	300, 788
Post Office Department	874, 160	806, 461	564, 964	564, 964	----------
Department of State	308, 168	409, 382	361, 985	95, 431	266, 554
Department of the Treasury	10, 204, 088	10, 820, 721	11, 297, 032	33, 524	11, 263, 508
Atomic Energy Commission	2, 547, 338	3, 134, 738	2, 893, 000	68, 700	2, 824, 300
Federal Aviation Agency	728, 863	755, 503	810, 100	75, 560	734. 540
General Services Administration	606, 244	631, 458	658, 719	104, 683	554. 036
Housing and Home Finance Agency	861, 291	797, 524	829, 410	223, 640	605. 770
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1, 824, 930	3, 673, 313	5, 712, 000	600, 300	5, 111, 700
Veterans' Administration	5, 447, 110	5, 594, 746	5, 580, 262	50, 425	5, 529, 837
Other: executive branch	1, 153, 117	1, 455, 754	1, 998, 428	1, 056, 807	941, 621
Legislative and judicial branches	188, 338	226, 263	217, 876	32	217, 844
Grand total	92, 862, 309	103, 192, 008	107, 927, 212	12, 001, 572	95, 925, 640

Unexpended balances

A hard look at unexpended balances, totaling $87.2 billion, already available for expenditure by virtually every major agency and department of the Government (shown at the outset) is the first requirement in consideration of every request for new funds.

Some of these balances could and should be rescinded. The firmness of obligations shown against many of them cannot be taken for granted. This is particularly true in accounts like those for foreign aid funds appropriated to the President.

Exclusive of any new funds that may be granted, balances alone range from $34 million for a major agency like the Department of Justice to $21.3 billion for foreign aid, and $30.8 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense.

If new appropriations and other spending authority were added in the amounts requested, total funds available to executive agencies would range from $389 million for the Department of Justice to $26.7 billion for foreign aid, and $83 billion for military functions.

From the opening table in this statement it may be seen that balances in accounts for foreign aid should be given special attention. They total $21.3 billion in all accounts. And to this the President's budget requests for all foreign aid programs would add $5.4 billion in new spending authority for a total of $26.7 billion.

Funds for foreign aid generally are made available in four areas: regular funds appropriated to the President for economic and military assistance and the Peace Corps; authorizations for international financial institutions; spending authority for Export-Import Bank; and appropriations, etc., for regular departments which become involved.

The balances totaling $21.3 billion in all foreign aid accounts together with new budget requests totaling $5.4 billion would make up this tremendous sum of $26.7 billion available for foreign aid in the coming year, under budget recommendations:

	Billions
Funds appropriated to the President for military and economic assistance grants and loans, and Peace Corps	$12.0
Funds authorized for international financial institutions	8.0
Funds authorized for Export-Import Bank activities	$6.4
Funds authorized for regular departments	0.3
Total foreign aid	26.7

This $26.7 billion in foreign aid funds, in terms of unexpended balances and new budget requests, is shown by programs in the following table:

Foreign aid spending authority, fiscal year 1964

[In millions of dollars]

Programs	Unexpended balance, start of year			New obligational authority	Total availability
	Obligated	Unobligated	Total		
Military assistance:					
Appropriations to President	944	30	974	1,480	2,454
"Reservations" in Defense Department	1,385		1,385		1,385
Total, military assistance	2,329	30	2,360	1,480	3,840
Economic and other assistance:					
Appropriations to President:					
Grants and loans	4,082	482	4,564	3,465	8,029
Peace Corps	30		30	108	138
Inter-American Development Bank		200	200	50	250
International Development Association				62	62
Economic and other assistance—Con.					
Appropriations to President—Con.					
International Monetary Fund		2,000	2,000		2,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development		5,715	5,715		5,715
Export-Import Bank	1,806	4,552	6,358		6,358
Department of Agriculture		31	31	215	246
Department of Commerce	13		13	16	29
Department of State	3		3	12	15
Total, economic assistance	5,933	12,980	18,913	3,928	22,841
Total, foreign aid	8,263	13,010	21,273	5,408	26,681

Of the $26.7 billion available for foreign aid, $14.3 billion is in the nature of backdoor spending authority (authority to spend from public debt receipts) for the International Monetary Fund, International Bank, Export-Import Bank, and the foreign investment guarantee program.

It should be noted further that there is a budget request for $2 billion in new backdoor spending authority for Export-Import Bank, but it is shown as a supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1963. This affects the balance for next year, but not the 1964 requests for new spending authority.

There is a 1964 budget request for $215 million for the Agriculture Department, but it is to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures already made. And there is $28 million in requests for expenditures by Commerce and State Departments, but contract authority and treaties are involved.

Foreign aid cut

The Commerce Department foreign grants and credits report of December 1962 (p. S-5) shows that from 1945 through June 1962, the United States spent a gross total of $105 billion in foreign aid. With current year expenditures, the total will approach $110 billion.

This $110 billion has gone out through grants, so-called loans, and other means to more than 100 nations and foreign areas reaching to the four corners of the earth. This Nation has played Santa Claus, banker, and policeman for the free world for 17 years.

There is no doubt about the fact that this foreign aid has contributed to our continuing deficits, the great increase in our debt, the high cost of our interest, and the need for high taxes. How long will it continue? *There will always be those who will take* the money.

We have experienced the ingratitude of some nations which have not hesitated to accept the largesse of our assistance and, as time goes on, the situation will grow worse, unless we sharpen our attitude. The time to start curtailing overall foreign aid is past due.

I suggest that the 1964 budget requests for $5.4 billion in new foreign aid funds be reduced by at least $3.3 billion. This would be a 66 percent reduction in new funds. It would leave $23.4 billion—$2.1 billion in new authorizations, and $21.3 billion in balances.

This foreign aid reduction would be in new funds to be appropriated to the President for military and economic assistance, the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Development Bank. In addition, I shall vote against the 1963 supplemental bill for $2 billion more in Export-Import Bank funds.

Payroll cut

The $1.1 billion Federal pay raise act, signed last October 11, said:

"The departments and agencies, establishments and corporations in the executive branch shall absorb the costs of the increases in basic compensation provided by this act to the fullest extent possible without seriously affecting the immediate execution of essential functions."

Instead of absorbing the pay raise, the budget shows that over the 2-year period, beginning last July 1, payroll costs will rise $1.8 billion, and the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government will rise by 86,000.

The Federal civilian payroll last year cost $14 billion. This year it is running at the rate of $15 billion. And next year it may be estimated at $15.8 billion.

Federal civilian employment in the year ended last June 30 totaled 2,484,654. The budget estimates employment this year at 2,534,041, and shows it for next year at 2,570,533.

The increase is general throughout the civilian agencies and departments. For example: National Aeronautics and Space Administration up 39.7 percent; Agriculture Department up 10 percent; Health, Education, and Welfare Department up 15.5 percent; Interior Department up 16.6 percent; Labor Department up 21.9 percent; Treasury Department up 10.4 percent; General Services Administration up 19.2 percent; Housing and Home Finance Agency up 11.6 percent; U.S. Information Agency up 12.5 percent.

And it is of special interest to note that in this year and next Commerce Department employment is up 15.5 percent. A year ago the Secretary of Commerce told a congressional committee that his Department could save tremendous sums by "doing away with jobs that ought not to be there."

When the statutory policy laid down by Congress in the pay raise act is applied to every budget account from which Federal civilian employment is paid, it can be concluded that Federal civilian payroll costs could and should be reduced by at least $1.5 billion.

Attrition among Federal employees through voluntary resignation, retirement, and death is running at the rate of 300,000 a year, and Federal employee pay is averaging about $5,800 a year. Absorbing the pay raise should be possible without impairment of essential functions.

Reductions in civilian payroll costs, based on account-by-account examination conforming to the policy fixed by Congress, are summarized categorically in the following table:

Reductions in civilian payroll costs for fiscal year 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	January budget requests	Suggested reduction	Fiscal year 1964 after reduction
National security (including military, atomic energy, and other defense-related activities)	6,509,520	319,027	6,190,493
Foreign aid (including Export-Import Bank)	153,277	52,833	100,444
International affairs (including USIA)	233,183	38,935	194,248
Domestic-civilian	8,896,676	1,049,139	7,847,537
Total	15,792,656	1,459,934	14,332,722

New program cuts

Some 200 actions and proposals involving increased Federal obligation of public money and credit can be documented in Presidential communications to Congress in the past 2 years; 30 or more new programs and projects appear in January requests for initial funds.

Exclusive of new construction starts under old programs these new programs are in the budget for $2.2 billion in appropriations and other spending authority, and it is estimated that they would spend $0.7 billion in fiscal year 1964.

First year authorizations and expenditures for new programs almost invariably are small. They finance establishment of the organization, and open the doors for increased expenditures in the future. Among the new proposals are:

New proposals, fiscal year 1964, requested in the President's January budget message

[In thousands of dollars]

Proposals	New obligational authority	Expenditure estimates
Land-use adjustment program	27,000	27,000
Rural housing programs	107,350	56,850
Defense food stockpiling	30,000	30,000
Civil defense programs	220,800	107,500
New education program	1,215,170	143,600
Hospital construction, area planning grants	35,000	5,000
Aid to medical education	34,352	9,314
Grants for comprehensive maternal and child health	17,250	17,237
Educational television facilities	7,000	7,000
Outdoor recreation fund	25,000	8,000
Youth employment opportunities	100,000	60,000
Urban transportation assistance	100,000	10,000
Comparability pay adjustment	200,000	200,000
Other	40,772	30,195
Total	2,159,694	711,696

Some of these new proposals, such as a new Federal building for a National Agricultural Library which are included among the items in the preceding table, may be desirable, but they can wait until some other time when the Federal Government is not backed up against the wall of continuing deficits and rising debt.

And some of the new programs, such as urban transportation assistance are primarily matters of local and State concern. The Federal Government has no more money than the localities and the States for financing solutions to the problem.

It is suggested that all of these proposals for new programs and projects be eliminated or postponed. Requested appropriations and other spending authorizations in fiscal year 1964 would be reduced by $2.2 billion, and expenditures would be reduced by $0.7 billion.

Waste cuts

Perhaps there are some public works which may be desirable under better financial conditions, but it is suggested that starting any new construction projects under any program financed through the general fund of the Treasury, not absolutely essential at this time, be delayed until the Federal Government is in better financial position.

Federal highway projects are financed out of the highway trust fund, and are not involved in the deficit difficulties being experienced by the general fund of the Treasury. Therefore they are excluded from this discussion.

Exclusive of highways and projects related to military functions, new direct Federal civil public works alone proposed in the 1964 budget would cost more than $3 billion to complete (budget documents, p. 380). Funds for these projects in 1964 are in numerous accounts throughout the budget.

The budget proposals for new appropriations and other spending authority totaling $107.9 billion could and should be reduced by upward of a billion dollars through postponing starts on new public works projects which are not urgent.

In addition, for economy and efficiency, and elimination of waste and extravagance, the $12 billion reduction in appropriation and other spending authority includes a 10-percent cut in new money for Federal civilian construction projects already underway.

Along with all other civilian construction projects, this would apply to those of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This agency is requesting $800 million for this purpose to be added to $780 million in its construction account balance. The reduction in new funds for the construction item would be $80 million. There would still be $1.5 billion in new funds and balances.

I am suggesting also that employment by this agency be held to the current year's level. In the year ending last June 30 it employed 23,686 persons. Employment this year is more than 29,000 and next year it is estimated at 33,100.

This would be an increase of nearly 10,000 or 39.7 percent in 2 years. Payroll costs last year were $165 million. This year they are estimated at $240 million. Holding the payroll at this year's level would reduce appropriation requests by $59 million.

Space agency funds appear in two budget accounts. Through both accounts it is spending $2.4 billion this year. It will start the coming year, on July 1, with $2.4 billion in balances, and it is asking for $5.7 billion in new funds.

With new appropriations as requested, it would have a total of $8.1 billion. I suggest reduction in new funds for construction and personnel totaling $0.6 billion. The reduced total would still be $7.5 billion.

Including 1964 funds the Space Agency has programed $8¼ billion for the man on the moon project alone. Far more will be spent, of course. The total cost has been estimated at all the way from $20 to $40 billion.

For an agency with so much money to spend, which is putting great emphasis on sending a man to the moon, constant and rigid policing against extravagance, waste, inefficiency must be a primary requirement at every level of administration.

Certainly we must provide adequate defense for this Nation, but neither the space agency nor the military is sacrosanct. Demands upon them for achievement of objectives are not license to tolerate waste, extravagance, or inefficiency.

Balances in accounts for the Space Agency and military functions on July 1 will total $33.2 billion. Together they are asking for $57.9 billion in new funds. This would give them a total of $91.1 billion. Together they expect to spend $55.2 billion in the coming year.

The President has requested $52.2 billion in new spending authority for military functions alone. This would be in addition to $30.8 billion in balances. The total available would be $83 billion. Expenditures for military functions next year are estimated at $51 billion.

I suggest reductions of at least $2.1 billion in new appropriations and other spending authority for military functions. The total remaining available for expenditure after such a reduction would be $80.9 billion—$50.1 billion in new funds and $30.8 billion in balances.

Waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the military is obvious to most citizens who will look. More of it can be documented. For example, in the past few weeks the Comptroller General of the United States has reported:

"Military services are paying about $15 million a year in pay, allowances, and reenlistment bonuses to personnel with records of continued misconduct and/or inefficiency who are permitted to reenlist."

"Repair and maintenance of noncombat vehicles in the Department of Defense is costing $66 million a year more than it should * * * because of inefficiency in maintenance operations in the Army and Air Force."

These items of $15 million and $66 million are relatively small in terms of a military budget of a half-a-hundred-billion dollars. But they can be multiplied over and over again in similar cases of waste, extravagance, and inefficiency.

On an account-by-account basis, I suggest reduction in every category of military appropriations except retired pay and claims. I suggest reducing military pay funds by 2 percent and, with certain exceptions, reducing everything else by at least 3 percent.

The exceptions are military housing, the Secretary's emergency research fund and civil defense. All funds for new military housing would be eliminated and the remaining military housing funds cut 10 percent. The Secretary's $150 million emergency research fund would be cut by a flat $50 million.

Budget requests for civil defense total $300 million in all military accounts. I suggest reduction of $275 million, including the new Federal shelter construction program. This anticipates elimination of the program, and leaves only enough to liquidate outstanding obligations. If this program is vital, funds requested are not enough. If it is not vital, it should be eliminated.

The budget claim of $750 million saving in the Department of Defense this year is noted, and so is the belief by the Secretary of Defense that he can save billions a year.

But the fact remains that both expenditures and new spending authority for military functions are increasing by about $4 billion in 2 years. Claims that the increases are being reduced are not enough. Solid reductions in appropriations and other spending authorizations are needed.

There are increasing signs and complaints of waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in research grant programs under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Science Foundation, and elsewhere throughout the Government. These programs appear to be in real need of efficient administration.

Based on my own examination to date, I suggest that new funds for research grants, fellowships, etc., throughout the Government should be sharply reduced. For example, medical research programs under HEW for fiscal year 1964 are proposed at $900 million—an increase of $300 million or 33 percent over fiscal year 1962. I would suggest that these programs be held to the 1962 level.

Reasons for such suggestions as these with respect to reductions for economy and efficiency, and elimination of waste and extravagance can be documented in scores of the 800 budget accounts, exclusive of payroll, construction, foreign aid, etc.

There is no doubt about the fact that the $107.9 billion in requests for new appropriations and other obligational authority could and should be reduced by at least $5.1 billion in the interest of efficiency, and economy, and the elimination of waste and extravagance (along with nonessential and postponable programs, projects, construction, etc.).

EXPENDITURES

The basic reason for Federal taxes is to meet Federal expenditures. And Federal expenditures, under the Constitution, are made pursuant to appropriations enacted by law. Federal taxes are too high, but Federal appropriations and expenditures are higher.

Federal expenditures have exceeded the revenue in 27 of the last 33 years. Over this period the Federal debt has been increased from $16.2 to 304 billion; and interest on the debt has risen from $659 million to $10 billion a year.

The danger of inflation always lurks in Federal deficit financing. It is there now. The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped in every year since 1955. There will be another deficit next year unless expenditures are held to the level of revenue.

Deficits are determined by the excess of annual expenditures over annual revenue. Expenditures are made pursuant to appropriations enacted by law. Obviously the first thing to do is reduce new appropriations and other spending authority.

But with $87.2 billion of balances in prior appropriations and other spending authority already available before the first dollar of new spending authority is enacted, something more than cutting new appropriations and other spending authority needs to be done.

Cutting appropriations will directly reduce annual expenditures in accounts where there are no balances, and where annual appropriations do not exceed annual expenditures. But cutting appropriations does not necessarily reduce annual expenditures from accounts where any other situation exists.

Congress could rescind balances; and I think it should in many cases. It could enact an annual expenditure limitation on each appropriation account; I think it should, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, now pending before the Rules Committee, would provide for this.

Otherwise, effective reduction of annual expenditures from accounts where balances exist, and in instances where appropriations exceed estimated expenditures, must be left largely to administrative control in the executive branch.

There was a $3.9 billion deficit in fiscal year 1961. There was a $6.4 billion deficit last year. There will be a $9 billion deficit this year. Another deficit next year of $10 billion or more would produce a 4-year combined deficit of $30 billion.

Under these circumstances there is urgent and obvious need for the administration and the Congress to join in a concerted and effective effort to reduce Federal expenditures to meet realistic revenue estimates for the coming year.

My own examination and evaluation of the spending objectives represented in the more than 800 budget accounts leads to the conclusion that new appropriations and other spending authority could and should be cut by at least $12 billion from the $107.9 billion budget request to $95.9 billion.

Similar examination and evaluation, considering actual spending in the coming year under firmly obligated balances and other prior commitments, leads to the conclusion that expenditures in the year beginning July 1 could and should be reduced by at least $7.1 billion from budget estimates of $98.8 billion to $91.7 billion. The $7.1 billion reduction includes $1.8 billion in military functions and $0.4 billion in the Space Agency.

And there is no doubt that, under combined and sympathetic effort by both the legislative and the executive branches, Federal spending next year could and should be reduced still more without impairment of any essential Federal function.

Meanwhile, I suggest minimum reductions in expenditures which may be categorically summarized as follows:

	Billions
Foreign aid (including payroll costs)	$1.3
Federal civilian payroll costs (excluding foreign aid)	1.4
Proposed new programs and projects	.7
Waste, extravagance and inefficiency (along with nonessential and postponable programs, projects, construction, etc.)	3.7
Total expenditure reduction	7.1

These suggested expenditure reductions, as applied to Federal departments and principal agencies, are shown in the following table:

Suggested expenditure reductions by departments and agencies

[In thousands of dollars]

Departments and agencies	Fiscal year 1962 actual	Fiscal year 1963 estimated	Fiscal year 1964 estimated	Suggested reduction	Fiscal year 1964 after reduction
Executive Office of the President	28, 993	24, 713	31, 496	8, 986	22, 510
Funds appropriated to President (except foreign aid)	33, 220	340, 077	433, 365	197, 175	236, 190
Foreign aid:					
Military assistance, funds appropriated to President	1, 390, 011	1, 750, 000	1, 450, 000	478, 500	971, 500
Economic assistance	2, 371, 745	2, 261, 657	2, 116, 949	824, 744	1, 292, 205
Funds appropriated to the President:					
Grants and loans	(1, 836, 297)	(2, 100, 000)	(2, 300, 000)	(764, 974)	(1, 535, 026)
International financial institutions	(171, 656)	(121, 656)	(111, 656)	(25, 000)	(86, 656)
Peace Corps	(11, 409)	(47, 000)	(80, 000)	(33, 000)	(47, 000)
Export-Import Bank	(101, 087)	(−224, 253)	(−647, 000)	(600)	(−647, 600)
Other programs (Agriculture, Commerce, and State)	(251, 296)	(217, 254)	(272, 293)	(1, 170)	(271, 123)
Department of Agriculture	6, 426, 745	7, 298, 496	6, 319, 353	244, 314	6, 075, 039
Department of Commerce	585, 791	736, 370	881, 957	108, 304	773, 653
Department of Defense, military functions	46, 815, 362	48, 300, 000	51, 000, 000	1, 819, 689	49, 180, 311
Department of Defense, civil functions	999, 337	1, 105, 664	1, 140, 345	139, 689	1, 000, 656
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	4, 215, 450	5, 047, 540	5, 742, 092	905, 243	4, 836, 849
Department of Interior	907, 816	1, 054, 000	1, 165, 000	190, 660	974, 340
Department of Justice	294, 441	316, 805	336, 956	44, 612	292, 344
Department of Labor	619, 796	238, 715	433, 230	136, 589	296, 641
Post Office Department	796, 876	802, 461	553, 524	579, 464	−25, 940
Department of State	305, 426	442, 820	347, 504	70, 824	276, 680
Department of the Treasury	10, 173, 006	10, 811, 464	11, 232, 247	27, 314	11, 204, 933
Atomic Energy Commission	2, 805, 631	2, 870, 000	2, 850, 000	67, 900	2, 782, 100
Federal Aviation Agency	698, 410	790, 915	801, 000	66, 320	734, 680
General Services Administration	444, 893	532, 246	594, 392	74, 848	519, 544
Housing and Home Finance Agency	739, 327	1, 088, 396	695, 337	50, 013	645, 324
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1, 257, 048	2, 400, 000	4, 200, 000	421, 200	3, 778, 800
Veterans' Administration	5, 391, 592	5, 532, 182	5, 470, 072	29, 704	5, 440, 368
Other:					
Other executive branch	908, 069	988, 742	1, 462, 764	603, 957	858, 807
Legislative and judicial branches	210, 457	223, 430	224, 023	41	223, 982
Total	88, 419, 442	94, 956, 693	99, 481, 606	7, 090, 090	92, 391, 516
Deduct interfund transactions	−632, 656	−646, 132	−679, 243		−679, 243
Grand total	87, 786, 786	94, 310, 561	98, 802, 363	7, 090, 090	91, 712, 273

Reasons and justifications for these suggested expenditure reductions follow generally the same pattern already described with respect to suggested reductions in the new appropriations and other authority to obligate public money.

The highly publicized Budget claim that domestic-civilian expenditure estimates, exclusive of military, space and interest, have been "severely" limited and in the overall reduced, has been noted and carefully checked.

The fact is that—exclusive of 80-odd accounts in military, space and interest—the budget shows some 450 expenditure items increased in the coming year as compared with the current year level, against some 250 reduced. About 40 items are in approximately the same amounts.

Too many of the so-called reductions, such as those anticipating the sale of Export-Import Bank loans, and mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association are questionable. They represent no restraint on Federal expenditures. And these are not the only questionable so-called reductions.

Expenditures for "agriculture and agricultural resources" have gone up in every fiscal year since 1960, but the budget for the coming year estimates that they will be reduced by $1 billion.

As a matter of fact, actual budget figures show categorical increases outside of military, space and interest, as follows:

	Millions
Natural resources up	$123
Commerce and transportation up	63
Health, labor and welfare up	698
Education up	$176
General government up	154
Allowances for pay adjustments, etc.	300
Total	1,514

Domestic-civilian expenditures have increased in every year since the end of the Korean war in fiscal year 1954. Exclusive of space and interest they have risen more than $7 billion since fiscal year 1960.

The record of Federal expenditures, by category, for the past 5 years is shown in the following table:

Federal expenditures, fiscal years 1960–64, broken categorically to show national security, foreign aid, etc., and domestic, civilian

[In millions of dollars]

Category	1960 actual	1961 actual	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
National security:					
Military functions	41,215	43,227	46,815	48,300	51,000
Atomic energy	2,623	2,713	2,806	2,870	2,850
Defense related activities	244	104	92	84	133
Total, national security	44,082	46,044	49,713	51,254	53,983
Foreign aid:					
Military assistance	1,609	1,449	1,390	1,750	1,450
Economic and other	1,477	2,126	2,372	2,262	2,117
Total, foreign aid	3,086	3,575	3,762	4,012	3,567
International affairs	354	374	446	613	563
Total, other than domestic, civilian	47,522	49,993	53,921	55,878	58,112
Domestic, civilian:					
Space research and technology	401	744	1,257	2,400	4,200
Agriculture and agricultural resources	4,882	5,173	5,895	6,731	5,696
Domestic, civilian—Continued					
Natural resources	1,714	2,006	2,147	2,380	2,503
Commerce and transportation	1,963	2,573	2,774	3,325	3,388
Housing and community development	122	320	349	525	276
Health, labor, and welfare	3,690	4,244	4,524	4,915	5,613
Education	866	943	1,076	1,361	1,537
Veterans' benefits and services	5,266	5,414	5,403	5,545	5,484
Interest	9,266	9,050	9,198	9,782	10,103
General Government	1,542	1,709	1,875	2,041	2,195
Allowances for pay adjustments and contingencies				75	375
Total, domestic, civilian	29,711	32,176	34,499	39,079	41,369
Grand total	77,233	82,169	88,420	94,957	99,481
Deduct interfund transactions	−694	−654	−633	−646	−679
Total	76,539	81,515	87,787	94,311	98,802

In view of the continuing and worsening deficit financing state of Federal fiscal affairs, the excessive spending record over the years, and the size and character of the President's January spending proposals for the coming year, I earnestly suggest that the $107.9 billion in budget requests for new appropriations and other spending authority now pending before Congress be reduced by a minimum of $12 billion, and the $98.8 billion budget expenditure estimate for the fiscal year beginning July 1 be reduced by a minimum of $7.1 billion.

OPERATIONS OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT UNDER SALINE WATER ACT OF 1952

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, because of the intense interest that the Senate has always shown in the progress of the program to make fresh water from saline and brackish sources, I ask unanimous consent that the letter summarizing the operations of the Department of Saline Water for calendar year 1962 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Operations of the Department of the Interior during calendar year 1962 under the Saline Water Act of 1952 (Public Law 448, 82d Cong., 2d sess., as amended) are summarized in this letter which is my report required by the act. More detailed information is given in the "Saline Water Conversion Report for 1962" of the Office of Saline Water.

Under the provisions of the Anderson-Aspinall Act (Public Law 87–295), the Department's effort to develop economical methods for the desalination of sea or brackish water has been rapidly expanded, with greater emphasis being placed on basic and applied research for the development of new or improved processes.

In 1962, the Basic Research Division of the Office of Saline Water awarded 51 contracts with a total value of $3,059,823, compared to 38 contracts with a value of $376,983 in 1961. Fifty-six contracts awarded by the Processes Development Division totaled $4,259,940, compared to 26 contracts amounting to $1,336,028 in the previous year. Thus, in just 1 year, the level of effort in basic research has been increased 711 percent, and the applied research activities expanded by 219 percent.

This Nation's leadership in research for low-cost conversion of saline water to fresh was highlighted March 10, when over 4,000 people gathered on Point Loma, near San Diego, Calif., for the dedication of the 1-million-gallon-per-day saline water conversion demonstration plant.

The Point Loma plant is the third to be completed under the Department of the Interior's program to demonstrate the reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potentials of the most promising of presently-known processes.

The first such plant, now operating at Freeport, Tex., and providing that city with high-quality fresh water to supplement its natural sources of supply, also has a capacity of 1 million gallons of water per day. The second plant, located at Webster, S. Dak., serves that city with 250,000 gallons per day by converting brackish well water to fresh.

The State of California, through its department of water resources, provided 50 percent of the $1,608,000 construction cost of the Point Loma plant. Water produced by this plant is sold to the city of San Diego.

A $1,794,000 contract for the construction of a fourth plant was awarded by the Office of Saline Water on April 5, 1962. Located at Roswell, N. Mex., the plant is designed to desalt brackish underground water to fresh at the rate of 1 million gallons per day. Ground breaking ceremonies for this plant were conducted on July 10, 1962. Construction is proceeding on schedule with completion of the plant anticipated in April 1963.

A cornerstone inscribed with a quotation by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, "Experimentation Is the Mother of Progress," was set on August 3, to mark the initiation of construction of a saline water conversion research and development test station on land donated to the Department by the State of North Carolina at Wrightsville Beach. A $825,000 construction contract provided for necessary test station facilities, such as a boiler plant, sea water intake lines, utilities supply, office building, maintenance building, a pilot plants test area, and related installations.

Construction of the pilot plants test station was virtually complete at the end of the year, and process development contracts had been let for three pilot plants which will be operated at the station to develop new or improved saline water conversion processes. The first of these, a 37,000-gallon-per-day unit based on a thin-film evaporator process, is scheduled to be in operation in March 1963. The second plant will have a 10,000-gallon-per-day capacity to develop a new hydrate process for demineralizing sea water, and the third facility will be a 15,000-gallon-per-day freezing process pilot plant.

A complete evaluation of the current status of freeze-demineralization processes has determined that the objectives of the Office of Saline Water to exploit to the fullest this promising desalination method can best be achieved through the construction and operation of a large pilot plant which will incorporate the most advanced experimental features and flexibility of design. Negotiations are currently underway, and a contract will be awarded early in 1963 for a

200,000-gallon-per-day research and development pilot plant for the accelerated development of freezing processes. This plant will fully qualify under the demonstration plant program.

Solar distillation sea water conversion pilot plants are in operation at Daytona Beach, Fla.; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.; and the University of Arizona, at Tucson. Electrodialysis pilot plants are being operated for the Office of Saline Water by the Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colo.; a distillation and a freezing process pilot plant are under test at Wrightsville Beach, N.C.; an experimental program to partially soften sea water by cation exchange as a method to reduce formation of scale in a sea water evaporator was tested with good results in a 5,000-gallon-per-day pilot plant at Freeport, Tex.; valuable data was obtained from the operation of a 35,000-gallon-per-day freezing process pilot plant at St. Petersburg, Fla.; and the heat-exchange system without a metallic heat-exchange surface was under development in a 48,000-gallon-per-day single stage vapor reheat distillation pilot plant at San Jose, Calif.

A new and significant basic research program linking the Department of the Interior's saline water conversion activities with the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory was launched during the year. Scientists have increasingly realized what a complicated substance water is, particularly when it is mixed with salts, and how little we know about it. Continued progress toward economical saline water conversion is likely to depend on finding out much more than we know now about the behavior of salt and water solutions. Through a transfer of $365,000 to initiate this program, the scientists and engineers of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, are working for the first time on a nonatomic problem, by applying their skill and experience, in separating dissolved substances from each other, to a basic research study of the chemical properties of water and the technology of materials in aqueous solution.

During the year the first research-and-development contract to an oversea contractor was awarded to an English firm, serving to indicate the growing international interest and effort to develop economical conversion processes to meet the ever-increasing worldwide demand for fresh water. Other research proposals from firms outside the United States have been received and are being considered for financial support.

On March 28, the Department of the Interior sponsored a 1-day conference on saline water conversion. Nine technical papers were presented by Office of Saline Water contractors. C. F. MacGowan, Director of the Office of Saline Water, who arranged the successful program which attracted over 500 persons, provided me the opportunity to make the opening remarks. Others who participated in the conference included Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman; Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr; Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Kenneth Holum; and the Science Adviser to the Secretary, Dr. Roger Revelle. The large attendance at this meeting underscores the growing interest in the potential benefits to be gained through the development of economical conversion processes.

Through correspondence and visits, a marked increase in interest in the U.S. desalination effort by foreign nations was noted during the year. Closer liaison with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Parliamentarians Conference was established. The Rapporteur of the Scientific and Technical Committee of the Parliamentarians Conference has accepted an invitation to visit the United States to inspect our saline water conversion research and development projects.

Several new or improved processes now under development will soon be ready for demonstration plant programing, and processes already being tested in demonstration plants are being studied for use in plants of larger capacity. While these plants will be erected primarily to advance the science and technology in the field of saline water conversion, they will also provide a substantial amount of supplemental water for cities and communities, either in the United States or in foreign lands, where urgent problems of providing adequate fresh water exist.

In cities where there is no alternative source from which water can be obtained at a cost appreciably less than the cost of converted saline water, the Department of the Interior is interested in entering into cooperative arrangements whereby the Department and the city would share on an equal basis, both the capital cost and operation and maintenance, with the city to take over the plant at the end of the demonstration period and operate it without further Federal subsidy.

The provisions of section 4b of the Anderson-Aspinall Act were interpreted by the Solicitor of Interior in Opinion M–36637, dated May 7, 1962, to require that patents on inventions resulting from research and development work financed under the act be available to the general public without royalty or other restriction. Some contractors have protested this patent policy, but maximum patent rights are being obtained for the benefit of the general public.

The sea water conversion demonstration plants now being operated by the Office of Saline Water are producing fresh water in the range of $1–$1.25 per thousand gallons. As the new technology that has been developed is incorporated in multimillion gallons per day plants, the present cost of conversion will be reduced to 60 cents per thousand gallons or less—a price that will make fresh water from the ocean an economically competitive source of fresh water for many of the world's water-short areas.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,

Secretary of the Interior.

THE 325TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF SWEDISH SETTLERS AT THE ROCKS, WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the city of Wilmington, Del., has just completed a 2-day celebration of the 325th anniversary of the landing of Swedish settlers at The Rocks in Wilmington.

The ties between this country and Sweden have long been close, and this celebration not only emphasized those ties but strengthened them.

Prince Bertil, of Sweden, headed a visiting delegation from his country, while Vice President JOHNSON, representing President Kennedy, was gracious enough to appear Friday at the key ceremony at The Rocks.

The Prince was making his second appearance at a ceremony marking the landing of the Swedes. Twenty-five years ago he represented his father, the present King Gustav VI Adolf, at ceremonies attended by President Roosevelt.

A few words of history:

Two small ships, the *Kalmar Nyckel* and the *Fogel Grip,* landed at Wilmington three and a quarter centuries ago. Both had survived perilous crossings from Sweden.

They reached the Delaware River about the middle of March 1638, and soon after cast anchor before a ledge of rocks within the confines of the present city of Wilmington.

A salute of two guns notified the Indians that white men had come up the river. Later five chiefs of the Leni-Lenape Confederation agreed to sell their land to the colonists, who were headed by Peter Minuit.

The Swedish coat of arms was sent aloft on a pole and the land ceremoniously taken by the settlers as New Sweden. A fort then built at this spot was named in honor of the young queen, Christina.

Thus began the first permanent settlement in what is now Delaware. It was also the first permanent settlement in the Delaware Valley.

From this start came a stream of valuable contributions to the life of the young country—in culture, literature, industry, and statesmanship, not to mention a tradition of warmth and friendship.

I am pleased to say that the city of Wilmington and the State of Delaware responded wholeheartedly to the opportunity to mark this 325th anniversary. City and State officials did all they could to make their Swedish visitors welcome. Citizens were caught up in the spirit of the occasion and turned out in large numbers for the ceremonies.

Wilmington is a sister city of Kalmar, Sweden, and at a special program in the city council rooms Thursday night, city officials and representatives of Kalmar pledged a lasting friendship. Both Kalmar and Wilmington were officially cited at this time by the American Municipal League for their promotion of international friendship.

On Friday, a representative of organized labor in Sweden, Erik Johansson, president of Kalmar Local 39 of Municipal Workers, exchanged gifts and official greetings with Clement J. Lemon, president of the Delaware State Labor Council.

All in all, it was a wonderful time, a fitting celebration of a significant historical event in our country's, and Delaware's, early history.

While in Delaware, by the way, Prince Bertil was the guest of Mrs. Thomas E. Brittingham, Jr., of near Centerville, who is well known in Sweden because she and her late husband established scholarships for Scandinavian youths for study in American colleges.

Mr. President, the entire Swedish jubilee was an outstanding success and well worthy of recognition. I would like at this time to insert at this point in the RECORD the speeches of Prince Bertil and Vice President JOHNSON at The Rocks, as well as a proclamation by Mayor John E. Babiarz, editorials from the Wilmington Morning News and Evening Journal, a column by Morning News Columnist Bill Frank, and a Morning News story of March 30 summarizing the whole affair.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remarks of Prince Bertil, of Sweden, at Fort Christina Monument, Wilmington, Del., March 29

Today, near the ledge upon which the Swedish colonists of 1638 first stepped ashore in America, I bring you, as I did 25 years ago, a heartfelt message of good will and friendship from the people of Sweden. I know that my father, King Gustav Adolf, and Queen Louise are with us in their thoughts.

We representatives from Sweden feel greatly honored by the presence of the Vice President of the United States. Your participation, Mr. JOHNSON, effectively underlines the importance of this occasion. The Governor of Delaware represents further evidence, as well as a direct connection with the traditions that bring us together.

Twenty-five years is a rather long period in human life. In a world of rapid change, it is also a respectable span in the history of civilization. This, I believe, is one of the main reasons why we have assembled again to commemorate the founding of the Swedish settlements on the banks of the Delaware, 325 years ago.

By thus stopping for a moment and listening to the past, we pay homage to an audacious and farsighted venture, to the statesmen who planned it, and to the pioneers who participated in it. We are also reminded of common roots and ancient bonds, and of the encouragements and responsibilities that this heritage implies.

The settlers of the little colony on the lower Delaware laid the first visible foundation for a friendship between Sweden and the United States that has never been broken. It has been strengthened by millions of family ties. An association of this type combines stability and challenge. The present era offers great opportunities for increasingly active mutual relations in many fields.

The Fort Christina Monument's new status as a national historical site will be deeply appreciated in Sweden. Through me, the Swedish people also extend its gratitude to the authorities and historical organizations in the State of Delaware and the city of Wilmington, for everything that has been done to preserve the landmarks of the Swedish colonial period.

The Swedish people's own contribution to the Fort Christina Monument, which was presented in 1938 to the State of Delaware and the people of the United States, will also, I trust, gain in meaning as the years go by. May the ship that carried the first Swedish colonists to the Delaware Valley, *The Key of Kalmar*, sail forever as a symbol of powerful bonds and the lasting possibilities of friendship.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Plaque Presentation, Fort Christina Monument, Wilmington, Del., Friday, March 29, 1963

Your Royal Highness, Your Excellencies, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my high honor to be here today as the personal representative of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. On behalf of the President—and all Americans—it is my added privilege and pleasure to welcome for these ceremonics, Your Royal Highness.

We are especially grateful, Your Royal Highness, that you have returned to be with us for this occasion, just as you were here 25 years ago on the 300th anniversary of the arrival of the first Swedish settlers in America.

In a real sense, our purpose in gathering today is not to commemorate age but to celebrate youth. If 325 years is ancient as time is measured by the lives of men, that same span is brief as time is measured in the lives of nations.

We of the United States are ever mindful of our Nation's youth. We are also ever mindful of the strength we have been permitted to build and the leadership we have been privileged to provide to the cause of freedom during the years allotted to us. We realize fully that our accomplishments have been feasible only because our heritage has been so greatly enriched by the contributions of many peoples from many lands who chose to make these shores the home for their aspirations to be free and to build a better life for themselves and their children.

We cannot, in fairness and honesty, weigh the contribution of any one people above that of others. But this we do know and this we can say: In the building of the industrial strength of our land, few areas have contributed so much—and none has contributed more—than this development in the valley of the Delaware where citizens from Sweden, and also from Finland, were the brave pioneers.

Many regions of our Nation have been enriched by the contributions by Swedish settlers. But here along the Delaware the special qualities of character and resourcefulness of those who came to us from the northern countries have contributed to the building of a memorable and impressive modern monument.

It is fitting that this epic phase of our heritage should be permanently commemorated by this monument built by funds subscribed from 200,000 Swedes. In 1638, the journey of the first handful of brave and daring explorers from Sweden required 3 months to cross the Atlantic. Today, that same Atlantic can be crossed in less than 6 hours. This is fittingly symbolic of the ties between our two countries which have always been friendly and which have grown closer and closer with the passing years.

It is my great pleasure now to present this bronze plaque to designate this Fort Christina Monument as a national historic site.

Proclamation by the City of Wilmington, Del.

Whereas it is fitting that each generation be reminded of the struggles and sacrifices of those who made possible this blessed land of liberty and freedom; and

Whereas among those who built well for future posterity were the men from Sweden under Peter Minuit who landed at The Rocks, purchased land from the Indians, established their claim, and then set forth to develop it for the benefit of all who came to this part of the New World; and

Whereas new effort has been made to establish contact with men and women of modern day Sweden through sponsorship of Kalmar as a sister city; and

Whereas this method of communication has opened a new era of friendship, trade relations, and an increased desire to know each other better—

Now, therefore, I, John E. Babiarz, mayor of the city of Wilmington, Del., and honorary chairman of the Greater Wilmington Sister City Civic Committee, do hereby decree that Thursday, March 28, 1963, be proclaimed as Kalmar Day in Wilmington.

I further declare that in concert with His Excellency Governor Elbert N. Carvel, of the State of Delaware, who has proclaimed that Friday, March 29, 1963, be set aside as provided by State law to mark this significant anniversary, that the city of Wilmington wholeheartedly joins in observing Swedish Colonial Day.

I further urge that all citizens extend the hand of friendship to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and his Royal Highness Prince Bertil of Sweden and other foreign dignitaries who will gather here to honor the memories of their forefathers after 325 memorable years.

May the days of March 28–29, 1963, become as vividly impressed on the minds of all of us as was the day of June 27, 1938, when the tercentenary of the landing of the New Sweden Company was so ably observed.

JOHN E. BABIARZ,
Mayor.

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Mar. 24, 1963]

Skaal, Friendly Swedes

(We are indebted to Olaf G. Sundin, president of the Hiab Co., of Wilmington, for the Swedish translation of this editorial.)

Three and a quarter centuries ago, Sweden planted a colony on the shores of the river called Christina. This became the first permanent European settlement in the Delaware Valley.

The Swedish colony didn't last too long but its wholesome influence has been part of this Delaware Valley ever since. The first Swedes brought with them their standards of fairplay, justice, and religious devotion—all now part of our American way of life.

Today, we, as the residents of what was New Sweden 325 years ago, welcome visitors from old Sweden—with the same friendship their ancestors received from the aborigines who once lived here.

We who now dwell in the Delaware Valley and on the shores of the Christina and Delaware Rivers are indebted to the Swedes of olden times. This is intertwined with our present day affection for the visiting Swedes of today.

We hope their stay in our State and city will be enjoyable and that out of this 325th anniversary jubilee will come a greater enrichment of American-Swedish friendship.

To our friends from Sweden, we raise our glass and say, "Skaal."

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Mar. 27, 1963]

"Vallkommen till Delaware"

To our Swedish visitors coming to America as friends, we say, "Welcome to Delaware."

Here in Wilmington the city and State authorities and the history-minded societies cannot, of course, attempt to reproduce Delaware's Swedish tercentenary celebration of 1938. But the warmth of the welcome is just as great as it was on a June day 25 years ago.

Nobody, certainly, would wish to see repetition of anything like the 6 inches of rain that fell on Prince Bertil and President Franklin D. Roosevelt that day.

Mr. Roosevelt nevertheless put it well that soggy day by the Christina when he said:

"'To this spot came the pioneers of Swedish blood. But in the succeeding centuries tens of thousands of others have come to our shores and added their strength and their fine qualities of citizenship to the American Nation. In every phase of our history, in every endeavor—in commerce and industry, in science and art, in agriculture, in education and religion, in statecraft and government, they have well played their part."

The Swedish-born John Ericsson is credited with inventing the screw propeller and designing the *Monitor* that defeated the *Merrimac* in Hampton Roads in 1862. The poet and historian, Carl Sandburg, born of Swedish parents, at 86 embodies today one of Sweden's major cultural contributions to America. Because of Sandburg, America knows Abraham Lincoln better.

Of late we have been told on good authority that the Swedish settlers brought to these shores that famous type of early American architecture, the log cabin. State Archivist Leon de Valinger, Jr., presiding at ceremonies at the Rocks, can be pardoned if he finds some way to mention the Delaware log cabin he had moved to the State museum in Dover.

Nor let it be forgot that the Swedish settlers left no bloody record of battling the Indians along the Delaware. Swedish Governors were given orders not to use force on any persons—native or transplanted—except in self-defense.

What clear marks of Delaware's early Swedish settlers are still to be found? Not a great deal, maybe. Besides the creek named for the young queen there is the creek called Shellpot—from Skoldpadde (turtle). Delaware watermen—muskrat trappers and the like—call the common freshwater terrapin a "skillpot" without knowing they are using just about the only Swedish word still in the rural vernacular.

But for the chief and most enduring link with our Swedish past we must look down East Seventh Street to Old Swedes Church, where Swedish was the language used by a succession of 10 Swedish Lutheran ministers, among them Israel Acrelius, who wrote a history of New Sweden. As well as at the Rocks, the ceremonies at Old Swedes, amid the mossy old gravestones, can serve to connect once more, for us all, the past and the future on both sides of the Atlantic.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 29, 1963]

THEY THINK WE'RE WONDERFUL

(By Bill Frank)

OK, so you are disgusted with Wilmington as your native city, and you think your city is this and that and something else.

Well, my friends, wait a minute. Yesterday I was eavesdropping on some of the visiting Swedes who were talking about Wilmington.

So let's get a bit of their views:

First, there's Olle Nyman, he's basically a public relations man, and he's here with the exhibit from the old Swedish warship, *Vasa*, that sank in 1628 and was raised in the Stockholm harbor 2 years ago.

Nyman was telling some of his fellow Swedes, "I must say Wilmington backed us all the way. Everywhere I went, people were willing to help."

And of course, the very biggest bit of help that Nyman got was from the Delaware Air National Guard through the courtesy of Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Scannell, adjutant general.

There was this huge Vasa cannon over in Seattle.

It had to be moved to Wilmington for the opening of the Wilmington Swedish celebration.

General Scannell was approached. He said "Yes, the Air National Guard will lift it and deliver it."

No sooner said than done.

In case you didn't know, practically all of Sweden's officialdom is talking about this good will gesture.

Also from Nyman:

"I wouldn't dare leave this cannon in Stockholm unguarded. Yet, here I leave it in Wilmington for about 10 days, all by itself in Rodney Square, and nothing happens to it."

When I heard this, I looked at Nyman as if to say, "Look, friend, you don't have to spread the jam that thick on the bread."

So I asked around among other Swedes. They confirmed what Nyman said—it would have been dangerous to have left a Vasa cannon unguarded in a Stockholm square for any length of time.

What would have happened to it there?

Swedes shrugged their shoulders and said, "Well, it wouldn't have been good for the cannon."

"So you see," said Nyman, "here in your Wilmington, we leave this cannon unguarded and nothing happens. Wonderful city—your Wilmington."

Is Wilmington unkempt?

A few Swedes told me not to worry about that.

"All cities are unkempt these days," they said. "You should see some of our cities in the redevelopment process."

What about our historical sites?

"We have the same problem," a Swede from Kalmar told me. "We are trying to save them and there are those so-called progressive people who think old buildings stand in the way of progress."

Traffic?

Tage Forsberg, of Kalmar, one of Sweden's leading editors, looked at Wednesday's afternoon traffic jam and was thrilled.

"Magnificent," he said.

To him, traffic jams mean business.

Wednesday night, Mayor and Mrs. John E. Babiarz entertained some officials from Kalmar at their home.

From the Babiarz home, they could see the heavy shopping traffic.

The mayor was trying to explain about the heavy traffic and the problems of controlling it and all that.

But the officials of Kalmar pushed his explanations aside and said,

"This is wonderful. Lovely heavy traffic. We would love to have it all in Kalmar."

So that's how it goes. We look down our noses at our hometown; visitors gasp and rave.

Before this Wilmington Swedish jubilee comes and goes, a few comments about our mayor and Miles Frederick.

I've watched Mayor Babiarz get into the preparations for the celebration and I want to testify that he was up to the challenge and then some.

He caught the real spirit of the celebration; he was able to delegate authority and yet keep control of the whole situation so that practically nothing went wrong.

He displayed a finesse that was most unusual and he needed very little prodding in latching onto an idea and pushing it through to a conclusion.

As for Miles Frederick, I don't know how he manages to scamper around from post to post and still come up with some breath.

Frederick was the public-relations workhorse of this event.

And he had a time trying to keep two newspapers happy with their respective releases; trying to smooth over ruffled feelings of committee members and their kin and kith.

We don't have decorations for civilians in Wilmington but there ought to be a special one for Miles Frederick: "The Order of the Job Well Done."

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Mar. 30, 1963]

L. B. J. REMINDS JUBILEE NATION IS STILL YOUNG

Wilmington ended its 2-day salute to its 325-year past with a reminder of the Nation's youth among countries of the world from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON yesterday.

"If 325 years is ancient as time is measured by the lives of men, that same span is brief as time is measured in the lives of nations," said JOHNSON.

"We of the United States are ever-mindful of our Nation's youth. We are also ever-mindful of the strength we have been privileged to provide to the cause of freedom during the years allotted to us."

The Vice President—who arrived late and left early—spoke briefly at a ceremony at The Rocks in which he presented a bronze plaque designating Fort Christiana Monument as a national historic landmark.

Yesterday was the anniversary of the landing of the Swedes at The Rocks on March 29, 1638, and the presentation was the high water mark of Wilmington's 2-day salute for the occasion.

It was a day which started with a luncheon in the Hotel Du Pont at 1 p.m. and ended with a dinner late last night at Longwood Gardens.

The sun remained at its brilliant best for the second day of the celebration, in sharp contrast to the heavy rain of the tercentenary celebration 25 years ago, a point repeatedly brought up by Sweden's Prince Bertil.

The ceremony at The Rocks was the heart of the 2-day program, and the most colorful.

In addition to the Vice President and Prince Bertil, it was attended by Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, of Sweden, Ambassador Richard R. Seppala, of Finland, the State's complete congressional delegation, officials of Sweden's Province of Jonkoping and Wilmington's sister of Kalmar, members of the State judiciary, the general assembly, city officials, and leading members of the clergy.

Crows lined the long walk into the small park dominated by the Carl Milles Monument; the American Rifles of the Delaware National Guard, dressed in their colorful colonial garb, and the Guard band provided additional color.

It was a program of short speeches, laying of wreaths, and exchanges of gifts, but three parts of the ceremony stood out:

The designation of Fort Christiana Monument and the nearby Old Swedes Church as national historic landmarks, with citations and bronze plaques designating them as such presented by the Vice President.

Acceptance by Gov. Elbert N. Carvel of a 200-year-old Swedish log cabin, transplanted from Price's Corner and completely restored in the park, as a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Harvey C. Fenimore, of Hockessin.

Dedication of the Hendrickson House on the Old Swedes property. The small stone house, built in 1690, was moved from its original site in Ridley Township, Pa., and rebuilt here.

The Vice President, originally scheduled to arrive at 11:30 a.m., didn't reach the Greater Wilmington Airport until 2:20 p.m. because of the special meeting of the National Security Council yesterday. He had to leave in the middle of the Old Swedes ceremony because of another commitment in Washington.

Four wreaths were laid at the monument—one each from Sweden, Finland, Wilmington and the Delaware Swedish Colonial Society. The latter, as was pointed out by the society president, Dr. Victor D. Washburn, is a custom carried out every year.

The succession of gift exchanging started Thursday continued yesterday, including the presentation of sterling silver plates to Vice President Johnson and Prince Bertil by Governor Carvel.

There was an overflow attendance in the Gold Ballroom of the Hotel Du Pont for the luncheon given by Mayor John E. Babiarz and city council.

After its late start, it proceeded smoothly, with a talk by Prince Bertil and the reading of Johnson's speech by William Owen of the State Department's section for Sweden and Finland.

Gifts were exchanged at the luncheon, as well.

The 2-day Delaware celebration ended on Pennsylvania soil, with the dinner at Longwood Gardens held as the annual meeting of the Delaware Swedish Society.

Approximately 250 attended the affair in the dining hall behind the Longwood Conservatory. Formal dress was optional, but the atmosphere was relaxed and informal.

Gifts were exchanged here, too, with the sculpture, "Sprite of the Brandywine," executed by Charles C. Parks presented to

Kalmar, and the society receiving a huge piece of crystal containing the key to Kalmar. Prince Bertil received a pewter bronze plaque from the society.

CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 6.1 percent of the American labor force is out of work today. This is a shocking commentary on the inability of our economy to provide for our people. Although the present administration in Washington does not classify this period as one of recession, yet, be it remembered that at the bottom of the past recession—February of 1961—6.9 percent of the work force was unemployed.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the situation is far worse. There, 9.3 percent of the labor force is unemployed. Fifty-seven of our sixty-seven counties are classified as depressed areas.

I have discussed this matter in the Senate before and have made several proposals. I am urging the administration in Washington to issue a new Executive order that would require the U.S. Government to buy a larger proportion of its purchases from American producers.

I recently proposed also that companies in depressed areas get percentage advantages when they bid on Government contracts.

Today I would like to call to the attention of the Senate another problem which is aggravating the excessively high rate of unemployment in the United States and contributing to depressed economic conditions: the dumping of foreign steel on the American market.

For the past 5 years American steel producers have been hurt badly by imports of foreign steel. From 1.1 million tons in 1957, U.S. imports of steel had climbed by last year to 4.1 million tons.

It has been estimated that this rise in imports and the accompanying drop in U.S. steel exports have eliminated the jobs of 50,000 American steelworkers.

If the growing importation of steel products to the United States were attributed only to a superior quality of foreign steel, or to a universally lower price, there would be little ground for complaint.

Americans know that foreign workers get paid less. In 1961, for instance, American steelworkers drew $3.99 an hour in pay and benefits, while Luxembourg millhands, the highest paid in Europe, averaged only $1.47 per hour.

But American producers are willing to take their chances in the marketplace. They count on greater efficiency, greater productivity, and the high quality of our products to offset most of the lower wages in other countries.

However, in many instances this has not been possible because foreign steel is being unloaded at prices fixed by foreign cartels—prices which are substantially below those charged in the producers' home markets.

This is called dumping. As defined in international trade agreements, dumping occurs when a producer sells his products in a foreign country at a price below the one he charges in his own country and so low as to be injurious to producers in the foreign country.

As David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, said recently:

> The United Steelworkers of America believe in free trade under fair conditions. We are certain that, under such conditions, our steel industry can compete effectively with foreign steel companies under the labor contract standards we strive to maintain.
>
> But dumping is another matter which is of grave import to the United Steelworkers of America. If foreign producers are unloading excessive tonnage on the American market at prices unjustifiably under those set for their own domestic or other foreign consumers, then the statutory prohibition against such alleged activities should and must be invoked.
>
> No American steelworker should be confronted with the prospect of unemployment because of unfair trade practices by foreign producers.

The steel industry has recently turned to the Government for help under the law.

Last fall seven companies—Armco, Bethlehem, Colorado Fuel & Iron, Detroit Steel, Jones & Laughlin, Republic, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube—charged that producers in Japan, West Germany, France, and Belgium-Luxembourg were selling wire rods in the U.S. market at prices below those in effect in their home markets.

United States Steel lodged several complaints against producers in the United Kingdom, West Germany, Belgium-Luxembourg, France, and Japan on welded steel pipe. Kaiser Steel has lodged complaints against the Japanese sales of hot rolled sheets. And, most recently, United States Steel charged that producers in Japan are dumping commercial quality cold-rolled carbon steel sheets in the United States at prices as much as $40 per net ton under those charged Japanese consumers.

The U.S. Treasury has ruled in favor of the American complaints against mills in Belgium and Luxembourg on wire rods.

It is an open secret that dumping is going on and foreign producers are filing complaints against one another. The European Coal and Steel Community has lodged charges against Japanese and British producers, and the British have made charges against producers in other countries.

All of these countries have signed the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, known as GATT, which explicitly condemns dumping. All nations of the free world recognize that dumping is harmful and must be controlled.

I commend the American companies for filing their complaints under existing law because I am confident that they will be able to halt some of the dumping that is now going on.

But I believe that the Antidumping Act itself needs tightening and I have been in touch with the majority whip, Senator HUMPHREY, about legislation to accomplish that end. The Senator from Minnesota and I have sponsored this legislation before and I am hopeful that we can introduce legislation again in view of the most recent developments in this area.

I do not fear for American producers when the competition is legitimate. This may be hard to handle, but it is a fair and just development of the marketplace, and Americans have always faced such things squarely and come off pretty well.

But the situation in steel today is something else again. I believe it is the duty of the Congress to be sure that American producers, working without the sponsorship of their Government and working without the controls of cartels, will have at least an equal chance to compete.

REFORMS IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, since the introduction of my bill (S. 87) to effect urgently needed reforms in the area of labor-management relations, my mail has brought many interesting communications on various aspects of the subject. There has been a great deal of questioning about the meaning and scope of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, and especially concerning how it deals with the so-called agency shop, a form of compulsory unionism now being widely mentioned in the Nation's press. It is my purpose here to cite the record on 14(b).

There is no question at all that Congress, in 14(b), intended to recognize that States have the right to outlaw "agency shop" arrangements—in which employees of a company who do not wish to join and support the union are forced nevertheless to pay initiation and monthly fees to the union or be fired.

Section 14(b) says:

> Nothing in this act [Taft-Hartley] shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

On page 6675 of the June 6, 1947 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is recorded the following statement on section 14(b) by Senator Robert A. Taft, sponsor of the Taft-Hartley legislation in the Senate, and a member of the Senate-House conference which approved the final version:

> Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in such States illegal. As stated in the report accompanying the Senate committee bill, it was not the intent to deprive the States of that power.

Mr. President, this clearly leaves no room for question on the intent of Congress in its enactment of section 14(b).

But the intent to provide full States' rights in legislating on all forms of compulsory unionism is further emphasized in other segments of the legislative history of section 14(b). For instance, the report of the managers on the part of the House stated—with reference to section 13 of the House bill, H.R. 3020, and section 14 of the conference committee amendments:

> Under the House bill there was included a new section 13 of the National Labor Relations Act to assure that nothing in the

> act was to be construed as authorizing any closed shop, union shop, maintenance of membership, or other forms of compulsory unionism agreement in any State where the execution of such agreement would be contrary to State law. Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in those States illegal. It was never the intention of the National Labor Relations Act, as is disclosed by the legislative history of that act, to preempt the field in this regard so as to deprive the States of their powers to prevent compulsory unionism. To make certain that there should be no question about this, section 13 was included in the House bill. The conference agreement, in section 14(b), contains a provision having the same effect.

This House statement may be found on page 6378 of the June 4, 1947, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are two other pertinent statements on the intent of section 14(b). House report No. 245, 80th Congress, page 34, states:

> The United States expressly declares the subject of compulsory unionism one that the States may regulate concurrently with the United States, notwithstanding that the agreements affect commerce, and notwithstanding that the State laws limit compulsory unionism more drastically than does Federal law.

House Conference Report No. 510, 80th Congress, states:

> Under the House bill there was included a new section, 14(b), of the National Labor Relations Act to assure nothing in the act was to be construed as authorizing any closed shop, union shop, maintenance of membership, or other form of compulsory unionism agreement in any State where the execution of such agreements would be contrary to State law.

It is noteworthy that when section 14(b) was being debated and enacted in the Congress, 11 States already had right-to-work laws which were legal under explicit policy expressions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and all the other Federal legislation in this area that followed. Six of the State laws, among the 11, specifically spelled out prohibitions against all forms of compulsory unionism, including what is now called "agency shop." The recognition by Congress of the right of States to have these laws was, in my opinion, merely a recognition of one of our great constitutional bulwarks, the governmental precept of States' rights. This is why in my proposal to effect a comprehensive reformation in labor-management relations, with Senate bill 87, I have recognized this basic principle of our republican form of government, States' rights. My bill, in the area of union membership provisions, merely enunciates the national policy of individual freedom, freedom of choice. It leaves to the individual State the decision whether it wishes to authorize any form of compulsory unionism.

BOY BUILDER TO SOLVE SCHOOL DROPOUTS ON A LOCAL LEVEL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we have been reading and hearing much lately about the dropouts in our schools. The community of Bloomington, Ind., which is also the home of Indiana University, is making a sincere local effort to solve their problem of school dropouts.

The program, which has been designed to solve this problem is one worthy of the attention of the Members of the Senate, and I want to take this opportunity to explain how this program works.

The local citizenry has organized Boy Builders, Inc., which has been operating actively for about 6 months. It got its greatest boost, however, when recently the Eli Lilly Endowment, Inc., granted $30,000 toward an operating budget.

Boy Builders immediate objective is to provide an in-between program for the boy who is legally permitted to drop out of public school, but is limited in his vocational opportunities.

Each boy in the program will have an individual tutor or counselor, to whom he will look for guidance and assistance.

The vocational program will provide the boys a chance to work under the supervision of skilled instructors and craftsmen primarily in the house construction industry. At the same time, although he will not be forced to complete his high school education, he will have an opportunity to participate in a broad course of diversified education leading to high school graduation.

I am pleased to be a member of the national board of sponsors of this organization, along with such other distinguished persons as the Governor of Indiana, Matthew E. Welsh; the Lieutenant Governor, Richard O. Risteine; William G. Bray, Congressman of Indiana's Seventh District; Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University; Dr. Daniel Schreiber of the National Education Association, Dr. Arthur S. Daniels, Dr. Harold G. Shane, both of Indiana University; Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, University of Chicago, and Dr. Lindley J. Stiles, of the University of Wisconsin.

This meritorious program, it is hoped, will spread throughout the Nation, since this problem is a national one.

A recent news story in the Bloomington, Ind., Daily Herald-Telephone, describes this program in detail. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this news story be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOY BUILDERS RECEIVE $30,000 FROM LILLY FUND—NATIONAL RECOGNITION EXPECTED FOR PROJECT

A grant of $30,000 from Lilly Endowment, Inc., of Indianapolis to Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc., was announced today by Charles G. Curry, president of Boy Builders.

The grant marks the first step toward obtaining an operating budget for an organization that is expected to attract national attention.

Although organization of Boy Builders here has been carried on actively for the last 6 months, today's announcement of the grant brings the program into public focus for the first time.

"This grant is all the more remarkable to us," said Curry, "because we are just 6 days short of being 6 months old."

"It is unusual," Curry added, "for a new organization to have its application processed this rapidly. It seems to me that this speaks well of the work done by our board of directors and the advisory board of consultants."

"We have had the assistance of nearly 200 different persons in the organization of this prototype for school dropouts," Curry said.

Edward J. Kuntz, Boy Builders Foundation committee chairman, said, "The foundation committee of Boy Builders is certainly encouraged with this grant from Lilly. The foundation committee, composed of Sarkes Tarzian, Dr. Herman B Wells, and William S. Armstrong, endeavored to find foundations whose interests were covered by our proposed project.

"We are particularly pleased that the Lilly Endowment, Inc., an Indiana foundation, was the first to be contacted by the committee and also the first to award a grant," Kuntz said.

Boy Builders here, said Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, University of Chicago professor of education who has agreed to serve on the national board of sponsors, "is just the kind of project that ought to be picked up by local communities all over the country."

Announcement of the Lilly grant today also brought this comment from John S. Lynn, secretary and general manager of the Lilly Endownment: "This is a vote of confidence in the program projected by Boy Builders of Bloomington. We are pleased to have a part in the development of this new program."

The Boy Builders immediate objective is to provide an inbetween program for the boy who is legally permitted to drop out of public school at the age of 16, but is limited in his vocational opportunities until he is 18 years old because of insurance and compensation regulations.

The program here takes on additional importance because the school dropout problem has only recently been brought into national focus.

Bloomington will be watched closely in coming months by other communities—and local, State and Federal governmental agencies—concerned with the same problem.

It will also offer an opportunity for both undergraduate and graduate students attending Indiana University from all over the world to observe a program which provides a practical program for dealing with the problems of educational deficiencies.

There are no restrictions placed on membership in Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc. Any boy 16 years of age or older is eligible for membership in the organization. Unlimited opportunities are available to boys regardless of race, religion, creed, or degree of academic and vocational deficiency through Boy Builders.

The boys are involved in a comprehensive program beyond the normal concept of a 5-day week regular school program. Each boy will have an opportunity to indicate his individual needs through a series of tests and evaluations to be administered by professionally trained faculty and staff members of Indiana University.

Each boy will have an individual tutor or counselor, using the wives of faculty members or retired teachers, to whom he will look for guidance and assistance. A broad course of diversified cooperative education leading to high school graduation is being projected through educational channels from the local to the State level. No boy will be forced to complete the required academic work, but it will be available to any boy who desires to better himself by working in a program of study designed to award him a high school diploma.

The vocational program will center around the house construction industry. Each boy will have an opportunity to work in all areas under the direction and instruction of skilled craftsmen and instructors. He will start with the preparation of the ground for footers and foundations and continue through to the capping of the chimney and the landscaping of the grounds.

The program is designed to offer a preapprenticeship program which may lead to acceptance as an apprentice in the trade of his choice when he becomes 18 years of age and can satisfy the entrance requirements for apprenticeship training. Boys whose manual dexterity or mental ability prohibit entrance into skilled apprenticeship programs will be directed toward employment commensurate with their abilities.

The boys will not be paid salaries, but will be taught the value of service as the houses will be built for, and with the help of, young married couples within the community who otherwise would not be financially able to build or purchase a house. It will embody a self-help plan, again under skilled craftsmen, which will permit the young couple to build up a "sweet equity" of their own. Although the boys will not be paid, each will receive a personal allowance of $5 a week. Hot lunches will be furnished. Clothing and shoes will be furnished. Foster homes will be provided where needed. Those who wish to engage in sports may be members of basketball, softball, bowling teams, etc. Clothes, equipment, fees, etc. will be paid by the organization.

Each boy will receive regular medical, dental, and optical examinations and checkups. Several different kinds of insurance, including health and accident, are carried on each member of the organization. Saturday will be "outside work day" and assistance will be given to the boys who wish to earn additional money. The hourly rate has been established at $1.25. The work must be within the framework of what the State regulations will permit.

In addition to Curry, other officers of Boy Builders are Dr. Kuntz, vice president; Ralph J. Nelson, treasurer; M. E. Klootwyk, assistant treasurer; William C. Reed, Jr., secretary; George L. Bower, Sr., Bruce B. Temple, and Tarzian, directors, and Dr. Jack B. Fellows, executive administrator.

The group's national board of sponsors includes Congressman William G. Bray, Dr. Arthur S. Daniels, of Indiana University; Dr. Daniel Schreiber, of the National Education Association; Dr. Harold G. Shane, of Indiana University; Dr. Lindley J. Stiles, of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Herman B Wells, of Indiana University; Senator Vance Hartke, and Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.

There are 33 local persons on the advisory council.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 69, Senate bill 6, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 3, line 7, after the word "their", to strike out "instrumentalities, and mass transportation companies both public and private," and insert "instrumentalities"; in line 21, after the word "areas", to strike out "(including commuter service into or between such areas)"; in line 24, after the word "areas.", to insert "Assistance may be provided for land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of such use, if the Administrator obtains adequate assurance of repayment of the assistance where the land and improvements are not in fact put to the proposed use within a reasonable period of time."; on page 4, line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "legal" and insert "legal,"; on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

(c) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator (without regard to the proviso in section 202(d) of such amendments) solely to obtain funds for loans under this section.

On page 6, after line 3, to insert:

(d) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence a semicolon and the following: "except that notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to provide financial assistance under section 202(a)(2) (as modified by section 3(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance by the Administrator of the notes or other obligations".

On page 7, line 3, after the word "enterprise.", to insert "Where facilities and equipment are to be acquired which are already being used in mass transportation service in the urban area, the program must provide that they shall be so improved (through modernization, extension, addition, or otherwise) that they will better serve the transportation needs of the area."; on page 8, after line 6, to strike out:

(c) No loan shall be made under section 3 for any project for which a grant is made under that section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under section 3 shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator solely to obtain funds for loans under section 3 of this Act.

On page 9, line 23, after the word "service,", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 12, line 13, after the word "assisted", to strike out "highways, the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas" and insert "highways (including the acquisition of land and the acquisition or construction of improvements in advance of such use), the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information and otherwise cooperate with respect to the planning, financing, and construction of proposed projects in urban areas"; at the top of page 13, to strike out:

INTERSTATE COMPACTS TO IMPLEMENT COMPREHENSIVE URBAN PLANNING

Sec. 9. Section 701(f) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to enter into compacts or other agreements, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance (including the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable) for comprehensive planning for the physical growth and development of interstate, metropolitan, or other urban areas, or for carrying out mass transportation programs and other measures determined to be necessary for such growth and development."

At the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; on page 15, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(but not including charter or sightseeing service) and moving over prescribed routes" and insert "and moving over prescribed routes, but does not include charter or sightseeing service, or aircraft or steamship service (other than ferrying service)"; after line 20, to strike out:

(e) Grants made under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 12½ per centum of the amount of grant funds authorized in section 4(b), except that the Administrator (without regard to the foregoing limitation) may make additional grants in accordance with section 4 aggregating not to exceed 10 per centum of such amount.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, contracts for grants under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $12,500,000 which limit shall be increased by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1965. The Administrator may make additional contracts for such grants (subject to the limitations prescribed in section 4(b)) aggregating not to exceed $50,000,000, but such additional contracts for grants for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $5,000,000. In the case of any project undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a duly approved compact or other agreement, the Administrator may apply the foregoing limitations by allocating any portion of the grants contracted for such project to any one or more of such States.

On page 16, after line 19, to insert:

(f) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the administration of this Act. Such report shall indicate to whom financial assistance has been extended pursuant to this Act, the purposes for which such assistance is to be utilized, and the amounts involved, and may include such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

On page 17, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; in line 11, after the word "as", to strike out "amended, and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be" and insert "amended"; at the top of page 18, to insert:

(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

And, at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

(2) that the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration of inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities and services, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning on a comprehensive and continuing basis; and

(3) that Federal financial assistance for the development of efficient and coordinated mass transportation systems is essential to the solution of these urban problems.

(b) The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private;

(2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private; and

(3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private mass transportation companies as determined by local needs.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to make grants or loans (directly, through the purchase of securities or equipment trust certificates, or otherwise) to assist States and local public bodies and agencies thereof, and mass transportation companies both public and private, in financing the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such service with highway and other transportation in such areas. Assistance may be provided for land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of such use, if the Administrator obtains adequate assurance of repayment of the assistance where the land and improvements are not in fact put to the proposed use within a reasonable period of time. Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and any other real or personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Administrator determines that the applicant (which in no case shall be a private company) has or will have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control, through operation or lease or otherwise, over the use of the facilities and equipment. The applicant shall, with respect to private mass transportation companies, give full consideration to the exercise of such continuing control through the appropriate existing governmental regulatory agency authorized to issue to the operating company, in the form of certificates of public convenience and necessity, franchises, or other indicia of operating authority, the authority to operate as a private mass transportation company. No such funds shall be used for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses.

(b) No grant or loan shall be made under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of acquiring the facilities or other property of a private transit enterprise operating buses or similar motor vehicles, or providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of buses in competition with an existing transit company, unless the applicant has certified to the Administrator that (1) a grant or loan for such purposes is essential to the program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (2) such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, and (3) just and adequate compensation will be paid to such companies for acquisition of their franchises or property to the extent required by applicable State or local laws.

(c) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator (without regard to the proviso in section 202(d) of such amendments) solely to obtain funds for loans under this section.

(d) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence a semicolon and the following: "except that notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to provide financial assistance under section 202(a)(2) (as modified by section 3(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance by the Administrator of the notes or other obligations".

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) Except as specified in section 5, no Federal financial assistance shall be provided pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, and are necessary for the sound, economic, and desirable development of such area. Such a program shall encourage, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise. Where facilities and equipment are to be acquired which are already being used in mass transportation service in the urban area, the program must provide that they shall be so improved (through modernization, extension, addition, or otherwise) that they will better serve the transportation needs of the area. The Administrator shall estimate what portion of the cost of a project to be assisted under section 3 of this Act cannot be reasonably financed from revenues—which portion shall hereinafter be called net project cost. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed two-thirds of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

(b) The Administrator may contract to make grants pursuant to this Act aggregating not to exceed $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by $200,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and by $200,000,000 on July 1, 1965. The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant contracted to be made pursuant to this Act. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all grants contracted for under this Act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

EMERGENCY PROGRAM

SEC. 5. Prior to July 1, 1966, Federal financial assistance may be provided pursuant to section 3 where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, referred to in section 4(a), is under active preparation although not yet completed, (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system, and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed one-half of the net project cost: *Provided,* That where a Federal grant is made on such a one-half basis, and the planning requirements specified in section 4(a) are fully met within a three-year period after the execution of the grant agreement, an additional grant may then be made to the applicant equal to one-sixth of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized to undertake research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. He may undertake such projects independently or by contract (including working agreements with other Federal departments and agencies). In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator is authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from public or private sources.

(b) The Administrator may make available to finance projects under this section not to exceed $10,000,000 of the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b), which limit shall be increased to $20,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1965. In addition, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of this Act or of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, the unobligated balance of the amount available for mass transportation demonstration grants pursuant to the proviso in such section 103(b) shall be available solely for financing projects under this section.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956 or any other provision of law.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) No financial assistance shall be extended to any project under section 3 unless the Administrator determines that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project and that there are being or will be provided (in the same area or in other areas generally not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the displaced families) an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings available to those displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, financial assistance extended to any project under section 3 may include grants for relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants may be in addition to other financial assistance for the project under section 3, and no part of the amount of such relocation payments shall be required to be contributed as a local grant. The term "relocation payments" means payments by the applicant to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement by the project. Such payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization. Such rules and regulations may include provisions authorizing payment to individuals and families of fixed amounts (not to exceed $200 in any case) in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHWAYS AND FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

SEC. 8. In order to assure coordination of highway and railway and other mass transportation planning and development programs in urban areas, particularly with respect to the provision of mass transportation facilities in connection with federally assisted highways (including the acquisition of land and the acquisition or construction of improvements in advance of such use), the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information and otherwise cooperate with respect to the planning, financing, and construction of proposed projects in urban areas.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402, except subsections (c)(2) and (f), of the Housing Act of 1950. Funds obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(b) All contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment in furtherance of the purposes for which a loan or grant is made under this Act, entered into by applicants under other than competitive bidding procedures as defined by the Administrator, shall provide that the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall, for the purpose of audit and examination, have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the contracting parties that are pertinent to the operations or activities under such contracts.

(c) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "local public bodies" includes municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State;

(3) the term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

(4) the term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth; and

(5) the term "mass transportation" means transportation by bus or rail or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, serving the general public and moving over prescribed routes, but does not include charter or sightseeing service, or aircraft or steamship service (other than ferrying service).

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the funds necessary to carry out all functions under this Act except loans under section 3. All funds appropriated under this Act for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, contracts for grants under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $12,500,000 which limit shall be increased by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1965. The Administrator may make additional contracts for such grants (subject to the limitations prescribed in section 4(b)) aggregating not to exceed $50,000,000, but such additional contracts for grants for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $5,000,000. In the case of any project undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a duly approved compact or other agreement, the Administrator may apply the foregoing limitations by allocating any portion of the grants contracted for such project to any one or more of such States.

(f) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the administration of this Act. Such report shall indicate to whom financial assistance has been extended pursuant to this Act, the purposes for which such assistance is to utilized, and the amounts involved, and may include such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 10. (a) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of loans or grants under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Administrator shall not approve any such loan or grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, 40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Sec. 11. In providing financial assistance to any project under section 3, the Administrator shall take into consideration whether the facilities and equipment to be acquired, constructed, reconstructed, or improved will be designed and equipped to prevent and control air pollution in accordance with any criteria established for this purpose by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the pending bill (S. 6) staff members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Subcommittee on Housing may be admitted to the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HONORABLE HARRY FLOOD BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the highest and most meritorious attributes a man can possess are absolute integrity, absolute honesty, and absolute courage. The Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, has these qualities, and he is indeed one of the true statesmen of all time. His State and Nation owe him a lasting debt of gratitude.

In the words of William S. White, the respected Washington columnist, writing in the April issue of the Reader's Digest:

> Harry Byrd symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and history.

All who have served with Senator Byrd in this body know that Mr. White wrote with great truth. The Senator from Virginia has been dedicated, courageous, and forthright throughout all of his outstanding service in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's tribute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Meet the Honorable Harry (the Rare) Byrd

(By William S. White)

(Even those who disagree with his policies cannot help liking and admiring the patriarch from Virginia as a man of integrity and courage.)

A veteran Congressman said recently, "There are three parties in the U.S. Senate—the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, and the party of Harry Byrd. Harry is far too fond of the old Democratic Party ever to leave it, and he is too old-fashioned a southern gentleman ever to join the Republican Party. So, he has his own party—the Byrd-Democratic Party."

Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, is the Senate's southern conservative patriarch. Some of his colleagues think of him as a force of reaction and pennypinching; others think of him as the last, best guard over the Federal Treasury, the last, best hope against Federal intervention in State and local affairs. But all of them think of Harry Byrd as a man of absolute integrity, absolute honesty, absolute courage.

Why absolute integrity? Because he votes as he believes. Why absolute honesty? Because he says what he believes, and only what he believes. Why absolute courage? Because no mere part-time valor can arm any man to vote invariably, and to speak invariably, only upon his own convictions.

Two years ago when the Senate voted on the Kennedy administration's proposal to extend unemployment insurance, Byrd lost, by only two votes, his fight to preserve the principle of State responsibility for the administration and distribution of the funds. But he did not, as a lesser man might, take the narrow defeat as a personal rebuke and go off sulking. Byrd, confident that his convictions were right, stayed on the floor. When the Senate clerk had called the last name and it was apparent how the vote had gone, Senators who had opposed him went to Byrd's front-row desk to congratulate him for his fortitude.

This respect for Byrd is bipartisan. When, after years of Democratic Party rule in Congress, the Republicans won a majority and the right to name committee chairmen in 1947 and 1953, they asked Byrd to remain as chairman of the House-Senate Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which he had been instrumental in setting up in 1941. "That's Byrd's committee and he should keep on running it," one Republican explained. Today, the committee is one of the best sources of information about Government spending. Byrd, with 21 years as chairman, has been head of a congressional committee for a longer unbroken time than any other man in history.

Byrd is a true aristocrat, perhaps the last in the Senate and one of a nostalgic few remaining on the U.S. political scene. The name Byrd has been written across all the pages of Virginia's history since 1674. Yet, like many aristocrats, Byrd seems unconscious of his status. A thrifty man who has a horror of any kind of show, he could be picked as the least well-dressed Member on the Senate floor. He drives only low-priced automobiles. He buckets around his vast apple orchards in the Shenandoah Valley (he is the largest individual grower in the world) and around his hometown of Berryville in khaki pants and shirt like a farmer on the way to the general store.

Byrd's sole visible symbol of status is his white-pillared country house, Rosemont, which surmounts Berryville like a manor house over an English village. When, and very rarely, Byrd entertains at Rosemont (always in the spring, when the apple blossoms cover the hills), "H. F. Byrd," the apple grower, and Harry Flood Byrd, the U.S. Senator, become simply Byrd of Rosemont. In these moments Byrd is dressed for the role of southern squire, usually in white linen gleaming against his reddish, apple-cheeked face and his blue, amused eyes.

But Byrd's public life is his real life, and has been for 55 of his 75 years. His father, Richard Evelyn Byrd (the late admiral and explorer of the same name was Harry Byrd's younger brother), had sat with such absorption as speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates that he had neglected both his law practice and the small family fortune bound up in the Winchester Star. The Star had become so debt ridden that the elder Byrd had about decided to liquidate it. But Harry Byrd, although only 15, asked permission to quit high school and have a go at the paper.

His first problem was a heavy indebtedness to the firm that supplied the newsprint. He persuaded that firm to send newsprint c.o.d.—1 day's supply at a time. By day-and-night collection of bills owed the Star and by working as manager of the local Bell Telephone office, young Harry managed to pay for each shipment of paper as it arrived. And, finally, through his managerial skill, all back bills, too, were paid, and the newspaper became solvent.

But from early boyhood Harry Byrd had meant to be a public man. He was elected to the Winchester City Council before he was 21, to the State senate at 27, and was Governor of Virginia at 38. He has been a U.S. Senator since 1933, the year in which Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House.

In the years since he left the Virginia statehouse, Byrd has had some little hand, as he puts it, in the election of nine Governors of Virginia. Eight have been Byrd men—men who in general have shared his philosophy of fiscal prudence and belief in the maintenance of worthwhile traditions.

The Byrd organization is no Tammany Hall, no machine like the one the Republicans once had in Pennsylvania. It is variously described as an association of like-minded men (by its friends) and as Harry Byrd's steamroller (by his enemies). In the organization there are no direct ukases from on high; Byrd does not personally pick who is to run for what office. Still, when election time comes around, everybody in Virginia knows how the Senator feels. Byrd himself says, "For the success that I have had and the organization has had, there is, I think, one very simple explanation: I have always been conservative and it has always been conservative."

The catalyst that formed the organization came in 1923, when Virginia was torn by a debate over how to pay for badly needed highways. Byrd, as a State senator, advocated building modern roads; but unlike his opponents he felt the $50 million cost should be paid as the roads were built rather than by floating a bond issue. Resolving to carry the decision to the people, he slogged through muddy roads to nearly every city and village in the State. Byrd's proposal was simple: "Pull the farmers out of the mud, but do it sanely through a pay-as-you-go gasoline tax." The voters were convinced; the proposal for a bond issue was defeated, and Byrd became the logical choice for Governor.

As chief executive, Byrd streamlined the State constitution until it became a model studied throughout the the United States. He changed a $1,900,000 budget deficit into a $5,700,000 surplus. He persuaded the legislature to pass a tough law that ended lynching in Virginia. He lured new industry, and put Virginia on such a sound financial basis that, while it now ranks well above the national average in growth, expenditures for education, and percentage of surfaced highways, it has virtually no State debt.

Never has the organization been remotely accused of corruption. One of Byrd's few orders (decisions he calls them) to the organization was to resist the slightest touch of influence peddling. Indeed, Byrd's own antagonism to influence peddling is so marked as to seem to more relaxed politicians almost an obsession. For example, when President Eisenhower named Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, as Secretary of Defense in 1952, nearly all of Washington assumed that Wilson would have no trouble in being confirmed by the Senate. But Byrd, though a strongly probusiness politician, read the conflict-of-interest laws to say that Wilson must sell his stock in General Motors, which held large contracts with the Defense Department.

There was a hard deadlock between these two hardminded men. Other Senators wanted a compromise; BYRD would have none of it. Wilson threatened to go over the Senate's head with a television appeal to the country. (What he meant was to go over BYRD's head.) BYRD told him, "Mr. Wilson, I do hope you won't do that. It would be very bad—for you." Wilson finally sold his stock.

BYRD's insistence on budget balancing, on pay-as-you-go, and his hostility to the spread of Federal powers often irritate his colleagues, but they could hardly imagine the Senate without him. In 1958 he announced that he was retiring. Mrs. Byrd had been ill, and he had promised her that he would not run again. There was an outpouring of genuine regret in the U.S. Senate, but the General Assembly of Virginia did more than regret. It passed a resolution, the first of its kind, calling on him to reconsider. "The general welfare of the entire United States and Virginia demands his continued service," the resolution concluded.

BYRD, bearing his promise in mind, went to Mrs. Byrd with the assembly's request. She herself wrote a letter to the assembly: "I have looked forward to my husband's retirement, but I do not feel that my hope should obstruct the judgment of those better informed than I who think he can render a public service in these trying days."

So BYRD ran again for the U.S. Senate. His favorite corner there is the finance committee, of which he is chairman. He fights a cheerful but endless rearguard action against too much spending, too much foreign economic aid, too much intrusion by the Federal power. His arguments, in brief, almost offhand speeches, are never stilled.

Hundreds of major legislative actions in the fiscal field over the years have borne the imprint of BYRD's thrifty hand. The soundness of the social security system, for one, represents an enduring BYRD victory. From the enactment of the law in 1935, BYRD was dissatisfied with it, because it promised billions of dollars in pensions but offered no guaranteed means for paying the bill. He wanted nothing less than a pay-as-you-go plan—and 4 years later, in 1939, Congress accepted a Byrd amendment for pay-as-you-go.

Seventeen years later, when the Eisenhower administration proposed the vast multibillion-dollar highway program now in the process of lacing this country, BYRD returned to the same principle. Eisenhower and George M. Humphrey, then Secretary of the Treasury, wanted to finance the system with a bond issue which would augment the already mountainous Federal debt. BYRD told them, "Roads, yes, gentlemen. Bonds, no, gentlemen." When the Federal Highway Act of 1956 was finally adopted, it carried BYRD's pay-as-you-go financing plan.

He fights doggedly even on small items. When in 1945 the time came for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's fourth inauguration, BYRD was chairman of the Inaugural Committee. Congress appropriated for the occasion $25,000, to BYRD an ample sum. F.D.R., who had conducted polite but relentless warfare for years with the Senator, observed one night to friends: "Old HARRY is so worried about money, I think I shall simply announce that I want nothing from him for the inauguration—not even his precious $25,000."

BYRD calmly took the President at his word. He issued orders to the Inaugural Committee to return the $25,000 to the Federal Treasury. Roosevelt paid for the chicken a la king inaugural luncheon out of regular White House funds.

BYRD has always assumed that because he means a thing when he says it, other public men mean what they say. Demagogery is utterly foreign to him; he never hides his motives or apologizes for his actions. "I just go on my regular course," BYRD was quoted by Time. "I don't claim to have any special virtues at all. I just vote for what I think is right."

Truman once said that there were "too many Byrds" in the Senate. But there is only one HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia; and there will not soon, if ever, be another. Issues are endlessly debatable; but character is not. And HARRY BYRD symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and history.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it has become commonplace for the criminal conduct of individuals to be blamed on the ills of society, particularly in our large cities and here in the crime-ridden District of Columbia.

To subscribe to this doctrine is to deny that the individual has any control whatsoever over his actions, and to believe that man is a soulless being without any sense of what is right and what is wrong. It is to believe that if Abraham Lincoln were alive today he would grow up to be a rogue of the worst sort. Poor Abe, so underprivileged that he never had adequate schooling or proper housing, and without social workers to show him the way, never really had a chance.

However, no one told him this, and he persevered and determinedly set out to improve himself and to achieve the highest honor that can come to a citizen of this country.

The shortcomings of our society have for so long borne the brunt of the blame for the sins of man that it is refreshing, indeed, when someone puts the matter in its proper perspective, as was done March 28 in a letter to the Washington Evening Star by Elsie King Moreland.

With great truth, it is noted that only weak and irresponsible individuals will result from putting the blame on society for their behavior. It is time that individuals renew faith in themselves as masters of their fate, and act in accordance with responsible citizenship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY BLAME SOCIETY FOR SINS OF INDIVIDUALS?

Human behavior, which was once motivated by the individual's concept of right or wrong, has now become a kind of reflex action, controlled by causes and forces beyond the individual's reach. The sins of the fathers and of society are his formidable inheritance, which he must accept and endure.

A whole new science, based on this idea, has come into being. For every form of behavior, from a temper tantrum to a vicious murder, there is a precise cause or blame, says this science. And matching one with the other has become as simple as matching a spool of thread with a piece of fabric. A rape, a robbery, or a murder is committed, and before the individual is fingerprinted and booked, we have been given the exact cause of the particular crime. If the exact cause is not readily available, there is always society to blame, or the individual's immediate community, or, in some instances, the region of his birth. Never, but never, must the individual responsible for the behavior be blamed. Indeed, it would almost appear that his participation or involvement in the crime is hardly more than that of an innocent bystander.

Shakespeare, in "King Lear," has Edmund say of evaders: "This is the excellent foppery of the world, that when we are sick in fortune—often the surfeit of our own behavior—we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: As if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion, knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence."

At the present time, planetary influence does not appear to be on the approved list of causes, but we can be sure that sooner or later the sun, the moon, and the stars will be made guilty of some of modern man's disasters. However, another type of influence appears to have been added, not to the causes perhaps, but to the justifications for some forms of behavior. This influence has to do with numbers, or the statistical approach to ethics. The old idea that right is right if nobody is right and wrong is wrong if everybody is wrong has been changed to wrong is right if everybody does it, or is doing it at a given time.

A well-known legislator recently justified some of his behavior with this new influence of numbers. He was just doing what everybody was doing, he said, no more, no less. Another legislator, apparently also using the statistical approach, is reported to have stated, in connection with the stadium riot, that he knew of worse riots in the Midwest. It is not quite clear what this statement was supposed to show or to prove, but if everybody does it is the criterion, then we are left to wonder what influence statistical evidence of riots in other parts of the country may do to this form of behavior.

It would be difficult to assess the potentialities for evil in this idea of removing from the individual all responsibility for his behavior. It underwrites crime, and subsidizes sin. It robs the individual of self-restraint, self-reliance, and self-respect, and makes him an automaton, his actions determined or predetermined by forces over which he has no control. It gives every juvenile a built-in alibi, and puts a gun, a knife or a club in his hand, and, says "Go out and have fun—you are not responsible." If there is any doubt that this approach to behavior is wrong, it can be quickly dispelled by considering the ever-increasing rate of crime, delinquency, illegitimacy, and other related social problems.

There are no villains by necessity. No one becomes a criminal or delinquent except through his own choice. The line which separates right from wrong may not be as sharply drawn today, but the majority of those with average intelligence know when they have crossed it. The boy who throws a rock through a window knows he is doing wrong. If not, why does he run? Studies of crime and delinquency show that there are no exact causes which can be applied to particular crimes or behavior. There are only factors which may or may not influence certain individuals. Each responds in his own way to a given situation.

The society which produces a panhandler and a purse snatcher will also produce an Andrew Carnegie and a Henry Ford. The circumstances which produce a coward will also produce a hero. The sinking of the Titanic produced a number of both. The poverty which produces a criminal will also produce an Abraham Lincoln and a George Washington Carver. The same environment—race, early surroundings, college and the study of science—which produced Julius Rosenberg also produced Jonas Salk. The same parents who produced Al (Scarface) Capone also produced his brother, Richard J. (Two-Gun) Hart, who, as a marshal and an Indian agent in Nebraska, enforced the law for 30 years. True, he changed his name, but by any other name, his heredity was exactly the same.

Those who blame society for an individual's behavior are themselves creating a society of weak and irresponsible individuals. Making society guilty is an admission that the individual is not capable of choosing or controlling his behavior. No man is free who is not the master of his fate. If his fate is determined by society, or any other force outside himself, he is not the master, and he is not free. Let those who excuse and blame ponder this. Will they have a free and responsible citizen who can choose and control his own destiny? Or will they have one who is a slave of circumstances and conditions, without any sense of responsibility for his own life or the community in which he lives? They must decide on one or the other. They cannot have both.

Elsie King Moreland.

POLITICAL CLEARANCE FOR STUDENT SUMMER JOBS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, recently I received an inquiry about a disturbing report that student summer jobs in Washington were being controlled by the administration for political purposes. Reports that applicants were being subjected to clearance through the New Frontier political machine were brought to my attention.

I immediately made inquiry through the Civil Service Commission and was assured both by phone and by letter that there had been—to quote Civil Service—"no departure from past policies or practices in employing students."

The writer, Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., continued with the reassuring words:

> Any political clearances for appointments to positions in the competitive service, either permanent or temporary are clearly prohibited by the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations.

I realize the repetition involved in reading Chairman Macy's letter in full, but to avoid any chance of pulling his statements out of context I will quote the full letter at this point in my remarks:

> Dear Senator Simpson: This is in reply to your letter of March 12, 1963, in behalf of Mrs. Pollyann Lucas, 167 South 12th East, Salt Lake City, Utah, who asks about summer employment in the Federal service.
>
> Let me assure you that there has been no departure from past policies or practices in employing students or other persons for temporary periods during the summer. Pamphlet 45 has been reissued (a copy is enclosed) to set forth the summer employment opportunities known to the Civil Service Commission and the procedures to be followed by applicants interested in such opportunities. Any political clearances for appointments to positions in the competitive service, either permanent or temporary, are clearly prohibited by the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations. The Commission will promptly investigate any specific charge that such prohibitions have been violated.
>
> Your enclosure is returned.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> John W. Macy, Jr.,
> *Chairman.*

Despite the abuses of power politics that I have witnessed in my brief tenure in the Senate, this letter did seem quite explicit and I in turn assured Mrs. Lucas that her trepidation was without cause and that no politics figured in the summer jobs.

At this same time the administration testified before the House Civil Service Committee that there was certainly no political patronage involved and that White House interest in the program was predicated on the most noble of motives; simply to set up the summer student seminars. The fears of all who questioned the patronage reports were thus quickly assuaged.

Senators can imagine my surprise Sunday when I read in the newspaper that the official publication of the National Federation of College Democrats had unveiled this play for the cruel hoax that it is. In an article last week the paper informed its readers that responsibility for summer employment jobs had been transferred to the White House.

We learn that each applicant is to write his Congressman for his recommendation and then forward it to the White House patronage clerk who will ascertain the political thinking of the students.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is the rankest type of vicious manipulation of the 10,000 students who are honestly seeking summer jobs in Washington, and of the Civil Service Commission, which is obviously in the dark about the situation.

In its insatiable drive to twist a political advantage from every event, program, and person the administration has violated the civil service law as explained by Mr. Macy and it is attempting to turn a nonpartisan student employment program into a campaign device for the New Frontier.

The American people are witnessing the antics of an administration that plays politics with everything from students to Cuban refugees to an agency of its own Government.

It is patent now that the White House will subtly reject applications of students who are not deemed compatible with the New Frontier grand design.

In his note of reassurance Chairman Macy takes note of the prompt investigation of any reports such as this usurpation of civil service employment. Here we have a clear-cut case for such an investigation before Washington is surfeited with a summer youth corps which is unwittingly giving some Democrat Congressman a boost for reelection, at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, written by Mr. Young, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

College Democrats Are Told How To Get Summer Government Job

(By Joseph Young)

The Kennedy administration's disavowal of political patronage intent in the filling of student summer jobs in Government is sharply contradicted by one of the Democratic Party's own publications—the National College Democrat.

Only last Thursday, administration officials told the House Civil Service Committee that there was no political patronage involved and that the only interest the White House had in these jobs was in planning the student seminars which are held in connection with the summer employment.

However, the National College Democrat, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats, has this to say in its current issue:

"You may have noticed in recent newspaper stories that responsibility for such summer jobs has been transferred to the White House.

"The Young Democrats division has checked out what this means for you.

FORM TO WHITE HOUSE

"We have been recommended to suggest the following procedure. Write to your Senator or Congressman, asking him for a form 57. When you return it, ask him to enclose an accompanying letter of recommendation and to forward it with the form 57 to Mrs. Dorothy Davies at the White House."

Mrs. Davies is an assistant to Kenneth O'Donnell, special assistant to President Kennedy, and is handling Government summer employment for the White House.

The Democratic student publication mentions that "Washington's summertime lure is 'getting to' many college Young Democrats this time of the year."

With such competition among the Young Democrats, it reminded them that a political letter of recommendation to the White House from one's Senator or Congressman may not be a "guarantee" of getting a summer job. It urges the Young Democrats to follow up "any personal leads you may have" in pursuing a Government job.

The article concludes by reminding the Young Democrats that if they have any further questions they should contact Jim Hunt, the college director of the Democratic National Committee.

AN APRIL FOOL'S DAY NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is an unfortunate coincidence that the Congress chose April Fool's Day to fool the American people concerning the size of the national debt.

Pursuant to an act of Congress, the papers will solemnly announce that today the ceiling on the debt drops from $308 billion to $305 billion, leaving the impression that there has been a marked reduction in the size of the debt, which, of course, is not true. For purposes of flexibility, the Treasury in recent years has been insisting upon a debt ceiling of at least $3 billion above the actual debt at any given time. As of today, the actual debt is $303,171,874,612.20. The Treasury had planned to ask Congress to provide a ceiling above $308 billion, but abandoned the plan when it became apparent that a bitter fight over the debt ceiling would mitigate against the chances of an income tax cut.

April is the month of the largest payment of personal income taxes and the Treasury feels there will be sufficient funds to meet current bills for the next 2 months under a debt limit of $305 billion prior to June 25, when under existing law the debt ceiling will drop to $300 billion, the Treasury will be forced to ask for legislative action to increase the debt ceiling. We do not know the exact figure that the Treasury will request, but in view of the fact that the Treasury Department anticipates a deficit of about $12 billion for the next fiscal year and probably just as much for the following fiscal year, there are many who now believe that the Treasury will ask Congress to fix the new ceiling at $320 billion. The budget estimate for interest on the present debt is $9,400 million, but if Congress concurs in the planned deficits for the next 2 fiscal years, the carrying charge on the national debt will soon be close to $1 billion a month.

On this April Fool's Day, it is pertinent to point out that almost one-third of our monumental national debt has been created by the money we have loaned and given to foreign nations since the end of World War II.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of those loans and grants which were published in the last issue of Time magazine. That tabulation shows how much each foreign country has received, making a total of $97,674,700,000. Whatever the accomplishments of foreign aid have been, the cost has been tremendous. We must review all further requests in this field.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE MONEY WENT

The breakdown of military and economic aid given to foreign countries and groupings from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1962. An asterisk indicates classified military aid that is included in the regional totals:

[In millions of dollars]

	Economic	Military	Total
Europe:			
Austria	1,173.8		1,173.8
Belgium-Luxembourg	739.5	1,256.4	1,995.9
Denmark	300.3	605.3	905.6
France	5,175.6	4,262.4	9,438.0
West Germany	4,047.5	951.9	4,999.4
Berlin	131.0		131.0
Iceland	70.2		70.2
Ireland	146.2		146.2
Italy	3,463.3	2,292.5	5,755.8
The Netherlands	1,288.6	1,252.8	2,481.4
Norway	349.8	797.0	1,146.8
Poland	522.6		522.6
Portugal	152.1	336.6	488.7
Spain	1,173.6	537.7	1,711.3
Sweden	108.9		108.9
United Kingdom	7,668.2	1,045.0	9,713.2
Yugoslavia	1,703.0	693.9	2,396.9
Regional [1]	718.4	1,908.6	2,627.0
Total	28,872.7	15,939.8	44,812.5
Far East:			
Burma	95.4		95.4
Cambodia	248.6	85.9	334.5
Nationalist China	2,051.6	2,376.7	4,428.3
Hong Kong	30.4		30.4
Indochina region [2]	825.6	709.6	1,535.2
Indonesia	670.9		670.9
Japan	2,660.7	1,033.1	3,693.8
Korea	3,431.4	2,002.2	5,433.6
Laos	291.9	169.8	461.7
Malaya	23.2		23.2
Philippines	1,334.4	418.8	1,753.2
Thailand	336.1	417.8	753.9
Vietnam	1,699.3	742.4	2,441.7
SEATO	1.8		1.8
Regional	41.9	461.1	503.0
Total	13,743.2	8,417.3	22,160.5
Middle East and south Asia:			
Cyprus	16.9		16.9
Greece	1,784.8	1,602.8	3,387.6
Iran	732.3	577.9	1,310.2
Iraq	21.6	46.1	67.7
Israel	874.7	3.0	877.7
Jordan	325.2	24.1	349.3
Lebanon	80.4	8.6	89.0
Saudi Arabia	46.6	*	46.6
Syria	75.8		75.8
Turkey	1,581.3	2,288.0	3,869.3
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	628.6		628.6
Middle East, etc.—Con.			
Yemen	22.9		22.9
CENTO	27.4		27.4
Afghanistan	216.8	2.8	219.6
Ceylon	79.7		79.7
India	3,952.0		3,952.0
Nepal	48.4		48.4
Pakistan	1,889.6	*	1,889.6
Indus Basin [3]	33.8		33.8
Regional	139.4	713.0	852.4
Total	12,577.7	5,266.2	17,843.9
Latin America:			
Argentina	596.5	44.0	640.5
Bolivia	254.9	3.5	258.4
Brazil	1,736.8	215.9	1,952.7
Chile	675.6	62.2	737.8
Colombia	360.7	47.8	408.5
Costa Rica	89.1	.8	89.9
Cuba	41.5	10.6	52.1
Dominican Republic	39.3	6.1	45.4
Ecuador	113.1	25.2	138.3
El Salvador	39.6	1.1	40.7
Guatemala	158.2	4.4	162.6
Haiti	94.6	6.2	100.8
Honduras	43.0	2.3	45.3
Jamaica	8.8		8.8
Mexico	760.7	6.2	766.9
Nicaragua	65.1	3.8	68.9
Panama	99.9	.9	100.8
Paraguay	57.9	1.4	59.3
Peru	387.1	83.6	470.7
Uruguay	58.7	29.5	88.2
Venezuela	220.9	52.9	273.8
West Indies	22.5		22.5
British Guiana	3.5		3.5
British Honduras	2.4		2.4
Surinam	3.4		3.4
Regional	262.0	7.4	269.4
Total	6,195.5	616.1	6,811.6
Africa:			
Algeria	15.0		15.0
Cameroon	15.3	.3	15.6
Central African Republic	.2		.2
Chad	.4		.4
Congo (Brazzaville)	1.3		1.3
Congo (Léopoldville)	94.6		94.6
Dahomey	5.6		5.6
Ethiopia	117.8	67.5	185.3
Gabon	.5		.5
Ghana	156.5		156.5
Guinea	14.3		14.3
Ivory Coast	4.6		4.6
Kenya	18.5		18.5
Liberia	127.2	4.3	131.5
Libya	187.2	4.5	191.7
Malagasy	1.3		1.3
Mali	5.1	1.0	6.1
Mauritania	1.6		1.6
Morocco	352.0	*	352.0
Niger	3.2		3.2
Nigeria	43.6		43.6
Rhodesia-Nyasaland	36.1		36.1
Ruanda-Urundi	6.1		6.1
Senegal	4.6		4.6
Sierra Leone	3.5		3.5
Somali	27.4		27.4
Sudan	65.0		65.0
Tanganyika	17.6		17.6
Togo	5.8		5.8
Tunisia	293.3	*	293.3
Uganda	5.2		5.2
Upper Volta	3.2		3.2
Zanzibar	.1		.1
Other French possessions	6.0		6.0
Other Portuguese possessions	12.8		12.8
Other British possessions	.9		.9
Regional	11.1	34.3	45.4
Total	1,664.7	112.0	1,776.6
Nonregional [4]	3,561.4	708.0	4,269.4
Total	66,615.2	31,059.5	97,674.7

[1] "Regional" expenditures include multilateral programs in given areas; in Europe "Regional" also includes contributions to NATO.

[2] Aid given before Indo-China was given up by France in 1954.

[3] India, Pakistan, and other nations' participation in the Indus River project.

[4] Includes international bodies such as the United Nations and the International Labor Organization.

Source: Time, Mar. 29, 1963.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, April Fool's Day is a good day to remind those who are now contributing to their Government the largest percentage of their earned income of any free nation in modern times that the shibboleth of our State Department, "foreign aid with no strings attached," has actually meant foreign aid with little regard to a return to the American taxpayer.

April Fool's Day is likewise a good day to warn every man, woman, and child that, unless we take courageous steps to end deficit financing, there will come an April Fool's Day when they will learn to their sorrow that inflation has eroded the value of their life savings to a point where their insurance policies, savings accounts, and savings bonds are worthless. This has happened in many countries. It can happen here, unless we take steps to prevent inflation. We must take those steps, beginning today.

FREEDOM HOUSE POSITION ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a full page advertisement which appeared in the March 25 edition of the Washington Post concerning a relatively new organization known as the Freedom House. Under the very able leadership of Roscoe Drummond, who is chairman of the board of trustees, the Freedom House is dedicated to the principles of peace and liberty throughout the world. Through their educational program, conducted by means of mass media, the Freedom House attempts to alert the public to any threats to our security and, in addition, it makes positive recommendations for action.

Mr. President, in this most recent advertisement, the situation now existing in Cuba is discussed. The advertisement correctly points out the bipartisan areas of agreement—first, to eliminate the Soviet political and military base in Cuba; second, to prevent the spread of Communist subversion and terrorism to other countries in Latin America; and third, to liberate Cuba from the terror of Castro's police state. The Freedom House puts forth six viable propositions which they believe are fundamental to a satisfactory solution to the Cuban matter—a solution in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks here today the text of the advertisement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE CUBA

A Communist Cuba is intolerable. It is intolerable to America for reasons which bear upon our security. But beyond that, there are other concerns which must move freemen.

Communist Cuba has betrayed 6 million people who won their freedom from the Batista dictatorship.

It has deprived them of a free press and the right to vote.

It has imprisoned more than 100,000 Cubans for suspected antipathy to communism.

It has compelled a quarter of a million to flee their homeland. An additional 180,000 await transportation and countless others wish to escape the reign of terror.

It has become the first Soviet satellite in the Americas. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba, there would remain the most effective offensive weapon of the 20th century: aggressive communism.

Freedom House holds it imperative that Americans close ranks to meet that threat.

The leaders of both parties appear to agree on these objectives of U.S. policy: (a) eliminate the Soviet political and military base in Cuba, (b) prevent the spread of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage and guerrilla warfare, and (c) liberate the Cuban people from the terror of Castro's police state.

The issue before us, therefore, is not whether to move toward these goals, but how and when. Only the President, who has full access to the facts, can determine the character and timing of actions that will meet hemispheric and global requirements.

Freedom House believes, however, that public acceptance of the following propositions is basic for a viable solution:

1. The heart of the issue is the existence of a Communist regime in Cuba, serving as a Soviet political and military base for the purpose of multiplying Soviet satellites in this hemisphere.

The Soviets have helped to make Cuba a major training center and staging area for armies of Communist agents and guerrillas.

They have made Cuba the No. 1 military power in Latin America as a direct threat against weaker republics, which could generate an arms race with serious economic and political consequences.

2. The solution of the area's grievous social and economic problems will become increasingly difficult if not impossible to achieve should Cuba continue as a base for Communist penetration.

Under rising pressure from Communist Cuba, no Latin American government can be sure from one day to the next that it can maintain the peace and order necessary to carry out its social and economic plans. This could doom the Alliance for Progress.

The spread of the Castro-Communist infection is inclining influential Latin Americans to reach for the traditional solution of rightwing military dictatorship. Communists would welcome that as a step toward their seizure of power.

3. The nature of the threat requires that we be as much concerned with the security and freedom of our neighbors and allies as we are with our own.

A narrow interpretation of our national security suggesting that we will only take great risks to protect our own territory is bound to breed uncertainty. Some Latin Americans are already beginning to say: if the United States is unable or unwilling to repel this Communist menace we may have to fend for ourselves and somehow come to terms with it.

4. It is important to act and to time our action in consultation with our allies to assure maximum unity of the Organization of American States and the Atlantic Alliance.

Such action is authorized in the 1947 Rio Treaty which applies the U.N. Charter provision for self defense to the Organization of American States (OAS).

The resolutions adopted at Punta del Este in 1962 focus this doctrine on Cuba and call for individual and collective measures to counteract the continued intervention in this hemisphere of the Sino-Soviet Powers.

While preparing for action, we must not downgrade the danger. Nor should we defer to the timid members of the OAS in making decisions. The confidence of those who are under attack would thus be shaken; further provocations and miscalculations would be invited.

5. Failure to follow up initial success jeopardizes the gain and can lead to a setback.

The forceful and prudent U.S. action in the missile crisis induced Khrushchev to back away from his gamble. His credibility as well as the influence of Castro and Communism were considerably diminished. But these gains have since been partly dissipated.

Communists and their sympathizers can now make headway in Latin American trade unions, in universities and among the discontented generally. Growing uncertainty is causing flights of capital and discouraging investments sorely needed to get the Alliance for Progress moving.

6. The uncompromising assertion of our bipartisan objectives by word and deed is vital in rallying support for measures to realize our goals.

Our determination to see Cuba free and independent can be demonstrated now by helping qualified Cuban refugees to prepare themselves for democratic leadership. They should be given a chance to use their language and skills in the struggle for freedom throughout Latin America.

Our commitment to prevent the spread of Castroism should be implemented in cooperation with the threatened countries by working out unified defenses against the infiltration of Communist propagandists, terrorists and guerrillas. Their movements should be more effectively controlled and freedom fighters trained to counter their tactics.

We are confronted with a clear and present danger of more "Cubas" in Latin America. To turn the tide, we must not permit preoccupation with risks to impose paralysis on action. Consideration of this issue must not degenerate into a partisan wrangle.

An alliance for freedom is indispensable to the success of the Alliance for Progress. To that end Americans north and south of the Rio Grande should unite in a movement for a free Cuba.

FREEDOM HOUSE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Roscoe Drummond, Chairman; Harry D. Gideonse, president; Leo Cherne, chairman, executive committee; Harry J. Carman, George B. Ford, honorary chairman; Rex Stout, treasurer; Mrs. Henry Gale, assistant treasurer; George Field, executive director; Herbert Agar, Irving Brown, Ernest Cuneo, Christopher Emmet, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Mrs. Andrew Jackson, Jacob K. Javits, Maxwell A. Kriendler, John V. Lindsay, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Dwayne Orton, Mrs. Bonaro Overstreet, Rudolph Rathaus, Whitelaw Reid, John R. Richardson, Jr., Elizabeth M. Riley, Francis E. Rivers, Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Eric Sevareid, Whitney North Seymour, Mrs. Caroline K. Simon, Nathaniel Singer, Gerald L. Steibel, Herbert Bayard Swope, Jr., James J. Wadsworth, William L. White, Roy Wilkins.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DOWNSTATE NEW YORK DIVISION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the ruthless murder of 14,000 Polish officers 23 years ago was recently commemorated by the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress. This brutal act of genocide committed by Soviet NKVD agents in 1940 still remains unpunished, and, at the present time, Poland still remains the exploited victim of Soviet imperialism, subjugated to the force and terror of Communist tyranny. In my judgment, the United States—in fact, the entire free world—cannot afford to neglect the hopes and ideals of these freedom-loving people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 1,200 American friends of the cause of a free Poland are assembled this 10th day of March 1963, in the Polish National Hall, 19 St. Marks Place, New York, under the auspices of the Downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress, for the purpose of commemorating the 23d anniversary of the brutal murder of 14,000 Polish officers, professors, scientists, priests, and other leaders of Polish life in the Katyn Forest of Russia; and

Whereas a special congressional committee following the conduct of hearings in the United States and Europe, found substantial evidence that this infamous crime was committed by Soviet NKVD agents in the spring of 1940; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress forwarded these findings to the Secretary of State requesting him that all of the evidence produced at these hearings as well as the record be transmitted to the Geneva Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas the then Secretary of State failed to pass on these findings and this evidence to the Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas this murder at Katyn perpetuated by Soviet Russia and constituting one of the worst acts of genocide in the recent history of mankind still remains to be formally brought to the attention of the Assembly of the United Nations: It is hereby

Resolved, That the perpetrators of this crime must be punished; that the continued evasion by free nations of their responsibility to Poland, their loyal ally during World War II must cease; that we join with every friend of liberty in a continuing effort to bring to justice those who were responsible for this massacre; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting calls upon the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, the Honorable J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Jacob K. Javits and the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senators from New York, to make every effort to bring the findings of the special congressional committee investigating the Katyn massacre to the attention of the Assembly of the United Nations, with the demand that the perpetrators of this crime be punished in order that the ideals of justice may be made to prevail.

WLADYSLAW BORZECKI,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
FELIKS POPLAWSKI,
EDWARD WITANOWSKI.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINES OVER FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly this afternoon on two subjects: First, dealing with the problems arising in connection with the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands; and second, dealing with some of the problems that are arising in connection with what I consider to be, under international law, illegal conduct on the part of certain Cuban exiles in the United States.

Turning to the first subject matter first, I was very happy to learn that last weekend the Interior and Agriculture Departments gave final approval to new regulations governing the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands. Secretaries Udall and Freeman have demonstrated that it is possible to protect the public interest in spite of the pressure of utility interests which want free access to the public domain.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] submitted for the the RECORD a column from Newsweek entitled "Whose Lands Are These?" written by Mr. Raymond Moley. It was in response to the announcement of the two secretaries on granting rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over public lands that Mr. Moley wrote his article.

Mr. Moley was talking about the public lands; and if I did not know him better I would have expected from the title to hear that the public lands belong to the people of the United States, through their Government.

This is not the way Mr. Moley sees it. He viewed the public domain as the property of the private power companies.

Referring to Mr. Moley's column, Senator SIMPSON expressed the fear that the private utilities may be forced to "importune" the Government for "the right of existence" if the new regulations go into effect, requiring the companies to wheel Government power when excess capacity is available.

Mr. Moley goes even further and says that a Government policy attaching conditions to the granting of rights-of-way across these public lands would, "in effect, be violations of primary rights of property."

That is very interesting language—"primary rights of property." Whenever I read that sort of language, I am always looking for the definition. That is what we call the use of an emotional sanction. The question may be asked, "What is meant by 'primary rights of property'?" What do they accomplish?

This is a very interesting journalistic technique. It involves the use of phrases that can be characterized as emotional sanctions that stir the thalamus rather than the cortex.

When we start dealing with "primary rights of property," we must deal with legal definitions.

As I say, Mr. Moley talks about "violation of primary rights of property."

This is curious reasoning indeed. The proposed regulations were in effect in pretty much the same form from 1948 and 1954 and during that period some 84 rights-of-way were granted to utilities which willingly, if not cheerfully, agreed in return to carry Government power where excess capacity was available. It was not until the heyday of the Eisenhower "partnership" with the private utilities that the regulations were rescinded, under circumstances which needed the careful scrutiny which they received from a congressional committee.

Senator SIMPSON says that in imposing a wheeling requirement in exchange for a right-of-way across the Federal lands the Government is somehow violating the sanctity of company property. Or, as he said, the power companies "are seeking to build a house in which the Federal Government demands the right of entry as a building prerequisite."

If a fellow came to me and asked for permission to build a road across my farm, I might give him permission to do so if it did not damage the farm unduly. If I were a hard-headed business man, I might sock him with a substantial bill for the valuable right-of-way. At the very least, I feel sure that I would ask permission for me and my family to use the road, since it crossed our property. Only if I were in an exceptionally generous mood would I agree to use this road only at times when it would not inconvenience him.

In my view, the Interior and Agriculture Departments have adopted the generous view, in proposing that only excess capacity would be used to carry Government power, capacity not needed by the utility for its own deliveries.

What could be fairer? What could be more equitable?

Let us not forget for one moment that these lands belong to the people of the United States and are held in trust for them by their government. In asking permission to construct transmission lines over them, the power companies are asking a favor of no small magnitude.

Mr. Moley remarks in his column that "for such easements and rights-of-way, they—the power companies—pay to the Federal Treasury."

Mr. Moley does not say how much they pay. That is quite understandable, because it is so little that it would damage his argument rather than strengthen it. It is a token payment, roughly covering the cost of administering the permit. To compare these payments with the cost of acquiring right-of-way from private owners of land, possibly resorting to time-consuming condemnation proceedings, indicates the magnitude of the gift which these companies receive when they are permitted to build lines across the public domain.

And let us take a look at these allegedly onerous conditions which they must accept along with the gift:

First, the Government reserves the right to use excess capacity in the lines to transmit power—at its own expense. Second, where additional capacity is needed, the Government would have the right to add it, again at Government expense. And, third, where the proposed private transmission lines would conflict with the power-marketing program of the United States, companies could be refused permission to cross public lands but not, it should be pointed out, permission to build the lines elsewhere. In other words, the companies may build duplicating lines if they will, but not on Government land.

I fail to see how the first or second conditions could damage the utility companies in any way, except in weakening their monopoly position in some areas. Their power moves first, and in a manner to be determined wholly by the company.

But let us examine this monopoly question. The top spokesman for Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in hearings on this question back in 1955, said frankly that P.G. & E. did not want to wheel Government electricity because "there is no reason why in my opinion we should permit our lines to be used to enable the Government to take away our customers."

Here we get to the heart of the matter. That spokesman was the company's executive vice president, Mr. Gerdes, and the customers he was talking about were the so-called preference customers, entitled by law to first call on power from the Central Valley project in California. With the wheeling requirement, as with Federal transmission lines, these municipalities and rural electric cooperatives could contract directly with the Government for power from the Federal projects. Without wheeling or transmission, the preference customers were obliged to buy their wholesale power from P.G. & E., at P.G. & E. prices, at the very moment the power company itself was enjoying low-cost Central Valley power. The congressional intent to pass along the benefits of this power to nonprofit groups was frustrated because a single utility controlled the transmission system.

Mr. Gerdes testified that his company reluctantly agreed to wheel Federal power, by agreement, in 1951, and subsequently the General Accounting Office found the deal most beneficial to the company, if not to Uncle Sam.

It was brought out during the same hearings, which were conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the House Government Operations Committee, that virtually every major power company in the West took part in the effort to get the transmission line regulations repealed in 1954. He named them—Montana Power Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Colorado Public Service Co., Portland General Electric Co., the California Pacific Utilities Co., Washington Water Power Co., Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Arizona Public Service Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., California Electric Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., and perhaps some others. He explained that the list comprised "the principal electric companies in the western part of the United States where the lands are in substantial part owned by the Federal Government"—hearings, "Certain Activities Regarding Power," Department of the Interior, "Changes in Power Line Regulations," page 438.

Representatives of these companies got together to prepare a list of changes which they thought Interior should make in its regulations, you will recall, and the result was a memorandum, drafted in the offices of Idaho Power Co., and left on the most appropriate desk in the Interior Department by Herman Kruse, Pacific Gas & Electric's chief Washington lobbyist.

The memorandum was adopted—as the Chudoff subcommittee described it in its report:

> The changes in the regulations * * * were adopted by the Interior Department verbatim from an anonymous document delivered personally without a covering letter or memorandum by a registered lobbyist of

> the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the then Solicitor and now Undersecretary of the Interior, Clarence A. Davis, following Mr. Davis' request to the lobbyist to secure for him the views of the western electric utility companies on the changes they would like to see in the regulations * * *. The anonymous document was prepared in the office of the Idaho Power Co., following consultations among the utility company attorneys.

Idaho Power presumably played a key role because in essence the wheeling requirement came out of a dispute between Idaho Power and the Government. It began in the late 1940's when the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration studied the possibility of bringing low-cost power into southeast Idaho to make feasible the development of Idaho's rich phosphate reserves. The two agencies came up with a proposal that the United States construct, own, and operate a transmission line across southern Idaho in order to bring low-cost power into the area. Within a few weeks after this proposal was made, Idaho Power applied to the Bureau of Land Management for a right-of-way easement over public lands to permit construction of the identical 230-kilovolt line proposed in the Bonneville-Bureau report. The Interior Department proposed that the Government would grant the right-of-way on condition that it would reserve the right to transmit Federal power over any unused capacity of the line upon payment of an equitable share of the operation and maintenance costs. This led to issuance of a general regulation embodying the terms of the proposal to Idaho Power.

The company refused to go along, withdrew its request for a right-of-way permit, and instead asked the Federal Power Commission to approve the 230-kilovolt line as a project line for the 70,000-kilowatt Bliss project. At the Interior Department's request, the Bliss license included a similar wheeling provision in the license, and the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the validity of the provision.

Meanwhile, the regulation remained in effect, and as I mentioned earlier, some 84 rights-of-way were granted, subject to the wheeling requirement.

So much for the wheeling requirement. The third condition which is imposed by the new regulations seems to be entirely noncontroversial, in my opinion. It states that where the proposed private transmission lines would conflict with the power-marketing program of the United States, companies could be refused permission to cross public lands.

This could require the companies to relocate their lines in order to build them on private property, or it could lead to a healthy reconsideration of plans in order to provide the most economical delivery for government and private customers alike. In any case, I believe that just as I could turn down a request to build a road through my front lawn the Agriculture and Interior Departments have the right to prevent unnecessary duplication of lines, which after all will mean unnecessary despoilation of the public lands.

The key here, however does not lie in the new regulations. The Departments have a broad authority to protect the public lands, conferred in several rights-of-way statutes.

A joint statement issued recently by both Departments, announcing final approval of the regulations, said it this way:

> Both Departments have general authority to grant or deny rights-of-way over Government lands in the public interest. The purpose of the new regulations is to make clear that the two Departments intend to exercise this authority in acting upon rights-of-way and to condition the granting of rights-of-way on the applicant's making surplus transmission capacity available for wheeling power for the Government. The Department of the Interior relies extensively upon wheeling arrangements with other utility systems to carry out the congressional intent of delivering Federal power to public bodies and cooperative customers at lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

In my view the Departments have not only the authority, but also the responsibility to "grant or deny rights-of-way over Government lands in the public interest," Mr. Moley to the contrary notwithstanding. I commend the Departments for making it clear that they intend to exercise this responsibility. Whose lands are these? They belong to the American people, Mr. Moley, and our Government is exercising its trust in their behalf.

Mr. President, I would have Mr. Moley well understand that. For 18 years I have served in the Senate, in part as a watchdog, seeking to protect the users of public preference power. It has been a tough fight. It is not over, for periodically the selfish interests of this country which want to put private interests above the public interest try to make a raid through various mouth organs such as, in this instance, Mr. Moley, writing for Newsweek, whose record has been a rather shabby one over the years in defense of the selfish interests of private utilities of this country. But so long as I sit at this desk, I intend, when this kind of propaganda is given to the American people, to answer it.

In my judgment, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are deserving of the sincere thanks of the American people for the new regulations which they have issued. They are really, after all, a revival of old regulations to protect the interests of the public against an attempt by the private utility combine in this country to turn the public domain, belonging to all the people, into their own private domain.

I want Mr. Moley to know that if this is the beginning of a new fight in defense of the best interests of the public power preference users of the country, I welcome it, as I have in the past, when the fight has been made on the floor of the Senate to protect the interests of the users under the public preference clause.

Mr. President, on a related matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD testimony which I gave today before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concerning the Pacific Northwest intertie power line.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE ON S. 1007, APRIL 1, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this statement in support of S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. The following factors are of great importance and I trust they will receive serious consideration by the committee:

1. The Pacific Northwest's economic growth—past, present, and potential—is inseparably linked with the development of Federal hydroelectric power. In his statement to this committee last year, Bonneville Power Administrator Luce most adequately delineated the importance of Federal power in our region. He stated:

"For years industries in the Pacific Northwest have been important customers of the Federal system. Their purchases have varied from more than 60 percent of the energy sold by Bonneville Power Administration in 1945 to an average of approximately 36 percent during the past 4 years. Their original plant investment is more than $350 million. Their plant replacement cost would be double that figure. They employ 15,000 Pacific Northwest citizens directly and another 30,000 indirectly. The utility of those plants and the thousands of jobs which they have made possible are directly dependent upon the maintenance of a low-cost power supply. If Pacific Northwest Federal power—and that area has no low-cost alternative—is diverted to other regions, many of these industries would have to stop production. The Nation would not gain by shutting down these plants in order to export the power from the Pacific Northwest, and the impact on that region would be catastrophic."

2. Prime income-producing activities in the Pacific Northwest are lumber, agriculture, and tourism. All three are subject to the whims of weather. All three exhibit severe seasonal fluctuations and are highly sensitive to business cycles. Lumber and agriculture are presently confronted by serious problems and are subject to drastic fluctuations due to demand in elasticity and international marketing problems. Electroprocess industries provide stable payrolls. Low-cost power compensates for our long distances from major markets and supplies industrial incentive for creation of new jobs.

3. Water is the source of our electricity. We have no proven reserves of gas or oil, and known coal resources are limited. Approximately 96 percent of our firm energy capability is hydro and about 62 percent of this hydro is owned and operated by the Federal Government. No other area in the country is so dependent on hydropower and, only the Tennessee Valley exceeds this region in percentage of federally owned generation.

4. The people of the Pacific Northwest are paying off the Federal Government's power investment there—with interest. To date they have returned to the Treasury over three-fourths of a billion dollars.

5. An electrical interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and California was outlined as early as 1935 by the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, which included a representative of the State of Oregon. With the knowledge that such transmission link is technically and economically feasible, the Department of the Interior has this year requested $24 million

to begin construction of this extra-high-voltage line.

6. A common-carrier, high-capacity interconnection linking the electrical systems of the two regions will provide enormous benefits to both areas. With public and private electric systems participating and with optimum facilities, it is currently estimated benefits would exceed costs by a ratio of more than three to one. The economic benefits which would accrue to BPA would restore Bonneville's surplus repayment picture, open a market for nonfirm, dump power, and provide a means by which the Pacific Northwest could obtain additional firm power when needed in the future.

7. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has long recognized the need for proper protection of the interests of power consumers in any energy or capacity interchange involving Federal power. In a resolution of June 21, 1960, the committee requested that no contract be made for transfer of BPA power to California pending completion of further studies and consideration of legislation to preserve the position of BPA customers in the Northwest. I joined with other Northwest Senators in asking the then Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to act in accordance with that resolution.

8. Interconnection of the Northwest and Southwest by major transmission facilities will soon be a reality. Already the Bonneville Power Administration has received six offers to build all or part of the extra-high-voltage line. A Federal request for an appropriation of $24 million to begin construction of a Federal intertie is now before Congress. New technology has made it possible to use such lines to transmit power from northern Washington to southern California.

A solution to the problem pointed up by hearings held by your committee in 1959 and 1960 should insure two things: It must (a) protect against raiding the resources of one region to make rich another and (b) provide for an orderly and equitable share of benefits between regions. I believe that maximum mutual advantage can be achieved without Balkanization and without doing violence to traditional power marketing policies.

Integrated operation can produce benefits for individual electric systems which are impossible with isolated operation. Power pooling in the Northwest provides a practical demonstration of this fact. Coordination has produced benefits impossible of achievement by power producers operating singly, and this has been accomplished without infringement upon the basic rights and responsibilities of particular utilities. Technology has increased the opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation. Organization and operational patterns must keep pace.

In 1962, similar legislation was considered by this committee, and passed by the Senate. At that time, Mr. Luce informed the committee, of the exhaustive review which preceded the submission of this proposal by the Department of the Interior. The bill has wide support, including the general backing of private and public utilities throughout the Northwest, and has received bipartisan support in Congress. The committee in its study of this legislation gave full consideration to the comments of residents of the Northwest last year when S. 3153 was acted upon favorably. I know that the committee will reiterate its positive position of last year, and act favorably on S. 1007 in recognition of the vital stake of the people of the Northwest in the ultimate decision of Congress on this matter.

The good of the Northwest, Southwest, and in fact the whole Nation will be served by establishing ground rules which will permit cooperation and coordination in use of our surplus electrical energy resources for the maximum benefit of all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Florida if he wishes to have me yield to him, without my losing the floor, so that he may make an announcement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement relative to the ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment by two additional States. I realize the distinguished Senator from Oregon has finished one of his subjects. Before he proceeds to another, I wonder if he would yield to me for the time necessary to make the announcement and to respond to the comments which Senators may wish to make.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as is my custom, I am delighted to yield to a colleague in a situation such as this. Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY KANSAS AND MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which would eliminate the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress.

These two States, I am delighted to note, are Kansas and Massachusetts. This brings the number of States whose legislatures have ratified this most important amendment to the Constitution to 29. As Members of the Senate are aware—for a constitutional amendment to become valid—article V of the Constitution requires ratification by three-fourths of the States of the Union or 38.

Mr. President, the Kansas Senate, on March 21, ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment by a vote of 24 to 8, the the Kansas House having previously ratified the amendment on March 14 by a vote of 111 to 0.

I wish to express my profound appreciation to my distinguished colleagues from Kansas, Senator CARLSON, who cosponsored and supported my resolution to passage in the Senate and has worked diligently in seeking its ratification by his State's legislature, and Senator PEARSON, who supported my resolution in the Senate and has likewise directed his efforts toward ratification by the legislature of his State.

I should like to add that his predecessor, Senator Schoeppel, was among the 67 cosponsors of my resolution, but passed away prior to its passage by the Congress and its submission to the States. His distinguished successor, Senator PEARSON, has continued to give leadership in this important field.

In the case of Massachusetts, the assembly of that State's legislature approved the anti-poll-tax amendment on last Thursday, March 28, by a vote of 223 to 0, completing ratification by Massachusetts, the Senate having previously approved the measure on March 27 by a vote of 36 to 0.

I am, indeed, indebted to both the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY] for their leadership in this matter. Senator SALTONSTALL cosponsored, and supported my resolution in the Senate, and lent his assistance toward ratification of the amendment by the Massachusetts Legislature, and Senator KENNEDY has been most helpful since he became a Member of this body in securing the gratifying action which I am announcing today. I wish to thank Senator KENNEDY very much for having gone to the trouble personally to send word to me from Massachusetts on Friday about the action taken unanimously by the legislature of his great Commonwealth.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very kind and gracious remarks. I am delighted, as well, that Massachusetts gave the very fine bipartisan support to the amendment, such as we have seen exhibited by so many other States.

I wish to join with the score of voices from this body in commending the outstanding work which has been done by the distinguished Senator from Florida. It has been an honor for me to be able to work with him on this important amendment, and to render what small assistance we have been able to provide.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. In my humble judgment, if he continues in the path of service which he is following—having been so helpful, constructive, nonpartisan, and, I think, truly patriotic in this matter—he will achieve a great record as a Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the good news of today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the very fine letter written by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to the editor of the Washington Post, the letter having been published in last Thursday's edition of that newspaper, on March 28. I particularly appreciate the statement in his letter to the Washington Post that the demise of the poll tax in Tennessee has resulted in a "healthy increase in the percentage of voter participation" in his State. I found the same thing to be true in Florida, after Florida eliminated the State poll tax requirement in 1937. I again congratulate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee upon his leadership in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDING COUP DE GRACE

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I read with interest your editorial of March 22 applauding the fact that 24 States have now approved the proposed 24th or anti-poll-tax amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

I expect that many readers were intrigued by the map which you printed, showing the State of Tennessee, which was the first Southern State to approve the amendment, surrounded by other States that have not yet done so. This is no legislative accident, but is in keeping with the progressive traditions of Tennessee, and with a historic stubborn anti-poll-tax sentiment among Tennesseans.

The Tennessee Legislature first voted to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in 1943. This was frustrated by a decision of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, which held the act unconstitutional. In 1953, this court decision was overruled by an amendment to the State constitution which finally eliminated the poll tax requirement.

Since the demise of the poll tax restriction in Tennessee, there has been a healthy increase in the percentage of voter participation, and I am proud that our legislature has approved the amendment to eliminate this voting restriction from the Nation as a whole.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish again to congratulate the Senator from Florida for his leadership on behalf of the ratification of the 24th amendment. As he has stated, there is no organized group or paid lobby behind this effort. The great success of the proposed amendment has been due to the interest of all Members of the Senate and the interest which we have been able to generate in our own States through the Governors and members of the legislatures.

I am very happy that Tennessee was the 25th State to ratify the amendment. At that time I said that a large part of the credit was due the Governor, Hon. Frank Clement, and two members of the general assembly, who took the lead in behalf of ratification, Senator Robert C. Taylor, of Nashville; and Representative Ray R. Baird, of Rockwood.

I am proud of the fact that Tennessee was the 25th State—and the only State in that section of the country—to ratify the amendment. I am also proud that this action was taken by overwhelming majorities in both the senate and the house of representatives.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I thank my distinguished friend, who, himself, has been so greatly responsible for the action taken by his State.

Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., a fine article written by John Chadwick, of the Associated Press. It is a well written, factual summation of the situation in regard to this amendment; and the article states, in a more comprehensive manner than anything else I have seen, the situation at this time. With 29 States having ratified the amendment and with ratification by 9 more required to complete action on this important proposal—and it will be difficult to get them all, this year—the picture is fully painted by Mr. Chadwick in his article. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Anti-Poll-Tax Amendment Needs Ratification by Nine More States," be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT NEEDS RATIFICATION BY NINE MORE STATES

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Will an anti-poll-tax amendment be written into the Constitution before next year's elections?

The proposed amendment, approved by Congress last summer, must be ratified by the legislatures of 38 of the 50 States to become effective.

As of today, it has been ratified by 29 States. This leaves 9 to go, with 15 other State legislatures now in session or to be in session before the end of the year.

SIX STATES OPPOSED

What's the outlook in these 15 States? In six of them, ratification is unlikely. Backers of the amendment are not counting on approval by Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Texas.

This means the other nine States all must ratify if the amendment is to become effective this year.

In three of these States, Arizona, Iowa, and Missouri, one branch of the legislature has approved the amendment but not the other. In Delaware, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma neither house has acted yet. The Florida Legislature doesn't meet until next week.

HOLLAND OPTIMISTIC

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, chief sponsor of the amendment, said today he regards as excellent the prospects for ratification by the Florida Legislature.

The amendment would outlaw payment of a poll tax, or any other tax, as a requirement for voting in presidential or congressional elections.

Only five States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—now make poll tax payments a requirement for voting.

HOLLAND first introduced an anti-poll-tax amendment in 1949 and has been plugging for it ever since.

The Senate approved the amendment by a 77 to 16 vote last March 27 and the House by a 294 to 86 vote August 27.

HOLLAND says that abolishing the poll tax will make an important contribution to better government by bringing about greater participation of qualified voters.

DEPLORES PRICE IN VOTE

"I have strongly felt for many years that the voter who is otherwise qualified should not have a price set upon his right to participate in the selection of his national leaders," he says.

"Nor do I believe that the qualified citizen's right to vote in a national election should be abridged or denied because of his failure through poverty or oversight to pay a poll tax or any other tax."

His fight against the poll tax goes back to his days as a State legislator. He played a key role in Florida's elimination of its poll tax in 1937 when he was a member of the State senate.

But HOLLAND, like other Southerners in Congress, battled bills introduced year after year by civil rights advocates to wipe out the poll tax by statute.

Illinois was the first State to ratify HOLLAND's amendment, completing action last November 14. Since then it has been ratified by the Legislatures of New Jersey, Oregon, Montana, West Virginia, New York, Maryland, California, Indiana, Rhode Island, Michigan, Alaska, Ohio, Idaho, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, North Dakota, Colorado, Vermont, Washington, Nevada, Tennessee, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Kansas.

The Mississippi Legislature is the only one that has voted to reject the amendment, but the Legislatures of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arkansas adjourned this year without acting on it.

HOLLAND told the Senate the other day that the legislatures of 9 States had ratified the amendment unanimously and that in 12 other States either the house or the senate ratified without a dissenting vote.

The closest vote was in the Montana house, where ratification was voted 56 to 37. But the Montana Senate voted for ratification 51 to 4.

HOLLAND has credited Senate colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, with yeoman service in bringing the amendment to the attention of State officials and urging its ratification.

But he told the Senate that "there is no lobby behind the effort. Not a nickel's worth of money from any source in pushing it."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his courtesy, which I have learned to expect from him during all these years of friendly association. He is always courteous to his colleagues, and particularly to his seatmate, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that from day to day I await with great anticipation the reports by the Senator from Florida on the progress which his anti-poll-tax amendment is making throughout the country.

As I have said before, and I repeat today, one of the greatest contributions to the civil rights issue, and one which is completely helpful in connection with a most important part of it, is made by the Senator's anti-poll-tax amendment. Certainly their right to vote is a civil right which is completely basic to freedom for Americans. In that connection, the anti-poll-tax amendment is most important.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that although, as usual, he speaks with considerable understatement when he discusses the prospects for incorporation of his anti-poll-tax amendment in the U.S. Constitution, I venture to predict—dangerous though prediction is—that his amendment will be ratified by a sufficient number of States and will become part of the Constitution of our country at a very early date.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon always overwhelms me.

As he knows, I am very greatly interested in the right to vote, and have been for many years. In that connection, I found that even in my own State, literally thousands of citizens were prevented from voting, either by penury or by other circumstances, when we had a poll tax. Certainly it is most important that every citizen, whatever his circumstances, have an opportunity to vote for electors for President and Vice President and for Senators and Representatives in Congress; and certainly his right to vote will be protected if this amendment is ratified by a sufficient number of States and becomes part of the U.S. Constitution.

So, all of us are very much interested in having it ratified. No one has helped more in that connection than the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is quite correct when he says that all of us are very much interested in having the amendment ratified. Whenever exercise of the right to vote is made difficult of attainment by any citizen, of whatever color, full citizenship rights are denied him. So I believe it most important that every American citizen be given ample opportunity to exercise the precious right to cast a free ballot.

ACTIVITY OF CUBAN REFUGEES AND THEIR RECENT FORAYS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, events of recent days have brought to the fore a matter which has largely been ignored in this country, although it can cause painful consequences if it is ignored any longer. That is the activity of the Cuban refugees and their recent forays against Cuba.

Not much has been said about the fact that since the Castro government took power, some 250,000 Cubans have come to the United States, nearly all of them simply as guests of the United States. They are not here under immigration quotas, but are outside them. They are here in a form of asylum, despite the fact that it has never been a normal practice for the United States to receive political refugees, except as immigrants who have come to live here as permanent residents.

As noted in Hackworth's Digest of International Law—volume II, page 622:

> The Government of the United States has strongly disapproved of the principle of asylum as such and has declined to recognize or subscribe to it as a part of international law.

Yet about 95 percent of the registered Cuban refugees over the past 2 years have entered this country under a visa waiver, and are on parole here.

The provision of law which authorizes such a proceeding is section 212(d)(5), which reads:

> The Attorney General may in his discretion parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergency reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any alien applying for admission to the United States, but such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States.

There appears in the same statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the following provision, just a few paragraphs after the provision I have already cited:

> Whenever the President finds that the entry of any aliens or of any class of aliens into the United States would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, he may by proclamation, and for such period as he shall deem necessary, suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens as immigrants or nonimmigrants, or impose on the entry of aliens any restrictions he may deem to be appropriate.

We know that the use of the mass parole provided by the 1952 act, although contrary to American practice, and quite unique in our history, was completely justified on humanitarian grounds alone.

We have done more than merely admit these people. Over three-quarters of them have sought and have received cash assistance. Thus far, the Federal Government has spent more than $50 million in direct financial aid. The cost of medical care, educational benefits, and other items is not counted in that total. The current rate of grant assistance is running at about $2½ million each month.

Because of the difficulties experienced in handling this sudden influx into the Miami area, over 50,000 refugees have resettled in other parts of the United States. Many of them have obtained jobs, with the help of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I do not question for a moment the good faith of all the Cuban refugees. They have been grateful for our assistance, and in many cases, have repaid our financial help as soon as they were able to do so.

But it is also true that all of them are here on a temporary basis, under special regulation. Save for an early wholesale return to Cuba, their status in time will have to be regulated by special legislation by the U.S. Congress.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CUBAN REFUGEES

While they are here, however, it is not amiss to remind them that they are expected to observe all the laws, and to respect the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

Nor is it for Cuban refugees to determine U.S. foreign policy. It is not for Cuban refugees to attempt to determine American foreign policy. It is for Cuban refugees never to forget for one moment that they are here as our guests. We are providing them with a sanctuary. We are providing them with protection. They are not in the United States with any rights, legally or morally, to use the territory of the United States for activities aimed at implicating American foreign policy in situations that might very well lead to war.

I wish to stress that point by way of digression, because I know that what I am now saying will not be music to some ears. The responsibility for American foreign policy rests with the American Government and not with Cuban refugees.

One of the most important, and most critical of these foreign policy objectives is the removal of the forces of the Soviet Union from the island of Cuba. The type of raid on Cuba which has been carried on recently is certainly more of a display, built up by publicity and advertising, than a genuine assault on the Russo-Cuban armed forces in Cuba; it does nothing to hurt or diminish those forces. But it certainly gives the Russians a justification for remaining to protect Cuba.

Similarly, the raids give Castro justification for increasing his indigenous armed forces, and for taking sterner measures against the Cuban people.

Yet in neither case do the raids inflict any real damage or harm upon either the Castro forces or the Russians.

There is the even more important consideration that the repercussions of raids planned and staged by the Cuban refugees will bring patrol actions that will draw American forces into the picture. The shooting at U.S. ships on the high seas is one ramification of this possibility. Increasing measures taken by the Russo-Cubans against the raids will, sooner or later, be directed against Americans, either civilian or military, who may have every right to be where they are, but who will nonetheless feel the brunt of these defense measures by Cuba.

The repercussions of these raids, in other words, will undoubtedly have to be borne by the United States and not by the Cuban exiles at all. It is here where the real danger of them lies. In the end, the confrontation between ourselves and the Soviet Union could build into proportions that would once again threaten us and the world with war.

I do not rule out the possibility that such a confrontation could again occur. But if we are forced into such a situation, it should be on behalf of ourselves and not because we were forced into it by a hotheaded group of guests in our own house.

It is not outside the realm of possibility that such a climax is exactly what the exiles' raids are designed to bring about. One cannot help but wonder what the real objective of the raids may be, when it is so evident that they are completely inconsequential in their military effects.

A final reason why the raids are harmful to American foreign policy interests is the bad precedent they set for other exiles in the hemisphere. So long as these raids have any connotation of American support, approval, or even permission, they encourage exiles from other Caribbean countries to begin the same type of operation in order to return to power.

We know that conditions in Haiti parallel those in Cuba; there are Haitian exiles in the United States, too, who may be encouraged to undertake raids against Haiti. And who is to say but what the change of government in Guatemala may create a faction of exiles seeking to overthrow its new military regime.

The Caribbean is too unstable to permit the United States to become the home base of dissident elements from any of its member countries. If we ever do become such a base, we will become hopelessly entangled in the web of Caribbean politics.

STATUTES LIMITING INTERFERENCE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We have many statutes on the books which restrict Americans and noncitizens alike from engaging in expeditions against other countries. One of these is the Neutrality Act which reads in part:

> Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or domination of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Some of the Cuban exile raiders claim they have violated no law because they jumped off from islands not belonging to the United States.

But we know they left from the United States as individuals and returned to the United States when the raids were over. I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States on March 20 about one of these raids and the application to it of this section of the law, section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code.

I shall read the letter into the record.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I am much impressed with the cogency and logic of the Senator's argument. I have seldom found myself in disagreement with his public policies. But I wonder if he does not have a little sympathy for or understanding of people who have a burning conviction, people who are frustrated here, and are waiting on a policy of liberation which does not seem to eventuate. They would like to do something to bring it about even at the sacrifice of their own lives. History is full of the exploits of brave people who have been ready to die in fighting tyranny—tyranny of the kind that exists in Cuba. What shall we do about those people who are willing to risk their lives to strike a blow for freedom—the kind of freedom which we would like to see restored in Cuba? Is there not something to be said on that side?

Mr. MORSE. Not a thing. Not a single thing can be said on the side of people who desire to use a sanctuary in the United States to endanger 180 million Americans by following a course of action as exiles which they cannot reconcile with international law, and which may very well determine whether or not we engage in war or remain at peace. I favor a settlement of the Cuban issue, but not by a group of self-appointed diplomats to whom we have given sanctuary in the United States, and who obviously are seeking to follow a course of action that could very well embroil the United States in war.

I shall tell the Senate what I would have done down at the Roger Smith Hotel the other day when two of the exiles held a press conference at which they boasted to the world of the raid they had just carried out in Caribbean waters. I would have had them met with U.S. marshals.

Mr. GRUENING. I am not concerned about what a group of diplomats meeting in a hotel far from the firing line might do, but I think there is something to be said for young men who are so determined, who have seen such atrocities as those committed by the Castro regime in Cuba, who are willing to risk their own lives to go down there and strike a blow for freedom. I doubt whether such individual actions would imperil the safety of 180 million Americans.

Mr. MORSE. Of course it is going to imperil the safety of 180 million Americans. Suppose they sink a Russian ship. Suppose they sink a U.S. ship. I have not forgotten my history, about the sinking of the Maine. Does the Senator think that would not increase the possibilities and dangers of war?

I wish to say that American foreign policy must be run by America and not by Cuban exiles to any degree whatsoever.

If they were so anxious to die for freedom they could have stayed in Cuba.

Mr. GRUENING. They would either be shot or imprisoned in Cuba, and they would not be very effective, if either dead or imprisoned.

Mr. MORSE. There are many patriotic Cubans who are still in Cuba, in the Oriente Mountains, fighting for freedom in Cuba.

I do not object to the giving of sanctuary to those who want to leave Cuba, but I am objecting to Cuban exiles using the United States as a base, to the embarrassment of American foreign policy.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator's objection that they returned to the United States after striking a blow for freedom? In other words, if they were to stay in Cuba and fight for the underground, would that meet the Senator's test?

Mr. MORSE. If they stayed in Cuba they would not be involving the United States, through their activities, in difficulties with Cuba.

We will handle Castro. But so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the Cuban exiles in the United States should be told by the U.S. Department of Justice, as I shall point out in a moment in my manuscript, that we are going to enforce the law governing their sanctuary in the United States. If they do not like that, they can leave the United States. They have no right to stay in the United States and proceed to follow a course of action which jeopardizes American foreign policy.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator's objection seems to be that they leave the United States and then come back to the United States. Suppose they should leave the United States and go to Cuba and fight in the underground. Would that still be objectionable to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I think it would have been preferable if they had stayed there in the first place.

Mr. GRUENING. At the time, perhaps they did not realize we would not be able to be successful in the effort at the Bay of Pigs.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator means they did not realize we would not go to war.

Mr. GRUENING. No; that we would not give the support necessary to enable them to win.

Mr. MORSE. I do not take the position that we must have a bloody victory over Castro to defeat him. We will have a bloody victory over Castro if he forces us into a war, but I do not propose to let the Cuban refugees force us into a war with Castro.

We must reach that decision on the basis of our own independent judgment, as the people in charge of the Government of the United States, and not by way of collusive activities in which the Cuban refugees are engaging. There is no question, when we read their statements to the press, that what they want is a war between the United States and Cuba. That is what they are after.

It is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon that we must meet the Communist threat. We must continue our efforts. We must contain the Communist threat. We must continue, as the President did last October, to make it clear to Castro and to Khrushchev, "If you cross the line of defense into the area of aggression, then we will proceed immediately to protect our security."

But I do not propose to sit in the Senate in silence while a group of Cuban exiles in this country engages in various activities designed to embarrass American foreign policy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I agree with the premise of the Senator from Oregon that no group has the right to decide extra-legally what shall be the foreign policy of the United States, and this must be true with respect to Cuba. It follows that Cuban exiles have no authority to take action—sympathetic as we are toward their plight and their cause—to decide what our policy and course of action shall be respecting Cuba.

I must say that what troubles me is that the action of the Cuban exiles is a part of a series of provocations and events that are a source of continuing danger. There are provocations which come from the other side, from Castro. Only recently American ships have been fired on by MIG planes, and we can anticipate that there will be additional provocations—firings upon American ships, and the mounting of subversions and even aggressions by Castroites against the countries of Latin America.

Though I do not speak directly to the Senator's point, I affirm the statement which I made in the Senate on February 11. I believe the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba provides to Castro the authority and backing, which will result in reckless provocations and continuing subversion against Latin American countries.

I hold that the United States ought to have a clear policy—which I do not think it has now—and it should be that we will not accept the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba, or any place else in this hemisphere. It is their presence which gives authority to Castro, which will lead him to reckless actions, and increases the danger of war.

I am sure that the President is trying to secure the removal of Soviet troops, as Khrushchev promised, but we may reach the point where there will be a deadlock and the Soviets will not withdraw. Then I believe we would have to take sterner measures.

What I have said is not quite upon the Senator's point. I agree with the Senator's point that Cuban exiles cannot be allowed to make policy for the United States. But I would see greater hope for a Cuban solution if we insist that the United States will not accept the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba and this hemisphere.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, if I correctly understand him, that we are in agreement that American foreign policy vis-a-vis Cuba should be carried out by the United States, so far as our part in it is concerned, and that the Cuban exiles should not be allowed to assume any power of intervention in the determination of that foreign policy.

Secondly, I wish to say that no one could be more concerned about the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba than the senior Senator from Oregon. My Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs—in fact, the whole Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—is greatly concerned about it.

I wish to say that the President of the United States, in my judgment, is doing a magnificent job of leadership and international statesmanship in his international negotiations with the Russians concerning that matter.

However, there is one ugly fact to be faced. In mentioning it, I do not want to be interpreted as implying that we should in any way retreat from our position in connection with Russian troops in Cuba. But there is one ugly fact which we must face, and that is that under international law a Communist nation has the same sovereign rights as a free nation; and a Communist nation has the same sovereign right to negotiate its treaties, agreements, understandings, and alliances.

I have not yet exhausted the analysis of the international law concept concerning Russian troops in Cuba and their right to be there, so far as the relationship between Castro and Khrushchev is concerned; but I am satisfied that we should exhaust every possible resource of diplomacy in trying to arrive at an arrangement for their removal. The Cuban exile raids are not going to help such diplomatic negotiations. As I said earlier in my speech, we must watch both Castro and Khrushchev for excuses and alibis. They will seize upon every rationalization they can for delaying or suspending negotiations looking toward an agreement.

This afternoon I am only making the plea that the Cuban exiles understand clearly from the U.S. Government that they must conform to their obligations under sanctuary, and that they cannot be allowed to continue to pursue a course of action that could be interpreted by anyone as creating a critical situation which might very well lead to armed conflict.

I think the Senator from Kentucky is perfectly correct in stating that there will be many incidents. The shooting at an American ship the other day followed the Alpha 66 raid. The fact that we were not responsible for the Alpha 66 raid is not going to stop Castro and Khrushchev from saying that we were. That kind of propaganda, which the Russians are able to disseminate about the world, puts us in a very embarrassing situation.

The other night a group of us were discussing the subject, and the question was asked, "What would happen in a discussion of this situation in the United Nations, where the contention is made by the Red bloc, and by other countries which are not Communist countries, that we have the responsibility for doing a better job than is being done, to hold the Cuban exiles in check while we give them protection or sanctuary in this country?"

My plea today is that we make clear, not only to the Cuban refugees, but to the world, that we are going to conduct our own foreign policy, and that we will not tolerate any meddling with it or intervention in it by a group of patriotic Cuban exiles who would like very much to have armed intervention in Cuba on the part of the United States.

I had referred to a letter which I wrote to the Attorney General under date of March 20. It outlines in part the position of the senior Senator from Oregon. I stated in that letter:

> DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have called my office staff from Costa Rica, asking them to obtain for me certain information concerning the recent attack on Cuba by a refugee group, and asking that a letter be sent to you over my signature, posing some specific questions about it.
>
> As you know, the Department of Justice is responsible for the enforcement of section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code, which provides: "Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or domination of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."
>
> I would like to know whether the Department has ascertained the facts of the raid on Cuba claimed to have been carried out by the groups called Alpha 66 and the Second National Front of Escambray, widely reported in the press on March 19 and 20.
>
> 1. From where was this expedition begun?
> 2. Who financed it?
> 3. From what country were its weapons obtained?
> 4. Why were its participants admitted to the United States after the raid?
> 5. If the leaders Vazquez and Veciana reside in Miami, as reported in the press, does Section 960 apply to them, irrespective of the takeoff point of the raid itself?
> 6. On what kind of visa are these men admitted to the United States?
>
> I would also like to know what general steps the Immigration and Naturalization Service takes to enforce the statutes against this type of activity when it is carried on by Cuban refugees.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WAYNE MORSE.

I have not yet received a reply; but I am pleased and gratified to read of the steps taken over the weekend to curb the adventurers among the exiles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech the following articles and editorials:

First, an article entitled "Raid on Soviet Camp in Cuba Disturbs United States," written by Murrey Marder and published in the Washington Post under date of March 20. This article deals with the conference held by the Cuban refugees at the Roger Smith Hotel after they came back and announced to the country their course of action.

As I stated in Costa Rica, in a confidential conference with American officials, I thought they ought to be met by U.S. marshals, because in my judgment they stood in violation of their right to sanctuary; and I think we should put a stop to that kind of misuse of the right of sanctuary.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Dangerous Game," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1963; an article entitled "Controlling the Cuban Exiles," written by William S. White and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1963; an editorial entitled "Caught in the Vise," published in the Washington Post of March 30, 1963; an article enitled "Cuban Exiles Angered by U.S. Restrictions," written by Theodore Ediger, and published in the Washington Post of April 1, 1963; an editorial entitled "The Coup in Guatemala," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1963; and an article entitled "United States Curbs Miami Exiles To Prevent Raids on Cuba," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles and editorials may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with that material in the RECORD, I congratulate the Attorney General for the course of action he has taken over the weekend and the steps he has enunciated, aimed at bringing the Cuban exiles within the framework of their sanctuary rights, and notifying them of the intention of this Government to confine them to the framework of their sanctuary rights.

In addition to the condition put upon the parole of many of these persons under the authority residing in the Attorney General which I cited at the beginning of these remarks, several other statutes have application and it would seem they are being invoked.

One relates to the illegal exportation of war materials, and is found in section 401 of title 22.

It states:

> Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles.

It is my hope that the Customs Bureau will stringently enforce this section.

There has also been brought to my attention section 215 of the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, which provides for control of travel outside the country by aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency. Under this section, it would be illegal to enter or leave the United States without a valid passport, unless under exceptions or exemptions set forth by the President. The penalty for violation of this section is a $5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both.

The national emergency proclaimed in 1950 during the Korean conflict remains in effect and brings section 215 into full force.

Still another international obligation we are bound to observe is the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, signed at Havana in 1928 by the Inter-American Conference.

Article I reads:

> The contracting states bind themselves to observe the following rules with regard to civil strife in another one of them:
>
> 1. To use all means at their disposal to prevent the inhabitants of their territory, nationals or aliens, from participating in, gathering elements, crossing the boundary or sailing from their territory for the purpose of starting or promoting civil strife.
>
> 2. To disarm and intern every rebel force crossing their boundaries, the expenses of internment to be borne by the state where public order may have been disturbed. The arms found in the hands of the rebels may be seized, and withdrawn by the government of the country granting asylum, to be returned, once the struggle has ended, to the state in civil strife.
>
> 3. To forbid the traffic in arms and war materiel, except when intended for the government, while the belligerency of the rebels has not been recognized, in which latter case the rules of neutrality shall be applied.
>
> 4. To prevent that within their jurisdiction there be equipped, armed, or adapted for warlike purposes any vessel intended to operate in favor of the rebellion. (46 Stat. 2749; entered into force for the United States May 21, 1930.)

Also involved in this matter is article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, to which we are signatories, which states:

> No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other states. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements. (TIAS 2361; entered into force for the United States, Dec. 13, 1951.)

I would hope that the exile community itself would understand the importance to the United States of living up to these treaty obligations, and of maintaining in the hands of our President and his administration complete control of American policy regarding Cuba. We simply cannot allow a faction of the exile group to take that control out of our hands.

What I have said with respect to the raids also applies to the statements made by some Cuban refugees about the Bay of Pigs affair, and about current conditions in Cuba. I have become increasingly of the opinion that many of these individuals have found that any statement made by a Cuban on these subjects will be snapped up by the American press, whether it is said in ignorance or in full knowledge of the truth.

What the Cubans know as facts about conditions in Cuba should be reported to the proper U.S. authorities.

On the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago I indicated that one of these exile groups had gotten in touch with me and had offered to supply me with what were described as very important photographs, photographs which would show that certain things were going on in Cuba which could not be reconciled with announced policies of the Government of the United States.

I said, "Take them to the CIA and the Department of State. Do not be bringing them to a politician in the U.S. Senate. It is our job, under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, to give our Government advice and consent in regard to foreign affairs in regard to the official policies of our Government."

It would be unfortunate, Mr. President, if we established a pattern whereby exiles in this country could think that they could submit to us information which they claimed was sound information and use that in an attempt to embarrass the official foreign policy of the United States.

I do not like to say it, but it is true—and I say it because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I know that we have been briefed sufficiently to know it to be true—that a considerable amount of the information which is offered by Cuban refugees is not reliable, is not true. Much of it is propaganda. Much of it is designed to bring about their desires.

The Cuban refugees owe it to the State Department and to the White House to submit any material they have through the channels which have jurisdiction and primary responsibility over American foreign policy and over our relationships with Cuba.

What they are only guessing at, or what they would like Americans to think is going on in Cuba, is better kept to themselves.

I realize that many American newspapers are as culpable in this respect as are the refugees from whence come many of these stories, which might better be labeled rumors.

In short, I want to remind the American public, the Cubans in this country, and the administration, that aside from the dictates of what constitutes appropriate behavior on the part of refugees enjoying asylum in the United States, the Federal Government is amply clothed with power to forestall actions by the exiles which conflict with American policy. I am very pleased that the agencies of the Federal Government are beginning to make use of the statutes giving them this authority. I surely hope they will continue to see to it that the Cuban exiles conduct themselves in conformity with U.S. law and U.S. foreign policy objectives.

One closing word about the United States-Cuba situation. I was one of the congressional delegates from the Senate, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], to the Punta del Este Conference in January of 1962. Many people are still not fully aware of the commitments the United States undertook in the pact of Punta del Este. We have kept faith with those commitments.

When we were at Costa Rica a few weeks ago, it was interesting to take note of the attitude of some of the Central American Presidents, after they had been briefed by the President of the United States on the commitments we are already carrying out in connection with the Punta del Este pact. Reading some of the quoted statements attributed to some of our friends in Central America, it seems that apparently they have been unaware of the fact that we have been maintaining a vigilant surveillance by water and by air in protection of the Western Hemisphere from any attempted threat on the part of the Castro regime to export from Cuba Russian arms sent through Cuba or attempted to be sent through Cuba into the Western Hemisphere. They apparently were unaware of the 24-hour vigilance and surveillance in international waters by various segments of the American naval forces. All are on the alert to protect the Western Hemisphere, including the United States, from any threat to the security of the free nations of this hemisphere.

Apparently they had not been fully informed of the air surveillance that we have been maintaining in defense of the security of the Western Hemisphere, including that of the United States. The Kennedy administration is thoroughly familiar with and greatly concerned about the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere via Cuba and Russia.

Mr. President, it is important that we stay within the framework of international law, so that we can maintain our allies and can prove to the world, as we proved it to the world last October, that we move only when our opponent violates our right of security.

I say again, as I have said so many times before, that the American people have every reason to have complete confidence in the handling of the Cuban crisis by the President of the United States. The President is deserving of the wholehearted support of patriotic Americans in his insistence that we follow a course of action such as has been announced over the weekend in connection with conducting American foreign policy by ourselves and for ourselves. We should not permit a group of exiles who have been given sanctuary in this country to engage in provocative acts which could very well lead to a serious crisis in the Caribbean, a crisis which might endanger the peace of the world.

Oh, I know it has been said that this position is some form of appeasement of Castro. Nonsense. Let us take a look at what is happening inside Cuba. We must present to the American people the facts concerning the policy of containment which we have been following with respect to Cuba. According to the best information our intelligence provides, the economic productive capacity of Cuba is down some 66 percent. Cuba is in a bad way internally. In my judgment, we ought to continue to follow the course of no economic intercourse with Cuba, and call upon our friendly allies among the free nations to understand that they have some moral duty in the cause of freedom to see to it that they do not strengthen the economic sinews of Cuba.

I believe that if we maintain the kind of vigilance that the President is maintaining, it will not be too far in the future when the people of Cuba recognize that there is no hope under communism and under the false leadership that Castro is giving them.

Of one thing the senior Senator from Oregon is certain: We cannot justify, from the standpoint of the foreign policy interest of the American people, permitting a group of exiles in this country to superimpose themselves as intervenors in the direction of American foreign policy.

I close by congratulating the Attorney General for the course of action he has taken over the weekend in calling to the attention of the exiles and the American people our position with respect to our determination to carry out our international law obligations.

Exhibit 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

Casualties Put at Dozen: Raid on Soviet Camp in Cuba Disturbs United States

(By Murrey Marder)

Cuban exile leaders claimed here yesterday that anti-Castro commando units inflicted more than a dozen Russian casualties in a dawn attack Monday on a Soviet military camp and a Soviet ship at a Cuban port.

The raid, which could turn into a major international incident, was openly discussed at a news conference at the Roger Smith Hotel. The raid was carried out in the name of two Cuban exile revolutionary groups that have announced similar hit-and-run attacks in the past—Alpha 66 and the Second National Front of Escambray.

Just before the news conference, the United States denounced these irresponsible and ineffective forays.

They "serve to increase the difficulty of dealing with the unsatisfactory situation which now exists in the Caribbean," said the State Department.

"The U.S. Government is strongly opposed to hit-and-run attacks on Cuba by splinter refugee groups," said the statement. "It has stated repeatedly that such raids do not weaken the grip of the Castro regime in Cuba. Indeed they may strengthen it.

"Nothing we have heard of the latest incident changes our judgment on this matter. * * * The U.S. Government is investigating fully to determine whether any violation of U.S. law is involved."

As in the past, the Cuban exiles' spokesmen stressed that none of the attacks were mounted from U.S. territory. U.S. officials yesterday said neither Central Intelligence Agency nor any other arm of the American Government was involved with Monday's raid.

In the Cuban crisis that brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the edge of war last October, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev wrote President Kennedy that piratic attacks on Cuba justified the Soviet decision to supply Cuba the defense means missiles which you describe as offensive.

RED REACTION MODERATE

Up to last night, the Soviet reaction to the new raid was relatively moderate.

Moscow radio charged that anti-Castro revolutionaries staged a "new provocation" in an attack on the Cuban coast. But Moscow radio made no mention of Russian casualties or attacks on a Soviet vessel or personnel.

The Fidel Castro government, after a daylong silence, last night also admitted the raid, United Press International reported.

But the Cuban regime did not confirm that any Russians had been killed or wounded as claimed by the raiders.

A communique from the Armed Forces Ministry, broadcast by Havana radio and heard in Miami, blamed the United States directly for the attack.

Spokesmen at yesterday's news conference were Antonio Veciana, 33, described as "coordinator" of Alpha 66 and Cecilio J. Vazquez, representing the Second National Front of Escambray.

They distributed a mimeographed paper entitled "War Communique 4," issued "in the Caribbean area" by a Maj. Eloy Gatiarres Menoyo.

It said that at dawn on Monday, commando units in two boats "attacked a Russian encampment located at Isabela de Sagua's port, on the north central coast of Cuba," which the group previously raided on October 8, when they said they captured a Russian and Cuban flag and Czech weapons.

DREW RETURN FIRE

In Monday's raid the exile groups said the attackers drew return fire "from the coast guards, the custom house and trenches of the Russian encampment." A Russian merchant ship anchored in the bay opened fire, and return machinegun and cannon fire from Alpha 66 hit the Soviet ship's smokestack and bridge. "As a result the Russian ship was seriously damaged" it was claimed and "the estimates of casualties of Russians (on ship and ashore) was more than a dozen." Two commandos were reported lightly wounded.

This demonstrated, the exiles claimed, "that the Cubans have the ability, the courage and the strength to overthrow the Communist government of Havana if given the necessary support of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere; especially the people of the United States and the Cubans themselves."

Veciana and Vazquez, who said they live in Miami, spoke through an interpreter and said in answer to questions, that:

The raiding operation lasted 45 minutes, and some of the men went ashore.

They believe the raids have "a physical and economic impact upon the Castro regime * * * leading to discontent and internal action in Cuba against the present regime."

FURTHER RAIDS PLANNED

Neither United States nor British territory is used in the raiders' secret base of operations; further raids are contemplated.

No attempt was made by the United States to block their news conference yesterday, or to hamper their activities. Asked if they believe their raids conform with U.S. policy they replied they "are not sure of the present policy in reference to these things."

The men said they and their organizations are registered with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. A Justice spokesman said last night that officials of the two groups "talked with us," but at present no active registration statements are on file.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963]

Dangerous Game

The hit-and-run attacks by Cuban exiles and the counterharassment of American shipping by planes based in Cuba add up to a dangerous kind of game in which someone, sooner or later, is going to get hurt.

The Cuban exiles who attacked a Russian freighter off the coast of Cuba Tuesday night doubtless were inspired by what they considered to be patriotic motives. But actually they were behaving like juveniles, irresponsible and ineffectively.

The same thing goes for the pilots of the Mig planes, which, unquestionably are based in Cuba. Last February two of these planes fired in the general direction of an American shrimp boat. Yesterday two other planes, presumably Mig's, fired machinegun bursts near the U.S. MS *Floridian* in international waters. Since the *Floridian* is 360 feet long, it is obvious that the aircraft, one of which flew in quite low, were not trying to hit the vessel. Nevertheless, this sort of thing is a serious business, and it can lead to serious consequences—as Castro will find out if it continues.

Our own Government has condemned the hit-and-run raids by the Cuban exiles, and, as far as we know, it is not responsible for them. We suspect, however, that our officials could find the means to put a stop to these attacks. And we think they should do so.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963]

Controlling the Cuban Exiles—Raids Are Believed Likely To Entrench Castro and Defeat Their Purpose

(By William S. White)

Though it is a harsh thing to have to say, the fact is that a means must be found for bringing into control the anti-Castro Cuban exiles in this country.

This is one of those painfully paradoxical occasions in the cold war when honorable and patriotic but foolish efforts to strike at the common foe of international communism are far more dangerous to the common cause than no action at all.

Pinprick exile Cuban raids upon Soviet shipping in Cuban waters, and upon the shore positions of Castro himself, have got to stop, for all these reasons:

1. They are wholly ineffectual and serve only to help entrench rather than to weaken Fidel Castro. They permit him to present himself to the Cuban people as their protector from foreign attack, and beyond doubt will retard rather than advance that

hoped-for day when the Cuban people will have had enough of him.

2. They are both fatally weak and fatally irresponsible. There will be no gettting rid of Castro, in a heavily armed island fortress, by small and gallant but also pointless sorties against a ship here or there, a coastal position there and yonder. When and if military forces go after Mr. Castro from offshore, they ought to go in overwhelming force, or not at all.

Surely, we have learned this terrible lesson from the abortive invasion by Cuban exiles in the spring of 1961. All this accomplished was the unnecessary expenditure of good lives and an unnecessary loss in American prestige. If and when the big blow is to be put in against Mr. Castro it must be put in at the decision of the United States and not of its exile guests, welcome among us though they are.

3. They embarrass the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States by its only rightful conductor, the U.S. Government, itself. No matter how galling the present situation—and galling it is, indeed—no set of foreigners granted sanctuary by the United States has the right to involve this country indirectly in military adventures which this country has not sanctioned and—worse yet—which in any case will do nobody but the Communist enemy any good.

4. They—these unauthorized attacks—may give the Russians some excuse to refuse to withdraw the balance of their troops in Cuba. Though it is true they have no business whatever being there in the first place, it is also true that American policy does not now contemplate any forcible effort to remove them. This being the bedrock reality, there is no sense in needlessly muddying the diplomatic waters in this affair, having in mind that we are not in any event ready at this point to go beyond diplomatic into military action.

Apart from all this, there lies upon the U.S. Government a heavy responsibility not to allow cruelly false hopes of early deliverance to rise among the Cuban people. To our lasting national shame, we encouraged just such cruelly false hopes among the Hungarians nearly a decade ago. And the end of it all was to bloody the streets of Budapest with the broken bodies of Hungarian patriots who died waiting for the deliverance that never came.

There is an old expression from back in frontier days that only a fool draws a gun unless he really means to use it. We cannot escape it that the world—and not merely the Soviet Union—can be led to believe that through others we are drawing a popgun we don't mean to use. If there is one thing worse than no action by a great power it is the puerile action of sending, or appearing to send, a boy to do a man's job.

The State Department's repeated admonitions against these hit-and-run sorties, therefore, deserve everybody's support—and the support of Cuban hardliners most of all. To this columnist's knowledge, the most authentic hardliners in both Congress and administration well know this. It is the time for them to speak up, unpopular though the message may be.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 30, 1963]

CAUGHT IN THE VISE

The hit-and-run raids on Fidel Castro's Cuba stir the blood but also chill the mind. The latest foray by Cuban exiles again puts the United States in an intolerable dilemma. What is President Kennedy to do? If he retaliates fiercely against Cuban exiles, he puts the United States in the hapless position of being the guarantor of Mr. Castro's regime. The Cuban Prime Minister presides over a despotic totalitarian government—and why should we protect Mr. Castro from the wrath of his fellow citizens who want to terrorize a foreign force occupying the island?

And yet it must be understood that these free-booting raids could place the United States on the first step of an escalator leading to a massive confrontation. Suppose, in retaliation, the Cuban regime begins shooting at our reconnaissance planes that regularly scrutinize the island. The United States would have no alternative but to fire back—and at this point the escalator could begin moving up.

The Cuban Government has denied that the planes which fired across the bow of the American ship *Floridian* did so on orders, but this kind of reprisal might occur in any ascending scale of military measures and countermeasures. Even an unintended move in violation of orders might set forces in motion that would be beyond recall by the time corrections and apologies were made.

What makes the problem more grievous is that the pained denials of the State Department do little good at all. The Soviet Union, if it wishes, can insist that the CIA is covertly supporting the raids; to prove that this is not the case is about as difficult as it would be for Mr. Kennedy to prove that Soviet troops have completely evacuated from Cuba. Even in times past, diplomatic denials about encouraging revolutions elsewhere have occasioned skeptical hoots. Today, the word "volunteer" itself is usually bracketed by quotation marks in reporting what the other fellow claims.

But the problem of the raiders remains. It is disquieting to recall—as Edmund Taylor reminds us again in his "Fall of the Dynasties"—that the ghastly tragedy of World War I was set in motion by a high-minded terrorist in the Balkans. It is against this nightmare that the United States must balance the demands of prudence and the claims of conscience.

Surely the Government has no reasonable alternative but to disavow the raids and to investigate the incidents in order to determine if any U.S. laws were violated. Whatever the Cubans do in retaliation, let us keep our heads and sense of proportion. The primary appeal should be to the Soviet Union and not to the Cubans—and the appeal must be for a removal of Russian forces.

These forces are a provocative presence. They do not protect Mr. Castro as much as they expose the Soviet Union to the risk of having Russian prestige involved in a national struggle between Cubans. Every incident that occurs throws into more vivid relief the terrible hazards involved in trying to sustain a Soviet military outpost on an island so vulnerable to uncontrollable hit-and-run raids. It is this circumstance that provides the kindling for a conflagration.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

CUBAN EXILES ANGERED BY U.S. RESTRICTIONS

(By Theodore Ediger)

MIAMI, March 31.—Exiles reacted angrily today to U.S. Government restrictions designed to halt commando raids on Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Some exile leaders were especially critical of orders prohibiting 18 exiles from leaving the Miami area. The orders were issued yesterday to persons considered prospective raiders.

The 18 received notices from U.S. Immigration agents not to leave Dade County, a 2,500-square-mile area including Miami and environs, or the continental United States.

Edwin Guthman, public information officer for the Justice Department, said the notices were issued following a meeting in Miami of representatives of the Coast Guard, the State Department, the Customs Bureau, the FBI and the Immigration Service.

Guthman did not identify the Cubans but said some of the 18 were admitted to the United States as permanent residents. Others of the group, he said, are on parole status as refugees.

He said if they violate the restriction, they will be detained by the Immigration Service, a branch of the Justice Department.

Immigration authorities indicated more orders might be issued.

Exile organizations went into emergency session to discuss plans.

Commandos L., whose attack on a Russian vessel off Cuba's north shore last week appeared to have brought the issue to a head, declined comment pending study of the situation.

A spokesman for the Second National Front of Escambray, and Alpha 66, merged organizations which raided a Russian encampment in Cuba 2 weeks ago, declared, "We are continuing the fight."

A member noted that their chief, Eloy Gutierrez Menoyo, was safe from U.S. directives at the moment. He is directing operations from a Carribean base.

"We violate no U.S. laws," the member said. "We never operate from American soil."

Antonio Veciana, coordinator, and Armando Fleites, secretary general of the combined groups, were among those handed restriction orders.

Jose Antonio Lanusa, spokesman for another group, the Revolutionary Student Directorate, said:

"If these restrictive orders are going to completely snuff out any outside action against Castro, internal rebellion will become almost impossible in Cuba."

DEPEND ON RAIDS

Lanusa said his group had learned from underground contacts in Cuba that they depend greatly on raids as an impetus for uprising.

"The restrictions will undoubtedly cause many heartaches in Cuba," he added.

Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, Castro's former air force chief, who created headlines with leaflet raids over Cuba in 1960, said he and several associates had received restriction notices.

He declared such action means the Kennedy administration has decided on a policy of coexistence with Castro.

Immigration authorities said the notices went only to persons who have participated or plan to participate in raids.

The Cuban Revolutionary Council, headed by Jose Miro Cardona, and formed in 1961 to mount the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion, was not included.

An exile leader who did not want his name mentioned, said of the U.S. action:

"This is the last straw. No invasion, no government in exile, no jobs, and now no more attacks on Castro. It looks as if Castro has won."

Two notices were served by Immigration agents. One by the Department of Justice expressed sympathy for the exiles' cause, but added, "this does not mean that we are prepared to see our own laws violated with impunity, or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals."

The other said the exiles' parole into the United States would be violated if they left Dade County. Also, that their departure from the United States could mean $5,000 fines or 5 years' imprisonment or both.

BRITAIN TO COOPERATE

Meanwhile, it was learned that the British Government has agreed "to do anything possible to prevent the use of British territory for illicit purposes," United Press International reported.

The statement referred to a U.S. request for the British to increase surveillance of isolated keys in the Bahama Islands north of Cuba, which raiders are suspected of using as bases for launching raids.

U.S. officials confirmed that the British Government had agreed to increase its vigilance in the Caribbean. There was no elaboration, but informed sources in London said the British frigate *Londonderry* had been ordered from Bermuda to patrol the region.

For its part, the United States was reported to be strengthening its Coast Guard sea and air patrols to guard against forays launched from Florida or U.S. Territories in the Caribbean.

United Press International also reported that the FBI is investigating Cuban refugee groups in the Miami area to determine who is backing their efforts. In addition, immigration authorities were intensifying checks of Cuban refugee movements.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1963]

The Coup in Guatemala

The military coup in Guatemala spells danger for all of Central America and will send shock waves deep into South America. Every indication points to this as an example of the sort of reaction by the extreme right that all authorities on Latin America have been fearing. It is an attempt to answer the leftism symbolized by Fidelismo but is a swing to the other extreme. The irony and the danger are that such a reaction will play straight into the hands of the Fidelistas and of Latin-American communism.

The Guatemalan military clique had indicated in recent weeks that it would act if ex-President Juan José Arévalo was allowed back into the country to campaign for the presidency. Dr. Arévalo returned Friday night. The armed forces seized the opportunity "to defend Guatemala from the threat of communism," as they put it.

An idea of how far to the right the new chief executive, Colonel Peralta, and his group are can be gleaned from the fact that they accuse President Ydígoras of "complacency in dealing with communism." It was President Ydígoras who arranged for the training of the Cuban exiles for the Bay of Pigs invasion and whose presidential career has virtually been based on his anti-Fidelismo.

President Kennedy certainly would not want to condone, let alone support, a straightforward, old-fashioned, military dictatorial extreme rightwing coup in Guatemala. Whether he does or not, the coup was a blow to democracy in Latin America.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1963]

United States Curbs Miami Exiles To Prevent Raids on Cuba

Washington, March 31.—The Government moved today to enforce its policy of preventing Cuban refugees from using U.S. territory to organize or launch raids against Cuba. The Justice Department placed restrictions on 18 Cubans in the Miami area.

In some cases they were ordered not to leave Dade County, in which Miami is situated, and in others not to leave the United States.

The Department did not disclose the names of those restricted. Dispatches from Miami confirmed that some members of two exile groups already involved in raids had been given the restriction orders. These were the Alpha 66 and the Second Front of Escambray groups.

VIOLATORS FACE ARREST

Violation of the orders, issued through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, could be enforced by arrest or deportation.

In its announcement yesterday that it planned to take "every step necessary" to prevent raids, the Government expressed sympathy for the anti-Castro cause. But it said it could tolerate no activities that might provoke reprisals against American forces.

Yesterday's announcement was made by the State and Justice Departments. It did not specify what the measures would be to guard against new hit-and-run attacks on Cuba. Today's action by the Justice Department revealed one step.

RAIDS TRACED TO BAHAMAS

In addition, officials said, they expect the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Coast Guard to increase their surveillance of Cuban refugee circles, of the Florida coastline and the waters between the United States and Cuba.

It was understood that some of the small boats used by raiding groups had been tracked and might be seized in the next few days. The Coast Guard can challenge the seaworthiness of any vessel and presumably will check on suspicious craft by invoking this right.

Information available now about the two attacks on Soviet ships in Cuban ports in the last 2 weeks suggests that the raids were not launched from American soil, the Government said yesterday.

But its statement promised further investigation. The statement avoided the question of whether the expeditions were supplied with men or materials from the United States.

Some of the recent raids, it has been established, were launched from some of the smaller islands of the British Bahamas group. However, the participants did not live there and their expeditions almost certainly originated elsewhere.

American surveillance efforts will be coordinated with the British Government.

The administration's dilemma was reflected in the careful wording of yesterday's statement. Washington fears that, should the exile attacks continue, the Soviet Union and Cuba would be provoked to retaliate, either against American shipping in the Caribbean or against the American reconnaissance planes that now fly over Cuba daily with impunity.

But because it has encouraged Cubans to work for the overthrow of Premier Fidel Castro, the administration has hesitated to harass or take sanctions against the anti-Castro fighters.

However, the refugee raiders have been exceptionally resourceful in carrying through attacks that have damaged Soviet merchant ships in Cuban ports.

Because of this President Kennedy and his advisers have therefore decided to do everything possible to discourage and prevent continuation of the refugees' raids.

The United States will not, however, take responsibility for events in Cuba or her territorial waters.

THE POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT

The following is the text of yesterday's statements by the State and Justice Departments:

"The position of the U.S. Government regarding hit-and-run attacks by Cuban refugee groups against Soviet ships and other targets in Cuba have been made perfectly clear by the President and Secretary of State. These attacks are neither supported nor condoned by this Government. The President has pointed out that they may have effects opposite to those presumably intended by those who carry them out; that is, they may strengthen the Soviet position in Cuba rather than weaken it, tighten Communist controls rather than loosen them.

"For preliminary evidence suggests that these raids have not in fact been launched from the territory of the United States. However, the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with the cooperation of the Coast Guard and Customs Service, are intensifying their investigations.

"We intend to take every step necessary to insure that such raids are not launched, manned or equipped on U.S. territory.

"The sympathy of this Government and the American people is with those Cubans who hope to see their country freed from Communist control. We understand that these raids reflect the deep frustration of men who want to get back to their homeland, to a Cuba that is independent.

"But this understanding does not mean that we are prepared to see our own laws violated with impunity or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals, the brunt of which would be borne by the Armed Forces of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF OREGON SENATE AND HOUSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Senate Joint Memorial 7 of the Oregon Legislature, pertaining to Rogue River Basin project, and House Joint Memorial 13, of the Oregon Legislature, relating to the livestock slaughtering and processing industry, together with covering letters of the Oregon secretary of state.

There being no objection, the letters and memorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Salem, Oreg.,
March 25, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: As directed by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, I transmit herewith a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7, pertaining to the Rogue River Basin project, a memorial enacted by our legislative assembly now in session.

Respectfully,
Howell Appling, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

Enrolled Senate Joint Memorial 7

Resolution introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback, and Redden

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of $50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of $365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition, and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

DALE HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

SALEM, OREG.,
March 27, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As directed by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, I transmit herewith a certified copy of House Joint Memorial 13, a memorial enacted by our legislative assembly now in session.

Respectfully,
HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

Resolution introduced by Representatives McKinnis, Flitcraft, Hansell, and Senators Hopkins, Leth

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately one and one-half times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of 1 to 1, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

Whereas the public utility commissioner of the State of Oregon, the director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat-producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry and leaders of labor in the meat-handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That:

1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

LET US ACT TO STOP OUR MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT: LET US ACT TO SOLVE OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, unemployment is our No. 1 economic and social problem. This is not only my own view but the view of one who is far more important in any effort to do something about it. These are the words of none other than our President, John F. Kennedy.

Frankly, I would say that it is America's No. 1 problem, No. 2 problem, and No. 3 problem. In my view it overshadows all others. Unemployment has just reached a new high—in other words, we are not gaining, we are not conquering unemployment but are dropping behind. Action—effective action, prompt action—is imperative.

Let us bear in mind constantly that the 6.1 percent current unemployment is not just a statistic. It means personal disaster, fear, sorrow, want, often broken homes, and all the other tragic consequences of joblessness in millions of families. And this in America. America the affluent. America the prosperous.

In other words, tackling unemployment should take precedence, priority, and action before anything and everything else at home.

The United States is the wealthiest nation on earth. We are constantly reminded of it. As a result of it, we are requested annually to appropriate billions of dollars for foreign aid, and when there are those who differ with some of the ways this foreign aid has been administered, we are suspected of the heinous offense of being anti-foreign aid.

A reasonable and constructive critique of the administration of our foreign aid by a very distinguished committee of outstanding Americans, all committed to foreign aid, headed by Lucius Clay, comes under violent attack by a local newspaper and by others who feel that almost any amount spent abroad, no matter how spent and for whom, is justifiable, but who apparently do not have, or at least do not exhibit, a corresponding concern for the tragic plight of over 5 million of our own unemployed fellow American citizens and their families. While our foreign aid program is seeking to relieve the plight of the unemployed, the undernourished and the otherwise disadvantaged and others in 95 foreign countries, what about our own American unemployed? Moreover, unless we diminish our unemployment at home, unless we shore up our domestic economy, unless we get it moving, we will be unable to keep up with our commitments abroad. Our strength is not merely military. It rests in no less degree, indeed in even greater degree in the health and vitality of our economy.

Let me quote at this point exactly what the President said in his March 11 manpower report to the Congress:

> Unemployment is our No. 1 economic problem. It wastes the lives of men and women, depriving both them and the Nation. Our continued underuse of human and physical capacity is costing us some $30 to $40 billion of additional goods and services annually. This means a considerably lower standard of living than we would otherwise enjoy. More seriously—ominously—it means we are doing less than our best in staffing ourselves in the struggle for freedom at home and abroad that now commands our energies and resources on an unprecedented scale, and in ever more demanding forms.

Believing that something should be and must be done about it, and speedily, I introduced, on March 19, a bill to increase the amount available for an accelerated public works program from $900 million to $2.6 billion, with a number of distinguished cosponsors who included: Senators BARTLETT, KEFAUVER, METCALF, MORSE, CANNON, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH.

There are some among us who may think that this is not a necessary expenditure. I feel it is absolutely essential. The facts are that we have an accumulated backlog of ready public works—desirable projects—and others which could be brought into realization, which would more than absorb the $2½ billion which my proposal envisages—public works programs suited to the needs of every community, but not merely employ people in the project's locale. The impetus to employment from such projects reaches back through our entire economic structure, into the factories, into the fields, forests, and mines where the raw materials are produced. The further accelerated public works provision galvanizes, stimulates, and revitalize our now regrettably sluggish economy.

I shall ask for an early hearing on this legislation and trust it will have overwhelming support in both Houses. We cannot continue to act as the leader of the world politically, economically, and socially if we fail, as we are failing, in meeting this number one problem at home—the disaster and tragedy of unemployment—a problem which if it continues unsolved will impair our efforts at world leadership.

In this connection, an excellent leading editorial entitled: "America the Backward?" appears in the March 30 issue of the New Republic. It deals largely with this issue—our continued and increasing unemployment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

America the Backward?

Unemployment is our No. 1 economic problem. It wastes the lives of men and women, depriving both them and the Nation. Our continued underuse of human and physical capacity is costing us some $30 to $40 billion of additional goods and services annually. This means a considerably lower standard of living than we would otherwise enjoy. More seriously—ominously—it means we are doing less than our best in staffing ourselves in the struggle for freedom at home and abroad that now commands our energies and resources on an unprecedented scale, and in ever more demanding forms." Thus spoke the President in his March 11 manpower report to Congress.

What are the facts? In 1962 ten million more people were employed than in 1947, a gain of 17 percent over 15 years, but during the same period the labor force grew by 13 million, or 21 percent. Since 1957 the jobless rate has averaged 5½ percent (6.1 percent as of the latest count), compared to 4 percent in immediately previous years. It was 5½ percent in 1962, a year of "recovery," which suggests that the next downturn will shoot the jobless rate to new heights. Those out of work stay out longer and longer. Between 1957 and 1962, unemployment for 15 weeks or more went up 100 percent; unemployment for 6 months or more 150 percent; and these figures do not take into account workers who are on the job (not by choice) less than a normal workweek. Nor do total unemployment figures show the special penalties imposed on particular groups—younger and older people, non-white workers, workers in declining or unstable industries or in depressed areas, and unskilled workers generally. For example, the jobless rate for nonfarm, unskilled laborers is 12 percent; for the semiskilled, it is 8 per cent. And in their impersonal neutrality, such figures conceal the human reality: millions of individuals deprived of a productive role, many of whom are responsible for feeding, clothing, educating, and entertaining children, and keeping them well.

The whole economy limps along at a tired pace. Average annual growth of gross national product over the last 5 years has been about 2.9 percent, as against the 3½ to 4 percent of former years.

There will always be some unemployed: people change jobs; one season is better than another in certain lines of work. Full employment, therefore, amounts to having an equal number of people looking for jobs and of jobs looking for people. The administration has not specified how much unemployment would be acceptable in this sense, but the Economic Report of the President suggests that if an interim goal of 4 percent were to be reached by the end of 1963, 3.1 million new jobs would be needed, plus additional ones to absorb workers being displaced by technical progress. This means an 8- to 9-percent boost in gross national product, at constant prices. Furthermore, just keeping the unemployment rate where it is would require a 3½ percent rise in Gross national product. If the present average rate of growth is maintained, unemployment will rise further by the end of 1963, and in the next 5 years it will exceed 7 percent. Apparently the United States is moving from a situation justifying concern to one warranting alarm.

Some steps have been taken to reduce structural unemployment. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 is designed to rejuvenate economically depressed areas and has provisions for worker retraining; the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 has broader provisions for retraining and relocation assistance; and there are similar provisions in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, though these will not have any effect until 1964 or thereafter. The number in retraining programs thus far is unimpressive (in the two active programs some 37,000 workers), but the programs may pick up speed.

Serious questions have to be asked, however. What skills can workers be retrained for which will be in demand? Industrial jobs in the future will differ from those of the past. The need of manufacturers for unskilled workers is rapidly diminishing; technicians, engineers, teachers, public administrators, and specialists in new skilled tasks like computer programing are what will be sought. Retraining can only make a marginal contribution here.

The President has made other suggestions. He would extend unemployment compensation, improve methods for identifying impending job dislocations and job opportunities nationally, establish a Youth Corps reminiscent of the old CCC. He has also asked for a civilian industrial technology program which would give a kind of point 4 technical assistance to lagging business, but his requested appropriation of $8.7 million is small. To facilitate labor mobility, Mr. Kennedy wants to eliminate from taxation the reimbursements paid new employees for their moving expenses by business. But this helps those who need it least. It is the unskilled and semiskilled, whose moving expenses are not reimbursed by employers, who need tax deductions for their moving costs.

Hemmed in—so he has calculated—by a variety of hostile political forces and not wanting to be thought a prophet of gloom and doom, Mr. Kennedy chose to phase a tax cut over 36 months, and to avoid really extensive discussion of other needed remedies for the sickness of the economy. As a consequence, we may well find the situation worsening in the next 18 months. In 1962, the New Republic dissented from the prevailing opinion that a tax cut was then premature. We dissent now from the administration view that a cut phased over 3 years will do the trick. It must come sooner, be large enough—at least $10 billion—and have most of its effect by the end of next year, or better, in the 12 months beginning this July. Anything less will discredit—because it will not produce predicted results—the very theory of compensatory economics the President wishes to prove.

Can nothing be done in the next month or so to enact the kind of tax revision that will make a substantial difference? A new initiative could come from Congress at even this late juncture. The Joint Economic Committee's stand in favor of a much bigger cut in 1963 is one hopeful development. The Congress could rescue the President from his fears of the Congress by stepping up tax reduction, as well as by approving other parts of the administration's recovery program.

However, even if Congress performs heroically in this session, we cannot assume a healthy economy through the next decade. Technological development has brought with it a steadily declining requirement for new capital expenditures. To put it in another way, we are getting more output for a relatively smaller amount of money spent on plant and equipment. Add to this the fact that there is today a large amount of underused plant capacity, so that production can increase considerably without much new capital outlay.

Moreover, expansion supported primarily by more investment in the kinds of industries which have been so prominent in the past will be less than vigorous. New sources of demand for consumer goods and new sources of demand for substantial investment will have to be found. Serious consideration must be given, therefore, to encouraging industries which could lead growth in the way that railroads, steel and automobiles did in an earlier time. The best contender for a big push at this time is the construction industry. The Nation needs a face lifting, particularly in its more blighted areas, and transportation needs modernizing. Such reconstruction would, moreover, absorb the very unskilled and uneducated workers now seeking jobs.

Some are of the opinion that the American economy is so well developed that we cannot expect it to attain the high growth rate it once had. That is the gospel of American affluence. But if it is true (and it is not; the United States is underdeveloped—socially, esthetically, intellectually, as well as materially), then a choice has to be faced. Either we find new outlets for the widening pool of unemployed, or we accept permanent responsibility for the support of the unskilled and uneducated, and pay the high social cost of their alienation from a community that says, "We don't need you."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask further consent that the statement I made in the Record when I introduced this legislation, which I entitled: "Let Us Try To Do as Much for the Folks at Home as for Those Abroad—Let Us Get the U.S. Economy Moving—Let Us Tackle Our Mounting Unemployment Realistically," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let Us Try To Do as Much for the Folks at Home as for Those Abroad; Let Us Get the U.S. Economy Moving; Let Us Tackle Our Mounting Unemployment Realistically

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the desk until the close of business on March 28 so as to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to cosponsor this bill.

The Vice President. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; will lie at the desk as requested; and, without objection, will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit I.)

The bill (S. 1121) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–658) introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I believe that my introduction of this bill will not come as a surprise.

On April 25, 1962, when S. 2965 was reported by the Senate Committee on Public

Works, of which I am a member, I filed separate views in which I clearly predicted that the sum authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill—$900 million—was insufficient to do the job.

Mr. President, I wish I could stand here today and admit that my prediction was wrong—that the amount authorized to be appropriated had been sufficient—and that the serious pockets of chronic unemployment throughout the Nation had been eradicated or significantly decreased.

Eleven months ago, in my separate views, I stated:

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation."

At that time, I referred to my proposed amendment to raise the amount authorized to be appropriated to less than half the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance—namely, $2,645 million.

I stated at that time, Mr. President:

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my separate views to S. 2965 be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it may be that my suggested amendment focused attention on the insufficiency of the amount authorized to be appropriated and was instrumental in increasing that amount from $600 million to $900 million. But even that amount has not proven to be sufficient.

On March 7, the Department of Labor reported that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in February increased to 6.1 percent of the civilian labor force. This was up from 5.8 percent in January, despite the fact that customarily there is little change in the unemployment rate from January to February. The February 1962 rate was 5.6 percent.

This means, Mr. President, that in February 1963, 4,918,000—nearly 5 million—men and women were seeking employment and could not find it.

This continued chronic unemployment cannot be permitted to endure. The time has come for a massive effort to make taxpayers out of these tax consumers. They seek work. Let us give them work.

I said last year it was no time for half-measures.

It is even less a time for half-measures this year.

Consider, Mr. President, what continued unemployment does to a man and his family. Continued want and deprivation do not reaffirm a man's faith in the strength of our economic system.

And yet, Mr. President, that system is strong—as strong as it ever was. Our problem is to take sufficiently energetic steps at the correct time. Let us not do too little too late.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. President, that we did just that last year. Who can say what the results would now be if last year we had authorized the appropriation of three times the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program? How many of the nearly 5 million unemployed today would now be gainfully employed? How many of this nearly 5 million unemployed would today be taxpayers instead of tax consumers? How many of the families of these men and women would today have been able to hold their heads high and say that their fathers or mothers were gainfully employed and they were not dependent on handouts?

Mr. President, we will not be able to meet a serious unemployment problem with half measures, or with quarter measures. We tried it last year and it did not work.

Now one of the arguments advanced last year against my proposal to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works measure was that the States could not possibly spend all that money.

In an effort to prove this argument fallacious, I wrote all the States having areas of chronic unemployment asking how much could be spent on worthwhile public works projects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may have 5 more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, when I reported to the Senate on May 17, 1962, on the responses received up to that date—only 12 States—fewer than one-fourth of the total number—indicated that they could use $1,566 million.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that date and some of the exhibits inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at that time, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

Mr. GRUENING. I stated at that time:

"The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greenville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku-Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?

"For myself the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars, then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately."

I am again today addressing to the Governors of all the States having serious pockets of chronic unemployment, a letter requesting the information as to the public works projects ready to go upon which unemployed men and women can be put to work.

At the appropriate time, I shall report to the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the Senate the results of this inquiry.

But I have no doubt at all that we shall find that there can be spent on useful, needed public works projects, throughout the land, more than the sum of $2,645 million which I propose to authorize to be appropriated for the accelerated public works program. In view of the $900 million already authorized, this is only an increase of $1,745 million.

As a matter of fact, the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, at a press conference on February 8, 1963, stated that at the end of January, the backlog of applications for funds for projects expected to meet program standards was $1,069 million. In addition, new projects were coming in at the rate of $300 million every month or $3,600 million per year.

It is not, therefore, a question of whether the money can be well spent in putting American unemployed men and women to work. The worthy projects exist. The necessary projects exist.

The question is: Are we willing to make the effort to get America rolling—to give America the shot in the arm it needs to get it rolling—to make an all-out effort to stimulate the American economy at the level required to drastically reduce these pockets of chronic unemployment?

For myself, I can only see an affirmative answer.

For myself, I can say only that when one considers what we are doing in the way of assisting the economies of countries abroad, there can be no question about our doing at least as much here at home for our own unemployed—for our chronically unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from Mr. Batt's press conference and a list of unemployed percentages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment expresses the amount authorized as the equivalent authorized to be appropriated for the following economic foreign aid purposes:

	Million
Sec. 202: Development loan fund	$1,500
Sec. 212: Development grants	380
Sec. 402: Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451(a): Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have drafted my amendment in this fashion, Mr. President, rather than expressing the sum in figures, because I desire to call attention to the fact that we are granting this same sum—and indeed more in various other ways—to aid the economies of foreign countries—to reduce the unemployment problem in foreign countries—and that we literally cannot afford to continue to do that unless we do at least as much for the unemployed here at home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Gruening. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. Humphrey. I wish to commend the Senator on his initiative, and I wish to assure the Senator that a number of his colleagues, as he well knows, have joined in reexamining the entire accelerated public works program. The President has submitted a supplemental request of $500 million under last year's authorization, which is sorely needed. In fact, the local communities have set aside by bond issue the necessary funds for local community cooperation, as prescribed by law. I am convinced that we could well use a substantially larger sum of money, at least double what we did last year, for the accelerated public works program, to meet the necessities of existing projects which are already funded and already prepared and already designed by the local jurisdictions.

I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation. I know that I can expect from him the same kind of cooperation, as we met together shortly to get at the new program of accelerated public works.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. No Member of the Senate has been more concerned about the unemployment problem, this tragic situation which is not a mere statistic but affects the lives and happiness and welfare of millions of Americans, or has shown more concern about getting the economy moving again, than the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Exhibit I

A Bill To Increase the Amount Authorized To Be Appropriated To Carry Out the Provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87-658)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 87-658 (76 Stat. 541), approved September 14, 1962, is hereby amended by striking out the words "the sums of $900,000,000" in section 3(b), thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 402, and 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

Exhibit II

Separate Views of Mr. Gruening

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works program of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

	Millions
"Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500
Sec. 212—Development grants	380
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof of the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provision of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

Exhibit III

Let Us Just Once Do at Least Half as Much for the Folks at Home as for Those in Foreign Lands

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2965—the emergency public works bill—which it is my intention to call up at the appropriate time.

The amendment is simple.

It raises the amounts authorized to be appropriated for emergency public works from $600 million to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." Those are the exact words of my proposed amendment. However, in order that my colleagues may have the amendment before them in customary form, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **Presiding Officer.** The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have previously served notice of my intention to offer this amendment in my individual views in the committee's report on S. 2965. I ask unanimous consent that those views be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **Presiding Officer.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, my amendment seeks only to place our domestic program for alleviating unemployment in a position of equality with what we are doing abroad. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and I sincerely trust that it will be—there still will not be equality.

The amendment which I propose would raise the maximum authorized to be appropriated for the program of emergency public works from $600 to $2,645 million computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund (for fiscal year 1963 only)	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

Actually the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of much more than $2,645 million for foreign economic aid. Actually, for the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1963, section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500 million for each of these fiscal years or a total of $7,500 million for the 5.

Thus, even with the adoption of my amendment, there would be authorized to be appropriated for this one-shot program of emergency public works to help our own unemployed only about one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

I wish to make it crystal clear that my amendment does not affect or apply to the standby provisions of S. 2965. Actually, it can be said that my amendment moves up the $2 billion authorized for a program of standby public works to the emergency program and says in effect that emergency intended to be met by the standby program is upon us now.

And, considering the all too many pockets of depression of the United States, that is by no means an exaggeration.

We cannot accurately judge the human misery stalking our land by looking at the overall rate of unemployment.

During the week ending April 28, 1962, insured unemployment in Nome, Alaska, was 33.5 percent. It was no comfort to the unemployed worker in Nome to know that the national rate of insured unemployment during the same week was 4.3 percent.

The unemployed worker in Fairbanks—insured unemployment rate 17.9 percent—could derive little comfort from the fact that the Congress was talking about standby public works when things get worse.

How much worse must it get, Mr. President, before the Congress acts to relieve to the extent possible unemployment in the numerous pockets throughout the Nation?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table, prepared by my office, of unemployment in Alaska for the week ending April 28, 1962. These figures have been derived from the Labor Market Bulletin issued by the Alaska Department of Labor.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, this is no time to stand by. This is a time for bold, decisive action. In my opinion, nothing can be more heartrending than a man—a husband and a father—who cannot find work to support himself and family even though, week after week after week, he trudges wearily from door to door seeking such work. It is distressing for single men with no family responsibilities.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith has written an excellent book entitled "Our Affluent Society" showing that more people in the United States are now living at a higher standard than ever before. I agree with the picture he has drawn in his book and I am happy that it is so.

But in rejoicing at the greater affluence of more and more of our people, let us not overlook the almost one-fourth of our Nation who are living in abject poverty without hope for the future or for their children's future unless prompt and intelligent measures are taken at once. The plight of these 40 million Americans is graphically pictured in a recent book by Mr. Michael Harrington, entitled "The Other America," published by Macmillan Co. this year. I commend it highly to my colleagues for it brings to our attention forcefully the need for immediate action—and action on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem.

As long as this problem exists for some 40 million Americans it is our inescapable duty to face it and to eliminate it as far as it is humanly possible. Our obligation to these Americans, in my judgment, supersedes aid for impoverished people in other lands. Moreover we shall be able to help these people in foreign countries all the better if we raise our own living standards and put an end to the costly wastes of chronic unemployment.

In this—the richest of all lands—such a situation cannot and should not be tolerated.

Nor should we meet an emergency situation with halfway measures. We should not delude the people of the Nation. We must bring to bear on a solution of this problem all the resources that are needed. To do less is little better than doing nothing at all. To do less would be to disappoint millions of unemployed men and women throughout the country who are looking to Congress for action now.

According to the report from the Area Redevelopment Agency of the Department of Commerce as of May 1, 1962, 933 areas in the United States are designated as eligible to take part in the area redevelopment program. These are divided as follows: 148 urban-industrial areas; 735 rural and small labor markets; and 50 Indian reservations.

These areas have a population of 34.7 million people and a labor force of 13.2 million. Of the latter 1.4 million are unemployed. Thus these areas have 19 percent of the Nation's population and 19 percent of the Nation's labor force, but they have 31 percent of the unemployed of the country.

Now what is proposed to meet the persistent high rate of unemployment of these 933 areas throughout the Nation?

It is proposed in S. 2965 to authorize the appropriation of $2 billion for a program of public works on a standby basis, usable only if the total unemployment in the Nation rises to a predetermined figure. In addition, it is proposed to authorize the appropriation of an additional $600 million for an emergency, immediate public works program. This sum averages about $600 for each man and woman unemployed in these designated areas, assuming the entire amount is spent on wages, which, of course, will not be the case.

My amendment would quadruple that sum. That quadrupled sum would be much more realistic considering the magnitude and the urgency of the problem.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that my proposal would not take a single penny from the foreign aid program. It merely uses the particular wording to point up the fact that we would be spending on this one-shot, emergency program here at home far less than we are spending abroad for economic aid.

The foreign aid program would continue as now authorized and the money appropriated for that program would remain intact, if Congress approves.

I know that the question will be raised: can the sum you propose to spend on public works within 27 months actually be spent by the States economically and efficiently within that period of time.

It should be raised, and answered, because I do not want to propose anything here that would lead to wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. I know that none of my colleagues want to do so either.

But I do know that along with me many of my colleagues are concerned that we do enough to meet the problems of persistent unemployment in the 933 designated areas throughout the country.

In order to obtain the answer, I wired the Governors of the 50 States of the Nation and asked them the question and asked them to be specific in their replies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my telegram to the Governors of the States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have to date received replies from the Governors of only 12 States who have indicated that they are ready to go with public works projects totaling $1.6 billion.

I also ask unanimous consent that the detailed replies received from the Governors of these States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, let no one here delude himself.

We shall either spend this $2,645 million on constructive investments in the future economic strength of the United States—in schools, hospitals, roads, sewer and water works, dams, airports and the like—or we shall spend that and much more in the next 27 months and in the years to come in unemployment compensation and in welfare payments, and suffer the loss of tax revenue which fuller employment will generate.

We cannot long neglect our own resources—human and natural—while building the resources of foreign nations. At stake is not our willingness to continue to aid the less-developed countries; at stake is our ability to continue without at the same time renewing our own strength.

We can renew that strength by a program of public investments of the magnitude which I propose by my amendment.

In the years 1955–61, we have granted to foreign nations for foreign economic aid projects of exactly the same type as would be constructed under my amendment millions upon millions of American dollars.

Can we afford to do less for our own people at a time when many of the areas of our Nation are so hard pressed?

Can we afford to do less for the unemployed of the United States when we are doing so much for the unemployed and others abroad?

As one reads about the flight of capital from Latin America one cannot but compare the lack of faith of the rich of those nations with the abiding faith of our unemployed who are willing to pitch in and work but lack only the opportunity to work.

I ask, Mr. President, for an additional $2 billion to give our own citizens the same chance that we have given and are giving to the citizens of other lands.

The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greeneville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the KuKwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?

For myself, Mr. President, the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

Mr. President, to date I have received replies from Governors of the following States giving the amounts which they could use for public works which could be completed in 27 months:

State:	*Amount*
Alabama	$50,500,000
Alaska	64,184,400
California	183,000,000
Colorado	20,926,000
Connecticut	28,545,000
Hawaii	24,111,912
Maryland	92,590,000
Michigan	639,000,000
Nevada	4,968,000
Ohio	329,259,645
Washington	40,000,000
West Virginia	89,155,950

It is obvious from even this response that in all the States at least four times the amount of funds which I propose could be spent on useful public works projects to relieve unemployment in areas of chronic unemployment.

My proposal is really a very modest one considering the need.

EXHIBIT 1

On page 10, line 2, and on page 11, line 1, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".

EXHIBIT 2

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works program of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this onetime appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

ERNEST GRUENING.

EXHIBIT 3

Private industry insured unemployment rates by administrative area and industry

By administrative area	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
State	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	6,500	19.9
Anchorage	3,005	16.7	3,198	17.8	3,315	18.4
Fairbanks	1,220	17.9	1,322	19.3	1,664	27.6
Juneau	282	10.5	294	10.9	328	11.5
Ketchikan	276	10.3	302	11.3	500	15.9
Nome	177	33.5	201	38.0	207	33.3
Petersburg	274	34.7	297	37.6	312	40.9
Sitka	88	7.2	85	7.0	165	13.8

By industry	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
Total	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	5,600	19.9
Mining	201	17.4	257	22.3	310	27.6
Construction	2,044	45.0	2,238	49.3	2,706	46.6
Manufacturing	1,035	19.7	985	18.8	1,232	21.5
Transportation and utilities	462	6.6	542	7.7	502	8.3
Trade	503	6.2	571	7.0	627	8.3
Finance	56	3.7	51	3.4	80	5.7
Service and other	1,021	19.8	1,055	20.5	1,043	21.0

[1] Insured unemployment rate.

EXHIBIT 4

APRIL 18, 1962.

Senate Public Works Committee today reported emergency public works bill authorizing appropriation of $600 million for one-shot effort for public works projects in economically distressed areas. As member of committee, I expressed concern that sum authorized was totally inadequate to meet Nation's needs. Would appreciate your writing me as soon as possible giving me as much information as possible concerning public works projects in economically distressed areas of your State which could be completed in 27 months, giving estimated costs and man-hours of work which would be provided.

EXHIBIT 5

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, May 2, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We have gathered the following information from the Alaska Department of Public Works.

Of the approximately $388,812,748 listed as capital improvement needs for the next 6 years, approximately $99 million would be paid for by the State of Alaska, exclusive of any Federal moneys made available under Federal grant-in-aid programs. A summary of this $388,812,748 program is set forth on page 8 of the attached document, "A Capital Improvement Program for the State of Alaska, 1962–68." Projects which are to be financed in whole or part from State or local funds are summarized on pages 11 through 17.

As you can see, we have a considerable inventory of buildings, structures, and improvements that should be built. We do not have a great many projects ready to be advertised at this time, but we should be able to add to the list fairly quickly providing that we can obtain Housing and Home Finance Agency advances for advance planning and providing that the various bonding proposals pass. With the incentive provided by a public works act, such as S.

295, the State could prepare a number of the more uncomplicated projects, such as classroom additions to State-operated schools, small State-operated schools for contract, and make application for Housing and Home Finance Agency planning advances and grants for the more extensive projects. Actually, we are now working on a number of applications for HHFA advances and grants for the planning and design of a number of State-operated schools and various facilities at the University of Alaska.

Accordingly, the following list of projects which are designed, are being designed, or will be designed in next year, very substantially understates our ability to utilize S. 2965 in carrying out the purpose of that act. In this connection, I should note that the capital improvement program is a conservative document. In preparing the capital improvement program many needed projects were deleted to hold the program within the State's ability to finance.

The projects which probably most nearly qualify for immediate consideration under a standby public works act are:

1. The International Airport Terminal buildings projects at Anchorage and Fairbanks, representing a value of $3.8 million and $1.8 million, respectively, are fully complete and ready for bidding.

2. Projects which are now in the planning stage with design completion anticipated before August of this year are Salcha Elementary School ($160,000), Eagle River School addition ($288,000), Soldotna School addition ($183,000), and Glen Allen refrigeration and foundation ($55,000). Funds for these projects have been provided under the 1962-63 State education budget. The total for these schools is $686,000.

3. At present, three applications are being prepared for submittal to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an "Advance for Public Works Planning." If approved, funds would be available to complete architectural-engineering design for the Ninilchik School addition ($400,000), the Metlakatla Elementary School ($600,000), and the Fort Yukon School addition ($260,000). Approximately 5 months will be required before these projects would be "set to go." The total for these schools is $1,260,000.

4. The following schools might be ready for contract this year if the $5 million bond issue for State operated schools passes:

Ambler School	$55,000
Eagle River (further classroom addition)	52,000
Delta Junction	516,000
Homer	554,000
Tanana	252,000
North Kenai	554,000
Sterling	150,000
Chugiak High School	1,200,000
McGrath	78,000
Brown's Ct	160,000
Fortuna Ledge	78,000
Total	3,649,000

NOTE.—The legislature appropriated $75,000 for planning and design for Chugiak High School. Some preliminary work has already been done on this project.

5. The vocational school at Nome, although funded under a $1,500,000 general obligation bond authorization, is another project which could qualify. Final plans could be completed within 5 months.

6. If the $7,200,000 bonding program for the University of Alaska passes, money will be available for the construction of an addition to the engineering and physical sciences building, a biological sciences and renewable resources building, completion of the university's new heating plant, and other related facilities.

7. Invitations to bid on the construction of fire and crash stations at the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports, approximately $180,000 each will be advertised this June.

8. A $160,000 addition to the Miner and Minerals Building in Anchorage may be erected in the 1963 construction season.

9. Proposed water and harbors projects scheduled for the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons which are not yet under contract are:

Angoon, docks	$50,000
Cordova, floats	50,000
Craig, dock	40,000
Douglas, floats	45,000
Homer, floats	65,000
Hydaburg dock	25,000
Hyder, float	7,500
Klawock, dock approach	40,000
Kodiak, floats	30,000
Ninilchik, floats	23,000
Seldovia, floats	65,000
Seward, floats	46,000
Valdez, floats	38,000
Wrangell, floats	31,000
Total	555,500

NOTE.—Considerable work has been done on some of the foregoing projects or is now underway. Since this work is already contracted out, it is not reflected in the above estimated cost figures. Other projects which are now under contract are also not reflected.

10. The following bush airfields are programed for construction in the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons:

New Stuyahok	$15,000
Alitak	50,000
Anvik	15,000
Buckland	10,000
Chevak	15,000
Circle City	7,500
Egegik	20,000
False Pass	10,000
Goodnews	10,000
Holikachuk	15,000
Kasaan	5,000
Koliganek	10,000
Koyukuk	15,000
McCarthy	49,000
Metlakatla	5,000
Nulato	25,000
Ouzinkie	30,000
Pilot Point	15,000
Quinhagak	5,000
Russian Mission	15,000
Shakeluk	7,400
Shungnak	10,000
Stebbins-St. Michael	10,000
Tanunak	15,000
Togiak	10,000
Total	393,900

I have omitted mention of projects planned for our annual $37 to $40 million Federal aid highway program and the Federal aid airport program. I gather that these programs will not be affected by the proposed standby public works act.

If I can supplement any of this information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GARY THURLOW,
Executive Assistant.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 17, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram of April 18, it is estimated that the State of California could initiate and accelerate $183 million in public works projects and complete them within a period of 27 months. These projects would utilize an estimated 18 million man-hours of labor at the job site.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *May 2, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Review of public works of our State indicates that nearly $400 million would be needed for the completion of the total public works projects contemplated in the next 3 to 4 years in economically distressed areas when limited to projects believed to have a completion date within a 27-month period. The total would amount approximately to $40 million. This latter figure would represent specific items such as buildings, utilities, etc. The larger figure given would include such items as dam completion, the canal possibility, atomic generation of electric power, and steam generation coal plants.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Public Works Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am happy to supply the information you requested in your recent telegram regarding the emergency public works bill.

The accompanying data, compiled by our department of highways, relates to roadway construction contemplated or underway in the counties of Lincoln and Mineral, the two Nevada counties officially recognized by the Federal Government as depressed under the area redevelopment program.

I trust the enclosed data provides you with the information you desire. If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Cordially,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

Road contracts to be completed within approximately the next 27 months, Lincoln and Mineral Counties, Nev.

	Estimated construction cost	Estimated man-hours
Lincoln County:		
Project S-544(10) U.S. 93 from 14 miles southeast to 1 mile north of Alamo (15 miles)	$1,600,000	150,000
Project S-544(9) U.S. 93 from 14 miles to 22 miles southeast of Alamo (8 miles)	700,000	63,000
Project F-008-1(3) SR 25, from 2d St. to 6th St. in Panaca (0.5 mile)	70,000	7,000
Subtotal	2,370,000	220,000
Mineral County:		
Project F-004-1(3) U.S. 6 from 8.6 miles east of California-Nevada State line to 3.5 miles east of Basalt (6.7 miles) (construction underway)	948,000	86,000
Project F-004-1(4) U.S. 6 from California-Nevada State line to 8.6 miles east (8.6 miles) (construction underway)	1,100,000	99,000
Project S-525(1) FAS 525 from Nevada-Scheelite mine north to U.S. 50 (19.1 miles) (25 percent of this project in Mineral County)	550,000	52,000
Subtotal	2,598,000	237,000
Grand total	4,968,000	457,000

STATE OF COLORADO,
Denver, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegram of April 18, we are enclosing a list of public works projects in Colorado redevelopment areas that reportedly could be initiated and completed in 27 months subject to availability of funds.

This information was accumulated through contact with various city and county officials and State agencies.

We are not entirely familiar with the criteria for eligibility to participate under the terms of the proposed legislation or with the legislative definition of public works. We have not, therefore, attempted to evaluate whether or not all of the listed projects could qualify for assistance under the proposed legislation.

We were not able to obtain an assessment of the man-hours of work which would be provided by the projects as engineering studies are not available in connection with most of the proposals.

Very truly yours,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Alamosa		Water service to East Alamosa	$250,000
		Community youth center	200,000
		Addition to county courthouse	150,000
		Storm sewer and curb and gutter for East Alamosa	50,000
		Dike and river work on Rio Grande through city of Alamosa	50,000
		Total	700,000
	Alamosa	Paving city streets	386,000
		Extending airport runway	40,000
		New water well, mains, and extensions	100,000
		Enlarge sewer lagoons	50,000
		Storm sewer, South Alamosa	60,000
		Sanitary sewer system; new major trunkline	330,000
		Total	966,000
		Total, Alamosa County	1,666,000
Clear Creek		Georgetown Reservoir	360,000
	Idaho Springs	Shortwave communication system for city and county	8,000
		City street paving	75,000
		Sewage disposal plant	20,000
		Total	103,000
	Georgetown	Sewage disposal plant and collection system	100,000
		Develop Georgetown Lake as recreational area	225,000
		Rebuild water distribution system	100,000
		Total	425,000
		Total, Clear Creek County	888,000
Conejos		No county projects reported	
	Antonito	75 low-cost dwellings for transient workers	400,000
		Waterline	60,000
		Sewer system	180,000
		Total	640,000
	La Jara	No projects reported	
		Total, Conejos County	640,000
Costilla		County courthouse and jail	225,000
		County shops	100,000
		Fort Garland community building	35,000
		Hospital addition	50,000
		San Luis Water and Sanitation District sewage system	(1)
		Total	410,000
	Blanca	Water and sanitation system	(1)
		Total, Costilla County	410,000
Gilpin		Improvement, Corona Pass Rd	225,000
	Blackhawk	Water system and sewage disposal plant	75,000
	Central City	Water system and sewage disposal plant	100,000
		Recreational development, park, etc	25,000
		Total	125,000
		Total, Gilpin County	425,000
Huerfano		County courthouse and jail	1,000,000
		Surfacing county roads to ski and other scenic areas	239,000
		Acquisition and development of irrigation system for development of recreational facilities for Huerfano-Cucharas area.	3,000,000
		Waterfowl development	110,000
		Total	4,349,000
	La Veta	Expansion of sewer collection system and disposal plant	40,000
		Water filter plant	65,000
		Total	105,000
	Walsenburg	Sewage disposal plant	158,000
		Street paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewer system	500,000
		Rebuilding and extending waterlines	100,000
		Purchase and install watermeters	108,000
		Extension of sewerlines	42,000
		Rebuilding electric distribution system and expanding electric production facilities	1,500,000
		City park recreational area	50,000
		Mine museum	18,000
		Senior high school	750,000
		Total	3,226,000
		Total, Huerfano County	7,680,000

---

[1] No estimate.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department—Continued

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Las Animas		Grade and pave Cucharas Pass for 12 miles	$1,000,000
		Construction of 2-mile connecting roads between 2 State highways	40,000
		Recreational development at fairgrounds	50,000
		Pave connecting road from Aguilar to Highway 111	200,000
		Develop mountain recreation area	100,000
		Enlargement of North Lake	100,000
		Enlargement of Mountain Lake	200,000
		Alkali Creek Reservoir	100,000
		New road construction, North Fork, Purgatoire River	50,000
		Total	1,840,000
	Aguilar	Filter plant and water distribution system	200,000
	Cokedale	Pave streets	50,000
		Water distribution and storage	300,000
		Total	350,000
	Trinidad	New sewage lines and disposal plant	627,000
		Animas St. Bridge over Purgatoire River	230,000
		Rebuild water distribution system and water storage facilities	2,230,000
		Curb and gutter and paving	1,500,000
		Garbage, refuse, and disposal	40,000
		Police and fire building	200,000
		Development of Monument Lake Recreational Area	2,000,000
		Total	6,827,000
		Total, Las Animas County	9,217,000
		Grand total	20,926,000

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, April 27, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. E. S. Preston, director of highways, has estimated that in the 20 counties which have been declared as distressed areas, that his department could have the capacity to develop plans and complete $250 million worth of highway construction projects in the next 27 months. There is now under construction in the same area 102 miles of highways estimated to cost $79,797,000. He further estimates that the $250 million highway construction program would generate 28 million man-hours of work.

This area, I think, will be benefited immeasurably by the improvement of the highway situation which I think contributes very largely to the chronic depression that exists. If it is difficult to move man and materials into a community, then this community does not lend itself to industrial or economic development. Other programs can be of assistance, but there is no program that can be more helpful and is as basic as is the improvement of the manner of transportation.

I have asked our director of public works to also report on the necessities of this area with reference to public works generally and, as soon as those figures are available, we will make them available to you.

With all best personal wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Ohio Brush Creek Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Adams	$3,530,700	321,920	3	$3,000,000	Construction plans needed.
Brush Creek and Shawnee State Forests.	Timber stand improvement, roads and trails, structures.	do	442,060	268,350	1	(1)	
Trimble water system	Villge distribution system	Athens	60,000	4,081	1	5,000	Plans complete.
Strouds Run State Park development.	Buildings, water and sewer, camping, swimming beach, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation.	do	600,000	50,000	3	50,000	Estimate 10,000 annual increase park attendance. Dow Lake in this park is an attraction which far exceeds facilities available.
Watterloo, Gifford, and Athens Park State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	74,011	45,260	1	(1)	
Belmont Lake	Road relocation	Belmont	205,000	17,083	1		Plans complete.
Barkcamp State Park	Buildings, water and sewer, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation, camping, picnic areas.	do	700,000	58,000	3	500,000	New park with lake ready for filling except for road relocation. Would serve transient trade using Interstate 70.
White Oak Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Brown	3,106,783	121,872	3	1,500,000	Construction plans needed.
Stonelick State Park development	Camping area	Clermont	250,000	20,833	1	150,000	Construction plans complete.
Salt Fork Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Guernsey	2,157,600	206,757	1	4,000,000	Construction plans complete. Includes road relocation and land needed.
Hocking State Park development	Camping area	Hocking	257,000	21,417	1	100,000	Plans complete.
Hocking and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	244,215	138,650	1	(1)	
Richland Furnace State Forest	do	Jackson	426,000	252,000	1	(1)	
Dean State Forest	TSI, roads and trails	Lawrence	48,500	30,000	1	(1)	
Forked Run State Park development	Camping area	Meigs	70,000	5,833	1	50,000	Do.
	Buildings, roads and parking, reforestation.	do	75,000	6,000	3		
Shade River State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	94,825	41,370	1	(1)	
Burr Oak State Park development	Camping area	Morgan	110,000	9,167	1	75,000	Do.
Wolf Run Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Noble	577,830	48,153	2	500,000	Need construction plans.
Pike State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	Pike	416,800	243,900	1	(1)	
Ross County Lake	Recreation	Ross	400,000	25,000	1	50,000	Feasibility report being completed.
Scioto Trail and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	526,600	329,300	1	(1)	
Shawnee Recreational Area	Construct 3 impoundments and reconstruct another for recreation.	Scioto	506,933	42,245	2	150,000	Need construction plans.
Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	1,322,400	813,900	1	(1)	
Lake Hope State Park development	Camping area	Vinton	$86,000	7,167	1	150,000	Plans complete.
	Cabins, water and sewer, swimming pool, roads and parking.	do	1,300,000	108,000	3	320,000	Estimate of 64,000 annual increase in park attendance.
Wheelabout Reservoir	Recreational impoundment	do	130,000	6,667	2	150,000	Construction plans needed.

See footnote at end of table.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public work projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio—Continued

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Zaleski and Tar Hollow State Forests	TSI, roads and trails, structures	Vinton	$533,343	320,225	1	(1)	
Muskingum River locks and dams	Repairs to locks and dams 1 to 8, inclusive for recreation and commerce.	Washington	677,870	56,489	1	$233,000	Construction plans needed. Preliminary design on No. 6 completed.
	Fishermen's access and boat ramps at 8 lock and dam pools.	do	20,000	2,000	1	48,000	These facilities would accommodate 16,000 fishermen per year.
Total			18,855,645	3,582,360			

---

[1] The improvement of the timber stands on State forests will not result in immediate financial returns to the community except for the wages paid to local workers; however, ample benefits will be enjoyed in future years. Timber stand improvement includes tree planting, pruning crop trees, thinning dense stands, and removal of cull trees and vines. The increases in value to the remaining stand will result from more rapid growth and higher quality timber. Under Ohio conditions, this improvement will often double the volume of wood produced. The cutting and fabricating of the raw materials will support local industries and attract new users of wood to these dependable sources of supply. Recreational benefits will accrue also. Wild land under intensive forest management produces maximum populations of wildlife.

OHIO

Project cost summary by counties

County	Cost
Adams	$136,050
Athens	19,280,700
Belmont	989,630
Brown	114,080
Clermont	61,050
Gallia	7,597,360
Guernsey	3,268,563
Highland	19,080
Hocking	1,460,860
Jackson	19,080
Lawrence	101,360
Meigs	536,360
Monroe	19,080
Morgan	903,360
Noble	229,080
Pike	81,080
Portage	17,517,223
Ross	137,080
Scioto	2,580,360
Vinton	972,050
Washington	557,510
Southeast Ohio	3,823,709
Total	60,404,705

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, April 19, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Senate Public Works Committee's approval of President Kennedy's $2.6 billion public works program to combat unemployment is encouraging. With 268,000 workers, 9.2 percent of our labor force, currently unemployed in our State, we feel the need of this legislation is eminent.

You ask for information concerning Michigan's ability to participate in the $600 million immediate effect provision of the program.

We currently have 53 areas in our State that qualify under this legislation as area redevelopment or eligible labor surplus areas. In an analysis I recently conducted, I found that we are ready to embark upon capital improvement programs totaling $639 million that would provide approximately 60,000 man-years of employment. These figures were developed only from those projects in Michigan that can meet the limitations of the $600 million proposal. They constitute, if anything, an understatement of the volume of activity that could be started in Michigan without delay.

While we have not projected our figures to a period longer than 12 months, it is our belief that the backlog of public works projects that could be initiated at the present time in Michigan would certainly absorb any extension of the time and financial limits of the program.

Concerning the time duration of the project, I urge the House Public Works Committee to grant a flexible time limit for project duration. Due to weather conditions in Michigan, a limit of 12 months would prohibit the initiation of some public works projects that might otherwise qualify.

My statement to the House Committee on Public Works contains a detailed breakdown of the type of projects we could initiate in Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of this statement for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, April 26, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The following is a list of public works projects as requested in your telegram of April 18:

Project	Cost
Ansonia area:	
Ansonia-Derby flood control project	$6,000,000
Street and road reclassification project	250,000
Sewage disposal plant	1,000,000
Additional recreational facilities	100,000
Reconstruction of Route 34 in Derby from 3d St. to A St	200,000
Reconstruction of 0.2 mile of Route 115 and railroad underpass, Maple St. to Broad St., town of Seymour	1,000,000
Reconstruction of 1.5 miles of Route 115 in Derby and Ansonia from Route 34 to Colburn St	800,000
Bristol area:	
City hall (Bristol)	1,630,000
Civic center (Bristol)	450,000
Fire station (Bristol)	250,000
City streets (Bristol)	2,000,000
Sewage treatment plant (Bristol)	2,535,000
Airport (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Industrial park (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Construction of truck climbing lane on Route 69, Bristol	205,000
Widening approximately 1 mile of Route 6, Bristol, in Jerome Ave. vicinity	250,000
Extension of truck climbing lane on Route 6 in Plymouth from end of 1962 construction to vicinity of Todd Hollow Rd	100,000
Correcting sight line on Route 6, in Plymouth, in the vicinity of Orchard and Kellogg Sts	150,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Sewer treatment plant and pumping station (Killingly)	800,000
Town dump and incinerator (Killingly and Putnam jointly)	700,000
Downtown renewal project (Killingly)	3,000,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Town roads drainage and repair (Killingly)	$100,000
Sewage facilities and disposal (Plainfield)	500,000
Recreational project	150,000
Correction of sight line on Route 169, 1 mile south of Brooklyn town line	75,000
Reconstruction of 1.2 miles of Route 171 from Thompson town line to Quinebaug River	400,000
Reconstruction of 2.6 miles of Route 169 in Pomfret and Woodstock from Route 44 to Route 171	700,000
Reconstruction of Maple St., Killingly, from Route 6 to Route 101	375,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 south of Route 6 underpass	200,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 in Putnam and Thompson from 300 feet south of Route 12 to 0.5 mile north of Route 193	4,500,000
Resurfacing of Main St., Killingly	100,000

The estimated cost of the above-listed projects is $28,545,000 including $19,865,000 in local projects and $8,680,000 in State highway department projects.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 25, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Governor Tawes has asked me to reply to your telegram of April 18 regarding possible public works projects in persistent labor surplus areas of Maryland.

To date we have been able to learn of 23 projects in such areas whose total cost is estimated at approximately $92,590,000. It is estimated that total man-hours would exceed 15,600,000.

The single most expensive project would be the relocation of U.S. Route 40 as a 4-lane highway for a distance of 112 miles from Hancock, Md., to Washington County, Pa. This would traverse five labor surplus counties. The estimated construction cost for the entire highway, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition, is $84,400,000 providing an estimated 15,275,000 man-hours of work.

The most critical Allegany County project is the construction of a new Pinto Bridge and improvement of the road from the bridge to U.S. 220. The existing bridge is wholly inadequate for the movement of employees to and from the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory and efficient delivery of some materials to the plant. The estimated cost for this project is $1 million involving 100,000 man-hours.

There are at least four projects in Washington County including the proposed North-East Highway at a cost of $400,000 and 75,000 man-hours. A new water transmission main from Williamsport to Hagerstown would cost $1,450,000. There is no estimate of the number of man-hours. A project involving sewer system extensions in Hagerstown and other Washington County towns would cost $3,500,000. Again there is no estimate of man-hours. Sewer and water main extensions and highway improvements to a proposed industrial park would cost $670,000. The number of man-hours is unknown at this time. The total cost of these Washington County projects is $6,020,000. Man-hours were computed for only one of the four projects; i.e., 75,000 man-hours.

Seventeen projects for the city of Cambridge in Dorchester County were proposed and a tabulation is enclosed. The total cost is $1,070,000 involving 196,800 man-hours.

We are also endeavoring to uncover other appropriate projects and will forward details next week.

I hope this information will be useful and please wire or phone if additional details are required.

Cordially,

ROBERT M. SPARKS,
Chief, Business and Industrial Development.

City of Cambridge, Md.—List of projects which could be completed in 27 months

No. and name of project	Approximate cost	Approximate labor-hours
1. Improvements to Race St	$19,000	4,000
2. Streets and utilities, Plaza Park, pt 1	18,500	4,000
3. Improvements to Maryland Ave	12,000	3,200
4. Extension of Goodwill Ave	13,500	3,500
5. Streets and utilities, Parkside subdivision	33,000	6,000
6. Sewage pumping station, Stone Boundary development	20,000	3,800
7. Bozarth Farms area, drainage	33,000	6,000
8. Improvements to sewage system, Jimson Rd	33,000	6,000
9. Repair shop and garage, public works department	9,000	2,400
10. Sewer, storm water separation, Fairmount Ave	70,000	12,000
11. Improvements to Leonards Lane	80,000	14,000
12. Drainage improvements, Dorchester Ave	24,000	4,300
13. Drainage improvements, Phillips Ave, Robbins St	30,000	5,400
14. Sludge disposal units, sewage treatment plant	200,000	40,000
15. Improvements to water distribution system	340,000	58,000
16. Woods Rd. to wire cloth intercepting sewer	100,000	18,000
17. New 1,000,000-gallon-per-day well	35,000	6,200
Total	1,070,000	196,800

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Montgomery, April 23, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: At the request of Governor Patterson, I am pleased to furnish the information requested in your telegram of April 18, 1962, regarding emergency public works which might be completed in Alabama in 27 months.

Both the State highway department and the State conservation department, which would be largely responsible for emergency public works, made estimates and plans some time ago. Engineering has been completed and it is believed all projects could be commenced within 6 months.

The following estimates, in broad categories, cover proposed projects in those areas declared economically depressed:

County roads and bridges	$3,500,000
State highways	8,000,000
Interstate highways	20,000,000
Reforestation, water, and wildlife conservation, State parks, fire control	19,000,000
Total	50,500,000

Man-hours are estimated as:

Highway and roads	3,000,000
Conservation projects	6,000,000
Total	9,000,000

The Governor is in agreement that the suggested authorization would be very inadequate, particularly, if such funds are allocated to the States on the usual pro rata basis.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. WILLIAMS,
Director of Industrial Relations.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, May 3, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 18, 1962, concerning proposed public works projects in West Virginia.

I would first like to inform you of the situation with regard to public works projects in West Virginia and to give you some information relative to specific projects which could be accomplished under the proposed program.

At the present time, the State of West Virginia has a public works program based on the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program. We have elected to participate in this program with a stipulation that each recipient who receives assistance will work for that assistance. As of March 30, 12,600 men were employed under this program. As you know, this program is financed by both the Federal and State Governments on a matching basis, the State paying 30 percent of the cost and the Federal Government paying 70 percent.

One shortcoming of this program is that only individuals who are married with dependent children qualify. No employment is made available under this program for individuals who are not married or individuals who are married and have no children or whose children are grown.

Three million dollars in State funds have been appropriated for the coming fiscal year for emergency employment. I may, as chief executive, use these funds to match any Federal funds which may become available for the relief of unemployment. This, of course, means that should the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program be continued at the Federal level, these funds may be used for participation in that program.

It is my understanding that the public works plan proposed by President Kennedy will make Federal money available to various State and local governmental units on a 50–50 matching basis. I would like to strongly urge that consideration be given to a more favorable matching ratio in favor of State and local governments.

A program with a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State matching ratio would provide employment for approximately 7,000 to 12,000 persons. As only $3 million are available in State funds for matching purposes, a 50–50 matching ratio would only provide employment for 1,500 to 2,400 persons. These figures assume expenditures for material and equipment of 20 to 50 percent.

Enclosed you will find proposed projects from our State department of natural resources and from our State road commission. I would like to emphasize that these projects are only a sample of those projects which can be undertaken and completed within 27 months under this program and which would qualify under the rules and regulations of such program. It is anticipated that many projects at the community level, both county and municipal, would be submitted for accomplishment.

Again let me express my desire that Federal money be made available at less cost to the States.

I sincerely hope that this information meets your needs and that you will give every consideration possible to the suggestions which I have outlined. If I may assist you in any way or provide any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Yours truly,

W. W. BARRON,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, May 2, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is in reply to your recent cablegram wherein you requested information on public works projects which could be completed during the next 27 months in our economically distressed area (Hawaii County). The attached tabulation gives information on gross construction costs by major types of functions and the estimated number of man-hours needed to complete the projects. These represent projects which are currently authorized or those for which authorization begins on July 1, 1962, for the new fiscal year. It is estimated that all of these will be completed during the 27-month time period you cited.

I have not seen a copy of the proposed emergency public works bill. Hence, it is not possible to say if all projects included in this tabulation would be eligible for financial assistance. As you know, highways and airports now receive Federal grants. Perhaps these projects would not be eligible for further aid. It would also be of value to know if such financial assistance would be in the form of interest-free loans or grants. The mechanics of the proposed bill may affect an area's willingness to participate in the program

Hawaii's public works program for the coming fiscal year is the largest in our history. Part of the reason for this scale of State public works is to stabilize our employment situation. However, all of us recognize that public works construction alone will not solve our Nation's unemployment problem. Increased public works construction is only one tool of many that must be utilized to spur the growth of our economy. The Area Redevelopment Act and the program of retraining unemployed persons are examples of other actions that will help. Some areas will continue to suffer chronic unemployment until new economic activities are introduced. The private sector of the Nation's economy must maintain a vigorous growth if public efforts to solve unemployment are to be successful. Thus, any public works program should be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage and promote increased employment through new permanent job opportunities.

I hope this provides you with the information you need. However, if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)

I. Public works division (miscellaneous public buildings and the State's share of a sewage treatment plant):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$1,351,412
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	122,184
II. Airports division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,500,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	320,000
III. Harbors division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,855,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	617,000
IV. Highways division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$14,427,500
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	1,978,000
V. Land and natural resources department (land development, parks, water development, forestry, fish, and game):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$978,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	136,500
Total estimated construction costs	$24,111,912
Total estimated man-hours of work	3,173,684

EXHIBIT IV

PRESS CONFERENCE OF HON. WILLIAM L. BATT, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BATT. Now in terms of numbers the area redevelopment areas comprise about 1,000 counties in the United States, and in terms of numbers again the blue areas or the areas that are in only for public works comprise only 100. But these are much bigger cities, by and large. There are about the same number in the blue areas as there are in all the red areas.

The arithmetic works out a little something like this—let me see if I can recall it. In the areas taken together, these red areas and the blue areas, we have about a third of the country's population, about a third of the country's labor force, and over half of the country's unemployment. They are, of course, the areas of longtime labor surplus, the ones we work with, the coal towns, the textile towns, the iron towns, the Great Lakes, the lumber towns, Pacific Northwest, Indian reservations in the Southwest, and the cotton textile towns in the Southeast. You know the economics of them.

Now over 2,900 projects representing $361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds—because you remember the communities have got to match this 50–50—$361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds are in various stages. Some are actually underway, some are being planned, some are just in the process of approval.

Approximately 580,000 man-months of direct employment will be generated by all these projects with the same number of man-months of additional employment based on the normal ratio of direct to indirect labor on public works projects.

Now of the total, Federal agencies are using $110 million of this total $361 million for direct Federal projects for such purposes as conservation work in our national forests and wildlife ranges, medical and sanitary facilities on Indian reservations, modernization and extension of small post offices, and other authorized public works.

That is about 30 percent of the funds that have been allocated to Federal agencies who do their own construction substantially. That, of course, is 100 percent Federal.

The agencies we are talking about are the Forest Service, the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of Interior, several others in Interior; Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers.

The largest, Paul, are Interior and Agriculture?

Mr. SOUTHWICK. Yes.

Mr. BATT. Now the larger share, the 70-percent share, $251 million, has been earmarked for State and local projects. You see, the Congress said to give priority to the stuff that comes out of the communities, and this has been committed for waterworks and water pollution control, for sewers, streets, hospitals, libraries, for police and fire stations, for public buildings, and many other types of needed community facilities for which communities put up matching funds.

About 50 percent of all the applications to CFA over here, Community Facilities Administration, are for sewer and water lines. I personally never realized how many communities didn't have any sewerlines or any waterlines.

The response from local governments has been gratifyingly quick, demonstrating the strong desire of local communities to alleviate unemployment, and to get these public works built.

Our latest available figures, at the end of January, disclosed the following applications, expected to meet program standards, are on hand: Over in HHFA, CFA, $274 million. This is the backlog. This we haven't gotten to yet. HEW—and this is administered by the Public Health Service, waste treatment works $218 million, and hospitals $127 million, for a total backlog of $1,069 million.

And let me say parenthetically—this isn't in the printed statement—they are coming in at the rate of about $300 million every month.

Is that a fair statement, Paul?

The President is sending to Congress, sent to Congress yesterday a supplemental appropriation of $500 million to carry on this program. This sum was forecast in the 1964 budget recently transmitted to the Congress, and will exhaust the $900 million authorized in the accelerated Public Works Act.

It is clear, therefore, that there are already on hand more than enough applications for Federal and local projects to use up the funds authorized by the Congress for this program. Accordingly, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are suspending the accelerated public works program except for those especially hard-hit areas which have already been allowed matching ratios in excess of 50 percent. This is a relative handful of areas, about 20 percent of the total, where the unemployment is so severe that Congress directed us to provide matching ratios higher than 50 percent, going up to a total of 75 percent.

While applications from all areas will continue to be accepted and dated as to time of receipt, they will receive no further processing unless they are located in the hardest hit areas referred to previously.

Status of APW projects approved, by type of project, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Alabama	41	$4,254	7,028
Alaska	16	2,699	1,928
Arizona	15	2,935	4,192
Arkansas	60	1,274	2,542
California	62	6,916	8,732
Colorado	16	1,630	2,362
Connecticut	19	1,602	2,412
Delaware	2	93	223
Florida	25	3,099	5,407
Georgia	36	4,012	4,981
Hawaii	1	134	1,752
Idaho	37	2,367	2,645
Illinois	49	3,234	5,331
Indiana	25	1,758	3,413
Kansas	3	115	193
Kentucky	61	4,629	8,486
Louisiana	29	6,126	14,055
Maine	1	360	432
Maryland	3	158	583
Massachusetts	15	4,036	5,946
Michigan	111	15,814	20,952
Minnesota	41	4,196	6,230
Mississippi	27	2,302	5,611
Missouri	65	4,254	4,784
Montana	31	1,616	2,573
Nebraska	5	596	827
Nevada	2	200	276
New Hampshire	3	420	528
New Jersey	20	8,632	13,869
New Mexico	57	3,347	4,256
New York	28	6,284	7,130
North Carolina	46	3,032	5,370
North Dakota	2	275	528
Ohio	32	6,097	8,816
Oklahoma	23	3,430	7,944
Oregon	36	3,357	4,220
Pennsylvania	80	15,829	20,757
Rhode Island	6	2,786	2,196
South Carolina	20	1,400	1,524
South Dakota	3	650	1,104
Tennessee	32	5,538	14,112
Texas	27	2,627	4,808
Utah	34	1,211	1,746
Vermont	1	366	878
Virginia	11	100	209
Washington	46	4,144	3,281
West Virginia	56	6,017	5,365
Wisconsin	37	1,110	2,812
Wyoming	8	384	382
Puerto Rico	10	721	607
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Agriculture: Forest Service	741	$14,961	21,192
Army: Corps of Engineers	55	9,392	10,304
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads	34	8,141	5,436
Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service	181	40,004	56,951
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Community Facilities Administration	352	72,969	118,383
Interior:			
Bureau of Land Management	11	1,972	2,784
Bureau of Indian Affairs	19	5,701	9,984
National Park Service	10	1,736	5,310
Commercial Fisheries	1	380	540
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	12	2,910	5,454
Total, Interior	53	12,699	24,072
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by type of area, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Area	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months onsite employment
5(a)	340	$51,088	67,599
5(b)	809	49,771	76,607
5(br)	20	5,310	9,296
LS	247	51,997	82,836
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved by States as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Type	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months onsite employment
Construction and improvements:			
Hospital and health facilities	72	$21,639	31,598
Administrative building	47	12,627	19,774
All other buildings	44	5,340	6,914
Road and streets	261	20,965	24,171
Airports	5	1,374	2,448
Water, sewage, facilities and other utilities	192	41,651	70,416
Waste treatment works	113	19,503	27,562
Recreational facilities	50	9,337	15,667
Water resources projects	15	3,355	3,626
Fish and wildlife facilities	9	2,180	4,662
All other construction	234	7,766	9,010
Repairs: All types of repairs	170	7,100	9,809
Conservation measures: All types of conservation	204	5,329	10,681
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session for today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as the debate on this measure begins——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield, if it is understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the debate on the pending measure—the Mass Transportation Act of 1963—begins, I should like to make a few observations.

This is not the first time the Senate has been called upon to consider legislation to help urban areas with their transit needs. Senators will recall that in 1960, a mass transportation bill, that is, S. 3278, was considered and passed by the Senate. No action, however, was taken on that bill by the House of Representatives.

In 1961, provision was made on a temporary basis, as a part of omnibus housing legislation—that is, Public Law 87–70—for Federal assistance to communities to help solve mass transportation problems. It was understood at the time that the loan and demonstration grant funds provided in the 1961 legislation would be for only a temporary period, pending further study by the administration, for the purpose of preparing a plan for a long-range and comprehensive federally assisted urban mass transportation program.

The study was completed in late December 1961; and, based upon its findings, recommendations were drawn by the administration and were presented to the Congress by the President on April 5, 1962. Subsequently, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee considered pending mass transportation legislation, and favorably reported a committee bill, S. 3615. Senators will recall that this measure was then referred to the Commerce Committee. S. 3615 was reported by that committee without comment. No further action was taken on S. 3615 during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

During the closing days of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Congress did, however, extend, by Senate Joint Resolution 235, the temporary program for a 6-month period. At present, this program will expire on June 30, 1963.

This is the fourth year that we have been called upon to provide a means of meeting mass transportation needs of our people. During these 4 years, more than 35 days have been devoted to receiving testimony on mass transportation legislation. The testimony on this subject received from witnesses who appeared before the Senate committees fills nearly 3,000 pages of the hearings. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee alone have spent 16 days in executive session, in deliberating on mass transportation legislation.

I point out these statistics in order to show the vast amount of time and the deliberate consideration which have been given by the Senate to mass transportation legislation.

Mr. President, it is time that we face up to the question of whether Congress intends to take any action to help serve the transportation needs of our country. There is no doubt that the mass transportation industry in this Nation faces a real crisis; and the longer we delay in recognizing this fact, the greater will be the cost to our people, our towns and cities, and to the entire economy of the Nation.

I should like to use two examples to illustrate my point. First, many private companies are finding it extremely difficult to meet the operating expenses of existing facilities, and they are finding it almost prohibitive to finance new capital improvements required in order to meet expansion requirements. Caught in the squeeze of rising capital and operating costs and declining patronage, many private companies must resort to raising fares, trimming service, and deferred maintenance—which simply drives away more riders and accelerates the downward spiral. These declines in riding, with their resulting serious financial impact, have caused the abandonment of many transit companies in recent years. One regrettable consequence of this trend is that many communities have abandoned mass transit rights-of-way. It is possible that if the Congress had acted to establish a permanent mass transportation system in 1960, 1961, or 1962, many of these rights-of-way might have been saved.

Today, if these communities desire to reestablish a local mass transportation system, we can be assured that rights-of-way will be redeemed or replaced only at very heavy cost.

Second, during the mass transportation hearings of 1962, the committee was informed by the American Transit Association about the number of transit companies abandoned since January 1, 1954. Again, during the 1963 hearings, the association's witness presented the same information, but of course, updated by 10 months. During this 10-month period, 20 transit companies were abandoned. The witness further stated that many companies presently in existence are on the verge of being abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table by the American Transit Association which supports my statement.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary, by States, showing the number of U.S. transit companies sold or abandoned from Jan. 1, 1954, to Feb. 1, 1963

State	Number of companies sold	Number of companies abandoned	Total sales and abandonments
Alabama	1	0	1
Arizona	3	0	3
Arkansas	3	8	11
California	10	11	21
Colorado	4	7	11
Connecticut	5	3	8
Delaware	1	0	1
District of Columbia	2	0	2
Florida	10	5	15
Georgia	5	5	10
Idaho	1	3	4
Illinois	5	14	19
Indiana	9	14	23
Iowa	4	3	7
Kansas	3	4	7
Kentucky	6	2	8
Louisiana	2	0	2

Summary, by States, showing the number of U.S. transit companies sold or abandoned from Jan. 1, 1954, to Feb. 1, 1963—**Con.**

State	Number of companies sold	Number of companies abandoned	Total sales and abandonments
Maine	2	3	5
Maryland	3	3	6
Massachusetts	7	3	10
Michigan	17	8	25
Minnesota	1	2	3
Mississippi	1	2	3
Missouri	4	2	6
Montana	5	4	9
Nebraska	0	6	6
New Hampshire	2	1	3
New Jersey	5	3	8
New Mexico	2	1	3
New York	21	14	35
North Carolina	7	3	10
North Dakota	1	0	1
Ohio	18	14	32
Oklahoma	3	3	6
Oregon	8	7	15
Pennsylvania	19	7	26
Rhode Island	2	0	2
South Carolina	1	1	2
South Dakota	2	0	2
Tennessee	4	0	4
Texas	10	14	24
Virginia	2	3	5
Washington	8	3	11
West Virginia	1	2	3
Wisconsin	11	4	15
Wyoming	2	2	4
Total	243	194	437

Summary, by years, of the number of U.S. transit companies sold or abandoned from Jan. 1, 1954, to Feb. 1, 1963

	Number of companies sold	Number of companies abandoned	Total sales and abandonments
1954	29	19	48
1955	27	26	53
1956	17	29	46
1957	27	20	47
1958	35	19	54
1959	29	28	57
1960	21	13	34
1961	23	9	32
1962	23	21	44
1963 (to Feb. 1, 1963)	1	1	2
Date not available	11	9	20
Total	243	194	437

Source: American Transit Association.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, it would be foolish to assume that the program proposed by S. 6 would save all the transit systems that are on the brink of abandonment, but each one that is prevented from "going under" will save that many jobs, will keep that many rights-of-way open, and will help to avoid an economic decline in the local area.

The bill reported by the committee, that is, S. 6, is basically the same bill that the Banking and Currency Committee reported to the Senate last year. Last session the committee deliberated mass transportation legislation over a 3½-month period prior to reporting the bill to the Senate. During that period the committee very painstakingly considered all the objections of those who presented their views. I believe the committee, by amending the bill, met the majority of these objections.

For example, during the last session of the Congress, those representing private mass transportation companies expressed grave concern that the legislation did not permit them to participate in the proposed program. Although these representatives were mistaken in their interpretation, and were assured on many occasions that they could participate in the program, the committee very carefully wrote into the bill the so-called private operator amendments. These amendments were retained in S. 6 this year.

In addition, during the last session many voiced concern that the bill would provide assistance for large cities only. Others voiced concern that the bill gave the Administrator broad and unlimited powers. Some said the legislation would provide assistance to uneconomical systems. Others stated that the legislation provided for rail-type transit only, ignoring bus systems, and so on. The committee squarely faced each of these objections and, in my opinion, resolved these matters satisfactorily.

This year, witnesses from labor organizations expressed concern that the proposed legislation would first, promote automation thus causing a loss of jobs; and, second, imperil the rights and privileges of those now employed in existing private transportation companies. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee are just as sensitive to unemployment and the rights and privileges of employees as are any other groups in this body, and the committee was most sympathetic to the plight of those presently engaged in mass transit service. The committee added an amendment to S. 6 in order to help safeguard the rights and privileges of those now employed by transit companies in communities where such projects are assisted or financed under the bill. It is my opinion that this amendment provides ample protection to those who might be affected by this legislation.

Mr. President, like any measure that comes before the Senate, S. 6 does not satisfy every Member nor does it satisfy every individual group who is concerned with mass transportation problems. Quite frankly, I have reservations about some of the provisions of the bill. However, I believe that S. 6, in general, is a sound bill and that it will go a long way toward serving the mass transportation needs of this Nation and our people.

I should like now to explain the major features of the bill.

Very generally, S. 6, as amended by the committee, is designed to establish, in place of the temporary mass transportation program authorized by the Congress in 1961, a long-range Federal program to assist State and local bodies, and agencies thereof, to provide the kind of mass transportation facilities necessary for the orderly growth and development of urban communities. Basically, the bill provides for a program of Federal loans and grants to supplement State and local funds to finance the capital facilities and equipment needed for the extension and improvement of comprehensively planned urban mass transportation systems. These systems could be either publicly or privately operated.

The major features of the bill are as follows:

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Federal grants would be provided for mass transportation facilities and equipment, including land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of use, with strict planning requirements, including the preparation of an areawide transportation plan as a part of comprehensive planning for the development of the urban area. To the extent that projects cannot be financed from estimated revenues, Federal grants could be made for two-thirds of the remaining cost—"the net project cost." Local grants would be required for the other one-third. Part or all of the Federal and local grant could later be repaid from any surplus revenues.

Federal loans, limited to the amount authorized for mass transportation loans under existing law, would be authorized for projects where loans cannot be obtained privately on reasonable terms, if such loans would make effective mass transportation possible without grant assistance.

EMERGENCY 3-YEAR PROGRAM

For a 3-year period, Federal loans and grants could be made on an emergency basis, with less strict planning requirements but with a one-half rather than two-thirds Federal grant. The remaining one-sixth Federal grant would be available if full planning requirements are met within 3 years from the date of the grant agreement.

FINANCING FOR LONG-RANGE AND EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

Contract authorization would be provided for grants of $500 million over a 3-year period in the following manner: $100 million upon enactment, $200 million on July 1, 1964, and another $200 million on July 1, 1965. The present $50 million loan authority would be retained, but without expiration date.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

A research, development, and demonstration program would be authorized, to apply to all phases of urban mass transportation, in place of the present demonstration grant program. This program would be financed through the present $25 million demonstration grant authority, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority.

RELOCATION PROVISIONS

An adequate relocation program for families displaced by each project would be required; and Federal grants for relocation payments to individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations would be authorized similar to those applicable to the Housing Agency's urban renewal program.

Mr. President, those are the major features of the pending measure. For a more detailed analysis of S. 6, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a section-by-section summary of the Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

Section 1. Title of bill: "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963."

Section 2. (a) Findings and (b) purposes.

Section 3. Federal financial assistance:

(a) Eligibility for assistance: Eligible applicants: States and local public bodies and agencies thereof. Applicants must have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control of use of facilities and equipment; but shall give full consideration to such control being exercised by an existing regulatory agency with respect to private companies.

Eligible projects: Facilities and equipment, acquired, constructed, reconstructed, and improved, for use in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such services with highway and other transportation in such areas. Federal assistance authorized for advance acquisition of land and improvements provided assurances received for repayment if not put in use in reasonable time.

Eligible facilities and equipment: Any real or personal property including land (but not public highways), buses, and other rolling stock needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system.

(b) Protection of rights of private bus and motor companies: No grant or loan shall be made for a project involving acquisition of facilities or property of private enterprise motor transit systems unless—

(1) Such assistance is essential to the program for a unified coordinated urban transportation system;

(2) The program provides for participation of private mass transportation companies to the maximum extent feasible; and

(3) Just compensation will be paid to such companies for their franchises or property to the extent required by applicable State or local laws.

(c) Loan authorization: Extends for an indefinite period the $50 million Treasury borrowing authority under existing law. Loans are subject to restrictions and limitations as provided by the public facility loan program (a term of 40 years).

Loans would be authorized for projects where private loans cannot be obtained on reasonable terms if such loans would make effective mass transportation possible without grant assistance.

(d) Interest rate formula: Establishes a new rate of interest to be paid by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury for funds with which to make mass transportation loans. Under the new formula the current interest rate to the consumer would be 4⅜ percent.

Section 4. Long-range program:

(a) Planning requirements: Complete preparation of a program for a unified coordinated urban mass transportation system as a part of a comprehensively planned development of the urban area encouraging, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise.

Acquisition of existing systems: Federal assistance only if improvements made to serve better the transportation needs of the community.

Grant formula—Federal share: Two-thirds of net project cost (that portion of project cost that cannot be financed on reasonable terms from revenues).

Local share: One-third of net project cost in cash from sources other than Federal funds. Refund permitted provided a proportionate share is made of Federal share.

(b) Granting authorization: Authorizes Administrator to enter into contracts for grants of up to $100 million upon enactment; an additional $200 million on July 1, 1964; and an additional $200 million on July 1, 1965. Full faith and credit of United States pledged upon contract appropriations for payments authorized.

Section 5. Emergency program:

Eligible facilities and equipment: Same as the items listed in section 3 above, provided, there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision and such items can reasonably be expected to be required for a long-range program.

Federal share: One-half of net project cost (defined same as in section 4(a) above) or two-thirds if conditions of long-range program are met within 3 years after execution of grant contract.

Financing: Grants or loans may be used to finance emergency program. Funds would come from the same authorizations described in section 4 above.

Expiration date: No emergency project may be entered into on or after July 1, 1966.

Section 6. Research, development, and demonstration programs:

(a) Eligibility: The Administrator is authorized to undertake development and demonstration projects for all phases of urban mass transportation which will result in (1) the improvement of mass transportation service, or (2) in meeting total transportation needs at minimum costs.

(b) Financing: The unobligated balance of the present $25 million demonstration grant authority would be made available to finance such projects, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority under section 4 above.

Section 7. Relocation requirements and payments:

(a) Relocation program: Requires adequate relocation for families displaced by mass transportation programs as a prerequisite for financial assistance.

(b) Relocation payments: Requires payment of not to exceed $200 to families, or $3,000 (or if greater, total certified actual moving expense) to businesses or nonprofit organizations for relocation expenses. Federal Government to reimburse applicant for full amount of relocation expenses.

Section 8. Coordination of Federal assistance for highways and mass transportation facilities:

Requires Administrator of HHFA and Secretary of Commerce to consult, cooperate, and exchange information on all urban transportation policies and programs.

Section 9. General provisions:

(a) Gives HHFA Administrator the necessary functions, powers, and duties to carry out the purposes of the bill.

(b) Empowers the Administrator and the Comptroller General or their representatives to have access to and audit the books and records of all pertinent contracting parties.

(c) Defines certain terms applicable to the act.

(d) Authorizes funds to be appropriated for administrative expenses of program and funds appropriated for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended.

(e) Provides a grant limitation of $12.5 million to any State until June 30, 1964. The limit would then increase to $37.5 million after June 30, 1964, and to $62.5 million after June 30, 1965, except that the limit for any State could be increased at any time by $5 million, if these specific increases do not exceed $50 million. Further provides that in case a project is undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a compact or other agreement, the Administrator may, subject to the overall limits set forth above, allocate any portion of the grant for the project to any one or more of such States.

(f) Requires the President to submit annual reports to the Congress which shall include among other things (1) to whom financial assistance has been extended, (2) the purpose for which the assistance is to be utilized, (3) amounts involved, and (4) such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

Section 10. Labor Standards:

(a) Makes applicable the prevailing wage-scale provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

(b) Gives the Secretary of Labor authority to issue regulations and provide for enforcement of labor standards.

(c) Requires as a condition of Federal assistance that fair and equitable arrangements be made to protect the rights of employees (including collective bargaining rights, pension rights, priority of employment privileges, retraining programs, and protection against worsening of their employment position).

Section 11. Air-pollution control:

Provides that Administrator, in approving grants and loans, shall take into consideration whether facilities and equipment will be designed or equipped to prevent and control air pollution in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I reiterate that S. 6 is a good bill and that it will help to serve the transit needs of our people. I am hopeful that the measure will receive favorable consideration by the Senate, by the House of Representatives, and will be signed into law by the President.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purpose of making the record clear as to the purport of the bill, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the terms of the bill, is it a fact that every community in the United States with a plan for the development of mass transportation, having a population of 2,500 or more, would be eligible to receive grants with which to buy buses, rolling equipment, parking lots, buildings, and other facilities?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Technically, the answer is "Yes." I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 15 of S. 6:

> The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

Mr. President, this is a matter on which a good deal of time was spent in discussion in the committee. I did not wish to see a bill the benefits of which would be limited to half a dozen, or even a dozen, large cities.

Testimony was presented before our committee to the effect that a great many smaller cities have lost their transit systems. Certainly such smaller cities and towns should be eligible for assistance.

An urban area is defined by the Bureau of the Census to be any built-up place with a population of 2,500 or more. That is the reason why I say that technically the answer to the Senator's question is "Yes." Practically, I do not believe it is proper to assume that any such program as that would be carried out.

We would make these areas eligible, but we would place the discretion in the Administrator to handle the program in such a way as to solve mass transit problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Administrator of HHFA would have the discretion to determine to which community grants would be made, within the definition of the term "urban area," as read by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That language is—

> The term area "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality—

So municipalities would be entitled to grants—

> or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator.

I ask the Senator what limitations are provided anywhere in the bill with respect to the Administrator exercising his discretion concerning the community to which he would grant the money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how Congress could be expected to spell out the communities that are to be eligible under the act. Discretion for administering the program must be left with somebody. We felt in this instance that it was best to leave the discretion with the person who was to administer the act.

There could be a relatively small city a few miles from a big one—or a place where people live a good many miles from their area of work—where perhaps a mass transit system was needed to tie the communities together; that is, to give the people commuter service. Should such smaller areas be ruled out arbitrarily?

If such situations should arise, we tried to provide broad enough authority to link up communities of this nature. Under the provisions of S. 6, the Administrator has discretion to do so. I do not see how we could grant assistance more fairly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The answer is that there are no limitations on the Administrator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The good judgment and discretion of the Administrator would be exercised within the terms of the act as a whole.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that not a dangerous method of writing laws, to say that the Administrator may do whatever he wishes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder how the Senator from Ohio would do it. Would the Senator designate the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Cleveland, and a few others to participate in the urban transit program, leaving out the smaller cities, which, perhaps, are as badly in need as are the big cities?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not disputing that aspect of it. My position is that it is a hazardous thing to allow the changing minds of changing Administrators to determine to whom aid shall or shall not be given.

The Senator from Alabama asked me a question about how I would write the language. It is my understanding that New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Newark are begging for the gift. So to procure the support of the small communities in the Nation the language was so written that they would be tempted to support it in the belief that they would be given aid.

I ask the Senator from Alabama how many municipalities there are in the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot say, because I do not know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand there are 15,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly I am not willing to admit that the language of the bill was either written or changed in order to get the smaller communities to come in. They were in first. They were in ahead of time.

For my own part, I insisted, and others on the committee insisted, that if we were to have a bill at all, smaller cities and communities were to be eligible to participate in the program.

The Senator might be interested to know that during the time the experimental program on the statute books—for 2 years—a total of 227 cities in 44 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have made inquiries about the mass transportation demonstration and loan programs enacted as a part of the 1961 Omnibus Housing Act. The only States from which inquiries have not been received are Delaware, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming.

There is a great deal of need for mass transportation systems throughout the country as has been indicated by the inquiries made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate those statistics, but I wish to point out that in the hearings which I attended of the Committee on Banking and Currency the question was thrown to me:

> Do you know the city of Findlay? The city of Upper Arlington? Is it not a fact they have no mass transportation at all?

It is a fact that they do not have it, but they do not need it, and they do not want it.

I should like to do a little questioning on the matter of demonstration grants. Does the Senator from Alabama know which demonstrations have been completed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I did not hear the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Tests are being made throughout the country to determine how the transportation problem will be solved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Demonstration grants are made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Demonstration grants.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I call the Senator's attention to the demonstration grants in Massachusetts. The Federal Government put up $3,600,000 and the Massachusetts Transit Authority put up $1,800,000 to ascertain how they could get the people to give up using their automobiles and begin using railroads. So a contract was made with the Boston & Maine Railroad, under which the railroad was paid $2,200,000 in 1 year. The Boston & Maine Railroad reduced its fare from $1.99 to $1.10, and increased the frequency of service. The results showed that the Boston & Maine Railroad picked up 7,000 passengers a day, supposedly taking them off the highways and out of their automobiles.

My question is: Does the Senator from Alabama know how much taxpayers' money goes each day to the Boston & Maine Railroad to pick up those 7,000 passengers from the highways?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The taxpayers are paying $7,000 a day to the Boston & Maine, and they are being paid out of this program. My query is, Where has the demonstration been made showing that the program proposed in the bill will work out as contemplated? Where has a demonstration been completed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been several demonstrations programs, as is shown commencing on page 9 of the report which accompanies the bill. We discuss some of the demonstrations programs on that page. For instance, at the bottom of page 9, reference is made to the demonstration program in Detroit. We also refer to one in Massachusetts and another one in Philadelphia. Three specific examples are set out.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I think we must do more than merely consider what may happen within a matter of days or weeks, or even months. I think everyone knows that traffic on the highways is becoming so heavy that the highways simply cannot carry it.

The Senator has spoken of using taxpayers' money on railroads in an attempt to work out the transportation problem. I was wondering how much of the taxpayers' money is spent on an interstate highway running parallel to a railroad, or, if not parallel to the railroad, perhaps through another section of the State. We are spending enormous sums of money in this area. The Senator from Ohio knows that today, even with all the new highway construction, our roads and highways are becoming overloaded to an alarming extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I continue?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me yield to the Senator from New Jersey first.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is germane to the discussion of the Massachusetts reference. It was just about a year ago that the State of Massachusetts announced that on an 11-mile stretch of highway, from U.S. 128 into the center of Boston, an expenditure of $118 million had been made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much of that was Federal funds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is a State project, but, of course, we all know the extent of Federal participation in the Interstate Highway System, a program of $41 billion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The answer is 90 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is on a 90–10 basis, 90 percent Federal money, 10 percent local money; and $20 billion of that $41 billion is being spent in urban areas and the rest all over the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Picking up where the Senator from Alabama left off, I submit no tests have been made anywhere that demonstrate people will be induced not to use their automobiles but to use railroads, buses, and other rapid transit.

Tests are now being made in Massachusetts and in Memphis, Tenn. The Detroit test was negligible. It was a $200,000 sort of study. One test was completed on the monorail in Seattle. That was a $10,000 test.

The question is: Who can, by demonstration, point out that I, or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], or the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], for example, will be induced to give up using automobiles and instead ride on buses or railroads to go in or out of town? I would like to have any one of the proponents point out one study that has been completed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I pointed out that studies are listed on page 9 of the report to accompany S. 6. I do not know of any projects that have been completed to the extent questioned by the Senator. I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] knows of such instances or not.

But, are we going to wait before we make efforts to meet these problems until we know the answer to this question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think we ought to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If so, I do not see how we are ever going to keep up with the needs of a throbbing, growing, more prosperous country, the people of which are moving from place to place, as Americans seem to like to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have read the studies that have been made——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator let me interrupt?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am somewhat puzzled by the questions of the Senator from Ohio regarding the timeliness of this legislation, because, he, himself, is the author of a mass transportation bill, S. 807. I have it before me.

If I may revert to the definition of urban areas which might be eligible by a mass transportation program, then I might say that the provisions in Senate bill 6 are certainly not as broad as those in S. 807. The Senator has this language in his bill:

> The term "local public or private transit agency" means—
>
> (A) any State, or any county, city, political subdivision of a State, or public corporation created by State law, which is authorized by State law to acquire, construct, complete, develop, own, operate, and maintain a mass rapid transit system.

Certainly that definition is much broader than is the one contained in the pending bill. The bill of the Senator from Ohio contemplates assistance for mass transportation in a way which indicates that he apparently feels a need for a program. There would be no greater need for help under the plan provided in his bill than there is in our bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to comment on that statement. My bill contemplates guaranteeing the loans——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator knows——

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I complete my statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that an amendment will be offered which we propose to accept, that would provide for the guarantee of bonds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My bill contemplates an authorization of a $50 million revolving fund, which is to be used to guarantee borrowings made by local transit companies; and before a guarantee can be given, the local transit company must agree to charge rates of fares adequate to produce revenues to (a) pay the operating expenses; (b) pay the interest on the borrowing; (c) pay the principal.

Fifty million dollars is involved in my bill on a guaranteed loan basis. However, the bill of the administration and the Senator from New Jersey contemplates a $500 million gift program. I cannot see how the proponents of Senate bill 6 can argue that my bill is more extravagant. It can be argued that under my bill private companies and municipal transit systems and country transit systems can be beneficiaries. I submit, however, that the bill of the administration and the Senator from New Jersey provides that no one can get this money for nothing except governmentally operated plants. Private enterprise can get it if it goes through the governmental plant and applies to the Federal Government.

The point I wish to make is that the pending bill is the machinery to drive private transit systems out of existence. They will only be able to get help if they come through a public body. The public body will have the private systems by the throat. They will be able to say to them, "You will get help if you will comply with what we want."

On that score, that broadness of my bill, I respectfully submit, is intended to stop the Fabianists from pushing the private enterprise system of mass transportation into public, nationalized operations. I wish the Senator would comment on that statement, because I believe it is pertinent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I did not say his bill was more extravagant. I did not use that term. I said that, so far as the areas to which it would apply are concerned, the Senator's bill was much broader than S. 6, because the Senator from Ohio's bill applies to any incorporated area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Where the State would authorize the operation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I admit that the Senator's bill is one of guaranteeing. As I said, as a matter of fact, the Commerce Committee, of which the Senator from Ohio is a member, will offer an amendment to provide for that method of financing in this measure. I believe it is a method very close to what the Senator's bill provides.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator explain the amendments that were made, under which the Federal Government will direct the transit systems on collective bargaining, and other labor situations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. First let me get back to the private enterprise situation. As a matter of fact, the Senator will find provisions in S. 6 which show our concern for private enterprise. In my statement I set out that last year we wrote in provisions, and it was largely at my insistence that those provisions were carried forward in the bill this year, to take care of privately owned mass transportation companies. If the Senator will look at page 5 of S. 6, he will find this language set out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What line is that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Page 5, line 10. I am commencing in the middle of a sentence:

> such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies.

Then on page 7, at the top of the page, starting at the end of line 1:

> Such a program shall encourage, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise.

Now let me turn to the other matter, with respect to the public body, which the Senator has mentioned. I am sure the Senator will realize that some agency must have supervision—someone must be responsible for the comprehensive planning. As a matter of fact, all transit companies are supervised in one way or another. There is always some kind of regulatory body in the picture. Let us take the situation right here in the District of Columbia. We have set up an agency in the Federal Government, which lends assistance to and supervises the mass transportation system of this urban area. I do not know the administrative procedure of how loans or grants would be handled for the District under the bill, but certainly if the transit system in the metropolitan Washington area applied for assistance under S. 6, the application would be eligible. I do not know how the application would be made, or how it would be handled. However, there would have to be some agency to supervise and to oversee the mass transportation program which evolved. That is all we provide in the bill. We are not trying to socialize industry or force private industry out. As a matter of fact, we wrote that provision into the bill for the very purpose of preventing that effect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 4, line 4, this language appears:

> Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and any other real or personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Administrator determines that the applicant (which in no case shall be a private company

Why has it been stipulated that in no case shall the applicant be a private company?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator read on about one sentence further and pick up on line 14? The language reads:

> The applicant shall, with respect to private mass transportation companies, give full consideration to the exercise of such continuing control through the appropriate existing governmental regulatory agency authorized to issue to the operating company, in the form of certificates of public convenience and necessity, franchises, or other indicia

of operating authority, the authority to operate as a private mass transportation company.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe we agree on that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that answers the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Application must be made through a public authority.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not through a private company.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I am sure the Senator would agree to that procedure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the Senator's estimate of the full cost of this bill, by way of grants, to the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would prefer it if the Senator would wait until the presentation is made from the Commerce Committee, because the amendment to it he offered completely rewrites this language of S. 6. A member of the committee who will present the committee version will be able to give the cost. I know only from talking with the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that he believes that the guarantee principle will completely resolve the problem. He believes that there will be very little cost to the Federal Government, if any. I am not saying that on my own responsibility, but only based upon what he has said. The amendment to be offered derives somewhat from the Senator's bill. I will not say it is identical with it. It is somewhat similar to the provision in the Senator's bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to say at this point that the Administrator of HHFA testified that it will cost from $4 billion to $6 billion before we are through. In my judgment, it will cost $8 billion. I repeat: $8 billion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I do not know where this cost figure comes from. It seems to me to be pulled out of the air.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Oh, no.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under the plan that was suggested in the bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio and adopted by the Commerce Committee, which I understand is to be accepted here, I am sure——

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not my bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator would not provide any such subsidy program as that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not my bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am referring to S. 807, which the Senator from Ohio introduced. This formula was in his bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not the original $50 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Committee on Commerce adopted it; we are going to adopt it; so it seems to me that we are swinging right into line with the Senator from Ohio, who, I am sure, would not provide for any such expensive financing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My bill provided for a $50 million loan guarantee program. The administration's bill provides $500 million for 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is a grant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A grant; a gift.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the Committee on Commerce was not content with $50 million or $500 million. They said they would give $1 billion. So the bill of the Committee on Commerce provides $500 million for grants and $500 million for guaranteed loans. I was glad to get out of the meeting for fear they would jump the amount up to $2 billion. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the so-called mass transportation bill as it exists would extend further, over the country, the massive paternal hand of the Federal Government. It would deal a heavy blow to the concept and practice of separation of powers and functions between State governments and the Federal Government.

Supporters claim the bill will set in being a plan whereby the traffic problems in the congested areas of our Nation will be solved. However, the bill contains provisions which would confer czaristic powers on the HHFA Administrator, leaving too much to his arbitrary will and discretion. The bill is devoid of appropriate limitations; it is lacking in proper control.

The total cost of the program as established under S. 6 is only a start. In the 1962 committee hearings on a similar bill, a survey report made by the HHFA and the Department of Commerce conceded that $9.8 billion would be needed to alleviate urban transportation needs in the major cities. This near $10 billion estimate is not mine; it is that of the Agency which is going to administer the program. The $500 million S. 6 calls for is nothing more than a foot in the door, and is conceded as such by witness after witness. This $500 million is a mere drop in the bucket compared with the total future cost.

Most of the witnesses who testified for the bill were from the large cities. They knew what they were talking about concerning costs of mass transportation. They have had experience with such costs. This knowledge has been gained through experience in their respective areas. Many witnesses, by and large, felt that cities and States simply could not meet the problem headon and solve their own problems; that the cost was too much for the cities and States to bear themselves.

The witnesses from the metropolitan areas were certainly correct when they testified as to the tremendous cost of the program, but they were in error when they testified that cities and States themselves could not solve the cost problem. Consider what San Francisco has just done. Residents of the San Francisco Bay area approved, last November, a $792 million bond issue to finance their own transit system, a brandnew one quite complex in nature. That mass transit system will be financed partly through a property tax approved by the Bay area voters themselves. It is my understanding that Los Angeles, planning for a new and complex and costly mass transit system, will use farebox revenue as one of the primary sources of necessary funds.

One witness estimated that his city could use $200 million, another $300 million, another $100 million, and on and on. The $500 million in S. 6 will not go far—just far enough to open the door for an ultimate expenditure of $10 billion. The $500 million in S. 6 will go just far enough to keep communities and States from solving their own problems and meeting their own needs by discouraging local initiative.

Many smaller cities and towns are solving or planning to solve their own problems. The Committee on Commerce has heard a number of witnesses testify and present statements showing how the transportation problems in their respective areas are being met.

The bill before the Senate, S. 6, has undoubtedly already stifled incentive in various communities throughout the country. If there is one thing this country does not need, it is a program that will force communities and States to be even more dependent upon Federal aid from Washington, particularly at this time. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Federal Government is encountering opposition to aid programs—stiff opposition in some cases—from States which feel that they can solve and work with problems within their own borders much better and much more effectively than can Washington. This opposition is coming from States which have Republican Governors and States which have Democrat Governors. This increased interest at the State level should lead to more efficiency, to lower costs, to better administration and control. Let us encourage communities and States to solve their own problems, let us not discourage them. Federal involvement in local and State affairs will always reduce and, in some cases, destroy initiative on the part of local and State governments in seeking to solve their own problems.

Although I am not generally regarded as favorable to trade union demands, I have always maintained cordial relations with the representatives of labor in my own State. We believe in treating each other fairly, and in giving each other the right to be heard, the opportunity to be heard.

The trade unions were not afforded the time to express themselves before the committee on the amendment with which they were most concerned. Labor's fears did not exist last year or the year before. They supported and endorsed this legislation at that time, but because of the public acquisition of a private transit system, or more properly systems, in Dade County, Fla., problems that labor might face under this legislation were suddenly brought to light, so labor requested, and rightly so, the opportunity to present their views before the committee.

On March 8, the Secretary of Labor offered an amendment to the mass transportation bill. Labor representatives testified immediately afterward without knowing fully what the Secretary's position would be. The labor representatives did present an amendment a day or so later, which was considered along with the Secretary's proposals in executive session. But labor was not given any opportunity to testify further.

The labor section of this bill is one of the most important, and certainly those whom the bill will directly affect should, in fact, be encouraged to inform the proper committee of Congress of their feelings. I have received telegrams and correspondence and personal messages, as I am sure many other Senators have, both from labor leaders and individual union members, who say they are opposed to the bill. These messages have come from those who certainly have a great interest in the varied effects of the proposed legislation.

There is another matter related to the labor section of the bill which is extremely important.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield with respect to the question of labor?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder whether the Senator would feel that adequate consultation can be had with interested groups both in public hearings and in private discussion.

Mr. TOWER. I am not certain I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As the Senator knows, the committee has closed its hearings. We did not have labor spokesmen appear again at the public hearings of our committee; but we know that in the legislative process more than public hearings are held. There is the day-to-day work with persons who have vital interests. I am sure the Senator is aware that that is one of the legislative processes of Congress.

Mr. TOWER. I understand that when we are working under pressure and are anxious to pass legislation, sometimes we treat matters a little more cursorily than when we have more leisure in which to consider measures.

The fact is that there was a substantial body of testimony on the bill prior to the inclusion of this amendment, but none from labor subsequent to the inclusion of the amendment. It is not a part of the formal hearings on the bill.

I would be hypocritical if I said that I am a great champion of trade union leadership; nevertheless, I believe that the representatives of organized labor have a right to be heard. I have never denied anyone a fair hearing, as I think anyone on either side of the fence will testify. I think the representatives of labor should have the opportunity to testify.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Since the record was closed, persons of great ability in the Senate and representing affected labor unions have been in discussion day and night. The Senate is meeting on Monday afternoon. I know that some Members of the Senate burned more than the midnight oil last night with Mr. Cushman, who spoke for the amalgamated union. If all these problems are resolved, and perhaps with an amendment tomorrow, to the satisfaction of all concerned, I shall be happy indeed to share the Senator's joy in that fact.

Mr. TOWER. I am not expressing any joy; let there be no mistake about it. I am, however, stating the argument against the bill. I think it is a valid argument against the bill. Whether I intend to support labor's demands or not, labor still has the right to make its demands and the right to be heard.

I was not aware that there was in the making some rapprochement between some of the proponents of the bill and organized labor; and I shall be very much interested to see what the outcome is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In regard to labor's being heard, I wish to say the Senator from Texas will recall that the Secretary of Labor did not testify before our committee until nearly the end of the hearings. The labor organizations which had manifested an interest in the proposed legislation had been given ample opportunity to appear before that time; but they told us they did not wish to appear until after the Secretary had testified. So they followed the Secretary immediately, as the Senator will recall, and did testify in regard to the amendment the Secretary had proposed. They told us very frankly that they did not believe it was sufficient. They said they did not believe it went far enough. The Senator will recall that I asked them whether it would be agreeable to them to submit their proposal to us in writing.

So far as I know—and I was chairman of the subcommittee—no one representing the labor organizations asked for a subsequent hearing. Apparently the representatives who were there were well pleased with the opportunity they had to submit a memorandum following their testimony and to submit a specific amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Let me say that it was not my intention to infer or to imply that either the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from New Jersey intentionally was trying to deny anyone a hearing. Certainly that was not my intention, and I hope my remarks will not be construed in that way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course not. No representative of labor who was present requested a hearing in addition to those we held.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, they testified on the next to the last day. I believe the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] testified on the last day when testimony was taken.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I believe they testified on Thursday, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] testified on the following Monday.

Mr. TOWER. However, even if they had not asked to testify, I think it would have been wise on our part to see what was their comment on the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If they had wished to return on Monday and to testify then, we could have heard them then. But no such request was made.

Mr. TOWER. Probably there was very little time for them to make a survey of the effect on the unions or their constituents, and to obtain a reaction. In any case, the reaction since that time has been negative. It seems to me that perhaps it would have been in the best interests of the proponents of the measure to have allowed more time for the representatives of labor to consider this provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder whether the Senator from Texas will describe what he believes to be labor's anxieties about this measure.

Mr. TOWER. They feel that it does not go far enough in protecting existing bargaining rights, pension rights, and so forth—any number of things. I think that is rather clearly indicated by the proposal made by labor which is included in the committee's hearings.

Another matter relating to the labor section is extremely important. A number of States have, in one form or another, restrictions prohibiting certain labor activities by employees of the State and its political subdivisions. Would Federal assistance be given to States whose labor laws conflict with the labor provision in this bill? Would the labor provisions in this bill supersede the laws of the various States? The Secretary of Labor indicated there would be no superseding of State law, but said the question of whether there would be an effect was a somewhat different question. However, in section 10(c)(2) of the bill, in the language referring to the enforcement of the prevention of curtailment of collective bargaining rights by the HHFA Administrator, the words "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law"—approved in subcommittee—were deleted from the bill in full committee. From this, one can only assume that this measure could be enforced in a manner not consistent with State or local law. Texas law prohibits the State or its political subdivisions from entering into a collective-bargaining contract with a labor organization in respect to wages, hours, or conditions of employment of public employees; and any such contracts shall be null and void. It is further declared to be against the public policy of the State of Texas for any such official or group of officials to recognize a labor organization as the bargaining agent for any group of employees. It is my understanding there are similar laws in several of the States. At any rate, this probable conflict with State labor laws is a most important consideration in connection with this bill. It is a matter that should be gone into in detail before the proper committee, in order to determine the effect of the labor provisions of the bill upon our State laws.

Secretary Wirtz, in referring in his testimony to the situation in Dade County—where, as I have mentioned, there was a loss of collective-bargaining rights, due to the establishment of a new transit system operated by the municipality—said that in the application of Senate bill 6 to situations of that kind:

> There would be a question that would have to be squarely faced, as to whether or

> not Federal funds should be used in connection with a situation of that kind, unless better arrangements could be worked out for the preservation of collective bargaining rights.

Will State laws be superseded, if not in one way, in another? The question is certainly raised as to whether the Administrator will be forced to deny assistance to certain States. Or would he deny assistance to certain States only until they changed their laws? The point is not at all clear, because no testimony was made available to the committee after the deletion of the words "not inconsistent with State or local law."

Senate bill 6 lacks economic justification and basis. I feel that the local and State governments are in as good a position, if not a better one, to finance their own transportation needs. States are certainly better agents to solve mass transit problems than is the Federal Government. I do not, of course, recommend that local governments be enlarged to include suburban areas, unless the residents of these areas desire to be so included; but I point out that for the purpose of solving specific problems, some metropolitan areas have organized in this manner. There are also in existence interstate compacts dealing with urban projects, such as the one creating the New York Port Authority.

Testimony presented before the committee showed that 194 transit companies have been abandoned since January 1954. The primary cause for these abandonments is that these systems are simply not performing the function desired by persons in the areas they serve. As a witness so aptly pointed out last year, the transit systems did not leave the people; the people left the transit systems.

Is modernization the answer? When people stopped using transit systems, they sometimes stopped using systems that were modern at that time.

It is held that improved, new mass-transit systems will mean less automobile use, and traffic congestion will be curtailed or eliminated. But there is no assurance; there was not brought out in the committee hearings any real evidence that new and improved mass-transit facilities would cause a significant number of people, now commuting in automobiles, to abandon their private vehicles in favor of mass transit. We must look at the primary reason for the use of the automobile by the commuter. The primary reason is convenience. The versatility of the automobile makes its use so desirable. There is no type of mass-transit system to duplicate this versatility and this convenience. Let me quote from a study—made by Northwestern University—relating to competition between the two; that is, between the bus system and the private automobile:

> For example, if a man said his next best alternative to using his own car was the bus, and now for this group of people—call them this population of bus users, meaning the bus is their next best alternative—supposing you want to get them to give up the use of the car and go to the bus, since they have named it their second best alternative. Well, for a 0 fare, in this case, for bus, you would divert 13 percent of them. At a −10-cent fare you would divert 24 percent of them. At a −20-cent fare, you would divert 37 percent of them. In other words, if you provided free transportation to these people you would divert 13 percent of them from the use of their automobile for the use of the bus; if you paid them 10 cents to ride the bus, you would divert 24 percent of them. If you paid them 20 cents each, you would divert 37 percent of them from the use of their private automobiles to the bus systems. These people would rather use their own automobile, which to them is more convenient, than to ride the buses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is meant by the term "zero fare"?

Mr. TOWER. That is to say, no fare charged at all. In other words, it is a free ride.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the passenger were given a free ride, would it be termed "zero fare"?

Mr. TOWER. With the offer of a free ride, 13 percent of riders would be diverted to buses. The ride would not cost the passengers anything. At a minus 10-cent fare, 24 percent of the passengers would be diverted. That is to say, if each passenger were paid 10 cents to ride the bus, 24 percent of those who travel would be diverted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Has that result been determined in an actual demonstration through making bus rides free and actually paying people 10 cents to ride them?

Mr. TOWER. It was determined by asking them questions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What study is that?

Mr. TOWER. The study was made by Northwestern University, and the report was placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Moses made the study. He concluded that ample time was not available for him to finish it. The quotations referred to by the Senator from Texas are correct. Dr. Moses, however, went still further. He pointed out how much people would have to be paid in order to get them out of automobiles and into buses or railroads.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator identify Dr. Moses? What Dr. Moses?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Moses is professor of transportation at Northwestern University, and was employed to make the study.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Who paid him?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Federal Government. The U.S. Government paid him. I believe that the Department of Commerce or the H.H.F.A. paid him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the Senator sure of that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Bureau of Public Roads?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Ford Foundation and the Government hired him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The automobile associations?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, not the automobile associations. If the Senator will examine the record, he will find that Dr. Moses was to submit his report to the Federal Government. He testified that people would have to be paid in order to get them out of automobiles and into bus and railroad transportation.

Mr. TOWER. In all candor, I do not maintain that the study has a monopoly on truth, but at least it is a study that has been made. Whether it is 100 percent accurate or not I do not know. I do not know of any survey that has ever been 100 percent accurate. I remember that a Gallup poll predicted a Dewey victory in 1948. Predictions are never entirely accurate, of course, but they are indicators. In any case, there is no study to show that improved facilities would cause people to abandon automobiles in great numbers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read from the transcript of the hearings of last year. Dr. Moses is director of research at the Northwestern University Transportation Center, Evanston, Ill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In a brief study made in Detroit, which is contained in our report, it was shown that riders were diverted from automobiles to buses—3,000 riders were picked up, which represented an increase of 12 percent. That was described by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The study was only a brief one, and probably not as long as it should have been.

Experience in the Boston, Mass., area was even more dramatic. Again, as a study, it is an infant. But the Boston and Maine demonstration indicates that perhaps 2,000 automobiles have been taken from the highways when people were diverted from highway travel to the Boston & Maine Railroad. The Senator knows what 2,000 automobiles mean. It is about one lane of traffic 5 or 6 miles long, at least, bumper to bumper. It represents a great deal of valuable land in the downtown section of our cities which is used merely as parking lots for automobiles.

To get some idea, by way of comparison, of the space required for the number of cars on Capitol Hill, the staff of the Senate and all committees are allocated 836 parking spaces. We all know how much open land is taken and how much it cost to build the new Senate garage, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I shall yield in a moment.

I point out to the Senator from New Jersey that enterprising Texans build skyscrapers for parking facilities, which takes care of the land usage problem. We stack them. And we in Texas have much more space available than do people in New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would it not be better in downtown sections of cities to have productive people, rather than idle automobiles, stacked in those skyscrapers?

Mr. TOWER. A skyscraper race is going on in Dallas to see who can go highest. We are going up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Tall Texans need tall buildings. I appreciate that.

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read from the transcript of the testimony taken September 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1962, on the bill S. 3615. I asked Dr. Moses the following question:

> For whom have you made studies? Have you made any for the Federal Bureau of Public Roads?

Dr. Moses replied:

> Yes; this study which I referred to was partially financed by the Bureau of Public Roads.

So I repeat unequivocally that Dr. Moses and Northwestern University were employed in part by the Bureau of Public Roads. Dr. Moses gave the testimony to which the Senator from Texas is now referring.

In relation to the Boston & Maine demonstration, 2,000 automobiles were taken off roads and 7,000 passengers were added to the Boston & Maine Railroad. But for each passenger the cost was a dollar a day. So in the Boston & Maine demonstration, in order to get people to give up their automobiles, they had to be paid a dollar a day. If we could carry that load, well enough. But I do not believe we could.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a comment on that statement?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When an automobile is brought into a city, it represents a heavy cost to the city. The city of Philadelphia has estimated that per capita annual expenditures for all the care and attention necessary, from policemen to streets and roads, is approximately $140 a year. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. TOWER. To get the remainder of the study into the RECORD, we noted that a minus 10-cent fare would divert 24 percent. At a minus 20-cent fare, 37 percent would be diverted. In other words, if we paid people 20 cents a person, we could divert 37 percent of the people from their automobiles. That is what the Northwestern study showed. It is interesting. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators who are considering the measure.

I am not opposed to mass transit systems, neither do I believe are others of those who are not supporting the proposed legislation. Nor do we deny substantial need for improvement. But I question the contention that the problems of mass transportation create a national crisis which it is the Federal Government's responsibility to solve.

Taxes should be levied on a sound and equitable basis. The benefit principle, by which users or recipients of the service would pay for the service according to the benefit received, is not present here.

Proponents expressed many times in the hearings that the highways are being subsidized, and therefore mass transit should be subsidized. There is, in fact, no comparison between the two—that is, between highway financing and the proposed mass transit financing. The major difference is of course apparent. Those who receive the benefits from highway use provide to the Government funds through gasoline taxes and other user taxes. In highway use, those who receive the benefits are paying for the facilities.

The major metropolitan areas are the wealthiest areas in the country. They enjoy high per capita income. It has not been proven that they lack the resources to meet their own needs.

Some sort of feasibility study, including reasonable alternative schedules should be undertaken to determine whether or not proposed improvements are actually in the interest of the public.

One serious objection to this bill is the lack of consideration given the Comptroller General. His recommendations were largely ignored. These were embodied in a letter from the Comptroller dated March 8, 1963, and received by members of the Banking and Currency Committee on March 12, the date that the committee met in executive session intending to take final action on the bill. Among the Comptroller's recommendations were matters which I considered to be extremely important to the drafting of proper legislation. One thing the Comptroller found, for example, was that if the administration's concept is fully implemented in this bill, projects might receive Federal and non-Federal grants equal to nearly 100 percent of a project cost.

The Comptroller, of course, supported the concept of annual appropriations instead of the contract authority, the financing aspect embodied in the present bill. I believe, as the Comptroller pointed out, that the Government programs should be able to withstand the tests of recurring congressional scrutiny. In this case, even the administration called for annual appropriations. Contract authority provision here is nothing more than a type of back-door financing. There are actually no limitations on the funds here, because the U.S. Treasury is pledged to pay whatever the administration commits.

In summary, Mr. President, I am of the opinion that there is no national crisis in mass transit to the extent that the entire country should be asked to sacrifice, in these times of high taxes and deficit spending, so that the larger cities can be relieved of their responsibilities. We should be making plans to curtail our spending, instead of plans to increase it. This drastic Federal program is not needed.

The business leaders throughout the country feel that this vast new Federal giveaway is unnecessary.

In summing up, Mr. President, again I point out that the bill would do nothing but tend to destroy local initiative and responsibilities. The communities will be less likely to work to meet their own problems, as long as they know that they can come to Washington to get Federal money to help finance the solving of these problems.

The bill is very loosely drawn. It leaves too much to the arbitrary whim and discretion of the administrator of HHFA.

Many of those who testified for the bill candidly said that this was to be only the beginning, that they anticipated much more money would be needed in the future. So, in the long run, it would cost us many, many times more than $500 million.

There is also the possibility that the program under the bill could be used for political purposes. Although I would not imply that anyone in the immediate future might do that, conceivably some administration some day might see this as an advantageous instrument to promote its own political welfare.

Mr. President, it is my fervent hope that the bill will be defeated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to say that the passage of the bill would tend to destroy the initiative of local communities as to trying to solve their own problems?

Mr. TOWER. It is my belief that it would. Some people testified to this effect. The man who testified for the United States Chamber of Commerce indicated that that was his fear.

Since there has been so much talk about some sort of mass transportation subsidization, a lot of cities have waited around to see how much Federal money will be available before proceeding on their own.

I think passage of the bill definitely would tend to stifle and discourage local and individual initiative and responsibility.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to point out to the Senator that in 1962, when Mr. John C. Kohl, the Assistant Administrator of HHFA, testified, I asked him the question, "How many loans have you made under the $30 million appropriation?" And he answered, "Two; one of $6 million and the other of $5 million." I then asked him, "How much money do you have left for lending purposes?" And he answered, "$19 million." I asked, "Are there any efforts being made now to borrow out of that $19 million?" His answer was, "No." I asked, "Why not?" The answer he gave was, "Because the grant prospects came into the picture early this year."

Up until 1962 there were loans. In 1962 the talk began about gifts. The more the gifts came into the picture the smaller the number of local transit systems which wished to borrow.

In Cleveland, my home city, five members of the board by a vote of 3 to 2 decided to extend their own rapid transit system from Cleveland out to the airport. They learned that gifts were to come from Washington, so they changed their decision.

Mr. Gasper A. Corso, one of the members of the Cleveland Transit Board, testified, in answer to my question, "Did any one of the members of the board who changed his mind state why his mind was changed?" that he changed his mind because, "It would be foolish to borrow when you can get it for nothing." This is in substance what he said, though not an exact quotation.

I submit that the bill would corrupt the morals of individuals in our home States who have the responsibility of trying to solve their own problems. It has already done so. No one has made application for loans. Why should they?

I should like to quote again from the testimony by Mr. Kohl:

> I think any prudent management would wait and see which way financing could be worked out most effectively.

As between borrowing and receiving for nothing, Mr. Kohl implied that prudent management would say, "Let us wait until it comes to us a gift."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think it would be timely to make certain observations on how, in the proposed legislation, we have taken account of the criticisms by the Comptroller General, and there is more to come.

I know the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is seeking recognition. Those of us on the committee who are proponents of the legislation have the deepest of affection, respect, and gratitude for our chairman who, notwithstanding opposition to the bill, has made every possible effort that could be made to give us an opportunity to advance the bill which we support.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield further to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that San Francisco voted some $690 million or more to solve its own problem?

Mr. TOWER. To solve its own problem, $792 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about Los Angeles? Does Los Angeles have anything on the ballot now with respect to a 15-percent ad valorem tax, in order to solve its problem?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct. They have supported the ad valorem tax, as well, to finance the system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did a private enterprise install a system in Houston, Texas, which is now self-sustaining? Is the Senator familiar with that situation?

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator referring to the one in Houston or the one in Fort Worth?

Mr. LAUSCHE. This particular company owns two systems, one in Texas and one in Kansas. The head of those systems testified before our committee.

Mr. TOWER. That is true. I might note that the chamber of commerce of the city of Houston has notified me it believes Houston can resolve its own mass transportation problems without assistance from the Federal Government.

Houston is a burgeoning industrial area. It is moving out. More satellite towns are springing up. Once-sleepy country towns have become dormitory towns. Of course, there are problems as to getting people in and out of the city and the various industrial centers surrounding it.

The leaders of the city of Houston have informed me that Houston can and will resolve its own problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am referring to Mr. Bernard E. Calkins, president of the Rapid Transit Lines, Inc., Houston, Tex., and also president of the Rapid Transit Lines, Inc., Wichita, Kans.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When he testified, he said that he took over those systems and has made them a going concern.

If the Senator will yield further, he also testified that he has had the cooperation of public officials in allowing him to charge a rate or fare that would make the business a success.

I respectfully submit that where they have not been able to operate on a self-sustaining basis, it has been because of interference of the local public officials in not permitting the operators to charge rates of fares that would be self-sustaining. Subsidies were granted by the local officials. Now they come to us and say, "You join us in these subsidies." I am not going to agree to be one of the joiners in such a program.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator for his statement, especially the reference to the situation in Houston. Just as so often happens when man tries to upset the balance of nature, when the politicians start interfering by regulating a system, trouble usually results. This fact may account for loss of revenues and abandonment of services, because the operators were proscribed from charging fares necessary to meet costs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was mayor of Cleveland when the city acquired the Cleveland Rapid Transit System. A charter was adopted taking out of the city council the right to fix fares. It was done because I knew that, if the city council fixed fares, at every election there would be promises of fare reductions, and the inevitable result would have been a denial of the fiscal stability of that system.

As a result of the adoption of the charter, which took from the city councilmen the power to fix fares, that system has been self-sustaining. The city of Cleveland bought that system for $17½ million, paid for it out of the fare boxes, borrowed $30 million to extend the rapid transit system, and the city is now paying off the obligation on the borrowed $30 million.

I submit that back home they can solve the problems if there is a purpose to do so.

Mr. TOWER. I agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Before I yield the floor, I should like to join the Senator from New Jersey in what he said about the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He has been very fair and cooperative with both the proponents and opponents of the measure. We are deeply grateful to him. He has shown a great spirit of fair play and cooperation, which we all appreciate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Texas on his frank, forthright statement opposing Federal subsidization of local mass transit systems.

Few would argue that the flow of traffic in large metropolitan areas is without problems. I personally am not aware of any phase of our economy or society which is devoid of problems.

At a time when many American people are greatly in favor of a tax reduction—but only on the condition that Federal expenditures be held to a minimum—it does not seem proper to begin massive programs which admittedly are just a beginning and are intended to expand into all urban areas.

Some expenditures included in the Federal budget are very important and are properly matters which can be best performed on a Federal level. This is not true of local transit systems.

Mass transportation problems are of a local nature. Many communities have systems which are both adequate and profitable. Such communities, through their own efforts, solve any problems which may arise. Transportation districts can be and have been organized to solve problems that cover an area larger than the local area. In some cases, these districts cross county and State boundaries. The problem is one that can better be solved by those who are close to it than by a Federal agency.

It has been claimed by representatives of the large cities that mass transportation needs have outstripped the present resources of the cities and States. These claims infer that the Federal Government is more able to make such expenditures. We should remember that any expenditure made by the Federal Government must be provided by residents of all States and localities in the form of increased taxes. The funds would be taken from the people to Washington, reduced by whatever costs are incurred to administer the proposed mass transit bill, and then returned to selected metropolitan areas. Quite obviously, there would be a transfer of income and buying power in such transactions.

If this program were to be approved, those in the more sparsely populated hinterland areas of the country would be required to subsidize those in metropolitan centers—centers which already have higher per capita income and are more financially able to solve their own problems than are the rural areas which often have far more acute, though different, problems of their own to solve.

The claim of those who support this program has historically been that they stand for more equality in income and living standards. Yet this measure would have an opposite effect and would result in greater inequities between geographical areas and place an added burden on the less prosperous regions of our country.

Proponents have repeatedly claimed that our great metropolitan centers are losing population and industry and that, therefore, their local tax base is being impaired. I am of the opinion that the move from large cities to other, less congested areas is not primarily because of inadequate transportation, but has been caused by such factors as dirt, crime, poor living conditions, decay, and other undesirable conditions.

There is no evidence to suggest that the trend away from the central city is detrimental to the welfare of the citizens or the economy of the United States as a whole. Some communities have benefited greatly from the relocation of industrial facilities. Movement of industry, no doubt, has resulted in more modern, more efficient, and more productive facilities—as well as more pleasant and safer working conditions. Decentralization of new factories and offices has required increased investment and thus created greater employment opportunities for the whole economy.

Should communities which have received benefit from the trend away from the central city subsidize new mass transit programs whose purpose would be to give a competitive advantage to the large cities?

It is my position that the Federal Government's responsibility does not extend to a point of preserving the tax base of any group of individual cities or areas at the expense of others.

It seems only reasonable that if mass transit systems will be of benefit to the metropolitan area socially and economically, these areas should be willing to pay for them. If such monetary and nonmonetary benefits to the central cities are not sufficient to warrant this investment, then it would be difficult to justify a Federal subsidy for such transit systems on any basis of national benefit.

No evidence has been presented which proves that the establishment of a new modernized and improved mass transit facility would cause automobile users to leave their cars home and use mass transit. On the contrary, information developed in the hearings and from still uncompleted studies indicates that to cause a significant shift from automobiles, it would be necessary actually to pay people to use the mass transit systems. There is no known economically feasible system today that can equal the versatility and convenience of the automobile in providing the transportation needs of our metropolitan areas.

Now, to consider the amount of employment that could be created by the investment in new mass transit systems: Nearly every witness who was specifically asked the question by proponents of mass transit subsidies said that improvement and modernization of transit equipment, facilities, and service would be likely to increase employment in the transit system. How could one answer other than affirmative? This, however, is no indication that such a move would produce more overall employment in the economy than would be generated without new or improved transit systems.

If one were to assume that the transit systems were established, were successful, and that a significant number of automobile users would use the mass transit instead of their autos, this would mean a decrease in production and sales of petroleum products, tires, and other automotive items. Great numbers of employees would find themselves not needed in these industries. We have reason to believe that establishment of mass transit systems could actually decrease significantly the aggregate of employment and thus add to the problem of unemployment, which is already at a dangerously high level.

In addition to the loss of jobs, we must consider the possible loss of millions of dollars of annual revenue now provided by State and Federal gasoline taxes. The tax per gallon, which is already about 30 percent of the total price, would then necessarily have to be increased in order to collect sufficient revenue to build and maintain highway systems throughout the country.

It seems unwise, to say the least, to penalize a transit system which is obviously preferred by the American people in order to install one which proponents apparently admit will not have sufficient support to pay its own way. In this the American way to allocate resources?

In a free society such as ours, the desires of the people determine allocation of resources. Each time a dollar is spent, a choice is made and a vote is cast for the item on which it is spent. This, of course, is primarily what determines what is produced, who produces it, and for whom it is produced.

Over the recent years, more and more prospective users have voted against mass transit systems. As a result, some systems that existed a few decades ago have been discontinued; and others are having a difficult time operating profitably. This has occurred because the services offered have not been desired by a sufficient number of the residents of the areas in which they served. Have the mass transit bill's proponents abandoned the American philosophy that the people are able to decide for themselves how they would like to spend their income? Is it the purpose of these planners to eventually take the decisions of such matters away from the people? I sincerely hope not. But the evidence seems to indicate such a trend.

Proponents of Federal subsidization of mass transit systems claim that a person is not consistent in his views if he supports the Federal interstate highway program but does not support the mass transit bill. This is not necessarily true. Funds used for highway construction and maintenance are provided either by the local areas which receive benefit from the highways or through gasoline or other user taxes. Thus, the highway program is not subsidized by those who do not want it. It is financed by those who gain benefits from its existence.

There was a time when people used mass transportation facilities to a great extent. With the coming of the automobile, however, they discovered that individual private transportation was more convenient; and, as would be expected, a gradual change began to take place. As more automobiles were purchased, less use was made of mass transit facilities. The only way to attract automobile commuters away from their automobiles is to offer a new program which, in itself, is more desirable than the one they are presently using.

I am not against mass transit systems. If the people in our metropolitan areas desire such systems and are willing to support them, certainly they should exist and complement individual automobile transportation.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, we all know that we do have transportation problems in our metropolitan areas. I have also stated that I think the present mass transit bill should be rejected.

Now, lest I be accused of being only negative in my remarks, let me take a few minutes to offer several positive suggestions.

Without committing myself to the assumption that the whole problem of mass transit is a proper area for Federal participation, I suggest that the present bill should be rejected and a new and opposite approach be taken which, in my opinion—if Federal participation is proper—would lead to a more satisfactory solution.

The present bill sets down no really effective guidelines for the development of community programs. It could set up a whole series of hastily conceived programs, whose approval by the administrator could commit the Federal Government to an unknown and unmeasured obligation. It could also set in motion programs which might have to be changed, even abandoned, because they have not been adequately checked through in advance.

Instead of the grab-bag approach, I suggest that the problems of each community are different and that if action on our part is necessary, it should take the form of separate programs tailored to the needs and resources of each community that applies for help—but only after all of the basic facts in each case have been developed. To be specific, I suggest that if Congress considers any bill at the present time, it should be a bill setting forth guidelines for the preparation of applications by individual communities for Federal participation in carefully developed and feasible programs.

With that in mind and without attempting to write the specific legislation, because I think that is impossible to do on the floor of the Senate, let me suggest for your consideration some of the features of this alternative:

First. Each community desiring Federal help should be encouraged and required to prepare, at the community level, a plan designed to take care of its mass transit problems for a period of time at least as long as the duration of the debt that would be created to finance it.

Second. Such a plan obviously should include the use of existing transit systems, both public and private, if they are to be continued, as well as necessary improvements in their facilities and service pattern envisioned or projected to the end of the period covered. It should also include definite proposals for any new types of mass transit which the planners believe would be needed and adequate to supplement existing systems.

Third. In the preparation of any such plan, the pattern of employee participation and the preservation and/or extension of their rights as employees should be completely developed.

Fourth. Each plan should also develop the program for financing this particular system to the end of the planning period. It should include: (a) the extent of private financing for the participation, (b) local public financing, (c) the extent and pattern of Federal financing, including Federal grants in cases where the problem is created by the impact of employees of Federal agencies, and (d) Federal loans to the extent that they may be needed.

In view of the amendments suggested by the Commerce Committee with respect to Federal guarantees, in no case should such Federal loans and grants or guarantees equal more than 50 percent of the total cost.

Fifth. The bill should provide that any Federal loans made would receive interest at a rate equal to the average cost of Federal obligations with a term comparable to the repayment schedule proposed in the plan.

Sixth. The mass transit plan should also include any other items necessary to demonstrate its complete feasibility. Among such items would be: (a) a definite breakdown of development and operating costs, (b) projected use rates based on reasonable population and economic growth rates, (c) estimated income to be produced by user fares, (d) the proposed system's capability to provide effective, economical transit service for the period covered, and (e) its ability to pay new obligations which it creates.

Seventh. After the details of the plan have been worked out at the local level by cooperation of all interested participants and they have accepted and approved its feasibility, it should be submitted to the voters of the community, either as a referendum or as a referendum plus an approval of the bond issues required to finance the local public participation in the plan. Unless 51 percent of those eligible to vote on it will approve the plan, it should not be considered by any Federal agency as an appropriate proposal for Federal participation.

Eighth. After the plan has been approved by 51 percent or more of the eligible voters, then a bill could be introduced in Congress authorizing specific Federal participation in accordance with the terms of the plan. Such a bill could then be handled by Congress in the normal way. It could be circulated among the Federal agencies involved for their report, including a check on its claimed feasibility, and then be set for hearings and consideration by the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. If approved by Congress, it would have the same status as any other bill to authorize appropriations.

A second bill would then go through the appropriations process in the regular pattern, and such funds could be appropriated year by year as would be necessary to carry out the plan.

The argument might be raised that this proposal would give Congress too much work. A reviewing agency should be set up in an appropriate department in the executive branch of Government and given authority to approve applications up to a certain size—say, for example, $1 million—leaving Congress the power to reject that approval within 60 days, but requiring affirmative approval by Congress of all applications above the set maximum. This would eliminate the charge that to operate on this basis would overburden Congress. Actually, there are only about a dozen giant cities whose possible drain on the Federal Treasury would be very large, and these themselves are so large that they should be specifically reviewed.

An approach such as I have outlined would parallel the approach now taken by reclamation projects and other programs in which Federal participation is necessary but on which a repayment, in part at least, is expected. Such a program would recognize that each community faces a different problem and, therefore, requires a different solution. It would give Congress some assurance that the proposed solution is feasible and would permit Congress to review and, if necessary, amend the recommended amount of Federal participation. It would still leave the local community with the initiative, responsibility, and opportunity to set up its own plan without political interference from Washington. Congress also would know in advance, before it started on any program, the ultimate amount for which it was obligating the Federal taxpayers.

It is my opinion that the present bill should be rejected, because nobody really knows what it means. The remarkable unanimity of opposition which ranges from the conservatives to the international officials of the unions that might be involved, as well as the officials of the AFL-CIO Federation, demonstrates this.

I hope Congress will reject the present bill and give those who are sincerely concerned with a mass transit problem an opportunity to present new legislation based on the kind of pattern I have suggested.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is in receipt of comments relating to the Urban Transit Development Act of 1963 and the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, prepared by Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, of the Department of Economics, University of Minnesota. The Senator from Ohio and I believe that this is an excellent document, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the Record following our remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments Relating to the Urban Transit Development Act of 1963 and the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963

(By Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota)

The proposed Urban Transit Development Act and the Urban Mass Transportation Act raise three very important questions: (1) Are subsidies to urban transportation activities desirable? If so, (2) what role should the Federal Government play in providing these subsidies and what form should they take? (3) What agency of the Federal Government should administer whatever programs dealing with this subject may be adopted?

To state our position on these questions briefly, a decline in patronage, particularly during periods other than morning and afternoon rush hours, has brought about marked deteriorations in the financial positions of many mass transit systems. Taken by itself, this financial deterioration does not, in our view, justify any type of temporary subsidy program. Even if transit subsidies were deemed desirable, the effects of a temporary program probably would not be lasting. In large measure, the decline in public transit patronage reflects a basic shift in consumer tastes—a shift that is likely to continue in the absence of permanent countervailing action. The very serious inadequacies that presently do and perhaps inevitably must exist in transportation pricing procedures—might provide a sound economic basis for a permanent subsidy program. Even if an economic justification for transit subsidies could be found, however, it would seem preferable to have local rather than Federal Government agencies assume responsibility. Communities can reasonably be expected to be less profligate in their use of dollars that cost them a dollar each than of dollars which, as is the case with the Urban Mass Transportation Act, would have a direct cost to them of only 33 cents. Furthermore, the residents of say, Houston, have little interest in the transit system of New York and vice versa.

Any Federal action as may be taken in support of mass transportation should, we feel, not be taken in isolation but rather within the broader framework of metropolitan transportation as a whole. The specific agency that should be made responsible is not a matter that we feel ourselves competent to judge.

To elaborate, greatly increased real incomes and technological improvements have combined during the last half century to change the automobile from an expensive toy into a convenience well within the reach of the great majority of American families. For a growing proportion of the population, the convenience and time savings associated with automobile transportation have more than made up for its higher dollar costs. As a result, mass transportation patronage has declined.

Two further ramifications of the increase in auto ownership have been detrimental to mass transit service, patronage, and financing. First, the automobile has led to profound changes in the structure of urban areas. Residential population densities have diminished—the much commented upon phenomenon of suburban sprawl. In relative if not absolute terms, commercial and industrial activity has become decentralized. As a result of these changes in urban structure, the demand for service along individual mass transit routes has diminished. Service frequencies have therefore declined. Further shifts from mass to private transportation have therefore inevitably resulted.

Second, the financial problems of mass transportation systems have been compounded by the uneven character of the shift from public to private transportation. Indeed, there is good reason to argue that the financial crisis currently besetting mass transportation systems stems not so much from a decline in patronage per se as from a decline in patronage at the wrong time of day. On most transit systems, the loss in patronage has been concentrated mainly during offpeak hours. Indeed, on many systems, patronage during morning and afternoon rush hours has experienced little if any decline. As a result, the average load factor on mass transit vehicles has declined steadily—a growing proportion of the capacity necessary to meet peakload demands goes unutilized during the remainder of the day.

Clearly, a substantial permanent subsidy program would eliminate the financial plight of public transportation system. Indeed, by enabling provision of more frequent service at lower prices, subsidies might serve to halt and perhaps even to reverse the decline in mass transit patronage. A substantial research effort might succeed in devising vehicles that could provide rapid, frequent service on low density routes at low cost. Barring this seemingly unlikely possibility, however, it seems doubtful that the effects of a temporary subsidy program would prove lasting. After all, the mass transit crisis is not of recent origin, but has been developing for the better part of half a century. It seems likely that the conditions responsible for this crisis could be reversed, if at all, only by committing substantial resources to the task over a substantial period of time.

Furthermore, even if there were some way of assuring that these conditions could be reversed, there is serious doubt in our minds that doing so would be socially desirable, for the soruce of the crisis is the various ramifications of an apparently growing preference for the speed and convenience—flexibility—afforded by private passenger vehicles. Consumers are willing to pay for such flexibility.

There is, however, one attribute of metropolitan transportation and, indeed, transportation in general, the ramifications of which might serve to justify permanent subsidies to mass transit systems. This attribute is the fact that both presently employed and, very likely, feasible alternative means of charging for the use of transportation facilities do not adequately reflect the costs of providing these facilities. The capacity requirements for transportation facilities in urban areas are determined by morning and afternoon rush-hour demands. If these two peaks did not exist, capacity requirements and hence the costs of providing transportation facilities would be substantially lower than is presently the case. For this reason, if each traveler were to be charged the costs incurred in serving him—the costs that would be saved if his trip were not made—peak hour travelers would pay substantially higher prices for trips than would offpeak travelers. Clearly, our present system of transportation-user charges does not possess this seemingly desirable characteristic. Public transportation fares typically do not differentiate between peak and offpeak loads. Similarly, the level of such highway user charges as gasoline taxes and license fees is not appreciably affected by the time at which private passenger vehicle operators make trips.

The imposition of higher peak than offpeak transit fares and highway user charges would very likely make a substantial contribution toward alleviating the present crisis in mass transit financing. Also, by discouraging nonwork trips at peak hours and encouraging car pools and perhaps the staggering of business opening and closing hours, such a pricing system would reduce the highway expenditures required to alleviate peak hour congestion problems.

Charging peak hour mass transit patrons approximately the cost of providing them with service would be a comparatively easy task. Levying cost-based user tolls on private passenger vehicle operators would be considerably more difficult, however. A very imperfect approximation to cost-based charges is perhaps the most that could be hoped for. If this is in fact the case, a permanent mass transit subsidy program might well prove economically justifiable. That is, a permanent subsidy for peak hour mass transit service might be required to minimize the money and time costs of metropolitan transportation. Unfortunately, the word "might" must be emphasized. To our knowledge, no one has as yet undertaken the substantial research effort required to determine the nature of optimum metropolitan transportation systems and user charges on these systems when cost-based tolls cannot be levied.

Whether the organization responsible for administering the research and other programs that may develop out of these acts should be the HHFA, the Department of Commerce, or yet a third agency is not a matter about which we feel competent to make recommendations. We do, however, strongly recommend that the agency given responsibility for these programs be authorized to deal with urban transportation as an integrated whole rather than exclusively with public transportation. In dealing with any problem, an integrated rather than a piecemeal approach seems preferable. In this case, the desirability of an integrated approach is reinforced by the great difficulties involved in establishing a genuinely cost-based system of user charges.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I had to leave the floor briefly while the Senator was speaking. I heard enough, however, to get the impression that the Senator from Utah proposes a very thorough study and planning and local acceptance of new mass transportation problems at the local level. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. It is my proposal that we approach mass transportation problems the way we in the West approach reclamation problems. We expect each large community to study its own program and develop a proposal which would fit that community, have it checked for feasibility, and demonstrate that the people in the community approve of it.

Each large community would submit a separate bill, which would give Congress a chance to check the feasibility of the project, authorize it, and then appropriate funds for it. The approach taken by S. 6 is to set up a fund and permit the communities to come to Washington and try to persuade the Administrator to give them a share of the fund, without any knowledge on the part of Congress of how far the programs could eventually go.

The bill now provides $500 million. This amount would not provide new mass transit systems for all our giant communities. Again, as in the case of reclamation projects, I think if there were a separate plan for each community, *planned at least to the end of the* obligation, Congress would be able to pass more intelligently on the advisability of approving such a plan.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Ultimately, there will be two major measures on which the Senate can work its will—S. 6 with the amendments added by the Committee on Commerce, and the substitute for it as proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Under S. 6, the administration's program, no applicant can be a participant in the grant program without a comprehensive plan for the urban area covered. That is provided by the proposed legislation.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that; but the difference between the approach of S. 6 and the approach I have recommended is that under my proposal if a community like New York or Chicago developed a pattern or a plan, Congress would review the specific plan, not some appointee in the HHFA, because we are dealing here with billions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Not under the plan which is before us.

Mr. BENNETT. No; because the bill provides only $500 million. But the mass transit problems of all our giant cities will not be solved with $500 million. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey realizes that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We know there are urban renewal programs and public housing and community facilities programs, and that each year or so we vote on the legislation and do what we can to improve it within the national budgetary limits. We know we have not succeeded, and that more work remains to be done.

I think the only area in which we have been truly successful is one in which there has been massive Federal spending. On the domestic scene, I am sure the Senator from Utah would agree that we have succeeded in providing an abundance in agriculture, and that has been due to the expenditure of billions of dollars of taxes raised.

Mr. BENNETT. I am afraid I cannot agree that we have succeeded in agriculture. We have succeeded in piling up agricultural surpluses which have cost billions of dollars as a result of high price supports which continue to plague us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When we started land-grant colleges and the research on avian leucosis, and all the rest, were we not as a nation expressing the necessity of an abundance of food, and have we not an abundance of food?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; we have too much of an abundance.

The difference between my approach to mass transit and the approach of S. 6 is that I feel that we should see each of the programs through to the end. The Senator from New Jersey says that we have a large urban renewal program and that we do the best we can with it. The mass transit problem is a specific problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There is a problem; the Senator is saying that?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; there is no question about it. There are so many people to move. There is a different pattern and a different combination of facilities in a city like New York, with its waterfronts, than in a city like Chicago.

I think we would be able to legislate more intelligently if Congress passed on the plans of the giant cities and appropriated no funds until we had approved the plans which were before us, than if we simply said we were going to set up a $500 million fund and accept applications. We might get started on a number of plans, and it would be a long time before we knew whether we had provided enough money to permit a comprehensive program, or had merely provided enough to clean up the cars in the subway.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It seems to me that the Senator from Utah has given this subject much thought. I am sure it reflects an understanding of the need for vastly improved mass transportation facilities. However, I would pause at this point, where the decision for local transit depends so much on a decision in Washington. It seems to me that back home is where the method of working our way through to a more efficient local transportation system can best be determined.

Mr. BENNETT. I suggest that the plans be developed locally, with no Washington interference.

Under S. 6 the decision will be made by an appointee in the Housing and Home Finance Administration. I suggest that Congress pass upon mass transit programs, much as we now insist on passing upon each large reclamation project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. My final observation is that we do not know what would happen to local initiative if the folks back home knew they had to move through Congress with its mysterious labyrinth.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has had the experience of steering a billion-dollar reclamation project through Congress. It takes a lot of doing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Perhaps we should have had the Senator from Utah on our side. The bill provides only $500 million for all the Nation. What was the billion-dollar project which the Senator steered through Congress?

Mr. BENNETT. The upper Colorado storage project, which will take 50 years to complete.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is any New Jersey money involved in that particular billion-dollar project?

Mr. BENNETT. First, let me say that most of that billion dollars of Federal money will be repaid by farmers and communities in the West, who will be furnished with the water which the project will develop.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When will repayments be made?

Mr. BENNETT. They will start as soon as the power units begin to operate within the next year or two. Some of the repayments will run as long as 50 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. How long has the project been under construction?

Mr. BENNETT. It was approved in 1955—7 years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I had better check my voting record. Perhaps I voted for that project.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. What the Senator is suggesting is not that we replace the development of plans locally with the development of plans in Washington, but simply that Congress approve such plans. Do I correctly understand that the Senator proposes to substitute for the arbitrary whim and discretion of one man the will of Congress?

Mr. BENNETT. In programs that are large enough to require congressional action. I have put a floor under the proposal. This would enable smaller communities to present their plans without the involvement of Congress.

Mr. TOWER. Is not the Senator aware that during the testimony on the bill several witnesses contended that $500 million would be a drop in the bucket, and that the communities would be returning to Congress for more money? Therefore, this program could mushroom into an extremely expensive one. Indeed, the Senator from New Jersey has indicated that he is prepared to accept an amendment suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] which would already double, or perhaps triple, the amount provided by the bill, and to provide an extra $100 million for revenue bonds. If there is any substantial amount of defaulting, the amount could well be in excess of $500 million.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I can speak briefly on the bill because my views are set forth in the committee report, which are available to all Members of the Senate.

Before taking up specific objections, I wish to refer to the last statement made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio about how they made the transit system in Cleveland pay its way. Last October I had the pleasure of visiting for a few days in the former capital of Brazil, the beautiful city of Rio.

I learned, on that visit, that the Government owns the railroads, the utilities, shipping, and a great many other facilities. The Government took over the railroads from the British, when those railroads were paying good dividends. Now those same railroads are losing $300 million a year, and we have helped to pay those losses. Some of the other losses have been paid by the simple device of printing money.

I was interested in the transit system that the Government had worked out for Rio. I was told that 1 million workers a day come into Rio to work, but live in the outskirts or in rural areas. The Government decided that the rural area from which the workers came to work in Rio was a distance of 45 miles out of Rio. So the Government fixed the rate for transporting those workers at one-third of 1 cent for 45 miles. The people voted for that. Anybody in Brazil who is 18 years old and can write his name can vote. Of course, the Government took care of the workers. They were uneasy about their situation when the Government took over the railroads.

So an amendment to the bill which took over the railroads was adopted, providing that if a member of the union had worked for the railroad for 6 years, he had a job for life. Everybody was happy. The workers and the union were taken care of. Those working in Rio were taken care of.

The only trouble is that they are losing $300 million a year.

When the officials of Brazil came here to get a new loan, they said that they were going to have some fiscal reforms. I asked the Ambassador, "What about the railroads?" He said, "We are going to increase the fares 400 percent." I asked him, "Is that so? What will they be?" He said, "Instead of one-third of 1 percent for 45 miles, it is going to be a cent and a half for 45 miles."

I am sure the Senator will agree with me that they are not going to solve the problem with that solution.

Now I wish to take up the specific objections to the bill.

I oppose S. 6, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

I do not think the program proposed by this bill is timely or necessary or well considered.

I

This is no time to start new spending programs running into the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars.

The bill would set up an urban mass transportation program involving $500 million of grants in the first 3 years and, in addition, extension of the $50 million borrowing authority already authorized under existing law.

The authorization of $500 million in S. 6 is not realistic. I am convinced that nothing short of an expenditure of $5 billion will show an appreciable effect upon traffic problems now existing in some of our great metropolitan areas. In fact, I understand that, according to a study made last year by Government officials—which for reasons best known to themselves they have refused to release—the cost of solving these traffic problems was so tremendous, this proposal was utterly impracticable.

An indication of the probable cost is shown by the experiment with the Boston and Maine Railroad. This road was given a subsidy of over $2 million a year for passenger service, in return for which it agreed to run more trains and charge lower fares. The number of former highway users who are now using that train service is too inconsequential to affect traffic congestion, and yet that subsidy is costing taxpayers about $1 a day for each passenger being carried under the subsidy program.

On March 7, 1963, I made a statement in the Senate on the subject of sound fiscal policies. I pointed out that we can expect a deficit this year of $10 to $12 billion without a tax cut, and that the President has proposed a tax cut which would reduce the Government's income by some $10 billion. I indicated my opposition to the proposed tax cut because of the deficit we are already experiencing, and I suggested ways for the

President to save some $6 billion from the 1964 budget. Elimination of the proposed urban mass transportation program from the 1964 budget was one of my suggestions.

I can well understand why any man would prefer to live in the country rather than in a city like New York. Some years ago, I had an offer of employment in New York which would have paid me three times what I had ever earned in my life. But there was not enough money in all the banks in New York to induce me to leave the shadows of the Blue Ridge Mountains in which I had been reared and to give up the hunting and fishing which I enjoyed from my boyhood days.

Naturally, thousands of those who work in the city would prefer to live in the country. But there is no cheap or easy way for them to get means of transportation which would be both comfortable and quick. Why should the taxpayers of the Nation furnish billions of dollars to provide transportation to people who want to live in the country and work in the city? The answer, of course, is that they should not.

II

This vast new program is one more step in the process of transferring all power and all authority to the Federal Government, and eliminating all State and local power and authority.

Under the bill, Federal aid would be advanced directly to localities and the States would be bypassed. Federal intervention in local affairs would be greatly broadened. To begin with, Federal control over local mass transit systems, including schedules of transit fares, would be increased. And Federal control over all urban development would be a prerequisite to any aid under the bill. Section 4 of the bill provides that Federal aid can be provided only if "the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, and are necessary for the sound, economic, and desirable development of such area."

Federal money brings Federal control. This is the case with Federal programs. Federal loans to college students brought with it a statutory requirement of a loyalty oath. This has since been removed, by congressional action, after strong protests from many of the Nation's leading colleges and universities. Federal participation in FHA and VA mortgage insurance has brought with it a requirement, not based on statute but only on a Presidential decree, relating to the use and disposition of such housing. Some of us disliked the educational loyalty oath. Some of us dislike the housing Executive order. But everyone, whether they like or dislike the particular form of Federal control involved, must recognize that Federal controls go along with Federal funds.

State highway departments, State unemployment insurance agencies, and other State agencies subsidized by the Federal Government will bear witness to the fact that Federal controls accompany Federal money.

It is inevitable for Federal funds to bring Federal control, to the extent necessary to make sure that the Federal funds are, in fact, being spent for the purposes intended. And human nature being what it is, there will always be added pressure to use Federal funds appropriated for one purpose to help in carrying out some other unrelated purpose. As an example of this, I need only remind Senators of the use of Federal procurement and the Federal contracting authority to establish set-asides to help small business—here at least there was a statute authorizing this—to help relieve unemployment and to aid depressed areas, and to change employment practices. In fact, rumor even tells us that the Federal procurement powers, and other equally flexible powers, were used to force reduction of steel prices and to encourage contributions of drugs for Cuba.

The only way to avoid Federal control which inevitably accompanies Federal funds is not to start a Federal program.

III

The bill would finance both the grant program and the lending program through forms of back-door financing.

On this ground alone I would oppose the bill, regardless of any of the other provisions.

The bill extends the existing loan program now operating with the benefit of a $50 million borrowing authority.

The Administrator would be given authority to sign contracts committing the Government for the $500 million grant program. In other words, the Administrator would have a free hand to write contracts providing for these grants in advance of any appropriations. The appropriations committees would have no alternative but to grant the appropriations necessary to carry out these contracts, because the bill expressly pledges the faith of the United States to their payment.

Back door financing raises serious constitutional questions. In addition, it is, in my judgment, extremely poor practice. When Congress authorizes a huge spending program, the funds necessary should be provided by annual appropriations. This not only has the advantage of giving Congress a yearly review of what has been accomplished and what is expected to be done in the coming year; it also puts the public on notice as to the effect of the spending on the budget and the national debt. Projects financed by back door financing add to the annual deficit and the national debt just as much as projects financed by the appropriations process, but Congress has lost control.

IV

The bill is loosely drawn, ignoring the recommendations of the Comptroller General designed to prevent waste of funds.

The Comptroller General's letter—hearings, pages 40 to 45, 484—lists many respects in which he considers the bill deficient in providing protection to the Federal Government. For example, the Comptroller General points out—hearings, page 41—that if the administration's concept of the method of financing is fully implemented, "most projects will receive Federal and non-Federal grants equal to nearly 100 percent of a project cost."

The Comptroller General also recommended—hearings, page 43—that the bill should contain requirements for legally enforceable commitments for local grant contributions and appropriate controls to protect the Federal Government's interest in the event of default or failure to complete a project. On numerous occasions, the Comptroller General has made similar recommendations and has pointed out the results of not getting such provisions—Comptroller General's annual report for fiscal year 1962, page 192; report to the Congress dated April 13, 1962, B-118754; report to the Congress dated October 31, 1962, B-118754.

The Comptroller General has also recommended—hearings, page 44—that the bill should be amended to make it clear that the HHFA's determination as to its own administrative expenses should not be final, but should be subject to audit and settlement by the Comptroller General in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

V

The bill contains new and untested labor-management provisions, in an attempt to alleviate the unfortunate results of this program to transit employees.

This huge new Federal program is likely to result in the development and use of automated equipment which might throw hundreds or thousands of workers out of their jobs. The program is also likely—in fact it seems to be designed—to encourage municipalities to take over private transportation systems. Employees of such systems would become Government employees and, in many States, would no longer have some or all of the benefits of collective bargaining.

The Labor Department has submitted a proposal to meet these problems. The unions have submitted a counter proposal. The bill attempts to reconcile the proposals of the Labor Department and the unions. The views of the private transportation systems and the municipalities which would be affected by these proposals have not been obtained on any of these proposals.

This is, in my opinion, an illustration of the kinds of problems which we can expect when the Federal Government undertakes a vast new program in fields which are now handled by State and local governments.

In my judgment, this is a matter which should be carefully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But whether or not the bill is referred to another committee, I am opposed to it for the reasons given above.

The general subject of Federal subsidies has been studied by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, of which David J. Mays, a great constitutional lawyer, is chairman, and James L. Kilpatrick, one of the outstanding editors of the Nation, is chairman of publications. That commission recently issued a brochure entitled "Federal Subsidies—The Facts and the Fiction," in which it recommended a calm appraisal, on its merits, of each new proposal for a Federal subsidy. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of that brochure be printed in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Subsidies—The Facts and the Fiction

In selecting a title for this paper, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government has purposely given preference to the term, "Federal subsidies," over the more commonly used term, "Federal grants-in-aid." We believe that the commonly used term is misleading, because the word "grant" implies a gift. The implication is erroneous in this instance. Furthermore, the word "aid" implies that the grantor is in a superior position, offering gratuitous assistance to some needy individual or institution. That implication, also, is erroneous in this instance. Thus we have selected the term "Federal subsidies" as more accurately describing the subject to be discussed.

Reduced to its simplest terms, a Federal subsidy originates and operates in the following manner. A Member of Congress, or a member of the administration, decides that a specified service is a desirable one and that a law establishing a program to provide the service should be enacted. A case in point is the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962, which is supposed to provide immunization against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Congressman Oren Harris, of Arkansas, was of the opinion that such a program would be advantageous to the people of the United States. Presumably, he examined existing legislation in the 50 States, and concluded that it was inadequate. He, therefore, introduced a bill, H.R. 10541, that would authorize subsidies to States or localities planning immunization programs. The bill was debated briefly in the House of Representatives, with only 60-odd Members present, and passed July 26, 1962, on a voice vote. Several Members of the House made the point that passage of the bill would inject the Federal Government into an area of activity that properly should be reserved to the States and the local governments, but their arguments were in vain.[1]

The bill went to the Senate where it was approved without a hearing by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was passed by the Senate on a voice vote, without debate, on October 4, 1962. On October 23, 1962, the President signed the bill authorizing $36 million to be distributed to States and localities by the U.S. Surgeon General during the next 3 years.

This is a fair example of how a Federal subsidy comes into existence. A need is asserted (usually for a very worthwhile purpose), a law is passed, and the money becomes available from the Federal Treasury.

WHO PAYS?

In the rush to accomplish this worthwhile objective, a number of important, and in some cases controlling, factors are overlooked. The most obvious error is the failure on the part of many legislators and administrators to observe that the money to finance the program must come from the people of the United States. Yet this is the most easily observable principle in all of Government: if the Federal Government is to subsidize a program, the taxpayers of the Nation must put the money in the Federal Treasury for that purpose. If the United States is to have a $36 million federally subsidized vaccination program, the people of the United States must pay to Uncle Sam $36 million in taxes, in addition to what they are now paying.

A related and similarly overlooked fact is that the people frequently have to pay additional State and local taxes in order to receive the Federal subsidies for which they have already been taxed at the Federal level. The reason is that two-thirds of all Federal subsidies are available only on what is called a matching basis. This means that State and local governments have to put up some specified percentage of their own funds in order to receive the subsidy from the Federal Government. But the taxpayer who provides funds for State and local governments is the same taxpayer who provides funds for the Federal Government, so the people actually have to pay increased State and local taxes in order to receive Federal subsidies that they were taxed to provide.

These are matters affecting the pocketbook, and they are not trifling matters. In 1960 total expenses of these subsidy programs amounted to $12 billion, or $66 for every man, woman and child in this Nation. For an average family of four, that means yearly taxes in the amount of $264 to maintain Federal subsidies and the matching funds required to receive these subsidies.

A BROADER TAX BASE

A second obvious error is the belief that the Federal Government is better situated financially to initiate and maintain these programs than are the States and localities. One frequently hears proponents of Federal subsidies maintain that the Federal Government has a broader taxing base than State and local governments. This argument is at best misleading. The States have basically the same tax resources that are available to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the States had power to levy direct taxes on income, the primary source of Government revenue, long before the Federal Government was given that power. The sales tax, real estate tax, personal property tax and other taxes of less general use and acceptance are all available to State and local governments. There are some taxes used by the Federal Government that are not employed by State and local governments, and vice versa, but this does not justify the statement that the Federal Government has a broader taxing power than the States and local governments.

It quite possibly would be accurate to say that the Federal Government can more easily increase taxes than can State and local governments. This appears to be true, since the Federal Government now collects income taxes ranging from 20 percent to 91 percent of net income, while State governments, with the same taxing capability, have limited their income taxes generally to the 1 percent to 10 percent range. The reason for this would seem to be that the State governments are close to the people and are more sensitive to the popular demand for economy, while the Federal Government with its gigantic bureaus is separated from the people by long distances and by massive tangles of red-tape.

Accordingly, it may be suggested that the "superior taxing power" of the Federal Government rests not upon a broader tax base, but upon the Federal Government's ability to increase taxes with relative impunity.[2] Phrased in another manner, the Congress is less subject to control of the people than are State and local governments. Do the proponents of Federal subsidies really mean that such spending programs should be passed upon by the legislative body that is least responsible to the people? Such a proposition would have found little support among the founders of this country, and should find little support among our people today.

SUPERIOR BORROWING POSITION

A related argument in favor of Federal subsidies is that the Federal Government occupies a borrowing position superior to that of the States and local governments. On close analysis, this argument falls of its own weight. The Federal indebtedness as of June 30, 1961, amounted to $289 billion. This sum is equivalent to 67.2 percent of national income. State debt is only 4.7 percent, and local debt is only 12.8 percent, of national income. Since 1932, the Federal debt has increased about four times as rapidly as State and local debt combined. In the decade from 1952 through 1961, the States as a whole showed surpluses of revenue over expenditure in 6 of the 10 years, with an overall deficit of only $300 million for the period. The Federal Government showed surpluses in only 3 of the 10 years, with an overall deficit of more than $35 billion. As a rule State and local governments make provision for the systematic repayment of their debt obligations. The failure of the Federal Government to make such provisions may go far in explaining our huge Federal debt.

As of June 30, 1961, States and local governments had made loans to the Federal Government totaling $18.7 billion. Far from being in a superior borrowing position, it is apparent that the Federal Government actually is in a borrowing position inferior to that of the States and the local governments.[3]

INEQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION

Proponents of the many Federal subsidy programs have promoted the idea that these subsidies result in an equitable distribution of tax funds. Nothing could be further from the truth. For example, Federal subsidies returned to the State of Delaware during 1959 amounted to only 40 cents per dollar of taxes paid by Delaware citizens in support of the subsidy programs. The taxpayer in Mississippi received $4.18 for the dollar that he paid for the same purpose. The taxpayer in Connecticut received only 43 cents for his dollar, while the taxpayer in Arkansas received $3.35. A comparable situation exists in other States: The citizen of New Jersey receives 44 cents for his dollar; in New Mexico, the citizen receives $2.97 for each dollar. The New Jersey Taxpayer reports that in 1960 that State lost $143.1 million through Federal taxes that were spent for subsidies to other States. Pennsylvania lost $125.6 million; New York lost $206.5 million; Virginia lost $6.3 million. Some States, of course, showed a profit at the expense of the others. All things considered, it would be rather difficult to devise a more inequitable system of tax distribution.

---

[1] Representative Durno, of Oregon, who is also a doctor, had this to say: "I think this is a continuing program, or it will be, and if the Congress proposes to adopt this kind of a program, it should be continuing. I think it is going to be an expansive program which is going to involve a lot more diseases. I don't think that it is the dollars in this bill or the medicine in this bill that is the answer. I think the answer is a continuation and an acceleration and an extension of the program of public health, and those public programs should originate at the county level and at the State level more than at the Federal level" (Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 9, pp. 11744–11745).

Representative Martin, of Nebraska, noted that he had sent a questionnaire on this matter to his constituents and that 73 percent of the replies were in opposition to an appropriation of Federal money for this program (Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 9, pp. 11743–11744).

Representative Dominick, of Colorado, said, "For the life of me, I cannot understand why it is necessary for the Federal Government to get into this realm." He then entered in the Congressional Record an article from the Denver Post which related in detail the plan that had been developed and used successfully in that locality, without Federal assistance (Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 9, pp. 117444–11745).

[2] In 1961, 67 percent of all taxes collected in the United States went into the Federal Treasury. The States received only 16 cents and the local governments only 17 cents of each tax dollar.

[3] See the appendix at the end of this paper for the figures upon which the comparisons of this section are based.

FEDERAL CONTROL

One of the greatest illusions perpetrated by proponents of Federal subsidies is that control over the expenditure of funds is left in the hands of the States and localities concerned. While it would appear practical for control of the subsidy programs to be vested in those governments closest to the people and most closely connected with the operation of the programs, this is not the case at all. To the contrary, it is a fact that regulation by Congress and by Federal administrative agencies is a normal incident of each subsidy program. This regulation extends to policy and operation questions, as well as to financial considerations.

The result is that both the States and the local governments are rapidly becoming subordinate units of the Federal Government. Programs of a purely local nature, financed by taxes collected from the people in the locality, are in effect operated and controlled by the Federal Government in Washington.

A recent case from Ohio will serve to illustrate the point. In that State, employers had paid to the Federal Government $30 million in taxes for the administration of an unemployment compensation program. Of this amount, $17 million was to be returned to the State for the purpose of making unemployment compensation payments to qualified persons in Ohio. The Federal Department of Labor threatened to withhold the $17 million from the State of Ohio pending that State's adoption of two procedural rules. The money in question had been collected from Ohio. It was to be spent in Ohio by an administrative agency of that State. The program under which the money was to be distributed had been approved by the Ohio courts. Ohio's unemployment compensation administration had been in operation for over 22 years and in the last 5 years alone had handled 95,684 cases without a complaint. Yet the Federal Department of Labor proposed to penalize the State of Ohio $17 million for failure to comply with federally established regulations for the distribution of this money. It is quite apparent that State and local governments are not left free to establish programs they believe proper with Federal subsidies. To the contrary, it appears that Federal regulation of an essential function touches upon its most minute detail and in at least some cases operates to the detriment of the people affected.

It is common knowledge, of course, that in urban renewal programs, Federal regulations touch upon virtually all areas of activity, including wages, hours of work, public housing, and a great many other items.

The area of farm subsidies is now so tangled and chaotic that it is difficult even for Members of Congress to understand what is taking place, but one thing is certain: The farmer is subjected to more Federal regulation in practically every area of his enterprise than he has ever been subjected to before.

In public welfare programs, where Federal subsidies play an all-important role, a summary and analysis of Federal-State regulations covers over 250 pages. A summary of Federal laws regulating urban renewal covers 62 pages.

In speaking against a proposed program of Federal subsidies for colleges and universities, John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Ill., is quoted as saying, "Any legislation which gives money away must have some restrictions to insure that the money is spent for the intended purpose." Furthermore, if the program is adopted, "the Federal Government, which proposes to underwrite a third of the cost of construction and provide substantial scholarships to students, will become in one congressional vote the largest single customer of all private colleges and a substantial customer of all public ones."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

Surely the most harmful and the most deceptive argument used in favor of Federal subsidies is typified in the statement, "The Federal Government must perform those functions that the State and local governments will not perform." This statement and its several variations are directly contrary to the U.S. Constitution, for they mean that any State power not used, or, in the opinion of the Federal Government, improperly used by a State, is conferred upon the Federal Government. The 10th amendment to the Constitution provides to the contrary, that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." If a State legislature considers, for example, a State vaccination act, and passes such an act, this is perfectly proper. On the other hand, if a State legislature rejects such an act or fails to consider such an act, this does not confer on the Federal Government power to consider a vaccination act for all the States. As a matter of fact, the Constitution implicitly denies such a power in the Federal Government, though the Supreme Court has in recent years held to the contrary.

One of the basic purposes of the Fathers of this Nation in establishing a Union that left the States free to handle their internal problems was to permit a diversity of experiment on the proper solution of complex problems. Thus in the prevention of contageous diseases, New York might decide that a statewide voluntary public vaccination program offers the best chance for success. Oregon might decide that each town, city, or county should be left free to establish its own program. Arizona might determine that people uncoerced by State pressure, and free of taxes to support such State programs, could best care for their own needs. If one plan proved better than the others, and equally suitable to most areas of the country, presumably that plan would be adopted by most States. Perhaps different plans would have varying appeal to different areas of the country. And if one plan proved detrimental to the interests of the people, that plan would be avoided, and its ill effects confined to the State that had attempted it. But with federally subsidized programs covering the entire Nation, the opportunity for experiment is curtailed, and we are reduced to an all-or-nothing situation. This is a far cry from Supreme Court Justice Harlan's observation that one of the great strengths of our Federal system of government is that we have in the 50 States 50 separate laboratories for social experiment.

Another basic purpose accomplished by reserving to the States the power to deal with their internal problems was the keeping of government as close to the people as possible. It was believed by the authors of our Constitution that the creation of an all-powerful Central Government would lead to restrictions on the liberty of the people. With this in mind, the Central Government was given power to act only in those cases when it was necessary or extraordinarily desirable for all the States to act as a single unit. With extreme caution, the powers to be exercised by the Central Government were expressly set forth in the Constitution, and the Congress was given power to do those things necessary and proper to give effect to the expressly enumerated powers. Those powers not given the Central Government were reserved to the States, and the authors of our Constitution went so far as to have this basic principle explicitly stated in the 10th amendment. In this manner they guaranteed, or thought they guaranteed, for all times that all functions of government except those specifically delegated in the Constitution should be performed by those bodies of government closest to the people, the States. Jefferson, Madison, and those other authors of liberty as we have known it understood that government kept close under the watchful eyes of the people is good government; they knew that an all-powerful Central Government far from the watchful eyes of the people could become careless, incautious in the expenditure of public money, and unjust.

A POWERFUL HAND

Today the Federal Government, by managing more than 90 Federal subsidy programs accounting for the expenditure of $12 billion, is extending a powerful hand into the affairs of all the States, all the local governments, and every citizen in this country. Power feeds upon power, and the staggering growth of the subsidy programs in the last few decades attests to the increased power of the Federal Government over our day-to-day lives. "A power over a man's subsistence amounts to a power over his will." [4]

The commission does not maintain that all Federal subsidies are unnecessary and without constitutional justification. Some of these programs clearly fall within a proper interpretation of the power of Congress to maintain armies and navies, or within other powers delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution. But a great number of the subsidy programs, costing billions of dollars in tax funds each year, do not fall within any power granted to the Federal Government, and many improper programs are proposed each year. The inevitable result of continued expansion of Federal power in this field is the creation of an all-powerful Central Government that substantially controls the life of each citizen.

The waste, inefficiency and corruption found in many of the subsidy programs only emphasize the need for change. Practically every day brings a new report of wasted welfare payments, scandal in agricultural subsidies, or questionable dealings in urban renewal projects. As we surrender more of our freedom to high Federal taxes, we receive in return more waste, inefficiency and corruption. The situation is not improved by the fact that our Government officials may be making their best effort—if the program itself is faulty honest administration cannot cure the defect.

A FIRST STEP

As a first step toward solution of this difficult problem, the commission recommends that all citizens and their representatives in Government calmly consider on its merits each new proposal for a Federal subsidy. Any proposed Federal subsidy concerning a matter that can be solved within the framework of city, county, or State government should be rejected. Furthermore, any proposed program that does not reasonably fall within one of the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government should be rejected. If this is done and done faithfully, the normal course of events will bring about a reexamination of the more unnecessary existing subsidy programs. The industrial States of the North and Midwest will begin to understand that by a balanced program for reducing Federal subsidies they can actually improve their State programs and at the same time reduce the tax burden on their citizens. And perhaps it is not too much to expect that the Federal Government, as it is partially relieved of the expensive subsidy burden, may relieve the taxpayer of a portion of his burden.

---

[4] The Federalist No. 79, at 497 (Wright ed. 1961) (Hamilton) (italics in original).

MARCH 1963.

APPENDIX

Figures relating to comparison of the relative debt position of Federal, State, and local governments; latest comparisons are for the year 1961:

	Billion
National income for 1961	[1] $430.2
Federal debt in 1932	[2] 19.5
Federal debt in 1961	[2] 289.0
State debt in 1932	[3] 2.8
State debt in 1961	[4] 20.0
Local debt in 1932	[3] 16.4
Local debt in 1961	[4] 55.0

State surpluses (+) and deficits (−) of general revenue over expenditure, 1952–61: [5]

	Billion
1952	+$1.0
1953	+1.1
1954	+.1
1955	−.7
1956	+.5
1957	+.4
1958	−1.9
1959	−1.9
1960	+1.2
1961	−.1

Federal surpluses (+) and deficits (−), 1952–61 [6] (excluding trust funds):

	Billion
1952	−$4.0
1953	−9.4
1954	−3.1
1955	−4.2
1956	+1.6
1957	+1.6
1958	−2.8
1959	−12.4
1960	+1.2
1961	−3.9

State and local governments held $18.7 billion in securities issued by the Federal Government as of June 30, 1961.[7]

[1] Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1962, p. 312.

[2] Annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, p. 380.

[3] Historical Statistics of the United States, U.S. Bureau of the Census, pp. 728–730.

[4] Summary of Governmental Finances for 1961, U.S. Bureau of the Census, p. 24.

[5] Compendium of State Government Finances in 1961, U.S. Bureau of the Census, p. 1.

[6] Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1961, p. 415.

[7] Id at p. 98.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, it seems to me that I should make a statement concerning my objections to the mass transportation bill. There appear to be numerous objections, and they have been rather clearly outlined, it seems to me, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Virginia Mr. [ROBERTSON].

However, there are two main objections which I believe deserve emphasis. The first involves the statement of the Senator from Virginia the other day that there will be available for expenditure in the next fiscal year $195 billion, an inconceivable sum, if all of this administration's recommendations are added to existing but unexpended appropriations.

In this statement the Senator from Virginia also indicated that the deficit for fiscal 1964, if the proposed tax cut becomes effective, will be $15 to $18 billion, the largest in our peacetime history.

How can we, as responsible representatives of the people, obligate our constituents to an initial charge of $500 million, as anticipated in the pending bill, and to a program which over the years will undoubtedly cost about $10 billion before it is concluded?

To find proof of this latter computation, all we need do is to look at the recent San Francisco private effort, in which a bond issue of $792 million was authorized by the voters for this one area. We can also look at the majority report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which states:

> It would be a mistake to conclude that mass transportation is a problem of concern only to larger areas.
>
> The American Transit Association, however, estimates that there are about 70 cities of 25,000 population or more which have no public transportation service at all.
>
> The proposed Federal program is designed to help assist in the solution of mass transportation problems wherever they occur in large cities or in small ones.

It seems to me that this is definite proof that the purpose and the intent of the proposed program is to go far beyond the initial $500 million which is presented in the pending bill.

The other major objection, which I believe is of great importance, is the uncontrolled authority which is given to the Federal Administrator to spend these enormous sums of money wherever he may decide in his discretion is best, and in local areas not generally considered as a Federal responsibility. This will create a race for influence with the Administrator, as well as a deterrent to local initiative, both of which could be sharply harmful to the integrity of governmental service, to the growth of local responsible government, and another detriment to economic growth and planning.

As I said in my additional views, printed in the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in summary of my objections, at a time of serious national fiscal problems, it is unwise to thrust down the throats of the taxpayers a bill which, first, gives uncontrolled power to an Administrator to spend $500 million without congressional supervision; second, is opposed in its present form by responsible business and labor groups; third, will be only the beginning in an enormously expensive program as evidenced by the fact that San Francisco alone has obligated its own citizens to spend more than $792 million; fourth, fails to meet legal and logical objections of the General Accounting Office; fifth, fails to recognize far more constructive approaches to the problem; sixth, results in the Government borrowing money at relatively high interest rates while distributing the funds without interest; and, seventh, injects the Federal Government directly into local municipal governmental affairs.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is an unwise move for us to make at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 6.

I also send two other amendments to the desk to the same bill, S .6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 14, 1963, the Committee on Commerce considered the bill, S. 6, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and as discussed heretofore.

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation held hearings for several days. During these hearings certain amendments were developed which we propose to offer later insofar as S. 6 is concerned. We believe they will meet a number of objections that have been discussed on the floor of the Senate and which seem, to the members of the Committee on Commerce, to be advisable in order to report a bill which will meet the needs that are evident, insofar as this general program of mass transportation is concerned, and which will, at the same time, provide adequate safeguards insofar as Government participation is concerned.

The proposals which the Committee on Commerce will offer in the nature of a substitute bill are five in number. They will achieve the following objectives:

The first amendment relates to the method of financing as proposed in the initial form of S. 6. The first amendment proposed by the Committee on Commerce would provide for an authorization and an apporpriation in an attempt to get away from the so-called backdoor spending provision which S. 6 now appears to provide.

It will be noted that S. 6 contains a specific money figure, on the assumption that the Administrator can enter into a contract once he has the authority under the bill, and could limit the amount to $12.5 million for any one State as a maximum figure during the first year. In view of the fact that the proposed amendment to be offered by the Committee on Commerce will require a direct appropriation, and the appropriation may be less than the authorized contractual authority granted the Administrator, we propose to change the $12.5 million to a limit of 12½ percent.

Therefore, if the appropriation is less than that requested, the maximum authorization would still be limited to the 12½ percent figure.

Proposed amendment No. 2 to S. 6 would require the Administrator to consult with the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to projects affecting interstate transportation, and further requires the Administrator and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission to exchange information, and otherwise to cooperate with respect to such projects.

This comes about by reason of the fact that a number of projects obviously will involve interstate transportation as well as intrastate transportation in attempting to resolve this very serious problem of mass transportation.

Our proposed amendment No. 3 would provide, that the applicant would operate in accordance with the presentation made by the local authority. If, after a grant shall have been authorized with respect to that project, a change were effected in the rate schedule, a change which the Administrator determined would substantially reduce the revenues from the project and lessen the chances for economically sound operation, the recipient would be notified. Thereafter, the Administrator would not be authorized to extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, except assistance pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to such notice.

This limitation would effectively eliminate further financing, in whole or in part, of any project to be undertaken in that area, under such authority, until the Administrator determined that the schedules by the local operator had been revised or other action had been taken so as to permit an economically sound operation.

This limitation would discourage a municipality or other public body from making a presentation to the Administrator in order to get assistance, and then taking action which would result in an uneconomical operation, which would, of course, be a detriment to this kind of program and a detriment to the agency concerned. If such action were taken without local assistance being given to make up for such inefficient or uneconomical operation, future aid would be withheld.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have some question about this particular amendment. Most of the mass transit bodies that I know of have their rates determined and fixed by a State public utility commission. As I understand the proposed amendment, it would, at least indirectly, give the Administrator a power of veto over what the public utility commission in a State could do. The Administrator could simply say, "The public utility commission may have authorized the rates, but we do not believe the rates are correct; therefore, we will not provide any more Federal grants or loans."

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to respond to the Senator from Colorado on that point. If he will notice, the amendment is specifically directed toward a change which might occur after a grant or loan had been made. In other words, in order to get assistance, an applicant must apply to the Administrator and say, "This is what we proposed to do in the way of service; this is the rate structure we propose to put into effect." On that basis the Administrator would then be able to grant the relief requested, whether in the form of a loan or a direct grant, under the substitute bill proposed by the Committee on Commerce.

Then, if at a later date the local body made a change, a change which would make the operation of the operating agency uneconomical, the Administrator would be authorized to withhold further aid under these types of programs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I understand that; but this is the specific thing about which I am concerned: Suppose a body submits a rate upon which a loan or a grant is made, and it goes into operation. Then suppose it finds, or thinks it has found, a method by which it can increase its revenues. The operator then goes before the public utility commission and gets approval of a new rate structure.

The Administrator, in his own discretion, determines that the new rate will have just the reverse effect, so he says to the operator, "If you go through with this change, we will not provide any more Federal loans or grants." In effect, the Administrator thus has the right of veto of a rate schedule which has been approved by the public utilities commission.

Mr. CANNON. The Administrator does not automatically disapprove a rate or notify a recipient if any kind of change is made. The Senator will notice the language provides:

> If, at any time after the making of such grant with respect to such project, a change is effected in such schedule which the Administrator determines will substantially reduce revenues from the project and lessen the chances for an economically sound operation, he shall so notify the recipient of such grant.

Let us suppose an operating agency tries to reduce rates and gets approval from the local governing body to put the new rates into effect. He would not necessarily be notified immediately by the Administrator. I am sure the Administrator would give the operating agency, if it thought the change in rates would improve its posture so far as overall revenues were concerned, a chance to operate and see whether the new rates were more economically sound. If they turned out not to be sound, and simply reduced operating revenues, then the Administrator would be in a position to notify the recipient of the grant that he was giving them an opportunity to take corrective action. If the operating agency did not take corrective action, then the Administrator would be authorized not to extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, except in pursuance of a commitment which had already been made.

Mr. DOMINICK. I really do not intend to get into a debate on this question. I merely point out that the wording of the amendment gives the Administrator the sole discretion to decide whether some operation is proving uneconomical or not. There is no after-the-fact decision on the basis of actual operation. What the Senator from Nevada is saying is that the Administrator makes the determination whether a certain rate will substantially reduce revenues. The point I make is that this authority in effect gives the Administrator a veto over what a public utility commission does.

Mr. CANNON. I cannot agree with the conclusion of the Senator. I point out, further, that the local operating agency has to appear before the Administrator and make a representation, and on the basis of that representation would be given assistance. We are simply trying to insure, by the amendment, that once the assistance has been received, the operator cannot arbitrarily and indiscriminately change the position which it represented to the Administrator it was going to carry out. If the position is changed, then the Administrator is authorized to withhold further aid, except so far as aid may already have been committed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection, I notice in the report the statement by the Committee on Commerce, on page 10.

> By "projects" your committee is referring to area programs involving a local government or agency thereof.

I realize that that would include programs such as urban renewal, public housing, and projects of that type. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct, so far as urban renewal projects are concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. These are projects which would be sponsored by political subdivisions. I want to be certain that one other program administered by the HHFA is not included. It seems to me that the committee does not intend to include it. That is the college housing program.

Ordinarily, college housing would not be connected with cities or political subdivisions. It is possible that it could be, but I would certainly want it understood that college housing—dormitories and buildings of that kind, intended for colleges—would not be interfered with.

Mr. CANNON. I assure the Senator from Alabama that it is certainly not the intention of the committee to include the college housing program in this particular provision.

In regard to the first part of the Senator's question, I direct his attention to this part of the committee report:

> If corrective action (which might involve various forms of relief including a direct local subsidy) is not taken, the Administrator shall cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA (except pursuant to prior commitments) for projects in the area involved.

In that connection, I emphasize the words "except pursuant to prior commitments," because I think they would cover urban transit plans.

In any event, college housing would be omitted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have that statement.

Mr. CANNON. And that is the intention.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. From this colloquy between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Alabama, do I correctly understand that if a transit plan is in jeopardy because of a change in rates, the Administrator would then notify the HHFA not only to cut off all loans to the transit body, but also to cut off all other Federal administrative programs which might be going on in that whole area?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Colorado is correct in part. For projects which have not been commenced "the Administrator shall cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA (except pursuant to prior commitments) for projects in the area involved."

Mr. DOMINICK. In other words, if the transit body does something the Administrator does not like, the area will be blackballed?

Mr. CANNON. No; that is not correct. The Administrator must adhere to specific guidelines, rather than simply oppose something he does not like.

In that connection I point out the following language:

> However, should the schedule of fares be so altered after the grant has been received, and the Administrator finds that the transit system will not thereafter be able to operate on a sound economic basis—

That would be after the fact, rather than before—

> then the Administrator would so notify the recipient of the grant.

The grant is made only on the basis of representations which have been made to the Administrator by the local transit body. If it changes its mind and proceeds to take action which makes the operation uneconomical, as defined herein, then the Administrator would take the action outlined in the proposed amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. But the effect of the action would be to cut off all aid to programs under the HHFA?

Mr. CANNON. Well, as I pointed out to the Senator from Alabama, that is not quite correct.

Unless corrective action is taken at the local level, it is intended to cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA. But, as I indicated, it is not intended to cut off college housing or FHA guarantees or things of that nature.

Insofar as the proposed fourth amendment is concerned, Mr. President, it provides that:

> (c) No Federal assistance under this act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes and franchise taxes; and no grant or loan shall be made under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist a public mass transportation company or any division or segment of its operations when one or more other divisions or segments are operating profitably unless the Administrator is assured that the transfer of funds from one division or segment to another would not be compatible with the maintenance of a coordinated mass transportation system in the area covered by the proposed project.

One reason for that amendment is that the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission testified at great length before our subcommittee concerning a case which was considered by that body over a 3-year period—from 1956 until 1959. The findings in the case indicated nine specific areas in which relief could and should be given, in order to try to resolve the mass transportation problems or the general transportation problems, insofar as public transportation is concerned. It was obvious to the members of our subcommittee and to the members of the full committee that in many instances local bodies were in difficulty with their mass transportation systems, and yet had not provided relief such as was recommended in the case to which I have referred; for example, relinquishment of franchise taxes or the relinquishment of real property taxes or personal property taxes.

It was the feeling of the full committee, I believe, and certainly it was the feeling of the subcommittee, that an attempt should first be made to try to solve the problem at the local level—as was stated today here on the floor. In other words, the local bodies should first try to do the job themselves. With that, we are in accord.

I do not personally agree with some of the Senators who have spoken today, in that I do not believe that the local bodies can always solve the problem. In some instances, they cannot. But this amendment is an attempt to write into law a provision requiring them first to try to solve the problem at the local level, by granting such relief as had been recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by many other experts in this field, in order to try to assist in solving the problem at the local level.

The fifth amendment, as proposed, is the so-called guaranteed-loan provision. We had before us and under consideration a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. It was along the lines of a bill introduced last year by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. The purpose of the bill was to try to solve this problem through federally guaranteed loans.

I think it is obvious that if the local agencies can solve their problem through the guaranteed-loan provision, that would be more desirable. As a result, the committee has proposed an amendment which would authorize the Federal Government to guarantee loans of the public body, up to an amount not to exceed $500 million, as set forth in the amendment. Of course this is only a contingent liability. In the amendment we have provided for one-fourth of 1 percent as a reserve, which should build up over a period of time, to enable them to handle the administration of this provision, and perhaps as a reserve fund to cover contingent losses which might occur thereafter.

The amendment also requires the local agency or local body to first attempt to come under a guaranteed-loan provision, if it can do so. The Administrator would have to review the picture from the standpoint of the eligibility of the applicant, and would have to determine whether it could qualify for a guaranteed loan. If it could, that would be the first type of relief to be provided.

If it could not qualify for a guaranteed loan, then—and only then—it would become eligible to proceed under the grant provision of the bill, as set forth at the present time in Senate bill 6 and in the amendment in the nature of a substitute which we propose to offer.

One of the objections raised during the consideration of the guaranteed-loan provision was based on the fact that local agencies were not required to contribute. The Banking and Currency Committee considered this provision. We have attempted to act upon that point by requiring a contribution of 25 percent at the local level and 75 percent at the Federal level.

So the contribution provision is covered in the proposed amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Last year, when the suggestion was first made that the bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency be considered by the Committee on Commerce, my attitude was the attitude of Sir Balthazar Gerbier expressed in 1662 when he said:

> Too many cooks spoil the broth.

I believe I had the same attitude this year. But the gentle persuasion of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] prevailed with me, as it always has, and I am now glad that the measure did go to the Committee on Commerce. I am particularly happy that it received the deep and comprehensive consideration of the Senator from Nevada. Now I believe my attitude is best expressed as Plato is reported to have stated:

> If you will attend to me, two together will be searching, and so mayhap we shall find what we seek.

My feeling—and I believe it is the feeling of all Senators who serve on the Subcommittee on Housing—is that the measure has been helped greatly by the suggestions proposed by the Committee on Commerce. I know that at the proper time we as a committee will be accepting ideas of the Committee on Commerce.

Of course, there will be some questions that we shall desire to clear up. The first question that I have deals with fare levels. Historically we know what has happened in transit systems. As costs rise and, indeed, as ridership declines, fares are increased, which begets a further decline in service.

I am sure it was not the intention of those who proposed the part of the amendment referred to, to take from transit authorities the necessary flexibility to deal with such situations, and to seek and find ways that would encourage people back to the use of transit facilities, or encourage people to continue using such facilities.

Mr. CANNON. The record is quite clear. It is certainly hoped that every effort would be made to try to resolve that problem, which is certainly serious. It is a problem that is not being met in many areas, and it cannot be met in those areas without some type of Federal assistance. Certainly we do not take an inflexible position insofar as fares are concerned, or other methods of trying to encourage greater use of facilities and thereby provide greater and better service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am reassured. The next amendment about which I desired briefly to inquire relates to State and local tax relief or other relief mentioned in the amendment. The Senator knows that, particularly in connection with rapid transit and commuter railroads, there are cities which are gathering places, either at the terminal or the makeup point of the transit facilities. At such points we have large areas of concentration of land and facilities devoted to the transportation system, be it commuter rail or rapid transit, or even buses. Such communities have a great measure of responsibility in terms of local public service and all the things that go into local government. Of course, the beneficiaries would be the rapid transit terminal or whatever other system there might be. Those systems would feed it through multiple jurisdictions of government to people in the commuting range as far out as 50 miles in some cases. If heavy demand were made at the terminal for relief, an undue burden would be saddled on one city for the benefit of all the riders on the line.

I am wondering whether in the proposed language there is not the necessary flexibility and whether the local demand met by the amendment could not be met in other ways? Perhaps it could be done by way of a State contribution in lieu of taxes. In such cases it would not be the terminal city that would apply. It would be a broader part of government, such as an authority. In my State it would probably be the State government.

Mr. CANNON. First, the administrator would have certain discretion.

Second, the proposal would not prohibit a State or a local agency from granting a subsidy to try to give some relief, rather than to place the burden strictly on the tax base. In the type of situation which the Senator has indicated, I am certain the record will indicate very clearly that in a number of instances there has not been granted enough relief at the local level to try to create some incentive to try to resolve the overall problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the judgment of the Senator, the local level could be the local level of application. Perhaps it would be the State level.

Mr. CANNON. It could be at the State level. In many instances, it might be at the State level. In some instances, I presume it could be beyond the State level. There might be a joint operation in two or more States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator for his amplifications and observations. In connection with the provision that the bonds would not carry a tax exemption, there might be fear that a precedent would be established that would cut deeply into the historical pattern of financing at the local level. I know that such is not the intention or expectation of the Senator, and that he sees the situation as a case sui generis.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for bringing up that point. I had not completed my explanation. I intended to cover that one particular provision. One of the other features of the guaranteed bond proposal is a provision that they would not be tax exempt. That provision departs from the usual and customary theory of tax exemption in dealing with municipal bonds. That is in nowise intended to be a precedent for the taxation of municipal bonds, and I, for one, would oppose entering into the field of taxation of municipal bonds generally.

That is a different area entirely. The Federal Government would be asked to guarantee the bonds of the local transportation authority. They might therefore be able to market their bonds at a lesser interest rate than would be possible on the open market today. In my opinion, the private investment segment of our country would be induced to come in under that type of proposal. Such participation is necessary if we are to solve the overall problem, because of its magnitude. But again I say that that is nowise intended to be a precedent. It is intended to be exactly the opposite. A non-tax-exempt provision would be established solely by reason of the fact that the Federal Government would be coming into the picture as a guarantor, just as the Federal Government enters into the picture in FHA and VA guarantee provisions. In both those situations, interest is not exempt from taxation. That is the specific reason why we are trying not to get into that area in the present case.

Also, if a guarantee provision were allowed on tax exempt bonds, in effect it would place the bonds in a better position from the standpoint of salability than those of the Federal Government.

That, of course, would place the local agencies in an unfair competitive position insofar as the sale of Government securities is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If they were tax exempt?

Mr. CANNON. If they were tax exempt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The measure introduced by the Senator from Ohio, I believe S. 807, was a guarantee of loan bill. I believe the Senator has introduced it as another substitute. This is a guarantee approach. It specifies, however, a revolving fund for the payout of any guaranteed loan in total or partial default. The revolving fund, as I understand, would be $50 million.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I see no revolving fund in the measure advanced by the Senator from Nevada. I note there would be an authorized total amount for guarantee of $500 million. If this were spelled out in terms of the amount of money which had to be in a revolving fund for payout on possible default over a period of the life of bonds, *30 to 50 years, I would compute the* requirement to be a revolving fund of a negligible amount. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. I could not answer the Senator as to how to equate this into a relative figure compared with a revolving fund. *I simply say that the* $500 million authorization is to be a maximum amount of guarantee for which the Federal Government could obligate itself, under the circumstances, if the bill should pass. This would mean that the Federal Government would have a contingent liability, if it guaranteed $500 million in bonds, of the full amount.

Certainly, the only way that would equate itself into an actual payout would be if every applicant defaulted on the payment of the bonds over the entire life of the bonds, which would be over a very substantial number of years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I believe the potential annual loss, assuming total default, could be computed. I hope that before we complete consideration of this problem tomorrow we can at least have an estimate of an annual possibility. That would be very helpful for Senators, I am sure. The $500 million is the limit of possible guarantees. The annual amount which possibly could be paid out, when one expresses it, is not nearly as terrifying, and of course we expect the guarantee program to be fully self-supporting.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know that it would be fair to say that one could equate this general type of guaranteed loan to an FHA or VA guaranteed loan, insofar as the payout experience is concerned, because this would involve a lending to a public body, while under the FHA and VA guaranteed loan provisions the loans are made to private individuals. The situations are somewhat different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think that over the evening recess perhaps we can give the problem to the actuaries, to see if it can be put in some frame of comparison.

Mr. CANNON. I shall be happy to check, to see if we can find some basis which is reasonably accurate for an estimate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Subsection (c) of section 3 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is, I understand, the subsection which deals with the tax relief which would be sought in the local and State communities.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any other provision in the proposal which would deal with tax relief that should be sought?

Mr. CANNON. So far as I know, it is entirely covered under subsection (c) of section 3.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 5?

Mr. CANNON. Commencing on page 5 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute to be proposed for S. 6.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct the Senator's attention to subsection (c), from which I read:

> No Federal assistance under this Act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes and franchise taxes;

Am I correct in the understanding that as a prerequisite to the right of obtaining any relief, the Administrator would have to be satisfied that, on a local and State level, tax relief had been granted compatible with the fiscal responsibilities of the local government?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct; though not necessarily tax relief. It could be some other relief. A subsidy might be granted in lieu of tax relief. The tax relief would apply only when they were attempting to assist a private mass transportation company as distinguished from a local or municipal government owned system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One thing bothers me about the language. How could it become equally operative throughout the whole country, when one of the conditions would be that tax relief or other relief "compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities" would be granted?

I have in mind the fact that there are different tax laws in various States. I have in mind also the fact that some communities are strong in money, while others are weak. How could we be assured that there would be equal operation of the law throughout the country? I am exploring the question.

Mr. CANNON. I could not assure the Senator that this would result in absolute equality in every instance, because the situations might be different. There might be a different tax base. The transit company in one State might be taxed a little more than one in a neighboring State, for example, yet the programs could still be "compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities."

One of the purposes of the proposal is to insure that the local government would not simply "skim the cream" off the top of the taxes received from the private operator, and then use only a portion of that amount to meet the Federal grant requirements. If they were to request relief from the Federal Government, then they in turn would have to plow back whatever they were getting out of the transportation company, to try to solve the problem at the local level.

That is the intent. I presume that in each instance it would require a very careful review by the Administrator. Of course, the entire program would be subject to periodic review by the Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My fear, again, is that there is given to the Administrator a discretionary power to determine whether the tax or other relief granted has been compatible with local fiscal responsibilities. It gives him a discretion which in my opinion he will be unable to apply equally throughout the Nation. That is my own fear of that provision of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I simply say that there are general guidelines which can be used in this type of situation, and that is evident, as an example, from the testimony given by the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission when he testified concerning the passenger deficit investigation. One of the recommendations they made was that the local bodies grant this type of relief, consistent with their financial responsibility.

I presume there are general guidelines which would be applicable, but to give an assurance of absolute equality of treatment of an applicant in Ohio as compared to an applicant in New Jersey I do not believe is any more possible than to give an assurance of absolute equality in any type of program that involves a different application of State and local law.

Mr. President, I am open to further questions any Senator desires to ask. If there are no questions, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The proposals of tax relief made by the Interstate Commerce Commission were also made by other agencies of the Government dealing with the manner in which the problem should be solved.

Mr. CANNON. A number of studies have been made of this particular problem. It is evident that some States and some local bodies have not met their responsibilities, in attempting to solve the problem themselves, in the eyes of those bodies that have made reports on this subject and in the eyes of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The testimony shows a number of studies have been made. In most of them one of the methods recommended for solving the problem is that the Federal Government should grant tax relief by not siphoning off the income derived by transit companies through tax remissions made by local and State governments, and also that direct tax relief and other relief be provided by local and State governments.

Am I correct in that statement, so far as the Senator from Nevada understands?

Mr. CANNON. I understand that is the recommendation which has been made by some of the reporting bodies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I intend to discuss that subject tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the floor.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to introduce into the RECORD a joint resolution from the Vermont Legislature?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on March 6 the U.S. Internal Revenue Service announced its intention to emasculate several of the most efficient internal revenue State offices and transfer them to offices in bigger cities.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a joint resolution enacted by the Vermont Legislature expressing its views on this proposal.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

Joint resolution relating to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service offices in Burlington, Vt.

Whereas on March 6, 1963, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service announced that it proposes to eliminate the district offices in Burlington, Vt., and maintain there only a field office; and

Whereas this action will result in substantially diminished service to the citizens of Vermont, making it necessary for them to travel considerable distances for personal interviews with officials of the Internal Revenue Service in a large number of cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont opposes the proposed action and the resulting loss of service to the taxpayers of the State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford, as well as to Hon. Mortimer Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Approved: March 26, 1963.

DOUBLE TALK—DOUBLE SPEND

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, officials of the Department of the Army have programed two new Army Reserve Centers at Columbus, Ohio, for 1963, at a cost of more than $1,200,000. Each of these units will have a complement of 600 men.

I have been informed that at the present time consideration is being given to the location of these centers. Although no final decision has been made regarding them, it is reported that the Department of the Army is seriously contemplating purchasing two new sites in Columbus, or in surrounding Franklin County, for this purpose. Those who are guilty of promoting this sort of program would be guilty of wasting more than $1,200,000 of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, the Fort Hayes Military Reservation at Columbus, Ohio, is to be abandoned by the Army in 1965. This installation covers over 70 acres of land in the heart of the city of Columbus. It is easily accessible from all parts of the city and from all parts of Franklin County. It is already the property of the U.S. Government.

It would be an unconscionable action if taxpayers' money were spent for land for two new training centers, when this excellent location, already owned by the Federal Government, is available.

Mr. President, this excellent installation, which has been owned for many, many years by the Federal Government, was useful in the past, but is being "phased out", as the military use the term. You see, Mr. President, in Pentagonese it would be too simple to say "phased out." At any rate, this fine acreage in the heart of Columbus, Ohio, is definitely to be abandoned by the Federal Government.

We talk about saving taxpayers' money. Here is one place where we can do that very easily by turning over, for use for these training centers, only a small section of the 70-acre property at Fort Hayes.

There is no reason why a part of the Fort Hayes reservation could not be set apart for these training centers, in fact, why are two training centers needed? As I have said before, Fort Hayes is an ideal location for this purpose. These units could be combined and built on federally owned property at Fort Hayes. That would not cause inconvenience to reservists in the Columbus area. At the same time it would save thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I for one, cannot understand how, at a time when we are trying to keep the budget within limits, we would condone a manifest waste of the taxpayers' money, like the one being considered in this instance. I have written to Secretary of the Army Vance, and strongly protested any such move.

I couched my letter in forceful language in order to indicate my amazement at the contemplation of such a waste of the taxpayers' money. I hope Secretary Vance and other top officials of the Department of the Army will carefully scrutinize this situation. I am sure that once they are aware of the facts, the proposed purchase of new sites will be discarded. The Defense Department has millions of acres of surplus land throughout the Nation. This land should be utilized whenever possible, before the Federal Government purchases unneeded additional land. The scheme seems to be to buy additional land in Columbus at an inflated price. I denounce this proposal as a fantastic, unthinkable raid upon our Federal Treasury. I will oppose this to the uttermost.

Mr. President, Don E. Weaver, outstanding editor of the Columbus Citizen-Journal, recently wrote an excellent and persuasive article regarding this proposed boondoggle. His article is entitled "Fort Hayes—Double Talk, Double Spend." It is a fine example of responsible journalism at its best, and Mr. Weaver is to be congratulated on his attempt to save the taxpayers' money. I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fort Hayes—Double Talk, Double Spend

(By Don E. Weaver)

Early this week Mayor Westlake announced that the Army intends to build two Reserve training centers in Columbus, at a cost of over $1,200,000.

Three days later the mayor said that since the Army is going to give up old Fort Hayes, he has asked the General Services Administration to give it to the city for parking or a city storage lot.

This is a close-home illustration of why Government costs so much.

If the Army needs two new training centers and is also going to give up century-old Fort Hayes, why not use Fort Hayes for the new training center and save the cost of buying more land and taking it off the tax duplicate?

A Washington checkup indicates the Army already is taking second thought and may do just this.

We have had ample evidence that the military's right hand often doesn't know what its left hand is doing. Such may be the case here.

There is said to be an Army plan for 1,700 Reserve centers across the country.

The Defense Department has millions of acres of surplus land. It should be utilized, rather than buying more for new programs.

Of course the abandonment of Fort Hayes—opened in the Civil War—has been hot and cold for years. Now the Army is supposed to be giving it up in 1965.

Mayor Westlake's vague proposals for parking lots, storage or maybe recreation aren't very high uses for Fort Hayes' 70 acres of good level land, strategically located at an interchange. On the completed expressway it will be one of the most accessible sites in Columbus.

As Mayor Westlake admitted, the State of Ohio will have first call on Fort Hayes if and when it finally is abandoned for Federal use. And we think the State could utilize it for higher purposes than parking, storage or a neighborhood playground.

Ohio State University faces a mighty expansion problem. Plans are forming for an Ohio Research and Development center. The Ohio Historical Society Museum owned by the State and not part of the university, nevertheless stands on the campus at the main entrance, occupying space badly needed by OSU.

At the same time, Ohio has made a start toward a State archives center—and after 150 years Ohio certainly needs it—by taking over the old Governor's mansion on Broad Street. This is valuable land, but far from ideal for an archives center. All or part of Fort Hayes' 70 acres could be used for the related history and archives functions of the State, thus releasing to the university a site it badly needs and allowing sale for private—and taxable—use the old mansion site.

At all levels of government we've had a tendency continually to acquire new lands and buildings, also more debt, without getting full value from the old or obsolete facilities. For example, the old State blind and deaf schools, replaced years ago by new schools on newly acquired land. These valuable sites in the heart of the city could be restored to the tax duplicate if auctioned to private ownership and use.

The Army is vague as usual about its plans for new training centers. But Mayor Westlake indicated the sites, which he declined to name if he knows them, may require extension of water and sewer services. True or not, it sounds typical.

Ignore the readily available, the already owned, and go out and spend a lot more tax dollars getting more land and building new buildings.

Senator Stephen M. Young, of Ohio, is one who has sounded a warning against unnecessary spending for these research centers when Fort Hayes is available.

We hope Senator Lausche, always a vociferous advocate of Government economy, and Representative Samuel L. Devine, of Franklin County, who also testifies for conservative spending, will add their voices and their efforts to the prevention of costly squandering.

A million dollars may be peanuts to the tax eaters, but it's a lot of money to us taxpayers digging deep to pay the bill before April 15.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has discussed the major provisions of this legislation, and on many occasions I have spoken of the need for this bill—the staggering traffic congestion that is choking so many of our cities, and costing the Nation between $6 and $8 billion a year in loss of time and wages, traffic accidents, and loss of business, to say nothing of the exhaustion of our energies, both physical and emotional, by the traffic jams we face daily.

We all know that traffic congestion is discouraging private investment in the revitalization of our cities. We know that our transit systems are seriously deteriorated, and that deterioration is forcing the construction of more and more high-cost highways in the cities to compensate. We know that great numbers of people—perhaps up to 40 percent of the population in both large and small cities—are highly dependent on public transportation because they are too old, too young, too poor or even too afraid to drive an automobile.

To me the problem is so clear and so serious that it hardly needs further discussion.

Even the strongest opponents of Federal action in that field concedes the existence of the problem. We saw an example of that in the earlier statement of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett]. On several occasions the U.S. Chamber of Commerce conceded the point in testimony and in responses to questioning. So I do not think I need add anything more to that question.

I would, however, like to make some comments with respect to certain objections that have been raised against the bill now before the Senate, which I had the honor of sponsoring with 22 other Senators from both sides of the aisle and from most parts of the country.

I am especially happy over the broad bipartisan support the proposed legislation has received this year and in past years. I desire my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to know our appreciation and our full knowledge of the value of their support and assistance in connection with this measure.

I am only sorry that the late distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Styles Bridges, is not here today, for he was likewise a strong supporter of this legislation when he was in the Senate. I recall in 1961, he made this statement:

> I trust that before this session of the Congress is concluded, we shall be able to say that in the field of domestic problems, one of the most aggravating and serious was that of mass transportation, and that this Congress recognized it and passed legislation

necessary to alleviate this important and critical problem.

Senator Bridges was deeply respected, and his loss is deeply regretted. However, he did live to see a start at meeting the problem, because in 1961 the temporary emergency program with which we have been working was adopted. That program was the forerunner of the measure now before the Senate. When Senator Styles Bridges spoke, he spoke in the noblest tradition of his most beautiful and rugged State.

Those of us who served in the House of Representatives were inspired as we sat in that Chamber and observed the words etched in marble behind the Speaker's stand:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

That is a quotation from another great man from New Hampshire—Daniel Webster.

THE COST

Mr. President, we all know that there is a great deal of talk this year about the size of Federal spending, and I agree we should try to eliminate every possible waste and economize where we can without doing injury to the security or welfare of the Nation.

But I say flatly and firmly that there is no shortcut to economy through the defeat of this proposed legislation.

We have asked the people of this Nation to pay $41 billion in taxes for the construction of the interstate highway program. About $20 billion of that amount will be going into urban highway construction.

We simply cannot evade the fact that there are certain periods of the day—2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the evening—when the working population of this Nation must move to get to and from work. Many of those people now use public transportation, and many more would use it, if it were modern, convenient, quick, and reasonably priced. But more and more of those people are being forced into their automobiles for rush-hour commutation because we have allowed our bus and and rail transit systems to deteriorate and decline.

If we do not spend a modest amount to preserve and improve essential rail and bus transit service, the taxpayers will only end up paying far more in taxes to build the highways that will be necessary to compensate for the decline and loss of transit service.

The American Municipal Association has estimated that if five cities—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Chicago— were to lose just their rail commuter service, it would cost more than $17 billion to move a comparable number of people by automobile.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to stress the point the Senator has made that, in the long run, the bill would save the public money. If we in the greater Philadelphia metropolitan area, using the funds made available by the bill, can complete the mass transit plan which has already been agreed upon in substance, we will save future generations of taxpayers tens of millions—even as much as $100 million—in the cost of extra expressways, automobile highways and truck highways, which would otherwise have to be built. As long as 10 years ago, when I was mayor of Philadelphia, the cost of 1 mile of our Delaware Expressway, which is not yet built, was $17 million. I am sure that cost is substantially higher today. Yet, until we can get the modern equipment and the necessary Federal financing, we have unused and unavailable a network of railroads which could be utilized to bring more than 100,000 people, in and out and around the metropolitan area every day.

So the Senator from New Jersey is quite correct, when he says that the very modest expenditures which are contemplated by the bill would, in the end, pay for themselves many times over in saving the cost of highways which would otherwise become necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I could not more completely agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. Those who address themselves to the question of the economy and feel that the bill is uneconomical could not, in my judgment, be further from the truth.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator has contemplated a comment by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, in testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which the Senator from New Jersey and I both serve, in connection with the youth employment bill, which I hope will be taken up and passed when the bill relating to mass transportation is disposed of. The Senator will recall that Mr. Wirtz pointed out that the amount called for by that bill, which is slightly in excess of $100 million, would have been spent for the defense program since 6 o'clock the night before to 10 a.m., when Mr. Wirtz was testifying.

I invite the attention of my friend from New Jersey to the fact that the mass transit bill would authorize the expenditure of $500 million over a 3-year period. Does the Senator recall how much of that money was in loans and how much in grants?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is all in grants.

Mr. CLARK. All grant money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The grant program is $500 million. In addition, the bill contemplates carrying forward the loan program which was approved in 1961.

Mr. CLARK. So the $500 million for the grant program represents total expenditures over a 3-year period equivalent to one-half of 1 week's expenditures for the defense program, on which we are now spending at the rate of $1 billion a week. So we ought to view the question of expenditure in some perspective. This is a subject which the Senator from New Jersey has well said involves the life and the continued well-being of our cities and, indeed, many of our towns, too. We hesitate on grounds of economy to spend as much for the purposes for which the bill is intended over a period of 3 years as we are spending in 1 week for the defense program. I believe that if Senators were generally aware of that fact, some of the opposition to the bill on the ground that we cannot afford the program would be dissipated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator has stated the case even more dramatically than I have.

Two pages of a newspaper published last Wednesday carried two interesting stories. One story related:

> Senate trouble predicted for the transit bill.

The newspaper article contained a story on that subject.

On the other page, in two columns, was listed a total contract authority for defense in the sum of $890 million; $385 million of that amount was for the Dyna-Soar space glider. In the newspaper story the statement appeared:

> Of course, it is not known whether this will be a final vehicle in our space effort.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In other words, we might spend $385 million for it and then junk it. The Senator and I have not been willing to "short cut" on defense. All we are saying is, "Let us make a beginning of national strength in the urban areas of this country, where truly we are facing decay."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with what the Senator says. I think the example he has given is excellent.

Aside from the defense program, it has always seemed to me to be slightly more important to get the hard-working American citizens back and forth and in and out of Camden, Newark, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, than to get a man on the moon. I am quite ready to put a man on the moon when we can afford to do it, after having taken care of some of our domestic needs.

I suggest to Senators who are interested in economy that a good, hard look at the space program should be taken before they vote against a modest expenditure to give adequate services to American citizens who are earning the money which makes it possible to have a defense program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I agree with him.

Mr. President, I continue with my remarks on this subject.

In addition to the added highway expenditure that will be necessary if we do not preserve and modernize essential urban transit service, we have the problems and costs of providing enough parking space for all the automobiles, the loss of tax ratable property, the dislocation of families, the added traffic control and street maintenance costs.

In my judgment, much of this pain and confusion is inevitable, for urban highways will always be essential to meet a variety of needs that public transportation will never be able to meet. The automobile is here to stay, but we cannot handle the crush of rushhour travel by highways and automobiles alone.

What we are trying to do is get a little balance, to improve rail and bus transit to help supplement our efforts to handle the rushhour problem.

And no one that I know of disputes the need for a balanced and coordinated urban transportation system, using all modes of transportation to the best natural advantage.

But how in the world can we get balance when the Federal Government provides 90 percent of the cost of highway construction and provides nothing for the improvement of transit?

So I say that there is no shortcut to economy. If we do not provide the modest help proposed here, we will end up paying far more to move people some other way—for move they must, and move they will during the rush hours.

And the expenditures proposed in S. 6 are modest.

The $100 million expenditure proposed for the first year is only $30 million more than it cost to build less than 3 miles of a highway loop in the city of Cleveland, Ohio. It is exactly the same amount that it will take to build little more than 1 mile of highway across lower Manhattan.

A FOOT IN THE DOOR?

At this point, I can almost hear the thoughts of some Senators:

> Ah yes, $100 million the first year, but this is just the foot in the door, the nose in the tent, the drop in the bucket. It can't begin to do the job, and the program will balloon to gigantic proportions in later years.

We will hear—as we have already heard—that San Francisco is building a $792 million rapid transit system. We will hear that Los Angeles is planning a $600 million system, that Washington is planning a $790 million system. So how can this proposed $500 million expenditure be anything else but a drop in the bucket that will expand enormously in later years?

For that reason, I want to make a special plea to every Senator to study the way this program would actually work.

Let me emphasize that the Federal aid would not cover two-thirds of the cost of constructing any transit system or project.

We are not proposing to provide free transportation service.

The riders of every transit system will be paying for the service they get. All we are saying is that we cannot put the entire burden of capital costs on the farebox. To do so would require higher and higher fares, producing fewer and fewer riders. This defeats the whole purpose of transit service which is to attract riders, especially during rush hours.

So this bill proposes that the Federal Government share up to two-thirds of the net project cost; that is, the gap between the cost of the project and the amount that can be reasonably financed with bonds sold to private investors and supported by revenues from the farebox.

And how large could this gap be?

Well, let me give an actual example of a typical net project cost in the construction of a new rapid transit project, which of course involves a higher capital cost than would a project involving buses.

The Delaware River Port Authority has received permission to build a 12-mile high-speed rapid transit line between Philadelphia and Camden at a cost of about $55 million. Approximately $25 million of the cost will be covered by bonds sold to private investors supported by the estimated revenues from the farebox. This would leave a net project cost, in this instance, of $30 million, which the authority is planning to provide locally out of surplus reserve funds.

If these surplus funds did not exist, and if the project was undertaken under this program, the Federal share would hypothetically be $20 million, which could be spread over the construction period of the project, thus further reducing the impact on the program.

In other words, the Federal assistance is designed to serve as "seed money" to stimulate far larger amounts of local and private financing.

And the more experience and confidence the private investors get under this program, the more risk they will be willing to assume, and the less burden there will be on the Federal Government.

So the amounts provided in this bill are not just a drop in the bucket.

There is no reason to believe that the program must balloon to vast heights in later years.

But I am sure, before this debate is over, we will hear this called a $9 billion bill.

Let me emphasize that this figure was never the estimated Federal cost of this program.

This was the estimate of total national need over a 10-year period to improve and modernize the Nation's transit systems.

Now let us take that figure and analyze it a little bit.

First, a certain portion of that amount will never apply for Federal assistance, and another portion will be found ineligible for assistance, for one reason or another.

These amounts alone could be very substantial, but let us just say for the sake of discussion that it totals $1 billion, leaving us with a figure of $8 billion.

Out of that $8 billion, we then have to subtract the amount that can be financed out of the fare box. In the example I gave, the fare box covered almost 50 percent of the total cost, and this percentage could be substantially higher in many types of projects.

So it would not be unreasonable to earmark $4 billion for private financing.

This would leave us with a net project cost of $4 billion, and a potential Federal contribution of $2.6 billion over a 10-year period, which amounts to $260 million a year.

I believe I have been conservative in this analysis, and still the level of funding would not be substantially higher than the level proposed in this bill.

And I need not add that when the authority in this bill terminates at the end of 3 years, Congress will decide whether the program has been successful and whether it should be continued or dropped, reduced or enlarged. On top of that, the program will be subject to annual review by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

DO WE HAVE THE MONEY?

Mr. President, I know that some Senators will still feel that at this time in our Nation's economic life we cannot afford even this modest amount of expenditure.

We all know that the Federal Government is faced with a high level of spending. We are faced with the prospect of a deficit in this fiscal year. We are faced with the possibility of a tax cut and so we hear that we must slam the lid on Federal expenditures. In fact, some are even going so far as to argue that we must take the meat axe to all kinds of existing vital programs.

Mr. President, this is not just a fiscal and economic problem we are talking about. The real issue facing the Senate is whether we have any faith and confidence in this Nation.

It is easy to bewail the state of the Union and run down the Federal Government. But I think it is about time that we gave a little credit to the people and the representatives of this country.

We are the greatest and strongest Nation in the world. I think we ought to be proud of that fact. I do not think it befits our stature in the world today to talk as though we believe the economic strength of this country is on the verge of collapse.

Thirty years ago, we weathered a tremendous depression. We weathered $50 billion deficits a year during the Second World War. We weathered the dire predictions of gloomy pessimists after the war, that we could not possibly adjust from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Throughout the fifties we weathered constant predictions that inflation was going to ruin the Nation, yet prices today are more stable than they have been in years. And all the while, wages have been increasing, and the people of this Nation are enjoying a degree of prosperity unknown to any other nation in the world.

Mr. President, I think we ought to be proud of this Nation and the accomplishments of the American people over the last 30 years of turmoil and strife. I do not think we ought to be going around talking as though the day of economic doom is just around the corner. It is not just around the corner. The fiscal strength of this Nation is in good shape, despite what some people say.

We hear them say that the Federal debt has increased to ruinous heights. It is large. It is about $300 billion.

But the fact is that the Federal debt is only 11 percent higher than it was in 1946. The fact is that State and local government debt has increased over 300 percent in the same period of time.

The fact is that private debt in this country today is twice as large as the Federal debt and it has also been increasing at a far more rapid rate than the Federal debt.

Mr. President, businessmen of this country know that to borrow for their own expansion is a sign of health and not weakness. It is a sign of faith in the future of their own business. It enables them to obtain today what they would otherwise have to wait years for, and in the process they help stimulate the economic growth of the Nation in all kinds of direct and indirect ways.

The same thing is true when the Federal Government invests in the future economic growth of the Nation.

Because, Mr. President, the only way we are going to meet the challenge of communism over the long run, and convince the world that they do not have to trade their freedom for the promise of three square meals a day is to show the world that we can meet the pressing economic and social problems that we face in an atmosphere of political freedom through the democratic process.

I do not think there is any reason for us to act like a band of frightened and timid men. If we do not have faith and confidence in the future of our Nation and in our ability to meet our own social and economic problems, I think we might as well give up.

Yet, we tremble over the size of the Federal debt when in fact it is decreasing and not increasing as a percentage of our gross national production. It is decreasing and not increasing as a burden on the American people. In 1946 the national debt amounted to about $2,000 for every person in the country. Today that debt is less than $1,600 per person.

And the same thing is true of Federal spending. Certainly Federal spending has risen over the years, but again, in relation to the gross national product, it has remained virtually stable for the last decade.

I do not think these trends in debt or expenditures give cause for alarm. I think the economy of this country is in good hands and is being managed in a sound and prudent manner. I think the most critical problem facing us today is not spending, or deficits, or inflation.

I think the most pressing problem today is the growing gap in a large number of vital public needs, from education to unemployment to urban transportation.

I think the longer we neglect these problems, the weaker a nation we are going to be.

This bill is one modest effort to meet one serious public need. The expenditure of $500 million over the next 3 years will trigger a combined Federal, local, and private investment of more than $1¼ billion in the improvement of this Nation's mass transit system.

The beneficial effect of this program on employment will be tremendous. Without this program, neither the local nor private investment will be made. Unemployment on our rail and bus transit systems will continue to decline at the present alarming rate of more than 35 percent in the last 10 years.

LOCAL INITIATIVE

Mr. President, this brings me to another charge that has been made against this bill—that this is going to destroy local initiative and responsibility.

But the whole history of transit decline and deterioration is proof that local and private initiative is not enough. Some Federal help is essential if there is to be any meaningful local initiative.

This scare word about local initiative has been hurled at just about every Federal activity ever initiated. But does anyone contend that the passage of the accelerated public-works program last year destroyed local initiative?

I do not think I have ever seen a program in recent years that has stimulated more interest, activity, and local initiative than this accelerated public-works program. The same thing is true of urban renewal.

Would anyone argue that we would have as many cities actively working to eliminate their slums and revitalize their cities as we have today if it were not for the urban renewal program?

Would any Senator say that the programs of the F.H.A. have destroyed the initiative of the homebuilders of this Nation? Would anyone say that the aid we are giving under the Federal Airport Act has destroyed local initiative in meeting the growing needs of the jet age?

Does anyone feel that the communities receiving help under the school impacted aid program have lost their initiative in meeting the educational needs in their communities? The answer to all of these questions is clearly and absolutely—no.

When you get down to cases, it becomes clear that we are dealing with a hollow slogan.

RURAL VERSUS URBAN BURDEN

Mr. President, one of the most unjust accusations that has been leveled against this program is the charge that we are forcing the people in the small towns and rural parts of the Nation to pay for the solution of a big city problem.

In the first place, this is not just a big city problem. Over the last 4 years of hearings on this legislation we have heard from cities and towns across the Nation—from east to west and north to south. We have heard from cities as large as New York and towns as small as Laurel, Miss.

We have heard from communities from Cocoa, Fla., to Seattle, Wash.

So this is not just a big city problem. There are plenty of smaller towns that have their share of traffic congestion. There are plenty of towns that have either no public transportation service or totally inadequate transit service despite the large number of people who depend on public transportation to meet their travel needs.

Mr. President, this is a rich nation, but not everyone in the United States has the luxury of an automobile. There are plenty of elderly people living on extremely low incomes who have become virtual hermits because they can no longer afford or cannot drive an automobile and who do not have adequate public transportation service.

We have people who are too young to drive or disabled or who for one reason or another do not wish to use their automobiles.

We have lots of moderate income families living out in the suburbs with only one car that must be used by the husband to get to work leaving the wife stranded without transportation.

We have plenty of families with two jobs and only one car who are deeply troubled by the inadequacies of our public transportation service.

The American Transit Association estimates that nearly 70 cities in the United States with populations of more than 25,000 are without any public transportation systems. Since 1954 more than 400 transit companies, mostly in small communities, have been sold or abandoned and this has almost invariably resulted in a drastic reduction in service.

This has been especially hard on our smaller communities which are trying to attract new industry and revitalize their business centers.

Since the enactment of the mass transit program in 1962 the Housing Agency has received inquiries or requests for assistance from about 250 cities and towns from 44 different States. So this is not just a big city problem and this bill is not forcing a burden on the smaller towns and rural areas of the Nation to help solve the problems of wealthy big cities. Because they are not wealthy.

The cities of this Nation are facing a financial crisis of the greatest magnitude. They may have a lot of industry but they also have a lot of slums. They have social and economic costs that are unknown to the smaller towns and rural areas of the Nation.

Their tax bases are declining. Their slums are spreading and welfare costs are rising. While their per capita income may be greater than it is in the smaller towns of the Nation, so are the costs of living.

The fact is that the cities of this Nation simply do not have the resources to do this job alone. If they did, they would not be asking the Federal Government for help because they do not like the redtape involved any more than anyone else does.

And I would not want this discussion to end without pointing out that while the cities of the Nation account for about 75 percent of the economic productivity of the Nation they also pay the lion's share of the taxes.

I cannot help but recall the vivid statement made by an official of Philadelphia when he said:

> From 1924 to 1954 residents of the city contributed $384 million to the State motor license fund for highway costs. We received back $82 million and so paid $302 million to get the farmers out of the mud.

And the fact is that the Federal Government has been doing precisely the same thing for years and years.

Mr. President, I can tell Senators that urban taxpayers of New Jersey tell me often enough how they are paying more than $2 in Federal taxes for every dollar they get back. And where has that missing dollar been going? It has been going into agriculture, into water projects, into reclamation projects and a lot of other programs that do not benefit New Jersey.

But I have supported many of these programs that do not directly benefit New Jersey because they help make a stronger nation.

All we are asking for here is a little bit back.

And, Mr. President, I want to say that if we do not soon start solving some of the urgent and growing problems facing the urban areas of this country we are going to be a weaker nation and the urban areas are going to be poorer and poorer and we are going to be sending less and less to the smaller States of this Nation to help them meet their problems.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope the Members of the Senate will heed this plea. We need this bill. The Nation needs it, and I hope it will pass by a decisive margin.

FALSITY OF COMMUNIST ASSERTION REGARDING ON-SITE INSPECTIONS UNDER A TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on March 28, 1963, I spoke on this floor and expressed concern over an assertion made at the Geneva Conference by Delegate Tsarapkin that it was the United States and not the Soviet Union which originally offered to settle for three on-site inspections under a test ban treaty.

I have received a letter dated March 29, 1963, signed by Mr. William C. Foster, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This letter repudiates the statement made by the Soviet delegate. I believe that it is appropriate and right that Mr. Foster's letter be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This illustrates once more that lying is part of the Communist technique and that the Communist propagandistic claims cannot be relied upon. It would seem to me that we should not enter into any negotiations with them on the subject of disarmament because they cannot be relied upon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Foster's letter be printed in full.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 29, 1963.

The Honorable CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: On March 28, 1963, you indicated in a statement on the floor of the Senate your concern over an assertion made at the Geneva Conference by Soviet Delegate Tsarapkin that it was the United States and not the Soviet Union which originally offered to settle for three annual onsite inspections under a test ban treaty. You said: "If what the Soviet delegate says is true, our delegates have made a dangerous and potentially disastrous retreat."

I assure you, Senator CURTIS, that this allegation, which has also been made by other Soviet officials, is not true. As early as December 28, 1962, in reply to a letter from Chairman Khrushchev, President Kennedy stated:

"With respect to the number of on-site inspections there appears to have been some misunderstanding. Your impression seems to be that Ambassador Dean told Deputy Minister Kuznetsov that the United States might be prepared to accept an annual number of **on-site inspections between 2 and 4.** Ambassador Dean advises me that the only number which he mentioned in his discussions with Deputy Minister Kuznetsov was a number between 8 and 10."

This exchange of correspondence between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev on the possibility of negotiating a nuclear test ban agreement was reported in the press.

The Soviet assertion was repeated by Mr. Kuznetsov at the February 20, 1963, meeting of the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference. In reply, Delegate Godber from the United Kingdom said:

"* * * our Soviet colleague spoke this morning of the West's having in fact suggested two to three inspections; he said the Soviet Union accepted that and therefore we should now be able to agree. Well, he knows perfectly well that is not the case. The matter has been expounded with absolute clarity, and I am sure all other delegations around this table are fully cognizant of what the West did propose, and indeed it would be strange, even if the Soviet Union had been under that misapprehension, if it still were, because as early as President Kennedy's reply to Premier Khrushchev the matter was made abundantly clear."

Later, at the same meeting, I made the following statement:

"I think it is perfectly clear that the official numbers put forth by the United States and the United Kingdom were expressed in President Kennedy's letter of December 28, 1962; and in no official manner have they ever been two to three on the part of either of our delegations."

Again, at the March 1, 1963, meeting at Geneva, I commented on the matter again at greater length:

"The Soviet delegation has alleged, in presenting its position on on-site inspection, that Mr. Arthur H. Dean suggested as acceptable two to four on-site inspections annually at some point during informal discussions with Mr. Kuznetsov in New York last autumn. That is not the case. Here is the record. On October 30, Mr. Dean, accompanied by Mr. Akalovsky of the U.S. delegation, called on Mr. Kuznetsov in New York. The conversation centered primarily on current General Assembly matters, and the test ban problem was discussed briefly and only in general terms. Mr. Kuznetsov reaffirmed the position held by the Soviet Union at that time, denying the need for on-site inspection and stating that such inspection was unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Mr. Dean stressed the U.S. desire to engage in serious negotiations for a test ban. He further expressed the view that some mutually satisfactory arrangement to cover cessation of testing in all environments, while providing assurances against clandestine tests underground, should be possible. In that connection he said that the United States had in mind a small number of onsite inspections but did not mention any specific figure. Thus, the Soviet claim that Mr. Dean offered two to four inspections on October 30, is inaccurate.

"They met next on November 7 at Mr. Kuznetsov's initiative, at the Soviet Mission in New York. Again Mr. Dean was accompanied by Mr. Akalovsky. Reading from a prepared text and stating that he was acting on instructions, Mr. Kuznetsov reviewed the Soviet position on the test ban—a position which still excluded any onsite inspection on Soviet territory.

"Mr. Dean reemphasized the U.S. position that onsite inspections were necessary and that their number was related to the number of unidentified seismic events. He also said that, because of the progress achieved under the Vela research program, the United States might be prepared to accept something like 8 to 10 onsite inspections, and 8 to 10 nationally-manned control posts under international supervision. Mr. Dean observed that 90 percent of the territory of the Soviet Union was aseismic and suggested the possibility of subdividing Soviet territory into seismic and aseismic areas. He remarked that U.S. scientists believed that if two control posts were located in the aseismic portion of the heartland of the Soviet Union, and eight in the seismic areas, only very few inspections might be required in the aseismic areas.

"After the meeting Mr. Timerbaev, a member of the Soviet mission who also attended the meeting, approached Mr. Akalovsky to check Mr. Dean's remarks about the number of nationally manned stations and of onsite inspections. Mr. Akalovsky referred Mr. Timerbaev to what Mr. Dean had said, with Mr. Timerbaev repeating the number of 8 to 10 onsite inspections and Mr. Akalovsky confirming the accuracy of his account.

"Consequently, there are no grounds for doubt about the numbers mentioned by Mr. Dean and that makes subsequent claims by Soviet representatives that, on October 30, Mr. Dean had in fact mentioned the two to four figure quite surprising. Both U.S. participants in those meetings confirm the facts which I have just given to this conference."

My statements denying the Soviet allegations were also given press coverage.

I am sorry that you were unaware of these statements refuting the propagandistic claims of the Soviet officials.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on what the Senator from Nebraska has said. I am perfectly confident in my own mind that Mr. Foster's denial of the validity of the charge made by the Soviet delegate is correct.

I was at Geneva during November and December, as an observer at the Disarmament Conference, and I had occasion to discuss then, and later with Mr. Arthur Dean, our principal negotiator, the charge which even then was being made—it was made more specifically later—that the Americans had agreed to three onsite inspections as the basis for the treaty. Mr. Dean told me categorically—and I believe him—that this was not the case, that the Soviet Union misrepresented his stand, that he had never made such a suggestion or been authorized to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

When I received Mr. Foster's note I felt a responsibility to put it in the RECORD, because it clearly repudiates the Soviet position.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly about a short statement made on March 21 by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] with respect to the integrity of the officials of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I advised the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] that I intended to speak on this subject, and he indicated that he felt no desire to be present in the Chamber when I made this statement.

On that date the junior Senator from Arizona implied that the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was "guilty of crass dishonesty" by the "issuance of deliberately false and misleading information."

Those are quotations from what the Senator said. I quote further:

> Either the Disarmament Agency is guilty of crass dishonesty in its dealings with the press or the reporters who wrote the stories about the Disarmament Agency's denial are guilty of completely misunderstanding what the agency was talking about.

Again, he said:

> But I do not doubt that the issuance of deliberately false and misleading information, and then blaming the conclusions stemming from that information on reporters—may be the newest brand of news management.

While the Senator did not make a flat accusation of dishonesty, it is quite clear that some irony can be drawn from the fact that the Associated Press story as to what the Senator had said, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald the next morning, was under the headline "Untruth Laid to Arms Unit by GOLDWATER."

The first paragraph of the news story stated:

> Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, yesterday accused the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of putting out deliberately false information about a proposal for a joint United States-Russian burning of bombers.

This was not exactly accurate either but I am sure the Senator from Arizona would vehemently deny a charge of news management.

This altercation arose when the Senator posed the following question at a recent speech:

> Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there would then be a gigantic bonfire in which all of these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?

Two days later the press reported:

> United States disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

This was the first paragraph of a story headlined "Administration Denies Bomber-Burning Plan." The story went on to quote an Agency spokesman as saying the Senator may have confused this with a proposal calling for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons as outlined in a treaty outline on general disarmament which the United States presented in Geneva last summer. The following two paragraphs concluded the story:

> The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away. But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47's and 30 Badgers—both obsolescent bombers—would be no more than a token gesture, in any event since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

This story, which appeared in the papers on Monday, March 11, was based on telephone conversations between reporters and the Agency spokesman.

These conversations took place on Sunday, March 10. On Monday morning, March 11, the Agency representative who spoke to the press the day before, felt after reading the morning papers that his earlier comments to news correspondents evidently had not been clearly understood. To clarify any misunderstanding, the Agency at noon that day released the following statement through the State Department:

> The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has over the past months engaged in several internal studies, in cooperation with other pertinent agencies, to consider the feasibility of proposing separate limited disarmament measures which might develop the first steps towards disarmament consistent with national security. These various studies are still taking place. The appropriate agencies, including the Department of Defense, are participating in these studies. None, other than the measure to reduce the risks of war, has been presented to the Geneva Disarmament Conference.
>
> The possibility of a simultaneous reduction of B-47's and Russian Badgers is one such study taking place within the U.S. Government. No such proposal, however, has been discussed with the Soviet Union or presented at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.
>
> Any such proposals receiving Presidential approval would first be discussed with the appropriate Members of Congress before submission at Geneva.

The same day, Secretary Rusk, when questioned about the news reports in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, explained the apparent misunderstanding and commented on the study. Yet, the Senator from Arizona, as what I suggest is a part of a determined effort to discredit the Agency, implied it was guilty of crass dishonesty in denying his assertion that such a mutual plane burning proposal was under consideration and not correcting this alleged "denial" even after Secretary Rusk had explained it. This was simply not the case, and I submit that the Senator's charge was inaccurate and unwarranted.

Mr. President, what does all this come down to? I suggest four points.

The first is that the Disarmament Agency did not deny the existence of a plan for reciprocal destruction of obsolete bombers. Anyone who took the trouble to acquaint himself with the facts could come to no other conclusion. When first asked, Agency officials stated that the plan had not been put in final shape; that it had not been "shaped." The following day, they made it clear that the plan was under consideration as a part of a broader package proposal, although no decision had been reached to propose it to the Soviets.

Why should the Disarmament Agency undertake to deny that such a proposal was under consideration when, in fact, it had been discussed with Members of the Senate, including Members of the Foreign Relations Committee? It is utterly incredible that such a denial would be made. In fact, it was not made. All that was said was that the proposal had not been "shaped" to the point where it had either been agreed upon or submitted to the Russians.

My second point is that it is a disservice to the cause of peace to imply that honorable men patriotically and intelligently serving their country are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by reporters. Neither charge is true. The first suggestion is inaccurate; the second is just plain wrong.

It has been my privilege to be associated quite closely with the distinguished men who head our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Mr. William Foster, Director of the Agency, has had a long career in public service. He has done yeoman work in the field of disarmament. He is a man of complete integrity, who deserves the confidence of the Congress and the country. Frankly, I resent it when Members of this body cast aspersions on either his patriotism or integrity, or that of his fine associates, Mr. Adrian Fisher, Dr. Long, of Cornell University, and Mr. George Bunn, General Counsel of the Agency. These men should be supported by Congress, and not torn to pieces on unfair charges that they are not representing their country with patriotism and integrity.

My third point is that nobody in the Agency ever said the plan to burn obsolete bombers was not under consideration. Such a charge is at complete variance from the facts.

Aside from the question of who told the truth, and it is clear to me that the Agency told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—I pose these questions:

What public purpose is served by questioning the integrity of able, conscientious, honest public service? I say none.

Second, what public purpose is served by ridiculing the efforts of the ACDA to implement the policy of the President of the United States? What is that policy? It is our fixed and determined policy to work unceasingly for total and complete disarmament under enforceable world law—to challenge Russia to a peace race, and not an arms race.

The effort to cast doubt on the able men who are doing their best to carry that policy into effect is, in my judgment, a very real disservice to the cause of peace.

I am confident that the President speaks for the overwhelming majority of the American people when he says we mean to negotiate with the Russians. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who said that we cannot trust the Russians, but I say proposals which are in their self-interest and in our own interest, under a treaty which gives adequate inspection and gives arms control, can constitute a small step toward removing the heavy burden of arms, and we can thereby make some effort to remove the threat of nuclear terror under which we now live; and we can make a step toward having the kind of world in which our children and grandchildren can grow up in reasonable safety and with some assurance that they will live out their lifespan. I hope that in the future these enlightened and patriotic public servants will receive more support and less criticism in their efforts to do something to advance the cause of humanity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks. I knew of his speech. I have been listening to the final part of his address in support of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and in particular the Director of that Agency and his staff. The Senator has spoken my sentiments. I assure him that the Senator's words of encouragement mean a great deal to those who are working in the field of arms control and disarmament. I know the Senator's speech will mean a great deal to the Agency Director, the President, and the American people, because the story of what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is attempting to do and the proposals being advanced by the President and the officers of this Government at Geneva is a story that is not understood; that, regrettably, is not fully reported; and that, regrettably, is often distorted. The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a real contribution in setting the record straight.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind words and comments. I point out that the Senator from Minnesota, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has rendered yeoman service in support of the President's program and in defending the able agents whom the President has appointed, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to follow up on our national policy. I regret that the elaborate and fine speeches the Senator from Minnesota has been making in this regard have received much less attention than what has been said by certain other Members in this body, or by individuals on the outside, who derogate our efforts to obtain a just and lasting peace.

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I generally have supported most farm programs, because I saw no other alternative to some of the serious commodity problems.

I was an enthusiastic supporter of Secretary Freeman's voluntary feed grain program and the 1962 and 1963 wheat programs. They have proved eminently successful in helping to maintain income and reduce surpluses. I was most happy to learn recently that as a result of these programs, we now are saving over $900,000 a day in storage and handling charges on grain we no longer hold.

I supported the 1964 wheat program for the same reasons. It seemed to me a workable and sensible solution to a problem that was becoming increasingly unmanageable.

I am confident that if wheatgrowers study the economic benefits they will receive under this program, they will approve it in the May 21 referendum.

However, should they reject it, the legislation provides that they will have an opportunity next year to consider the same decisions. My vote last year was based on the belief that farmers should have an opportunity to make a choice. I believe this feeling is shared by my colleagues; and, speaking for myself, I see no need to consider new legislation on wheat this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 21 the wheatgrowers of this country will for the first time have the opportunity to vote for the kind of wheat program they have discussed and worked for and supported for more than 30 years. Many farmers remember the legislative struggles of the 1920's when the McNary-Haugen bill was passed twice by a rural-minded Congress and twice vetoed by President Coolidge.

Again in 1956, Congress approved essentially the same wheat program in the omnibus farm bill which was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Wheatgrowers achieved a substantial victory when the modernized version of the domestic parity wheat program was included in the Agricultural Act of 1962.

The members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees voted for it.

The Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives voted for it.

President Kennedy signed it into law.

Now the question goes before the farmers themselves. If two-thirds of the growers vote "yes" in the forthcoming wheat referendum, they will bring into operation a grassroots program, devised by farmers, won by farmers, to be administered by farmers.

In this referendum, farmers will be asked to make the most important economic decision since 1933, when the first Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed. Since the decision is strictly economic—directly affecting the farmer's income—this decision should be made on the basis of fact and not fiction—reason and not fear—information and not ignorance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for the statement he is making about the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962. I supported the enactment of that measure even though I come from a largely industrial State, because I liked its approach and the effort to meet the total problems of rural America. I am confident that there is much in the 1962 Farm Act which will benefit my State in the years to come. I hope that in due course the overwhelming majority of farmers of my State will be persuaded that that is the case. They are not at the moment persuaded, but I hope they will be, because it is the truth.

I supported the wheat program because it is a sound approach to a problem that was before the Senate even before I came here. I believe that the 1964 wheat program will provide a fair level of income for wheatgrowers and at the same time reduce unnecessary and costly surpluses, which have caused considerable resentment among my constituents. However, I believe it will be good for Pennsylvania, because it will save money for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania by reducing surpluses, which are costing the taxpayers of the Nation too much money.

I hear reports that if farmers reject the program in the forthcoming wheat referendum, Congress will enact a better wheat program. This I hesitate to believe. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota is better qualified than I to speak on that subject, but it seems to me that, in the first place, a rejection of the program in this referendum does not repeal the 1964 wheat program. It was passed as continuing legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. It provides that another referendum may be considered again in 1964, and in the years ahead.

In the second place, if wheat farmers turn down the program, I can only interpret this as meaning they do not want a program. I could not support new wheat legislation if the farmer did not want it. If we do not have new wheat legislation, I suspect that the wheat farmers will be a good deal worse off than they are now. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Unfortunately, there are those who would like to turn this referendum into a political contest, or a test of a farmer's loyalty to a farm organization, or somehow present it as a controversy over civil rights for farmers. There are even those who are saying this is a kind of civil war between the wheat farmers of the North and the wheat farmers of the South—of the East against the West.

All of this is ridiculous.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, coming from the other side of the Delaware, I echo the sentiments expressed by my neighbor and friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I have in my office some letters from constituents, a couple of farm publications and some pamphlets from various organizations—all claiming that Congress will pass new what legislation in the event the 1964 wheat program is rejected in this year's referendum.

All I can say is that either these people are completely unaware of the prevailing attitude of this Congress toward new farm legislation, or completely naive as to what it takes to get any kind of legislation through Congress.

In the last session, we gave wheatgrowers a good program—the best one I ever have seen since coming to Washington. The program provides for a referendum. The farmers can approve or reject it—that is their business. This is a choice they must make. It is the same choice they have had since 1952.

I hope wheat farmers will vote on the merits of the program and not on some unlikely possibility that the Congress will pass a new program should the referendum fail.

If wheat farmers vote not to have a good wheat program, I do not intend to vote for a program which would not be as good for the farmer or the taxpayer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. The Senator from New Jersey is one of those who helped us on the basic legislation. I believe it is fair to say that New Jersey is certainly not one of the large wheat-producing States of the Union. Nevertheless, the Senator from New Jersey saw fit to give the wheat farmers of America an opportunity to improve their economic situation. The Senator's vote was deeply appreciated by the farmers of Minnesota and the farmers of the Midwest generally, with whom, I believe, I am rather well acquainted.

I am hopeful the farmers will heed the words of their friends from the eastern seaboard, particularly the words of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senator from Pennsylvania also was one of those who supported this important agricultural legislation. They cast votes in the national interest and for the Nation's economic welfare without regard to the welfare of a particular State.

This is the kind of statesmanship the Nation appreciates.

The stakes in the referendum are these: A "yes" vote will result in a high level of income for wheat farmers and the orderly disposal of wheat surpluses. A "no" vote will mean runaway production, exceptionally low prices and more surpluses.

And there is another factor deserving close consideration. If this program is approved, the uncertainty surrounding wheat programs will be over. Growers will know how to plan for years ahead, not just for months ahead.

In the unlikely event that farmers vote against their own best interests in this referendum, "dollar" wheat very well could be the result.

A few years ago, in two separate studies made by economists from the top land-grant colleges in the Nation—one study for the Joint Economic Committee and one for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—it was found that the price of wheat could go as low as 93 cents a bushel with uncontrolled production.

I think there is no disagreement among the supporters and the opponents of the 1964 wheat program that, if it should be turned down in the referendum, wheat acreage would increase to at least 65 million acres and production would go to 1.5 billion bushels.

Since with uncontrolled production there would be no effective price support and no storage loan program for farmers, the glut of wheat would have no place to go but to the market. Economic chaos would result.

A few weeks ago, North Dakota State University released a study of the effects for North Dakota of a "yes" or "no" vote in this referendum. The study produced some remarkable and disturbing figures.

The university economists found that North Dakota wheatgrowers would conservatively lose $68 million in income in the event a "no" vote carried.

Additionally, the study revealed that if a "no" vote prevailed, wheat farmers in western North Dakota would have to get $1.73 a bushel and increase their acreage 30 percent to end up with the same gross wheat income they would get under the 1964 wheat program. Central North Dakota wheat farmers would have to get $1.80 a bushel and Red River Valley farmers would have to get $1.70 a bushel.

Even the opponents of the program who are urging a "no" vote never have predicted that wheat prices would be higher than $1.40 if the referendum fails. The North Dakota study shows that figure to be too high—even for high-quality spring wheat.

These are convincing and conclusive dollar-and-cents arguments in favor of a "yes" vote. I am convinced that when farmers get the facts, instead of the fiction, they will agree in overwhelming numbers.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. There appears to be a determined effort underway to mislead farmers into believing that the Congress will consider new wheat legislation this year if the May 21 referendum proposal is not carried.

If my recollection is correct, I voted against the proposed farm legislation the year before, but the farm legislation enacted last year was supported by me and other Senators as a practical program leading to a reduction of the costly and unnecessary wheat surpluses.

This program provided the wheat farmer with a choice, which is reasonable and fair. It provided the means, for those who wished to have protection for farm price supports, to agree to accept controls of acreage. Or, if the farmers did not want controls, then they had to accept a withdrawal of support. It provided a means for the farmers to decide one way or the other.

As I have said, this program gave the wheat farmers a choice which is reasonable and fair: either controls with supports, or no support and no controls.

It also provided that, regardless of his decision in the referendum this year, the wheat farmer would have another opportunity next year to vote in another referendum, after seeing the effect of his decision this year.

Therefore, in my view, there is no need for further wheat legislation this year, regardless of the outcome of the referendum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, expressions such as the Senator from Rhode Island has just made, together with those of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], indicate to me that the arguments which are being made across the land, that if farmers reject the wheat referendum, the thing to do is to come back to Congress and they will get a new program, are without merit.

As a friend of agriculture—and I do not believe anyone can honestly contend that this is not a true friendship—I believe farmers ought to listen very carefully to the words of Senators who have voted with them and have voted for the farm programs to help farmers, but who do not themselves have particularly large farm constituencies. We cannot always expect Senators who come from States such as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and other States where there are not large farm populations, to stand up, time after time, and support farm programs, if the farmers themselves are going to reject them.

So I make appeal today to farmers to vote "yes" in the referendum, because I think it is in the Nation's interest and in the farmers' interest. I am convinced, from the statistical and economic studies I have seen thus far, that it is in the interest of the entire free world. It adds strength to our country. It has a way of leveling off production to meet the requirements at home and abroad. The referendum surely will provide relief to the American taxpayer.

There are some who would have farmers believe that if a "no" vote prevails, Congress will pass new wheat legislation. But the wheat legislation passed by Congress last year is long-range, continuing legislation—legislation that provides an alternative program of 50 percent of parity price supports to those farmers who stay within their allotments, should the referendum fail. It also provides that in 1964 farmers again would have the opportunity to vote in referendum for or against the wheat certificate plan. Therefore, I doubt very much that Congress would pass any interim, stop-gap, relief-type program, since the possibility of a "no" vote in the referendum already has been dealt with.

Regardless of my personal views, or what I am personally seeking to do as a Senator from the Midwest, I think I owe it to my friends in agriculture to tell them that we had a hard fight last year, a close battle to get the farm legislation we now have. If we have to go through another battle, with Members of Congress seeing a good program defeated in referendum, I doubt whether there will be any progress at all or any action by Congress.

It seems to me the prevailing attitude of Congress is if wheat farmers reject the 1964 wheat program it is because they prefer the alternative in the law. An increasing number of nonfarm Congressmen and Senators are weary—even exasperated—with the problem of wheat surpluses. The political facts are that farmers must get city support for farm legislation if it is to be enacted—and the prospect for any new action on wheat is unlikely at this time.

We are exceedingly grateful to Senators who come from predominantly urban States for their willingness to support the farm program. I think it was a good illustration of statesmanship and unselfish concern for the farmers of the

Nation, and indeed a wise decision on the part of Senators and Representatives.

Every Member of Congress, every farm organization, every person and organization interested in and dependent upon the prosperity of farmers, should cooperate in seeing that farmers get the facts and all the information necessary to make a wise decision in this referendum.

I support the referendum. I urge farmers to vote "yes." I am happy to say that most midwestern Senators, regardless of party, have made such a declaration. Senators from North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota have urged, regardless of our differences politically, that farmers vote "yes" in the wheat referendum. We believe it is the wisest and most prudent vote, a vote which will help the farmer, the community, and, indeed, the entire Nation.

I am convinced that if the farmers can get the facts, such as the University of North Dakota has recently made available, on an objective, nonpartisan basis, the wheat farmers will approve the 1964 wheat program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a letter from President Kennedy to Mr. M. W. Thatcher, chairman of the National Wheat Committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, Mr. Thatcher also is general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn., and president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, which is holding its annual convention in Washington, D.C., this week.

The President, in his letter, reiterates what he has said on previous occasions, that no new wheat legislation was intended or is needed this year. I join with the President in commending Mr. Thatcher and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives on their work in presenting to rural America the most complete and accurate information available in connection with the forthcoming wheat referendum.

The National Wheat Committee consists of leaders of several farm organizations and of wheat producers of America. The committee, without partisanship, since it is comprised of Democrats and Republicans, is attempting to bring the facts concerning the wheat referendum to the American farmer. It is doing this of its own accord, at its own expense, in the interest of the Nation and in the interest of the wheat producer as well.

I hope this measure of concern over the plight of agriculture and the opportunities which farmers now have in terms of the wheat referendum will command the attention of American farmers.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1963.

Mr. M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. THATCHER: You and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives are to be commended on the leadership you have taken, not only with regard to cooperative marketing of grain, but on other public issues affecting farm families. Your leadership in establishing the National Wheat Committee to inform farmers about the 1964 wheat referendum is the most recent example of your concern, and that of your federation, with larger matters of public policy.

In this referendum, farmers will decide on the wheat program for 1964. The decision they make will determine the price they receive for their crop next year.

This is a straight economic issue. It was presented to the Congress as an economic issue of importance to the farmer, consumer, and taxpayer, and the Congress acted upon it as such. It is a continuing program, and, whatever the result of this referendum, another referendum will be held next year for the 1965 crop.

There has been some speculation recently that the Congress might consider new wheat legislation this year if the referendum should not be approved. Had the Congress intended new legislation to be considered as an alternative to wheat marketing quotas, I believe it would have so provided. Instead, Congress provided a stopgap program of 50 percent of parity ($1.25 a bushel wheat) for those who elect to observe allotments if the referendum should fail in 1963. It also provided an opportunity for the wheat farmer to vote again in 1964 after he had a chance to see what happened under the stopgap program. It is clear, then, that no new wheat legislation was intended or is needed this year.

The stakes in the referendum on May 21 are the incomes of thousands of farm families in 1964. The Department of Agriculture estimates that total income from wheat production in the United States in 1964 will be some $700 million more with a "yes" vote than with a "no" vote. A recent report from North Dakota State University shows that net farm income in that State would be reduced by $68 million if the wheat program is not approved by farmers. Typical wheat farms in North Dakota would have their income cut in half.

The prosperity and well-being of many Midwest and Northwest communities depend, therefore, upon the extent to which farmers are informed on the issues in the coming wheat referendum. Farm equipment manufacturers, sellers of farm supplies, and businessmen up and down the main streets of every rural town have a stake in a favorable vote on the wheat program.

I believe the work you and the federation are doing to make sure that the wheat farmer understands the economic issues involved will contribute to the trend of progress now underway in agriculture.

Best wishes for a successful convention.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

REPORT TO FARMERS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a news letter which I circulated among farmers in Minnesota. It pertains to the President's farm message to Congress and the efforts made by this administration to improve the agricultural economy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS RECEIVES FARM MESSAGE

President Kennedy's farm message to the Congress this year contains good news for rural America. It was an honor to be asked by the President to work on this message, and share with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and the White House some of the views I have held on agricultural policy for many years. Here is what the President had to say:

"Net farm income for all of 1962 was $1.2 billion a year more than it was in 1960. Gross farm income is $2.7 billion higher.

"Average net income per farm has risen 18 percent, from $2,961 to $3,500, the highest level in our history.

"The increase in farm income has generated added business for rural industries and farm communities, putting millions of dollars into Main Street cash registers and adding at least 200,000 jobs to the national economy.

"At the same time, Government stockpiles of surplus grain have been reduced by 929 million bushels from their 1961 peak.

"And finally, over this same 2-year period, the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has declined to the lowest ratio in history—19 percent of take-home pay."

FEED GRAINS

The President called for new feed grains legislation which will take advantage of the experience gained under the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs. He said it should be a voluntary program, be flexible enough to meet varying conditions and needs, and be based upon the same basic principles which have proven successful in the last 2 years.

The 1961 and 1962 feed grains programs were successful. The 1963 program, which contains the new feature of a direct payment to cooperators, is an improvement. I suggested this revision for the 1963 crop year, and it is this type of program—a permanent, voluntary, direct payment program—that I will propose and support for the 1964 and subsequent crop years.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The American dairy industry, from producer to distributor, received well deserved commendation from President Kennedy in his farm message. The Chief Executive pointed out that any American family can depend upon the availability of pure, nutritious milk and dairy products anywhere in the United States. "This accomplishment is the product of hard work, skill and knowhow and heavy capital investment," the President said.

President Kennedy stressed, however, the urgent need for new dairy legislation, emphasizing there is little prospect for any improvement in dairy farmers' income or substantial reduction in Government cost unless a new program is passed.

I am pleased that the President accepted my recommendation and asked Congress to apply the successful principles of voluntary supply management to the dairy industry. He called for a program under which cooperating producers would receive price supports through market prices and direct payments.

I will, during this session of Congress, work for passage of a dairy program designed to improve farm income, to reduce the surplus, and make greater use of our dairy products at home and abroad.

WHEAT

President Kennedy called for "an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum, to be held under the permanent legislation enacted by the Congress last year. Failure to approve the wheat program," the President said, "will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports * * *. New legislation for wheat is neither necessary nor feasible this year."

In a Senate speech this year I called upon the producers of wheat to cast an affirmative vote in the wheat referendum, stating that approval is in the farmers' interest and in the national interest. The permanent wheat program—the so-called wheat certificate plan—passed by the Congress last year is a good wheat program. Under it, the national marketing quota will be about 1.2 billion bushels, and the national acreage allotment will be between 49 and 50 million acres. Most individual farm allotments for the 1964 crop will be the same as allotments for the 1962 crop and each farmer will know his farm allotment before the referendum. It may be identical to the allotment he had in 1962.

Price support for wheat will be about $2 a bushel and will apply to about 925 million bushels, 86 percent of the expected crop of 1,070 million bushels. Price support for the remainder of the crop will be about $1.30 a bushel. Advance diversion payments will be made at the time of signup. It is anticipated that production of special crops, such as safflower, sunflower, and castor beans will be authorized on diverted acreage. Wheat production on feed grain acreage will be authorized if there is a feed grain program in effect for 1964.

The total value of wheat production under the 1964 program will be at the high 1961–62 levels—overall more than $2.3 billion. Relative to other sectors of agriculture, wheat farmers will continue to have a very favorable income. If the referendum is defeated, gross income from wheat will be $700 million less than with a favorable vote, despite a wheat harvest of 65 million acres. This would shatter any hopes for prosperity in nearly every county seat town in 10 or 15 major wheat States, including Minnesota. The economy of the entire Corn Belt, and ultimately the great livestock producing States, is linked to the outcome of the wheat referendum.

SUGAR

Hard work, patience, and persistence have paid off with my announcement that a new sugarbeet processing factory will begin operations in the Red River Valley in 1965. The $18 million plant will be built by the American Crystal Sugar Co. in Drayton, N. Dak., and will process sugarbeets grown on an initial 12,000 acres in Kittson and Marshall Counties. I spent countless hours last year in talks with representatives of our Government and of the sugar industry in an effort to get a meeting of the minds on a new sugar bill. The success of these negotiations resulted in the Sugar Act of 1962, which provides a greater share of the domestic market to our own sugar producers, including those in northwest Minnesota.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Richard W. Reuter, who replaced South Dakota Senator GEORGE McGOVERN as director of the food-for-peace program, submitted an encouraging report recently on the program and outlook for 1963.

Mr. Reuter said under food-for-peace emergency feeding activities, U.S. food currently is reaching an average of 92 million people a day in more than 100 countries throughout the world, an increase of 9 million compared with a year ago. He also declared:

"Sales of foodstuffs and other agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under the program were 50 percent greater in the last 6 months of 1962 than in the previous 6-month period—having totaled 15.6 million metric tons to 19 nations for the foreign currency equivalent of $888 million; and

Six agreements were signed for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars payable over a span of years, the total of $51.9 million, including ocean transportation costs, representing a 15-percent increase over the previous 6 months.

I introduced the concept of food for peace 5 years ago at a time the negative attitude of "surplus disposal" was causing ill will among people of our own country and our neighbors abroad. Through food for peace this negative attitude has been replaced with the positive approach of using our abundance of food and fiber to aid those less fortunate then ourselves.

The food donations, Mr. Reuter said in his report, "are bringing new life and hope" to needy people throughout the world while the sales programs "are proving to be a unique weapon for waging war upon economic backwardness, and also help for developing future commercial markets for U.S. agricultural commodities."

RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT

Here are the highlights of President Kennedy's recommendations:

Rural housing loans put on an insured basis in order to increase volume and reduce demands on the Federal budget. Loans to farmers and rural residents for high school, vocational and higher education. Expand the permissible size of small watershed projects.

Provisions to keep conservation reserve land from reverting to crops when contracts expire. Lift the $10 million limit in the 1962 farm bill on the pilot land adjustment program.

The Department of Agriculture, in addition to the President's recommendations, is considering its own requests:

More loan authority for rural facilities such as access roads, community halls, and swimming pools.

Increase the ceiling on volume of insured farm ownership loans from the present $200 million to $250 million. My bill last year raised the limit from $150 million to $200 million.

A commission on rural life similar to Theodore Roosevelt's of more than 50 years ago.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

In view of the widespread and enthusiastic acceptance, and the beneficial results of my food stamp program, President Kennedy has recommended that enabling legislation be enacted to permit its progressive expansion into all areas of the Nation where conditions warrant its establishment. Under this program, food stamps are issued to the needy and used by them for purchases at the local stores. It currently is in effect in three Minnesota counties—St. Louis, Itasca, and Carlton. My mail indicates strong support for this program and a desire on the part of many county officials for its expansion to their areas.

FARMERS' WEEK

I will introduce a bill in the Senate this year to set aside the first week in spring each year as Farmers' Week. Such a week would serve to call attention to the American people the farmers' contribution to the strength and resources of our country. It is entirely appropriate that the farmers of America should be singled out, as are our other working men and women, for their highly successful efforts in making this Nation the best fed on earth at the lowest cost.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

In a recent Senate speech I asked that the Farmers Home Administration be given an additional $50 million for operating loans for the remainder of this fiscal year. There is an urgent need for these funds to be appropriated in order to help farmers buy equipment, livestock, feed, and fertilizer this spring. I will continue to urge that the FHA be given sufficient funds to adequately meet the credit needs of our deserving farm families.

FOOD RESERVES

I will introduce legislation this year which will set up a commission responsible to the President, and reporting through him to the Congress, to study the entire subject of necessary reserves of food. This is a matter of the greatest national and international importance. Such a commission could greatly assist the Congress in establishing legislative guidelines to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Department of Defense, to the Department of State, and to the National Security Agency on the need, management and location of supplies in the national interest and in the interest of the free people of all nations.

EXPORTS AND THE COMMON MARKET

Exports of farm commodities reached a record $5.1 billion in fiscal year 1962. Dollar markets abroad for the products of our farms have been expanded to a total of $3.5 billion, and thus constitute a significant factor in our balance of payments.

In his farm message, President Kennedy paid tribute to the American farmer as "one of our best foreign exchange earners." "It is our firm policy," the President said, "to maintain and expand these exports." After pointing out that we have a special problem of maintaining access to the European Common Market for some of our important agricultural commodities, the President added this significant statement:

"This Government intends to take every step necessary to protect the full rights due American agricultural exports. We have impressed on our trading partners the vital necessity of a fair agreement as an essential first part of the broad scale negotiations to be undertaken under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962."

We will be hearing a lot about the Common Market in the days to come. The strong words of the President, the outstanding battle being waged by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on behalf of rural America, and the concern of the Congress in maintaining and increasing agricultural exports, provide a ray of hope for the future of American agricultural products in international trade.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

CURTAILMENT OF USE OF VITAMIN K_3

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to the removal from the market of a highly questionable ingredient which had been used in certain multivitamin capsules. The removal was accomplished only last week. The Food and Drug Administration has prepared an order to rescind the temporary extension of a food additive petition on vitamin K_3.

I mention this subject because as chairman of a subcommittee, I have been holding hearings on matters relating to the Food and Drug Administration, particularly those relating to certain drugs which may not have been sufficiently tested and scrutinized as required under Food and Drug regulations. So I submit a release I issued March 28, following our hearings on the questionable vitamin K_3.

The Food and Drug Administration still has a long way to go in achieving greater scientific and administrative excellence in connection with its programs; but I am happy to report it is making progress. From time to time I have reported to the Senate on the proposed National Drug Information Clearinghouse to conduct interagency studies on drug research and regulation. I shall continue to do so in the days ahead. I also will continue to submit brief progress reports on the protection of the public health, on our efforts to secure safe and efficacious drugs and on the efforts we in the subcommittee have been making to improve the administrative structure of the Food and Drug Administration.

Today, I merely wish to say that there is improvement, and that we have reasons to feel encouraged.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Humphrey Predicts "Consumer Victory" on "Questionable" Vitamin Implicated in Injury of Newborn

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, predicted "consumer victory shortly" over a "questionable" ingredient which appears in certain multivitamin capsules, given to pregnant women.

The Food and Drug Administration, he said, is reportedly preparing an order to rescind temporary extension of a food additive petition on vitamin K_3.

Last week, a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which Humphrey is chairman, heard testimony, implicating this particular vitamin in possible damage to the newborn.

Humphrey stated that he will present "additional strong evidence" on dangers of the drug in a Senate speech on Friday.

Dr. John O. Nestor, a pediatrician employed by FDA, had charged that use of the vitamin in prenatal supplements may result in some instances in "brain damage, spasticity, and death" to the newborn.

Nestor stated that the drug, Menadione, appears on the market in 50 to 70 products, many of which can be purchased without a prescription. He contended that nonmedical officials in FDA's Division of Nutrition and Pharmacology had overruled the Agency's Bureau of Medicine on use of the drug. The non-M.D.'s, he asserted, "overlook that a pregnant woman carries a fetus and that babies are sometimes born with jaundice."

Humphrey stated that the vitamin K_3 case now appears "even more incredible than it did at the outset."

"It was, first, curious that nonmedical officers in FDA chose to fight so long and so tenaciously, despite thick folders full of medical evidence from nongovernmental sources pointing to dangers of vitamin K_3."

He continued, "many of these nonmedical officers in FDA are outstanding scientists in other fields, and their acting in the best of faith has never been and is not questioned."

"But now," said Humphrey, "we learn that, in the same Federal Department, the National Institutes of Health (which know more about prenatal injury than any other source) had also publicly expressed concern over vitamin K_3."

The subcommittee "has just learned," he said, "that 2½ months before Dr. Nestor testified, the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness had included in an 84-page report a brief but solid criticism of the practice of giving high doses of vitamin K_3 to pregnant women."

This Neurological Institute comment, Humphrey added, "offers another illustration of the soundness of the subcommittee in insisting upon closer, prompter and more continuing cooperation between the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies."

FDA, he said, may now attempt to pass off prospective elimination of vitamin K_3 as an allegedly routine action. "The fact is," he continued, "that it has taken a behind-the-scenes battle of more than a year and a public airing of the situation to get FDA to act decisively."

Humphrey said that he had further confirmed that another drug, Mylicon, which Dr. Nestor had forced from the market as a pediatric drug, is still unfortunately being sold for infant use.

The company, making the product, had admittedly marketed it without applying through standard new drug application procedure. The company had contended that the product was "physiologically inert" and was generally regarded as safe. Following Dr. Nestor's complaint with regard to use by infants, the company had agreed to remove the drug's specific claim for use for infant colic. The company stated publicly, moreover, that it ceased to promote the product for infants.

Humphrey, however, announced that after public testimony, Dr. Nestor, in purchasing Mylicon at a nearby drugstore, found that the product was only available, in that instance, in the very form in which it is likeliest to be used for infants; namely, as drops. In addition, said Humphrey, an upstate New York mother wrote him that, as recently as 2 weeks ago, her doctor prescribed the drug for her 5-month-old baby. We were shocked and heartsick, the mother wrote, when she heard of Dr. Nestor's statement that the drug's safety for babies had not been proved and deeply grateful for the subcommittee's inquiry.

Humphrey concluded on Mylicon, "the net effect of all FDA's and the company's actions is that a drug, not specifically cleared as to safety for babies, is still used for babies, because there is no specific word of caution against such use, and, indeed, because there is ambiguous wording which might contribute to such use."

In other developments, Humphrey stated:

(a) He is informing the Food and Drug Administration that the subcommittee will expect "as soon as feasible its detailed written reactions" to criticisms offered in last week's hearings.

(b) The Senate subcommittee will schedule future hearings only after its staff has examined FDA files on drugs criticized by Dr. Nestor, as well as "on certain other cases" and subcommittee members have received the facts.

Humphrey commended the interest of Dr. Luther Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, in a proposed National Drug Information Clearinghouse.

The Minnesota Senator praised the "dedicated activity" of Terry's Assistant for Science Information, Dr. F. Ellis Kelsey. He is the husband of Dr. Frances Kelsey who prevented the commercial marketing of thalidomide in the United States.

"A Drug Clearinghouse," Humphrey concluded, "could help increase the use of the vast number of safe, efficacious drugs; it could help minimize the use of whatever drugs are not safe and/or efficacious.

"The Clearinghouse could help further raise the high and well-justified confidence of the American people in the healing arts, including pharmaceutical science."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 11 o'clock a.m., in accordance with the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, 1963:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

State Department

Roger Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1963:

Post Office Department

Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

Postmasters

CALIFORNIA

Floyd H. Erickson, Ahwahnee.
E. Vernon Putnam, Arbuckle.
Joy L. Fansler, Big Pine.
Carl W. Fischer, Jr., Camarillo.
Laura B. Morgan, Clayton.
Clayton F. Malling, El Cerrito.
Alice O. Mills, Finley.
Joe R. Edde, Five Points.
Nathaniel R. Evans, Fortuna.
Robert M. Lee, Freedom.
Frances M. Reed, Glen Ellen.
Ralph E. Lozano, Greenville.
Jack J. Snyder, Harbor City.
Louis L. Brunnemer, Los Molinos.
John F. Bushell, Oakland.
Nancy C. Avery, Pacoima.
Edgar L. King, Stratford.
Lee B. Downs, Whittier.

DELAWARE

Thomas Holcomb, New Castle.

FLORIDA

Myrla M. Bishop, Archer.
Ross C. Marler, Destin.
Ruth A. Childers, Florahome.
J. Donald Carter, Fort Myers Beach.
Daniel D. Clements, Land O'Lakes.
William C. Hurston, Laurel Hill.
A. Edward Hoyt, Port Richey.

ILLINOIS

James C. Hobbs, Abingdon.
Eugene J. Tafel, Algonquin.
Charles E. Resch, Anna.
Peter W. Bast, Ashland.
Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph.
Clemit T. Peifer, Beecher City.
Marvin H. Stewart, Brighton.
Orville E. Van Brocklin, Caledonia.
Lee Bush, Cambria.
Maynard R. Koltz, Capron.
Joseph F. Alfeld, Carrollton.
Marvin C. McCulley, Chatham.
James T. Bobbit, Dalton City.
Mabel J. Atkins, Dawson.
Joel F. Parker, Divernon.
Verna H. Welsh, Durand.
Arthur L. Lawrence, East Alton.
Richard C. Hazer, Elizabeth.
Robert A. Smith, Elvaston.
Clifford L. Lehman, Eureka.
William H. Haycraft, Franklin.
George C. Cavanaugh, Gillespie.
Charles J. Nash, Greenville.
Edythe A. Grover, Hamburg.
Russell W. Martin, Hanover.
Paul D. Jordan, Herscher.
L. Dale Wingo, Kenney.
Carl H. Vaughn, Kinderhook.
Dona J. Beard, Leaf River.
Richard J. Thilmony, Loda.
Donald W. Ferris, Marshall.
Haven W. Hammond, Martinsville.
Leroy M. Smith, McHenry.
Ora K. Reid, Media.
Betty J. Jones, Mound City.
John R. Ryan, Mundelein.
Morris A. Mettendorf, Neoga.
Anton Macrowski, Jr., North Chicago.
C. Kenneth Sizemore, Paris.
Vincent E. Stephenson, Pittsfield.
Norbert W. Haberer, Pocahontas.
Leo A. Hayes, Ramsey.
Henry W. Roehrkasse, Red Bud.
Charles F. Schultz, Reynolds.

Owen A. Reimer, Roscoe.
Curtis J. German, Rossville.
Leonard M. Koeberlein, St. Elmo.
Wendell L. Smith, Sandwich.
G. Kenneth Furrer, San Jose.
W. Rex Butler, Saybrook.
G. Clark Ewing, Sheldon.
Ralph F. Bennett, Sidell.
William J. Murphy, Stockton.
Kenneth B. Lorenson, Sullivan.
Gerald A. Melvin, Tamaroa.
Cornelius L. DiPiotti, Taylorville.
Edwin B. Wirth, Techny.
William E. Morgan, Tennessee.
Dorothy E. Anderson, Thomasboro.
Donovan O. Hutchins, Viola.
John R. Graves, Virginia.
Warden D. White, Wayne City.
Eldon R. Bristow, Waynesville.
Thomas A. Wood, Wheaton.
James T. Shinnebarger, Williamsville.
Harold G. Minor, Windsor.
Ruth P. Spraggins, Yale.

KANSAS

Henry L. Smith, Abilene.
Donald I. Beamgard, Atwood.
Joseph B. Nick, Basehor.
Virgil W. McCune, Benton.
Francis R. Gorman, Chapman.
Fred A. Riggs, Cottonwood Falls.
Myrl H. Kliesen, Dodge City.
Harold D. Brown, Eureka.
Herbert P. Franz, Goessel.
Donald E. Plank, Iuka.
Burgess L. Stephenson, Leoti.
Robert W. Foster, Sterling.
Daryl M. Ford, Valley Falls.

LOUISIANA

Rhea L. McIlveene, Cotton Valley.
Nelson J. Falcon, Duson.
Rowland C. Regan, Egan.
Lloyd E. Chachere, Eunice.
Phillip A. Hanks, Greensburg.
William E. Scott, Lake Providence.
Chester L. Guidry, Morse.
Cecile B. Cheramie, Paradis.
Frances B. Farmer, Princeton.
Marvin E. Schauf, St. Joseph.

MICHIGAN

Florence W. Letvennow, Atlantic Mine.
Stennette E. Walsworth, Augusta.
Robert E. Mohr, Clinton.
James M. Mahoney, Decatur.
William H. Schwartz, Flint.
Allen J. Dahl, Iron River.
John W. Kelly, Manistique.
Leslie C. Willer, Marion.
Leo E. Osterberg, Pleasant Lake.
John H. Brule, Watervliet.

MINNESOTA

Marvin G. Loeck, Balaton.
M. Wallace Post, Cottonwood.
William J. Pattinson, Currie.
Charles G. Lenz, Ellsworth.
Audrey A. Johnson, Esko.
Earl W. Dressen, Green Isle.
Virgil R. Buffington, Kenyon.
Walter A. Dietz, Mapleton.
Fred M. Colwell, Morton.
Eugenie A. Wollum, Porter.
Harold A. Legatt, Rice.
Loren L. Marsden, St. James.
Chester L. Stimpert, Sleepy Eye.
Gordon W. Friesen, Solway.
Bertrand H. Strandlund, Stacy.
Dellin F. Segar, Wells.

MISSOURI

Albert D. Teter, Callao.
Griffith E. Benson, Chillicothe.
Lewis D. Baldwin, Collins.
Charles A. Reed, Concordia.
Johnnie Moyer, Jr., Corder.
John W. Volker, Craig.
Kenneth W. Alexander, Greentop.
Walter E. Bamman, Jacksonville.
George E. Bennett, Purdy.
Herbert L. Coggin, Republic.
William B. Bales, St. Peters.
Clyde E. Maxwell, Thompson.
Barclay T. Cortelyou, Troy.
James M. Crighton, Willard.

NEVADA

Maxine A. Anderson, Verdi.

NORTH CAROLINA

J. Preston Andrews, Jr., Bahama.
L. Hubert Collins, Brunswick.
Patricia S. Fipps, Clarendon.
Josephine D. Riggs, Cove City.
George B. Herndon, Fayetteville.
Henderson W. Haire, Garner.
Edward K. Leggett, Hobgood.
Helen H. Huggins, Laurel Hill.
Louis E. Bottiglier, Lillington.
Giles F. Bryson, Marble.

NORTH DAKOTA

Robert E. Fischer, Hague.
William L. Arenstein, Washburn.

OHIO

Kathryn E. Peters, Arcadia.
Louise E. Hoover, Bascom.
Herbert G. Wright, Grand Rapids.
Kenneth W. Gerber, Kidron.
Frances M. Adams, Ludlow Falls.
Mabel M. Bendetta, Malvern.
Russell E. Yackee, Martin.
Paul L. Casci, Middleport.
John W. Sharick, Nankin.
Emmet F. Millard, Oregonia.
Ruth E. Kenny, Paris.
Josephine E. Pittenger, Pavonia.
Wesley D. Wickline, Rio Grande.
Billy H. Ten Eyck, Vanburen.
Harold A. Schonhardt, Venice.
Kenneth H. Haynes, Whitehouse.

OREGON

Ned Palmer, Dayton.
Vernon E. Stewart, Haines.
Orval R. Layton, Lakeview.
Joseph L. Dail, Nyssa.
Eva L. Albert, Trail.
Bernice M. Ladd, Tualatin.
Laura A. Wassenmiller, Tygh Valley.

PUERTO RICO

Sixto G. Mercado, Isabela.

SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Lawton Harper, Estill.
Ralph E. Edenfield, North Augusta.
William D. Russell, Ware Shoals.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William C. Feather, Marty.
Wanda M. Humiston, Oelrichs.
Virgil C. Guderian, Waubay.

TENNESSEE

Robert E. Harris, Kingston Springs.
Roscoe M. Hill, Luttrell.
William A. Roberts, Newport.
James H. Armstrong, Rogersville.
Gladys I. Price, St. Bethlehem.
John E. Griffith, South Pittsburg.

TEXAS

Thomas H. Journeay, Angleton.
Marjorie W. Duncan, Bedias.
Thava H. Brown, Canutillo.
Oscar R. Hawkins, Crawford.
A. Earl Beck, Dumas.
James J. Kaster, El Paso.
Anna L. Franklin, Fort Hancock.
Clarence E. Garrett, Pittsburg.
Mary L. Rutherford, Putnam.
Elmo W. Ullrich, Randolph Air Force Base.
Milton H. Elliott, Shallowater.
Bertha L. Delz, Texon.

UTAH

Harry J. Bigelow, Kamas.

VIRGINIA

Alfred P. Tirelis, Alberta.
Robert J. Sturgis, Belle Haven.
Doran W. Fary, Deltaville.
Annie D. Berry, Madison.
Hume P. Doyle, McKenney.
John G. Mizell, Richmond.
Charles M. Mastin, Spotsylvania.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maynard W. Weaver, Arthurdale.
Robert F. Wilson, Decota.
Kenneth L. Taylor, Hopemont.
Fletcher E. Andrews, Proctor.
Clyde E. McClung, Reedy.
Dennis P. Stanley, Superior.
Ross White, Weston.
Benjamin F. Lowe, Jr., Yolyn.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Virginia Is Proud of Goodyear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as you drive along Route 2, the Ohio River Road, midway between Huntington and Point Pleasant, W. Va., you reach one of the most modern industrial facilities in the entire region, the $12 million plant of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

There are great industrial opportunities in the booming Ohio River valley, and few concerns have taken better advantage of these opportunities than Goodyear. Half a dozen years ago, the electric news streaked through West Virginia that Goodyear planned to construct a new plant at Apple Grove, devoted to some strange new products which seemed a far cry from the automobile tires which our fathers always associated with Goodyear.

ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY

Actually, the Goodyear chemists 20 years ago were bent over their test tubes and microscopes in a restless laboratory search for a fiber which would make an improved cord for tires. When the chemists came up with their answers, they came close to being fired because they produced fibers which were useless for making tire cord. Fortunately, the moguls of Goodyear told them: "Go on back to your test tubes and see what you have produced." Out of this polyester research came a new polyester resin. The researchers never dreamed they would be producing something which might revolutionize the textile industry and the building industry.

The magic new products were Vitel, a resin from which manmade, synthetic fibers are spun; and Videne, a laminating film with tough, resistant qualities.

The Appalachian Electric Power Co., which has done so much aggressive work for West Virginia industrial development, negotiated the sale of a 300-acre tract along the Ohio River so that Goodyear could have the elbow room to manufacture these new products. It scarcely seems possible that less than 5 years ago, on May 15 1958, ground was broken at Apple Grove, W. Va., for the new Goodyear plant. As a bulldozer took a tentative bite from the rich soil to symbolize the groundbreaking, national, State, local and industrial leaders were there to point to the significance of the great event. They were mighty men, men of vision, some of whom have moved upward to greater responsibilities, some whom God has called to eternal duties. There was George E. Hervey, district manager of the Appalachian Power Co., whose magnificent achievements in the Point Pleasant region are too numerous to mention. Mr. Hervey leaves today for an even more challenging assignment in flood-torn Logan, W. Va. There was the late U.S. Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a tireless, dedicated worker for greater industrial development in West Virginia. Point Pleasant was also represented by Mayor B. W. Krodel and Chamber of Commerce President John Hushion. Jack Lloyd, aggressive young industrial development representative of the Appalachian Electric Power Co., who has also moved up the ladder of responsibility, was present, as was Stanley C. Higgins representing Governor Underwood. And then there was the boldly imaginative Goodyear plant manager, Swedish-born Oka Carlson.

WHY WEST VIRGINIA?

We asked why Goodyear would decide to locate in West Virginia. The answer was that West Virginia provided the best river, rail, and truck transportation facilities, a good labor supply, and a good geographic location for distribution of the Goodyear product.

Work proceeded rapidly on the five-story main building, which provides 100,000 square feet of floorspace. Four years ago, in 1959, production got underway. The miracle in the Ohio Valley actually happened. Spreading over the level acres once devoted to a truck farm, the mighty industrial facility was in production.

One of the fairly obvious but much talked-about discoveries which the Goodyear plant managers made was that West Virginians proved to be conscientious, steady, dependable, and highly productive employees. Some of them drive great distances to get to Apple Grove. Many of them live in Point Pleasant, that warm and fast-thriving community 15 miles north. Enriching Point Pleasant spirit with their energy and community spirit was a new group of Goodyear plant executives, who played an important role in civic activities.

Steady employment was provided for 120 workers, and the Point Pleasant plant built up to provide a yearly payroll of $850,000. The Vitel produced at the Point Pleasant plant is utilized by Beaunit Mills, Inc., which produces Vycron, for extensive use in shirts, suits, dresses, and other textile products. The Videne laminating film is used to laminate textiles, metal, wood, paper and plastics. Important new uses in the housing construction industry may multiply the production of Videne in the coming months.

A NEW EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Point Pleasant plant has just started an expansion program which will increase capacity by 50 percent. The construction of these additional facilities will start right away. It is expected that the expansion will be completed by September. These new process facilities are being added in order to boost the production of what is called pelletized resin, from which manmade fibers are spun for clothing and other textiles. This expansion signals another forward surge of activity in the industrial Ohio Valley.

West Virginia is proud of Goodyear. West Virginia is proud of the new industrial growth in the Point Pleasant area, which adds up to a brighter future for the people of Mason County and the Ohio Valley.

A Bill To Permit Deductions for Federal Income Tax Purposes to Persons Who Are Paying Educational Expenses at the Primary, Secondary, or Undergraduate College or University Levels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes to persons who are paying educational expenses at the primary, secondary, or undergraduate college or university levels. I am convinced this legislation is timely in terms of national economic and educational objectives. It is in the national interest that all young people complete the highest level of education of which they are capable. Through their educational attainments these students will benefit themselves and the Nation and improve their ability to contribute to our society and our economy. Those citizens who support the public schools through taxation and also bear the burden of educating their children in private schools and colleges are entitled to some relief for the double expenses they bear on behalf of education.

The growing demands of our society for educated citizens makes it desirable for persons of moderate income to provide the highest level of education possible for their children. Many students of high ability are forced to discontinue their education for financial reasons. We must recognize the national importance of encouraging and assisting able students to remain in school and to go on to and graduate from college.

In the United States, we have consistently raised the level of educational opportunities. We provide not only the teachers and buildings but also public transportation of students and in many cases books and supplies as well. We have done these things because our youth require educational opportunity to meet the increasing complexity of society. The world continues to grow more complex. The educational levels that led to intellectual maturity yesterday do not go far enough today. There has been a continuous upgrading of jobs. The increasing use of the products of scientific technology clearly calls for a higher degree of education and technical skill in every line of work. The bill I have introduced is one means of providing an incentive for remaining in school and some tax relief for those who must finance the costs of this education.

To encourage increased investment in our advancing economy, it has long been our practice to provide for tax-free recovery of income-producing capital outlays through allowances for depreciation and replacement. By the same principle, the tax treatment of investment in education should be at least as liberal as it is for investment in capital goods, since education is at least as important a basis for producing income as is investment in physical capital.

For some years, we have provided for tax deductions by professional individuals who must upgrade their educational training in order to meet the rising educational requirements of the work they are already doing. There should be some tax relief to encourage investment in the education of those preparing to enter the trades and professions, especially since the amount of education required at the threshold level of most professions is rapidly increasing—and must continue to increase—to provide for the flexibility and adaptability needed to cope with our advancing technology.

My bill restricts its tax deductions to tuition and fees, books and supplies, and the cost of living away from home when necessary. The limitation to not more than $200 per month for each month of enrollment is a safeguard to prevent abuses by those who might choose expensive preparatory schools and colleges.

While tax relief would accrue before the individual receives income from the investment in education, it must be pointed out that in the long run increased individual incomes would more than offset initial tax income foregone in allowing deductions for amounts invested in education. Studies have shown that the median income of families with heads having 4 or more years of college is almost 40 percent higher than the median income of families with heads whose education stopped with completion of high school. Also, the high school graduate earns about 27 percent more than does the eighth-grade graduate during his peak earning years. Obviously, then, education is an income-producing investment, and whatever tax relief we grant to encourage it will not only contribute to the economic progress of the Nation but will be more than recovered out of taxes on increased future earnings.

It is currently estimated that about 40 percent of the students who enter college go on to graduate in regular progression from the institution of first registration, that another 20 percent transfer or return at a later date to complete the requirements for graduation, and that about 40 percent withdraw and never finish. Financial difficulties are reported to be among the chief reasons for dropping out, especially in the loss of the better students. This impetus to stay in school would also tend to encourage high school students to complete their secondary education in many cases in preparation for higher education. It is presently estimated that almost 40 percent of pupils who reach the fifth grade do not graduate from high school. A college graduate earns about $175,000 more in his lifetime than a high school graduate, and a high school graduate earns about $50,000 more than an eighth-grade graduate, according to recent estimates. If the provisions of this bill are successful in salvaging a fraction of those students who fail to graduate from high school and continue through a higher education because of financial difficulties, the loss of tax revenue will eventually be offset and conceivably the amendment would improve the overall position of the Treasury.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee."

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Record.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for your letter of March 20 and the enclosed brochure on the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

I will indeed find it useful as a reference source and appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending it to me.

Regards.

Sincerely,
Bill Stinson,
U.S. Representative.

P.S.—I shall support you in this.

Pittsfield, Mass., *March 18, 1963.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of our organization, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations would with honor and truth understand and present to the world, knowledge and information as to the plight of submerged nations. This in turn, will aid our Government, our peoples, and our foreign policy.

Respectfully yours,
Amelia Stefeunck,
President.
Eugenia Tymesuk,
Secretary.

Ukrainian Center, Inc.,
Passaic, N.J., March 13, 1963.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to Congressman Howard W. Smith in which we ask him to submit to vote on his committee your resolution (H. Res. 14) for establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,
John Chomko,
President of the Ukrainian Center, Inc., in Passaic, N.J.

Ukrainian Center, Inc.,
Passaic, N.J., March 13, 1963.
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: On behalf of the Ukrainian Center, Inc. in Passaic, N.J., we urge you to submit the Flood resolution calling for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations to vote by your committee.

The creation of this Special House Committee on Captive Nations at this particular time would serve in a most effective manner to combat Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism and would serve as vital reservoir of the true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which would be very helpful to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We wish to thank you in advance, sir, for anything that you can do in supporting the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,
John Chomko,
President of Ukrainian Center, Inc., in Passaic, N.J.

Minneapolis, Minn., *March 18, 1963.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: This land of Washington has always been the only hope for many enslaved nations in their struggle for liberty and human rights denied to them by tyranny of communism.

To keep this hope alive we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

The creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations and will help the American people to recognize the true dangers of Communist aggression.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Anatol Lysyj, M.D.
Mrs. Daria Lysyj.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 15, 1963.
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We understand that Congressman Flood presented a resolution (H. Res. 14) concerning establishment of a congressional Committee on Captive Nations. We urge you to submit this resolution to vote by your committee. We also sincerely ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

The necessity of establishing such a committee is evident from the fact that even in our State Department there is a confusion concerning the situation in Eastern Europe. The information given in 158 issue of the State Department Research News Letter on the Soviet Union and the letters of Secretary Rusk to your committee in connection with the proposed establishment of Captive Nations Committee are a good illustration to this.

While the Soviet Union has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations, constituting a decided weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

The objective study performed by the proposed congressional Committee on Captive Nations will tremendously help in bringing the authentic information for our State Department and will clarify the confusion in the minds of American public concerning the true situation behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

We sincerely urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,
William Dombrowsky,
President.
Mykola Derbush,
Secretary.

ST. JOHN'S SOCIETY,
Hartford, Conn., March 11, 1963.
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of the 600 members of the St. John's Society in Hartford we urge you to submit the resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee.

The fact that many millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain are enslaved by Russian imperialism today cannot be overlooked by those who are now enjoying freedom which is one of the blessings of our democracy.

It is our opinion that nations which have lost their political and cultural independence became subjugated by Russian imperialism now taking form of communism deserve to be helped in their continuous struggle for independence which is also an incorporation of their beloved freedom and democracy.

Your qualified support to the Flood resolution, Congressman SMITH, will be most gratefully appreciated. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
WALTER WASYLENKO,
Chairman.
STANLEY HOMOTIUK,
Secretary.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *March 18, 1963.*
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: With regard to the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, we strongly urge your support, and to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations would be of great value and we hope you will give it your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,
UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN MEN'S CLUB.
WILLIAM NYKONCHUH,
President.
STANLEY F. SMICHUKO,
Secretary.
WILLIAM HOWE,
JOHN JORMOROSKEY,
WALTER J. HUSKA,
MICHAEL W. JANSWYEZ,
WALTER W. KOPYCHOK.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: Many thanks for your letter dated March 20 together with the brochure on the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence.

Be assured of my cooperation.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

HARTFORD, *March 11, 1963.*
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The members of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc. Branch 5 in Hartford, Conn., appeals to you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist imperialist Russia pose as "defenders of liberation of the Asian and African nations from colonialism," but at the same time they practice the worst possible form of colonial oppression and enslavement over the non-Russian nations under their domination and use all and every means at the disposal of their cruel and totalitarian regime to suppress and strangle every manifestation and aspiration of these non-Russian nations to freedom and national independence.

Existence of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a real reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
ALEXANDRE RUDZINSKY,
President.

Grafton, W. Va.: The Town That Refused To Die—Now an All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are all doubtless aware of the All America Cities Awards given each year to 11 U.S. communities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League which is the cosponsor with Look magazine of the annual awards competition. This program is now in its 15th year.

This year, I am happy to report, Grafton, W. Va., was chosen as one of these cities, along with Allentown, Pa.; Bartlesville, Okla.; Boston, Mass.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Dade County, Fla.; Grand Junction, Colo.; High Point, N.C.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Quincy, Ill.; and San Diego, Calif.

No individual is more pleased than I at the honor bestowed on Grafton, for since it is located in my first congressional district, I have worked very closely with Grafton's officials in dealing with the problems confronting the community. Therefore, I have more than a passing interest in her accomplishments.

Many of you will remember that Grafton is the town that refused to die. In 1958, its only major industry, a glass plant, closed its doors, forcing 480 people out of work. This came close on the heels of the closing of a large pottery and a drastic drop in local railroad employment. But Grafton citizens were determined to keep their town alive, whatever the cost, and on a bitterly cold December day, more than 2,000 women turned out in an Operation Survival parade.

Forward-looking civic leaders formed the 1,300-member Grafton Area Development Council to attract industry, and the Tygart Valley Development Association, armed with $30,000 in voluntary subscriptions, began to develop industrial sites. Local women took a labor inventory, listing skills available in Grafton.

Efforts were made to improve the town's physical appearance. Streets were paved, sidewalks repaired, storefronts modernized and 54 condemned houses were torn down.

Two new industries did come into Grafton and there is a good prospect that a third will follow. I am especially elated at this for I have attempted to aid and direct civic leaders in their attempts to interest industry in locating in Grafton.

Today Grafton's unemployment problem is far from solved, but we all feel that "things are looking up." The indomitable spirit that refused to let Grafton die will find ways and means to restore her to a healthy, thriving city.

We are grateful for this opportunity to bring Grafton to the attention of all the Nation. Industries desiring to relocate should capitalize on this strong will to survive and grow.

I commend Grafton again for its devotion to the cause of industrial development and civic improvement, and recommend its recipe for recovery to other cities which may find themselves in distress.

Welcome South, Mr. Chisholm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 of this year, I inserted an editorial in the RECORD taken from the Daily Reveille, written and edited by the students of Louisiana State University. The title of the editorial was, "Is ELLENDER Wrong?"

The editorial, written by Colin Chisholm, a student at the university, dealt with the remarks of the senior Senator from Louisiana, the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, who had questioned the wisdom of our foreign giveaway program. It contained the following statement:

> ELLENDER, in a few choice words, said what probably a majority of Americans have been thinking for many years, that African nations are simply not ready for self-government.

I inserted the editorial because I was impressed by the young writer's obvious ability to cut through the verbiage and the fog of uncertainty surrounding our giveaway program and to see right to the heart of the matter. His display of clearmindedness was worthy of note by all of us here in the House.

Since that time, I have received a letter from Mr. Chisholm thanking me for sending him a copy of the insertion. His brief reply is equally worthy of note. Again he has shown that same instinct for stripping away the smug, the obvious and the false to find the truth hidden away in the center.

A hundred writers have written scores of thousands of words, particularly in the past two decades, on a subject to which most of them were ill prepared to address themselves: the South and its so-called conditions and problems.

Here, in 200 words, Mr. Chisholm tells of doing what few, if any, of these self-appointed savants have ever done: investigated these conditions and problems for themselves with a mind uncluttered with muddled presuppositions.

His two paragraph summation is a brilliant statement in which I would not want to change a single word:

> Before coming to Louisiana, I had lived for 20 years in the State of Colorado. I was born and raised there. During the time I lived there I was filled with the usual ballyhoo about the South and the conditions that were supposed to exist there. When I had finally had enough, I decided to come to the South and take a look for myself.
>
> Since the day I first came to Louisiana, I have fallen in love with the State and its people. I have made many friends over the past 2 years. The kind of friends that are lasting and ready and willing to help with any sort of problem I might have; something I could not find in my native State. I have found employment, not on the second or third try, but on the first attempt; something I had been unable to do in my native State. Illusion after illusion about the South has been shattered before me and I have grown to love Louisiana more and more as each day passes by. I plan to remain in Louisiana, to marry and raise my family here and to establish my own business here someday in the not-so-far-off future. I am most happy to be able to say that on September 13, 1963, I will be able to register to vote as a citizen of the State of Louisiana. It is also my pleasure to say that my parents, also native Coloradans, will move into a new home in Pascagoula, Miss., this summer after some 62 years of residence in the West.

I would like to welcome this young man to Louisiana, though selfishly I know he could serve the State and the South better by returning to those parts of the Nation where these illusions and delusions are still held and still, sadly, passed on from one generation to another. He would make the South an illustrious missionary.

Welcome south, Mr. Chisholm.

Prayers Asked for the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians alike throughout the Nation were saddened last week to hear that the presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, is suffering from Parkinson's disease, and will in all likelihood have to retire at the next convention of the Episcopal Church to be held in St. Louis next year.

The Episcopal diocese of Springfield covers a substantial part of my congressional district, and it is with deep pride that I noted that our newly consecrated bishop, the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, was the first Episcopal bishop in our country to ask for diocesanwide home and public prayers for the ailing Episcopal presiding bishop.

The leadership of Bishop Chambers is typical of the firm and constructive things he has done since he was consecrated October 1, 1962, as the bishop of Springfield by Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger.

I join the many members of Bishop Chambers' Church and his friends in commending the diocese of Springfield's leadership in this matter, and I hope that the example being set in Illinois will be followed in other parts of the country.

In a statement the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, bishop of Illinois, said:

> Like the human body, the holy, catholic, and apostolic church, of which the Episcopal Church is a living part, suffers when one of its key members suffers from a disabling disease. Since the church is moreover the communion of saints, we ought to pray for one another, even as the faithful of other ages pray for us.

Opportunities for Small Business in Export Trade Are Being Expanded and Significantly Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee last week held extensive hearings on the organization and operations of the Small Business Administration, including the opportunities for small business in foreign trade.

It is significant to point out that small business is continuing to increase in both number and dollar volume of participation in export trade and that although this increase is encouraging much more needs to be done, not only in the interest of promoting the sale and export of American manufactured products abroad, but also because of our balance-of-payments situation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, which discusses our committee hearings be reprinted in the RECORD.

My newsletter follows:

> SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HOLDS IMPORTANT HEARINGS
>
> (Capitol Comments by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)
>
> With the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee having completed hearings on budget requests except for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and with the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee not scheduled to begin hearings on the TVA and the Corps of Engineers budgets until after Easter, this week provided an excellent opportunity for the House Small Business Committee to hold hearings on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration and to develop information on the opportunities for small business in foreign trade.
>
> With the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there were dire predictions that the lowering of tariffs made possible by this bill would adversely affect many small businesses and that many would fail because of foreign competition.
>
> As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I felt that it was very important that we hold hearings on the effect of the European Economic Community on small business and gather information on what effect the implementation of the Trade Expansion Act might have on the small business sector of the economy. Our committee felt that it was also extremely important to document for small businesses the foreign trade opportunities that are open to them and the means by which small businesses might most effectively use these foreign trade avenues.
>
> Among the several top Government officials which presented testimony to the committee were John Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Jack N. Behrman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business; Ben David Dorfman, Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission; Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of Export-Import Bank; Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator; G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.
>
> Testimony showed that the various agencies and departments of our Government are vitally concerned with expanding our foreign trade and with increasing the opportunities of small business to participate in foreign trade. Mr. Daniels, who has the responsibility of coordinating all parts and phases of the export expansion program, pointed out that through governmental assistance and encouragement 1,197 new exporters were introduced to international trade last year. He also stated that 36,000 businessmen attended export seminars in 1962 and that he estimates at least 85 percent of these businessmen were small businessmen.
>
> Testimony indicated that our various Government agencies are doing a creditable job in expanding foreign trade but more must be done. Expanding our foreign trade so as to provide a stimulus to our economy and to help in solving the balance of payment problem is one of the most important tasks facing us today. Small business should be encouraged and helped to participate in foreign trade to the fullest extent possible and I so pointed out to agency, bureau, and department heads which appeared before our committee.

Gross Replies to Editorial on Churchill Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, although not mentioned by name, my colleague, H. R. GROSS of Iowa, and I were referred to in an editorial carried by the Des Moines, Iowa, Register on March 14, 1963, because we had voted against granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

Congressman Gross submitted a letter to the editor of the Register which rebuts the position of the editorial that a "sense of shame" should be felt for the action of two Members of the Iowa delegation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Congressman Gross' letter to the editor appear in the Record.

The letter follows:

Gross Replies to Editorial on Churchill Citizenship

To the Editor:

In your March 14 editorial, concerning action of the House in granting honorary U.S. citizenship to Winston Churchill, you state in part: "We feel a sense of shame at the bad manners and ill grace of one Iowa Congressman who asked whether this gesture was designed to influence an extension of the British debt to the United States. We regret that another Iowa Congressman voted against the honor, though he at least did it on a matter of principle, believing it would set a bad precedent."

Had the editorial writer taken the trouble to refer to the Congressional Record (Mar. 12, 1963, p. 3995), he would have found abundant proof that I opposed this legislation on the grounds of a bad precedent as well as questioning its influence on another suspension of all payments (interest and principal) on the multibillion dollar loan which the then Prime Minister Churchill negotiated following World War II.

Again referring to the Congressional Record (Mar. 12, 1963, p. 3996) I said: "Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detract from the leadership Mr. Churchill gave to the British Isles and the Commonwealth during World War II, but this, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee frankly admits, would be an unprecedented action. This apparently would be a granting of U.S. citizenship, no matter how limited, on a basis accorded no other citizen of a foreign country in the history of this Republic. Who will be the next?"

On the walls of the House are two huge portraits: of George Washington and of General Lafayette. No citizen of a foreign country made a greater contribution to the creation of this Republic than did Lafayette. Not only did he give of his military and diplomatic talents, providing the invaluable help of the French Government to the revolution, but he gave of his personal fortune. Yet throughout the years Congress never bestowed any form of citizenship upon Lafayette.

It should also be pointed out that, only 5 years ago, when approached on the subject of honorary U.S. citizenship, Mr. Churchill made it plain that he would refuse. What was the reason for his change of mind? Having been repulsed by Churchill himself, what motivated Congress to reinitiate this action? Is U.S. citizenship, honorary or otherwise, a commodity to be dealt out on the basis of whimsy?

Britain's debt to this country is some $13 billion as a result of obligations incurred in World War I and subsequent thereto. Payments on the $4 billion "loan," which Mr. Churchill negotiated shortly after World War II, and which were suspended by Congress for 8 years, must be resumed in the near future or another extension voted. Is there anyone gullible enough to think that the British have any intention of paying the full $4 billion, much less $13 billion?

And it can well be noted here that some 10 years ago the Churchill influence was instrumental in prevailing upon the U.S. Government to relinquish its interest in more than $1 billion in counterpart and similar funds which were then applied to retirement of the British internal debt.

Churchill once said in effect: "I have not been selected as the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire." As a nationalist and spokesman for Britannia he has few equals. Neither has he had many peers in his ability to open the doors of the U.S. Treasury.

If, as the Register laments, it be "bad manners and ill grace" to protest a very bad precedent and at the same time question the influence that such a precedent may have indirectly upon the debtridden taxpayers of Iowa and the Nation, then so be it.—H. R. Gross, U.S. Representative, Third Iowa District, Washington, D.C.

(Editor's Note.—Lafayette and all of his male heirs were granted citizenship by Maryland and Virginia before the union was formed and so automatically became full U.S. citizens.)

The 442d Combat Team: Hawaii's Gift to America's Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last week veterans of the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team celebrated in Honolulu the 20th anniversary of their organization.

It was on March 18, 1943, at historic Iolani Palace in Honolulu that 2,600 volunteers, all Americans of Japanese ancestry, were sworn in en masse into the Army of the United States. They were later to be joined by more than 1,000 other Nisei who had volunteered from behind barbed wire fences of the so-called relocation centers to form the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Before the call for volunteers was issued, the quota for Hawaii was set at 1,500 men. Within a few days after the call was issued, more than 10,000 had volunteered, the first of whom was Joseph Itagaki, who died of a heart attack almost to the day on the 20th anniversary of his volunteering, and the best known of whom is your former colleague and now U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye.

This tremendous and almost unbelievable response helped to quelch the talk of evacuating all of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii, and the Army boosted Hawaii's quota to 2,875 men.

On the mainland United States the Army experienced an even more remarkable response. From within the confines of concentration camps more than 3,000 men wearing Japanese faces had volunteered to serve the country whose Government had placed them behind barbed-wire fences despite their American citizenship. Among them was the first volunteer of them all, Mike Masaoka, described by Reader's Digest as the "most successful lobbyist" on Capitol Hill, and his four brothers, Hank, Tad, Ike, and Ben.

The Army's decision to organize the 442d was largely based on its observations of another Japanese-American outfit which had been organized about a year earlier on June 2, 1942, and which was in training at Camp McCoy, Wis., and Camp Shelby, Miss.—the 100th Infantry Battalion—separate—of which I was a member, and which subsequently became the first battalion of the 442d Regiment.

Together on the battlefields of Europe, men of the 100th Battalion and the 442d Regimental Combat Team won the respect and admiration of all who knew them. Gen. Mark Clark referred to them as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They had fought for and died for ideals which they had learned to uphold in the democratic process. They had died so others could have a better world in which to live—men like Private Kawano, my messenger, who, in his last few words on earth, told me in effect:

> Well, Lieutenant, I know I'm going to die, but I have no regrets. I know that as a result of my dying, those of us who will go home and our folks back home will be recognized as true Americans and will live a better life.

The veterans of the 442d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion and, lest we forget, of the Military Intelligence Service, irrefutably proved on the fields of battle through sacrifice of blood and life that Americanism is a matter of the heart and mind and not of race or color, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt so aptly stated.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the people of Hawaii, I call your attention to Hawaii's gift to America's heritage, the 442d Regimental Combat Team, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

One of the Most Dramatic Moments in All Industry—The Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan Christens the SS "Export Champion," and Explains Its Significance to Our Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and as a Member of Congress who for 16 years has had the honor of representing a district which includes one of the greatest ports in the world, the port of Baltimore, I have had occasion frequently to attend the launchings of new ships for merchant marine and Navy. A launching is always a most impressive event, and represents the culmination of many man-hours of labor and of great investments of funds in creating a new ship which will carry the American flag on the high seas.

Customarily, a charming lady smashes a bottle of champagne against the bow as the ship slides down the ways, and then, later, she expresses her pride in the vessel.

A ship launching which I attended last Thursday in Chester, Pa., was another such occasion, but with a very significant difference. The ship was the SS *Export Champion,* built by Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., for the American Export Lines—one of our sister ships of 12,528 deadweight tons, with a cargo capacity of 800,000 cubic feet, a speed of 18½ knots, rated horsepower of 13,750, and overall length of 493 feet. The four ships display an unusual profile for cargo vessels, with an engine-aft arrangement for maximum cargo carrying capacity. J. J. Henry Co., Inc., was the naval architectural firm for the four ships, which have General Electric cross compound steam turbine main engines with double reduction gears, and 20-foot diameter, 5-blade propellers revolving at 110 revolutions per minute.

These are outstanding cargo ships, and are part of our subsidized American flag-merchant marine. The SS *Export Champion* is designed for use on trade route No. 10—line B—U.S. Atlantic/Mediterranean and Black Seas—freight service.

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN ACTS AS SPONSOR

I said the ship launching Thursday of the SS *Export Champion* was an occasion similar to many others I have witnessed, but with a very significant difference. As is customary, a charming lady smashed a bottle of champagne against the bow at the exact split second, and then later expressed her pride in the vessel. The lady who performed the important role of sponsor of the SS *Export Champion* was our own colleague in the House of Representatives, and my esteemed colleague, a senior member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, and it was her participation which made this an unusual occasion.

Mrs. Sullivan not only performed the customary tasks assigned to a sponsor of a ship, but made an outstanding address following the launching, and discussed the importance of this ship, and of our entire American-flag merchant marine to the people of the United States. Never before, to my knowledge, has the sponsor of a cargo vessel been a woman with as great an understanding of the significance of the event to our Nation as the conscientious and well-informed Congresswoman from Missouri, who is now serving for the 11th year on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal.

Mrs. Sullivan described the moment when the ship started on its way to deep water as "one of the most dramatic moments in all industry." I think it was a very apt description, and, as she performed the sponsoring rites, she made me proud, as all of us in the House of Representatives would have been proud, at that moment.

Later, in her remarks following the launching, she made me even prouder of her as a colleague in the Congress for her eloquent and informative talk. I want to share that pride with the rest of the Members, Mr. Speaker, and so I submit the text of Congresswoman Sullivan's address, for inclusion as part of my remarks in the Congressional Record, as follows:

Remarks of Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, Following Launching of SS "Export Champion," Sun Shipyard, Chester, Pa., Thursday Afternoon, March 28, 1963

My wish today—my prayer—in christening the SS *Export Champion* is that all who serve aboard this vessel in the years ahead will always have the same pride of identification with her that we will always have as a result of participating in her launching.

The men and women of Sun Ship, who have devoted nearly 1 million man-hours of skilled hard work in transforming assorted lengths and shapes of steel and pipe and other materials into a rugged, fast, seaworthy carrier of the cargoes of world commerce, cannot help but be deeply proud of their handiwork, and I congratulate them for the excellence of their labors.

And to Admiral Will and his associates of American Export Lines, there is the pride of seeing their industrial vision become a reality here, in seeing a great project for the expansion of a great shipping line come to fruition in the form of the fourth ship in this unusual new design.

As a woman who has just enjoyed one of the great privileges traditionally reserved to women—the opportunity to officiate at one of the most dramatic moments in all industry—the moment when a high-and-dry hull suddenly begins its plunge into deep water and its emergence as a ship—I shall always treasure my memories of that moment, and relive again and again the glorious experience of christening a fine ship.

My pride of identification with this ship goes even deeper than that, however, for the SS *Export Champion,* which I shall always regard now as a personal possession I have merely placed on loan to its operators, symbolizes for me the entire American merchant marine, with which I have become closely familiar during 10 years in Congress as a member of the committee of the House of Representatives which has legislative jurisdiction over merchant marine affairs. In that capacity, I have attended numerous launchings for a variety of vessels, and have invariably been thrilled when the champagne crashed against the bow, and the blocks were battered away, and the ship slowly moved, and then raced down the ways. But thanks to those who have given me the privilege today of sponsoring the *Export Champion,* the merchant marine will hereafter always be symbolized for me by this one vessel. I shall watch for the reports of her comings and goings. Each time she returns to home port from her travels in the Mediterranean or Black Sea, I shall have the feeling that "my ship has come in."

The SS *Export Champion* belongs, in a sense, to all of the American people, as do all of our vessels in the subsidized American-flag merchant marine. Congress is providing currently about $300 million a year for assistance in the construction of such ships, and in their operation. But this is no gift, no handout, to a few ship builders or fleet operators. This is an investment by the people of the United States in a major arm of national defense, the bridge of ships which helped so decisively in the winning of World War II, the ships which today speed our cargoes to our troops abroad, and to friends and allies around the world—modern ships, fast ships, designed for today's needs, including the possible needs of wartime military support. The so-called subsidies are necessary in order to enable American enterprise to compete on a more equal basis with foreign firms in both the operation of and the construction of our merchant ships. Otherwise, our flag would virtually disappear from the masts of the world's cargo ships. And there are reciprocal requirements: The operator must provide for the periodic, systematic replacement of ships on a long-range basis, and must agree to return to the Government a share of profits exceeding a specified level.

Above all, he must operate under the American flag, which means under conditions of employment and safety on the high seas which far exceed those of any other maritime power. Incidentally, our merchant marine employs more than 200,000 people from every section of this country, at wages equal to the best in American industry as a whole.

But lest we fall into the mistake of considering these programs of aid to the merchant marine and to those who work in related activities as an expensive drain on our Treasury and our economy, it should be realized that the economic aspects constitute a two-way street; for instance, this industry, including seagoing, shoreside, shipbuilding, and ship repair segments, contributes better than $5 billion annually to the U.S. economy, and helps to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments by between $600 million and $1 billion a year. And, of course, such an industry and its employees pay very, very substantial Federal taxes.

These are facts I had to learn 10 years ago as a midwestern Member of Congress serving on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I was, and am, from Missouri, and had to be shown. And I was shown. I have always supported the American merchant marine in their united efforts to obtain legislation needed to expand and strengthen this industry.

Is it any wonder, then, that I am deeply proud, highly honored, and profoundly moved by the privilege I have had today to sponsor a great new addition to the American-flag fleet? The SS *Export Champion,* long before any cargo is loaded into her holds, already carries our great pride in the role she will fulfill.

May this ship, a true champion always, and those who man her, meet their forthcoming challenges of time and space and the elements with resolute confidence born of the strength you have built into her solid steel hull. And may each voyage not only be undertaken with eager excitement, but also be completed in harmony, and with full success.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of March 30, 1963:

Washington Report

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

TAX HEARINGS CONCLUDED

The hearings on the President's tax recommendations are concluded. For the time involved a good record of pros and cons has been made. All witnesses agreed on the need for a tax cut. Few approved of the tax hikes, called structural reforms. The background for these hearings was the least favorable possible. The President and his Secretary of the Treasury recognized no relationship between Federal spending and tax revenue, that is, the balancing of income and outgo. On the contrary, the premise of planned deficit underlay the recommendations, although periodic lipservice was paid to fiscal integrity and Government self-discipline. Comic relief, although hollow as a bad joke, was provided by Budget Director Gordon, who spoke of the tight or strict budget of $122.5 billion, $20 billion more than the budget for fiscal 1961 inherited when Mr. Kennedy took office. The President's goals of (1) economic growth, (2) freeing of investment funds, (3) curing unemployment, (4) increasing consumer purchasing power, according to the witnesses, were, separately and collectively, contradicted by the tax recommendations. The results would be: (1) Growth would be impeded; (2) investment funds would be less fluid; (3) unemployment would result in industry after industry; and (4) consumer purchasing power would drop.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon threatened a Presidential veto if the reforms did not accompany the rate changes. The President promptly contradicted this, agreeing to postpone reforms consideration. The President disavowed tax legislation consideration as related to recession, then reversed himself warning of possible recession if we failed to accept his recommendations. The witnesses repudiated this threat, saying that acceptance of the President's recommendations could aid in bringing on recession. Some, the bravest, bluntest, agreed that the recommendations showed an appalling lack of knowledge of the industries involved. Generally, there was agreement that (1) high tax rates intensified the tax inequities involved; (2) the recommendations would result in a shift of present tax burden from lower to middle income groups. Some areas of disagreement were (1) disallowing the first 5 percent of itemized deductions for individual income tax computation; (2) taxing as ordinary income (instead of capital gains) (a) lump-sum pension distribution, (b) real estate gains, (c) stock options when exercised, (d) sale of timber; (3) change depletion allowance on mineral resources; (4) capital gain treatment of assets at time of death or gift (treating both as though a sale).

ADMINISTRATION CONFUSED

The contradictions, ignorance and/or misrepresentations by the President and his advisers will now undoubtedly result in further reversals, repudiations and new proposals, so that it is impossible to forecast with any certainty at this time, what the outcome will be. My prediction, most tentative, is that no tax changes will result this year but a strong chance of tax rate change next year, an election year. It is my hope that rate adjustment will be of the Baker-Herlong-Alger bill type, a several year transition bill tied to a balanced budget reducing individual rates from the present rates of 20 percent to 91 percent to 15 percent to 42 percent; corporation taxes 52 percent to 42 percent with more realistic depreciation rates. My ultimate goal is the flat percentage tax which would result in everyone paying the percent necessary to balance the budget and retire a percentage of the debt, or a rate of tax approximately 20 percent of income with reduction possible as Government spending decreases.

GOLD SQUEEZE

H.R. 4413, a bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, because of a transfer tax in it, came before the Ways and Means Committee this week. Since the Treasury (through the Banking and Currency Committee) proposes to demonitize silver, except for coinage, it is proposed that the transfer or transaction tax be repealed. While this 1934 Act is obsolete and undoubtedly should be repealed, the spectre of devaluation of our currency looms now in front of us. The Treasury now proposes that $1 bills, silver certificates, be retired and replaced by $1 Federal Reserve notes (compare a $1 and $5 bill), backed by gold. Here's the hitch—the silver certificate is worth the face value in precious metal (silver), the Federal Reserve note is worth only 25 percent in precious metal (gold), and the latter is not redeemable in gold as is the silver certificate in silver. Unquestionably, this is devaluation of our currency. The new 25 percent gold backing will require approximately $35 million per year additional gold be earmarked to add to the $11.7 billion undergirding our total currency. As this official gold reserve underpinning goes up our gold outflow continues, a sort of gold squeeze. At our current rate of outflow of $100 million per month, money devaluation (by reducing gold backing of currency) is less than 4 years away. In addition, the liquid liabilities of foreign nations totals now about $24 billion. In the last 2 years of 1961 and 1962 our gold outflow was $1,748 million ($1.7 billion) and the increase of foreign liquid liabilities was $4,640 million ($4.64 billion). Liquid liabilities are convertible into our gold, at the pleasure of foreign banks (a privilege not extended by our Government to United States citizens). As the world's banker any so-called run on the bank by foreign nations would wipe out the precious metal backing of our money. Then, only the good faith of our Government would undergird our money and there is always some question in the minds of people, at home and abroad, over our fiscal responsibility, in view of our debt and deficit financing policies. It is of some significance to note that free societies that have fallen always tampered with the value of their money. Is this to be our fate? What do you think?

GREED MAY COST US OUR FREEDOM

We, as a Nation, are spending ourselves into bankruptcy. If the people and Congress do not soon begin to exercise some self-discipline and reduce Federal spending, we may, indeed, witness the death of our Republic in our lifetime. The cause of our astronomical Federal spending spree is simple, everyone has his hand out. Attached to this week's newsletter is an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing some remarks I made in the House pointing out the danger we face.

KEEPING THE PEOPLE INFORMED

It is my firm belief that the survival of this Republic depends upon an alert and informed citizenry. To help in getting the facts to the people I make weekly television and radio reports. On television, channel 8, WFAA at 10:15 a.m. Sunday. (For April 7 only, the program will be presented at 1:15 p.m.) Check your favorite radio station in Dallas for the time of my radio report.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's Address Before the National Rocket Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the text of the Vice President's address before the National Rocket Club dinner, held March 22, 1963.

I think it points up the need for this country's continued efforts in the field of space and the need for a greater understanding between our scientific, civil, and legislative communities:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

In recent weeks, others of the Marine Corps and of the administration have been engaging in the pastime of hiking together. Your honor guest and I have refrained from such hazardous practices. Instead, we have indulged in the pastime of eating together.

I assure you it is the colonel—and not the calories—that brings me here tonight. Certainly, one of the most pleasant—although unofficial—duties of the office I hold has been the privilege over the past year of speaking at banquets honoring John Glenn. I am not sure whether he regards this as a pleasure, also. I understand the colonel has suggested that an extra tube of food be put aboard the capsule to the moon as a precaution against the possibility that when the first meal is being eaten there, the Vice President might show up to make a presentation.

Tonight, at this Goddard memorial dinner, it is appropriate for us to concern ourselves with the fundamental issue of our national space effort: the matter of public support for our public policy in this field.

This is an audience of experts—experts on the meaning and potential of the space age and on the needs of the space program of our country. Individually and collectively, you appreciate what a dynamic force the space program is for our economy. You know it means improved technology, greater security, a rising level of business activity, a higher standard of living for our people. Above all, you understand the essential fact that if the United States is to be a source of leadership for freedom tomorrow as it is today, we must succeed in our space efforts now during this decade.

In all realms of specialized knowledge, there is the ever-present danger of parochialism. Many of my scientist friends think that the most narrow and parochial men they know are engineers. Nearly all engineers I know think the same of scientists. But both scientists and engineers agree on one thing: nobody is more parochial and narrow and shortsighted than politicians.

I hardly need to say that some of my best friends are politicians. I can say of them that what you think of them, they in turn think of you. That is precisely the point to which my remarks tonight are addressed.

We are at a point in our national history in which the future capabilities of our country, and the future of our country's role as a leader of freedom, depend decisively upon both mutual understanding and mutual trust, as well as mutual comprehension, between the community of technology and the community of public affairs.

To say this, and to weigh the merits of each side, does not automatically lead to the conclusion that one side or the other is the right side. The concern of the space scientists for maintaining the schedule of space projects is right and proper—beyond dispute. The concerns of the political community for the implications of supporting those programs are no less right and proper—beyond dispute.

Between these viewpoints—each responsible, each prudent, each sincere and conscientious—there exists what we must frankly acknowledge to be a dollar gap. Those charged with responsibility for public policy know that the total space program has cost us about 20 cents a week per capita. They also know that in the near future the program may cost as much as 60 cents a week per capita. On the other hand, those in the technological community know that as a nation we are spending more on cigarettes, alcohol or recreation than we do on space. Last year alone, Americans bet more on horse races than on space.

Personally, I believe—as I am sure you believe—that we must be concerned with where America finishes in the space race; and I am not content to bet on America merely to place or show, and certainly not to finish out of the money altogether.

In either case, from either viewpoint, the present period of preoccupation with the dollar aspects of space is symptomatic of a failure to bridge the gap of understanding between the two communities which are jointly responsible for our national success or failure in mankind's age of space. In the long term, dollars alone will not be the decisive factor of either our success or our failure. We shall succeed only in proportion to our understanding of what is at stake and of how the stakes of space relate to those qualities of our society and our heritage to which no dollar value can be attached.

Of those qualities, none is more priceless than the fact that in our representative democracy public policy must be an expression of the public's will and support. The technological community which understands the stakes of space has a responsibility, therefore, for helping the public to understand those stakes. Unless and until this is done, the technological community cannot justifiably be impatient with those who are chosen to represent and express the public's own will.

Throughout our national history America has moved forward on waves of new invention. The individual inventors of 50 and 60 years ago have been uniquely honored as virtual national heroes in this century. They have become a part of our folklore—not to mention of our textbooks and motion pictures, as well. But we can only wonder what would have happened if Thomas Edison or Samuel Morse or Alexander Graham Bell had come to Congress and to the people and had asked for funds with which to invent an electric light bulb or a telegraph or a telephone.

We can imagine that the response would have been somewhat less than enthusiastic.

Today, the age of space is an infinitely more inventive age for America—and the world—than the era at the beginning of this century. Our national space program already has produced more than 3,000 new products and processes of private commercial potential. These achievements already are being put to work. Today's inventor is working on a much surer course, with a much greater certainty of what will be accomplished, than were the men who changed history by tinkering in their bicycle shops not so long ago.

Experimentation is still present in our efforts now but the factor of uncertainty has never been so small. We know what we are likely to do. We can be more certain of what our efforts are likely to produce. If there is a consistent pattern of error, it is error on the side of underestimation—not overestimation.

This simply means that we are able to tell the people more of where we are going and more of why we should go there. If we fail to do this, if we fail to utilize this greater capacity, then the responsibility for lack of public support will fall upon those who had the knowledge but failed to impart it to the people.

Along with the knowledge of our own capabilities and directions, we are also possessed of knowledge about the capabilities and directions of our principal competitors in the space adventure. I believe it is a part of our responsibility to keep the public better informed about the relative progress and capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let us look at a few basic comparisons:

1. Rocket power: Today the Soviets have in operation more powerful rockets than do we. We are trying to catch up. We have under development much more powerful rockets than the Soviets now have in operation. But we must assume that the Soviets are likewise working to improve the power of their own rockets.

2. Number of successes: At the end of 1962, the United States had successfully orbited 120 payloads in space. This means that we have put about four times as many payloads into earth orbit as have the Soviets. But at the same time the smaller number of Soviet payloads have weighed substantially more than the total of our larger number of payloads.

3. Ratio of failures: We can say with reasonable assurance that the Soviets have had a ratio of successes to failure comparable to our own. Our failures as well as our successes are known to the world. The Soviets have announced their successes and concealed their failures. But the basic fact is that in both nations the reliability of launching vehicles has shown a remarkable and comparable increase. For example, through 1960, the United States had about one failure for each success. In 1961, the ratio of successes was 3 to 1. In 1962, the ratio reached 5 to 1.

4. Space applications: In utilizing space technology, to improve mankind's lot on earth, the United States is well ahead. Weather satellites, communication satellites, navigation satellites, and many other activities are measures of this. In this realm, the Soviet Union—despite the potential of its technology—is not choosing to compete.

5. Scientific information: Comparisons between the nations as to which has obtained the most useful scientific data cannot be exact. Both nations have done remarkably well. The United States is sharing much of its information with the world scientific community. The Soviet is more selective and secretive.

6. Manned flights: Soviet cosmonauts have put in more flying time than our astronauts. Certainly the U.S.S.R. is ahead in the total knowledge obtained from manned space flight.

7. Guidance and control: Both countries have made rapid progress in this technology. Last year's dual near-rendezvous launch by the Soviets is the outstanding single accomplishment by either nation, thus far. However, the United States has shown remarkable progress particularly in the Mariner shot and the Schirra flight.

We can say that competency is growing in the space programs of each nation. What space gap exists is not due to a lack of ability or resources on our part but exists because we started later and do not have a surplus of time.

The year of 1962 was a rewarding year for the United States in its space efforts. We demonstrated convincingly through both showcase successes and supporting scientific progress our ability to translate sound decisions into significant accomplishments. A gratifying number of historic successes were achieved by our efforts last year.

In this year of 1963, our program will be passing through a year of concentrated development. Concentrated development does not always produce spectacular events, and it is possible that our efforts may be overshadowed by Soviet space shots. I urge, therefore, that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years.

The United States is, at all times, cognizant of the fact of competition in the development of space technology. At the same time, neither the pattern nor the purposes of our program are controlled by other than our own national purposes to develop the peaceful uses of outer space. We do what we do in space because of our national faith, not our national fears. We proceed on the program scheduled because of our confidence, not because we are seeking to copy or duplicate what others have done or may do.

In the long prospect of the space age, our national efforts to this point are to the future as a minute is to a millennium. We cannot measure our continuing advance by the calendar. We are compressing generations of progress into months or even weeks of time.

This very speed at which the U.S. effort is moving makes it imperative that we not form tomorrow's goals on yesterday's thinking. It is also imperative that we not set our purposes by the narrow horizons of a dollar debate.

There would be no reason for us to be concerned with space at all except for the clear and compelling implications of space to those values of our system and our society for which no price is too great. Freedom is a sturdy plant, but it cannot grow and flower on this earth if the universe which envelops us is poisoned and contaminated by tyranny.

If we are to be successful in freedom's cause, we must, as I have said, concern ourselves with bridging the gap between space science and political science. Nowhere else has science served freedom as nobly and abundantly as under our system. Likewise, nowhere else has the political system supported scientific inquiry and achievement more effectively or more understandingly. Our achievements of the past 5 years dramatically demonstrate both of these points.

Americans now are able to be infinitely more confident about the future than in the first anxious days after Sputnik I in 1957. We can say now that on our present course there is no danger of a default by our Nation in space. We can also say with equal confidence that there is a growing prospect of decisive success for our free society in the competition to preserve the realms of space for the peaceful benefits or mankind in this century.

In a day when machines can talk to each other and work with each other, it is neither too much to ask—nor too much to hope—that responsible men of the technological comunity and the political community can and will find their way to mutual understanding to assure our greater success in achieving the goals essential for our freedom.

Award to Constantine N. Kangles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago recently, a group of distinguished Americans received the Good American Award from the Chicago Committee of One Hundred, a civic organization devoted to the promotion of better human relations. The award is conferred on those "who champion the cause of equal human relations and who practice the basic principles of American democracy without expecting recognition or reward," according to Ernest R. Rather, president of the Chicago Committee of One Hundred.

There is one recipient of this award, Constantine N. Kangles, to whom I should like to bring special attention. I do this because the very scope of his activities and the magnitude of his efforts have brightened the lives of many individuals, directly and indirectly.

Constantine Kangles is a Chicago attorney and a master in chancery of the Superior Court of Cook County, Ill. I think that he is a very remarkable man. In our age of automation and complexity which is still suffering from some barbaric customs he is in the tradition of the renaissance man. He is both contemplative and active. His vocation as a practitioner of the science of the law has not detracted from his love of literature and the fine arts. But what distinguishes him, above all other things, is his devotion to his fellow man. Constantine Kangles is representative of other Americans like him; who, through our history, have fought to preserve and protect our system of law and justice; our institutions of religious expression, culture and education; our thriving commerce and industry; and, above all, the basic human rights of equality of opportunity for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

This devotion to human rights is probably the most important activity in which all of us can engage. Representing a district such as mine, in which we are trying to break down the last vestiges of discrimination; and as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa; I know how vital it is that we bring full rights of citizenship to all Americans as speedily as possible, not only because it is right and just, but because it is necessary if we are to continue to be the leader of the free world and if we are to hold the respect of Afro-Asian nations to whom second-class citizenship in America is most repulsive.

Constantine Kangles, in every phase of his life, has striven to bring us closer to our American ideal. Although he is of Greek descent and has been active in Hellenic organizations, the Justice for Cyprus Committee and the Greek Orthodox Welfare Foundation, much of his work as an individual and as an attorney has been directed toward improving the conditions in Latin America. Before President Kennedy had taken office and brought to our attention the vast problems of our sister republics, Kangles had been directly working to solve many of these problems and has recently been instrumental in the release of Americans and others imprisoned in Cuba, and in handling many matters involving Latin Americans seeking political asylum.

In the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, where he resides and practices most of the time, Mr. Kangles has constantly worked to open up the opportunities for employment for individuals who have been discriminated against for prejudicial reasons. He was an articulate proponent of the first fair employment practices bill to be passed into law in 1961.

As I indicated before, Constantine Kangles bears resemblance to the Renaissance man, or to Jefferson and Franklin, to whom we Americans can proudly refer. His activities have not been solely directed toward seeking equality but also toward creating the type of atmosphere in which life is robust, healthy, and harmonious. And so, much of his effort has been in behalf of educational institutions—North Park College, Loyola University, Chicago, the Chicago-Kent College of Law and Clark University to name the few in which he is most active. He was also a cochairman of the Chicago Committee for the Harry S. Truman Library and is a member of the Bishop Sheil Foundation.

Last year he was appointed by President Kennedy as a member-at-large of the National Advisory Council to the Small Business Administration established to evaluate the effectiveness of Government programs.

I could go on to speak of his activities in Masonic organizations on behalf of children and the crippled. Or of his interest in the strength of our system of government by his participation in the affairs of the Democratic Party.

Let me conclude, however, in speaking of Mr. Kangles on the occasion of his receiving the Good American Award, that his interests and his energies have pervaded many of our most worthwhile activities, and his dedication to his fellow human beings should stand as an inspiration to those who have been associated with him, to those who have benefitted from his hard work, to those who read this tribute, and to us as we try to do our best in insuring peace, prosperity, and good health for our Nation, and indeed, for all mankind.

A $1,000 Reward Offered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, here is a good chance for someone among our foreign aid spenders to make himself $1,000 in cold cash, provided he can put his finger on the very words in our Federal Constitution specifically authorizing this gigantic, backbreaking, nation-ruining, inflationary, ineffective foreign aid adventure that has already cost our country $100 billion since its inception. I now make this cash offer to President Kennedy, Chief Justice Warren, Secretary of State Rusk, or any Member of Congress who will point out to me the constitutional words giving this kind of legal authority to any officials whatever in our government of the people.

I have always voted against every single dime of this unconstitutional outpouring of the resources of our people. And so I now challenge all those who have so faithfully supported it from year to year to show me, though I do not hail from Missouri, whereby they have derived their just power from the consent of the governed so as to have enabled them to take a total of $555 from each man, woman, and child in America, over the years, and broadcast that bounty throughout the world, frequently among communistic countries.

BUT DEAN RUSK SAYS

The latest statement from Secretary Rusk about this piece of outlawry says that any failure to keep up this foreign aid program right now might cause us to lose Vietnam. Now when did we ever have Vietnam? Where is the official sanction for making Vietnam a state or territory of the United States? And if we do lose that which we do not have, how could it possibly matter? Are those jungles in southeast Asia really necessary to our survival? Do they furnish additional war potential to the Kremlin? Do they have atomic powered submarines or long-range missiles? Is Vietnam such a suitable locale in which the sons of American parents may die that we must continue to pour our blood and money into that distant territory thousands of miles from our shores? Frankly, we all know the Vietnamese would not recognize any democracy, or care about it, if they should meet it out on the sweet highway to paradise.

We may indeed lose Vietnam. But truthfully we have already lost Vietnam. And yet we know we never did have it in the first place, if we just tell the simple truth about the whole matter.

WHAT A JOKE

You may recall that recently someone in our Government accused the ruling authority down in Brazil of being soft on communism, or words to that effect. And immediately the Brazilians jumped up and said, "If you are going to insult us in that manner, we will just stop taking all your foreign aid." And then we calmed down considerably and said, "Now do not get ruffled, just be good boys and keep on taking our aid and another shipment will soon be on the way." What a joke when you have to apologize for telling the blunt truth and when you even have to beg some foreign nation to take your handouts.

And then also what a joke it is whenever some little, struggling county or city down in Kentucky, Tennessee, or Georgia could not come to Washington on its hands and knees and get enough money to build a small bridge or a dam from these very "Constitution disregarding" authorities who would yet hasten to pour out millions of your cash dollars before sunrise tomorrow to help keep India "neutral." Why not let India be unneutral? She will eventually learn all about communism regardless of our pattern of behavior. In fact, she has already learned, even before the recent ides of March, has she not?

Mr. Speaker, I will never be very much of a governmental economizer here in Congress until and unless we see fit to prefer an American bridge or a Kentucky dam over and above the building of an airfield over yonder in Afghanistan.

And did you know—yes, of course, you must know—that we have given several billions of dollars to foreign powers to help reduce their national debts and balance their budgets? And yet in order to do this we had to increase our own national debt and unbalance our own budget. Ours is the largest national debt on earth. It is even larger than the combined debt of all those receiving our foreign aid. But we just go blithely and bounteously along on our merry way toward national and fiscal destruction. Will I vote this week to add on the increased $500 million for accelerated public works? Of course, I will. My simple motto declares, "Millions for the near east we call eastern Kentucky and not one additional dime for the near east we might call East Germany." Maybe you really did not know we had already spent several millions on communist East Germany. But it is true. Just look at the dismal record and you will see SILER has not infringed on the Ninth Commandment against false witnessing.

Mr. Speaker, you well know that Rome lasted only as long as there were real Romans interested in Rome. Now it is equally true, I believe, that America will only last as long as there are real Americans interested in America.

Well, I will be hanging around with my checkbook ready to give $1,000 to anyone who will show me some rhetoric in the Federal Constitution about like these words: "And shall have power to make appropriations for the use and benefit of other foreign nations." My address here in Washington is 209 House Office Building and I will be ready, willing, and able if you will only "point out them words."

Is It Fact or Fancy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my "Washington Report" of March 29, 1963, together with the attached reprint from the Civic Center Sun of Los Angeles, Calif., August 31, 1951.

The articles follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

This report could well be entitled "Is It Fact or Fancy?" My recent report on Exercise Water Moccasin III produced a torrent of inquiries, and some condemnation, from people who like to play games. I have no objection to training some of the officers of our allies. I do not consider that Communist Indonesia is an ally, but rather a member within the Communist orbit whose attacks are leveled against our allies, Great Britain and Holland. Liberia is not a NATO ally, but is a member of the U.N. as is Indonesia. Therefore, the Operation Water Moccasin III took on somewhat the nature of a United Nations operation.

I was fully aware that similar operations had been conducted in this country over a long period of time, but the original plan for Water Moccasin II was much greater than was actually carried out. An Army release dated January 14, 1963, stated that "between 2,500 and 3,000 men will participate." Subsequent releases reduced the figure to 1,000 and the final Army release indicated something under 600 participants, scattered over 1½ million acres of land.

I am unalterably opposed to subjecting the civilian population to massive psychological, counterinsurgency warfare. I objected to the military secrecy surrounding the operation, and I recalled a similar operation in California in the summer of 1951, when the "U.N. Military Government" took over Culver City and arrested the mayor and established martial law. Included as a part of this report is an additional reprint covering the Culver City operation and the "United Nations Forces Military Government Proclamation No. 1" which is reprinted in full, and which should be read by all patriotic Americans.

In May of this year, there will be a similar operation in the State of Washington entitled "Coulee Crest." This operation will be started by a special forces unit which is now in the area. In a picture and interview with four members of the special forces unit, which appeared in the Wenatchee, (Wash.) Daily World, of March 12, 1963, it is interesting to note that these men wear the type berets such as those worn in the Katanga takeover by the U.N. forces. From now on, however, and during the maneuvers, these men will be wearing civilian clothes. They will be underground agents for the "red army" which will try to gain control of Wenatchee, Wash., from the "blue army." This special underground unit will call on civilians to hide them and to transport them to points of demolition, and will urge that they not be turned over to the Army.

My question is, how will a resident know whether the man knocking at the door is a part of the maneuver or whether he is a robber, seeking to gain admission to the home, or actually a foreign spy requesting transportation to a demolition site such as a bridge or a hydroelectric power plant? It is simply more psychological warfare practiced on the American civilian population.

During a similar action in Lampasas, Tex., on April 3, 1952, we are informed on excellent authority that greenclad aggressor troops took over the city, a ranching town of 5,000 people, closed churches, bullied teachers and set up concentration camps. Businessmen were arrested; brief one-sided trials, minus habeas corpus, were conducted; and guards were posted in school classrooms. An AP dispatch for April 3 said in part:

"But the staged action almost became actual drama when one student and two troopers forgot it was only makebelieve. 'Ain't nobody going to make me get up,' cried John Snell, 17, his face beef red. One of the paratroopers shoved the butt of his rifle within inches of Snell's face and snarled, 'You want this butt placed in your teeth? Get up.'"

There can be only two reasons for this type of operation, both of them bad. The first is that our defenses are weak because of the abandonment of our first-strike capabilities, which are the only war deterrent we have had, plus the fact that we are dismantling our missile bases around the world and programing a unilateral disarmament in general, which by 1970 will place us at the absolute mercy of Russia.

The second is that we are probing the resistance of the American people to an internal takeover, fantastic as that may seem, although the present tendency is to deliver this country into the tender hands of the U.N. peacekeeping army. I recall that Abraham Lincoln said, "If this Nation is ever destroyed, it will be from within, not from without."

A Mock Military Government Takeover or Rehearsal for the Real Thing in the United States?

The Army Military Government Reserve units "occupied" nine small cities around Los Angeles in July 1951. The "guinea pig" village taken over sometime prior to these nine was the fashionable winter resort of Palm Springs.

The press in Palm Springs, referring to these military government summer maneuvers for the reservists, said that the action was thought to be one of the first of its kind in the country.

This first-of-its-kind exercise, conducted by an authority whose title has as alien a ring as ever was heard in a republic; namely, military government, was carried on one weekend in September 1950.

COINCIDENCE?

Is it coincidence that this military government resembles the recent legislation for universal military training?

The date of September 1950 places these military government maneuvers 9 months before the passage of the present universal military training legislation whose hidden provisions make possible the military dictatorship of the United States.

SLICK TRICK? TRIAL BALLOON?

Was the military so sure of its dictatorial powers that it pushed the dateline forward by 9 months in a tryout, under the guise of maneuvers, which could show how somnolent or submissive the American public was?

The press reports indicated that during the proceedings in Palm Springs the civilian activities were taken over, the mayor and city manager jailed, and all persons in the town over 16 were to be registered for "labor uses."

This act of regimenting civilians for labor service has its counterpart in the universal military training bill.

Senate bill 1 (unamended) called for all citizens to be trained for civilian as well as military service so that there might be a ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

Provisions such as these plainly would make possible permanent labor service (regimentation) for civilians in the United States, not in some faroff Liliput.

SOOTHING SYRUP

Of course, these military government takeovers are presumably for action in some distant lands. To assure the nervous Nellies that it could never happen here, the Culver City press, during the takeover of that area, carried a single line stating that such action would not operate in the United States.

Phooey.

A UNITED NATIONS FORCE

At Palm Springs maneuvers in 1950 the Stars and Stripes were accompanied by a newly-designed flag intended for use of the unit, according to report.

This new flag was blue, not unlike the United Nations flag, and had a center design. Only, not the world with a wreath around it.

However by July 1951 the military government took over the Huntington Park area boldly in the name of the "United Nations Forces Military Government of Agressi." Agressi is the name of a mythical state contrived by these "summer project" pranksters.

Where does fun end and military dictatorship take over? When the emergency arises?

We recall that world government advocates continually refer to "the rule of law," "world law," regulation "by law." What law? Universal military law?

We likewise remember that world government advocates tell us that the international system will operate directly upon the individual wherever he is.

Do you like to be operated upon directly by that international debating society known as the U.N. which conducted its continuing conversations at Lake Success while our boys died at the 38th parallel in Korea?

WHAT CONCLUSION?

What attitude are we, the everyday God-fearing Americans who love our Republic, to assume toward a hitherto unheard of military government in the United States?

Has not the day come when we are to stand up and be counted for our country? Are we afraid?

The scripture says, "Be ye strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak: for your work shall be rewarded" (II Chronicles 15: 7).

UNITED NATIONS FORCE OR FARCE?

HUNTINGTON PARK.—Military government occupancy of Huntington Park last week aroused indignation from many responsible sources and many local people expressed misgivings over such a development. All concerned were outspoken regarding the Bulletin's coverage of the so-called occupation and it is believed that this newspaper was the only one, at least locally, to feature the seizure proclamation.

Huntington Park, South Gate, Los Angeles, Eagle Rock, and Hollywood guardians of freedom obtained hundreds of extra copies of the Bulletin and it is known that officials in Washington, D.C., have been deluged with telegrams and letters protesting the invasion.

It has been stated that the entire program of occupancy of Huntington Park, South Gate, Culver City, Long Beach, Torrance, Hawthorne, Compton, Redondo Beach, and other cities was planned at an Army officers' meeting at which prominent civilian law enforcers were present.

The original idea, it is believed, was for the maneuver to be conducted without previous or advance warning. Since it was impossible to keep the idea secret, reports state, it was decided to inform the public of this.

Observers have pointed out that military men are being taken into governmental departments with alarming rapidity and many locals believe seizure to be a forerunner of events to come unless immediate precautions are taken.

There is a definite indication that Huntington Park city officials and those of other cities will not permit a repetition of this maneuver this year, next year, or otherwise unless circumstances beyond their control compel them to do so.

They agree that if it was purely a tactical maneuver for the education of Army personnel it has merit, but if it is the beginning of any other procedure it is dangerous.

In the meantime the Bulletin will watch the picture closely to see if the seizure is, as many irate readers believe, the Army's lesson to civilians.

UNITED NATIONS FORCES MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF AGRESSI

Proclamation No. 1

To the People of Agressi:

Whereas in prosecuting the war against Agressi, it has become necessary for the armed forces of the United Nations under my command, to occupy this town, adjacent areas, and other portions of Agressi, and

Whereas it is the policy of the armed forces of the United Nations not to make war upon the civilian inhabitants of the occupied territory but to protect them in the peaceful exercise of their legitimate pursuits, insofar as the exigencies of war and their own behavior will permit, and

Whereas in order to preserve law and order and to provide for the safety and welfare both of the forces under my command and of yourselves, it is necessary to establish military government in the occupied territory: Now, therefore,

I, Jones Smithman, general, U.S. Army, commanding U.S. Forces Oceania, and Military Governor of Agressi, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the United Nations Security Council, do hereby proclaim as follows:

I

All powers of government and jurisdiction in the occupied territory and over the inhabitants thereof, and final administrative responsibility are vested in me as Commanding General of the Forces of Occupation and as Military Governor of United Nations Forces, Military Government of Agressi is hereby established to exercise these powers under my direction.

II

All persons in the occupied territory will obey promptly all orders given by me or under my authority and must not commit any act hostile to the forces under my command or helpful to the Agressi forces; must not commit acts of violence or acts which may disturb public order in any way.

III

Your existing customs, religious beliefs and property rights will be fully respected and your existing laws will remain in force and effect except insofar as it may be necessary for me in the exercise of my powers and duties to change them by proclamation or order issued by me or under my direction.

IV

All Agressi civil and criminal courts and all universities, schools and educational establishments will be closed until further order of United Nations Forces Military Governor of Agressi.

V

All administrative and police officials of towns, cities, counties and States and all other Government and municipal functionaries and employees, and all officers and employees of State, municipal or other public services, except such officials and political leaders as are removed by, or under my direction, are required to continue in the performance of their duties subject to my direction or the direction of such of the officers of the armed forces of the United Nations as may be deputed for the purpose.

VI

So long as you remain peaceable and comply with the orders of the forces of occupation, you will be subject to no greater interference than is made necessary by war conditions, and may go about your normal vocations without fear.

VII

Further proclamation, orders and regulations will be issued by me or under my authority from time to time. They will state what is further required of you, and what you are forbidden to do, and will be displayed in courthouses, city halls, or other public places.

VIII

In case of conflict or ambiguity between the English text of his proclamation or any other proclamation, order, or regulation issued under my authority, and any translations thereof, the English text is to prevail.

JONES SMITHMAN,
Commanding United Nations Forces Oceania, General, United States Army, Military Governor of Agressi.

The Black Watch To Be at Quincy, Mass., Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives the following letter which I have received from the office of the Canadian Consulate General signed by the Honorable S. D. Hemsley.

CANADIAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
BOSTON, MASS.,
January 15, 1963.

Mr. JAMES A. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: I am sure that you will be glad to know that agreement has been reached at last for a marching detachment and band of the 3d Battalion, the Black Watch (Royal Highland Regiment) of Canada to be present at the Memorial Day services to be held on May 30 of this year in Quincy.

Those in Quincy who are concerned with this operation have been advised of this decision and they are, I understand, now working out arrangements with the commanding officer in Montreal.

I can only add how glad I am that the unit will be coming down, for I am sure that many new friendships—stemming from the old valuable associations—will result from it.

With my kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

S. D. HEMSLEY,
Consul General.

The above information has been received in a very enthusiastic way not only by the citizens of my congressional district but throughout the entire New England area.

The purpose is to honor the Americans who served with the 236th Battalion, MacLean Kilties of America, during World War I, from the Greater Boston area, under the command of Lt. Col. Percy Guthrie. Permission was granted by the United States for Lieutenant Colonel Guthrie to come from Canada and recruit men from the Greater Boston area, for the 236th Battalion, known as the MacLean Kilties of America.

Invitations were sent in November 1961, by Sfc. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiter in Quincy, at the request of the city of Quincy, the Quincy Veterans Council, and the Royal Canadian Legion to possibly obtain a unit from the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) of Canada, to participate in the Veterans Day parade, November 11, 1962, in honor of those Americans who served in the MacLean Kilties, many of whom were transferred into the Royal Black Watch upon their arrival overseas, during World War I. However, they notified Sergeant Johnston, that they were laying away their old colors on that day, and were unable to accept the invitation. However, an invitation was extended to Sergeant Johnston and Sgt. George J. Matta to be the guest of the 3d Battalion, stationed at Montreal, Canada, when the regiment received their new colors on the 8th of June 1962. Arrangements were made by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, 11th Congressional District, to assure every assistance possible during their visit.

Due to the great disappointment of all concerned, Sergeant Johnston was again asked to try to obtain the same Black Watch unit for the Memorial Day parade and exercises, to be held in the city of Quincy on May 30, 1963. This time, with the assistance of the Canadian Consulate General, Mr. S. D. Hemsley, and by the Deputy Minister for External Affairs from Ottawa, Canada, Sergeant Johnston was notified by Mr. Hemsley on January 9, 1963, that the Canadian Government has accepted the invitation and a contingent from the 3d Battalion, Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.), to include 70 men of all ranks, would handle the commitment for the Memorial Day parade. Also the keen interest of the visiting unit and the enthusiasm here in the city of Quincy and the

Greater Boston area is certainly a sign of good will. This was the result of a continuous effort which lasted over a year.

A committee has been formed to welcome the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) on the evening of May 29, 1963, by having a military ball, which is to be held at the Massachusetts National Guard Armory, 1000 Hancock Street, Quincy, Mass., starting at 8 p.m. This will include many Federal, State, and local dignitaries.

On Memorial Day 1963, a preparade ceremony will be held in front of city hall in Quincy, starting at 9 a.m. This will include playing of both national anthems and raising of both national colors, also the inspection of the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) and the U.S. Army honor guard. Wreaths will be laid in the tomb of the second and sixth Presidents of the United States, John Adams and John Quincy Adams. Upon completion of the short ceremony, both units will proceed to School Street, Quincy, the starting point for the main parade. The parade will proceed to the Mount Wollaston Cemetery for the main Memorial Day exercises.

Arrangements have been made to billet the unit at the President City Motel, 845 Hancock Street, Quincy, and messed at a local U.S. Army installation.

The advanced party is scheduled to arrive 8 hours prior to main unit. A welcome committee will be present. When information is received as to approximate time and place of arrival the proper authorities will be notified.

It is anticipated due to the large population of Canadians residing in the Greater Boston area a large turnout can be expected.

ASSISTANCE

Decorations for the National Guard armory and Memorial Day parade, will be arranged by Mr. Richard Koch, park and recreation division, city of Quincy.

Billeting and messing arranged by the U.S. Army, recruiting station, Quincy.

Publicity: U.S. Army recruiting main station, army base, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Gertrude Whitney, chairman, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. John Harding, cochairman, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant of arms, Quincy Veterans Council; Mr. Ron Redquest, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. Percy N. Lane, reporter, Quincy Patriot Ledger; Mr. Henry Bosworth, reporter, Herald-Traveler, Boston, Mass.; and Mr. Herb Fontaine, announcer, radio station WJDA, Quincy, Mass.

Master of ceremonies, Mr. James Asher, of radio station WJDA, Quincy, Mass.

Commander Mr. Francis S. MacKenzie, of the Quincy Veterans Council, ex officio all committees.

Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) committee: past commander, Veterans Council, Mr. David Alexander, chairman; Sfc. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiting, cochairman; M. Sgt. George J. Matta, U. S. Army recruiting, cochairman; past commander, American Legion Post No. 95, Quincy, Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant at arms; Mrs. Grace M. Blasi, deputy sheriff of Norfolk County, secretary; Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, director of music; and Mr. Alec Smith, city of Quincy auditor.

Canadian: Comdr. James Fraser, Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command; Past Comdr. Dave Boucher; Mr. John Harding, Royal Canadian Legion, publicity; Mr. John Tompson, Royal Canadian Legion; Mrs. Gertrude Whitney, secretary; Alfred Walker, former 236th Battalion; Kent Brydle, treasurer and ticket chairman; and Douglas Cummings, former 236th Battalion.

Main Memorial Day parade committee: Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, Quincy Veterans Council; Past Comdr. Charles N. Ross, Quincy Veterans Council, chairman; Sgt. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiting, Quincy, cochairman; Arthur I. Senter, and John Wipfler.

Aides to the distinguished guests, unknown at this time.

Invited dignitaries and guests for military ball, tentative list: President John F. Kennedy, Congressman James A. Burke, Governor of Massachusetts Endicott Peabody, Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, S. D. Hemsley, Canadian Consulate General of Boston, Mass., Quincy City Council, Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, Quincy Veterans Council, Comdr. James Fraser, Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command, clergy, military representatives, living members of the 236th Battalion and Royal Black Watch, and Gold Star Mothers.

Mr. Speaker, in a few years the famous Black Watch will be 250 years old. That is a long time to sustain a reputation of distinction; but that is what the soldiers of the Black Watch have done. Famous for their outstanding military performance, their honor, bravery, and devotion, as soldiers they have ever been considered exemplary. Long since a regiment, the Black Watch originated in 1725, formed from a group of four companies of Scotch Highlanders for the purpose of preserving order in the area.

It is interesting that from the first the Black Watch was a distinctive group. The companies were composed of men of good family, who were eager to bear arms and to wear the Highland dress, both of which practices had been forbidden by law since the Scotch uprising against the English in 1715. The name Black Watch originated partly from the dark hues of the Highland tartan of which their kilts were made. To this day the particular dark blue and green plaid is a favorite and bears the name of the regiment. Their bright scarlet jackets are the British red.

The British, quick to perceive the superior character of these independent Highland companies, added four more, forming them into a regiment. In 1739 the Black Watch became a part of the regular British Army.

From the beginning the Black Watch was noted for its shining example of loyalty, courage, and endurance. It has maintained that reputation throughout its brilliant history. A mere listing of the battle honors won by this regiment fills a closely printed page. They date from 1759, "Guadaloupe," and during World War I were so numerous that a selection had to be made to emblazon them on the King's or Regimental Colors. Among them is one for "North America," for their achievements during the French and Indian Wars.

The Black Watch fought with distinction in numerous campaigns in India, in the Indies, in France against Napoleon—notably at Waterloo—and in the Crimea. They fought in South Africa before and in the 1850's, and again in the Boer War in 1899–1902. They gained 69 battle honors in World War I. During World War II the itinerary of the 6th Battalion alone starts at Perth and, covering various parts of England, includes Dunkirk—the very name is now synonymous with heroism—France, Belgium, and back to the Isle of Wight, to defend England, then on to north Africa, Egypt, Italy, and Greece.

The 6th Battalion was but one of those of the Black Watch which took part in almost every theater and nearly every principal campaign of World War II. Besides the early days in Belgium and France, there were Somaliland, Crete, the defense of Tobruk, in the Middle East, Gibraltar, the conquest of north Africa from El Alamein to Tripoli, the capture of Sicily and the Italian campaigns, back to the fierce struggle at Normandy, the crossing of the Rhine and on to the German capitulation. In the Far East, Burma and Malaya are some of the milestones passed by units of the Black Watch in the long trek to victory over all the King's enemies.

The fine reputation of the Black Watch has been enhanced in every war that the British have fought since 1725. They have earned the highest praise for unstinted good work, for gallantry. Their untarnished record of high achievement has been attributed to the continuous spirit of trust and good fellowship which has united all ranks of the regiment since its earliest days. In an officer's "History of the Black Watch" he comments that history shows that it was this spirit which inspired the great victories and sustained the heroes and filled the hearts of those who gave their lives in the service of their King, their country, and their regiment.

Unconstitutional Usurpation of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD the text of a speech made by my good friend and our colleague, the gentleman from California, JAMES UTT. I believe every Member of Congress should make it a point to seriously study Mr. UTT's views in connection with his Liberty Amendment which would return the power of government to the people and reinstitute the constitutional limited government envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Briefly, the Liberty Amendment would, first, take Federal Government out of all activities except those specified in the Constitution; second, keep the Government from reentering such activity through later agreements, laws, edicts, or treaties; third, liquidate Government-in-business assets, properties, and facilities within 3 years; and fourth, at the end of 3 years repeal Federal personal income taxes.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that the basic struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. Which of these two philosophies will prevail will determine if your children will live in a free country with unlimited opportunities for all, or as subjects in a federally controlled dictatorship. For added emphasis to the very fine talk by Congressman UTT, I would like to emphasize some major points he has made.

We ought to recall George Washington's warning that, if government "is not controlled, it will destroy you."

The Federal doctrine of preempting authority over a field—that is, subversive activities—usurps State prerogatives. The doctrine can carry into every field of activity until there is no State. Utt recalled a plan some years ago which envisioned the demise of States into nine territories, each run by three bureaucrats.

Bureaucracy is the invisible government which really governs the country. There are more administrative laws on the books than there are statutory laws passed by Congress.

These bureaus control 20 percent of America's industrial capacity, compete on a tax-free basis, and cost taxpayers $20 billion a year in subsidies.

After defining the understood restrictions on Federal Government written into the 9th and 10th Amendments—personal and States' rights—Mr. Utt pinpointed events which inspired the Liberty Amendment:

Attorney General Francis Biddle—1941–45 under F.D.R.—justified Justice Department intervention in a Chicago stockholders' fight by claiming "the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution."

Utt said the first part of the Liberty Amendment was to return to the principle that the Government can do only what is provided by the Constitution.

The second and third parts are to protect against time and inaction eroding the bill's intent.

The fourth part was written in 1957 when it was shown that the reduction in Government spending would offset the $45 billion personal income tax revenue.

Congressman Utt's speech in full follows:

Remarks of Hon. James B. Utt, of California

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege and honor to be invited to address this meeting. Especially am I honored by the very kind invitation of my distinguished colleague and outstanding citizen of your great State, the Honorable Elmer Hoffman, for whom I have a high regard and deep affection.

The subject matter of my talk is somewhat controversial, and I know there are many here today who disagree with my position. To them may I say that I respect the sincerity of their convictions and hope that I may be able to shed some convincing light upon a grossly misunderstood subject. I only ask that the same respect for my sincerity be granted to me in return.

I have never demanded that people conform to my political philosophy, but, having been born an American, and expecting to die as an American, and in between the dignity of birth and the glory of death, I intend to live my life as an American. I have always adhered to the moral absolute that if something is right it is right, though all men think that it is wrong, and if something is wrong it is wrong, though all men believe it to be right.

Your most distinguished citizen, Abraham Lincoln, expressed that moral absolute in this manner: "If I am right, history will vindicate me, and if I am wrong, all of the angels in Heaven cannot justify me." And surely Abraham Lincoln had far more difficult decisions to make than any of us will ever be called upon to decide. But in these days of rapid communication, mass media, economic and political pressure groups, many of these decisions are difficult.

A hundred years ago, a great Civil War was being fought to test whether a nation conceived in liberty could long endure. Today, we are engaged in another civil war testing the same premise. It is not a hot war, but a cold war, which can be just as deadly. During that hundred years, the poles of the compass have swung in a 180° arc. At that time it was a question of whether or not the sovereignty of a State or a group of States transcended the sovereignty of the Union. That conflict was resolved in favor of the Union. The conflict today is whether or not the sovereignty of the Union transcends the sovereignty of the States which created the Union. That conflict has yet to be resolved.

Our Founding Fathers were well aware that man's eternal enemy was government, whether that government was a dictatorship, a benevolent monarchy, a democracy, or a republic. Usurpation of power is the natural trend of every government. George Washington expressed it in these words: "Government is like a fire, which, if it is properly controlled, will light your homes and cook your food and run your factories, but if it is not controlled, it will destroy you."

Based on this concept, the Government of the United States was founded upon a Constitution of delegated powers with checks and balances of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Beyond these three checks and balances against usurpation of power, the rights of the sovereign States were well defined in the 10th amendment, which reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There were no inherent powers derived from the Constitution to the Federal Government. The powers were specific, enumerated, and limited. Government is not wisdom, it is not benevolent, it is plain brute force.

Washington, in his farewell address, said: "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way in which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use itself can at any time yield."

The Federal Government has ignored many of the provisions of the Constitution, while the sovereign States have condoned this usurpation of power, not realizing that these invasions of State sovereignty would lead to the ultimate subjugation of the States. On this I will have more to say later. Suffice for the moment to say that the liberty amendment is the vehicle which will return to the States their rightful possession of power.

There is only one basic issue, national and international, and that is socialism versus capitalism. They are incompatible, they cannot coexist, and only one system can or will survive the current conflict.

The graduated income tax, as provided in the 16th amendment, is the most deadly weapon in the arsenal of socialism. Its genesis rests firmly in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, two men dedicated to the destruction of capitalism. Capitalism is the American way of life, and let's quit apologizing for it. Why should we have a guilt complex over the system which in a century and a half brought this Nation from a weak and unimpressive beginning to the highest plateau of economic production, military strength, and the highest standard of living known to man?

America as a nation seems to have something of a guilt complex over our success, and feels that we are obligated to scatter our substance all over the world. This theory flies in the face of the parable of the talents, and violates the admonition that we should not cast our pearls before swine, "lest they turn again and rend you."

I should like to address a few remarks to the doctrine of preemption. This important subject attains its highest magnitude as it relates to the several States, and my remarks are especially directed to State legislators who may be present.

It is a doctrine that has too long been endured by the States. It reached its height in an opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Steve Nelson. Nelson had been convicted under the anti-Communist laws of the State of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court held that the antisubversive laws of Pennsylvania or any other State had been nullified by the passage of the Smith Act, a Federal law in the field of antisubversive activities. There was no question as to the fact of Nelson's guilt, but the Supreme Court opinion held that no one could be prosecuted under State antisubversion laws, as Congress had preempted the field of antisubversion.

California had convicted the now-famous "Hollywood ten" for violation of our State antisyndicalism laws which had been on our State statute books for more than half a century. These 10 convicted Communists were released because of the Supreme Court decision.

In the Smith Act, there was not one paragraph, not one line, not one word, to indicate that Congress intended to preempt the field of antisubversion to the exclusion of the States. The Supreme Court decision, therefore, was a usurpation of legislative power by the judicial branch of our Government, and should not be tolerated.

For 5 years, Congress has been attempting to pass legislation to the effect that, if any Federal law did not specifically state that it was the intent of Congress to preempt any field of legislation, that field was not preempted. The Senate has refused to go along with the House on two separate occasions. I bring this to your attention to show to you what can and may happen in any other field of State legislation, especially in the field of taxation, which surely is one of the attributes of State sovereignty.

The insatiable demand for Federal revenue, not only to run the constitutional governmental processes, but to make grants to the States so that the Federal Government can extend its control over the States, may very well cause the Supreme Court to rule that Congress has preempted the field of income taxes, next the gift tax, next the estate or inheritance tax, and even sales and excise taxes. This would deprive the States of most of their sources of revenue to provide the necessary State government, the State school systems, and other services. The States will then have to turn to Uncle Sam for financial assistance to administer State programs in accordance with Federal standards.

Federal grants to the States are like a blood transfusion in which you draw the blood from the right arm and transfuse it into the left arm, losing at least 15 percent in the transfer.

Examples of this Federal control are evident on every hand. The State of California could administer its welfare programs for half of the sum which it is now spending if our legislature were free to set up its own standards, but they have been warned by Federal administrators that if they do not conform to Federal standards, they can get no more money from the Federal Government.

Just last week, the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a far-reaching decision requiring that State criminal proceedings conform to Federal standards, and opening up purely State matters to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

May I direct your attention to the fact that the Federal Government has strayed from constitutional provisions and prohibitions of power in many other fields. Article I, section 8, paragraph 17 of the Constitution reads as follows:

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;"

The Federal Government has no right to acquire land in any State without the consent of the legislature of that State, and even then it must be acquired by purchase. The price is not important. As an example, the Federal Government acquired the San Francisco Presidio with the consent of our legislature for the sum of $1. This property happens to be worth over $300 million today, but at least the acquisition fell within the constitutional provisions.

It was not until the admission of the State of Ohio that the Federal Government began to withhold the land which the Government owned when the State was a territory. In California, the Federal Government has withheld and acquired nearly half of our land area—in Nevada, nearly 90 percent. The Federal Government not only withheld the land, it withheld the natural resources on the land, and now even claims the rain and snow that falls on those lands.

The Federal Government now owns and controls 20 percent of our industrial capacity, engaging in business activities not permitted to it by the Constitution. I have here a fact sheet published by Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Fact sheet No. 1 lists 700 corporate activities, competing with private industry on a tax-free basis, which cost the American taxpayers $20 billion a year in subsidies.

The liberty amendment provides that these corporations shall be sold to private industry and further provides that natural resources which rightfully belong to the States or to various State compacts shall be returned to the States or to the compacting States.

Some of these corporations have been returned to private industry. The synthetic rubber industry, formerly owned as a monopoly by the Government, has been sold to private industry. While owned as a Federal Government monopoly, this business was losing money, but private industry has turned it into a profitable venture, producing better rubber, and contributing millions of dollars in taxes. While the synthetic rubber program was sold at a profit, others are a total loss. Some of them will bring from 5 to 50 cents on the dollar, but, even if they were given away, the taxpayer would save money.

Some of these corporations we don't have to worry about any more. For instance, the Cuban Nickel Company "grand design" which cost the American taxpayers $100 million plus an annual loss, was taken over by Castro. Little did he know that it was bankrupting the American taxpayer and that it will probably bankrupt him.

The abaca production and sales program will be phased out this year at a total loss. This was our great experiment in growing hemp in Latin America, and was a dismal failure. It wasn't very good hemp, and could not be sold on the open market. But they did sell it, and guess who bought it? We did. Yes, one agency bought it from another agency—the strategic stockpile bought it, and we had to build a warehouse to put the stuff in while it rotted.

Incidentally, the Federal Government has a strategic stockpile which cost us $8 billion to say nothing of the annual rental for storage. We have more than 20 years' supply of tungsten, and, believe it or not, we are still buying it.

Your tax dollars built the Rama road through the jungles of Nicaragua. It originally cost $12 million. It is interesting to note that it starts nowhere and ends nowhere. So, after it was built, Congress appropriated $3 million to survey the road. It would seem to me that it should have been surveyed first. When they surveyed the road, they found that the jungle had overgrown it, and so they are building it over again, at a cost of $24 million this time around.

The Texas City tin smelter has been sold to private industry, and has gone from the red into the black.

Your tax dollars helped to give a new look to the Eskimo igloo. It started out as a lending program for igloos, but it didn't work out very well, so it was turned into the Alaska housing project, which was just as bad. Then they tied it with seven other lending programs into one great liquidation program of about $2½ billion; $1½ billion has been lost with no recovery possible. Of the other billion dollars, about 70 percent has been recovered, and the balance is now being written off.

The Alaskan Railroad is another pet Federal project. Even tax and interest free, it is losing money, and should be sold or given to the State of Alaska, who probably won't take it on a bet. This railroad does have one distinction, however, it is the only railroad in the world that had a steamheated tunnel, with a small settlement inside to run it. The only trouble was, when the train came along, they had to open the doors, and everything got cold again. This was easily resolved. They routed the railroad around the tunnel. I could go on for hours regaling you with these stupid, costly projects, but I must hasten on.

The easy availability of revenue from the graduated income tax feeds the fires of bureaucracy, and supports foolish and unnecessary projects. Bureaucracy is the invisible government which really governs the country. There are more administrative laws on the books than there are statutory laws passed by the Congress. The bureaucrats are men you have never seen. They govern without the consent of the people, and you cannot recall them from office.

You have heard of the "tree that grew in Brooklyn." I want to tell you about the tree that grows in Washington. The seed is planted by a new program calling for a very small expenditure, and then proceeds to proliferate like a cottonwood tree. May I cite you an example or two?

In 1948 there was an appropriation for the National Institutes of Health of $3,776,311. This has now grown to $166 million. They have so much money that they are at a loss as to how and where to spend it, so here are a few of the activities of the National Institutes of Health:

"Empirical tests of a theory of interpersonal behavior, $17,250.

"Juvenile delinquency in Japanese-American population, $50,180."

That's an insult to the Japanese-American people, as that is one group in which I have never been able to find juvenile delinquency.

"A stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain, $9,775.

"Role of behavior of frontal monkeys, $15,998."

I could suggest a fertile field for that one.

"The establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony, $13,816.

"Initiation and support of a colony of baboons, $61,985."

These are just a few of the examples of waste and the duplication of what is now being carried on by private research.

I received a bulletin from the Department of Agriculture which was most enlightening. It told me that if I dropped a ripe tomato it would bruise more easily than a coconut, and that if I dropped it twice it would be very badly bruised. That was a real production in genius.

In a bill just passed by the Senate, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was made official. It was pictured as a small Bureau with a moderate budget. Last year it started with $28,000 and 15 employees. This year, it jumped to $1,100,000 with 95 employees, and next year it is requesting $2,462,000 with 218 employees. If you project that for 10 years, the cost will exceed $24 million annually with over 2,000 employees.

Here is the ultimate in bureaucracy: There used to be a room in one of the Federal buildings in Washington which had this legend stenciled on the door: "4156—General Services Administration, region 3; Public Building Service, Building Improvement Division, utility room, custodial." It was a broomcloset.

When Richard Nixon was Vice President of the United States and considered by many not to be the most popular man in the world, he was assigned two Secret Service men. Now we have what is regarded as a very popular Vice President, but two Secret Service men are not enough to guard him. He now has 18 and is asking for 36 for the coming year, at a total cost of about $300,000.

Without debating the pros and cons of the Peace Corps, I think you should know that, without the knowledge or consent of Congress, we now have an International Secretariat for the Peace Corps at a cost of $150,000 a year. Congress did not appropriate the money. It was simply given to the Peace Corps by the State Department, which is always complaining about a shortage of appropriations.

You will recall that I said there were no inherent powers derived from the Constitution. For 150 years this was the accepted understanding by everyone, and it was not until the Justice Department intervened in a stockholders' fight in Chicago, and threw Sewell Avery, long-time president of Montgomery Ward, bodily out of his office, that the concept changed. At that time, the action was justified by Attorney General Francis Biddle when he said that Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution. This was one of the most outstanding pronouncements ever made, and had the effect of reversing the idea that the Federal Government was a government of limited and specific delegations of power.

Fortunately, when President Truman, relying on this statement, attempted to take over the steel mills, under the guise of "implied or inherent powers" as delineated by Attorney General Biddle, he received a stinging rebuke by Judge Pine who rendered the opinion in the case, stating that there were no implied or inherent powers derived from the Constitution. Still the Federal Government persists in operating on supposed inherent powers. It was the action and statement of Attorney General Biddle that started the liberty amendment.

The liberty amendment will not add to, nor subtract from, the powers delegated under the Constitution, but has for its purpose the restoration of government to its original, fundamental and basic purposes. The liberty amendment is in four sections.

"Section 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution." Now this language is very clear in section 1. It prohibits that which had been implied for prohibition. When Mr. Biddle said that the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it, he reversed the intent and purpose of the 9th and 10th Amendments. The Ninth Amendment says that the enumeration of certain rights in the Constitution does not deny nor disparage others retained by the people. The 10th amendment is a little more explicit, but it deals with powers reserved to the States and to the people. Attorney General Biddle reversed this in his viewpoint. Now, we have the problem of knowing that law is, as Aaron Burr said, "whatever is boldly asserted and plausibly maintained." Law is the way it is enforced. And this is what we are living under. If we don't like it, there are three things we can do about it. We can either live with it, or violate it, or change it. And if we want to restore the Constitution, we are going to have to change and alter the interpretations and get it back to a fundamental base. And the liberty amendment's first section does exactly this, because, if you read it again, the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution. These are clear, definitive terms, and the last six words, "except as specified in the Constitution," reconfirm every delegation of power and authority contained in the Constitution, but it has the capacity to retrieve all that has been usurped. And, as Washington said, it is this usurpation of power that is our danger.

Now, to defend this constitutional arrangement of this first section from the same erosion that has happened to other parts of the Constitution, we have added section 2. Section 2 says the Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment. In other words, it is protected from any group of people, or combination of groups, foreign or domestic, or both, that might at any time, by edict, invade this constitutional provision and alter it. This is a simple protective device, but it works.

Section 3 describes the time limit for the liquidation and transfer of these properties to the States and local jurisdiction, and to private enterprise where it is deemed best. Section 3 says that the activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purpose of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated, and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

That was all of the language of the liberty amendment for a long while. It wasn't until 1957, when we had documented the fact of the scope of these invasions upon our private enterprise system, and could clearly identify the potential savings under the terms of these first three sections, that we even talked about the taxation problem. We recognized the truism that, if you cut a dollar off the spending, you cut the dollar off the need for taxation, and when you cut enough off the spending proclivities of the Federal Government, you have cut all of the need off for this particular tax which was applied in 1913. We proved by 1957 that the potential savings under the terms of the first three sections of the Liberty Amendment were adequate to offset the loss of revenue that would result from the repeal of the 16th Amendment.

On June 10, 1957, the language of the fourth section was added to the liberty amendment. It provides: "Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

Taxing and spending are so interlocked that they cannot be separated. The more you tax the more you spend, or the more you spend the more you tax. That is a truism.

Contrary to the popular concept, the repeal of the 16th amendment does not repeal the tax on corporations. The corporation tax is not an income tax but is an excise tax which was passed in 1909, and held constitutional prior to the adoption of the 16th amendment. The repeal of the 16th amendment simply repeals the personal graduated income tax and the graduated gift and estate tax. This would mean that $45 billion now collected from this source would be retained by the people, increasing purchasing power, and eliminating many controls burdened upon the individual.

The question uppermost in your mind is, How can the Federal Government function with the loss of this $45 billion?

Disposal of the assets which I consider to be held by the Federal Government in violation of the Constitution would produce from $60 to $70 billion, which would reduce the national debt by that amount, and result in an annual interest saving of nearly $2.5 billion.

There would be an annual saving of more than $20 billion now being paid out in subsidies to maintain the various unconstitutional Federal activities.

There would be an annual saving of $5 billion in the Federal payroll when the persons employed by the Government corporations are transferred to private industry.

There would be an additional $8 to $10 billion annual saving by the elimination of goods, services, and facilities now required to support this payroll.

There would be a $2 billion saving by eliminating foreign economic grants and credits. There would be at least $4 billion additional revenue generated from the sale of 20 percent of our industrial capacity to private enterprise.

There would be an additional $5 billion revenue generated by extending the corporation excise tax to unincorporated businesses to place them on an equal competitive basis.

These savings, plus the additional revenues generated, are equal to a total of $46½ billion annually, or a complete offset for the elimination of the personal income tax.

For years, my opponents at election time have charged me with wanting to sell the U.S. Post Office Department, shipyards, and even the Defense Department, because I introduced and support the Liberty Amendment. Now let's look at the facts. The Liberty Amendment in the first section states: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution." What are these exceptions? Article I of the Constitution provides among other things, for the Congress to establish post offices and post roads, to coin money, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to acquire land from the States for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. But my opponents have never taken the trouble to examine the Constitution.

The question has been raised from time to time as to the status of our national parks under the Liberty Amendment. For example, Yosemite is a national park in California. This park was acquired by the Federal Government without constitutional authority, as the Government did not have the consent of our State legislature, nor did they purchase it. Under the Liberty Amendment, the Federal Government would have to make arrangements either to relinquish this park to the State of California, who could, if they wished, sell it back to the Federal Government for $1, and grant the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction. On the other hand, it can become a State park, and I can say to you that there is not a State park in California that is not operated more cheaply and efficiently for the benefit of all people than any national park. So you see, there are two alternatives.

I have been questioned about the disposition of the dams and hydroelectric facilities owned by the Federal Government. Their status would be simplified, and most of them are, or should be, self-liquidating. The impounded water belongs to the States, and the Federal Government would own the dams as trustee in perpetuity for the benefit of the people of the State or the compacting States. For example, Hoover Dam would be held in trust for the seven compacting States by the Federal Government and the financial obligation would be paid off in the same manner in which it is now being liquidated.

When it became apparent that the people in the States were looking upon the liberty amendment with favor as a vehicle to recapture their sovereign rights, the U.S. Senate caused to be printed and widely distributed what is known as Senate Document No. 5. This document has little, if any, authenticity. It is impossible to find out who prepared it, and it has been thoroughly debunked. The printing was authorized by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The document does not address itself to the liberty amendment, but to some other fantastic subject matter. It is a scare-head document to frighten the people as to the dire results of limiting the graduated income tax. The document boldly states that the liberty amendment would repeal the corporation taxes, which of course, it would not. The front page of the document boldly states that the subject matter deals with the proposals to repeal the 16th Amendment, and then it proceeds for 26 pages to a subject matter not closely related to the liberty amendment, and purports to warn the people that our defense posture would be ruined for lack of money to support it. On page 5 the heading is "Proposals for a Constitutional Limitation of Federal Taxing Powers." The document then states that the elimination of Federal income, estate and gift taxes would cost the Federal Government $6.5 billion. Apparently those who drafted this document are unaware of the fact that corporation taxes are in the form of excise taxes, because they included the tax revenue from corporations in this figure. They then proceed to discuss various proposals for limiting rates of income taxes. All of their computations include corporation tax revenue.

While it is impossible to get important Senate documents that are out of print, such as Edward Hunter's testimony on Communist psychological warfare, there was no hesitation on the part of the Senate to reprint 50,000 copies of Senate Document No. 5 and get them into the hands of the legislators of the 50 States. U.S. News & World Report played up the Senate document in one of its issues 2 years ago, and when I took them to task for the falseness of this document, their simple reply was, "We have a right to rely on a Senate document."

I am happy to report that some Members of the Senate have become alarmed over the rapid intrusion of the Federal Government into the private sector of industry, and on March 14 of this year Senate bill 1093 was introduced by Senator **BENNETT**, Republican, of Utah; Senator **McCLELLAN**, Democrat, of Arkansas; Senator **MUNDT**, Republican, of South Dakota; Senator **BYRD**, Democrat, of

Virginia; Senator Williams, Republican, of Delaware; Senator Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina; Senator Tower, Republican, of Texas; Senator Miller, Republican, of Iowa, and Senator Dirksen, your own Senator from Illinois.

The title of this bill is "A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes." That is the greatest breakthrough we have had for the liberty amendment to date.

The liberty amendment is properly sponsored by the National Committee for Economic Freedom. You cannot have human freedom without economic freedom. They are one and inseparable, and all of us who believe in human freedom must preserve economic freedom.

Several years ago it was proposed that the States should be eliminated. There was a map designed by a former Secretary of the Interior based on the idea that State governments will cease to exist, as a matter of economy, and that, by having them cease to exist, government would be transferred to regional authorities—nine of them—with three appointed administrators in each of them to govern all of the affairs within the regional authority. That would mean that 27 men appointed by the President would constitute our entire governing body. That program was temporarily put aside, but it still simmers on the back burner, and the Department of the Interior is still rapidly increasing its vast domain.

If the liberty amendment is not adopted, the various States will cease to be sovereign. The counties and cities within the States will lose their sovereignty, and the State legislatures will become mere errand boys for a vast and monolithic Federal Government. Action must be taken positively and promptly to put the Federal Government in its constitutional place and thus preserve a Union of 50 sovereign States.

For this reason, I have again introduced House Joint Resolution 23, known as the liberty amendment to the Constitution, with a firm conviction that he who is governed best is governed least. In order to attain this amendment, all good Americans should give it active support by urging their State legislature to adopt a resolution in support of the liberty amendment.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who revealest Thyself in the true, the pure, and the lovely, grant us an awareness of Thy undergirding, taking the dimness of our souls away, as for demanding days we seek Thy guidance for the tangled ways we tread.

We come with gratitude for the love that our indifference cannot discourage, and for the patience that our wayward folly cannot exhaust. Though our faces are shadowed by the tragedies that darken the earth, we lift them in faith to the light that no darkness can put out.

In this day freighted with human destiny, vouchsafe to us, we pray, such a vision of our needy world with all its yawning divisions and its poisoning suspicions, and yet with its dawning sense of world brotherhood, that the decisions that are here made may never have to be reversed by those who come after us.

As we spend our years as a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a record of work well done, of duty faced without expediency, of honor unsullied, and of beckoning far horizons that we have not yet attained.

And when there comes the twilight and evening star and journey's end, and our work here is done, grant us a safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 131. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans;

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia;

H.R. 220. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan;

H.R. 243. An act to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein;

H.R. 248. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity;

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans;

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1988. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations; and

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 131. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1988. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations; and

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans;

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia;

H.R. 220. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; and

H.R. 243. An act to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 248. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; and

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Government Operations Committee.

The District of Columbia Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness of the educational and cultural exchange program of the U.S. Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON GRANTS FOR BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on grants for basic scientific research, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORTS ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC. AND GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.'S EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT AND BENEFIT TRUST FUND AND SUPPLEMENTAL PENSION PLAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, audit reports on Government Services, Inc., and Government Services, Inc.'s employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, year ended December 31, 1962 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF UNECONOMICAL UTILIZATION AND PREMATURE DISPOSAL OF AIRCRAFT SPARK PLUGS BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of uneconomical utilization and premature disposal of aircraft spark plugs by the Department of the Air Force, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PRACTICE OF FURNISHING UTILITIES FOR CERTAIN VENDING MACHINES OPERATED BY POSTAL EMPLOYEE GROUPS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Post Office Department practice of furnishing utilities for certain vending machines operated by postal employee groups, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF OVERPRICING OF SPARE PARTS AND MODIFICATION KITS PURCHASED FROM HAZELTINE CORP., LITTLE NECK, N.Y.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the overpricing of spare parts and modification kits purchased from Hazeltine Corp., Little Neck, N.Y., by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. under Department of the Navy cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract No. as 56–987c, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF EXCESSIVE COSTS OF A FIRE EXTINGUISHER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of excessive costs of a fire extinguisher replacement program in the Department of the Army, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

MANAGEMENT OF CERTAIN LANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR LOANS UNDER THE SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the St. John Irrigating Co. of Malad, Idaho, has applied for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the King Hill Irrigation District of Elmore County, Idaho, has applied for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Trust, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONSOLIDATION OF JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

"Joint resolution relating to pending Federal legislation on gold mining development

"Whereas gold production in our Nation, now at an all time low, is essential to the stability of the monetary system of the United States; and

"Whereas use of gold for industrial and commercial purposes has increased to more than 3 million ounces annually and is still increasing; and

"Whereas mining production of gold has been only 1,500,000 ounces, the deficit being made up by sales from the Nation's monetary reserve; and

"Whereas it is evident that the gold miners of this Nation need higher prices to produce gold; and

"Whereas an increase in the dollar price of gold may interfere with international monetary policy, but incentive payments for newly mined gold from domestic gold mines would not; and

"Whereas such an incentive would reopen closed gold mines and restore lost jobs, particularly in the State of Alaska which is in need of such an industrial incentive to bring back a great Alaskan industry; and

"Whereas the passage of H.R. 1095 now pending before Congress will provide the incentive for a great new gold mining development and still protect the monetary stability of the United States; and

"Whereas H.R. 1095 has been endorsed by the Mining Advisory Committee of the Western Governor's Conference: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to take favorable action on H.R. 1095; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President and President of the Senate; Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Hon. Wayne Aspinall, Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Hon. Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and the Members of the Alaskan delegation to Congress.

"Passed by the house March 20, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 22, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"By the Governor:

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to reconsider any plans for the relocation of the Denver Mint, and to consider expanding the present Denver Mint to meet the increased production requirements of the U.S. Mint

"Whereas the relocation of the Denver Mint has been proposed as a solution to the problem of meeting the increased coinage requirements of the United States; and

"Whereas the forecast of total domestic coinage requirements for the fiscal years 1964 through 1966 is 4.1 billion coins per year, and the requirement is forecast to increase steadily until it reaches 7 billion coins per year by 1975; and

"Whereas although the Denver Mint and the Philadelphia Mint operating during the fiscal year 1962 produced a combined total of 3.6 billion coins, of which 2.5 billion coins were minted in Denver, the present facilities of both mints are not adequate to meet the forecast needs; and

"Whereas a study was undertaken to determine the feasibility of different alternative solutions to the problem of increasing minting requirements, and in connection with such study, Arthur D. Little, Inc. has published to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, entitled 'Production Facilities of the U.S. Mint,' in which the existing mint facilities were evaluated; and

"Whereas the report disclosed: That the Denver Mint produces coins at a cost of $0.30 per thousand less than the Philadelphia Mint; that the cost of securing land for the expansion of the Philadelphia Mint would be great, while the property for the expansion of the Denver Mint has already been acquired; that the Philadelphia Mint is limited by existing structure to a production of about 1.2 billion coins per year less than the Denver Mint could produce with only the addition of certain equipment; that the transportation costs for a single mint would be significantly higher than for multiple location mints: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress and the President of the United States be hereby respectfully requested to reconsider any plans for relocating the Denver Mint, and to consider the expansion of the Denver Mint as the most economical and feasible solution to the problem of increased coinage needs; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"DONALD H. HENDERSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"ROBERT L. KNOUS.
"President of the Senate.

"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works:

"JOINT RESOLUTION—

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine

"Whereas it has been recognized that the Nation's economy and the Nation's security require the construction of a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

"Whereas the primary responsibility for construction of such a system rests in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the objective is to complete the presently designated National System by 1972; and

"Whereas the people of Maine through appropriate action have deemed it essential that the highways of this State be integrated into the Interstate and Defense System; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense of the U.S. Government has extensive defense installations in northern Aroostook County; namely, Loring Air Force Base located in Limestone, Maine, and supplemental installations to this base also located in the general area of northern Aroostook County, in the State of Maine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that appropriate actions be taken to require the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Public Roads to relocate the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point on the northern boundary of the State of Maine which would more adequately serve the more heavily populated areas of central and northern Aroostook County and would provide additional highway facilities for defense installations in northern Aroostook County; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly attested by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"Read and adopted in senate chamber, March 26, 1963.

"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"Secretary.

"Read and adopted in the house of representatives, March 27, 1963.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"PAUL A. MACDONALD,
"Secretary of State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

"Whereas the present low waterflow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

"Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

"Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

"Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

"Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

"Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:*

"1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of $50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

"2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of $365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

"3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

"DALE C. HENDERSON,
"*Secretary of Senate.*
"BEN MUSA,
"*President of Senate.*

"Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

"CLARENCE BARTON,
"*Speaker of House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

"Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

"Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately 1½ times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

"Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of 1 to 1, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

"Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

"Whereas the Public Utility Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry, and leaders of labor in the meat handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:*

"1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

"CECIL L. EDWARDS,
"*Chief Clerk of House.*
"CLARENCE BARTON,
"*Speaker of House.*

"Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

"BEN MUSA,
"*President of Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby resolves as follows:

" 'SECTION 1. The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing as follows:

" ' "ARTICLE—

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President for electors for President or Vice President or for Senator or Representative in Congress shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

" 'SEC. 2. A certified copy of the foregoing resolution shall be forwarded to the Administrator of General Services in accordance with section one hundred six (b) title one United States Code and also to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.'

"R. P. STIMMEL,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*
"W. STUART HELM,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"RAYMOND P. SHAFER,
"*President, Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1963 Ex-13

"Whereas the recently executed amendatory repayment contracts of the Quincy, South, and East Irrigation Districts provide for the completion of the project to the original 1 million acres; and

"Whereas the President's budget allows for less than $4 million for Columbia Basin project construction; and

"Whereas this amount is not sufficient to begin any new work; and

"Whereas facilities to deliver water to block 81 are complete; and

"Whereas this block would be a substantial addition to the project, contains 15,000 acres in 132 full-time farm units; and

"Whereas an increase in the budget for Columbia Basin project construction of $1,700,000 dollars would be required for the 1964 fiscal year to bring in block 81 and continue the orderly development of the project; and

"Whereas undue fluctuations in the construction budget necessitate deletions and additions to the Bureau staff resulting in a less efficient expenditure of funds; and

"Whereas basin communities and facilities are geared to a reasonable level of project development; and

"Whereas a consistent level of development encourages processors and industry to establish in the basin: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the members of the senate respectfully urge the budget for construction of the Columbia Basin project be increased by the Public Works Committee of the Congress to an amount that will insure the orderly development of the project and the beginning of new work during the 1964 fiscal year as outlined herein; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Members of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 1963 Ex-11

"Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his state of the Union message January 7, 1954, called for a White House Conference on Education; and

"Whereas this unprecedented citizen study of elementary and secondary school needs, involving more than a half million American people in local, county, regional, and State conferences and 2,000 participants in the White House Conference, held November 28 to December 1, 1955, demonstrated a desire and capacity to meet the major problems facing American education; and

"Whereas the traditional decennial White House Conferences on Children and Youth having played an extraordinary role in mobilizing public and professional opinion for more effective work with children and youth, there is a parallel need for a continuing process for the solving of problems in and improvement of education; and

"Whereas during these intervening years since the first White House Conference on Education in 1955, the problems of education have been multiplying with our expanding technology, the impact of automation upon employment and the intensity of the cold war; and

"Whereas there is immediate need for focus on such problems as identification of potential high school dropouts and preventive programs, non-college-bound and nonvocational youth, community colleges, the gifted, the handicapped, the impact of instructional technology such as instructional television and programed learning, increased research for improvement in education, and the relation of education to the achievement of national goals; and

"Whereas education is a priority concern in the minds of the public who recognize that the future of our Nation depends upon how well we provide an education for all children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate,* That this body respectfully request that the President of the United States consider the need for another White House Conference on Education and that he consider requesting that the Congress enact legislation providing for such a Conference on Education for 1965, the decennial anniversary of the first such conference; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That this body respectfully request Congress to enact the necessary legislation for such a conference; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Whereas the people of the State of Washington take great pride in the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard with its 65 years of building, converting, and repairing the ships of the U.S. Fleet; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard at Bremerton, Wash. has been rated No. 1 of its class in speed, efficiency, and economy throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the maintenance of this fine naval shipyard has been of incomparable aid in the successful termination of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and serves this Nation in readiness in such crises as recently encountered over Berlin and Cuba; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard which has been home port to thousands of young men from all parts of the Nation has as such contributed many fine citizens to this State; and

"Whereas the skills and training received by employees at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has been an important asset to the economy of this State when such employees have moved into other phases of industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives commend the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions to the citizens of this State and this Nation, their dedication to the security of this Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency, and economy unmatched elsewhere in these United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house transmit copies of this house resolution to the officials in command of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas the President of the United States has recently requested the Congress to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs to train American Foreign Service personnel for the multitude of tasks which confront them throughout the world; and

"Whereas such a proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would provide schools for the personnel of all governmental agencies in the United States involved in the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy, and would have graduate school status with a tentative student body of approximately 1,000 student officials; and

"Whereas the present Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State would be incorporated into the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which would also be open to Army, Navy, and Air Force officers whose military assignments involve the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy; and

"Whereas by concentrating such training in one Academy there could be provided an essential unity of purpose and action so that all of these operations can be coordinated into a harmonious whole; and

"Whereas the proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would command respect throughout the Government, in academic communities, and with all knowledgeable persons concerned with U.S. foreign policy and oversea operations of our diplomatic and Foreign Service officers; and would provide the United States with added skill and strength to meet and overcome the continuously more complex problems of the cold war, and would be a source of pride and stability for freemen everywhere; and

"Whereas the cost of such an academy would be extremely small as compared to the cost of other service academies, and would provide the potential for a far greater dollar-for-dollar return on the cost of operation than these Academies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington*, That we do hereby express our approval and support for the recommendation of the President of the United States that Congress establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and do hereby urge prompt approval of this needed educational facility; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas continuing construction, projected to cost up to $60 million during the next 5 years, is planned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on additional irrigation blocks of the Columbia Basin project within Franklin County; and

"Whereas previous bond issues for farm-to-market roads in irrigation blocks within the county have been exhausted; and

"Whereas Franklin County is without financial resources or bonding capacity to meet new farm-to-market road costs in these new areas: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, That the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, be requested to consider the construction of farm-to-market roads as an integral part of the reclamation project for the balance of the Columbia Basin development program, and to accept the financial responsibility therefor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Lutheran Council of the City of New York, relating to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE UNITED NATIONS

The National Lutheran Council, having received the memorandum of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs regarding selected actions of the 17th Assembly of the United Nations and taking note that the United Nations has continued to serve effectively as:

(a) a forum for world opinion, where representatives of more than 100 nations express their positions and share in decisions on matters of world concern;

(b) a meetingplace for the discussion and resolution of international tensions, and as a center of influence toward the orderly reduction of armaments and the peaceful uses of nuclear power;

(c) an agency through which the nations have been able to establish peacemaking and peacekeeping machinery, whereby in some instances serious threats of worldwide conflict have been reduced;

(d) a channel of cooperation among the nations for scientific study and technological advance;

(e) a coordinator and administrator of efforts being made to assist developing nations through the "decade of development," the U.N. Special Fund, Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, regional economic commissions, and in other ways;

(f) a primary force in mounting an organized attack on disease through the World Health Organization, and on hunger through the Food and Agriculture Organization and the freedom-from-hunger campaign;

(g) a means of developing a world conscience against injustice, inequality, and inhumanity through the formulation of covenants on human rights, including religious liberty, freedom, the status of women, and other matters, and as a vehicle for specific assistance to victims of international disputes, such as the Arab refugees; and

(h) a symbol of the God-given aspirations of men toward responsible international conduct and more brotherly relationships among men;

1. Expresses its gratitude for the United Nations not only as a forum of world opinion and a useful instrument of national policy, but also as an agency which is making a significant contribution to the welfare of mankind.

2. Encourages the Government of the United States to continue its strong support of the United Nations as a means of interpreting and extending the ideals of our Nation in an international setting, as an effective way of making a contribution toward the alleviation of human suffering, and as a major factor contributing to the development of more peaceful, just, and orderly relationships among nations and peoples.

3. Commends those representatives of both the religious and secular press and the broadcast media who have made responsible efforts to interpret the United Nations and its work, and in view of the importance of understanding this principal organ of international cooperation, encourages them to continue and intensify such efforts.

4. Recognizes the service and dedication of the many Christians who along with others are fulfilling their vocations and serving humanity by working in or with the United Nations, and remembers in particular that two gifted and courageous sons of the Lutheran Church, Count Folke Bernadotte and Dag Hammarskjold, have given their lives in this service.

5. Calls upon Christians in our land to make greater efforts to know and understand the United Nations, its strengths and weaknesses, its problems and achievements, to the end that intelligent and prayerful support may be given to the efforts of nations to regulate their affairs for the best interests of all humanity.

Whereas the present immigration policy of the United States was framed in a completely different international situation and setting than now prevails in the world; and

Whereas a bill was introduced in the U.S. Senate in the 87th Congress which included provisions which in a large measure would adjust and correct our present immigration policy in such important respects as: (1) Providing for an allocation of immigration quotas from countries outside the Western Hemisphere on a basis which is more equitable and less discriminatory; (2) facilitating reunion of separated families; (3) further opening the way for the immigration of persons with special skills; and (4) providing for the regular admission of specific numbers of refugee persons (without the enactment of special legislation in each instance); and

Whereas these goals are in substantial accord with the expressed convictions of the

National Lutheran Council, based upon extensive and careful study of the issues involved in immigration policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council express the hope that these same principles and goals will be embodied in legislation enacted by the Congress in its current session.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America (Rept. No. 86); and

H.J. Res. 282. A joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes (Rept. No. 87).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc. (Rept. No. 105).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 74. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer (Rept. No. 88);

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Flora Romano Torre (Rept. No. 89);

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte (Rept. No. 90);

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci (Rept. No. 91);

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo (Rept. No. 92);

S. 310. A bill for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis (Rept. No. 93);

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Domenico Martino (Rept. No. 94);

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa (Rept. No. 95);

S. 715. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald (Rept. No. 96);

S. 822. A bill for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli (Rept. No. 97); and

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Enrico Petrucci; (Rept. No. 98).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 72. A bill for he relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi (Rept. No. 99):

S. 206. A bill for the relief of Chang Ah Lung (Rept. No. 100):

S. 215. A bill for the relief of Mannor Lee (Rept. No. 101); and

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian (Rept. No. 102).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 752. A bill for the relief of Janos Kardos (Rept. No. 103).

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 104)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted the 13th annual report of that committee, which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James A. Carr, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; and

S. 1251. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits):

S. 1252. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1253. A bill to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1254. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1255. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Lt. John F. McPhail, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. Smathers):

S. 1257. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Santer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1260. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

THE CHEMICAL PESTICIDES COORDINATION ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, had there been no DDT to administer to the war-racked city of Naples at the close of World War II, there is little doubt that the populace of that doleful city would shortly have been decimated by the ravages of typhus. Today, through the use of chemical insecticides, typhus, yellow fever, and malaria, man's ancient and dismal scourges, are rapidly disappearing throughout the world.

Were it not for modern pesticides—the collective term for the vast family of chemical insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, miticides, rodenticides, and soil fumigants—our agricultural resources would be fearfully inadequate to the task of sustaining an expanding world population at acceptable standards of living and health.

Yet today, instead of symbolizing man's triumph over a hostile environment, the term "pesticide" is far more likely to evoke a harsh image of poisoned wildlife, polluted streams, and uncontrollable genetic mutation. Is this image grounded in fact, or is it the product of distortion and rumor?

Several years ago the director of the Oregon State Department of Agriculture dismissed as "insignificant" the hazards of pesticide use.

I am not so certain. Recent events in Oregon alone strongly suggest that a truly monumental risk is inherent in the indiscriminate broadcasting of pesticides. Nearly 400,000 silver salmon fingerlings in a rearing pond in the Columbia River gorge recently perished as a direct result of an overzealous antimosquito spraying campaign conducted by agents of the county, the State highway department, and the Union Pacific Railroad; a campaign evidencing an astonishing lack of coordination among the agencies concerned.

Another example in my region is the destruction of waterfowl stricken by the runoff of pesticide residues from heavily sprayed agricultural lands in the Tule Lake and Upper and Lower Klamath Lakes in northern California and southern Oregon. Yet the Klamath reclamation project, whose rich agricultural lands were the source of this pollution, represents a singular achievement in the reclamation of barren, unproductive desert.

It is essential that we strike the critical balance between the lifegiving products and the life-destroying byproducts of pesticide use, that the crusade of the agriculturalist for an agriculturally antiseptic environment be tempered by the scientifically documented viewpoint of the conservationist, the resource analyst, and the biologist.

During the hearings conducted by the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation in May 1960, representatives of State wildlife agencies furnished damaging evidence of the needless destruction of fish and wildlife by the application of chemicals too toxic, in quantities larger than necessary, put in the wrong places, in the wrong seasons, and by the wrong devices.

An official statement by the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish

Commissioners revealed a disturbing pattern of noncooperation and nonconsultation between Federal agencies responsible for chemical pesticide programing and wildlife agencies:

> The control workers of agriculture have usually failed to consult or cooperate with or to inform the State and Federal wildlife agencies which have primary responsibility for the conservation and management of fish and wildlife and have generally disputed the findings and ignored the recommendations of State and Federal wildlife agencies.

Moreover, there is evidence that following such consultations as actually occurred—usually after the fact—the recommendations of the wildlife agencies are publicly ridiculed and often ignored entirely.

There is virtually unanimous support among conservation officials and organizations for meaningful coordination between pesticide users and wildlife agencies. The National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon Society, the Animal Welfare Institute, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Wildland News have all in the past endorsed legislation leading to this goal.

Congressman Dingell, of Michigan, long a leader in advancing the cause of sound conservation principles in the Congress, has introduced legislation in the House which I believe will greatly promote the sound and sane employment of pesticides. The Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act would require advance consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and, through such Service, with the head of the particular State wildlife agency, before the start of any Federal pesticide program. This legislation would serve to insure—not the elimination of chemical pesticide use—but the least destructive use consonant with the needs of animal and plant pest control.

I therefore introduce for appropriate reference the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act and a second bill to augment present programs of research into the biological effects of pesticide use and the dissemination of information relating to the effects of pesticides.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills be printed at the close of my remarks and this bill iay over for 5 legislative days for cosponsors.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record, and will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bills, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act."

Sec. 2. No officer or agency of the Federal Government shall initiate or provide any financial or other assistance for any program involving the use of any chemical insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, rodenticide, or other chemical for the purpose of eradicating or controlling animal or plant pests until such officer or agency has consulted with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and through such Service, with the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of each State to be affected by the program.

Sec. 3. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall advise the officers and agencies consulting with it, as required by section 2, of the damage to wildlife resources which might result from any proposed program. Such Service shall cooperate with such Federal officers and agencies in developing programs involving the use of chemical insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, or other methods for the purpose of eradicating or controlling any animal or plant pest, with a view to achieving the results desired while minimizing the undesirable effects of the program on the wildlife resources of the area. In the event any Federal officer or agency shall fail to take any action recommended by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, such Service shall make a report thereof without delay to the Congress for referral to the appropriate committees.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior may, by regulations make exceptions from the application of this Act where, by reason of the limited nature of the program or by reason of the proved harmlessness of the chemical involved, little or no damage to wildlife resources could result from the program.

Sec. 5. Any Federal department or agency, in submitting requests to the Congress for appropriations for programs involving the use of chemical insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, or other chemicals for the eradication or control of any animal or plant pest, shall accompany such request by a full description of the proposed program, including the comments and recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Sec. 6. This Act shall take effect one year from the effective date hereof.

S. 1251. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of August 1, 1958 (16 U.S.C. 742d–1), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) On the basis of the studies carried on pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit information to the Secretary of Agriculture as to how, in the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, or pesticides, injury to fish and wildlife can be prevented or minimized and the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall require that such information or warning pertinent to any insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, or pesticide shall appear on the label of each package of such insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, or pesticide, as the case may be, which is required to be labeled under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135–135K)."

Sec. 2. The Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended by the Act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 563), is amended by deleting section 2 and by inserting new sections 2 and 3 as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized—

"(1) to conduct a program of evaluating chemicals proposed for use as pesticides for the purposes of determining whether the chemicals are harmful or hazardous to the Nation's fish and wildlife resources;

"(2) to distribute to interested persons and agencies, both public and private, data collected under this Act showing the effects of pesticides; and

"(3) to construct, operate, and maintain facilities, including laboratories, necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"Sec. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Javits] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System.

In 1956 the Federal Aid Highway Act provided that the Interstate Highway System would consist of approximately 41,000 miles of unified, modern highways for the entire Nation. The Federal share of the costs for this 41,000 miles was set at between 90 and 95 percent, with the State contributing only 5 to 10 percent.

The original Interstate System was laid out in 1944. Around 1947, New York State, as well as many other States, did not feel that it could wait any longer for Congress to make appropriations available to build a system. It felt it must proceed with the construction of highways that had been delayed because of the war and for other reasons.

In New York State, for instance, about 580 miles, principally on the New York State Thruway, were constructed without any Federal funds of any sort. The cost was well over $1 billion, even then, in the mid-1950's.

Under the total allocation of 41,000 miles in the Interstate Highway System, New York State received 1,227.2 miles. After the allocations had been made it was decided not to duplicate satisfactory roads that could be incorporated into the system. This was good planning and good judgment. Duplication is wasteful.

Up to this point everything was fine. However, New York State and other progressive States were then penalized because they had had the prudence, the initiative, the foresight, and the ability to proceed on their own. From New York State's allocation of 1,227.2 miles was subtracted approximately 580 miles, principally for the New York State Thruway, which were incorporated into the Interstate Highway System.

It does not seem right that these progressive States should have to forfeit a portion of their allocation because they did not wait for a Federal handout but proceeded on their own to construct a great deal of mileage now designated as Interstate.

This is inequity.

The injustice would be rectified by this bill to permit substitute mileage to be added to existing overall plans. It would give all States their true allocation. New York State would then be allowed to add its approximately 580 miles of badly needed miles of highways to the interstate routes.

There are many areas in New York State which do not have adequate interstate highways to fulfill the need. The people of New York State are substantial contributors to Federal highway use taxes. Yet they must be doubly taxed for the roads they desperately need by tolls and by use taxes. Continued efforts to secure a portion of the unallocated interstate mileage for the southern tier expressway for the Binghamton to Lake Erie section have been turned down.

If these critical needs did not still exist, I would be content with the matter as it now stands, for New York State is an independent State. It always moves forward in every way possible without Federal doles. It does not sit back and wait for handouts. But this is no reason for it to be denied its fair taxpaying share in areas where it needs assistance. Self-progress should not be punished. Initiative should not be thwarted.

This bill would enable New York State and many other States to construct badly needed roads that would add to the overall national requirements. It would provide needed work for the unemployed and be of assistance to our lagging economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1252) to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and Mr. Javits), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter I of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System

"(a) In the case of each State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, the Secretary shall, on application by the State, approve as part of the Interstate System, other routes within such State designated in accordance with section 103 of this title, which do not exceed in length the number of miles of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 90 per centum of the depreciated cost to that State of all completed and partially completed toll roads, bridges, and tunnels, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which were approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, as such depreciated cost is established in table A–5a on pages 28 and 29 of House Document numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such depreciated cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area, except that the total Federal funds payable for all routes approved under this subsection in any one State as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 95 per centum of such depreciated cost.

"(b) In the case of each State having a free road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, the Secretary shall, upon application by the State, approve as part of the Interstate System, other routes within such State designated in accordance with section 103 of this title which do not exceed in length the number of miles of all such free roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed (1) 90 per centum of the depreciated cost to that State of all completed and partially completed free roads, bridges, and tunnels, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which were approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, as such depreciated cost is established in table A–5b on pages 30 and 31 of House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such depreciated cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area, except that the total Federal funds payable under this title for all routes approved under this subsection in any one State as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 95 per centum of such depreciated cost, (2) less all amounts received as the Federal share on account of such free highways, bridges, or tunnels under any provision of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), or of any Act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto."

Sec. 2. Subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "plus the total of all mileage approved as part of the Interstate System under section 132 of this title."

Sec. 3. Paragraph 5 of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the last sentence.

Sec. 4. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System."

WORLD WAR I VETERANS' PENSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing a $100-a-month pension for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I.

World War I veterans have never received benefits comparable to those given to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. They left their homes and families to fight for their country just as did the young men in our later conflicts. But, when they returned there were no educational programs such as the GI bill which benefited World War II veterans. There was no program to assist them in buying new homes.

Today these same veterans are older men, most of them in their sixties. The majority of them are retired and living on small fixed incomes. Because of their ages or for health reasons, few are employed or employable.

Our country has done well by the veterans of World War II and Korea. But, I do not think it is asking too much for our Nation to give compensation to those veterans of World War I who were excluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1260) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOMINICK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of Mr. Magnuson, No. 11, in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGLE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND CORK STOPPERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEATING submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2053) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors of my bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor of my military pay equalization bill S. 401.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] be included as a cosponsor of S. 1.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the bill is about to be reported by the committee. I ask that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts be added to the bill as it is reported by the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many expressions of support are coming to me for the truth-in-packaging bill, S. 387. The recent series of hearings has served to remove the fears of some manufacturers and to solidify sentiment for effective remedies of conditions that tend to deceive the consumer and bring confusion to the marketplace. The distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] has informed me of his warm support of the bill and has asked that he be listed as a consponsor.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be listed as a coauthor of S. 387.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 747, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, inadvertently the names of two cosponsors were omitted from the first printing of S. 1117, a bill to extend the life and broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] be added, at its next printing, as cosponsors of S. 1117.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 2, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered at a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Raleigh, N.C., on March 30, 1963.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial from the Greenville (S.C.) News of March 29, 1963. Newsletter by him dated April 1, 1963.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address delivered by Vice President Lyndon Johnson at the Big Brother dinner, Washington, D.C., on March 29, 1963.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him at the Greater Moorhead Day Celebration at Moorhead, Minn., on March 22, on the subject of American agriculture.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT—U.S. AGRICULTURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am quite disturbed over Common Market efforts to cut our American trade by erecting high tariff barriers. What is happening now is that the ingenuity and efficiency of our industry is backfiring on us: After years of technological improvement so that our products can undersell those in European nations, high tariff walls are now being built so that some of our products will be virtually excluded from European markets.

Sales of U.S. farm products amount to nearly $5½ billion in exports. The U.S. Government must promote and protect the interest of American agriculture abroad if the new Trade Expansion Act is to live up to its name.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the text of a resolution adopted by the New York State Horticultural Society at the recent annual meeting, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Trade Expansion Act—U.S. Agriculture

Whereas Western Europe, with its six-nation European Common Market, and with pending membership of associate membership of increasing numbers of nations, are evolving a market bloc second to none other in the world;

Whereas they are eliminating or drastically reducing intramember tariff and other regulatory restrictions and are adopting common external tariff and other regulatory restrictions for trade relations with nonmember nations;

Whereas there is evidenced by the Common Market nations a trend to establishing higher common external tariffs and other restrictions for trade with nonmember nations than existed prior to development of the EEC; and

Whereas our newly approved U.S. Trade Expansion Act provides for greater trade negotiating authority by our Government, with greater bargaining authority and broader and more liberal powers to make concessions in U.S. tariffs and other regulations in the interest of greater free world trade and in exchange for greater access to various other markets in the world.

Whereas the impact or the economy of the United States by both the European Common Market and our new Trade Expansion Act, separately and/or in interchanging effects, is potentially at an alltime high and of extremely critical importance to our agricultural industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the New York State Horticultural Society, That we urge with all emphasis possible that highly competent agricultural industry advisory counsel be retained by our Government trade negotiating representatives to assist in protecting and expanding the best interests of our U.S. agricultural and our national economy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York.

INSPECTION OF PLANT MATERIAL FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

It is being proposed by the Federal Government that quarantine 37 be amended to permit the inspection of plant materials in the country of origin instead of at the port of entry. This is dangerous because it increases the possibility of the introduction of plant pests presently not known to be in the United States. This is vital to the agriculture of New York State because of our large seaports and airports and because we have 375 miles of sea coast adjacent to the St. Lawrence Seaway, Lake Ontario, and Lake Erie.

We recommend that no plant material be brought into this country without inspection at the port of entry.

RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO COMMON COUNCIL ON COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo urging that Columbus Day, October 12, be made a legal holiday.

I am pleased to be cosponsor of a U.S. Senate resolution to achieve this end. Among all the great men whose accomplishments have gone into the making of this Nation, none showed greater initiative, greater determination, and greater courage than Christopher Columbus, the Genoese captain, who discovered this hemisphere. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 162

Resolution—Columbus Day, October 12

Whereas the birthdate of the great Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus, October 12, is observed as a legal or public holiday in 30 of the States; and

Whereas there presently is a bill pending before the U.S. Senate asking for the enactment of Columbus Day, October 12, as a Federal holiday; and

Whereas the bill has received such great support from many organizations and communities throughout the United States, and that there are now about 34 U.S. Senators who are cosponsors of said bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council memorialize and urge the U.S. Congress, on behalf of the people of the city of Buffalo, to pass the bill which would make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to both Houses of the Congress and to our respective two U.S. Senators from New York State and our Congressmen from this area.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL'S THOUGHTFUL APPRAISAL OF FARMERS' PLIGHT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal is a newspaper which has appraised the situation of the American farmer with considerable independent criticism. It has not favored substantial subsidy programs. In view of this attitude, I think an analysis which was made in the Milwaukee Journal last Sunday of the plight of the Wisconsin dairy farmer is extraordinarily interesting. It is a very careful, convincing analysis of the great difficulty which the Wisconsin farmer has in making a go of his operation, in spite of the fact that he is extremely efficient, has a great investment, and works very hard.

In an editorial, the Milwaukee Journal calculates that the average farmer in Wisconsin has an income of 88 cents an hour. I think this is a disgraceful income, judged by any measure, especially for people who invested $40,000 or so per farm and have established remarkable efficiency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "State Farm Problem, Too," published in the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, March 31, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE FARM PROBLEM, TOO

Although some groups continue to demand that farming as a way of life be preserved, there is increasing evidence that farmers themselves are making decisions about their future on an economic rather than a sentimental basis.

This was typified in a recent series of articles by Loren H. Osman in the Journal. They involved a Dane County dairyman who called it quits this spring. Although a cut above the average, this farmer backed away from a $40,000 investment to buy a farm. He had exhausted the possibilities of tenant farming, he felt. At 38, he chose to sell out and start over in another occupation.

Such moves aren't easy for the farm family which loves its independence and the out of doors. But the alternative often is more distressing: A load of debts, inadequate opportunities for the children, long hours with low returns.

Agricultural economists report that eastern Wisconsin grade A dairy farmers, some of the top operators in the State, have an average investment of $62,350. Yet they net only $6,938 on their investment and labor.

Interest, at current rates, runs to $3,429, leaving $3,509 for family labor, a worker and a half per farm. That's only 88 cents an hour.

Wisconsin farmers average only $3,252 in net returns last year, about $250 under the national average.

While the State concerns itself about industrial problems, here is another area to study. Are there new income possibilities, new marketing methods, which might help matters?

Although the State's dairymen, with their tradition of good husbandry, are not keeping pace nationally, their economic future is tied closely to national policies. Chances of major dairy legislation in this congressional session are not good. Farmers face a continuance of milk prices at the 75 percent of parity minimum. Some Congressmen are ready to drop them further.

Meanwhile, Wisconsin is losing 3,000 farmers a year, now is down to 130,000. Ten years ago, there were 161,000 Wisconsin farmers. The farm exodus picked up considerably since the war. In 1935, there were 200,000 farmers in the State; by 1940, the number had dropped to 193,000.

Ways must be found to ease our disappearing farmers into the labor market, either in home grown industries or through retraining for urban jobs.

A small start has been made through the area redevelopment act program. Local communities, which need the social and economic contributions these families can make, also should turn to this problem.

Rural vitality is as important in Wisconsin's future as urban vitality. With planning, it can be maintained, even if we can't keep them down on the farm.

SCHOOLING OF WORKING AGE GROUP IN HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, not long ago, the people of Hawaii were shocked and concerned to learn that the Census Bureau rated Hawaii as third highest State in the Nation in illiteracy.

The Hawaii State Department of Economic Development has just completed an analysis of Census Bureau official census data for 1960 which puts the situation in better perspective.

Census Bureau figures show that Hawaii's people are generally better educated than the national average.

Nearly 45 percent of Hawaii's population over 14 years of age graduated from high school; only 40 percent for the United States as a whole.

Seven and two-tenths percent of Hawaii's people finished at least 4 years of college, as against the U.S. average of 6.5 percent.

The average number of years of schooling for people 14 years and older was 11.2 years in Hawaii, but only 10.6 years for the entire United States.

At the critical "dropout" age of 16 or 17 years, nearly 88 percent of Hawaii's boys and girls were in school, whereas the national average was only 81 percent.

Four years or more of high school were completed by 52.5 percent of Hawaii's population in the 14–44 age group and 49.4 percent in the 14–54 age group, compared with 18.6 percent in the age group 55 or older.

Evidence of Hawaii's impressive progress in overcoming illiteracy appear in the figures on the percentage of persons who have not completed any years of schooling and those who have completed only from 1 to 6 years.

Of those in the 14–24 age group, 0.4 percent had completed no years of schooling; of the 25–34 age group, 0.5 percent; of the 35–44 age group, 1.1 percent; of the 45–54 age group, 7.4 percent; and in the age 55 and older group, 22 percent.

Of those in the 14–24 age group, 1.5 percent completed only from 1 to 6 years of school in Hawaii; of the 25–34 age group, 2.9 percent; of the 35–44 age group, 8.4 percent; of the 45–54 age group, 24.4 percent; and of the 55-plus age group, 36.4 percent.

In other words, of those in the 14–24 age group, 98.1 percent completed 7 years or more of schooling; of the 25–34 age group, 96.6 percent completed 7 years or more; of the 35–44 age group, 90.5 percent; of the 45–54 age group, 68.2 percent; and of the 55-plus age group, 41.6 percent.

Historical reasons related to the influx of immigrants from abroad during the late 1800's and early 1900's account in large part for the higher percentages of little or no schooling in the older age groups in Hawaii.

What these figures show, I believe, is that Hawaii is making good headway toward wiping out illiteracy. Our record in the younger age groups is good. We must always do better, and I am confident that we will do better.

To correct any misimpressions that may have been created by the Census Bureau's ranking Hawaii third among the States in illiteracy, I ask unanimous consent that these tables to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Years of schooling completed—Potential labor force, State of Hawaii, 1960

Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 44	Age 14 to 54	Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 44	Age 14 to 54
Total population in age group	300,345	359,794	4 years high school	110,258	121,233
None	1,924	6,355	1 to 3 years college	25,833	29,561
1 to 6 years	12,008	26,530	4 years college	12,899	15,828
7 to 8 years	43,507	56,460	5 years or more college	8,564	11,097
1 to 3 years high school	85,370	92,748	With 4 years high school or more……percent	52.5	49.4

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, "Detailed Characteristics—Hawaii." From combined data for urban, rural, nonfarm, and rural farm population given in table 103, pp. 13–136.

Years of schooling completed—Selected age groups—Number of persons over 14 years of age, State of Hawaii, 1960

Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over	Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over
Total population in age group	117,585	93,578	89,182	59,449	66,701	4 years high school	35,959	42,709	31,590	10,975	6,312
None	492	462	970	4,431	14,677	1 to 3 years college	9,026	9,110	7,697	3,728	2,481
1 to 6 years	1,797	2,714	7,479	14,522	24,317	4 years college	2,241	6,266	4,392	2,929	2,077
7 to 8 years	19,640	8,002	15,865	12,953	10,966	5 years or more college	613	4,384	3,567	2,533	1,530
1 to 3 years high school	47,817	19,931	17,622	7,378	4,341	With 4 years high school or more…percent	40.7	66.7	52.9	34.0	18.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population 1960, "Detailed Characteristics—Hawaii." From combined data for urban, rural, nonfarm, and rural farm population given in table 103, pp. 13–136.

Years of schooling completed—Selected age groups—Expressed as percent of population in group, State of Hawaii, 1960

Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over	Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over
Total population in age group	117,585	93,578	89,182	59,449	66,701	4 years high school……percent	30.6	45.6	35.4	18.5	9.5
None……percent	0.4	0.5	1.1	7.4	22.0	1 to 3 years college……do	7.7	9.7	8.6	6.3	3.7
1 to 6 years……do	1.5	2.9	8.4	24.4	36.4	4 years college……do	1.9	6.7	4.9	4.9	3.1
7 to 8 years……do	16.7	8.6	17.8	21.8	16.4	5 years or more college……do	.5	4.7	4.0	4.3	2.3
1 to 3 years high school……do	40.7	21.3	19.8	12.4	6.5	With 4 years high school or more…do	40.7	66.7	52.9	34.0	18.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, "Detailed Characteristics—Hawaii." From combined data for urban, rural, nonfarm, and rural farm population given in table 103, pp. 13–136.

FLAT GLASS INDUSTRY IMPORTANT TO ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF WEST VIRGINIA AND ITS WORKERS—IMPORTS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES DETRIMENTAL TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in commenting on the pending bill S. 1100, to limit the import of flat glass from Communist countries, I call attention to the latest available figures from the U.S. Department of Labor confirming that national unemployment has again exceeded the critical 6-percent level.

In West Virginia, which I am privileged to represent in the U.S. Senate, from information supplied by the State department of employment security for the week ending March 23, 1963, the present number of insured unemployed is approximately 2,700 more than on the same date in 1962. This does not include others who are unemployed and may be trying to obtain work but are ineligible for unemployment insurance because they have not entered the labor market.

The flat glass industry is of significant importance to the economy of our State. There are four plants in West Virginia. The largest is the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. in Charleston—Kanawha City—which has a total employment of 1,233. In 1955, the number of workers was 1,850, showing a decrease of 617 employees.

A further breakdown of employment figures in this factory discloses that in 1955 the total number of production and maintenance workers was 1,417.

As of March 6, 1963, there were 845 employees, or a decrease of almost one-half of the 1955 number.

The figures are not available for the other three plants which are the Adamston Flat Glass Co., the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and the Rolland Glass Co., all located in Clarksburg, W. Va. I am advised that employment has constantly declined in these operations.

Mr. President, unemployment in West Virginia is of continuing concern to me. I have worked to mitigate unemployment in cooperation with my colleague, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and the other members of the West Virginia delegation. The administration, by developing such programs as public works acceleration and area redevelopment, is trying to deal effectively with the problem. We shall continue to work diligently toward the growth of production.

We will also work to alleviate unemployment and prevent a further decline in loss of job opportunities. For this reason, I have joined with Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and other colleagues in cosponsoring S. 1100 to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism. Early enactment of this measure would prevent further damage to the American flat glass industry and help to protect the jobs that are urgently needed to maintain our own economy.

I ask that an explanatory letter from the president of the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., George P. MacNichol, Jr., and a table of U.S. imports of window glass, 1961 and 1962—from the Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce—be included as a part of the record.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBBEY-OWENS-FORD GLASS CO.,
Toledo, Ohio, March 20, 1963.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, has been asked that a bill introduced by him (S. 1100) be left on the table for 10 days to permit other Senators to cosponsor it. This bill would seek to limit the imports of flat glass from Communist countries. As a corporate constituent of yours (as you will recall, Libby-Owens-Ford has a factory in Charleston), I commend your favorable attention to that bill.

Enclosed is a table of window glass imports, 1962 against 1961. As is apparent, the increase in window glass tariffs proclaimed last year by the President and effective since June 18, 1962, has not proved a deterrent to producers in free enterprise countries. With lower labor and other cost advantages, they still find the United States a profitable market to exploit. Specifically, I call your attention to imports, 1962 against 1961, from Belgium (up 42.3 percent), France (up 17.3 percent), United Kingdom (up 15.3 percent), and West Germany (up 25.4 percent).

More ominous to us, however, and I should think to these European nations is the figure for U.S.S.R.: up 62.6 percent.

The substantial increases on the part of friendly European countries may indicate that a share of the business which was placed with Communist countries might have been enjoyed by them as well as, hopefully, U.S producers, if restrictions against the importation of Communist glass had been in effect. From the commercial point of view, I can assure you that it is preferable to compete with manufacturers who, even though they enjoy cost advantages, must sell their produce at a profit, rather than with factories whose prices are governed by political expediency. And from the point of view of U.S. foreign policy, it seems desirable that such business as is placed abroad be placed with friendly rather than unfriendly countries.

Sincerely yours,

George P. MacNichol, Jr.,
President.

U.S. imports of window glass, 1961 and 1962, by country of origin

	1961		1962		
	Pounds	Percent of United States	Pounds	Percent of United States	Percent change, 1961-62
Reduced rate countries:					
Austria	2,415,893	0.7	2,921,875	0.6	+20.9
Belgium	107,154,500	28.9	152,481,592	32.7	+42.3
Canada	9,403,717	2.5	6,913,738	1.5	−26.5
Colombia	22,256	0	------	------	------
Denmark	142,843	0	152,519	0	+6.8
Finland	7,707,738	2.1	10,514,244	2.3	+36.4
France	29,211,557	7.9	34,271,895	7.3	+17.3
Greece	921,167	.3	4,990,267	1.1	+441.7
Hong Kong	110,951	0	1,704	0	−98.5
Israel	768,380	.2	1,459,061	.3	+89.9
Italy	7,234,131	1.9	6,559,167	1.4	−9.3
Japan	57,831,276	15.6	59,169,716	12.7	+2.3
Korean Republic	------	------	1,293,288	.3	------
Mexico	8,443,378	2.3	12,679,732	2.7	+50.2
Netherlands	444,064	.1	417,219	.1	−6.0
Norway	1,496,214	.4	------	------	------
Philippine Republic	409,205	.1	------	------	------
Poland	1,576	0	1,874,955	.4	+118,869.2
Portugal	107,833	0	5,183,357	1.1	+4,706.8
Spain	1,141,660	.3	4,066,614	.9	+256.2
Reduced rate countries—Con.					
Sweden	18,953,316	5.1	12,339,896	2.6	−34.9
Switzerland	146,287	0	63,326	0	−56.7
Taiwan	8,944,734	2.4	12,783,374	2.7	+42.9
Turkey	------	------	396,850	.1	------
United Kingdom	44,528,218	12.0	51,337,300	11.0	+15.3
Uruguay	12,502	0	------	------	------
West Germany	38,524,621	10.4	48,292,027	10.4	+25.4
Yugoslavia	46,487	0	648,762	.1	+1,295.6
Total	346,124,504	93.2	430,812,478	92.3	+24.5
Full rate countries:					
Czechoslovakia	13,360,383	3.6	14,365,124	3.1	+7.5
East Germany	1,361,941	.4	1,172,299	.3	−13.9
Rumania	105,013	0	2,974,539	.6	+2,732.5
U.S.S.R.	10,491,048	2.8	17,053,955	3.7	+62.6
Total	25,318,385	6.8	35,565,917	7.7	+40.5
Grand total	371,442,889	100.0	466,378,395	100.0	+25.6

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

MARTINSBURG, W. VA., PLANT OF CORNING GLASS WORKS SCHEDULED FOR EXPANSION—CORNING OFFICIALS HELPFUL IN SENATE HEARING ON EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR WOMEN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginians are gratified that officials of the Corning Glass Works have decided to institute a program of substantial expansion at their Martinsburg plant, in the eastern panhandle section of our State. Plant Manager Robert A. Sanders has announced that the addition to existing facilities amounts to 10,000 square feet, and will be used to house additional manufacturing equipment.

We are gratified that the leaders of Corning Glass Works are continuing to demonstrate their faith in the capabilities and stability of the citizens of West Virginia. During the 3 years in which Corning has operated its factory in Berkeley County, that respected firm has become more than just an industrial trade name—it has taken on the character of a trusted member of the community; one vitally concerned with local projects and anxious to participate in projects of civic improvement. In short, the relationship established between Corning and the citizens of Martinsburg is one of mutual regard. Both realize that they are working together to create not only a commercial product of value to millions, but a happy and successful community that is an integral part of American prosperity.

An editorial in the March 12, 1963, issue of the Martinsburg Journal stated: "Corning, we have found out, is also a good citizen in addition to being merely a good employer. If you notice, there is never a community improvement project undertaken where either or both Corning company financial contributions or Corning employee assistance does not play an important part."

The editor goes on to write that "The meeting of Corning and Martinsburg was love at first sight with an industrial marriage resulting in an uninterrupted honeymoon over the past 3 years."

And, Corning Glass Works is being constructive in other areas of public interest as well. In today's hearing before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, E. G. Hester, director of industrial relations research for Corning Glass Works, gave important and effective information. Testifying on S. 910, the equal pay bill for women for equal work, Mr. Hester indicated his company's longtime concern for equal employment opportunity for women, and pointed out that Corning presently employs female workers at virtually all levels of its vast industrial complex, including executive and managerial positions.

During his testimony it was my pleasure to question Mr. Hester as to the number of persons employed by Corning Glass Works in the State of West Virginia, and the number of women so employed. He replied that 300 of the 750 employees in Corning's Parkersburg, W. Va., plant are women; at Martinsburg, W. Va., 175 out of 495 are women; about 10 of the 56 employees of the facility at Buckhannon, W. Va., are women, as are 70 to 80 of the citizens now working at the Paden City works.

From these figures it is clear that the Corning Glass Works has become an integral part of the economy and welfare of our State, a fact which has earned the gratitude, respect and loyalty of all West Virginians. We are grateful to Mr. Hester for his lucid and helpful testimony before the Labor Subcommittee. Likewise, commendations are due William J. Belknap, Corning's director of Government services, for his counsel and cooperation during our study of this vital question. Both of these men have given meaningful assistance to those attempting to bring forth effective legislation which will benefit all Americans.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few days ago I and a number of my colleagues introduced a package of legislative proposals dealing with civil rights. These measures were based upon the recommendations of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, the Commission established to advise the President and the Congress of the steps necessary to assure all Americans of the rights to which each of us, whatever our race, color, or religion, is entitled under the Constitution.

The response to our action has been most encouraging. Clearly there is widespread awareness of the need for legislation. For too long the Congress has put off facing up to its responsibilities in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the New York Times of April 2, 1963, entitled "Reminder on Civil Rights," an editorial from the Newark Evening News of March 29, 1963, entitled "Up the Hill Again," and an editorial entitled "Politics and Promises" from the Washington Post of April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1963]

Reminder on Civil Rights

A group of Senate Republicans has introduced a sheaf of civil rights bills which top anything we have seen thus far in the new Congress. New York's two Senators, Javits and KEATING, are in this group. So are CASE of New Jersey, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts, KUCHEL of California, BEALL of Maryland and FONG of Hawaii.

The bills these gentlemen have introduced would do many useful things: give the Commission on Civil Rights permanent status; outlaw discriminating practices at the polls; do the same thing in federally financed housing projects; penalize discrimination in Federal employment, and enforce a more rapid pace in the achievement of school desegregation.

It is easy enough to dismiss all this as a political gesture, designed to embarrass the Kennedy administration. But the fact remains that, while President Kennedy sent a civil rights message to Congress on February 28, he has not followed it up with concrete legislative proposals. The Republicans now have.

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 29, 1963]

UP THE HILL AGAIN

What has become an annual pilgrimage up Capitol Hill in behalf of effective civil rights legislation once more has been undertaken by New Jersey's Senator CASE and a small band of liberal Senators.

They seek nothing more radical than the rights which the Constitution and moral decency assure to all citizens. Yet how far from realization we remain is evidenced by the treatment of Negros engaged in a southern voter registration drive and by bullets fired into the home of a youth who wants to enter the University of Mississippi.

Proposed by Senator CASE and seven of his Republican colleagues are Federal safeguards against discrimination in employment, housing, education, public accommodations, and polling places. President Kennedy agreed to the need for more equitable treatment in each of these fields in the program he proposed earlier this month.

But where the President generalized, the Senators specify. They want the Attorney General empowered to institute suit against the violation of any civil right, not just voting rights. They also propose a Federal commission to enforce fair employment practices, Federal technical assistance to schools seeking to desegregate and more equitable access to home mortgage credit.

The possibility of enactment concededly is slim. No one knows this better than the sponsoring Senators. For they are veterans of the campaign to break the filibuster rule that smothers civil rights legislation in Southern oratory. But they mean to keep trying and that is to their credit.

Beaten before, they return unbowed.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

POLITICS AND PROMISES

Republican Senators CASE, FONG, JAVITS, KEATING, KUCHEL, and SCOTT have introduced a comprehensive set of bills designed to eradicate racial discrimination in the areas of voting rights, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. We think it is scarcely too much to say that if these bills were enacted and effectively administered they would serve to solve the most vexing and disfiguring of American domestic problems. They would confer on American Negroes the first-class citizenship promised to them by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments nearly a full century ago.

These Republican proposals are radical in the sense that they go to the root of the race problem and seek to excise it by treating all men equally regardless of color. But they are not at all radical in the sense of being novel. One need not search very far to find their antecedents. All these proposals are set forth as solemn promises in the Republican Party platform for 1960. All these proposals are also set forth as solemn promises in the Democratic Party platform of 1960. It would be hard to say which platform trumpets the promises more appealingly and melodiously. But it is easy to say that the promises are as yet unfulfilled.

They are not unrealizable. They are not visionary. Indeed, the Republican platform of 1960 said of them that "each of the following pledges is practical and within realistic reach. They are serious—not cynical—pledges made to result in maximum progress." The Democratic platform asserted that "the time has come to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities." The Democrats were then seeking the Presidency and so their platform included an observation that "what is now required is effective moral and political leadership by the whole executive branch of our Government to make equal opportunity a living reality for all Americans."

For all the loftiness of purpose and sincerity of concern among the half dozen Republican sponsors of the civil rights measures pledged by the two major political parties, no one, we suppose, seriously expects any of these bills to be enacted into law in the 88th Congress. The chances are against any of them even coming to a vote in both Houses of Congress.

SOUTH DAKOTA IMPLEMENTS KERR-MILLS ACT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the session of the South Dakota Legislature just completed there was enacted legislation implementing in South Dakota the Kerr-Mills Act. The action taken in South Dakota which is now law is unique in two ways in that it was taken under the authority of Public Law 87-543 enacted by the Congress last year and provides funds to finance a pilot or demonstration program. The South Dakota statute also establishes a prepayment system of operation in this area.

This is indeed another milestone in bringing the benefits of the Kerr-Mills program to the people of this country. According to my information there were 25 States in addition to Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands which had implemented the law by December 1962. Since that time 3 States, including South Dakota have approved similar laws and 13 others were considering bills of this type during the sessions of their individual legislatures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a résumé of South Dakota's Kerr-Mills implementation program and a copy of the bill as it was enacted and signed into law by the Governor of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the résumé and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was the feeling of the legislature that many States had jumped into a program without any accurate estimate of the total needs. Several of these have found that their appropriations far exceeded the demand for fund utilization.

A pilot program will determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their needs, and will provide a more accurate determination of the cost of a full program.

The South Dakota State Medical Association took the position that any program for persons in the near-needy or medically indigent area should be treated as nearly akin to their more fortunate (and solvent) confreres as possible. Those persons having resources protect themselves against the cost of medical-surgical and hospital care with prepaid Blue Cross-Blue Shield or insurance contracts so it was determined that persons who turned to the Kerr-Mills program as a resource should receive comparable benefits. The legislative committee studying the problem concurred in this view and a bill was drafted and introduced by Representative Ellen Bliss, Sioux Falls, chairman of the house committee on health and welfare.

The bill was signed into law by Governor Archie Gubbrud and becomes effective on July 1 or when the plan receives approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whichever is later.

The law empowers the State department of public welfare to set up a program to qualify for Federal funds and provides that—

1. A person to be eligible for aid must not be a recipient of old-age assistance when he applies, must be unable to pay for medical or remedial care, must not have an average annual income of $1,500 or more, or $1,800 for a married couple, and must not have a net worth of $10,000 or more. If available funds are insufficient, the department may set lower limits on income and resources but may not go above these specified limits.

2. The department is empowered to accept applications and determine eligibility of those who apply. All individuals wishing to do so shall receive an opportunity to apply and assistance is to be furnished with reasonable promptness to those who are eligible.

3. The department may appoint county advisory committees to assist in recommending selection of applicants. Basic intent of this provision is to keep a local flavor to the selection where needs are best known.

4. The welfare department shall contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield or licensed insurance companies to purchase prepaid health coverage which shall include the following:

Hospitalization is to be limited to 30 days per admission in semiprivate or ward accommodations. Said provision includes a $25 deductible clause, outpatient hospital care and services. Physicians' services are limited to 12 office calls per fiscal year and to medical calls, surgical, and other services in a hospital for 30 days per admission. Laboratory, X-ray, and other special procedures may be limited to $100 per fiscal year. The latter procedures are subject to a $10 deductible clause. Physicians must agree in writing to participate in the plan.

5. A provision is made for the insurance company or Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan to operate without profit or loss. A contingency fund was established to not only take care of the possibility of loss, but to provide services for individuals not on the program whose illness makes them eligible.

6. The usual provisions are included in the law which makes it effective simultaneously in all political subdivisions, prohibits payment by the recipient of enrollment fees as a condition of eligibility, reserves the State department of welfare the right to cancel a contract within 30 days' written notice, provides safeguards against use and disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance, and provides a penalty for fraudulent information given by the applicant.

The program, as adopted by the legislature, has the endorsement of the State medical association, the State hospital association, and other health organizations. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the pilot program aspect of the plan which will curtail high administrative costs, met with high favor from most legislators and other individuals involved.

House Bill 510

An act authorizing the State public welfare department to establish a medical aid to the aged program, and to purchase medical care and hospitalization contracts for recipients of medical care to the aged; empowering public welfare commission to establish rules, regulations, and income and net worth qualifications for the operation of the program

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

Section 1. In addition to the authority and duties granted to the State department of public welfare in chapter 55.36 of the South Dakota Code of 1939, and all laws amendatory thereof, the State department of public welfare is granted the following power:

(1) To qualify for Federal money under the provisions of title 1 of the Federal Social Security Act, as amended, pertaining to the provision of medical assistance in behalf of individuals 65 years of age or over who are not recipients of old-age assistance at the time of application and who are unable to pay for needed medical or remedial care services;

(2) To establish reasonable standards consistent with the objectives of title 1 of the Social Security Act, as amended, for determining eligibility of individuals for such medical assistance and the extent of such assistance: *Provided, however,* That such medical assistance shall not be made available to any individual who has had an average income, during the preceding 12-month period prior to the submission of an application for such assistance, of $1,500 or more, nor to a married couple having an average income of $1,800 or more, or at the time of application, a net worth of more than $10.000. *Provided, however,* That the State public welfare commission may by resolution lower, but may not increase such income and net worth qualifications, as herein established, if the commission concludes that insufficient funds are available to provide medical care to the medically indigent aged;

(3) To accept applications for medical assistance for the aged from any individual who deems himself eligible for assistance under the terms of this act, to determine such individual's eligibility or ineligibility for such assistance in accordance with rules and regulations adopted for such purpose by the State public welfare commission;

(4) To certify the medical indigency of any individual who applies and qualifies for medical assistance under the terms of this act and the period of eligibility;

(5) To appoint in any county a county advisory committee on medical aid to the aged consisting of not less than three nor more than five members. The members of such committees shall be residents of the county for which appointed, shall serve without compensation except for actual expenses incurred in the attendance at meetings within the limitations fixed by the department of public welfare, and shall serve at the pleasure of the department.

Sec. 2. The State department shall purchase, in behalf of individuals certified as medically indigent under section 1 of this act, medical care and hospitalization contracts from corporations licensed to operate either under SDC 1960 Supp. 31.17A or SDC 1960 Supp. 31.17B, or "company" as defined in subsection (6) of SDC 31.0101, operating under a certificate of authority issued by the South Dakota Department of Insurance, and provided that the responsibility of such corporations or company for payment of hospital services incurred by such medical indigent individual shall be as follows:

1. For contracted inpatient hospital care and services provided in semiprivate or ward accommodations during a period of eligibility and for a period of 30 days for each admission less $25 per admission.

2. For contracted outpatient hospital care and services provided during the period of eligibility.

It is provided further that the responsibility of such corporations or company for the payment of contracted physician services incurred by such medically indigent individual, provided such physician agrees, in writing, to participate in such prepayment plan shall be as follows:

1. For calls, and services provided in connection with such calls, including injectible drugs, or other material provided by the physician and administered in connection with such calls. During the period of eligibility, except for inpatient hospital services by a physician in any appropriate place including the physician's office or clinic, the patient's home, nursing home, or outpatient department of a hospital, such calls may not exceed a total of 12 during any fiscal year period;

2. For contracted laboratory procedures, X-ray procedures, and other special procedures in the physician's office provided during the period of eligibility by a physician, less the first $10 for such services, provided that the total cost of such services may be limited to $100 during any fiscal year period;

3. For contracted medical calls and services in a hospital provided during the period of eligibility by a physician for a period of 30 days for each admission.

It is provided further that no profit nor loss shall accrue to the contractors and when such corporations or company anticipate a loss from such program, immediate renegotiation to decrease levels of service or utilize the medical aid to the aged contingency fund, as hereinafter provided shall be initiated and completed within 30 days of notice by the contractor.

Inasmuch as State and Federal funds are the source of all moneys for the medical aid to the aged program, the contractors shall not be liable for payment of State insurance premium taxes for operation of this program.

Sec. 3. Any prepayment contract purchased by the State department in behalf of medically indigent individuals shall incorporate the following provisions:

1. It shall be effective simultaneously in all political subdivisions of the State and the benefits of said contract shall include residents of this State who are temporarily absent;

2. It shall prohibit payment by the recipient of enrollment fees, premiums, and similar charges as a condition of eligibility;

3. It reserves to the State department the right and authority to administer or supervise the administration of such contract or to cancel it upon 30 days' written notice of such cancellation without liability after the effective date of said cancellation other than for cases incurred prior to the date of such cancellation;

4. It shall provide safeguards against use and disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance, except for purposes directly connected with the administration of the contract.

Sec. 4. The State public welfare commission shall adopt rules and regulations requiring the following:

1. An opportunity for a fair hearing before the State department of public welfare by any individual whose claim for assistance is denied or not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

2. Methods of administration deemed necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the State plan, including the adoption of a merit system for personnel;

3. The filing of necessary reports to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

4. Safeguards against use and disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance, except for the purpose directly concerned with the administration of the plan;

5. All individuals wishing to do so receive an opportunity to apply for assistance, and assistance is to be furnished with reasonable promptness to those who are eligible and certify such individual as medically indigent for the purpose of any contract entered into by the State department of public welfare; and

6. Such reports on premium costs, recipients counts, utilization data, and similar administrative matters necessary to be fully accountable for the expenditure of public funds.

Sec. 5. The authority contained in this act shall become effective upon the approval or acceptance for Federal participation of a South Dakota medical aid to the aged plan by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the provisions of title 1 of the Social Security Act pertaining to medical assistance to the aged, but not prior to the effective date of this act.

Sec. 6. There is hereby created a fund to be known as the medical assistance for the aged contingency fund to serve as a contingency fund to meet emergency disbursements as hereinafter provided by the State department of public welfare, not to be included in the general appropriations which provide for the ordinary operational expenses of the medical assistance for the aged program administered by the State public welfare commission, and to be used for the purpose of carrying into effect the objectives of said program. No part of this fund shall revert to the general fund.

Sec. 7. When, in the course of normal administration of a medical assistance for the aged program, the State department of public welfare shall realize a temporary deficit in the general operating expenditures of medical assistance funds, such deficit may be removed by said department, with the approval of the State public welfare commission, by withdrawal of contingency fund reserves or so much thereof as may be necessary. Withdrawals of said fund shall be disbursed on warrants drawn by the State Auditor on vouchers submitted by the public welfare department and approved by the State welfare commission.

Sec. 8. The term "medical assistance" and "medical or remedial care" as used in this act shall be deemed to include all of the services described in section 1385 of title 42, U.S.C.A.

Sec. 9. 1. Whoever knowingly obtains or attempts to obtain or aids or abets any person in obtaining medical assistance for the aged to which he is not entitled, medical assistance for the aged greater than that to which he is justly entitled, by means of false statement or representation, or by impersonation or other fraudulent device, or by failure to supply the State Department with full and accurate information at the time of application for medical assistance for the aged or promptly thereafter, whenever changes in the extent or amount of income or eligibility occur, or

2. Whoever aids or abets in buying, concealing, or in any way disposing of the property of a recipient of assistance, with the intent to defeat the purposes of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $500 or by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed 3 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Approved March 11, 1963.

ASSAULT ON CONGRESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last night's Washington Evening Star—the April 1 issue—contained a most perceptive piece by the noted political columnist, Mr. William S. White, in which he comments on the current effort being made to further usurp the power of the Congress.

Mr. White describes this effort as an "assault of the sixties upon the last home of representative government, Congress."

I would go a step further and define these attempts as brazen moves to radicalize the Congress into something which was exactly the opposite intention of the inspired authors of our Constitution.

With the convening of the 88th Congress, 1st session, we were witness to and participants in the struggle to dilute the power, the rights, and the obligations of the Senate as set forth in the Constitution.

What happened this winter was merely one battle in the apparent never-ending attempt to reduce not only the Senate but the Congress to no better status than that enjoyed by a dangling puppet responsive only to the whims of modern-day stringpullers whose concept of government has scant allowance for the rights of individuals and no room at all for dissent.

Mr. President, Bill White has been on the Washington scene a long time. Most of us recall when he was the Senate correspondent for the New York Times and later the Times chief congressional correspondent.

He is no mere casual observer of the Congress; in fact, if one were to compile a list of what might be termed "expert students" of the Congress—and particularly the Senate—the name of Bill White would be high among that group.

So it is with this background of Mr. White's in mind that I call to the attention of the Senate his discussion of the constant attempts being made to diminish the role of Congress in our system of government, a system of government, I might add, which stands in danger of destruction, in my opinion, should the efforts to mute the voice of the people—the Congress—achieve success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. White's article in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Assault on Congress Charged

(By William S. White)

The most vehement attack upon Congress as an institution since the first Roosevelt New Deal—when for a time it seemed that the just and constitutional powers of the National Legislature might be forever destroyed—is now being mounted.

The old assault of the thirties was led by a President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who wanted to have it all his own way, all at once. There was some small color of justification then. For the country was in a massive and malignant depression in which it appeared to some good men who were too much afraid and too much in a hurry that the alternative to a thoroughly cowed and docile Congress might be mobs in the streets.

For the new assault of the sixties there is no justification whatever, save the self-justification of unreasonably demanding pressure groups which see in Congress constitutional right to reject their proposals simply some evil denial of what, in their own minds alone, is best for the Republic.

LEFT LEADERSHIP

This new assault of the sixties upon the last home of representative government, Congress, is being led by a combination of leftwing men and forces, almost all of them Democratic and some of them actually Members of Congress.

Their objective of all objectives is to pressure the present Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, to join them in discrediting the actions, the procedures and sometimes even the motives of a currently Democratic Congress.

These forces have, in every instance, two things in common.

In 2 years of the Kennedy administration their legislative desires have repeatedly been frustrated by their own simple inability to marshal an effective majority for them.

And in 2 years of the Kennedy administration they have repeatedly been unable to force Congress to agree to change itself and its procedures in such a way as to forward the adoption of those desires over the manifest objections of a majority in Congress and the country.

Thus, unable to win the game under the rules, they demand changes in the rules. Thus, unable to persuade the public to back their notions and bills, and convinced of the infinite righteousness of those notions and bills, they conclude that only some giant conspiracy, or some dreadful weakness in Congress, is to blame for their own minority ineffectuality.

They follow the classic pattern of well-intentioned reformers. They know for a fact that what they propose is good for the people. When the people and the people's forum, Congress, refuse those proposals, it is, in their minds, the Congress which is wrong and the people who are deluded and defrauded.

NEW DOUBLETALK

They have evolved a whole new jargon in which old words have new meanings. The defeat of their measures in Congress becomes not merely defeat but obstructionism. The inability of the present President to persuade Congress to do everything he wants—where what he wants is suitably liberal—becomes not merely ordinary disagreement, but deadlock.

Congressional unwillingness to listen overmuch to them automatically means that Congress is foolish—or worse. Congress undoubtedly hesitant and plodding present pace is, to them, not simply an obvious reflection that Congress prefers just now to go slow. It is, instead, some large and glitteringly frightful thing like a paralysis of Government.

To them, to go slow is automatically to go wrong—if not worse. To them, deliberation becomes defiance; caution becomes cravenness; dissent from them becomes conspiracy; the refusal of a congressional majority to surrender to a minority becomes the capital crime of not moving the country forward.

But whose country is it? And who is to define forward?

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BOSTON COLLEGE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Boston College, one of this country's leading institutions for higher learning, is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding this year. A formal ceremony commemorating this occasion was held at the Chestnut Hill, Mass., campus on Sunday, March 31, 1963.

It is appropriate that recognition be made of this event for Boston College has, since its inception, made a substantial contribution to the academic, cultural, economic and social fabric of the community and Nation. That this is so is due primarily to the philosophy of Boston College which emphasizes the importance and value of liberal arts and its influence in the development of moral and spiritual values. A corollary to this is the development of the intellect, an understanding and appreciation of human values, and the proper regard for individual rights.

It is the application of such a philosophy which has enabled Boston College to achieve preeminence as a significant and positive force in its relatively brief span of existence. The standard incorporated on the official seal of Boston College is "Ever To Excel." This motto has characterized the impressive record of this institution.

Boston College is today, in every respect, a university. There are presently 12 colleges, including 5 postgraduate and professional schools within the university. The original small college of liberal arts consisting of 22 students has matured into the third largest Catholic university in the United States with an enrollment of approximately 10,000 students.

Three out of five living alumni of Boston College are serving their community in education, government, medicine, nursing, religion, and social work. It is interesting to observe that one out of every five attorneys admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over the past 10 years is a graduate of the Boston College Law School; one out of every six physicians in Greater Boston is a graduate of Boston College.

The contribution made by Boston College to the life of the community is evident by various programs conducted at the university. Annual citizens' seminars on economic difficulties bring together civic leaders who discuss methods for solving common problems. The law school forums have sponsored discussions by professional experts on the legal ramifications of social problems within a community. The school of Education has inaugurated special programs for the teaching of the mentally retarded and of the blind. A weekly television program, sponsored by the College of Business Administration, has focused public attention upon such subjects as urban renewal, State and municipal finances, transportation and housing.

This is indeed an impressive record. I compliment Boston College on the occasion of the centennial of its founding for its many achievements. I wish it continued success in the years ahead.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the noted humanitarian, lecturer, author, and social worker, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, has accepted the responsibility of becoming chairman of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools. Joining her on the executive board of this organization are Dr. Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College; the Honorable William Benton, a great and distinguished former colleague who so ably represented Connecticut in this Chamber; Gen. Omar N. Bradley; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, ex-Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the well known author, John Hersey; the Honorable Mary C. Kohler, who served with distinction for 15 years on the bench of the San Francisco, Calif., juvenile court; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; and Mr. John I. Snyder, Jr., member of the board of trustees for the Committee for Economic Development. Mr. David E. Scoll serves the organization as secretary-treasurer.

This group of distinguished American educators and public servants, in preparation for the first national conference of the national committee which will be held April 7, 8, and 9 here in Washington, has prepared a report entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications." In the foreword to the report, Mrs. Meyer eloquently voices the committee's goals. I ask unanimous consent that the foreword to the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, if is my intention from time to time to bring segments of this report to the attention of my colleagues through insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since in my judgment the information contained in it will be most helpful to us in accomplishing our legislative duties in the field of education during this session of the Congress.

In pursuance of this objective, I ask unanimous consent that the chapters entitled "Field of This Report," "Technological Change and Automation," and "Education and Earnings" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The hope of our free society lies in the public schools. It is here that the society of tomorrow begins to take shape; here that the spark, the strength, the character of our democracy is generated.

The National Committee for Support of the Public Schools was organized in January 1962 by a bipartisan group of community leaders who believe that the survival and progress of the United States depend as never before upon full development of our human resources. That our school system is a good one is unquestionably true. It is equally true that it has not kept pace with the mounting demands of the times.

A much stronger national determination to improve the scope and quality of public education is urgently needed. Accordingly, the committee has these objectives:

1. To publicize individual and social benefits which accrue from investment in the right kind and amount of public education.
2. To focus public attention on individual and social problems associated with inadequate schooling of a considerable percent of citizens.
3. To point out areas of educational policy and action essential for full development of human resources.
4. To identify fiscal action essential to adequate financial support for effective public education at all levels, from kindergarten through grade 14.

The public school problem challenges each member of every community. Efforts to develop a system of public education to meet the demands of today and tomorrow should be based on fact and on thoughtful deliberation. Accordingly, the committee's program emphasizes factual studies, believing that people will act when they are fully informed.

This report, "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications," is the committee's first effort to increase understanding and to stimulate organized effort on behalf of public schools throughout the country. We hope that it will lead many citizens to examine carefully the urgency and the dimensions of the school problem and to unite in a common effort to make more effective use of education in developing our human resources.

AGNES E. MEYER,
Chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools.

FIELD OF THIS REPORT—I

This report is concerned primarily with the interrelations of education and economics as they affect the well-being of the individual and the Nation. This emphasis in no sense implies that economic considerations should predominate in determining the purposes and content of public education.

The fact is, however, that regardless of the point of view one takes concerning this public service, it is costing a lot of money and, according to careful estimates, will cost more with each passing year.

This fact tends to evoke two differing reactions. One point of view, whicle acknowledging that values accrue to society from quality education, maintains that expenditures for public schools fall on the consumption side of the economic ledger. This point of view holds that taxes decrease the amount of capital available for investment. Hence, public school expenditures are something on which we must "save" if investment and economic growth are not to be hampered.

Another point of view that has received increasing attention in recent years is one that maintains that wise expenditure for education is economic investment. By developing human resources through education and other services such as health programs, a stock of human capital is built up which is an essential ingredient of a productive and viable economy.

The point of view of this report is that expenditure for good schools is both a high order of consumption and an essential form of investment. This should be taken into account in determining what amounts may wisely be budgeted for public education.

Education for intellectual development and for informed and perceptive minds was never needed more than it is today. The danger is that when education is thought of solely in these lofty and noble terms it is likely to suffer financial limitations which will prevent full achievement of both its intellectual and its economic goals. The latter cannot be ignored in a nation such as the United States, in which world leadership and even survival depend upon economic power.

Accordingly, this report explores the economics of education from several approaches. It deals with these questions:

1. What are some of the major demands of modern technology on the public schools?
2. What is the relation of education to individual earnings?
3. What new insights and evidences are economists developing concerning education as investment in human capital and as a factor in national economic growth?
4. What is the effect of education when its full power is focused on a particular segment of production?
5. What are the individual and social penalties resulting from denial of adequate schooling to a considerable percentage of our population?
6. What are some of the requisites for the development of a system of public education which is right in amount and kind?
7. Has the financial support of public schools been sufficiently responsive to the demands made upon them?
8. What expenditures will be required in the future for the effective development of public schools?
9. What are some of the fiscal actions required to provide adequate financing for public education?

Information on such questions as the foregoing does not provide easy answers to the problem of what amount should be expended for public education in a particular locality, in a State or in the Nation as a whole. They do constitute one basis for decision in the complex process of budgeting funds for public schools.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE AND AUTOMATION—II

Research, the application of new knowledge to industrial processes, and automation are remaking the economy of the United States. The scope and rapidity of this change are bringing about what some have called the second industrial revolution. The impacts of this revolution are profound for education. It is imperative that schools and colleges respond to the new and changing demands being made upon them.

Occupational trends

Professional and Technical Workers

One of the most persistent occupational trends in the United States is the growing demand for workers with increased general education and advanced technical and professional training. A college degree is required even for admission to training for a mounting number of callings.[1] Many business concerns look upon a college degree as the minimum requirement for employment in positions that lead to the more attractive types of work.

The fastest growing occupations are those that require larger amounts of general education and advanced technical and professional training.

The 1960 U.S. Census Report states that "professional and technical personnel, the most highly educated of all workers, are increasing fastest." The following are figures for 1950–70:

	Millions
1950	5
1960	7.5
1970 (estimated)	10

Professional and technical workers in 1950 were 8 percent of the employed population. By 1970, this percentage will be well over 12.5.[2]

Skilled and Semiskilled Workers

Below the professional and technical occupations in amount of training required are those designated as skilled and semiskilled. Both are growing in number, but the skilled occupations are growing more rapidly than the semiskilled.[3]

Unskilled Workers

The percent of the employed population now classified as unskilled will continue to decline.

The least skilled of all workers do the hardest physical work, except perhaps farm laborers, and are usually the lowest paid. Over the past half century their place in the labor force has dropped from 12.5 percent to less than 6 percent in 1960. In numbers, the need for unskilled workers will remain about the same during the coming decade, but their proportion in the labor force will continue to drop—to less than 5 percent by 1970.[4]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Occupational Outlook Handbook," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 24.

[3] Ibid., pp. 22–25.

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

Figure 1 shows the trend for three occupational groups from 1900 to 1960 and estimates the trend to 1975. The group with the highest training (professional and technical workers) composes a rapidly rising percentage of the work force. The percentages of the work force classified as farm workers and industrial laborers are rapidly declining.

FIG. 1.—*Occupational distribution of workers*

[Percent of all workers]

Professional and technical:	
1900	4.39
1920	5.4
1940	7.5
1950	8.6
1960	11.2
1975	14.0
Farm:	
1900	37.5
1920	27.0
1940	17.4
1950	11.8
1960	8.1
1975	5.3
Laborers (industrial):	
1900	12.5
1920	11.6
1940	9.4
1950	6.6
1960	5.5
1975	4.4

Sources: Data for 1900–50 from Kaplan, David L., and Casey, M. Claire. "Occupational Trends in the United States, 1900 to 1950." U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Working Paper No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958. Table 2, p. 7. Data for 1960 and 1975 from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Actual 1900–1960 and estimated 1975.

Farm Workers

Farm workers made up 53 percent of the total labor force in 1870; by 1970 they will represent only about 6 percent. The greatest technological revolution in the United States has taken place in agriculture.

In 1870, the number of farmers and farm workers was about 7 million. It reached a peak of 11.5 million around 1910.

By 1950, the number of farm workers had declined to 7 million (12 percent of the labor force), the same number as 80 years before, even though the Nation's population had increased almost fourfold and the quantity of farm products by 4.5 times.

This downward trend in the number of farm workers continued during the 1950–60 decade. In 1960, only 5.9 million farmers and farm laborers were in the labor force; by 1970, the total will have dropped still further, to about 5 million, only 6 percent of the labor force, a ninefold drop in 100 years.[5]

The impact of the reduction in the number of farmworkers is far greater in some States than in others. This is how it is in Mississippi:

The 1960 census shows that over half the farm population of Mississippi has moved to urban centers in the past 10 years, and also about 75 percent of the population lives in urban centers, so we need fewer and fewer farmers, and industrialization is demanding more education. To just get out there and plow a mule, you know, like it has been in Mississippi up until a few years ago, could be done without being able to read and write. But, now we have come to the time that something is going to have to be done about this thing because it requires skills and education that haven't been required before. And it is an emergency.[6]

Industrial Workers

The following examples are illustrative of the present condition of industrial workers:

Because of technological change, about 200,000 production jobs have been eliminated in recent years in the aircraft industry alone.

Productivity (or output per man-hour) in the soft coal industry rose 96 percent since World War II, but employment fell by 262,700.

Steel production in 1960 was almost the same as in 1950, but employment declined by 80,000, or 14 percent.

Employment in the manufacture of refrigerators and washing machines has fallen 18 percent, and employment in instrument production has fallen 15 percent in the last 7 years.[7]

In the highly automated chemical industry, the number of production jobs has fallen 3 percent since 1956, while output has soared 27 percent. Though steel capacity has increased 20 percent since 1955, the number of men needed to operate the industry's plants—even at full capacity—has dropped 17,000. Auto employment slid from a peak of 746,000 in boom 1955 to 614,000 in November 1961.

Since the meat industry's 1956 employment peak, 28,000 workers have lost their jobs, despite a production increase of 3 percent. Bakery jobs have been in a steady decline from 174,000 in 1954 to 163,000 in 1960.[8]

Employment in railroad jobs fell from a total of 1,400,000 in 1947 to 730,000 in 1961—a drop of 670,000. Technological shifts (the diesel displacement of steam was a large factor) and dwindling business in the postwar period are what worked this occupational upheaval in the Nation's railroads.[9]

Changing composition of the labor force

White-Collar and Blue-Collar Jobs

The growing demand for highly trained and skilled personnel and the declining demand for unskilled workers have brought about a major transition in the composition of the labor force.

In 1956, for the first time in the Nation's history, professional, managerial, office, and sales workers outnumbered craftsmen, operatives, and laborers. The startling import of this continuing trend can be fully realized only when we remember that in 1910 the number of white-collar jobs was less than half the blue-collar jobs; now they have left the blue-collars behind, and by 1970 they will be 25 percent greater than blue-collars.[10]

Employment of Women

Another major occupational change concerns the employment of women. It is estimated that during the 1960's the number of women working for salaries and wages will rise at nearly twice the rate for men. By 1970, women workers will number 30 million and will constitute one-third of the labor force. At least two of every five women aged 20–65 will be gainfully employed in 1970.[11]

The growing demand for skilled, semiprofessional, and professional workers can be met in part by capitalizing the potential talents of our womanpower. The considerable percentage of women who lack training required for better-paid jobs are the last untapped reservoir of unspecialized brainpower.

Gains and problems of technological change

Technological change has brought highly significant gains and has also created serious problems, as illustrated below.

Hours and Character of Work

On the gain side is a sharp decline in the number of hours per workweek. The hours in the average workweek declined from 70 in 1850 to 60 in 1900 and to just under 40 in 1960, as shown in figure 2 [not printed in RECORD].

There has also been a marked change in the nature of work. Fewer and fewer workers are engaged in hard manual labor. Gerard Piel describes this change as follows:

"During the past 25 years our technology entered upon the era of automatic production. The real work of extracting nature's bounty from soil and rock and transforming it into goods is no longer done by human muscles, and less and less by human nervous systems. It is done by mechanical energy, by machines under control of artificial nervous systems, by chemicals, and by such subtle arts as applied genetics."

"While the impact of these developments upon industry has attracted most of the attention, their impact upon agriculture has amounted to a revolution."[12]

Per Capita Production

The length of the average workweek has sharply declined. Hard manual work is the lot of a decreasing minority of our labor force. Nevertheless, productivity per capita has sharply increased in the United States.

Between 1929 and 1962 our population grew 53 percent, while our gross national product, in constant (1954) dollars, grew 159 percent. The result is the high standard of living of our affluent society and the economic power that is a major deterrent to foreign aggression.

Technology has brought great gains and also has given rise to serious problems. A major problem is the imbalance between the type of labor force our new technology increasingly requires and the skills and qualifications of large numbers of workers in our present labor force. Far too many receive inadequate education and meager training, while the demand grows for broader education and more specialized skills.

School Dropouts and Elderly Workers

A great variety of unskilled jobs, which youngsters formerly filled at least as stepping stones to something better,[13] or which elderly workers filled, are now disappearing. For example, in New York City alone, there are 40,000 fewer elevator operators as a result of the use of automatic elevators. Each year there will be proportionately fewer openings for the unskilled workers.

Unfilled New Jobs

At the same time that thousands of jobs are being wiped out, new ones are being created in areas unknown only a few years ago. Many of these jobs are unfilled for lack of qualified workers. It is not that there are not jobs to be filled but that there are not enough people with the training required to fill them.[14]

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 16–17.

[6] Williams, W. E., supervisor of adult education, Mississippi State Department of Education. Testimony before U.S. 87th Cong., House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, 1962.

[7] U.S. 87th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation. "Impact of Automation on Employment," Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, 1961, 23 pp.

[8] Time, "The Automation Jobless—Not Fired, Just Not Hired." Time 77: 69; Feb. 24, 1961.

For further data see U.S. 87th Cong., op. cit.

[9] From a study by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, October 1962.

[10] U.S. Department of Labor, op. cit., p. 23.

[11] U.S. Department of Labor. "Manpower Challenge of the 1960's." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 7.

[12] Piel, Gerard, "Can Our Economy Stand Disarmament?" Atlantic Monthly 210: 37; September 1962.

[13] President Kennedy, speaking recently on behalf of the youth employment opportunity bill stated that "we have in this country 1 million boys and girls who are out of school and out of work. In the next 8 years of this decade, according to some predictions, we are going to have 8 million boys and girls who are going to leave school before they finish, and they are going to be looking for work. They are going to be unskilled, and they may have trouble finding jobs."

Costs of Unemployment

These conditions add up to a hard core of unemployed workers. The insidious growth of unemployment is one of the most critical problems confronting our economic system.

Economic losses from unemployment are never regained. The social costs of unemployment are even greater than the economic losses. The discouragement and frustration of able-bodied men and women, eager to work but unable to find employment, cannot be measured in dollars any more than can the distress of their families. Prolonged unemployment contributes to further unemployment, since human capital deteriorates when it is idle. Unemployment impairs the skills that workers have acquired. It also contributes to family distintegration, crime, and other social ills.[15]

The evils of unemployment afflict all age groups in our labor force. Unemployment is especially high among out-of-school teenagers. This is undoubtedly one of the factors responsible for juvenile delinquency. Unemployment among men from age 20 to age 60 or 65 afflicts both the unemployed man and the other members of his family. Many qualified persons aged 60 and older are ready and able to work, but are denied employment.

Proposed cures for unemployment

There appears to be general agreement that a greatly expanded program for training and retraining the work force is essential if unemployment is to be lessened. There is disagreement about whether such a program is enough. William Glazier states that there is a persistent hard core of unemployed workers, which grew from fewer than 500,000 persons in 1953 to about 2 million at the beginning of 1960. He writes:

"The number has continued to grow. Technological change, decline in some industries and growth in others, shifts in the geographical locations of plants, and changes in consumer demand have caused these many millions of workers to be unemployed and have kept them that way. They are the victims of growth and progress in the American economy.

"The consequential shifts in the structure of industry have left behind a growing pool of unskilled and semiskilled workers handicapped by the limits of a grade school education, equipped with years of routine production-work experience, and burdened with families to support. Many are members of minority groups. In addition, there are the young people under 22 years of age, who have the highest unemployment rate of any group in the Nation today; half of them have still to get their first jobs. They are largely untrained for employment.

"The paradox * * * is that all over the Nation jobs go unfilled. * * * There seems to be no lack of people on the one hand or unfilled jobs on the other; what appears to be lacking is people with sufficient training and the right skills. The jobless worker, in the wrong place with the wrong skills and aptitudes, has become the fall guy. * * *

"As a social objective, training or retraining employed and unemployed persons is much to be desired. It would improve the employability of workers, open up more attractive and higher paid job opportunities, and raise the productive level of the entire Nation. The debatable issue is the appropriateness of retraining as a remedy for the current chronic unemployment."[16]

Positive Measures

Various measures have been suggested so that automation can increase productivity without creating serious unemployment. Some would slow down the pace of automation to a rate that would decrease the amount of labor displacement and joblessness. In some industries, featherbedding is defended as preferable to unemployment.

There is disagreement about how far retraining of those dispossessed of their jobs can be accepted as a solution for technological unemployment.

Regardless of one's point of view on these problems, modern technology and automation are here to stay. They are a stepped-up stage of the industrial revolution through which the output from an hour of labor has constantly been increased. If the United States should attempt to turn back or to stop the clock in this regard, it would lose its paramount economic position in today's competitive world.

The problem is not a new one. At a faster pace than in the past, we must discover the means whereby the rising productivity and standard of living, which are the fruits of technological progress, may be enjoyed without suffering the evil of unemployment and the ills that it breeds.[17]

Governmental Action

Various types of governmental action to alleviate unemployment are being considered, and some are being put into effect. Among the steps that have been suggested for government to take in dealing with chronic unemployment are these:

1. Objective and thorough study to determine the extent, location, and underlying causes of chronic unemployment.

2. Strengthened programs of vocational and technical training to help the untrained become proficient and to retrain those whose original skills are no longer needed.

3. Better information about employment opportunities in other areas of a given State or elsewhere in the country.

4. Industrial development programs on local and regional bases.

The first large-scale effort of the Federal Government to meet the problems posed by automation and unemployment is the $430 million manpower development and training bill which became a law on March 15, 1962. It authorized $100 million in Federal funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and $165 million in each of the 2 succeeding years, with States matching the Federal funds in the third year. More than 1 million persons are expected to benefit during the 3-year program. Priority is to go to unemployed persons and to farm families having net incomes of less than $1,200 per year.[18]

It is outside the scope of this report to appraise the many proposals that have been made and the actions that are being taken to alleviate unemployment. The important fact is that there is general agreement that education has a major role to play in working toward this end.

Modern economy

Ours is an economy that would be unable to operate without a growing percentage of educated workers. Schools, colleges, and graduate schools, by responding to the demands for an ever more highly educated labor force, make a major and indispensable contribution to economic growth.

This, to be sure, is only one of the purposes of education, but it is an important one. "Occupational Outlook Handbook" states the situation as follows:

"The nature of one's job determines in large measure the nature of one's life. Young people who have acquired a skill or a good basic education will have a better chance at interesting work, good wages, steady employment, and greater satisfaction in life in general. Getting as much education and training as one's ability and circumstances permit should, therefore, be high on the list of things to be done by today's youth."[19]

Current conditions indicate that the educated are most in demand and least likely to be unemployed in periods of either high or low economic activity. Under present trends, there appears to be little danger of overeducating our population, especially if effective guidance results in as close a matching as foresight will permit of the number trained and the number needed in each field.

One answer to the obsolescence of skills caused by technological change is reeducation and retraining of displaced workers.

Youths out of school and out of work present a different problem. The need is for cooperative work-training programs between schools and industry, which postpone the entry of these youths into the labor market until they are equipped with marketable skills.

Report of the 21st American Assembly

The final report of the 21st American Assembly on Automation and Technological Change states that to prepare our labor force for the needs of the new technology, we must further improve our educational standards generally and—

1. Increase substantially the number of scientists, engineers, teachers, doctors, and others in the professions.

2. Develop management personnel equipped with the background needed to understand the social and economic consequences of the new technology and with the capacity to adapt technology to the achievement of greater productivity.

3. Expand training programs for technicians and assistants to engineers, scientists, and other professional personnel.

4. Upgrade and modernize the skills of craftsmen and other workers.

5. Improve the quality of the elementary and secondary educational systems, giving particular attention to the basic skills of reading and mathematics, which provide the foundation for all later education and training, and increase the productivity of our education through new techniques.[20]

Range of New Demands

The following points from several sources suggest new demands which schools and colleges must meet:

1. The work force must be both broadly educated as citizens and highly trained as workers if they are to comprehend and adjust to current and future technological change. People must learn to face the necessity for geographical and occupational transfers; low levels of education and training limit mobility and increase insecurity.

2. An adequate supply of professional and technical people must be trained to meet the

---

[14] Buckingham, Walter, "The Impending Educational Revolution." Occasional Paper No. 1, Washington, D.C.: Project on the Educational Implications of Automation, National Education Association, 1961, p. 3.

[15] U.S. 87th Cong., op. cit., p. 14.

[16] Glazier, William. "Automation and Joblessness." Atlantic Monthly 210: 44–45; August 1962.

[17] See the following collection of 20 articles reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. U.S Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Impact of Automation." Bulletin No. 1287. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, 114 pp.

[18] NEA Journal. "News and Trends." NEA Journal 15: 4; April 1962.

[19] U.S. Department of Labor, "Occupational Outlook Handbook," p. 28.

[20] Reported in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 6, 1962.

growing needs. In recent years practically every field has been hampered by a shortage of scientists and engineers, of managers and competent administrators, of trained researchers, teachers, skilled craftsmen, and technicians.[21]

3. Vocational education must be geared to visible and continuing changes. Vocational education has been slow in adapting to changing needs, operating too much within the boundaries of concepts formulated around the time of World War I.

4. There should be much more careful planning of women's education to take account of the thousands who enter upon lifelong careers and the rising proportion of women who enter gainful employment before marriage and again after their children are in school or are past school age. To permit more and more women to enter the labor market without adequate training would be disadvantageous to them and to the economy.

5. How leisure time is used will determine whether technological progress and the shorter work day and week serve cultural, moral, and spiritual values as well as material ends. This calls for greater emphasis on education aimed at wise use of leisure time.

6. A more adequate educational and vocational guidance must be offered part-time and full-time junior and senior high school students and community college, junior college, and 4-year college students.

7. Education must be a lifelong process. Lifelong learning is a new imperative. To survive as productive members of our society and even to enjoy the opportunities offered by the promise of additional leisure will require additional knowledge and lifelong learning.

"It should be made clear to every worker in the land that the price of holding a job will increasingly depend on continuing education throughout the entire working life of the individual."[22]

How to deal with technological unemployment is a controversial issue. It is clear, however, that there is need for a labor force with constantly rising levels of general education and occupational training.

Schools will be involved in varying degrees in dealing with technological unemployment. In some cases, such as the elimination of illiteracy, the primary responsibility will rest on a system of public education that makes it impossible for a normal child to reach maturity lacking the ability to read and write. On the other hand, the retraining of adult workers, unemployed because of automation and other factors beyond the control of the individual, will require the involvement of schools to a lesser extent. Doubtless this retraining will require the cooperation of management and labor, certain types of governmental action, and understanding on the part of the community as a whole. Such cooperative action will not be easy to accomplish. But to permit the full impact of automation and other elements in the technological revolution to fall upon the individual worker without appropriate response would be folly with the gravest social consequences.

Fiscal implications

Substantial increases will be required in the financial support of education if it is to play its role in meeting our economy's rising demand for workers with more and better education and training and its role in providing certain types of education to reduce unemployment resulting from automation and technological change.

Whether this additional cost can and will be met will to a considerable degree depend upon the public's conception of the economic significance of education. The next sections of this report bear on this question.

EDUCATION AND EARNINGS—III

The correlation between amount of education and average earnings of individuals has caught the interest of economists. Leaving aside for the moment the issue of whether there is causal relationship between the two, and recognizing the complexity of the factors involved, let us look at the facts.

Education and average annual earnings

Studies as early as 1917 and many dated subsequently have shown that "persons with larger amounts of schooling generally have larger earnings."[23]

The most recent comprehensive figures on this relationship are those of Miller.[24] His findings show that in 1958 average earnings for males 25 years of age and over, associated with varying years of schooling, were as follows:

Less than 8 years	$2,551
8 years	3,769
High school, 1 to 3 years	4,618
High school, 4 years	5,567
College, 1 to 3 years	6,966
College, 4 years and more	9,206

Miller notes the regularity which marks the correlation between education and higher earnings. He finds "that in every year for which data are presented, the completion of an additional level of schooling was associated with higher average incomes for men. This finding parallels that obtained in numerous other studies of the relationship between education and income dating back to the early part of this century. Although the income levels have changed considerably during the past 20 years, the basic relationship between the extent of schooling and income appears to have remained the same."[25]

Education and lifetime earnings

Estimates of lifetime incomes, related to amount of education, are more significant than those for 1 year. Miller's study by complex computations produces derived figures for lifetime earnings from age 18 to death of individuals in the United States in different educational groups. Figure 3 is based on calculations from Miller's study. Miller, commenting on his estimates, states:

"Additional schooling is associated with a very substantial increase in lifetime income. On the basis of conditions in 1958, an elementary school graduate could expect to receive during his lifetime about $52,000 (or two-fifths) more income, on the average, than the person who had no schooling or who terminated his formal education before completing the eighth grade. The difference between the expected lifetime income of the average elementary school and high school graduate was equally striking. In 1958, the average elementary school graduate could expect a lifetime income of about $182,000, as compared to about $258,000 for the average high school graduate. The expected income differential associated with the 4 years of high school education therefore amounts to about $76,000, or 42 percent."[26]

FIG. 3.—*Estimated earnings from age 18 to death and years of schooling completed*

Elementary:	
Less than 8 years	$129,764
8 years	181,695
High school:	
1 to 3 years	211,193
4 years	257,557
College:	
1 to 3 years	315,504
4 years or more	435,242

NOTE.—The above data are based on arithmetic mean for males, 1958.

Source: Miller, Herman P., "Annual and Lifetime Income in Relation to Education." American Economic Review 50:21; December 1960.

Miller points out that many complex factors, other than education, are associated with the higher lifetime earnings of those with higher levels of education. For example, "Since a college degree is the 'open sesame' to many, if not most, high-paying jobs, it should come as no surprise that the greatest income gains associated with additional schooling appear at the college level."[27] Miller claims no direct causal relation between lifetime incomes and education. The conclusions of his study are these:

"This study largely represents an attempt to ascertain if the marked increase in the number and proportion of high school and college graduates during the past generation has been associated with a reduction in income differentials for these groups. * * *

"The figures show that despite large relative reductions in the supply of workers whose schooling did not extend beyond the eighth grade, this group had smaller relative income gains than high school graduates. On the other hand, the large relative increase in the supply of college-trained workers did not adversely affect their relative income position. On this basis it is concluded that the demand for more highly educated workers has kept pace with the increased supply of such workers, and, as a result, their relative income position has not changed. The fact that the proportion of men employed in professional and managerial work—the two major outlets for college-trained men—increased by 50 percent during the past generation suggests that industry has absorbed the increased flow of graduates from our universities."[28]

Demand for educated personnel

Some economists have argued that differentials in earnings associated with different amounts of education eventually will be reduced. It has been predicted that persistent increases in the supply of college-trained students will so flood the market that many of them will eventually be doomed to economic disappointment after graduation. No such trend is discernible in the period since 1939.

It is doubtless true that a prolonged economic depression would result in an oversupply of college graduates. There was an oversupply of nearly all classes of workers in the 1930's, but unemployment was less among trained than unskilled workers. The unskilled are the first to be laid off and last to be employed.

If one assumes prolonged depressions, when the economy comes near to dead center, there will be periods of unemployment and lowered earnings by persons with all levels of education. If one assumes economic activity even as vigorous as that of the United States since World War II, then there is an increasing demand for highly trained persons and a declining demand for the unskilled.

---

[21] Cassell, Frank H. "Changing Manpower Needs." NEA Journal 51: 55; April 1962.

[22] Clark, Harold, "Education in Our Complex Society." NEA Journal 51:52, April 1962.

[23] Norton, John K., "Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy." Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, 1940, pp. 115–121.

[24] Miller, Herman P., "Annual and Lifetime Income in Relation to Education." American Economic Review 50: 5; December 1960.

[25] Ibid., p. 4.

[26] Ibid., p. 22.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., p. 24.

A substantial stepping up of economic activity immediately requires more trained workers. During World War II, there was a serious shortage of workers in many occupations. Many public and private vocational schools ran two and sometimes three shifts and trained 13 million workers in response to the needs of the war period.

Today, there is a continuing shortage of many types of highly educated personnel. For example, the Federal Government finds it extremely difficult to fill civilian posts calling for highly trained persons.

The military demands an increasing percent of trained personnel. Most rejections for military service are among those with little schooling. Once, a young man was urged to "join the Navy and see the world." Now, he is urged to join the Armed Forces to obtain training and education available in hundreds of fields, provided directly by the military or in cooperation with educational institutions.

It is possible that agreement for substantial reduction of armaments would result in temporary oversupply of professional, technical, and skilled workers. Such a situation would require vigorous action in order to absorb this personnel in production for consumption rather than production for military preparedness.[29] However, dire predictions of unemployment and economic depression to follow the end of World War II were not fulfilled.

Under present trends, there appears to be little danger of overeducating our population, especially if effective guidance results in as close a matching as foresight will permit of the number trained and the number needed in each field.

Conclusions

It can be concluded from the facts to date that persons with larger amounts of education earn larger incomes. Even though the general level of schooling has continued to rise during the past generation, the substantial differentials between the earnings of those with less schooling and those with more schooling, at both the high school and the college levels, have continued to hold. The demand for highly trained technical and professional personnel continues to grow.

Just how much the higher earnings of those with more schooling are due solely to their larger amounts of education has yet to be determined. A number of economists are seeking objective answers to this question. They are also exploring the relation of the development of human capital to economic growth. The next section reviews their findings on this important question.

"FULL SPEED AHEAD"—ADDRESS BY CLYDE T. ELLIS, GENERAL MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for more than 25 years the rural electric program, financed by REA, has been recognized as an unquestioned success. Members of Congress who support this program can feel justly proud of its accomplishments. I consider it one of the greatest living success stories in modern American annals.

There are those who say that REA's work is nearly finished. They say, "Nearly all farms in the country now have electric lights, so what more is there for REA to do?" Anyone familiar with the electric industry knows that the demand for electricity in the country is doubling every 10 years and on the rural systems about every 7 years. A doubling of demand necessitates the installation of heavier conductor, transformers, and the like; this represents large capital outlays. Failure to meet this demand is to fail to meet the needs of rural people for adequate and reliable electric power.

Men with foresight have made it possible for the rural electric systems of the country to meet rural America's needs in the past. The REA program has had good leadership. The list of Administrators includes men of foresight and undoubted ability such as John Carmody, Claude Wickard, and the present able and energetic Administrator, Norman Clapp.

If one were to name the man who has done the most to mold and guide the rural electric program there would be no other choice than to name my good friend, a former Member of Congress, Clyde T. Ellis, long the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. For more than 20 years Clyde Ellis has provided continuity of leadership that has assured the growth and success of the rural electric cooperatives. He has led them in one successful campaign after another against the forces of the power companies which would spread their monopolistic control over the areas pioneered and developed by the small but courageous rural systems.

More than 95 percent of all of the REA-financed associations in the country belong to National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and more than 7,000 of these systems' managers and directors, and other rural leaders attended the association's 21st annual meeting in Las Vegas, Nev., in January of this year.

Clyde Ellis gave a ringing address; he did not rest on past successes, rather he focused the attention of his association's representatives on the more important role of the program in the future. That role includes more than just maintaining good electric service in our own rural areas. It includes exporting the REA idea to other areas in the Western Hemisphere.

In many Central and South American countries rural development is the most promising bulwark against the growing pressures of communism. It deserves our full support.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the most inspiring address by a great American, Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL SPEED AHEAD

The theme of this meeting is: "Rural Electrification—Important to America's Strength."

This is the story we want to tell—more of the future than of the past. We want the Nation to be aware of the continuing, increasingly important role our systems are playing in the modern society.

I. RECAST THE IMAGE

I want to recommend to you a program of action, beyond anything we have done yet, for getting us on the offensive with a positive living story. I want us to proudly hold up our heads like men, roll up our sleeves and get started full speed ahead. We must recast the image of rural electrification.

Too many people, even some of our friends, think and talk of us in terms of the depression-day programs of the thirties. Too many of us think and talk in terms of the dead past. We recite our glorious success in lighting the darkness of rural America and virtually ignore the tremendous contribution we are making now and will make to the total strength of the Nation.

We shall be judged now and in the future, not on what we have done, but on what we are doing today and shall do tomorrow.

What we're doing today

What are we doing today? We are serving 10 percent of the population and perhaps over three-fourths of the landmass of the country—the difficult part.

We are serving the breadbasket of the world, and partly because of our service the American farmer produces more food of higher quality at lower prices to consumers than any farmer anywhere in all of history.

We are serving more than 80,000 rural schools and churches.

We are employing directly more than 28,000 people with an annual payroll of more than $140 million, and much of this employment is right in the middle of some of the most depressed areas in America, where employment and income really count.

We are providing a yardstick for determining what electricity should cost, and every electric consumer in America benefits from that.

And because we are extending the benefits of electricity to so many millions of people, we have created a new billion-dollar-a-year market, still growing, for electric appliances and equipment. Most of this is made in the cities and gives jobs to city people, and to those in all the related fields of mining, transportation, and marketing.

All this that we are doing is new, a completely new sector of the economy.

We are serving directly hundreds of defense installations, all vital to the security of this Nation—missile bases of all types, missile and satellite tracking stations, radar and navigation control stations, even in the remotest areas—that help protect all America.

Throughout the United States we are taking the lead in rural areas development projects, just as we took the lead in getting the area development programs established. Rural areas development and the Area Redevelopment Administration have already achieved remarkable success and they're just getting started.

There is something more here, too—in our rural electric program—something which in the longer reach of history may be even more important than our tangible accomplishments. We are extending the cooperative, private ownership of electric systems to more than 5 million American households. Every consumer member of a rural electric system and every citizen of a local power district has one vote in the conduct of its affairs and the establishment of its policies. This is democracy at its finest, and this is the cause which America seeks to carry to the other nations of the world.

The REA pattern

In the highest Government circles in Washington this is becoming known as the REA pattern. As you know, we are being asked by the Agency for International Development (AID) of the State Department to lend our experience and know-how to the task of helping the critically important developing countries establish rural electrification cooperatives of their own.

---

[29] Piel, Gerard. "Can Our Economy Stand Disarmament?" Atlantic Monthly 210: 35–40; September 1962.

Last November National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and AID signed a reimbursable agreement in President Kennedy's office whereby National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is coordinating your efforts in this area. On that occasion, the President was highly complimentary of you and the rural electrification program as it is being carried out in this country and as you will now help others, and he underscored its importance to the Nation by saying, "I think this can be very important, in fact, one of the most significant actions taken by the AID agency."

For our part, all of us are proud, as Americans, that the country is turning to our program in a time of crisis as a significant weapon for democracy in the worldwide struggle with communism.

All of these, and many others, are things rural electric systems are doing today. The rural electrics are dynamic organizations, geared to the needs of the present in their own communities and responsive to the needs of the United States of America.

And they are ready, willing and able to go full speed ahead to meet the needs and challenges of tomorrow. They are prepared to serve their areas completely—and I mean provide the leadership and serve anything and everything that needs serving in those areas.

II. DEVELOP ALLIES

The second part of the program I want to present to you this morning deals with developing allies among other consumer groups. We've given lip service to this in the past, but unfortunately little has been done beyond the valuable work performed constantly through ECIC—the Electric Consumers Information Committee—in Washington.

If our program is to go full speed ahead, we must take other action now, to develop and hold all possible allies. To do this, we must identify our interests with those of consumers everywhere in a positive manner, urban as well as rural. To get and keep consumer support in the urban areas we must join with all loyal organized consumer groups in a drive against high electric rates everywhere. The desire for low cost electricity is something we share with all other consumer-oriented groups. We must take to them the story of the ridiculous padding that goes into the rate base of the cost-plus power company operations.

I recommend that every system and statewide take steps to establish a local and State counterpart of our national Electric Consumers Information Committee, now. This will provide a vehicle for bringing together on a local and statewide basis all consumer groups which have a natural interest in low cost power. This has already been done with some success in a few States. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the national Electric Consumers Information Committee are ready to assist all of you with any organizational details.

Electric consumers are being overcharged by well over a billion dollars a year by the monopoly power companies, and next to nothing is ever done about it. Under our present system of regulation, next to nothing can be done about it.

Our economists have compared the allowable rate of return for 38 large electric utilities with their actual rate of return between 1956 and 1960, inclusively. They calculate the total overcharge by just these companies during this 5-year period at $1,259,043,000—and this is only part of it. Incidentally, if the people of Nevada are interested, the total overcharge during this period by the Nevada Power Co. is calculated at $8,290,000—assuming that 6 percent is a fair rate of return. No wonder it can afford to build spite lines in the desert to try to kill Amargosa.

Here is how it works. A rate, usually suggested by the power company, is fixed by a regulatory commission which is supposed to give the company a certain rate of return, or profit, over and above all operating costs and taxes. But almost always the company gets the rates fixed so high that it earns considerably more than the allowable rate of return.

Most commissions are in effect powerless to do anything about this. The company keeps it.

I propose that we join with other consumer organizations in demanding a congressional investigation of power company overcharges, and in supporting State and Federal legislation to give commissions the power to make them do it—make them in some way return these overcharges to their consumers.

This might be done in part by an amendment to the Federal Power Act to provide that all earnings in excess of a fair rate of return must be used in the public interests as provided by the commission. This would require the Federal Power Commission to check into power company earnings each year. Such an FPC amendment could apply, of course, only to interstate and wholesale power sales. State commissions need similar legislation to cover retail sales.

If a commission should find it not feasible to require a company to actually return the excess to each consumer—though this would be the most desirable—then the commission might treat the excess profits as capital contributed by the consumer, and deduct them from the rate base. This would help bring about a reduction in rates, including wholesale rates to rural electrics.

Now is an excellent time to call for a congressional investigation and to try for reform legislation. There is mounting evidence that consumers are beginning to rebel against high electric rates. In November, the Boston Herald demanded editorially that the new Governor of Massachusetts do something about the high power rates in New England.

A few weeks later a group of industrialists in New York City charged publicly that industrial expansion there is being and would be seriously slowed unless the wall of unreasonable power rates is lowered as soon as possible.

As people everywhere constantly use more power in their homes and businesses and industries, as people realize that power is a rapidly growing cost factor in everything they consume, I predict a rising interest and concern about power rates. So now is the time to move, full speed.

III. GO ON THE PUBLIC-INTEREST OFFENSIVE—FULL SPEED

I have suggested we go on the offensive full speed with a positive story, and I've outlined some proven techniques. I have suggested we recruit all possible allies in a broad program of assisting not only ourselves but electric consumers of the cities too, and I have suggested how it might be done. Now I suggest we go on the offensive to reverse or reform certain trends and practices of the Nation's power industry that are not in the public interest.

I believe it's in the public interest for the rural electrics to have legal protection against these territorial raids, whether they be in the form of a sellout or piracy of individual loads. In several States you have demonstrated that some sort of protective, fairplay legislation can be passed. I recommend that, in every State where such protection does not exist, you move through your statewide to achieve it and that you give your statewide resources it needs to do the job. If Idaho could do it—and Arkansas, Wisconsin, Oklahoma, and other States—then so can the rest of you who need it.

And I think the time has come, too, when we should call on our lawyers and legislative experts to make further efforts to determine what types of Federal territorial protection, legislative and otherwise, are possible.

In another area of the public interest, I believe the consumer groups have a real stake in joining us to get repeal of the vast subsidies now flowing to the power companies under the fast tax writeoff schemes, including that absurd 3-percent tax credit subsidy Congress gave the power companies last year. Even the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. testified against that one, although it would have meant a $75 million annual windfall for the company. A.T. & T. said it would be an outright subsidy for something a utility was supposed to do anyway.

But the power companies were right in there fighting for it. They don't share such concern for the taxpayer any more than they do for the ratepayer.

I don't have to document to this audience that REA, the Interior Department, the Corps of Engineers, TVA, and the Federal Power Commission are not all going in exactly the same direction on matters affecting us. We have become increasingly disturbed by the actions of the Federal Power Commission.

The latest and most alarming is FPC's very recent decision to declare the rural electric co-ops to be public utilities and to exercise jurisdiction over many G. & T. cooperatives and some distribution systems. FPC's action promises to give us all the disadvantages of being public utilities without giving any of the advantages. This action, unless reversed, could throw us to the mercy of the power companies and give them everything they've sought against us but failed to get through normal processes—prolonged public hearings on our loans and wholesale rates, review and appeal to the courts of every FPC decision they don't like.

I believe it is now necessary and in the public interest that the administration exert more leadership and solidarity of purpose in the interest of an abundant supply of electric power in the economy at low cost, for everybody. Somehow we have just got to help get the various agencies of the administration going in the same direction—the right direction—on power.

The President of the United States has called several White House conferences to get people together and crystallize policy in several other areas, such as recreation, conservation, and education.

You have already made suggestions in this direction, with respect to power, in the regional meetings, even when the need was less urgent. Therefore, in your behalf, I now ask the President to call a White House conference on electric energy at the earliest possible time, to include all sources of energy and every segment of electric power generation and distribution.

I won't dwell this morning on other aspects of our public interest legislative program which we have explored together in the past. Your policy is clear in support of regional interties and common carrier transmission lines, and we will be in there fighting for them. We will also do everything we possibly can to secure authorizations and funds for the water resources development projects which you support but which have not been realized as yet.

In the session of Congress just begun, we expect the hardest fight in years—even tougher than last year—on REA loan funds, particularly for generation and transmission. And we must drive again, I believe, for the loan account bookkeeping arrangement to give us credit for the loan funds we repay.

Great battles lie ahead for us. Ever more rapidly changing times make our chances of continuing success more difficult each year.

CURBING THE CUBAN EXILES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very good editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "We Have To Curb the Cuban Exiles."

Since my speech of yesterday urging a strict enforcement of our laws against the irresponsible conduct of Cuban exiles, manifested through their raids on Cuban and Russian shipping from our shores, I have received many calls and messages agreeing completely with my speech.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE TO CURB THE CUBAN EXILES

The dissatisfaction of the Cuban exiles over U.S. Government efforts to curb their raids by sea against Castro and his Russian exiles is evident and understandable. To them, anything that harasses communism in the Caribbean is legitimate and necessary, and many Americans sympathize with that attitude and the actions that flow from it. But the reasons why Washington is backing its disapprobation of the raids with stringent enforcement of American neutrality statutes are sound and compelling.

The raids have not, and, under present circumstances, cannot have any real effect in weakening either Castro's hold on Cuba or the Soviet Union's hold on Castro. They are pinpricks. And while the same may be said for anti-Castro guerrilla attacks in Cuba itself, the raids are taking place at sea—that is, in an area where policing becomes an international, rather than a municipal, obligation.

The law of the sea regarding military activity by those who do not act under the commission of a legal, recognized government is very ancient and very stern. To put no finer point on it, such activity is piracy.

To be sure, in recent years there has been a tendency to condone illegal acts committed on the high seas (as well as in the air) when these are politically motivated. The granting of asylum by Brazil to the terrorists who seized a Venezuelan freighter is a case in point. But the trend is not a healthy one for those who travel by sea or in the international air on their lawful occasions. And in the particular case of Cuba, seaborne raids by exiles pose a special danger to the United States.

Some of those exiles undoubtedly would like to precipitate an armed conflict between the United States and Castro's forces as the surest way in which to free Cuba. Some of Castro's officers, if not the dictator himself, are not averse to raising the temperature of the Caribbean in order to keep Russian troops in the island and bring back the Soviet missiles. And the Soviet Union itself, after backing down on the missile question, might well wish to assert itself on an issue in which international law is on its side.

This could mean a succession of incidents and reprisals in which the United States might lose its freedom of action and be forced into hostilities over acts as meaningless in themselves as the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand that precipitated World War I. That would be intolerable.

Surely Washington can acquire the information, as it has the means, to prevent a type of anti-Castro activity that cannot benefit the cause of a free America and could set the world aflame.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] spoke last Sunday evening, March 31, 1963, before the opening dinner of the biennial meeting of the B'nai B'rith Women at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In his remarks, Senator KEATING, one of the Nation's most respected champions of equal rights, called for an end of discrimination against women and chronicled the increasingly important role which women are playing in all phases of our national life.

The B'nai B'rith Women have been concerned throughout their history with problems of equal rights and equal justice.

It was fitting that Senator KEATING, with his magnificent record in this field, should have been chosen to address this outstanding organization.

His pertinent and eloquent remarks, will be of interest to many Members of the Senate, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KEATING URGES PROGRESS IN ENDING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

It is appropriate, I feel, that your dynamic organization should meet here in Washington. Washington is the old-fashioned town meeting of America's years of birth and growth—a town meeting magnified in size, but unchanged in essence. Under the dome of the Capitol, as under the roof of the old town hall, the voice of the people is heard—the will of the people is made manifest.

This home of our National Government is the beating heart of the body politic we call our Republic.

It keeps in constant, unending flow, to the remotest reaches of this vast Nation, the lifeblood of our historic traditions of freedom and human dignity. And just as the heart takes its strength from the body, only to return it, so does government take its strength from the body of citizens—180 million Americans—who are America. Many life forces flow into the mainstream of our national life to create the surging power of that mainstream.

B'nai B'rith is a manifestation, a living, vital manifestation of the great life force that is the Jewish people.

Your own personal involvement in the future of humanity, in the fate of humanity, is a reflection of a centuries-old acceptance by the Jewish faith of the concept that life is not perfect but perfectible, and that its perfectibility is not the mission of leaders and governments alone, but of individual citizens.

It may well be said that the stream of history is like the sea. Some generations are privileged to travel an ocean of time that is, in a sense, a life cruise on serene waters, unmarred by the storms of war, unaffected by sudden convulsive disturbances of tremendous social change or of political tides that threaten to engulf and sink the very ship of human freedom.

Our voyage today is not serene. It would be false to paint calm into the sea of life on which we are embarked. This is not a pleasure cruise but a sea trial that will call for our full reserves of courage of the heart, sharpness of the mind, and dedication of the spirit.

For we stand at a point in history where no man, no woman has stood before. Consider with me for a moment what makes this year of 1963 an unparalleled year in the history of human destiny.

In vast areas of Africa and in parts of Asia the long silent centuries have come to an end.

The bugles of freedom have blown. Nations rise literally before our eyes, like giants long deep in sleep, and they bring a new dimension to history, a new challenge to the free nations of the world.

And their people are no longer remote from us. In the arithmetic of time and space we used to think of them as light years away. But today they are only a heartbeat distant. The drums of their destiny resound in our ears—because it is a common destiny that we share—the destiny of humanity on this earth. What happens in the Congo, or in southeast Asia doesn't merely happen to the Congolese, to the Laotians, to the people of South Vietnam. It happens to us. It is a shaping force in our lives. Victory or defeat for the common cause of the dignity of man in those areas in victory or defeat in our lives, in our destinies.

The world is full of areas of ferment and change—Europe, the Middle East—Latin America—wherever we spin the globe we touch points of the vast combat area where freedom fights tyranny, where the present fights the past—and all this against the ominous background of man's new-found power to destroy the very civilization he has built up over centuries of time.

Now this is a less spectacular phenomenon of history that I should like to discuss with you briefly today. This is the new role, the more dynamic, more meaningful, more decisive role that women are playing in the shaping of our present and in the creating of our future. As I said, it is not a spectacular phenomenon, because it is a growth rather than an explosion, a developing factor rather than an achieved reality. But this slow revolution is nevertheless a revolution—and its implications are great, its promise is great.

Time was—and within our time—when the only possible award to a woman was—shall I say—a Good Housekeeping Award—in the sense that her preeminent and accepted role was that of wife and mother. Careers were the vested interest of the male of the species. Marriage, maternity, and homemaking, all important as they are, were the only futures to which the average woman could aspire.

But the revolution is here. The sleeping beauty that is womanhood has awakened—awakened to the challenge of life, the opportunities of life, to the new dimensions of interest that make the world a matter of concern as well as the home, that direct her energies to new channels of participation in the life of the community, of the Nation, of the globe.

I spoke of this change as a slow revolution yet in the light of the silent centuries of women's noninvolvement in life beyond the home, much, indeed, has happened in the little more than four decades since American women were accorded the vote. Since that historic acceptance by the male of a two-power world, the ladies have amply proven that they are fully capable of accepting the rights and discharging the responsibilities of active and affirmative participation in the life of this Nation. American women have made outstanding contributions to business, labor, and the professions as well as to government and politics.

It strikes me as more than a mere coincidence that the era of the great forward strides in our national progress—in fields of social advance, of education, of closer international cooperation has, in fact, occurred during the 42 years that the vote has been accorded to—and used by—the women of our land. I say "used by" pointedly, for in the 1960 national election, is is estimated that as many women voted as did men, perhaps a few more.

The fact is, of course, that you members of the fair sex did not look upon the vote as an adornment, as a bouquet thrown to you by a nation of gallant males.

You accepted it for what it is—not an end, but a means to an end—and you made use of it with this purpose in mind.

For what did the women want? They wanted an end to illiteracy—something less than a 72-hour week for women workers—an end to child labor—a lower death rate for mothers and infants—clean milk, clean streets, pure food. These and much more.

They wanted equal guardianship for their children and they wanted to serve on juries. They wanted honest elections and shorter ballots. They wanted consolidated schools and the control of venereal diseases. They wanted better libraries and compulsory school attendance laws.

They wanted protection of dependent, delinquent, neglected, and handicapped children and they wanted better ways to nominate candidates for office. They wanted freer trade among nations and they wanted independent citizenship of women. They wanted the abolition of the spoils system and the strengthening of civil service.

They got most of these things and more besides. They didn't do it simply by mentioning their wishes to their city councilmen, their State assemblymen or their Congressmen. They studied and they worked and they were politically effective.

Now the fact remains—the disturbing yet not disheartening fact—that despite the change in the status of women, in the role of women, in the influence and impact of women in our national life, there remain areas of disparity, of discrimination which are, if I may so put it, the battlefields of the present and the future in this campaign to take sex out of citizenship, to make opportunity no longer a closed corporation.

In this connection, merely to cite the Federal service, 76.1 percent of women were—at the most recent calculation—in the five lowest salary grades, earning less than $4,500—while only 25.1 percent of the men earned this little.

At the other end of the spectrum, let us look at the figures on high salaries. In spite of the fact that approximately 1 out of every 3 Federal white collar workers is a woman most of them don't reach the high salary levels. In grade 18, for example, which is the highest civil service grade, there are 254 men and 3 women. In grade 17 there are 561 men and 8 women; grade 16, 1,271 men and 13 women; grade 15, 11,159 men and 162 women.

Now, parenthetically, let me brag a little and say that out of the seven of my own top people, on the professional staff three are women—which, I feel, illustrates rather forcibly my personal stand in this matter.

On the debit side, as well, are other facts of life that women are forced to live with in our Nation. They are not eligible to serve on juries in Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina. In Texas a married woman cannot go into business for herself without the permission of the court. In four of our States, a husband has complete control over his wife's holdings.

I used the term battleground in appraising the all-too-often secondary role assigned to women, and I think it is appropriate, because women like yourselves—the women of B'nai B'rith, and so many other dynamic groups, are not passive, but militant, in extending the frontiers of involvement, of service, of acceptance that the male sex persists in defending.

This defense is what I firmly believe to be a rear guard action that is not fated to succeed.

Indeed, its success would be a failure, in a sense, insofar as the broad concept of democracy and freedom truly has meaning. It would be a failure as well because it would deny this Nation the use of the great sources of strength, of skill, of talent, of spiritual force, that lie—let me, as a man confess it—under the pretty hats and in the dedicated hearts of the sex that men call gentle—while secretly respecting its strength.

To me one of the signal contributions of American women to the life of our times is the active concern they are showing in the vast and complex housekeeping chore represented by the problems, the challenges, the dangers of the world in which we live. Through the medium of organizations like your own, through clubs, committees, study groups and citizen associations, you have extended the searchlight of your interest, your concern, until it now ranges the world.

If I would pay a special tribute to you women of B'nai B'rith today, it is not in a spirit of rising to the occasion—but of recognizing the fact that you women—in a very special, in a very meaningful way, have risen to the occasion that history has created—the occasion to lift hearts and voices to make this a world closer to our concept of what it means to be a member of the community of man.

After all, the dignity of man and of woman is not something we can sit home and wait for—like a letter we hope has been written—a letter we hope will arrive.

On the contrary, the forward movement of humanity to new levels of justice, of freedom, comes only when human effort, human will, human resolve push it forward—when the human spirit stops accepting the world as it is, and fights for the better world it finds in its dreams, in its hopes—in its heart.

The cause of B'nai B'rith is a great and stirring cause—because it is the cause of humanity, the cause of brotherhood, the cause of free men who seek to give freedom an ever richer meaning, an ever-extending dominion.

This cause you honor and enrich by your dedication was born of a great and ancient faith. It was born deep in the hearts and in the history of the Jewish people. It is as old as that spirit of brotherhood, which was, in a sense, the birthmark of that splended and courageous people.

I have been several times, either six or seven, to Israel. I know it not merely as a place on the map. Having seen it, I know it for what it is—a page in history—a page written in bold, brave letters by a bold, brave people—a page that tells what man can achieve on this earth when his spirit, his will, his mind and his muscle are committed to creating the substance of reality out of the challenge of a dream.

And it is because I know Israel and its people—it is because I know the great spiritual and intellectual enrichment our Nation has received from its Jewish citizens—and it is because I know the magnificent role and achievements of B'nai B'rith that I feel proud and privileged to be with you here today.

One may well say that any victory over prejudice is a victory for us all—for our Nation—for humanity. The battle is not easy. At times it seems almost hopeless, but there is a candle of courage that leads us on, because we know that we are building, however slowly, greater mansions for the spirit of man—that we are building a world where freedom does not come in colors, in creeds, in sizes, or in half portions—but is the common heritage, the common pride, the common glory of us all.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record two editorials discussing the series of civil rights bills, which a group of Republican Senators, including myself, introduced last Thursday to implement the legislative recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the platform pledges of both major parties in 1960. The editorials, one from the New York Times this morning, the other from the Washington Post yesterday, underscore fairly both the broad scope of our bills and their significance.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1963]

Reminder on Civil Rights

A group of Senate Republicans has introduced a sheaf of civil rights bills which top anything we have seen thus far in the new Congress. New York's two Senators, Javits and Keating, are in this group. So are Case of New Jersey; Scott of Pennsylvania; Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Kuchel, of California; Beall, of Maryland; and Fong, of Hawaii.

The bills these gentlemen have introduced would do many useful things: Give the Commission on Civil Rights permanent status; outlaw discriminating practices at the polls; do the same thing in federally financed housing projects; penalize discrimination in Federal employment, and enforce a more rapid pace in the achievement of school desegregation.

It is easy enough to dismiss all this as a political gesture, designed to embarrass the Kennedy administration. But the fact remains that, while President Kennedy sent a civil rights message to Congress on February 28, he has not followed it up with concrete legislative proposals. The Republicans now have.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1. 1963]

Politics and Promises

Republican Senators Case, Fong, Javits, Keating, Kuchel, and Scott have introduced a comprehensive set of bills designed to eradicate racial discrimination in the areas of voting rights, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. We think it is scarcely too much to say that if these bills were enacted and effectively administered they would serve to solve the most vexing and disfiguring of American domestic problems. They would confer on American Negroes the first-class citizenship promised to them by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments nearly a full century ago.

These Republican proposals are radical in the sense that they go to the root of the race problem and seek to excise it by treating all men equally regardless of color. But they are not at all radical in the sense of being novel. One need not search very far to find their antecedents. All these proposals are set forth as solemn promises in the Republican Party platform for 1960. All these proposals are also set forth as solemn promises in the Democratic platform of 1960. It would be hard to say which platform trumpets the promises more appealingly and melodiously. But it is easy to say that the promises are as yet unfulfilled.

They are not unrealizable. They are not visionary. Indeed, the Republican platform of 1960 said of them that "each of the following pledges is practical and within realistic reach. They are serious—not cynical—pledges made to result in maximum progress." The Democratic platform asserted that "the time has come to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities." The Democrats were then seeking the Presidency and so their platform included an observation that "what is now required is effective moral and political leadership by the whole executive branch of our Government to make equal opportunity a living reality for all Americans."

For all the loftiness of purpose and sincerity of concern among the half dozen Republican sponsors of the civil rights measures pledged by the two major political parties, no one, we suppose, seriously expects any of these bills to be enacted into law in the 88th Congress. The chances are against any of them even coming to a vote in both Houses of Congress.

THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an outstanding book review printed in the Catholic Transcript, the archdiocesan newspaper of Connecticut. The review concerned the new book by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, "The Iron Curtain," and was written by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Kennedy, an outstanding scholar, lecturer, writer, and churchman, who is the editor of the Catholic Transcript.

Monsignor Kennedy points out how the Overstreet book traces the origin of the Iron Curtain under Lenin, its development under Stalin, and its perpetuation and refinement under Khrushchev. The books points out that the absolute control over information, travel, and communication which the Communist Party exercises over the people in its grasp is essential to the preservation of the Communist system. Should the Kremlin ever become unable to practice a ceaseless brainwashing of the Russian people, or to prevent these people from getting information from the outside, their system could not survive.

The Overstreets point out that the free world should make a constant target of the Iron Curtain. In Monsignor Kennedy's words:

> The authors strongly urge organized action against the Iron Curtain. World public opinion, they maintain, should be brought to bear against the barricade set up by the Communists. "It is high time," they say, "for totalitarian communism to be confronted not by random questions and expostulations but by an informed and tenacious demand that it show cause for its need to operate behind a barrier of electrified barbed wire, minefields, guard towers, jamming stations, press censorship, and travel restrictions."
>
> They list specific demands which should be voiced endlessly and tirelessly, and which they believe are bound to have profound impact. If the free world focuses attention on the Iron Curtain by every possible means and on every possible occasion, this device so useful to the Communists is bound to be less so.

I congratulate Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, whom I am proud to know and number among my friends, for another profound and valuable contribution to the understanding of communism by the people of the free world, and I commend Monsignor Kennedy, also a valued friend, for his unusually perceptive and illuminating book review.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Khrushchev's Curtain," by Msgr. John S. Kennedy, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV'S CURTAIN

(By Rev. John S. Kennedy)

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, who, a few years ago, produced an invaluable handbook on communism, now turn their attention to one of the principal features of the Communist empire, "The Iron Curtain" (Norton. $4.50). The name, of course, was coined by Winston Churchill in 1946, but the reality, although denied by the Soviets, has functioned since the days of Lenin and ever must remain, in the Overstreets' judgment, an integral feature of the Communist system.

The Iron Curtain, they aver, is unique in human history. No other nation has ever devised a more complex and complete barrier between itself and the outside world. It constitutes a concrete definition of what communism takes to be the proper relationship between its sphere and the realm of freedom. It consists not merely of the artificial physical barriers which run unbroken for some 6,000 miles between the Artic Ocean and Iran, but also of travel restrictions, censorship, radio jamming, the rewriting of history, and so on. Its maintenance is phenomenally costly, but the Communists are ready to pay any price for this absolute necessity.

It proclaims that there is irreconcilable enmity between the Communist concepts and practices and all others. It also proclaims the Communist insistence on totalitarian control of its subjects and on their isolation from, and immunization against, ideas other than the Communist and persons holding such ideas.

The Iron Curtain has two purposes: first, to keep in—that is, "to keep the people where the party wants them to be and to keep them subject to influences of the party's choosing until they can be brought to the point where they will feel free in adhering to the party line;" secondly, to keep out—that is, "to make the party the supreme arbiter of contacts between the two orbits."

Since the Iron Curtain was so designated for the first time during Stalin's rule, it may be thought of as having been brought into being by him. The Overstreets show that it existed before he came to power. Nor did it cease to be when he died. Khrushchev is commonly credited with having somewhat liberalized contacts between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. But he has done nothing of the sort. The Overstreets think that Khrushchev has as tight a grip on his people as did Stalin, but exercises it by less obvious, if no less effective, means.

The party now has extremely efficient and far-reaching psychological controls. It "has the machinery it needs for enacting total watchfulness and total interference in private lives." In the social laboratory which Khrushchev runs, man is being redesigned. And this is not done by brainwashing. Rather, it is done, first, by making everyone and everything utterly dependent on the party; the party has a monopoly of the ways of making a living, of rewards and punishments, of access to education, work opportunities, living space. Secondly, and even more tellingly, the private aspects of life are all but eliminated and existence is so thoroughly socialized as to convince a person that he is the creature of the collectivity, with no intrinsic, individual significance or value and no recourse.

The authors maintain that the characteristic Russian makeup has been an invaluable asset to the successive dictators in their design. They cite, for example, the Russians' immemorial experience and expectation of being rigorously ruled from the top; their penchant for the emotional and practical security of group life; their "preference for rigidly dichotomized either-or formulations and an accompanying contempt for qualifying phrases"; their ingrained conviction that Russia's destiny is to "civilize" the whole world. The "new Soviet man," then, is simply the old Russian newly disciplined.

But for all Khrushchev's success in this respect, the Overstreets feel that time is working against his—or his successor's—indefinitely maintaining tight control over the people. It is not only that every dictatorship undergoes an erosion of its powers, not only that crises in production inevitably recur in the Soviet system, it is also, for example, that there has emerged a class of experts in science and technology. This type, as well as the multiplication of it, is requisite to both the economy and the defense of the U.S.S.R. And the expert will not be as amenable as simpler folk to strict control.

Another factor which disrupts the closed world of communism is the conflict which has broken out within the Communist bloc. This is altogether at odds with Marxist doctrine, which flatly declares that such friction is an impossibility. But its existence is by now notorious, and the fiction that the Communist world is a monolith has been irreparably shattered.

Resurgent nationalism has manifested itself in the satellites, the most striking example being Poland. And although Soviet force could once stamp out any such unwanted development, its utility has been severely reduced, as witness tiny Albania's defying Khrushchev and doing so with impunity.

More meaningful, however, are the Yugoslav-U.S.S.R. and the China-U.S.S.R. quarrels. The history of Tito's assertion of some measure of independence is recapitulated. It began in 1948, hence has been at work for 15 years. Stalin resorted to every sort of pressure to crush it, but to no avail. Khrushchev has assiduously courted Tito, and at present the two countries have drawn closer. But the Overstreets interpret this as indicating merely that "Yugoslavia feels firmly enough grounded in its autonomous rights to enter into as much cooperation with the Soviet Union as its national interests dictate."

The story of the split between China and Russia is much more interesting and consequential. Mao Tse-tung followed Stalin's plan for Communist conquest of China, only to have it fail. He then devised his own scheme of procedure, and this succeeded. Thus, from the start of the Communist ascendancy in China, the leader was his own strategist and tactician, not taking orders from Moscow, but relying on his own methods. And this has left Mao with the conviction that his way is the right one for communism's conquest of the world.

The cleavage and rivalry between Khrushchev and Mao are, then, real and extreme. The two are in competition for leadership of the Communist world and for hegemony over the new nations, such as those in Africa. Polycentric communism is here to stay, the Overstreets conclude, and uniformity behind the Iron Curtain is now no longer possible.

The authors strongly urge organized action against the Iron Curtain. World public opinion, they maintain, should be brought to bear against the barricade set up by the Communists. "It is high time," they say, "for totalitarian communism to be confronted not by random questions and expostulations but by an informed and tenacious demand that it 'show cause' for its need to operate behind a barrier of electrified barbed wire, mine fields, guard towers, jamming stations, press censorship, and travel restrictions."

They list specific demands which should be voiced endlessly and tirelessly, and which they believe are bound to have profound impact. If the free world focuses attention on the Iron Curtain by every possible means and on every possible occasion, this device so useful to the Communists is bound to be less so.

In addition to its main line of argument, this book presents many occasional observations on the Communist system which are thought provoking. Its tone is calm, its manner objective, and its reasoning cogent. It is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the enemy we face, and who, smiling or frowning, remains implacably an enemy.

SAFETY IN FLYING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, member airlines of the National Air Carrier Association established a record in 1962 that was unequaled by any other segment of the American airline industry by flying more than a billion passenger-miles without an accident involving injury or loss of life, according to figures released by the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D.C.

This perfect safety record for 1962 compares with two other segments of the U.S. airline industry as follows: First, the certificated all-cargo airlines flew 946,638,000 revenue passenger-miles under charter and sustained 3 accidents with 121 fatalities; and, second, the certificated domestic trunk airlines flew 32,059,681,000 revenue passenger-miles and sustained 4 accidents with 158 fatalities. All of the figures used are from official records of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

These supplemental airlines, all Government and civilian contract carriers, also maintained a perfect safety record during the year 1961. In fact, CAB records show that the seven members of NACA have operated an average of 15 years with only one accident involving loss of life.

In addition to flying 1,063,398,000 passenger-miles during the year 1962—more than 75 percent of all presently certificated supplemental airline passenger-miles flown—the seven members also flew 259,881,632 cargo ton-miles safely, to almost every part of the world.

The members of the National Air Carrier Association—NACA—are: American Flyers Airline Corp., Fort Worth, Tex.; Capitol Airways, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.; Modern Air Transport, Inc., Trenton, N.J.; Overseas National Airways, Washington, D.C.; Saturn Airways, Inc., Miami, Fla.; Southern Air Transport, Inc., Miami, Fla.; and World Airways, Oakland, Calif.

The seven members of NACA hold all requisite permits from the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Military Air Transport Service with respect to both operating authority and safety requirements.

These are the same rules under which the scheduled airlines, the scheduled air-cargo carriers, and other certificated segments of the U.S. airline industry operate charter trips. In addition to these normal governmental operating and safety requirements, NACA members impose on themselves even more stringent safety rules, violation of which can mean being dropped from the association.

NACA functions as a normal trade association in behalf of its members and also provides a single source of procurement of charter air transportation—both passenger and freight.

In establishing their perfect safety record for 1962, CAB reports show that NACA members transported within the continental limits of the United States and overseas a total of 396,955 passengers, military and civilian. The passengers ranged from soldiers moved for the Cuban crisis to lodge members of Eastern Star.

Total revenue miles flown were 30,796,548 and the total operating revenue of the seven companies was $60,887,961, of which $50,664,630 was in Department of Defense contracts.

NACA members have gross assets of $35,868,324. By the autumn of 1963, these assets will have more than doubled due to the acquisition of new jet aircraft now scheduled for delivery.

The combined total employees of NACA members is 1,139, operating more than 100 aircraft.

These aircraft range from C-46's carrying vital cargo loads to the Caribbean to the most modern jet turboprop airlines. This summer one of the NACA members, World Airways, will receive three Boeing 707-320C jets. The 320C is a convertible cargo-passenger plane with the longest range of any commercial jet—6,500 miles—and World is the first airline anywhere to buy them.

Another NACA member, Capitol Airways, will accept delivery this summer on a Douglas DC-8F jetliner.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statistical table prepared by the National Air Carrier Association, relating to this matter.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table I

	Revenue-miles	Revenue passengers	Passenger-miles	Cargo ton-miles
American Flyers Airline Corp	954, 518	39, 645	41, 664, 000	4, 536, 670
Capitol Airways, Inc	11, 214, 806	69, 790	258, 721, 000	93, 332, 126
Modern Air Transport, Inc	325, 747	17, 776	18, 379, 000	1, 875, 080
Overseas National Airways	3, 244, 911	96, 386	249, 280, 000	26, 245, 658
Saturn Airways, Inc	530, 360	21, 312	33, 566, 000	3, 815, 445
Southern Air Transport, Inc	3, 271, 024	87, 417	97, 662, 000	19, 848, 759
World Airways, Inc	11, 255, 182	64, 629	364, 126, 000	110, 227, 894
Total	30, 796, 548	396, 955	1, 063, 398, 000	259, 881, 632

Table II

	Defense contracts	Total operating revenue	Total assets
American Flyers Airline Corp	$1, 633, 291	$2, 208, 865	$689, 567
Capitol Airways, Inc	14, 911, 657	18, 775, 194	16, 143, 750
Modern Air Transport, Inc	913, 448	1, 005, 491	351, 409
Overseas National Airways	6, 160, 785	8, 439, 293	1, 993, 282
Saturn Airways, Inc	781, 888	1, 417, 285	913, 599
Southern Air Transport, Inc	4, 824, 834	5, 733, 821	2, 244, 041
World Airways, Inc	21, 438, 727	23, 308, 012	13, 532, 676
Total	50, 664, 630	60, 887, 961	35, 868, 324

MGM-CINERAMA COMMENDED ON "HOW THE WEST WAS WON"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the other evening many Members of this body and the House were guests at the premier performance in Washington of the new motion picture, "How the West Was Won."

This is a spectacular tribute to the brave men and women who helped make this country great. Parts of it were filmed only a few miles from my home in Indiana.

The screenplay took up five related, but distinct, periods—the early days of the Ohio Valley, the covered wagon and gold rush, the Civil War, building of the transcontinental railroad and the development of roads. My own State, Indiana, was, of course, a part of two of these phases. All of them opened the West.

I wish to commend Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and the Cinerama Co. for their work in creating this magnificent historical document. They should be pleased with the results of this undertaking. Those who see the film will be justly proud of the heritage we have in America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I support the mass transportation bill not merely because the commuters of Connecticut need it—which they do—not merely because the New York metropolitan area must have it—which it must—and not merely because commuter transportation is one of the most serious problems facing our Nation.

I speak for the mass transportation bill because of its importance to the Senate itself, because of its importance to the legislative process, and because of its importance to the lawmaking function of our Federal Government.

For this bill will put to the test—as will no other bill before the Congress—whether the lawmaking process of our Government is going to work in the national interest, or whether it is going to founder on the shoals of State and regional self-seeking.

This bill requires us to decide whether we are lawmakers for a nation or ambassadors from the States to the Nation's Capitol.

Let us face the facts: In this debate we have been told that the bill should be rejected, because there are some States where mass transportation is of little concern. "What good does this bill do for my State?" That is the question asked or implied by much of what has been said here.

To those who ask that question, I answer: This bill is good for the Nation, and for that reason should be supported by every State.

We have become a nation of cities, and the trend toward urban living will continue. If we are to legislate for the needs of today and tomorrow, if we are to preserve in an urban future the great human values which flourished so successfully in our rural past, we must concern ourselves with the grave ills that threaten our cities with premature deterioration.

I ask no Senator to support a bill he believes harmful to his State. But if Senators reject a bill because it helps solve a national problem which is more serious in other States than their own, then our Federal Government is in serious danger.

We became a nation when the representatives of our States realized that selfish provincialism must be replaced by constructive cooperation. History shows that we are weakened as a nation when we fail to cooperate in solving problems that reach beyond the borders of our separate States.

Let no one mistake the serious implications in the attack upon the mass transportation bill.

If votes are withheld by States that have little or no present need for Federal funds for commuters, where do these States expect to find support for their own urgent needs? If State benefit becomes the test, why should the representatives of metropolitan America spend their constituents' money for the needs of rural America? If State benefit becomes the test, where will the votes be found to reclaim the lands of the vast Southwest; to develop the mighty power potential of the Northwest; to provide rural electrification for the Southeast; to insure farm income in the Midwest?

Opposition to this bill would not only be short-sighted in the national interest, it would be economically short-sighted as well. If the cities do not receive help for their commuter problems, they may not help the rest of the country with their votes—and they certainly will not be as able to help the rest of the country with their money.

We are told the Nation cannot afford this bill—that our national revenues will not permit this amount of spending. The facts are just the opposite. Our national revenues require this amount of spending. The revenues of our country will decline if our cities cannot continue their crucial role in the economy of this Nation.

The New York metropolitan area and the other large urban areas of the Nation are the hubs around which turn the industry, finance and commerce of these United States.

They are the high income areas—indeed, much of the opposition to the bill dwells on this fact—but they are also income-generating areas; from them stems the wherewithal for the industry—the mining—the agriculture of our entire country.

Yet today our great cities, and their suburbs, are in need. They are being strangled—choked to death—for lack of adequate mass transportation.

We have before us now a bill which would take a giant step forward in providing this mass transportation.

Will the rest of the country, so dependent on our cities, refuse them aid now in their hour of need?

The Federal Government—representing all our people—cannot ignore this question. The continued economic vitality and growth of our urban areas is essential to our national welfare. Indeed, the welfare of all our citizens directly depends upon the commerce and industry of our great cities.

This commerce and industry generate economic activity which in turn produces profit taxable for Federal income purposes. From these funds come Federal programs to aid the peanutgrower in the South and the corngrower in the Midwest. From these funds come Federal irrigation and reclamation projects to make the deserts of the West bloom and the farmlands of the Midwest prosper. From these funds come the electrification programs that have changed the living standards of rural America.

Most of our Federal programs, even those programs in which the cities do participate, are usually weighted in favor of rural America. Each dollar put up by a rural State for public welfare, for example, is matched by far more Federal money than the dollar put up by an industrial State.

We citizens of the industrial urban States have for years gladly supported programs to help our fellow Americans who happen to live in less affluent parts of our country.

The people of the States of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, for instance, in fiscal 1962 paid almost one quarter of the total Federal tax collection for that year. Yet Federal aid payments to these States and their local units of government and individual citizens amounted to about one-tenth of the total Federal payments throughout the Nation.

These three States alone—Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey—are paying 25 percent of the bill and receiving 10 percent of the return. They do not begrudge this arrangement; they do not bemoan this discrepancy—though many of our residents find it increasingly difficult to justify. These States can continue to do their share—in reality more than their share—in recognition of their responsibilities under our Federal form of government. They will continue their payments unless shortsighted opposition to legislation such as the bill before us kills the goose that is laying the golden eggs for the Nation.

Our opponents are saying, "It's every State for itself and the Devil take the underrepresented hindmost." This is a dangerous slogan for the Nation and ultimately for every single State.

This bill must stand or fall on its merit, its worth not to any one State or any one group of States but its worth—its necessity—for the entire Nation and its growth.

These are days when a very large proportion of our attention is directed to the great issues that confront us throughout the world. I do not minimize these matters. Of course they require our urgent attention. But we must also meet the urgencies that confront us here at home.

High on that domestic agenda of unfinished business is safe, convenient, and economic transportation for the commuters of this country, and the sane and healthy development of our cities and suburbs. This is a priority item. We need it now. We needed it yesterday—indeed, the day before yesterday.

Today we are spending billions to reach the moon while we just talk about spending millions to move commuters in and out of our great cities. Only last week a high ranking official of NASA estimated the cost of the first roundtrip of Americans to the moon's surface to be $20 billion. And that is the cost only of those activities directly related to realizing the goal of landing on the moon by 1970. The goal is laudable, but I believe that getting to work and getting home again is just as important as getting to the moon.

Let me tell Senators what this legislation means to the commuting areas of Connecticut which I represent and to the entire tristate region of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. The future of the New York metropolitan area depends on the success of its mass transportation system, and in this region rail service must play the key role.

Where Detroit's auto production, Chicago's metal manufacture, or southern California's aerospace industries lie outside their central business districts, in New York there is a high concentration of key economic decisionmakers in a relatively few acres of real estate on the island of Manhattan, and a very heavy movement of workers in and out of that area every day.

Not only is the area small and the size of the total contribution of New York's goods and services great, but many of its activities cannot be duplicated elsewhere. It is the home of the American theater and opera and the cradle and marketplace of all the arts. Nowhere else in the world are so many of the nation-serving functions so readily available. Nowhere else can so many different leaders communicate face to face: corporation executives, financial advisers, lending institutions, leading law firms, advertising men, management consultants.

Clearly, this Connecticut-New York-New Jersey region plays a vital and irreplaceable role as the largest single industrial, business, and cultural center of the Nation. The main key to the successful functioning of this marvelous urban complex is to get the people into these beehives of activity in the morning and back to home at night.

And the best means of accomplishing this goal is through rail mass transit commuter service. Anyone who thinks more highways can do the whole job in this region just is not being realistic. Already, because of lack of good and flexible rail commuter service, a vast new population of automobiles, rather than people, is daily poured into downtown Manhattan. The automobile requires about 300 square feet of parking space, three times as much as a person requires for office space or commercial area.

If the present highways are not capable of handling the peak traffic to New York in the morning and evening hours, what are we going to do? Build more highways? Take more property off the tax rolls? Place a greater burden on remaining property owners for essential services to which they are entitled? Pump more carbon monoxide into the atmosphere? The cost of acquiring land for rights-of-way and the costs of construction are skyrocketing.

Safe and efficient mass transportation is essential if city dwellers are to live in true communities, and to enjoy the sense of neighborhood which characterized American life in the small towns in which most of us grew up. Without it, families will remain isolated from the cultural advantages which lie at the heart of the city. Without it, city streets will deteriorate into parking garages. Without it, the rich and the poor will lead increasingly separate lives—and this will be a marked departure from the democratic life in which we were brought up. Without it, adjacent communities will become utterly isolated from each other.

What are we going to do with the cars which are brought into the city?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I believe that when the Senator testified before the committee he said that actually what is proposed to be spent now is only a start, and really not enough.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Truthfully, I agree with that, I say to the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. Then actually, when we consider that the immediate needs over the next few years would be an amount of about $10 billion, the bill before the Senate could not resolve all the problems for us, could it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. But I say to the distinguished Senator that we must make a start at some time. The longer we wait the more we compound the problems facing our Nation. Since some 70 percent of the people today live in the urban centers of the United States, each delay of each year means more crowding and crowding, to strangle the economic life of urban America. Therefore, I say that a start must be made and must be made now. I believe that America is too late in starting at the present time, and tomorrow will be still later.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator anticipates, then, that we face only a start and that we shall have to subsequently adopt additional measures authorizing much vaster sums for transportation?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would have to say, in all truth, to the Senator from Texas, that this is only a start. I would anticipate that considerably more money will be needed to solve the problem. But I believe this is a very important investment for America, because, as I said previously, this measure allows America to generate productivity, wealth, and taxes which will go to support all the processes of our Government, whereas we would lose much if we choked off the productivity and life of our Nation.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RIBICOFF. People can be piled 30, 40, or 50 stories high, but cars cannot be piled that way. The streets are already choked with traffic so that not only does it impede the flow of commuter traffic, with attendant delays and hazards, but it interferes with the essential local city traffic, impedes necessary deliveries, slows down emergency services such as fire apparatus and ambulances, and makes it difficult to get to stations and airports.

Mass rail transportation must carry more of the load. But, in order to attract commuters to this service, it must be frequent, convenient, comfortable, and reasonably priced. This the railroads of the area cannot afford to do on their own. They are financially weak—our own New Haven Railroad is bankrupt—and they cannot modernize and support what amounts to a true public service out of other revenues.

An already bankrupt railroad cannot continue to add almost $6 million in commuter service losses annually to its present debt. The interest and labors of the Governors of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey have helped, but the States alone cannot provide a long-range cure.

The very nature of the mass transit problem in the great urban areas requires major financial aid by the Federal Government. Many of us dislike increased Government participation or further subsidization of any phase of our economy.

But national needs require national effort. That effort must be supported at all levels—private, local, State, and Federal. The Founding Fathers recognized that States could not deal with matters involving interstate movement beyond their jurisdictions and that inconsistent, independent action by the several States could hamper and burden regional and national progress. Indeed, this recognition is one of the factors that impelled them to draft the Constitution and form a federal union.

The Federal Government has been aiding transportation in this country for a long time. In many areas the size of the support has reached major proportions.

Federal funds build interstate highways, construct airports, dredge harbors, improve river navigation, and, in one way or another, aid many of the carriers that use these facilities.

Federal dollars have made it possible to drive across the Nation in days, to fly across the Nation in hours, to move cargo on inland waterways faster than ever before. What we need are Federal dollars devoted exclusively to the problem of moving large numbers of commuters in and out of the great urban centers of this Nation.

And each Federal dollar spent on this program will benefit more people per day than any other form of Federal aid which has ever been given to any form of transportation.

Yet we are told that State and local resources are sufficient to solve this problem. But who makes that assertion? Have governors come here and said, "We will send to our legislatures budget requests for millions in new spending authority for mass transit"? Have members of State legislatures come here and said, "We will vote to increase States taxes to pay for modern commuter service"? I know of no such testimony.

It is easy to say what can be done when you do not have the responsibility for doing it. It is easy for the national chamber of commerce to assure us that State and local revenues are sufficient. But in what State has the chamber recommended higher taxes to produce this revenue? And how many local chambers of commerce along the New Haven-New York commuter run agree that Federal funds are not necessary?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Governors and legislatures of the States and the mayors and councilmen of the cities do not believe that there should be remissions made of taxes and grants made by the Government, how does the Senator from Connecticut come to the conclusion that

that which the local officials refuse to do, the Federal Government should do, with its $305 billion debt, with its inability to balance the budget, and with all the other fiscal problems confronting the Government?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to answer the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who, like me, was the Governor of a great State. I do not believe the great State of Ohio is much different from other States in this land of ours. The truth is that the States of our Nation are rurally dominated in the State legislatures. One of the great tragedies of America and one of the reasons why the Federal Government is involved in so many of these programs is the fact that the States refuse to face the great problems of a changing America. It is these rurally dominated legislatures which close their eyes and do not pay heed to the crying needs of the cities. It is this rural domination throughout the 50 States that makes it impossible for the States to face those problems.

Why does the Congress come into this problem? Because the Congress of the United States looks at the problems with perspective and a philosophy about the growth of America and realizes that these problems must be solved. If the States do not solve these problems because of the rural domination in their legislatures, we must come to the U.S. Congress to help solve them. I am not trying, here in the Congress, to solve a problem which is purely local, but when we deal with the needs of our people and the growth of America, and when we deal with matters of interstate commerce, there is definitely a role for the Federal Government.

In my State the problem we have with transportation is not a Connecticut problem. If it were merely a local problem, Connecticut would be handling it. But the problem of the 30,000 people who go out of Fairfield County every morning, get on the train and go to New York City, and those same 30,000 people who leave New York City in the evening and go back to Connecticut, is not merely a Connecticut problem.

This same problem is multiplied many times in the State of the Senator from New Jersey, where many, many more thousands are affected. The same thing happens in all the great metropolitan complexes.

What surprises me today is the great resistance to this bill in view of the fact that all over the Nation there are these great metropolitan complexes, and when Congress has provided a great amount of money in the way of subsidies for all forms of transportation except one; namely, the railroads. It is surprising because we have provided millions of dollars to give aid to airlines, shipping, highways, and harbors, but refuse to give this kind of aid.

I wish to make another statement to the Senator from Ohio, because, as a former Governor, he realizes the problems involved in our highway systems. I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with interest, and I noted the comment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have the highest respect, concerning what proof there is that people will give up use of the automobile. I say the proof is that we are so choking our highways that soon we will not be able to use them. If the problem in the State of Ohio is the same as that in Connecticut, and perhaps every other State, we cannot build highways fast enough to take care of the people using the highways.

Does the Senator want to see, not many years from now, the time come when we will have nothing but concrete roadways and amacite roads, without a blade of grass or space for people to live in? That is what we are coming to. This is an effort to provide economical, efficient transportation, and in so doing we will save billions of dollars in highway construction, by not having such a great need for additional highway systems.

Congress has voted a series of appropriations, amounting eventually to $41 billion, for the Federal highway system. The Federal Government pays 90 cents for every dollar spent, to match the 10 cents the States pay. If the Federal Government can put up 90 cents to match every 10 cents provided by the States for roads, I cannot understand why we cannot vote for two-thirds matching grants to help build a mass transportation system which will move the same people who now use the roads. The highways cannot do the whole job. To the extent we can help solve the problem, we will make it unnecessary to appropriate additional huge sums of money for interstate roads.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question was why the people do not help solve the problem back home, and the Senator answered that the State legislatures are dominated by rural representatives.

We have many rural States, and in some instances, the argument of the Senator from Connecticut may be correct. However, I wish to point out to the Senator from Connecticut, for whom I have the highest regard, that when this idea with respect to Federal aid to the local transit systems had its inception, there appeared before the Commerce Committee Hon. Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of St. Louis, Hon. Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia, Hon. Robert Wagner, mayor of New York City, Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze, mayor of Cleveland, and James Symes, of the Pennsylvania Railroad, as well as George Alpert, of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. I should like to read what Mr. Alpert said. He is the president of what the Senator from Connecticut has identified as the defunct Hartford Railroad.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The former president.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The former president; yes. Mr. Alpert testified before the committee. He said:

> Municipalities find it difficult, some of them, to do a great deal for us. Take taxation, for example. The city of Boston taxes us to the queen's taste.

If the Senator from Connecticut knows Mr. Alpert, he can easily identify that to be Mr. Alpert's language.

> The city of Boston taxes us to the queen's taste. Our South Station, one of our two terminals in Boston, is assessed for $12,200,000. It was built in 1897 for about $15 million. And here 60 years later it is still assessed for $12,200,000, which is supposed to be its fair value.
>
> The fact that we have been trying for 3 years to get somebody to buy it for $4 million doesn't seem to be relevant, but it is assessed for $12,200,000.

This is Mr. Alpert still speaking:

> This is a statement I know that you will find hard to believe. Our tax rate in Boston is $101.20 per thousand dollars. So that on an assessment of 300 percent of the value, at a rate of $101 a thousand, this is confiscatory.

That New Haven Railroad is paying to Boston a tax of $1,200,000 a year on this one building, which it is willing to sell for $4 million. How does the Senator from Connecticut explain the refusal of the city of Boston to take care of that problem? I might say that Boston, according to the witnesses who appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee, seems to be one of the main proponents of this multibillion-dollar giveaway scheme.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio by saying that in my opinion, if those facts are correct, the continuation of such a policy by Boston would be sheer stupidity. There is no justification whatever for Boston or any city or any State to continue to carry out such a policy.

In recognition of what this means, let me give the Senator from Ohio an example in our own State of Connecticut. Starting in 1961, Connecticut gave up its gross revenue tax, which had produced $1.2 million a year. Towns levy property taxes, but only on nonoperating property, and that totals less than $100,000 in all of the State.

The State of Connecticut pays the railroad one-half million dollars each year, starting in 1961, for maintenance of bridges, crossings, and other property. Thus there is no State tax on the New York, New Haven & Hartford of any sort, and no city tax of any sort, with the exception of the $100,000, which is spread through the 169 towns where the railroad might own a piece of commercial property.

It would seem to me that the Housing Administrator should, in the exercise of his discretion, make a condition, before any of these grants are made to public bodies, that some tax relief be granted. There is absolutely no justification for relief being granted without the States and municipalities doing their part.

My contention is that this should not be entirely a Federal obligation. This is an obligation of the cities and States, who must bear a part of the burden. However, that burden is so great, and the national interest is so vitally involved here, that there is distinctly a role for the Federal Government to play. This is of vital importance to the security of our whole Nation. It is not only important to Cincinnati and Cleveland and New York and Fairfield County in Connecticut and New Jersey, but it is important also for all of the 50 States, because the rural States, to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, are the States which are the beneficiaries of the great revenue-producing States such as the States the Senator and I represent.

I do not begrudge, as a Senator from the State of Connecticut, the money we generate in tax revenue being used to help America grow, and to make sure that even the least prosperous State will get the benefit the State of Connecticut gets.

It would be tragic indeed if these States, whose growth is generated by the tax revenue from the Senator's State and my State, were to kill the goose that lays the golden egg by refusing to recognize the economic problems our States have in generating the revenues that are so essential to the growth of America.

The Senator speaks about the national debt. The debt will go sky high, and will go even higher, if the people who work in New York City, for example, and live in the suburbs, cannot get back and forth to work. That is what will happen if we break down this complex.

There are those who decry all this and who say they prefer a rural America, and prefer not to have an urbanized America. However, we cannot stop, and is impossible to stop, the normal growth that is taking place in the United States. We must recognize that we are no longer 13 rural States on the eastern seaboard, but that we are a vital nation of people who have moved into cities. The cities are becoming heavily populated, and they will represent the bulk of the population of America. It would indeed be shortsighted for the least populated States, whose representatives come here year in and year out, to receive substance and benefit with the assistance of Senators from the larger and industrial States, to now say, "What does this do for my State?" I hope the time will never come when every measure that is decided here is decided by the yeas and nays depending on "What does my State get out of it?" It would be a sad day for the future of our country if that were to happen.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I should like to say that the Commerce Committee amendments, with all due respect to the Committee on Banking and Currency, have improved the bill and have strengthened the bill. On page 5, subsection (c) reads:

> (c) No Federal assistance under this act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes, and franchise taxes;

Therefore, if the city of Boston comes to the Administrator for help under this bill, and if the Housing Administrator notes this outrageous action on the part of Boston, it may not get relief.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am thoroughly familiar with that language. I discussed it yesterday. I will not repeat my views today. However, it is of a very flexible nature. The State of Connecticut and, I believe also—is there another State that has entered into some sort of agreement to provide tax relief?

Mr. RIBICOFF. New York and Rhode Island.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Rhode Island. I would like to point out that beginning in 1959, and especially in 1960, recommendations were made that, instead of coming to the Federal Government for grants, the attempt should be made to try to solve the problems back home.

I wish to read now the testimony given at the hearing of February 16, 1960, when Symes and Alpert and the mayors appeared. They said they had developed a four-point program.

First, they said a national policy should be established by Congress for a balanced, coordinated transportation system; second, that the Federal, State, and local governments should be asked to develop rational tax policies for the railroads.

The railroads were begging Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, and Boston for relief. It was not until 1961 that some thought was given to that petition. I respectfully submit that while those three States have given some relief, Massachusetts gave very, very little. Most of the States have given no relief. An effort ought to be made to see what will happen under the recommendation for State relief.

Mr. RIBICOFF. When that recommendation was made, I was Governor of Connecticut. The Legislature of Connecticut meets in odd years, not in even years. The next meeting of the State legislature, which took place in 1961, less than 1 short year from that period, granted all this tax relief and gave up its taxes on the railroad.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What did that amount to?

Mr. RIBICOFF. For Connecticut, it amounted to $1,200,000 a year. In addition to removing their tax obligation, we gave a subsidy of another half million dollars a year to enable the railroad to repair its trestles and bridges. So the State of Connecticut has acted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That amounted to $1,200,000?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It amounted to $1,200,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the program under consideration now will cost the Federal taxpayers $6 billion, according to some estimates; probably $8 billion, according to others.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I should say the United States could not make a better investment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Connecticut subscribe to that expenditure?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I subscribe to that expenditure. We do not quarrel, do we, in the U.S. Senate about spending $41 billion for an Interstate Highway System to move people across State lines? That is what is proposed to be done in this instance, when we are talking about a transportation problem, and are spending $41 billion to move people across State lines in automobiles. I cannot see why we cannot justify spending, even granting the Senator's figures, some $6 billion over 3 years to move people across State lines by means of mass transportation.

I want to see something remain of our cities and suburbs; but if we build highways to take care of the vast growth in automobile traffic, we shall have nothing left to tax. That is what we are coming to.

Everywhere we go in America we find that highways—and they are needed—are tearing down cities, destroying taxable property, and invading rural America, until we see one ribbon of concrete after another ribbon of concrete.

We are talking not only about the economic life of the country, but of the esthetics of the country, as well. Let us save a part of America and bring people back to the cities. I think it will not be possible to prevent the increase in the number of crowded highways unless we pass a bill such as has been developed and is now before Congress in the form of the Mass Transportation Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Connecticut will concede, will he not, that for the building of highways, the users of highways pay taxes on the purchase of gasoline, tires, and automobile accessories? These taxes are placed in a trust fund, in order that the building of the highway system may be self sustaining.

But the bill sponsored by the administration contemplates that all citizens shall pay money out of the general taxes to relieve, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other places which are said to have metropolitan problems.

Mr. RIBICOFF. With all due respect to the Senator from Ohio, I should say nothing of the sort. A tax is a tax, no matter what it is called, whether it is an income tax, a sales tax or a tax on gasoline and tires. The tax still comes out of the taxpayer's pocket.

What we are asking for out of the general revenues is exactly the same as Congress votes, year in and year out, in rivers and harbors legislation.

The funds which are appropriated constantly, year in and year out, for the improvement of rivers and harbors, comes from the general revenue. If the Federal Government can spend the taxpayers' money to widen rivers, deepen channels, and dredge harbors, then, for heaven's sake, why may it not spend some of the Federal revenue to move people into and out of the cities? I think it is a shortsighted attitude to neglect the problems of the cities.

We live in a changing America. We are 37 years away from the 21st century. The time has come for many of us to stop and realize that we are approaching the 21st century, and not continue to argue and talk as if we were in the middle of the 19th century.

Great problems face our country. We ought to realize that America is moving ahead; that we are not the rural America of past years. We must recognize the needs and problems that have arisen from the fact that we have become an urbanized Nation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I regret that I must disagree vehemently with the Senator from Connecticut when he says there is no difference between the taxes collected to build up a trust fund for the highway building program and the taxes which are generally assessed throughout the country. There is a trust fund. When I pay a gasoline tax, it is a user's tax. But under the proposed program, there will be nothing of that nature. The funds will come out of the general taxpayers' pockets. That is considerably different from paying a user's tax.

I come from a large city. I know what that means. Cincinnati is not asking for this benefit. There is not a single city in Ohio which is asking for it, except Cleveland; and Cleveland began to ask for it only when it learned that there was to be a gift program.

I point out how the giving away of money corrupts the morals of the people. Cleveland decided to build a transit system on its own initiative. Taxes were voted. Highways were ordered to be rebuilt. Cleveland was going forward with a project to extend rapid transit. The vote was 3 to 2 in favor of going forward on a local basis. Then word came from Washington that there was to be a giveaway program. What happened? The officials of Cleveland changed their judgment. One of the members of the board said, "If the Government is planning to give the money away, why should we spend our own money?" So they changed their vote, and now they are waiting to see whether the Federal Government will say, "We will give you the money; do not borrow it. Do not try to do the job yourself. The good Government in Washington, through the U.S. Congress, will give you what you need." I cannot subscribe to that policy.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I simply wish to close on this note in the debate with the Senator from Ohio. He has not answered the question as to rivers and harbors legislation, which benefits the various States. I imagine the great State of Ohio was the beneficiary of the rivers and harbors program as it affects the Ohio River and many other rivers in his State, and also the Great Lakes. Funds for those projects come out of the general revenues, I am sure. I do not begrudge the use of such funds, when they are necessary, to widen or deepen the Ohio River, or when they are necessary to make the streams of his State more navigable, or are necessary to improve navigation on the Great Lakes. I think that is fine. But those funds come out of the general revenue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with that statement. But I have been fighting subsidies to the airlines. I have been seeking to impose a user's tax on the inland waterways. I have been seeking equality of treatment for the railroads. But I do not want to have equality of treatment achieved by pushing the Federal Government still deeper into the subsidy field. That is where I part from the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks. We have been told that no Federal funds are needed for mass transit throughout the Nation because in San Francisco the voters approved a bond issue to finance a rapid transit system for that city. Does it also follow that the Nation can do without Federal funds for the Interstate Highway System because Connecticut voted bonds for the Connecticut Turnpike before 90–10 matching funds became available? If that argument had prevailed in 1956, we would not have our interstate highways across the Nation today. If the argument prevails today, what will become of our cities in 1970?

The Federal funds are desperately needed for States and regions with major commuter problems, and should be used in whatever way the State or region wants to use the money. Each State or region faces its own problems in mass transportation. No single answer can or should come from Washington. In the New York metropolitan area, we would use the funds primarily for rail service, for that is our greatest need.

The only earmarking on the funds would be their use solely for commuter transit. The method of transportation would be the choice of the State or regional authority applying for the funds.

The bill before us meets the need head on. It is vitally needed, and should be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, defeat of this bill would be a tragedy for the commuters of this country and for the lawmaking process of our Government. Its passage will help insure the strength and vitality of our Nation, the growth of our economy, and the preservation of our traditional values in urban America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut on his speech. It is his first speech of major significance in this body. I think it has cleared up many of the questions which have been in the minds of many of us, especially those of us who come from not exactly rural areas, but certainly not urban areas—areas in the Rocky Mountain West.

The Senator from Connecticut has a distinguished record—first, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in which body I had the pleasure and the privilege of serving with him, and also, incidentally, on the same committee.

The Senator from Connecticut has been the Governor of his State. Therefore, he has first-hand, personal knowledge of the problems which confront an extremely crowded area.

The Senator from Connecticut has been a member of the President's Cabinet, and thus has become more fully aware—on the national level—of the problems which he saw as a State Governor.

And now the Senator from Connecticut is a Member of this body; and he has given us the definite benefit of his wide and varied experience.

As a spokesman in this respect for the approximately 70 percent of our population who live in urban areas, the Senator from Connecticut has done a magnificent job. I commend him for the clarity of the statement he has made, and also for the fact that he has "laid it on the line," so to speak, insofar as the needs of those who live in these areas are concerned.

I must state, in all honesty, that the Senator from Connecticut was not speaking for only the State of Connecticut. Instead, he was speaking for all the States which are in a similar situation.

I was very much impressed by the Senator's statement that he hopes the day will not come when Senators will think only of how a particular piece of legislation will affect their own States, and will vote only on that basis. Of course, that is a factor which all of us must never forget; we must always keep it in mind. But just as we are Senators from a particular State, so are we Senators of the United States; and on that basis we have to consider the interests of the Nation as a whole.

This is one area in which those of us who come from the least populous States can do something to give the consideration which is due to the part of the country in which 70 percent of the population live—70 percent of the population who have no Cabinet representation or no status as such, but who, in my opinion, are entitled to as much consideration as the farmers, who comprise 9 percent of the population.

This is a good bill. The Senator from Connecticut has made a good and a sound case in favor of it; and I compliment him on the clarity of his statement and on the dispatch he has shown.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to add my word of commendation of the Senator from Connecticut for the very fine presentation he has made on the pending measure.

In the course of the hearings on the bill, one of the finest and clearest statements made to us was made by the Senator from Connecticut. I am very much pleased to hear him follow it up here on the floor of the Senate while the bill is under consideration by this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I certainly join our senior leaders in applauding the eloquent statement the Senator from Connecticut has made. No one could speak with greater knowledge of the problems of urban transportation. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has certainly been most helpful to the Senate; and I hope that Senators who are not present at this time will read in the Record the statement the Senator from Connecticut has made. If there is time for that to be done before the final vote is taken, it will be most helpful.

I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut one or two questions.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We have heard many statements to the effect that urban transportation is a local problem, and that local answers should be found. Many persons have asked, "What has the Federal Government to do with it?"

Let me ask the Senator from Connecticut whether the principal commuter line in Connecticut is the New York & New Haven Railroad.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is the only commuter line which can possibly transport people to work from one of the most important segments of the State of Connecticut to New York, and then return them home.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It passes through many towns and cities as the commuters journey from Fairfield County to New York, does it not?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. It taps a county with a population of approximately 600,000, then passes through Westchester County, N.Y., which is heavily populated, and then reaches New York City. Therefore, perhaps one and half-million persons—both in New York and Connecticut—depend upon this railroad for their daily transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Can any town, city, county, or State really accomplish anything to meet the problems of this railroad in the absence of a regional plan for it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That would be impossible. New York by itself could not do the job. Connecticut by itself could not do the job, either, because this railroad crosses State lines.

This fact points up the great problem which exists in many of the urban centers of the Nation, because by using mass transportation and fast transportation, people cross State lines to go to work and then to return home.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. So far as local initiative is concerned, have not the three States—Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey—joined in a transportation committee?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; and they are studying the question of working together on this problem.

After having worked on this problem with Governor Harriman, Governor Meyner, and Governor Rockefeller, and after having watched the Governors who have succeeded us in these three States, it is my considered judgment that all three of these States are more than willing to do their share. I know that Connecticut is; I know that New Jersey is; and I know that New York is. But because of the fact that three States are involved, and also because of the fact that their transportation problems are indissolubly tied together, it becomes absolutely necessary for the Federal Government to play a role. Furthermore, if any problem affects interstate commerce, this is a classic example.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the situation of these three States unique; or is their situation similar to that of other States, in terms of fiscal policy, fiscal hardship, rising debt, rising cost, and increasing pressures to meet the public needs?

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is no question that their situation is not unique. I think it will be found that the tax rates and the debts of the States and the cities have risen entirely out of proportion to their share of the Federal taxes and the Federal debt. Although debt is to be decried, the fact remains that these States and cities are very hard pressed in this field. I think the important factor to be considered is that here we have an opportunity to create wealth, because these commuters are not going on joyrides. They are traveling to work, and they must arrive on time. Thus they have an opportunity to earn income; and, in that way, taxes which help pay the bills of the entire Nation are generated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When the Senator returns to his beautiful State, I wonder if he hears the taxpayers' associations and others lament that Congress has been approving programs to benefit the Southwest, the West, and the Northwest, while the State of Connecticut is sending $2 to Washington and getting $1 back.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have not been in this body long enough to have heard such complaints, but I anticipate that I shall hear them with increasing frequency as the years go by. There is no question that what the Senator has said is becoming an almost universal cry of dissatisfaction. Every time a program is approved, whether it is a program related to agriculture, reclamation, or another type of water project, there is lack of understanding and an irritation concerning the expenditures. That is why I have pleaded with Senators to recognize the problems of our State and the fact that we in our State are generating the tax dollars to help such projects. All we ask is that Senators take into consideration the fact that we have a unified and interdependent America, and that a Senator should not look at every problem from the standpoint of how the program would help his own State. If we are to start adopting that kind of philosophy and voting that way, the consequences will be tragic for the future growth of our Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not know whether it is because those of us from the populous Northeast have a greater understanding or that our friends from rural States are men of greater persuasion, but it is a fact that again and again we from the cities have voted for reclamation, water conservation, and other similar projects, and we receive precious little for the cities.

We are talking about a bill that would provide $100 million for the first year for a national transportation program.

The senior Senator from Utah reminded us of a great program that he guided through the Senate some years ago. I believe that the program provided $1 billion for a reclamation project in the Upper Colorado. The Senator said it was in 1955. I refreshed my recollection and discovered that I voted for that program in March 1956. In view of the budgetary situation, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut and I will have to sharpen our pencils. If we cannot strengthen our Nation at the urban level with the amount of money that is so desperately needed, will we have enough for a $1 billion reclamation project?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I hope that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and I will never adopt that philosophy.

I do not believe in the philosophy of retaliation. I understand the problems of the respective States. I want the West to grow. I want to see growth in the South, the Midwest, and the North, because the growth of each State helps all other States. My only plea is that Senators from States which are the beneficiaries of such programs have the same philosophy that we have, and understand that the proposal would be a part of our growth and our very sustenance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is my philosophy, too.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I point out that the project that has been referred to was a self-amortized project. I further point out that the issue is not a rural-versus-urban issue. I have made a survey of every city in my State having a population in excess of 50,000, and I have found that every one has expressed opposition to the bill. The survey included Houston, Tex., which is the heart of a complex of an area containing 2 million people. The cities are by no means unanimously in favor of the bill. The representative of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce testified that their survey showed a majority of their constituents were opposed to the measure.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In answer to the Senator from Texas, I should like to say that while those cities may be opposed to the proposed program, they are in favor of many projects in the rivers and harbors program of which they are beneficiaries and the cities in our State are not.

This is the problem on which I plead for the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Texas. I should like the Senator to understand that while the cities in his community might reject the program, denying a need for the type of help proposed, they plead for other types of help which are a drain on the Federal Treasury. Senators who are opposed to the bill go to the Federal Treasury for money to support measures which help their States.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Have the urban areas of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey never received any benefit from rivers and harbors legislation?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes, but in an infinitesimal amount compared to what has been received by other States of our Nation in the more rural areas. I have no objection to those programs. I am for building up rural America. All I ask is that rural America understand the problems and needs of urban America.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. TOWER. At some future date will the Senator from Connecticut join me in an effort to take the Government out of the business of subsidizing agriculture? I would be happy to cooperate with him in such a project, recognizing the great outlays for agriculture. However, I point out that only 25 percent of our agrarian economy is subsidized.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would be pleased to discuss the subject with the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. First, I wish to congratulate my good friend from Connecticut for a magnificent major maiden effort as a Senator in support of proposed legislation which is as vitally important to my State as it is to his. We have come to expect from the former Governor of Connecticut and the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the same incisive ability to go to the heart of a problem, and the same understanding of the problems of others, as he showed clearly in the address he has just completed. The Senate is indeed fortunate to have the junior Senator from Connecticut in its midst, fighting for proposals that will make America strong at home as well as abroad.

I should like to ask the Senator a few questions. Is it not clear to the Senator from Connecticut that one of the three vital elements which would preserve the health, integrity, and indeed, the continuance and prosperity of our cities, middle sized as well as large, is an ability to move people and goods in, around, and through metropolitan communities with a minimum of delay and a maximum of expedition?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. I believe my friend will agree that the other two problems confronting the great metropolitan areas are in the fields of housing and water.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. In the housing field and in the water field is it not true that the Federal Government has already intervened on a mass scale to assure health in our metropolitan communities in connection with those two great services which they so much need?

Mr. RIBICOFF. We might as well face the fact that in the future there will be increasing demands for recognition of the problems of urban America. We shall hear increasing debates in behalf of such developments. We have neglected those problems on a national scale, and neglected them to our peril.

Perhaps there are those who are fearful of facing the consequences of those problems, but we dare not refuse to face them. The problems of urban America relating to human rights are upon us today. They concern juvenile delinquency, health, medicare, air pollution, and transportation. Not wanting them to exist does not mean that they will go away. No great nation such as ours can allow itself to be choked off by failure of the national legislative body to recognize the needs of our people and to tackle the problems that face us. In future years the Congress will face more and more of such problems. Perhaps we do not like them, but we must be honest with one another and recognize that they exist. The Congress will have to deal with them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Was it not true in the Senator's wide experience as Governor of the great State of Connecticut, as was the case in my experience as mayor of Philadelphia, that, dealing with the problem of shelter and housing—residential, commercial, and industrial—it became clear perhaps 15 or 20 years ago that we could not provide a healthy shelter situation in our cities without intervention by the Federal Government through the FHA, through the urban renewal program, and through the public housing program?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It is not true that in each instance it was necessary to bring the credit of the Federal Government to bear, because private enterprise was unable to construct adequate housing at a profit to take care of the needs of the people?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Not only is the Senator's statement correct, but also this fact is amply shown in the case of mass transportation. Time and again I have had occasion to talk with bankers, investment counselors, and insurance companies about the prospects for obtaining private money for the field of mass transportation. The response has been unanimous, to the effect that there is no profit in mass transportation, and that no sound private investment would be justified. Consequently, the great resources of investment from private sources do not go into this field.

If there is a national need—which there is—if private means cannot take care of this need; if local means cannot take care of this need; and if State means cannot take care of this need; we as a nation cannot allow the need to go neglected. This is where the Federal role comes into play, because it is an absolute necessity to take care of a basic need facing the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend if he has not looked with profit at page 5 of the committee report from the Committee on Banking and Currency, where there is set forth a summary, by States, of the number of U.S. transit companies which have been sold or abandoned in the past 9 years. I invite my friend's attention to the fact that in Connecticut five have been sold and three abandoned. In Pennsylvania 19 companies have been sold and 7 have been abandoned.

Has it not been my friend's experience that it is becoming increasingly difficult, and in some areas absolutely impossible, for private transit companies either to operate at a profit or to render the service required by the inhabitants of the districts they serve?

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is no question about it.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend one more question. I am sure that he—the same as I—has always supported the Federal road program which is under the A-B-C sections and which provides for 50-percent Federal subsidy for the major highway systems within the States, and also the Federal Interstate Highway System, which calls for the Federal Government to put up $9 for every interstate road built for every $1 put up by a State or local authority.

I ask my friend how he could justify that vast expenditure of Federal money for highways, supported by the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate, and then fight this bill, which is intended to provide mass transit for the same people at a far lesser cost both to the Federal Government and the individual taxpayers.

Mr. RIBICOFF. To do so would be most illogical.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his remarks.

Mr. DODD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator RIBICOFF, made his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately I was detained at a committee meeting at the time. I have read every word of this outstanding speech.

Senator RIBICOFF spoke of the compelling need of our State and of our region for a Federal program to promote the development of mass commuter transportation. Senator RIBICOFF's speech was eloquent, incisive, and statesmanlike. It was essentially an appeal to our colleagues from other sections of the country to show the same concern and sympathy for our problems as those of us from the Northeast and other urban areas have shown for problems of agriculture, reclamation, public power, rural electrification, and other programs essential to the development of those regions.

Senator RIBICOFF pointed out that Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey pay 25 percent of the Nation's taxes and in turn receive only 10 percent of Federal expenditures.

He pointed out that we are willing to do this because what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. But now we have an urgent need, a need shared by great urban areas throughout the country, and we have a just claim upon support from the whole Nation.

I congratulate Senator RIBICOFF on the first of many distinguished addresses to this body. It is a real personal pleasure for me to have this good friend and this great public servant as my colleague in the Senate.

HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by direction and by authority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that out of order I may call up for immediate consideration H.R. 4374, which is a bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that Senators who may wish to proclaim the merits and great attributes of Winston Churchill withhold their remarks until some time tomorrow, in order that the Senate may get on with the business of the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was the bill reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4374) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I am gratified by the overwhelming response to the proposals presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and other Members of the Congress to accord honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill of Great Britain. It was a genuine privilege to have joined in the cosponsorship of legislation to bring this deserved honor to a gallant gentleman and an esteemed leader of freemen.

It is pleasing to recall, too, that the West Virginia Legislature, on February 22, 1963, adopted a resolution bestowing on Sir Winston Churchill the title of "Honorary Citizen of the State of West Virginia."

Sir Winston Churchill is not only a most distinguished elder statesman and citizen of Great Britain, but, indeed, he is now about to become officially an honorary citizen of the United States. In a larger sense we can honor this courageous and inspiring leader during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars as truly a citizen of the world.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], I wish to suggest that the committee amendments be agreed to at this time. Then there will be a clean bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill may be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—it will be understood, of course, that all rights are to be preserved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. As I understand, under the procedures of the Senate, the bill before us would be considered as if a clean bill, and amendments would be in order to all parts of the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I asked unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, so that the bill can be considered as a clean bill, and amendments may be offered to the whole bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I call up the amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 6, as reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr Magnuson] from the Committee on Commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be agreed to and thereafter be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the measure which the Senator from California is offering is the one that has a $500 million grant provision and a $500 million guarantee loan program in it. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator is correct. It is the substitute offered by the Senate Committee on Commerce. If the request is granted, it will then be a substitute under the number of the bill offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and will be subject, of course, to further amendment, and all rights will be protected. This is a procedural step.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this the bill that picked up my $50 million guarantee program, which another Senator raised to $100 million, and still another raised to $500 million, at which time I quit?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what happened. I proposed $50 million. Another Senator said $100 million. Finally, a third Senator said $500 million.

Mr. ENGLE. That was for the guarantee bond program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I said I had better get out.

Mr. ENGLE. We adopted the principle sponsored so vigorously by the Senator from Ohio; we merely expanded it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that we will be treating this proposal as an original bill, and it would be subject to amendment just as an original bill would be. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. It is a procedural step for the purpose of getting the matter before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the request is agreed to, amendments can be offered to the substitute, as I understand. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May an amendment be offered to one of those amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Further reserving the right to object—and I am certainly not going to object—I wonder what the substitute does in terms of the guarantee and the $500 million guarantee authority. It is not a reduction of the authority to guarantee that was in the original proposal of the Senator from Ohio. As I understand his approach, he provided a revolving fund, and that amount would have permitted a guarantee of over $1 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Over $1 billion.

Mr. ENGLE. I will leave it to the Senator from Ohio to answer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will answer that question. My bill provided for a $50 million guarantee loan fund for 1 year. I want to repeat what I said previously. In the committee a Senator said, "Raise it to $100 million." Then out of a clear sky another Senator said, "Raise it to $500 million." I did not know what it was going to jump to and I got out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I want to say categorically that my bill provided a guarantee loan fund to be appropriated, not by financing out of the back door, $50 million for 1 year. The amended bill provides a $500 million authorization.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is talking about a revolving fund that would be used to pay off what was guaranteed. We are talking about apples and oranges, not the same thing.

Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. ENGLE. This is a procedural matter. It places the amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 6 before the Senate for the purpose of amendment, and the Senator from Ohio and all other Senators can either vote against it or amend it; but what it does is put us in a position to operate upon this particular legislative proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have it adopted. As I said to the Senator, it is a procedural step. He has a right to offer his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I repeat the question. The measure offered by the Senator from California comes as a new bill, subject to amendment in accordance with the regular rule. Is that correct?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am opposed to these mass transportation bills, both the original proposal and the proposal as proposed to be modified.

EXCESSIVE COST OF BILL

I can see the advantages these bills may have, and it may be that they will bring some assistance to hard-pressed commuters in our cities. Residents of our cities need and deserve Federal assistance. I have supported urban renewal programs. I think the record on urban renewal has been a good one. I intend to support it in the future.

I think we have to recognize several things about the pending bill, however; in the first place its enormous cost. To begin with, only as a starter, and I stress the words "as a starter," the bill provides $500 million in outright grants over the next 3 years. As the Senator from Ohio has mentioned, it is a $1 billion bill, in view of the additional $500 million guarantee. I think a realistic appraisal suggests that it is going to cost as much as $1 billion or more a year in the future.

The need for the bill in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston, and many other cities has been stressed before our Banking and Currency Committee. There has not been any showing that this need cannot be met locally if there is a desire to do it.

SAN FRANCISCO PROVIDES $729 MILLION WITHOUT FEDERAL HELP

The fact is that San Francisco has already found that it can engage in one of the most ambitious and extensive transportation programs in the country, a program costing $792 million for this relatively middle-sized city, which will finance the entire cost itself. If San Francisco can do it, I cannot understand why other cities cannot do it.

It is said that these commuters need assistance. I think they do. But, after all, those who commute from rural areas to large cities have incomes that exceed the national average income, and if anybody can afford to pay the cost of the service, it seems to me the commuters can do so.

The point has been raised by the able Senator from New Jersey that at least in 3 States, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, there is a complicated interstate problem and that only the Federal Government can move in and solve the problem. At least, that has been the implication.

Authorities have been established in the past, along with interstate compacts, to solve similar problems. Why not this problem? For example, the Illinois-Wisconsin-Indiana area and the great New York metropolitan area suggest this kind of reasonable approach. We have had experience with this kind of problem in the past, and it has worked. The money is there. The income is there. San Francisco has shown, it seems to me, that it can be done.

Sure, the sacrifices and the burdens are great, but I think, on the basis of what we have learned in the hearings, this problem can be solved and solved locally.

In view of the enormous size of our budget and the need of keeping Federal spending as low as possible, to support a new program that will become a multibillion-dollar program in a short time is a serious mistake.

I have a series of amendments I want to offer to the bill. Because of the complicated legislative maneuvering, it has been very difficult for me to draft the amendments, not knowing which bill was going to be before the Senate, and therefore what line or page my amendments would refer to.

I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce my amendments later on in the day, before, say, 6 o'clock, even if the Senate adjourns, and that the amendments can be printed and be available for introduction as printed tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

PROXMIRE AMENDMENTS CARRY OUT COMPTROLLER GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these are amendments all of which were recommended by the Comptroller General, all of which will safeguard the interest of the Federal Treasury, some of which can save the Federal Government many millions of dollars. One amendment, for instance, provides for renegotiation if a Federal project grant turns out to result in an excessive, unjustified profit for the local transit company. This gives an opportunity for the Federal Government to reclaim some of its grant.

These recommendations by the Comptroller General make a good deal of sense to me, and they will make a great deal of sense to Senators, regardless of their position on the bill, if they will listen to the arguments in support of the amendments with an open mind. They will, in my opinion, improve the bill substantially in this regard.

THE WAUSAU STORY; CASE HISTORY OF ADVANTAGE OF LOCAL FINANCING

Mr. President, my prime objection to the pending bill is that it eliminates the discipline which it is necessary to have in order to insure efficiency in transit operations.

I believe that a classic example of what I have in mind is provided by what transpired in Wausau, Wis., between 1955 and 1959. It shows the importance of efficiency. It shows the importance of the cruel, painful, and tough adjustments which local businessmen and local transit authorities often must make if they are to have a profitable operation.

ECONOMIC PRESSURE FORCED LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR EFFICIENCY

The Wausau, Wis., Transit System was operated between 1955 and 1958 at a loss which exceeded $6,000 each year. The operation was absentee-owned by persons who lived in Chicago, Ill. The local businessmen, in the period from 1954 to 1957, made an exhaustive analysis of the whole situation locally and made a thorough study of transit operations all over the country. They then brought in some very tough and difficult recommendations—tough for the people who lived there and for the people who operated the transit system.

The story of what happened in Wausau indicates what will happen to a system if it is left alone and no Federal subsidy is provided to meet the very difficult economic exigencies in connection with the survival of our free enterprise system.

In the first place, the transit system curtailed its service by one-third; in other words, that it eliminated one-third of its operation.

In the second place, it reduced its time of operation, to provide operation only from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.; the 6 to 9:30 p.m. service was dropped. Sunday morning service was eliminated.

The city council, which provides the money for the Wausau school system, was persuaded to agree to an increase in the fares, charged to the local property taxpayers, for students who were being transported by bus owned by this transit system. The fare was increased from 12½ to 16½ cents.

EFFICIENCY ADJUSTMENTS IMPOSSIBLE WITH FEDERAL HANDOUTS

I believe that all of these very tough and difficult adjustments would have been impossible if a Federal subsidy program had been in effect and if it had been possible for the local authorities to turn to the Federal Government for assistance.

Incidentally, the increase in the fares was approved by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

In addition, it was necessary, in order to keep operating and in order to provide for the necessary transportation facilities and buses, to borrow money. Local businessmen loaned $2,500. The school board loaned another $2,500. Other local money was raised. It was raised on the basis of local people who had a direct, immediate, and personal knowledge of the transit operation.

During this period the transit system went through as difficult and as rocky a time as can be imagined. The transit system owed $22,000, which was a great deal of money for such a small system. Most of it was owed to the Internal Revenue Service. The Internal Revenue Service came within an eyelash of foreclosing on the property.

There was a period during which the transit system lacked cash to meet its payroll. There was a strike threat. The transit system almost came to the point of halting its operations. It was difficult to get spare parts to continue operations. A petition was filed by the owners of the transit system to abandon operations. That petition was denied by the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin.

WAUSAU ACHIEVES SUCCESS

Because of the painful but necessary economies in operation which were instituted, based on the pressure of economic necessity, this transit system slowly and gradually solved its problems itself.

Now it is expanding its service. It has found credit with which to buy new equipment. It found that credit locally. It has new local open lines of credit. It is successful. It is making a small profit each year. That profit is beginning to grow.

In the words of Mr. Delmar Drum, of the Wausau Chamber of Commerce;

> We feel very strongly that our problem was a local problem and one that only can be effectively dealt with at the local level. Financing was just a small part of this thing. It is the cooperation between people and understanding between the various organizations and people that really was the reason for the success.

I believe, if we consider the situation in Wausau, Wis., we must know that, after all, if Wausau had been in the position of being able to get a substantial grant from the Federal Government, money which would not have to be returned to the Federal Government, there would have been an entirely different course of action followed in Wausau. It would not have streamlined its operations, including working rules, to make it more efficient. There would not have been the realization of the importance of cooperation to provide a more efficient operation.

It was the pressures of economic necessity which drove this operation to self reliance and success, not by subsidy, but by efficient and profitable operation. It accomplished what was needed in Wausau to the satisfaction of all the people involved. Incidentally, the cutting back of service and the increase in the fares did not result in complaints in Wausau. If a subsidy had been involved, there would have been very vehement protest.

BILL PUTS BIG INCENTIVE ON ELABORATE TRANSIT PROGRAMS

This is a good fiscal reason why I believe the bill is unsound in its terms. The bill provides, in the grant section, that the Federal Government shall contribute two-thirds of the net project cost.

This means that if it is possible to finance, say, a $10 million program out of revenues, and the local authorities have the choice or the alternative of having simply a $10 million operation with no Federal gift or a very elaborate $40 million operation with a $20 million giveaway there is a real incentive for going for a big, substantial operation.

Let us assume this program becomes as big as everyone assures us it will, a multibillion dollar operation.

Now assume that a particular transit company has a net income available for buying facilities, and so forth, after all operating costs of $10 million a year. Let us say that this is considered adequate to finance a $100 million transit program that will do the basic transportation job. In the city council debate there are local boosters who argue, "Let us make our city really bloom. We ought to have an elaborate subway system, or perhaps a monorail, or some other very attractive transit to bring people in from all the surrounding territory. Of course this is going to cost more. It is going to cost $400 million."

However, of the additional $300 million over the basic $100 million, the Federal Government will pay $200 million, and we will only have to pay $100 million. The argument will be that employment can be provided through this elaborate system, and profit can be made through additional business, surely during the construction period itself.

The argument can be made that all this additional business and additional profit will be made by the local people. With local pressures such an argument can be very convincing, indeed.

INCENTIVE TO PUSH COST ON TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There is the further provision in the proposed legislation, which was spotted by the Comptroller General, which makes makes the net project cost system especially vulnerable to exploitation.

Let us say in this hypothetical situation that although the local authorities in their hearts recognize they would have $10 million left over after covering operating expenses, they still might like to persuade the Federal Government to put up as much as possible, not one-half of the total project cost, not two-thirds of what they would calculate the net project cost to be, but two-thirds of the whole project cost. What would they have to do in order to achieve that purpose? They would have to convince the Administrator that probably there would be no substantial amount available over the cost of operation. Therefore, in this $400 million project the Federal Government has to come in with $270 million, and the local people will put up not $200 million, but $130 million, of which $100 million is in reality financed out of fare box net revenue. Local taxpayers chip in $30 million and get $270 million or nine times that much in Federal money.

Now there is a tremendous incentive for local transit authorities to make this case. It is extremely difficult for the Administrator to find anything else, because in all these cases we have to make all kinds of extraordinarily difficult assumptions as to the number of people who will use a new transportation system, what amount of fare they will be willing to pay, and a number of other assumptions that can provide almost any answer one wants.

On this basis, if the local transit people advise the Federal Government that they will not have any excess above their operating cost, the Federal Government if convinced will come in with $270 million of the $400 million cost. Then what will happen? As the Comptroller General points out, although the local transit company is making a substantial amount, the Federal $270 million is gone for good. It may be possible for the local people to finance a $10 million operation. There is no possibility for renegotiation, which the Comptroller General urges, and there is no possibility of the Federal Government getting its money back. So there is every incentive for the local people to make a showing that they cannot do more than cover the cost of operation and thus, in effect, require a maximum contribution from the Federal Government.

My main point, which I wish to reiterate, is that there is every incentive in every city council to go for the big elaborate, costly operation, rather than a simple system which can be financed out of farebox revenues. Why? Because the Federal Government will come in on the big one, and the Federal Government will contribute nothing if the operation can be financed locally out of farebox revenues.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], in his very fine maiden speech, talked, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators, about the importance of the planning subsidy that will be paid for highway construction. The fact is that at the present time our cities and urban areas gain greatly by this subsidy. I quote from page 12 of the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

> Under the present $41 billion Federal-aid highway program, approximately $20 billion will be spent for the Interstate System in urban areas. In addition, on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems the expenditures for streets and expressways in urban areas runs into hundreds of millions of dollars every year. For example, Congress has authorized for this program $925 million for fiscal year 1963, 25 percent of which is earmarked specifically for urban portions.

This is a novel protest. The people who want these funds for the big cities are saying, "We are getting such heavy subsidies from the Federal Government, that we are building too many roads into our cities."

The argument is that they are getting so many automobiles into the cities that more and more valuable urban locations are needed for parking space. This ties up the cities in traffic jams, so it is necessary to have a separate subsidy which will enable people to come into the cities by buses at lower cost.

This is a quite novel, intriguing kind of argument. I suppose if the subsidy to transit systems becomes more and more generous, the advocates of highway building will come along and say, "We need to balance this out. We need a larger subsidy for highways." Obviously, it would be possible to become involved in a vicious circle.

The argument was made, on the basis of a very careful study at Northwestern University, that it is highly questionable that a low, subsidized fare will necessarily result in an increase in the number of people who will not take their automobiles into the cities, but will travel by the transit systems. It may well result in more people using the transit systems, people who use it little or not at all now. In some instances—as the Boston experiments show—it will. But whether those who have come into the city before by automobile will stop coming by automobile, and come in by bus transportation, is, I submit, questionable. The Northwestern University study shows that it is necessary to reduce the fare to zero, or even to minus 10 cents or 25 cents, to get any significant increase in the number of people who will use a transit system. Obviously, if that kind of incentive is needed, it will not be possible to get it.

WHY SUBSIDIZE MASS CONCENTRATION?

There is a basic assumption in the bill that the central metropolitan area needs an additional subsidy, beyond the urban renewal subsidy, in order to get more people to live in the central city, to work in the central city, and to shop in the central city.

Is this assumption reasonable? I think that from the standpoint of national defense and the economic standpoint there should be at least equal opportunity, economically, for people to live outside cities, to obtain the great advantages of living in wider spaces. The kind of artificial incentive provided in the bill, it seems to me, would concentrate the population in a way which I think we could argue strongly is unhealthy and unwise. I think at the very least we can say that the Federal Government should not use its enormous power and its great financial ability to increase artificially the size, activity, and business in the central cities, the big cities, as compared with smaller areas.

To sum up, there are very definite, clearcut, obvious local advantages, as every Senator knows, in having an operation paid for on the basis of local financing. If a subsidy is needed, it should be paid for out of the local imposition of taxes in the area. There is a great advantage in that. I think the Wausau story is a perfectly valid one, one which could be applied in hundreds of cities throughout the country.

Some of the transit systems have been abandoned, and perhaps they should have been abandoned. If there is enough will and ingenuity in the cities to keep them going, they will be kept going. If not, why should the Federal taxpayer subsidize them.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate, and to stress it, the fact that the Comptroller General had a whole series of objections to the bill, most of which have not been included in the amended bill and have been given no consideration. I expect to offer some of the amendments tomorrow to take care of the Comptroller General's proposals.

Finally, I think we should recognize that the net project cost conception in the bill places a very heavy artificial, unnatural, uneconomic incentive on the building of big, elaborate transportation operations and discourages operations which can be financed locally from local revenues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Talmadge in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the urban mass transportation bill is costly—one of the most costly domestic programs ever considered by the American Congress.

It is wasteful.

It is autocratic.

It is political.

It is loosely and carelessly drawn.

And it is unnecessary.

The original bill calls for $500 million for grants. The Commerce Committee amendment added $500 million in guaranteed loans. Thus, this is now a billion dollar program. But this is merely a drop in the bucket. Its most ardent supporters estimate it will cost $2½ billion over the next 10 years. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, who will administer it, testified that the cost might reach $5 billion. In other testimony the cost was estimated to be $10 billion in 10 years. After having watched these programs mushroom, I find that it is always safe to expect the highest figure.

Let us make no mistake; our action on this bill will be decisive. If it is enacted, it will launch the Federal Government on a new spending program involving billions of dollars. If the bill is enacted, it will dash the hopes for reducing the Federal budget. If enacted it will mean that probably we shall have no tax cut, or that we shall have a tax cut so slight that it will be utterly ineffective in providing jobs and stimulating the national economy.

The bill is a beautiful example of waste. It specifically provides subsidies only for transportation systems which are economically unsound and have no hope of being self-supporting. It has long been said that the sure way for any nation in the world to secure American foreign aid is to furnish evidence that it is in danger of going Communist. The only way for a city to get Federal transportation aid under this bill is to make sure that its transit systems are bound to lose money. Thus, the measure discourages prudence and rewards waste.

It is autocratic, in that it makes a czar of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. There are no real safeguards or legislative guidelines in the bill. The Administrator could give away millions of dollars—and ultimately billions—to whom he chose. Furthermore, he could force the agency of the city or community to adopt a plan and a rate structure acceptable to him, and to him alone. If they failed to comply with his wishes, he could not only cease extending Federal grants or loans; he could also stop all forms of assistance to the area from his agency, which would mean cutting off slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and any other program which had been in effect, no matter how long it had been in effect or no matter how well administered it had been. Has there ever been a greater example of naked, ruthless Federal power?

By the same token, the bill gives unlimited opportunity for politics. There are no priorities or standards for selecting the beneficiaries out of the long lines of applicants. It is a political grab-bag, pure and simple. Without impugning the motives of the present or the future occupants of the Administrator's chair, the bill would confer a power that would be almost irresistible; and the money would likely be distributed where it would do the most good when the votes were counted.

The bill is loosely and carelessly drawn in other respects than the lack of priorities, standards, or guidelines. The definition of "urban area" would permit, according to testimony, as many as 17,000 built-up localities to qualify. Under the language of the bill, the Administrator could give aid to freight distribution systems which did not carry a single passenger. The bill has constantly been referred to as a 3-year bill. Yet it has no termination date; and in one section it specifically refers to a long-range program.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator from New Hampshire aware that in the testimony submitted before the Banking and Currency Committee, witness after witness testified that the bill would be only a start, and that the intention was to expand the program very greatly?

As a matter of fact, just this morning, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] said he anticipates that the bill would be only a start.

So could we not be getting into billions of dollars of expenditures?

Mr. COTTON. I think it would be inevitable that we would be getting into billions of dollars of expenditures. I think this program would be absolutely bound to grow—and to grow even beyond the limits of our imagination today.

The only restrictions of the bill on the mode of transportation—and I am referring to some of the parts of the bill which do not indicate careful draftsmanship and workmanship—is that it shall be over prescribed routes, open to all the public, and not by air. Under that definition, almost everything could qualify, even moving sidewalks and elevators.

Does the need justify the huge expenditure involved? The evidence seems to indicate that the need is decreasing, rather than increasing. The Federal Highway Administrator testified before our Commerce Committee that 45 percent of the interstate highway funds are being spent in urban areas, and that spectacular progress is being made in the construction of freeways or freeway systems in cities. He noted that in Detroit the opening of its freeways has reduced traffic volume on adjacent streets by as much as 34 percent; and in Boston, travel on some streets has been speeded up as much as 50 percent by diversion of traffic through high-speed, high-capacity central arteries. This highway program is financed almost entirely by user charges, in the form of gasoline and other taxes, imposed on the motorists who use them. The "passing through" traffic is rapidly being diverted by adequate bypasses. More important than this, however, is the change of the location of jobs and population. The moving of industries into the country and the establishment of market centers in the suburbs are annually reducing the traffic into central business districts. The shopper goes to the suburbs; the clerks who serve them are moved there, too.

Considerable light is thrown on this situation by a report entitled "Technology and Urban Transportation," by John R. Meyer, of Harvard University; John F. Kain, of the Rand Corp.; and Martin Wohl, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The report was prepared at the request of the White House; and, to my mind, at least, it takes on added significance from the fact that Professor Meyer has been a White House consultant, and Professor Wohl is a Commerce Department consultant on transportation matters.

The report notes that evening rush-hour traffic leaving downtown Detroit has declined by about 8 percent over the 10-year period ending in 1953. In Chicago, the rush-hour traffic leaving the downtown area has declined over the last 10 years, despite a 20-percent increase in the population of the metropolitan area, and despite the continued existence, and even expansion, of a well-developed rapid transit system. In Minneapolis, there has been a steady decline in the number of people entering the central business district each day—a decline which has amounted to 16 percent since 1947. In New York City, a 10-percent decline has occurred between 1948 and 1956 in the number of people daily entering downtown Manhattan, and other examples are cited.

As the report points out, the growing decentralization of our major cities poses major problems for mass transit enterprises. Indeed, it states that "the best future public system may not be mass transportation as conventionally conducted in the past." Personally, I have a suspicion that most Americans are likely to continue driving to work until someone invents a transit system that will pull into his driveway, take him to work at a time he chooses to leave, and stop at the bakery or drycleaners on the way home.

Mass transportation service in most urban areas has been declining in recent years. In the 4-year period from 1956 to 1960, the number of passengers carried by buses and streetcars declined by 22 percent. And since 1954, about 195 transit companies have been abandoned. Proponents of this bill see in these facts a crisis in urban transportation, and contend that they prove the need for Federal subsidies. If we had followed this line of reasoning 50 years ago, we might still have Federal subsidies for hitching posts and horse watering troughs.

In the light of this evidence, how can we even think of throwing away our chances of conquering the twin giants of the 88th Congress—economy and tax reduction? That is what the passage of this bill, in any form, is bound to do.

As the Senate approaches a vote on the urban transportation bill, let Senators make no mistake. The bill would launch the first of new programs. Speaking for myself, I believe that the President of the United States, when he spoke of spurring our sluggish economy and making sure that the Nation will grow and move, made a most constructive proposal by stating that we must find a way to reduce the restrictions of the tax burden. The words I am about to use may not have been the President's words. I will take responsibility for them. We must find some way to reduce the tax burden, especially on the jobmaking industries. I hope to be able to support such a tax reduction. I want to be able to support it even if we are unable to prune the existing budget as substantially as we might hope.

But as surely as day follows night, if we launch and inaugurate new spending programs in this year of our Lord 1963, we shall be utterly unable to enact a bill that would relieve the tax burden and would give the spur to our economy that we so badly need.

Mr. President, if we enact the proposal, the first program to be submitted, should our action be followed by approval in the other body, we shall have "crossed the Rubicon." We shall have enacted the first of the big spending bills, and we shall be sounding the death knell to any hope of really constructive achievement in the 88th Congress toward spurring our Nation's economy.

I shall vote against S. 6, and I urge the Senate to reject it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I must yield first to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey because he spoke first.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I asked the Senator to yield for perhaps what is not a germane question. However, we are talking during the relaxed luncheon hour and, I gather, we have not adopted a rule of germaneness.

I wish to ask my friend and part-time neighbor one or two questions to correct a rather fuzzy recollection of mine.

As the Senator knows, I am a property-owning taxpayer at a little place called Tamworth in the great State of New Hampshire. When the Senate business, or lack of business, permits, my wife, children, and I travel to our place for a few days—and, in recent years, it has literally been a few days.

When we were there in the fall—I believe, though it may have been the spring of 1960—I saw the picture of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in the local newspaper. It depicted his presence at the dedication of a dam in the State of New Hampshire. The former Vice President was with the Senator, as I recall. I desired to attend the dedication, but I concluded that perhaps, coming from this side of the aisle, I would put a pall on an otherwise very happy occasion.

The first question I wish to ask the Senator is in relation to that dedication. What dam was it? Was it the Hopkinton?

Mr. COTTON. I believe that was the ground-breaking ceremony of the Hopkinton-Everett Dam, a flood control project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is that a local or a State project?

Mr. COTTON. That is a Federal project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Involving Federal funds only?

Mr. COTTON. Practically totally, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The purpose of the dam is purely flood control?

Mr. COTTON. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What will be the cost to the national taxpayers of that dam?

Mr. COTTON. I cannot recall those figures.

Let me say first, we are most happy to have the distinguished Senator from New Jersey in New Hampshire as a part-time resident of the beautiful town of Tamworth, which was once graced by an ex-President of the United States, Grover Cleveland. Grover Cleveland was a pretty hardheaded, tightfisted conservative Democrat of the old school.

I was waiting for the point of the question of the Senator.

If there is anything inconsistent in opposing a new program on mass transportation and permitting the building of a dam for the protection of life from floods, a program which is paid for by Federal funds, but which is for the benefit not only of one State but of several, and which is designed to hold back the floodwaters from Massachusetts—we New Hampshire people are very solicitous about Massachusetts these days—first, I see no analogy. Second, I add that whatever would be the merits or demerits of past programs, my principal point is that this is not the time to start a new one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Then I gather that it is implied in the Senator's statement that he recognizes that a need has been stated. We are not meeting our requirements in transportation, and particularly in mass transportation in urban areas.

Mr. COTTON. Oh, no. If the Senator listened to what I said, I think he would realize that one of my principal points was that the need, if there is such need for mass transportation—I did not say Federal—is on the decrease rather than the increase, for the reasons stated.

I have heard repeatedly on the floor of the Senate the comment made by friends of mine for whom I have the most profound respect that we who live in the small, sparsely populated States of this country ought to contribute to the solving of the problems of the metropolitan, thickly populated areas of the great States because—and I ask Senators to listen to this, Mr. President—because those great States pay so much of the taxes, such a huge proportion of the taxes, and more taxes than we pay.

The logic of that has always escaped me. I do not feel a need for contributing to the Kennedys or the Rockefellers or the Vanderbilts from my meager bank account because they pay more taxes than I do. They pay more taxes because they have more money.

As I have listened to the words of the Governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller; to the words of a distinguished former Governor of New York, Mr. Averell Harriman; to the words of the mayor of New York City, Mr. Wagner; unless I am grossly deceived, the treasury of the great State of New York is in a far, far better condition than is the Federal Treasury. New York is in a far better condition to cope with such transit problems as it may have, peculiar to the State. I can see no rhyme or reason for making this a Federal problem and reaching into the pockets of the people in my State and in other States across this broad land to finance these things.

Why, one can follow one street in Greater Boston, from south Boston through to the northern extremity of what is known as Greater Boston, and one can find more wealth and taxable property on that street than exists in the entire State which I represent.

When we are asked to finance a Federal mass transit program to help those who are in absolutely the best possible condition to help themselves, and when there is written into the bill a provision that they cannot be helped unless they can show they are inefficient and losing money, and when there is written into the bill a provision to create a czar in Washington, D.C., why, the bill becomes the most glaring example of Federal domination of States and of local communities that I have seen, I think, in all the years I have served in the Congress.

That is what I am talking about. I do not say that there is no transit problem. But I say, first, that it is being blown up, though it is on the decrease; and, second, that the Federal Government, in this particular year when we are straining every nerve to hold the line, when we are not going to be able to inject some real life blood into the veins of this country unless we reduce the budget and, above all, refrain from plunging into new expenditures, should not engage in such an activity at this time.

Mr. President, I feel that I must yield to the Senator from Ohio, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield for one observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not wish to make this into an argument, but I respectfully ask the Senator from New Hampshire to read the Record for April 1, 1963, at page 5338, at his leisure, since there appear the statements of two of his former colleagues from New Hampshire, who spoke quite to the contrary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator raised that question. I was beginning to fear that he would not do so. I did read the quotation in the Record. It was incredible to me, after having been a lifelong friend and associate of the late Senator Bridges, and after having served with him in the Congress for 14 years and in this body for 7 years.

It was also incredible to me that he should be quoted as one of the fathers and sponsors of Federal mass transportation, so incredible that I thought there must be something wrong. Therefore, before I came to the Chamber to take the floor, I looked up the Record.

As Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record."

I found that on June 8, 1961, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], who is now on his feet hoping for an opportunity to ask a question, offered an amendment to the housing bill to strike out the authorization for mass transit demonstration grants, and on that there was a yea-and-nay vote.

I find that there were four absentees from this body who were paired as desiring to be recorded as voting for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which was against the mass transit proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I wish to read the names first. Those four were Senators Aiken, Allott, Bridges, and Goldwater.

I noticed that my distinguished friend from New Jersey quoted something which the late Senator Bridges had said. I noticed also that he quoted some words from Daniel Webster, and referred to him as that other great statesman from New Hampshire. Those words appear, I believe, in the House of Representatives.

I was in the House when that Chamber was rededicated, and I read that with some amusement. I remember turning to a friend of mine and saying, "They must have searched for days and days and days, to take out of context something which the great Webster said which was absolutely applicable to the New Deal and to the New Frontier; and they finally found something, a rather innocuous statement that we should develop our country, that we should develop its resources and we should improve opportunities, and so forth and so on."

Those are all very praiseworthy sentiments. Good heavens, the New Frontier and the New Deal are not the only people who believe in their country and who want to see it developed.

Daniel Webster would turn over in his grave if he could hear the words he used interpreted as bearing out a system of complete government support and government control over the people of this country.

I could not find the text from whence the Senator from New Jersey took the words of my late friend Styles Bridges. I am sure he did it most sincerely. He was a friend of Styles Bridges. He loved him and respected him. He would not take advantage of one who is not here to answer for himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I clarify that?

Mr. COTTON. I know that Styles Bridges voted against the mass transit proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The answer is that he did not. The late Senator Styles Bridges was a sponsor of the mass transportation bill that year. He was absent and not voting on the one vote. That was with respect to a demonstration program. That was not the bill.

Mr. COTTON. He must have been very much less than enthusiastic about mass transportation when he voted against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The statement which I quoted was from his testimony, submitted to the committee in the hearings on the bill.

Mr. COTTON. The only vote he cast was against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There was only one vote taken, and he did not vote.

Mr. COTTON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There was only one vote taken, and he did not vote.

Mr. COTTON. He was paired, and it was announced that he was against the experimental mass transportation proposal. I do not get that impression from the Senator's quote, put in the Record yesterday.

Whatever may be the facts, I am not my brother's keeper. I was a Member of the Senate at that time. I spoke and I voted as I speak and shall vote today. I shall continue to speak and to vote the same when the solvency of my country is at stake. Whatever the late Senator Bridges may have said or done, the fact is that we who are living have our duty to perform.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If I have done nothing else, I have brought forth the great eloquence of our friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. And the Senator has caused his friend from New Hampshire to do a little homework, to find out how the late Senator Bridges voted.

I am sorry to have made the Senator wait so long, and I yield with pleasure to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Hampshire made the statement that this program is a new one by way of subsidization. Will the Senator elaborate on that statement?

Mr. COTTON. I am not sure that I quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Hampshire has said that we are entering into a new field of governmental activity.

Mr. COTTON. I mean exactly this: Despite this experimental bill, when the Federal Government assumes the burden of financing to the extent of 66⅔ percent on grants and 75 percent on guaranteed loans for mass transportation, we are certainly entering a field that we have not penetrated beyond the outer crust before, and we are starting on a program that will go down a long, long, expensive road. That is what I meant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are entering into a field of subsidizing mass transportation, and that is a field in which the Federal Government has not been until this time.

Mr. COTTON. Other than the mere scratching of the surface. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator refers to the program of 2 years ago.

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the program of 2 years ago, against which I believe Senator Bridges voted, provided that there shall be loans, and not grants. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. COTTON. I think that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two years ago we provided $12½ million to be available to local transportation systems to make tests of how they might improve their service. I have a letter here from the American Municipal Association stating they represent 13,000 municipal governments and they support this bill.

Is it not a fact that, under the language of the bill, every municipal government within the Nation, having a population of 2,500 or more, will be made eligible to get grants from the Federal Government?

Mr. COTTON. That is certainly correct, if they are willing to surrender their birthright in that respect to the Federal Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, they will be able to come to the Federal Government and say, "We cannot finance our own systems. We need financial help. We want to buy buses. We want to buy buildings." And if they have an overall transportation plan, they will become eligible for a Federal Government gift.

Mr. COTTON. They will become eligible if the all-powerful Housing Administrator approves of the plan and likes the color of their hair and decides that he will put them on the eligible list.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Hampshire has spoken of the "all-powerful" Director of the HHFA. Does he mean by that statement that it will depend upon what he thinks has been done by the local communities, and, in the final word, he will be able to say either, "Yes, you get the money," or "No, you do not get it"?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire means exactly that. This bill is the most amazing bill, if I can read English, that I have ever seen in this body, because it does not set up any guidelines. It does not set up any criteria of any importance in determining eligibility. It simply provides that the Administrator of the Housing Agency, if he approves of a plan presented to the Agency by the city or community, if he chooses to do so, at his own will or pleasure, can put them on the list and can decide to give them grants or afford them guaranteed loans. Then those local governments cannot change their plans without his permission, and if they do not behave and stay in line according to his precepts, he withdraws his approval, and when he withdraws his approval that city is completely starved of everything that his Agency does. They get nothing for urban renewal. They get nothing for slum clearance. They are just outcasts—and at the will and pleasure of one bureaucrat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been interested in the Senator's statement that in this year when people are asking for a tax cut we are entering into a new program of subsidizing. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire can make an observation on this statement? Those Members of the Senate who are speaking most vigorously for a tax cut are the ones who are speaking most vehemently for this new spending program.

Mr. COTTON. The only observation the Senator from New Hampshire would make in reply to the very pertinent inquiry of the Senator from Ohio is that what he says is true—that, in most respects, the same Senators are supporting this bill who are supporting the President and asking for a tax cut. I would say that up to the present moment, looking back at all history, they are affording on the floor of the Senate and to the country the greatest demonstration of one's trying to have his cake and eat it, too. It just cannot possibly happen.

Even if we should pass this and other new programs to launch new spending programs and then, heedless of all laws of economics, should pass a tax cut—and, as I remember, the President's recommendation is a tax cut that will be applied consecutively over 3 years—before the first year was completed we would be engulfed in such an avalanche of spending, inflation, debt, and fiscal irresponsibility, that the taxes would go back into effect, and more taxes would go into effect than had been taken off. Does the Senator from Ohio agree with that statement?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of course I agree with it. I am, frankly, deeply amazed by those who are going to the people of the country and saying, "We will get you a tax cut. We want to help you in your financial distress." They are reaching ears that in many instances are listening and believing. But these people do not know that the ones who are talking about a tax cut are following a course of conduct that makes a tax cut impossible and, if passed, would make it practically criminal.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator has put his finger on the real issue before the Senate and before the Congress. I am one who has always been thankful that we have in the Senate a man with the convictions and the clarity of vision and the power to speak and stand for those convictions that have always characterized my friend from Ohio. I pray God that the Senate, when it comes to vote, will rise to the occasion and that we will not pronounce the doom of the real program that the country needs in the 88th Congress by frittering away our resources with such a bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I get letters from citizens of Ohio stating, "I am amazed that you are against a tax cut."

I answer them by saying: "I favor a tax cut. I have been trying to follow a course of action in the 6 years that I have been in the Senate that would make a tax cut possible. I now will vote for the tax cut if we will reduce expenses."

This is not the way to reduce expenses. The pending bill means that we will get into a new field. We have heard the Administrator of HHFA testify that it would cost not less than $4 billion and probably $6 billion. I believe it will cost $8 billion to $10 billion before we get through. Yet there are men who profess to be friends of the public who are promising a tax cut, entering into this extravagant and unjustified program.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to repeat what I said twice this morning. When we considered the new part of the bill, I had a $50 million guarantee loan provision in it. One of my associates said, "Make it $100 million." Then someone else said, "Make it $500 million."

So what began in the bill as a $50-million-a-year program, has now risen to a $500-million grant and a $500-million-guarantee loan program.

The argument was made a moment ago that we must save the country, and that the way to save it is to send to Boston and New York and Philadelphia and Newark money with which to subsidize street transportation. To those who argue that way I say, "The way to save the country is to quit the spending programs. That is how we will save the country, not otherwise."

I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution in the form of his very pertinent observations. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, during the last year and a half or 2 years I believe I have spoken to as many undergraduate bodies and university bodies as any other Member of the Senate. It was something I liked to do, because I have had certain political extracurricular activities to perform during the last 2 or 3 years. It was something which I felt I should do. It is interesting to me that only one generation ago, when I graduated from college, in 1929—I believe that is one generation ago—the total Federal budget was about 40 percent or less than 40 percent of what the interest is today on our national debt. These young men and young women who are starting out to earn a living and starting out to pay taxes are faced with a national debt which is 2½ times the cost of the Government when I got out of college.

For this reason I believe we, as Members of the Senate, must exercise a degree of selectivity in the new programs which we undertake. We must establish priorities. I believe that we, who have been Members of Congress for a period of years, recognize the impossibility of curtailing or restraining programs which are established, for our whole social and economic life has been geared to these programs. If we eliminate one, whether it is good or bad, we upset some segment of our economy.

Now we are faced with a hundred-billion-dollar budget; in fact, it is $107 billion in obligational authority. We are now faced with a demand for lower taxes.

It seems to me that this puts extra emphasis on our responsibility to be selective, to establish priorities.

I would be the last to say that there is not a great problem in our metropolitan areas with respect to commuter transportation. One does not have to live in New York City, one need only to visit there occasionally, as I do, to know that this problem exists. However, there are many other problems. We have the problem of unemployment, especially among our young people. We have the problem of surplus agricultural products. We have the flood control problem. We have a great number of problems.

It seems to me that some of these problems must be solved locally. It is our obligation, as national representatives of the National Congress to exercise our best judgment, and only adopt those new programs which are absolutely essential and which are a Federal responsibility.

I know that the example of San Francisco has been given, that San Francisco has authorized a bond issue in excess of three-quarters of a billion dollars, whose chief purpose is to solve this problem in their community.

I do not see how we can continue to go down that road.

About 8 months ago, during the busy days of the last Congress, I went home to Louisville for the weekend, or what was left of the weekend. My oldest grandson reminded me that I had forgotten his birthday, which indeed I had. So I said, "All right, get in the car." I took him down to the toy store in the suburban area in which he lives. Of course, he wanted everything in the store. That is a natural reaction for a young child. I finally convinced him that he could have any one item in the store, that I did not care which one it was, but that he had to make a decision. He had a very difficult decision to make. However, he had to exercise some degree of selectivity. I might say that I am happy that he could not read the price tags, because I came out of it pretty well.

The fact remains that it is our responsibility to establish priorities and to exercise a degree of selectivity. Uncle Sam cannot do it all at home or abroad. I was glad that the President sent us a message today in which he cuts down his former request for foreign aid. Unless I am misled by the political signs, it will be further cut.

Here, in this instance, I know there is a problem. However, I believe there is a cheaper and a better solution than to turn this thing over, as it is done in this very loosely drawn bill, to the Federal Government.

COMMISSION TO REVISE THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it may be received and appropriately referred, a bill to establish a Commission to revise the antitrust laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1255) for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the minority of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, unanimously recommended this measure in the committee's 1963 report, issued on March 13.

Our antitrust laws were written in the 1890's, and they have not been reviewed in a comprehensive manner in 20 years. It is my belief that in certain of their applications, they are having an adverse effect upon U.S. productivity, on our long-range economic growth, on trade, and on foreign investment and foreign economic policy generally.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court decisions applying the "rule of reason," under which antitrust laws are interpreted and which really represent, in a sense, the very regulations under which we expect business to proceed, come too late in many such situations to enable the Government and business to deal adequately with our national interest.

I point out that so much emphasis has been placed on tax reduction this year that there is an impression that it is the sole needed remedy for the Nation's economic ills.

But other important actions must be taken at the same time, and other things must be done, if we are to bring our economy into that area of growth and productivity which we must have to deal with endemic unemployment.

I have urged that we deal with strikes, with modern technology, and automation. I urge also that we deal with bringing the antitrust laws more into line with the needs of our Nation. We cannot afford to continue to stumble along with an antitrust policy created for an almost entirely different world than the one in which we live today. Much of our antitrust laws is valid, but much needs to be revised, too.

I should like to outline a number of compelling situations which dramatically underscore the need for a review and revision of the antitrust laws.

First. The repeated vacillation of a series of successive administrations on Middle East oil consortia in the Iranian oil case underscores the need for greater assurance on the part of U.S. industry as to the position which the Attorney General will take at a time far enough in the future to permit the long-range planning necessarily involved in important and complex industrial and financial actions. The need for greater definiteness which is so forcefully demonstrated in the Iranian oil case is equally applicable to domestic applications of the antitrust laws.

Second. Extraterritorial application of the antitrust laws has become a matter of particular concern for U.S. business in relation to the developing antitrust laws of the European Economic Community. There is a grave danger that the emerging Common Market antitrust policy may afford European firms a degree of flexibility which will render U.S. business uncompetitive. Our serious balance-of-payment problems and the concomitant need to increase U.S. exports strongly demonstrate the need for a reappraisal of our antitrust policies and in particular the extraterritorial application of those policies to U.S. companies.

Third. A special and difficult case of extraterritorial application is that of Western inability to counteract the Soviet trade offensive which is becoming more widely recognized every day. The particular need for guidelines in combatting economic warfare was recognized in section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which gave the Attorney General of the United States power to exempt agreements from the antitrust laws—that is, as between competitors—where he found that the defense benefits of the transaction would outweigh the anticompetitive aspects. Almost without comment, the Congress in 1955 repealed so much of section 708 as authorized the exemption in regard to nonmilitary goods. As a result the foreign oil agreement, one of several civilian agreements entered into prior to 1955, cannot now be repeated, although the Soviet oil offensive has been stepped up to proportions which are causing increasingly greater alarm in the West. As recently as last fall, the National Petroleum Council, a joint industry-government group, in a comprehensive report concluded that Soviet oil exports to Western European nations had reached alarming proportions and that "concerted effort by the leading countries of the free world" was required. Such cooperative action might well demand the kind of antitrust exemption powers which the Congress eliminated from the Defense Production Act in 1955. The limited scope of the export promotion exemption of the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act of 1918 would also be a relevant subject for study in this connection.

Fourth. Another area where extraterritorial application of the antitrust laws requires study is that of potential United States and European private enterprise cooperation for development of underdeveloped nations.

The President of the United States in his message on foreign aid, sent to Congress only today, made a statement which is one of the most significant I have ever seen in a foreign aid message to Congress.

He says:

> The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries.

That is a campaign in which I have been engaged for 17 years. I am glad to see, at long last, that the full impact of it is being realized at the top level. If we are to do that, we shall also have to devise some means by which people will not be prosecuted under the antitrust laws if they actually pursue a national policy which the President asks us to adopt. No one is looking for untrammeled authority for business to do anything it pleases; on the contrary, any implementation of this policy will, I am sure, involve the tightest, strictest supervision and control. There is considerable difference between saying that what is permitted must be done in the public interest, and having laws which prohibit its being done at all. Such laws are really getting in our way, causing us to stumble over our own feet, in a way which now requires review.

Fifth. What took place in the development of the Communications Satellite Corporation during the last session of Congress highlighted another important area to which a commission such as I propose would undoubtedly devote study—the possibility of wide-scale joint cooperative efforts by Government and industry in partially public, partially private, corporations to undertake vast ventures in the realm of space and atomic technology. The size and complexity of the subject matter and the public interest involved in such undertakings may make wholly private ownership unfeasible, and the productive capacity of private enterprise and technological risks involved make wholly public ownership unsatisfactory. Numerous other potential applications of this novel and very hopeful technique make a thorough study of antitrust implications highly important, particularly in view of the strong attack on the Communications Satellite Corporation measure made by a minority of Senators on antitrust grounds.

The list of critical cases which the proposed Commission would be charged with studying could be elaborated at much greater length. But these are some of the major areas of concern.

My bill calls for a bipartisan, 12-member Commission, composed of the widest spectrum of membership, including four Members of Congress, two members of the executive branch, and six experts from the private sector. The Commission will undertake a review of all the antitrust laws of the United States, along the lines of the Temporary National Economic Commission which undertook a similar study, at congressional direction, in 1940, 23 years ago. Unfortunately, that effort was eclipsed by the beginning of World War II. No similar study has been undertaken since that time except for the more limited Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws in 1955, 8 years ago.

When one considers that the Sherman Act dates from 1890 and the Clayton Act from 1914, and that the last major study was undertaken more than 20 years ago, it seems clear that the time has come for the kind of broad-based analysis which the proposed Commission would be most capable of providing. This is especially true in view of the fact that we want to stimulate and accelerate our growth rate and the progress of our economy. This activity is one of its major, inherent factors.

We have very important and excellent antitrust and monopoly subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary of both the Senate and the House. They are generally engaged in the process of review and revision of the antitrust laws. However, their efforts are not, of course, comparable with the analysis in depth which an independent commission of the kind to which I refer can provide. Participation on the Commission by Members of Congress, and, of course, the opportunity for ultimate action by Congress on the Commission's recommendations, insure that Congress will retain full control of the formulation of policy in this area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for additional sponsorship until the end of this week.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the bill will remain at the desk until the end of this week; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the economy of the United States, to increase the efficiency of United States business (which is defined to include management, labor, investors, farmers, and consumers), to improve quality, stabilize prices, and increase output and real wages, to promote the free flow of goods and services to the American people and to enable United States business to play its proper role in the preservation and development of freedom and well-being at home and abroad by (1) strengthening the laws prohibiting monopoly and unreasonable restraints on trade and commerce; (2) clarifying standards of conduct deemed unlawful under the antitrust laws in domestic and foreign business; (3) adjusting the antitrust policies of the Federal Government as they affect the productivity and long-range economic growth of the United States and United States foreign trade, investment, and economic policy; (4) eliminating conflicts in policy and inconsistencies in the said antitrust laws as interpreted by the courts and administrative agencies; (5) providing limits upon the responsibility under said laws of business for acts performed at the request of duly authorized United States Government authorities; (6) revising Federal antitrust laws, the effect of which is to impair initiative and business development in the public interest; (7) coordinating the activities of the Government in relation to the administration and enforcement of the antitrust laws; and (8) improving the methods and procedures of administration and enforcement of such laws.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policies set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life.

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) VACANCIES.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress, who are members of the Commission, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding $22,500; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 10(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission for the purpose of recommending to the Congress measures required under and amendments to the antitrust laws to accomplish the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, and other measures deemed by the Commission necessary or appropriate thereto shall study and investigate and shall hear evidence with a view toward determining, but without limitation, (1) the effect of the existing price systems and pricing policies of trade and industry upon the general level of trade, employment, profits, production, and consumption; (2) the effect and operation of existing antitrust statutes as interpreted by and administered under judicial decisions and administrative regulations, decisions, and orders, upon competition, price levels, employment, profits, production, and consumption; (3) the extent and causes of concentration of economic power and financial control and their effect on competition and the public interest; and (4) the capability of trade and industry to assist our Nation in meeting its responsibilities at home and abroad.

(b) Report.—The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress on or before February 1, 1965, and may submit interim reports prior thereto.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 11. (a)(1) Hearings.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) Official Data.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the number of studies into the problems of the aging now in progress is an indication of the interest which this situation has aroused. Economic factors as well as medical services, physical facilities, and health care are aspects of the problem which must be studied and analysed on a continuing basis.

One study is currently underway by the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged which was organized at my suggestion. Its report, which is likely to have an impact on the health care legislation now before the Congress, is expected to be ready early in May. The membership of this Committee is representative of interested and qualified groups and consists of Dr. Arthur Flemming, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, now president of Oregon University, Chairman; Marion B. Folsom, also a former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, now director of Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.; Dr. Vernon W. Lippard, dean of Yale Medical School, New Haven, Conn.; Thomas Tierney, executive vice president, Colorado Hospital Service, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Arthur Larson, former Director of USIA, now professor at Duke University, Durham, N.C.; Russell A. Nelson, director of Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, emeritus professor of medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York City; Dr. Russell Lee, Palo Alto Clinic, Calif.; Hubert Young, vice president, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Dr. James Dixon, president, Antioch College, Ohio; John C. Leslie, vice president, Pan American Airways, New York City; Winslow Carlton, health consultant, New York City; and Dr. Howard Bost, of the University of Kentucky, Executive Director of the Committee.

I do not think enough attention has been given to the organization of this body; and in the sense that people may look forward to and may expect this report—which of course will be available to all the public—I call attention to the fact that this group is in being, and I also call attention to those who are members of it and to the problems with which it will deal.

I hope that when the National Committee on Health Care for the Aging makes its report, it will immediately be made available to all Members of Congress, and that it may be a real guide as to whether the bill which I and a number of other Republican Senators have introduced or the Anderson-Javits bill of last session or the administration's bill or some other plan is the best. But I am confident that the report will be a very important milestone in this field; and I think the members of the group are very representative professional and lay persons who have undertaken this very large task. It will take about a year to complete. They have held an enormous number of meetings; and certainly they are entitled to be known, and certainly they are entitled to the respect of all of us for the job they have undertaken. So we eagerly await the result of their work.

Another group at work on this subject is the Health Information Foundation, which became affiliated with the University of Chicago in 1962. It has recently released an analysis of the national health situation and the needs which will have to be met in order to provide for the changing medical picture of our population. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an analysis by the Health Information Foundation and a report of its own future plans, entitled "Current Problems in Hospital and Medical Administration," which was released on March 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Current Problems in Hospital and Medical Administration

The maintenance of health and the reduction of disease and impairment is important to the public welfare. This country has excellent medical resources. The services of hospitals and other medical personnel are being used to a greater extent than at any time in the past. Health levels in the country are at the highest point in history, but there is an insistent demand for improvement.

There is continual examination of medical services. Questions are raised as to whether the total national cost is too great, whether services are broadly available to all, whether care is organized on the most efficient basis, whether the public is able to pay for needed care, and whether the quality of education and the number of people being trained is adequate. Similarly, question is raised as to the adequacy and distribution of physical facilities.

Questions raised about the efficiency of hospital and medical care are given urgency by the increasing costs of service. This country in 1962 spent $30 billion or 5.8 percent of gross national product. This contrasts with expenditures of $3.6 billion or 3.4 percent in 1928–29.

There is need for additional research to provide facts needed for decision on major national policy issues. Programs of the Federal Government are being formulated which will materially affect future developments. Expanded Federal support is contemplated for medical research, for planning and construction of hospital facilities, for the support of group practice units, for medical, dental and nursing schools and for the purchase of hospital services for all older people.

The non-governmental sector of the health field, representing three-quarters of all expenditures, is moving forward. But voluntary health insurance, in spite of its rapid growth, has not reached desirable goals in enrollment and extent of benefits. Beds available are inadequate in numbers but are increasing rapidly, but without exact knowledge as to the number needed in general hospitals and in institutions for the care of long-term illness such as mental hospitals and nursing homes. The practice of medicine is becoming increasingly institutionalized, but with no agreement as to the best methods for organizing practice in or out of the hospital.

A better educated public is using medical care more intelligently and is spending an increasing proportion of greater incomes for such services. Unresolved is the portion of personal expenditures which should be covered by health insurance. Disease patterns are changing. The infectious diseases are better controlled, but the population is aging with a greater incidence of chronic disease and a concomitant increase in demand for care. In the face of increasing public use of services, there is criticism of overuse by some segments of the population and acknowledged underuse and lack of availability for others.

The importance of medical care, the rapidly shifting patterns for the provision of care, and the increasing demand for service all point to the need for a university center which can contribute new knowledge and better trained people to assist in planning hospital and medical services for the future. Crucial to the future is the development of the proper organization and administration of the hospital and medical establishment.

FUTURE PLANS FOR THE FOUNDATION

The University of Chicago has many resources to draw on to broaden the program of the Health Information Foundation. The foundation's concern is with improved understanding of the social and economic aspects of medical care. Members of the faculty in a number of departments have varying degrees of interest in this field. The foundation provides focus for such interest and its staff can often be helpful. Faculty from other departments also are of assistance with research carried on by the staff of the foundation. The involvement staff in teaching makes immediate use of knowledge gained through research.

The University of Chicago has one of the leading medical schools in the country. Discussions with members of the medical faculty indicate interest in broadening the curriculum of that school to provide pertinent courses in preventive medicine. There are a number of doctoral students in several schools within the university, doing their dissertation in the hospital and medical care field, who have come to the research staff of the foundation for assistance and guidance. In addition, students are applying for enrollment in the Ph. D. program of the graduate school of business for study under the guidance of the staff of the foundation.

Plans for the future are now being formulated. It seems clear that there is need for a core staff within the foundation. Such a staff needs to be drawn from several disciplines. Working together as staff of the foundation will provide an opportunity for interaction and for a broad approach to the complex problems of the field of hospital and medical care. The core staff should be small in number. Each should have teaching and research interests. Each should, over time, be responsible for a number of research projects.

The foundation's director of research is a medical sociologist, and that discipline is represented by another member of the staff who is concerned with the organization of research. A sociologist experienced in survey research has just been appointed to the staff of the foundation and the faculty of the graduate school of business, and as associate study director in the National Opinion Research Center, which is affiliated with the University of Chicago.

The hospital and medical care field involves many professionals—physicians concerned with very diverse specialties, scientists with a background in physics, mathematics, and many others, and in addition, nurses and other technical workers trained for some aspect of patient care. Patient care often involves all of these specialties, and effective care is dependent on joint efforts in an organized setting operating in a harmonious and cooperative manner. Hospitals and other medical care organizations present a primary challenge to management. Behavioral scientists have been increasingly concerned with research which will shed light on interpersonal and group relationships. A foundation staff drawn from these disciplines can continue to make substantial contribution to better understanding of how people work together most effectively in the care of patients.

The foundation staff should also include an experienced medical economist. A faculty committee is seeking an economist of stature with an interest in medical care, for appointment to the faculty of the graduate school of business and the staff of the foundation.

The economy of the medical care field needs continuing study if national decisions are to be made on the basis of fact. Medical care expenditures, the product of use and price, are under searching public review and criticism. Wise public decision requires more economic analysis of these factors. Such analysis will definitely affect public policy decisions, particularly as to the place of government. Economic analysis can also improve efficiency in the delivery of quality hospital and medical care.

Discussions are progressing with the appropriate representatives of the faculty of the medical school for the appointment of a physician to that faculty and to the staff of the foundation. Research on hospital and medical care, to be effective, requires the participation of a physician with primary responsibility for certain types of research and for consultation on research by other members of the staff from the social sciences.

A physician staff member would have responsibility for teaching preventive medicine in the medical school. Jointly with social scientists there would be opportunity in teaching to provide a broad range of information on the social and economic aspects of medical care, all of which would be pertinent to some degree for medical students, the students in the graduate program in hospital administration and for doctoral students concentrating on the field of hospital and medical care administration.

Increased expenditures for hospital and medical care have raised questions about the quality of service. Increased costs can be explained only as it is demonstrated that the quality of service is satisfactory. Study of the quality of hospital and medical care is complex and requires a multidisciplinary approach. Elementary to the consideration of quality is the service rendered by the physician. Research in this area, to be effective, requires participation by physicians respected by their profession and experienced in research in the use and quality of medical care.

There is also need for the appointment of a faculty member to the graduate school of business interested in the field of operations research and willing to be concerned with improving the efficiency of operation of hospitals and other medical organizations. As possible, such an individual should be added to the faculty and to the staff of the foundation.

The increased cost of care in hospitals and other medical care organizations emphasizes the need for concentrated attention in improving efficiency in the planning and operation of institutional services. Operations research in medical care is being developed in a few universities and is the most promising approach to fundamental examination for improved efficiency of hospital operation.

The foundation will not, in all likelihood, be able to assemble more than a limited number of such senior study directors. It is, however, one of the strengths of the university setting that such a staff will be active members of the faculty of the appropriate school involved both in teaching and research.

THE CENTER FOR HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

The University of Chicago presently contemplates the development of a Center for Hospital and Medical Administration to operate as a unit of the graduate school of business, to include the activities of the Health Information Foundation, the graduate program in hospital administration, a doctoral program in the graduate school of business with hospital and medical administration as a field of concentration, and with teaching responsibilities in the medical school.

The Center for Hospital and Medical Administration, with the key staff contemplated, has an opportunity on an interdisciplinary basis to extend and deepen the original purposes of the Health Information Foundation and the graduate program in hospital administration in both research and teaching. Such a staff will develop courses for students in a master's degree program in hospital administration. Some courses would have content equally valuable for medical students and for doctoral students who are preparing to do teaching and research in the hospital and medical care field. Advanced education at the doctoral level should also be valuable as preparation for hospital and medical administrators who might contribute the leadership needed if the field is to be efficiently organized to meet its full potential in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease.

The Health Information Foundation has been generally recognized as contributing useful, factual information for the health field. Research projects financed or directed by the foundation have developed new and consequential information. From the first the foundation has endeavored through a public education program to distribute widely pertinent information. The foundation has also helped develop the emerging field of social and economic research in health.

Funds are available from private foundations and from Government for the support of specific research projects, but success in developing the Center for Hospital and Medical Administration is dependent on support not now available through the usual resources of the university. The pharmaceutical industry, at the time of affiliation, transferred to the university funds which will be helpful in developing the Center but inadequate to give assurance of support on a stable basis.

The University of Chicago, building on the going program of the Health Information Foundation, can become a center under nongovernmental auspices which will have significant impact on the development of medical and hospital care in this country. With adequate support, the Center will be concerned with research and teaching in the interests of a better understanding of our system of medical care. Public education actually carried on by the foundation will be continued. The entire program should be supportive of the original intent of the sponsors of the foundation. Namely, that a well informed public will make the needed investment in medical care, maintaining a proper balance between support from Government and from the private sector of the economy, a balance which has to date assured a free flow of funds for the needed expansion of medical care services and at the same time permitted the flexibility which has encouraged high quality care.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to direct my attention to the pending bill.

I favor the bill, and I shall vote for it.

I must say that I have been surprised to notice that in some newspaper accounts it has been stated that "the bill is facing solid Republican opposition."

Mr. President, I know of no such "solid opposition." I shall vote for the bill; and, in my judgment, other Senators on this side of the aisle will also vote for the bill. So it disturbs me to read such statements about some "solid Republican opposition," because in my opinion millions of Americans, in cities large and small, in the great metropolitan complexes of the Nation, will be much interested in the vote on the bill.

The bill will affect vitally the 70 percent of the Nation's population which now lives in the urban areas. In fact, this percentage is increasing. Most of these people have dismal daily experiences with commuting and transportation problems. It is almost literally true that metropolitan complexes are strangling in the toils of impossible transportation facilities. These include overcrowded facilities, frustrating delays, inadequate service, bottlenecks, and so forth.

So certainly it would be most unfortunate and most misleading if there were published any statements to the effect that a monolithic approach was being made by the members of my party in the Senate to this very, very serious problem.

Mr. President, in discussing the merits of the bill, let me state that it is a fact that communication and transportation systems of the kind we are discussing—commuter systems, and so forth—are involved in grave difficulties, and more and more it is being found that if they are going to charge any sort of economic fares, they cannot be maintained as municipal services strictly in the realm of private enterprise. In one way or another, municipalities which have been interested in such means of transportation must help with them if they are to be maintained. So the bill really signalizes greater participation by such municipalities in the consolidation of systems, in the modernization of systems, and, indeed, in their ownership and operation, whether actually or by contract, in order to make sure that they continue and that these growing metropolitan complexes do not become completely anarchic through dependence on automobile transportation. I have previously joined the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in supporting this bill. I have done so on previous occasions, and I do so now. It is well known that the individual automobile—considering the road space it uses, and so forth—is, on the whole, a very uneconomic means of solving the transportation problems of the metropolitan complexes.

So, first of all, the bill signalizes the fact that there will be greater community participation, at the governmental level, and so forth, in helping all these areas face their great transportation problems. Through many other programs they have been helped in many other ways by the Federal Government. Among those programs are those which deal with unemployment, so this is one of the essential characteristics of the bill.

One of the points which always is made in connection with such measures is that it will give someone "a free ride" or "a handout." But, Mr. President, that will depend upon the administration of the program. On the other hand, among the members of the Banking and Currency Committee are some very clear-sighted Senators, including Senators on my side of the aisle who are opposing the bill, who, I am sure, will "ride herd"—and I pledge that I will do so, too—in order to make sure that the administration of the bill will not be profligate. So, Mr. President, it is clear that the program will not become unduly costly. The cost will depend very largely upon the action we take. It is clear that the bill as it now stands will authorize appropriations in the amount of half a billion dollars; and another half a billion dollars will be added if we accept the amendments proposed by the Commerce Committee. I refer to its amendments which authorize guaranteed bonds—which, incidentally the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], recommended, although he made very clear that that does not mean he is committed to the bill.

I am in favor of getting the municipalities or the States to carry the load insofar as they can, although superficially that would increase the money tag on the bill. But it is important that we note that if the cost of the program were to tend to get out of hand, we would not have to make further appropriations or to authorize additional appropriations.

In addition, it is said that the program is "new." However, I feel very strongly that if we were to adopt a rule that, because of our economic exigencies, we would not approve any new program, we would be in very grave trouble and would show a parochialism and a narrowness of outlook which the country does not expect of us.

Many persons point out the necessity for economy, particularly in view of the $56 billion of estimated expenditures for the national defense. However, I do not think those estimates are sacrosanct, and I would join in voting for any cuts which may be possible. In addition, it is felt—and this was acted on in the other body—that the national defense does not actually require total appropriations of $56 million. As a result, economies could very well result.

Likewise so, I have joined other Senators in voting to make reductions in the funds for agricultural programs and in those for programs in the field of health, in view of the fact that all the money proposed could not be used, and that if the entire amount requested were to be placed in the pipeline, much of it would be wasted.

In short, Mr. President, we cannot well adopt the doctrinaire point of view that we will not vote for any new programs, regardless of what may be involved. In my opinion, one of the most important features of the bill is that it will make possible a new approach to mass transportation.

I do not believe we have begun to approach the potentialities of innovation, invention, research and development in that field and, because it is an unprofitable field. Because in many cases it is a burden even upon municipalities it is a proper area for consideration. Great numbers of people are involved. There are great concentrations of population in metropolitan centers. If they are really strangled, traffic-wise and communications-wise, it is most unwise from the point of view of the national interest, in terms of either communications within these metropolitan complexes or the undue concentration of population to disregard the problem. The people do not have the transportation means to enable them to spread out.

So there is a vital national interest. There is a vital public interest which well deserves the support of the Congress.

I do not hold that we can write the bill off because it can be said superficially that the people who are interested in it are largely in New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, Washington or Baltimore. What is wrong with that, when those complexes represent the overwhelming taxpaying majority of the United States.

So I hope that Senators will take a sympathetic look at the proposed legislation. That does not mean that the door would be closed to any amendment. I am not pledged to vote for the bill with every line and word contained in it. At a meeting this morning one of our colleagues pointed out that there may be much wider power in the administrator in respect to cutting off aid when certain conditions occur in a particular project than anybody had in mind or wished to accept. That provision can properly be amended. I think the fundamental concept is essential. I think it is right. I think it will serve a basic and important element of our population, which urgently needs help in this regard.

People are looking to us to take an interest in our people in the cities and to have some solicitude for them, I hope very much that the members of my party will look with open eyes and open mind on this particular measure. I am confident that they will.

Again I repeat what I have previously said. When the votes are counted, I believe it will be found that there is no "solid Republican opposition," to the measure, which I consider to be highly desirable for the people in the cities. They represent the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

NATIONAL HARMONY WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the direction and request of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to call up for immediate consideration House Joint Resolution 282, which was reported earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as National Harmony Week, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 15 the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartette Singing in America, Inc., will observe the 25th anniversary of the founding of this organization. The organization has extended to all corners of the country. Members have entertained in schools and hospitals, and everywhere they have rendered a very useful service.

I think it was Shakespeare who once remarked:

> The man that hath no music in himself,
> Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
> Is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils;
> The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
> And his affections dark as Erebus:
> Let no such man be trusted. Mark the music.

I used to do a little barber shop quartet singing myself once upon a time, and I know the glories of its cadences, the lilting music, and the inspiration we find in such lyrics and melodies as "Down by the Old Mill Stream," "Back Home in Indiana," or "Sweet Adeline."

So may their tribe increase and may their glories flourish.

The measure is a House joint resolution. I asked the President to issue a proclamation. Under the act of Congress a 6-day period would be designated as National Harmony Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the action of the Congress of the United States in authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America will be greeted with acclaim throughout the free world, and by the governing officials of all countries of the world which are now engaged in the grim struggle against Communist aggression.

In the entire history of mankind, very few individuals have made as many notable contributions to their times as has Winston Churchill in the 20th century. The entire world is indebted to him for his leadership in the struggle of free men and women, first against nazism and fascism, and then against communism. He is one of those honored few whose names themselves speak for their achievements.

As a writer, an historian, and an orator, he is, indeed, one of the great masters of all time in the use of the English language. He has earned for himself a place among the literary giants of the English-speaking world.

In addition, Winston Churchill has manifested his greatness and his patriotism in such a manner that a thousand years from now people in far places will recall his life and say of him that, in the dark hour of Nazi aggression, under his leadership, the peoples of the world were restored to their simple dignity as creatures of God.

Many years ago—in fact, in the latter part of December 1941, following Pearl Harbor—as Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, I sat within a few feet of Mr. Churchill and heard him tell a joint meeting of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that his father was an Englishman and his mother an American and had that situation been reversed and had his father been an American and his mother an Englishwoman—he hoped and believed he would be sitting there in his own right as an American citizen.

I remember also on that occasion when he was denouncing that day of infamy, December 7, 1941, he said:

> We Anglo-Saxons will teach them a lesson that they and the world will never forget.

He fulfilled that pledge.

Mr. President, on August 9, 1962, I introduced a joint resolution which would have authorized the President to issue a proclamation declaring Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. This was the first resolution introduced for this purpose. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and other Senators joined me as coauthors. That joint resolution was reintroduced on the opening day for receiving resolutions and bills in the present Congress.

Mr. President, the facts are that on July 23, 1962, only a short time before the joint resolution was introduced in this Chamber by me and cosponsored by my colleague [Mr. LAUSCHE] and other Senators, the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in Cleveland, Ohio, and in our Nation, published an excellent article on Winston Churchill. The article was entitled, "Hero of Two Nations." Its author was Kay Halle.

Miss Halle is one of the outstanding women in the United States. She is a personable television and radio commentator, a journalist, an author, and a world traveler of note. Not only is she at the present time one of the world's outstanding women, but also during World War II she served her country in an executive capacity in the Office of Strategic Services. In recent years she has been serving the administration as a member of President Kennedy's Advisory Committee on the Arts.

Miss Halle, of Cleveland, Ohio, first met Winston Churchill in 1931. At that time she was writing a column from London for the Cleveland News. During her stay in England in the following years, she spent many weekends at Chartwell with the Churchill family. She recalled those years, 30 years later, in her article published in the Plain Dealer.

In that article she wrote of the contribution and the service which Winston Churchill had rendered to his nation, to the United States and, in fact, to all the nations of the free world. She suggested that it would be fitting if the President of the United States, under an act of Congress, should bestow upon Winston Churchill honorary citizenship of this country.

When the word goes out from Washington that the President of the United States has issued such a proclamation—and it will be issued very shortly, due to the authorization by both bodies of the Congress—it will be a fitting honor, and, I fear, one of the final honors which will come to this great citizen of the world.

I invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that although many resolutions have been introduced in both bodies to confer honorary citizenship upon Winston Churchill, we should recall at this time that Kay Halle of Ohio was the person who first suggested that this be done.

We can all take some satisfaction that this action, without precedent in the history of our country, has taken place; and that, in his final days on this earth, Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, former leader of the free world, is an honorary citizen of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield first to my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I merely wish to commend my colleague for the beautiful remarks he has made with respect to Sir Winston Churchill. I was glad to join him in sponsorship of the measure. I am prouder now, knowing that the objective is reaching its achievement, to be a sponsor along with him of this very fine measure. I commend him for the remarks he has made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should afford full credit to the distinguished Senators from Ohio and West Virginia for having introduced the measures in the Senate.

I was directed by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning to report the House bill and ask for its passage, because the Senate bill carried a preamble. Since there was a variance as between texts, the Senate bill would have had to go to conference. Time was of the essence. Therefore, we submitted the House version, and the bill was passed today.

I am deeply grateful to my friend from Ohio for having taken cognizance of this matter quite some time ago.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The distinguished minority leader has, from the beginning, been enthusiastic in his support of this measure, and all Americans can be grateful to him for the fact that, largely due to his leadership, this action was taken today.

The bill will go immediately to the White House, and very shortly Winston Churchill will be made an honorary citizen of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the Constitution of the United States allows for no titles of nobility, I think the record ought to show that, here, he will be Mr. Winston Churchill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree. Like the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I have no truck with titles of nobility.

THE SITUATION IN GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly concerning the situation at Greenwood, Miss., largely a factual statement, and I prefer not to yield until I have finished my brief statement, at which time I shall be glad to yield.

The public statements about the situation at Greenwood made by outside agitators and picked up and circulated by the newspapers, radio, and television, have painted a very unfair and wholly misleading picture.

I am not saying the newspapers gave slanted accounts—certainly not all of them—but the statements themselves were slanted, and as reflected through this medium, gave a very unfair and wholly misleading picture. Also, these statements are an unjust vilification of the fine people and public officials of Greenwood and Leflore County.

The facts are simple. The people of Greenwood are the innocent victims of organized pressure groups imported into Greenwood from outside Mississippi, hundreds and thousands of miles away. Under the guise of assisting the local Negro people in registering to vote, these professional troublemakers have organized one of the most bitter hate campaigns ever devised in this country. In conducting these meetings, they have gone out of their way to flaunt their organized mobs and publicize their intentions to secure the widest possible public notice and to create all possible resentment. In short, they have purposely inflamed the public mind, through their meetings, their organized mob marches on the courthouse, and their wild charges and speeches. They have misled not only the local Negroes they profess to be assisting, but they have misled the people of the Nation into believing there is a wholesale effort on the part of local city and county officials to prevent the local Negroes from registering to vote.

The fact, however, is that the circuit clerk, Mrs. Martha Turner Lamb, a fine public official, has received the applications for registration offered by those who presented themselves.

If I may add a statement at this point, it should not be in order for mobs of people to congregate and push themselves as a group into the office of any public official, much less the office of a lady public official; and it should not be in order to do so anywhere, and make immediate demands on the lady official, or any other official, so far as that is concerned, for immediate mass attention and immediate favorable response to their requests, whatever they may be. If we have reached the point where that is the rule to be followed, we have reached the point where we no longer have law and government.

Those found by Mrs. Lamb to be qualified for registration, according to the laws of the State of Mississippi, have been registered. The office of the circuit clerk, the registrar, is open each day. Each day, a number of qualified applicants have been registered. Last week, during 1 day alone, I am advised that 50 Negro applicants were actually registered to vote.

I do not know that all 50 had applied that day—there has to be an examination—but I am told that at least that many were put on the rolls that day. Others registered as late as yesterday.

Of course, the law does not permit any organized group, white or Negro, to form in the middle of a public street in the business district of the city of Greenwood, blocking, traffic and disturbing the peace and good order of the community, and march shouting to the courthouse, creating further violence every step of the way.

And of course, this is what the officials of the city of Greenwood have stopped. They have the legal duty and responsibility to maintain law and order, to quell disturbances, to keep traffic moving and to arrest those disturbing the peace. They have not interfered with an attempt of any person to enter the courthouse or the county registrar's office, individually or in small groups, to make an application to register to vote.

But, in the face of these facts, the Justice Department has filed a suit, with many requests for the court to enter orders against the local officials.

The Justice Department should stop its well-known practice of filing suits right and left whenever a member of some minority group makes an allegation unsupported by proof, and contrary to the facts. The Federal Government does not have a monopoly on protecting constitutional rights. Under the facts, it has no authority whatever in this matter in the city of Greenwood. Our State and local governments have the responsibility for maintaining law and order; and Greenwood, Miss., and Leflore County are doing this very thing under the most difficult circumstances.

The law-abiding citizens of a peaceful community like Greenwood rightfully look to their local public officials to maintain law and order and to protect them from unlawful invasions and breaches of the peace.

In connection with this very suit, I should like to turn briefly, not merely to what I might say about the situation, but to what Judge Claude F. Clayton said yesterday at the regular term of court in Mississippi, in passing on the application of the Justice Department for a temporary restraining order against these very officers I have been talking about.

Judge Clayton is one of the outstanding Federal judges in the entire Nation. I assure my colleagues that I know Judge Clayton personally, and have known him for a long time. He is an experienced, able judge. He had served on the bench before he was appointed a Federal judge. He is a man of firm convictions. He is resolute by nature. He has the greatest professional pride and also the highest judicial pride. He represents integrity on and off the bench.

As I have said, in hearing this matter yesterday, on a temporary basis, Judge Clayton very properly ruled that the request of the Justice Department was not sufficient to "warrant trampling on the rights" of these officials, and he refused to take any action pending a full hearing on the merits on Thursday of this week.

In announcing his action, Judge Clayton said:

> I detest any action on the part of anyone which interferes in any way with any right of any person which is given and protected by law.
>
> This includes the right to register and the right to vote, provided the standards now rightfully established by the laws of the State of Mississippi are met.
>
> These are the rights which belong to all of us. These are the rights which belong to the city of Greenwood, its officials and its police officers and to the officers of Leflore County.

Mayor Charles E. Sampson, of Greenwood, has rightfully announced his intention to keep law and order in Greenwood. Mayor Sampson and City Commissioners B. A. Hammond and W. G. Mize, Jr., have done an outstanding job in dealing with this most difficult situation.

The chief of police, Curtis Lary, has taken precautions to prevent breaches of the peace, and has repeatedly made a public announcement to these groups, as follows:

> Because of present public excitement resulting from recent events here, it is considered necessary to peace and order that no large organized groups be allowed on the streets of Greenwood. Therefore, you must disperse. If it is your purpose to go to the courthouse to apply for voter registration, you will not be prevented from doing so but in order to insure that there will be no breach of the peace you must proceed in smaller groups.

This is a step which is absolutely necessary in order to maintain law and order under the most difficult circumstances and tremendous provocation.

The real issue is whether unwanted and unwelcome outside organizers, vote peddlers and pressure groups will be permitted to invade a peaceful community for the sole purpose of creating turmoil and disturbing the peace.

These professional troublemakers are not interested in Greenwood, in Leflore County, or in Mississippi. Nor are they truly interested in the welfare of the Negro citizens of that community. Nor are they welcome or wanted by either race. Their sole purpose is to create strife and discord and to overturn the peaceful and harmonious cooperation among the people of the two races built up over generations.

These people, representing the so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, CORE, and other notorious busybodies, had hardly parked their cars in Greenwood before they were sending telegrams to Washington calling for Federal troops.

As is usual in such cases, once the trouble starts these paid professional agitators will be satisfied and will move on elsewhere to start new battles and new tensions, leaving behind them the turmoil and unrest they were paid to create. Unfortunately, they also will leave to the local people of both races the hopeless task of repairing the damage and attempting to restore the peaceful and harmonious cooperation between the races built up over the years.

The people of Greenwood are not responsible for the situation in which they find themselves. They have acted in good faith, with remarkable patience and admirable restraint, under the most extreme provocation.

I am confident the duly constituted law enforcement officers of the city of Greenwood and Leflore County will continue to maintain law and order.

To the degree that I have kept in touch with these gentlemen during this ordeal, I can say that they are carrying this added responsibility, and have uniformly obtained certain assurances which were supported by action from day to day.

I think the public will soon realize what is happening and will no longer follow these schemes of publicity and building up of false issues and the carrying out of such planned provocation.

Instead of the Federal Government filing suits against local authorities, if they are going to be there at all, they ought to be standing side by side or at least encouraging them to follow a pattern of their own law as made by the legislature and as written in the regular constitutional way and in the processes of self-government, and to maintain law and order and orderly processes of government in that way.

Heretofore all the complaint has been directed to the charge that local forces do not maintain law and order. In this case the entire pattern has been within the processes of the law, according to the statutes, and action through duly constituted authority.

If that is not protection through local government and self-government and representative government and free government, I do not know where we can turn for an example of it.

I warn the people of this Nation against taking a superficial and surface impression, artificially created. They should look to the facts and determine the real issues and to get down to the heart of the problem.

Instead of condemning, we should commend. I believe that the filing of suits of injunction against all the officers is an invitation to violence and an invitation for some group outside the law to act for themselves.

I hope that this matter will be reconsidered. In the meantime I urge the people of the city of Greenwood and the county of Leflore, through their officials, to stand their ground and continue, of course, to follow their course as in the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. As my colleague realizes, there has been no allegation that an attempt has been made to prevent people from registering.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I have not had an opportunity to read the bill of particulars in the suit that has been filed. Perhaps the Senator has.

Mr. EASTLAND. There has been no allegation of that kind; in fact, 300 persons have applied to register in the past few days. Those who are qualified will be registered. There is no such contention as has been suggested. Outside agitators from New York and other areas talk to Negroes and say, "If you want to get relief, if you want to get social security, if you want to get commodities, come with us." Then they take them in a body and parade them down the street, demonstrating and stopping all traffic, walking through red lights, and being taken to the courthouse. The only obstacle has been that they cannot demonstrate, they cannot stop traffic, they cannot violate the the ordinances of that city. When they reach the courthouse they can go to the clerk's office at any time and make their application, as provided by the laws of our State.

Judge Clayton is a great lawyer. I agree with my colleague that he is one of the great judges of this country. Charley Sampson, the mayor, has rendered distinguished service. The chief of police has done a good job. The city attorney has done a good job. There is no allegation anywhere that an attempt has been made to prevent these people from applying for registration. In fact, they have come forward by the hundreds to do so. They have been there at the instance of outside agitators who say, "You cannot get relief, you cannot get social security, you cannot get commodities unless you follow us, and follow us down the main street, against red lights, and deprive the citizens of the city of the right to govern their own affairs."

The suit which the Department of Justice has filed is not a voting rights suit. The question is, Can the people maintain order on the streets of their own city?

Mr. STENNIS. Through their own officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course; through their own officials. That is the test. Judge Clayton was eminently correct in his decision.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank my colleague.

This situation can come close to home in the case of each of us in Washington in our official offices. It can come much closer home than anyone might think. Only last week some of this same group that is in Greenwood, Miss.—perhaps not the same individuals, but individuals with the same connections—showed up in our offices in the Senate Office Building, to parade and picket and make a show. The way we learned about the probable presence of these people in our offices was through the members of the Senate Press Gallery, who called and said, "Have they gotten there?"

The response was, "Whom are you talking about?"

We were told, "We have been called by this group and they said they were going to picket your offices."

The purpose is to make a show of publicity, to create a disturbance, and to create a false issue, merely to carry a point or to create a disturbance and mislead the American people.

It is pitiful to me—and I say this with the greatest respect to our news media—that items like this can be instantly picked up and publicized in every living room or drawing room, and on every newsstand all over the Nation, causing the public to fall victims to such misleading tactics and to planning of this kind.

It is a severe strain upon free government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I live close to the city of Greenwood. I was in Greenwood several days last week. I speak with firsthand knowledge. This demonstration had not caught on. There is not the tension in Greenwood that has been pictured in the eastern press. The movement is not supported by a majority of the Negro race or by a majority of the white race; in fact, it is condemned by a majority of the Negro race. The Justice Department action was merely an attempt to rescue a drowning baby. It is not possible to get citizens of the Negro race from the city of Greenwood to participate. So the instigators have gone into the rural areas and have contacted Negroes who want commodities and have said, "Join with us, and we will lead you to the promised land, provided you march down the street, obstruct traffic, walk a red light, and go to the courthouse."

Those acts of walking down the street and obstructing traffic are the heart of the suit that has been filed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The officers, the board of aldermen, the mayor, the police, the city attorney, and others, are due the commendations and the appreciation of the whole body of people of the Nation, especially those who appreciate the difficulty that is always present when any kind of agitation starts which would try to pit the races one against the other.

I feel certain that every Senator, if he understood the situation, would join with me in heartily commending the action taken by those officials. I hope they will continue their pattern of conduct; I believe they will.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the understanding. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Alaska, with the understanding that I will not lose my place on the floor.

WHY STAND IN THE WAY OF CUBA'S FREEDOM FIGHTERS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday, while the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was criticizing the Cuban refugees for their raids on Castro's Cuba, I engaged in a colloquy with him in which I expressed my sympathy for, and understanding of, these courageous freedom fighters who feel impelled at the risk of their lives to strike whatever blows they can at Castro's totalitarian tyranny and its ruthless and bloody suppression of the liberties of the Cuban people.

While I did not engage in a lengthy discussion with the Senator, who was making his customarily effective presentation of the legal and other aspects of these raids, condemning them unqualifiedly, I sought to indicate my view that there was another side to this issue, and that I was not convinced of the correctness of his view and of the position which the administration appears to be taking that these raids should at all costs be prevented by the United States.

I was therefore interested to note in this morning's Washington Post a column entitled "The Cuban Raids," with the subtitle "Why Stand in the Way?" written by Roscoe Drummond. The article expresses a view with which I find myself in general accord. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CUBAN RAIDS—WHY STAND IN THE WAY?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably President Kennedy seeks the goal of a "free Cuba." He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugee's harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in the way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and handmade grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we would do more to help the Cuban resisters both inside and outside Cuba. Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong, then at the very least it should be making suggestions and helping them to do it right.

THE SITUATION IN GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been informed that while I was at lunch, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] made a statement on the Senate floor which at least brings into question the propriety of the action taken by the Attorney General of the United States in connection with the situation in Greenwood, Leflore County, Miss., where the United States is seeking to enjoin local authorities from interfering with a petition by the local citizenry—Negroes, to be precise—for the redress of grievances.

I express my approval of the action of the Attorney General in instituting the suit. I think it was his manifest duty to do so, in view of the fact that constitutional rights are brought into question, including the right of petition for the redress of grievances by constituted authorities. I approve very much of the Attorney General's taking this action.

As a matter of general principle, I have very deep faith in the processes of the law and the courts. I have argued this point before, and I do so again. In the face of situations which have such incendiary possibilities as in this particular area about which the press has written so much, the chances will be very much better for the processes of order and tranquillity if an individual citizen feels that tongue may be given for his grievances through the courts, and that there is a possibility of redress.

The Attorney General is in this civil injunction suit proceeding under section 1971 of title 42 of the United States Code, which was part of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The important thing, which I wish to emphasize, is that here is an outlet, here is a substitute for either the effort which the marchers are making or the efforts to stop them which are being made by the police and other municipal authorities. In an area where there are the raw materials of violence, the capability of the courts to act in situations of this kind is designed to head them off and to give, as I say, an outlet, a tongue, to every man's grievance.

Therefore, I have always favored strongly the so-called part III in regard to civil rights, so that the Attorney General might sue in representative cases; and I feel very deeply that this is the way to save ourselves from the dangers involved in such situations—dangers which we have already seen erupt into violence, not only like that which occurred at Oxford, Miss., where marshals and troops are employed, but also the danger involved when people are fired on while they are in their homes and the danger involved when buildings are burned. This is no tea party. This situation is very, very dangerous, in terms of the future of the Nation. So anything we can do to give it a peaceful outlet—and I think recourse to the courts is the most logical and most desirable procedure—we should encourage.

Although I respect, and indeed would fight for, the right of the Senator from Mississippi to say whatever he believes he should say, I also feel it my duty to juxtapose to the general thrust of the statement of the Senator from Mississippi—as I understand it from what I have been told by my assistants who heard him make it—this statement of my own position.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New York that, if I correctly understood him, I am glad he did not substantially contradict the facts I related in regard to the registration—in other words, that the applications were being received and were being passed on, without denying any person the right to file his application in an orderly way and to have it passed on. The Senator from New York does not know of any exception to that general statement, does he?

Mr. JAVITS. I was addressing myself to what we have read in the press about the action of the police and other authorities in blocking and breaking up any march by a number of persons—for example, on one day last week by a group of some 100, and on another by a group of some 42. It is claimed—and the courts will try it out—that in the community there is a climate of intimidation which runs counter to the fundamental provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act which prohibit interference with any effort to register and to vote. I say to the Senator from Mississippi that the courts will decide as to that.

For myself, I believe that the path of constitutional propriety is to permit people to march peaceably in order to petition for redress of their grievances.

But the fundamental point I make now is even more limited than that. I only say that if we do not want violence—and I know of no Senator who does want it—in my opinion, people must have an outlet. So I think litigation of this character is a proper and sensible outlet; and I hope very much the Attorney General will prosecute this suit with speed and with diligence.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say that it would be one thing to bring a suit if someone had been denied an opportunity to file an application or to take the examination or to register, or even had protested and had been arrested on that account, or if someone wanted to test the legality of an arrest. But this is a broadside lawsuit, in the absence of an application by anyone to have the law-enforcement machinery used to enjoin such action. It has not been charged that there has been a violation of anyone's right. It is to that point that I addressed my remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I only say that when it appears that in a particular community it would be unhealthy for some persons to register and to vote, the U.S. Government has a right to take action. In my opinion, those who at least seemingly make the situation look unhealthy have the burden to withdraw such barriers.

So I think the Attorney General is taking action in that situation; and I am glad he is doing so by means of action of that kind.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—PLAN WITH SOVIET UNION FOR RECIPROCAL BURNING OF OBSOLETE BOMBERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I see on the floor the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Therefore, I wish to refer now, briefly, to a statement he made yesterday.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], had a number of remarks to make about my efforts to get a straight story from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on its plan with the Soviet Union for the reciprocal burning of obsolete bombers. He charged me with doing a "disservice to the cause of peace" by implying that officials of the Disarmament Agency are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by newspaper reporters. He then went on to make out a case for the fact that the Disarmament Agency officials were misunderstood by newspaper reporters.

Mr. President, the whole episode goes back to March 9, when, in a speech I made in Aurora, Ill., I asked whether it was true that plans were in the making for the reciprocal burning of 30 American B-47's and 30 Russian Badgers, in a giant disarmament demonstration. On March 11, wire service stories which appeared in the newspapers reported:

> U.S. Disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now let me quote the reference by the Senator from Pennslyvania to the denial story, in his remarks on the floor yesterday. He said:

> This story which appeared in the papers on Monday, March 11, was based on telephone conversations between reporters and the Agency spokesman. These conversations took place on Sunday, March 10. On Monday morning, March 11, the Agency representative who spoke to the press the day before felt after reading the morning papers that his earlier comments to the newspaper correspondents evidently had not been clearly understood. To clarify any misunderstanding the agency at noon that day released the following statement through the State Department.

The statement referred to by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] was that the Disarmament Agency had been engaged in several internal studies, and that among them was the possibility of a simultaneous reduction of B-47's and Russian Badgers.

Before I proceed, Mr. President, let me quote from a press release which the Senator from Pennsylvania issued yesterday in support of his remarks on the floor. Here is what it said, in part:

> It is a disservice to the cause of peace to imply that honorable men patriotically and intelligently serving their country are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by reporters. Neither charge is true. The first suggestion is inaccurate; the second, just plain wrong.

Mr. President, if my suggestion that Disarmament officials are being misunderstood by reporters is "just plain wrong," as the Senator from Pennsylvania claimed, why is it necessary for him to defend the denial story which was based on the conversations with the Disarmament official? Why is it necessary for the Senator from Pennsylvania to point out that, after reading the newspapers, the Disarmament official decided that he had not been clearly understood?

Another point I should like to raise right here is that if—as the Senator from Pennsylvania contended—the Disarmament official hastened to issue a statement clarifying the situation at noon on March 11, why did the press release referred to carry the date of March 12? Could it be that the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11 prodded the Disarmament official to issue a clarification on March 12? In that testimony, Secretary Rusk told the committee that the bomber-destruction plan had been under study and consideration, and that the stories about a denial from the Disarmament Agency must have stemmed from a misunderstanding.

Another point made in the press release by the Senator from Pennsylvania was that the Disarmament Agency told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the bomber-destruction plan. This raises several questions.

First. If the Disarmament Agency had told the whole truth—including the fact that the bomber-destruction plan about which I inquired had been under discussion—is it likely that competent newspapermen would have been so lacking in understanding that they would have taken that statement to be a flat denial of the plan?

Second. Why did it take the Disarmament Agency 3 days to tell the whole truth?

I submit that the fact remains that I asked a perfectly legitimate question, based on solid information; and the Disarmament Agency answered it in a fashion that caused most newspapers in the United States to publish headlines to the effect that the Government had denied the existence of a bomber-destruction plan. The fact also remains that the Disarmament Agency apparently did not get around to trying to correct this impression until after Secretary of State Rusk had testified that the denial story was erroneous. With the flow of news being what it is today, of course, the Agency's clarification never saw the light of day in any newspaper I read. So the public was left with the impression that the question I had put to the administration had no basis in fact. I say this was as neat an operation in news management—whether wittingly or unwittingly—as any I have witnessed since the New Frontier came into office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to place in the RECORD two newspaper stories, one from the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, entitled "Plan To Burn 30 Bombers Hotly Denied," and the other from the Washington Star of the same date, entitled "Administration Denies Bomber-Burning Plan."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

PLAN TO BURN 30 BOMBERS HOTLY DENIED

U.S. disarmament officials denied yesterday that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The disavowal of such plans came as a result of a speech given in Illinois Saturday by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, a spokesman for Republican conservatism and a frequent critic of U.S. disarmament negotiations.

GOLDWATER asked, "Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there then would be a gigantic bonfire in which all these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?"

GOLDWATER said, "I have heard that the administration is seriously considering a pool with Russia to destroy weapons, item for item." He added this would be "stupid (and) ridiculous."

A spokesman for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said he is puzzled by GOLDWATER's reference to 30 bombers and hazarded a guess that the Senator might have been confusing it with the figures in a proposed general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva last summer.

That draft called for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons in the first phase of a move toward general and complete disarmament.

The proposals never got anywhere and one of the chief obstacles was, the spokesman said, that while the Russians agreed that there should be mutual inspection of the destruction of weapons, they rejected further inspection to determine what arms remained. The U.S. position was that there could be no destruction without the right of followup inspection.

The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away.

But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47's and 30 Badgers would be no more than a token gesture, in any event, since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 11, 1963]

ADMINISTRATION DENIES BOMBER-BURNING PLAN

U.S. disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The disavowal of such plans came as a result of a speech given in Illinois Saturday by Senator GOLDWATER of Arizona, a spokesman for Republican conservatism and a frequent critic of U.S. disarmament negotiations.

Senator GOLDWATER asked, "Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there then would be a gigantic bonfire in which all these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?"

GOLDWATER STATEMENT

Senator GOLDWATER said, "I have heard that the administration is seriously considering a pool with Russia to destroy weapons, item for item." He added this would be "stupid (and) ridiculous."

A spokesman for the U.S. Arms Control trol and Disarmament Agency said yesterday he is puzzled by Senator GOLDWATER's reference to 30 bombers and hazarded a guess that the Senator might have been confusing it with the figures in a proposed general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva last summer.

That draft called for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons in the first phase of a move toward general and complete disarmament.

The proposals never got anywhere and one of the chief obstacles was, the spokesman said, that while the Russians agreed that there should be mutual inspection of the destruction of weapons, they rejected further inspection to determine what arms remained. The U.S. position was that there could be no destruction without the right of followup inspection.

INTERNAL DISCUSSION

The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away.

But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47s and 30 Badgers—both obsolescent bombers—would be no more than a token gesture in any event since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I listened with interest to the comments made by my good friend from Arizona. As a result of what he has said, I should like to ask him whether he is still of the view that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency executives were guilty of crass dishonesty by the issuance of deliberately false and misleading information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that, unless we both admit that the newspaper people in this country cannot understand the English language, the executives were guilty of what I charged them with. The press must have telephoned them on Sunday after my speech on Saturday night, because on Monday morning newspaper stories were published in both the morning and evening newspapers, in which the headlines stated "Plan to Burn 30 Bombers Hotly Denied" and "Administration Denies Bomber Burning Plan."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I take it, then, that my friend from Arizona is still of the view that Mr. William Foster, who must bear the ultimate responsibility for what is done by subordinates in his Agency, and the other chief executives of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, are guilty of crass dishonesty, having issued deliberately false and misleading information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If they accept the responsibility for the statement to the press on Sunday, I must make that statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In the light of what the Senator from Arizona said on March 21, what I said yesterday, and what he and I have said today, I contend that we ought to let the record rest where it is. I reiterate everything I said yesterday. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I could not be happier than to let the matter rest. But I think it would be an injustice to the American people if what I have said had not been called to their attention. I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the impression was so widespread that a newspaperman who is an old personal friend of mine took me to task sharply in a newspaper in California, pointing out that I was going off halfcocked, not knowing what I was speaking about. In effect, the denial by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency made me out to be a liar, although those words were not the terms used.

I think we have served our purpose. I still contend that the original release from the Agency on the Sunday following my speech was erroneous. I must consider that it was purposely erroneous because it was retracted and changed 2 days later.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to inquire of the Chair if I am correct in my assumption that during my absence earlier today the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on behalf of the Committee on Commerce was accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. By unanimous consent, the Senate agreed to the amendment proposed by the Commerce Committee as a substitute for the bill (S. 6) as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, as amended, for the purpose of further amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to determine whether a quorum is present?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to yield for that purpose, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may be permitted to yield to me for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum without his losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 20 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out everything through line 23.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for years I have based my opposition to Federal aid to education in part on the ground that Federal assistance inevitably leads to Federal control over the activity assisted.

No better example of the manner in which Federal domination follows the Federal purse strings has recently come before this body than the mass transportation bill we are debating today. Both

S. 6, reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Magnuson substitute, approved by the Commerce Committee, contains a provision requiring as a condition precedent to the granting of any Federal assistance or financing of any project that arrangements be made by the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing.

Mr. President, I read the language from the bill:

> Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to—

I suggest that this is the pertinent and important language—

> without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs.

Mr. President, it should be fully understood that the language contained in section 10(c) of S. 6 and section 19(c) of the Magnuson substitute would place State and local governments and their subordinate agencies under the control, domination, and authority of the Federal Government with respect to their dealings and agreements with their own employees.

The enactment of this provision would represent a complete reversal of the public policy of the United States, which for over a quarter of a century, as enunciated in the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, has specifically excluded, by definition, any State or political subdivision thereof from all obligations imposed by the Federal Labor-Management Relations Act, including the requirement to bargain collectively with representatives of its employees. Both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act have long recognized the right of the States, local governments, and communities to regulate and manage their affairs and their arrangements with their employees free from Federal interference and control.

I might say in this connection, Mr. President, that many States have laws which prevent bargaining with unions in the area of public employment. This section of the bill would preempt such laws and such ordinances as passed pertinent thereto by the local authorities.

If my amendment should fail, I believe it would be advisable to refer this particular provision to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that the committee might give due consideration to such a far-reaching and novel proposal.

I do not believe it is proper to legislate in the field of labor in a mass transportation bill or, in fact, in any other type of bill; and I believe that historically the Senate has been very circumspect in paying attention to the prerogatives of the several committees.

If this subject had been given adequate discussion in the committee hearings there might have been some answer to the problem. I have been reading the transcript of the hearings. I noticed that Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, as shown in his testimony, on page 308, gave to the bill the language which I have read, with the exclusion of "without being limited to".

In looking for further comments on this particular subject, I found that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] questioned Mr. Wirtz, as shown on page 312. I quote the question by the Senator from Texas:

> I was particularly interested, because in my State it is prohibited by law for public employees to strike. And this would not affect that?

This is the answer which was given by the Secretary of Labor. It is a rather fuzzy answer, I must say.

> Secretary WIRTZ. When you say "not affect" it, that would be a somewhat broader question. Surely on the question of superseding—I say "surely"; to the best of my knowledge—that is true. Now, whether there would be an effect I think is a somewhat different question.
>
> It is my understanding it could not change those laws. Now, I assume that this kind of provision would require the facing up to some problems which would be presented in that situation. I think they could be worked out.
>
> But I should like it quite clear that I think that there could be no superseding here of the State law.

That is not very conclusive language from the Secretary of Labor. I wish he had pursued the subject further and had been better advised on it, because it is my understanding that prior to the obtaining of any loan or grant under the terms of the bill all the provisions of the bill must be met. One of those conditions is the continuance of any collective bargaining arrangements which may have been made with a private transportation company which is about to be taken over by the local community, which means by the Federal Government.

This being true, if the language remains in the bill, the bargaining arrangements—which are quite unlimited because of the language reading "without being limited to"—would be so broad, in my opinion, as to allow the local employees engaged in transportation to strike if they felt a strike were necessary against the local government, or, in fact, against the Federal Government, because an arm of the Federal Government would be involved in it.

I have no objection to local employees having bargaining rights. I object violently to any employee of any government having the right to strike. I will defend the right to strike of any worker except those who are engaged in work for the Government. I do not believe they should ever be allowed this right, and they are not allowed this right under the Taft-Hartley law, section 2, paragraph (2), of which provides in part:

> The term "employer" includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof,"

This same idea is perpetuated throughout our labor laws.

In the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, under section 3, "Definitions," subparagraph (d), it provides that:

> "Employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of that State.

If this language remains in the bill, I am afraid we shall again be preempting established State laws, city ordinances, county ordinances or laws, whichever pertain.

As I said a moment ago, if the local government wishes to extend the collective bargaining rights, wages, working conditions, and so forth, with no right to strike, that is up to the local government, be it city, county, or State; but if the United States moved in with the language contained in subsection (c) of section 19, it would have the effect, I believe, of preempting State law in this area.

I wanted to bring this subject to the attention of my colleagues, because I could not believe that most of us would like to see that happen. I think this provision was put into the bill without adequate hearings or discussions. Had there been discussions, I feel certain that the very capable chairman of the subcommittee would have suggested that it go over to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which he also serves so well.

That is all the discussion I care to make on this subject. It is a very plain case. Shall we preempt State and local law by the proposed act, or shall we allow State and local governments to grant that right if they so desire, or withhold it if they do not wish to grant it, without the right being preempted by the Federal Government?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator aware that in the subcommittee, when the bill was being considered, a provision was included following the word "rights" in line 17 of page 26, "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law"? In other words, the section read, "The encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law." In full committee, the phrase "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law was deleted."

Under those conditions, could it not be considered that it was the legislative intent that the laws of the States should be overridden and superseded?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Whether that was the intent or not, the result of the language of this section, to which I have referred, and to which I have offered my amendment, certainly would preempt local and State law. It cannot be read any other way. Even the Secretary was very fuzzy on this point. He did not think it would. We cannot take the Secretary's thoughts as binding in law and legislative intent. As I read the language, it would absolutely preempt State and local law.

Mr. TOWER. Furthermore, there was no testimony from the Administrator as to whether or not he thinks the language supersedes State or local law; and, after all, it is the Administrator who is going to make these decisions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I said earlier, when the point was called to my attention by one of the witnesses who testified, that I was concerned about it. I was hopeful that the committee would drop the language and let the Labor and Public Welfare Committee study it. I have not followed it "down the road" far enough to know, but I have the feeling that this language could destroy the purpose of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am not a lawyer, but I have to follow my lawyers' advice, and they are pursuing this subject. But certainly, if we make interstate business what heretofore has been intrastate business, because we impose Federal jurisdiction, it may be that the application of section 14(b) cannot be applied to what is purely local business.

I feel that this provision goes much further than the committee realized, and further than many other Senators realize.

Mr. TOWER. I have it on the authority of a lawyer that it is an assault on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that many States have laws that prohibit political subdivisions from recognizing unions as bargaining agents with reference to strikes and picketing? This provision would knock those laws into a cocked hat. I believe that 20 States have some kind of prohibition against strikes against public utilities. The proposed act would supersede those laws. At the very least, the Administrator could lay down, as a condition for giving aid, the condition that a State should have to revise its laws or make an exception to its laws to accommodate this program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I invite the Senator's attention to the language of subsection (c) of section 19; namely:

> It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor.

I do not see any mention in that language of local, county, or State government. The condition of the granting of assistance is that these conditions, as a minimum, must be complied with.

As I have said, the language reads, "Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to," and while strikes are not mentioned, the language "without being limited to" is used. Then we go through every other operation of collective bargaining; and, as I have said, if it is the desire of the State or local government to grant that right, after it has become wedded to the Federal Government, it may do so. But let the local governments decide that question. Let not the Congress of the United States preempt State laws.

I do not think it is so important that we should continue to tear down further what I consider to be the great bastion of the 10th amendment, or the rights of States.

The rights under the Labor-Management Act have been granted and protected time and time again. This body overrode a Presidential veto which attempted to strike out section 14(b). Section 14(b) is one of the most important parts of the Labor Act. Of course, it is a target of organized labor. I do not believe this body or the other body should be partners in the crime of destroying the Labor-Management Act without adequate consultation with the appropriate committee.

Mr. TOWER. In practical effect, so far as the implementation of the law is concerned, it will not be Congress, but one man, who will have in his hands the power to abrogate, supersede, or nullify existing laws of State and local governments; namely, the Administrator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. He would have to have the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, which would not be very difficult to obtain.

Mr. TOWER. No; not likely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been trying to analyze the language contained in subsection (c) to determine how far the Administrator could go in the imposition of working conditions and wages upon a city which might take over a private company under the proposed act. Let us assume that there is a private transit company which is shaky in its finances, and it is decided that a public transit company shall take it over. As a prerequisite to the right to obtain money from the Federal Government, the Administrator would first have to make provision for the preservation of the rights, privileges, and benefits under existing collective bargaining agreements.

Am I correct in my understanding that that would mean that the city or the public body taking over the shaky transit system would have to continue the collective bargaining agreement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. My answer to my good friend from Ohio is "Yes"; that they would come under the provisions of this language, even including the right to strike. If they were employed in a private transit company, they would retain those rights in Government employment by the language "without being limited to," and even without the language "as determined by the Administrator" they certainly would get into this area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, to summarize, the Administrator would have the power to say, "Your application for aid will be denied unless you agree to collective bargaining and unless you agree that the right to strike against the municipality or other public body shall be granted"?

Mr. GOLDWATER. My answer again would have to be "Yes." It would be whatever the Administrator determined in each and every case. However, I certainly understand this language to mean that anything that is of a collective bargaining nature, including working conditions, hours, and wages, and pension rights, and so forth, including the right to strike, would go into the public body once it was transferred from the private sector.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Going to item 2, on line 16, he would have to make provision for the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Labor went one point further on that item, and he urged that this item 2 be retained as follows: I am now reading from page 308 of the testimony. He urged the "prevention of curtailment of collective bargaining rights." That language is in italicized type on page 308. The Secretary of Labor wanted to add a provision which would prevent the curtailment of collective bargaining rights. Obviously the committee did not go that far on that subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will yield for an observation, the committee wisely did not accept that language, but I believe the language "without being limited to" very adequately replaces that suggested language.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Item 1 achieves what item 2 may not achieve. Let us go to item 3:

> The protection of individual employees against worsening of their positions with respect to their employment.

My inquiry is, let us assume that featherbedding caused the shakiness of the private transportation system's finances, and the public body takes it over and wants to eliminate that featherbedding. Could it be done under the language of this bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. In the testimony, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] elicited from Secretary Wirtz this answer:

> Senator SPARKMAN. In other words, this would conform here with that?

He was referring to the Supreme Court decision on featherbedding.

> Secretary WIRTZ. Yes.

We have only the Secretary's own personal feelings there. There was no testimony by the Solicitor. No cases were brought up to prove that. Nothing was said except the word "yes." All the language that the Senator has read so far would, in my opinion, negate that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, to me it is rather clear that if he must make provision for the protection of individual employees against the worsening of their positions with respect to their employment, he could prohibit the elimination of their featherbedding jobs. I do not believe there is any question about subparagraph 3 meaning that very thing.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Ohio is a lawyer, and I have great respect for his ability. I am merely a layman. I have a divided opinion as to whether the Supreme Court decision could overrule the Administrator, or whether they might even go so far as to determine that this is intrastate, and thus keep it from under that decision. However, I would have the same fear the Senator from Ohio entertains, that this could be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Supreme Court decision against featherbedding was made in the absence of statute. The Supreme Court said that the company has a right to determine how they will employ their employees. Here we have a Federal statute in contemplation which provides that the Administrator shall not worsen the positions. Therefore we have a completely different situation from that which prevailed in the Supreme Court case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me see if I understand the Senator's contention. If there is featherbedding which is being practiced, and the company is transferred to the ownership of a municipality, and they cannot worsen the working conditions, they cannot, therefore, eliminate featherbedding. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. That is the force of the language in the bill.

On line 19, the language reads:

> Priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid of.

That means that the Administrator will have to make provisions for the granting of priorities in rehiring of employees laid off.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then No. 5: "Paid training or retraining programs." That is understandable.

Now my question is, Does this not mean that the Federal Government, as a prerequisite to the making of these grants, can impose conditions of employment as the Administrator sees fit, conforming with the language that we have just read?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, he can. I might add that these conditions of employment could be against existing Federal law. In other words, we could, by the adoption of this language, in one area of employment in our country go against not only the Labor-Management Relations Act, but also against the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, the language which the Senator from Arizona and I have been discussing has nothing to do with the general language contained in the Davis-Bacon Act. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator has brought up that point. This in no way affects the application of the Davis-Bacon Act. It in no way interferes with the action of the Secretary of Labor in this general field of jobs involving Federal funds. That is contained in paragraph (a) of section 19. My amendment in no way affects that. My amendment merely gets at what I think is a back-door way of destroying certain parts of our labor laws and destroying State and local autonomy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not studied this item. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona has. Is there any other statute on the Federal books in connection with grants which contains a provision that seeks to give the Federal Government the right to establish working conditions?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If there is, I am not aware of it. I am informed that, outside the Davis-Bacon Act, there is no other law that can be applied. This then could become a precedent, and it could become an established part of any grant-in-aid program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the Senator allow me to put a question to the sponsor of the bill, to ask whether there is any statute on the Federal books which now, as a condition to obtaining grants, imposes working conditions?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Well, we have referred to the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have conceded that. However, is there any other statute anywhere that imposes such conditions as a prerequisite to the obtaining of grants?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are some areas that we all know of, where there is a Federal program, and where as a result of the Federal program individuals are adversely affected in working conditions, provision is made for training and retraining, and priority of employment.

The answer is "Yes." If by Federal action a man's working situation is worsened, we think it is fair and equitable to take care of him. That is true in the trade expansion program; certainly it is true in the railroad field, where mergers and consolidations have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am sure there are other areas, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not apply to grants. My question deals with grants. Is there a Federal statute today which provides that unless these working conditions are introduced, the aid will not be provided?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not know if there are any. I cannot answer the Senator's question. If we never did anything for the first time, we would all be living back in the times and the dress of revolutionary days, never having left New Hampshire.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from New Jersey. Does he not believe it would have been much wiser to have had the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hold hearings on this particular section? This section has a very heavy effect upon cities and communities.

Several men who testified before the Senator's committee told me about this. Two of them were mayors. They expressed great concern over the fact that this language was being made a part of a mass transportation bill, when it so vitally affected all sectors of the employment problems of local governments. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare might well have agreed to this language. However, I believe it is so vital and important that it should not be included in a bill which is aimed as a solution of transportation problems.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure that every measure of any importance is of interest to one or more committees other than the principal committee. We know that the bill under consideration has been thoroughly studied by two committees. Perhaps the Committee on Finance would be interested in the part of the bill relating to financing, and other committees might have a minute interest in the bill also.

This provision is truly ancillary to the thrust of the transportation program. It is only included in the interest of fairness and equity. If as a result of the expenditure of Federal funds, a railroad employee having a lifetime of contributions to a pension system were to lose it because his railroad was taken over by the public, that would be grossly unfair. This provision protects those rights which have been hard earned and enables them to continue.

The legislative history has to be corrected, however, because if the bill shall be enacted, we must have a record that will show that the bill does not preempt State law; it does not control or dominate with irrevocable authority local situations. The bill provides for the encouragement of collective bargaining. That does not put the force of a mandate on a community. Although I am a lawyer, I am rather rusty for lack of practice. However, I do not believe we can pass a law which would change State law; and we do not attempt to do so. The bill encourages collective bargaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the intention, so far as the Senator from New Jersey and the committee are concerned, to the best of the Senator's knowledge, that the provision which is the subject of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona shall not be inconsistent with State law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is that another way of saying that it cannot preempt or be a substitute for State law?

Mr. MILLER. I should think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is my answer. It was the same answer the Secretary of Labor gave to the committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, that I may propound a further question to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TOWER. If that is the case, why did we strike from the bill, reported by the Committee on Commerce, on page 26, line 17, the collective bargaining section: "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law"?

If it is our intent not to be inconsistent with State or local law, why was that provision deleted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The answer is very simple. The provision should not have been included in the first place. If we had not made a mistake in the first place by doing what was unnecessary, it would not have been necessary to delete that provision.

Mr. TOWER. I still do not understand the point in taking it out if, as the Senator has said, it is not the intent to be inconsistent with State law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Must we, in every paragraph of every bill, say, "The action under the authority of this legislation shall be in conformity with the Constitution of the United States"?

Mr. TOWER. What reflects legislative intent more clearly than the language which was deleted from the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator knows that if one makes a mistake, he should not try to preserve it. In our legislative history, shall we magnify a mistake which we made together?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield? I think I can suggest something which will perhaps clarify this point.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was not the only change. I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that lifting the words "not inconsistent with State law," was not the only change that was made. The language was worded differently. We rewrote it to read "The encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights." The way it was originally written, with the words "not inconsistent with State law," it was virtually a mandate to continue collective bargaining rights not inconsistent with State law. The committee decided that it would be better simply to use the words "encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights."

Mr. TOWER. It would have been better if we had recognized that the trade unions do not appreciate this particular provision: "To the extent not inconsistent with State or local law."

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the trade unions came in on that change one way or the other.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I point out to the Senator from Alabama that we would not need that second provision. We already have the language "the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits, including continuation of pension rights and benefits, under existing collective bargaining agreements."

The provision "the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights" is redundant. I do not see that anything has been added. That provision could be eliminated. The language has been complicated.

The fact that the provision "not inconsistent with State or local laws" has been deleted does not have any effect.

My whole point is that we are attempting a major alteration in the Nation's labor laws, and are seeking to do it through a subsection in a mass transportation act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is a distinction. The language to which I *was calling attention referred specifically* to collective bargaining rights. The one to which the Senator from Alabama refers is "the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits, including continuation of pension rights and ben*efits, under existing collective bargaining* agreements." That relates to agreements which are already in existence.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the only place we worry about. The present State and local laws, in many cases, prevent certain kinds of bargaining. Mostly, such laws prevent striking. State and local governments provide for bargaining for working conditions mostly, but do not include the right to strike.

The preservation of rights under existing collective bargaining agreements is repeated:

> The encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights.

I am not arguing one point against another. I am arguing that the entire approach should not be in the bill; that if it is desirous to have such legislation, it should come as a major alteration to the existing labor-management act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There may very well be duplication; I do not know. I know that the language was written, it was done clearly with the idea that while there would be an encouragement of a continuation of collective bargaining rights, it was not intended to supersede State laws. I believe the questioning of the Secretary of Labor indicates our concern about that. It was not our intention to supersede State laws, and we do not intend, I am sure, to do so. We do not believe that the language has that effect.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If we are to depend on the Secretary's testimony for legislative history, neither side has much of a leg to stand on, because this language is about as fuzzy-wuzzy as any I have ever tried to read. It reads like some of the texts on proper punctuation, because when one gets through reading it, it is just a lot of language.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, the Secretary was testifying on the basis of the language he submitted to the committee, not the language which was finally provided in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I admit that in reading the Secretary's answer, there is a chance of someone's misunderstanding it. But if the entire statement is read, I think we find that he clearly said it will not supersede State laws.

He was asked, "Does it affect them?" He replied, "That is different"—and it is. If it has any effect whatever on them, that would be covered by the word "effect." I think the Secretary was splitting hairs when he tried to make that distinction. Of course, it might have an effect upon State laws; but even in that connection he repeated his statement that it will not supersede or displace or override them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me read what Secretary Wirtz said, as it appears on *page 313. His statement was made in* answer to a question by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]:

> But I should like it quite clear that I think that there could be no superseding here of the State law.

But that is not a statement on which one could rely with any conviction. He merely said he thought there could be no superseding of State law.

I may point out to the Senator from Alabama that this is one of the reasons why I grow so much concerned about this matter—namely, when I find that both of the committees are attempting to have the Senate legislate in a very sensitive field and thus amend legislation which has taken over 30 years to develop—a field so sensitive, indeed, that we do not dare deal with it on the floor.

So I think the bill should properly have been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Alabama has a right-to-work law, under section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and so does Arizona. Some persons believe that a back-door attempt to get at section 14(b) is being made.

The only statements to which I can refer in connection with this matter are some rather limited ones by Secretary Wirtz. The hearings on the other phases are quite complete; but this matter is entirely different, and is one in regard to a legislative field which is so sensitive that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats dare deal with it here on the floor—in other words, the question of how far the Federal Government can go in stamping out rights and laws of local governments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me point out that at another place Secretary Wirtz said "surely" this amendment would not supersede State laws.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On what page is that statement to be found?

Mr. SPARKMAN. On page 312, near the bottom.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But he added "to the best of my knowledge."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, he said "to the best of my knowledge—that is true."

But aside from this, that is something new. We tried to work out what we regarded as fair protection of the workers, without in any way trying to change the ruling of the Supreme Court on featherbedding.

The Senator noted that I was careful to inquire about that—and at the same time without superseding or doing away with State laws. I believe we did make sure of that. I believe we have worked out about as good a provision as could be obtained.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must say that my experience in 11 years of service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in hearing testimony in regard to this delicate field, does not make me feel assured about this matter. Secretary Wirtz said, "to the best of my knowledge—that is true." The entire sentence reads as follows:

> Surely on the question of superseding—I say "surely"; to the best of my knowledge—that is true.

But if in the mind of the Secretary of *Labor there is a question about the effect*, I suggest that we should hold some rather deep and long hearings on this subject. The floor of the Senate is not the proper place for the original consideration of amendments to the labor-*management relations law.*

I shall not argue this matter sentence by sentence and word by word. I merely state that this is not the proper forum for such action on the national labor relations law. Therefore, I suggest that the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I do not know of any necessity to engage in a mad rush to bring about a change in this situation. Perhaps after further study is made I shall change my mind—although I may not. At any rate, I wish to learn more about this matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator from Arizona say there is no mad rush to have this bill passed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. I see no reason why we should be in a great rush to give the President an Easter egg. I would just as soon give him a Fourth of July firecracker, or perhaps a piece of Thanksgiving pumpkin pie. This is a very important measure, and I do not believe we have to pass it in the next few weeks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then I heard the Senator correctly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Ohio certainly did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me say that never before have I begged as fervently as I did to have the bill referred to the Commerce Committee, where it rightfully belongs. Finally, I was given about 10 working days in which to deal with the bill.

I assure the Senator that there is an intense rush to have the bill passed; that is my interpretation of the situation. I regret that in that respect I must disagree with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, no; the Senator from Ohio does not disagree with me. I said there is no mad rush to have the bill passed; but perhaps I should say there is no mad rush on the part of the Senator from Arizona. I think the Senator from Ohio should also hear more testimony about the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think there is an attempt to give the President an Easter present.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. After listening to the debate, it seems to me that we should be able to agree on an amendment. If I correctly understood the statements of the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from New Jersey, and apparently those of the other members of the committee, the intention is that anything done under this section of the bill shall not be inconsistent with State law. I believe that the provisions set forth in paragraph (c) have some merit. It seems to me that if we can do this consistent with State law, without superseding it, that will be desirable—in other words, to seek to preserve the rights, privileges, and benefits of those affected by this legislation and also the priority of employment and the pay for training or retraining programs.

If it is agreed that these are desirable provisions, on the one hand, and yet, on the other hand, that they should not be inconsistent with State law, it seems to me we merely have to insert a provision to the effect that these provisions shall not be inconsistent with State law.

If what I have proposed seems reasonable, I should like to ask the Senator whether it would be well to change the amendment, as follows:

In line 10, following the comma, insert the words "and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located" so that paragraph (c) will then read, in part, as follows:

> (c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator, after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located, to protect the interests—

And so forth. It seems to me that if we could adopt such language, we could reach an agreement. I think that such a provision would make very clear what we desire. Then we could get on with consideration of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the point that I believe my friend from Iowa misses is that any provision at all of the type to which I have referred in the bill might affect a part of the Labor-Management Act and a part of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I have serious concern that it could affect section 14(b) regardless of how the bill might be amended, other than striking the entire provision. Should we write in language "consistent with State laws," I point out that there may be States—though I do not know if there are any such—that already have right-to-work laws but have no laws applying in that field. So "consistent with State law" would open wide the field for destruction of that section of the Taft-Hartley Act. I would much prefer to get the feeling of the Senate on the elimination of the entire subsection, and if I fail in my endeavor, if the Senator from Iowa then wishes to offer his amendment, I would be perfectly happy to go along with it. I would like to have an expression of the Senate on my proposal to eliminate the entire provision.

Mr. MILLER. I share with my friend from Arizona his concern about amending section 14(b) through a back door. While I do not claim any expertise in the field of labor law, it seems to me that it would be clearly inconsistent with a State law which covers the subject of union shops to permit the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, to act contrary to legislation in a State on that point in the face of language such as that which would provide:

> These equitable arrangements must be approved by the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, and be consistent with the laws of the State in which the project, or a portion of the project, is located.

To have something like that happen would do violence to plain language. I suggest that if an attempt were made by the Administrator to take such action, a very successful case could be brought by the aggrieved parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, politics and lawmaking are arts of compromise, I suppose. I do not believe any language should be in the bill relative to that subject because it is not needed. Not only is it not needed, but also any language that we might insert would be dangerous to the existing law of a State, and a failure to recognize the right of the States in that field. It is also wrong to legislate in this sensitive and delicate field on another piece of proposed legislation. We are very careful about that when we refrain from legislating on many subjects, and when we in this body respect the prerogatives of the other body by not introducing and acting upon appropriation bills.

I merely point out that in principle the entire section is wrong, in this or any other bill. If the provision would be a good thing for the laboring people of our country, for the States, and for management, it should come before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and we should have adequate hearings on the measure.

I do not argue that the language proposed by the President might not be good in another case. But my particular objection is to the inclusion of any language of that type in a bill of this kind. If it is the desire of the Senate to have it, it should be included in a separate piece of legislation coming from the appropriate committee after proper study. With all due respect to the committee—and I have the utmost regard for all members of the committee—we could not call Secretary Wirtz's wobbly opinion of his own words testimony on which some future court or some future lawyer could lean. If we were to lean on such testimony, it would be like leaning on an old, rotten fence, which is likely to fall down because there is nothing to hold it up.

Much as I respect the Senator from Iowa, I shall not accept his amendment because I think the subject is a matter of law principle. It is a matter of Senate principle. Do we or do we not believe that we should amend the Labor-Management Act by a section appearing in a law that has absolutely no relationship to the act to which I have referred?

Mr. President, I have no further argument to offer on the amendment. I am ready to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel that the debate has been useful. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] expressed the intention of the committee, which was necessary in this legislative debate. But lost in the discussion is the fact that while a few workers might be adversely affected, in the net there would be a great stimulus to the return to the railroads of workers who have been furloughed. There would be more employment in transit on the buses. So far as working people in transit are concerned, there is great hope for them in the proposed legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I could not agree more fully with the Senator. If the bill is passed, it should stimulate employment. But that has no bearing on the subject we have been discussing today. I believe there are 42 cities in the United States with a population of 300,000 or more that already have bargaining agreements with transportation unions. I am not concerned that the collective bargaining arrangements would be disturbed in the cities. I think they would continue. I do not wish to amend a very important law by the proposed back-door method.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request to make. I hope that all bases have been touched.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow 1½ hours be allotted for consideration of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]; that 1 hour be allotted for the consideration of all other amendments, to be divided 30 minutes to each side; and that 6 hours be allotted for consideration of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a rather serious official mission abroad which will take me away Thursday night. I am sure the Senator is aware of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the intention of the leadership with respect to concluding consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It should be concluded by Thursday.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I must leave about 4:30 or 5 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall do our best to finish. If necessary, the Senate can meet early on Thursday. Unfortunately, some proud fathers in this body must look after some princesses until the noon hour tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I missed one base.

Mr. GORE. I do not have an important mission abroad, but I have an important engagement in Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be of equal importance.

Mr. GORE. Tennessee is not foreign territory. I was hoping the vote would come either tomorrow or on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It could come tomorrow. We cannot tell. The pending request will give us an opportunity to sound out sentiment among Senators.

Mr. GORE. I think I am being sounded out on the vote. Under the circumstances, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to strike out subsection (c) of section 19.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—63

Aiken
Anderson
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Bartlett
Bayh
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Beall
Bible
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—10

Hayden
Hickenlooper
Kefauver
Magnuson
McGee
Mechem
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Smathers

So Mr. GOLDWATER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that this time I have not touched all bases, but I am not absolutely certain. Nevertheless, I should like now to renew the unanimous-consent agreement I sought previous to the yea-and-nay vote; but that instead of 6 hours of debate on the bill, I ask that there be substituted 4 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How much time will that allow on amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One hour on all amendments, except 1½ hours on the Lausche amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator believe that we can finish with the bill some time Thursday evening?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will do our very best.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator mean that we will do our very best to finish by Thursday or by tomorrow evening, if we can?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow. We will do our very best to finish tomorrow.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire whether it is the intention of the distinguished majority leader to hold the Senate in late session tomorrow evening in order to vote on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope it will not be necessary, because of a commitment.

Mr. KEATING. I might say that I have a very important speaking commitment in New York tomorrow evening. I will be glad to stay as late as necessary, but would appreciate the majority leader's guidance as to what may be expected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I believe the rest of us have a very important dinner engagement tomorrow night, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and myself I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The amendment will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 26, line 10, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that 20 minutes of debate be allotted to the pending amendment, 10 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to clarify with the majority leader whether any more yea-and-nay votes will be had this evening.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, during the discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona I pointed out that it seemed to me, from the discussion that had been held on the amendment, most of us were in agreement that the points covered on page 26 of the bill, in section (c), are desirable. Furthermore, the opinion was expressed very strongly by the managers of the bill that there was no intention that State law be usurped or that anything be done under this section of the bill that would be contrary to State law.

The purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas and myself is merely to state what has been stated on the floor by the managers of the bill, and nothing else. The purpose is merely to write into the bill, so that we will have no question whatever, that the intention that has been expressed on the floor will be in the law and will be so interpreted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let us suppose that a project extends into two States. Does that mean that the law will be different in one State from what it is in the other State?

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for making that inquiry. The amendment is designed to cover that subject. The language of the amendment provides that nothing shall be done by the Administrator——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MILLER. The language of the amendment makes it clear that nothing shall be done by the Administrator which will be inconsistent with the State law in the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located.

The intention, of course, is that where there is a multi-State project, as, for example, a project in New Jersey and New York, the State law with respect to the portion of the project in New York would control, and the State law of New Jersey with respect to the portion of the project located in New Jersey would control.

In other words, we have tried in this simple amendment to express very clearly what I am sure is the intention of the sponsors of the bill and what the Secretary of Labor himself expressed was the legal meaning of the bill, but as to which he could not say definitely, because the language was not there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe this is a good amendment. The intent has generally been expressed that we are not trying to break State law, we are not trying to supersede or nullify State law. Therefore, there does not seem to me to be any reason why we cannot provide specifically in the bill that our intent is not to supersede State law, and include a provision that the language will apply insofar as it is consistent with the laws of the States. That is the least we can do if in reality it is our intent not to try to nullify State laws.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this proposition was discussed in connection with a previous amendment. It seems to me that we have one or two very simple propositions. If the requirement of the amendment that the program be consistent with State law is tantamount to meaning that the program cannot supersede or preempt or override State law, this is, in my judgment, a dangerous amendment, for one very important reason: It is unnecessary to include it at this point, because it gives the clear implication that it is needed. If the provision is needed, we will find, day after day in this Chamber, that it will have to be put in on the record made on this bill. I believe it is good doctrine that one should never write into legislation what clearly is unnecessary; to do so opens a dangerous precedent for the future. That is simply my position.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator recognizes that the mere opinion of the Secretary of Labor regarding the interpretation of the language of the bill would not stand up in court. What really counts in court is what the law provides. Now we have a chance, merely by adopting a simple amendment, to make certain, beyond any shadow of a doubt, what we are seeking to do.

The Secretary of Labor was honest in his statement. He indicated that what he was saying was his opinion. He "thought." He "felt sure." He "felt sure that was the way the law would be construed." He covered himself by making certain that he could not speak as a judge.

We are trying to make the language clear, so that there will not be any litigation and no question about the meaning.

If I gained the correct impression from what both the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Alabama said, the intention is exactly what the amendment provides. All we are trying to do is to make the intent certain, beyond a question of a doubt; and all that is necessary is to adopt a very simple amendment.

There is no intention to weaken the bill. Actually, this gives the section the effect which we seek. The provisions of this section are desirable provisions; at the same time, we want to make certain that the desirability is consistent with State laws.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It has been expressed that the Secretary of Labor did not express himself strongly in his language to the effect that this provision could not supersede State law. He said, "I think," and "I believe"; but it must be remembered that there is no one off the bench in this country in whom we can have more reliance for opinions on the language of labor law than Secretary Willard Wirtz, who has had a lifetime of practice in this field and is acknowledged to be one of the great labor leaders of the country. When he says, "I believe this is true," I will believe that it is true.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will support the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The Secretary of Labor stated in ambiguous terms that the language of the bill as now written could not impose conditions as a prerequisite to the right to a grant, if those conditions were in conflict with State law.

A reading of the language of the bill indicates to me that the Secretary of Labor made a statement that could not be supported by the language herein written. His answer was of a doubtful nature. His language was "if" and "but."

The proposal of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Texas is to write into the bill language which will clearly carry into effect the purposes enunciated by the sponsor of the bill and others who support it. The language that is contemplated being written into the bill would appear on page 26, line 10, and reads:

> with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located.

The amendment contemplates that whatever conditions the Administrator shall impose must be consistent with the laws of the State in which the project is situated. I believe the amendment should be adopted. We ought not to leave the question in doubt. The language proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] clearly sets forth the intent that no conditions will be imposed which will be in conflict with the laws of the State in which the project is located.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York as much time as he may require.

Mr. JAVITS. I will take 3 minutes, if that is agreeable, to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The reason I oppose the amendment is that I believe the provisions with respect to labor are in balance now, so far as Senators like myself are concerned. I should like to state my understanding of the situation and why I believe the amendment will complicate it rather than improve it.

My understanding of the amendment is that the Secretary of Labor, under the bill, cannot supersede State law. If State law makes it impossible for the employees of municipal transit systems to bargain collectively, then it makes it impossible. There is nothing in the bill that can override it. Indeed, I doubt that the Constitution will permit it, and I doubt that it can be done under any phase of the Taft-Hartley law.

However, what it does, by not mentioning the proposition, is to enable the Secretary of Labor and the Housing Administrator, to go into a State where a right-to-work law or some other law deprives the municipal employees—that is, employees of the transit system—of collective bargaining rights. Perhaps because the Administrator has money to give out, some States may be induced to make some accommodation on that score by the necessary exemption from the law or any interstate compact entered into with other States.

Therefore, we have a balanced scheme. We do not override the law; at the same time, we do not compel the Federal Government to go in where the law is adverse to the interest of labor and labor's own point of view, and perhaps also even give encouragement to exempt a situation of this kind where the State desires to get this type of Federal help.

I think that is giving something on both sides, while at the same time not giving the Administrator instructions, which is what the amendment would do, that he must go into such States, notwithstanding the fact that the municipal transit system workers might be deprived of collective bargaining rights.

Therefore, I believe the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It does not seem to me that every State having a right-to-work law necessarily creates an unfavorable climate. Texas is a right-to-work State, and Texas has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country.

What this amendment is primarily addressed to is the fact that many States have laws relative to public employees. For example, in Texas a political subdivision is prohibited from recognizing a union as a bargaining agent. Public employees are prohibited from striking or picketing. These are the things we are concerned about in right-to-work laws.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGOVERN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Missouri (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was resumed and concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 29 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Bennett
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Goldwater
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Johnston
Jordon, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd, Va.
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGee
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Robertson
Smathers

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT THAT TIME LIMITATION START AT THE CONVENING OF THE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time limitation previously agreed to start at the convening of the session tomorrow, and not at the conclusion of the morning hour or the regular business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 3, 1963, upon the meeting of the Senate, a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the Tower amendment No. 12 to S. 6, the Urban Transportation Act of 1963, and that during the further consideration of the said bill, debate on any amendment (except the substitute amendment (No. 18) to be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] which is to be limited to 1½ hours), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal. (April 2, 1963.)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 12 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 12, it is proposed after "rights" to insert "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be allotted to the amendment, 5 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and 5 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, by way of explanation, the amendment that I propose is one that was written into the bill in the subcommittee and was stricken out in the meeting of the full committee. The amendment would merely affect only one small provision of section 19, subsection (c). It would provide that the provision for the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights would be not inconsistent with State law. It would affect only one of the many things that are listed here—preservation of rights, privileges and benefits under collective bargaining agreements, and so forth. It would apply only to the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights. All I seek to do is to protect the laws of States which provide that political subdivisions may not recognize unions as bargaining agents.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment really contains the same provision contained in the amendment just acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. The amendment previously acted upon would have covered all of the so-called rights enumerated. The present amendment would cover only one. It would cover only the right pertaining to collective bargaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It seeks to accomplish the same objective?

Mr. TOWER. It seeks to accomplish the same objective.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Then the debate can be shorter; but it is the same debate.

Mr. TOWER. The amendment is addressed, however, to only one of the enumerated rights, whereas the other amendment was more comprehensive and addressed to all of them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the amendment would eliminate from the bill the present provision that a State, or a portion of a State, to obtain a grant of help under this particular bill, would have to waive the applicable provision of State law, even if it provided a right-to-work provision by constitution? Would it have to negate that as a condition to bringing itself under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. TOWER. The provision is as follows:

> The Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing will make "protective arrangements."

The language continues:

> Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to—

One of the enumerated protective arrangements is—

> the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights.

Such encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights would have to be consistent with the State law, if my amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would that not mean, unless the amendment is agreed to, that in a State which has a right-to-work provision under its constitution, the city which is seeking an advantage of Federal largesse under the bill would have to agree in advance that the provisions of the State constitution should be inoperative?

Mr. TOWER. It would have to make an exception to its own laws, if the Administrator decided this was a condition for giving aid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement. My reasoning is the same as it was with respect to the previous amendment.

To provide specifically that the rights could not be inconsistent with State law would be to imply that without such language there is the possibility of the program being inconsistent with State law, which we know is not the fact. If the language is put in, it seems to me, while it might seem a small matter in respect to this bill, it would set a precedent for other legislation, which I think would be dangerous.

The provision is that there shall be encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights. I do not see how encouragement could ever be inconsistent with any law—a local law, a State law, or a constitution. Encouragement relates to hope.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida.

I shall vote for this amendment because I think it is clarifying in nature, but I am not at all in agreement with the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida as to what the effect would be if the amendment were not added. All the way through our consideration of the bill our purpose was to draft provisions which were not inconsistent with State law. We repeated that statement over and over. We have repeated it on the floor this afternoon. It was not intended that the language was to supersede or override State law in any way whatsoever.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall vote for the amendment because I think it would make the language more clear. That was our intention all the way through. The testimony bears it out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the Senator thinks the inclusion of these words would carry out the intention of preserving and protecting State right-to-work laws?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it would.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall vote as the Senator from Alabama indicates.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I still cannot understand how one could definitely say that the provisions of the bill would not be inconsistent with State law, when the bill has not been enacted and tested in the courts.

I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to make a brief statement while many Senators are in the Chamber.

The provision allowing the Administrator to establish conditions in working relations as a prerequisite to the right to obtain a grant is a completely new philosophy in government. Up until now there has been the right to impose the Walsh-Healey Act and the Davis-Bacon Act. If and when the bill is passed, any local or State government which wishes a grant will have to bow to the conditions of labor-management relations imposed by the Congress.

I say to Senators, "You are joining the movement to drive collective bargaining into State governments."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] (putting the question).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Texas said he would not ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is not asking for the yeas and nays. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there was a commitment made that there would not be a yea-and-nay vote. I should like to vote "yea."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to explain the situation. The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] stated at the beginning that he would ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. Then he indicated that he would ask for a voice vote.

The only reason why I have raised the question—and of course, any Senator can ask for a yea-and-nay vote—is that I believe both leaders informed Members on both sides of the aisle that it was their understanding that there would not be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, but only a voice vote.

That statement is made by way of explanation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Could we have the vote tomorrow morning?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have any objection to a request for a division?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. I have no objection to a request for a yea-and-nay vote. I am merely trying to explain the position of the leadership in this regard, for we have unintentionally created an impression that there would be no yea-and-nay vote, and we may have been wrong in so doing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I request a division.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if a yea-and-nay vote is ordered, that the vote be taken at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, immediately after the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, with that understanding I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK and **Mr. ELLENDER** addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I should like to send to the desk, to be considered as an amendment to the bill after the vote is taken on the Tower amendment. I should like to have the yeas and nays taken tomorrow on this particular amendment, which does not deal with a labor problem, but deals with another situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a point of order. I do not think the Senator is in order in requesting a yea and nay vote on his amendment at this time, because the amendment is not the pending question. I assure the Senator that when his amendment becomes the pending question tomorrow we shall be delighted to assist him in having the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduced on Thursday, March 28, S. 1222, a bill to strengthen and improve vocational education in this country in the belief that this is a sensible, long-range method of alleviating the unemployment problem and at the same time easing the continuing shock to our economy caused by rapid technological changes.

I also offer it as an alternative to the youth employment bill (S. 1), which claims to answer in part the unemployment problem for youth, but which in fact only postpones facing this problem. And it is a costly postponement, in terms of wasted opportunity for young people as well as in dollars. We can afford to spend neither foolishly.

Statistics tell the story pretty well. The latest rate of unemployment for February is 6.1 percent, the first time the rate has topped 6 percent since December of 1961.

But even this figure is misleading if we consider the plight of the young adults who are unemployed. That rate is 2½ times the overall rate. In our present employment revolution the young and untrained citizens of our country are finding it increasingly difficult to find work.

The picture does not look any brighter as we look ahead. We have coming into the labor force between 1960 and 1970 some 26 million young people, many of whom will find no jobs available for them because they do not have the skills employers need.

That is the paradox in today's unemployment situation. At the same time that the President calls unemployment "our No. 1 economic problem," the "help wanted" columns of our newspapers are filled with offers of jobs. But employers have difficulty filling their needs. There simply are not enough trained people to go around.

The report of Secretary of Labor Wirtz last month on research and training activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act points up this situation.

In talking about the program under this act, the Secretary says:

> It is particularly concerned with the anomaly of persistent unemployment amid shortages of workers qualified to fill existing job openings.
>
> This failure to mesh available jobs with available jobseekers is the result of economic developments which have been operating for some time—

He continues:

> Among these developments are: the emergence of new industries and products and the decline of older ones; the impact of new technologies, notably automation; shifts in the location of industries; shifts in market demands; the effects of foreign competition; and the entry of vast numbers of youth into the labor force.

In a later published statement, the Secretary comments about the need "to work out a complete new kind of training program, one which is going to involve integration of the system of education with the new demands of the job market. That is going to involve a much heavier demand on our facilities for vocational education," he said.

Some steps have been taken to solve this gap between available jobs and qualified applicants. The Manpower Development and Training Act just mentioned, which I supported last year, is one step, and a good one. There are other avenues for supplying the skills necessary for persons to get jobs. I am impressed with the opportunity a young man has in signing up for a training program in the military service, for instance.

But the chief source of trained jobseekers must come from an expanded, broad program of vocational training, or, as I prefer to call it, education for employment. Consider again these young people of our Nation who are entering adulthood. Some have completed high school but have decided not to continue their education. Others have dropped out of school for one reason or another as soon as they reached the minimum legal age for leaving school. There are few places ready to accept these youth in our rapidly changing labor market. Unskilled labor is needed less and less as machines take over much of the drudgery of industry.

These young people I speak of are simply not prepared, by today's standards, to get and hold a well-paying job. And the problem will almost surely get worse. "Automation" is still a new word in our vocabulary, and its tremendous effects need the searching examination which could be gained through a White House conference, which would be called if a bill I introduced earlier in the session were passed.

There is before the Congress a bill, S. 1, which seeks to answer in part the unemployment question. Proponents of the youth employment bill say this CCC-type measure will not only give jobs to young men but will provide "useful work experience opportunities" to aid them in finding jobs when they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. A second feature of the bill would provide State and local area employment under various levels of government. In effect, the young men would be doing jobs which do not now exist, and which, if they did exist, would not have attracted regular workers, anyway.

Frankly, if this were the early 1930's, I would vote for such a measure. But this is 30 years later and conditions are far different than they were then. At that time there was a desperation which caused men to welcome the chance for any employment at all. The Nation's economy was staggering.

Today we have a variety of economic cushions which help support a man and his family. We are also in the midst of a prosperous era.

Proponents of the bill cite its beneficial provisions as far as reducing juvenile delinquency and helping this country's needed conservation projects are concerned. As long as the measure is voluntary, however—and I do not see how it could be otherwise—there is going to be great difficulty attracting to it that segment of our young population which causes our delinquency problems. We should be getting some help in this area as a result of the Juvenile Delinquency Act passed by the Congress last year, and signed by the President last September 22. As for conservation, I would sooner support increased appropriations for existing agencies to carry out needed conservation work than to have gangs of inexperienced young men attempting the projects on a Youth Conservation Corps basis.

These two aspects of the bill—curbing delinquency and aiding conservation—are really side issues. The administration calls it a youth employment bill. Employment is the big problem. The chief trouble with the administration's proposal is that it simply postpones a long-range solution by putting thousands of young men on the Federal payroll. Regardless of what the bill's proponents say, I cannot understand how this outdoor work would give a young man the marketable skills he needs in today's job market.

Let me quickly say that I understand how the purpose of the bill can attract support. Who does not want something done to help these young people find jobs? But let us see that they have something to offer so they can both find jobs and keep them.

We come down, then, to a fairly simple proposition: Give these young men, and young women too, I must emphasize, the skills they need to fill the job opportunities. Give them a greater chance to learn to earn.

I realize this has the sound of an oversimplification. And it lacks the definite prospect of putting a specific number of people immediately to work, as would occur if the youth employment bill were passed and we were successful in recruiting young people for both the conservation and local employment job areas.

However, look at the alternatives. On the one hand, there is a new Federal sub-agency which, like most agencies, is bound to grow. There is a depression-type program operating at a time when this country is the model of successful free enterprise in the world. And there is at best a temporary solution to a grave and vexing problem which will only get worse if it is not faced squarely.

Simply, my bill provides for an expanded and improved vocational education system through cooperation with State vocational agencies on a matching fund basis. The purpose of the bill is plain: to help people get jobs by providing greater opportunities to learn saleable skills.

The amount of money provided—$150 million—is approximately $100 million more than is now being spent under existing Federal laws providing vocational education aid. I am in large part guided, in setting this figure, by the informed estimate of the National Vocational Education Association that this is as much as could be effectively utilized the first year.

At present the annual investment in vocational education in this country amounts to $250 million, with $117 million from local funds, $89 million from State funds, and $48 million from Federal funds.

Let me also mention this. My bill would not destroy any of the programs set up under the time-tested George-Barden Act of 1946. Instead, it updates vocational education legislation since that time and allows for expanded vocational education programs.

It is important at this point to emphasize that vocational education should not be thought of as applying only to highly skilled or technical trades. We need a wide range of skills taught in our schools—especially in the clerical, sales, and service fields which the Department of Labor's just-issued "Report on Manpower, Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training" shows to be growing rapidly. The summary report by the panel of consultants on vocational education, appointed at the President's request, also stresses the need for training in office and distributive education occupations. This report, issued last year, also calls for a broader vocational agriculture program.

We must see that persons in the "slow learner" category in our schools get at least a general preparation for employment. This is a group which I am afraid has often been overlooked.

One new type of vocational education facility is the area vocational-technical center which can serve a number of high schools. By concentrating tools and other training aids in one place and serving a large number of students, it is possible to provide the up-to-date instruction needed. We have an admirable example of this type of institution operating in Sussex County, Del., and I know a vocational-technical center can be a boon not only to the students themselves but to an area's economy.

While the provisions of this bill are intended principally to benefit the young people who are entering the work force, including school dropouts, it also allows for vocational training for older persons who are unemployed, in need of increasing their skills, or who have never worked but now find a need to do so.

A relatively small portion of the Nation's education budget is now spent on vocational education but at least the programs are sufficiently established to provide a firm basis for expanded training. Other ways of providing job training, effective as they might be in a limited way, do not have the broad base of a varied vocational education program administered by State vocational education departments which best know local conditions and employment opportunities.

I would like to point out that vocational education is not being proposed as a cure-all. Stimulation of our economy by one means or another will create additional jobs. But the point has to be emphasized that jobs alone are not the answer. We must have trained people to fill them and that is what I hope will be brought about through passage of the bill which I am introducing.

To further point up my contention of the need for training to fill the jobs, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a thoughtful editorial from the March 14 issue of the great newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor. It is entitled "Employment: The Challenge."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT: THE CHALLENGE

"The most pressing internal challenge before the Nation today," says President Kennedy, "is the achievement of full employment in the United States."

The analysis he and his advisers make is relatively familiar: Since 1957 the number of new jobs created annually has been only half as great as during the preceding decade—an increase of half a million jobs a year—not enough to employ the million new workers coming into the labor market each year.

Yet this is only one side of the picture. On the other are columns, even pages, of "help wanted" advertisements in local and metropolitan newspapers, lists of unfilled jobs at employment agencies, and employers who have given up trying to find certain skills.

This is not to say that large numbers of Americans are dodging work, though there probably are abuses of unemployment compensation to match the cases in which benefits ought to be lengthened. But many young Americans, whether through their own indolence or by public neglect, are not getting the vocational training needed to equip them with skills for today's jobs. And older workers lack the retraining that would make new companies want to take them on.

Lester Velie explored this situation in a trenchant article in the January Reader's Digest entitled, "Why Can't Johnny Get a Job?" He found thousands of well-paid jobs going begging but at the same time one out of every five boys between 16 and 19 looking for work without finding it. Why?

Mainly because Americans have permitted an appalling obsolescence in their trades and commercial high schools over the last 25 to 50 years. With emphasis on university degrees, "the job needs of the majority who will drop out or won't go beyond high school are largely neglected," says Mr. Velie. Only 4 percent of public school funds go for vocational training.

Vocational education has lacked status, equipment and manpower. For years, vocational instructors were left out of local teachers' associations. The ancient ovens in a baker's school or the battered gages in a metalworking shop would not train pupils for yesterday's jobs, let alone tomorrow's. And the pay offered to an instructor in plumbing or bricklaying was far below the going rate in the trade.

America will never meet its employment problem this way. Conservation corps and domestic peace corps might help a little. A cut in Federal income tax rates might help more broadly. And for a little while an easy money or lavish spending policy might help—though that way can lie "boom and bust."

But it would not take astronomical amounts of money to improve the country's vocational education establishment, certainly not as compared with Skybolts and moon shots. It would take some revision of the law passed in 1917 under which aid to vocational education still is distributed among American States with more emphasis on dressmaking and farmwork than on modern factory employment. It would take also a great deal of local attention to high school shop and commercial training.

But it might do more to solve unemployment than economic gimmicks.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I think that an expanded vocational education program is a practical, long-range way to attack the unemployment problem, especially as it affects the young people of our Nation. I hope that my colleagues will give this proposal their close attention and I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill (S. 1222) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Education for Employment Act of 1963".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to authorize Federal matching grants to States to assist them in expanding and improving their programs of vocational education. These expanded and improved programs are to help provide the skills necessary for persons to get jobs. The programs are for students in high school, persons who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, and persons who are already in the labor market but want to upgrade their skills or learn new ones. The programs are to be related to actual or anticipated opportunities for useful and remunerative employment.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

SEC. 3. The Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), is amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Vocational Education Act of 1963'.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $150,000,000, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for the purpose of making grants as provided in this Act.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 3. (a) Ninety-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

"(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged five to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(2) an amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(3) an amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(4) an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under subsections (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amount allotted to all the States under subsections (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

The allotment to any State for any fiscal year computed pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection which is less than the total amount apportioned to such State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments so computed for each of the remaining States, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from thereby being reduced to less than the amount apportioned to such remaining State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under such Act or Acts.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly realloted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(c) (1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645) (relating to Federal school construction assistance in federally affected areas), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of the Vocational Education Act Amendment of 1963. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

"(3) The term 'per capita income' for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 4. (a) A State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

"(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

"(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

"(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

"(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

"(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as in-service teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership.

"(b) Five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State boards designated under section 5(a)(1), or with the approval of such board in any State, to local education agencies, and to other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions in such State, to pay part of the cost of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such boards, agencies, or institutions and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this Act shall submit through its State board for vocational education, designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929)), (hereinafter referred to as the 'State board') to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this Act will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a), and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

"(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

"(4) provides for consultation with, and utilization of, the public employment services, including use of counseling and guidance services and use of occupational information supplied by such services in determining whether there is a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupations for which persons are to be trained;

"(5) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this Act;

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part;

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board.

"(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), any State which desires to receive a portion of its allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, or for each of such fiscal years, equal to the total amount apportioned to such State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, may do so if the State board files with Commissioner, at such time or times as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe, a request in writing that the State plan approved by the Commissioner under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts be deemed the State's approved plan for purposes of this Act. Such State plan shall be deemed to be the plan of the State approved under this section for the purpose of entitling the State to such portion of such allotments for such year or years unless and until (1) such request is withdrawn by the State, or (2) such State plan or the State's administration thereof is determined by the Commissioner not to conform with the requirements of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or (3) the Commissioner approves a State plan of the State pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (b) or (c), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this Act (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this Act (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(e) A State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b) or (c) which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b), (c), or (d) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State's plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

"(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

"(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

"(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and (b) shall receive overtime compensation in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87-581). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'vocational education' means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for useful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including the occupations vocational training for which was assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding such occupations as the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance in connection with such training, the in-service training of teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

"(2) The term 'area vocational education school' means a school (A) principally used for the provision of vocational education to high school students, or to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time or part-time study in preparation for entering, or improving their situation in, the labor market, or to both such students and such persons, and (B) available to all residents of the State or of an area thereof designated and approved by the State board administering a State plan approved under section 5.

"(3) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(4) The term 'State' includes in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(5) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

"(6) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(7) The term 'high school' does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

"(8) The term 'Vocational Education Act of 1946' means the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), in effect immediately prior to the enactment of the Education for Employment Act of 1963.

"(9) The term 'supplementary vocational education Acts' means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam), all as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1963.

"FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system."

SEC. 5. Section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam), are hereby repealed.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have studied S. 6, the urban mass transportation bill, reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I have also reviewed the amendments to be offered as a substitute for S. 6, reported by the Committee on Commerce. I find myself in total disagreement with the bill, as well as the proposed substitute.

I am opposed to this legislation on several grounds, most of which have been discussed and pointed out by the minority views of the members from both committees that considered the problem. I have found the criticisms, particularly those of my distinguished colleagues, Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, cogent and to the point. I am in full agreement with their thinking. In addition to the points they have raised in opposition to this bill, I would like to go one step further.

There is one main objection which should be raised to this legislation, but so far I have not seen it voiced by any of the dissenting members of the two committees which had this bill under their consideration. I shall get to that point further in this discussion.

First, let us consider some of the many objections that have been raised. High on this list is the excessive cost that is attached to this proposal. I note that S. 6 calls for an expenditure of between $500 and $650 million over the next 3 years. This is quite a large sum. It becomes particularly large when we consider the precarious budgetary condition in which our country finds itself today.

Over the last 25 years, the floodwaters of debt have slowly risen up to the chin of the American taxpayer. They are much like the fabled Tantalus of Greek mythology. It will be recalled that poor Tantalus was floating in a pool of water while just out of his reach was a limb by which he might pull himself up to dry land and safety if he could reach it. Each time he reached, however, the water would recede and make his effort in vain. Tantalus would try and try to pull himself from the water, but each time he failed.

Our Government has tried and tried to pull itself from the floodwaters of debt, but each time it has failed. Each year the promise of a balanced budget has hung just out of our reach. Each year, the promise that the debt will be reduced has been held before us, but like Tantalus, we never seem to gain it.

I do not believe that the floodwaters of debt will recede from the chin of the American taxpayer in the foreseeable future, but I, for one, intend to do everything possible to put these floodwaters back in the channels of fiscal responsibility. We have all heard much talk of budget cutting, yet when we come down to individual items, the talk seems to dissipate into thin air. Oh, yes, I know it well—how well I know it. I have spoken out continually and conscientiously for an intelligent and adequate program of economy. Yet, when support is needed and I knock on the door, nobody is at home.

Today, we are being asked to authorize $650 million of transportation aid to the large cities of our Nation. We are faced with this proposal even though the Federal Government is currently saddled with a $300 billion debt and even though we are scheduled to increase that debt during the current fiscal year by $10 billion. I do not believe the cities we are being asked to give assistance are in any such financial condition, at least I hope they are not, for if so, it does indeed bode ill for the Nation.

The $500 million expenditure envisioned in this bill is but a drop in the bucket of what this program, if adopted, will ultimately cost. I note this statement on page 6 of the majority statement of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

> Total capital requirements for mass transportation in the next decade were estimated at $9.8 billion by the Institute of Public Administration in its 1961 report to the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing Administrator. The estimates were rough approximations, but they were based on intensive study of published information and on-the-spot investigations in 26 urban regions. The $9.8 billion estimate was made up of the following: $2.8 billion for already planned new systems; $1.7 billion for extensions of existing systems; $4.3 billion for rehabilitation and replacement; and $1 billion for new projects being considered for initiation in the next decade. For all these purposes, the costs of rights-of-way and structures were estimated at $6.4 billion and rolling stock at $3.4 billion.
>
> Although the maximum theoretical Federal contribution of the total estimated $9.8 billion need could be $6.3 billion over a 10-year period, this assumes that Federal assistance will be sought for every single project, that every single application will meet the tests of soundness, feasibility, and consistency with the planning requirements of the bill. It also assumes that no part of the total cost can be privately financed with revenue bonds supported by the fare box.

I note that the majority of the committee assumes that the expense to the Federal Government will not be anywhere near the $6.3 billion figure quoted above. I find this assumption extremely faulty. According to the report, it is stated that Federal assistance will not be sought by every city seeking a solution to its transportation difficulties. Experience has proved, I believe, that those cities which will not seek such assistance if this bill becomes law and if this assistance becomes available, will be very few indeed. As an illustration of this, I might point out an example quoted on page 6 in the majority report. The report says:

> The Delaware Port Authority is constructing a high-speed rapid transit line between Philadelphia and Camden to cost about $55 million. Approximately $25 million will be met from the fare box, leaving a gap or net project cost of about $30 million, which the authority is prepared to provide from its own reserve funds.

I would like to repeat those last four words—"its own reserve funds."

In other words, Mr. President, the Delaware Port Authority, a local body, has moved to meet the transportation requirements of the Philadelphia-Camden complex, a local area. The local need is being met by the local people and this is the way it should be. I do not believe that the Delaware Port Authority would have acted to solve this problem on its own in using its own funds if Federal money were available.

That represents my second main objection to this bill. In addition to it being extremely costly to the Federal Government, with every expectation that the cost will double, triple, and quadruple in the forthcoming years, the bill puts the long hand of the Federal Government into one more local area where it does not belong. Urban transportation is a local problem, which is open to local solution. There is no need for a gigantic Federal program to step in with its financing and, naturally enough, with its control. I think the evidence clearly indicates that where there are urban transportation problems and where those problems are great enough, the local community will stir itself to find solutions. I turn again to the majority report to find justification for this view.

On page 9 of the report, the majority cites a situation prevailing in Pensacola, Fla. The transit company there is operating with 22 buses, mostly old. It has been suffering from a drop in patronage over the last 5 years and last year lost about $8,000. I now quote two paragraphs from that portion of the report:

> Company officials estimate that if the city of Pensacola were to purchase 18 new air-conditioned buses costing about $160,000 and lease them to the company with repayment over the life of the equipment, this would produce a savings of $10,000 in maintenance and $35,000 in depreciation savings from nonownership of the equipment thus eliminating their present deficit.
>
> Based on their knowledge of the reversal of ridership in San Antonio when air-conditioned buses were installed, these officials believe they would also be able to halt the decline in their ridership which, if accomplished, would enable them to stay in business indefinitely without further assistance.

I now ask why the city of Pensacola, Fla., could not issue revenue bonds, set aside part of its tax revenue, give tax reductions or exemptions to this local transit company, in order to raise the funds which apparently are needed for the transportation system. The majority says that "any Federal assistance rendered in this situation would be of significant help." Naturally it would be of help. Anywhere we make cheap money available with a minimum of justification, we can be of significant help.

A second example which the majority cites as showing where this bill is needed is analyzed by Senator ROBERTSON in his dissenting view. I refer to the example of the Boston & Maine Railroad, which the committee says is "showing results which are attracting nationwide attention." The Senator from Virginia analyzes this example on page 39 as follows:

> An indication of the probable cost is shown by the experiment with the Boston & Maine Railroad. This road was given a subsidy of over $2 million a year for passenger service in return for which it agreed to run more trains and charge lower fares. The number of former highway users who are now using that train service is too inconsequential to affect traffic congestion, and yet that subsidy is costing taxpayers about $1 a day for each passenger being carried under the subsidy program.

I submit that any subsidy which is costing taxpayers about $1 a day for each subsidized passenger should attract nationwide attention.

My good friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], goes on to point out that many, many people in the cities would prefer to live in the country; at the same time the money to be made in the city is usually much greater than that to be made in the country. As a result, every individual must weigh in the balance whether he or she prefers city or country life. Some choose to live in the country and work in the city and these people make up the tides of humanity which flow and ebb over our city streets in the morning and evening. In effect, they are trying to have their cake and eat it too. Many of them have learned to their consternation that this cake is not so sweet and tempting as the frosting of country life and city wages make it appear. As a result, they are now calling upon Uncle Sugar to supply the sweetening in the form of cash.

Thus far, my criticism of this proposed legislation has been based, first, on the cost, which is almost certain to grow substantially greater over the next few years. We have seen that the $500 million expenditure represents a very small part of the $10 billion estimated need. I have not gone into the subject of backdoor financing which is contained in S. 6. That provision alone would be more than sufficient to warrant my opposition to this measure.

Secondly, I am opposed to the bill on the grounds that it is a further invasion of local rights and local responsibility on the part of the all-powerful Federal Government. My friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] goes into this aspect in detail in his dissenting view. He points out that several cities have attacked this problem on their own with gratifying results. He notes that during the hearings on this measure there was "no showing that our great cities are so lacking in financial resources that they are incapable of solving their own problems." He also says:

> It is possible that some cities may find that they desire mass transportation systems that cannot be financed by charging those who will use the system. In this case, as in Boston, San Francisco, and other cities, they may decide on a locally financed subsidy. But if this is inadequate, why should the Federal Government be called upon to pick up the bill for whatever economically unfeasible system of transportation local authorities may decide on?

He continues further to point out that there is built into this legislation incentives that will work in favor of elaborate, expensive investments that cannot be justified on the basis of what users can afford or will pay. He makes plain that—

> The most serious shortcoming of this program is that it will surely tend to discourage the hard, tough job of streamlining transportation operation to meet the necessities of population, location, income, work schedules. The political pressure for uneconomic schedules, and unjustifiably low fares is sure to increase with "Uncle Sugar" picking up the tab for two-thirds of additional investment costs.

But, Mr. President, though these criticisms are all extremely valid, they do not touch upon one of the most serious aspects or objections that I find in this bill. In my view, the most dangerous feature of this legislation is that it will put the Government into a large scale program of subsidizing transportation. It will set a precedent that can easily be extended; it will extend from the cities to the suburbs and grow until it reaches all across the country. With the Government subsidy will come Government control, and with Government control will come Government ownership. I have no doubt that many of the central planners in our Government cheerfully envision this prospect. They are looking for the day when a little group of men sitting behind mahogany desks here in Washington can control, by managerial edict, every facet of the transportation system which stretches across this great continent. To bring this plan into being, a start must be made somewhere, and I believe that the cities were chosen to form a first battleground.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the proposed legislation on the above grounds and because, in my opinion, it represents the first battleground in the fight for Federal control of our transportation system.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS AT 10 A.M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to have it clearly understood that at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the Senate will vote. Not only will the Senate convene at 10 o'clock, but it will also be voting at 10 o'clock. The officers of the Senate will notify Senators between the hours of 9 and 10 o'clock that a vote will take place at 10 o'clock, so that all Senators can be present and accounted for.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND HELPING TO ASSURE SAFE, EFFICACIOUS DRUGS—FDA STILL HAS A LONG WAY TO GO TOWARD SCIENTIFIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXCELLENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I stated that I would report to the Senate on the protection of public health and the efforts which are being made in Congress, particularly in the Subcommittee on Reorganization, to improve the administrative action and structure of the Food and Drug Administration.

I note today that the Food and Drug Administration has made considerable progress in meeting the standards and goals we have outlined. For this I wish to commend them.

From time to time, I have reported to the Senate on the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee's study of "Interagency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation." I shall do so once again today. I feel that the Senate and the Nation are entitled to a current account of what is being done in their behalf.

The views which I shall express are my own, based on evidence compiled by the subcommittee. On technical issues, the best medical judgment has been sought, since, as laymen, we do not attempt to render technical judgment.

It will be recalled that, on March 20 and 21, 1963, our subcommittee resumed its hearings. The subcommittee heard seven witnesses. The first—Dr. John Nestor—testified concerning his personal experiences as a medical officer in the New Drug Division, Food and Drug Administration. Six other witnesses followed.

ISSUES WITHIN FDA

I shall speak today almost exclusively as regards the issues raised by Dr. Nestor. His comments involved serious allegations about inadequacies inside the Food and Drug Administration. The agency and the Nation are, therefore, entitled to a further report.

THE SIX OTHER ISSUES DISCUSSED

I shall have more to say in the future about the comments of the other six witnesses.

But, briefly, let me list the six topics which they individually discussed:

First. Reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration and strengthening of policies of the Bureau of Medicine—Dr. Charles May.

Second. Avoidance of excessive use of psychotropic drugs by noninstitutional patients, and recognition of the extravagance and unsoundness of certain claims—Dr. Fritz Freyhan.

Third. Avoidance of overuse of antibiotics—Dr. Hobart Reiman.

Fourth. Improvement of clinical testing of drugs—Dr. Walter Modell.

Fifth. Improvement in standards of drugs for infants under 2—Dr. Norman Kretchmer.

Sixth. Reestablishment of a physician-to-physician, 24-hour-a-day, long-distance telephone communication service like the former mediphone—Dr. Cortez Enloe.

Each of these witnesses was selected with care. Each is a physician, recognized by his peers. None has less than a decade-and-a-half of medical experience. Each has repeatedly presented his views before the medical community, in significant articles, papers and statements. Each merited the further attention of the Senate and the forum of public opinion. Each commented on issues involving medical communication; that is, on improved exchange of information on safe, efficacious drugs, or on the side effects of drugs—or on a certain number of unsafe, ineffective, or useless drugs.

TESTIMONY SUBSTANTIATED ON THREE DIFFERENT BASES

Now, as regards Dr. Nestor, let me state the following.

Thirteen days have elapsed since his comments on March 20. During this time, the subcommittee has received additional strong evidence of the soundness of his presentation. This evidence has consisted of three types of support:

(a) Actions taken by the Food and Drug Administration itself, and by companies which produce certain drugs criticized by Dr. Nestor.

(b) The inability of the agency in its initial rebuttal to challenge successfully a single major point which he made.

(c) Additional information compiled by the subcommittee from other sources, from letters, telephones calls, visits and the medical literature.

ACTIONS TAKEN ON THREE DRUGS, AS URGED BY DR. NESTOR

First, as regards subsequent actions, let these facts be noted. Three of the drugs mentioned on March 20 by Dr. Nestor were: Menadione—vitamin K_3; Coldaid; PRN. In the last 10 days, action has occurred on all three, in a manner which had been urged by Dr. Nestor. Thus:

(a) In the March 28 Federal Register, pages 3051-3052, the Food and Drug Administration, after a 60-day waiting period, rescinded the right to include vitamin K_3 in prenatal supplements. FDA stated:

> The petition did not establish the safety of Menadione for this use.

(b) The day after Dr. Nestor's testimony, Coldaid, an antihistamine, which had never been cleared as a new-drug application, was withdrawn by the company. A week and a half before his testimony, Dr. Nestor had written to the company, notifying it to file for a new-drug application.

(c) The day after his testimony, the company which had produced PRN, an antihistamine which has also been used as a form of tranquilizer, voluntarily withdrew its new-drug application.

These were no small actions; each was highly significant in its own way.

Two of the actions, Menadione and PRN, had been long in the making; each action had, unfortunately, been needlessly delayed; each action—when it came—represented an advance in the protection of the public health.

The record shows and the record will further show—that Dr. Nestor's testimony was right on each of the three types of issues involved in these three drugs.

THE KEY ISSUE OF WHEN DOES FDA ACT

Of the three, the FDA action on vitamin K_3 was, of course, the most important.

In this action, as in virtually all actions involving the public health, the key question for the Senate to consider is: "Was the right decision taken by the Food and Drug Administration at the right time?"

Please note that to make the right decision, but tardily, is to risk the public health.

ACTION AT "TURTLELIKE" PACE

FDA ultimately did make the right decision. But it proceeded at a turtlelike pace.

Let it be carefully noted that FDA does have to satisfy detailed requirements of law. FDA does have to accord producers and owners of a drug their prerogatives under due process of law; that is unquestioned. But, within this statutory and administrative framework, FDA's supreme obligation is to the public health; FDA could have acted and should have acted with greater speed.

The food additive law—Public Law 85-929—has been on the statute books since September 6, 1958. That was 4½ years ago. To be sure, it does take a considerable time to begin implementation of a new law; 4½ years, nonetheless, is a long time.

The Menadione issue, itself, has been actively pending for well over a year.

What does a year really mean? For one thing, it means that 4¼ million American babies were born during that time period. It means that an uncounted number of pregnant women—nobody knows how many—might have taken vitamin K_3 on a prescription or over-the-counter basis. Dr. Nestor testified Menadione is present in 50 to 70 products.

Time is obviously of the essence in protecting the public health, particularly the health of pregnant women.

Exactly where and how time was needlessly lost can be spelled out only after exhaustive analysis of the file which is within FDA's own possession. But, our review of the chronology has already confirmed a needless loss in time, at several key junctures.

REPEATED WARNINGS IN MEDICAL LITERATURE

The regrettable timelag speaks particularly eloquently against this background—within a year of the enactment of the food additive law, the literature of medical science began to contain warning after warning against use of vitamin K_3 by pregnant women, particularly in high dosages.

The warnings were not merely in obscure journals; they were in the leading journals of the land, such as Pediatrics.

As in the case of most such medical comments, many of the authors invariably urged "more study" of vitamin K's hazards; the dangers were not regarded as absolutely conclusive. But, for that matter, scientists, with their usual reserve, may urge more study even when evidence mounts very sizably. For example, even after thousands of European babies were born deformed and apparently from thalidomide, there were still some scientists who sought definitive proof.

That was their prerogative.

But a regulatory agency cannot wait indefinitely for more study.

BURDEN OF PROOF WAS ON MANUFACTURER

For here is the crucial fact: The burden of proof was not on FDA to prove vitamin K_3 was unsafe. The burden of proof rested exactly to the contrary—that is, on the manufacturers to prove it was safe.

How could they prove it was safe if article after article contended it was potentially or actually harmful?

And, how could so much resistance within FDA be justified when the only pediatrician in the agency stated emphatically—over a year ago—that the medical literature contained adequate warning of hazard?

SENATOR HILL'S COMMENTS IN 1958

In the legislative history of the enactment of the law, we find the report by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as presented by its distinguished chairman, Senator Hill, on August 18, 1958. In reporting the amended version of H.R. 13254, 85th Congress, Senator Hill stated on page 6:

> Safety requires proof of a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from the proposed use of an additive.

He added:

> The safety of a given additive involves informed judgments based on educated estimates by scientists and experts of the anticipated ingestion of an additive by man and animals under likely patterns of use.

A WARNING IN 1959

But, if we look at the "educated estimates" of scientists, we see that their estimates ran precisely in the direction against use of Menadione, particularly at high dosages.

In Pediatrics, 23: 553, 1959, I repeat, 1959, J. F. Lucey and R. G. Dolan wrote:

> The assumption has been made that this is a harmless prenatal vitamin. It is being widely and needlessly used. This certainly does not seem wise.

That was 3 years—or, one might say, three times 4¼ million baby births—ago.

NINDB REPORT 4 MONTHS AGO

Here, however, is another crucial point. In December 1962 the National Neurological Institute prepared for the House Committee on Appropriations an 84-page report, describing the perinatal collaborative research project. The report is formally titled, "Report on a Collaborative Project for the Study of Cerebral Palsy. Mental Retardation, and Other Neurological and Sensory Disorders of Childhood." This is what the report states on page 26:

> In the last few years, it has become a practice to add Menadione to prenatal supplements, in dosages of 1–3 mg. daily. This dosage exceeds several fold that considered to be safe for the newborn, and since it is taken daily for many months by pregnant women, the question arises as to whether the Menadione taken by the mother is a factor in the hyperbilirubinemia or jaundice of her offspring.

The report goes on to say:

> The approach to the resolution of this question requires an adequately controlled clinical study.

On March 27, 1963, Dr. Richard L. Masland, Director of the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness wrote, in response to my request:

> In one of our collaborating institutions, a controlled study of the effect of Vitamin K in pregnancy already is underway. We consider this type of investigation to be one of the important potential areas of contribution of the collaborative project.

He was referring, of course, to the perinatal collaborative research project, the greatest in the world, I may add.

I am delighted this additional study is underway. But, the Federal regulatory process should not have to wait for study after study, particularly when the studies should have been made in the first place before the temporary petition was submitted by the manufacturers and allowed by FDA.

The question is: in the future, will FDA resolve reasonable doubts in favor of the public, including unborn babies?

The President of the United States has launched the greatest program in history to protect unborn babies. And I want FDA to become a real, operating part of that program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, as appendix A, certain additional comments from the medical literature as regards Menadione.

There being no objection, appendix A was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APPENDIX A

[Reprinted from Pediatrics, vol. 28, No. 3 September 1961]

VITAMIN K COMPOUNDS AND THE WATER-SOLUBLE ANALOGS—USE IN THERAPY AND PROPHYLAXIS IN PEDIATRICS

The present report concerns the nature and functions of natural vitamin K compounds and of some synthetic naphthoquinone derivatives, referred to as vitamin K analogs. The report emphasizes the use of these compounds in pediatrics, especially for prevention and treatment of hemorrhagic disease of the newborn. The demonstration that water-soluble analogs of vitamin K may be toxic for the newborn infant makes it imperative that these substances be used judiciously.

However, it seems impossible as yet to specify a maternal dose that will be both effective and safe for the newborn infant. It is not yet possible to specify a dose and route of administration of vitamin K for the woman in labor that will provide effective and safe prophylaxis for the infant.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

For reasons mentioned, it is recommended that vitamin K prophylaxis be administered to the infant after birth rather than prenatally through administration to the mother.

[From Pediatrics, June 1962]

HYPERBILIRUBINEMIA OF THE NEWBORN AND PRENATAL ADMINISTRATION OF VITAMINS

To the Editor:

It is now admitted that hyperbilirubinemia suffices to produce kernicterus in the neonate. Therefore, the prophylaxis of kernicterus parallels that of hyperbilirubinemia. Any factor thought to favor or induce hyperbilirubinemia commands full investigation. Among the different pharmacologic agents responsible for the production of hyperbilirubinemia, the administration of large doses of vitamin K or its precursors to the newborn has been incriminated in many instances.

Recently, I have come across two cases in which the ingestion by the mother of a multivitamin preparation containing 0.5 milligrams of vitamin K daily up to the morning of delivery was followed by the development of hyperbilirubinemia high enough in one case to necessitate two exchange transfusions.

RAYMOND G. D'ADESKY, M.D.
MARQUETTE, MICH.

(Editorial comment: Implicit in Dr. d'Adesky's letter is the common problem of identifying and assessing any single cause of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is to ascertain in a given infant that any one of several factors, especially the iatrogenic, is not responsible. The problem is aggravated by nagging doubts as to whether all potential factors are yet identified.)

[From American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mar. 15, 1963]

ARTICLE BY MIRIAM G. WILSON, M.D., ON "THE EFFECT OF MATERNAL MEDICATIONS UPON THE FETUS AND THE NEWBORN INFANT"

(By Miriam G. Wilson, M.D., Department of Pediatrics, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Until recently, fetal effects of maternal medications have been studied primarily in relationship to congenital anomalies. Although teratogenic or potentially teratogenic effects continue to be of interest, increasing attention is being given to other fetal alterations showing administration of medication to the mother. Stimulating such study has been the relatively recent evidence that the placenta is not an effective barrier between the maternal and the fetal circulations. Substances found in the mother's blood, including proteins of large molecular size and red blood cells, may be transferred to the fetus. Whether or not placental transfer is of clinical significance for the infant needs to be determined for many different medications.

Another reason why maternal medications are being more carefully evaluated is that as fetal and neonatal physiological processes have become better understood, neonatal drug metabolism is found to be quite complex. The relationship of kernicterus and hyperbilirubinemia has encouraged investigation of the metabolism of many substances in addition to bilirubin. These studies have yielded information about the participating enzyme systems and individual variation in drug detoxification and excretion among infants of different ages. Drug metabolism may be a greater problem in the newborn infant because of drug competition for enzyme systems that are also very likely immature and inefficient. Further complicating the problem of neonatal drug metabolism, many new medications used in the management of pregnant women have become available, particularly tranquilizers, antihypertensives, diuretics, synthetic narcotics, and antibacterial agents. The effect of these substances on the fetus is not well known. Many drugs, harmless for the pregnant woman, may have unforeseen and undesirable effects on the fetus. In addition to the medications used for obstetrical conditions, a large number of drugs have contributed to the improved medical management of seriously or chronically ill pregnant women. More of these women, consequently, are now able to be delivered of viable infants, with medical complications, in some instances, attributed to maternal drug therapy. The important social problem of narcotic addiction, which does not spare the young pregnant woman, has also contributed to perinatal morbidity and mortality.

Some of the reasons for the increasing attention to fetal effects of maternal medication have been reviewed. Since the placenta is known to be an ineffective barrier between the maternal and fetal circulations, any drug dangerous to the infant may be considered potentially dangerous to the fetus when given to the mother. Certain specific medications known or suspected to show fetal or neonatal effects will be discussed.

SYNTHETIC VITAMIN K, NAPHTHALENE, AND OTHER DRUGS CAUSING HEMOLYSIS

Certain drugs are associated with increased jaundice and hyperbilirubinemia in the newborn infant, thus exposing him to an increased risk of kernicterus. Synthetic analogs of vitamin K, which contain the radical naphthoquinone, have resulted in neonatal hyperbilirubinemia when administered in large amounts. Menaphthone dipotassium bisulfate, a synthetic vitamin K preparation used in England, has not resulted in hyperbilirubinemia in premature infants, when given in total doses of 60 milligrams during the first 48 hours of life. The danger of synthetic vitamin K, when given to the mother before delivery, was not appreciated until Lucey and Dolan noticed in their hospital morbidity review an unusually high incidence of exchange transfusions in premature infants. Further review of the cases disclosed that certain mothers, just before delivery, had received menadione sodium bisulfite in high parenteral doses in the range of 70 milligrams. A disproportionately high number of their newborn infants had serum bilirubin levels above 20 milligrams percent, followed by exchange transfusions in almost all instances.

Hyperbilirubinemia following the administration of synthetic vitamin K is probably due primarily to increased red blood cell hemolysis. The manner in which hemolysis is produced in newborn infants is very similar to that seen in individuals whose red blood cells are genetically susceptible to hemolysis by fava beans and certain drugs. Hemolytic anemia in such susceptible individuals may follow exposure to naphthalene, which is similar in chemical structure to synthetic vitamin K, and to drugs such as primaquine, nitrofurantoin, phenylhydrazine sulfonamides, and other aniline derivatives. The extreme sensitivity of certain newborn infants to naphthalene is evident from some of the dramatic cases reported. For example, hemolytic anemia occurred in the newborn infant of a mother who ate mothballs during pregnancy to satisfy an inordinate craving for flavor. Another newborn infant had acute hemolytic anemia following the use of diapers that had been stored in mothballs.

The red blood cells of individuals susceptible to hemolysis from exposure to chemical agents appear to be genetically abnormal in that they are deficient in certain enzymes, such as glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase, which in turn maintains glutathione contained within the red blood cell in a reduced state. Reduced glutathione, in turn, protects the cellular hemoglobin from toxic effects by various drugs. Zinkham and Childs have observed that neonatal red blood cells incubated with vitamin K analogs show decreased glutathione and subsequent hemolysis. Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia from synthetic vitamin K, as well as from the enhanced sensitivity of the genetically predisposed individual, may be due to a glutathione instability of the red blood cells.

The dangerous ill effects observed when synthetic vitamin K preparations are given to newborn infants probably depend on cumulative effects. In one study, hyperbilirubinemia was not observed when as large an amount as 25 milligrams of vitamin K_1 was given intravenously the first day, but when the same total amount was given orally in five divided doses at 3-hour intervals, hyperbilirubinemia was found. Studies have not shown the hemoglobin to be decreased proportionately with the degree of hyperbilirubinemia. It has been suggested that the usual laboratory measurement of hemoglobin will not be affected unless the bilirubinemia is marked.

Some evidence suggests, in addition, that vitamin K analogs are hepatotoxic, especially in "sensitive" indviduals, including premature infants as well as patients with hepatitis. Hepatic damage has been observed in dogs given menadione sodium bisulfite in large doses (15 to 40 milligrams per kilogram per day for 15 days). Following synthetic vitamin K administration, serum bilirubin values have increased in patients with early hepatitis. As a further complication, vitamin K analogs may be partially excreted as glucuronides and, therefore, compete with bilirubin for the glucuronyl transferase hepatic enzyme system. Synthetic vitamin K substances, therefore, may produce hyperbilirubinemia in the newborn infant in at least two and possibly three ways.

[From Pediatric Herald, vol. No. 9, November 1962]

DRUG TOXICITY IN NEONATE IS KEY TO SUSPICION OF FETAL RISK

CHICAGO.—Drug toxicity in the neonatal period often provides a good index of suspicion of fetal risk, physicians were told here during a discussion of placental transfer of noxious agents.

Addressing the annual session of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Dr. Sidney Q. Cohlan, associate professor of pediatrics at New York University School of Medicine, said a painful awareness has recently developed that the fetus and newborn infant may respond very differently, sometimes with calamitous results, to the rapidly proliferating therapeutic agents.

EFFECT OF DRUGS

In a review of drugs that may induce morbidity in the fetus, he said fetal toxicity, by and large, parallels the known side effects in the newborn and mother. After discussing thalidomide, he made these comments on other specific agents:

Vitamin K's disputed role in the prevention of hemorrhagic disease of the newborn makes its routine prenatal administration open to question. "Certainly where the advent of prematurity is a possibility, prenatal use of vitamin K is a potential hazard."

OTHER DRUGS: COLDAID AND PRN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us turn briefly to the other two drugs I mentioned at the outset.

With regard to Coldaid, the Food and Drug Administration had this to say in its public statement of March 21, 1963.

> Coldaid: This is an antihistamine preparation for the common cold. It was not regarded as a new drug in the reduced dosage in which it is being distributed until quite recently.
>
> The firm has been advised that it may not be distributed without a new drug application for the symptoms of the common cold.

It was Dr. Nestor who so "advised" the firm, as of March 8, 1963.

> The company had, in effect, marketed Coldaid at one dosage—without a new drug application; it had then come in with a new drug application so as to market it at a higher dosage. Under the circumstances, Dr. Nestor did not see how the original, uncleared, drug dosage could be allowed on the market while review was being made of a brand new application at a higher dosage.

The company has now withdrawn Coldaid, albeit "under vigorous protest."

I shall have more to say in the future about this matter of: (a) appearance of drugs on the market which do not receive the clearance of new drug applications.

(b) the inadequate procedure within FDA to prevent such marketing in the first place or to take prompt remedial action, once it is noted.

The issue of what is or is not a "new drug" is often exceedingly difficult and complex. A private decision may and often is made in perfect good faith that a drug is not a new drug; that, however, is not the paramount issue. The issue is: the establishment of a sound Federal system which will minimize possible hazard to the public.

I turn now to PRN—the trade name for Phenyltoloxamine. Of this product, FDA stated on March 21:

> Dr. Nestor asserts that one drug, PRN, was allowed on the market without the necessary chronic toxicity studies. Animal studies with the drug on dogs were regarded as adequate by our Division of Pharmacology and Bureau of Medicine. As an extra precaution, long-term rat studies were requested. This drug has not been distributed since 1961. It was discontinued because it was not profitable. No evidence that we have seen calls into question the original judgment on the drug.

Here are the real facts, as information reaches me:

(a) The original new drug application for PRN was made effective in 1957 with the understanding and condition that the company perform certain long-term chronic toxicity studies in rats and report the results to FDA.

The firm never sent these studies in until Dr. Nestor demanded them, some months ago. When the studies were received, the data raised considerable doubt as to whether the long-term toxicity testing established safety.

(b) Whether a drug is profitable or is being "pushed" by a company at any given time is hardly the question which should be of determinative interest to FDA. What should be of interest was that the company's new drug application was still effective. That was the crucial fact; it was so crucial that: (a) the company owning PRN authorized another company to use its files so as to remarket the drug; and (b) Dr. Nestor has strong doubts over some 25 new drug applications which also contain the same chemical ingredient, but at lower dosages. All of these new drug applications are now effective; the prescription and nonprescription drugs are now on the market. The whole files of these related new drug applications must now be reviewed, in the light of doubt over PRN.

SAFETY OF SERIES OF DRUGS MAY COLLAPSE LIKE "HOUSE OF CARDS"

I emphasize this last point. FDA approval of one drug may and does often serve as the foundation for approval of a whole series of drugs. If the safety of the first drug comes under a "medical cloud," so to speak, the other drugs' "evidence of safety" may also come under the same cloud.

I do not attempt to judge whether this or any other drug is safe or unsafe. I have merely described the doubts in the minds of medical and pharmacological officers. The fact that proof of safety does not exist does not, of course, mean that proof of harm exists.

But it can happen and has happened that a group of drugs, once thought "safe," collapses like a "house of cards," when the "foundation drug," so to speak, on which all others were based, is recognized as unsafe.

Unfortunately, I may add, the Food and Drug Administration does not have a satisfactory cross-indexing system as regards the thousands of drugs and chemical entities, reflected in new drug applications.

FDA's admittedly awesome burden becomes even more burdensome because it has not equipped itself with the modern means, electronic data processing equipment, to handle its staggering load.

SUBCOMMITTEE'S FUTURE PROCEDURE

I shall not at this time attempt to detail a number of other serious aspects on individual drugs.

I shall merely say that the subcommittee will continue to proceed in an orderly fashion to get the facts and in fairness to all concerned.

I am inviting FDA's written reactions in as much detail as it wishes to express—to the criticisms made in the March 20, and for that matter in the March 21 hearings.

These written reactions will be studied in the light of facts to be gained from direct study of FDA files by the subcommittee's own staff.

I am content to let the facts—or lack of facts—in FDA's full files speak for themselves, adding only such evaluation as is necessary to provide a summarized but rounded picture. This subcommittee has always "done its homework." We prepare carefully. I have stated nothing in my public or private comments which is not backed up by solid medical documentation.

The subcommittee now confronts so many "leads" that it cannot reschedule public hearings until after the additional facts have been traced on which to base the soundest possible hearings.

It had been my hope to hold additional hearings on April 11. That is not feasible if full justice is to be done to the enormous amount of factual material involved. The subcommittee has, it should be noted, many other important obligations.

On this particular subject, we will want to hear from the American Medical Association and possibly other witnesses, either before or after official Health, Education, and Welfare Department testimony. A date for resumption of the hearings will be announced at the earliest practicable opportunity.

I may say, in addition, that we have a very considerable residue of material which we would have taken up at the March 20–21 hearings, had time permitted. We have covered only a fraction of the material already in our files—material of the type which commands the attention of the Congress and of the Nation.

VIEWS ARE PRO-FDA AND PRODRUG THERAPY

These views are presented with the goal of serving the health of the American people.

The views are based on deep convictions which are prohealth, pro-FDA, and prodrug therapy. But my convictions require frankness; we dare not ignore persistent conditions which are harmful to the best interests of health, of FDA, and the cause of pharmaceutical science.

The only purpose in identifying these conditions is to effect improvements. My goal is to help build a stronger, sounder FDA, a stronger sounder program of drug research, drug testing, drug evaluation, drug communication.

My goal is a Federal medical community—of 10 or so health agencies—which work together instead of living in separate worlds, as they have to so considerable an extent heretofore.

SUMMARY

How may we summarize the situation at this point?

First. The Food and Drug Administration still has a long way to go toward scientific and administrative excellence within the Bureau of Medicine and between that and other bureaus.

Second. There are twin dangers ahead but at opposite poles. At one extreme is the danger, feared by the pharmaceutical industry and, indeed, by many outstanding medical researchers—the fear that a Federal bureaucracy will grip the over 2,000 clinical investigations underway and that drug progress may be stifled; there is the fear that excessive caution, a tendency to panic, may doom otherwise worthwhile drugs whose value outweighs their risk.

The opposite danger, feared by the strongest supporters of the drug amendments of 1962, is that the letter and spirit of the new regulations may become dead letters, because of what they fear will be a continued, permissive attitude on the part of the Food and Drug Administration.

Either a dead hand of bureaucracy or a dead law would be intolerable, so far as I am concerned.

I cannot reiterate too strongly that we need to maintain a sense of perspective, a sense of balance, on drugs.

Fortunately, within the Food and Drug Administration there are some signs that neither of the above extremes will take place. I welcome such signs.

Third. The Food and Drug Administration will not make satisfactory progress toward excellence until it realistically recognizes its shortcomings of the past.

We must be assured that the blunders of the past are not repeated in the future. When I say "blunders," I refer to the tragic, inept handling of drugs such as Marsalid, MER/29, Altafur, and so forth, which took an awful toll in human suffering. The subcommittee is now publishing the chronologies of the Food and Drug Administration of actions on these drugs.

NEW YORK POST EDITORIAL COMMENDS SENATE DRUG HEARINGS

Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues will be interested in an editorial which appeared in the Monday, March 25, 1963, issue of the New York Post. The editorial commended the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee hearings. It concluded with the sound suggestion to the Nation "This is no time to take a sleeping pill."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMPHREY'S DRUG HEARING

The Senate could not have a more knowledgeable man heading an investigation of drug marketing safeguards than HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. A pharmacist himself before he turned to politics, HUMPHREY is in a uniquely informed position to evaluate the testimony being presented before his subcommittee.

In one of the developments, the FDA is challenging the testimony of its medical officer, Dr. John O. Nestor, who said it has overruled expert medical opinion and permitted the sale of potentially dangerous drugs.

HUMPHREY says he is unimpressed by the denials. The FDA will have a chance to defend itself at a public hearing in the near future when Commissioner Larrick and his associates will be subjected to cross-examination.

The Kefauver-Harris drug-reform bill, enacted by Congress last year, is a good measure, but its effectiveness depends on the way it is administered by the FDA. Without an infusion of new blood, Senators KEFAUVER and DOUGLAS warned at the time, it was doubtful the FDA would apply the new regulations forcefully.

The main purpose of the HUMPHREY hearings is to revitalize the FDA by replacing tired old bureaucrats with scientist-administrators. It will only be achieved if the public pays attention.

This is no time to take a sleeping pill.

SUBCOMMITTEE'S FAIRNESS TO DRUG COMPANIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make one additional point. It will be noted that in all of my prepared statements, I have identified drugs only by the name of the drug itself, and not by the name of the company.

Whenever one of these drug names is mentioned, however, I suppose that it is inevitable that the press will call to identify which company produces the particular drug. When we have been asked that question, we have suggested the names of standard medical publications where the information can be found, or have suggested that inquirers contact the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, or other authoritative sources, or, if a press service urgently needed the information, we have provided the data directly.

In the hearings on March 20 and 21, it was, likewise, almost inevitable that the names of individual drug companies came out in the back-and-forth discussion.

Throughout this entire effort, however, we have endeavored to be absolutely fair. If any company has any reason to question the facts or policy assertions or conclusions expressed in the course of the subcommittee's work, I want to invite that company to file a statement with the subcommittee. We will then consider how to handle the matter in the fairest way possible. If it turns out that the subcommittee's record should be amended or supplemented in any way, shape, or form, we will be glad to do so.

I do not want the hearings or the testimony taken there to do any injustice. I want it clearly understood that if, perchance, any witness makes a statement which later does not turn out to be creditable or which cannot be verified, I want the record at that point amended so that the pharmaceutical manufacturer or the company which manufactured the drug will be given every opportunity in the record, as early as possible, to refute erroneous testimony. It is not the desire of the subcommittee chairman or of the subcommittee to do any injury whatsoever to any legitimate manufacturer or to any doctor or to any scientist or, indeed, to the Food and Drug Administration. We would like every company to recognize that our continued interest is in advancing the cause of pharmaceutical science.

Time and again I have been pleased to state that the American pharmaceutical industry is second to none in the world in its high standards; it is second to none, in comparison with foreign drug industries, in its contributions to research; it is second to none in its philanthropic efforts; it is second to none in the public services it has rendered.

At this point I note that the ship SS *Hope* has been supplied with literally hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of drugs, free of charge, from the American pharmaceutical manufacturers themselves, a fine organization representing some of the best companies in America. Dr. Austin Smith, who represents the pharmaceutical manufacturers, is considered to be one of the outstanding men in his profession. He is a very competent scientist, and is a man of the highest integrity.

The pharmaceutical industry faces problems which I have publicly identified and will continue to identify. The industry is entitled to fair play and respect, as is every American citizen or company; and that is precisely what we have been pleased to accord it, and will continue to accord it.

I may say that I would be particularly interested in reasonable treatment to the smaller drug enterprises which, in this highly competitive industry, inevitably face particularly difficult problems.

The subcommittee's focus, in any event, is on Federal activities. We are the Committee on Government Operations, and our stress is on what our U.S. agencies do or do not do, have done or have not done.

I repeat that I am going to pursue this inquiry without fear or favor, because we are dealing with a subject which affects the life, the well-being, the happiness, and the health of every American citizen; and I think it is the sworn duty of a Member of Congress to pursue his responsibilities and obligations with fairness, but with fearlessness; with prudence, to be sure; but also with a sense of public dedication. I shall attempt to live up to this standard.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HART. There is no doubt in the mind of any of us, Mr. President, that that is precisely the course which the hearings under the leadership of the Senator from Minnesota will follow; and that is consistent with his course for many years in the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I continue with my statement:

Fourth. The Food and Drug Administration needs frankness from its friends; but it also needs their support for adequate resources. The Food and Drug Administration must have more manpower, better salaries for manpower, better space, better equipment.

It would be cruel and unfair to ignore the enormous handicaps under which the Food and Drug Administration has labored. In many respects, the Bureaus of the Food and Drug Administration have done a remarkable job, considering the limitations imposed upon them. But, in other respects—including those I have enumerated—the Food and Drug Administration has made its own problems, or has failed to deal with its own problems.

Fifth. The Food and Drug Administration must have a topnotch Director of the Bureau of Medicine, and soon. A vacancy in so crucial a position for a period of as long as 1 year is indefensible. The Bureau has inevitably drifted like a ship without a rudder. The Commissioner had sought to fill the vacancy; but apparently the matter has been out of his hands.

Sixth. The Food and Drug Administration will never be able to do its job adequately until it is able to call on, and does call on, the resources of the U.S. Government and of the professional community. It has yet to do so. Other agencies have given it little attention. The U.S. Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration have acted like an indifferent married couple; they know they should "stay married," but they prefer to observe the union with gestures, instead of with real meaning.

As to private medical science, the Food and Drug Administration is beginning now, fortunately, to call on more private consultants, but still on a relatively spasmodic, ad hoc basis.

Seventh. The future of the Food and Drug Administration depends on this agency's personnel—their caliber, their morale, their leadership. It is they who will determine whether the agency will achieve true excellence.

The day must come when the existing nucleus of the Food and Drug Administration, of outstanding scientists, of dedicated inspectors, and of other personnel will modernize their own agency.

The day must come when the personnel of the Food and Drug Administration enjoy a reputation second to none in the esteem of the American people. This Nation is already deeply in the debt of Food and Drug Administration for many faithful services. The problem now is to extend this record into the other areas where even the agency's strongest partisan should be willing to concede the need for improvement.

A NEW HONOR TO COMMISSIONER LARRICK

Next month, at its annual meeting, in Bal Harbour, Fla., the American Pharmaceutical Association will bestow honorary membership upon Commissioner George Larrick.

Last year, it was my pleasure to receive the same honor, along with Sir Hugh Linstead, president of the International Pharmaceutical Federation.

I congratulate Commissioner Larrick upon this latest in a series of honors during his long career.

The Federal issues which I have raised and which I will continue to raise are issues of fact and policy. They are not, and never have been, issues of personalities.

The pharmacists, the M.D.'s, the Ph. D.'s, and other professionals who have written to me enthusiastically from all parts of the Nation have demonstrated their awareness of my desire to advance in a fair and objective manner the best interest of the healing arts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD: (a) An additional statement which I have prepared in regard to a goal I have long fought for—a national drug information clearinghouse. I include an excellent Washington Post editorial on this subject. (b) One of innumerable letters received from overseas—this one from Prof. Dr. W. Kroll, of the Federal Chamber of German Physicians, responding to my inquiry as regards collection of information on adverse reactions. (c) Finally, an article published in the distinguished periodical, the Reporter, of March 28, 1963. The article was written by one of the most knowledgeable journalists in the land on this subject—Mr. Morton Mintz. It was Mr. Mintz' story on Dr. Frances Kelsey and thalidomide, as published in the Washington Post, which triggered an incredibly beneficial chain reaction for protection of the public health. Mr. Mintz has subsequently and deservedly received the Heywood Broun and George Polk Awards for his reportorial feats.

There being no objection, the statement, the letter, and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE IN PROTECTING THE PUBLIC HEALTH: PROPOSAL FOR A CENTRALIZED DRUG-DATA INFORMATION SYSTEM

On Thursday, March 21, the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations heard important testimony on, among other topics, the critical need for a centralized system of drug information.

Coincidentally, that very morning, I received an advance copy of a welcome statement which was to be delivered that day before the National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services.

The statement was prepared by F. Ellis Kelsey, Ph. D., Special Assistant for Science Information to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Ellis Kelsey is the husband of Dr. Frances Kelsey, the medical officer of the Food and Drug Administration who has been honored for her success in preventing the commercial introduction of thalidomide into the United States.

In his statement, Dr. Ellis Kelsey proposed the establishment of a National Drug Information Clearinghouse.

The full text of Dr. Kelsey's excellent speech will be printed within the subcommittee hearing record, volume III.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ELLIS KELSEY

I should like to congratulate Ellis Kelsey for his vision and enterprise.

It will be recalled that it was he who had arranged, on behalf of the Surgeon General, Dr. Terry, the successful Conference on Health Communications, held at Airlie, Va., in November 1962.

I had personally urged the calling of such a conference in a public statement [1] 6 months earlier on May 14, 1962.

---

[1] Release, Senate, May 4, 1962, "An Action Program for Strengthening Medical Information and Communication."

OPPORTUNITY CONFRONTING SURGEON GENERAL

It is gratifying to note that Surgeon General Terry is moving ahead expeditiously in this field of better communication.

The Surgeon General confronts many other problems and challenges. We, of the Congress and of the Nation, expect a great deal of him.

But, I believe that if he and his staff continue to spearhead this particular drive, we will all have great reason to be proud of the results which will accrue to medical and pharmaceutical science.

PROBLEMS OF A CLEARINGHOUSE

Bringing Dr. Kelsey's proposal into reality will require men, money, material, and time.

A "clearinghouse" implies cooperative arrangements between a wide variety of sources, both as to input and output. These sources would have to include, for example, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the National Library of Medicine, the Veterans' Administration and other agencies, as well as a wide variety of nongovernmental sources—the American Medical Association, specialty medical organizations, pharmaceutical companies (to the extent they feel it feasible, without endangering their proprietary rights) the American Pharmaceutical Association, and others.

The time to proceed on this effort is now. Too much time has already needlessly elapsed. Much of that time was lost, speaking very frankly, because the leading Federal agencies were, for so long, relatively indifferent to the problem.

The medical research agencies contended this was "not a research function"; the medical care agencies contended it was "not a service function"; most agencies looked to private efforts; private sources looked to supplemental Government efforts.

Month after month, year after year, I personally reiterated to all of them—in statements in committee, on the Senate floor, in the press and before public assemblies—the absolute importance of affirmative action.

What does the record show?

Who actually did what and when?

Who did not do what and when?

Let us see a few of the principal actions, step by step, over the past 2 years.

A 2-YEAR CHRONOLOGY 1961–63

June 20, 1961, I testify before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the need for centralized abstracting-indexing on all drugs.[2]

I point out that only the National Heart Institute is centrally abstract indexing its drug literature. I point out further the duplication and waste which occur when, entirely independently, other institutes or other sources later scan the very same journals for information on similar or other drugs.

March 20, 1962, I write to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pointing out that there is still no comprehensive, departmentwide information system.[3]

August 1962, at hearings of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee the Director of the National Institutes of Health concedes that only three of the then seven categorical institutes have a substantial drug information program. NIH reveals no plans as regards the other four institutes, nor plans for an overall interinstitute system, such as I had urged.

August 15, 1962, Senate Reorganization Subcommittee gathers information on the operation of Mediphone, Inc. For 4 months this service had provided 24-hour-a-day, physician-to-physician information on any of 9,000 drugs—on contraindications, toxicity, side effects, etc.[4]

September 21, 1962, the Director of the National Institutes of Health announces at our hearings the beginning of a more comprehensive drug information program.[5]

November 5–8, 1962, Surgeon General's Conference on Health Communication takes place, but fails to recommend a "drug information management system," such as was mentioned in a preconference working document.[6] The conference does urge "cooperation of all groups, governmental and nongovernmental, concerned with drug information" to establish a "worldwide drug information system." [7]

January 10, 1963, a panel on information of the President's Science Advisory Committee issues a comprehensive report.[8] It suggests that each NIH institute "consider establishing what would amount to a very elaborate specialized information center with services available to the entire biomedical community." This would include drug and nondrug areas and is precisely what I have been recommending for 2 years.

January 23, 1963, a specialized panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee comments on the great potentialities of computers in the life sciences. It states that "new information technologies would appear ideally suited to prompt recording, analyzing and reporting of any untoward effects" from drugs.[9]

March 16, 1963, Senate Reorganization Subcommittee releases [10] report, "The Nature and Magnitude of Drug Literature." The report, prepared by the National Library of Medicine at the subcommittee's request, estimates that 200,000 original papers in the pharmaceutical literature are prepared annually and describes other problems of elusive drug information.

March 20, 21, 1963, witnesses testify at Reorganization Subcommittee hearings on imperative necessity for improvement in drug information and evaluation resources.[11] The former head of Mediphone estimates that—for $200,000—he could provide its type of service on a contract basis to Federal agencies and the Nation's scientific community. He reports, however, virtually no previous interest in Mediphone on the part of any agency but the Veterans' Administration.

A LARGER SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS

This is where we now stand. Obviously, we still have a long way to go. But, let's not lose any more time. Let representatives of the principal drug information sources—the generators, packagers and users—work out together a common program.

And, let them plan it, as Dr. Kelsey rightly urged, as a part of a much larger, i.e. drug and nondrug health clearinghouse system.

To that I may add, let the clearinghouse for health sciences be recognized as an integral part of an overall system for all the sciences—the physical, social, mathematic, engineering and life sciences.

This is no idle dream. The fact is that parts of an "all-science" system already exist and are already functioning, but on relatively uncoordinated, disuniform basis. I refer to:

The very modern NASA system.

The system of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The system of the Armed Services Technical Information Agency.

The Science Information Exchange, etc.

The present patchwork should be transformed into a rational "system of systems," such as this subcommittee—its members and staff—have long proposed.

GREAT POTENTIAL ON USEFUL DRUGS

I predict that there will be a drug information clearinghouse and that it will be a great boon to medicine and to pharmaceutical science.

It should be pointed out, too, that in much of the advance thinking about a clearinghouse, its value has been mentioned as a means of calling attention to adverse drug reactions. The fact of the matter is, however, that the clearinghouse could serve for just the opposite objective also. It could and would call prompt attention to the beneficial effects of the vast number of efficacious and safe drugs.

And, it would provide varied information for the widest variety of audiences—for basic and applied researchers, administrators, drug companies, practitioners, pharmacists, other members of the healing arts, etc.

The clearinghouse could help further raise the high and well-justified confidence of the American people in the healing arts, including pharmaceutical science.

The type of dedication which Ellis Kelsey has evidenced should be paralleled by dedication on the part of all sources whose cooperation will be so vitally necessary. Exactly where the clearinghouse or system of clearinghouses will be established, under whose auspices, whose financing, whose "language" system, etc.—are important but hardly insoluble problems. Let us get on with the task.

[From The Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 28, 1963]

Aid to Health

The creation of a national drug information clearinghouse is a necessity if the public is to be given ample protection in this age of rapid development of new medicines. Many agencies are now assembling information about new and old drugs, but often one does not know what the others are doing. It is said that the National Library of Medicine collects drug information from 2,200 medical journals, but 1,800 other medical journals are not screened for this purpose. The mountains of information available in many different places will be of only limited service until it can be brought together in one place and systematically classified.

Perhaps the greatest use of the proposed clearinghouse will be made by the Food and Drug Administration. With its extended authority to pass on the efficacy as well as the safety of drugs, the Food and Drug Administration would doubtless have to create a drug information center of its own if one were not otherwise available. In addition the center should be of enormous value to the National Institutes of Health, the American Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the drug-manufacturing companies and innumerable health agencies.

The net effect should be to hasten the detection of any harmful effects of drugs still in the experimental stage. On the other hand, the center could serve to speed the dissemination of information about new, safe and highly efficacious drugs. The large potential of the proposed clearinghouse has been fully explored in the hearings conducted by Senator HUMPHREY. No one appears to be in opposition. It remains for Congress to provide the funds, admittedly a sizable sum, to make this essential aid to health a reality.

---

[2] Reprinted in Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, hearings on "Inter-Agency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 1, p. 140.

[3] Ibid., pp. 141–143.

[4] "Inter-Agency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 2, pp. 591–604.

[5] Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, "Inter-Agency Coordination of Information," pt. I, pp. 115 ff.

[6] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Surgeon General's Conference on Health Communications," February 1963, p. 24.

[7] Ibid, p. 13.

[8] President's Science Advisory Committee, "Science, Government, and Information," The White House, p. 49.

[9] President's Science Advisory Committee, Life Sciences Panel, "Some New Technologies and Their Promise for the Life Sciences," The White House, p. 5.

[10] Release, House, Mar. 5, 1963.

[11] "Interagency Coordination of Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 3 (to be printed).

ARZNEIMITTELKOMMISSION DER
DEUTSCHEN ÄRZ TESCHAFT,
Göttingen, March 26, 1963.

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, U.S. Senate International Health Study, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY. The president of the Bundesärztekammer, Dr. Fromm, has sent us your letter of February 13 concerning the system of collecting informations on adverse effects of drugs and a warning service of the Federal Chamber of Physicians.

I have the honor to inform you, that the first steps to this system had already been done before the thalidomide tragedy had happened. It was after the spring meeting of the German Society of Internal Medicine in April 1961, that the drug committee of the Federal Chamber of Physicians published a proclamation asking all doctors to send any observation on adverse drug effects to the office of the drug committee. The publication of the proclamation has been repeated several times and is now going to be changed to a continuous publication in the journal "Ärztliche Mitteilungen" of the Federal Chamber of Physicians. At the same time we are now preparing a very simple form to be filled in by the doctors to make it as easy as possible for them to give the informations.

Since 1961 several warnings have been given to the doctors on serious side effects of drugs and in other cases we have urgently asked the manufacturers to give more detailed information on the side effects of certain drugs.

The activity of the drug committee in collecting information of side effects is now considerably intensified. Some time ago we have also contacted Dr. Norman DeNosaquo, secretary of the Section on Adverse Reactions of the Council on Drugs, Chicago, for exchange of informations. An exchange of informations is also being prepared with the members of the European Economic Community and will work as soon as in these countries a system of collecting informations and warning has been established.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Dr. DR. W. KOLL.

[From the Reporter, Mar. 28, 1963]

NEW DRUGS: IS GOVERNMENT SUPERVISION ADEQUATE?

(By Morton Mintz)

"The more we have examined the handling of the new drugs by the Food and Drug Administration," HUBERT H. HUMPHREY told the Senate last October, "the more we have been surprised, shocked and disappointed. Often, testing has been going on in a manner which should have sent shivers down the spine of the medical profession—drugs intended for use by victims of chronic disease—day after day, year after year—were released by FDA even before—I repeat—before—chronic toxicity tests had been completed on animals * * * shocking reports of injuries and deaths to test patients, as received by drug companies, have often gone unreported to FDA, or have been downgraded by skillfully contrived half-truths, or have been reported accurately to FDA, but virtually ignored. Drugs have been approved which FDA now admits should never have been approved. Drugs have been kept on the market long after FDA admits they should have been eliminated * * *."

Senator HUMPHREY made these disclosures on October 3, 1962, just as the Kefauver-Harris drug-reform bill was being enacted into law. Many of its provisions, such as the requirement that experimental drugs be properly tested on animals before being tested on human beings, go a long way toward correcting the drug abuses that have been making headlines since Senator KEFAUVER began his investigation of the drug industry 3 years ago. Under the new law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) can order a drug off the market instantly if there is evidence that it is an imminent hazard to the public health; drug companies must list the side effects of their products in their advertising; and a new drug must be proved effective as well as safe before it can be marketed. Furthermore, physicians must obtain the consent of patients before giving them experimental drugs, unless this is deemed not feasible or not in the patient's interest.

The FDA, moreover, has been given greater powers for factory inspection and quality control. In addition, tighter regulations for human testing proposed last summer by Anthony J. Celebrezze, the new Secretary of HEW, went into effect this February. These require that the FDA must be notified of all clinical (human) trials of new drugs, and that the FDA must be kept fully informed of what happens during testing. The clinical testing must be properly planned and executed by qualified investigators, and again must be based on adequate animal studies.

But the effectiveness of the new law and of the regulations depends greatly on the organization that exists to administer them. Senator HUMPHREY, the only licensed pharmacist in Congress, is beginning hearings on the FDA this month, but the Senate majority whip has already gathered enough evidence in the preliminary investigation by his Government Reorganization Subcommittee to cast grave doubts on the agency's use of the power it already had, let alone its ability to exercise more. And Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, far from being encouraged found in the belated issuance of the new HEW regulations "an unparalleled example of bureaucratic inertia." The fact is that the FDA could have issued them at any time since 1938.

That year marked the passage of the first significant drug-safety legislation since the FDA was established 56 years ago. It resulted from the disastrous carelessness of a manufacturer who the year before had marketed sulfanilamide in liquid form, using an automobile antifreeze as the solvent. More than a hundred people died. The 1938 law prohibited the sale of any new drug unless the FDA allowed an application for it to become effective. The FDA's decision was to be based on its evaluation of the animal and clinical testing reported by the manufacturer in his application. It was ruled that human testing was to be under the direction of an expert "qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety of drugs." The FDA, however, has never set standards for an "expert," on the debatable ground that to do so would interfere in the practice of medicine. Even if this premise could not be challenged, the fact is that clinical testing is sometimes performed by research scientists who are not physicians. The new HEW regulations, moreover, set higher standards for the initial clinical tests than for those which follow, and their adoption by the FDA would seem to imply that the FDA agrees that it had some rights to set standards without interfering in the practice of medicine. Though FDA Commissioner George P. Larrick has complained that he could not find a consensus on the definition of an "expert," he has never asked professional or industry groups to help him obtain agreement and arrive at workable definitions. Nor did the FDA regulate or require reports on drug testing on humans.

The FDA was concerned only with the testing done on drugs for which marketing applications were filed. Currently, the agency receives an average of 375 new-drug applications a year, but manufacturers have been testing four to five times as many without reporting them. In 1959 alone, manufacturers tested 1,900 new drugs on humans. Since the Second World War the drug industry has expanded tremendously, and 90 percent of today's prescriptions are for drugs that were unavailable 20 years ago. Meanwhile, qualified investigators are in increasingly short supply, and some manufacturers have decided that the mere possession of an M.D. or Ph. D. degree in basic medical science is sufficient for clinical testing. "Nobody knows," HUMPHREY told the Senate, "how many thousands of drugs have been tested, have caused harm, have been shelved, and never reported, never discussed * * * the most dangerous part of the iceberg has lain below the surface."

OF MICE AND MEN

Though the new regulations finally require that the FDA be informed hereafter on all clinical testing while it is in progress, its past performance in evaluating the relatively few medical-research reports it did get has not been reassuring. Even less reassuring has been its anesthetized response to various cries of alarm.

"We firmly deny," Commissioner Larrick told Senator KEFAUVER's subcommittee in June 1960, "that new drug applications have been allowed to become effective on the basis of inadequate laboratory and clinical investigation work." The 61-year-old Commissioner has been with the FDA for 40 years. In 1955, a year after he became head of the agency, a citizens advisory committee had found cause to urge the FDA to develop better methods for evaluating new drugs. In June 1960, Dr. Barbara Moulton, a former FDA medical officer, testified before the Kefauver subcommittee that the situation was "extremely dangerous," in October of the same year she presented extensive evidence to document her charge, and in September a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council called for remedial action "with the least possible delay."

In July 1961, Dr. Louis Lasagna of Johns Hopkins University gave the Kefauver subcommittee some insight into the quality of animal testing that sometimes preceded the clinical testing: "I have been approached to start human testing of a drug," he said, "with the only information available being the amount of drug necessary to kill 50 percent of mice receiving the drug in one intravenous dose."

There were warnings from the agency itself. In October 1961, an FDA statistician, drawing on 13 years' experience, said in a paper presented at a conference of FDA's top officials: "* * * the low quality of research data in NDA's (new-drug applications) is general and not isolated. Unfortunately for the medical officers, they must within short periods of time make decisions one way or another * * * they are forced to gamble; the information which they need to reduce almost to zero the risks of an incorrect decision too often is unavailable to them, because of weaknesses in research methods * * *."

But such criticism had little real impact on the FDA hierarchy or their superiors in HEW—until the scandal about the thalidomide sleeping pill. A number of details in that story, as brought out by Senator HUMPHREY's subcommittee, amply illustrate the shortcomings of FDA'S head-in-the-sand posture about drug testing.

Smith, Kline & French Laboratories of Philadelphia tested thalidomide in 1956–57, without any reported deformities resulting among 875 patients. Not having required that it be informed, the FDA knew nothing of this until March 1962. In September 1960, the William S. Merrell Co. of Cincinnati filed an application to market the sedative. It came out later that Merrell and three other subsidiaries of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., ultimately distributed 2.5 million thalidomide tablets to 1,267 physicians for experimental use.

About a month after Merrell had first applied to the FDA, it issued to its sales force a manual on how to present physicians with its clinical-testing program for Kevadon, its brand name for thalidomide. "You can assure your doctors that they need not report results if they don't want to," the manual stated, "but that we, naturally, would like to know of their results. Be sure to tell them that we may send them report forms or reminder letters, but these are strictly reminders, and they need not reply. Let them know the basic clinical research on Kevadon has been done.

"Don't get involved by selling a basic clinical research program instead of Kevadon," the manual continued. "Appeal to the doctor's ego—we think he is important enough to be selected as one of the first to use Kevadon in that section of the country. Don't forget that you are a salesman, a professional salesman."

Perhaps such an approach to testing helps explain why the former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. William S. Middleton, has found that "the desultory returns from over 1,200 physicians * * * could have no scientific significance or validity." "Yet," he added, "this formula for deriving new drug introduction and acceptance has obtained for many years." When the FDA finally investigated last summer, it discovered that only 276 of the 1,267 physicians had reported to Merrell in writing on their clinical trials, and further, that at least one-fifth had not signed the statement of investigative qualifications that FDA regulations required the manufacturers to obtain.

On November 29, 1961, a year after the company had filed its application with the FDA, Merrell learned from West Germany that thalidomide had been associated with birth deformities. The next morning it notified Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the FDA, who had been withholding approval of the drug. At that point, Commissioner Larrick could have issued a public warning—the very course recommended by Dr. Herman I. Ghinn, our deputy scientific attaché in Bonn, in a dispatch relayed to the FDA and HEW in January 1962. Larrick, however, chose to let the company handle the matter.

Why the FDA didn't undertake an immediate effort then to retrieve the drug puzzled Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, among others. He asked Commissioner Larrick during the preliminary investigation by HUMPHREY's subcommittee, what happened when Dr. Kelsey got the information.

JAVITS: "Then did you just talk to the company in general?"

LARRICK: "It was not conclusively proved at that stage."

JAVITS: "When was it?"

LARRICK: "There was strong circumstantial—there would be people who would give you an argument about it now . . . who would say that the problem here has been exaggerated."

Larrick admitted that the FDA could accomplish the retrieval of drugs more effectively than any company, but added that he was "not quarreling" with what Merrell did.

What Merrell did, according to its own report cited by HUMPHREY's subcommittee, was send a warning letter in early December, 1961, to its "active" thalidomide investigators, although the FDA was unaware that they represented only one-tenth of the physicians who had received the experimental tablets. Three months later, Merrell and its affiliates finally wrote all of them asking them to destroy or return the remaining supplies. "At the time," Commissioner Larrick said later, "I thought that was sufficient."

That it was not sufficient has become by now a familiar story. After reports published in mid-July of Dr. Kelsey's achievement in blocking the application of thalidomide, the FDA embarked on a crash program to ferret out the unsuspected numbers of tablets that had got into the hands of the public. A month later, the FDA, finding that substantial quantities were still at large, had to plead with the public to clean out medicine chests and flush all unidentified pills down the toilet. Nearly 21,000 persons in this country had obtained thalidomide from both foreign and domestic sources, and at least 9 women who took it during pregnancy bore babies without arms and legs.

DRUGS ON THE MARKET

Recently the FDA has decided that it does have a quarrel with Merrell, and it has asked the company to show cause why its method of distributing the thalidomide tablets should not be referred to the Justice Department for possible legal action. Thalidomide, at least, was never allowed to go on the market. Other drugs that had to be recalled were. One was Marsilid, and in its case the FDA displayed what can be called remarkable patience in dealing with its manufacturer, Hoffmann-La Roche of Nutley, N.J. Marsilid was first approved in 1955 for use, with limitations, in treating critical cases of tuberculosis. Later it was found to have effect as a psychic energizer, or "happiness pill," and the company applied for a supplemental new-drug application for its use in treating mental depression. But Marsilid also was associated with 246 known cases of hepatitis (liver damage), 53 of which resulted in death. At least 400,000 patients used it. Hoffmann-La Roche, it would seem from the account given HUMPHREY's subcommittee by the FDA, was rather casual in reporting some of the hazards of Marsilid. Although it received the first reports of deaths and injuries in connection with the drug in September 1957, it did not mention liver damage to the FDA until half a year later, in February 1958, when it asked permission to change the label. By the end of 1958, the adverse reports on a variety of side effects were mounting and the drug company asked for another supplementary new-drug application under which a brochure listing new restrictions on its use would accompany the drug. The FDA, in turn, suggested a strong warning to be printed in bold type on the label.

The strong warning was not put on, however, and during the next year the company continued to market the drug. Nonetheless, the FDA approved the supplemental new-drug application in January 1960. Seven months later, it renewed its request for the stricter warning label. Finally, in September 1960, its request was complied with, but the sale of Marsilid under a proper warning label was short-lived. It was withdrawn from the market the next January, because, as the FDA put it, "drugs with similar therapeutic usefulness but with greater safety were available."

But these drugs had been available and marketed since 1959. Moreover, the five Veterans' Administration hospitals that had tested Marsilid had discarded it much earlier, between December 1958, and June 1960, because of reports of "severe liver damage," "excessive toxicity" and—in a hospital system with more psychiatric patients than any other in the world—"limited usefulness."

Why did the FDA permit Marsilid to remain on sale until 1961? Larrick's explanation is that it was regarded as valuable in "near deathbed cases" but this was true only initially when it was used to treat tuberculosis, not mental depression.

Larrick has said that he is "proud" of the FDA's handling of Marsilid. Dr. Moulton, on the other hand, seemed prouder of the press when she testified about an earlier request to change the label. Marsilid's hazards, she said, "were well known in the Bureau of Medicine long before the newspapers began to carry reports on the subject. When this occurred there was prompt if not entirely effective action by FDA to revise the labeling. Prior to the newspaper publicity, however, we raised our voices in vain."

Another drug that had to be withdrawn from the market was MER/29, a Merrell product intended to reduce the amount of cholesterol in the blood, although the role of cholesterol in heart disease is controversial. Senator HUMPHREY has called the FDA's handling of the application for this drug "shocking * * * a sharp indictment of the FDA itself—its laxity, its tardiness in seeking to remove the drug from the market, its failure to protect the public interest."

The new drug application for MER/29 was filed in July 1959, and was assigned to a 32-year-old FDA physician who had only recently completed his residency in internal medicine. He was promptly contacted by Merrell's F. Joseph Murray. "The company was extremely anxious to get the drug on the market," the young man recalled. However, the report of the FDA pharmacologists on MER/29 was unfavorable. And, the physician said, he was aware that scientists at the National Institutes of Health were concerned about MER/29's effects. (Later, their research showed that in blocking the formation of cholesterol, MER/29 largely defeated its purpose by causing an abnormal accumulation in the blood vessels of a related fatty substance, desmosterol.) The FDA physician felt the MER/29 might be helpful in dealing with arteriosclerosis. Nonetheless, he repeatedly held back approval by judging the application incomplete because it failed "to report clinical studies in full details." But 22 days after he again made such a judgment, on April 19, 1960, FDA's young medical officer let MER/29 be marketed—before, according to Senator HUMPHREY, the "full details" were in, and even though he regarded its value as "theoretical." The new drug went on sale, not because its effectiveness against heart disease and arteriosclerosis had been established but "solely on the evidence of safety."

By September 1960, the FDA had so many disturbing reports about the effects of the drug—cataracts, baldness, changes in hair and skin color—that it asked Merrell to submit a supplemental NDA and to revise the label to warn against use of MER/29 in women of child-bearing age. Meanwhile the adverse reports continued to pour in. On November 16, 1961, FDA scientists recommended that the drug be withdrawn, but the FDA administrators did not suspend the application. For a total of 2 years the Merrell product, heavily advertised in medical journals, was profitably sold as a prescription drug and taken by more than 300,000 persons. Then in March 1962, by sheer accident, the FDA learned, as it reported to HUMPHREY's subcommittee that reassuring data in the NDA from tests on monkeys "had been falsified." The FDA investigation of this has been followed up by a Federal grand jury. In April, Merrell recalled the drug. In May, Larrick cited clinical evidence showing "that the drug was unsafe" and suspended the application. In August, the FDA admitted that the decision to allow marketing had been a mistake.

That decision was made 2 months before Larrick had told the Kefauver subcommittee that it "is extremely improbable" that falsified data would not arouse the FDA's suspicion, and "categorically" denied that the review of new-drug applications "may in some instances have been superficial." The criterion for release of a drug, he said, is whether "the good in saving lives and alleviating suffering clearly outweighs the hazards."

By a curious aspect of the FDA's decision-making machinery, approval of a new-drug application can be given by a medical officer "on his own initiative, without review by any of his colleagues," according to Dr. Moulton. And as Commissioner Larrick has testified, the medical officer's decision "represents an institutional decision that the drug is safe for use under the conditions and in the dosages prescribed in the labeling." But when a medical officer believed a drug to be unsafe and wanted to deny its approval, the situation was different. According to Dr. Moulton, he had to have "the unanimous support of the Chief of the New Drug Division, the Director of the Bureau of Medicine, the Commissioner, and usually also the Director of the Bureau of Enforcement and the General Counsel's office." The agency statistician described an FDA physician's plight quite well in the internal report already cited. "The medical officer," he said, "is in an untenable position because if he were to adopt the view that an application were incomplete unless the research supporting it were properly conducted, he would pass few applications. But this would result in a major shift in FDA policy, and have a far-reaching effect on a major industry. Clearly, a shift of this magnitude is not to be made by the medical officers."

In view of the medical officer's responsibilities, however, it seems strange, as Senator Humphrey points out, that the physician handling the NDA for MER/29 "never consulted with the National Institutes of Health before the drug went on the market. Nor did NIH initiate such consultation," although it "has been supporting considerable research on cholesterol-lowering substances."

This lack of communication between two branches within HEW particularly irritated Senator Humphrey, who for years has been trying to bring about a systematic exchange of drug data between the FDA, the hospital systems of the Public Health Service and the Defense Department, and the NIH, which "has the greatest pool of drug research information in the world." He has found "little systematic communication," even among the institutes of the NIH. The thalidomide scandal has brought Senator Humphrey some measure of success, however. The NIH, for example, is now methodically feeding the FDA the result of an electronic data processing survey of 50,000 pregnancy case histories, yet NIH's Director acknowledges that he is "not at all certain we would have done" precisely that if the thalidomide story had not been publicized.

As for the FDA itself, Humphrey claims that its high officials "have apparently been content" to let the agency "stagnate as a scientific backwater" despite the "deep interest of a few extremely talented M.D.'s and pharmacologists." The FDA's isolation has made it dependent, in many cases, on plain luck. The "falsified" MER/29 monkey data came to FDA's attention only because an FDA inspector happened to ride in a car pool with the husband of a woman who had quit her job in Merrell's animal research laboratories. Dr. Kelsey's determination to block the marketing of thalidomide was decisively hardened because she "chanced" to read a letter to the editor of one of the world's 4,000 medical journals, a letter that associated the drug with peripheral neuritis.

Humphrey considers it "a miracle that we learn as much as we do." Though many sources—such as pharmaceutical companies, the FDA, hospitals, the Veterans' Administration, and the NIH—compile data on reactions, they do not cooperate "to any real extent" with each other. According to Humphrey, the individual clinician "tends to be so busy that often his reports are a fraction of what they might be. This is a crucial point; it explains in part a tendency to overvalue fragmentary favorable reports." Although the FDA itself has had a small reporting program, involving at most 150 out of the Nation's 6,000 hospitals, Humphrey's subcommittee has "yet to find anyone who has substantially used this program or anyone at the reporting end who had received useful 'feed-back' from it."

Consequently, Humphrey found it "incredible" that the FDA had not made "systematic use" of outside consultants. Although the agency supplied him with a "nominally" long list of outside consultations Humphrey found it "completely misleading." "It pretends that an isolated telephone call or letter or short visit for a curbstone—I emphasize—curbstone judgment represented 'consultation.' I am surprised," he continued, "* * * that FDA states consultation has 'routinely' occurred. The men * * * inside the agency who have fought and begged for outside consultation * * * have been discouraged at worst, or ignored at best, from above."

PRESSURE AND PERSUASION

The atmosphere inside the agency apparently has been one of considerable discouragement from above, accompanied by constant harassment from some drug manufacturers. Dr. Moulton has told of cases in which orders came "from above" for medical officers to certify drugs about which they had doubts, the justification being that the manufacturers should "be in a much better position to judge their safety." She contended that in many of its activities the FDA had become "merely a service bureau" for the drug industry.

Dr. Moulton has also complained that manufacturers' representatives spend "3 or 4 days a week in the New Drug Branch offices, arguing each point step by step, wanting to know and being told exactly where the application is at all times and which chemists and which pharmacologists are assisting in its review."

One physician who worked on the application for Marsilid, the "happiness pill" associated with hepatitis, left the FDA shortly thereafter to work for Marsilid's manufacturer, Hoffmann-La Roche. The letter he authorized, while in the FDA, to warn prescribing physicians about Marsilid's side effects did not impress Dr. Moulton, who informed the Kefauver subcommittee that "the important facts were obscured by so much irrelevant material that it failed to serve as an effective warning."

The FDA's involvement with the industry was brought home forcibly by the disclosures that the head of its Division of Antibiotics, Henry Welch, was writing articles for professional journals that brought him a profit, as Senator Douglas told Congress last summer, of "approximately $288,000 * * * from the firms he was supposed to be regulating." Dr. Welch was allowed to resign in 1960, when the Kefauver subcommittee fully explored the matter, but even then, as Kefauver found, his superiors "were derelict in the performance of their duty * * * they whitewashed it. He was not even asked by FDA's top officials how much his 'honorariums' as he called them, amounted to. That was an outrageous conflict of interest." The matter is now before a grand jury.

When the new-drug bill was passed in Congress, both Senator Kefauver and Senator Douglas voiced their concern about the ability of the FDA to administer it, and both called for "an infusion of new blood." Senator Humphrey has made it clear that he has "little reason for confidence in the policy echelons of FDA," but does not attack Commissioner Larrick personally; indeed he calls him "a faithful and dedicated public servant." Last October, however, a second Citizens Advisory Committee, reporting on a year-long study of the FDA, recommended that its top posts should "no longer * * * be held primarily by persons whose backgrounds have been as inspectors, but should include scientists with broad experience as well." The Commissioner's post was specifically included. Larrick, who is not a college graduate, joined the FDA as an inspector in 1923 and rose through the ranks, becoming Commissioner in 1954. His Deputy Commissioner started as an inspector in 1925.

But the chairman of the Citizens Committee, George Y. Harvey, who has since become a consultant to HEW on FDA matters, blunted what appeared to be a committee attack on Larrick. He told a press conference that the report was directed "to the future," and that Larrick could carry out its recommendations if he takes them "to heart and attracts the right kind of people."

Attracting and holding the right kind of people may prove exceedingly difficult. Dr. Moulton had quit in disgust so that she could speak out. A former scientific director, Dr. Paul L. Day, found life at the FDA impossible after he had criticized the agency for its "lack of sufficient vision of its proper role in the protection of the health of the American people" and "courage to present, adequately, a bold program." He resigned.

In a recent reorganization, Dr. Kelsey was promoted to head a new Investigational Drug Branch, and she has received from the President the Nation's highest honor for distinguished Federal civilian service. But generally, FDA medical officers have been overworked in thankless, glamorless, paper-pushing jobs. Under the new regulations and the Kefauver-Harris law they will get hundreds of thousands of additional reports a year. More physicians have recently been recruited for the Bureau of Medicine—22 in February—but there will still be too few specialists to evaluate the highly specialized material that will be flooding in, and they still do not have an effective consulting service.

To attract and hold top scientists to the Bureau, Larrick could have pushed for FDA's own research program, as Dr. Day recommended. Larrick could have pressed for exemption of more physicians from civil service salary restrictions, and he could have tried hard to make working conditions more attractive. He did neither.

Since 1957, while enforcement and other FDA branches have stayed put in the HEW Building, the Bureau of Medicine has been shifted from a formers nurses' dormitory near the city incinerator to ramshackle structures that were not air-conditioned, and from those to a World War II temporary building.

All of these quarters were distant from the Division of Pharmacology, whose work is integral with the Bureau of Medicine because it evaluates the animal testing in new-drug applications. Yet, as of early March, the Bureau was destined to be moved once more, this time to a converted automobile-servicing garage in one of the most crime-ridden precincts of Washington and at least a mile from the Division of Pharmacology and other FDA scientists with whom the Bureau physicians should consult.

Congress has long treated the FDA shabbily, but Humphrey has said that the price of generous treatment will be a demand for "men with drive, with initiative * * * not just 'going by the book,' by the letter of the law, but by its spirit, its tone, its fundamental purpose."

HEW is assuming that it can put new life into the FDA by teaching the old watchdog new tricks, but in and out of Congress this approach is considered excessively optimistic in view of the past handling of drug problems. Critics believe the FDA can become the great, vital agency HUMPHREY envisions only if the old watchdogs are replaced by a new breed of scientist-administrators.

The hearings by Senator HUMPHREY's Government Reorganization Subcommittee this month and next will be followed by more hearings in the House. But it remains to be seen whether the FDA can continue to ignore criticism as it has in the past, or if Dr. Moulton will continue to stand by her testimony of 1960 that "hundreds of people, not merely in this country, suffer daily, and many die because the Food and Drug Administration has failed utterly in its solemn task of enforcing those sections of the law dealing with the safety and misbranding of drugs * * *."

THE GIANT CANADA GOOSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my intention yesterday to call to the attention of the Senate a human interest story. At this time I shall take only a few moments to do so.

I had hoped to announce to the Senate, yesterday, that the world's largest goose, the giant Canada, which for over 30 years was thought to be extinct, has been rediscovered in Minnesota. These huge geese, which range in weight from 15 to 19 pounds, were found by Dr. Harold Hanson, of the Illinois Natural History Survey. Dr. Hanson, in cooperation with personnel of the Minnesota Department of Conservation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Bureau of Sport, Fisheries and Wildlife, trapped approximately 200 of the birds, for examination and banding.

I am sure this will come as welcome news to sportsmen throughout the country. It also will be a source of joy to the membership of the Midwest Goose Association. Our Minnesota town of Sleepy Eye was privileged to be host to that association when it held its annual meeting January 10.

The flock of giant geese has been roosting on Silver Lake, which is in a Rochester park. The present nesting grounds of this giant goose are not known with certainty; but small scattered populations are believed to nest in the Dakotas, in western Minnesota, and in Manitoba. Returns from birds banded this winter may shed further light on the location of the present breeding grounds.

The giant Canada goose was well known to a past generation of hunters in the northern prairie States. In 1951, Jean Delacour, the internationally known waterfowl authority, supported the findings of James Moffitt, America's foremost student of geese, by describing and naming the giant Canada goose after it was thought to be extinct.

We in Minnesota are inclined to boast a bit about our North Star State. Our forefathers built a great and growing commonwealth out of the beautiful and fertile wilderness they found there. The rediscovery in Minnesota of the giant Canada goose is just one of many significant occurrences involving our great State which give us even more reason to do a little bragging.

We are very proud of the fact that our State provides very wholesome recreation. It is one of the fine hunting areas in the United States; and we are particularly proud of the fish, the fowl, and the other wildlife which make possible some of the most enjoyable outdoor sports activities which America is privileged to have.

Let this be notice to historians of the future that on Silver Lake, in Rochester, Minn., a lake kept partly open by the discharge of warm water from a nearby electric generating plant, it was discovered that the giant goose not only is still among us, but even appears to have a sizable population that is adapting to man's changes of environment.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come at this time before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, at 10 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

Lt. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Creighton William Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Edward W. Snedeker, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 14: *Above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness.*

Almighty God, our Father, who art the same, yesterday, today, and forever, amid all the miseries and mutations of time, grant that our hearts may be the sanctuaries of Thy love.

May we feel the wealth and warmth of Thy love and seek to make it the commanding and controlling factor and force in our daily life.

Inspire us to discover in these critical and confused days that love is the one cardinal virtue that will cast out fear and constrain us to rise above all cold and rebellious tempers of spirit.

Hear us for the sake of our Lord who walked the road of the loving heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1035. An act to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63-9.

CUBAN ANTI-CASTRO GROUPS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy to discourage Cuban exile raids on Castro's seacoast is a complete contradiction of our national goals.

It is true that the Government must uphold U.S. neutrality laws. However, this Nation has no right to interfere with the operations of foreign-based anti-Castro Cubans. Furthermore, the United States is not responsible for foreign-based raids against Communist Cuba.

It is argued that these hit-and-run raids have little significance. This argument is false. Hit-and-run tactics signaled the beginning of Castro's rise to power. The Communists are using these same tactics even now to subvert Latin America.

The Cuban Communists do not want war in the Caribbean, and they have backed down with an apology for firing on a U.S. boat last Saturday. Freeing Cuba is a job for Cubans, and I certainly hope the United States will encourage them to do it.

BLOCKADE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, at last the United States and Great Britain have established a blockade of Cuba, but, unfortunately, the United States seems to have lost sight of its values and traditions, for through this blockade our country is protecting Castro from those Cuban exiles who yearn to return freedom to their homeland. I find it extremely hard to understand why we are actually protecting a Communist government and suppressing the activities of people who are fighting to rid Cuba of the Communist menace. This is a complete reversal from our policy of aiding the anti-Castro invasion just 2 years ago. How foolish it is to take steps which permit communism to survive in Cuba when we all realize that Cuba is the chief steppingstone to the establishment of communism throughout Central and South America. Our excuse for protecting Castro seems weak, indeed, when we glance back at our own history of fighting for freedom and human rights. It seems to me that the attacks launched against the Communist Cuba would have a terrific morale-boosting effect on those patriots still in Cuba, who with sufficient evidence of support could rid their country of communism.

How can any of our South American allies gain confidence in the policies of the United States when with one hand we tell the anti-Castro forces that we want them to free their homeland while with the other hand we take steps to insure that they will not? To make matters worse, we are now playing the role of informant against the Cuban patriots as well as protector for Castro.

In my opinion, the administration has failed to understand our demands for a blockade of Cuba, for what we are demanding was a blockade of Communist Cuba, not a blockade of freedom.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," wrote Milton. And no peacetime victory in history has been as far reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of freedom so well, as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs. These victories have been, in the main, quiet instead of dramatic. Their aim has been, not to gain territories for the United States or support in the United Nations, but to preserve freedom and hope, and to prevent tyranny and subversion, in dozens of key nations all over the world.

The United States today is spending over 10 percent of its gross national product on programs primarily aimed at improving our national security. Somewhat less than one-twelfth of this amount, and less than 0.7 percent of our GNP, goes into the mutual assistance program: roughly half for economic development, and half for military and other short-term assistance. The contribution of this program to our national interest clearly outweighs its cost. The richest nation in the world would surely be justified in spending less than 1 percent of its national income on assistance to its less fortunate sister nations solely as a matter of international responsibility; but inasmuch as these programs are not merely the right thing to do, but clearly in our national self-interest, all criticisms should be placed in that perspective. That our aid programs can be improved is not a matter of debate. But that our aid programs serve both our national traditions and our national interest is beyond all reasonable doubt.

History records that our aid programs to Turkey and Greece were the crucial element that enabled Turkey to stand up against heavyhanded Soviet pressures, Greece to put down Communist aggression and both to re-create stable societies and to move forward in the direction of economic and social growth.

History records that the Marshall plan made it possible for the nations of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, to recover from the devastation of the world's most destructive war, to rebuild military strength, to withstand the expansionist thrust of Stalinist Russia, and to embark on an economic renaissance which has made Western Europe the second greatest and richest industrial complex in the world today—a vital center of free world strength, itself now contributing to the growth and strength of less developed countries.

History records that our military and economic assistance to nations on the frontiers of the Communist world—such as Iran, Pakistan, India, Vietnam, and free China—has enabled threatened peoples to stay free and independent, when they otherwise would have either been overrun by aggressive Communist power or fallen victim of utter chaos, poverty, and despair.

History records that our contributions to international aid have been the critical factor in the growth of a whole family of international financial institutions and agencies, playing an ever more important role in the ceaseless war against want and the struggle for growth and freedom.

And, finally, history will record that today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect barriers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most, helping to build the kind of world community of independent, self-supporting nations in which we want to live, and helping to serve the deep American urge to extend a generous hand to those working toward a better life for themselves and their children.

Despite noisy opposition from the very first days—despite dire predictions that foreign aid would bankrupt the Republic—despite warnings that the Marshall plan and successor programs were "throwing our money down a rathole"—despite great practical difficulties and some mistakes and disappointments—the fact is that our aid programs generally and consistently have done what they were expected to do.

Freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world—not in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America—as it might well have been without U.S. aid. And we now know that freedom—all freedom, including our own—is diminished when other countries fall under Communist domination, as in China in 1949, North Vietnam and the northern provinces of Laos in 1954, and Cuba in 1959. Freedom, all freedom, is threatened by the subtle, varied and unceasing Communist efforts at subversion in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. And the prospect for freedom is also endangered or eroded in countries which see no hope—no hope for a better life based on economic progress, education, social justice and the development of stable institutions. These are the frontiers of freedom which our military and economic aid programs seek to advance; and in so doing, they serve our deepest national interest.

This view has been held by three successive Presidents—Democratic and Republican alike.

It has been endorsed by a bipartisan majority of nine successive Congresses.

It has been supported for 17 years by a bipartisan majority of the American people.

And it has only recently been reconfirmed by a distinguished committee of private citizens, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay and including Messrs. Robert Anderson, Eugene Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert Lovett, Edward Mason, L. F. McCollum, George Meany, Herman Phleger, and Howard Rusk. Their report stated:

> We believe these programs, properly conceived and implemented, to be essential to the security of our Nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities.

There is, in short, a national consensus of many years standing on the vital importance of these programs. The principle and purpose of U.S. assistance to less secure and less fortunate nations are not and cannot be seriously in doubt.

II. PRESENT NEEDS

The question now is: What about the future? In the perspective of these past gains, what is the dimension of present needs, what are our opportunities, and what changes do we face at this juncture in world history?

I believe it is a crucial juncture. Our world is near the climax of a historic convulsion. A tidal wave of national independence has nearly finished its sweep through lands which contain one out of every three people in the world. The industrial and scientific revolution is spreading to the far corners of the earth. And two irreconcilable views of the value, the rights, and the role of the individual human being confront the peoples of the world.

In some 80 developing nations, countless large and small decisions will be made in the days and months and years ahead—decisions which, taken together, will establish the economic and social system, determine the political leadership, shape the political practices, and mold the structure of the institutions which will promote either consent or coercion for one-third of humanity. And these decisions will drastically affect the shape of the world in which our children grow to maturity.

Africa is stirring restlessly to consolidate its independence and to make that independence meaningful for its people through economic and social development. The people of America have affirmed and reaffirmed their sympathy with these objectives.

Free Asia is responding resolutely to the political, economic, and military challenge of Communist China's relentless efforts to dominate the continent.

Latin America is striving to take decisive steps toward effective democracy—amid the turbulence of rapid social change and the menace of Communist subversion.

The United States—the richest and most powerful of all peoples, a nation committed to the independence of nations and to a better life for all peoples—can no more stand aside in this climactic age of decision than we can withdraw from the community of free nations. Our effort is not merely symbolic. It is addressed to our vital security interests.

It is in this context that I hope the American people through their representatives in Congress will consider our request this year for foreign aid funds designed carefully and explicitly to meet these specific challenges. This is not a wearisome burden. It is a new chapter in our involvement in a continuously vital struggle—the most challenging and constructive effort ever undertaken by man on behalf of freedom and his fellow man.

III. OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVEMENT

In a changing world, our programs of mutual defense and assistance must be kept under constant review. My recommendations herein reflect the work of the Clay Committee, the scrutiny undertaken by the new Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the experience gained in our first full year of administering the new and improved program enacted by the Congress in 1961. There is fundamental agreement throughout these reviews: that these assistance programs are of great value to our deepest national interest—that their basic concepts and organization, as embodied in the existing legislation, are properly conceived—that progress has been made and is being made in translating these concepts into action—but that much still remains to be done to improve our performance and make the best possible use of these programs.

In addition, there is fundamental agreement in all these reviews regarding six key recommendations for the future.

Objective No. 1: To apply stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries. This objective was given special attention by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World (the Clay report), which estimated that the application of such criteria could result in substantial savings in selected programs over the next 1 to 3 years.

Considerable progress has already been made along these lines. While the number of former colonies achieving independence has lengthened the total list of countries receiving assistance, 80 percent of all economic assistance now goes to only 20 countries; and military assistance is even more narrowly concentrated. The proportion of development loans, as contrasted with outright grants, has increased from 10 to 60 percent. We have placed all our development lending on a dollar repayable basis; and this year we are increasing our efforts, as the Clay committee recommended, to tailor our loan terms so that interest rates and maturities will reflect to a greater extent the differences in the ability of different countries to service debt.

In the Alliance for Progress in particular, and increasingly in other aid programs, emphasis is placed upon self-help and self-reform by the recipients themselves, using our aid as a catalyst for progress and not as a handout. Finally, in addition to emphasizing primarily economic rather than military assistance, wherever conditions permit, we are taking a sharp new look at both the size and purpose of those local military forces which receive our assistance. Our increased stress on internal security and civic action in military assistance is in keeping with our experience that in developing countries, military forces can have an important economic as well as protective role to play. For example, in Latin America, in fiscal year 1963, military assistance funds allocated for the support of engineer, medical, and other civic action type units more than doubled.

Objective No. 2: To achieve a reduction and ultimate elimination of U.S. assistance by enabling nations to stand on their own as rapidly as possible. Both this Nation and the countries we help have a stake in their reaching the point of self-sustaining growth—the point where they no longer require external aid to maintain their independence. Our goal is not an arbitrary cutoff date but the earliest possible "take off" date—the date when their economies will have been launched with sufficient momentum to enable them to become self-supporting, requiring only the same normal sources of external financing to meet expanding capital needs that this country required for many decades.

For some, this goal is near at hand, insofar as economic assistance is concerned. For others, more time will be needed. But in all cases, specific programs leading to self-support should be set and priorities established—including those steps which must be taken by the recipient countries and all others who are willing to help them.

The record clearly shows that foreign aid is not an endless or unchanging process. Fifteen years ago, our assistance went almost entirely to the advanced countries of Europe and Japan; today it is directed almost entirely to the developing world. Ten years ago most of our assistance was given to shoring up military forces and unstable economies; today this kind of aid has been cut in half, and our assistance goes increasingly toward economic development. There are still, however, important cases where there has been no diminution in the Communist military threat, and both military and economic aid are still required. Such cases range from relatively stabilized frontiers, as in Korea and Turkey, to areas of active aggression, such as Vietnam.

Objective No. 3: To secure the increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of international development assistance. The United States is no longer alone in aiding the developing countries, and its proportionate share of the burden is diminishing. The flow of funds from other industrialized countries—now totaling on the order of $2 billion a year—is expected to continue; and we expect to work more closely with these other countries in order to make the most effective use of our joint efforts. In addition, the international lending and technical assistance agencies—to which we contribute heavily—have expanded the schedule and scope of their operations; and we look forward to supplementing those resources selectively in conjunction with increased contributions from other nations. We will continue to work with our allies, urging them to increase their assistance efforts and to extend assistance on terms less burdensome to the developing countries.

Objective No. 4: To lighten any adverse impact of the aid program on our own balance of payments and economy. A few years ago, more than half of U.S. economic aid funds were spent abroad, contributing to the drain on our dollars and gold. Of our current commitments, over 80 percent will be spent in the United States, contributing to the growth of our economy and employment opportunities. This proportion is rising as further measures are being taken to this end. I might add that our balance-of-payments position today is being significantly helped by the repayment of loans made to European countries under the Marshall plan and by the Export-Import Bank. I am confident that in the future, as income in the less-developed countries rises, we will similarly benefit from the loans we are now making to them.

Our economy is also being helped by the expansion of commercial exports to countries whose present growth and prosperity were spurred by U.S. economic assistance in earlier years. Over the last decade, our exports to Western Europe and the United Kingdom have more than doubled, and our exports to Japan have increased fourfold. Similarly, we can look forward to a future widening of trade opportunities in those countries whose economic development we are currently assisting.

In addition, our food for peace program is increasingly using our agricultural commodities to stimulate the economic growth of developing nations and to assist in achieving other U.S. foreign policy goals. As the economies of developing nations improve, we are encouraging them to shift from foreign currency to cash sales or to dollar credit sales for these commodities.

The relative burden of our assistance programs has been steadily reduced—from some 2 percent of our national product at the beginning of the Marshall plan to seven-tenths of 1 percent today—from 11.5 percent of the Federal budget in 1949 to 4 percent today.

Although these figures indicate that our aid programs cost, in relative terms, considerably less today than they did 10 or 15 years ago, we are continuing our efforts to improve the effectiveness of these programs and increase the return on every dollar invested. Personnel, procedures, and administration are being improved. A number of field missions have been closed, scaled down, or merged into embassies or regional offices. These efforts toward greater efficiency and economy are being accelerated under the new Administrator.

Objective No. 5: To continue to assist in the defense of countries under threat of external and internal Communist attack. Our military assistance program has been an essential element in keeping the boundary of Soviet and Chinese military power relatively stable for over a decade. Without its protection the substantial economic progress made by underdeveloped countries along the Sino-Soviet periphery would hardly have been possible. As these countries build economic strength, they will be able to assume more of the burden of their defense. But we must not assume that military assistance to these countries—or to others primarily exposed to subversive internal attack—can be ended in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, while it will be possible to reduce and terminate some programs, we should anticipate the need for new and expanded programs.

India is a case in point. The wisdom of earlier U.S. aid in helping the Indian subcontinent's considerable and fruitful efforts toward progress and stability can hardly now be in question. The threat made plain by the Chinese attack on India last fall may require additional efforts on our part to help bolster the security of this crucial area, assuming these efforts can be matched in an appropriate way by the efforts of India and Pakistan.

But overall, the magnitude of military assistance is small in relation to our national security expenditures; in this fiscal year it amounts to about 3 percent of our defense budget.

> Dollar for dollar—

Said the Clay Committee with particular reference to the border areas—

> these programs contribute more to the security of the free world than corresponding expenditures in our defense appropriations. These countries are providing more than 2 million armed men ready, for the most part, for any emergency.

Clearly, if this program did not exist, our defense budget would undoubtedly have to be increased substantially to provide an equivalent contribution to the free world's defense.

Objective No. 6: To increase the role of private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. In recent months, important new steps have been taken to mobilize on behalf of this program the competence of a variety of nongovernmental organizations and individuals in this country. Cooperatives and savings and loan associations have been very active in establishing similar institutions abroad, particularly in Latin America. Our land-grant and other universities are establishing better working relationships with our programs to assist oversea rural development. Already there are 37 U.S. universities and land-grant institutions at work in Latin America, for example, with a substantial increase expected during the coming year. Public and private leaders from the State of California are exploring with their counterparts in Chile how the talents and resources of a particular State can be more directly channeled toward assisting a particular country. Labor unions, foundations, trade associations, professional societies, and many others likewise possess skills and resources which we are drawing upon increasingly—in order to engage in a more systematic and meaningful way, in this vital nation-building process, the whole complex of private and public institutions upon which our own national life depends. For at the heart of the modernization process lies the central problem of creating, adapting, and improving the institutions which any modern society will need.

IV. PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries. Already considerable progress has been made fostering U.S. private investment through the use of investment guaranties—with over $900 million now outstanding—and by means of cost-sharing on investment surveys, loans of local currencies, and other measures provided under existing law. During the first half of this fiscal year alone, $7.7 million in local currencies have been loaned to private business firms.

I believe much more should be done, however, both administratively through more vigorous action by the Agency for International Development, and legislatively by the Congress. Administratively, our ambassadors and missions abroad, in their negotiations with the less developed countries, are being directed to urge more forcefully the importance of making full use of private resources and improving the climate for private investment, both domestic, and foreign. In particular, I am concerned that the investment guaranty program is not fully operative in some countries because of the failure of their governments to execute the normal intergovernmental agreements relating to investment guaranties.

In addition, the Agency for International Development will also strengthen and enlarge its own activities relating to private enterprise—both its efforts to assist in the development of vigorous private economies in the developing countries, and its facilities for mobilizing and assisting the capital and skills of private business in contributing to economic development.

Legislatively, I am recommending the following:

(a) An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code for a trial period to grant U.S. taxpayers a tax credit for new investments in developing countries, which should also apply to some extent to reinvestments of their earnings in those countries. Such a credit, by making possible an increased rate of return, should substantially encourage additional private investment in the developing countries. The U.S. businessmen's committee for the Alliance for Progress has recommended the adoption of such a measure.

(b) Amendments in the investment guaranty provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act designed to enlarge and clarify the guaranty program.

Economic and social growth cannot be accomplished by governments alone. The effective participation of an enlightened U.S. businessman, especially in partnership with private interests in the developing country, brings not only his investment but his technological and management skills into the process of development. His successful participation in turn helps create that climate of confidence which is so critical in attracting and holding vital external and internal capital. We welcome and encourage initiatives being taken in the private sector in Latin America to accelerate industrial growth and hope that similar cooperative efforts will be established with other developing countries.

V. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

In a special sense, the achievements of the Alliance for Progress in the coming years will be the measure of our determination, our ideals, and our wisdom. Here in this hemisphere, in this last year, our resourcefulness as a people was challenged in the clearest terms. We moved at once to resist the threat of aggressive nuclear weapons in Cuba, and we found the nations of Latin America at our side. They, like ourselves, were brought to a new awareness of the danger of permitting the poverty and despair of a whole people to continue long anywhere in this continent.

Had the needs of the people of Cuba been met in the pre-Castro period—their need for food, for housing, for education, for jobs, above all, for a democratic responsibility in the fulfillment of their own hopes—there would have been no Castro, no missiles in Cuba, and no need for Cuba's neighbors to incur the immense risks of resistance to threatened aggression from that island.

There is but one way to avoid being faced with similar dilemmas in the future. It is to bring about in all the countries of Latin America the conditions of hope, in which the peoples of this continent will know that they can shape a better future for themselves, not through obeying the inhumane commands of an alien and cynical ideology, but through personal self-expression, individual judgment, and the acts of responsible citizenship.

As Americans, we have long recognized the legitimacy of these aspirations; in recent months we have been able to see, as never before, their urgency and, I believe, the concrete means for their realization.

In less than 2 years, the 10-year program of the Alliance for Progress has become more than an idea and more than a commitment of governments. The necessary initial effort to develop plans, to organize institutions, to test and experiment has itself required and achieved a new dedication—a new dedication to intelligent compromise between old and new ways of life. In the long run, it is this effort and not the threat of communism—that will determine the fate of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

These years have not been easy ones for any group in Latin America. A similar change in the fundamental orientation of our own society would have been no easier. The difficulty of the changes to be brought about makes all the more heartening the success of many nations of Latin America in achieving reforms which will make their fundamental economic and social structures both more efficient and more equitable.

Some striking accomplishments, moreover, are already visible. New housing is being expanded in most countries of the region. Educational facilities are growing rapidly. Road construction, particularly in agricultural areas, is accelerating at a rapid pace. With U.S. funds, over 2 million textbooks are being distributed to combat the illiteracy of nearly half of the 210 million people of Latin America. In the countries of the Alliance for Progress, the diets of 8 million children and mothers are being supplemented with U.S. food for peace, and this figure should reach nearly 16 million by next year.

In trouble-ridden northeast Brazil, under an agreement with the State of Rio Grande do Norte, a program is underway to train 3,000 teachers, build 1,000 classrooms, 10 vocational schools, 8 normal schools, and 4 teacher training centers. A $30 million slum clearance project is underway in Venezuela. In Bogotá, Colombia, the site of the old airport is becoming a new city for 71,000 persons who are building their own homes with support from the Social Progress Trust Fund.

This year I received a letter from Senor Argemil Plazas Garcia whom I met in Bogotá upon the dedication of an Alianza housing project. He writes:

> Today I am living in the house with my 13 children, and we are very happy to be free of such poverty and no longer to be moving around like outcasts. Now we have dignity and freedom. * * * My wife, my children, and I are writing you this humble letter, to express to you the warm gratitude of such Colombian friends who now have a home in which they can live happily.

Of even greater long-range importance, a number of beginnings in self-help and reforms are now evident.

Since 1961, 11 Latin American countries—Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—have made structural reforms in their tax systems. Twelve countries have improved their income tax laws and administration.

New large-scale programs for improved land use and land reform have been undertaken in Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and two States in Brazil. More limited plans are being carried out in Chile, Colombia, Panama, Uruguay, and Central America.

Six Latin American countries—Colombia, Chile, Bolivia, Honduras, Mexico, and Venezuela—have submitted development programs to the Panel of Experts of the Organization of American States. The Panel has evaluated and reported on the first three and will soon offer its views on the balance.

Viewed against the background of decades of neglect—or, at most, intermittent bursts of attention to basic problems—the start that has been made is encouraging. Perhaps most significant of all is a change in the hearts and minds of the people—a growing will to develop their countries. We can only help Latin Americans to save themselves. It is for this reason that the increasing determination of the peoples of the region to build modern societies is heartening. And it is for this reason that responsible leadership in Latin America must respond to this popular will with a greater sense of urgency and purpose, lest aspirations turn into frustrations and hope turn into despair. Pending reform legislation must be enacted, statutes already on the books must be enforced, and mechanisms for carrying out programs must be organized and invigorated. These steps are not easy, as we know from our own experience, but they must be taken.

Our own intention is to concentrate our support in Latin America on those countries adhering to the principles established in the Charter of Punta del Este, and to work with our neighbors to indicate more precisely the particular policy changes, reforms, and other self-help measures which are necessary to make our assistance effective and the Alliance a success. The Clay Committee recommendation that we continue to expand our efforts to encourage economic integration within the region and the expansion of trade among the countries of Latin America has great merit. The determination of the Central American Presidents to move boldly in this direction impressed me greatly during my recent meeting with them in San Jose, Costa Rica; and the Agency for International Development has already established a regional office in Central America, is giving support to a regional development bank and has participated in regional trade conferences.

A beginning has been made in the first 2 years of the Alliance; but the job that is still ahead must be tackled with continuing urgency. Many of the ingredients for a successful decade are at hand, and the fundamental course for the future is clear. It remains for all parties to the Alliance to provide the continuous will and effort needed to move steadily along that course.

VI. THIS YEAR'S AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

Translating the foregoing facts and principles into program costs and appropriations, based on the application of the standards set forth above and affirmed by the Clay Committee, yields the following results:

First, upward of $200 million of economic assistance funds now available are expected to be saved and not used in the present fiscal year, and upward of $100 million of these unused funds will remain available for lending in the future;

Second, in addition to the savings carried forward into next year, close review has indicated a number of reductions that can be made in the original budget estimates for economic and military assistance without serious damage to the national interest.

Together these factors permit a reduction in the original budget estimates from $4.9 to $4.5 billion. This amount reflects anticipated reductions in military and economic assistance to a number of countries, in line with these standards and recommendations, and unavoidable increases to others. The principal net increases proposed in 1964 appropriations are the following:

An additional $325 million for lending in Latin America—$125 million through the Agency for International Development and $200 million through the Social Progress Trust Fund, administered for the United States by the Inter-American Development Bank (for which no appropriation was needed in fiscal year 1963 because a 2-year appropriation had been made the year before);

An additional $85 million for lending elsewhere in the world, mostly in countries such as India, Pakistan, and Nigeria which are meeting those high standards of self-help and fiscal and economic progress which permit our aid to be directed toward ultimate full self-support;

An additional $80 million for military aid, including the increased requirements for India (but still far below the fiscal 1961 level); and

An additional $50 million for the contingency fund, which provides a flexibility indispensable to our security. We cannot ignore the possibility that new threats similar to those in Laos or Vietnam might arise in areas which now look calm, or that new opportunities will open up to achieve major gains in the cause of freedom. Foreign aid policy can no more be static than foreign policy itself.

I believe that it is necessary and desirable that these funds be provided by the Congress to meet program needs and to be available for program opportunities. Funds which are not required under the increasingly selective program and performance standards of our assistance programs will, as in this year, not be spent or committed.

The legislative amendments which I am forwarding herewith carry forward the basic structure and intent of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. No fundamental changes in this legislative structure now appear to be required.

One relatively minor change I am proposing is for a separate authorization for the appropriation of funds to assist American schools and hospitals abroad. A number of these schools sponsored by Americans have been most successful in the developing countries in providing an education built upon American standards. Until now some assistance has been made available to these schools from general economic aid funds, but this is becoming increasingly inappropriate. Separate authorization and appropriations would be used to help these schools carry out long-term programs to establish themselves on a sounder financial footing, becoming gradually independent, if at all possible, of U.S. Government support.

Finally, I am requesting the Congress in this legislation to amend that section of the Trade Expansion Act which requires the denial of equal tariff treatment to imports from Poland and Yugoslavia. It is appropriate that this amendment should be incorporated in this bill since it is my conviction that trade and other forms of normal relations constitute a sounder basis than aid for our future relationship with these countries.

VII. CONCLUSION

In closing, let me again emphasize the overriding importance of the efforts in which we are engaged.

At this point in history we can look back to many successes in the struggle to preserve freedom. Our Nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against Communist subversion in the slums and hamlets, in the hospitals and schools, and in the offices of governments across a world bent on lifting itself. Two centuries of pioneering and growth must be telescoped into decades and even years. This is a field of action for which our history has prepared us, to which our aspirations have drawn us, and into which our national interest moves us.

Around the world cracks in the monolithic apparatus of our adversary are there for all to see. This, for the American people, is a time for vision, for patience, for work, and for wisdom. For better or worse, we are the pacesetters. Freedom's leader cannot flag or falter, or another runner will set the pace.

We have dared to label the sixties the "Decade of Development." But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1963.*

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the sorry spectacle of throwing money away to solve problems is best demonstrated by our foreign aid programs, via the President's message.

The President says "Peace hath her victories, no less renown'd than war" quoting Milton about the peacetime victory of our foreign giveaway. The President should be quoting the hard-pressed patriotic taxpayers who want the battle of the budget to be won, who expects a victory in fiscal responsibility, who needs the security of sound currency and a government oriented around freedom and capitalism, not regimentation and socialism.

The people of the United States believe morally and spiritually in the importance and dignity of human beings, in God-given rights, and they are tired of our exporting gross materialism, of granting aid to dictators who subjugate the people with our aid, who teach socialism and downgrade capitalistic freedom.

People are tired of shipping food and supplies to other nations who transship them to enemies, even as Poland aided North Vietnam, whose people are busy killing American men.

Our taxpayers are tired of the farce of aiding Socialists and Communists in the name of Christian charity, and saddling the debt on our children of the future.

How can our aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the U.N., which then dispenses our money further, help protect capitalism and freedom in the life or death struggle of our society against this alien philosophy? How can our people be helped by borrowing money to give it away? How do we strengthen the United States when we aid neutrals like India that turn against us? How stupid does the President think we Americans are?

The President says:

> Our Nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against Communist subversion.

How tragic. Those with eyes that cannot see. We are losing our shirts financially in our giveaway programs, which are threatening our currency, undermining out entire economy, endangering the entire free world which has looked to us for leadership.

And we are losing, in spite of our tremendous outpouring of over $100 billion since World War II. Indeed, communism is now on our doorstep in Cuba, and we are permitting the subversion of all of Central and South America. Has foreign aid prevented this—or has it encouraged communism's expansion—or does not our annual foreign aid make any difference?

Well, there is the proof. We borrowed $100 billion since 1945 to give it away, and Khrushchev and worldwide communism controls Cuba 90 miles from the United States. Now, who is kidding whom?

The President's choice of words is interesting. In his closing paragraph he says, "But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us." Look at the slogans, this bill is now "free world defenses and assistance programs," not a foreign aid bill. New Frontier replaced the tired old New Deal and Fair Deal. The Peace Corps, foreign and domestic, is more foreign aid abroad, and CCC, Civilian Conservation Corps at home. The campaign slogans "missile gap" turned out, not to be a gap at all. The "fallen prestige" label of the Eisenhower foreign policy, which now seems utterly virtuous by comparison, replaced with the no-policy of the New Frontier. And so it goes. Slogans are all we are being given, as a poor substitute for vigorous policy at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, if treason is defined as "giving aid and comfort to the enemy," how can we give aid to Communists and Socialists? Are they enemies or not? They mean to bury us.

If we believe in self-determination for nations, how can we, through foreign aid, "jimmy" up the economies and programs of other nations? If we are spiritually motivated, how can we set out to buy the world with dollars, to buy friends? If we believe in charity, how can we take money from taxpayers through force, and threatened jail sentences, to give to dictators and governments who misuse the money, who relabel the goods, who build bank deposits in Switzerland in individual names?

If we love freedom, why do we subsidize the enslavement of others through gifts to their governments?

Why cannot we proudly, unapologetically, brand ourselves freedom-loving, capitalistic, sovereign, and help others by precept and example; not by robbing them of their own initiative, inventiveness, and self-respect as we pour money into their economies?

The foreign aid that will help will be those programs conceived, created, and financed by each nation according to their own level of development and preference. We could sell our services, for value received, in helping others in projects when they ask us. No gifts are needed. More dislike us for our giving, than appreciate it, and we rob them of their pride and independence as well as foul up their economies.

The President says "leadership which history has thrust upon us." What does that mean? Our leadership was earned, not thrust upon us, earned by sweat, by ingenuity, by hustle and so we grew economically strong with the highest standard of living.

We earned it. It was not given to us. The good Lord gave us the opportunity and we took matters into our own hands.

All we can do to help others is to set a good example. No gifts. Build American industries and trade, brag about capitalism and free enterprise and individual freedom—to sink or swim. Capitalism deserves to be bragged about. Our people are energetic, hard working, thrifty, and believe in the private and free market of supply and demand. Let us show it off to the world. Let us not apologize for it, or pretend we do not know our own strength. No gifts, just get up and go. A good example: finer homes, cars, refrigerators, school buildings—all produced privately by free people—capitalistic entrepreneurs.

Finally, if there be some who want power for themselves in leadership positions through foreign aid let us not reward them in the United States or abroad. Our "Republic within a democracy" is limited government, of limited power. Let us not build our Government so powerful we are subjugated. Let us not give aid to other governments which subjugate their peoples. Foreign aid or free world defense and assistance programs must be stopped now.

THE BUYING AND SELLING OF COMMUNIST-MADE MERCHANDISE AT REQUEST OF STATE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post, in a story written by Phillip Warden, reports that two of the Nation's largest department stores are buying and selling Communist-made merchandise at the request of the State and Commerce Departments. One of the stores is Macy's, in New York, the other is Davison-Paxon Co., in Atlanta, Ga.

In recent years the Federal Government has been interfering in private business to an unreasonable extent. The Federal Big Brother attitude is being extended by the Kennedy administration way beyond anything seen in America in recent decades. It is getting so that, whether as a creditor, lender, observer, regulator, or law enforcer, the Federal Government is a silent partner in everybody's business. This is harmful to individual initiative. It is contrary to cultivation of the independence and driving force that helped to create this great Nation. It is time that the balance wheel started to swing back toward less Government interference in private affairs.

But there is one field in which the Federal Government has no business at all telling the private businesses what to do and what not to do. This is in the field of patriotism. The Departments of State and Commerce have no right to ask any business, even such a big one as R. H. Macy Co., to trade in Communist-made goods. Neither has R. H. Macy Co. any obligation to abide by such requests.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is unpatriotic and anti-American for American stores to stock in trade goods that are the product of Communist slave labor. I say that it is the solemn obligation of all business, including Macy's, to decline Government requests of this nature. I say it is close to a sin to put Communist goods on American shelves to undersell American products because the men and women making those goods are not paid a fair wage for their hours of slave labor.

The State Department and the Commerce Department should know better than to make such a request. Once again we see evidence of the dismal fact that the Kennedy administration just does not realize that communism is the mortal enemy of the United States and seeks to destroy us. Trading with communism only helps communism to be stronger. The trade will not make friends for us. It only spreads wider our international reputation for being suckers. Once again, it is the responsibility of this Congress, acting through the proper committees, to find out who is responsible in the Department of State and in the Department of Commerce for requesting America's private business to trade with Communists.

Such governmental policies are not only incredibly stupid; they are tainted with yellow. In the President's message to Congress today he requests amendment to the Trade Expansion Act in favor of imports from Communist satellites Poland and Yugoslavia. This is just more of the same stupidity. Congress, for America, should deny this request.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DAVID H. FORMAN AND JULIA FORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1544) for the relief of David H. Forman and Julia Forman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to David H. Forman and Julia Forman, his wife, of Maricopa County, Arizona, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, township 1 north, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of the said northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, said point being south 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 661.37 feet from the northeast corner of said section 2; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 33 feet to the true point of beginning; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 second east a distance of 111.08 feet to a point on the north right-of-way line of the Appropriators Canal; thence south 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds, east, along said north right-of-way line, a distance of 81.78 feet; thence south 0 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 63.05 feet; thence north 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds west, parallel to the south right-of-way line of said Appropriators Canal, a distance of 190.90 feet; thence north 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 100.57 feet to a point 33 feet south of the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter; thence north 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds east, parallel to the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter a distance of 80.06 feet to the point of beginning. Subject to an easement to the city of Phoenix for sewer purposes within the right-of-way of the said Appropriators Canal.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That consent is hereby given that a civil action may be instituted against the United States within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by or on behalf of David H. Forman and Julia Forman in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to determine their right, title, and interest in and to a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of section 2, township 1 north, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of the said northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, said point being south 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 661.37 feet from the northeast corner of said section 2; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 33 feet to the true point of beginning; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 111.08 feet to a point on the north right-of-way line of the Appropriators Canal;

thence south 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds east, along said north right-of-way line, a distance of 81.78 feet; thence south 0 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 63.05 feet; thence north 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds west, parallel to the south right-of-way line of said Appropriators Canal, a distance of 190.90 feet; thence north 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 100.57 feet to a point 33 feet south of the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter; thence north 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds east, parallel to the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter, a distance of 80.06 feet to the point of beginning."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEWIS S. CASS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2291) regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reinstate the homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass (Anchorage Numbered 031055) that was canceled because at the time the entry was made the land was in a withdrawn status, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to process the entry in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modification of time requirements as he deems equitable in view of the prior cancellation of the entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY LAND IN VICINITY OF UNALAKLEET, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2294) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, subject to the provisions of section 2, to Mrs. William E. Beltz a patent in fee (exclusive of oil, gas, and other mineral rights) to the following described tract of land, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon, situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska: Post numbered 1 located on left limit of North River on sandbar approximately 400 feet east of the North River Bridge; thence 2,640 feet in an easterly direction following the river upstream to a narrow slough and following the slough to post numbered 2; thence 2,640 feet in a southerly direction (through timber) to post numbered 3; thence 2,640 feet in a westerly direction to post numbered 4 located on the bank of the North River; thence upstream in a northerly direction back to post numbered 1 approximately 2,640 feet from post numbered 4; such land being the same land described in the homestead settlement claim (No. F–023595) of the late William E. Beltz.

Sec. 2. The patent shall be subject to outstanding gravel permits and rights-of-way, the patent may be issued only after payment of the fees that the deceased entryman would have been required to pay, and the patent shall be based upon a survey made without cost to Mrs. Beltz.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS E. VILLAREAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1230) for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nicholas E. Villareal, 342 West Beechwood, Pinedale, Califorina, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States all interest and costs on the sum of $322 representing the total of allotment payments made to his mother, Mrs. Carmen T. Estrella, in the period from January 1, 1948, to April 30, 1949, inclusive, which have been ruled to have been overpayments because no deductions were made from his Army pay in accordance with the authorizations he executed directing that the proper deductions be made from his pay in order that a class F allotment would be paid to his mother.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. FRANK D. SCHWIKERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3623) for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3625) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RONNIE E. HUNTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3626) for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle the claim of Ronnie E. Hunter, 6512 Lake Steilacoom Avenue, Tacoma 99, Washington, for reimbursement of expenses incurred incident to the employment of expert witnesses to testify in his behalf at a special court-martial trial held at McChord Air Force Base, Washington, on August 18 and 21, 1961, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of $200. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $200 for payment of said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR C. BERRY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3627) for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF PRIVATE LAW 87–673

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1535) to amend section 2 of Private Law 87–673.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of October 23, 1962 (Private Law 87–673), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mehmet Vecihi Kalaycioglu shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of that section of the said Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] rise?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, I make this reservation in order to call the attention of the House to House Document No. 90, a communication from the President of the United States. In essence, this communication states that the cost of claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, enacted by the Congress last year, amounted to about $17 million. This amount is not related dollar by dollar to private claim bills, but no doubt a substantial portion of it is a result of bills passed under the procedure we have on the floor of the House today, the calling of the Private Calendar.

So the Private Calendar is not just a perfunctory procedure that we go through. It does represent a substantial cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] and one-half of the time to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am just wondering why on a bill involving something like $5 billion, the first departmental appropriation bill that we have up for our consideration, and the House having no further business between now and next Thursday, why should there not be an ample amount of time for Members who wish to talk on the subject of the budget have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I shall not make any objection, if that is the decision of the gentleman in charge of the bill. If that is the case, it is all right, but I still do not understand just why when the House has nothing else to do there should not be ample time for a little talk about this situation of the Federal budget not only with reference to this bill, but on other bills that will come later on.

Mr. KIRWAN. May I point out to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, that this bill does not call for even $1 billion to say nothing of $5 billion, which is the amount mentioned by the gentleman. The amount involved here is only $935 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I probably have another bill in mind, but the amount involved in this bill does amount to quite a bit of money in anybody's book.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is a lot of money, but this budget has been well trimmed and furthermore the activities covered here take in quite a bit in revenues. The amount that will be received is $787 million, and as a result the bill costs only about $150 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not complaining about your bill, but I am wondering why there should be so much haste here when the House is not doing anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman ask for 3 hours and, if the time is not used, of course, it can be yielded back.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not have any objection even if we talk here until the next Fourth of July.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine, then how about making it 3 hours?

Mr. KIRWAN. I have no objection to that. It is all right with me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] and one-half of the time by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked for only 2 hours general debate on the bill is because that is all we thought would be needed. Only a very few Members indicated a desire to use time. I have no objection to the Members talking as long as they want on whatever subject they want, but to talk about the bill.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their cooperation in processing this bill. Their attendance at the hearings was almost 100 percent and everyone worked hard. The new members gave much time and close attention to everything we had to do. The gentleman from Wyoming, who is the ranking minority member, was new to the job but made outstanding contributions and was always most cooperative.

If you go to a ball park you find a fellow just inside the gates wanting to sell you a program so you can identify what is going on at the ball park. The same thing applies at a racetrack or a football game. There is a good report on this bill, a very good one. That is why I ask everyone to read the report, for those who did not sit through the hearings will get a great deal of information from it.

In 1896 when I started to work, the last year of Grover Cleveland's administration, I knew America like very few people knew it. In 1896 it took less than $500 million to run this country. There were 92 million people in America at that time. In 1940 we had 132 million people in the country, and now we have 180 million people. It is obvious what this has meant in the expansion of requirements that have to be met with this bill, involving everything from mapping to provisions for millions of visitors to our parks. For example, over $266 million is now required for the education, health, and welfare of the Indians.

Very few people have any good idea of the Indian problem unless they have lived in an area where there are Indian reservations. We have had some 400 ironclad contracts with the Indians and I do not think we ever kept 1. If we do not keep contracts with the people who owned this country what chance have we got trying to please the rest of the world?

It was my job to go down to the South Pacific a year ago last November and when I got down there the first school I saw with the American flag flying on it did not have one bench in it, one chair, or one desk. Our enemies realize this. All they have to do is take the hearings on the Interior Department appropriations. We have owned American Samoa for many years and this year we graduated the first high school students—never a college student. No wonder parts of the world are shocked when they hear us say we are the greatest race on earth. Now we are providing funds in this bill to correct the neglect in American Samoa and the trust territory.

This bill is cut approximately 9 percent and the interesting thing about it is that this bill is cut $21 million below the chamber of commerce recommendation.

Now, if I had my way, and if the Nation were in a better financial situation, this bill would call for $2 or $3 billion, because there is not a man or woman in this room who does not know we have robbed and looted the greatest country in the world for 300 years, all the way from Maine to California. One of our great Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, established the Reclamation Act of 1902. He was the savior of this country. It stopped them from robbing and looting. But all the money we spent on America from 1902 to 1932 on reclamation was about $300 million to save the greatest country in the world.

Here is a bill that produces revenues of $787 million, largely offsetting the $935 million that you are appropriating. If the rest of the bills were like it we would have money in the bank.

You cannot continue to have this country go forward and not spend a few dollars on its natural resources.

There are some problems of overlapping in agency and department programs. That is why I asked you to look at the report. There are 8 different departments and 19 agencies that have gone into the study of water. Can you imagine, 19 agencies have gone into the study of water? With budget requests totaling over $76 million.

When I tell you that it is a good bill, I mean it is a good bill.

You hear a lot of people say, "I wish we could go back to the olden days." Here is a picture that shows what happened during the olden days. This was taken in 1896. Th oldest boy working in the breaker was 9 years of age and the youngest was 7. He got 3½ cents an hour. And, notice the breaker boss. You cannot see his body, but you can see his hands. In one hand he has a club and in the other a mace. That is what he beat you with. A camera does not lie. That is the olden days. That was America when we were not spending a dime on ourselves, and it has not changed much down through the years, when you look at the objections at every turn of the road when we try to help mankind or try to improve this country. You always find people objecting and denouncing things that are good for America. But, life was good to me; the country was good to me; my Maker was good to me, very, very good.

You will notice in this bill that the Park Service is trying to buy 5,000 more acres in the Everglades when they have 1,300,000 acres already and should be budgeting its request on urgent items. And, again, they are trying to buy more land across the Potomac River from George Washington's home. We took care of the essential purchase at Mockley Point last year. We have appraisals on land in that area running as high as $12,000 an acre.

I defy any man in this room to say he voted to spend $12,000 an acre for land to protect the view from Mt. Vernon. This view is not going to be disturbed anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to look back and again ask the Members to reflect upon our forests and our streams. For instance, the Susquehanna River in the early 1890's I recall quite vividly. As a boy on a steamboat which traveled that river between Harrisburg and other points. Today you cannot run a canoe on it. There has been a great eroding and filling in that river, and all of the rivers in America. When you undertake to correct this and spend the money, oh, the howling and the growling that comes about.

Mr. Chairman, we would not have this budget in here today if the Congress down through the years had done its job. We did not in the Committee on Appropriations pass the authorizing legislation providing for the programs for which we are now asked to appropriate money. It was the Congress that passed it and not the Committee on Appropriations. We have no authorizing rights. Everything in this bill was passed by the Congress of the United States. Some of the Members who voted for its passage are now complaining about the cost involved. We cannot blame the people down the street for this. This is the result of action on the floor of the U.S. Congress. The Congress passed the bill. Some want us to buy almost one-third of America for parks and wet lands. We already have over 500 million acres of land under the control of the Department of the Interior. Look at the money we are wasting buying additional land when we have so much land now that we do not know what to do with it. But, we are grinding out the authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, we may have been a little slow in getting this bill before the House for action, but when it comes in here, the bill is as nearly correct and right as we can make it. I urge the Members to get a copy of the report and take a look at it. In my opinion any time a committee of the Congress brings a bill out of the committee in the amount of $21 million less than the chamber of commerce suggested, that committee is doing a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. By what amount is this bill below the spending level for this agency last year?

Mr. KIRWAN. The bill is only $9,242,200 or 1 percent, over the current year. One item of increase is to improve education in the trust islands. The authorizing committee authorized over $15 million for this purpose in the trust islands. We did not authorize this. However, this is the law.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, what is it below the budget?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is $92.8 million below the budget. We cut that much out of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has made an excellent statement with respect to employment in the Department of the Interior which statement is to be found on page 49 of the committee hearings. However, I would ask the gentleman if his committee increased the number of employees and, if so, by how many?

Mr. KIRWAN. We added something like 796 employees, a 1 percent increase. We cut out 2,679, a 5-percent reduction in the total.

The increase is for teachers for the Indian schools, trust territory, mapping, parks, and all those items in the budgets. The committee did not authorize that, the Congress did.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but this again gets back to the innocuousness of an authorization bill. The gentleman from Ohio, I am sure, does not believe that any authorization bill coming to the House of Representatives is innocuous simply because it is an authorization bill; is that not correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. Within the total, we had to provide an increase of $22.5 million for forest access roads because of the new contract authority in the Federal-aid Highway Act. That we have nothing to do with. It is back-door spending. Probably the bill would be millions less if it were not for the fact that we have no control over the contract authorizations, such as highway spending, and so on. What we are faced with is that we owe the money and have to pay it according to the law. If it were not for that, this bill would be way below the bill of last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on the subject of the pay increase bill, does the gentleman have in mind the amount of increase in the bill that was necessary because of that pay increase bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. They asked for over $13 million and we cut the pay increase item 40 percent. They will have to take care of that themselves.

Mr. GROSS. That is, the amount that they asked to fund the pay increase of last year?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct. We cut it 40 percent.

Mr. GROSS. On the assumption that by attrition and by greater productivity they could take up that 40 percent?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. They will have to find ways and means.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is acquainted with the Randall report last year which said that the entire pay increase in all agencies and departments of Government would be taken care of through greater productivity.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have cut employees each year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's committee cut it 40 percent, but there is still a 60-percent increase for that purpose in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Was it the Committee on Appropriations that authorized the pay increase? The gentleman knows that is not so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a question I would like the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to answer for the record. I should be surprised if the information is available without some research, but I think Members of the House and the people of the country ought to know the vast amount of money that is being spent by the executive departments traveling all over the United States and throughout the world. Nothing has impressed me more in our hearings in the Independent Offices Subcommittee than the constant and continuous requests for increased funds to finance travel. Would it be possible before this debate is concluded, sometime during the afternoon, for the chairman to have some information placed in the RECORD indicating how much money there is in this bill for travel?

Mr. KIRWAN. We cut the travel item in two agencies that did not live up to our requests in the last bill. We censured them in this bill. That is what I am trying to tell the gentleman, this is a good bill.

Mr. JONAS. I think it is a good bill and intend to vote for it. I want to congratulate publicly the subcommittee on making substantial cuts.

Mr. KIRWAN. There were only two agencies in this bill that did not conform to the committee's request last year and cut out travel. We censured those two agencies for not doing so.

Mr. JONAS. It is a question of control and how much travel is involved.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. We have asked the agencies to exercise strict control on travel. I will say this about travel; one of the wealthiest men I know used to denounce me every time I took a trip. He finally retired from business and went around the world. He sent me a letter saying, "I know that you have my letters on file and I would like to have them sent back to me. All my life I was a businessman, but after my trip around the world I found out that you do not make enough trips, you and the rest of your friends in Congress, to see what is becoming of the American dollar and the American boy. Every time you make one of those trips somebody in the press denounces you for going on a junket."

It takes a man of courage to make one of those trips to find out what becomes of the boy and the dollar.

Mr. JONAS. I agree. I think we ought to have closer examination and investigation of places where the public money is being spent. I have never hesitated to take trips when they can serve a useful purpose.

Mr. KIRWAN. But you have to do it.

Mr. JONAS. The congressional branch of the Government is subjected to most of the criticism, but I think somewhere along the line the record ought to show how much travel is being done by members of the executive branch. I know it would be a difficult thing to pull it all together in one lump sum in a bill as big as this is. We are going to make an effort to do it in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will be glad to do it in this bill and every bill to find out how much travel is going up.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I commend my friend from Ohio for another very fine conservation statement. I know how deeply he feels about the soil, the forests, and the land of America. I know he knows that in the years to come we are going to have some 300 million people living in this country. I commend him for the many hours of work he and his committee have put in on this bill. There is no finer or more worthwhile expenditure in the whole budget than the amount he has in this Interior Department Appropriations bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Ohio has made a very good point in regard to the authorization by the legislative committee, but I want to remind our colleagues that the legislative committee also has a problem in this regard. Take for instance the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] this committee no longer writes an open-end bill. There is always a specific dollar amount in the bill.

When the committee asked the people who were sponsoring this legislation from the administrative branch how much this would cost they said it would cost $14 million. This year when the Park Service came to the committee of the gentleman from Ohio they said, "I think we estimated the entire cost at around $20 million." You see it has gone up $6 million from the time they told our committee $14 million. But if we take the average figures that have been paid for land to this point and look at the amount of land that is left to buy there, we will spend not $20 million but in the neighborhood of $50 to $60 million to acquire all this property.

What I am asking the gentleman is whether he does not think that we might have a little more honesty in the estimated appraised value of these properties we are acquiring when the bills are before the Congress in the first place.

Mr. KIRWAN. Certainly. I know what the gentleman is talking about. A few years ago they said most of the people were going to donate easements on their land on a particular project and that $1,600 an acre would be the most we would have to pay for the land to be purchased. If I were on the committee I would do the same as the committee did, I would vote it out as they did, without a dissenting vote. But when it came before the Committee on Appropriations the lawyer representing some of the people who were supposed to donate the land said, "Do you think we are crazy? We are not donating a foot of this land." That is not what they said to the authorizing committee. I am not blaming them. Now the waterfront property comes up to $12,000 an acre. But that is not what we were told. It is when they come before the Committee on Appropriations that we get the truth. It all looks pretty when they come in front of you, but when they come in front of the Appropriations Committee and they have a lawyer in there they say, "No, we won't donate a foot of this land."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on bringing before the Congress what I think is a very good bill. I am very pleased I can be a member of this committee. It is a pleasure to work with both the majority and minority members of the committee.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the two clerks of this committee, Eugene Wilhelm and his assistant, Carson Culp. They know the Department of the Interior and related agencies from A to Z, and I know the chairman knows that they have been a great help to the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee. In my opinion, they have reported out a very realistic bill. I think in light of conditions as they are in the Nation at the present time, perhaps, this is about all that can be logically spent for the purposes set forth.

I particularly wish to commend the chairman and the committee for his and the committee's willingness to work with the authorizing committee. This has been a relationship that has developed within the last few years. It makes it much easier for the authorizing committee to know the problems of the appropriating committee. I am sure that in some instances it makes it much easier for the appropriating committee to understand the difficulties under which the authorizing committees work. I think the gentleman from Ohio has made a very good statement. I do not know how you keep these evils of the private-enterprise system from working as they sometimes do. It is my opinion that when we authorize some of these park facilities, the people who appear before the authorizing committee are honest, and they are sincere in the position that they take and in the statements they make, but as soon as the authorization has been approved, then the people who want to make money move in and boost up the prices and make it almost impossible to follow through on a satisfactory legislative procedure.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the appropriating process that they just leave some of these facilities unappropriated, for after they reach the authorized sum of money, and let us see if we cannot get some of this operation back on a sound financial basis. It has only been in recent years that we have tried to close up these open-end authorizations, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House is one of the few committees that endeavors to do this. We do not get the job done, apparently, but there is this about it, everybody in this body can understand what has happened since the time of the authorization, and the appropriation and the construction that takes place thereafter in many of the activities, even in what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has to undertake, some of these programs, because they have had open-end authorizations, have grown from 1 installation to 23 installations. I am referring now, of course, to the Bureau of Mines. Perhaps the work that they do is satisfactory. Perhaps it is reasonably necessary. But certainly this body has the right to know every time a new facility has to be constructed. This has not been the case in the past. I commend the gentleman for the fine work that he has done not only in this instance but in the past.

Mr. KIRWAN. Please understand I am not condemning any of the witnesses who come before your committee or any authorizing committee or before the Committee on Appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us see about this bill. The amount recommended for 1964 is $935,690,200. This year appropriations are estimated at $926,448,000. In other words, this is $9.2 million, or 1 percent, over 1963, including the pending supplementals. The bill is $92.8 million, or 9 percent, below the budget estimate.

The revenues generated by activities in the bill are estimated at over $787 million, an increase of $7 million.

We made a 40-percent cut in requests for the increased 1964 Pay Act costs. No new construction starts of research facilities or vessels were allowed, which represented a cut of about $11,337,000.

Requests for additional research funds totalling $15.7 million were cut $7.8 million, or 50 percent, allowing only the items placed in the highest priority by the bureaus.

All requests for additional passenger motor vehicles, were disallowed, except for 25 school buses.

Per diem allowances for consultants were held to $75 per day.

The limitation on the unit cost of employee housing was continued at $20,000.

Travel limitations were placed on two bureaus which did not take effective action to control expenditures as requested by the committee last year.

We have disallowed 2,679 positions or 80 percent of the requested increase of 3,475 permanent positions. This is a 5-percent cut in the total positions requested. The increase of 796 permanent positions allowed represents an increase of only 1 percent.

We would like to have cut out all new personnel, but we must provide expanded operations as follows:

Education and welfare and health of the Indians. There will be an additional 1,245 pupils to care for in Indian boarding and day schools, and an increase of 21,965 patient days in Indian hospitals.

It is estimated there will be 217 million visitors to the national parks and forests this year, an increase of 11 million.

Major budget increases allowed in the bill include an increase of $8.9 million for the education, welfare, health, and economic development of the Indians. This is $8.4 million less than requested.

An increase of $5.7 million for Geological Survey, which is $4.3 million less than requested, for additional topographic and geologic mapping and water resources investigations.

An increase of $2.4 million for saline water research, a reduction of $500,000.

An increase of $22.5 million for forest access roads, a cut of $6.4 million.

An increase of $9.1 million for the Smithsonian Institution, including $5.4 million for remodeling the old Patent Office Building.

It is desired to preserve the old Patent Office Building because of the associations with great people and events in our history. The additional funds for the Smithsonian Institution are needed because so many of their activities are scattered in different buildings and they should be concentrated in one place. They want to get into this building which the Civil Service Commission is vacating to take up permanent quarters in their new office building.

I hope when we start reading the bill the Members present will remember that this is one of the best bills the committee has brought in, at least during my 21 years on the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not yet said anything about the fish tank down here. I know we have appropriated something over $300,000 to get blueprints for the tank.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think enough was said about it last year.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no. I just want to help the gentleman cut the bill a little more.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. Now, just let me tell you something. They opened up an aquarium in Philadelphia recently. They are charging $2 admission for an adult and $1 for children under 18. It is planned to charge only 60 cents here and with the millions of visitors to the Nation's Capital the entire cost, as required by the authorization, will be repaid.

Mr. GROSS. I will not buy that at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might use.

Mr. Chairman, when the Department of the Interior and related agencies bill came before our committee, I must confess I was shocked to note that the Department asked for a 14.5-percent increase over their budget in 1963. It is no secret that I am one of those so-called conservatives. I join with many Members on my side of the aisle who feel that this country of ours is in a very serious financial situation, and that Congress, because it is the duty of the Congress, must make an effort to eliminate unnecessary domestic expenditures, reduce our continuing deficit spending, get back on a balanced budget, and make some honest attempt to pay our national debt. If this is not done, there is no question but what in years to come our survival will be much in doubt.

I was pleased to find that the welfare of our country and the need and desires to save money was not a partisan issue. I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his willingness and his desire to see that proper and substantial cuts are made in the spending requests of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service.

I want to commend the other majority members of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who also went along with my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], and myself in a desire to be perfectly fair in cutting this bill; perfectly fair in giving the Department the money they might need and should have without crucifying them or hurting their program, yet at the same time eliminating all of that money which we feel is unnecessary and which is now wasted.

It is no secret that over the years the Department has come before the Congress and asked for more money than they actually hoped to get. I do not believe there is an appropriation bill submitted to the Congress that cannot be cut, and I think they should be cut. It is our duty here in this body to see that the proper cuts are made and that the proper allocations are made to keep the departments in line and to see that they can continue the work they have to do.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. A discussion was engaged in about the rising cost of travel in the Department of the Interior. If my facts are straight, the Department of Defense, about a year ago, due to an Executive order which required that all personnel traveling by air at Government expense do so at the lowest available fare. I realize you cannot legislate in an appropriation bill. What would the gentleman think about the appropriation bill being amended to require that the personnel of the Department of the Interior using funds for air travel may do so only at the lowest available fare?

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the gentleman that I certainly agree with his thinking. But, if he will check our record of the hearings, he will find that that point was brought out, particularly by the chairman, and that on many occasions a directive or instructions were issued to the different departments to use the economy class fare instead of first class. I think under the circumstances, in view of the hearings and the instructions given, that it would not be necessary to amend the bill this year. Of course, if they do not comply with those requests, then I think it would be in order next year to see that it is written in there so that they could not violate it in any way. There were some departments who did not take care of their travel in the proper way, and we specifically provided that they could not go over the amount that was allowed or spend any more money than allocated for that particular service.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct in assuming, then, that it is departmentwide policy today that air travel be at the lowest available rate?

Mr. HARRISON. At the lowest economical rate. I assume they would use the economy rate rather than first-class travel.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. Throughout our hearings our committee gave very thorough consideration to the requests of each of the departments. The hearings are lengthy, as you can tell from the volume of the hearings, and I think that we came up with a very fair figure as far as the amount which the committee allowed for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service. We did make a cut of 9 percent. We think that is a very substantial cut. We think, however, it is a justified cut. The total cut of the amount requested was $92,818,800. We also made a substantial cut in the number of new employees which the departments requested. There was a request for 3,475 new employees, an increase of 6 percent. We allowed an increase of 1 percent or 796 employees. And, they were designated for certain areas, such as health and other areas of that type, so that they were not spread all over the agency.

I might point out that the Bureau of Land Management wanted 198 new positions. They were all disallowed. The Bureau of Mines wanted 139; all disallowed. Forest Service, 427; turned down. Indian Affairs asked for 664 to serve 1,245 new pupils, and they were allowed 47. I think our cut in employment is substantial, but I think the Department can operate on that basis. I think they will not be crippled in any way.

One thing that we found in our hearings is that there is a tendency—I know it is not only with these departments but with others—to use the word "research" to secure money from the Congress. We found that there were over 20 agencies engaged in water research, and we eliminated the Bureau of Mines from going into new research of ocean water, because that agency had no business there. And, I only hope that over the years Congress will take a much closer look at the question of research and try to avoid duplication in the different departments, and if research is necessary, for heaven's sake let us put it in those agencies that now handle it but not have duplication, because with duplication there is an excessive waste of the public's money.

I might say that I recognize the fact that there are many people who say we did not cut enough. There are probably many people who say we cut too much. There will be many people who say we did not put our cuts in the right place.

I think we did a good job. I think the committee worked hard and conscientiously. I am proud of the results that we have achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I might say very frankly to the members of the committee that I would have been most happy if we could have found other places to reduce, especially in view of the necessity to pinch every penny we can in this country, to really reduce every unnecessary expense, whether it be good or not, particularly if it is not needed at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope if those things are found that they will be eliminated, but our feeling was that some of the funds that were left in the bill were the result of actions by legislative committees of the House of Representatives. They were programs which had been previously authorized and we felt we could not eliminate them. However, it will be your duty and your obligation and your prerogative here on the floor of the House to reduce those if you so desire.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a very fair bill. I think it represents a substantial cut. I feel that if other departments receive the same cuts we will make a very substantial dent in the Federal expenditures for fiscal 1964.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentlemen of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and particularly the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and also the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON]. I am greatly pleased with the increased appropriation of $100,000 for expansion of pesticide-wildlife studies under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. This is a vital and important area and I urge that immediate action be undertaken lest we have a series of silent springs. It is of the utmost importance that we move quickly and do everything that we can to control this major problem which confronts all of humanity. In another area, I am pleased with the $30,000 appropriation for the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. With a strong professional staff already available there, I am sure important investigational work will be done immediately.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I might say to the gentleman that I too am very proud of the cuts we have made. I might say if we had not made substantial cuts I would have personally been in here with a minority report. But I also want to say in deference to our chairman and the cooperation which I received from the chairman and the majority members, and the fact that we did make substantial cuts and cuts which I thought were proper, certainly prevented me from even considering a minority report. I certainly will stand on the report which we have presented as being one which I think is a good report and one which should be approved.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commending the subcommittee for reducing this budget by something like 9 percent. I think this is clear evidence that the information we have been getting—and most of it has been coming from the executive branch—that this budget was so tight it could not be cut is not true. I hope this is something which will give stimulus to other subcommittees to try to strive for further reductions. I think such cuts can be made and can be made in a way that they will not in any way damage the best interests of the United States either here or abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee, and I certainly hope with all this publicity we are getting on the budget that this will be the initiative whereby we reduce it further. I feel it can be reduced in other areas as well as what the members of this subcommittee have done here.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, this is an historic occasion for the gentleman from South Dakota. I happen to be a member of a tribe that is being covered by the appropriation which is contained in this bill. I want here to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his continued and deep interest in the welfare of the American Indian in this country.

I also want to express my appreciation at this point to the Members on my side and the leadership which enabled me to be assigned to the Committee on Appropriations. It was doubly difficult for me to scrutinize every item contained in this appropriation bill for the reason that I spent almost a quarter of a century as an employee in the Department of the Interior, and I was familiar with the work. I was familiar with the work of each of the sections, branches, and bureaus and I knew the fine job that is done by the employees in those agencies. Of course, each wants to do an outstanding job and each can find many worthwhile things to do. But in a time such as we are in now, when we feel that we ought to get our budgetary arrangements in better shape, it was with some reluctance, knowing the job that needs to be done with our resources, that needs to be done with our people in order that we shall leave in a day ahead a better America for all who are yet to come, I was delighted to find the chairman of our subcommittee and the ranking minority member concerned with bringing the budget requests within some semblance of balance between the needs and the cost to our country.

So we find almost a 10-percent cut, agreed to by both sides alike, as the thing to do. I feel we have here a bill that has cut back in those areas that can be cut back without damage to our country and without harm to the people who will be affected. I feel that it is an excellent bill.

We have devoted a great deal of time in committee, with the help of the staff, to cut wherever it seemed possible to cut without doing harm to our country.

And so I am hopeful that when the debate finally ends we will be in sufficient agreement so that we can accept this bill as it is. I am sure, as was pointed out by the ranking minority member of our subcommittee that there are those who feel that there should be a greater cut and there are those who feel that we cut too much. But it has been our best judgment that this is a bill that we can defend here on the House floor.

We have joined together in bringing about the cuts that we think it can stand and leave our country with the kind of service that can be provided by the Department of the Interior and keep it a good and a going country.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure almost every Member of this House knows I was a member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior for many years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. JENSEN. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot pass up the opportunity to say something for the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations. We all know our able and distinguished, hard working friend, Congressman JENSEN. We have all known him for many years. I do not think there is a finer man in this House, or any place else; or a harder working

Member, one more dedicated to the people of his district and the Nation.

As well as I recall, Ben, if I may call him that affectionately, and our able friend from Ohio, Mr. Kirwan, have worked together on this bill for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, what a tremendous job they have done. I hope the best of everything for our able friend from Iowa [Mr. Jensen]. I want to listen very carefully to what he says, because whenever he takes the floor and talks, it is worthy of the attention of the membership of the House.

Ben, I wish you well, and I hope you live to be as old as I am, and that will make you only 34.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank my esteemed friend from Texas [Mr. Thomas] for his kind words. I feel I am not entitled to all the praise he has just showered on me, but we are all vain, you know, so I thank you, Al.

I was about to say that I served on this subcommittee for the Interior Department appropriations for a period of 20 years. I found it necessary during this session of Congress to yield my membership on that committee in order to make a place for a new member on the Appropriations Committee. It has proven that my appointment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] has borne out my contention that they would be valuable Members of this House to serve on this very important committee.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] was a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for several years and as such he became very well acquainted with all the ramifications of the Department of the Interior in all its facets. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] was an area director of the Indian Service for many years, and as such he is familiar with most every agency of the Interior Department. They have served on this committee in the most commendable manner during this session.

I want to compliment the chairman of this committee, my friend from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan]. I served with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] on this subcommittee 20 years. Some think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] is a liberal spender. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] knows that we must head off this unconscionable spending of the American people's tax dollars, or soon our dollars, the dollars in our pockets, will be very greatly depreciated in purchasing power.

This bill comes to the floor of the House reduced over 9 percent, making a dollarwise cut of $92,818,800 below the President's budget.

Every dollar in this bill is for America and the American people, for the preservation and the conservation of our priceless topsoil, our forests and all our natural resources. In this bill is appropriated funds for recreation, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and for the national parks and numerous other agencies.

Most important of all is the preservation and conservation of our most precious natural resource—our children. I plead guilty, my colleagues, to being quite liberal in helping to appropriate for recreation, for the Fish and Wildlife Service and for the National Park Service. And why do I do that? Because I know that for example last year over 200 million people visited our lakes, our parks and forests. What does that mean? That means that mothers and fathers took their children to the great outdoors where they communed with nature. Nature, as you know, is God's business. These children by going to the great outdoors commune with nature and become interested in all the things that are natural. When they become natural, they become practical. When they become practical, they become good children and they grow up to be fine men and women. There is an old adage, my friends, which is just as true today as when the words were first uttered, "Take your boy hunting, and you will never have to hunt for your boy." Child delinquency is greatly reduced among children whose parents take their children to the great outdoors. So I shall not have it on my conscience nor will the members of this committee have it on their conscience that they have been a party to more child delinquency. The cost is a small fraction of 1 percent of the money wasted across the seven seas. I only wish we would put greater emphasis on clubs that would spend their time taking our American boys and girls to the great outdoors. In time child delinquency would dwindle to a minimum, if every American boy and girl could be taken by their parents or by people who are interested in children to the great outdoors. There is hardly such a thing as child delinquency among children whose parents take them hunting and fishing, boating and swimming.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk now about the education of our Indian children. When Glenn Emmons took over the directorship of the Indian Bureau in 1953, there were over 20,000 Indian children of school age without a teacher or a schoolroom. Today there are less than 2,500 Indian children without school facilities and that fine record has been made at minimum cost. We must continue to live up, as best we can, to the treaty which Uncle Sam made with the American Indians which was that we would furnish a schoolroom and a teacher for every 35 Indian children. We are now trying hard to live up to that treaty Mr. Chairman. I have always reserved the right to vote for any amendment that I felt was justified, which is introduced to any appropriation bill or any legislative bill. I reserve that right today. But I do say in all sincerity that the members of this committee and their great clerk, Gene Wilhelm, and his fine associate, Carson Culp, have done a good job, and I compliment them for it. I am happy that this bill comes to the floor with a cut of $92,818,800 below the President's budget.

I thank you.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I would like to commend and congratulate Chairman Kirwan for the fair and impartial manner in which his subcommittee hearings were conducted and for this same fairness in the preparation of the Committee's final report. Chairman Kirwan has an intimate grasp of the problems facing the agencies whose budgets were under consideration; his understanding of the general budget situation was a realistic one and it is a privilege and a pleasure to serve here.

I should also like to pay tribute to my committee colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

I want also to mention the work of the helpful and capable staff, Eugene Wilhelm and Carson Culp, who assisted us so skillfully and knowledgeably.

This is a luxurious budget. As finally approved by the committee the bill appropriates $936,690,200 of which $597,860,200 is for the Department of the Interior and $337,830,000 for related agencies which represents a cut of $95,423,200 from that suggested by the Bureau of the Budget. However, today's bill will continue existing services at present levels, allowing only increases with the highest justification.

The bill appropriates $37.5 million more for 1964 than was available during the 1963 fiscal year. Most of this increase is explained by the additional $8,400,000 suggested for the Trust Territory Schools and the additional $22,500,000 suggested for forest access roads.

As Members of the House of Representatives know, the lumber industry throughout the Nation is faced with many problems. This is particularly so this year in the Pacific Northwest. The Appropriations Committee in its deliberations recognized this fact by increasing the amount appropriated for forest access roads from $37½ to $60 million.

The committee realized that the hurricane winds last October 12 in the Pacific Northwest resulting in a blowdown of about 11 billion board feet of prime timber, about 2 billion of which was on Federal lands, justified increases in funds to build roads on which this timber could be taken out of the woods. The committee realized also that a major factor to be considered was the necessity of removing ripe timber from the woods before fire and insect infestation endangered forests in the entire Northwest.

Among the other important programs so essential to the entire Nation in the field of forestry is that of research in the many major categories. For example one of the great problems is in the field of seeding and in the development of research to find better methods relative to wild-animal damage to small newly planted trees.

Not long ago I had a letter from Mr. Bill Hagenstein of the Western Forestry Association, in which he listed several case histories, and these I call to your attention now:

CASE HISTORY NO. 1

One example of this is a 957-acre area within the 1951 Forks Burn in Clallam County. This area was planted with 2-year-old Douglas-fir in November and December of 1957 to an average density of 650 trees per acre. All seedlings had been previously treated with animal repellents to discourage damage by wildlife. Reports from planting crews and company foresters observed herds of elk in the area immediately after planting, and upon inspection found extensive damage to the planted seedlings, large numbers of which had been completely pulled from the ground. Seven months later an intensive inspection indicated seedling survival was only 20 percent of those planted. This survey also indicated that the remaining trees were 53 percent damaged by animals. The financial loss on this one area is outlined here:

Cost of planting at $19 per acre	$18,183.00
Approximate cost of seedlings at $4 per acre	3,828.00
Total cost of project	22,011.00
Cost per acre	23.00
Loss of wildlife (80 percent)	17,608.00
Dollar loss per acre	18.40

In addition to elk, deer and mountain beaver were contributors to the seedling loss. This is one example of what has occurred to various degrees on 2,897 acres of ——— ownership in the Forks Burn planted between 1958 and 1961. As a result, hand planting, as a means of obtaining adequate reforestation in the Forks Burn, has been discontinued.

CASE HISTORY NO. 2

Area scarified in 1958–59 and planted in 1958–59, Clatsop

Elk activity here this past winter is probably the heaviest ever seen concentrated in an area. This plantation after scarification is severely browsed, in fact, to my eye is practically a total loss. Bordering area, containing some Douglas-fir planted in 1953 which was replanted in this 1958–59 season is equally struck. Evidence of heavy elk use is demonstrated by close cropping of herbacious brush, grasses, and conifer trees, runs and tracks and beds.

Also, bordering the scarified-planted area is ground where alder encroached on 1953 plantings. This was sprayed by helicopter in the summer of 1959; and some of ground containing closed canopy alder was replanted in the 1959–60 season. Elk damage is severe here also. A staked survival row was checked from the 1959–60 planting. Following are the results:

TABLE I

Planted species	Number stakes	Thrifty number	Weak number	Dead number	Missing number	Percent survival
Sitka-spruce	24	5	10	3	6	62.5
Douglas-fir	19	0	9	5	5	47.5
Total or average	43	5	19	8	11	55.8

The above determines survival as is, but does not indicate the serious condition of 66.7 percent of the living trees. As follows:

TABLE II

	Number Sitka-spruce	Percent of total	Number Douglas-fir	Percent of total
1. Dead (undetermined)	1	4.2	0	0
2. Killed; tree found pulled out, or stub found without foliage	2	8.3	5	26.3
3. Missing; no complete evidence, but probably elk pullups	6	25.0	5	26.3
4. Heavy, close cropped; trees not likely to survive	7	29.2	6	31.6
5. Medium, leader clipped, but tree should survive	1	4.2	3	15.8
6. Light, leader tip clipped; tree not impaired	3	12.5	0	0
7. Underaged	4	16.6	0	0
Total	24		19	

Table II illustrates more conclusively the fate of this plantation by exactly categorizing each tree of the staked row examined. For example:

While table I shows 47.5-percent survival for Douglas-fir, actually only 15.8 percent of the trees will survive. Sitka spruce shows 62.5-percent survival, but only 33.3 percent will survive. And these trees will only survive if browsing ceases. It also illustrates that under severe conditions, spruce may be browsed, but not to the extent of Douglas-fir.

CASE HISTORY NO. 3

Reforestation on various company lands

Section 19, township 14 south, range 4 east: Hand seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1954; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1958.

Sections 19 and 30, township 14 south, range 4 east: Hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1957; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 25, township 14 south, range 3 east: Hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954.

Section 25 and 26, township 14 south, range 3 east: Hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1958.

Section 23, township 14 south, range 3 east: South half aerial seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1951; portion of south half hand planted Douglas-fir, 1952; portion of southeast quarter hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1955; portion of southeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 26, township 14 south, range 3 east: West half, northwest quarter hand seeded Noble-fir, 1955; east half, northwest quarter hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1955; northwest quarter, southwest quarter seeded Douglas-fir, 1958; northwest quarter, southwest quarter aerial seeded Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 22, township 14 south, range 3 east: South half aerial seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1951; northwest quarter and west half, northeast quarter aerial poison baited, 1951; northeast quarter and north half, southeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1957; south half, north half, northeast quarter hand seeded Ponderosa Pine, 1959; north half, north half, northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1960.

Section 16 township 14 south, range 3 east: No reforestation work.

Section 9, township 14 south, range 3 east: West half, northwest quarter, northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954; scarified area in northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 5, township 14 south, range 3 east: North half hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954.

It was recognized in this bill that acceleration of the process of providing educational facilities in the trust territories is more than justified, indeed is a necessity.

Recognition of the lag in elementary education among the young people in the trust territories led to the start of an accelerated elementary education program in 1963. The future of these people in a modern world depends largely upon the education they will obtain in their school systems. Certainly everything we can do to help these young people prepare for the future is our responsibility.

It is true in the territories as well as in our own Nation, that an educated person is a more responsible and productive person.

I want to mention also the appropriation requested for the Fish and Wildlife Service wherein funds requested for this agency are allocations of money to preserve and improve our fish resources. Many of our people depend upon fish for their livelihood and in view of the rapidly increasing population in our Nation it is absolutely essential that these important sources of food be protected and expanded. There is, of course, another aspect to this and that is the sport fishing industry. Millions of our fellow Americans relax with a fishing rod in their hand, and a great industry has been built around sport fishing.

Related to this preservation of our fishing industry is the work of the Bureau of Land Management. The appropriation bill allocates many millions of dollars to this agency. All of it to be used in making our Nation better. Millions of acres of Government land are managed by this agency. Thousands of acres of rangeland are being reseeded. Thousands more will be planted in trees and other crops. Soil conservation projects are underway. Certainly it is to the interest of this generation and to those in the future that this agency be given adequate funds to do the job assigned to it.

When discussing appropriation measures we cannot fail to mention money being used to improve the lives of our Indian citizens. The Bureau of Indian Affairs have under their care and supervision Indian tribes throughout the Nation. Money appropriated today will be used to prepare our Indian citizens for a more active participation in the life of their communities, States, and our Nation. Health standards will be improved, infant mortality decreased, the lifespan lengthened, educational needs fulfilled. Opening new and broadened opportunities for the Indian is a necessity if they are to achieve the full benefits of United States citizenship.

Again, my congratulations, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Ohio and his fine committee for a job well done. He always does a fine job on that committee. I think he has made substantial reductions that will not disrupt any essential function of this Government. I wish it had been possible for him to make a few more. I hope every chairman as he comes along with an appropriation bill during this session of Congress will fall in line and do as well for the American taxpayer as the gentleman from Ohio has done.

I want to disagree, however, a little bit with the gentleman on Indians. I yield to no person in this Congress in the matter of sympathy for the American Indian. I think I know the American Indian possibly better than any man or woman in this great body, except perhaps the gentleman from South Dakota, BEN REIFEL. I have headed the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for a little over 8 years. I think I have visited every Indian reservation in America. I have wondered as I traveled about and wonder still if the Members of this Congress really know how much benefit the American Indian is obtaining from the tremendous amounts of money we are expending in his behalf. In 1954 the requested appropriations for the Indian Bureau were $103 million.

The expenditures were somewhat less than $85 million. The items contained in the present budget amount to $266,533,300, an increase in the last 10 years of approximately $181 million against an expression of the Congress of the United States that we wanted, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indian self-supporting and get him off the backs of the American people.

This Indian problem is not a new one. It has been with us since we became a nation. However, following the instructions of the Congress in the last 10 years, 13 tribes have been terminated, with a total population or a total number of 13,382.

I think there is a policy here in the Congress, it is not only in this particular bill but in every bill that you bring here or that we bring here, to look at the requested budget and not look back and see what the increases have been over the years and trying to find out where these tremendous sums of money are going.

Yes, I am sympathetic to the little Indian child, but I may say to my friend from Ohio, we have less children today going to Indian schools than we had 10 years ago. I say that nobody can challenge that, because as we move along on this program we are asking the State to take over the teaching of the Indian children.

In my State of Florida, where we have been operating Indian schools in the past, we do not operate them any more. We make an agreement with the local school authorities of those counties nearest the Indian reservation, and they take over the education of the Indian children at less than half the amount that was necessary to maintain Indian schools.

I do not blame this committee for this tremendous increase, I do not blame any chairman of the Appropriations Committee for bringing in a bill, to do what? To take care of the obligations that Congress has authorized, has obligated you to move forward on. Yes, as the chairman, Mr. ASPINALL, said just a while ago, we try in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to have the people downtown, when they present a bill to that committee, tell us what it is going to cost. Every committee of the Congress should do that. If we did that we would find that in order to get additional money they would follow along. I assure you that in any of these programs you will be lucky if you get out of them with no less than twice the amount that they asked for. So it is not the fault or responsibility of this committee to cut beyond certain essentials. It is up to the Congress of the United States. You say you control the purse strings, you should control the purse strings, but do not lay the thing in this committee's lap. When you authorize programs, when you pass bills on this floor, find out what they are going to cost, put a ceiling on them, and make them come back and tell you if they have made a mistake. I assure you 75 percent of the time they will be coming back to this Congress and saying, "Oh, we made a mistake this time. We have expended more money. The project is about one-third to one-half complete, and we must have additional money."

Mr. Chairman, I again want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for doing the job, but I want to say to you that I think every person in this Congress, every chairman in this Congress should, when he brings a bill up, make them lay it on the line and let us find out what we are expending it for, and let us not let the people downtown tell us how to run the appropriations of this great Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, it is ironic—and that is a charitable word—it is ironic that today we have a message on foreign aid on the same day we consider appropriations for the American Indian. Have your Alianza Para Progreso, if you wish, but for heaven's sake may we also have in the words of the Ogallala-Sioux "Toe ka'ta Kee'ya-un yampi-wolakota," a treaty of progress for the American Indian.

The voluminous hearings on the appropriations bill before the House include many statements expressing great satisfaction with the Federal Government's Indian program. It is not my purpose to charge anyone with incompetence or malfeasance. Nor is it my purpose to pose as an expert on Indian affairs. I have lived with Indians and close to Indians and have a continuing interest in the Indian which took me to several reservations and settlements last autumn and winter.

When one reads the other side of testimony before the Appropriations Committee, and witnesses first hand, the conditions on our Indian reservations, I cannot avoid the conclusion that our program for development of the American Indian has been a miserable failure. There are many who can take credit for trying to help the Indian. We all must share the blame for the lack of constructive results.

Bear two basic facts in mind:

There are now 380,000 Indians for which the Bureau is responsible. The Bureau was established in 1849.

On page 842 of the hearings note that 95 percent of the Indian children in the boarding schools come from non-English-speaking homes.

On page 844, note:

> It is estimated that 65,000 Indian families are living in housing far below decent minimum standards. Many are living in tarpaper shacks, grass wickiups, etc., under extreme climatic conditions.

On page 845, we quote:

> Our experience over a period of years has shown a steady annual increase in the number of people receiving general assistance.

On page 1468, find this comment:

> Medicine men are still active on some of the reservations and at times the Indians place a great deal of faith in their ability in the healing arts, in conflict with medical treatment as we know it. * * * A language barrier still exists * * * which makes it difficult to communicate with many of the beneficiaries and requires the use of interpreters. * * * Approximately 60 percent of the Navajo and 35 percent of the Papago do not speak English.
>
> Tens of thousands have only polluted water to drink and use. Even this must be hauled long distances.

On 1472, find this table, indicating the Indian mortality rate compared to those of all races in the country: Infant deaths are listed as less than two times greater except for Alaska natives where the rate is about 2.5 greater. There is some excuse for the latter.

Infections diseases—rates per 100,000 population—Indian excluding Alaskan 4 times greater. Gastroenteric diseases, Indian nearly 7 times greater. Influenza and pneumonia over 2 times greater.

Supplement these statistics with figures from 1487:

> Up to the time the Indian infant leaves the hospital after birth, the rates of death are comparable to all races. However, when he leaves the hospital and goes to his Indian home he is subjected to marked unsanitary conditions, poor housing, poor nutrition, crowding, and all the adverse things that we find in the Indian community. As a result, we see the death rate among the Indians between the ages of 28 days to 11 months is 4 times greater than it is in all races.

These statements of fact, are quotations from personnel of the Indian Bureau and the Public Health Service.

How can we be proud of a 110-year record which leaves so much to be desired?

Nor can we complain about a lack of personnel. The chairman of the subcommittee reports on page 841 that investigations reveal 5,800 employees for educating approximately 42,000 Indian students. This represents a ration of one employee assigned to the educational activity for every seven Indian pupils.

Nor can the blame be laid at the feet of the Appropriations Committee which has provided generous funds through the period. In fact, we have provided for expenditures repeatedly which were used impractically.

The Federal Government proposes to spend many hundreds of thousands of dollars in one area for the purpose of attracting industry to make jobs for reservation Indians. This is part of a reservoir project. Yet, one can find only a handful of Indians employed today on the vast projects right on the Indian reservation. Every level of labor skills is needed on the project. Yet, practically no Indians are employed.

Nearby is an Indian resettlement. It is a shameful huddle of tents, log cabins, and disreputable shacks. Sometime—sometime, a new town will be built. But for many months, the Indians are relocated on a dusty flat where there is no plumbing, there are no streets, there is no community lighting. There is a well, the water of which I would not drink. As a matter of fact, the make-shift well was condemned late last fall because of the presence of infectious disease. I suppose we should give credit to the State health authorities which closed the well. I cannot give credit to those who provided what I term unequivocably, an unsatisfactory supply of water.

There is, in an adjacent area, a clinic where the doctor serves the people 1 day a week. The day I visited was the appointed day for the medical visit. The doctor was present for a half hour, then left. I assume he had other duties. There was no note indicating he would be back. The Indian lady who walked a long distance carrying a child which she thought needed medical attention, simply started to walk away when she found the clinic unattended.

Elsewhere in America we fight segregation. With the Indians, we promote it. Except for a limited number of major crimes, an Indian judge provides justice.

One Indian judge I know has a fourth grade education. She is a fine woman. She is ambitious. She loves her people. But if she sentences an Indian for a violation which falls under her jurisdiction, there is no court of appeal except the Indian tribal council. Hers is a court apart. Of course, this procedure is in accordance with a treaty or agreement. It is inviolate. Yet, we violate another treaty on the same reservation, by taking land and water rights from the Indian.

There has been progress in some subject areas in various geographic areas. Yet, the general condition of the American Indian is a disgrace and a tragedy.

I compliment those who sincerely try to do something about this situation. I cannot agree that our record is good. Nothing short of a complete redirection of our effort will alter the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In 1849, that was the Old Frontier; was it not?

Mr. KYL. I would assume so.

Mr. GROSS. And, if the gentleman will yield further, the New Frontier in 1963 cannot waste a minute to get hundreds of millions of dollars down to South America, to the Congo, Africa, Ghana—you name it—and they are ready to go there with money to take care of the underdeveloped countries in those areas; is that about right?

Mr. KYL. I would assume so.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my commendation of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and members of his subcommittee for producing this wonderful bill, this great report and these 1800 pages of hearings.

Perhaps the developments of the past 3 weeks may have focused my attention a little more sharply on some of the bad effects of strip mining, because 3 weeks ago today, as a result of much of this strip mining in West Virginia and Kentucky our floods were made much more serious, and caused a great deal more damage. I wish each Member of the House could have been with me to the Staton Brothers Grocery Store and the Freeman Supermarket in Peach Creek, and numerous other areas of Logan County, W. Va., to see the damage done by this black, gummy, sludgy substance that came down out of the tributaries, which resulted I believe largely from the kind of strip mining which is going on in our coal producing States. Strip mining not only affects the mined areas, but makes it mighty tough on those for miles downstream from the strip mining operation.

Why cannot the Department of Interior do more about this? There are 500,000 acres, as I understand it, of abandoned and unreclaimed strip mining land in the coal-producing States. These lands place an increased tax burden on the whole area. They present health and safety hazards. They contribute soil erosion and stream pollution. And 103,000 of these acres are in the State of West Virginia.

What can be done about this strip mining? I am very deeply impressed with the thoroughness with which the committee has gone into this subject, citing the examples of what the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority are already doing in this area. This is really not duplication. The Soil Conservation Service is obligated to protect the soil. TVA has a particular geographical area to which it devotes its energies. The Forest Service has to plant trees. But who is going to provide the leadership in order that we can do something about reclaiming these strip mining lands? It is an insult to God and nature to gouge out our beautiful hillsides, not only ruining the landscape but also making vast areas more vulnerable to floods.

I simply throw up my hands in despair and ask the question of whoever could answer it: Who can do something about this terrible situation in strip mining?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the interest of the gentleman from West Virginia, but I wish to advise him that this matter is not going unstudied as far as the Congress is concerned. We had legislation before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the last Congress. We had people from various States who appeared before the committee and we had members of our committee who visited some of these areas.

We find that the States themselves and the authorities are not united in what they think is necessary to help take care of the situation. Neither are the representatives of industry. I can say that we have not finished our studies. We still have legislation before our committee and we shall continue to try to find the answer. It is the feeling of some of us that the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior does not have any specific authority for this work. That is the reason why the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and others of our committee have asked the committee to take further notice of the condition which the gentleman so forcefully brings to our mind.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I hope that aggressive efforts may be made to rehabilitate and reclaim these lands after strip mining has been completed, and I hope that the Federal Government in cooperation with the States and private industry can work harder toward this end.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee is again recommending that the House break faith with those who have worked to preserve the view from Mount Vernon, George Washington's home.

Less than 2 years ago, a bill which I introduced to preserve the Mount Vernon view passed the House without a dissenting vote.

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON's companion bill, passed the Senate without a dissenting vote, and those bills became Public Law 87-362.

Just a year ago, the Appropriations Committee recommended the disallowance of the funds to implement this law. The House, and the Senate, again without a dissenting vote, approved $213,000 to begin acquisition of land, as recommended by the joint conference committee.

In spite of this, the Appropriations Committee recommends that we disallow any funds. The committee advances the same reasons as last year.

These so-called reasons are, that no actions are planned in this area which would detract from the present view of Mount Vernon, that the area is under adequate planning and zoning controls, that the cost will be far greater than estimated, and that the local jurisdiction should make a park at this site.

As I did just 1 year ago, I must again correct the RECORD so that the House may have the true facts.

To take the committee's last point first—that the purposes should be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction—as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I can again assure the House that the record is entirely clear. This is not a local bill passed to provide a park for local citizens. The

Interior Committee recommended Public Law 87-362 to protect the view from Mount Vernon for the millions of visitors who come to that shrine from all over America and all over the free world.

The Appropriations Committee again makes the point that it knows of "no evidence that any action is planned that would in any way detract from the present view from Mount Vernon." The committee again this year has chosen to ignore testimony, and repeated statements that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission desires to locate a sewage plant within the confines of the area covered by Public Law 87-362.

The committee then re-recites the presence of adequate zoning. From testimony which it has, the committee must be aware that the adequate zoning they refer to allows development of 10,000 square feet lots under the rural residential category, and that the local zoning laws have no control over such agencies as the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, who have the power of eminent domain over land, even if it is directly across from Mount Vernon.

At this point the committee suggests that the generous donations by patriotic foundations of 350 acres along the Potomac and an additional 151 acres already donated on the south shore of Picataway Creek, coupled with the donation of scenic easements on hundreds of acres by scores of private citizens without cost to the Government, justifies the Congress going back on its commitments.

The committee's recommendations, if followed by the House, it will allow the three to five farmers who claim their farmland is worth $12,000 per acre—a rather high price for farmland—to make a real killing. If the House allows the committee's recommendations, the farmers' land will be surrounded with lands donated without cost to the Federal Government, and protected by easements donated to the Federal Government. The committee wants these farmers to be free to proceed with high-density development within the area protected by Public Law 87-362, and the committee would have the House disregard the scores of individuals, and the organizations who have donated their land, or the rights to their land generously and patriotically.

I am afraid that the committee was outrageously bamboozled by the paid representative who testified for the farmers. This representative summarily dismissed the Interior Department's estimate of $1,600 per acre. The committee now reports to the House "the committee can now find no basis for this estimate."

I call to your attention the fact that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received testimony from the Interior Department and reported to the House that the $1,600 price was based on the most recent transactions in the area between a willing seller and an informed buyer. This report and the testimony is, and has been, available to the Appropriations Committee.

The Appropriations Committee report then shows how completely the paid representative of the three to five farmers took them in. This representative gave the following unsubstantiated testimony:

> Up-to-date appraisals indicate the acquisition cost may run $12,000 per acre instead of the $1,600 per acre estimated by the Interior Department.

The committee solemnly advises the House "it is evident from recent appriasals running as high as $12,000 an acre in this general area that a considerable increase in authorization would be required."

The committee has thrown out the testimony of the Interior Department based on the most recent comparable sales in the area covered by Public Law 87-362 and substituted the unsubstantiated opinion of the paid representative who believes his clients will want more money for their land.

The House is aware that these three to five farmers last year found time—between crops no doubt—to subject the House and the Senate to a barrage of letters distorting the facts, attacking our colleague Frances Bolton, attacking the landowners in the area who have agreed to donate land and easements, attacking the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union—and even suggesting that Mount Vernon be condemned—as well as other organizations who have supported this measure.

A few days ago, after our colleague Frances Bolton had left the witness chair, where she testified for this appropriation, and the hearing room, she was subjected to an attack by Mr. William Edison Owen, the paid representative of the farmers. This attack which grossly distorted the truth provided, as I have pointed out, some of the basis for the committee report. The House will be able to judge the testimony of Mr. Owen from the following excerpt from Frances Bolton's statement:

> Mr. Owen having attempted to show that the Moyaone Association is working with ulterior, selfish and profitmaking motives, then indicates that the cost of acquisition by the Government of his clients' land may run $12,000 per acre instead of the $1,600 per acre estimated by the Interior Department. This, the committee may consider is rather expensive land for farming.
>
> The members of this committee should know that the acreage owned by Mr. Owen's identified clients, is, according to the Department of the Interior, currency assessed by the tax assessor of Prince Georges County at figures between $28 and $52 per acre.
>
> Thus, Mr. Owen would have the committee believe that the property of one of his clients valued by the tax assessor at $6,000 should be purchased by the Government for $1,380,000; and another client whose property has an assessed value of $8,000 would sell to the Government for $2,676,000 and still another client's land assessed at a value of $3,100 should bring $1,547,000 from the Department of the Interior.
>
> Thus, Mr. Owen calls upon the Appropriations Committee to believe his identified client's lands with a valuation set by the assessor of Prince Georges County at $16,100 should cost the Interior Department $5,603,000 or a selling price of 35,000 percent higher than assessed valuation.

It is on the basis of Mr. Owen's grossly inflated figures and flimsy evidence that the Appropriations Committee advises the House:

> A considerable increase in authorization would be required if the Federal Government were to purchase the remaining acreage in question.

I can only say that if the Appropriations Committee's dilatory tactics prevail, the price may ultimately rise to some figure like that presented by the committee.

Meanwhile, I urge the House not to stand idly by, but to act now to preserve this view so important to Mount Vernon, which, unless we act, most certainly will give way to high density development.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I would advise the gentleman that it was appraised by J. Randall Walcroft. He said there were 10.446 acres in this tract, and appraised it on January 28, 1963, as valued at $120,113.

Mr. SAYLOR. Last year the appropriations committee broke faith with the Congress. At the time we brought in the authorizing bill they led us to believe the money would be forthcoming, and I call upon the Appropriations Committee now to put the money back and acquire these lands now.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I should first assure everyone that the few remarks I want to make at this time certainly are not partisan in nature. I should like also to suggest at the outset that I am very happy that the appropriation bills are beginning to come before the House, because we all know that these are matters that must be disposed of before we can adjourn sine die. As far as I am concerned I think it is highly desirable that we dispose of as many of these appropriation bills as we can before the end of the fiscal year.

Last January, I think about the middle of the month, we received from the executive branch of the Government, the budget for the next fiscal year It was right around $108 billion in new obligational authority, and that is what is generally referred to as the budget. I think a great many people were honestly and genuinely concerned about these spending proposals that were therein contained, and I say that advisedly when I refer to the fact that people here in the Congress on both sides of the aisle, and I can say it without regard to the political situation in the country, felt that we ought to do something about it if we had any regard for the welfare and the security of our country. Many of us thought that if we could make cuts we should make them. We felt that there were certain dangers inherent in excessive Government spending. As the leader on my side and being in the minority, I have recognized from the beginning, and I say again, that whatever must be done should be done on a bipartisan basis, because no matter what determination we might make on our side of the aisle as to cuts that might be made, if we did not have some Members on the other side who feel the same way we do we would not get very far.

I have also said, and I say again, that it is the obligation of all of us to look this budget over very carefully and to cut it wherever we deem it can and should be cut.

I talk to the people once in a while on television, on the radio and personally. Earlier this year I appeared on a television program called "Meet the Press."

That was on February 6, last. Some of those reporters were quite insistent on inquiring about the budget. I took the position then that it should be cut, and I have maintained that position since that time in public and private statements and conversations.

On our side, the Republican side, we thought it might be well for us, having regard to the fact that whatever is accomplished must be on a bipartisan basis, to be able to do what we could to make the contribution in the direction I have been talking about, and that many of us have been talking about.

We started meetings with some of our members on the committee and with our legislative committee members. We set up a task force about which you have read and heard, headed by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bow]. We got some expert advice from people knowledgeable on matters covered by this budget, and I think it is fair to say that weeks and weeks of hard, diligent work, and effort have gone into this study. We have gone through the budget line by line. It was no hit and miss operation.

I recognize, of course, that some people shout when you talk about cutting the budget, "You cannot cut the budget. Sure, Congress controls the purse strings, but this is something you just cannot cut."

If anyone should take that position, may I say, in my opinion it is a negative, defeatist attitude that I do not find expressed here on the floor of the House today.

Some people have said, "Give us a bill of particulars." We have the bill of particulars, but the time and the place to talk about the bill of particulars will come along as we progress further in this session.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that there is alarm in the country about the spending that is proposed for the next fiscal year. I say people are alarmed and I think the mail all of us are getting is pretty clear proof that the people are expecting us to cut this budget wherever we can.

Having said as much, I am happy to see that the President has already cut, on his own direction, $142 million from his requested budget; and, if my memory serves me correctly, the budget was often referred to as a hard budget right down to minimums. The message we heard today takes $640 million out of the foreign assistance program.

May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and the people who work with you, you have cut $93 million from this budget request. The target some of us had set was something over $100 million of a reduction.

So, in my opinion, this proves what can be done. Whether or not more cuts can be made, I do not know. There is a place or two I may be able to find I could vote to take something further out. But what has been done in connection with this bill, in my opinion, proves that the Congress can make some substantial reductions in the budget, and I hope as we go along we can continue to do that very thing.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk a little bit more about the general budget and our fiscal situation than I do about this particular bill, which was the reason I suggested we might have a little more time.

First let me say that I think this committee has done quite a comprehensive and laudable job on the question of reducing expenditures on projects in these appropriation bills that can be dispensed with or postponed. This bill represents a cut of $93 million in the requested budget. It is still, however, $37 million over the budget of last year. I would hope that this committee's action on this bill has set a percentage example for all of the appropriation bills that are going to come along later. They have cut 9 percent below the budget request. Now, that is very substantial progress, and I do not want anything I may say here to be taken as being in anywise critical of the splendid work of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and his able assistants on the subcommittees.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a very large budget. Now, just remember that the budget of 2 years ago was $81 billion. You are asked this year to appropriate $107 billion.

Now, if you take a pencil, you can very readily ascertain that in those 2 years we have increased the requested budgets by 34 percent at a time when the country needs to cut its taxes. Now, we are all interested in cutting taxes. The country wants a tax cut. It would be good for the economy of the country. But, there are many of us and there are many people in this Nation who feel that you cannot properly cut your revenues by tax reduction at the same time that you are increasing your expenditures and have to borrow the money to operate your budget every year. Now, I think we have to consider that in every appropriation bill that comes up, because everybody is hungering and thirsting for a tax bill that is less confiscatory than the one we have now. I expect all of you know substantial business people as I do who have reached the point in the confiscatory nature of their income taxes that they have just about decided that they will take what they have made and go home and sit down and put it in a sock and just not contribute further to the economy of this country. And, that is bad. We ought to do something, but how are you going to do it when you are constantly increasing your expenditures every year and at the same time undertake to reduce your taxes? Now, that is not commonsense, and the people of America are commonsense people, and they do not want that sort of an arrangement. So, I am deeply interested, as I know other Members are, in reducing all of these bills as much as we can without hurting the economy of the country. I do not think you will find a bill that comes before you that has not worthy and commendable projects in it that we can well postpone for a year or two or until we are in better shape to do so.

This bill in my judgment, with all due respect and with all my compliments to the committee, is no exception to the rule that somewhere there is some fat that can be cut out, or can be postponed.

Mr. Chairman, I refer particularly to the subject of ducks. There is a provision in this bill for a program on ducks. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has said, he did not authorize it. This Congress authorized it. In this bill there is an item of $10 million for a program to acquire some—I think it is 1 million—when I get into these figures I get all balled up—acres of land that is either already marshland or is going to be converted into marshland for the use of migratory ducks to go back and sit down on and spend the winter. Now, I wonder. The ducks have been right patient with us. I wonder if they would not be willing to wait a year or two. I do not think it would do the duck hunters much harm. I am an old duck hunter myself. I cannot think of any more uncomfortable pursuit than hunting ducks in the middle of a snowstorm, sitting out in the middle of a river, hoping one is going to fly over. But, nevertheless, it is a very popular sport. I am sympathetic with the sport. But I think we could postpone that $10 million. As a matter of fact, I think the committee probably felt a little that same way because the figure was supposed to have been $12 million in the budget, and they cut it to $10 million.

That program was authorized by this Congress. I reckon I was sitting around here somewhere when we did it, because I do not remember it. However, it authorized a program involving over $100 million to buy over 1 million acres of land in North and South Dakota and Minnesota. I do not know why they want to buy land in Minnesota. Minnesota advertises itself as the State of Ten Thousand Lakes. That looks like it would take up enough of the State so that they would not want to be building any more duck ponds. But, nevertheless, we are going to build duck ponds in the State of Ten Thousand Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, in the Dakotas many thousands of acres can be bought there. Perhaps, they do not have so many lakes, because I notice from the figure they will have a good deal more ponds to be built than Minnesota. I also understand from what reading I have been able to do on the subject that North and South Dakota are saying "Now, hold a while; we do not want all our farmland turned into marshes to feed the ducks in the wintertime, so that they can fly down south and these rebels are going to shoot them all." They would rather have the farmland up there.

So, there is a good reason to postpone this appropriation, and let us wait a little bit until we are in better shape to do this.

I think even the duck hunters would appreciate it if we created here an atmosphere conducive to a tax reduction than to have a few more ducks. They cannot shoot but two of them in a day, anyway. So let us think about that when this bill is taken up for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, along that line, does not the gentleman think we might also postpone the $10 million fish tank to be built along the Potomac and for which planning money is provided in this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know about fish in tanks, but I have not seen anything in the bill about that.

Mr. GROSS. It is in there, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] does not seem to realize that the bill said that it would not cost the taxpayers a dime; that is the point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There is a gentleman on the floor who once told the House that the Washington Stadium would not cost the taxpayers a dime, either.

Mr. KIRWAN. I did not say anything about the stadium. The stadium and this aquarium are two different things. The law requires that the aquarium pay back all costs of planning and construction.

Mr. GROSS. Let me suggest that the gentleman not stake his reputation on the statement that the aquarium will pay for itself in 5 years.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would not change the subject to fish. I want to talk about ducks.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that even if you cannot use this $10 million it will not absolutely stop this program because in the authorization authority is given to use the receipts from duck stamps, which I understand amount to about $4 million; and you can use that to acquire some of these ponds up in Minnesota or South Dakota or wherever they are; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is entirely right. But we got off ducks onto fish and I had not reached that point. This authorization that calls for $100 million for duck-pond renewal is supposed to be paid for out of what is called the duck stamp tax. That is supposed to yield $4 million a year. So when I said that this bill carried $10 million for duck ponds that did not include the $4 million that they get out of the duck stamps each year, and which receipts are supposed to be used to liquidate this other expense.

Let us do it the way it was contemplated in the bill, instead of trying to have a crash program to inundate half of Minnesota or North and South Dakota. Let us do it the way it was intended to do it. Let the $4 million from the duck stamp money go each year, as it is going this year, but let us cut out this $10 million and show the people of this country that we are going to cut the fat out of these bills wherever we can find it. I do not believe that this committee, which has done such a fine job on this bill, is going to object too strenuously to the elimination of that section.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the debate on H.R. 5279 and read the report of the committee amounting to some 46 pages, but I still have many reservations, I understand that no record vote was had because many do not want to go on record on this bill. This I do not understand.

I appreciate the fact that the committee has cut out $92,818,800 worth of fat from this bill. I am glad to join with my colleagues in supporting amendments which have cut another $6,600,000 from the bill. I also supported the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Florida, which would have eliminated another $11 million had they passed.

This bill as amended still is almost $31 million over the current appropriation. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Department of the Interior and the related agencies have not suffered for lack of money in the current budget.

Included in this $31 million is 796 new civilian Federal employees, the cost of which I cannot accurately determine from the report. The titles and groupings in the report make it impossible to determine all the fat in this appropriation, but some of it is indicated to me by comparison with this current year's authorization.

I cannot in good conscious support the expenditures of $310,000 for planning of the fish aquarium which will ultimately cost the taxpayers $10 million. It is said it would not cost a cent—but a third of a million is being spent today—and it is the taxpayers money. I must agree with Judge SMITH that $10 million for the creation of wetlands for duck refuges, while admirable, is not essential. Could not the Department of Agriculture quit paying for draining such lands and alleviate the problem?

Apparently this Congress is more interested in ducks than people—in fowls than taxpayers. People in my State could use some flood control projects rather than this "bird money." There is already $4 million available for this work from the sale of Federal hunting stamps. Let us get our fiscal affairs in order and spend our money—if we must—on our people, not the birds and foreign enemy countries. This $10 million for the birds is an increase of $3 million over the current year.

I see salaries for the Office of Saline Water are up $2,400,000, while operating expenses are down $150,000.

It appears to be more and higher paid employees to do less work. Salaries of the Office of the Solicitor are up $138,000; salaries of the Office of the Secretary are up $301,000; salaries of the Commission of Fine Arts up $8,000; salaries of the National Planning Commission are up $25,000 and the salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution up $2,055,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask why this appropriation cannot be cut further. Sir, if this is an example of a hard budget, I would hate to see a soft one.

I suppose that without a record vote which I desired that this statement is indicative of my stand, I am willing to be counted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to express my disapproval of H.R. 5279 making appropriation for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. I refuse to support any spending program that exceeds last year's astronomical increase which led to a tremendous deficit. Not only should we cut back the bill to last year's level, which means eliminating the increase of 796 new positions and $37,508,000, but we should cut the expenditures 5 percent or even 10 percent below last year. In either of these cases, I would vote for passage of the bill.

The committee report gives us adequate reasons for disapproving this bill and I commend the committee for those moments of blunt forthrightness. Here are some examples why this bill should not be passed:

First. The duplication of the overlapping agencies conducting research, including the seven agencies conducting research in reduction of evaporation and transpiration, the nine agencies studying flow in natural and artificial and open channels, and the eight departments of the oceanographic program.

Second. The request for increase in personnel of 3,475 when reduced to 796 is still an increase rather than a reduction.

Third. The limitation of cost per unit of employees housing of $20,000 is too high.

Fourth. The income-producing receipts of Government should further reduce the need for new appropriations.

Indeed an effort should be made further to get Government out of business, wherever possible.

Fifth. The request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of additional outside funds from the Area Redevelopment Administration and through accelerated public works funds warrants further study in the pyramiding of appropriations.

Sixth. General administrative expenses should not be increased by $64,000 over the 1963 appropriation.

Seventh. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should not receive $762,900 more than last year.

Eighth. The Office of Oil and Gas should not receive further increase of $51,000 for increased requirements under the administration of the oil import program.

These specific examples, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the reasons why I cannot agree to support this program and suggest that further economies can be made. There is no way to cut spending without economizing; namely, cutting expenditures. Pretty speeches and good intentions will not get the job done. At a time of deficit financing and the danger of continuing inflation and gold outflow, the latter being so serious that money devaluation is just around the corner, there is no excuse for passing an appropriation bill increasing expenditures over last year. As I said earlier, last year's expenditures should be reduced.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I was, of course, disappointed that the Committee on Appropriations decided to delete from H.R. 5279 the $2 million which was proposed for the use of Project Gasoline. However, I am pleased to note the references in the report which have been made by the committee that such action was merely deferred without prejudice, pending the review being conducted by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

This project is both notable and worthy. It has been suggested by Mr. Samuel G. Lasky, Assistant Director of the Office of Coal Research, in hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee, that we are at a point in this Nation where research thus far would indicate that gasoline could be made from coal—100-octane gasoline—at 13.6 cents per gallon. Observations have been further made that this is competitive with the refinery price of gasoline made from petroleum.

To continue research at its present rate in this field would indicate than 10 to 15 years would be consumed before a breakthrough could be obtained. The suggestion by the Office of Coal Research that they be permitted to enter into a contract to hasten or accelerate this research seems to me to be of tremendous importance, especially since they feel that a breakthrough could be accomplished within 3 or 4 years. This could have a powerful impact in every coal-producing State in this country.

We have had before us from various committees of the House programs which have as their purpose resurrecting the economies of the depressed areas of our country, which are situated for the most part in the coal-producing States, in which great sums of money are committed for many of these programs which have been of little value or help in meeting the problem. It, therefore, seems reasonable to me that this Project Gasoline should be approved because when the breakthrough is obtained, coal-producing States and their economies will begin to move without the necessity of any pump priming by the Federal Government. We will again be self-sufficient; we will again have the opportunity to maintain our personal dignity and to shake the image of despair that surrounds us all.

I am pleased that the subcommittee chairman is sympathetic with this project, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the authorizing committee in this instance, will report favorably in the not-too-distant future on this project in order that the moneys might be made available in conference on this appropriation bill so that not a moment may be lost in realizing results from this venture.

The $2 million that was requested in this instance is a budgeted item. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. What I am asking the Congress today is not inconsistent with the budget presentation. Therefore, I respectfully request the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to move with deliberate speed in approving this project.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to one very important section of this bill we are considering today—the section which would provide $2 million to begin land acquisition and development for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Last year, after thorough investigation and consideration, Congress approved the bill, which I had cosponsored, to create this seashore—an area which the National Park Service has described as possessing a combination of scenic, recreation, and scientific interests found nowhere else in this country so near a large center of population.

Unfortunately, Congress adjourned last year without providing funds to begin land acquisition and development. Land developers and speculators, however, have not waited. Their advertisements, in fact, are encouraging people to purchase lots in "one of America's most sensational and exclusive communities—in the very heart of one of your country's newest and most gorgeous national parks."

Not only are land values being inflated by this speculation—an inflation which can only increase the eventual cost of this park to the people of the United States—but the valuable natural resource which Congress sought to preserve is being whittled away and destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, this relatively small amount of money—this $2 million—is an investment in the future of our country. It is an investment which will pay rich dividends in education and in recreation for countless future generations of Americans. It is an investment which is within our power to make today, but which if we further delay, may be lost forever.

Now, Buy a Dream Lot in the Proposed Point Reyes National Seashore—Spectacular Drake's Bay Estates

Now available: 45 dramatic view lots on gently sloping hills a stone's throw from the bay.

From $5,500; as low as 10 percent down; easy terms.

A few marvelous beach sites—right on the historic shores of famed Drake's Bay.

Join one of America's most sensational and exclusive communities in the very heart of one of your country's newest and most gorgeous proposed national parks.

People do live in national parks. Hundreds, for example, own private property and homes in Yosemite National Park. Drake's Bay Estates dream sites have been going, going—$600,000 worth of spectacular lots have been sold to date, with $300,000 spent on exclusive homes—all-year, summer or winter retreats—deep in nature's solitude yet only 45 minutes from San Rafael. Unsurpassed swimming, boating, beachcombing, trout fishing, horseback riding.

All public utilities are in, as well as 5 miles of smooth paved roads.

Act now. Call, write, or visit for full particulars, prices, and attractive brochures.

DRAKE'S BEACH ESTATES, INC.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of longhorned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; $29,879,400.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 24, line 3, after the figure "$29,879,400", strike out the period and insert a comma and the following proviso: "of which not to exceed $30,000 shall be used to establish a cooperative fishery unit at Pennsylvania State University."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not cost any money. It will not cost $30,000. All it does is make sure that a part of the $29,879,400 be allocated to Pennsylvania State University for conducting a fisheries cooperative unit authorized in accordance with Public Law 686 of the 86th Congress. The units authorized by this law are now in operation in 14 different universities. I think the great university which originally started the fishing research in the eastern part of the United States should be included. I just ask that the Secretary of the Interior be directed to use a portion of this $29 million to establish one of these research centers in Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while this committee was holding its meetings during the past several weeks, there were three Members who appeared before the committee from three different States, New York, Massachusetts, and Montana, requesting cooperative fishery units and the committee graciously gave them $30,000 for each State. Now here is a gentleman, a fine gentleman, who not 10 minutes ago gave a lengthy talk and, yet, he did not appear before the committee with his request. The gentleman says it would not cost a dime? It will cost $30,000, which would have to be taken from some other budgeted project. He did not come before the committee, but now to come here in the well of the House and tell a group of intelligent men to take $30,000 out of some other project and put it into something that he wants, I think is asking too much.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would just like to say, if I had known that my Pennsylvania State University did not have this facility, I would have appeared before the committee. This morning I received a letter from the Pennsylvania State University informing me of the fact that they did not have such a facility, and they wanted to know whether or not it was possible. That is the first I knew about it. Of course, this is not in my district but it is in my State, and therefore at the first opportunity I had I asked the Members of the House to see that of the $29 million, $30,000 is expended for the University of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think a great deal of Penn State University. Pennsylvania is my home State. I was born and raised there. But, if the university did not know enough about this until the hearings on the bill were closed and the bill was reported out, that in my opinion makes it even worse.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 24, line 3, strike the figure "$29,879,400" and insert "$29,829,400."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why, with respect to getting this $10 million fish tank underway, he put the planning money in two places in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, let me correct the gentleman. This is not a tank. The people of science who know about this will tell you that there will not be any tank in it. If you have not heard, the people downtown can tell you.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can describe it any way he wants to.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not describing it. They are describing it downtown.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us call it a gilt-edged, fur-lined fishpond.

Mr. KIRWAN. You can call it whatever you want to call it, but do not call it a tank.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to get at is why did you put planning money in two places in the bill and in two places in the report? This is planning money that you are asking for; $50,000 is covered by this amendment and then in the next provision of the bill you have $260,000 for planning. Why is it in two places in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because we are putting in the planning and the construction items. The construction goes under the GSA.

Mr. GROSS. But this is all planning money. There is a total of $310,000 to plan for this fish tank. Why do you not put it all in one place?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because this is for the commission that is appointed. This $50,000 is not for planning. It is for the commission that is appointed.

Mr. GROSS. This bill is still $37 million-plus more than was spent on the Interior Department last year. To be sure, there is a cut in the budget request, but that was the administration's asking price, and it is always ballooned and inflated. There is still fat in this bill and some of it is represented by the planning for the $10 million aquarium or glorified fish tank. This is something that can wait, as the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Smith has stated with respect to some of the duck ponds; this can wait for a year, or 2, or 3, or 4, if necessary. Let us cut out money for the fish tank this year, and try to get our financial house in order.

Then I assure the gentleman from Ohio that I will give real serious consideration to his fish tank. As a matter of fact, we might give consideration right now to putting some of his fish in the swimming pool in that marble pyramid on Independence Avenue known as the new, new House Office Building. There might be some two-legged fish there, too, but that would be all right. Let them swim with the finny tribes.

So I hope you will support my amendment. It takes $50,000 of the planning money out. Then we should adopt the next amendment which will take $260,000 out. This would be a nice substantial saving.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I review and study this appropriations bill, H.R. 5279, setting forth appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, I am faced with mixed and anxious emotions. There is much good in this bill. There are many justified and worthwhile projects.

I can conscientiously support this bill in many instances, such as the many good projects included for our American Indians, the preservation of our wonderful natural resources, the support of our fine national parks, our Fish and Wildlife Service and others.

But I very seriously question the soundness and advisability of including some of the items that are provided for in this bill. I specifically point to such costly projects as the $310,000 appropriation to initiate planning for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, estimated to cost a projected total cost of $10 million. It is difficult indeed for me to support such a bill as we have before us today with such irresponsibility as this when our country and our people are faced with a deficit spending program and record high budget. This, gentlemen, just is not consistent, sound, responsible business policy to spend this kind of money for such a project as this high-priced fish tank.

Further, I cannot support the kind of thinking that provides $10 million for winter or summer quarters for ducks. This migratory bird conservation account is something that I believe we can put off until we have surplus money enough to put in such a project.

In this all-inclusive bill, under the appropriations for the Office of Saline Water the appropriation for salaries is increased $2.4 million over the 1963 fiscal year while the costs of operation and maintenance in this division is reduced by $150,000. Apparently they will have less to do in 1964, but they need more people to do it. There are many other similar programs in this bill that can, or should, be eliminated, or at least postponed until we can afford them.

This bill calls for an additional 796 new employees in the Department of the Interior and an increase of $37,508,200 over their 1963 budget. At a time when this Nation and our people are facing an alltime-record-high budget and the resulting deficit spending, I cannot in good conscience, or in the interest of sound, responsible government, support this bill as it stands.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] made a statement, to be found on page 49 of the hearings, about employment in the Department of the Interior and how it had been going up. He made an excellent statement. Yet in this bill he provides the money for an advisory board and a director to start construction of his glorified fish tank. In other words, he is deliberately putting more bureaucrats on the payrolls. Creation of another director means the creation of a staff of secretaries and advisers to the director, and so on and so forth. So on the one hand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] properly castigates the Department of the Interior for increasing employment, but on the other hand he, himself, calls for an addition to the bureaucracy.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my good friend from Iowa, and he is my good friend, if he read what the dean of science at the Minnesota University said as to the benefits received by the public from the $10 million we gave to the science exhibit at the Seattle World Fair. He said that in the 16 months the science building proved to be a tremendous attraction and was visited by millions of people, adults and children, and proved to be immensely worthwhile.

There are several million students coming to Washington every year. The only aquarium we have in the city is a disgrace to the Nation, a disgrace to the greatest capital in the world. This is going to be the greatest aquarium in the world.

That man, who knows more than I know, and most people, went on to tell what this is going to do for education and science and it is not going to cost the U.S. taxpayers a dime.

The opposition to the aquarium bill misled the public when they said the cost would be saddled on the taxpayers. They did not make clear it would pay for itself through admission fees.

I am telling you this is one of the best bills that ever came before the Congress of the United States. No wonder we are fighting. It is not going to cost the taxpayers a dime. That is why I am asking you here today to vote for this bill. In the center of Moscow there is an excellent aquarium. We have one down in the basement of the Department of Commerce Building. It amounts to nothing. This will be a great asset to the Nation's Capital and will be of great interest and value.

I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 63, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $3,678,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 24, line 9, strike the figure "$3,678,000" and insert "$3,418,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply take out $260,000 of planning money for the gentleman from Ohio's fish tank down on Hains Point on the Potomac River. I do not know exactly what the gentleman meant a little while ago when he said that this proposition had not cost anybody anything. No, it has not cost anybody anything because up to this point no money has been extracted from the busted Federal Treasury to start the planning for this thing. I assume that is what he meant when he said it had not cost anything. However, it is about to cost $310,000 to get it off the ground unless this amendment is adopted. It was not many years ago that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] came to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to get an authorization to hire Government experts to raise carp down in the rice paddies of Arkansas. I wonder how that carp deal is coming along.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House can do the taxpayers a good turn here this afternoon by accepting my amendment and thus saving another $260,000 to start a project that will eventually lead to the spending of at least $10 million—a project that can well be delayed until the Federal Government can get its financial house in order. As I said last year when this subject first came before the House, there are 10,000 or 10 million better and more essential ways to spend this money.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Iowa has stated these two items will cost the taxpayers $310,000. Now, the law says that every dime has to be paid back to the U.S. Government for the planning, the construction, and all other expenses connected with it. Ten million tourists come to this city annually. They spend a million dollars a day here and they will be satisfied to pay to visit this National Fisheries Center. I repeat, in the city of Philadelphia they are charging $2 now for adults to get into the new quarium and $1 for the children. The admission fee will be only 60 cents here. So these appropriations will be repaid and I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 24, strike out all of lines 10 through 14.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for striking out the item that I spoke about a little while ago which is $10 million to buy land to inundate for duck ponds for the wild ducks to stay on during the winter months. Now, the item reads as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

And this is what I want to strike out:

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715K-3, 5), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Note that that provides for an advance on this program. The program, as I stated previously, was supposed to be paid for out of the proceeds of the duck stamps which are sold to duck hunters and which has been and is now estimated at $4 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very expensive program into which we are going, or that we are now into. My sole reason for offering this amendment is that in this time of an unbalanced budget when we are seeking to cut unnecessary expenses, to cut expenses that can be well postponed to a future date, that we cut out this $10 million and help to bring this bill back more closely to the expenditures of the year previously.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Virginia. I believe the gentleman's position in this area is just exactly correct, and if we are going to do anything in regard to the budget we can do it wisely here with very little problem to anyone involved. I wish to say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this authorization passed the House of Representatives the year before last, it called for the expenditure of $15 million a year to be spent on the wetlands. Now, perhaps, I might be in sympathy with some of the things which the gentleman from Virginia has said, but nevertheless that is the law. It called for $15 million a year. When the budget estimate of $12 million came up for our consideration we cut the budget request by $2 million. They asked for $3 million less than the law provided and we cut it $2 million more. I thought we did very well on the cut.

Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that on the floor of this Congress the Members of Congress of the United States—the west, the east, the north, and the south—all voted for this legislation. Now we come along 2 years after and we deny ourselves—not some country in Europe—and go against what we voted for previously.

Mr. Chairman, I shall always remember the story of one of our officials who had moved some pictures off the wall at one of the American Embassies. One of the career men said to him, "They will not like that here." The official replied, "Oh, but there are a lot of boys home in the barbershops who will like them." That remarks applies in exactly the same way with reference to this bill. There are a lot of boys home in the barbershops who have contributed to this wetlands problem through purchase of stamps and payment of excise taxes, and we ought to give them a little protection and give them a little run for their money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say that if this amendment is adopted it will be a very serious blow to our conservation efforts in the acquisition of wildlife refuges. We have a program of acquisition that is spread over the next 10 years and the money appropriated in this bill is simply a loan; it will be subject to repayment from the duck stamp funds.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission I sincerely hope this amendment will be defeated in order that our acquisition program may go ahead.

Mr. KIRWAN. I hope this amendment is voted down.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the statement he has made. He has been entirely consistent in calling the attention of Congress to the fact that a few years ago, if the Members of the House had not liked it, then was the time to vote against it and not now. All your committee is doing is to implement the law that Congress passed.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to speak against an amendment that is intended to save money, and that is offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], who I am sure is sincere in offering his amendment. But I want to point out to the House that when this public law was passed, it was about the most popular bill that came before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in that session of Congress. The Audubon Society and all the clubs in America that are interested in migratory waterfowl or birds or fish wrote to the committee in support of the legislation that was then pending before the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, millions of dollars have been spent by clubs and organizations throughout the country to arrest the growing disappearance of the hatching grounds of migratory birds. This bill is for the preservation of those grounds, not to build fishponds or duckponds, but to preserve the wetlands on the northern borders of the States that are next to Canada. Millions of dollars have been spent by private citizens of the United States to buy lands in Canada for the propagation of migratory waterfowl.

The duck stamp is not the only tax that is imposed on the hunter, boys 16 and 18 years old and men up to 65 who participate in this sport. They pay the ammunition tax, the gun tax, the hunting tax of the State, and so forth. And it all goes into funds for the protection and propagation of migratory birds and wildlife.

This is necessary because the decrease, by the actual count of the Fish and Wildlife Service, shows that unless something is done it will only be a few years, Mr. Chairman, when you will not see a canvasback or a mallard or birds of that kind down in Virginia, in the southern part of the country, along the Chesapeake and the Atlantic coast, the middle flyway through Mississippi and the Pacific flyway.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with my distinguished friend from North Carolina in the remarks he has made, as well as with my colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Karsten]. I have been on this Commission now for the past several years and I think it is very constructive work—the propagation of our wildlife. I feel that this investment which will ultimately be repaid is a very wise one. I want to say that I concur in the recommendations of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Missouri as far as migratory bird conservation is concerned.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to see an increase in migratory birds rather than their extinction—should this amendment carry and the wetlands therefore not be preserved—it will only be a few years before all breeding grounds will disappear. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this is not an expenditure, but it is a loan on the part of the Government. This wetlands program is financed by the duck stamp. By the programs of the Department of Agriculture, we are draining wetlands, the habitat of the ducks, and we are losing ducks on account of that. This program proposes that we set up permanent wetlands. If this amendment is adopted it would cost a good deal of money because the land would be drained and then we would have to buy land and set it up as wetlands again. I know of one State where they have drained wetlands, and now they are talking about buying them and reestablish them for a duck refuge. They have drained the land and now they are talking about setting it up as wetland again. Congress passed this law. We reduced the request by $2 million. I think it will be pennywise and pound foolish to adopt this amendment, because this enables the Commission to buy this land before it is drained. If you do not do that, you will have to buy up land after it has been drained and put it back to its wetland condition, if you want to keep the ducks.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a high regard for the author of this amendment, but I am sure he does not understand what his amendment does to the legislation before the Congress. This appropriation was authorized by a unanimous vote of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This legislation came about because the migratory waterfowl are approaching the lowest limits in history. Duck limits are falling to a point where it is hardly worth the trouble for a duck hunter to go out.

In 1936 or thereabouts when the Migratory Water Fowl Treaty was signed between the United States, Canada, and Mexico it was determined we needed 12,500,000 acres of land in which to care for the migratory waterfowl of this Nation. Subsequently an analysis was made of the rate at which wetlands were being acquired. It was found it would take 330 years for the United States to acquire the needed wetlands at the rate we were acquiring them. As a result of this a loan program was set up which is the subject of the appropriation for $10 million which the gentleman seeks to strike.

This cut is not a cut of an appropriation which will not be paid back, this is a loan program. This money, every nickel of it, will be paid back by the duck hunters of the United States who will purchase migratory waterfowl hunting stamps, the proceeds of which will go to pay back this $10 million loan.

The fact is that unless this money is authorized and appropriated by Congress, we may very well be seeing the last days in which we and our friends may hunt waterfowl on this continent. In the next few years we will have a population growth that will stagger anything gone before. By 1980 we will have 285 million people. For houses, roads, shopping centers, and municipal use we are taking 1 million acres a year from our lands. That is the equivalent of the acreage of Yellowstone National Park. A lot of this land is coming from draining waterfowl habitat. The purpose of this appropriation is to see that we acquire this desperately needed land in the time remaining. Land costs are going up, population is exploding, and the swamps, the habitats of the migratory waterfowl of this Nation, are being done away with at an accelerated pace. Unless the Congress appropriates the money to carry out the purposes of this law, that was unanimously enacted by this Congress not long back, you and I will be responsibile to our constituents for having helped to destroy the migratory waterfowl resources of this country. What are these resources, and what is their value?

First of all, according to the studies of the Patman-Robertson Act, they bring in better than $1 billion a year in expenditures for food, lodging, clothing, and from the sale of firearms, equipment, and ammunition. This is an enormous benefit to our country. Over and above this, hunter expenditures are mainstays of the economy of large portions of this country. Duck-hunting revenues derived from catering to duck hunters furnish a very important portion of the economy in many parts of this country. Most of us in this Congress have enjoyed the sight of migratory waterfowl. These refuges provide the population of this country with an opportunity for outdoor recreation. Just last year this Congress passed a piece of legislation authorizing the public recreational uses of these refuges bought through duck stamp purchases. This is an additional benefit that goes to all of our constituents. The principal author of this legislation was a minority Member of this body from

Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. What I am saying to the House today is—do not be penny-wise and pound foolish. This is the last opportunity the United States will have to acquire these wetlands. They are being drained at a fantastic pace. The limited bag limits that we have on migratory waterfowl today will be very generous when we contrast them to what we will have in the future unless we act now to save the habitat on which these waterfowl, a national treasure and a trust for the future are absolutely dependent.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to joint with the chairman of our subcommittee in opposition to this amendment. Although, of course, I am very sympathetic to any move to save additional money in this bill, I want to again point out that under the terms of H.R. 7391, which is now Public Law 87-383, this House and the Congress passed legislation which provided for an appropriation for a 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 not to exceed $105 million. If the $105 million was divided by 7 years, it would mean an appropriation this year of $15 million. The committee has recommended $10 million instead of $15 million. If this appropriation is not given this year and unless the legislation is repealed or changed, we are merely stirring up trouble for ourselves in years to come because we are going to have to double, perhaps next year or the year after, the amount of money requested under this law which is now in effect. I regret very much that the money is necessary. I would much prefer to see it not appropriated. But I think the committee did the right thing in allowing the $10 million. I hope the amendment will not carry.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that my State of Arkansas is, perhaps, the greatest or one of the greatest duck-hunting areas in the United States. I know we can get a great deal of amusement out of talking about the ducks and the duck population, but I want to emphasize what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] said.

I suppose there are several hundred million dollars that have been spent by citizens and organizations and businesses in the construction and provision of duck hunting facilities and so forth throughout this great country of ours.

Stuttgart, Ark., is probably the duck capital of the world. I do not know how much money is needed in the wetlands to provide the necessary habitat. But, Mr. Chairman, let me give you, just for one moment, a little information affecting this important program.

The ducks go back to the North when the winter season is over, and contrary to what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the author of the amendment, suggested a moment ago, they do not go back there in wintertime, they go back in the summertime for the purpose of propagation.

Twenty-five years ago, let me remind you, the legal limit in my own State was 25 a day; 25 years ago any one individual could legally kill 25 ducks a day during the season with 2 days' possession. That continued for many years. For years now the legal limit was four per day and 2 days' possession. Everybody knows of the drought in Canada and in the northern parts of the country in the last few years. Let me remind you that 2 years ago the legal limit in my State that one could kill during duck season was 2 a day and 2 days' limit.

Let me remind you further, and this House, that because of the condition that exists—I do not know anything about it up in Canada and the northern part of the country—but I know what the result is. In my State last year the legal limit on this, one of the greatest sports in this country, was one duck a day, and 2 days' possession. From what has been going on for the last several years, in the last 20 years, I do know that something needs to be done. I wish I had more information as to what is needed in this program; $4 million goes into the fund from duck stamps, but I want to say that last year we lost thousands or perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars from people not buying duck stamps, because they could not kill ducks. I did not buy a duck stamp last year, for the first time I cannot remember when, because it was not worth it to go out for the purpose of trying to kill one duck a day. Year before last I did, and then the limit was only two, and I must say I had a very hard time getting even the limit of two. That shows you how scarce they were last year. I think we will have more this year and next. I hope so.

One of the objectives I have had in mind, and I want to say this in all sincerity to every Member of this House, is that I hope someday, if I may have the privilege of staying here that long, that we will get enough ducks and the Secretary of the Interior will set a limit and that we will have an increase in the limit per day so that I and the delegation from my State and our friends from my State can legally get enough wild ducks to bring them to Washington and have them served in the House restaurant to every Member of this Congress.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation to acquire wetlands was first introduced and came before the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee it was proposed to finance the program through back-door spending; in other words, the money could be borrowed from the Treasury to carry out the program of conservation looking to an increase of our duck population.

By arrangement in our committee, that financing was changed to the appropriation process. The reason I take the floor at this time is to indicate that had this legislation passed as it was originally introduced, the Department could have simply gone to the Treasury and borrowed $15 million for acquiring these wetlands without having to come to the Congress.

The point I want to make today is that by coming to the Appropriations Committee careful scrutiny has been made as to the needs of this program. The committee has cut $2 million off of it. In allowing money they are fulfilling a responsibility that the House created originally when we passed the authorizing legislation.

I do not think anybody wants to cut down on the budget more than I do, but I feel in this instance the Congress adopted a program and we have to meet that commitment; therefore, it seems to me that we should carry out the recommendation of the very fine committee that brings this legislation to us. I am therefore with regret going to oppose this amendment and then will support the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get the ducks in a row here and find out exactly what we are doing.

It is a very popular program; I recognize that. I have participated in duck hunting myself. It is a great outdoor recreation, there is no question about that, but there are some facts that ought to be pointed out so that we know exactly what we are doing.

It is estimated—and I have the official records here—that this program before you are through with it will cost $457,500,000. The income from duck stamps today is $4 million a year. If you take it on this basis it is going to be over 100 years or more before there is an attempt to pay this off. The States of North Dakota and South Dakota have not yet approved the land acquisition plan as required by the Wetlands Act. What the gentleman from Virginia has done here is simply to say we can delay this for a while because of the fiscal situation of our country.

I hope when you sit in the duckblind waiting for the ducks to come by, as you take 5, 10, or 15 minutes, whatever it may be, that each minute while you sit there you will realize that $19,000 a minute is being paid on the national debt. I hope you will realize what you are really faced with, and that it is going to be a question of whether the ducks are going to fly or whether your Nation goes bankrupt. It seems to me it is time we began to think about the condition of the country.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to ask a question. As I see the testimony of Daniel Janzen, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, one of the reasons for this outlay or this appropriation is that the Department of Agriculture has been spending public money in order to help drain land so that the natural habitat is nonexistent. Now we find that the Department of the Interior asks for millions of dollars for acquiring additional lands in order to provide waterfowl with the natural habitat that the Department of Agriculture is eliminating.

Is that the way the gentleman understands it?

Mr. BOW. I think that is true. It is said this is not going to cost anything because these are loans that are to be paid back. But they are interest-free loans. You are not paying any interest. Do not tell me it is not costing us anything. When we lend money at this time interest free, at least the interest is costing the American taxpayers something.

I join with the gentleman from Virginia. This is one of those programs that may be put over for a year or two. Do not forget, as I said, as we wait for the ducks to fly, there is the $19,000 a minute on the national debt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. With reference to paying this money back, how do we know it is going to be paid back? The only way it will ever be paid back will be over a good many years on which you get this $4 million a year, when this program is finished, to pay on it, if enough people buy the duck stamps. It is a nebulous question as to whether any of it is ever going to be repaid.

Mr. BOW. This provides for land acquisition of 4.5 million acres at $269 million; a basic minimum for levees, pools, roads, and fencing, $188.5 million. We are not dealing with a small item; this is a big item. Let us take a good, hard look at it. Let us find out whether we are justified in a program of this kind and whether, under present financing methods, which will take 115 to 120 years, we will put that additional mortgage on the backs of our children and grandchildren. It is time for us to make up our minds whether we are for ducks or whether we are for grandchildren and for fiscal responsibility in this country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to any Member in this House when it comes to a desire to lower this budget, but personally I do not believe that this is the proper place to do it. What will happen if we do not purchase this land at the present time? You need not look into your crystal ball to know what is going to happen if we wait for several years as has just been suggested. The Department of Agriculture is going to reclaim this land, and instead of spending $10 million to acquire it we will probably spend $100 million and pay subsidies to raise more farm surpluses. I personally think this is a good investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 107, noes 105.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. DENTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: On page 32, strike out lines 21 through 25.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I realize the ducks have gotten in a row around here, but this is not a duck amendment, this is an amendment based on frugality. We have had talk of the old frontier, and of the New Frontier and all kinds of frontiers discussed here today.

I would hesitate to try to improve on the excellent work this committee of the House has done on this bill. I have read this committee report through thoroughly. I think it is a very fine report in general. But I have had some experience in a State legislature in matching this type of funds on this type of program. I would say without fear of challenge that with this $1 million that is to be saved here: not one tree will fail to be planted that otherwise would not be planted if the $1 million were spent or not. This is a good time for the Congress to say that in the planting of trees on non-Federal lands as this appropriation proposes, that trees should either be planted by private enterprises, who reap the harvest from the tree farms, or they should be paid for by the States. This is one of those cooperative Federal-State programs for which I think there is no use. For those of you who are for trees, I say there are 183 million other dollars in this appropriation bill that will adequately take care of all the trees. This is just a $1 million cut in this budget that will practice a little frontier frugality instead of frontier spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

REMODELING OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING

For an additional amount for necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for remodeling the Civil Service Commission Building to make it suitable to house certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), including construction and not to exceed $25,000, for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $5,465,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 39, strike out all of lines 1 through 9, inclusive.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the committee on an excellent job in cutting the appropriation request in this bill. As a matter of fact, it created a lot of hard work for members of the committee in searching for something else to cut out, and I want to commend them highly for the great work they have done.

I hesitate to offer this amendment because I may be falsely accused of lacking proper respect for things cultural. But it has to do with striking out some money that is to be used for remodeling the Old Patent Office Building out of which the Civil Service Commission is moving. The remodeling is to be accomplished with the goal of putting into that building, which occupies 2 blocks in the center of the District of Columbia, in downtown Washington, valuable portraits and other works of art. I do not want anyone to think that I am not appreciative of the inspirational qualities of great art. I do indeed feel that the proper preservation and display of the Nation's art treasures is an important thing for our people. But I think that at this time and under the circumstances, this Government should not spend almost $6 million to create a gallery in downtown Washington for still another display of works of art. If that building is to be vacant, I think it could be better used for housing some of the essential operations of the Government. I certainly do not criticize the committee for leaving this item in, but I think the membership of the Congress should have an opportunity to express an opinion at this time on this particular item.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman from Texas in support of his amendment. It is absolutely unthinkable that this Government would spend $5½ million to remodel into a portrait gallery a structure occupying two full city blocks in the heart of Washington, D.C., when this same Government is spending millions of dollars a year on rent in private commercial buildings throughout the city to house overflow personnel from the various departments and agencies. How can you do this? If we must have such outfits as the Peace Corps, both domestic and international, put them into this Government-owned building as well as other overflow agencies. We are just completing a new Smithsonian Institution—a huge new building I mean to say—and yet you are telling us here today you do not have room for those portraits in the new building. How can this be possible in view of the huge structure that is being built down there? Do not do this to the taxpayers of this country. Do not remodel this usable office building when there is such an acute need for office space. Do not do this to the taxpayers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand this would put the Government in the portrait holding business, that is, put the Government itself in that business?

Mr. GROSS. I assume it would.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And, therefore, from now on, this would put us in the museum business in addition to the Smithsonian Institution that we already have?

Mr. GROSS. I understand these portraits are already in the Smithsonian Institution or at least a part of them are. I see no reason why, if you want a portrait gallery, one of the old Smithsonian buildings cannot be used for that purpose? Do not spend $5½ million to tear out the insides of this office building that can and should be used for the purpose for which it was intended. Let us try to save the taxpayers these millions of dollars.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, much as I admire the chairman and members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I must disagree with them on this issue.

At this time when money is scarce at all levels of government, when our economy is hard pressed, when our unemployment is a matter of major concern to all—in short, at a time when our country must utilize every dollar to its maximum, I cannot go along with the start of a $10 million addition to the beauties of our capital when these funds can be so much better employed elsewhere.

Thus, I must oppose the inclusion of planning money for the Aquarium as suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and others.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from Iowa picking on me. I did not authorize this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that I accused the gentleman or any other member of the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me explain who is on the Board of Regents. It is not I who is deciding this. Sitting in the chancellor's chair on the Board of Regents is the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. That is no recommendation for what you are doing.

Mr. KIRWAN. Next to him is the president of the largest bank in Washington, and next to him there are a half dozen scientists; then Senator ANDERSON, Senator SALTONSTALL and Representatives Bow and CANNON. I happen to be on that Board of Regents myself, and the Board of Regents adopted this. They are for it. We have millions of dollars' worth of art and no adequate space to display it.

The committee thought these funds were justified so we could bring these priceless collections out of the storage barns and other places, where they could be cared for and displayed. Are you opposed to protecting them?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Let them stay in the barns until we balance the budget. Think of the solvency of the Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman calls that economy. We just had the Mona Lisa on exhibition here in the city and people came from all over the country to see that picture. The pictures we want to protect are valuable acquisitions of our Government and are of interest to many.

I hope the committee certainly will vote this amendment down.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Perhaps some of the gentlemen do not realize that the building the gentleman is talking about is one of the most historic buildings in the city of Washington and, as I said, it has been declared a national monument.

Mr. KIRWAN. Not only in Washington, but one of the most historic in the world.

Mr. MILLER of California. There is a great history to this building. When the British burned Washington this is one of the first buildings they went to. The curator of that building persuaded the commander of the British soldiers to spare the building in the name of science.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to make this statement: I do not want to destroy the building, I am just trying to remodel it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to destroy this building; let us get this straight; nobody wants to destroy it. All I am saying, and I am sure that goes for the gentleman from Texas too, is that we do not want it remodeled into a portrait gallery. Leave it as it presently exists and use it as an office building. Let the portraits stay in storage until we can balance the Federal budget and get out of the financial situation we are in.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas) there were ayes 112, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM

For necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable building for a National Air Museum for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of September 6, 1958 (20 U.S.C. 77b note), and not to exceed $60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,600,000.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GIBBONS: On page 39, line 18, strike out lines 18 through line 2 on page 40.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to save $1,600,000 of architects' fees and planning costs for a National Air Museum that no one knows how much it will cost.

This, I believe, is something that could certainly and wisely be postponed at this time. We have a lot of airplanes. We have air museums in this country at this time. Certainly this is one of the things that we can postpone until we are able to get the budget balanced.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this was authorized on September 6, 1958. The Board of Regents has recommended this planning appropriation, the completed plans must be submitted to Congress for authorization of construction before any construction funds are appropriated.

Smithsonian has accumulated the world's largest and finest collections of historic air and spacecraft, engines, rockets, and so forth.

Less than 10 percent of the collection is now on display in a World War I hangar and in overhead areas in the Arts and Industries Building. The remainder of the collection is, of necessity, in storage.

Over 38,000 visitors in 1 day tried to get into the World War I hangar last year. There were nearly 1 million visitors during last July and August.

I do not care how you vote. That is up to you. But you are not going to save anything. You are just postponing it, and that could make it more costly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I note on page 41, $100,000 for the Civil War Centennial Commission. How much have we put into the Civil War Centennial Commission up to this point, and how much longer will it go on?

Mr. KIRWAN. About 1 more year.

Mr. GROSS. Another year?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That does not take into consideration financing the present operation in Mississippi?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is all; 1 year.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHANSEN moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5279 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 87–346, RELATING TO DUAL-RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual-rate contracts. An identical bill to H.R. 4555, passed the House on yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87–346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964."

(b) By striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill (H.R. 4555) was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department in recent years has entered many new fields through programs authorized by the Congress. I cite the rural areas development program which is doing so much to revitalize many small rural communities. In a recent statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman outlined the objectives of the rural areas development program.

According to Secretary Freeman, this program seeks to fulfill several high priority national goals, which he described as follows:

First. To give direction, purpose, and hope to rural America as it adjusts to rapid changes;

Second. To readjust the rural land-use patterns, making more land available for the increasing needs of outdoor recreation and open spaces, while decreasing cropland areas:

Third. To fully protect and develop the Nation's renewable resources of soil, water, forests, fish and wildlife, and open spaces;

Fourth. To encourage more rapid rural industrialization and expansion of commercial enterprise in rural areas to provide new employment and other nonfarm economic opportunities;

Fifth. To eliminate the causes of rural poverty;

Sixth. To strengthen the family farm pattern of American agriculture, insuring an efficient and productive source of food and fiber in a way that increased efficiency does not bring less income to the producer.

Another new USDA program, Mr. Speaker, was authorized by Congress last year. This is the public recreational development of watershed projects under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

This program permits the Agriculture Department to help create, enlarge, or improve bodies of water within watershed projects to assist in developing recreational areas bordering the water.

Up to 50 percent of the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way, construction and minimum basic facilities needed for public access may be paid the Agriculture Department. Land bordering the reservoirs developed under this program could be used for picnicking, camping, hunting, or other outdoor uses with the Department being able to provide local sponsors with funds to cover up to half the land costs. In addition, the Department would help local sponsors pay for the land inundated for recreational purposes.

Among minimum basic facilities which could be cost-shared are boat docks and ramps, beach development, parking lots, public water supply, sanitary facilities, planting, and other shoreline or area improvements, roads and trails, other similar facilities needed for public health, safety, access to, and use of the recreational areas.

Since the Congress, in these new nonfarm programs, has recognized the need for greater utilization of the special skills, resources, and facilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and because of the growing interest of many communities in Massachusetts in conservation activities and the formation of local conservation commissions under the authority of a State law passed a few years ago, I am introducing in the House today a bill calling for increased participation of the Soil Conservation Service in such nonagricultural fields as the protection, development, and use of land in urban areas and the utilization of soil and water resources in these areas.

Many Massachusetts towns are taking advantage of the Massachusetts law which authorizes the establishment of local conservation commissions. In fact, this law has already enabled some towns to make desirable changes in land use through the cooperation and assistance of the Soil Conservation Service.

One community, the town of Hanover, has already gained favorable nationwide publicity through its community planning program prepared in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and the Soil Conservation Service. One of the features of the program is the remarkable use of scientific soil and water information, largely supplied by surveyors of the Soil Conservation Service, who made an acre-by-acre inventory of the town's resources.

Hanover has issued a planning document which is serving as a guide to other communities with similar problems. The plan features detailed maps of the town's natural resources which are helping the community in making decisions regarding future potentials and limitations in land use. In addition, the plan contains nine special soils maps rendered in colors and symbols to serve as guidelines in determining boundaries and locations of community facilities.

In previous years, Hanover had made random use of available soils information for construction projects, sewage disposal areas, and related activities, but now with the aid of the soil conservation experts the community has prepared a most helpful document outlining the quantity and quality of its natural terrain.

Most Massachusetts towns are not as fortunate as Hanover with its completed survey and, as a result, are seriously handicapped by the lack of soils information—the very same type of soils information made available from a soil survey used as a basis for a farm conservation plan. Some of these communities are becoming aware that the Soil Conservation Service can make available the same basic data for the development of land capabilities. Consequently, more and more local conservation commissions are turning to soil conservation officials for guidance on the best land use and water management. Local conservation commissions are learning that these same Agriculture Department officials can render expert assistance on proper land spacing, clean water, and other necessities in their rapidly expanding urban areas.

To meet the growing demand from urban areas for these special aids available from the Soil Conservation Service, I am introducing legislation directing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical help on community projects dealing with soil, land use, and water problems. Early approval of my bill would help many small communities to complete their development plans.

It has become apparent in my State and elsewhere that basic soils information is needed for good decisions on the lands to be used for industrial plants, housing developments, shopping centers, highways, and schools. My bill would strengthen the national soil program and I urge the early consideration of my proposal by my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there are parts of five soil conservation districts—the Northeast Worcester County Soil Conservation District with the district office in Sterling, the Northwest Worcester County Soil Conservation District with an office in Barre, the Southern Worcester County Soil Conservation District with an office in Rochdale, the Middlesex Soil Conservation District with an office in Concord, and the Norfolk Soil Conservation District with its headquarters in Walpole.

When originally established, these districts dealt primarily with farmers on erosion control, drainage, and land improvements. With additional technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, the districts have expanded their programs to include assistance on watershed planning and flood prevention.

While our farmers have continued to receive direct help on their conservation problems, there has arisen in recent years a greater need for assistance from the communities within these districts with the result that the soil conservation staff is faced with a much greater challenge and a growing demand for technical assistance.

Many sections of my district, now one of the largest in the State with nearly 450,000 people, are experiencing large population increases. These rapidly growing towns are trying desperately to decide on their future development. They are confronted with intense pressures on their natural resources with almost daily growing demands for land for industrial plants, parking lots, highways, housing developments, and schools.

Local officials are doing their best to meet the urgent problems of increasing population and industrialization and still retain the more desirable aspects of country living, but they are finding that the whole character of the town is changing. These officials must make important decisions on how much good farmland can be retained for agriculture, how to utilize wetlands and woodlands as open green areas with water developments for recreation and wildlife.

Recognition of these special problems has brought about a new development in my State with the establishment of conservation commissions by many communities. Nearly 30 have already been established in my district alone and it is expected the total number in the State will soon reach 200.

These conservation commissions are working intensively on inventories of their towns' natural resources and are helping to develop plans for greenbelts and wildlife preservation. In increasing numbers, the commissions are turning to the Soil Conservation Districts for help on the technical features of their soil and water management problems. Increasing requests for Federal assistance are reaching me in recent months and I am cooperating fully with many town officials in seeking for their communities Soil Conservation Service help on a large number of drainage and water problems.

I have previously addressed the House on the value and importance of the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service. This program has been of great assistance to many Massachusetts communities which suffered losses in the 1955 floods.

There have been two watershed work plans developed in my district under the Small Watersheds Act with the State and the towns in each watershed contributing toward the total costs. The first is the Suasco project, named after the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers in the watershed, which is being developed at an estimated cost of $1,660,000 of which $650,000 will be paid by the State, the towns benefiting and the local landowners.

The second is the upper Quaboag project with a total estimated cost of $2,750,000, of which about $1 million will be borne by the State, local towns, and landowners. The watershed plan for this project was completed in the summer of 1961. After careful review by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, upper Quaboag was authorized for construction last September.

The upper Quaboag project consists of a dike, some channel enlargement and eight reservoirs, three of which are multiple purpose. The work will also provide fish and wildlife habitat improvement, recreation, and flood prevention. The State plans to add recreation benefits to one reservoir, while the town of Leicester plans to add municipal water supply to another reservoir in the group.

There are three great ponds in the watershed that will be greatly improved because the water level will not be raised to a great extent in time of flooding.

The upper Quaboag watershed project is located in the western end of my district with work earmarked for Shaw Brook in Spencer and Leicester, Turkey Hill Brook in Spencer, Meadow Brook in New Braintree, and Kittredge Brook in Spencer. The balance of the work will be done in towns lost to the Third District as a result of the congressional redistricting last year: Meadow Brook in North Brookfield, Sucker Brook in West Brookfield, Lamberton Brook in Warren, Horsepond Brook in Brookfield, and Rice Reservoir in Brookfield.

The project also calls for a concrete dike along the East Brookfield River in East Brookfield to protect industrial plants and stream channel improvements along the Quaboag, beginning in Warren and extending into West Brookfield to provide flood protection to industrial and residential areas at the Quaboag marshes and Quaboag and Quacumquasit Ponds.

The Suasco project with 7 dams and reservoirs when completed will provide flood protection and other benefits to a 31-town area extending from Shrewsbury to Lowell. As planned, Suasco calls for seven dams—one each in Shrewsbury and Westboro, two in Berlin, and three in Northboro.

The Suasco work is being carried out by the Middlesex and Northern Worcester County Soil Conservation Districts, the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission, and the Soil Conservation Service.

The Suasco watershed project is among the first to be approved for Massachusetts under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When completed, the project will help reduce and control floodwaters at key points on the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers and their tributaries. The project starts at the Assabet River in Northboro and extends to the junctions of the Sudbury and Concord Rivers in Concord, then to the Merrimack River in Lowell. In all some 377 square miles of watershed are involved with the flood prevention work designed to help these Third District communities, some of which were added to my district as a result of the redistricting last year: Maynard, Upton, Marlboro, Boxboro, Sherborn, Berlin, Littleton, Westford, Harvard, Clinton, Acton, Bolton, Holliston, Stow, Natick, and Hudson.

Other towns included in the Suasco watershed are: Carlisle, Lincoln, Framingham, Shrewsbury, Chelmsford, Sudbury, Grafton, Tewksbury, Weston, Ashland, Westboro, Billerica, Wayland, Southboro, Boylston, Bedford, Concord, Hopkinton, and Northboro.

The watershed program is one of several important Federal programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service. Another is the National Cooperative Soil Survey, which is helping to provide basic soils information to many of our towns on a cost-sharing basis.

Four towns in my district have initiated action to share costs with the Soil Conservation Service for the basic soil interpretations they need—Sterling, Millis, Littleton, and Acton. Of the 351 towns in Massachusetts, it is estimated at least half have urgent need for soils information.

This is a worthwhile program which deserves the support of the Congress, Mr.

Speaker. My bill would help to improve and strengthen this national program.

For instance, my district has about 790,000 acres and only 132,000 acres have been soil surveyed. Completed soil survey maps are needed right now in Massachusetts, but the mapping job for my State is currently projected for completion by 1985, based upon current appropriations.

A large number of land use and water problems are being solved by many communities in my State in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts. It has been demonstrated that the skills developed in handling soil, land use, and water problems on farms can be applied directly in many cases to similar problems on nonfarmland. My bill would provide greater authority to the soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service in making available their skills to the many communities in my State and in the Nation which could benefit considerably from these needed services.

As an illustration, I cite the town of Spencer in my district, which recently suffered the loss of its main industry through the relocation of a shoe factory to the nearby town of North Brookfield. Town officials have requested the Soil Conservation Service to provide water and flooding facts on a commercial development on great meadows adjacent to the Seven Mile River and Hare Brook near Route 9.

The town has a sewage plant in the area, which needs to be enlarged. The town has asked for information on the extent of flooding to be expected in the area after the upper Quaboag watershed project is installed. This information is needed to help control building in the area.

I have been assured that the Soil Conservation Service will make the necessary studies for Spencer as soon as personnel can be detailed to this work from other activities.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts would be able to cope more efficiently and rapidly with the many demands for technical assistance in land and water use problems reaching them from many communities.

The Soil Conservation Service is very active in Worcester County and agricultural conservation program work in this county represents the largest share of Federal aid to farmers in Massachusets. In all, there are about 258,000 acres of farmland in the county. Farmers employ some 16,000 workers and do about a $27 million annual business. Farming is a most important part of the Worcester County economic picture.

However, as in other urban areas, Worcester County farms are changing year by year. Recent farm censuses show that farm land has decreased about 100,000 acres in a 5-year period. Individual farms with an average $27,000 value are growing larger and are largely mechanized.

The full text of my bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, resulting in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land and the effects of such changes on the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and other public agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning for such changes in land use and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources.

SEC. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, regional, State and local planning boards and commissions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon the request of the State or other public agency, to—

(1) make investigations and surveys in connection with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;

(2) make studies necessary for the interpretation of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by or available to the Secretary;

(3) furnish technical and advisory assistance in connection with such planning; and

(4) obtain the cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the puropses of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

COLLEGE EXPENSES SHOULD BE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide a tax deduction for the expenses of higher education incurred by either full- or part-time students or their parents.

The rising costs of higher education prevent many capable students from continuing their studies. During the past decade, tuition fees have risen some 86 percent, putting such opportunities far beyond the reach of many unable to meet these expenses. The legislation which I have introduced would include deductions for the costs of ordinary living expenses as well as the cost of books and tuition.

College and university enrollment is expected to increase some 30 percent by 1965, and 66 percent by 1970. The impact of these figures can be readily seen in Florida, where we are building new facilities and enlarging present ones to keep pace with our expanding industrial and social needs.

However, as a nation, we should not concentrate solely on technical education, but should strive to provide the facilities necessary to produce well-rounded citizens. Our national survival may well depend on this Nation's ability to train its most precious resource—brainpower.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that this legislation to provide tax deductions for education expenses would accomplish the desired results through rewarding individual initiative rather than relying on comprehensive Federal assistance. This principle seems more in keeping with our national goals, and by the adoption of this legislation I have introduced today we will achieve these goals efficiently instead of adding to our already overburdening programs of Federal spending.

CUBAN COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the threat which the Cuban Communist government poses to the Western Hemisphere is one of the most serious this Nation has had to face. But face it we must.

Those of us from the great State of Florida are keenly aware of this cancerous sore which festers only 90 miles off our State's shore. We have absorbed thousands of Cuban refugees fleeing from Communist tyranny, and particularly do the people of the Miami area see firsthand the misery and despair, the anguish and the heartbreak, of the people of this once proud and free land.

For these remarks I do not wish to dwell upon the tyranny of the Batista regime, only to say that what the Cuban people now suffer is far worse than anything seen under that dictatorship. And neither can be condoned. What we must deal with now is the present crisis, the existence of a Cuban Government under the domination of communism, an international godless plague.

I have said on many occasions that I fear far more the subversion which is promulgated by the Cuban Communist dictatorship than I do the remaining Soviet troops on that island.

For international communism has gained a foothold, and unless rooted out, will infest another Latin American nation, and then possibly another. This is the threat we face, and one which we must meet.

I was proud of our President when he pledged to the Cuban freedom fighters in Miami recently that their battle flag would be returned to them in a free Havana. This should be the pledge of all Americans.

Recent events have again brought into sharp focus the dangers of the subversive activities of Cuban communism in the Western Hemisphere. These dangers challenge not only the United States, in its quest for peace and security, but every one of our Central and South American neighbors, and the entire free world.

For our Latin American neighbors are more vulnerable than we to these activities, which have as their objective the overthrow of governments and the installation of Soviet-dominated puppet regimes similar to that of Fidel Castro.

We in the Congress, and the American people, concerned as we are with the security of our great Nation, must maintain an awareness of the nature and scope of these activities. Toward this end, the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee recently held hearings on "Castro-Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere." I recommend highly to all Members that they study the report of these hearings.

For my part, I would like to point out some of the things I have learned recently about this threat, in the hope that such information might in some way contribute to the full realization of this threat.

First, I would like to remind my colleagues of some of the techniques of subversion which are being employed throughout the hemisphere by the Cuban-based Sino-Soviet Communist movement. Recruitment and training of new adherents to the revolutionary line are prime activities of Communist agents in every country in the Western Hemisphere, including probably the United States. Recruits are normally sent to primary training schools first, and then on a basis of performance and reliability, may be sent to further centers for training activities of all kinds: Leaders, orators and propagandists; experts in sabotage, espionage, and terrorism in all its forms; specialists in the handling of arms and radio equipment, in guerrilla warfare, and so forth. Recruitment is carried on preferably among students, teachers, workers, artists, and writers. Some selected few students of subversion are sent on to advanced schools, where courses may last a maximum of 3 years. These schools refine the skills and techniques learned earlier, and train the man or woman as a party functionary. On an even higher level, there are schools in Russia and other bloc countries where personnel are trained to occupy key posts in the party or other allied agencies.

The next Communist technique employed in Latin America is infiltration into previously selected organizations and institutes in order, progressively and methodically, to gain absolute direction and control of them. Infiltration is undertaken in any social class, in government agencies, social and cultural centers, student groups, labor unions, and even in armed forces. The priority and magnitude of that infiltration will depend on the facilities found, the environment in which action is taken, and the aim being sought.

Another Communist technique being used in Latin America as elsewhere is called psychological penetration. An effort is made to attract and convert indifferent people by exploiting the contradictions present in every organized society and the justified longings to resolve them. Attractive material easily accessible to the masses is prepared, and the penetration is carried out through the constant utterance and repetition of slogans adapted to the situation, as well as the affirmation of carefully chosen topics.

Next, dislocation, or weakening of the social structure, is pursued by the Communists. Freedom to congregate, the right to strike, and other liberties granted by democracy are abused; laws are labeled as antidemocratic or dictatorial, and the authorities are criticized and attacked as being solely responsible for the situation. All kinds of arms are employed and offenses are perpetrated against individuals and public and private property, thereby inciting violent action on the part of the police or the Army, which serves the Communists' ultimate ends of portraying the regime as oppressive.

Finally, through a process of proper organization, a military apparatus of growing complexity is created. Action, or shock teams, are first created which engage in hand fighting, sabotage, or acts of terror. We have seen Communist efforts in Venezuela to pass from this stage to the next, that of organized guerrilla warfare, culminating in the takeover of strategic areas, and finally, the overthrow of the local government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of these are the techniques of Communist subversion, and Cuba is the Western Hemisphere headquarters for training in these techniques. A series of schools and training centers have been set up there in which instruction is given not only to Cubans but to nationals from many other Latin American countries. There are perhaps a dozen of these schools in Cuba, some of them under Russian instructors. At least a thousand persons came to Cuba from Latin America during 1962 for training of this type. And as Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the CIA stated to the subcommittee:

> In essence, Castro tells revolutionaries from other Latin American countries: "Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage, and in terrorism. We will see to it that you get back to your homeland.
>
> "Once you are there, we will keep in touch with you, give you progaganda support, send you propaganda materials for your movement, training aids to expand your guerrilla forces, secret communication methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

There have been organized, in addition to all this, groups whose purpose it is to facilitate the carrying of subversion to Latin America. Such groups as the Board of Liberation for Central America and the Caribbean, the Latin American Youth Organization, the Free Latin American Association, and others perform this function of spreading the Castro doctrine. A series of meetings, conferences, and congresses has been held in Cuba to give Communists and their sympathizers from other Latin American countries a good excuse to go to Cuba for training or for strategy discussions and integration.

This is a grave problem, perhaps the most serious threat to the United States and the Western Hemisphere we have ever witnessed. It cannot be minimized, it cannot be swept under a rug. We must marshal the full resources of this Nation, and that of all Latin America, to meet this threat. So long as this threat of Cuban Communist subversion remains, this hemisphere is in grave danger. We must meet this threat with bold and vigorous action, for in my opinion, the free and abundant life which we seek for all men can never be achieved in this hemisphere so long as this threat remains.

ROGUE BASIN PROJECT FREIGHT RATE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN MEAT AND LIVESTOCK

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself, I wish to place in the RECORD a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7 pertaining to the Rogue Basin project and House Joint Memorial 13 pertaining to the historic freight rate differential between meat and livestock. These memorials were enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly now in biennial session at Salem, the State capital.

Both these matters are of crucial importance to the State of Oregon. The Members of the Oregon congressional delegation are pleased to bring the memorials to the attention of this House.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback and Redden

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of $50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of $365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

Dale A. Henderson,
Secretary of Senate.
Ben Musa,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

Clarence Barton,
Speaker of House.

Enrolled House Joint Memorial 13

Introduced by Representatives McKinnis, Flitcraft, Hansell and Senators Hopkins, Leth

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately one and one-half times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of one to one, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

Whereas the Public Utility Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry and leaders of labor in the meat handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The Secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

Cecil L. Edwards,
Chief Clerk of House.
Clarence Barton,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

Ben Musa,
President of Senate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest in recent weeks several theories that have been advanced on the manner in which the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery should be organized and operated. A matter of growing concern is the fate of the seven Veterans' Administration area medical offices, each presently responsible for the supervision of a group of VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics located in several States. Just recently, the Director of each of these area medical offices was transferred with a small staff to the Veterans' Administration central office in Washington. Meanwhile, the staff of specialists and technicians making up the area medical office continues to function in its field location. How the Area Medical Director can supervise his staff of specialists from Washington more efficiently than was previously possible from an adjoining office is a mystery to me. I sincerely hope that this move does not represent the first step in the complete elimination of area medical offices.

I have been privileged to receive a communication from Adm. Joel T. Boone, former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, expressing his views on this subject and the high quality of Veterans' Administration medicine in general. Admiral Boone is eminently qualified to speak on all matters affecting Veterans' Administration medicine. His background is rich with experience in the practice of medicine both on the field of combat under enemy fire and in peacetime in some of the finest naval hospitals in the Nation. Not only is he eminently qualified in the practice of medicine but he has proved to be an extremely capable administrator in his many assignments of increasing administrative responsibility in the U.S. Naval Hospital System culminated by 4 years as the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration.

Admiral Boone is a native of St. Clair, Pa. He was educated at Mercersberg Academy and the Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia. He began a distinguished naval career in 1914, served in combat with the Marines in Haiti in 1915, and in France during World War II. For extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity while serving with the U.S. Marines in actual conflict with the enemy in France in July of 1918, he was awarded the highest honor this Nation can bestow upon a serviceman, the Congressional Medal of Honor. He holds the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with five Oak Leaf Clusters and the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters for wounds received in action. As medical officer of the presidential yacht for several years he treated Presidents Harding and Coolidge. As White House physician, he attended President Hoover, and for a brief period, President Roosevelt. He has held posts as chief medical officer of a single ship as well as an entire fleet. He has directed the operations of a single hospital as well as all hospitals in a naval district. He has served as General Medical Inspector for all hospitals in the entire naval system. In 1947, Admiral Boone directed a medical survey of the coal industry.

This survey devoted to medical problems encountered by coal miners and conditions affecting health in coal mines has been responsible for improving conditions for workers not only in the coal industry but in many other industries as well.

Shortly after his retirement from naval service in December of 1950 Admiral Boone assumed the responsibility of directing the nationwide network of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities. During the next 4 years he devoted all of his many talents and boundless energy to making the Veterans' Administration hospital program the greatest system of high quality medical care this country has ever known.

Admiral Boone, in his letter, shares my concern lest the Veterans' Administration medical program which has been labeled "second to none" and which he played a prominent role in establishing, deteriorate in any manner.

The letter follows:

Washington, D.C.,
March 21, 1963.

Hon. John P. Saylor,
House of Representatires,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: In compliance with your request, I submit a statement herewith, dealing with the area medical directors and area medical offices of the Veterans' Administration.

The Congressional Record, Senate, of March 4, 1963, pages 3504–3507, published a speech by Senator Hubert Humphrey, titled "Maintenance of Highest Medical Standards in Veterans' Administration," in which he, with obvious concern and at length, expressed an obvious deep concern as to an action taken by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in establishing offices in the central office of the Veterans' Administration here in Washington for the seven area medical directors. Then on March 11, 1963, Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, made a speech in the House of Representatives in which he made special references to the area medical offices and the methods of function of the area medical directors and their respective staffs. The final paragraph of Congressman THOMAS' speech states: "The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals, so they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move."

It would seem from the above statement that Congressman THOMAS is unaware that some members of area medical staffs are nonmedical personnel and hence are not qualified as practitioners of medicine.

To one who knows, from long association with and experience in dealing with the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program directly and indirectly, Congressman THOMAS' statement is shocking to me. Predicated on my knowledge and experience which has included day-to-day supervision and operation of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program for a statutory 4-year term of office, I can readily foresee that, if such a proposal were enacted, it would: first, seriously cause deterioration of the program and; then, destruction of it as a medical and hospital program, which is not excelled by any other medical and hospital program in the United States and, as far as is known, throughout the world.

My relationship with the Veterans' Bureau and the Veterans' Administration covers a span of 43 years. As far back as early 1920, when I was an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Navy following my duty with combat forces in France in World War I, one of my duties was a liaison officer with the then Veterans' Bureau. A request was made to the Surgeon General of the Navy by the then Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Bureau to release me from my duty with the Suregon General for reassignment to duty with the Veterans' Bureau as the Deputy Chief Medical Officer. I declined this proffer of an administrative position outside of the Navy, but continued for the next 2 years in a liaison capacity with the Veterans' Bureau.

Over the years from time to time I had various and sundry relationships with the Veterans' Bureau and subsequently, when established, with the Veterans' Administration. It was on March 1, 1951, that I was sworn in as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. I had accepted a proffer of appointment very reluctantly, having been urged to do so from the highest authority in Government, against my wishes and desires, but I would add parenthetically that I am indeed immeasurably gratified that I accepted the position, for it gave me an opportunity to supervise the reputedly largest medical and hospital program in the world and required of me a most challenging and vital opportunity to serve again my country and the veterans of it, with many of whom I had served when they were in the Armed Forces in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

As the Veterans' Administration at the time of my appointment was under a senatorial investigation, to which Senator HUMPHREY made extensive reference in the Senate on March 4, 1963, he being the chairman of a subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Commitee of the Senate, I entered upon my duties as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration when the place was "on fire," "exploding," and "under attack." I could not have assumed these new duties at a more difficult and harassing period. It is not regarded as immodest to refer in passing to the adjustments successfully made in the medical and hospital program and the very substantial progress that was made during my 4 years of supervision of the program. I believe the record will strongly evidence that during that 4-year period the program was put on an even keel, and that substantial strengthening of the foundations of the program was attained, so that notable progress was able to be accomplished in the following 8 years under the able direction of my successor, Dr. William S. Middleton, who retired from that office February 28, 1963. He raised the therapeutic and educational measures to a high plane by his wide experience as an educator and by his knowledge and long interest in medical research. Instead of attacks on the program from various and sundry quarters and much criticism of it, as well from many varied sources when I assumed the office of Chief Medical Director in 1951, there is now no criticism to any substantial degree. There is valid evidence that the Veterans' Administration on medical and hospital program is now accepted as a way of life. Recently an article was published in the Atlantic Monthly and more recently excerpts of it in the Reader's Digest by a young physician whose only contact with the Veterans' Administration was as a resident in three hospitals for a period of a few months. The refutations of the aforementioned article by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Gleason, and the recent Chief Medical Director, Dr. Middleton, explode any validity to the articles. On the contrary, the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program is praised and acclaimed, and, because of its accomplishments and attainments, it has become the guidepost in medicine.

The initial and modern organizational structure of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program was developed and put in operation by the then Chief Medical Director, Maj. Gen. Paul M. Hawley, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, retired. The then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was Gen. Omar N. Bradley, U.S. Army. The modern program was formulated and established in 1946 and has, therefore, been in operation 17 years. General Hawley was succeeded by Dr. Paul B. Magnuson as Chief Medical Director, who under General Hawley had been Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education. He took a vital part in the concept and formulation of the modern program and contributed very importantly to it. I succeeded Dr. Magnuson and, as I have said, I in turn was succeeded by Dr. Middleton. We four physicians covered a continuous span of 17 years as Chief Medical Directors.

To my personal knowledge, General Hawley, Dr. Magnuson, Dr. Middleton, and I are absolutely opposed to the December 3, 1962, decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to locate the seven area medical directors and two members of their staffs in central office with the majority by far of their staffs remaining in the field offices of the area medical directors in their respective assigned geographical areas. Each of us feels that such a move will, quite the contrary to the Administrator's public announcement, make for less efficiency in operation and will not affect economy but will increase the cost of the operational functions of area medical directors and add to their exacting labors and further disperse their geographical responsibilities. The convictions of us four former Chief Medical Directors, predicated on experience, would seem valid when there are to be maintained two sets of offices for the area medical directors, which will require them to travel more and enforce multiplying communication expenses to carry out their wide range of functions throughout their areas and to and from central office. I have not been able to ascertain any medical advice that has been utilized in the decision made to establish offices for the area medical directors in central office.

The Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program, and I might add that it includes the broad program of hometown medical care, is a national program and not in any sense a local one. The hospitals and clinics constitute a system of treatment centers. The domiciliary program is also a part of that medical system. Veterans' Administration hospitals and clinics are not isolated community institutions. They are in marked contrast to a private, community, university, fraternal, religious, or any other operated hospital. The Veterans' Administration hospital and clinic and domiciliary and the hometown care program, which reaches practically every hamlet of the Nation and rural areas, must be a coordinated program and one supervised and directed other than according to the whim of an individual hospital director. An army cannot be run by a company, brigade, regimental, or division commander acting independently, but they must be under central supervision, direction, and control. If you had each individual hospital director of a Veterans' Administration hospital acting independently, there would be in existence a comparable detached organizational structure like the Congolese or Haitian armies, as I knew the latter in 1915, organized and directed under multiple, separate chiefs, unrelated one to the other.

Returning to Congressman THOMAS' proposal, there must be an awareness that budgetmaking—a very vital procedure—as applied in the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery and its subdivisions, begins in individual wards and sundry offices of a Veterans' Administration hospital and clinic. The initially foreseen requirements then are reviewed by the chiefs of the various services; then by the hospital or clinic director; the area medical director makes the analytical comparisons and recommends adjustments of each medical facility's budget submissions in his area; in turn, the budgets are transmitted to central office where the Chief Medical Director analyzes, screens, and modifies the budgets from the field and consolidates them together with the budget requirements for the operations of his subdivisions of central office before they are forwarded to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Administrator and his budget staff review the submitted budget from the Department of Medicine and Surgery and make an overall budget for the Veterans' Administration which is then submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration and submission to the Congress. It will, therefore, be seen that the budgets of all the various field medical facilities and the central offices of the Department of Medicine and Surgery must be a coordinated budget. From the beginning of its formulation until final review and adoption, many modifications take place in it, predicated on area and other overall broader analysis by officials in higher echelons with wider viewpoint than an individual hospital director who cannot, naturally, but be influenced by local desires and requirements as he is able to appraise them. The area medical director has the responsibility, with his knowledge as the area field coordinator, to review the budgets uninfluenced by individual hospital appraisement. He makes recommendations for adjustment in the individual hospital budget up or down. His screening, reviewing, and making recommended modifications of individual hospital or clinic budgets prepares them for central office consideration.

Dr. Middleton and I have observed in the past that area medical directors are "the eyes and ears of the Chief Medical Director in the field" and as the coordinators of the Department of Medicine and Surgery field activities. I do not believe I ever went into the various Veterans' Administration areas without having the respective area medical directors accompany me to the medical and hospital facilities within and throughout their areas. I was very dependent on the knowledge they possessed and their familiarity with and acquaintanceship with the institutions, the members of staffs, the universities, the deans and faculty of the medical schools in their respective areas with which the Veterans' Administration is affiliated, with the sundry consultants, and with the adjacent community life in the areas where Veterans' Administration hospitals are located; also with local and State veterans' organizations, chamber of commerce groups, church groups, and volunteer people who serve in various capacities in the medical and hospital field programs. The area medical directors and their staffs and offices are in close contact with the local and State medical and dental societies which together with the medical and dental schools create the atmosphere for and assist vitally in professional recruitment for the Veterans' Administration. In many instances the area offices' staff contacts the families of patients cared for in clinics and institutionalized in the Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary facilities in their areas. They have a definite relationship with the extensive hometown care program which is a service of inestimable value to veteran patients who are entitled to such service. The area medical offices are readily available to investigate complaints of disciplinary infractions and to ascertain information of a wide variety and nature. Area medical directors were indispensable to me in bearing my heavy responsibility as Chief Medical Director. In a large measure they provided information and a knowledge needed in the conduct of my high office. I am thoroughly convinced that I could not have functioned without them, dispersed as they are throughout the Nation.

It has been gratifying to me to have heard Mr. Gleason express his belief in and the need for area medical offices and that he not only supports the existence of seven, but that he would favor an increase in the number. He granted that, as an example of inadequate coverage, the area medical director with headquarters in San Francisco had too large a coverage (its area is from Canada to the Mexican border and besides the States of Washington, Oregon, and California; it includes the States of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona). Experience has demonstrated that this area should be divided into two areas. When the Booz, Allen, & Hamilton management consultant firm of Chicago made a study of the Veterans' Administration in 1951, it recommended that there be established 20 area medical offices. As Chief Medical Director, I felt 10 should be the maximum. Six was the original number. Some time subsequent to the Booz, Allen, & Hamilton study, and additional area medical office was established.

Due to circumstances unfortunately arising in recent weeks and months, I have reason to be very deeply concerned as to the continuance of the superb medical care provided for veterans as has been now attained. If the medical and hospital program is not maintained on the highest level, the best trained and most competent professional personnel will not be participants in it. It is foreseen that medical and dental schools would not continue their highly effective affiliations with the program. Were this to happen, there would follow the termination of the residency and other outstanding teaching programs; Veterans' Administration medical research would vanish and the program would revert to an earlier deplorable quality of medical care of the veterans, such as preceded the modern program established in 1946. Should that reversion in medical care eventuate, the ill veteran would be cruelly victimized. The progressive advances in medical science, so materially assisted and promoted by the Veterans' Administration, would not only be severely handicapped, but real damage to it would be a consequence. The integration of private and governmental medicine, as applied at the Veterans' Administration, is unique. Wherein there was skepticism when such a combine was created, time has proved its wisdom, and its success as a medical and hospital program has been acclaimed. This wedlock in medicine has justified the claim that Veterans' Administration medicine is second to none. It will require positive action upon the part of those who have the power and authority to require that that descriptive phrase is a reality in every sense of its meaning.

I am sure you will agree that the present Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program must be safeguarded and provisions maintained for its function on the present high plateau.

You well know of my devotion and dedication to the veterans of our country. When in 1956 at the American Legion national convention, in Los Angeles, I was awarded its Distinguished Service Medal and in the final declaration of my prepared response to the presentation address made, I said:

"I have many times pledged the veterans of this country my support—not in mere words but in positive action. I believe the record will evidence that I have stood firm as one of their constant champions. I here again pledge to you that I shall remain faithful—with you—to our association as comrades-in-arms in every deserving cause pertaining to the American veterans. Standing before you today is a most meaningful and memorable experience for me.

"With the new honor you have bestowed upon me comes greater responsibility. With each honor I have been fortunate to receive over the years, I have been ever conscious of my added responsibility to give a better and fuller account of myself to my countrymen. I, here now, in the presense of this great assembly of patriotic Americans, so pledge myself so long as God gives me strength and life."

With my kindest wishes, I am,
Very sincerely,
JOEL T. BOONE.

DR. JEROME B. WIESNER: EXPERT SCIENTIST AND EXPERT WITNESS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of the legislation which created the Office of Coal Research, I was particularly interested in this week's hearings conducted by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Such a review of the operations and activity of the Office of Coal Research is important in alerting Congress to the necessity of intensifying the coal research effort. At the same time, Office of Coal Research personnel and participating organizations and their employees may be assured that Congress has confidence in their efforts to develop new and expanded uses for coal.

I thank the chairman and those of the subcommittee who devoted so much of their time to the hearings. Attendance by members, many of whom represent constituencies far removed from coal regions, indicated a general desire to assist in the resurgence of coal and with it improvement of economic conditions in depressed mining areas.

The legislation setting up the Office of Coal Research was fashioned and nurtured by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 86th Congress. It had the unanimous support of the committee, whose membership at that time included the present Secretary of the Interior. All of us—and every other Member of Congress who had a voice in its passage—are interested in the success of the coal research program. The testimony presented this week gives every evidence that this hope will be realized.

Mr. Speaker, one witness to whom I should like to pay special commendation for his lucid and forthright testimony is Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, director of the Office of Science and Technology. He presented a brief but inclusive statement pointing out the necessity of coal research and development. He pointed out that only an infinitesimal amount of research expenditures have been applied to research on America's most abundant energy resource as compared with the totals—by both government and private industry—directed into other fields of science and technology.

In response to questions, Dr. Wiesner was never evasive. No equivocation. No oratorical embellishments. Under unanimous consent, I include his written statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY DR. JEROME B. WIESNER

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to accept your invitation to appear before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining during your hearings on coal technology and prospects. I should like to point out at the beginning that I am not here to discuss coal research in detail. It may be possible, however, for me to shed some light on broader energy research and development considerations now before the country in which coal plays a highly significant role.

Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, establishing the Office of Science and Technology, I am available to advise the President with respect to the review, integration and coordination of major activities in science and technology. Hence, I share the responsibility for looking broadly at the needs for research and development in the energy field to assure a balanced research and development effort that will best serve the national energy needs in future years, making the best use of natural, human, technological, and economic resources.

In response to recommendations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President in mid-February directed that a comprehensive interdepartmental study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the most effective allocation of our research and development efforts.

The study is to be concerned with such matters as the possible effects of major research efforts on the economics of various energy sources or on improved transmission methods for energy; the size and characteristics of future demands for energy; possible price trends for fuels; and available alternative technical approaches to the problem of supplying the long-term energy requirements of the Nation.

Some of the questions we shall be trying to answer include these: What is the general rationale for investment of research and development funds? On what basis can research and development priorities be assigned? Under what conditions is such investment economically justified? What guidelines should be used to determine balance in the total national energy research and development program?

At a more specific level, we shall of course be looking for those research and development opportunities which seem to offer the most attractive possible payoffs, in both the short and the longer range.

The Interdepartmental Energy Study is under the direction of the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, and the Interior; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Power Commission; and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Emergency Planning. I am the chairman of the steering group, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers is the vice chairman.

The study will of course be conducted in full awareness of the other important studies either recently completed or now underway by a number of organizations, including the Interior Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

As the Administration confronts this whole major question of development and conservation of energy resources, it is acutely aware that the amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth. We would like to know more than we do, for example, about where the most fruitful opportunities may lie in generation methods, high voltage transmission, coal pipelines, gasification and liquefaction of coal, recovery of petroleum from oil shales and tar sands, the use of integral trains and other improvements in transportation and the possible use of superconductors in generation and transmission and equipment.

Inasmuch as we have only just embarked on the interdepartmental energy study, I have had little occasion as yet to review specifically the state of the art in coal technology and prospects for research and development in this field, as compared with efforts in other facets of our energy system. My Office has of course been generally aware of the work of the Bureau of Mines and the Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior.

The amount of coal research—supported by some $11 million per year of Federal funds and about $9 million of private funds—is small when compared with research and development expenditures in civilian atomic power ($250 million per year) and in oil and gas ($300 million per year). As I indicated earlier, the interdepartmental energy study should throw fresh light on this question of allocation of research and development resources. However, it is my impression that financial support is not the only significant factor in coal research. Among other factors that need to be taken into consideration are: availability of research manpower and means for diffusing technological innovation through the coal industry and related enterprises.

As far as the direction for coal research is concerned, my present impression—subject to review as the interdepartmental energy study proceeds—is that development of economic liquefaction and gasification processes, as well as more economic transportation methods, both for fuel and electricity, would produce the greatest economic benefits for the coal industry. In this context, I am encouraged by the philosophy of the Department of the Interior whose coal research program aims at investigating the technical-economic feasibility of a mining and manufacturing complex whose end products—beside coal—would also include liquid and gaseous fuels and other chemical byproducts. Such systematic treatment of coal as a raw material to be processed into a variety of end products could lead to a new, broader, and invigorated concept of the coal industry.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wiesner's appearance was so refreshing that I decided to look into the background of this unique type of witness. I find that his extraordinary background, and his educational, industrial, and governmental experience easily qualify him to be so deliberate and specific on any questions which may be put to him.

In studying an article devoted to Dr. Wiesner's life and accomplishments in the New Yorker magazine, I am led to conclude that there could very likely be a wide crevice between his and my political and economic philosophies, yet his testimony this week convinced me that here is a sincere and knowledgeable public servant who is a far cry from the ordinary bureaucrat whose testimony invariably is based on the need for more funds, more personnel, and more authority for his own office.

My first acquaintance with Dr. Wiesner's work was through his February 20 statement to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. I found it to be terse, lucid, and to the point, with emphasis on commonsense in the conduct of the Atomic Energy Commission's civilian nuclear power program. I concluded at that time that the coal industry of this country might be in for more favorable treatment as a consequence of Dr. Wiesner's activities, not because he is looking primarily for new media of assisting an oppressed industry, but because of his objectivity and understanding of the energy resources, requirements, and potentials of our country.

Dr. Wiesner told the Joint Committee that he has been directed by the President to chair a steering group charged with the responsibility of conducting an interdepartmental energy study. Members of Congress who represent constituencies where conventional fuels are important economic factors will look forward to the progress and completion of this study, particularly because Dr. Wiesner has pointed out that the last AEC report to the President did not take into consideration the possible effect of additional research efforts on the economics of nonnuclear energy sources or on improvement of transmission methods for energy produced by either nuclear or nonnuclear means.

As I observed during the Mines and Mining Subcommittee hearings this week, if the discovery of coal in America had been delayed for two centuries, it would be much easier to obtain appropriations for research into this magic fuel. The country has been enamoured of possibilities offered by the atom and for 15 years Treasury funds have been made available for the purpose of finding a method of producing cheap electricity.

Before inserting the Wiesner statement on atomic energy, I should like to mention parenthetically that the magazine article to which I have referred, mentioned that President Kennedy's Special Assistant for Science and Technology is married to a former resident of Johnstown, Pa. Since Johnstown is also my hometown and is in the 22d District of Pennsylvania, my research into the background of Dr. Wiesner was all the more fruitful:

The above-mentioned statement follows:

TESTIMONY BY DR. JEROME B. WIESNER BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. CONGRESS, SECTION 202 HEARINGS, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the Joint Committee, I am pleased to accept your invitation to testify at this year's "202" hearings on the development, state, and growth of the atomic industry.

I would like to point out that the larger problem of research underlying the development and utilization of natural resources, including energy resources, has engaged the attention of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962 establishing the Office of Science and Technology I am available to advise the President with respect to the review, integration, and coordination of major activities in science and technology. Hence, I share the responsibility for looking broadly at the needs for research and development in the energy field to assure a balanced research and development effort that will best serve the national energy needs in future years, making the best use of natural, human, and economic resources.

You have asked me to comment specifically on the report on "Civilian Nuclear Power," prepared by the AEC last year at the request of the President. I should like to do that and then to discuss briefly some plans for following up on that study. This is a very useful report, representing much effort and thought on the part of the Commission and the other groups whose studies it reflects. The report proposes a pattern for nuclear power development, several aspects of which I feel are generally appropriate.

For example, it seems clear that breeder reactors will be essential to utilize our uranium resources efficiently. Since breeders can eventually multiply the energy available from uranium manifold, this opportunity for long-range conservation of nuclear fuels should, of course, be explored. There is important emphasis in the AEC report on the development of this technology.

It is probably also true that a highly selective development effort on certain converter reactors is appropriate during the interval before breeders become commercially available.

Drs. Seaborg and Haworth have discussed these aspects of the report in detail, so I would like to concentrate my observations on a broader point: the relationship of atomic energy, as discussed in the AEC report, to other energy sources.

In transmitting the report to the President, Chairman Seaborg pointed out that the Commission had concentrated on nuclear power questions, and did not consider it appropriate to cover in that report the possible effect of additional research efforts on the economics of nonnuclear energy sources, or on improved transmission methods for energy produced by either nuclear or nonnuclear means.

As a result, the President has before him a highly interesting and significant report, but one which needs to be viewed in the broader context of our total energy picture.

Also available are recently completed studies which relate to the energy question by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A study of the electric power requirements has additionally been undertaken by the Federal Power Commission.

Following his receipt of the Atomic Energy Commission report, the President requested recommendations for the most effective way to consider the questions which were left unanswered by the Commission. In addition, the President requested recommendations for dealing with the broader economic questions which are implicit in the Commission's report and the other reports, such as the size and characteristics of future demands for energy, possible price trends for fuels, and available complementary technical approaches to the problem of supplying the long-term energy requirements of the Nation.

In response to recommendations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President has now directed that a comprehensive interdepartmental study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the most effective allocation of our research and development efforts.

The participants in this interdepartmental energy study are to be the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Power Commission; and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Emergency Planning. I am to be the Chairman of the steering group, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers is to be the Vice Chairman.

As the administration confronts this whole major question of development and conservation of energy resources, it is acutely aware that the amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth.

Among the questions which need to be answered is one of major interest to this group, i.e., what degree of urgency the Nation should attach to nuclear power development, in the light of the projected availability of conventional energy resources, which should last well into the next century.

We also need to have some indication of what improvements in availability and economical use of nonnuclear fuels might result from increased investment of research and development funds. We would like to know more than we do, for example, about where the most fruitful opportunities may lie, not only in nuclear and other generation methods, but in high voltage transmission, the use of superconductors in generation and transmission equipment, very large conventional or nuclear plants, coal pipelines, gasification and liquefaction of coal, recovery of petroleum from oil shales and tar sands, and the use of integral trains and other improvements in transportation. We are also interested in the related problem of desalination of water and how this might affect the economics of power generation, both nuclear and nonnuclear, if purified water and power are produced together.

I am sure that the results of this examination cannot affect the basic need for long-term preparedness to meet energy requirements through nuclear power, nor can they affect the fundamental importance of conservation of resources which the AEC has so explicitly recognized. It is our hope, however, that this study will provide a perspective to judge both the desirable level of effort and programs proposed by the AEC and other Government agencies in the development of our energy resources.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I took this time to discuss H.R. 5131, the Youth Conservation Corps bill, which the Committee on Education and Labor recently approved. The bill shortly will be before the House Committee on Rules.

On March 31, 1933, the Congress responded to President Roosevelt's message asking for power to create a Civilian Conservation Corps and on April 5 the President established it by Executive order. There had been no precedent for the establishment of a Corps of this type in American history. In that message the President stated:

> I propose to create a Civilian Conservation Corps to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, but confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control, and similar projects.

Now 30 years later, we face a specialized unemployment problem of our youth. We do not have as many people out of employment today as we had back in 1933 but the unemployment in the age group between 16 and 21 perhaps is greater today than in 1933. In December 1962, we had in excess of 700,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 21 that were not in school and were unemployed. An 800,000 figure would perhaps be more accurate because there are no figures for the unemployed youngster who does not go about looking for work but we all know there are many in this particular group. Twenty-six percent of this unemployed group of youngsters are high school graduates. Of the dropouts in the 1960's it has been estimated that 2½ million of these youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 will not have completed the 8th grade. The unemployment rate among this age group is more than three times the unemployment rate in the adult population.

For several years many of the Members have been exerting every effort to enact legislation patterned after the old Civilian Conservation Corps, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman BLATNIK, and the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Congressman SIKES. This year legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Congressman SIKES, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman BLATNIK, along with many other Members in the Congress including myself, to authorize the establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps which we feel is the best and most economical method of meeting this unemployment problem among the youth of the country, and at the same time will advance the conservation and recreational programs in our national forests and national parks. This legislation also authorizes State and community youth employment programs for State and local public facilities.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point an analysis of both titles I and II prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor analyzing the principal provisions of S. 1 and H.R. 5131, as amended by the House and Senate committees, and letters from the National Education Association, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, and the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, urging approval of youth corps legislation:

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF S. 1 AND H.R. 5131 AS AMENDED BY HOUSE AND SENATE COMMITTEES

The bill contains two titles—the first of which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps; the second, State and community employment program. Both programs[1] are designed to provide modest paying jobs to the increasing problem of unemployed youth 16 through 21 years of age. Authorized program levels are in approximate accord with the President's January 1963 budget message for first year of operation. The House bill authorizes $100 million; the Senate version authorized $120 million.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

1. A Youth Conservation Corps is established within the Department of Labor for the purpose of performing needed conservation work under the direct supervision of the Federal conservation agencies.

2. Young men 16 through 21 will be eligible for enrollment in the Corps for a minimum period of 6 months. Reenrollment will be permitted up to a maximum of 2 years. During their enrollment they will be paid $60 per month (slightly higher on reenrollment), receive board, lodging, clothing, and other necessities.

3. Training and basic educational skills will be provided through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with local school authorities.

4. The House bill provides an allotment formula based upon the male population in the age group in each of the States. The Senate version provides that 50 percent of the enrollees are to be selected on the basis of population figures and 50 percent to be selected by the Secretary on the basis of high unemployment. Selection of the enrollees will be made by the State employment services which in turn will endeavor to find jobs in private industry upon the conclusion of the enrollment.

5. The Corps will be administered by a Director, nominated by the President, acting through an interdepartmental committee consisting of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and (in the House version) the General Services Administration. The Director of the Corps will represent the Secretary of Labor.

6. Appropriations in the two versions differ. The Senate bill has a first year appropriation of $60 million, with subsequent years to be determined by the Congress. The House version sets maximum appropriations of $50 million the first year, $100 million the second year, $150 million the third year, $200 million for the fourth, and thereafter to be determined by the Congress. For the first

---

[1] These programs are to be distinguished from proposals for a Domestic Peace Corps which will be manned by adult volunteers whose special talents and educational qualifications will be utilized to provide leadership to local volunteer service.

year the number of enrollees will not exceed 15,000; thereafter the number at one time shall not exceed 60,000.

STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

1. Through the use of 50-50 matching grants, public or private nonprofit agencies will be permitted to pay the costs of programs for the employment of youngsters for useful full-time or part-time work not now being performed by regular employees. The funds are available for any combination of useful work linked with schooling or training, or special school programs including work-study programs.
2. Young men or women between the ages of 16 through 21 are eligible for jobs under the program.
3. The program is designed to depend on local initiative. Thus local groups such as educators, welfare officials, and private agencies will together draw up plans for employment programs. These plans will then be submitted for the approval of the Secretary of Labor to assure compliance with requirements set forth in the bill.
4. Employment opportunities authorized by the program would include service in schools, hospitals, libraries, welfare agencies, children's homes, courts, in public programs relating to park improvement, playgrounds, and in private community activities such as the Visiting Nurse Association, Boy Scouts, and so on. Amendments to the administration's bill, made both in the House and the Senate versions, provide additional moneys for the establishment of Youth Conservation Corps type programs by States on State parks and forests.
5. The House version of the bill appropriates $50 million the first year, $80 million the second, and $110 million the third year, the program to terminate thereafter. The number of enrollees is not stated but would depend upon the makeup of individual programs and the size of appropriations. The Senate bill provides for a first-year appropriation of $60 million, with the subsequent 4 years to be determined by the Congress. The Senate bill version provides that the enrollees shall not exceed the equivalent of 60,000 enrollees during the first year, and thereafter the number determined by the appropriations.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.
Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: It is encouraging that the Youth Employment Act, which you are considering as H.R. 5131, has made the progress it has toward legislative enactment, and I hope that the Congress will proceed now without delay to final passage.

The National Education Association regards this legislation as promising an important contribution toward the problems of our disadvantaged youth, so many of whom have dropped out of school without adequate preparation for life. The future for most of them will be bleak indeed unless we can find some way of retrieving these lost talents.

We are impressed with the educational benefits contemplated in this proposal—the requirement in title I, providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, that State and local educational authorities are to establish educational programs, in cooperation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the maximum extent possible, and in title II the provision for local area employment which may provide the incentive needed by many to stay in school or return to school, or to acquire useful work experience.

The problem to which this legislation addresses itself is, we think, one of the most serious before the Nation today and one which will require action on many fronts for its resolution. There are 11.6 million young people in our high schools this year and, if recent experience is our guide, one-third of them (more than 3.5 million) will not graduate.

Measured against the size of the problem, the Youth Employment Act cannot be considered a panacea, but surely it will be worth the effort to make a start, and a good start, toward its solution.

Sincerely,
HAZEL BLANCHARD,
President.

AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.
Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of the urgency of the situation I am writing you again about the Youth Employment Act of 1963 (H.R. 5131). The time for action on this important social and educational matter is now. Perhaps never in our Nation's history has such a large segment of our young men and women faced so bleak an employment outlook as today. Efforts at solving this perplexing social problem are long overdue. H.R. 5131 will not provide all the help that is needed, nor will it solve all the problems. But, it is an important first step in putting forth a positive plan of action. There are several very important reasons why this legislation is so badly needed. May I relate to you again the major strengths of this bill as they occur to this association.

OPPORTUNITY

Many of the young men, 16 through 21, who are unemployed today, have never held a job for an extended period of time. They have never been out of the very city that holds them captive. Many are completely unaware of the world about them—much less the great challenge and opportunity that is America. They badly need an opportunity for gainful employment in order that they can lift their horizons beyond the narrow concrete canyon that now is home to them. For a young man out of work for extended periods of time, a chance to work may be the greatest boost he will receive in his lifetime.

WORK IN NATURAL RESOURCES

The opportunity to work as provided in this bill will be a great support to thousands of young men. The additional benefits from title I—the Youth Conservation Corps—with its provisions for healthful outdoor training and employment is highly commendable. The need for development and conservation in our parks and forests has been stated so well by experts in the field that it should only be called attention to here. These young men can be given a real sense of social contribution by working in the beautiful parks and forests of this Nation. Many of them have never seen the scenic wonders of our land and the very opportunity to learn and earn in this setting should accrue a great blessing to both this Nation and the young men involved. Both natural resources—youth and our land and forests—are important.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

The recent manpower report of the President stated that the unemployment rate in 1962 for boys 14 to 19 was about 13 percent and 9 percent for those in their early twenties while men 25 or over had an unemployment rate of 4 percent. This is an appalling situation. The truth is that things are not going to get better with the passing of time. These youth need more education and opportunities for employment now. Both are important. The lack of education, for many, is the basic cause of their unemployment. This bill makes an attack on this dual problem. These men need special educational programs for their age group and maturity level. Among them are many who can be skilled technicians or creative artisans if given the chance. They need a lift to get back on the right track of education again—while they work and earn. For many thousands of young men who can take advantage of this act the education benefits can prove to be equal to or more important than the employment opportunities.

An important aspect of this educational program will be the counseling provided for the enrollees. These young men need to be made aware of their human potential and the present and future opportunities that are available to them in this highly technical and complex world in which we live. A strong professional counseling program in this Youth Employment Act will give greatest possible meaning to the education and the training.

SOMEONE CARES

A young man out of school and out of work—a part of a core of long-term unemployed (15 weeks or more)—begins to wonder if his neighbors, his city, State or Nation won't reach out to support his desire to be a useful productive American citizen. Basically, these young men want to work, but many (and the number is growing) simply cannot find work with their educational skill and maturity level. They must be given a chance. This Nation must demonstrate to these hundreds of thousands of unemployed youth under 22 years of age that someone does care whether they have the opportunity for useful and productive employment and a fresh start on an educational program. The social and economic devastation of this prolonged unemployment can be very critical for these young people. This Nation needs the help of these young men, and these young men need the help of this Nation.

We urge you to continue to provide the strong leadership this bill needs for successful passage. Your interest and past support places thousands of Americans in your debt.

Cordially yours,
ARTHUR A. HITCHCOCK,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION,
Washington D.C., April 2, 1963.
Hon. CARL PERKINS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Congratulations on your leadership in bringing H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act, to the attention of the Congress as you are doing today.

Rural youth and young adults are often the victims of our changing economic and social structure. The chronic inadequate financing of public education has been particularly devastating in rural areas. This condition, coupled with the decrease in opportunity for work on the farm because of increased mechanization, has resulted in a migration of unskilled rural youth to urban areas, where they too often join the ranks of the chronic unemployed.

While as a rural group we obviously applaud the purposes of title I of H.R. 5131 providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, we are equally enthusiastic about title II, the local area youth employment program. Title I is limited to opportunities for young men. Title II would provide opportunities for both young men and young women. Our society requires increasing vocational competence from all of its citizens, not only for the benefit of society, but perhaps more importantly for the self-respect and self-fulfillment of the individuals concerned. We believe that service in the Youth Conservation Corps can be a fine experience for young men. We commend the authors of this bill for their concern for conservation of natural resources, a special interest of our department. But we emphasize that a youth conservation program cannot be complete if it ignores those young people who will spend their lives in the urban areas and who will profit most from on-the-job public service employment training programs. We urge, as we did last year, that the committee not fail to see all of the youth because of the trees.

We are particularly pleased that H.R. 5131 contains the explicit provision that training and basic education skills will be provided through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the local school authorities.

The department of rural education, NEA, representing the county superintendents of this Nation, supports H.R. 5131 and urges the Congress to approve the bill as presented. We believe this is a realistic approach to the present problems of youth employment.

Sincerely,
ROBERT, M. ISENBERG,
Executive Secretary.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: The American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation urges you and your committee to support and call for the early enactment of H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Our association was organized in 1885. It has over 34,000 members and is a department of the National Education Association. It is also the largest professional organization in America serving the fields of health, physical education, and recreation.

We feel that the two titles of this bill—one providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, and the other for a local area youth employment program—are equally important to make possible the greatly needed opportunities for youth employment. The useful work on projects which would be accomplished under the provisions of this bill would also contribute greatly to the conservation and development of natural resources throughout the Nation.

We are especially pleased that section 104 (2) under title I provides that enrollees of the Youth Conservation Corps may be utilized by agencies responsible for developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas. The increasing shortage of recreational areas and facilities is a critical national problem which must be solved in order to provide adequate recreational opportunities for all citizens.

We are also happy to see that section 104 (4) under title I provides that to the maximum extent practicable, educational programs shall be provided by State and local educational authorities under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Our association urges the support of your committee in calling on the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 5131 without delay.

Sincerely yours,
JACKSON M. ANDERSON,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have suggested that a Federal program aimed to provide employment to the young men and women of the country is an expensive way to meet the present problem facing these youngsters. They propose instead a substantial increase in the size of the vocational education plan on the theory that those who are unemployed need skills before they become capable of getting jobs.

I do not think that anybody can find me in second place on behalf of the cause of vocational education. These past 2 weeks, indeed, I have been the chairman of a subcommittee examining the needs of vocational education and listening to the overwhelming testimony in its behalf—testimony, in fact, from administration witnesses who have said that vocational education has been neglected in the struggle for the local education dollar; has been receiving the least able of the students; has been making out with obsolete machinery and with salary scales which are unable to compete with modern industry. I have, moreover, introduced H.R. 4955 which would aid vocational education to an even greater extent than the aid proposed by the administration. I have in my State and, indeed, in my own district one of the greatest vocational schools of the entire Nation, the Mayo Vocational School, and my most ardent wish is that all Americans have the opportunity to attend an area vocational school with the reputation and record of accomplishment which Mayo has demonstrated almost since its founding. Only very few States, North Carolina, Louisiana, California, and Connecticut have a sufficient organization of public vocational schooling to do the job Mayo is doing for my district. To rectify these deficiencies will require an enormous commitment of public resources.

But I think we should ask ourselves whether vocational education is the answer for the 800,000 young men and women between 16 and 21 who are this very day out of school and looking for work. The Secretary of Labor testified that there was an additional 200,000 who were out of school and not looking for work because they knew the task was futile—they lacked the qualifications which their experience had already told them were necessary before an employer would consider them for employment.

Bear in mind that the 800,000 of today will be on the increase tomorrow. In 1960 the monthly average, apart from vacation months, was 450,000, about one-half of what it is today. During 1963 the first wave of postwar births will become 16 years of age. In this very year 3,700,000 young boys and girls will become 16 years of age compared to the 2,700,000 who become 16 during 1962. Thus, for those who will drop out, who will start looking for jobs at 16 we are certain to be presented with a sudden new increase in the number of such youngsters.

At the very moment in time when the flood of new entrants into the labor force confronts us, another event is occurring in the manpower field. All of us know that the farm boy is being driven into the city because of the rapid technological developments taking place in agriculture. We all know that the number of odd jobs, unskilled jobs if you will, is decreasing. We know that the youngster who might have been an elevator operator or an errand boy finds such opportunities increasingly scarce because of the advance of automation. The Secretary said we are facing a future where the unskilled jobs will be done by machine. Department of Labor projections for the next 15 years show clearly that in a steeply rising labor force the number of unskilled jobs likely to be available will remain stable whereas all the growth in the labor force will be absorbed in the skilled or semiskilled areas.

We have had disastrous spring floods in Kentucky and in many other States in the country. When one swollen river meets another and the two combine, the confluence of these rivers flood the land below and it is this kind of situation which I am trying to describe. It is this kind of situation which committee members from the other side of the aisle during discussions of the Youth Employment Act are attempting to solve by vocational training, as though this institution could handle the vast problems of youthful unemployment in the immediate future.

Given 10 years of development of school construction, of rising teacher salaries, of recruitment of manpower, in short a crash program for education plan, some of the job of saving wasting manpower might be accomplished, but only under these circumstances.

But the task immediately ahead cannot be done solely by vocational education and their leaders, as I will describe, say as much. The job ahead must deal with existing conditions and predictable ones of high youth unemployment. The school dropout picture, reflecting over a period of years considerable progress when applied to the increasing supply of youngsters, shows the actual number of dropouts remaining constant. Moreover these youngsters are dropping out of vocational schools as well as regular schools. The problem is that the courses being offered are insufficient to insure their attention. They are not motivated for learning to work—their experiences in school or in their environment have turned them away from the path to a productive livelihood. Good vocational schooling for youngsters requires levels of accomplishment in a host of related subjects comparable to a high school degree.

The Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year has to date approved projects which total 30,000 trainees. When the matter was checked recently it was discovered that approximately 25 percent of the total were for the age group 16 through 21, the topic of our concern this afternoon. Many of these youngsters were eligible for the adult training allowances because they were already heads of families and had been in the labor force 3 years. Perhaps more important are the difficulties which the Department of Labor encountered in stimulating special programs for youth, the kinds of programs which the Congress asked the Secretary of Labor to give his special attention in view of the kinds of unemployment figures which I have already described. To date hardly a half dozen of such programs have been developed covering less than 500 trainees. The Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act are neither of them geared to the broad range programs required for our youth. They are chiefly used for those who have become unemployed and require retraining in order to resume beneficial and satisfactory employment in a new job.

The Secretary of Labor and numerous other witnesses made the point that what most of those youngsters who are now unemployed needed was actual experience in work, the kind of experience which enables an employer when considering the employment application of an applicant to ascertain for himself from the previous employer what he can expect. He wants to know whether the applicant has worked regularly, understands the discipline of promptness, of fitting in with the operations of others on the job. The vocational education programs do not give such answers. The Manpower Development and Training Act to the extent that it permits on-the-job training will give such answers to the employer who is cooperating in giving training, but for this employer the trainee is already his own prospective employee.

In quite different ways the two programs proposed by the Youth Employment Act provide unique experience to the persons for whom they are devised. In the case of the Youth Conservation Corps the money spent can be considered well spent for conservation purposes. The $4,000 per year per enrollee, despite some losses in efficiency, compares very favorably to the productivity of a regular employee performing similar conservation work, and if such is the fact the benefits to the young men who will be in the program will become a valuable byproduct. The healing values of camp experience, of work in a constructive purpose is the testimony of the old CCC and many of the persons who today deal with youngsters in the camp programs of many States.

The State and community employment programs on the other hand will be able to relate additional schooling with actual work experience. The work study programs and experiments in many school districts have proved their worth and such programs will receive substantial support when this bill is enacted. Indeed many youngsters will be able to receive vocational education for part of the day and work at a constructive, useful job financially supported by title II of the Youth Employment Act. In this very clear way the rebuilding of vocational education is related to activity under this bill but at the same time quite clearly complementary to it and in no way overlapping in its benefits.

Mr. Speaker, training under the vocational education program meets the needs of the fairly able kid, but only reaches to a limited degree the type of youngster we are trying to reach under the Youth Corps legislation.

Vocational education programs in general do not satisfy the needs of a sixth-, seventh-, eighth-grade school dropout, until this type of youngster has taken some camp training where he will be given an opportunity to test his aptitude and preference for various types of work. Then he may be given related training to the type of work most suitable to this particular youngster and from there take vocational training.

Much of the vocational training is largely post high school. Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, training highly skilled technicians is largely a post high school program. The Smith-Hughes Act and George-Barden Act, as far as home economics and agriculture are concerned start with the ninth grade, and go through some post high school work. In trade and industrial education, most of the programs start in the 10th grade. Many of these programs are likewise post high school. The distributive occupations which have to do with merchandising, retailing, and wholesaling on a cooperative basis, usually require 10th grade and go through high school, and much of this is post high school.

I have gone to the trouble of lifting from the vocational education hearings the testimony of a group of experts representing American vocational education, who appeared before the General Subcommittee on Education on Wednesday and Friday of last week. They are Dr. Milo J. Peterson, president of the American Vocational Association; Dr. William B. Logan, professor of education at Ohio State University and member of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education; Mr. James Patton, assistant superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education; Dr. Burr E. Coe, director, Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School of New Brunswick, N.J.; Dr. Mayor D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.; Dr. C. W. Patrick, president of San Diego Junior College, San Diego, Calif.; and Dr. Albert Jochen, assistant commissioner of education, vocational division, Trenton, N.J. These gentlemen are experts in the field and their testimony was to the effect that the dropout would benefit immensely from camp experience.

I think the Members of the Congress will be interested in the views of these outstanding vocational experts on the proposed Youth Corps legislation. These gentlemen support the youth camp approach and give their reasons. I have lifted out of the record the pertinent part of the testimony of these gentlemen, and under unanimous consent include them in the RECORD at this point. These statements are taken from the stenographic transcript of hearings, General Subcommittee on Education, March 27, 1963, commencing at the top of page 258, and extending through page 273:

Mr. PERKINS. I will address this question to all of the speakers.

On these 700,000 dropouts primarily from high school and grade school between the ages of 16 to 21 years, assuming that you had these expanded facilities today, how many of these dropouts do you figure that you may be able to train or retrain?

This is problematical, we all know it, but you people are specialists in this field and we have to get some views of the specialists. I would just like to get that in general. I want the comments from all of you, any of you.

Mr. PATTON. Could I make a comment on that? I want to back up a bit to discuss the dropout generally as it applies in Kentucky, our home State.

At the present time, or this last year, we only had 14 vocational schools, 1,700 dropouts. On the face of that we had about 37 percent, generally, 37 to 40 percent from year to year dropping out of school.

You can see just how small a dent we are making on it at the present time.

Of course, we need the facilities and equipment to do the total job. But I visited the Kentucky Business, the institution that serves the delinquents and I found more than 400 people in that institution and in the interest of the committee that were there at the institution, we found that everyone we talked to despised the school that they last attended. They didn't like the school, they didn't like the teacher. They would become a dropout and then a delinquent and then confined to an institution.

Now, it stands to reason that there is a large group of these people that could have been salvaged in the work camp situation.

I am old enough to have been able to find out and to have experienced the outstanding contribution the CCC camp made for many of our youths in Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. You feel with this kind of dropout they are usually unqualified to enter vocational education and the CCC or something patterned after the old Civilian Conservation Corps would be satisfactory?

Mr. PATTON. Yes. The very fact you are subjected to discipline and go to bed at a certain time and you associate with the group and you would develop certain work habits and it is certainly beneficial as a prerequisite to any education.

Mr. PERKINS. You would say that would be a prerequisite to vocational education?

Mr. PATTON. It would be.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to hear the comment of the gentleman here from California, just comment on that one point.

Mr. PATRICK. I would agree, in general, with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, and it seems to me that the expansion of the program of vocational education into areas—do you want us to expand on both ends of the spectrum? We talked this morning about great need for technical education and there is also a need for expansion in the lower level of vocational education, the service occupations and semiskilled occupations that have had to be filled by the completely unskilled man and now requires skills.

It would seem to me, and I am sure that the expansion of the vocational program at those lower levels would reduce considerably the number of youth that might need to be served by such a camp, but the failure to do both of these things in the face of any major lack of full employment will create idle youths, which we know, in our urban communities, can be a devastating and dangerous program.

Mr. PERKINS. But the first thing with an unemployed youngster who does not have the background to enter vocational education, a job will usually put an entirely different light into that youngster's life; am I correct?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, sir; there is no question about that. We are constantly aware of that and we are, I think, convinced we can do more in vocational education to help some of these less able youngsters and the provisions in 4955—there are provisions that may make it specifically possible to help these specially or socially handicapped groups that might not otherwise have been accommodated in our past programs since we are in the central area of vocational training.

Mr. Perkins. I understand one of the greatest drawbacks, perhaps "handicaps" is the better terminology—to the so-called manpower legislation enacted last year is the functional illiteracy problem they are running into in administering the program to get more of these youngsters and I am just speaking about the youngster, to get more of the youngsters into training.

Mr. Patrick. This is equally true of the adults too, Mr. Chairman. I am more familiar with what we have been doing to remedy illiteracy in adults. This has been a major problem in our own community.

We sometimes don't like to face these facts but there are a significant proportion of people who are functionally illiterate in some of our major urban communities and in some of our enlightened States such as California.

We have continued to have a major problem in adult education in reaching these people. The year before last the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego published a booklet at their expense urging these people to come back to evening schools. Many of them were recent dropouts. Half of the high school graduates at one of the adult high schools has dropped out of the regular schools within the last 3 years.

The chamber of commerce felt they had to spend the money to urge people to attend adult education because the surveys conducted by the Department of Labor, in which we cooperated, revealed that a significant amount of unemployment was simply due to functional illiteracy of these people and we have tremendous support for this kind of people from both management and labor in our community where we have highly technological industries in the aircraft, missile and electronics fields which simply can't use these people.

Mr. Perkins. From experience, the 16-year-old dropouts we find are unqualified under the present setup to get into vocational education and 9 times out of 10, they don't want to go back to school or some other school where they have already dropped out, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. Patrick. Yes, I would agree. I also feel that in some instances this is due to a lack of vocational programs in occupational—I would almost call it occupational programs in the schools in which he has been attending.

We can remedy some by increasing the programs and there will still be an additional corps of the individuals to whom you will refer for some other kind of work experience, job experience, camp experience, that it will be extremely beneficial.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Mobley.

Mr. Mobley. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention, if I may, for the sake of the record, that in your bill, H.R. 4955, on page 7, item 4, describing what money can be used for this, as one of the things you have vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, that require training programs adapted to the special needs of such persons.

I can conceive of a program that would be, or that some of this money could be used for the youth who are enrolled in the domestic corps, whereby once they get work, then through persuasion of the appropriate officials working with that particular program, they would be induced to enroll in vocational programs and here you are making it available. You are making money available that can be used.

Mr. Perkins. Do you not think the type of youngster I am talking about, Mr. Mobley, who has dropped out, say, 17 years of age and assume he has an eighth grade diploma and is loitering on the streets and not doing anything and his habits are bad, do you not think if he took camp training for 6 months or a year and in connection with that camp training got some kind of related training he is interested in, automobile mechanics, or masonry, and if he did some masonry work under appropriate supervision, do you not think that when he had completed his enrollment and with that experience, then you have developed that youngster to the point that he is better qualified to meet just what you are talking about under this vocational educational framework?

Mr. Mobley. I agree most wholeheartedly with that.

I would like to remind you, like Mr. Patton I am old enough to remember the NYA program and the CCC program and I had a lot to do with it. We cooperated wholeheartedly with those agencies when in existence and they did a lot of good. There is no question in my mind about that.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Peterson, I would like to have your comments.

Mr. Peterson. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is much I can add to what has been said except to concur and add special emphasis to this type of training or experience or change of environment for the type of individual you were describing.

I think as a special need which requires a special circumstance to correct, if it is ever going to be corrected, it is not going to be done by putting them back into the same situation or even into a similar one in a different school in the same community. There has to be a saturation point. He has to change his attitude. He has to develop some different ideas and he is not going to do that if you just let him be where he is.

I think that would be the part that strikes me as the most significant in this program.

Mr. Perkins. You cannot think of any better way to do it than a camp program and conservation work?

Mr. Peterson. When you think of the young man from an urban area and I think it is safe to assume less than the most desirable part of the urban center, a complete change of environment that this provides can't help but be beneficial.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Logan, I want your comments.

Mr. Logan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to refer to a quotation given in the panel report at page 5, comment from the study made by Wilbur B. Brookover and Sigmund Nozal, "A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Education in the United States":

"Reference to your comment on skilled training and reading, writing, and arithmetic, skills in reading, mathematics, and other general educational fields are essential for acquiring specific vocational competence at the higher levels of education needed for many occupations."

There is a longer quotation than that here, but I will be glad to turn this over to the clerk.

But during the study made by the panel of consultants, the committees visited one of the high schools in the United States and I would prefer not to identify the specific area right at the present time. We saw there some very bad conditions in classrooms of people who were ill prepared for going out and getting a job and holding a job but the job being done was excellent, but if those boys could have been taken out to the wide open spaces and taken out of the atmosphere of the area in which they were housed, I think it would have been greatly beneficial to them.

We saw an excellent job being done by teachers there. We saw them teaching the ruler, by referring to the large spaces and the small spaces, if you please, instead of an eighth of an inch, a quarter of an inch—they said "the large spaces" and "the small spaces." And they were able to raise the level of the skills of those young men considerably.

But on the other hand, it was costing this school system $20,000 a year just to keep the doors of the building open. That is not upkeep, if you please.

Mr. Perkins. Assuming that this camp program, at the most, even if you had to provide new housing, would only cost $4,000 per enrollee, would you say that was a good investment in this type of a dropout that we are talking about?

Mr. Logan. It is an investment in people and when you can make a person, raise him up through the proper application, bring him up to the level that he comes back and holds his head up and he lives as an acceptable citizen in the community and is proud of what he is doing, I would say it is a real good investment.

Mr. Perkins. Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown. I was interested in the comment made about previous experience in training of youth in these camp situations which was made by you, I think. You do not anticipate, I presume, there would be any problem today in providing adequate vocational instruction for the scale of program that we are contemplating here?

Mr. Mobley. Yes, there would, unless we can get more money. The vocational funds today are pledged right down to the last penny.

I think if Mr. Perkin's bill is enacted into law and money is made available, there will be no trouble.

I would like to give you, if I may, an experience we had in my home State. I worked very closely with the head of the NYA back all through the years that it was in operation. Mr. Jones, now of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was in charge of the program in my home State at the time and we worked very closely. We worked on a program whereby these young people were brought into centers for work. They worked a half of each day and then we gave them vocational education and general education. Some of them needed to read and write, learn to read and write, some were acquiring skills at the same time and it was a very fine program.

It was a very fine program. We trained hundreds of people and at the same time they learned good work habits.

Mr. Brown. But there is the type of thing that is contemplated in the title II section of this youth employment bill, these so-called local areas employment.

Mr. Mobley. Yes.

Mr. Brown. And I am very interested to know you have had experience and I presume, therefore, you see no mechanical difficulties if the money can be provided to provide the type of educational program we are talking about.

Mr. Mobley. Yes. That is one reason I called attention to this provision in Mr. Perkin's bill, because it provides the money for doing this and we can vary it. The language is such you wouldn't have to surrender the standards as you have in some other courses. You can develop the program to meet the particular needs.

So I anticipate no trouble at all in that respect.

Mr. Brown. Thank you.

Mr. Perkins. Any further questions?

Mr. Brown. Not right now.

Mr. Perkins. Now, Mr. Patton, you wish to further comment on this question? You have had experience in this, am I correct?

Mr. Patton. When I was director of the State vocational program. We had tremendous responsibility for attempting to adjust the young man who comes to school so that he would be ready to accept vocational training and the 8 years that I participated there in the study of the people that completed this, we had a higher percentage of dropouts from that vocational school among the very young that were not ready for such training.

Now, if these people had had a chance, let me say many of them had been roving the streets and had developed a poor attitude toward school and someone had gotten hold of them and said if they would come into the vocational school probably something would be done. But he could not, we were not in a position to break down that attitude and break down that social culture that they had been living in in the short period of time to get them ready for vocational training.

So if they had had a work experience situation like the camp proposal that you are thinking about, it would probably have salvaged many of these young people that we were unable to do anything with at that particular time.

Now, if we had had a larger counseling staff and if we had had sufficient funds to put them into an orientation program for a period of months to give them individual attention, we might have been able to hold them but we didn't have that kind of facilities, we didn't have that kind of leadership, we didn't have that kind of personnel.

Now, if this bill could be enacted into law, and if your camp bills were enacted into law, I believe we can begin to make a dent upon this social problem of the youth of this country, but otherwise, I think it is going to be a cancer that is going to eat the heart out of America unless we come to grips with it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. I would like to make this further comment. As we think ahead to the implementation of this type of program I think we must come back again to the fact that in order to do this job we have to have the kind of provisions for vocational educational education so that we will have a qualified corps of instructors to do the vocational training and counseling that will be needed.

But to do one without the other, I think you will fail in achieving the objective of either.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Mobley.

Mr. MOBLEY. I would like to make this comment. I studied your youth opportunities bill, and we are very glad indeed that you have as one of your provisions that any vocational or educational work that is carried on incidental in connection with on-the-job training, would be done through consultation and working with the HEW and through State and local educational authorities.

I think you know that most educators don't agree on too many things but there is one thing they do agree on, they don't want the Federal Government running the schools.

Mr. PERKINS. May I say to you, Mr. Mobley, it is the intention of the committee, and Mr. Brown is on the committee, to wholeheartedly see that the Federal Government does not run the schools. This is to be worked out with the State educational people and 9 times out of 10 it would be the vocational educational people in the State and, if not, it would be the State department of education. The bill so provides.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes, and I want to commend you for having that clause in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. That provision will remain in the bill. I can visualize where the vocational educational people, assuming that the Youth Conservation Corps bill is enacted, will play a very important role in developing that youth so he can make a contribution to the country and help expand the economy in the long run.

Mr. MOBLEY. Mr. Chairman, could I add one other thing?

You were mentioning about the cost. One of the things I think we must always keep in mind, too, is unless you salvage a youth they may cost you a lot more than $4,000 a year in terms of crime and juvenile delinquency.

Mr. BROWN. That is a good thought. It just occurred to me, as you were discussing it, that it is very well known you can go into our penal institutions and acquire very quickly certain skills and attitudes that are very difficult to overcome and it seems to me with vocational training and the healthful atmosphere we are contemplating in some of these programs, it will have the opposite effect and make useful citizens out of these people.

Are there any other comments from any of you gentlemen on this?

I am not sure what the chairman proposes to do about continuing the testimony but he will be back in a minute.

Mr. LOGAN. May I make this comment? In regard to giving instruction for these people who are handicapped in various ways, no matter what it might be, that type of instructor that you get is not easy to find and he is hard to train. It takes a long time to prepare him for this, because he not only has to know how to work with the skills, but develop those skills in an entirely different manner, in which we already have textbooks prepared to give him guidance and so forth, and he also has to know the psychological facets of working with these kids that many times are not written down in books.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, I have been very much concerned in California, about the development of programs which would involve these handicaps or marginally employed people and it is necessary to have a high degree of skill to accomplish this job and frequently it takes a shelter type of situation, which is not normally available. Yet if we make the effort to utilize these resources, we are going to tap a potential which is not a total deadweight and cost to society and put it into production.

Mr. Speaker, following are also statements of Dr. Albert Jochen, assistant commissioner of education, vocational division, Trenton, N.J., taken from his testimony before the General Subcommittee on Education, March 29, appearing in the stenographic transcript of hearings commencing on page 439 and extending through page 445; also his statement beginning on page 453 and ending on page 454:

Mr. PERKINS. I am thinking about the youngster 16 or 17 who has never had a job. He is unemployed. He has a sixth, seventh, or eighth grade education. There are no courses in your vocational school, I mean there are no training programs there for that type of youngster under present facilities?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes, sir, there are, but they are very limited. In the city of Trenton we have one program in the garment industry area, it has to do with the needle trades, double needle, single needle, closing machines, and that kind of thing. These people are referred by the Employment Security Division to the schools and we call it a type C.

Now, there is a possibility under the George-Barden Act of conducting type C programs. Our problems in New Jersey are these. Our problem is that at the present time we are reimbursing the local district for shop teachers' salary only because we have no other funds. According to the law, we could reimburse every vocational teacher, but we are so limited in Federal funds that we can only reimburse the shop or laboratory teacher and we are down now to where we are reimbursing at 6 percent of his salary. We don't have any money.

Mr. PERKINS. You say, though, any assistance you give these school dropouts, 17 or 18 years of age, sixth, seventh, eighth grade education, is very minor.

Mr. JOCHEN. It is; not because we want it to be but because of circumstances, financial.

Mr. PERKINS. But assuming one of these youngsters had dropped out of school at sixth grade level, 17 years of age, you may say that he dropped out of vocational educational school, would you not suggest that that youngster be put into a different environment and enrolled in a camp for a period of 6 months or a year and find out while he is in the camp what particular trade he is perhaps interested in and may take some related training in camp, and then after he came out of that period of enrollment with some new work habits and this related training, that he would be much more adaptable to vocational training of this type?

Mr. JOCHEN. I would think that that would certainly be worth experimenting with and looking at.

We have a Johnstone Training Center where they are doing some research at the State level in this area.

However, it is limited to youngsters who have gotten into trouble, they have become delinquent.

Mr. PERKINS. I am talking now about the youngsters who have dropped out of school, at the seventh or eighth grade level, where there are no jobs available. Would you suggest that camp life, enrollment for a period of 6 to 12 months, doing conservation work in the forest, and maybe some mental work, and taking some basic educational training in the meantime would be perhaps the most useful program that you could provide for that youngster to get him back on the road to get an education?

Mr. JOCHEN. Well, I would certainly feel that this would be most important to try. We have done some work with these people. You have an economic factor, you have a sociological factor. If they were brought back into the same environment, many times without giving them an opportunity of changing that, this could be very harmful.

I would want to see, too, what I believe in in this sense, that the program, if they were in the camp, was really and truly realistic in terms of the need of these people so that they would not again be frustrated by failure.

Mr. PERKINS. Be well-planned work?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Under park rangers and supervisors who really know their business?

Mr. JOCHEN. I certainly would like to see it tried. I would not mind making contributions in that direction if necessary.

Mr. PERKINS. You remember the old Civilian Conservation Corps, do you not?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. What is your idea of a corps of that type for youngsters and dropouts in school for a camp patterned after the CCC school?

Mr. JOCHEN. I think if I could organize, do a lot of good planning in developing the curricula and the socioeconomic kinds of things you want to train these people in and the social adjustments and develop it carefully and get the right kind of people running it, to me this is really wonderful. It might be the first time that some of these people had ever been out under trees and worked.

If you have ever been up to Cornell University and walked through Enfield Glen, you still see carved into the sides of the walls there CCC, No. so and so. I often thought this probably was the first time a youngster was ever out under the sky, he made something that he enjoyed that otherwise would never be there.

This glen is a beautiful thing. I have wondered if we could not look up some of those people and find out from them what they thought of the education and training they got under the program.

I also feel this way, though, that I would not want such a program to make the people locally feel now that the obligations that they really should have are not to be continued. In other words, too frequently you know we are very glad, we say, well, now, somebody else is taking care of this and we don't have the problem any more.

That would not be true. I think there should be close tieup.

Mr. Perkins. The responsibility would still be here. I think when that youngster gets some training in this camp, gets some experiences in the camp from camp life, that that would qualify him to take vocational education in something he is interested in and prepare himself for life and make a great contribution to the economy of the country. Those are my personal views.

Mr. Jochen. I worked in the NYA, which was a little bit like the CCC. I have seen some of the CCC camps, so I am not unfamiliar with what was done to these people. It literally improved their health and outlook.

We fail to recognize, some of us, that just eating habits are not the same. There are some nationalities who do not ever sit down as a family and eat. You eat when you are hungry. There is a little food cooking all the time.

I think they have to see some of these other things. They also have to be taught the importance of understanding the ethic and the sociological backgrounds of their parents so that there is a closer and warmer feeling there because you live in one world at home and when you go to school you are in another world lots of times. The two worlds should not be too far apart so that you build a barrier between the youngster and his family.

I would hope that we would recognize this in the program. If I wanted to destroy democracy the first step I would take is lick the home. I would break up and disintegrate the home and then I could more easily destroy democracy.

I would hope whatever we do in the CCC or the Youth Camp, it would strengthen the home, would build toward stronger homes, because to me these are the foundations upon which democracy is built.

Now maybe I can jump some of this Mr. Chairman; it will be in the Record even if I don't read it.

Mr. Perkins. I think you are giving the committee here wonderful testimony, especially with all your experience and background in the field of vocational-technical education.

Digressing just for a minute, how many youngsters, I am speaking of the dropouts, do you feel that you have enrolled in your vocational educational schools in New Jersey with sixth and seventh grade education, if any?

Mr. Jochen. Out of 34,000 almost 3,500 youth and adults, and I would have to give you a calculated guess.

Mr. Perkins. Now I am speaking of the dropouts, sixth and seventh graders.

Mr. Jochen. But whether they are youth or adult.

Mr. Perkins. No, just the youth and sixth and seventh graders, unemployed.

Mr. Jochen. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we don't have more than probably 60 in the whole State in such programs at the present time which are type C programs. There might be 60 to 70 such students.

Mr. Perkins. Thank you very much.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are you contemplating merely the kind of work the young people did during the existence of the Conservation Corps, or planning some kind of training and also going into industry to see that when they are trained they get jobs?

Mr. PERKINS. We are contemplating work very similar to that which was performed during the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, such as conservation work along with related training and other appropriate educational and vocational training.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I was afraid of that.

Mr. PERKINS. They will get related training. They will get vocational education, and basic education where it is needed.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are you making it very clear that this has no relation to the International Peace Corps?

Mr. PERKINS. We are making it clear that this work has no relation to the International Peace Corps.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I hope you do make that very clear.

Mr. PERKINS. It is entirely a domestic corps, and we cut the pattern under the old Civilian Conservation Corps and under the National Youth Administration for these programs under both titles 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the Youth Conservation Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'Brien of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, like most of you I lived through the big depression during the 1930's and along with you I can testify how that period was not just an economic depression—it was also a period of depression in the hearts of men; a period of dried-up hopes and wasted abilities.

Our Government in that period wrestled mightily with the many economic and human problems of that day. The New Deal period was one of the new starts, new plans, new efforts. Some of these worked wonders, others worked not so well. Some were received eagerly by a desperate citizenship, others were received with misgivings and often made the butt of many a popular joke or ridiculing statement.

But there was one venture on the part of the planners of that period which was received with acclaim, and which I have yet to hear criticized. That was the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC.

The CCC enjoyed a status in the minds of people then that perhaps no other government agency could equal, not even the popular and valuable National Youth Administration.

The CCC was never associated with the leafrakers of other projects of that period. The CCC was spoken of as the "Tree Army," for on its introduction that is what we were told it would do—using Army equipment, clothes, and blankets—an army of our dispossessed youth were going to go out and plant trees.

But the CCC did much more than plant trees and instead of being a pseudo army, those men became men whose dignity had been reclaimed, whose hopes had been restored. They came home on furloughs, and I remember well the popular comments of that time upon seeing tanned, khaki-clad boys come home and showing in their very walk what had happened to them. They had earned a few bucks, they often had learned a new skill, most important they had found that the country cared, and they wanted to tell about what they had been doing.

What did they do? What they did still stands in Texas. They changed the face of many parts of our State. They put in roads where no roads existed before, they ditched land which never before had this treatment. They went into the Big Bend country on the Rio Grande long before that area became a national park and put in trails and opened up the splendors of that mountainous country of Texas which stands 3,000 feet above Denver, Colo. They built simple, useful things that still stand and are being used in the State parks of Texas.

You asked me why I am excited by this bill and why I extoll these virtues of the old CCC. It is because you can drive around my State and still see the evidence of the good works those young men did. Now, I submit to you that whenever organization and a little help can create things that stand and are useful and are enjoyed by two generations of our people, no one can say this is a public waste.

I have every reason to believe that a renewal of the concept and program of the CCC as proposed in this H.R. 1890, and in my own bill on the same subject, H.R. 1918, will result in the same kind of good works as we had 30 years ago. I believe, also, that the American public will embrace and support this program.

It is particularly good that the concept of this proposed program has been broadened so as to provide in its title II for a program of local area employment. This is necessary, if for no other reason, in recognition of that fundamental change that has come about in our country in the last 30 years with the shift of our population from rural areas to urban centers. This bill recognizes that any "tree army" of the future can be well engaged in helping to chop out some of the underbrush that surrounds areas of deficiency in our public services.

This is more of a youth development bill than anything else, and I support it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I think that both sides of the aisle now recognize that the time is past due for some type of remedial action to at least stem the swelling tide of youth unemployment.

I doubt that many, regardless of political philosophy, will take issue with the President when in his recent manpower report he said:

> One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation—and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

The area of disagreement, I believe, is how to meet and solve this growing problem.

Some of our Republican friends say that the solution lies in an expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year, and in an expanded program of vocational training. By and large those who propose this approach can see little or no merit in the Youth Employment Act, because they contend, nothing in this proposed legislation will train our youths to qualify them for jobs in this age of rapid technical advance and automation.

And, in a limited sense—a very limited sense—this is true.

But, it is also true that not all of our youth—and not all of us here in this Chamber—have the necessary aptitude for this type of training, even assuming we have the educational background for it.

Job training, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. It depends on many things—intangibles—such as ability, aptitude and initiative, to mention but a few.

In the final analysis, only economic expansion will sharply increase job openings and provide adequate employment opportunities, including opportunities for many of our youths who are now rejected from the work force because of a lack of adequate job skills. The President, of course, has recognized this, and this is why the Congress now has before it proposals from the administration for tax cuts and tax reforms and for better educational opportunities.

An equally important part of the administration's package is the Youth Employment Act—because it will do something now for some of the 7.5 million youngsters who, statistics tell us, will drop out of school in this decade without having graduated from high school.

Experience under the Manpower Development and Retraining Act and under some State and local training programs seems to indicate that many of our unemployed have not had the necessary basic education to benefit either from retraining or from what we understand as vocational training.

I recently read that in some of the State programs, authorities follow the principle of avoiding the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any jobs. To the extent that this may be true, what chance does such a program offer a youth who cannot get a job because of his lack of skill?

The two-part program—the Youth Conservation Corps and the community youth employment program—contained in the Youth Employment Act of 1963 offer a present hope for at least a limited number of our unemployed youth.

In a very real sense, this legislation, if enacted, will provide work opportunities in areas that can be training grounds for future employment.

We know this is true in the Youth Conservation Corps program because of our highly successful experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. And, on the basis of expert testimony we have every reason to believe it will be true in the community youth employment program.

Also, on the basis of what the experts tell us and what we know from experience, this legislation will give those youngsters fortunate enough to participate in these programs some practical work habits coupled with actual job experience and not infrequently a realization of the importance of further education, either at the vocational level or possibly in completing high school and even going on to further studies in college.

As I view it, the Youth Employment Act is necessary to serve a group who now through no fault of their own cannot take advantage of other aids, such as vocational training and the various retraining programs. It is part of a package which is as important as any other and without it, all of us—especially those who could benefit from it—will be the losers.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to note that the youth employment bill has become a matter of renewed interest in this session of Congress, and am particularly pleased that this interest should be heightened by the 30th anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Between 1933 and 1942 this conservation program employed over 2½ million young people. The present Youth Conservation Corps section of the bill offers some of the same advantages.

This legislation can make a good start on the solutions to two major American dilemmas—conservation of our great resources and youth unemployment. On the one hand, we have nearly one-third of this great Nation which is still owned by the Federal Government—and on the other hand we will have 2 million unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 21 by summertime. This bill brings the conservation needs of the one factor into some sort of balance with the labor availability of the other.

Much was said at the House and Senate hearings on this bill about city slums, juvenile delinquents and the needs of city and urban area youth. Rural youth faces some of the same problems. There are now over 250,000 rural school dropouts, and this number is decreasing. There are also young people from rural depressed areas who need extra training if they are to become taxpayers instead of tax users In many sectors of farming, new methods and machinery have forced young people off the farms where they learned unskilled jobs in the first place. In short, some of the problems facing our rural youngsters can be met by this bill.

I note that in addition to the general work to be undertaken by the Youth Conservation Corps, there will be educational classes and programs under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Trades and skills such as plumbing, painting, welding, radio, surveying, machine operating, masonry, and game management are some of the likely profits of this bill, if the success of the CCC can be used as a yardstick.

While it is probably true that only a limited number of enrollees will gain specific skills from the Youth Conservation Corps, it is also true that others will find doing useful work improves their disposition toward getting further training and becoming useful citizens in the labor market. Title II of this legislation will permit States to participate in the conservation of State, county, and local lands, which come to over 110 million acres across the country. It will also permit States to lighten the load of local youth unemployment.

There seems to be little doubt in anyone's mind as to the moral and social benefits of this proposed program. But let us look at the other side of the coin—money. Will this program pay for itself in dollars and cents? I believe that it will, partly in immediate benefits and partly in accrued benefits over the next 30 years.

The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture estimates that this Nation loses over $1 billion per year from forest fires—this figure includes watershed damage as well as timber loss. The Forest Service also estimates that the Youth Conservation Corps could reduce these losses by 10 percent—or a saving of just over $100 million per year. The total saving in the life of the Corps, as now envisioned, would be one-half a million dollars, or more, that is enough to defray a goodly portion of the cost. The rest of the cost might well be defrayed in 30 years by the new timber that is planted while the Corps is in action. Even now, timber that the CCC planted is being harvested. I have confined my example to a narrow field, but as you are aware, there are other immediate and accrued benefits from such a program that can be determined in dollars and cents.

Title II offers an opportunity for local communities to form a hard core of young people working for community improvement. In rural areas there is just as strong a need for this kind of work as there is in city slums. Many potential spots for timber farms are now simply lying fallow while they could be put to a great conservation use.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me say I am convinced that this legislation is much needed. We are working for its speedy passage—so that some of the brunt of this coming summer's unemployment among youth can be borne more easily.

Mr. Speaker, in short, how we live and what we have in the year 2000 is being shaped today—we must therefore make every possible effort to conserve our two greatest assets—human and natural resources.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have joined Congressman CARL PERKINS and several others of my very distinguished colleagues to request today's 2-hour special order on the Youth Employment Act of 1963 to bring before the whole Nation the deplorable and unwholesome unemployment situation which is driving large numbers of our young people to discontent, dismay, and all too frequently to criminal destruction.

As Attorney General Kennedy recently pointed out:

> Acts of crime and delinquency are common among youth frustrated in their search for success in customary channels.

The current figures on high school dropouts and youth unemployment have a direct bearing on the appalling rise in the juvenile delinquency rate. Dropout figures just for the year 1961 are staggering. In the fall term of that year there were 10.8 million students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 of our public and nonpublic schools. Of these

10.8 million students, a fantastic 2.5 million dropped out during the year. Our annual dropout rate per 1,000 students, according to the 1961 figures, reached an incredible apex of 40 percent. Perhaps even more illustrative, and probably even less known, is the fact that annually 900,000 of our high school seniors drop out of school before graduation.

In direct relation to these destressing statistics on school dropouts, the figures on overall youth unemployment have been spiraling. Right now the level of youth unemployment in the Nation is more than twice the national average. And in my own State of Minnesota, where the total rate of unemployment is 8.2 percent, the rate of youth unemployment is a disordinate 20 percent.

Previously, in societies where youthful disturbances erupted, there were sufficient diversive channels open to the youngsters so that their discontent and misdirected energies were soon constructively used by the society. The system of apprenticeship took young men off the streets and taught them a trade toward which they soon began to develop the pride handed down from generation to generation. The guilds provided an appropriate inlet for youthful vitality and talent and an excellent outlet for the products of these two.

Yet in 20th century America there is no such specific and obvious method of deploying the potentialities of a large segment of our young people. This poses a distinct paradox in a country which has long been noted as a land of opportunity for all. Time was when any man who had the proper ambition and a sufficient amount of aspiration could achieve great things. Many of our humblest citizens have given us our proudest heritage; many of our most underprivileged have risen to contribute to the whole Nation. The opportunities were abundant.

But the America of today is far more complex and much more industrialized than the little Nation which boldly declared its competence for freedom to an imperial master, and then rose to take that freedom. Today's America still offers vast opportunities, but she offers them to men who have long had the freedom to expand their knowledge and to improve their knowledge and to improve their methods of producing. In other words, she offers opportunities today to those whose experience and skills have kept pace with her national growth and achievements. As Attorney General Robert Kennedy remarked in his testimony before the House General Subcommittee on Education:

> The opportunities to work are just as great and challenging today as ever before. But to get the same chance today, requires greater knowledge and greater skill.

Unfortunately, not all of our people have kept pace. All too often our young men and women, minimally educated and inexperienced, have found the doors to opportunity shut in their faces. They have felt unneeded and unwanted by their communities and by their country. They need training, motivation, and above all, they need hope. We must show them that this Nation has need of them and has a place for them.

Once before when our society experienced great social unrest and lack of direction, especially among the young, America had the imagination and the ingenuity to meet the challenge immediately and directly. I refer, of course, to the establishment of the CCC during the darkest days this country has ever undergone—the depression days of the thirties. Despite the enormity of the challenge they provided, our young people found themselves cared for and provided for by a concerned Nation. During its years of operation—from 1933 until 1942—the CCC not only provided food, shelter, and clothing for the discouraged young men who were idly roaming the country and contributing to its problems, it more importantly provided them with an incentive to learn marketable skills, to seek further education, and ultimately to become constructive members of society.

As an educational adviser to the CCC, I personally saw the excellent effects the corps had on its enrollees as well as the profound contribution made to our national conservation program. One of my good friends, Frank E. Smith, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has sent me a most informative letter, which I ask permission to insert at the end of my statement, outlining the benefits accruing to the people of Tennessee and the Nation from CCC work in just that one area. These statistics could be multiplied over and over and the examples of national benefits which could be drawn from the length and breadth of this country.

The work of the CCC gave us a heritage which has increased in value over the years. CCC'ers planted 3 million acres of trees, cleared 4 million acres of wooded land, and saved millions of acres of grassland from erosion. They made our national parks and forests places of refuge and refreshment for millions of our citizens to enjoy.

But since 1942 we have been letting this priceless investment decay. We have reaped the pleasure provided by the CCC, and we should preserve and increase that inheritance for our own children. Today the $13.2 billion reserve of conservation projects which has been accumulating represents a dual opportunity for us: First, to allay the youth unemployment problem with which we are faced by putting some of our energetic youngsters to work on these conservation programs; and, second, to offer to our Nation's children a heritage of health and beauty through a completed conservation schedule.

Public works in conservation have many economic impacts. They are concentrated in rural areas where other kinds of employment are lacking and where underemployment is high. They can be started rapidly and stopped if labor shortages develop. Most of the purchasing power is released in small communities where it has a large proportional impact. Because of the increased resource productivity, assets of value for permanent community improvement and more future employment are created.

And, of course, we cannot forget the young men and women not geographically situated so as to take advantage of the experience and stimulus provided through conservation programs. We must provide them with opportunities to further their education and their vocational training so that they will possess sufficient experience and skills to meet the challenges provided by today's labor market. Urban technology, by abolishing the only jobs they might be able to fulfill without previous training and experience—has deprived our mid-century American young people of an essential ingredient for developing maturity—the opportunity of learning and performing constructive and meaningful work. The challenge we must meet in the 1960's is that of using our national inventiveness, which we have long applied to making life easier, to make life more hopeful for those who have been adversely affected by the changes in industry and society.

I firmly believe that the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is one excellent mode of meeting this challenge. I ask that all of us in the Congress rally in full support of the sons and daughters of this Nation. Now that the need is apparent and the initial step of the remedy so clearly defined, I am hopeful that the Congress will speedily offer our young people the deserved promise of a productive and significant future by swiftly approving the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1963.
The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: At your suggestion, I have prepared an evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps program in the TVA area. During the nine years of operation of the CCC program, a number of camps were assigned to the TVA, at one time as high as 25, and a variety of work was carried on. I think one of the most significant results of this program is the fact that the average gross return to landowners from timber sales is going to be at least one million dollars per year. Not many years will be needed to repay the entire cost of the CCC program in the area.

One of the principal items of work was a large-scale reforestation program specifically aimed at eroding land generally considered worthless at the time. The TVA-CCC tree planting resulted in the following:

Private land reforested	70,000
TVA land reforested	40,000
Total acres reforested	110,000

Of this 110,000 acres, 73,000 acres are still in young stands of growing timber today. The difference in acreage is caused by a number of reasons, including land-use conversion, fire, insect and disease, and the planting of improper species for the site in use.

There are many lasting benefits to the region from the plantations established by the CCC, however. Some of the more important ones are:

INCOME FOR LANDOWNERS—$1 MILLION EACH YEAR

CCC plantings are just now reaching the age (25 years) where landowners are receiving significant dollar returns. Based on averages developed from intensively studied individual cases, they are now producing wood from thinnings, worth about $5 per acre per year to the landowner. Projected over a 50-year rotation, average gross return per acre per year is computed to be $15. Therefore, 73,000 acres of CCC plantations are returning, or will return, to landowners $1 million per year.

BASE FOR INDUSTRY—NEW PAPERMILLS

Two paper companies have built plants on the Tennessee River in the past 10 years at a capital investment of $144 million. An important consideration in the location of these mills was the extensive area of established pine plantations. Each year CCC plantings can be expected to yield 73,000 cords of wood for the paper industry, resulting in manufactured products worth about $7,300,000. (During a recent 5-year period, one mill paid $200,000 for some 60,000 cords of wood thinned from 6,400 acres of TVA land planted by CCC crews.)

JOBS FOR PEOPLE—730 NEW FULL-TIME JOBS

Foresters estimate that each 1,000 acres of planted pines create the base for 10 new full-time woods and industry jobs. Trees planted by the CCC are therefore providing year-around employment for 730 men. This means over $3 million to the region's industrial payroll.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

A 1961 survey showed almost 95 percent of the CCC plantings effectively controlled erosion.

REFORESTATION IDEA PROMOTED

In 1934 tree planting was a novel idea in the Tennessee Valley. Landowners were skeptical. Persuading them to reclaim eroded lands was often difficult, even though it cost them nothing. Early CCC plantings, and the obviously good results, were effective advertising. The idea spread and the reforestation rate accelerated. Landowners gradually assumed responsibility for doing the job. To date they have reforested 633,000 additional acres in valley counties.

EFFECTIVE FIRE PREVENTION

Woods burning was a common practice in the valley in the 1930's. An estimated 10 percent of the total forest land burned each year. The problem was an uninformed and unsympathetic citizenry. Growing, green plantations became a powerful influence in changing attitudes toward fire control. One very effective aid was tree planting. Landowners who owned tree plantations developed a desire to protect them, and this interest gradually spread from plantations to natural stands of trees. Today the annual burn is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, the 31st of March, marked the 30th anniversary of an event which by its inception has had far-reaching implications for our Nation. The event of which I speak was the signing of legislation by my father, then President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. Today it gives me a great deal of pleasure not only to participate in saluting the creation and accomplishments of the CCC, but also to discuss our present need for similar legislation such as that presently pending—the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Most of us can easily recall those dark and dreary days of the early 1930's. Our country was involved in an agonizing struggle to preserve itself from collapse; unemployment, with its resulting byproducts, was rampant, and no one dared to venture a guess as to how much longer chaotic conditions would be tolerated by the people without a catastrophic eruption on their part.

It was these unprecedented problems which moved President Roosevelt to remark, in his first inaugural address on March 4, 1933:

> The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes efforts to convert retreat into advance.

The state of affairs at that time demanded dynamic leadership and imaginative programs. As a result, the Civilian Conservation Corps was born amid a great deal of skepticism. But as was expected, the skeptics were proved wrong.

From its creation on March 31, 1933, to the day of its termination on June 30, 1942, the CCC had enrolled about 3 million young men. It had achieved its objective of training unemployed young men for private jobs while restoring the country's depleted natural resources through the advancement of an orderly program of useful public works. Over 1,500 camps were established to carry out the projects planned by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, projects such as structural improvements, transportation improvement, erosion control, flood control, irrigation, drainage, forest culture, forest protection, landscaping, and numerous others. As a result of that labor, we are today privileged to enjoy the benefits and pleasures of our national parks, forests, and recreational facilities. I should also like to mention incidentally that it was my great privilege during 1937 and 1938, while serving as secretary to the President, to count among my duties the task of coordinating among the various departments the work of the CCC, which was at that time under the able leadership of Mr. Robert Fechner, Director.

While today we rightfully applaud the contribution of the CCC, we would be derelict in our responsibilities to our children and the generations unborn should we not take some action to meet our current critical conservation and youth unemployment problems. On the one hand our conservation needs range from improving streams, stocking fish, check dams, planting of trees, food and cover planting to improvement of truck trails, access roads, service buildings, and recreational facilities It has been estimated that it would cost over $11 billion to make these improvements. On the other hand, unemployment among our youth runs 2½ times the national average, and approximately 7½ million will be leaving school during the 1960's without graduating. Furthermore, in 1962 there was an average of about 700,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 who were out of school and out of work.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of our youth is incredible, in view of the fact that we pride ourselves on being an affluent society. It took great vision and courage to meet the conditions of the 1930's. Are we not equal to the occasion now? The enactment of the Youth Employment Act will prove that we are.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one cannot discuss the problems of our youth without paying tribute to the outstanding efforts of my good friend and colleague the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK. His recognition of the specific problems facing the young people of our land and his determination to seek their solution in a sound and rewarding manner has been a constant source of inspiration to all of us who are charged with this responsibility.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education on which I have the honor to sit with him, on the great leadership that he has given in the preparation of this much needed legislation, the youth employment bill.

Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the text of the following statements by the following Members: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SENNER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, We are gathered here today to ask ourselves what we can do for the youth of our country. We are convoked here this afternoon to determine whether we can answer the challenge of the young man out of high school and looking vainly for work; the plaint of the teenage girl who wants to contribute to society but who finds the doors shut coldly in her face; the reproach of the frustrated teenage lad whose only avenue of expression is rebellion that ends in crime; the indictment of a generation whose creativity, productiveness, and aspirations are barricaded by the walls of inertia, indifference, and automation. We are convened today to measure our inventiveness, our wisdom, and our courage against the crisis of youth in the sixties.

In their cold, relentless way, the oft-cited statistics relate the tragic tale of young boys and girls who desert the schoolroom; who become immersed in wrongdoing; who find only half a job, or, still worse, no job at all; and whose plight finds no sympathy, no champion, no hope. Can we relegate to some dark, musty corner of our collective national conscience the youthful delinquent, the laborer without work, the schoolboy without education?

Can we afford the price of our inaction? We are paying a heavy fee in welfare cases, in unemployment compensation, in correctional institutions. But the greatest burden we bear is in the inestimable loss to our present and future society in the productive talents that go untapped and in the stifled idealism of youth that goes unchanneled. If the mortgage of the past is awesome, then the price of redemption cannot be too great.

In an earlier crucible of national need, a man of great fortitude and vision set in motion a program of urgent and imaginative response to the needs of a people in despair. Now more than a generation has elapsed and we are again faced with a dilemma of national proportions. We are challenged to offer hope and to present opportunities. The youth of our country demand and I urge that the Congress speedily proffer our young people the deserved promise of a productive and significant future by swiftly approving the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, unemployment is tragic for all, but its impact is especially heavy on those advancing in age and young people trying to enter the labor force for the first time. Too few of us realize that unemployment hits our young people, between 16 and 21, in far greater proportions than any other group in our population. Imagine the plight of the untrained, unskilled youngster wanting a job—who wants to be self-supporting, who wants to make a contribution to society—but who finds the door closed to him. It is very disquieting to see the effect these repeated rejections have on a youngster taking his first venture into the working life of our complex society. Today's youngster out of school and out of a job is faced with staggering economic and emotional problems. We just need to scan a few statistics to see the situation we presently face, a situation which is growing in alarming numbers daily.

> Out-of-school youths between the ages of 16 and 21 comprise 7 percent of the labor force but 18 percent of the unemployed.

During this decade some 26 million youngsters will enter the job market. It is estimated that 7½ million of these youngsters will have dropped out of school without having graduated from high school.

Providing job opportunities for these youngsters is one of the major domestic economic-social problems of this day. Without proper guidance and help these youngsters are likely to fall into a life of dependency and waste. With proper guidance and help these youngsters can become responsible, self-supporting citizens who will make a major contribution to their community and to our economy.

We have yet another resource which is suffering from years of neglect—our natural resources. Since the end of the CCC days there has been accumulating a tremendous backlog of work that must be done to save our great natural resources. There currently exists an $8 billion backlog of conservation work.

If these untrained, unskilled, out-of-school, out-of-work youths are given the opportunity to work on conservation projects in our national forests and parks, public lands, Indian reservations, reclamation lands, and fish and wildlife refuges, we will have made a substantial contribution to the Nation's most important resource—our youngsters. And the youngsters will have made an equally substantial contribution toward the conservation of the Nation's natural resources. After 6 months of healthy outdoor work these young boys should have a sense of accomplishment and a solid foundation to become responsible self-supporting citizens. Their first-hand work experience on conservation projects will have given them the variety of skills, the maturity, and the responsibility needed in today's society to find a respectable and suitable job. These youths will then be ready and able to compete effectively in a labor market in which their special training and experience will be appreciated.

Other youths between 16 and 21 could make a very satisfying contribution to local public service activities through work in schools, libraries, hospitals, welfare agencies, playgrounds, and other community projects. While contributing to the community work in such an environment would likely inspire the youngster on to additional education and training on a more professional level.

Legislation is most urgently needed to unite the creation of job opportunities for unemployed youngsters with the pressing need for conservation and development of our natural resources.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in his Chicago speech some 10 days ago, the President said that:

> The No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us.

Perhaps, we can get a better idea of this "tidal wave of men and women" to whom the President refers when we realize that about 2½ million young men and women—in the 16-to-21 age bracket—will join the labor force each year during this decade.

These 26 million youngsters will represent an increase in the work force of 40 percent over the 1950's, and, as the President said:

> A greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Now, no one needs to dwell on the difficulty in finding jobs in today's labor market. In this age of technological advance, and with automation, computers and other electronic marvels, a college degree is no longer the guarantee to a job it once was. But what about those youngsters coming into the labor market who have been limited to a high school education, or the 7.5 million of our youth who have not finished high school, including the some 2.5 million who have not even finished grade school.

If left to their own devices, and all too frequently this seems to be the case, we know pretty well what will happen. In the last decade juvenile delinquency cases in the courts more than doubled. Arrests of youths increased 86 percent, until they numbered 1 million arrests a year in 1960.

Now, no one contends that any single program will resolve the problems of unemployment, particularly the problems of youth unemployment. But, the Youth Employment Act of 1963, together with the President's proposals for tax reform and tax reduction, the programs of aid for distressed areas, for retraining, and the proposals of increased vocational training will go a long way toward meeting the need.

It seems to me that the group we are trying to reach in the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is a special group. For the most part, it is made up of young men and women who have achieved little or no success, either in school, their home, or in their community. Their only success is the failure they have achieved, with the result that they are fearful of attacking any responsibility, let alone a job.

They need to learn how to work, how to take orders, how to get along with their fellow man and how to carry out an assigned task. These things which we consider as elementary breed self-confidence and give these youths the encouragement many need to go back to school, to take up some type of vocational training or to profit from the several programs available for retraining.

In my opinion, the incentives offered by the Youth Employment Act for further education cannot be overstated. The National Committee on Youth Employment has estimated that in 10 years a minimum of 2 years of junior college or a technical school training will replace the high school diploma as a basic requirement for work.

This estimate would seem to be borne out by a survey of the Department of Labor, indicative that job opportunities in such areas as farming, mining, construction work, and manual labor are declining while jobs in the scientific and technical fields continue to expand. Greater opportunities can be expected for teachers, social workers, statisticians, draftsmen, mechanics of all types, servicemen and repairmen.

This listing points up one very important fact. Automation has and will no doubt continue to decrease work opportunities in exactly those fields in which unskilled youngsters once found jobs—often their first jobs.

Today's youth unemployment problem poses, as the President has said, one of the most expensive and most explosive social and economic problems now facing the country.

The Youth Employment Act may very well furnish for those fortunate enough to participate, the bridge to better citizenship and to a status of taxpayer rather than tax recipient of the tax dollar.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on the eve of floor consideration of the youth employment bill, we note that the 30th anniversary of the signing of legislation by President Roosevelt creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I well remember the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the CCC boys who came to Arizona with the program from many Eastern States.

Many of them stayed in Arizona, and some are now leaders in their communities. Just offhand, I can think of school superintendents, newspaper editors, and sales executives, who first came to Arizona with the CCC's.

The work they did still stands as a monument to the program. Many forest roads were built by these boys which would have been years in developing without their work. Their work in national parks and monuments in Arizona was a great push forward for the national park system, and I am sure many of the CCC boys had their first acquaintance with the end of a shovel in fighting forest fires in northern Arizona.

Youth unemployment is now as serious a problem as it was during the 1930's. This fact was brilliantly outlined by the President during his message to this body on the Nation's youth.

The Youth Employment Act will give many thousands of currently unemployed young people a chance to find employment, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives.

Personally, I believe that even with this act, we, as a nation, are doing too little too late. A dollar spent for constructive pursuits is better than a dollar spent for corrective measures.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this subject which is of tremendous importance and which should be of great concern to all Members of this body.

I am strongly in favor of the administration's bill, based upon the President's recommendations, the Youth Employment Act of 1963. I am hopeful that the Congress will proceed with speed and diligence to take favorable action on the measure, so that its programs can be put into effect as soon as possible. I introduced House bill 2396, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, and urged the House Committee on Education and Labor to approve the administration's bill, which also provides for a Youth Conservation Corps.

It is a tragic fact that there is a "lost" generation growing up in our great country with no skills and little hope; it is estimated that today there are about 700,000 young people looking for jobs, and jobs are unavailable to them. New York alone has at least 32,700 boys aged 16 to 23 years who are so discouraged at the "lack of opportunity" that they have given up looking for work. This year, 3,800,000 young people will be coming into the labor market. It is expected that 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market in the 1960's, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history. We are told that already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed.

The President recently stated that youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing our country. We know that the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. A high percentage are school dropouts, who need the opportunity to work if they are to be saved from a life of delinquency and crime. These out of school and out of work young people wish to become useful and necessary members of society. We must spare no efforts to assist our young people over the period of adjustment when they have stopped being students but have not yet found their place as workers. Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, which operates under grants from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, has proved conclusively that youths want to work; they much prefer employment to idleness and the evils created by idleness; they need to feel useful and wanted.

The problem is nationwide and so extensive that a Federal program, Federal leadership, and Federal funds must be provided. State and local agencies cannot provide all the help required. Communities cannot meet the problems alone; the fullest Federal assistance possible must be given if we are to meet the problems in a constructive manner and if we are to develop and conserve the human resources represented by the army of young people now denied employment and usefulness.

The Youth Conservation Corps has aroused great interest among school and youth officials as well as the youth of our Nation; it would put young men to work in our national and State forests, tackling the huge backlog of needed conservation work. They would also receive weekly training and basic educational skills would be taught. The local area youth employment program would provide a method for increasing employability of young men and at the same time would give them useful work to do.

Many thousands of young people exist under terrible conditions in the slums of our cities; many belong to minority groups and suffer from discrimination and total lack of job opportunities; they live without hope and their futures are bleak. Certainly, these countless young people must be given a helping hand and hope for a brighter future, the gratification brought by employment, and the opportunity to take their places as working, respected, members of their communities. When we take a boy out of an atmosphere of defeat and slum existence and furnish him with the guidance of people who care about him, we provide him with hope and incentive.

To what avail is it to create for ourselves a strong Nation from a military standpoint when we permit our very foundations to crumble—for the future strength of our Nation is truly dependent upon our youth; our young people are our future. It must be our aim now to help and save our young people from idleness and feelings of rejection and futility, to direct them along the path of industrious living and good citizenship, to give them pride in their heritage as citizens of our great Naton.

Our duty is clear; this Congress must take favorable action on the Youth Employment Act without delay.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Members of this Congress will recognize the critical need for the Youth Employment Act of 1963 just as the 73d Congress gave approval 30 years ago to the Civilian Conservation Corps which accomplished so much for the good of the Nation. During the years of its existence from 1933 to 1942, the Civilian Conservation Corps helped meet two of our greatest national needs: the protection and preservation of our youth and our natural resources. Today, we are again confronted with a tragic waste of our young people, our lands, and forests, and we must take positive action to salvage these precious resources.

There are many complex social problems facing young people today. The world is changing at a pace never before experienced. The years preceding adulthood are, it seems to me, even more crucial and bewildering today than they were for you or me.

The period of youth is after all a brief turn of the carousel when you reach for the golden ring—only the stakes are infinitely higher. Instead of trying for a free ride you are reaching for your life. So much concerning your social, economic, and intellectual development and attainments in the years to come depends upon the opportunities and experiences you encounter at this time.

A little good fortune during the formative years will often be felt for a lifetime. The same is true of a little misfortune. The main purpose of the Youth Employment Act, I believe, is to supply a little more good fortune and at least a little less misfortune in the lives of those among our Nation's youth who are in need of help along these lines.

All of us are familiar with the appalling and alarming statistics on juvenile delinquency, unemployment rates among youth, and school dropouts. These are serious problems now, and their dimensions are bound to increase in the immediate future with the population tidal wave that is about to sweep across the 16- to 22-year-old age group. We can expect to have three-fourths of a million more 16 year olds in the country this year than we had in 1962, or an increase of over 25 percent, and the increase in this age group will be maintained for the decades ahead owing to the stepped-up birth rate we have had since World War II.

For these reasons, effective measures must be taken now at all levels of responsible authority to eliminate as far as possible the situations which are the occasions for the development of problems involving juvenile delinquency, dropouts, and the rest in our increasingly complex machine age. The youth employment program would give our young people training and job experience and hope for the future.

I would like to emphasize that I envision the programs provided by the bills—both the Youth Conservation Corps provided in title I and the local area youth employment programs in title II—not as methods of handling juvenile delinquency problems, but as furnishing means to prevent them. The experience of the CCC in the 1930's bears out the result that can be achieved in this regard. It seems almost inevitable to me that an idle youngster from the city streets will benefit physically, morally, and spiritually from the experiences and training he will receive as a member of the Youth Conservation Corps proposed by this legislation. For some it will provide not only worthwhile health activity, but direct them in establishing principles of self-discipline and self-reliance—opportunities which might not otherwise visit them.

The local area youth employment programs established under title II of the bills have a little different purpose. In these programs emphasis will be placed on making it possible for youth—both boys and girls—who might otherwise drop out to continue in school.

The local community employment programs will, like the YCC, result in benefits both to society and to the youngsters who are employed. They will be working in hospitals, libraries, and public and private welfare and recreation agencies, doing jobs that in most cases would not otherwise be done. There are ample safeguards that only worthwhile types of employment will be undertaken, that regular workers will not be displaced, and that just compensation will be paid to the young people employed.

The Civilian Conservation Corps proved a sound investment; so will the YCC. It has been said before, but it bears repeating: our youth truly are the first resource of the Nation. We cannot afford not to make a sound investment in their future. As the President stated in his message on the Nation's youth:

> This Nation—facing increasingly complex economic, social, and international challenges—is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, during the 1960's about 7.5 million American boys and girls will drop out of school before graduation from high school. Almost one-third of these are not expected to graduate from grade school.

This situation constitutes a major problem in American society. Corrective measures must be taken to meet it.

One major step toward alleviation of this situation is contemplated in the Youth Conservation Corps program. It will give several thousand young men hope for the future, and a sense of accomplishment in learning how to work and live together in the out of doors—getting the feel of the sky and the trees and the water—learning self-respect and learning to respect others.

One great difficulty faced by social workers throughout the country is attempting to rehabilitate young people in tenderloin neighborhoods. These young people in great proportion have dropped out of school, have never held a job, never learned how to work, even if they had a job. Because of the conditions of their upbringing, they are resentful, hopeless and antisocial.

This era of rapid technological change has brought with it increasing demands for skill, education, and technical know-how from the youth who are now and will be entering the labor market in ever increasing numbers.

Under the existing condition of 6 million unemployed in the United States, the proportion of young people out of work is far higher to the total number of unemployed than among older groups. This would be true, even if we had full employment. There will be thousands of youngsters facing the future, undereducated, undertrained, and lacking proper motivation to improve their lot because of the conditions of their lives spent in a jungle world.

What could be a more hopeful beginning step to meet at least part of this total problem than to give thousands of our young men the upbuilding experience of helping to learn how to work, to learn that the work he is doing will motivate him to seek further training and education, after having spent his tour of duty in helping to upbuild the natural resources of his own country?

What better way of showing these youngsters that their country cares for them as part of the precious human resources of the oncoming generation, as well as for the land and water heritage which he has helped protect for his own and his children's use and enjoyment?

There is a need today for the Congress to realize that it has a major responsibility for America's youth and for America's resources. Passage of this legislation, in my opinion, will constitute a long forward step in the proper demonstration that Congress has the vision and foresight to move now.

It is my strong conviction, that the Youth Conservation Corps will make for itself a record of achievement that will emulate that of its predecessor—the Civilian Conservation Corps.

It is also my strong conviction that the success of this modern CCC program will be such as to make it imperative to enlarge it from its pilot status and spread its benefits over many thousands more young men who will make their contributions now and in the future to strengthen this Nation's democratic institutions as workers and citizens.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join a large number of my colleagues in sponsoring the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

The Youth Conservation Corps and Hometown Youth Corps proposals are good news for the 23,000 Minnesota young people who are out of school and out of work. I hope my district, Minneapolis, will be among the first to qualify and take advantage of this bill when it becomes law.

Congress must enact a tax cut as first priority action for stimulating employment. A growing economy will do more than anything else to help youth find work. Second, President Kennedy's program for educational improvement will upgrade the skills of our young people. The Youth Employment Act is a third vital step this Congress can take to help.

MINNESOTA GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH ENDORSES YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

The Minnesota Governor's Advisory Council on Children and Youth has passed a resolution endorsing the Youth Employment Act.

They report that the rate of unemployment among young people in Minneapolis is 20 percent, compared with an overall rate of 8 percent unemployed in the State. The jobless rate for youth is 2½ times higher than the average.

The advisory council has 256 members from throughout the State. The council resolution stated:

> Only immediate action can prevent further deterioration in the character, moral fiber, and attitudes of these young people. Adoption by Congress of the Youth Employment Act is one important step that can be taken to aid the out of school, out of work young people.

SENATOR HUMPHREY, REPRESENTATIVE BLATNIK HAVE PUSHED FOR THIS LEGISLATION FOR YEARS

I am proud that two fellow Minnesotans have spearheaded the drive for this legislation for many years. JOHN BLATNIK introduced a version of this bill as H.R. 1 on the opening day of this session, January 9, 1963. In the Senate, HUBERT HUMPHREY introduced this bill as S. 1 last January.

WHAT TYPE OF JOBS?

Senator HUMPHREY's statement at the committee hearing in February answers a very important question—what type of jobs will be available to the enrollees in these programs? Let me quote the Senator:

> Let me cite some of the specific jobs that would have to be done by YCC enrollees: building fences, carpentry work, planting trees, driving trucks and tractors, stringing telephone lines, painting camps, jackhammer jobs, fighting forest fires, fighting blister rust, surveying, machine maintenance, pick and shovel work, laying brick and stone, mixing cement, camp maintenance work, etc. Some of the work will be hard manual labor; other aspects of the work program will consist of more advanced and skilled training.

Those who sign up for jobs with the local public service agencies would find work available as secretaries, hospital and laboratory technicians, kitchen assistants, playground workers, gardeners, truckdrivers, office helpers, athletic instructors, maintenance employees, according to Senator HUMPHREY.

In both cases the bill provides that a program of training and education would supplement the work program.

SELF-CONFIDENCE AND SELF-RESPECT FOR YOUTH

Jobs in the Youth Conservation Corps or in the Hometown Corps for these young people will give them self-confidence and self-respect. They will learn responsibility and punctuality. They will learn how to work with others and how to take orders. This work experience will improve their chances of holding steady jobs on their own.

Up to 60,000 youths could enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps and many thousands in the Hometown Youth Corps. The YCC would be employed wholly on Federal projects in national parks, reservations, and forests. The local employment programs would be initiated by the State or local community.

Mr. Speaker, we need this bill, and I hope that the House will soon have the opportunity to act on it.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago on March 31, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the legislation creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. Today, 30 years later, much of the work that was done and the trees that were planted are part of the resources of this Nation; today, many of the boys who were taken from the streets and farms to do this work are constructive and important members of our society. The saying, "The evil men do lives after them; the good is often buried with their bones," does not apply to the Civilian Conservation Corps. Its benefits in both human and natural resources have repaid its cost manifold in the years since 1933.

Shortly we will be asked to consider a modern counterpart to the Civilian Conservation Corps. There are many who will say that the need for such a bill today is not what it was in the 1930's; that conditions have changed; that what was permissible in the depths of a national depression is not advisable in times of relative prosperity.

The fallacy of these arguments lies in the inevitable inability of some of the opponents of the new program to understand the pressing needs of the future as they are reflected in the society of today.

It is true that we do not have the mass unemployment of the 1930's, and certainly we hope we never do again. But we do have unemployment of a far more insidious type; it is the unemployment of youth. This unemployment is insidious not only because young people are involved; it is dangerous and destructive because so many of these idle youth will never be really employable.

These youth will not be able, in many cases, to find work even of the most menial type. The reservoir of unskilled jobs in this country is rapidly running dry. It requires a far higher level of training today to get and hold a decent job than it did at the time the Civilian Conservation Corps was operating.

Those who object to the new program generally agree with this; they say the new legislation is useless because it does not provide enough training in specific skills.

There is reason for concern over this argument. But the gentlemen who raise it miss a vital point: you cannot train a person who has no desire to be trained. It is the unfortunate fact that in many of our large cities, and many of our rural areas as well, there is a growing group of young Americans who have, in effect, given up. They have never had the surroundings or the family background to give them the desire to stay in school, to undertake the necessary training that will make them constructive citizens. These are the young unemployed, unemployables. There are perhaps a million or so of them.

It was the restless surge of unemployed and relatively hopeless youth that formed the backbone of Hitler's storm troopers; it is this same aimless and often rootless group in our country which accounts for much of the crime and delinquency.

This new revival of the CCC is aimed at this group of our youth. It would provide not so much employment as the desire for employment; not so much training as the motivation for training. If a reasonable number of these young people, in a new, healthy, and more stimulating environment, develop a desire to improve themselves and become constructive citizens this legislation will have served its purpose. Once the desire for improvement is there, other legislation, including present proposals for vocation education, will be needed to supply the refined skills so much in demand in today's labor market.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we need this bill very badly. The chief trouble right now is that it barely scratches the surface. If only 15,000 young men are provided for under the Youth Conservation Corps title of the act, this will mean only 4 per county in the State of West Virginia. In some respects, this takes on the aspect of scholarships.

However, it may be that getting the camps ready and starting the program on a sound basis necessitates such a modest start. In any event, I am completely sold that this program—no matter how small—must get started, and I am confident it will, in the future, prove to be one of the big factors in making a dent in our youth unemployment problem.

The problem of youth unemployment is just as serious in the rural areas as it is in the urban areas of the Nation. During the period between 1950 and 1960 when the State of West Virginia lost 7.2 percent of its population, a total of 145,131 persons, many West Virginians became alarmed to realize that of these 145,131 persons, 28,572 were our young people between the ages of 18 and 21. In 1960, we had in West Virginia 22.8 percent fewer young persons in the 18 to 21 age bracket than we had in 1950.

I believe the principle of the Youth Employment Act is the most thrilling development since the establishment of the Peace Corps. It may not be as important as education legislation. But youth employment certainly comes a close second to education.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in these halls about fiscal responsibility. It occurs to me that the most irresponsible thing we could do fiscally would be to sit on our hands and fail to take measures to save what could be a lost generation. The fiscally responsible thing to do is to invest a small amount in a program which will pay rich dividends in a stronger America, as our young people develop a sense of responsibility, new skills, and help not only improve our natural resources, but also learn the great lessons of service to their home communities.

I have cited one figure often, but I believe it illustrates the plight of our young people in West Virginia. I might say that I first got an inkling of this while listening to the then Republican Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, in a provocative address to the Huntington Elks. Right after the Korean conflict, West Virginia paid a bonus to its Korean war veterans, and when it came time to mail out the checks, it was discovered that 44.3 percent of the bonus checks went to out-of-State addresses—thus indicating that the cream of our young work force was leaving West Virginia because they found superior economic opportunities elsewhere.

Today, West Virginia has developed into a laboratory to determine whether the American economic system can flourish. Although nationwide in the past 2 years, the high school dropout rate declined, in West Virginia the dropout rate in the high schools rose. Not only that, but the national dropout percentage for 1962 was 30.2 percent and for West Virginia it was 40.1 percent.

Recently, the Secretary of Labor reported a very ominous figure: in West Virginia, unemployment of male youths between 16 and 21 in April 1960 was 19.4 percent. The national average in this age bracket is only 10.8 percent. Unemployment in this age group in the Nation is 2½ times the national average, but in West Virginia it is 4½ times the national average.

The Youth Employment Act would offer our young people hope for the future and would give them a chance to perform useful activities which would benefit both themselves and their State. The Federal land in West Virginia totals 950,000 acres, and State-owned land 220,000 acres. We have 19 State parks, 9 State forests, and 12 hunting areas.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this measure receives overwhelming approval. On this 30th anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps I urge my colleagues to mark this celebration by uniting behind the Youth Employment Act.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1963, marks the 30th anniversary of signing of legislation by President Roosevelt creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Once again we draw from the ideas of that ever great American, the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who 30 years ago signed the Emergency Conservation Act (48 Stat. 22) creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. President Roosevelt, signed this act in the presence of Senator Walsh, and Representative Ramspeck, who had piloted the act through Congress. President Roosevelt stated the proposal of his program as follows:

> This Nation asks for action, and action now. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

Again on March 1, 1962, another great American, President John F. Kennedy in a message to the Congress said:

> As our population expands, as our industrial output increases, and as rising productivity makes possible increased enjoyment of leisure time, the obligation to make the most efficient and beneficial use of our natural resources becomes correspondingly greater. The standard of living we enjoy, greater than any other nation in history, is attributable in large measure to the wide variety and rich abundance of this country's physical resources. But these resources are

not inexhaustible, nor do they automatically replenish themselves.

While the Nation's imagination seems to have enlightened our youth to the idea of working without regular pay in the underdeveloped nations, through the program of a Peace Corps, it is regrettable that it has somewhat cast a shadow on another important proposal for harnessing the energies of our youth, through a Youth Conservation Corps on our homefront.

Today as then a similar crisis exists. There are over 469,000 young men from 16 to 20 unemployed, and by 1965 we shall have 40 percent more persons under 20 in our labor force. By then an additional 800,000 young people will be job hunting. In February 1963, the jobless rate for all ages was 6.1 percent, whereas for those in the 14 to 19 age bracket it was 15.6 percent—more than twice the national average.

These statistics add up to trouble—a shocking waste of young lives and a scandalous waste of the taxpayers' money in fruitless efforts to seal off nonrehabilitable young people from the rest of society. And with the crop of war babies now coming of age, the problem becomes ever more acute. More and more young men are in the 16- to 20-year age bracket, and more and more of them who are dropping out of school cannot find employment.

Young men who have dropped out of school and cannot find jobs find it all too easy to end up in trouble. Trouble not only for themselves, but trouble for society.

The economic waste from this unemployment, although serious, is insignificant compared to the damage which may be done to the jobless individuals and to society. Are we to ignore our most important resource, a human resource, our American youth?

In the past 19 years, our population has shot upward at a tremendous rate. The demand for recreation areas has spiraled with it. The projected estimated needs for wood and wood products by our growing population for the year 2000 indicates a record high demand. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Board reported that while population is booming, recreation land is dwindling.

Recently the Department of Agriculture announced that within a few short years, approximately 50 million acres of agricultural producing land will be retired. Foresters estimate that another 275 million acres need replanting to become productive again and to provide against flood and erosion. Some 300 million acres of farmland need rebuilding. Are we to rehabilitate?

Mr. Speaker, wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. Our country has been generous with us in this regard, and we cannot now ignore her needs for future development.

The Youth Conservation Corps provided for in title I of this bill—H.R. 5131—now being considered would make worthwhile contributions in the improvement of our land and water resources as well as our human resources as represented by our unemployed young men. Both types of resources are very much in need of our attention. We cannot afford to fail to at least make a start this year on this program which is designed to do something worthwhile in enhancing both our natural resources and our human resources for our and their benefit.

There has been some criticism of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's by opponents of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. I believe these critics have not been fully informed regarding the accomplishments of the CCC. In my State of Montana there were an average of 24 camps in operation throughout the 9 years of the program. The results of their work are still evident in many places, and glowing comments are frequently heard regarding the good that program did for the young men enrolled in it and the worthwhile conservation work they accomplished. More than 22,000 young men from the State of Montana and enrollees from other States obtained beneficial work experience coupled with on-the-job and other training to better prepare them to make a living and contribute to society as a whole.

We still have a big backlog of worthwhile work to do on the federally owned conservation lands of this Nation to protect them, put facilities on them, revegetate and otherwise make them more productive for the multiple uses for which they are adapted—all for the benefit of the people of this country.

In my State there are 16,635,000 acres of national forest land administered by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and nearly 9 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

These 25,500,000 acres of Federal land would provide a very large reservoir of work suitable for YCC enrollees.

The development program for the national forests for the 10-year period 1963–72 includes an estimated workload of high priority jobs suitable for YCC enrollees amounting to 29,000 man-years. This would provide employment for 10 years for 2,900 enrollees on national forests alone.

The work would consist of such things as timber stand improvement and reforestation, construction and maintenance of recreation facilities, seeding of rangeland, construction of fences and stock water facilities, erosion control and other watershed improvement work, improvement and development of wildlife habitat, fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of structures for fire and general purposes, and road and trail construction and maintenance. This backlog of work is inventoried and ready to undertake in amounts dependent upon the size and locations of youth corps camps.

Some of this work would produce returns in one form or another almost immediately. Others would result in increased financial returns in 10, 20, or more years to the Government, local industry, local labor force, and local businesses in general. Local businesses would gain from the patronage of fishermen, hunters, and families seeking recreation from the improved facilities which would be constructed by enrollees. City and farm and ranch users of water should benefit from the improved watershed conditions created by erosion control, range seeding, tree planting, and other special watershed work.

The work, the camp and outdoor atmosphere, the on-the-job training, and other training and knowing that something worthwhile is being accomplished should fire the imagination and ambition of a high percentage of the young men enrolled in this program. These young unemployed men need our support. Let us give the YCC program a chance to be of help.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago almost to the day, the Civilian Conservation Corps was created to provide employment opportunities for the youthful unemployed of the thirties. In addition, its purpose was to do needed developmental work to improve our soil, water, range, and forest resources. The CCC had a life of over 9 years, extending from April 1933 to June 1942—6 months after Pearl Harbor. Every State in the Union benefited from this program. More than $76 million was spent in my State of Washington, and I am sure our soil, water, and forest resources were improved in value by an amount equal to, if not exceding, this figure. In addition, more than 40,000 enrollees from the State of Washington and many young men from other States occupied at some time the 43 camps in my State. They benefited tremendously from the work experience and training received during their period of enrollment.

Today we are considering, in title I of H.R. 5131, a program called the Youth Conservation Corps. The need and opportunity for improvement work on our soil, water, range, and forest resources are great. The unemployment and training needs of our young men of 16 to 21 years of age are also very great. Enactment of the bill would go far toward accomplishing both objectives.

In my State of Washington, on our national forest lands, amounting to 9,668,000 acres, there is an estimated 22,000 man-years of high priority resource development and protection project work that could be accomplished by a Youth Conservation Corps program. This would provide employment for as many as 22,000 enrollees for a period of 10 years.

The work would consist of such things as timber stand improvement and reforestation, construction, and maintenance of recreation facilities, seeding of rangeland, construction of fences and stock water facilities, erosion control and other watershed improvement work, improvement and development of wildlife habitat, fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of structures for fire and general purposes, and road and trail construction and maintenance. This backlog of work is inventoried and ready to undertake in amounts dependent upon the size and locations of youth corps camps.

A good share of this work would be timber stand improvement and tree planting which can be expected to return substantially more over a period of years than the cost of the work. The construction and improvement of family type recreational facilities and improvements in fish and wildlife habitat are other very important types of work on the national forest land in Washington which could be performed by YCC enrollees. The expenditures made each year in the local communities by the families using these facilities are expected to equal the cost of the initial construction. The revegetation of rangeland and such other work as fence construction and livestock water developments can be of considerable benefit to the local livestock industry. Soil erosion control and other special watershed work planned for enrollees, coupled with tree planting and range seeding, can make major contributions to our water resources. The fire hazard reduction and construction and maintenance of fire control and general purpose facilities would be of important assistance in protecting from fire and in managing the valuable timber, recreational, wildlife, range, and watershed resources of the nearly 10 million acres of forest land in the State of Washington.

What I have said about work and training opportunities on national forest land in my State and the benefits to our land, water, range, and forest resources is equally applicable to many other States and also to conservation lands administered by the Department of the Interior. The benefits to the youth of the Nation will accrue to every State in the Nation.

Our State in 1961 passed a youth conservation corps bill. The State of Washington is in a position to cooperate with the Federal Government in the employment of young men for improvement of our natural resources.

It established itself as a project which provided useful work for many of our unemployed youth. It rehabilitated boys and it has enhanced the value of our State.

I might mention that Howard Martin of Camas, Wash., now a member of the State Parks and Recreation Commission testifies to the effectiveness of such a youth program. He was a member of the Civil Conservation Corps in the 1930's. He said in a letter to me:

> I wish the old gang could go back to Minnesota with me and see what the millions of trees look like today, that we planted in the thirties. I had this pleasure 5 years ago.

On July 16, 1961, the Seattle Daily Times carried a lead editorial. Its title was "Wasted Years of Youth." The editorial pointed out that our Nation was facing a problem which was growing more critical each year. The numbers of our young people are increasing rapidly. The opportunities for gainful employment are not increasing as fast. I should like to quote some paragraphs from that editorial:

> Unemployment is tragic at any age. But in the case of youth, the long-range effects—the acquiring of habits of aimlessness and shiftlessness that could persist a lifetime—could be especially detrimental.
>
> Action on this problem should not be a matter of partisan politics or something to be put off until an election year.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, this country of ours has two great natural resources. One is our forests, parks, rangeland, wildlife areas and other public lands—222 million acres of land that provide recreation and outdoor experience for millions of people. The second is the talent and energies and potentialities of our young people, upon whom we must depend to keep strong the values and progress our history as a free people has brought us.

But these two natural resources, without which we cannot advance or even maintain the bases of our strength and economy, are being wastefully neglected at the time we need them most. While we give attention to many other projects, we shunt off into the lowest priority category the glaring needs of our physical and human resources, which are the real building material of this country.

Thirty years ago this month, with a different set of national priorities, an ambitious undertaking was set into motion to link together the problems of these two resources. When the Civilian Conservation Corps was set up in 1933, no one dreamed of the popular success and tangible achievements that would come out of its 10 years of existence. There were literally millions of young people—the "unwanted" of a feeble economy—who were out of school and out of work, with no place to go, nowhere to turn. Many of the more than 2 million of these people who went into the CCC literally went on to become leaders in our business, industrial, and political community. The lives of virtually all of them were changed. They came from varying backgrounds, but they all found certain things in common in the CCC—new degrees of self-respect, pride in accomplishment, confidence in their own ability, and a sense of being part of a growing and broadening process. Practically every boy who spent time in a CCC camp came out a better man, with more self-confidence in himself and more skills.

In addition to developing the human resources of 2 million young men, the CCC accomplished a major task in the development of our precious and irreplaceable natural resources. CCC enrollees planted nearly 3 billion trees, built 1 million miles of roads and trails, constructed over 85,000 miles of telephone lines, erected 4,000 fire towers, and 100,000 buildings and bridges. More than 4 million acres of forest land were improved as a protection against fire. The value of this work on public land alone has been estimated by forestry and park officials at more than $1.5 billion. This is a staggering achievement; a monument to a farsighted program that will stand for years.

Today, many of the problems that prompted the establishment of the CCC are mounting again. The passage of time has seen our conservation needs spiral, as our natural resources drop in the national list of priorities. There is a backlog of needed and useful conservation projects that are programed and mapped out of close to $8 billion. We cannot undertake all of these projects at once, as pressing as they are, but we can surely, by turning the public spotlight upon them, demonstrate the urgency of many of them. Let us look at some of these conservation needs. We need the reforestation of 28 million acres, the establishment and refurbishing of recreational facilities on National and State parks, timber stand improvement for 140 million acres, the expansion of fire protection for 200 million acres, brush clearing and revegetation over large parts of 200 million acres of Federal grazing districts and forest lands, and the establishment of wildlife habitat and structural improvements on wildlife refuges. This is by no means an exhaustive listing of needed projects. If we neglect our natural resources and ignore basic conservation, we will pay the toll of this neglect for centuries to come.

The neglect of our natural resources, as appalling as it has been, does not approach the gross neglect of our human resources. The relentless advance of automation has brought not only benefit but hardship as well, and few groups feel the brunt of this as much as our young people. Unemployment has risen to intolerable levels throughout the country, and deserves the greatest attention we can give it. Unemployment among the youth of our country has become a major boil on the body politic. In Detroit, for example, it has been estimated that close to 30 percent of the young people between 16 and 21 are unemployed. A survey in Detroit found that 3 years after the graduation of the class of 1958 of one of our public high schools, 48 percent of the graduates had not managed to find any employment whatsoever.

George Edwards, Detroit police commissioner, who then was a justice of Michigan Supreme Court after serving 5 years as a juvenile judge, had this to say:

> The young man who leaves high school with no place to go in terms of employment loses some of his own self-respect. He gains a great deal of hostility toward the society in which he lives if that society does not make useful employment available to him. These two things put together may well be sufficient to push him over the line from the ordinary useful citizen who obeys the law into the youthful hoodlum who becomes the real "I hate everybody" kid whom we dealt with over and over again in the juvenile courts.

One need not take great pains to dramatize this situation. It is a drama which should not be played out on the street corners or in the courts. Let us go back from the garish headlines and the grim statistics about youth and look further at the experience of the CCC. A 1938 study entitled "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys" states in its conclusions the opinion that:

> The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experience seem to fall into two general classifications: those having to do with the more or less concrete factors of improved physical health, increased weight, and financial gains, and those having to do with the intangible but significant factors of greater maturity, increased self-confidence, and general security. As we review the experiences and comments of these boys, we are

> impressed with the values from which many of them benefited but we are impressed, too, by the responsibility placed on the individual boy for seeing and obtaining these values. * * *

The experience of the CCC showed also that there were more than psychological benefits from the service. CCC "graduates" found a much easier time securing employment than did those young men who did not take part. Studies have shown that employers found them better and more skillful workers. CCC work was not merely manual labor; surveying, carpentry, and machine work were only a few of the skills gained by CCC enrollees.

It is neither nostalgia nor the rosy view of retrospective vision that prompts this praise for the many achievements of the CCC. There was a massive need for the program, and it met that need in an outstanding way. There is, I submit, an equal need today. The "social dynamite" of the out of school and unemployed youth is a fact that should prod us into immediate action. The unmet conservation needs of our natural resources is also a fact. The CCC coupled these needs in a dynamic and successful program. The Youth Conservation Corps should be an equally ambitious successor.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues from so many different parts of the country—East and West, urban and rural—in support of a Youth Conservation Corps. Coming from eastern Oregon, an area that is rich with natural resources that could so profitably utilize the conservation efforts of these young men, I have a particular reason to be a strong advocate of this measure. I am a sponsor of the legislation in this Congress just as I was in the 87th Congress. But I think my colleagues will find that members from urban areas advocate this legislation just as earnestly. I want to emphasize that the YCC bill encompasses a two-way program: increased opportunities for our young men combined with sound investment in our priceless resource heritage—a program that will return double dividends in the form of enriched lives and the more complete use of our human resources, in addition to the more efficient and economic management of our material resources of land, wood, and water.

Even since last year there has been a very decided and noticeable shift of sentiment in favor of this proposal. More and more people realize the tremendous need for a YCC program. I want to particularly commend our colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable CARL PERKINS, for the leadership he has shown in building the record for this legislation. Congressman PERKINS and his subcommittee have done a very effective job in shaping the details of the legislation. The bill that has been reported out of committee, H.R. 5131, is different from the original measure introduced. Many of these changes were the result of the subcommittee's holding long hours of hearings where they heard spokesmen for a variety of viewpoints.

The problem of unemployment among our young men has reached a point of urgency not experienced since the thirties. Young men from 16 to 21, the age group that would be affected by this legislation, make up 8.6 percent of the male civilian labor force while having an unemployment rate of 20.7 percent. About 700,000 of our young men are now out of school and out of work. I want to point out that these are February 1963 figures and so in no way reflect the great numbers of young men who normally look for jobs in the summer. The problem will become worse and not better. We can expect 26 million young men and women to enter the labor market in the 1960's as compared with 19 million in the 1950's. Of these 26 million, 7½ million are not expected to finish high school. They will pile up helplessly against the rising barriers to unskilled labor in our ever-advancing economy.

I consider this legislation to have the greatest economic importance. We on the Ways and Means Committee are now wrestling with the difficult question of restructuring the tax system to give our economy the stimulus that is needed to attain the proper rate of sound economic growth. These problems are technical and complex and the decisions to be made require a great deal of time. But even after the tax program is passed, the economy will need time to react to the new stimuli and the changed conditions. A Youth Conservation Corps is a program we need now.

A YCC program has not only economic but social urgency. Jobs have become increasingly difficult to obtain because of automation and the great influx into the labor market of young men born during the war years. It is not surprising that juvenile delinquency has greatly increased in the last few years when so many boys who have left school have been unable to get work. This program would help bridge that gap between high school graduation and the first job. The YCC would provide training and educational services to better prepare these young men to obtain jobs when they complete their enrollments. As one who grew up in the Pacific Northwest, I have had firsthand knowledge of outdoor living. I can assure my colleagues that it is not a romanticism to say that to live and work in our beautiful mountains and forests contributes to a person's health, both of mind and body.

Countless people in my district, who got their first start in life in the old Civilian Conservation Corps, have told me that they strongly advocate a similar program as an ideal way to help today's young men to get started on the right track. Though inspired by the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, this bill is an altered version of the old CCC designed to meet the problems of today. I would want to emphasize that this is not a program urged because of sentimental memories of the past, but because of the urgent needs of the present. Recent pilot programs in my own State testify to the great success that such a program would have. The 1961 session of the Oregon Legislature passed legislation similar to this bill that aided our counties in setting up summer programs where young men could do conservation work in our parks and forests. Numerous county officials, juvenile judges, and county commissioners, have written to tell me that this pilot program has been a great success and have urged that we institute such a program on the national level.

The need for conservation work is just as pressing, if not more so, than 30 years ago. Since the 1930's we have had a tremendous increase in the use of our national forests alone. The number of visitors has tripled in just the last 10 years. As the Civilian Conservation Corps did in the past, the Youth Conservation Corps would work on developing recreation areas, planting trees, building dams, brush removal, and the countless other needed conservation measures. In my own State of Oregon we had nearly 28,000 young men serving in the average of 51 CCC camps that were in existence during the thirties. In trips through my own congressional district I often come across examples of the lasting conservation work that these young men accomplished.

The Interior and Agriculture Departments who are responsible for the management of our natural resources have outlined the great backlog of much-needed conservation work in which young men could very effectively participate. As just one example, the Department of Agriculture has informed me that 43,000 man-years of work are needed in just the national forests in my own State. I would add that much work is also needed in State parks and forests and the other types of Federal projects such as national parks, reservoirs and Indian reservations. My colleagues know that I have consistently fought to expand the Federal Government's role in resource conservation. In the past I have urged increased appropriations out of the Treasury for conservation activities because I felt they would help guarantee our Nation's future security and prosperity while returning dividends in the form of increased Government revenues. The effective conservation and management of our natural resources is an area that we have too long neglected. In a YCC program we have an opportunity to start meeting the present backlog of conservation work which is estimated to cost $12.2 billion dollars. Very frankly a YCC program would help to accomplish vitally needed conservation work at much lower costs.

In summary this is a desirable program just on a cost-accounting basis. But a Youth Conservation Corps would return double dividends by conserving both our material and human resources. I consider this to be a sound and imaginative program—one in the best tradition of our Nation's approach to vital problems.

In view of these vital needs, I want to urge my colleagues that they work for speedy enactment of as strong a YCC program as possible. We have a great opportunity here to help in the conservation of our national resources, but there is no doubt that a Youth Conservation Corps would help in conserving an even more important national resource—our youth.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to a grave national problem, the gathering storm represented by millions of young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are neglected in our "affluent society." Unemployment among this group is practically three times the national average, which is itself a burden upon our society. In December 1962 there were 1,200,000 boys and girls from 16 to 24 years of age who were looking for work. For most of these, it has proved a fruitless search. An economy with as large a residue of unemployed adults as ours cannot easily find places for those young people with few skills and little training.

Unemployment at any age for any person is demoralizing, frightening and embittering. For youth who experience prolonged joblessness or a series of dead-end jobs broken by long periods of unemployment, it can only create attitudes, work habits, and loss of motivation which can deeply affect a young person throughout his whole adult life. Dr. James Conant has graphically pointed out this problem by saying:

> I am deeply disturbed by the implications that widespread unemployment among the youth of our big cities has for the future of our society.
>
> Although the causes of juvenile delinquency are complex, and there is no one solution, employment opportunities are clearly important. A youth who has dropped out of school and never has had a full-time job is not likely to become a constructive citizen of his community. Quite the contrary.
>
> As a frustrated individual, he is quite likely to be antisocial and rebellious and may well become a juvenile delinquent. The adverse influence of the street is largely a consequence of gangs of such youths, out of school and unemployed.
>
> I submit that the existence in the slums of our large cities of thousands of youths age 16 to 21 who are both out of school and out of work is an explosive situation. It is social dynamite.

I believe that a constructive and imaginative solution must be started now, if we are not to reap a bitter harvest among our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the district I have the honor to represent has no great forests, no expanses of lakes and wildlife and ranges. It would be, I think, a great benefit to thousands of young people whose lives and outlooks are bounded by concrete to participate in a program of needed conservation work similar to that undertaken in the past by the Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC was an ambitious experiment that fully justified the hopes of all those who helped start it. One example of this justification is provided by a man who was closely connected with the CCC during its whole life, and who is now the Director of the National Park Service. Conrad Wirth, in his final report to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, said that:

> Working out of doors, regular hours, and plenty of good, wholesome food did wonders for the boys at one of the most critical growing periods of their lives.

The impact of outdoor life upon young people, I think, cannot be overstated. A recent study in Minnesota, comparing delinquent youths who participated in a forestry camp with a matched group remaining in a more conventional correctional institution, reports significantly greater improvement among the campers. I do not suggest that a program comparable to the CCC should be thought of as a solution to the complex problem of juvenile delinquency, for it is bound up in the whole fabric of our society. But I do feel strongly that applying the energies and talents of our young people to the many unmet conservation needs that abound across the country can contribute to both their development and the development of our natural resources.

A recent study conducted for the New York City Youth Board reveals that New York City has at least 76,800 out-of-school and unemployed youth. Difficulty in finding and holding jobs hits most heavily school dropouts and young people in minority groups, particularly Puerto Ricans and Negroes. A local area youth employment program, if instituted on an adequate basis, could help many of these young people find work. But giving these youngsters a job outside of their present environment for a period of 6 months to 2 years can go a long way toward giving them a self-reliant outlook on life and the beginning of skills that can help them gain later employment. Anyone who has traveled through our magnificent national forests and parks can understand the effect doing hard and useful work in them would have upon young men accustomed to roaming through the streets of cities where the doors of employment remain closed. The experience of the CCC camps of the 1930's demonstrates how boys were made into men who became useful and productive members of society. The work that needs to be done is there. Since the CCC built recreation facilities and roads and trials, much of this construction has undergone substantial deterioration. The almost tenfold increase in the use of these facilities, coupled with the lack of funds and manpower in many areas to maintain them, has meant that a tremendous backlog of rehabilitation work has accumulated. In this kind of outdoor atmosphere the socially useful and productive nature of this work can benefit thousands of young men.

Mr. Speaker, April 17 will be the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the first CCC camp in the George Washington National Forest in Virginia. Thirty years ago the whole of American society was out of focus, and the need for the CCC program was obvious. Today, our general affluence tends to shield from our vision the soft spots in our society. It is hard for many people to comprehend the meaning of our hard-core social problems, which cannot be wished away or pushed out of sight. In the 1930's the impact of idleness on the young people was readily apparent, and the CCC as a solution was easy to understand. Thirty years later the need for a similar approach to the problem of youth unemployment should be apparent to all except those who believe that idleness is voluntary. We have a choice as to how we will meet this problem. We can spend our money for unemployment compensation for young people, for courts, law enforcement agencies and penal institutions; or we can spend it on a constructive program to attack our unmet conservation needs utilizing the energies and talents of our young people.

In its 9 years of existence the CCC provided immeasurable benefit to both our natural resources and our young men. To the 3 million young men enrolled in CCC camps, it offered discipline, the experience of healthful and body-building outdoor living, and training in a wide variety of skills. The success of many of the CCC enrollees in obtaining jobs after their camp service is directly attributable to the skills they picked up in the camps. The lasting benefits of the CCC—the millions of acres of trees planted, wildlife protected, the thousands of trails, bridges and campgrounds built—are impressive evidence of the intrinsic worth of the CCC program. The program also had lasting benefits that are not so tangible. These are the human assets reaped by the 3 million CCC graduates. Let me refer again to the words of Conrad Wirth, one of the Nation's great conservation figures, who said:

> Working in the open, with nature, brings optimum beneficial results to an individual which are almost impossible to obtain elsewhere. It builds the body and the mind; it teaches the basic principles of existence; and it creates an understanding of what must be done to protect and properly use natural resources.

No one program can completely excise the cause of youth unemployment and the social ills that attend this unemployment. It will take a variety of imaginative and boldly conceived programs to treat both the roots and the branches of the problems afflicting our youth. The CCC showed to the Nation one constructive avenue into which the energies of young people could be put. A modern version of the Corps, designed to meet the needs of our vast and expanding number of unemployed youth, can accomplish a great deal in the conservation of both our natural and our human resources.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent as well to insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent and informative statement by a former Member of this body, the Honorable Frank E. Smith, now Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with respect to the operation of the CCC program in the TVA region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: At your suggestion, I have prepared an evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps program in the TVA area. During the 9 years of operation of the CCC program, a number of camps were assigned to the TVA, at one time as high as 25, and a variety of work was carried on. I think one of the most significant results of this program is the fact that the average gross return to landowners from timber sales is going to be at least $1 million per year.

Not many years will be needed to repay the entire cost of the CCC program in the area.

One of the principal items of work was a large-scale reforestation program specifically aimed at eroding land generally considered worthless at the time. The TVA–CCC tree planting resulted in the following:

Private land reforested	70,000
TVA land reforested	40,000
Total acres reforested	110,000

Of this 110,000 acres, 73,000 acres are still in young stands of growing timber today. The difference in acreage is caused by a number of reasons, including land-use conversion, fire, insect and disease, and the planting of improper species for the site in use.

There are many lasting benefits to the region from the plantations established by the CCC, however. Some of the more important ones are:

Income for landowners, $1 million each year: CCC plantings are just now reaching the age (25 years) where landowners are receiving significant dollar returns. Based on averages developed from intensively studied individual cases, they are now producing wood from thinnings, worth about $5 per acre per year to the landowner. Projected over a 50-year rotation, average gross return per acre per year is computed to be $15. Therefore, 73,000 acres of CCC plantations are returning, or will return, to landowners $1 million per year.

Base for industry; new papermills: Two paper companies have built plants on the Tennessee River in the past 10 years at a capital investment of $144 million. An important consideration in the location of these mills was the extensive area of established pine plantations. Each year CCC plantings can be expected to yield 73,000 cords of wood for the paper industry, resulting in manufactured products worth about $7,300,000. (During a recent 5-year period, one mill paid $200,000 for some 60,000 cords of wood thinned from 6,400 acres of TVA land planted by CCC crews.)

Jobs for people; 730 full-time jobs: Foresters estimate that each 1,000 acres of planted pines create the base for 10 new full-time woods and industry jobs. Trees planted by the CCC are therefore providing year-round employment for 730 men. This means over $3 million of the region's industrial payroll.

Soil erosion control: A 1961 survey showed almost 95 percent of the CCC plantings effectively controlled erosion.

Reforestation idea promoted: In 1934 tree planting was a novel idea in the Tennessee Valley. Landowners were skeptical. Persuading them to reclaim eroded lands was often difficult, even though it cost them nothing. Early CCC plantings, and the obviously good results, were effective advertising. The idea spread and the reforestation rate accelerated. Landowners gradually assumed responsibility for doing the job. To date they have reforested 633,000 additional acres in valley counties.

Effective fire prevention: Wood burning was a common practice in the valley in the 1930's. An estimated 10 percent of the total forest land burned each year. The problem was an uninformed and unsympathetic citizenry. Growing, green plantations became a powerful influence in changing attitudes toward fire control. One very effective aid was tree planting. Landowners who owned tree plantations developed a desire to protect them, and this interest gradually spread from plantations to natural stands of trees. Today the annual burn is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Cordially,

Frank E. Smith,
Director.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the text of an article from the magazine Business Week of February 16, 1963, entitled "Coming: A Crisis for Young Workers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Coming: A Crisis for Young Workers

Imagine two locomotives careening toward each other at full speed. One represents the economic trends that have reduced job opportunities for young workers so drastically that unemployment among them is now twice the national average. The other represents the 26 million young workers who will enter the labor market before 1970. The two are about to collide—with potentially alarming results for both the Nation's economy and its politics.

SOBER SURVEY

The sober source for this sensational picture is a Labor Department manpower study, prepared for the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. Most of its background material is well known: the overall growth in unemployment levels; the rise in long-term unemployment; the concentration of unemployment among the blue collared, unskilled, and nonwhite. But where the study looks into the future, it contains dynamite.

Between 1960 and 1970, the number of working youngsters aged 14 to 24 is expected to increase by more than 6 millon—compared to an increase of less than 400,000 during the previous decade. This will bring the total number in this age group to 26 million. Yet in 1962 the unemployment rate for worker in this age group was about double the national average of 5½ percent.

In effect, almost every trend in the labor market is now operating to the young worker's disadvantage:

The shift from blue- to white-collar jobs, related to the shift from goods to services in the economy. The proportion of all workers in goods-producing industries fell from 51 percent in 1947 to 42 percent in 1962.

The shift from unskilled to skilled jobs within the blue-collar segment. Technological innovation has tended to upgrade jobs where it did not abolish them.

The shift from farm to nonagricultural jobs. Farm employment dropped more than 3 million between 1947 and 1962.

NO ENTRY

The net result is a scarcity of those bottom-rung jobs that were once the young worker's traditional entry into the labor market. Today's high school graduate with no special training finds few unoccupied jobs he can step into and use as a stepping stone to the next job up.

The high school dropout is in an even worse position—an estimated 30 percent of all youngsters beginning work in the 1960's will be dropouts.

On the other hand, those occupations that are growing fastest—the professional and technical specialties—require so much training that a person is out of the younger worker class before he begins work.

Moreover, the huge sums spent for research and development ($14 billion in 1960–61 compared to $5 billion in 1953–54) will accelerate these trends.

STIFF CHALLENGE

As the Labor Department sees it, the country will need:

Some 13 million more jobs by 1970 to keep up with labor force growth alone.

Two million additional jobs annually to offset technological advances.

This is a stiff enough challenge for an economy that has averaged only 258,000 in annual job growth for the past 5 years (464,000 new nonfarm jobs minus 206,000 lost on the farm). But, in addition, the new jobs will have to be matched up with a labor force bulging in those categories hardest to employ—principally young workers. Or else.

History, rather than the Labor Department, suggests alternatives; the depression, Hitler's Germany—created in great part by unemployed young Germany. Presumably such possibilities underlie President Kennedy's proposed Youth Conservation Corps. The chances are they will underlie many political and economic moves before the decade is over.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, these youngsters who are out of school and out of work and who are discouraged because they are virtually unemployable will benefit immensely from the Youth Conservation Corps. They do not intend to go back to school where they have already dropped out. They need to get away from their environment in many instances, and the chance to break away from depressing environments for a new life in conservation work will attract many boys who cannot be reached otherwise. These youngsters will have an opportunity to live in a well-regulated camp and to work in many fields. They will be in camps operated under direct leadership of forest and park rangers, wildlife management specialists and our soil conservationists. The bill should be passed at the earliest possible date.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUDGET FOR 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader in debate on the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior alluded to the fact that there is a Republican task force which has been organized for the purpose of undertaking to reduce appropriations in the budget for the next fiscal year.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on March 4 the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] issued a press release in which he announced that a House Republican task force had found ways to cut as much as $15 billion from the budget. On March 5 the Washington Post published this account of the group's press session.

I quote:

> A House Republican study group announced yesterday it has found projects costing $10 to $15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year. The group of senior GOP members of the Appropriations Committee told a news conference that their study of the budget, assisted by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director during the Eisenhower administration, showed such cuts both feasible and urgent.

The Post account then identifies the gentleman from Ohio as the source of the statement.

And then added, and I quote again:

> The Republicans did not specify where cuts should be made. They said they had compiled a list but did not want to appear to be prejudging testimony still to be given before the Appropriations Committee.

The Post then adds this statement:

> House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK suggested that Republicans submit a bill of particulars.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House and others on this side of the aisle have been asking for a bill of particulars every day since this statement was made. But all we have been able to get are claims that the budget can be cut up to $15 billion. We have seen a vague letter from former President Eisenhower encouraging budget cutters, but we have received no bill of particulars.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman made reference to this Eisenhower letter which has gotten rather wide circulation. I think it might be well that somewhere this should be made a part of the RECORD. I would like to refer to it, if the gentleman will permit me. One of the many things that former President Eisenhower mentioned was the defense items in the budget. This morning in the Washington Post in a column written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, that whole matter is discussed. I will quote just one paragraph from Mr. Lippmann's article. He said:

> On the first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the General must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Congress would be horrified at going back to the Eisenhower level. Indeed, the controversies which are raging around the "McNamara monarchy" all originate in his refusal to spend money that certain officers, politicians, and contractors want to have spent.

The article continues:

> General Eisenhower knows that. He learned it when he was President, and his valedictory on television will long be remembered for its warning that "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex.

The other item mentioned in former President Eisenhower's letter, and I have it before me, is the space program, and he used the expression, if I remember it correctly, that this was a "spongy" request—whatever that means.

I have here the Evening Star published as of today, Washington, Tuesday, April 2. The headline is:

> Reds Fire Moon Research Shot

Then the article goes on:

> Space vehicle due at target (meaning the moon) in 3½ days.

Then it goes on to describe this vehicle which weighs over 3,000 pounds. The essence of this, as I see it, is that we should cut back, according to President Eisenhower's letter between $10 and $12 billion. I say that probably the net result of it would be to give the Soviet bloc a commanding superiority in the whole progrom of space research.

I do not believe this administration or, for that matter, the American people, want to do that. The Eisenhower administration spent $180 million more than was spent in the 8 years of the Truman administration despite the fact that the Korean war was fought during the administration of President Truman.

With all the conversation about debt, the Eisenhower years increased the national debt by over $20 billion. I will say that these Republican budget directors ought to be well-qualified because one of them presided over the biggest peacetime deficit in history in the Eisenhower administration which approached almost $13 billion.

One of the other matters this Eisenhower letter talks about is children. I do not find anyone who does not relish talking about children. I have three children and two grandchildren. I want most of all for them to live in a free country; I want them to have the opportunity to participate in a free society.

When we talk about children, one of the real problems confronting this Nation today involves young people; and the idea that we turn our backs on them and do nothing seems to be part of the Republican philosophy and has been as long as I have been around here. That certainly, as I can see it, is not helpful to the children of the country.

I am told that today there are 46 million people in the United States under the age of 18 years, and that within a very few years there will be 70 million under 18 years of age. We have an unemployment rate ranging almost to 6 percent, but when you look at the young people, the unemployment rate is much higher than 6 percent; it is way above 6 percent.

So I say it is very easy for the Republicans to use these catch phrases, but it is pretty difficult to support positive and constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, and I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may incorporate the articles to which he made reference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the article by the distinguished journalist, Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 2, is as follows:

MONEY AND THE MOON

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has gone on record in favor of a cut of $10 or $12 billion in the Government's authority to make contracts which will be paid for as the missiles and the ships and the like are manufactured. While this is unlikely to make any substantial reduction in this year's spending, it would make a substantial difference in later years. General Eisenhower does not himself specify what the cut should be, being as he says out of touch with the details. But he takes his figures from his last two budget directors—Messrs. Stans and Brundage.

Although it is not likely to happen, it would be most enlightening if Messrs. Stans and Brundage would present their recommendations in detail and engage in a bout of reciprocal questioning and answering with Mr. Gordon, the present Kennedy budget director. Unless something of the sort can be arranged, the country will be subjected to conflicting assertions which never meet head on. This will add to the befuddlement which so far has been the outstanding production of this session of Congress.

But even without such a confrontation of views, there are in General Eisenhower's letter to Representative HALLECK two very large and very important statements of policy. One is that the defense budget can be reduced down to something like the last Eisenhower defense budget for fiscal 1962. General Eisenhower does not support, because he thinks it unnecessary, the Kennedy enlargement of our strategic and of our conventional forces. It would be interesting to hear him argue, not merely assert, this very important proposition.

General Eisenhower's second difference of policy is on the program to put a man on the moon and get him back again before 1970. This is, as he says, a crash program which is spectacular but too costly. Here too is an issue which ought to be debated.

On the first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the general must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Congress would be horrified at going back to the Eisenhower level. Indeed, the controversies which are raging around the "McNamara monarchy" all originate in his refusal to spend money that certain officers, politicians, and contractors want to have spent.

General Eisenhower knows that. He learned it when he was President and his valedictory on television will long be remembered for its warning that "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled Secretary of Defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the known-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control. If Mr. McNamara is overwhelmed, General Eisenhower can give up for lost any serious notion that military spending will be cut back.

As to putting a man on the moon, the real question, I believe, is not whether it is too expensive. The real question is whether the country would support a gigantic research and scientific exploration in outer space if it were not prodded by the fear that the Russians will get to the moon first and lured by the prize of being the first ourselves to get there. What General Eisenhower thinks, so it seems, is that we should "demonstrate commonsense" about the prod and the lure. We should spend less and take more time and let the Russians win the race to the moon if they can afford it.

No doubt the winner in the race will have great prestige and to many people the world over, he will look temporarily like a superman. But as the first man on the moon is followed by the second man on the moon, winning the race will be not much more than a 9-day's wonder. Most emphatically, it will not decide the course of history.

What does matter greatly is that since we have the technological capacity we should promote the research and the exploration into the nature of the universe. We do not know what we shall learn when we can place our laboratories and our instruments out beyond the envelope of the earth's atmosphere. But we shall know more than we can know now about the reality of which we are a part. In physics, chemistry, and biology we may be opening up a new world.

It is one of the melancholy facts of political life that the good is not often sought for goodness' sake. Men are not easily moved to serve so great a purpose as the revolutionary increase of knowledge. So we have to be prodded by the fear of being second and lured by the desire to be first.

Mr. Speaker, the article in the Evening Star of Tuesday, March 2, to which I referred earlier is as follows:

REDS FIRE MOON RESEARCH SHOT—SPACE VEHICLE DUE AT TARGET IN 3½ DAYS—3,130-POUND CRAFT SENT UNMANNED OFF PLATFORM IN ORBIT

Moscow, April 2.—The Soviet Union today fired a 3,130-pound interplanetary research station toward the moon, Moscow radio reported.

The radio said the unmanned space vehicle is scheduled to reach the moon in 3½ days.

A statement by the Soviet news agency Tass said the launching was part of the Soviet program for exploration of outer space and planets of the solar system.

FUNCTIONS NORMALLY

"All the apparatus on board the automatic station functioned normally," Tass reported.

The radio report said the interplanetary station—called Moon-4—was shot from an orbiting space platform.

The use of such unmanned devices is a preliminary to attempts to land men on the moon, a goal of both Soviet and United States Governments.

The Chief of the U.S. space agency, James E. Webb, has estimated at something under $20 billion the cost of landing the first Americans on the moon by 1970.

RESEARCH DEVICES

The American National Aeronautics and Space Administration is promoting a surveyor project which would soft-land instrument packages on the moon, to include some shots which would orbit that planet and not land.

The Russian device appeared to have a research mission of this type.

"The observation of the flight of the station, the determination of the parameters of its trajectory, the reception of scientific information are carried out by a special measuring complex on the territory of the Soviet Union," Tass said.

It gave the moon probe's last position as over the Yellow Sea.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to proceed. When I reach the Committee on Science and Astronautics I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the article in its entirety in the RECORD. This is insert No. 1.

The Speaker and others on this side of the aisle have been asking for a bill of particulars every day since this statement was made. But all we have gotten have been more unsubstantiated claims that the budget can be cut up to $15 billion. We have seen a vague letter from former President Eisenhower encouraging the budget cutters, but we have received no bill of particulars.

It would seem that a study group that includes senior Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations could produce such a bill—particularly after all the ballyhoo that has accompanied its operations.

The truth is that the only way a $15 billion cut can be made is to cut into the real muscle of indispensable functions of Government.

Using the total 1964 budget as a base, it is obvious that interest costs totaling $10.1 billion cannot be reduced.

It can also be assumed that a reduction of this size involves elimination of the new programs proposed by the President, which, except for military pay increases, total $1.8 billion in 1964.

And therefore the remaining $96 billion budget requests would have to be cut by $13.2 billion.

Faced with prolonged silence, we have been compelled—in the public interest—to make our own analysis of precisely how the Republicans would propose to cut the $13.2 billion. We have been forced to do this because there has been not even one statement explaining how a $15 billion cut would affect our space program, our defense program, our domestic programs.

Incidentally, the man upon whom the Republicans are reportedly relying for advice in their budget cutting, the gentleman who served as a budget director during the Eisenhower administration, Maurice Stans, is certainly well versed in Republican finances. He saw a highly publicized $500 million anticipated surplus in 1959 become a $12.5 billion deficit.

We have carefully analyzed the budget.

Working along guidelines discussed with the fiscal experts, we have apportioned the $15 billion reduction on an equitable basis between the departments, the new and continuing programs, and functions. At this point, I insert into the record material describing exactly how we arrived at our equitable apportionment. This is insert No. 2, insert No. 2 having been discarded.

We have asked for details because the American people want to know just what services the Republicans want to curtail. They want to know just what functions the Republicans intend to wipe out. They want to know just what new programs the Republicans would eliminate.

But no news has been forthcoming.

There have been some concrete indications by Republican leaders as to just where they intend to apply the knife, and we have considered those indications in making our analysis.

For instance, it is clear that they intend to slash deeply, or eliminate entirely, programs that are keyed to the welfare of the American people. Most of us on this side of the aisle favor the youth employment bill and the Youth Conservation Corps, most of our friends across the aisle are opposed.

I have been told that one distinguished Republican leader called the Youth Conservation Corps a—and I quote—a "Youth Waste Corps" unquote.

It is clear from the record the Republicans intend to eliminate or cut down programs vitally needed by millions of Americans—programs which have been supported by Democratic administrations and Democratic Congresses for more than a score of years.

They refuse to face the problems that beset us today.

They refuse to admit the 20th century is here.

They want to turn the clock back.

Like an ostrich, they stick their heads in the sands, oblivious to the problems that swirl around their feet.

They would ignore the millions of older people who live in constant dread of disastrous hospital bills. They scream "socialized medicine" when anyone attempts to help these older people.

They ignore the millions of children who grub out inferior educations in overcrowded classrooms. They scream federal control when we attempt to help these children.

They ignore the millions of young people who need guidance, employment, and training. They ridicule efforts to help our youth by saying we want to send them off into the woods to play.

They ignore the fact that millions of Americans need more doctors and dentists in their communities. The village council is working on that problem, they say.

Now let us consider the careful analysis we have made.

Exactly what will it mean to make a $15 billion cut in the budget?

If our friends across the aisle are really sincere in what they say they intend to do they will have to take this course. Aside from new programs and interest charges, they must cut: $7,756 billion in the area of national defense; $620 million in the area of international affairs and finance; $784 million allocated for space research and technology; $987 million allocated for our agricultural programs and resources; $357 million for preservation and development of our natural resources; $424 million allocated to commerce and transportation functions; $69 million for housing and community development; $242 million for education; $796 million for health, labor, and welfare; $768 million for veterans benefits and services; $312 million for General Government; $28 million allowed for pay adjustment; and $34 million for contingencies.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Seven hundred million dollars taken out of the space program is going to delay the goal that has been set for that program for many years in the future. It is interesting to note that the gentleman who made this statement, a former President of the United States, speaks about this spongy program, but he had some spongy talk during his own administration.

You will remember after Sputnik was put up that startled the world, Engine Charlie said that he could see no value in putting a basketball into the sky. But basketballs in the sky will represent a new system of communication worldwide, a new system of weather announcement that will bring credit to the whole program. If we want to retard the program, this is the way to do it.

We were shocked when the Russians orbited two astronauts and showed the capability of bringing these two people within 2 miles of one another, one being orbited some 24 hours after the other. When this capability was shown, we were shocked, just as we were shocked when Sputnik went up.

The future of this country lies in its science and technology. Going to the moon is part of the full scheme. It is the techniques that are developed there which will serve the whole program, and having established a goal, if we are to keep that goal we are going to need the space money that has been allotted.

And I would like to point out the international prestige that goes with that. International prestige at this time is important.

Who was sent to Argentina? The Vostok capsule and the Russian cosmonauts. Now they send them around the world, to China, to build up the prestige that they need in these countries. And, I am sure if any of you followed closely the triumphal trip that Colonel Glenn made into Africa and other places where they lined up to see him and to see his capsule, you would appreciate this value to us.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The distinguished chairman of the committee is making a most important statement. He talks about prestige. I would like to ask the gentleman what in his opinion would be the effect on, No. 1, our own country and, No. 2, upon world affairs if the Russians succeeded in reaching the moon and, for that matter, if they put a planet in outer space before we do?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think there would be any question about it, just as Sputnik was the thing that first revitalized them; that it would revitalize their position and reestablish their position in many parts of the world, particularly among the new emerging nations, and it would be a great setback for this country if that thing happened.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman think that Mr. Maurice Stans would then congratulate the leadership in this body in reducing the budget so that this would put the Russians on the moon sooner?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not know what he would do, but I am conscious of the fact that this program has the support of the American people. I am not conscious of anyone who during the last campaign advocated slicing the space budget lost out, but I know of at least one man who voted against it, for reasons that only he knows, that is no longer a Member of this body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlemen for his contribution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes; I must yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Apparently there is quite a discussion going on here about the budget, and we had a little action on the budget today which was, to me, highly satisfactory. As I indicated earlier, we accomplished a real substantial reduction by a couple of amendments that were adopted here with substantial Republican support. The savings that are now involved in this first appropriation bill come right up to the target we had set with respect to this bill.

I understand some references have been made to a letter addressed to me by former President Eisenhower. I do not care how much you undertake to belittle his advice to the American people, but believe me that advice will be listened to. Now, beyond that I shall not undertake to reply in detail to some of the things that have been said. I just hope the gentleman from Oklahoma, my counterpart on the majority side, whom I have the highest respect and admiration for, will agree with me that after we have a chance to look at the Congressional Record and see just what has been said here, why, possibly some of us will have something to say a little further.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to respond to the distinguished minority leader by saying that I think it is the duty of the Congress to survey every item and to scrutinize every item in the budget and make cuts where practical. We are trying to analyze the results of a cut across the board based on some of the figures that have appeared in newspapers and apparently have been given out by members of the so-called task force.

May I say that no one holds the distinguished minority leader in higher esteem than I. With reference to his last statement, I might say, however, that all we say here will be available in the Record for the inspection and scrutiny of all who want to read it, and we would like to see the bill of particulars made equally available to us.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman that the bill of particulars is right in that large envelope. The gentleman would undoubtedly be very happy if the gentleman could have a real good look at that. But I say right now that the gentleman is not about to. I said earlier today in the debate that we have a bill of particulars that has been looked over by conscientious Members of this body and by able people throughout this country who stand for what we know the majority of the people of this country want, which is to do away with deficit spending. If we are going to pursue that——

Mr. ALBERT. If I may respond further, I think a matter as important as the budget of the United States, is important enough that any suggestions relating to it should be made a matter of public record at the earliest posible date so that all those who are interested in making a contribution with respect to it will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I have no intention of belittling General Eisenhower. The letter to which I referred was given wide distribution by the distinguished minority leader. I first saw it in the discussion that the minority leader, the majority leader, and myself participated in last Friday. But this letter makes serious charges. A portion of the second paragraph of the Eisenhower letter reads as follows:

> Moreover, I am particularly concerned in this situation for our children. If we irresponsibly keep on passing them our bills they will inherit not a free country with bright opportunities, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos.

We would be less than responsible if we did not reply to that kind of language. Nobody is belittling the former President. We are simply presenting the point of view of the administration in power which has responsibility for the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the entire letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter follows:

(Text of a letter from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in response to a letter[1] from Representative Charles A. Halleck. Mr. Eisenhower's letter was made public by Mr. Halleck following a meeting of the Republican Committee on Budget Reduction headed by Representative Frank Bow of Ohio.)

Palm Desert, Calif.,
March 26, 1963.

Dear Charlie: Replying to your letter, I start by stating my conviction that if the Government is to accept deliberately a massive deficit, and then simultaneously embark upon lavish new spending and a huge tax cut, the Nation is headed for trouble. If we do this we will convict ourselves of fiscal recklessness and a failure to heed the plain lessons of history.

Moreover, I am particularly concerned, in this situation, for our children. If we irresponsibly keep on passing them our bills, they will inherit, not a free country with bright opportunities, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos. Our youngsters have the right to expect more from us than a confession of our unreadiness or inability to pay for the things we demand from our government.

Of course, there is no compulsion upon us to be so foolish. I believe the new spending programs in the pending budget can be drastically reduced without hurting a single essential function and still leave the level of Federal operations billions higher than I thought necessary only 2 years ago.

My last budget—for fiscal 1962—called for authority to spend $81 billion. The 1964 budget before you asks for $108 billion. Such a pyramiding of programs will inevitably create higher and higher spending in coming years and more and more difficulty in ever bringing our finances into balance. If this $27 billion increase were cut in half, we would still have the fastest growing budget we have ever had in peacetime. Cuts of that magnitude would seem to be both reasonable and desirable, if only we will keep in mind the adverse consequences of failing to make them.

---

[1] Text of Halleck letter to General Eisenhower, March 25, 1963:

"As you undoubtedly are aware, there is a great deal of concern here in the Congress on the part of both Democrats and Republicans about the spending proposals in the President's budget.

"Having in mind your vast experience both as a military leader and as our Nation's Chief Executive and realizing your continuing interest in the affairs of government, many of us feel that an expression of your views on this matter would be most helpful."

Take defense—up $10 billion in 2 years. In my view, it is almost incredible to say this program cannot be safely pared. The defense budget I left behind provided amply for our security. Even allowing for costly developments since then, I have no doubt that the enormous defense sums can well stand a judicious and sizable pruning.

The space program, in my opinion, is downright spongy. This is an area where we particularly need to demonstrate some commonsense. Specifically, I have never believed that a spectacular dash to the moon, vastly deepening our debt, is worth the added tax burden it will eventually impose upon our citizens. This result should be achieved as a natural outgrowth of demonstrably valuable space operations. But having made this into a crash program, we are unavoidably wasting enormous sums. I suggest that our enthusiasm here be tempered in the interest of fiscal soundness.

I am sure there are many other areas in the voluminous budget where substantial economies can be made, to the great benefit of the Nation.

May I stress this point: there is not a trace of partisanship in the views here expressed. Responsible government is not a partisan issue. Leading citizens, in both parties in and out of government, have most emphatically stated that they share similar convictions. Among these are my last two Budget Directors, whom I asked to appraise the pending programs, because I am not now in a position to specify the detailed reductions that can be made. They believe that a cut of $10 or $12 billion in spending authority would be practicable, without injuring any necessary activity. I agree with them that, at the very least, major surgery on the proposed programs, old and new, is a necessary accompaniment to a cut in taxes.

My hope is that our countrymen will grow indignant enough over these dangers to our country's future to make their views vigorously known to you gentlemen in the Congress. If this does come to pass, then we will face the happy prospect of reducing spending, reducing taxes, and looking after our children's tomorrow all at the same time.

With warm personal regard,
As ever,
Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not mean to say that you were belittling the former President of the United States. I do not think I used that word.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, you did, I hate to say.

Mr. HALLECK. If I did, I am going to stand on it. But beyond that, as I said, I do not think General Eisenhower—former President Eisenhower—needs too much defense at my hands, although I am willing to take on that defense at any time. I am going to see to it tomorrow that his letter goes in the Congressional Record, whether you put it in piecemeal or not. I do not know.

Mr. BOGGS. I have already put it in.

Mr. HALLECK. Have you put it in the Congressional Record?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That is very good, then, because I had planned to do that today in connection with the bill which we had under consideration. But I thought possibly it might be considered too partisan. So I refrained from putting it in the Record. But if you put it in, then all I can say is I commend you for putting it in.

May I say further, and then I shall discontinue my part of this discussion, because after all, as I said earlier, this is not the time to undertake to carry on this debate from our side, and that we will in due time have some further things to say about this matter of excessive spending in the budget; may I say I am absolutely sure that those of us who are trying to cut out excessive wasteful spending are supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the overwhelming majority of the American people are for cutting out wasteful spending. But our analysis of this matter indicates that if the kinds of cuts that have been publicized are made we are going to cut out some spending that I am sure the American people think is very desirable.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. This is not a question of personalities insofar as General Eisenhower is concerned. I think General Eisenhower is a fine gentleman, and I like him very much. I supported President Eisenhower when he was President oftentimes more than the members of his own party, both in committee and on the floor of the House. So I am not making any attack on General Eisenhower. I am dealing with this letter which he wrote, which I consider a vague document which says nothing. And also I am surprised that the minority leader would have what he calls a bill of particulars which he will not reveal for the benefit of the American people. If he has a bill of particulars I think it is important that the American people know what it is.

Just one other point, because I think what we are doing here is very important in making this record. Let us talk about this business of what we have left our children and what we are going to leave our children. Aside from the $180 billion increased expenditures under the Eisenhower administration, and the more than $20 billion they added to the national debt, in 1958 we had a deficit in our balance of payments of $3.5 billion. In 1959 it was $3.7 billion. In 1960 it was $3.9 billion. In 1961 it was $2.5 billion and in 1962 it was down to $1.9 billion.

This affects the flow of gold from the United States of America and it has a vital aspect in our so-called fiscal responsibility and the fiscal stability of our Government. I do not think this is something that the former President can be particularly proud of.

In addition to that he talks about our children, and about a dollar that is worthless. We have had more price stability in the last year than we have had at any time in the recent past. I think it is probably impossible to have total price stability in a growing country. I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is very knowledgeable on this subject; we serve together. But here are the figures. This is the wholesale price index.

Mr. CURTIS. How about taking the Consumer Price Index? That is what the people have to pay.

Mr. BOGGS. U.S. wholesale and consumer prices have remained more stable in the last 2 years than those of any other major industrial country on earth, except Canada.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the figures will show that that is not a true statement. The President used that, I might say, last year in his TV address to the Nation. I took the floor of the House to put the correct figures in. I think that we should have the correct figures from the Consumer Price Index. Then anyone can see that that is not a true statement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, let us consider some of these figures in more detail.

First, the $7.7 billion reduction in defense expenditures.

There would be an immediate loss of three Army Reserve divisions. There would be a real reduction in the Army's ability to provide modern equipment for the remaining forces.

The Nation's ability to react to such crises as the Cuban threat would be sharply reduced. The general capability of the United States to project its power quickly into strategic situations around the world would be reduced.

The Navy's ability to wage antisubmarine warfare would be crippled—as would its capability of maintaining the Polaris submarine force at a level needed to accomplish its deterrent purpose.

The shipbuilding and ship conversion program would be reduced by one-fourth.

There would be a steep reduction in aircraft procurement for the Navy.

The readiness of the fleet would be impaired.

Our Strategic Air Force would be cut back.

The Minuteman missile force would face curtailment at a time when the Soviet Union is continuing to build its intercontinental ballistic missile force.

Nine squadrons in our Continental Defense Command would be eliminated, reducing our capability in that area.

Gaps would be created in our perimeter defense.

Tactical Air Force squadrons would be reduced as would our airlift squadrons.

This is a black picture.

This is a gamble with the future of America I am not prepared to take.

We would be handing the Soviet Union a deck stacked against us in any future encounter.

In short, we would be a weakened nation.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] has discussed the effect of a cut of $784 million in the space program. Under leave previously obtained I shall merely insert my remarks on that particular point.

The Republican slash would reduce our $5.7 billion space budget by $784 million.

Inevitably, a cut this size would have to hit our effort to be the first nation to land on the moon.

The reason is simply that the biggest chunks of our space budget are for projects such the the three-man Apollo spacecraft which would make the landing, and for advanced boosters like Saturn V, which will send Apollo toward the moon.

A total of $1.2 billion has been budgeted for Apollo, and $733 million for Saturn, our workhorse in space.

No money could be cut from Project Mercury, which has already put three Americans into orbit, because that effort is nearing completion. And the Gemini project's two-man space efforts are fully planned already, so massive cuts cannot be made there.

The kind of money they are talking about would have to come from Apollo and Saturn V. There is no other possibility.

In all, the Republican cuts would postpone until some time in the 1970's our hopes for landing a man on the moon, and would destroy America's chances of being first in space.

I now insert into the Record a more specific description of the harm that the budget cutters would do to the space program. This is insert No. 4.

Now let us examine another area where the Republican ax would cut deeply: natural resources.

The reduction there would be $357 million.

The Corps of Engineers would sustain a $149 million slash.

This is an operation dear to the hearts of all Congressmen, as can be seen by the record.

Construction projects totaling $23.7 million would be eliminated. These include 32 major projects and 38 small projects.

Another 44 major projects—scheduled for construction this year—would be deleted, saving an estimated $97 million.

And contract awards on some projects already underway would be held up, saving another $28 million.

I remind the House that these Republican savers would not only kill vital projects, but for every $30,000 they chop from the Corps of Engineers budget, our calculations show that they will place one more American on the unemployed list—a list that is a costly moral and financial burden for this Nation.

A more detailed summary of this phase is now inserted into the Record. This is insert No. 5.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I want to commend the gentleman for pointing out that these cuts are cuts in really the muscle or indispensable functions of government. The gentleman would, of course, support cuts in expenditures that were not necessary, of the type the Secretary of Defense described in his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee. He described how he had shaved the defense budget by some $13 billion by improved procedures, how he proposed to save up to $3.4 billion in the future in changes in procedure, in procurement, in further reliance on competitive bids as composed to cost-plus contracts. As a member on the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I am personally very interested in the efficiencies proposed by the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. He has made a real contribution. Whenever savings can be made that will not cut into the muscle of Government operations of course we are all for them.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I with several other members of that committee have been working long and hard to try to bring some appropriation bills out here that we think will cut to the bone; but this is what we run into.

Item after item after item comes in from these various agencies increasing this year's budget over last year as the result of acts of this Congress. These are new services required of these agencies, and they bring us the bill for them. When I check back on the record I find that most of the items we are forced to add to the appropriation bills this year passed unanimously.

Who is trying to kid the American people? Are these folks who are trying to make these cuts in the budget really sincere? If they are, why were they not around here when some of these bills that force us to raise the budget passed the House without opposition? The way it figures out, because of the acts of the last Congress we are going to have to increase this year's budget by $2.5 billion, just to break even this year with what we did last year, and that takes no account of the increase in the mail volume and other things over which the Government has no control.

It seems to me that when a charge is made here that this increase is irresponsible it is a reflection on the Committee on Appropriations. Having worked on that committee for several years, I know of no group in or out of Congress more responsible for bringing responsible bills before the Congress than that committee. I think they are the most expert of all. I fail to see how we can pass bill after bill after bill requiring extra costs to the Government, without any opposition, and then expect appropriation bills to come in cut below what they were the year before. I think that is so foolish, such a fake idea, that there is going to be a lot of budget cutting when it is impossible to do it, that I think that idea is not going to take with the American people. When you analyze the budget and the acts of the Congress that require these expenditures, you will find that 75 percent of them are not for the committee to cut. We are all for economy, but the most foolish economy is to be penny wise and pound foolish. I hope this House does not do anything like that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished majority leader for having brought this entire subject of the budget into such clear and sharp focus.

Most of us would like nothing better than to be able somehow to reduce the cost of government dramatically if it were possible to do so without causing truly essential Government services to suffer.

Unfortunately, it is not easy. In fact, really spectacular reductions in the operating expenses of our Government could be achieved only at the price of rather severe curtailments in our military strength. This is true because approximately 80 percent of our entire Federal budget goes in one way and another to pay for past wars and to maintain our readiness in the hope that, by being prepared, we can prevent a future war.

Only about 20 cents of the Federal tax dollar remains to perform the entire broad spectrum of wholly nonmilitary Federal activities. This is the first thing we must recognize when we begin to sharpen our budget-cutting scissors.

Certainly it is the responsibility of Congress to eliminate every vestige of waste or extravagance that can be found. Clearly we have the duty to root out as ruthlessly as possible any duplication, overlapping, or inefficiency that can be found.

This we have been doing and will, I am sure, continue to do.

A few years ago, I joined with other Members in the sponsorship of several proposals embodying major recommendations of the Hoover Commission. A number of these bills passed, and we are enjoying today the rather substantial economies they made possible.

The military has made great strides in the consolidation of warehousing space and hundreds of millions have been saved. Disposal of surplus commodities has been toughened up and military procurement practices have been centralized and unified at considerable savings.

Each year since I have been in Congress, the lawmaking branch in its appropriations process has made substantial cuts in certain Presidential budget requests. This has been true in both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Yet the myth persists that a great, uncontrollable orgy of waste is going on. Some people appear to believe that Congress should approach the delicate and difficult and complex business of Federal appropriations with an indiscriminate meat ax rather than with a surgeon's instrument.

Broad and generalized charges are repeated, but the facts do not substantiate them. One such charge has been that our Government is dashing headlong into what its critics call a welfare state. Yet the facts do not bear this out. As a proportion of the Federal budget, welfare type expenditures have declined markedly over the past generation. Just 25 years ago, welfare programs of various types accounted for 44 percent of our total Federal budget. Today, they account for only some 6 or 7 percent.

Another charge has been that the Government is developing what the critics call a vast horde of Federal bureaucrats. Once again, the facts do not support the allegation. In 1946, out of every 1,000 American citizens 19 were civilian employees of the Federal Government. Today, the ratio has been reduced to 13 out of every 1,000. And of this 13, 6 are civilian employees of our armed services.

Unquestionably the basic underlying reason for the size of our Federal budget is the world in which we live. Whether we like it or not, the mantle of world leadership has fallen to our shoulders. For this, we pay a price. It is basically the price of providing the shield and the armor of freedom itself.

Out of each Federal tax dollar, about 61 cents go for our current military effort and for our space effort. We do this because we know that we live in a day when only the strong can stay free.

The next largest single item in the budget is the fixed interest charge on the national debt which claims approximately 11 cents of each Federal tax dollar. Most of this debt, of course, was accumulated during World War II.

A third big item is the veterans program in all its facets, which represents some 6 cents of the tax dollar for those services to widows and orphans, veterans' hospitals, and similar programs by which a grateful Nation has attempted to demonstrate that it appreciates the sacrifices of those who gave of their wholeness in defense of our country.

Add these three together, and the conclusion is unmistakable. War and the continuing competition with world communism account for the lion's share of our Federal outlays. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is working valiantly to provide a lean, hard-hitting Defense Establishment. He has made remarkable strides in trimming away all the fat that he can find. Yet there is a limit to what can be done in this line while still upholding our military responsibilities. No thinking person wants the Congress to take unnecessary chances with our military strength. We would be derelict in our duty indeed were we to place this land of ours at the mercy of those who have no mercy.

Let us by all means eliminate every item of waste that can be found. But let us not be stampeded into rash actions. Let us proceed in a statesmanlike fashion. Let us keep this matter in its rightful perspective. For it would avail us nothing if we were to save even several billion dollars and let the cause of freedom fail.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement. It is in line with the point I am trying to make.

We have heard these statements about the possibility of cutting out $13 billion. Analyze it any way you wish, we cannot do it without hurting national defense and other programs which serve the American people which we cannot afford to cut out.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished majority leader. The information he brings us is particularly helpful.

I am sure the membership on the majority side is as interested in economy as is any member of the minority. I noticed with some sadness a statement recently in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Economy, Anyone?" And it went on to say:

"Some budget cutters in Congress seek more funds for pet projects."

I noticed with particular interest this particular comment in the Wall Street Journal. They pointed out a simple fact that should be printed with this story. The opening paragraph of this story reads as follows:

> An Indiana Congressman pressures a committee of the House to add $25 million to the budget to help build a deepwater port in his district.

A Virginia lawmaker introduces legislation for a $39 million James Madison memorial building here in the Nation's Capital. Some Virginia economizer is mentioned as seeking a $50 million Patent Office in his own district.

The whole text of this seems to support the idea that these economizers rush to the floor and support economy in the other fellow's district, but even the loudest criers for economy still push for more spending for their own districts, States, or special interests.

One of the economizers from Indiana seeks $25 million of the taxpayers' money for a deepwater port in his district that serves no useful purpose in northern Indiana because Chicago and a number of other ports can adequately take care of the need. This is not economy.

I am deeply saddened that some of my Indiana colleagues on the minority side are not present for I would like to enter into a colloquy with them about this project.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. In connection with these documents that have been mentioned and with special reference to the letter which the minority leader has given such emphasis—the letter from the former President of the United States—some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party, some who have held office in the Republican Party, one of whom was Republican National Committee chairman, have said that these estimates of how much the budget might be cut were way out of line. As a matter of fact, his estimate was about $3 billion, as a practical matter. So it is quite evident that even within the Republican Party they know that this projected cut of $13 billion is wholly unrealistic and actually threatens the security of the United States.

I am glad to see that some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party are in disagreement with the former President.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his statement; and now I would like to continue.

Now let us turn to the Department of the Interior, another operation in which many of us are vitally interested. An estimated $153 million must be cut from that budget if the Republican's $15 billion goal is to be reached—far more than even the deep cuts sought by the appropriations committee last week.

A total of 26,735 man-years of employment would be lost. The budget of the Bureau of Land Management would be reduced by $4.4 million; the National Park Service, by $48.4 million; the Bureau of Reclamation by $27.5 million; the Bureau of Indian Affairs by $34.9 million—and the slashes go down into the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife; the Bonneville Power Administration; and the Southwestern Power Administration.

The Bureau of Land Management would be compelled to kill construction programs planned in a number of States—including Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming.

The National Park Service would be forced to take similar steps. Work planned in parks in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands—and other States—work planned in those States would be halted by the Republican budget busters.

The same is true for the other bureaus in the Department of the Interior.

A more detailed listing is now inserted in the Record. This is insert No. 6.

The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture would have its effectiveness drastically reduced. A detailed breakdown of the effects of the $45 million cut there is now placed in the Record. This is insert No. 7.

Now let us look at the rest of Agriculture.

A 15-percent budget cut must come under the Republican plan.

A total of $5.7 billion of the $7.2 billion agricultural budget request for 1964 must be used for previous commitments.

This leaves only $1.5 billion from which to make the proposed Republican cuts.

Thus, an overall 15-percent cut for the Department as a whole would leave only $511 million for the following programs:

Research, education, soil and water conservation, meat and poultry inspection, plant and animal disease and pest control, marketing services, food distribution, crop insurance, REA loans, and flood protection.

Such a severe cut would mean closing down most research laboratories and disbanding their highly trained staffs.

It would mean cutting Federal support for the Cooperative Extension Services by nearly $1 million a State and firing an average of 700 extension workers in each State, or one or more in each county in the Nation.

It would mean eliminating 38 million acres of soil surveys, about two man-years of technical assistance of each of the 2,900 soil conservation districts, and substantially slowing down 11 major flood prevention projects.

And it would mean:

Eliminating or drastically reducing the 700 crop and livestock estimate reports essential for the computation of parity prices.

Shutting down several hundred Federal meat and poultry inspection houses.

Eliminating electric service to 76,000 new rural customers and new or improved service to 99,000 rural subscribers.

Eliminating crop insurance programs from 700 counties and depriving more than a quarter of a million farmers of crop insurance protection for which they are willing to pay.

Stopping work in the eradication of plant and animal diseases and pest control, such as brucellosis, tuberculosis, hog cholera, cattle tick, Japanese beetle and sweet potato weevil to name a few.

Reducing by $90 million the amount of food distributed through the States to needy persons, including 10 million schoolchildren and more than 5 million persons in institutions and homes.

Reducing the food stamp program assistance by $25 million—enough to assist 200,000 needy persons in 23 economically depressed areas.

Curtailing watershed projects in Michigan and many other States.

At this point, I place insert No. 7 into the RECORD, giving an itemized description of the harm budget cutters would do to watershed and flood control projects.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I know that the gentleman is going to insert in the RECORD insertion 5 which details some of the public works projects affected by this cut.

I recall coming here in the 83d Congress. For the first 2 years I sat on the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. The Public Works Committee at that time was chairmaned by a member of the opposition party. I recall the arguments used in those days about this is no time to have any new starts because we were in the Korean war, and we should not get into these particular projects at that time.

The Congress went along. I joined the Committee on Appropriations 2 years later, and we did start some new projects. I think it is pennywise and pound foolish to have this kind of a program, a program which says we ought to have no new starts because this is not the time to do it. Savage waters and floods are not the respecter of time at all. So we held off building public works projects. I am not talking about deepening harbors, rivers, and the channels of some rivers around the country. I am talking about strictly flood control projects.

So we held off. We did not build the projects. But the storms came. They came in 1955, they came a couple of years thereafter. We lost lives, we lost property, and I say any bill of particulars which details a $145 million slash in the Engineers' budget is risking lives and the protection of property.

There are listed in the gentleman's insertion over 125 projects which will be stopped, either during construction or no new plants.

I think the membership of this House ought to go slow in this particular area. There are many other areas, too, with which I am concerned, the area with respect to the accelerated public works program, the Housing Home Agency programs. I sit on the subcommittee that makes money available to the agency, and I sit on the committee that makes available money for the Federal Aviation Agency. I am happy to see the distinguished and great chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sitting here. The bill of particulars will cut $111 million from this agency. Detailed for expenditure in fiscal 1964 is $755 million for the Federal Aviation Agency. Of that figure $127 million goes toward facilities and equipment. That is, the kind of things that make air traffic safe in the United States. When you start to cut these you get into an area where I think you endanger the lives and property of people who fly on these planes and the people who live underneath them.

I think this dialogue is good, not for the purpose of getting into an argument with the party of opposition but only for the purpose of letting the people of America know that there are areas detailed by the opposition that are dangerous areas in which to cut.

I hope that the membership of the House will read this dialogue and the insertions that the distinguished majority leader will put in here in detail, showing the areas that will be cut if we would follow the advice of the distinguished former President of the United States and also some of those who serve in this body.

I think it is a record that the people of this Nation ought to read, and the membership of this House ought to read.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very splendid contribution to this discussion.

And now let us consider the $796 million reduction in the area of health, labor, and welfare.

A total of $697 million would be chopped out of the budget of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

The Food and Drug Administration would have its capacity to protect consumers reduced sharply. Its ability to implement and enforce the new drug safeguards would be hit a body blow.

The Republican ax would drop on the Nation's schoolchildren.

Literally millions of youngsters would be deprived of school lunch and milk programs.

By whacking $39 million out of the $284 million of new authority requested for these programs, we would be forced to cut them by 14 percent.

The results:

There will be 381 million fewer meals served to schoolchildren.

There will be 417 million fewer half-pints of milk distributed.

The lunch program will drop 2.2 million children, an average of 40,000 per State.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to particularly commend the gentleman for his comments on this point. There are three areas that the gentleman comments on which particularly deserve attention. The first is the item which the gentleman discussed in regard to the proposal of our Republican brothers to reduce the food stamp program which would be required by the projected cuts and eliminate some 200,000 needy persons in 23 economically depressed areas. This would be a cruelty and a hardship on these people of almost unbelievable dimensions and deprive these people in a very real sense of a good, wholesome, and stable diet. More than this, it would impose a terrific additional servitude on the welfare payments of these communities which are forced to bear the load and the hardship which these agencies have to carry. Now, over and above this is another item of particular importance, and that is, from what our Republican brothers have indicated, it becomes plain that there would be a reduction, according to their plans, in the force of the Food and Drug Administration to protect the consumers. This is a particularly sensitive area. During the last session of the Congress we passed legislation which imposed a tremendous responsibility on the Food and Drug Administration which, coupled with previous enactments dealing with food additives and with color additives and now with additional policing responsibility in the field of drugs, requires a tremendous increase in the staff of the Food and Drug Administration to provide the level of protection that is needed.

The Food and Drug Administration requires this money not only to protect the people but to give industry the kind of service it requires, to see to it that the industry has the kind of quick service and the quick clearance of these substances which enables industry to make changes and which would enable the industry to market the products at an accelerated rate, possibly new drugs, which might result in a tremendous saving of life, and to give the Food and Drug Administration the kind of staff, technically competent staff, to accept or to reject new drugs which may have side effects of the most dreadful sort upon those who would receive them. This is one of the things that was particularly obvious in the drug hearings in the Senate and in our own committee in the last session of the Congress, and that is lack of adequate personnel. The Food and Drug Administration is incapable of giving the people of this country the kind of protection they need and giving the industry the kind of service it needs unless they have adequate personnel. Over and above this, which I think is particularly important, is the direct action that the Republican projected program would have on young people. For example, it can be anticipated from their program, as the gentleman pointed out, that something like $16.9 million in cash payments to the States, an average of about $300,000 per State, would be eliminated from the school lunch program. Many of our children in this country today have no opportunity to have a good, warm lunch, sufficiently balanced and good in body except that which they receive through their school lunch program. This is something else that our Republican friends would do to us and do to the people in every part of the country in their pennywise and pound-foolish advocacy of reduction, so I particularly commend my friend for his comments today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. It is hard to have those wild statements go by unchallenged. Of course, you can dream up everything that is most attractive to the public such as the school lunch program and say that the Republicans are out to wipe it out. There is no evidence of that. There are no plans along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, and I will have my 20 minutes to respond, what we are trying to do is to hold the budget and expenditures to the level of fiscal year 1963, which reflects an increase of $18 billion in a period of 3 years in Federal expenditures, from $81 billion, as compared to an $11 billion increase in the previous 6 years. Here is what we are trying to do, and to bring out these very attractive programs you are demonstrating exactly, I might say to the majority leader, why it is necessary to keep within our own confines our itemizations, otherwise you will stir up every pressure group in the United States to try to prevent it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr . Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to point out that the cutback of funds for the food stamp program would have dreadful effects in my community. We are about to commence the program on May 1. Some 68,000 recipients of this program in my community are waiting for the benefits which are going to supplement their very low relief allocations.

Mr. Speaker, in my community as a result of the policies of the State government which is not responding to the needs of the local communities, the family allowances for relief have been cut back to 60 percent of the need. This matter of the food stamp supplementation is absolutely imperative. We are one of the new communities involved in this program. We would suffer dreadfully if it were cut back at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in order to reorient this discussion and to bring it back to the issue with which it was begun, I would like again to quote from the Washington Post, which purportedly on March 5 published the account of a Republican task force press session, and this is the quote:

> A House Republican study group announced yesterday that it has found projects costing $10 billion to $15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year.

Now, of course, that means that from $10 billion to $15 billion has got to give from somewhere in the budget. What I have been trying to do is to apply such cuts to the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I see the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in the Chamber, and I would like to say that the Federal Aviation Agency would suffer a cut of $111 million, eliminating over 1,100 operating and planned facilities required for the safety of air traffic control if a total cut of $15 billion is applied to that Agency.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to also join in complimenting our distinguished majority leader in bringing to the attention of the House this realistic discussion of this highly sensitive and what has been so well described as complicated national budget.

The gentleman mentioned something about proposed reductions in our Federal aviation program. I have not seen the bill of particulars. I do not know just what services are to be reduced. I am concerned about any attempted reduction in the total funds to the extent mentioned by our distinguished majority leader affecting this service, because I think we should remind ourselves, each one of us, that not only are the lives of millions and millions of people who utilize the commercial airlines services of this country, but it has only been 4 years ago or a little more that, in an effort to try to bring about greater safety, authority to control the military aviation program was given to the Federal Aviation Agency and a substantial part of the funds to which the gentleman refers here is made necessary because of the increased responsibility that has been shifted from our military program to the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us had better give long and careful and thoughtful consideration before we attempt to do anything that would endanger the lives of our people who are going to use these services. Whether we like it or not, they are going to use them in the future, and I for one will be watching what happens. I am confident that the Committee on Appropriations is going to take that into consideration, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts a moment ago so well expressed in his comments to the Members of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

Twelve thousand schools, child-care centers, summer camps, and other nonprofit groups will be dropped from the milk program, an average of over 250 per State.

For the benefit of our Republican colleagues, I will present the financial savings to the Federal Government.

We would save $16.9 million in cash payments to States—an average of more than $300,000 a State—on the lunch program; and $14.2 million—an average of $284,000—on the milk program. I, for one, will not look upon those savings with pride.

A $50 million reduction in the Department of Labor budget would reduce appropriations for State employment services by $25 million, thus destroying 4,800 jobs. Also, it would cut $25 million from the Manpower Development and Training Act, thus preventing 22,400 workers from getting retraining. I insert a State-by-State breakdown of these disastrous economies into the Record. This is insert No. 8.

I turn to the field of commerce and transportation, where the Republican reduction must total $424 million.

ARA was established to eliminate pockets of depression that affect 35 million people in 1,000 areas. The 15-percent reduction in the Department of Commerce budget would reduce the allocation for the Area Redevelopment Administration by $28.5 million. This would mean 10,000 fewer jobs would be created in 1964. The regions hardest hit by this job killing are listed in insert No. 9, hereby placed into the Record.

A total of $500 million needed to supplement the existing accelerated public works program would be cut. Looking at this supplemental appropriation, we see that for every million dollars deleted from this program, 1,600 man-months of employment are lost.

The $500 million would provide approximately 120,000 man-years of employment. If we turn our backs on this appropriation, we turn our backs on communities that have already drawn plans for needed public works projects. We turn our backs on the unemployed because they are concentrated in those areas.

A State-by-State list of past accelerated public works achievements is hereby inserted into the Record. This is insert No. 10.

Ship construction would be cut by $16.5 million.

A total of $37 million would be cut from the Weather Bureau, from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other agencies that provide scientific information essential to transportation—particularly aviation—and our defense and space programs. Details of this $37 million cut are listed in insert No. 11, now placed in the Record.

The budget of the Federal Aviation Agency would be cut by $111 million, eliminating over 1,100 operating and planned facilities required for the safety of air traffic.

Communities like West Chicago, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Abilene, Tex.; and Utica, N.Y., would be among the 100 American communities where airport traffic control towers would be closed out.

Seventy instrument landing systems and 50 approach light systems also would be destroyed.

Elimination of radar procedures designed to prevent midair collision would be forced.

And hundreds of communities would be deprived of Federal assistance in making airport improvements.

The aviation industry contributes nearly $12 billion annually to the gross national product. It depends upon public confidence. I now place a list of the GOP targets into the RECORD. This is insert No. 12.

And now let us talk about the Post Office Department and its modest $78 million prorated reduction.

The effect of that reduction will be felt in Grand Rapids, Mich.; in Canton, Ohio; in Rensselaer, Ind.; in Pekin, Ill.; in Nashville, Tenn.; in Chicago, in Detroit, in San Francisco, in New York City, in Boston, in Denver—in other cities and towns across the nation.

Extension of daily city delivery service to approximately 1 million new homes and small businesses which normally would receive such service would stop.

Rural delivery service would be frozen through fiscal 1964, and all Saturday rural deliveries would be stopped.

The day-to-day handling of mail in every major city in the United States would be seriously crippled due to no further purchases of all mail-handling equipment, such as postage meters, facer cancelers.

The Post Office Department's research and engineering program would be wiped out.

Let us look at another vital governmental function, one that would suffer a $50 million slash in the Republican bloodletting.

The Coast Guard would be compelled to make its reductions in its replacement budget because of fixed items in other categories.

In other words, replacement of obsolescent ships, buildings, and other facilities would be halted.

The Coast Guard's ability to perform its functions would be threatened, as indicated by insert No. 13, which I now place in the RECORD.

Another small, but vital agency is the Small Business Administration.

Its prorated share of the Republican cut would be $30 million.

Many field and regional offices would be closed. For example, offices in Maine, Virginia, and Texas would be shut down.

Its loans to small businesses would be reduced, both in size and volume. It could accept no more loan applications for fiscal year 1964. Its relationship with commercial banks would be damaged.

Insert No. 14, a list of areas that could be hit by an SBA cut, is placed into the RECORD.

The Civil Aeronautics Board would be compelled to make its $10 million slash by eliminating airline subsidies for flight frequencies, so fares would be jacked up.

Let us discuss the effect of a $55 million reduction in the housing and community development activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This would mean a one-third reduction in public facility loans, in loans for housing for the elderly, and in loans to families dislocated by Federal projects.

This would mean that 70 small communities would be deprived of financial assistance in construction of essential water and sewer systems.

It would mean that 15 projects for the elderly—with facilities for 1,650 housing units—would be deleted.

And the cut in the loans for persons displaced by urban renewal and other Federal aid projects would mean that 2,250 families could not obtain financing they need for homes. Again, there is a group that needs help the most, would be hurt the most.

Mr. Speaker, we move to another major category:

Education, which would be reduced by $242 million.

Vocational education would be cut in half.

National defense fellowships would be reduced from 1,500 to 750.

Cooperative research programs would be cut by 69 percent.

The assistance to libraries would be cut in half.

Training of teachers for the mentally retarded would be curtailed.

The slash of $81 million in the National Science Foundation would be a blow to our requirements for highly trained technical manpower.

And I want to say parenthetically here—as the President pointed out in his message to Congress on education on last January 29—that Soviet institutions of higher learning are graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as we are.

Thousands of promising students would be deprived of fellowships they need to continue their education.

Expansion and modernization of science and engineering facilities would be halted.

The training of teachers would be slowed at a time when they will be needed to meet the demands caused by the enrollment in colleges of the 1946 baby boom.

Vital research programs would be stalled.

The college housing program would be curtailed by $41 million, resulting in cancellation of 30 college housing projects. This would mean that about 8,000 students may be denied a college education because of a shortage of dormitory space.

Construction of schools for our Indian population would be hard hit. In Alaska, for example, construction of eight schools by the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be called off. Others would be blocked in Arizona.

Now for another major area: international affairs and finance. The total reduction here would be $620 million.

Of that figure, $476 million would come out of the Agency for International Development—and this is substantially more than any reasonable review of that budget would permit.

The State Department would be cut $50 million, U.S. Information Agency by $30 million, the food-for-peace program by $30 million, and the Peace Corps budget by $15 million.

Now let us examine the effect on the Veterans' Administration.

A prorated $740 million reduction in appropriations for the Veterans' Administration—its share of the proposed $15 billion reduction—would have these effects:

First. Twenty-two thousand, nine hundred and sixty-five jobs would be cut out.

Second. Many regional offices would be abolished. Divisions in others would have to be consolidated.

Third. Services would be reduced because of the reduced personnel. Work could not be processed as it should. Huge backlogs would develop.

Fourth. The loss of physicians, medical administrators, engineers, nurses, statisticians, and other professional or skilled employees would hamper present medical programs, hinder planning.

Fifth. A 50-percent decrease in the medical research program would result in dismissal of 1,500 skilled research people. Their activities include research in medicine, surgery, psychiatry, neurology, problems of the aging, and pulmonary diseases. Research would be eliminated or curtailed in cancer, arteriosclerosis, use of tranquilizers in psychiatry, coronary heart disease surgery, and the automatic processing of heart tracings.

Sixth. Eight hospitals would be closed, eliminating medical care for 30,000 patients.

Seventh. Construction of seven new hospitals with 5,260 beds would be deferred. Modernization of 15 old hospitals with 18,088 beds would be delayed, as would 41 improvement projects in 37 other hospitals. No new research facilities would be built.

Eighth. No commitments would be made to help provide loans on 19,700 homes in areas of short money supply.

Ninth. Payments to 800,000 of the Nation's pensioners with service-connected disabilities would be eliminated. Pensions to 1 million disabled veterans and 800,000 widows and orphans would be cut by $60 a year.

Tenth. An estimated 200,000 veterans would be denied admission to hospitals during the year. This load would be shifted to already overtaxed State and local hospitals.

The loss of VA employees would include these positions:

Medical administration and miscellaneous: 165 positions, including 57 construction specialists.

Medical and prosthetic research: 1,500 skilled investigators.

Medical care: 18,500 employees, including 2,200 nurses and 900 physicians.

Insert No. 15, now placed in the RECORD, provides a clear idea of the cities and towns hardest hit by curtailment of the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the excellent speech being made by the majority leader has pointed up in many, many cases the fundamental weakness in this shotgun approach which has been adopted from the other side of the aisle with regard to the proposed budget reduction.

While each and every one of us has a stake in seeing that sensible reductions are made, I think we have an equally important stake in seeing that we keep faith with the people of America in the obligations which we have undertaken. And certainly this field which has just been mentioned by the distinguished majority leader of the effect upon our Veterans' Administration program is an excellent example of this.

If we go down the line with the proposed reductions to include the Veterans' Administration program in it, if we cut off the needed new hospital facilities that must be built to meet the requirements of our veteran population, if we cut down upon the services which are essential to the veterans, to the pensioners who are dependent upon the assistance from the Government for their very livelihood, if we take these steps in the veterans program certainly we break faith with the veterans of America just as we would be breaking faith with the schools of America and with the small communities of America and with the States of America if we cut back upon programs to which this Government has become firmly committed.

The proposed $15 billion cut would require inevitably a breach of faith with the American people upon more than a score of different vital fronts in our country.

I certainly join the gentleman in the hope that we will have this so-called bill of particulars at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague for his fine contribution.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I am sure it is pretty clear from what is being said on this side that the Members here do not object to cutting the budget. What has been done with respect to the bill we had on the floor today indicates that. Here is the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations where the budget was cut by the committee some 9 percent. I am certain the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill that will be here on Thursday will contain not a light cut but a substantial reduction. I am sure this will hold true in a number of areas.

Those of us who sit on the Committee on Appropriations are screening all of the requests of the various agencies. There is not a question about the fact that we will bring bills to this floor here that will have substantial cuts. But when they talk about a $10- to $15-billion cut, then they get up to the stratosphere. This is absolutely unreasonable. This is fiscal irresponsibility.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] a moment ago pointed to the cut in the Veterans' Administration budget. The budget for the Veterans' Administration this year amounts to about $5.3 billion. At least two-thirds of that budget is composed of fixed charges, compensations and pensions, the money that we pay to educate the GI's. All of this is occasioned by legislation passed almost unanimously by this House. When you cut $740 million out of this budget you are really hurting this agency.

The high in employment in the Veterans' Administration occurred in 1946 when the Veterans' Administration reported 226,000 employees. This year, that figure has been reduced substantially. The Veterans' Administration in 1963 reported total employment of 173,000. I think this is good. This is action by both sides of the aisle. I have no quarrel with that. I say it is good. But I do say that those who believe this budget can be cut from $10 to $15 billion place a sense of irresponsibility on the Members who serve on the Committee on Appropriations. I think that committee has shown it does a good job wehn the job has to be done. The bills brought to this floor by the subcommittees and the full Committee on Appropriations will show that there is real responsibility on the part of the Members who serve on that committee, both on this side and the other side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The point I want to make, and I think the gentleman has made it clearly, is that if you make this 10-percent cut, which would involve not adding any new obligational authority, then, if you cut 10 percent from a $108-billion budget you have a cut of from $10 to $15 billion. Let the Appropriations Committee continue as it did today and drop it out, and we have our answer.

Mr. BOLAND. The problem is, and I think the gentleman from Missouri recognizes it, is that you cannot go into a meat-ax approach by just cutting 10 percent. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and all Members who sit in this Chamber will cut where the cuts ought to come. But when you say willy-nilly we are going to cut 10 percent, this is a bad approach. I think you have to place some faith in the members of the Committee on Appropriations and you have to trust their judgment. This will happen in connection with all of the bills that will be brought to the floor, but this committee is not going to sit down and say, "We will knock 10 percent off here and 10 percent off there and 10 percent off the total amount." You just cannot do it. That is fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with that. All I am pointing out is that the Committee on Appropriations did cut this 10 percent, and if we project it across the $108 billion request for new obligational authority you have your $11 billion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, on that point, and I think it is highly important, the second appropriation bill, which has just been reported and is being scheduled for consideration Thursday, contains a reduction of only 2 or 3 percent.

That total would be a fraction of 1 percent of the total Federal budget.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. This is the very essence of what we are talking about. With reference to this idea of an across-the-board cut, you have to start off by admitting that you cannot cut the interest on the national debt. You cannot cut it 10 percent. You cannot cut it 5 percent. You cannot cut it 1 percent. You cannot cut it at all.

Now if you apply 10 percent to the Defense Establishment, 10 percent of $55 billion would be $5½ billion. That would be sheer folly.

The gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, just talked about using the meatax on agencies like the Federal Aviation Agency which would mean cutting out the aviation control towers and radar equipment and the other things that make it possible for you to fly safely.

So I predict—and I saw the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] with a brown envelope under his arm, and I am sorry he is not here—he talked about a bill of particulars, which was a great secret. We counted on a bill of particulars from the Republicans. But it is going to be just like the gentleman in the other body pointed out this morning, the recommendation of our distinguished former President Eisenhower is drastic and is not responsive to the conditions of the day.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the first time that a woman ever had any difficulty in getting the last word on something.

I would like to associate myself with Congressman BOGGS, that the Committee on Appropriations worked very hard to cut items. More than 50 people appeared in public hearings. Fifty members of the public, and not one person appearing offered any cuts nor did they offer any opportunity to make cuts nor did they show any desire for cuts. And when certain items were not included in the appropriation bill, they informed various of us Members that they were going over to the other body to have them put in over there. I may say that these people who want these research facilities and so on added to the bill are not Democrats. We would enjoy having them, but we know that there are certain limitations.

I do want to point out one thing. Mr. BOLAND has discussed the harbors and flood control programs. I want to say that on the west coast, we face the problem of keeping our trade facilities always in order. Many of us last year were able to support a trade bill because a great part of our district is based on trade. Of course, it is necessary to carry on that trade through the ever-protective work on the harbors and rivers, particularly in the channel deepening programs. In my own district and in Mrs. Green's district and in the rest of Oregon, and in the upper river it is necessary to have channel deepening in order to bring in any shipping whatsoever. If you curtail that shipping, you are curtailing the economy of our section of the country, and you will be putting more people out of work than are out of work at the present time. So I am very happy, may I say to the distinguished majority leader, that you are calling these facts to our attention today. I do not think the people in the West would for a moment want to go along on any program that would prevent the deepening of the Columbia River or the improvement of the harbors which mean more trade.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlewoman very much for the very fine statement she has made.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sorry to interfere with the majority leader's exercise, but I would like to ask one question. I would like to be clear on this: Have you or any members of your party seen this so-called bill of particulars?

Mr. ALBERT. I have not. We have asked for it. The Speaker of the House has asked the Republican task force to produce it, but up to now it has not been produced.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have not seen it either, but the reason I asked the question of the distinguished majority leader is simply this. As I have listened to the exercise put on by the majority leader and his people, I have been under the impression that they had seen it and that they were specifically rebutting the Republican position. In other words, if they do not know what the Republican position is, how can they rebut the Republican position? I am really confused about that.

Mr. ALBERT. The answer to that is simply this. A task force purportedly issued a press release in which it stated up to $15 billion could be cut. We have applied that cut across the agencies and these are the results—that is all there is to it. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. You people have done the prorating. You have not seen the bill of particulars.

Mr. ALBERT. We have no other way to approach the problem. We have done this in a pro rata way in those places where fixed budgetary items are not included.

Mr. CLEVELAND. It is your pro rata, it is not the Republican pro rata. You have not seen the bill of particulars.

Mr. ALBERT. No, it is prorating a very big Republican estimate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The point is that every Republican statement we have had except the statement made by the two gentlemen from the other body to whom I referred a moment ago talked about a cut of from $10 to $15 billion. They were ridiculous. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], if my recollection serves me correctly, said the budget could be cut between $10 and $15 billion, while former President Eisenhower in the letter which the minority leader put into such great circulation and which I have put in the Record, said it was between $10 and $12 billion. We asked the minority leader for a bill of particulars.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority leader for his very excellent presentation of a very important matter. I do not know of any matter that so deeply affects this great Nation of ours than does this legislative budget.

To make a meat-ax cut of $15 billion is not only going to severely hurt the defense of this Nation of ours, but will affect the lives of all our people, every segment of our economy, and this indirectly will be harmful throughout the free world.

I listened very attentively to the chairman of the Space Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller]. He talked about what the setback to the space program would be. I think we learned a terrible and a devastating lesson when we got behind with our missile program by waiting and cutting back the budget and letting the Russians get ahead of us with sputnik.

This particular so-called Republican $15 billion cut, this meat-ax approach would cut almost a billion dollars out of agriculture. But getting back to our space program, in 15 States they would cut something like 65,000 jobs, where 65,000 people would be taken from jobs where people are now employed.

They are working on this vast scientific program right now. They will be told: "Well, we have spent a lot of money getting ready in this program, but you cannot work any longer, you are cut back, you are curtailed"; "the Republican budget meat ax got your job." In my own home State of Louisiana some 6,000 employees would be dismissed from the Saturn project at the vast Michand plant in New Orleans and Slidell, which is one of the most important, and so regarded by all the scientists in America and throughout the entire world, as one of the most important space projects at this period in the entire world. This project will send men to the moon unless the budget is cut.

There are some 15 or 16 States that are directly affected, and many more indirectly affected in this space program where present employees would be discharged with this Republican budget cut.

This idea of people coming up here and saying that they are for economy in Government and for cutting useless expenditures is not a monopoly. I think there are just as many Democrats on this side who are for economy in Government as there are Republicans on that side. But on the other hand you have to realize that this is a great Nation and that we are fighting for our own survival to continue as a great free Nation. If we are going to do that we are going to have to take care of our national defense. Why, when you talk about a $15 billion cut, why do you not say $25 billion? Why do you not make it $50 billion? It is just as easy to say "cut $50 billion" as it is to say "cut $15 billion." You Republicans can go back home and tell your folks the situation as it has been outlined here and tell them that you were for cutting it back $50 billion but were not successful; it will be just as easy to use the figure $50 billion as it is to use the figure $15 billion. You have got to face reality and you have to face it when you say $15 billion. And to make that much of a cutback you are going to hurt and severely damage the defense of these United States, you are going to hurt the farmers of this Nation, you are going to cut back practically every farm program, every flood control program and every forestry program and on and on cutting out so many vastly needed programs.

With this $15 billion meat-ax approach you Republicans would cut almost a billion dollars from our farm program.

In other words, if you do that, under the name of economy, you are going to take it right off the skin of the farmers' backs. That is where it is coming from. At the same time you are taking funds that should go into the development of our natural resources and reforestation, taking care of our forests and improving our Nation.

You Republicans say we should not have this unemployment in one breath and then you say in the next breath you want a meat-ax curtailment of $15 billion so you will have thousands more unemployed. If you have any consistency at all in your soul you have got to admit you are advocating more and more unemployment, doing a far greater disservice to the unemployment problem than you are in trying to solve it.

I represent the city of Baton Rouge, La., that just got a $5 million post office and Federal Court Building. We have been waiting for 10 years for that. Those postal employees have been working in the back yard and when it rained they had to get a tarpaulin and put it over the back of the place. They asked me for years why the delay? I told them that we can get only a few new buildings each year in the United States. They say we have to cut the budget, cut down the appropriations. So we just have a few new buildings each year. This Federal building that went to Baton Rouge, capital of the State, was 10 years overdue.

I think there are only 20 such buildings authorized by the Congress this past session, yet over 200 cities in America have qualified for the same type of building, depending upon the proportion and size of each city. Yet of the 200 cities that were eligible only 20 cities got a public building, the other 180 had to wait.

You say wait. Wait for what? How long are we going to have to wait? You get only 20 out of 200. A lot of us will not be around when that last city on the list finally gets its building, a Federal building or post office, that it desperately needs now. And if you cut this budget we will not get the 20 that were recently authorized.

I just want to read off a few that will be canceled. There are Republicans as well as Democrats who live in these States and cities where you are going to get disastrous results if you cut $15 billion. You are going to cut construction of so many buildings. This cut would force the GSA to drop the following construction projects:

Arizona—Tucson—$344,000. You just will not let them have a $344,000 building that is already programed.

Arkansas—Pine Bluff—Post office and courthouse, $2,391,000. Gone with the budget cut.

California—Fresno—Courthouse and Federal office building, $5,400,000. Same.

Idaho—Boise—Courthouse and Federal office building, $7,500,000. Same.

That's just a few—there are many more in other States that will be eliminated also.

And there are others in every part of the country, including those that need it the most.

Cleveland, Ohio, needs a much larger building, and they certainly need it badly, but with this $15 billion cut theirs is eliminated also.

The idea is if you are going to take the meat-ax approach, and you chop so many people up, it does not make any difference what city is affected or what part of the country it is, how bad it is needed or what it is needed for; your building just vanishes into the thin air with the budget cut.

I want to say something when it comes to the defense of the country. I do not think anybody on either side of the aisle has a monopoly on patriotism or a monopoly on economy. I think I am just as much for economy or as patriotic as any Member of Congress.

I can remember when economy was practiced a little bit too much; it was before I came to Congress. Some Members took the meat-ax approach by saying, "Why should we fortify Guam?" Those that voted against fortifying Guam, some did not get reelected when Pearl Harbor came along. It was a terrible lesson and those who want to use the meat-ax $15-billion-budget-cut approach can profit by the failure to fortify Guam in the early 1940's because some thought then it was more important to both balance and cut the budget than to fortify Guam.

And who does not want to help the farmer? I think many of us sincerely want to help the farmer, but how can some help the farmer by wanting to curtail his program and at the same time try to make the farmer believe that you are helping him? So, the farmer has his product going out the gate and everybody makes a profit out of it as it goes to the market to the final consumer. But, what about the farmer who has produced it? Who is protecting him? It is not the people that want to cut $15 billion in a meat-ax approach on this appropriation bill and on the agricultural appropriation bill, where flood control, reforestation, watershed, and many agricultural projects will be cut almost a billion dollars.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MORRISON. I say in conclusion, and I beg your pardon for using so much of your time, here you can see just exactly the people that say they want to help the farmer. Well, here is a chance to keep their word and see that the program is not curtailed and see that this almost $1 billion is not meat-axed out of it, which would set the farmer, the farm program, and the people of this country back years and years with such a disastrous result that we could probably never overcome our devastation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I have been very interested in the valiant attempt of our great majority leader to elicit from our friends across the aisle on the minority side the most closely guarded top secret in Washington which apparently is, What is the content of this $15 billion budget cut?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, that is the only secret that has not leaked out in Washington in recent weeks.

Mr. REUSS. That seems to be true, and I have been trying for the life of me to see how this secret can be so well kept. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this $15 billion cut is apparently the brainchild of the six-man Republican task force, and I also call the gentleman's attention to a story which appeared just a day or two ago in the Wall Street Journal, certainly not a Democratic paper, in which it says that of the six-man House Republican task force masterminding force, to cut the President's money request, four Members have been urging additional unbudgeted funds to the appropriation bills that we are now considering. I ask the gentleman, could it be that the reluctance of the minority leadership to disclose the $15 billion figure is because 66⅔ percent, 4 out of 6, of the Republican task force, are apparently budget busters themselves?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman answers his own question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I wanted only to add to the colloquy that has been going on between the distinguished majority leader and others my own personal experience that is analogous to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said, because last week I went back home to the second largest city in my congressional district to announce the site of a new post office in that district which the people of that community, especially the members of the business community, had long been trying to get and had not been able to, although having a Republican President and a Republican Congressman had still not been able to bring to fruition.

But I was happy to be able to announce that they were going to get this new post office. One of the reasons I had pointed out was that I had had such great support in my own efforts from members of the business community and especially members of the chamber of commerce of this particular community.

I pointed out at a chamber of commerce-sponsored luncheon last Friday in the city of Elkhart, Ind., the fact that I had had a lot of letters from some members of that organization urging that we cut the President's budget, but I had not had one single letter from any citizen of that community and specifically from any member of the Elkhart, Ind., Chamber of Commerce, urging that the item for the construction of a new post office in Elkhart, Ind., should be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, I could cite other instances which have to do with other Members of this body in other districts, but I shall restrain myself and give only this personal instance of the example to which my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] has already made reference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman for a brief statement.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say to the majority leader that I am not nearly as enthusiastic about the exercise of the gentleman and his cohorts as some of the Members on the other side of the aisle have been, nor would I predict, with a 3-to-2 majority on the other side of the aisle, the outcome of the various task forces. But I would certainly say that this is one of the best organized fishing expeditions that I have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the majority leader that the armed services procurement bill has already passed. That record will stand on its own and for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the invective and the inferences that have been used about an across-the-board, meat-ax type of cut. Although realizing that this is the wrong bait in the fishing expedition, I will say that the task force will in due time, as the distinguished minority leader has said, bring out these various items to prove to the satisfaction of the people of our Nation the differential between the President of our Nation's speech on a Monday in January in his state of the Union message, and its utter inconsistencies the following Thursday in the budget message.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if an effort to cut $10 to $15 billion is successful, it will be a real threat to our economic stability.

It would mean more people out of work at a time when unemployment still is a critical problem.

It would be an economic shock and depressant at a time when the economy needs a stimulant.

It would mean that a policy of America last would prevail.

An America last in economic growth.

An America last in education.

An America last in defense.

An America last in assistance to its young people.

In the world today, in the competition with the Soviet Union, an America second is an America last.

We cannot afford to be anything but first.

Our freedom, our safety, our security, and the security of the free world depend upon our being first in defense, first in space, first in education, first in medical care, first in all things vital to the fabric of a great nation.

They would hamstring our space effort.

"Why rush to the moon?" they ask.

They are like the skeptics who scoffed at Christopher Columbus. They are like the short-range seers of that day who informed Columbus with a knowing smile that the earth was flat and that he would surely come tumbling off the edge if he persisted in sailing on.

They are the ones who looked at the tiny light that traced the path of Russia's first satellite and said, "Why worry about basketballs in the sky?"

I turn to the prorated $312 million reduction in general government.

A total of $114 million would be lopped off the Treasury budget.

The first effect would be the loss of something like $600 million in taxes, brought about by the reduced effectiveness of the Internal Revenue Service which would sustain a $110 million reduction.

The level of the operation of Internal Revenue Service would be cut back to 1960.

In terms of manpower, the cut would eliminate 12,000 man-years.

The division which investigates crime and tax fraud would be reduced.

The collection organization would be damaged.

The data processing master file system would be virtually halted.

The Narcotics Bureau's budget cut of $1 million would reduce its ability to control the illicit drug traffic.

A reduction of $86 million in the budget of General Services Administration would mean cancellation of construction projects totaling that amount in 10 cities. Also, it should be remembered that for every $15,000 taken out of General Services Administration's budget, one civilian job dies.

I place insert No. 16 into the Record, a list of the projects and the 10 cities.

The Justice Department would be hit by a $48 million cut. This will mean a substantial reduction in positions and a corresponding loss in effectiveness.

Now this does not include the many new programs which the Republicans have made doubly clear are in line for emasculation. That would come also.

The proposed Education Improvement Act would be paralyzed by a $1.215 billion slash.

The youth employment opportunities bill would be knocked flat on its back with a $100 million cut.

The $195 million needed for civil defense shelters would be knocked out.

Another $100 million needed to shore up our mass transportation systems in metropolitan areas would be deleted with gusto.

The rural housing guarantee program, medical education, maternal and child health, the campaign against mental illness and mental retardation—all these will die if the budget cutters have their way.

If they were successful, they must assume an awesome responsibility because their budget knife would have plunged deep into the heart of America's most urgent needs. This budget bloodletting would only mean destruction of these vital programs.

They rattle their political sabers and then they call for broad reductions in defense expenditures. They are like Janus, the old Roman god. Janus had two faces. One looked ahead. One looked behind. You never knew which way Janus was heading or which face to listen to.

Now is not the time to stop.

Now is the time to go, to move ahead.

Now is the time to believe in America, to believe in its resilience, to believe in its people.

We believe that we must meet our Nation's problems, that we must move ahead at a faster pace.

We believe that, at the same time, we must act to stimulate our economy, step up purchasing power, encourage business investment, broaden our industrial base, create more jobs—and bring the day nearer when a balanced economy will mean a balanced budget.

To accept the Republican position would be to shift the country into reverse gear at a time when it needs to shift into high gear.

I have presented a broad picture of what the false economists ask us to do to America.

And I have given some details regarding the specific effects this irresponsible budget slashing would have on the farms, towns and cities of this Nation.

We must repel this attempt to turn the clock back, an attempt that would make America last.

We must recognize our obligations, our responsibilities.

Insert No. 1

GOP in House Sees $15 Billion Cuts Feasible

(By Richard L. Lyons)

A House Republican study group announced yesterday that it has found projects costing $10 billion to $15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year.

The group of senior GOP members of the Appropriations Committee told a news conference that their study of the budget assisted by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director during the Eisenhower administration, showed such cuts both feasible and urgent.

Without cuts of this dimension, said Republican Frank T. Bow, of Ohio, chances that Congress will approve a tax cut this year "will be almost nil."

The Republican did not specify where the cuts should be made. They said they had compiled a list but did not want to appear to be prejudging testimony still to be given to the Appropriations Committee.

House Speaker John W. McCormack suggested that Republicans "submit a bill of particulars" before asking Democrats to join their drive on spending.

House GOP leader Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, had suggested previously that $3 billion might be cut from the defense budget, $1 billion from each service branch. Representative Melvin R. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin, member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said sizable amounts could be saved if the Pentagon would require competitive bids for all purchases.

Bow suggested that cuts could be made in the space program and foreign aid. He also listed guidelines for making across-the-board savings. They include holding down new jobs, requiring departments to absorb pay raises effective next January, postponing nonemergency construction and new programs, and cutting down low-priority current programs.

The cuts proposed would be in the $108 billion new spending authority requested, not in the $98.8 billion spending budget where $11.9 billion deficit is expected by the administration. Part of the spending budget will be financed by money appropriated in previous years, but Bow estimated the GOP's proposed cuts would reduce the deficit by $4 to $6 billion.

Major budget-cutting crusades have a habit of bogging down because of the complexity of the budget process, and the stake that all parts of the economy have acquired in Federal spending.

Asked if Members of Congress would give up public works projects for their districts to save money, Representative Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, senior Republican on the Appropriations Committee, said he was sure they would.

The cry to cut the budget has picked up steam this year from the combination of a planned deficit, a proposed tax cut and the need to raise the debt ceiling.

The administration has asked that the debt ceiling, which is scheduled to drop April 1, be kept at $308 billion for the rest of the year ending June 30. It will come back later with a request to increase the ceiling to about $320 billion. The House Ways and Means Committee has delayed action on the temporary $308 billion request. Republicans aparently are using the threat of a bruising floor fight to try to hold down spending during the rest of this fiscal year.

At the House Ways and Means Committee's tax hearings yesterday, Roswell Magill, Under Secretary of the Treasury 25 years ago, urged Congress to discard the administration's tax reforms and make more modest cuts in taxes. Proposed reforms would wash out much of the tax relief, Magill said. He also urged tighter control over spending.

Insert No. 2

Apportionment of the Republican $15 Billion Proposal—New Obligational Authority for Fiscal 1964. Where Can $15 Billion Be Cut?

The Republicans have claimed that $15 billion can be cut from the President's request for fiscal year 1964 new obligational authority, but refuse to specify where cuts totaling this amount could be made.

Using the total 1964 budget request of $107.9 billion as a base, it is obvious that interest costs totaling $10.1 billion cannot be reduced. It can also be assumed that a reduction of the size contemplated involves the elimination of major new programs proposed by the President, which except for military pay increases, total $1.8 billion in 1964. The remaining $96 billion of budget requests would thus have to be cut by $13.2 billion. Since no indication is given of how this would be accomplished, it is reasonable to assume that it would be done on a pro rata basis, across the board, with programs and agencies being reduced according to the proportions which they represent of the total.

The figures:

[In millions]

Total estimated requests	$107,927
Assume interest payments cannot (or will not) be cut	10,103
Remainder	97,824
Assume major new programs proposed by the President will be cut (or be in list of cuts), except for military pay:	
New education program	1,215
Youth employment opportunities	100
Civil defense shelters	195
Urban mass transportation	100
Medical education (34) and Hill-Burton hospital modification to permit renovation and modernization of older general hospitals, etc. (35)	69
Maternal and child health, including mental retardation, etc	$19
Land and water conservation fund	25
Rural housing guarantee program (to eventually shift direct loans to private banks)	100
Total, above new programs	1,823
Remainder	96,000

This remainder allocates by function as shown in column 3, below. If the remaining cut needed to reach $15 billion were allocated the same way, the reductions would be as shown in column 4. Amounts in millions:

Function	New obligational authority			
	Total in budget (1)	New programs listed above (2)	Remainder (3)	Added cuts needed for $15,000,000,000 total (4)
National defense	$56,702	$195	$56,507	$7,756
International affairs and finance	4,514		4,514	620
Space research and technology	5,712		5,712	784
Agriculture and agricultural resources	7,289	100	7,189	987
Natural resources	2,628	25	2,603	357
Commerce and transportation	3,091		3,091	424
Housing and community development	599	100	499	69
Health, labor, and welfare	5,984	188	5,796	796
Education	2,983	1,215	1,768	242
Veterans' benefits and services	5,594		5,594	768
General government	2,277		2,277	312
Allowances:				
For pay adjustment	200		200	28
For contingencies	250		250	34
Total (excluding interest)	97,824	1,823	96,000	13,177

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA needed for $15 billion total,[1] selected functions

[In millions]

	Reduction needed
International affairs and finance:	
Agency for International Development	$476
State Department	50
U.S. Information Agency	30
Department of Agriculture (title II, Public Law 480)	30
Peace Corps	15
Other	19
Total	620
Natural resources:	
Corps of Engineers	149
Department of Interior	153
Department of Agriculture (Forest Service)	45
Tennessee Valley Authority	6
Other	4
Total	357
Commerce and transportation:	
Department of Commerce	132
Federal Aviation Agency	111
Post Office	78
Coast Guard (Treasury)	50
Small Business Administration	30
Civil Aeronautics Board	13
Other regulatory agencies	10
Total	424

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA needed for $15 billion total,[1] selected functions—Continued

[In millions]

	Reduction needed
Health, labor, and welfare:	
Health, Education, and Welfare	$697
Labor Department	50
Department of Agriculture (school lunch and special milk programs)	39
Other	10
Total	796

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA needed for $15 billion total,[1] selected functions—Continued

[In millions]

	Reduction needed
Education:	
Health, Education, and Welfare	$101
National Science Foundation	81
Housing and Home Finance Agency (college housing loans)	41
Department of Interior (Indian education)	13
Other	6
Total	242
General Government:	
Treasury (Internal Revenue Service, etc.)	114
General Services Administration	86
Department of Justice	48
Legislative branch	17
Judiciary	9
Other	38
Total	312

[1] Excluding interest and major new programs proposed by the President.

INSERT No. 3

A $784 million slash in NASA budget—the consequences:

Summary of employment reductions by location

	Jobs
Alabama	1,600
California	9,220
Colorado	1,000
Connecticut	290
Kansas	250
Florida	3,200
Louisiana	6,340
Mississippi	800
Massachusetts	1,220
Minnesota	770
New York	1,890
Alaska	50
Missouri	1,800
Texas	800
Wisconsin	800
Iowa	600
Subtotal (identifiable contractor locations)	30,730
Various (unidentified by locations)[1]	35,000
Total	65,730

[1] Identification by State is available only for large prime and first tier subcontractors. The effects of the proposed reduction on the employment plans of lower tier subcontractors, venders and suppliers is approximately 35,000.

NASA—The budget-cutters' job toll on major contractors

Project	Major prime or subcontractor	Location	Employment reduction
Gemini	McDonnell	St. Louis, Mo	1,800
	Rocketdyne	Canoga Park, Calif	100
	AiResearch	Los Angeles, Calif	50
	IBM	Owego, N.Y	50
	Lockheed	Sunnyvale, Calif	600
	Convair	San Diego, Calif	800
	Martin	Denver, Colo	1,000
Apollo	NAA	Downey, Calif	3,000
	NAA subcontractors:		
	Minneapolis-Honeywell.	Minneapolis, Minn	720
	Collins	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	600
	Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford, Conn	290
	Aerojet-General	Sacramento, Calif	140
	Avco Corp	Massachusetts	120
	Northrop	Newbury, Calif	160
	AiResearch	Van Nuys, Calif	300
	Marquardt	do	140
	Grumman	Bethpage, N.Y	1,600
	MIT	Cambridge, Mass	400
	AC Spark Plug	Milwaukee, Wis	800
	Raytheon	Bedford, Mass	400
	Kollsman	Elmhurst, N.Y	240
	Chrysler	New Orleans, La	1,120
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif	900

NASA—The budget-cutters' job toll on major contractors—Continued

Project	Major prime or subcontractor	Location	Employment reduction
Saturn I development	Chrysler	New Orleans, La.	1,400
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif.	600
Saturn IB development	Chrysler	New Orleans, La.	1,000
	Douglas		300
Saturn V development	Boeing	New Orleans, La.	1,500
	do	Wichita, Kans	500
	NAA	Downey, Calif	550
	do	Tulsa, Okla	50
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif	1,000
	Rocketdyne (NAA) F-1	Canoga Park, Calif	200
GSE and other		Various	1,500
C. of F.:			
Launch operations center		Florida	300
Marshall Space Flight Center		Alabama	200
Mississippi test facility		Mississippi	800
Various			720
Center support costs:			
Launch operations center		Florida	200
Marshall Space Flight Center		Alabama	1,400
Manned spacecraft center		Texas	800
Other			300

Insert No. 4

CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS

(Pending and incomplete projects that would be killed or held up by $149 million reduction)

Alabama: Paint Rock River; Mobile Harbor; Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge lands.

Arizona: Alamo Reservoir; Tucson diversion channel.

Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries: Navigation locks and dams; Gillham Reservoir; Ouachita and Black Rivers; Bull Shoals Reservoir Units 7, 8; Greers Ferry Reservoir; Narrows Dam (Third power unit); Helena Harbor, Ark.

California: New Hogan Reservoir; Russian River Reservoir; Sacramento River flood control; Bear Creek; Camanche Reservation; Oroville Reservoir; Sacramento River bank protection; Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff; Ventura-Pierpoint area (reimbursement); Walnut Creek; Duck Creek.

Connecticut: East Branch Reservoir; Hancock Brook Reservoir; Northfield Brook Reservoir; West Thompson Reservoir; Cedar to Silver Beach (reimbursement); Stamford; Westport; Milford Harbor.

Florida: International Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami; Apalachicola River; Bakers Haulover Inlet; Miami Harbor, 1960 act; Canaveral Harbor; Garrison Bight, Key West; Cat Point Channel, Boca Ciega.

Georgia: Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin; Walter F. George Lock and Dam, Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge lands.

Hawaii: Wailoa Stream; Manele Bay, Lanai.

Idaho: Bruces Eddy Reservoir; Boise Valley (Columbia River local protection); Mission-Lapwai.

Illinois: Clear Creek drainage and levee; Sid Simpson (Beardstown); Shelbyville Reservoir; Calumet River and Harbor; Mt. Carmel; Mouth of Sangamon River; Warsaw Harbor.

Indiana: Huntington Reservoir; Levee Unit 5, Wabash River; English; Calumet River and Harbor.

Iowa: Little Sioux River; Van Meter.

Kansas: Pomona Reservoir; Perry Reservoir; Marion Reservoir; Florence.

Kentucky: Barren River Reservoir; Corbin; Green River Reservoir; Grayson Reservoir; Little Sinking Creek.

Louisiana: New Orleans to Venice, Hurricane protection; Big Choctaw Bayou; Bayou Nicholas.

Maine: Portland Harbor, deepen to 45 feet; Searsport Harbor; Kennebuck River.

Maryland: St. Michaels Harbor; Nan Cove.

Massachusetts: Chicopee Falls, Mass.; Three Rivers; Conant Brook Reservoir; Plymouth Town Beach.

Michigan: Detroit River, Trenton Channel; Saginaw River.

Minnesota: Duluth Superior Harbor, outer harbor; Marshall; Winona; Harriett Island Harbor, St. Paul.

Mississippi: Jackson and East Jackson.

Missouri: Canton; Cape Girardeau; South River Drainage District; Stockton Reservoir; Mississippi River at Clarksville; Sandy Slough; Gregory Drainage District.

New Jersey: Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea; anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantus Creek anchorages, New Jersey; Raritan Bay, Sandy Hook Bay.

New Mexico: Socorro.

New York: Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point; Buffalo Harbor (1960 act) and Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act); Herkimer; Rochester Harbor; Buttermilk Channel; Fire Island Inlet; Lackawanna.

North Carolina: Wrightsville Beach; Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe; Cedar Island Bay; Core Creek.

Ohio: Astabula Harbor (1960 act); Sandusky Harbor; Toledo Harbor (1950, 1958, and 1960 acts); Racine Locks and Dam.

Oklahoma: Short Mountain Lock and Dam; Cherry and Red Fork Creeks, Tulsa; Arkansas River and Tributaries, navigation locks and dams.

Oregon: Blue River reservoirs; Yaquina Bay and Harbor; Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, 35 and 40 feet; Fern Ridge Reservoir modification; Columbia River alternate barge channel, Interstate Bridge-Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.

Pennsylvania: Dam 4, Monongahela River, Bethlehem; Elkland; Robinson Run, Oakdale; Trout Run, Portage.

Puerto Rico: San Juan Harbor.

Rhode Island: Lower Woonsocket; Pawtuxet Cove.

Tennessee: Cordell Hull Dam; J. Percy Priest; Woodland Street Bridge.

Texas: Bardwell Reservoir; Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway; Deepening to 40 and 42 feet; Proctor Reservoir; Sabine-Neches Waterway; Big Fossil Creek; Fort Worth Floodway (West Fork Extension).

Virginia: Norfolk.

Washington; Little Goose Lock and Dam; Sammamish River; Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, 35- and 40-foot projects; Port Townsend; Zintel Canyon, Kenewick; Connell; Vancouver-Columbia River alternate barge channel, interstate bridge Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.

West Virginia: Racine Locks and Dam.

Wisconsin: Bay City Harbor; Pepin Harbor; Manitowoc County Shore, Revetment; Eau Galle River.

Wyoming; Jackson Hole.

Mississippi River and tributaries: Wolf River and tributaries; Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries; Cache River.

Insert No. 5

These are Interior projects that would be blocked by the proposed budget reduction of $153 million.

Alabama (National Park Service) construction: Horeshoe Bend National Military Park; Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Mississippi and Tennessee) maintenance and rehabilitation.

Alaska (National Park Service) construction: Glacier Bay National Monument; Mount McKinley National Park; Sitka National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction: Galena, fire control station. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction projects: Design exploratory fishing vessel; design research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, buildings and utilities: Koliganek Day School, Elim Day School, Goodnews Bay Day School, Kasigluk Day School, Circle Day School, Grayling Day School, Barrow High School, Kotzebue High School; road construction.

Arizona (National Park Service) construction: Casa Grande National Monument; Chiricahua National Monument; Grand Canyon National Park; Lake Mead National Recreation Area (see also Nevada); Navajo National Monument; Petrified Forest National Park; Saguaro National Monument; Southwest Archeological Center; Tonto National Monument; Tuzigoot National Monument; Wupatki and Sunset Crater National Monuments; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program: Hualpai Mountain Recreation Area; roads (Chloride-Tipton, Black Rock Mountain); operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Reclamation: Gila: South Gila collection drains; additions, Welton-Mohawk pumping plant; Glen Canyon (Arizona-Utah), general property; Flagstaff-Pinnacle Peak No. 2 transmission line; Glen Canyon-Flagstaff No. 2 transmission line. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, buildings and utilities: Sells gas system, Phoenix shop building, Kaibeto Boarding School, Shonto Boarding School; irrigation systems: Colorado River, Fort Apache, San Carlos, surveys and planning; road construction.

Arkansas (National Park Service) construction: Arkansas Post National Memorial; Hot Springs National Park; Pea Ridge National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Southwestern Power Administration construction projects: Jonesboro-Idalia 154 transmission line; Jonesboro substation addition.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Kelso Fish Farming Station.

California (National Park Service) construction: Cabrillo National Monument; Death Valley National Monument; Lassen Volcanic National Park; Muir Woods National Monument; Point Reyes National Seashore; Sequoia-Kings Canyons National Park; Yosemite National Park; Whiskeytown Recreation Area; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management contruction program, recreational facilities: Owens Valley Recreation Area, 3 sites; roads; Barrel Springs, grading 7 miles; Red Mountain, grading, 4 miles; Brock Gulch, grading 4 miles; Sheldon Creek, grading, 2 miles; Big Jackass Creek, grading, 4 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Kern-Pixley National Wildlife Refuge. Geological Survey construction projects: Rock Laboratory, Menlo Park; special facilities, Menlo Park (planning). Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, irrigation systems: Big Pine; Morongo; X-L Ranch; surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation project and major features, Central Valley: irrigation development; channels, levees, and floodworks (Federal part); Corning water distribution system; Pacific coast intertie; forebay pump plant intake channel; forebay pump plant.

Colorado (National Park Service) construction: Bents Old Fort National Historic Site; Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument; Colorado National Monument; Dinosaur National Monument (see also Utah); Great Sand Dunes National Monument; Hovenweep National Monument (see also Utah); Mesa Verde National Park; Rocky Mountain National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program, buildings, Craig district office; recreation, Five Points Places and Drowsy Waters Recreation Sites; roads, Trident Mesa, grading 10 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Geological survey construction projects: Nuclear research, Denver; special facilities, Denver (planning). Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Denver National Wildlife Research Center; Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction: Irrigation systems, Pine River; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, Florida participating project: Permanent operating facilities; O. & M. housing; Fryingpan-Arkansas (new project start).

Florida (National Park Service) construction: Castillo de San Marcos National Monument; Everglades National Park; Fort Caroline National Memorial; Fort Jefferson National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project: Design research laboratory; road construction.

Georgia (National Park Service) construction: Fort Frederica National Monument, Fort Pulaski National Monument, Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Hawaii (National Park Service) construction: City of Refuge National Historic Park, National Battlefield Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Idaho (National Park Service) construction: Craters of the Moon National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program; buildings: Bennett Mountain Lookout, Squaw Butte Lookout, Burley warehouse and fire office, Salmon office expansion and warehouse; recreation: Salmon River Recreation Area, three sites; roads: Deep Creek, grading 13 miles; Big-Knox-Bull, grading 6 miles; Herd Creek, grading 3 miles; Bell Mountain, grading 3 miles; bridges, five; Big Butte-Arco Road, surfacing 9 miles. Bureau of Land Management construction program, buildings (see above): operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project, Columbia River fisheries development. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, irrigation systems, Fort Hall; road construction, Bonneville Power Administration construction projects: Transformer additions; replacements and minor capital additions.

Indiana (National Park Service) construction: Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial.

Kentucky (National Park Service) construction: Mammoth Cave National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Louisiana (National Park Service) construction: Chalmette National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Maine (National Park Service) construction: Acadia National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Maryland (National Park Service) construction: Antietam National Battlefield Site and Cemetery, Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Catoctin Mountain Park, C. & O. Canal National Monument, Fort McHenry National Monument, George Washington Memorial Parkway (see also Virginia); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; construction: Patuxent Research Center.

Massachusetts (National Park Service) construction; Cape Code National Seashore, Adams National Historic Site, Minute Man National Historic Site, Salem Maritime National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Michigan (National Park Service) construction: Isle Royale National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project: Equipment for research laboratory. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildfish construction: Jordan River Fish Hatchery.

Minnesota (National Park Service) construction: Grand Portage National Monument; Pipestone National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction: Agassiz National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

Mississippi (National Park Service) construction: Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Alabama and Tennessee); Vicksburg National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project: Design research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction: Buildings and utilities, Central High School; road construction.

Missouri (National Park Service) construction: Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Southwestern Power Administration, construction projects: Carthage substation addition; Idalia substation addition.

Montana (National Park Service) construction: Custer Battlefield National Monument; Glacier National Park; Yellowstone National Park (see also Wyoming); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program; recreational facilities; Madison River Recreation Area; roads; operating programs; soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Range; Medicine Lake National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction; irrigation systems; annual contract payments: Blackfeet, Crow, Fort Beldnap, Fort Peck; surveys and planning. Bureau of Reclamation, projects and major features: East Bench Unit, Missouri River Basin; O. & M. housing; Lovell-Yellowtail transmission line (Wyoming-Montana); Yellowtail Unit, Missouri River Basin; Yellowtail Afterbay Dam. Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects: General structures and improvements, preliminary engineering, transformer additions, replacements and minor capital additions.

Nebraska (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction: Desoto National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction: Road. Bureau of Reclamation, projects and major features, Frenchman-Cambridge Division, Missouri River Basin; Frenchman Creek channelization; Dunlap substation.

Nevada (National Park Service) construction: Lake Mead National Recreation Area (see also Arizona); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, recreation: Red Rock Canyon Recreation Area; roads: Mount Wilson, grading 9 miles; operating program: soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, irrigation systems: Duck Valley, Fort McDermott, Moopa, Pyramid Lake; road construction.

New Jersey (National Park Service) construction: Edison Laboratory National Monument; Morristown National Historic Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries, construction: Sandy Hook Fishery Research.

New Mexico (National Park Service) construction: Bandelier National Monument; Carlsbad Caverns National Park; Chaco Canyon National Monument; Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, roads: Rio Puerco road system; operating program: soil aid moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, buildings and utilities, Chasgai Boarding School; irrigation systems: Mescalero, Hogback, Navajo project, Middle Rio Grande Pueblos, miscellaneous pueblos, surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features, Rio Grande recreational facilities (new start); San Juan-Chama participating project (Colorado-New Mexico; new start).

New York (National Park Service) construction: Federal Hall National Memorial; Hamilton Grange National Memorial; Sagamore Hills National Historic Site; Saratoga National Historical Park; Statue of Liberty National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction: Montezuma National Wildlife Range.

North Carolina (National Park Service) construction: Blue Ridge Parkway (see also Virginia); Cape Hatteras National Seashore; Fort Raleigh National Historic Site; Great Smoky Mountains National Park (see Tennessee); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

North Dakota (National Park Service) construction: International Peace Garden; Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features: Fargo substation additions; Hillsboro substation; Jamestown-Watertown transmission line (North Dakota-South Dakota); Northwood substation.

Ohio (National Park Service) construction: Perry's Victory National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project: Design research vessel.

Oklahoma (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems, surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Arbuckle (new project start).

Oregon (National Park Service) construction: Crater Park National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction, buildings, Riddle Mountain Lookout; recreation, Steens Mountain Recreation Area, seven sites; roads, Steens Mountain, surfacing, 9 miles; Grizzly, grading, 4 miles; Hampton Buttes, grading, 18 miles; Beatty's Butte, grading, 7 miles; Rudio Mountain, grading, 4 miles; Vale project road system; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project, Columbia River fisheries development. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems, survey and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature, Rogue River basin, Agate Dam (new project start); Vale, Bully Creek extension; minimum health and safety facilities. Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects, John Day-Keeler; Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection; Fairview Brandon No. 2; Dorena service; McMinnville service.

Pennsylvania (National Park Service) construction: Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church National Historic Site; Hopewell Village National Historic Site; Independence National Historic Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Mines, construction projects: Brucetown research facilities.

South Carolina (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation.

South Dakota (National Park Service) construction: Badlands National Monument; Mount Rushmore National Monument; Wind Cave National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction, Waubay National Wildlife Refuge; Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge; Lake Andes National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

Tennessee (National Park Service) construction: Andrew Johnson National Monument; Great Smoky Mountains National Park (see also North Carolina); Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Alabama and Mississippi); Shiloh National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Texas (National Park Service) construction: Big Bend National Park; Fort Davis National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project; research vessel. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature, Canadian River: Main aqueduct pumping plants; main aqueduct, Pipelines Canyon to Lamesa.

Utah (National Park Service) construction: Arches National Monument; Bryce Canyon National Park; Capitol Reef National Monument; Dinosaur National Monument (see also Colorado); Hovenweep National Monument (see also Colorado); Natural Bridges National Monument; Timpanogos Cave National Monument; Zion National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program, buildings, Vernal warehouse; Escalante warehouse; roads, 50-Mile Mountain, grading 2 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction projects, Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems. Uintah and Ouray; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features; Emery participating project, Swazey diversion dam; Weber Basin, East Canyon Dam, Warren Canal and laterals.

Virginia (National Park Service) construction: Appomattox Court House National Historic Park; Blue Ridge Parkway (see also North Carolina); Custis Lee Mansion National Memorial; George Washington Memorial Parkway (see also Maryland); Jones Point Park; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Petersburg National Military Park; Prince William Forest Park; Shenandoah National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Washington (National Park Service) construction: Mount Rainier National Park; Olympic National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction projects: Columbia River fisheries development; research vessel; design of research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Spokane Valley (new project start). Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects: Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection; system reactive facilities; Puget Sound area service; Bangor-Fairmount; Grand Coulee-Okanogan; Sappho area service; transformer additions.

West Virginia (National Park Service) construction: Harpers Ferry, National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Wyoming (National Park Service) construction: Fort Laramie National Historic Site; Grand Teton National Park; Yellowstone National Park (see also Montana); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program, roads: Green Mountain, grading 2 miles; Shirley Mountain, grading 5 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems: Wind River; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Glenrock-Glendo transmission line; Lyman substation and taplines; Lyman participating project (new project start); Seedskadee participating project—upper west side pumping plant, east side canals and laterals, west side canal and laterals.

District of Columbia (National Park Service) construction: National Capital Parks; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Puerto Rico (N.P.D.), construction: San Juan National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Virgin Islands (National Park Service) construction: Virgin Islands National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Various States (National Park Service) construction: Planning, general rehabilitation, and interpretive exhibits. Bureau of Land Management, construction programs, roads. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction projects, unmanned buoys, advance planning.

INSERT NO. 6

ESTIMATED PROGRAM REDUCTION DUE TO $45 MILLION CUT IN FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Alabama: 9 million board feet timber cut; 760 acres, reforestation (Fed. st. pri.) $25,000 road construction; $60,000, research; 70 employment loss (Fed. st. pri.).

Alaska: 54 million board feet timber cut; 20 acres, reforestation, $250,000 road construction; $60,000 research; 150 employment loss.

Arizona: 44 million board feet timber cut; 180 acres reforestation; $410,000 road construction; $105,000 research; 470 employment loss.

Arkansas: 25 million board feet timber cut; 3,100 acres reforestation; $75,000 road construction; $60,000 research; 150 employment loss.

California: 270 million board feet timber cut; 3,700 acre reforestation; $1,960,000 road construction; $275,000 research; 2,000 employment loss.

Colorado: 23 million board feet timber cut; 630 acres reforestation; $720,000 road construction; $75,000 research; 670 employment loss.

Connecticut: — million board feet timber cut; 160 acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $35,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Delaware: — million board feet timber cut; 50 acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $——— research; —employment loss.

District of Columbia: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $260,000 research; 170 employment loss.

Florida: 12 million board feet timber cut; 6,700 acres reforestation; $45,000 road construction; $70,000 research; 60 employment loss.

Georgia: 8 million board feet timber cut; 6,400 acres reforestation; $80,000 road constuction; $100,000 research; 170 employment loss.

Hawaii: — million board feet timber cut; 200 acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $5,000 research; — employment loss.

Idaho: 117 million board feet timber cut; 1,440 acres reforestration; $1,110,000 road construction; $50,000 research; 1,240 employment loss.

Illinois: — million board feet timber cut; 220 acres reforestation; $15,000 road construction; $65,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Indiana: — million board feet; 460 acres reforestation; $15,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 20 employment loss.

Iowa: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $— road construction; $10,000 research; — employment loss.

Kansas: — million board feet timber cut; 60 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $— research; — employment loss.

Kentucky: 4 million board feet timber cut; 2,400 acres reforestation; $40,000 road construction; $35,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Louisiana: 12 million board feet timber cut; 3,700 acres reforestation; $45,000 road construction; $80,000 research; 130 employment loss.

Maine: — million board feet timber cut; 800 acres reforestation; $5,000 road construction; $20,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Maryland: — million board feet timber cut; 550 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $55,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Massachusetts: — million board feet timber cut; 160 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $5,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Michigan: 21 million board feet timber cut; 5,700 acres reforestation; $190,000 road construction; $50,000 research; 200 employment loss.

Minnesota: 21 million board feet timber cut; 5,300 acres reforestation; $210,000 road construction; $95,000 research; 180 employment loss.

Mississippi: 22 million board feet timber cut; 11,900 acres reforestation; $65,000 road construction; $140,000 research; 190 employment loss.

Missouri: 5 million board feet timber cut; 1,000 acres reforestation; $50,000 road construction; $35,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Montana: 90 million board feet timber cut; 550 acres reforestation; $690,000 road construction; $115,000 research; 910 employment loss.

Nebraskai: — million board feet timber cut; 20 acres reforestation; $20,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Nevada: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $125,000 road construction; $5,000 research; 80 employment loss.

New Hampshire: 3 million board feet timber cut; 170 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $30,000 research; 60 employment loss.

New Jersey: — million board feet timber cut; 70 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $15,000 research; — employment loss.

New Mexico: 24 million board feet timber cut; 100 acres reforestation; $280,000 road construction; $35,000 research; 440 employment loss.

New York: — million board feet timber cut; 2,900 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $10,000 research; — employment loss.

North Carolina: 9 million board feet timber cut; 3,600 acres reforestation; $80,000 road construction; $155,000 research; 130 employment loss.

North Dakota: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $— road construction; $10,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Ohio: — million board feet timber cut; 1,000 acres reforestation; $10,000 road construction; $70,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Oklahoma: — million board feet timber cut; 280 acres reforestation; $10,000 road construction; $— research; 20 employment loss.

Oregon: 440 million board feet timber cut; 10,500 acres reforestation; $1,960,000 road construction; $195,000 research; 1,500 employment loss.

Pennsylvania: 4 million board feet timber cut; 2,700 acres reforestation; $40,000 road construction; $55,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Puerto Rico: — million board feet timber cut; 230 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $30,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Rhode Island: — million board feet timber cut; 40 acres reforestation; $ — road construction; $— research; — employment loss.

South Carolina: 14 million board feet timber cut; 8,400 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $30,000 research; 80 employment loss.

South Dakota: 7 million board feet timber cut; 170 acres reforestation; $80,000 road construction; $20,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Tennessee: 6 million board feet timber cut; 2,700 acres reforestation; $60,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 50 employment loss.

Texas: 16 million board feet timber cut; 1,750 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $25,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Utah: 11 million board fee timber cut; 230 acres reforestation; $300,000 road construction; $75,000 research; 390 employment loss.

Vermont: — millions of board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $15,000 research; 40 employment loss.

Virginia: 6 million board feet timber cut; 450 acres reforestation; $65,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Washington: 232 million board feet timber cut; 5,300 acres reforestation; $1,180,000 road construction; $60,000 research; 780 employment loss.

West Virginia: 5 million board feet timber cut; 1,900 acres reforestation; $50,000 road construction; $40,000 research; 100 employment loss.

Wisconsin: 11 million board feet timber cut; 1,350 acres reforestation; $120,000 road construction; $545,000 research; 300 employment loss.

Wyoming: 15 million board feet timber cut; 4,500 acres reforestation; $250,000 road construction; $15,000 research; 440 employment loss.

Total: 1,540 million board feet timber cut; 104,500 acres reforestation; $10,179,000 road construction; $3,335,000 research; 12,000 employment loss.

Insert No. 7

Flood control and watershed projects, pending or in progress, the bulk of which would be stopped by a $987 million budget reduction in the Agriculture Department.

Alabama: Watershed projects: Big Prairie, Bristow's Creek, High Pine Creek, Hurricane Creek, Lost Creek, Powell Creek, Terrapin Creek, Town Creek, Crowdabout Creek, Bib Nance Creek.

Arizona: Watershed: Apache Junction-Gilbert, Florence area, Frye Creek-Stockton Wash, Magma.

Arkansas: Watershed: Arkansas City, Big Creek, Caney Creek, Chicot, Desha and Drew, Crooked Bayou, East Fork, Point Remove, Flat Creek, Fourche Bayou, Grady Gould, Kelso-Rohwer, Muddy Fork of Illinois River, Randolph-Walnut Lake, Upper Culotches Bay, West Fork Point Remove, Tupelo Bayou, Poteau River.

California: Flood Control: Los Angeles, Santa Ynez. Watershed: Adobe Creek, Buena Vista Creek, Central Sonoma, Escondido Creek, Marsh-Kellogg, Napa River, Ulatis Creek.

Colorado: Watershed: Coalbank, Arroyos, Franktown Parker Tributaries of Cherry Creek, Indian Wash, Limon, Roatcap Wash, Vineland Area Tributary to Arkansas River.

Connecticut: Watershed: Blackberry River, Furnace Branch-Middle River, North Branch Park River, South Branch Park River.

Delaware: Watershed: Upper Nanticoke River.

Florida: Watershed: Fisheating Creek Marsh, North St. Lucie River Drainage District, Pine Barren Creek, Sarasota West Coast, Sebastian River Drainage District, South Sumter, Taylor Creek, Upper Josephine-Jackson Creek, Upper Tampa Bay, Istokpoga Marsh, Jumper Creek.

Georgia: Flood Control: Coosa. Watershed: Bishop Creek, Bull Creek, Fort Creek, Hazel Creek, head of Little Tennessee River, Little Satilla, Little Tallapoosa, Marbury Creek, Middle Fork Broad River, Mill Creek, North Broad River, Potato Creek, Rocky Comfort Creek, Sandy Creek, South River, Tobesofkee Creek.

Hawaii: Watershed: Puukapo, Waianae Iki, Waianae Nui, Naalebo.

Idaho: Watershed: Cedar Creek.

Illinois: Watershed: Big Blue, Hog River-Pig Creek, Scattering Fork, Seven Mile Creek, Shoal Creek.

Indiana: Watershed: Boggs Creek, Busseron, French Lick Creek, Lattas Creek, Little Wea, Middle Fork Anderson River, Prairie Creek, West Creek, Dewitt Creek.

Iowa: Flood control: Little Sioux.

Watershed: Badger Creek, Bee-Jay, Big Park, Big Wyacondah, Crooked Creek, David's Creek, Davis-Battle Creek, Held, Hound Dog Creek, Indian Creek, Mill Picayune, Moulton, Pierce Creek, Pony Creek, Rocky Branch Creek, Ryan-Henchal, Stennett-Red Oak Creek.

Kansas: Watershed: Andale, Beek Creek, Fall River, Frog Creek, Middle Caney, Nebo Creek, Silver Creek, Spring Creek, Twin Caney, Upper Verdigris, Walnut Creek, Whiskey Creeks.

Kentucky: Watershed: Beaver Creek, Big Muddy, Big Reedy Creek, Buck Creek, Caney Creek, Canoe Creek, Crab Orchard, Cypress Creek, Donaldson Creek, East Fork Clarks River, East Fork Pond River, Humphrey-Clanton Creek, Little Kentucky River, Meadow Creek, Mud River, North Fork Little River, Obion Creek, W. Fork Clarks River, W. Ford Pond River.

Louisiana: Watershed: Bayou Blue, Bayou Dupont, Bayou Folse, Bayou Rapides, North Tensas, Pleasant Valley, Big Ditch and Scarbroughs Creek, Upper Bayou Nezpique.

Maine: Watershed: Libby Brook.

Maryland: Flood control: Potomac River. Watershed: Ninepin Branch, Aydelotte, Gilbert Run, Little Creek, Little Youghiogheny, Long Marsh, Upper Rock Creek,

Massachusetts: Watershed: Baiting Brook, Powdermill Brook, SuAsCo, Upper Quaboag.

Michigan: Watershed: Little Black River, Little River, Misteguay Creek, Muskrat Creek, North Branch Mill Creek, South Branch Cass River.

Minnesota: Flood control: Little Sioux. Watershed: Bear Valley, Coon Creek, Middle Fork of Two River, North Branch of Two River, Zippel Creek.

Mississippi: Flood control: Little Tallahatchie, Yazoo. Watershed: Beasha Creek, Bentonia, Buck Island Bayou, Central Bogue Phalia, Chiwapa Creek, Gray's Creek, Muddy Creek, Mulberry Creek, Persimmon-Burnt Corn Creek, Second, Shammack Creek, Tacket Creek, Tallahalla Creek, Upper Bogue Phalia, West Hatchie, Upper Quiver River.

Missouri: Watershed: East Fork of Big Creek, Hoover-Frankum, 102 river tributaries, Panther Creek, Platte river tributaries, South Fork of Blackwater, Tabo Creek Calalhan.

Montanta: Watershed: Box Elder Creek, Whitehall.

Nebraska: Watershed: Antelope Creek, Big Indian, Bowman-Spring, Buckley Creek, Gering Balley, Mud Creek, Oak-Middle Creek, Plattsmouth, Plum Creek, Wildhorse, Wilson Creek, Bellwood, Bear-Pierce-Cedar.

Nevada: Watershed: Upper Meadow Valley Wash, Virgin Valley.

New Hampshire: Watershed: Olivarian Brook, Souhegan River (Mass.).

New Jersey: Watershed: Paulins Kill, Pine Mount Creek, Repaupo Creek, Stony Brook, Town Bank, River Cove.

New Mexico: Watershed: Apache-Brazito Mesquite, Fillmore Arroyas, Hackberry Draw, Saltpeter Creek, Santa Cruz River, Tortugas Arroyo, Case Draw.

New York: Flood control: Buffalo Creek. Watershed: Conewango Creek, Cowaselon Creek, Genegantslet Creek, Ischua Creek, Naticoke Creek, Upper Five Mile Creek.

North Carolina: Watershed: Broad Creek, Gum Neck, Abbotts Creek, Ahoskie Creek, Bear Creek, Conetoe Creek, Cutawhiskie Creek, Deep Creek (Yadkin), Grindle Creek, Horse Swamp-Flat Swamp, Moccasin Creek, Muddy Creek, Pollock Swamp, Town Fork Creek, Turner Creek, Mosley Creek-Tracey Swamp.

North Dakota: Watershed: Elm River, Lower Forest River, Middle-South Branch Forest River, North Branch Forest River, Swan-Buffalo Creek, Tewaukon (S.D.), Wild Rice Creek (S. Dak.).

Ohio: Watershed: Chippewa Creek, Dick's Creek-Little Muddy, East Fork Buck Creek, Marsh Run, Upper Wabash.

Oklahoma: Flood control: Washita. Watershed: Bear, Fall, and Coon Creeks, Bib Wewoka, Cache Creek, Caney-Coon Creek, Cottonwood Creek, Delaware Creek, Fourche Maline Creek, Haikey Creek, Boggy Creek, Little Deep Fork Creek, Little Wewoka-Graves Creek, Long Branch, Sandy Creek, Sallisaw Creek, Salt Creek, Squaw Creek, Stillwater Creek, upper Black Bear Creek, upper Blue River, upper Clear Boggy Creek, upper Red Rock Creek, Wagon Creek, Whitegrass-Waterhole Creek.

Oregon: Watershed: Beaver Creek, Little Pudding River, Lynx Hollow, Middle Fork Hood River, Skipanon River, Willakenzie.

Pennsylvania: Flood control: Potomac. Watershed: Brandywine Creek, Del., Brodhead Creek, Dunlap Creek, Greene-Dreher, Kaercher Creek, Lackawaxen tributaries, Little Schuylkill River, Mill Creek, Mill Run, North Fork Cowanesque River, Sandy Creek, Saul-Mathay, Briar Creek, Martin Creek.

South Carolina: Watershed: Broadmouth Creek, Brushy Creek, Coneross Creek, Duncan Creek, Fishing Creek, Hills Creek, Huff Creek, Thicketty Creek, Wateree Creek, Backswamp, Lynches Lake Camp Branch.

South Dakota: Watershed: Brule Creek, Green Creek, Marne Creek, Pattee Creek, Silver Creek, Turkey Ridge Creek.

Tennessee: Flood control: Coosa, Watershed: Bear Creek, Cane Creek, Cub Creek, Cypress Creek, Hardin Creek, Houser Creek, Jennings Creek, Johnson Creek, Lick Creek, Line Creek (Ky.), Meridian Creek, Pine Creek, Porters Creek (Miss.), Reelfoot Indian Creek (Ky.), Thompson Creek, Proctor Creek, Indian Creek (Miss.).

Texas: Flood control: Colorado (middle), Trinity, Washita. Watershed: Agua Dulce, Auds Creek, Caney Creek, Chiltipin-San Fernando Creek, Cummins Creek, East Bay Bayou, East Keechie, Kent Creek, Kickapoo Creek, Knob Creek, Langford Creek, lower Brushy Creek, lower Plum Creek, Madden Arroyo, Martinez Creek, northeast tributaries of Leon River, Olmitos-Garcias Creek, Plum Creek, Ramirez Creek, Salado Creek, San Diego-Rosita Creeks, Sulpher Creek, Tehuacana Creek, Town Branch, upper Brushy Creek, upper Lake Fork, upper Las Moras Creek, Valley Creek, York Creek.

Vermont: Watershed: Neshobe.

Utah: Watershed: American Fork-Dry Creek, Blue Creek-Howell, Miller Biglow, North Fork of Ogden River, North Sanpete.

Virginia: Flood control—Potomac. Watershed: Beautiful Run, Beaver Creek, Buffalo Creek, Leatherwood Creek, Little River, Marrowbone, Muddy Creek, Roanoke Creek, White Oak Run, Johns Creek, Horsepasture.

Washington: Watershed—French Creek, Lacamas Creek Tributaries, Marshland.

West Virginia: Flood control—Potomac. Watershed: Bonds Creek, Crush Creek, Harmon Creek (Pa.), Polk Creek, Saltlick Creek, Upper Decker.

Wisconsin: Watershed—Bad Axe, Bay City, Bogus Creek, Coon Creek, Garden Valley (Rose Valley), Lost Creek, Mill Creek, South

Nelson, Trout Run Creek, Twin Parks, West Fork Kickapoo.

Wyoming: Watershed: Arnold Drain, Boulder Lake, London Flats-Bovee, North Fork Powder River.

Puerto Rico: Watershed—Anasco River, Guayanes.

INSERT NO. 8

A reduction of $25 million in Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration would require a reduction in State staffs of about 4,800 positions and the closing of many small services. Clearly this would mean a deterioration in service to unemployment insurance claimants.

The figures:

Effect of $25,000,000 reduction on employment security operations

State	Estimated loss in positions	Number of offices to be closed
Alabama	69	8
Alaska	15	3
Arizona	54	8
Arkansas	51	7
California	484	10
Colorado	58	10
Connecticut	65	1
Delaware	14	1
District of Columbia	30	0
Florida	100	2
Georgia	72	4
Hawaii	16	1
Guam	0	0
Idaho	30	8
Illinois	225	2
Indiana	85	2
Iowa	64	12
Kansas	53	10
Kentucky	54	3
Louisiana	63	4
Maine	28	5
Maryland	77	3
Massachusetts	166	3
Michigan	185	20
Minnesota	83	12
Mississippi	50	8
Missouri	110	8
Montana	32	7
Nebraska	34	6
Nevada	17	3
New Hampshire	17	2
New Jersey	200	1
New Mexico	32	6
New York	575	10
North Carolina	92	10
North Dakota	21	4
Ohio	177	8
Oklahoma	60	6
Oregon	61	6
Pennsylvania	360	7
Puerto Rico	41	0
Rhode Island	41	1
South Carolina	53	8
South Dakota	24	6
Tennessee	61	6
Texas	240	14
Utah	33	3
Vermont	21	6
Virginia	66	8
Virgin Islands	1	0
Washington	32	5
West Virginia	50	5
Wisconsin	70	3
Wyoming	20	6

Manpower development and training activities: Effects on the allocation to States in dollars and numbers of trainees by a $25,000,000 reduction in the President's budget request

	Dollars	Number trainees
Alabama	420,160	380
Alaska	49,440	45
Arizona	123,520	112
Arkansas	271,840	246
California	2,496,800	2,262
Colorado	172,960	157
Connecticut	346,080	314
Delaware	49,440	45
District of Columbia	123,520	112
Florida	568,640	515
Georgia	494,400	448
Guam	5,710	5
Hawaii	74,240	67
Idaho	74,240	67
Illinois	1,211,360	1,098
Indiana	543,840	493
Iowa	271,840	246
Kansas	222,400	202
Kentucky	494,400	448
Louisiana	420,160	380
Maine	148,320	134
Maryland	346,080	314
Massachusetts	716,960	650
Michigan	1,285,440	1,165
Minnesota	420,160	380
Mississippi	296,640	269
Missouri	568,640	515
Montana	98,880	90
Nebraska	148,320	134
Nevada	49,440	45
New Hampshire	74,240	67
New Jersey	889,920	806
New Mexico	98,880	90
New York	2,595,680	2,352
North Carolina	593,280	538
North Dakota	74,240	67
Ohio	1,409,120	1,277
Oklahoma	271,840	246
Oregon	247,200	224
Pennsylvania	2,076,480	1,882
Puerto Rico	222,400	202
Rhode Island	148,320	134
South Carolina	271,840	246
South Dakota	74,240	67
Tennessee	494,400	448
Texas	939,360	851
Utah	98,880	90
Vermont	49,440	45
Virginia	346,080	314
Virgin Islands	5,220	5
Washington	420,160	380
West Virginia	321,440	291
Wisconsin	444,960	403
Wyoming	49,440	45
U.S. total	25,000,000	22,400

INSERT NO. 9

A 15-percent cut reduction in the Area Redevelopment Administration would mean a loss of an estimated 10,000 jobs that could have been created in 1964. These jobs break down this way:

Northeast region (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands)	2,500
Lake States (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin)	2,000
Appalachian (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia)	1,000
Southeast (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina)	2,500
Northwest (Alaska, Idaho, Iowa, Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming)	500
Southwest (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Missouri, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah)	1,500

INSERT NO. 10

Examples of pending projects scheduled for elimination if the President's $500 million supplemental request for accelerated public works is cut out.

ALABAMA

1. Graysville's $399,000 application for a new sewer system with 399 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Grant's $665,000 request for a new water system generating 665 man-months of labor.

3. Bullock County's $225,000 application for a new 30-bed nursing home creating 225 man-months of labor.

ALASKA

1. Dillingham's $269,000 application for a new water system generating 269 man-months of on-site labor.

2. North Pole's $220,000 request for a new sewer system creating 220 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Central Kenai Peninsula's $750,000 application for a new 20-bed general hospital generating 750 man-months of on-site labor.

ARIZONA

1. Parker's $139,000 application for a new water system generating 139 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Hopi Indian Reservation request for $180,000 community sewer and water system, 180 man-months of on-site labor.

3. U.S. Forest Service $119,000 construction of recreational facilities, 180 man-months of on-site labor, Sitegreaves National Forest.

ARKANSAS

1. McGehee's $300,000, new city hospital, 300 man-months on-site labor.

2. Leola's $70,000, APW funds, new water system, 70 man-months on-site labor.

3. Hazen's $112,000, new sewer system, 112 man-months on-site labor.

CALIFORNIA

1. San Diego Mercy Hospital, $1,997,000 to replace hospital, possible 2,000 man-months on-site labor.

2. Manteca's $348,000, new sewer system, 348 man-months on-site labor.

3. Orange Cove's $10,000 new water system, 10 man-months of on-site labor.

COLORADO

1. Alamoso Community Hospital's $713,000, 28-bed addition, 713 man-months on-site labor.

2. Trindad's $295,000 new electric system, 295 man-months on-site labor.

3. San Luis' $19,000 new harbor facilities, 19 man-months on-site labor.

CONNECTICUT

1. Bristol's $160,000 new sewer system, 160 man-months on-site labor.

2. Watertown's $141,000 water system, 141 man-months on-site labor.

3. Ansonia's $650,000, sewage treatment plant, 650 man-months on-site labor.

DELAWARE

1. Dover's $227,000 sewer system, 227 man-months on-site labor.

2. Greenwood's $87,500 sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer, 87.5 man-months on-site labor.

FLORIDA

1. Margate's $25,000 new bridges, 25 man-months on-site labor.

2. Florida City's $330,000 new waste treatment plant, 330 man-months on-site labor.

3. Jackson Memorial Hospital (Miami), $1,500,000, 252-bed addition 1,500 man-months on-site labor.

GEORGIA

1. Shellman's $5,000 new sewer system, 5 man-months on-site labor.

2. Martin's $45,000 water system, 45 man-months on-site labor.

3. Wrightsville's $90,000 sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer, 90 man-months on-site labor.

HAWAII

1. Hilo's $10,000 water system, 10 man-months on-site labor.

2. Hawaii County's $2,800,000 sewage treatment works, 2,800 man-months on-site labor.

IDAHO

1. Grangeville's $13,000 water system, 13 man-months on-site labor.

2. Plummer's $34,000 sewage system, 34 man-months on-site labor.

3. Bonner's Ferry, $75,000 for stabilization pond and outfall sewer, 75 man-months on-site labor.

ILLINOIS

1. Panama's $9,000, water system, 9 man-months on-site labor.

2. Bartelso's $108,000 water system, 108 man-months on-site labor.

3. Farmersville's $92,000 waste treatment plant, 92 man-months on-site labor.

4. Pocahontas' $91,500, sewage treatment works, 91.5 man-months on-site labor.

5. Richland Memorial Hospital, (Olney), $175,000 an addition and remodeling, 150 man-months on-site labor.

INDIANA

1. Charlestown's $35,000, sewer system, 35 man-months on-site labor.

2. Spurgeon's $83,000 water system, 83 man-months on-site labor.

3. Harrison County Hospital (Corydon) $150,000, an addition and remodeling, 150 man-months on-site labor.

IOWA

1. Centerville's $379,000 sewer system, 379 man-months on-site labor.

2. Moravia's $30,000, sewage treatment plant, 30 man-months on-site labor.

KANSAS

1. Arama's $154,000 sewer system, 154 man-months on-site labor.

2. Pittsburgh's $452,000, water system, 452 man-months on-site labor.

3. Walnut's $36,200, stabilization pond and out fall sewer, 36.2 man-months on-site labor.

KENTUCKY

1. Jackson's $85,000, water system, 85 man-months on-site labor.

2. Martin's $80,000 new sewer system, 80 man-months on-site labor.

3. Butler's $47,500, sewage treatment plant, 47.5 man-months on-site labor.

4. Pendleton County Hospital (Falmouth), $250,000 new hospital, 250 man-months on-site labor.

LOUISIANA

1. Estherwood's $85,000 new water system, 85 man-months on-site labor.

2. Dubach's $183,000 sewer system, 183 man-months on-site labor.

3. Opelousas' $448,600 sewage treatment plant, 448.6 man-months on-site labor.

4. West Carroll Parish Hospital (Oak Grove) $200,000 25-bed hospital, 200 man-months on-site labor.

MAINE

1. Madawaska's $39,000 new water system, 39 man-months on-site labor.

2. Saco City's $300,000 sewer system, 300 man-months on-site labor.

3. Webber Hospital (Biddeford) $200,000, an addition, 200 man-months on-site labor.

MARYLAND

1. Cumberland's $75,000 sewer system, 75 man-months on-site labor.

2. Cresaptown's $61,000 sewage treatment plant, 61 man-months on-site labor.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Gloucester's $304,000 sewer system, 304 man-months on-site labor.

2. East Longmeadow's $173,000 new water system, 173 man-months on-site labor.

3. Amesbury Hospital (Amesbury) $400,000, 18-bed addition, 400 man-months on-site labor.

MICHIGAN

1. Tecumseh's application for $80,000 for a new sewer system generating 80 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Manistique's request for $86,000 for a new water system creating 86 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Bottsford Hospital in Farmington application for $225,000 for a new 45-bed general hospital generating 225 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Sagula's application for $12,500 for a sewage treatment plant creating 12.5 man-months of on-site labor.

MINNESOTA

1. Cook's application for $55,000 for a new waste treatment plant generating 55 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bemidji's request for $33,000 for a new water system creating 33 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Evansville's application for $64,000 for a new sewer system generating 64 man-months of on-site labor.

4. St. Luke's Hospital in Duluth application for $1,939,500 for the replacement of 168 hospital beds creating 1,939.5 man-months of on-site labor.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Okolona's application for $183,000 for water system additions generating 183 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Prentiss' request for $6,000 for a new sewer system creating 6 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Humphrey's County Hospital in Belzoni application for $2,250 to replace flammable ceilings in corridors generating 2 man-months of on-site labor.

MISSOURI

1. Grandin's application for $50,000 for a new water system creating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Mayview's request for $71,000 for a new sewer system generating 71 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Gainesville's application for $9,700 for a stabilization pond creating 9.7 man-months of on-site labor.

MONTANA

1. Polson City's application for $49,000 for a new sewer system generating 49 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Culbertson's request for $84,000 for a new water system creating 84 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Eureka Community Hospital application for $240,000 for a new hospital generating 240 man-months of on-site labor.

NEBRASKA

1. Sargent's application for $164,000 for the improvement of city streets creating 164 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Litchfield Village's request for $20,000 for a new sewer system generating 20 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Good Samaritan Hospital in Kearney application for $728,250 for a new hospital creating 728.3 man-months of on-site labor.

NEVADA

1. U.S. Forest Service application for $50,000 to construct recreational facilities on roads in the Inyo National Forest generating 74 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Littleton's application for $202,000 for a sewage treatment plant creating 202 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital in Hanover request for $350,000 for an addition generating 350 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW JERSEY

1. Driebelle Borough's application for $39,000 for a new water system creating 39 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bordentown's application for $9,000 for a new sewer system generating 9 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Cinnamins Township request for $14,000 for the repair and improvement of community buildings creating 14 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Community Memorial Hospital in Toms River request for $75,000 for alterations generating 75 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW MEXICO

1. Raton's application for $325,000 for a new water system generating 325 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wagon Mound's request for $254,000 for a new sewer system creating 254 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Espanola Hospital's application for $33,000 for expansion of X-ray and laboratory facilities generating 33 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW YORK

1. Waddington's application for $45,000 for a new sewer system creating 45 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Tonawanda's application for $225,000 for a new water system generating 225 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Lake Placid-Saranac Lake Hospital in Ray Brook's application for $900,000 for a new hospital to replace two existing hospitals creating 900 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Sharon Springs' request for $70,500 for additions to the sewage treatment plant generating 70.5 man-hours of on-site labor.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Henderson's application for $13,000 for a new sewer system creating 13 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Highlands' request for $122,000 for a new water system generating 122 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Wautauga's application for $825,000 for a new 100-bed general hospital creating 825 man-months of on-site labor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Fort Totten Indian Reservation's application for $28,000 for individual water and waste systems generating 28 man-months of on-site labor.

OHIO

1. Brookside's application for $5,000 for a new sewer system creating 5 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Jackson's request for $50,000 for a new waste treatment plant generating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Union Township's application for $81,000 for a new water system creating 81 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Holzer Hospital in Gallipolis' application for $600,000 for the installation of a cobalt unit creating 600 man-months of on-site labor.

5. Clarksburg's request for $30,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

OKLAHOMA

1. Dewar's application for $48,000 for a new sewer creating 48 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Crowder's request for $17,000 for a new water system generating 17 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Sequoyah County Memorial Hospital in Sallisaw request for $198,000 for a new 28-bed general hospital creating 198 man-months of on-site labor.

OREGON

1. Gearhart City's application for $30,000 for a new water system generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Maupin's request for $63,000 for a new sewer system creating 63 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital in Klamath Falls application for $1,333,000 for a new 131-bed general hospital generating 1,333 man-months of on-site labor.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Brownsville Hospital's request for $1,800,000 for a new hospital creating 1,800 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Applewood's application for $21,000 for a new sewage treatment plant generating 21 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Borough of Aspinwall request for $13,000 for new water storage creating 13 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Center Township's application for $10,000 for a new sewer system generating 10 man-months of on-site labor.

5. Wilkes-Barre's application for $10,000 for new bridges creating 10 man-months of on-site labor.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Warwick's application for $75,000 for a new water system generating 75 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Narragansett's request for $142,000 for a new sewer system creating 142 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Mercy Hospital in Woonsocket application for $816,573 for a new hospital generating 816.6 man-months of on-site labor.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Williston's application for $51,000 for a new sewer system creating 51 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Lodge's request for $47,000 for a new water system generating 47 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Cherokee County Memorial Hospital in Gaffney application for $141,894 for new and expanded service facilities creating 141.9 man-months of on-site labor.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Wakpala application for $5,000 for a stabilization pond generating 5 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Fort Pierre's request for $28,500 for a sewage treatment plant creating 28.5 man-months of on-site labor.

TENNESSEE

1. Rutledge's application for $85,000 for a new sewer system generating 85 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bethel Springs' request for $32,000 for a new water system creating 32 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Bradley County Hospital in Cleveland request for $8,320 to expand service areas generating 8.3 man-months of on-site labor.

TEXAS

1. Douglassville's application for $61,000 for a new water system creating 61 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wells' request for $50,000 for new gas storage generating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Alba's application for $52,000 for a new sewer system creating 52 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Mother Frances in Tyler application for $757,050 for an addition of 134 general beds and 19 mental beds, generating 757.1 man-months of on-site labor.

UTAH

1. Wellington's application for $36,000 for a new water system creating 36 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Payson City's request for $42,000 for a new sewer system generating 42 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Utah Valley Hospital in Provo request for $90,000 for remodeling the 240-bed general hospital creating 90 man-months of on-site labor.

VERMONT

1. Island Pond's request for $180,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 180 man-months of on-site labor.

VIRGINIA

1. Big Stone Gap's application for $561,000 for a new water system creating 561 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wise's request for $57,000 for a new sewer system generating 57 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Gate City's request for $65,400 for a sewage treatment plant creating 65.4 man-months of on-site labor.

WASHINGTON

1. Centralia's application for $138,000 for a new water system generating 138 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Lynden's request for $125,000 for a new sewer system creating 125 man-months of on-site labor.

3. St. Anthony Hospital in Wenatchee request for $113,318 for a new hospital of 46 beds to replace an unsuitable structure, generating 113.3 man-months of on-site labor.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Glasgow's application for $15,000 for a new water system creating 15 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Summers County Hospital in Hinton application for $1,486,708 for a new 50-bed hospital generating 1,486.7 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Milton's request for $29,000 for a stabilization pond creating 29 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Belmont's application for $30,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

WISCONSIN

1. West Salem's application for $47,000 for a new water system creating 47 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Stevens Point's request for $48,000 for a new sewer system generating 48 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Marinette General Hospital application for $200,000 for an addition of 40 beds creating 200 man-months of on-site labor.

WYOMING

1. Deaver's application for $32,000 for a new water system generating 32 man-months of on-site labor.

2. U.S. Forest Service request for $60,000 to construct recreational facilities and buildings in the Targhee National Forest generating 90 man-months of on-site labor.

INSERT NO. 11

Itemized list of crippling budget cut in Weather Bureau and other related activities.

ALABAMA

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Montgomery, Huntsville, Birmingham, and Mobile. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Montgomery.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class II ship and one class IV ship will effect the probable bids of Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. of Mobile; and the Mobile Ship Repair, Inc., of Mobile.

Maritime Transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. of Mobile.

ALASKA

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Cordova. Reduce five man field office from full 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12-hour coverage at St. Paul Island. Reduce six-man field office from 24 to 12 hours at Yakutat, Barter Island, Bethel, Cold Bay, Juneau, Kotzebuc, and McGrath.

ARKANSAS

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Texarkana. Decommission short-range radar at Fort Smith.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

ARIZONA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Prescott. Close four-man station at Yuma. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Flagstaff.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

CALIFORNIA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man stations at Mt. Shasta, Sandburg, and Blue Canyon. Close three-man stations at Bishop, Eureka, and Alamoso. Reduce five-man field offices from full 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12-hour-a-day coverage at San Francisco (downtown office), Bakersfield, and Point Arguello. Reduce six-man field offices from 24 to 12 hours at Long Beach, Red Bluff, and Santa Maria. Close the weather office at Stockton. Decommission short-range weather radars at Eureka. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Santa Monica.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Sea Space, Inc., of Palo Alto, and National Engineering Science Co. of Pasadena. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the following probable bidders: Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco; Harbor Boat Building Co. of Terminal Island; National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at one or more of the following yards: Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco; National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego; Todd Shipyards of San Pedro.

COLORADO

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Pueblo. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Denver. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at New Haven. Reduce five-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Bridgeport. Decommission short-range radar at Hartford.

DELAWARE

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Weather Bureau: Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Dulles Airport.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Georgetown University; Computer Usage Co. and IBM.

FLORIDA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Pensacola. Close three-man station at Fort Myers. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day service to 12 hours a day at West Palm Beach and Orlando. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Miami.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Florida State University.

GEORGIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Valdosta. Close two-man station at Rome and Thomasville. Close three-man station at Columbus. Decommission short-range radar in Macon, Atlanta, and Savannah.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

HAWAII

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for the University of Hawaii.

IDAHO

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Lewiston. Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Pocatello.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

ILLINOIS

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Cairo. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Rockford. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Peoria. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Chicago. Cancel new wind measuring equipment at Quincy.

INDIANA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at South Bend. Decommission short-range radar at Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.

IOWA

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Dubuque. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Waterloo. Reduce six-man field office same amount at Burlington. Decommission short-range radar at Burlington.

KANSAS

Weather Bureau: Close the weather office at Concordia. Decommission short-range radar at Concordia, Goodland, Topeka, and Dodge City. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Topeka.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

KENTUCKY

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Lexington. Decommission short-range radar at Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Weather Bureau: Reduce five-man field office from 24-hours-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Alexandria. Decommission short-range radar at Baton Rouge and Shreveport. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Shreveport. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at New Orleans.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Louisiana State University.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Avondale Shipyards, Inc., of New Orleans.

MAINE

Weather Bureau: Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Portland.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Bath Iron Works of Bath.

MARYLAND

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Frederick.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

National Bureau of Standards: Deferral of special purpose laboratories at Gaithersburg.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Bethlehem Steel Co. Shipbuilding Division at Sparrows Point, and Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., of Baltimore. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for the Johns Hopkins University, of Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Pittsfield. Reduce five-man location from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day at Boston (downtown office). Decommission short-range radar at Boston and Worcester. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satelliate data at Boston. Reduce five-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Boston. Reduce six-man station same amount at Worcester.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at the Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, at Quincy.

MICHIGAN

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Escanaba. Close three-man station at Alpena. Close four-man station at Marquette. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Detroit City Airport. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Detroit (Willow Run Airport). Eliminate forecasting station at Detroit. Decommission short-range radar at Flint and Muskegon. Cancel new wind measuring equipment at Kalamazoo.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at Defoe Shipbuilding Corp. of Bay City.

MINNESOTA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Rochester. Decommission short-range radar at Rochester. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at International Falls.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

MISSISSIPPI

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Vicksburg. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Meridian. Decommission short-range radar at Meridian and Jackson.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Ingalls Shipping Corp., of Pascagoula.

MISSOURI

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24 hours a day coverage to 12 hours a day at Kansas City. Decommission short-range radar at Columbia. Close three-man station at St. Joseph. Decommission short-range radar at Springfield.

MONTANA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Kalistell and Havre. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Great Falls.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

NEBRASKA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Valentine. Close four-man stations at Lincoln and Norfolk. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Scottsbluff. Decommission short-range radar at North Platte, Scottsbluff and Norfolk.

NEVADA

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station in Elko. .

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Concord.

NEW JERSEY

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Trenton.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at New York Shipbuilding Co. of Camden.

NEW MEXICO

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Ratan. Close two-man station in Clayton. Close three-man station at Silver City and Roswell.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

National Bureau of Standards: Eliminate procurement of scientific equipment worth $740,000.

NEW YORK

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at La Guardia Airport. Decommission short-range radar at Rochester, Binghamton, and Albany. Reduce upper-air soundings from four a day to two a day at New York City.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Columbia University in New York City.

NORTH CAROLINA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Asheville (downtown office) and Winston-Salem. Close the weather office in Greensboro. Decommission short-range radar at Raleigh.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship will effect the probable bid of the Barbour Boat Works, Inc., of New Bern.

NORTH DAKOTA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Devils Lake. Close three-man station in Williston.

OHIO

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Sandusky. Close three-man station at Mansfield. Eliminate forecasting station operation at Cincinnati. Decommission short-range weather radars at Akron, Cleveland, Columbus. Reduce upper-air soundings from four a day to two a day at Dayton.

Maritime Transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships at one or more of the following yards: American Shipbuilding Co. of Lorain; American Ship Building Co. of Toledo.

OKLAHOMA

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Tulsa.

OREGON

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Meacham and Sexton Summit. Close three-man station at Roseburg. Close four-man stations in Burns and Eugene. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Astoria. Decommission short-range weather radar and cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Astoria.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that could affect the following probable bidder: Williamette Iron and Steel Co., of Portland, and Gunderson Bros. Engineering Corp., of Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Lancaster. Close two-man station at Reading. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Erie. Reduce six-man station same amount at Pittsburgh (downtown office), Scranton, and Williamsport. Decommission short-range weather radar at Pittsburgh. Cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Bradford.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at Sun Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. of Chester.

RHODE ISLAND

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Block Island.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Weather Bureau: Close the weather station at Florence. Decommission short-range radar at Columbia. Cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Anderson.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Huron. Decommission short-range radar at Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station in Memphis (downtown office). Reduce five-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day in Bristol. Decommission short-range radar at Nashville and Memphis.

TEXAS

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Victoria, and Galveston airport. Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Lubbock and San Angelo. Eliminate forecasting station at El Paso. Close weather offices at Dallas and Laredo. Decommission short-range radar at Abilene, Austin, Corpus Christi, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, Port Arthur, San Antonio, San Angelo, Waco, and Wichita Falls. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at San Antonio, Amarillo, and Fort Worth. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Fort Worth and Houston.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Texas Instruments, Inc., of Dallas. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the probable bid of Levington Shipbuilding Co., of Orange.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, at Beaumont.

UTAH

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station in Milford. Close three-man station in Wendover. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day in Salt Lake City.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

VERMONT

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

VIRGINIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Cape Henry. Close three-man station at Lynchburg. Decommission short-range weather radar at Richmond. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Norfolk.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship could affect the bid of the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. of Norfolk. Eliminate research and development grants slated for the American Scientific Corp. of Alexandria.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., of Newport News.

WASHINGTON

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Walla Walla. Close three-man station at Stampede Pass. Reduce 6-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Seattle (Boeing Field) and Yakima. Close the weather office at Olympia. Decommission short-range radar at Tatoosh Island. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Olympia. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Seattle. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Seattle.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

WEST INDIES

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day and decommission short-range radar at Swan Island.

WEST VIRGINIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Parkersburg. Reduce five-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day at Elkins. Close the weather office at Beckley.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the probable bid of the Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant.

WISCONSIN

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at La Crosse. Decommission short-range radar at Madison.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at the Chistie Corp. of Sturgeon Bay; the Fraser-Nelson Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. of Superior; and Manitowoc Shipbuilding, Inc., of Manitowoc.

WYOMING

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Sheridan.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

INSERT NO. 12

A $110 million reduction in Federal Aviation Agency budget would mean that these facilities and services currently provided would be discontinued: 100 airport traffic control towers; 70 instrument landing systems; 50 approach light systems.

These could not be built: 583 facilities to assure greater degree of safety; i.e., airport traffic control towers, airport surveillance radars, omnidirectional radio ranges and distance measuring equipments, instrument landing systems, and airport approach light systems.

A large percentage of the 400 airports requiring improvements for which sponsors have available funds to match the U.S. share would be affected.

Listed facilities are existing or planned. Existing would be discontinued and planned would be blocked by the $110 million budget cut.

ALABAMA

Anniston: Distance measuring equipment.
Eufaula: Distance measuring equipment.
Evergreen: Distance measuring equipment.
Huntsville: Distance measuring equipment.
Mobile: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Montgomery: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Birmingham: Airport traffic control radar beacon.
Dothan: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Mobile: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Muscle Shoals: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Tuscaloosa: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Butler: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Birmingham: Visual approach slope indicator.

ALASKA

Anchorage, Lake Hood: Airport traffic control tower.
Fairbanks:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.
King Salmon:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.
Annette:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Juneau: Airport traffic control tower.
Anchorage: Air route traffic control center.
Fairbanks: Air route traffic control center.
Cordova: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
Homer: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
Gustavus: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Anchorage: Radar bright display equipment.
Fairbanks: Radar bright display equipment.
Annette: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Bettles: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Big Lake: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Dillingham: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Hinchinbrook: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Nome: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Tanana: VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Unalakleet: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

ARIZONA

Phoenix:
Air route traffic control center.
Airport surveillance radar.
Douglas: Distance measuring equipment.
Drake: Distance measuring equipment.
Flagstaff: Terminal VHF radio directional range.
Gila Bend: Remote communications outlet.
San Simon: Air navigation equipment.
Tuba City: Air navigation equipment.
Yuma: Air navigation equipment.

ARKANSAS

Fort Smith:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.
Hot Springs: Airport traffic control tower.
Fayetteville: Long-range radar.
Fort Smith: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Little Rock: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
El Dorado: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Fort Smith: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Harrison: Doppler direction finding equipment.
Pine Bluff: Doppler direction finding equipment.

CALIFORNIA

Oxnard: Airport traffic control tower.
Stockton:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Palmdale: Airport traffic control tower.
Los Angeles: Air route traffic control center.

Oakland (Fremont): Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

San Jose (Reid's Hillview): Control tower.

Avenal: Distance measuring equipment.

Goffs: Distance measuring equipment.

Fort Jones: Distance measuring equipment.

Lake Tahoe: Distance measuring equipment.

Los Banos: Distance measuring equipment.

Chico: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Marysville: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Santa Rosa: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Arcata: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bakersfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Los Angeles: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Monterey: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

San Diego: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Santa Barbara: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Stockton: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Los Angeles: Radar bright display equipment.

Oakland: Radar bright display equipment (two units).

Burbank: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Long Beach: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Oakland: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Sacramento: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

San Francisco: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Bakersfield: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fresno: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Imperial: Doppler direction findings equipment.

Needles: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Palmdale: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Sacramento: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Burbank: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Palm Springs: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Porterville: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Santa Monica: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Visalia: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Avenal: Air navigation equipment.

Palmdale: Air navigation equipment.

San Diego: Air navigation equipment.

Oxnard: Instrument landing system.

San Jose: Instrument landing system.

San Francisco: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

COLORADO

Grand Junction:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Pueblo:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Denver: Air route traffic control center.

Hugo: Distance measuring equipment.

Thurman: Distance measuring equipment.

Cortez: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Grand Junction: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pueblo: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Hugo: Air-ground communications.

Denver: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Akron: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Grand Junction: Doppler direction finding equipment.

CONNECTICUT

New London (Groton): VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Windsor Locks:

Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Instrument landing system (second facility).

New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

DELAWARE

New Castle:

Airport traffic control tower.

Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

FLORIDA

Pensacola:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Sarasota, Bradenton: Airport traffic control tower.

Daytona Beach:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

St. Petersburg:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Jacksonville (Hilliard): Air route traffic control center.

Miami: Air route traffic control center.

Melbourne: Control tower.

Miami (Opa-Locka): Control tower.

Biscayne Bay: Distance measuring equipment.

Daytona Beach: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Orlando: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pensacola: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Tallahassee: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Miami: Radar equipment.

Miami (Opa-Locka): New tower service.

Jacksonville: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

West Palm Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Gainesville: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Key West: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tallahassee: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Vero Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Crestview: Air navigation equipment.

Gainesville: Air navigation equipment.

Key West: Air navigation equipment.

Lakeview: Air navigation equipment.

Vero Beach: Air navigation equipment.

Miami: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

Orlando: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

Jacksonville: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

GEORGIA

Atlanta (Hampton): Air route traffic control center.

Brunswick: Distance measuring equipment.

Columbus: Distance measuring equipment.

La Grange: Distance measuring equipment.

Royston: Distance measuring equipment.

Atlanta No. 2: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Augusta: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Columbus: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Macon: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Savannah:

Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Doppler direction finding equipment.

Baxley: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Jessup: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Waycross: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Augusta: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Columbus: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Atlanta:

Visual approach slope indicator.

Short approach light system.

HAWAII

Kahului: Airport traffic control tower.

Hilo: Airport traffic control tower.

Honolulu: Air route traffic control center.

Kamuela: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Honolulu: Airport traffic control.

Hilo: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Kahului: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Honolulu: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Kona: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hilo: Instrument landing system.

Honolulu: Runway end identification lights.

Hilo: Standard approach light system.

IDAHO

Idaho Falls: Airport traffic control tower.

Pocatello:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Twin Falls: Distance measuring equipment.

Boise: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pocatello: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Gooding: Air-ground communications.

Burley: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Idaho Falls: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mullan: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Dubois: Air navigation equipment.

Mullen Pass: Air navigation equipment.

Boise: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Pocatello: Short approach light system.

ILLINOIS

West Chicago: Airport traffic control tower.

Champaign: Airport traffic control tower.

Chicago: Air route traffic control center.

Bible Grove: Distance measuring equipment.

Bradford: Distance measuring equipment.

Samsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Galesburg: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Marion: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Chicago (Midway 13): Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Moline: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Peoria: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Quincy: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Springfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bloomington: Air-ground communications.

Chicago: Radar bright display equipment.

Chicago (O'Hare): Precision approach radar (second facility).

Chicago (Midway): Traffic control radar beacon.

Quincy: Droppler direction finding equipment.

Bradford: Air navigation equipment.

Champaign: Instrument landing system.

Chicago (Meigs): Instrument landing system.

Chicago (Midway): New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (2d facility).

Chicago (Meigs): Visual approach slope indicator.

Chicago (O'Hare): Short approach light system.

Champaign: Standard approach light system.

Chicago (O'Hare): Standard approach light system.

INDIANA

Evansville:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Terre Haute:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Indianapolis: Air route traffic control center.

Nabb: Distance measuring equipment.

Richmond: Distance measuring equipment.

Wolflake: Distance measuring equipment.

Fort Wayne: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Indianapolis: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Muncie: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Indianapolis: Instrument landing system (2d facility).

West Lafayette: Instrument landing system.

Evansville: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Terre Haute: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Indianapolis: Standard approach light system.

IOWA

Cedar Rapids:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Waterloo:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Sioux City:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Dubuque: Distance measuring equipment.

Sioux City: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Waterloo: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Des Moines: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Cedar Rapids: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Des Moines: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mason City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Des Moines: Runway end identification lights.

Sioux City: Runway end identification lights.

KANSAS

Hutchinson:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Russell: Distance measuring equipment.

Wichita: Distance measuring equipment.

Topeka: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Garden City:
Long range radar.
Air traffic control radar beacon.
Doppler direction finding equipment.

Hill City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Salina: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Centropolis: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Medicine Lodge: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Wilsey: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hill City: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Wichita: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Topeka: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

KENTUCKY

York: Distance measuring equipment.

Covington:
Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Bowling Green: Doppler direction finding equipment.

London: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Paducah: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Highway: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Whitesburg: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Covington:
Instrument landing system (second facility).
Visual approach slope indicator.

LOUISIANA

Shreveport, downtown: Airport traffic control tower.

Shreveport, greater:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Monroe:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Lake Charles:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

New Orleans: Air route traffic control center.

Alexandria: Long-range radar.

Baton Rouge: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Monroe: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Shreveport: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

New Orleans: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Lafayette: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Monroe: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alexandria:
VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Air navigation equipment.

Lake Charles: Air navigation equipment.

New Orelans: Standard approach light system.

MAINE

Portland:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Bucks Harbor: Long-range radar.

Auburn-Lewiston: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Portland: Equipment to improve relability of existing instrument landing system.

South Bangor: Center air-ground peripheral communications outlet.

Millinocket: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Presque Isle: Tactical air navigation equipment.

MARYLAND

Nottingham: Distance measuring equipment.

Baltimore: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Andrews: Air-ground communcations.

Salisbury: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Ridgely: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Salisbury: Air navigation equipment.

Snow Hill: Air navigation equipment.

Baltimore: Instrument landing system (second facility).
New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).
Runway end identification lights (two facilities).

MASSACHUSETTS

Worcester:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

New Bedford:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Westfield: Airport traffic control tower.

Hyannis:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Nantucket:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Boston (Nashua): Air route traffic control center.

Chester: Distance measuring equipment.

Hyannis: Distance measuring equipment.

Westfield: Distance measuring equipment.

Bedford: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Boston: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

New Bedford: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Worcester: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bedford: Visual approach slope indicator.

Boston:
Visual approach slope indicator.
Short approach light system.

MICHIGAN

Flint:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Muskegon:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Kalamazoo:
Airport traffic control tower.
Approach light system.

Battle Creek:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Jackson: Airport traffic control tower.

Detroit:
Air route traffic control center.
Airport surveillance radar.

Saginaw: Distance measuring equipment.

Traverse City: Distance measuring equipment.

Detroit (Willow Run): Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Lansing: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Muskegon: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Saulte Ste. Marie: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Alpena: Air-ground communications.

Battle Creek: Separate control tower.

Grand Rapids: Separate control tower.

Detroit (Willow Run): Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Grand Rapids: Separate flight service station.

Battle Creek: Remote communications outlet.

Marquette: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Saginaw: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Saulte Ste. Marie: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Traverse City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alpena: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Grand Rapids: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Detroit: Instrument landing system.

Battle Creek: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Detroit, Metropolitan: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

Grand Rapids: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

MINNESOTA

Duluth:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Rochester:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Minneapolis: Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

Farmington: Distance measuring equipment.

Minneapolis: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bemidji: Air-ground communications.

St. Paul (Holman): New tower service.

Duluth: Separate control tower.

Redwood Falls: Doppler direction finding equipment.

St. Paul (Holman): VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Minneapolis: Visual approach slope indicator.

MISSISSIPPI

Gulfport:

Airport traffic control tower.

Distance measuring equipment.

Hattiesburg: Distance measuring equipment.

Holly Springs: Distance measuring equipment.

Greenville: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Meridian: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Jackson: Airport surveillance radar.

Greenwood: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Laurel: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Greenwood: Air navigation equipment.

McComb: Air navigation equipment.

Jackson: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

MISSOURI

Springfield:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

St. Joseph:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Kansas City: Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

St. Louis: Air route traffic control center operating Aircraft Movement Information Service sector.

Macon: Distance measuring equipment.

Readsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Cape Girardeau: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Jefferson City: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Joplin: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Springfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

St. Joseph: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

St. Louis: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Marysville: Air-ground communications.

Kansas City:

Radar bright display equipment (2 units).

Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Vichy: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Butler: Air navigation equipment.

St. Louis: Instrument landing system (2d facility).

Joplin: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

St. Louis:

New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (2d facility).

Visual approach slope indicator.

Short approach light system.

MONTANA

Helena: Airport traffic control tower.

Great Falls: Air route traffic control center.

Miles City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Great Falls: Air navigation equipment.

Lewiston: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Whitehall: Tactical air navigation equipment.

NEBRASKA

Chadron: Distance measuring equipment.

Sidney: Distance measuring equipment.

Lincoln: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Scottsbluff: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Omaha: Runway end identification lights.

NEVADA

Tonopah: Long range radar.

Reno: Airport surveillance radar.

Sod House: Distance measuring equipment.

Wells: Distance measuring equipment.

Wilson Creek: Distance measuring equipment.

Reno: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Las Vegas: Air-ground communications.

Reno:

Separate control tower.

Separate flight service station.

Battle Mountain: Remote communications outlet.

Elko: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Ely: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Las Vegas: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Lovelock: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tonopah: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Beatty: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Reno: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Tonopah: Tactical air navigation equipment.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Keene: Distance measuring equipment.

Lebanon: Distance measuring equipment.

Laconia: Terminal VHF radio direction range.

Concord: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Manchester: Air navigation equipment.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Trenton: Airport traffic control tower.

Newark: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Teterboro: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Ship Bottom: Air-ground communications.

Teterboro: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Trenton: Instrument landing system.

NEW MEXICO

Roswell: Airport traffic control tower.

Santa Fe: Airport traffic control tower.

Hobbs: Airport traffic control tower.

Albuquerque: Air route traffic control center.

Carlsbad: Distance measuring equipment.

Corona: Distance measuring equipment.

Crownpoint: Distance measuring equipment.

Deming: Distance measuring equipment.

Hobbs: Distance measuring equipment.

Otto: Distance measuring equipment.

Pinon: Distance measuring equipment.

Texico: Distance measuring equipment.

Gallup: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Silver City/Hurley: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Albuquerque: Radar bright display equipment.

Deming: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Farmington: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Las Vegas: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Roswell: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tucumcari: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Zuni: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Grants: Air navigation equipment.

Roswell: Air navigation equipment.

Texico: Air navigation equipment.

Truth or Consequences: Air navigation equipment.

NEW YORK

Elmira, Binghamton, Utica: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.

Niagara Falls: Approach light system.

Islip: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.

New York (Jamaica): Airport traffic control center operation, aircraft movement information service.

White Plains: Airport surveillance radars.

De Lancey, Dunkirk, New York (LaGuardia), Utica, Watertown: Distance measuring equipment.

Ogdensburg, Saranac Lake: Terminal VHF radio directional ranges.

Binghamton, Buffalo, Islip, New York (Idlewild), Niagara Falls, Peconic, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, White Plains: Equipment to improve the reliability of instrument landing systems.

Buffalo: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Albany, Buffalo, Elmira, Watertown: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Plattsburg: Tactical air navigation equipment.

New York (Idlewild): Instrument landing system (3d facility): New standards approach light system, runway end identification lights, and visual approach slope indicators.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville: Airport traffic control tower; instrument landing system.

Wilmington: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Fayetteville: Airport traffic control tower.

Pinehurst: Distance measuring equipment.

Wilmington and Winston-Salem: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Hickory, New Bern, and Rocky Mount: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fayetteville: Instrument landing system.

Winston-Salem: Short approach light system.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo and Bismarck: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Jamestown and Williston: Distance measuring equipment.

Grand Forks and Minot: SAGE sector ARTC centers.

Dickinson and Minot: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Pembina: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

OHIO

Mansfield: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Cleveland (Oberlin): Aircraft traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service.

Newcomerstown: Establish long distance measuring equipment.

Cleveland, Columbus, Mansfield, Toledo, Youngstown: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Cleveland: Radar bright display epuipment and Air Traffic control radar beacon.

Findlay, Zanesville: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Akron-Canton, Columbus, Toledo: Runway end identification lights.

Cleveland: Short approach light system.

OKLAHOMA

Tulsa (Riverside): Control tower.

Hobart and Sayre: Distance measuring equipment.

Guyman and Stillwater: Establish terminal VHF radio directional ranges.

Ardmore, Hobart, Ponca City, McAlester: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tulsa: Instrument landing system (second facility).

OREGON

Pendleton: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach lights.

Hillsboro: Establish control tower.

North Bend: Distance measuring equipment.

Eugene, Klamath Falls, Pendleton: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

The Dalles: Doppler direction finding equipment.

PENNSYLVANIA

Erie: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Allentown: Same.

Wilkes-Barre: Same.

Williamsport: Airport traffic control tower and instrument landing system.

Lancaster and Slate Run: Distance measuring equipment.

Erie, Reading and Wilkes-Barre: Improved reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

North Mountain: Air-ground communications (second facility).

Lancaster: New tower service.

Philadelphia and Pittsburgh: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Pittsburgh-Allegheny: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Bradford, Harrisburg, Phillipsburg, Wilkes-Barre: Doppler equipment.

Pittsburgh: Instrument landing system (second facility).

Erie, Pittsburgh, (Allegheny): Runway end identification lights.

RHODE ISLAND

Providence: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville: Airport traffic control tower. Instrument landing system.

Spartanburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Columbia: Establish airport surveillance radars.

Myrtle Beach: Distance measuring equipment.

Charleston, Columbia Greenville, Spartanburg: Equipment to improve existing instrument landing systems.

Anderson, Myrtle Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Allendale, Columbia, Florence: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Charleston: New standard approach light system.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brookings: High frequency radio directional range.

Huron, Sioux Falls: Equipment to improve reliability of instrument landing systems.

Aberdeen, Pierre: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Bruce: Air navigation facilities.

Aberdeen, Rapid City: Tactical air navigation equipment.

TENNESSEE

Bristol: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Memphis: Aircraft traffic control center operating and aircraft movement information service.

Chattanooga: Airport surveillance radar.

Graham: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Clarksville (Outlaw): Very high frequency radio directional range.

Knoxville: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Tri-Cities: Tower resulting from separation of combined station-tower.

Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Crossville, Jackson: Doppler direction finding equipment.

TEXAS

Amarillo: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Corpus Christi: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Abilene: Same.

San Angelo: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

Plainview: Airport traffic control tower.

Longview: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

San Antonio, Stinson: Airport traffic control tower.

College Station: Airport traffic control tower.

Brownsville: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

El Paso, Fort Worth, San Antonio: Airport traffic control center operating, and aircraft movement information service.

Amarillo: Long-range radar.

Beaumont, Britton, Childress, College Station, Eagle Lake, Guthrie, Hudspeth, Llano, Newman, Quitman: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Abilene, Amarillo, Austin, Brownsville, El Paso, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, San Antonio, Tyler, Wichita Falls: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Forth Worth (Amon Carter Field) and Houston: Air Traffic Control radar beacon.

Lubbock, San Angelo: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alice, Austin, Childress, College Station, Cotulla, Dalhart, Galveston, Lufkin, McAllen, Wink: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Abilene, Galveston, Lufkin, Palacios, San Angelo, Wink: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Houston: (Second) instrument landing system.

UTAH

Salt Lake City: Airport Traffic Control Center operating and aircraft movement information service.

Myton: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Vernal: Establish terminal VHF Radio direction range.

Salt Lake City: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Cedar City and Delta: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Cedar City: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Bonneville, Bryce Canyon, Myton, Provo: Tactical air navigation equipment.

VERMONT

Burlington: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, approach light system, long-range radar, distance measuring equipment, and equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Montpelier: Doppler direction finding equipment, runway end identification lines.

VIRGINIA

Newport News: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Roanoke: Airport traffic control tower.

Lynchburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Lawrenceville and Richmond: Distance measuring equipment.

Staunton: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Newport News: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Dunn Loring: Air ground communications (second).

Blackstone: Remote communications outlet.

Charlottesville and Newport News: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Front Royal and Pulaski: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Charlottesville and Lynchburg: Instrument landing systems.

Roanoke: Runway end identification lines (second and third facilities).

WASHINGTON

Yakima: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing systems, approach light system, and equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Seattle: Airport traffic control center operating Aircraft Movement Information Service and radar bright display equipment.

Ephrata and Hoquiam: Distance measuring equipment.

Pullman and Moscow: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Bellingham: Air-ground communications and Doppler direction finding equipment.

Seattle-Takoma: Air traffic control radar beacon and instrument landing systems.

Hoquiam and Walla Walla: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Walla Walla: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Seattle-Boeing: New approach light system.

WEST VIRGINIA

Huntington and Wheeling: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing systems, and approach light system.

Beckley and Bluefield: Distance measuring equipment.

Elkins: Remote communications.

Bluefield and Huntington: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Charleston and Wheeling: Runway end identification lights.

WISCONSIN

Appleton and Manitowac: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Rhinelander: Air-ground communications.

Eau Claire, Green Bay, and Milwaukee: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Milwaukee-Racine: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Milwaukee: Instrument landing system.

WYOMING

Cody: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Rock River: Air-ground communications.

Rawlings, Rock Springs, Sheridan, Worland, and Casper: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Crazy Woman: Tactical air navigation equipment.

INSERT NO. 13

COAST GUARD

The following items would be eliminated if the proposed Coast Guard budget[1] were cut by $50 million:

1. Replacement of 1 large high endurance cutter (to be constructed by bid)	$14,000,000
2. Replacement of 2 medium reserve cutters (to be constructed by bid)	7,500,000
3. Replacement of 6 tenders (to be constructed by bid)	5,600,000
4. Replacement of 2 tenders and moorings to service Missouri River (to be constructed by bid)	1,174,000
5. Replacement of Tacan navigational equipment to service communications on cutters	2,200,000
6. Elimination of proposal to establish Astoria, Oreg., air detachment	1,249,000
7. Construction of air station, Boston	2,243,000
8. Construction of 24 family quarters for air detachment, Annette Island, Alaska	1,124,000
9. Relocation of air station, Miami to Opa-Locka, Fla	1,115,000
10. Construction of microwave tower and laboratory, Wildwood, N.J	84,000
11. Construction and improvement of lifeboat station, Fort Macon, N.C	459,000
12. Eliminate proposal for establishment of search and rescue facility, Brookings, Oreg	560,000
13. Eliminate construction of moorings at Mayport, Fla., and Juneau, Alaska	650,000
14. Rebuilding of primary radio station, Miami, Fla	900,000
15. Eliminate improvements at Coast Guard bases and yard: Terminal Island, Calif., Ketchikan, Alaska, Sand Island, Honolulu, Coast Guard Yard, Curtis Bay, Md	1,783,000
16. Eliminate 1964 phase of Academy improvement program, New London, Conn., and improvements on Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va., and receiving station, Cape May, N.J	2,317,000
17. Curtailment of procurement of helicopters, aids to navigation projects, construction, and improvement of shore stations	7,006,000
Total	50,000,000

INSERT NO. 14

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A $30 million budget cut in the Small Business Administration would mean that field and regional offices ~~would be closed~~. Typical of this type are the following:

Alaska: Anchorage.

Georgia: Atlanta.

Illinois: Chicago.

Kentucky: Louisville.

Missouri: St. Louis.

Montana: Helena.

Nebraska: Omaha.

Oregon: Portland.

Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.

Rhode Island: Providence.

South Dakota: Sioux Falls.

Texas: Marshall and Houston.

Washington: Spokane.

Puerto Rico: Santurce.

INSERT NO. 15

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A 15 percent reduction in the Veterans' Administration budget would mean closing from 7 to 10 hospitals; deferring planning and construction on seven others and curtailing the hospital modernization program.

This would adversely affect the quality of hospital care and the economies, including the construction industry, in these States and communities.

Alabama: Tuskegee.

California: Long Beach, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, and San Francisco.

Florida: Gainesville.

Illinois: Danville and Hines.

Indiana: Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.

Kansas: Wichita.

Kentucky: Fort Thomas and Louisville.

Maryland: Perry Point.

Massachusetts: Bedford.

Michigan: Saginaw.

Missouri: Excelsior Springs.

Nebraska: Grand Island.

New York: Castle Point and Northport, Long Island.

North Carolina: Oteen.

Ohio: Cincinnati.

Oregon: Portland.

Pennsylvania: Aspinwall, Coatesville, and Erie.

Puerto Rico: San Juan.

South Dakota: Fort Meade.

Texas: Temple.

Vermont: White River Junction.

Virginia: Roanoke.

Washington: Seattle.

West Virginia: Martinsburg.

INSERT NO. 16

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

An $86 million cut would force GSA to drop the following construction projects:

Arizona: Tucson—border patrol station headquarters	$344,000
Arkansas: Pine Bluff—post office, courthouse	2,391,000
California: Fresno—courthouse, Federal office building	5,400,000
Idaho: Boise—courthouse, Federal office building	7,505,000
Maryland: Baltimore—Federal office building (increase)	13,706,000
Nevada: Las Vegas—courthouse, Federal office building	4,772,000
New Hampshire: Portsmouth—post office, Federal office building	2,396,000
Ohio: Cleveland—Federal office building	41,223,000
South Carolina: Charleston	2,903,000
Texas: Fort Worth	15,664,000

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor describing the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Joint Economic Committee, together with that testimony itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

REFORMS OUTLINED: MCNAMARA LISTS SAVINGS

(By Juan Cameron)

WASHINGTON.—Dull are terms such as "logistics management improvement" and "*CPFF*" contracts.

Yet Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara told Congress this past week such bureaucratese is the key to whittling down the $50-billion defense budget by $3.5 billion in the next 3 years.

In an appearance before the House-Senate Economic Committee that had strong political overtones, the embattled Defense Department chief bared the record of past spending mistakes that cost the taxpayer billions.

And, to the pointed bipartisan applause of Chairman Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, and *WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrats and* Representative THOMAS CURTIS, Republican, the former Ford Motor Co. president outlined his program of management reform.

THIRTEEN BILLION DOLLARS SAVED

In a crisp, youthful voice, the sleek-haired Defense Secretary told how he had shaved *$13 billion off the 1963–64 new* spending requests of the military services.

And he rattled off how through increased emphasis on competitive bidding, centralized purchasing, combined operations, and elimination of "wasteful and inefficient" cost plus fixed fee (*CPFF*) contracts he hopes to pare defense costs by $1.9 billion in fiscal 1963 and $3.4 billion by fiscal 1965.

In pointed reference to the current TFX hearings before another Senate committee led by Arkansas Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Senator DOUGLAS said: "I consider you to be a great Secretary of Defense, a man who understands the intricate problems in these areas and has had the courage—and some of your actions have taken great courage—to act upon them."

ECONOMIES LISTED

Better procurement policies can affect substantially a major portion of the $50 billion defense budget. Roughly $20 billion of the Department's budget today goes toward payrolls, the remainder to logistics, which includes everything from the controversial $6 billion TFX design, to butcher smocks, belt buckles, and exercise bloomers.

Mr. McNamara ticked off the chief areas of savings thus:

Shifting from noncompetitive to competitive bids can save 25 cents on each dollar. By fiscal 1965 competitive bids will cover $1.9 billion of defense purchases against $760 million today with savings estimated at $500 million annually.

Reduction in cost plus fixed fee contracts from 23.3 percent today to 12 percent by fiscal 1965, with eventual savings of $700 million.

Arbitrary cuts in Department of Defense civilian 1 million-man employment on the basis of estimated gains in Department productivity. Reductions of 10,000 planned by fiscal 1964.

Closing of some 258 military installations in the United States and 58 overseas and release of 45,000 employees. "Good progress" made to date on program schedules to save $440 million annually by fiscal 1965.

Consolidation of military communications, headquarters intelligence operations, real estate management and equipment maintenance. The latter alone to produce savings of $300 million annually by 1965.

Joint supply and service purchasing—including eliminating buying of 18 different types of butcher smocks—which will reduce inventories by $232 million this year, an additional $112 million in fiscal 1964.

---

[1] It is assumed that the entire Coast Guard budget cut would come from its modernization program since other portions of its budget do not contain items susceptible to any sizable reductions.

Joint equipment, such as the TFX aircraft, that over the life cycle of the aircraft will save $1 billion in development, production, and operating costs.

BUILDING BLOCKS

He confirmed that the huge and expanding defense expenditures on research and development and sophisticated weapon systems did not lend themselves to competitive bidding.

But his philosophy in these expensive fields is to make sure the "technical building blocks"—acquired in research, exploratory, and advance development—are available before large-scale weapon systems are undertaken.

The failure to develop these building blocks before "metal is bent" has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in defense spending, Mr. McNamara told the Douglas group.

Some examples:

Some $1 billion and 15 years spent on a nuclear-powered aircraft before it was terminated in 1961. No efficient reactor was available.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars on the P–6–M jet-powered flying boat put into production before basic design problems were solved. Terminated August 1959.

Eighty million dollars on automatic decoy missile Goose that was found incompatible with concept of "fail safe" under which manned bombers automatically return to base unless specifically ordered to continue on target.

Eighty million dollars on radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va., before technical problems were solved. Terminated July 1962.

Statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara Before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, March 28, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is indeed a pleasure for me to come before this committee for the first time to discuss the progress made by the Department of Defense in improving the economy and efficiency of its procurement and logistics operations. The Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee is among the pioneers in this effort. To the continuing interest and prodding of this and other committees of the Congress, we owe much of the progress achieved in this area over the last 10 years. The personal interest and warm support of the chairman and Mr. Curtis and the other members of the committee have been a source of strength to me in my efforts to bring about improvements in our logistics management, many of which stem directly from the committee's recommendations.

As the members of this committee well know, it is extremely difficult to change the traditional way of doing things in the Defense Establishment. Many of the actions we have taken during the last 2 years to improve the management of our procurement and logistics operations were recommended by this and other committees of the Congress and by various nongovernmental committees and commissions, 10 and even 15 years ago. For example, the reorganization of the Army technical services, which we put into effect last year, had been recommended to the President by Secretary of Defense Lovett in 1952 with the comment that "A reorganizaion of the technical services would be no more painful than backing into a buzz saw, but I believe that it is long overdue."

Resistance to change is not unique to the Defense Department. This same problem is also found in almost any large business organization. Change means that people have to relearn the way they are doing things and this is always a painful and time-consuming process, whether in defense logistics or private business.

The term "logistics," in its broadest application, encompasses the entire spectrum of activity beginning with research and development and extending through procurement, production, construction of facilities, deployment, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc., and ending with the disposal of surplus materiel and facilities. In this sense, our logistics operations account for about three-quarters of the total Defense budget. Looked at in another way—our total payroll for active duty, reserve and retired military personnel and all civilian personnel accounts for roughly two-fifths of our total budget, with the balance (about $30 billion out of a total of $50 billion) accounted for by the purchase of goods and services of all kinds, that is, research and development; the procurement of weapons, equipment, spares and other consumables; military construction; maintenance; utilities; etc.

Truly important savings in defense expenditures can be achieved only by attacking this entire spectrum of logistics activities, and that is precisely what we are trying to do. Decisions in the development phase of a weapons system will affect not only the cost of development but also the cost of production and operation of the system throughout its life. As this subcommittee noted in one of its recent reports, "It is apparent that two identical items can be procured, stored, inventoried, issued and maintained in a common way much more economically and efficiently than can two different items." Yet, each new weapon or piece of equipment that enters the inventory brings with it thousands of new and different items of spares and supporting equipment. That is why any serious attempt to reduce the number of different items in our logistics system and thereby reduce costs, must begin in the research and development phase.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and development phase itself can be broken down into a number of significant sequential steps:

1. Research (basic and applied): The effort directed toward the expansion of knowledge in such fields as the physical and environmental sciences, i.e., mathematics, physics, psychology, biology and the medical sciences.
2. Exploratory developments: Work directed toward the solution of specific military problems, but stopping short of the actual development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing.
3. Advanced developments: Projects which have advanced to a point where the development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing is required, prior to the determination of whether the item should be designed or engineered for eventual service use.
4. Engineering developments: Developments which are being engineered for service use, but which have not as yet been approved for production and deployment.
5. Operational systems development: Continued development, test, evaluation, and design improvement of projects which have already entered the production-deployment stage.

It is from the first three categories—research, exploratory, and advanced developments—that we acquire the technical building blocks, i.e., the new technologies, and critical components, that we need for major systems development. We cannot do a proper job of engineering development, least of all operational systems development, unless these building blocks are available. Lack of attention to this principle in the past has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in the research and development program. All too often large-scale weapon system developments, and even production programs, have been undertaken before we had clearly defined what was wanted and before we had clearly determined that there existed a suitable technological base on which to draw in developing a system. And, all too often insufficient attention has been paid to how a proposed weapon system would be used; what it would cost; and, finally, whether the contribution the weapon could make to our military capability would be worth the cost. Let me give you a few examples to illustrate this point.

Nuclear-powered aircraft

Here is a case where a major development program was undertaken before a suitable technological base had been created. Nearly 15 years and about $1 billion had been devoted to the nuclear-powered aircraft project before it was terminated in 1961. Throughout its history the program was characterized by attempts to find shortcuts to early flight. Only a relatively small fraction of the money expended was applied to the really critical pacing item, namely the development of an efficient reactor with a potentially high performance. Most of the funds were consumed in aircraft and weapon system design, in trying to develop turbine machinery, aircraft components, radiation resistant tires and oils, and for the construction of various facilities, many of which would be needed only in support of a flight test program. The powerplant development was oriented primarily to the goal of early flight, an approach which yielded little, if any, potential for further growth into a militarily useful system. Neither of the two powerplants under development at the time the project was canceled held any great promise as practical propulsion units. Both would have required very large aircraft with limited speed and altitude characteristics, and involving severe operational and ground handling problems and hazards. Thus, due to the lack of the pacing item, it is highly unlikely that we would ever have obtained anything useful from a military point of view, had we continued the project.

The P–6–M jet-powered flying boat

Here is a case where a project was advanced into the production phase long before even the basic design problems were solved. The project was started in 1951 to meet an anticipated requirement for a fast, mine-laying, jet-powered seaplane, capable of flying at transonic speeds at sea level and at high altitudes, with an ability to take off and land in 6- to 8-foot waves and carry a payload of 30,000 pounds over a range of 900 miles. Even though various model tests conducted in 1953 and 1954 disclosed a number of serious design deficiencies, the development was continued. Further technical deficiencies were disclosed during flight tests in 1955 and 1956. Nevertheless, the first production contract for operational aircraft was placed in late 1956. By the time this project was terminated in August 1959, the Government had expended almost $450 million, of which more than $200 million was spent on the production contract. Even then, most of the technical problems had still not been solved.

SM–73—Goose aerodynamic decoy missile

Here is a case where the operational use of a weapon was not clearly foreseen prior to the commencement of full system development. The project was started in June 1955 and terminated in December 1958 at the cost to the Government of about $80 million. The Goose was essentially a pilotless aircraft which was designed to fly at about the speed of a B–52 and appear on enemy radar as a manned bomber. The operational concept called for launching Goose at the same time the manned bombers took off. However, the manned bombers could be recalled and returned to their bases, but the Goose could not be recovered once it was launched. Thus the Goose was incompatible with the new concept of positive control (under which the bombers automatically return to base unless specifically directed to continue to target) and had to be abandoned.

Construction of a radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

Here is a case where the construction of an extremely complex research facility was started before all of the technical problems had been thoroughly studied. Construction of this radio telescope, known as the Big Dish, was decided upon in the fiscal year 1959 budget at which time its total cost was estimated at $80 million. Two years later the cost estimate had risen to $135 million and to preclude a further increase, the House Appropriations Committee established this amount as a ceiling on the project. By the spring of 1962 it was clear that the cost would amount to $190 to $200 million, without any assurance the facility would meet the originally stated requirements. In the light of this, and other factors, the project was terminated last July at a cost to the Government of about $70 million.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

In order to minimize such problems in the future we are now following the practice of inaugurating large system development projects only after completion of what we call a program definition phase. This is the phase in which we, together with our contractors, do our thinking and planning—before we start bending metal."

Very briefly, the program definition phase begins with the solicitation of proposals from industry and involves a number of early study contracts whose purpose is simply to define the program, prior to authorizing full-scale development. In the early stages of the program definition phase we do not attempt to establish rigorous specifications, preferring to encourage initiative and innovation on the part of our contractors or contractor teams. Indeed, where competing approaches present an unusually difficult choice, we may support more than one approach throughout the whole program definition period.

Working together, a contractor team can explore in depth the many unknowns which are present in any new effort. They can accomplish the overall system design, define the subsystems and major components, and begin the early stages of laboratory experimentation and design. Most important, they can identify the critical problems and make good estimates of how long and how much money it will take to solve them.

With this information at hand, we are in a much better position to decide whether or not to proceed with full-scale development. And if we decide on full-scale development, the basic scientific and management team will have already been established, with a visible history of successful collaboration during the program definition phase. Finally, it will be possible to make the decision for full-scale effort with far greater assurance that the cost estimates are sound, that the performance of the system will meet the promise, and that the military requirement will be filled at the time needed.

Prior planning, and even feasibility testing of pacing components, are a lot cheaper than having to reorient, stretch out, or terminate expensive projects after they have been started. There are, of course, exceptions to this general rule. Where a development can add a new and unique dimension to our military capability like the A- and H-bombs and the ICBM, great costs and risks are justified. But such cases are rare. The typical development promises, if successful, to achieve a capability that can also be achieved in other ways or represents an improvement of but modest proportions in our total military capability. In these cases the urgency is not as great and the employment of a more measured and orderly approach to development and production is fully justified. In fact, I have observed that in most cases careful and comprehensive prior planning actually saves time as well as money and results in more effective and more dependable weapons.

Another major source of waste, as I noted earlier, is the parallel development of projects and systems designed for the same general mission. The cost of developing new aircraft today is reckoned in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In the case of the B-70, the development of three prototype aircraft will probably cost us about $1.5 billion and they will still not be designed as operational vehicles. The cost of developing a new major missile system is even higher. We have invested well over $1 billion in the Nike-Zeus already and the Atlas and Titan developments ran well over $2 billion each. Even the cost of developing a new aircraft engine to the point of production is about $150 million.

But this is only the beginning of the increased cost. If two models are produced where one could do the job, the cost of production is also increased. Two production lines instead of one must be set up and tooled and the economies of large-scale, repetitive production are lost, thus significantly increasing the cost per unit. Two separate pipelines of spares and unique support equipment instead of one must be established in the logistics system, with all the additional costs involved. And, finally, two sets of obsolete spares and support equipment instead of one will eventually have to be disposed of when the end item is finally phased out of the inventory. We have on hand, at this very moment, more than $12 billion of "Excess and long supply" items in our inventories, excluding the billions of dollars of surplus and obsolete major end items which have to be disposed of each year. Thus there are very great economic incentives for reducing the number of different weapon systems and major items of equipment in our inventories.

NIKE-TALOS CONTROVERSY

Yet the record is replete with instances of duplicate developments. One of the most memorable cases of parallel weapon projects conducted under the auspices of different services was the Nike-Talos controversy. The land-based Talos, an Air Force-sponsored adaptation of the Navy shipborne Talos, was directly competitive with the Army's Nike-B (later the Nike-Hercules) development, the follow-on effort to the Nike-Ajax. The history of this controversy was complicated by the roles and missions issue which need not concern us in this context. What is of interest here, however, is the fact that these parallel developments proceeded right up to the point where both were about to be produced and deployed.

At this point, however, Congress balked at the prospect of such an obvious duplication and refused to authorize the use of construction funds for Talos until the Department of Defense completed an evaluation of the two systems and came forth with specific recommendations. As the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee stated: "The committee concluded that both the Army and Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the antiaircraft and continental air defense fields. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapon systems costing in the multibillion-dollar ranges might result and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from a military standpoint." Faced with this mandate, responsibility for land-based Talos was transferred to the Army in the fall of 1957. Following an evaluation study, the Army canceled the project in July of 1958 at a cost to the Government of $118 million.

I know that I need not burden this committee with a recitation of the Thor-Jupiter controversy which involved essentially the same kind of issue.

MULTIPLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE DEVELOPMENT

Another area in which unnecessary duplication has long existed is in jet aircraft engine development. While there may have been a justification in the early stages for a large number of different projects, jet engine technology has now reached a point where parallel development is no longer justified. Indeed, the time has come where we should make use, whenever possible, of engines already developed. This we have done in the case of the new C-141 cargo transport aircraft. Here we had a choice of developing an entirely new engine, which would probably have given this aircraft perhaps a 2- to 3-percent improvement in overall performance, or of using an already developed engine, the TF-33, at a saving in development costs alone of well over $100 million. Considering the additional saving which will accrue in production costs and later in supply and maintenance costs, it was clear that we should use the TF-33 engine.

MULTIPLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENTS

One of the most costly areas of duplication has been that of fighter aircraft. For example, in the 1955-58 period there were no less than four aircraft under development to perform the fighter mission—two in the Navy and two in the Air Force. The Navy aircraft were the F4H-1 and the F8U-3. The Air Force aircraft were the F-105 and the F-107. One might argue that there were special requirements associated with Air Force and Navy missions which necessitated basically different aircraft. Even so both the F4H-1 and the F8U-3 were, as the House Appropriations Committee noted in its report on the 1958 defense appropriation bill, "all-weather fighters with approximately the same mission and operational characteristics." Accordingly, the committee directed the Navy to "take prompt action to decide which of these aircraft it will place in production. This should be accomplished at an earlier date and with fewer test and evaluation aircraft than is presently scheduled." The Navy eventually chose the F4H-1 for production, but by the time the F8U-3 development was terminated, it had cost the Government over $136 million.

In the case of the Air Force, the F-107 was terminated at a cost of about $85 million. Even so, two of the four aircraft, the F4H and the F-105, were actually placed in production. A comprehensive analysis of these two production programs in 1961 convinced me that one aircraft, the F4H, could meet the need of the Air Force as well as the Navy, and do it better than the F-105. Accordingly, further procurement of the F-105 has been terminated and the F4H, now designated the F-4, will be bought for both the Air Force and the Navy. In addition, I have assigned supply management responsibilities for all spare parts and components peculiar to the F-4 aircraft to the Department of the Air Force and I have asked the Air Force and the Navy to develop and submit to me, for my approval, joint plans for the maintenance of this aircraft.

TFX

Perhaps the most important single action we have taken thus far to reduce the number of different weapon systems in our inventory is the TFX, which has been so prominent in the news of late. This aircraft development is designed to provide a replacement for the F-4. Instead of developing and producing two separate aircraft, one for the Navy and another for the Air Force, as was done in the case of the F-105 and the F4H, we decided to develop and produce one aircraft which would meet the requirements of both services. Admittedly, this is not a simple undertaking. The development of a major weapon system to meet the requirements of more than one service is something of a precedent in the Department of Defense. It took more than a year and a half and tens of thousands of manhours of intensive study by both the Defense Department and industry to perfect this plan.

Yet it should be clear to all who are interested in economy and efficiency in the Defense Establishment that we can no longer afford to undertake major development projects to meet unilateral service requirements where a single project can meet the requirements of more than one service. The additional costs involved are much too great. From here on out, we must seek to develop weapon systems to perform a military task, and if it so happens that more than one service has the same task then they will be required, as a general rule, to use the same weapon system wherever this can be accomplished without compromising essential military requirements. Where operational conditions vary, as for example, in attack carrier operations, the minimum number of changes in the common system will be made to accommodate these differences.

This is the principle involved and I think everyone will agree it is an entirely sound one. While one might argue as to precisely how much one system would save as compared with two, I believe everyone would agree that the saving in logistics costs, as I am using the term here today, cannot help but be very substantial. In the case of the TFX we believe these savings will amount to at least a billion dollars in development, production, and operating costs over the life cycle of this aircraft.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

Because of the great uncertainties inherent in research and development, we have not attempted to establish precise monetary savings targets for that part of the "logistics spectrum," as we have for procurement, production, construction, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc. For the latter, we have established specific time-phased Defense Department goals for some 24 areas of logistics management. Selected goals in turn have been established for the military departments and defense agencies (i.e., DSA and DCA) so that our key logistics managers know exactly what is expected of them. These goals are admittedly ambitious and will be achieved only if all management levels in the Defense Department give them continuing, high priority attention. Accordingly, the service Secretaries and agency heads have been directed to make a monthly or quarterly review of progress achieved and to report the results to my office. These reports are audited by the Comptroller, both with regard to the goals and the progress against them.

The current cost reduction goals are summarized in the attached table. The last two columns show the goals reported to the President last July. Management improvement actions instituted in 1962 and planned for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce annual savings of about $1.9 billion. Our goal for end fiscal year 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to about $3.5 billion a year. These are higher goals than those reported to the President, but I believe they can be achieved with a real effort on the part of all concerned.

Mr. Morris will discuss these goals in detail later and give you an up-to-date progress report on their attainment. What I would like to do at this time is to discuss some of the basic concepts and principles upon which these objectives have been developed.

BUYING ONLY WHAT WE NEED

Before we can intelligently decide what to buy, we must first determine precisely what is needed, and what is needed must be directly related to realistic and soundly conceived military plans and policies. All too often in the past, materiel requirements were determined on the basis of unrealistic military plans which themselves reflected the wide divergence of views among the services as to the probable nature of a future war. For example, the Air Force, planning essentially for a short nuclear war, was not buying enough combat consumables to support the Army in a conventional limited war. And the Army, envisioning a long, large-scale general war, was generating requirements so large as to be useless in planning its actual procurement programs. As a result, serious imbalances developed in the stocks of weapons, equipment, and combat consumables held by different services and even within the inventories of a single service.

Therefore, one of my first actions in the logistics management area was to insure that the requirements calculations for our major combat items were soundly based on unified contingency planning and realistic, attainable logistics objectives. By redefining our logistics objectives to accord with approved Defense Department-wide contingency plans we were able to reduce our total stated materiel requirements by some $24 billion. By setting out realistic goals that could be achieved within a reasonable period of time, we have been able to assure that the readiness levels of all related elements of the military forces are raised together and maintained in balance, one with another.

The first step was taken in 1961, in connection with the development of the fiscal year 1963 budget, with the establishment of a specific procurement objective for a large number of important items needed to insure that all of our forces could engage in sustained nonnuclear combat operations for a reasonable period of time. In the 1964 budget, now before the Congress, we propose to take another step to a still higher level of readiness, but again with an eye to the balance among all the related elements of the forces.

In moving toward this goal, we are giving priority to those items in which we are most seriously short, and to those new items which offer large improvements in combat effectiveness in relation to their cost. Modernization simply for its own sake is a luxury we cannot afford. Only by carefully husbanding our resources can we insure that all of our essential material requirements are met and that all of our forces are supplied and equipped, on a balanced basis, and are able to carry out the plans we have set for them.

We are also taking steps to get away from the use of often arbitrary and wasteful rule-of-thumb measures for determining pipeline requirements. Instead of simply adopting a standard factor for pipeline computations, we must, at least in the case of high cost, major end items and components, determine quantitative requirements on an item-by-item basis. We must explore every opportunity to shorten leadtimes by using our transportation resources more effectively, by taking steps to increase the post D-day production potential, etc. It is obvious that very great savings are possible if we are able to reduce the pipeline requirements without adversely affecting combat readiness. Let me give you a specific example: in the case of the M-88 tank recovery vehicle, we found that the substitution of a fully adequate transit pipeline factor of 55 days for the previously used arbitrary factor of 120 days enabled us to realize savings of $12.5 million on just this one item. These actions not only reduce procurement requirements, they also reduce storage and maintenance costs for the entire operational life of the item and, eventually, the amount of surplus which has to be disposed of.

The problem of setting sound requirement standards for major items of equipment is admittedly difficult; however, in the area of supply inventories the logistics management problem becomes far more complicated. This complexity is caused primarily by the great number and diversity of the items involved—nearly 4 million different items, having a value of $40.6 billion, currently being carried in our supply system. Because these items are so numerous and diverse, we simply must decentralize their management. However, when we do so, we then encounter the tendency of each echelon in the supply system to introduce unilateral safety factors into its requirement calculations. The final result, of course, is that the computed requirement often grossly overstates true needs. To improve the soundness of our supply item requirement calculations, we are undertaking a series of management improvement actions such as wider application of automatic data processing equipment, the increased use of fast logistics communication links, and the continuous review and redefinition of safety factors in our requirements computations.

It is not enough to determine simply the quantitative requirements for equipment and supplies. We must also determine the qualitative requirements as well. There is no point in paying for performance or quality features that are not needed to accomplish the essential military task. In any meaningful sense, procurement of excessive quality, which we call gold plating, is just as wasteful as procurement of excessive quantities. While it is understandable that an item costing $1,000 may perform more effectively than another costing half as much, we must always make a judgment as to whether the additional performance is worth the doubled cost. This will always be a most difficult area, since informed judgment is required in all such determinations. It is an area, however, in which we have only just scratched the surface of potential management improvement and in which we feel that substantial additional savings can be made in the future.

CONSOLIDATION OF COMMON SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

In order to be sure that we are buying only what we need we must know exactly what we already have on hand and on order; and this, in an organization as huge, diverse, and far flung as the Defense Department is far from a simple problem. This is particularly true with regard to long supply and excess items, one of the most galling and troublesome areas of logistics management. Instances of one service buying items that are being disposed of by another are, to the taxpayer, the most unexplainable and inexcusable kind of waste. Yet this problem can never be entirely avoided as long as you have different parts of the organization buying and managing the same items. One solution, of course, is to have only one element of the organization purchase and manage all commonly used supplies and services, wherever centralized procurement is indicated. And this has been the solution long favored by many Members of the Congress.

The trend toward the consolidation of the logistics functions, including the procurement of common items of supply and services, has been underway in the Defense Establishment for a long time. Certainly, since the end of World War II, the sentiment, especially within the Congress, for faster progress towara consolidation grew markedly stronger. Following the Unification Act, the problem of overlapping logistics functions in the Defense Department drew the repeated attention and criticism of the Congress. Beginning with the recommendations of the Bonner subcommittee in 1952, the efforts of members of this committee in effecting passage of the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 Defense appropriation bill and later the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, Congress continually prodded the Department in the direction of truly unified logistics management.

The Defense Establishment, however, moved very cautiously toward that objective with various improvisations such as coordinated procurement, joint procurement agencies, and later the establishment of single managers for common supplies and services and the creation of certain Defense-wide coordinating agencies such as the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. These improvisations, however, did not get to the core of the problem—the need for a single agency charged with the responsibility for procuring and managing all commonly used and centrally procured supplies and services.

I remember a presentation made to me back in 1961 dealing with the lack of standardization in the clothing area. Each service, for example, was buying a different type of butcher smock, each in several sizes—a total of 18 different inventory items. Today we stock only two types in fewer sizes—a total of seven different inventory items. You all know the story of the belt buckles and the exercise bloomers.

Thus one of the first and most pressing tasks I had to face when I assumed the Office of the Secretary of Defense was the solution of this long-standing problem of the management of common supplies and services. In reviewing the efforts that had been made since World War II, I concluded that this problem must be attacked head on. It seemed clear to me, as it had to this committee for many years, that only through the establishment of a separate, single supply support agency could we ever hope to find a lasting solution. The result was the creation of the Defense Supply Agency, which now does the buying, the stocking, and where necessary, the surplus disposal of a wide range of commonly used supplies and services. Within its area of responsibility, it will greatly help to insure that we buy only what we need.

Already, the new Agency has made possible a personnel reduction of 3,700 in the fiscal year 1964 budget with an operations and maintenance saving of $33 million. Inventory is expected to be reduced by $232 million during the current fiscal year with a further reduction of $112 million in fiscal year 1964. DSA now handles about 1 million supply items but the number of different storage points is being reduced from 77 to 11.

The basic principle that there should be a single agency to procure and manage common items of supply or services for all users is, as this committee has repeatedly pointed out, as valid for the Government as a whole as it is for the Department of Defense. Therefore, in our own efforts to obtain greater efficiency through the consolidation of common logistics support activities, we should not restrict ourselves to Defense agencies alone. Whenever we find that it is more economical to use the capabilities or facilities of other Government agencies, with no loss in military effectiveness, and at the same or less cost, we should not and have not hesitated to do so. The General Services Administration annually buys for us about $770 million of common-use items such as office supplies, furniture and automatic data processing equipment. This agency also helps us in the screening and disposal of surplus property, in the leasing and maintenance of real property, the storage of records, the purchase of utilities, etc.

BUYING AT THE LOWEST SOUND PRICE

Once we have determined what it is we need to buy, the next problem is to procure it at the lowest sound price considering, of course, quality and delivery dates. For over 100 years, formal advertising has been the preferred method of Government procurement. This method not only insures that the price discipline of the competitive system is harnessed to the advantage of the Government but it also minimizes the risk of bias and preferential treatment in the awarding of contracts. However, since the end of World War II only a small portion of defense procurement has been awarded on a formally advertised basis. To a major extent this was unavoidable, as only conventional classes of equipment and supplies, purchased repetitively in volume, lend themselves fully to procurement by this method.

Formal advertising is inappropriate for virtually all research and development work and for the acquisition of many of today's sophisticated weapon systems, where it is impossible to draw up detailed specifications in advance and make firm fixed-price contracts, with selection based on price alone. Moreover, there are a number of other situations where formal advertising is not applicable by law; for example, small business set-asides, small purchases (under $2,500), emergency purchases, the procurement of perishable subsistence, and items subject to military security classification. These, too, serve to reduce the portion of defense procurement that can be accomplished through formal advertising.

Notwithstanding these limitations, we are making a vigorous effort to expand the use of formal advertising. In this connection, the so-called two-step procurement procedure recently approved by the GAO should prove extremely helpful where precise design is not as important as specific performance characteristics. Under this procedure bidders are first asked to submit proposals to meet specific performance criteria without providing a price quotation. These proposals are then examined by the Government engineers and buyers, and those which meet the desired performance characteristics are approved. In the second step, bidders whose products have been approved then submit sealed bids and the contract is awarded to the lowest responsible bidder under the formal advertising procedure.

INCREASING PRICE COMPETITION

But the fact that for much of our procurement we cannot rely on formal advertising does not mean that we should not demand and facilitate competition for defense contracts. This, in fact, has been one of my principal objectives, not only in the procurement area but also in research and development.

One way in which we can increase competition is to minimize sole-source procurement wherein, for example, we automatically buy spares and spare parts from the original producer of the end item. By breaking out these spares from the main contract we can procure them separately through competitive procedures. This, of course, entails the identification of the spares or spare parts, the preparation of procurement specifications and the seeking out of sources of supply in order to permit competitive bidding. In this effort, we have concentrated first on the high dollar value items already in the defense supply system. Now we are seeking to apply this technique to new items as they enter the supply system and to develop uniform procedures for screening and identifying such items in current and future procurements.

We are also trying to introduce competition at an earlier stage in our procurement process at the point where a new item is ready to be moved from development into production. If successful, this would enable us to avoid paying a price premium on the first large-scale production buy. But use of this method does open up a whole series of new and difficult problems. In order to introduce competition early in the procurement cycle, we must see to it that the necessary drawings and technical data are produced during the development phase so that they may be available at the time the first procurement is made. This is not always possible, especially where time is critical or where the design is still subject to major change. Also, where large engineering and tooling costs are involved, it is unlikely that any new source would be able to compete successfully against the development contractor who may have already completed a large part of the production engineering and tooling.

Experience has demonstrated that very large savings can be achieved by increasing competition. We estimate these savings at about 25 cents on each dollar shifted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement and this is the basis upon which we have computed the savings of nearly $500 million per year to be achieved by fiscal year 1965.

REDUCTION IN COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

It has long been recognized that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts usually provide no incentive for economy, or superior performance. Nevertheless, in recent years, an increasing share of our procurement has been carried out under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, rising from about 13 percent in 1952 to nearly 38 percent during the first 9 months of 1961. To some extent this shift to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracting was unavoidable because of the exploding technology of the 1950's which introduced unprecedented complexity and sophistication in our equipment.

However, even where firm fixed-price contracting is not feasible, penalties and rewards can still be utilized. There are other techniques available through which we can provide incentives to the Defense contractor to perform economically and efficiently. The most important method is the use of incentive contracts in which the contractor's fee is increased if he betters the target price or target performance goals, or conversely, is reduced or eliminated entirely if he fails to meet the contract targets. By fiscal year 1965, we hope to reduce cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 12½ percent of our total contract awards, with an eventual annual savings of nearly $700 million. Already in the first 8 months of the current fiscal year we have reduced the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 23.3 percent of the total as compared to 38 percent in the first 9 months of 1961.

REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

An equally important part of our cost reduction program is our effort to reduce the day-to-day costs of operating the Defense Establishment. One important aspect of this effort has been our program for the closing of unneeded bases and installations. To date, we have announced plans to close or reduce in scope some 330 activities, of which 72 are located overseas and 258 within the United States. As Assistant Secretary Morris will report in detail later, good progress has been made in carrying out these announced closures and continued studies are being made to identify additional installations and bases that can be reduced or closed in future years. We expect by the end of fiscal year 1965 to have initiated actions which will eventually save over $440 million per year. Progress to date is shown in the table below:

Actions announced as of Dec. 31, 1962

	Total
Number of locations	330
Acres to be excessed	274,000
Acquisition cost (millions)	$1,922
Personnel to be released	44,923
Annual savings when action completed [1] (millions)	$270

[1] Many actions require 2 or 3 years to complete.

In an organization as large as the Department of Defense, efforts to simplify procedures can yield surprisingly large savings. Therefore, we are examining our contractor reporting requirements, our requisitioning and transportation procedures and other types of logistics paperwork with the aim of eliminating unneeded or overlapping procedures and achieving the greatest degree of standardization where elimination is not practicable. Substantial success has already been achieved, and we expect to make even greater progress in the coming years.

Another area where increased management effort can yield significant monetary savings, as well as greater combat readiness, is equipment maintenance for which we spend about $11 billion a year. Actions which we have already taken and plan to take through fiscal year 1965 should produce savings of about $300 million a year. But this is an area in which we have barely scratched the surface. To insure top level attention to this function and to coordinate the efforts of the entire Department a full-time Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equipment Maintenance has recently been appointed.

One of the key ways in which we can make savings in the operations of the Department is through the consolidation of like activities. I have already mentioned the Defense Supply Agency but I am sure you will agree that the underlying principle applies to other areas of Defense activity as well. The swiftly expanding requirements for modern military communications, for example, and their even more swiftly rising costs have made departmentwide management of certain portions of the communications system both militarily necessary and financially imperative. Accordingly, a new Defense Communications Agency has been established to guide the development of unified long-line communications systems for use by all elements of the Department. This Agency is also responsible for other important functions such as the development and support of the National Military Command System and the supervision of the military communications satellite development program.

Still another area where consolidation appeared to be a necessity was in headquarters intelligence activities. For this reason, we created the Defense Intelligence Agency not so much, in this case, to reduce costs but rather to utilize more effectively our resources in this vital area.

Real property management, including military family housing, provides another area for reducing operating costs. We have now brought family housing under centralized management in each Department and established a new cost accounting system to facilitate better management. And with the cooperation of the Congress, we hope to bring together in a single appropriation all funds for construction, operation, maintenance, improvement and leasing of family housing.

Our efforts to improve the management of the entire logistics spectrum have resulted in some important changes, not only Department of Defense-wide, but also within the military departments. The Air Force in 1961 substantially realined its organizational structure to meet better the management requirements imposed by the radical change in the nature of modern weapon systems. The Army has virtually completed its reorganization started last year, and has significantly reduced the operational complexity and administrative overlapping of the former Technical Services. And now the Navy, too, is considering a substantial realinement of its organization to fit it better to the demands of modern warfare.

Mr. Chairman, the task of management in the Defense Department is never done. New problems arise as old ones are solved, as evidenced by the constant flow of GAO reports. I can assure you that these reports, as well as constructive criticism from any other source, receive top level attention in the Defense Department. For example, I examine all GAO reports as they come into the Department and all of the written replies are reviewed and initialed by either Mr. Gilpatrick or me, in terms of approving their substance, before they go back to the GAO.

I am sure that the logistics management improvement program, which I have outlined here this morning will not prove to be the final word. But I am equally sure that this program will correct many deficiencies of long standing and result in savings of several billion dollars per year.

Department of Defense procurement and logistics cost-reduction program

[Dollars in millions]

	Recurring annual savings to be realized from actions in fiscal years 1962 through current year				
	As estimated Jan. 15, 1963			As reported to President	
	1963	1964	1965	1963	1967
1. Buying only what we need:					
a. Refining requirements calculations:					
(1) Major items of equipment	(1)	(1)	(1)	0	0
(2) Initial spares provisioning	$104	$157	$210	0	0
(3) Secondary items	420	502	550	$150	$300
(4) Technical manuals	8	25	30	0	0
Total from refinement of requirements	532	684	790	150	300
b. Increased use of excess inventory in lieu of new equipment:					
(1) Equipment and supplies	189	284	394	225	450
(2) Idle production equipment	2	10	21	0	0
(3) Excess contractor inventory	20	20	20	0	0
Total from increased use of excess inventory	211	314	435	225	450
c. Eliminating "goldplating"	$64	$100	$100	$64	$100
d. Inventory item reduction	$1	$4	$5	0	0
2. Buying at the lowest sound price:					
a. Shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement:					
Total percent competitive [2]	(37)	(38.4)	(39.9)		
Amount of saving	$281	$402	$494	$160	$480
b. Shift from cost-plus-a-fixed-fee to fixed or incentive price:					
Total percent cost-plus-a-fixed-fee [3]	(25.8)	(19.1)	(12.3)		
Amount of saving	$322	$502	$684	$100	$600
3. Reducing operating costs:					
a. Terminating unnecessary operations	292	357	442	257	600
b. Standardizing and simplifying procedures:					
(1) Consolidation of 16 requisition systems into 1 on July 1, 1962	10	20	20	20	20
(2) Consolidation of 81 transportation documents into 1	0	22	32	30	30
(3) Reduction of contractor reports	1	4	25	30	30
c. Consolidating and increasing efficiency of operations:					
(1) DSA operating expense savings	31	33	42	28	50
(2) DCA and communication system savings	16	20	25		30
(3) Improvement of transportation and traffic management	17	23	23	40	65
(4) Improvement of equipment, maintenance and management	108	199	297	48	300
(5) Administrative vehicles	3	9	11	0	0
(6) Improvement of military housing management	6	11	19	3	27
(7) Improvement of real property management	24	34	45	0	0
Total program	1,919	2,738	3,489	[4] 1,155	3,082

[1] Savings will be reported as identified. In fiscal year 1962 requirements for major items of equipment were reduced by $24,000,000,000. In fiscal year 1963, the Army reduced 1964 pipeline requirements by $500,000,000; and substituted an expanded production base for a mobilization reserve inventory, saving a net of $36,000,000, a total saving of $536,000,000.

[2] Fiscal year 1961 was 32.9 percent; total annual conversion from sole source of $1,900,000,000; savings are 25 percent per dollar converted.

[3] For the 1st 9 months of fiscal year 1961, cost-plus-fixed-fee was 38 percent; a reduction of $6,000,000,000 is required to reduce that percentage to 12.3 percent; savings are 10 percent per dollar converted.

[4] Fiscal year 1963 goal reported in July 5, 1962 memo to President, on a conservative basis, as $750,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader on a very important statement insofar as the general welfare of this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Albert] on the budget appear in the Record immediately following my remarks on the Youth Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'Brien of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to express my continuing concern for the economic well-being of our Nation and those individuals who earn their livelihoods in the great American textile industry. On many occasions I have called to the attention of my colleagues the plight of American textile workers and employers as a result of the inequitable two-price cotton system.

A great American, commenting upon this problem on September 6, 1962, made this statement:

> Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

The great American who uttered those words was the President of the United States when he commented upon this question immediately following the Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation of an import fee of 8½ cents per pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports as authorized under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

When this statement was made great hope was engendered in the minds of those of us who have been so concerned about the problem. Today, after the passing of approximately 6 months, we seem no nearer a solution of this tremendous problem. As a matter of fact, it appears that we are further away from the desired solution than we were at the time the President uttered the truth which I have just quoted.

Since the two-price cotton system is bringing great injury to the domestic textile industry, I would like to review with you briefly some of the basic economic facts relating to the importance of the textile industry to my home State of North Carolina and to the United States.

Because of my desire to give to my colleagues an unbiased picture of the importance of the textile industry to Americans, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make an objective study of the importance of this industry to the economy of our Nation. The report, even though based on the census of manufactures taken in 1958 by the Bureau of the Census, revealed many interesting facts. I will now undertake to briefly state the basic facts reported by the experts in the Industrial Organization and Corporation Finance Economics Division of the Library of Congress.

Textile manufacture is North Carolina's leading industry, and North Carolina ranks first among all 50 States in the production of textile goods. North Carolina's textiles find their way into the marketplaces of the Nation and throughout the free world.

Because it provides clothing and contributes so extensively to shelter, the textile industry is basic to our American economy. Furthermore, textile production is essential to the national security. In this new era of space exploration, textiles are indispensable. As American men and vehicles whirl through space, textiles are playing an ever-expanding role, from the rocket nose cone to the astronaut's protective clothing and his recovery chute.

The annual value of all textile manufactures in the United States is well over $13¼ billion. Although the industry is concentrated in the Southeast, its 8,000 plants are scattered throughout 44 States. With more than 950,000 employees the textile industry has a payroll of at least $3½ billion.

Textile mills in the United States consumed 8,131,756 bales of cotton in 1958. Other raw materials important to textile production are wool and manmade fibers.

Each year the textile industry utilizes about $85 million in fuels, and almost $120 million in electricity.

Estimates place expenditures on new plant and equipment by the textile industry during 1962 at about $620 million.

Furthermore, outlays on research in the combined textile and apparel industry totaled $29 million in 1959, the latest year for which such data are available.

These then are the broad dimensions of the American textile industry.

The annual value of textile manufacture in North Carolina amounts to well over $3.1 billion, or one-fourth of the total value of American textile production. The textile industry of North Carolina produces in value almost a fourth of all broad woven cotton goods in the United States; more than a third of the manmade fiber fabrics; and almost 10 percent of all woolen and worsted goods.

North Carolina's spinning mills turn out nearly half of all cotton sales yarn produced in this country while its knitting mills produce about half of the Nation's entire hosiery output.

In 1958, according to the Census of Manufactures, value added by manufacture of textiles in North Carolina's plants amounted to more than $1 billion—$1,012,404,000—or about one-third of total value added by manufacture of products in all North Carolina's manufacturing establishments. Furthermore, the figure for the textile industry was approximately two-thirds higher than the corresponding data for cigarette production—$604,165,000.

For other industries important to North Carolina's economy the value added by manufacture in 1958, in order of magnitude, was as follows: food and kindred products, $235,207,000; furniture and fixtures, $210,457,000; chemical and allied products, $150,565,000; electrical machinery, $143,130,000; apparel and related products, $115,244,000; paper and allied products, $102,679,000; and lumber and wood products, $101,720,000.

Wages and salaries paid out by North Carolina's textile industry totaled $609,740,000 in 1958. Second to textiles in that same year was the furniture and fixtures industry, with a payroll of $122,958,000; followed by food and kindred products, $99,370,000; cigarette production, $73,837,000; apparel and related products, $69,742,000; lumber and wood products, $65,654,000; electrical machinery, $59,621,000; chemical and allied products, $53,364,000; and paper and allied products, $52,171,000.

North Carolina's textile industry and its employees pay more than $29 million annually in corporate and individual income taxes and sales taxes. This amounts to almost one-third of the State's total collection from these three sources.

North Carolina's textile industry is essential to the State's agricultural economy, tied to the cotton producers of the entire South.

Currently, more than 2.5 million bales of cotton are utilized a year by North Carolina's textile plants. This is almost nine times the total crop of 280,000 bales of cotton grown on the State's 4,827 commercial cotton farms in 1961.

According to the Census of Manufactures, in 1958, consumption of raw cotton by the textile industry of North Carolina totaled 2,387,000 bales. Of this aggregate, cotton weaving mills accounted for 1,163,000 bales and cotton yarn mills, 1,136,000 bales. The remainder was used by synthetic weaving mills, thread mills, and mills manufacturing miscellaneous textile goods.

The woolen and worsted mills consume many more pounds of fibers than are produced from the State's woolen clip.

The North Carolina textile industry is also a major source of income for other sectors of the State's economy.

Capital expenditures by the textile industry of North Carolina totaled $48,666,000 in 1958. Such outlays benefit especially the textile machinery manufacturers.

Other important industries in North Carolina which her textile production helps to boost are chemical and dyestuff manufacture, corn starch production, utilities and transportation.

In the present 10th Congressional District of North Carolina consisting of Gaston, Cleveland, Rutherford, Avery, Catawba, Mitchell, and Burke Counties, there were 344 textile mills in 1958, or 32 percent of the State's total.

Gaston County is the leading textile manufacturing county in the Nation. It consumes more cotton and has more active spindles than any other county.

The entire American textile industry faces the crucial problem of severe competition from low-priced textile imports, especially cotton goods. The agricultural subsidy on our cotton crop is in large part responsible for this situation. The two-price system for American raw cotton imposes an unfair strain upon the domestic cotton textile industry. Let us see how this cotton subsidy operates. In order to bolster cottongrowers, the U.S. Government subsidizes exports of raw cotton in the amount of 8½ cents per pound to make American cotton competitive on the world market. However, the American textile manufacturer then pays 8½ cents more for cotton than the foreign purchaser. Consequently, the foreign textile manufacturer gains a double advantage over his American counterpart. In addition to cheaper labor abroad, the foreign textile manufacturer benefits from lower raw materials costs. No wonder, then, that the American textile industry has been plagued with heavy competition from imports of inexpensive cotton goods.

Furthermore, on September 6, 1962, the Tariff Commission rejected a proposed increase in duties on foreign-made cotton textiles. This proposal would have raised the levy on imported cotton textiles by 8½ cents a pound, thus offsetting the price advantage that oversea manufacturers now receive on cotton purchased from the United States.

Bills were then introduced during the last session of the 87th Congress to remove the injustice of the two-price system for domestic cotton. No final action was taken.

During the present session of the 88th Congress similar legislation was again introduced into Congress. If this proposed measure is enacted into law it will provide an "in-kind subsidy" to cotton traders. For example, traders or middlemen would receive surplus cotton from the Government stockpile, thus enabling them to sell more cotton to domestic textile manufactures at a lower price.

Other measures have already been instituted to deal with the threat of imports of cheap cotton textiles. A short-term arrangement covering the year ended September 1962 was agreed upon in Geneva. This arrangement was designed to limit imports of cotton textiles and apparel into the United States to about the level of imports during the base period, that is, the year ended June 30, 1961.

During the short-term arrangement actual imports into the United States were the equivalent of 187 million square yards, or 33 percent in excess of the planned limit.

The temporary arrangement was then followed by a 5-year international arrangement. Import quotas were set under the terms of this long-range agreement with all textile importers to the United States.

The textile industry is fundamental to the economy both of the United States and North Carolina. Textiles supply us with clothing and much of our household furnishings. Their role in the national security is crucial. Moreover, textile manufacture boosts sales of countless other industries.

The textile industry of the United States, including that of North Carolina, has been adversely affected by extensive imports of low-priced cotton goods. Steps have already been undertaken to assist the textile industry. First, the 5-year international arrangement, limiting imports of cotton textile goods into the United States, should prove to be helpful to the American textile industry. Congressional action providing for import fees on cotton products would overcome the inequities of the present two-price system in our domestic cotton market. This seems to be the very least that an American textile worker could receive at the hands of his own Government.

Mr. Speaker, another segment of our population has an interest in a fair and equitable cotton pricing program which, in my judgment, is as vital as the interest of the domestic textile worker and his employer. I refer to the cotton farmer and his family.

In testimony before the House Agriculture Cotton Subcommittee I have tried to persuade my brethren of the necessity for the elimination of the two-price cotton system as a necessary step if the cotton agricultural economy is to survive. On several occasions I have brought this to the attention of my colleagues in speeches that have been made here in the House of Representatives. The same representations have been made by me to officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I see evidence of belief on the part of all except those in the Agriculture Department who have a responsibility in this area. Apparently they, even today, do not understand the seriousness of this situation as it relates to the American cotton farmer. A casual consideration of recent experience should be adequate warning to all who profess an interest in either our agricultural economy or the textile industry.

For the year ending August 1, 1961, domestic consumption and exports of cotton amounted to 14,757,000 bales; whereas it is estimated that on August 1, 1963, this figure will have dropped to 12,625,000 bales. CCC stocks of cotton for the year ending August 1, 1961, were reported to be 1,484,000 bales; whereas it is estimated that on August 1, 1963, there could be as much as 8,200,000 bales unless the recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture in his dumping operation lowers that figure.

As we recently saw in the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in cotton is skyrocketing, and it may well be that the figure will approach $2 billion for the cotton program in its various aspects before the end of this fiscal year. These facts point to some of the dangers that confront the agriculturalist who is dependent upon cotton.

Another and equally important threat to the cotton agricultural economy has been pointed out on many occasions as we have discussed the matter here in the House of Representatives. I refer to the rapid conversion of textile production equipment from the processing of cotton to the processing of manmade or synthetic fibers. I will not dwell upon that in any detail today except to call to your attention a typical news story which I have recently read with great interest. On Saturday, March 2, 1963, there appeared in the Southern Textile News a story under the heading "Cotton Pricing May Force New $7 Million Plant to Synthetics." I make that news story a part of my remarks:

COTTON PRICING MAY FORCE NEW $7 MILLION PLANT TO SYNTHETICS

GRANITEVILLE, S.C.—The president of the Graniteville Co., one of the oldest producers of cotton cloth in the South, Thursday, told a group of Texas cotton farmers that its new $7.5 million plant, now being constructed, might turn out blends or synthetic fiber fabrics rather than cotton cloth.

Francis A. Townsend made the remarks before a group from the Lubbock, Tex., area, an area in which the Graniteville Co. is one of the largest single buyers of cotton.

He told the touring group that initially the company had hoped the new spinning and weaving plant would help us maintain and improve the position we have gained in cotton textiles.

But, he said, the company felt it had to hedge our bets because of the pricing policies that control the purchase of American-grown cotton by American textile manufacturers.

He referred to the two-price system which forces American textile manufacturers to pay one-third more for American cotton than their foreign competitors have to pay for the same cotton.

"The Graniteville Co., which began operations as a cotton textile manufacturer in 1845, was an all-cotton operation until 2 years ago," he said.

"The competitive price of raw cotton will determine how large a proportion of our production will be in blends next year and the year after," he said.

The new plant is being designed so that it can turn out blends and manmade fiber fabrics as well as cotton with few machinery adjustments.

"We feel that we owe this versatility to our stockholders, to our employees, and to the communities in which we operate," he said.

COTTON PRICING

The Texans, 48 strong, were on a 2-day tour of textile operations in the Horse Creek Valley area of South Carolina, just north of Augusta, Ga. The tour was sponsored by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute and the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of Lubbock.

The group toured manufacturing facilities at Graniteville Thursday after a day of touring facilities of the United Merchants & Manufacturing Co. at nearby Clearwater on Wednesday.

There V. O. Roberson, U.M. & M. vice president had illustrated the price disadvantage of cotton by comparing manufacturing costs of two competitive fabrics, one of cotton only and one about half cotton, half synthetic fiber. The filling yarn in the half-and-half fabric had a manufacturing cost 17 cents a pound below that in the all-cotton fabric.

The startling announcement made by the president of the Graniteville Co. was made to a group of some 40 large acreage cotton growers who were being conducted on a tour of United Merchants & Manufacturers textile operations at Clearwater, S.C., and Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C.

The tour was designed to give major cotton producers an insight into textile operations in order to bring about a better understanding between the segments of the cotton industry. They were to see firsthand how the raw fiber they produce is converted into yarn and cloth.

Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1963, a story appeared in the same publication quoting a prominent official of the textile industry with reference to the encroachment of manmade fibers upon the cotton farmer's domestic market. As a part of my remarks at this time I would like to include the story which is entitled "Rapid Switch to Manmade Fibers Foreseen by Lowenstein Official":

RAPID SWITCH TO MANMADE FIBERS FORESEEN BY LOWENSTEIN OFFICIAL

NEW ORLEANS.—America's present two-price cotton system may be more detrimental to farmers than to the textile industry, the president of a major textile chain's cotton buying operation said here Monday at the annual meeting of personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's cotton division.

Robert W. Smith of Anderson, S.C., president of Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., pointed out that the Government's two-price policy requires U.S. mills to pay $42.50 more per bale than foreign buyers pay for American-grown cotton.

"It is inconceivable to me that the textile industry will continue to try to operate in the face of such a staggering inequity as two-price cotton," he said. "The end effect, I believe, will not be so much of a question of what the textile industry will do as what the farmers will do," Mr. Smith added.

MILLS SWITCHING OVER

Textile mills, Mr. Smith said, are "switching to manmade fibers on an increasingly broad basis, and the effect has been dynamic for some of the manmade fibers. Rayon has been received in the past 5 years and is booming along at record levels—and at prices from 8 to 11 cents cheaper than cotton. Nylon has been similarly revived and is in the midst of a striking boom, with its low-waste characteristic offsetting a slightly higher price. Other manmade fibers are prospering."

On the other hand, he added, cotton's domestic market is deteriorating and its export market is disappearing.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is becoming more and more the real 'market' for U.S. cotton," he said. "A distressingly large proportion of our crop is going into government warehouses, where it is of absolutely no value to anyone. Cotton is good for only one thing, and that is to be processed into a textile product."

Mr. Smith also called for stricter classing cotton to conform more closely with the fiber's spinning characteristics. He said inconsistent classing practices affect the price of cotton by failing to reflect spinning values and, also, by varying basic loan values.

Mr. Speaker, further indication of the dangers that the American cotton farmer will continue to lose great portions of the domestic textile industry market is apparent when one considers the rapid decline of the export market for American cotton cloth. In the Southern Textile News of March 16, 1963, a report by John W. Murray, secretary-treasurer, Textile Export Association of the United States, set forth most interesting data on this subject. As a part of my remarks I include that report at this point:

EXPORTS OF AMERICAN COTTON CLOTH HITS ALLTIME LOW AS IMPORTS HIT A NEW HIGH

(By John W. Murray)

Exports of American cotton cloth last year dropped to an alltime low as imports rose to an alltime high. Shipments to oversea markets amounted to 417,393,000 square yards as against 437,794,000 square yards in 1961. The alltime peak was reached in 1947 when close to a billion and a half yards were rushed to a war-stricken world famished for textiles.

Following is the chronology of exports in thousands of square yards since the removal of wartime emergency restrictions early in 1947:

1947	1,478,000
1948	940,440
1949	880,204
1950	557,595
1951	802,479
1952	760,709
1953	621,006
1954	604,788
1955	539,466
1956	511,614
1957	553,386
1958	500,501
1959	472,602
1960	437,794
1961	469,676
1962	417,393

This steady decline in shipments is rather easy to explain. In the first place, many countries have rebuilt their textile facilities to the point where they are not only able to provide basic clothing necessities but produce a surplus for export. These same countries for the most part have succeeded in sheltering their industries within invulnerable fortresses composed of exorbitant tariffs, license requirements far more strict than the surveillance regulations of the toughest criminal parole board, hidden surtaxes and a thousand and one customs vexations.

Over the last several months, in order to prevent the dissolution of the domestic industry, the U.S. Government, in conformance with the International Cotton Textile Agreement, has seen fit to impose restraints on imports from a number of foreign suppliers who regard such actions as a violation of their vested, sovereign interests. In this connection, it may be interesting to compare shipments from these whining suppliers with their purchases from the American industry.

CHIEF SUPPLIERS

Chief suppliers of cotton goods to the U.S. market in 1962 were: Japan, 134,769,300 square yards; Hong Kong, 110,206,900 square yards; Taiwan, 44,053,500; India, 32,775,300; Portugal, 25,987,700; France, 19,219,200; Egypt, 17,171,800; Pakistan, 15,097,200; Yugoslavia, 13,767,200; Korea, 8,316,300; Spain, 7,911,700; West Germany, 7,511,500. Total—436,787,600

In the same period these same countries purchased from the American industry these meager quantities: Japan, 490,742 square yards; Hong Kong, 206,891; Taiwan, 30,771; India, 69,991; Portugal, neg.; France, 16,833; Spain, 4,975; West Germany, 2,040,733. Total—8,517,073. Neg. means negligible, that is too small to be recorded.

These restrictions have caused world trade in cotton textiles to languish. Shipments from the main non-Communist exporting countries in the third quarter were about 4 percent less than in the corresponding period of 1961 following a decrease of about 7 percent in the first half of the year. Shipments from the United Kingdom, most of the continental European countries except Portugal, the United States, and Hong Kong were smaller than a year earlier while exports from Japan, India and Pakistan were greater.

Most of the drop in American shipments last year came as a result of restrictions imposed by Canada, the Philippines and Venezuela. Exports to Canada, far and away the industry's most important market, amounted to 189,690,076 square yards in 1962 as compared with 216,444,399 square yards in the previous year, a loss of 26,754,323 square yards. Faced with a financial crisis and a tumbling currency, the Canadian Government last June imposed surtaxes and other restrictions on imports which they promised to remove once the emergency was surmounted. Canada now is in the throes of a general election and it is unlikely that any action along these lines will be taken until the new government is chosen and settles down.

BOOSTS TARIFF

In August the Philippine Government boosted tariffs about 400 percent on cotton piece goods. The trade could not help but note that this action was taken only after Congress approved war claims payments to Manila of about $68 million. As a result, exports to this longtime traditional market dropped from 35 to 28 million square yards.

Increased exports to a number of markets such as South Africa, Dominican Republic, Australia, and the Congo failed to offset losses in other directions.

On the other hand, world trade in manmade fiber piece goods continued to improve. Shipments from most of the main exporting countries were larger than in the previous year. Exports from the United States of America, amounting to 139,590,409 square yards as against the postwar low of 138,684,698 square yards in 1961.

Following is a comparison of shipments in square yards to major markets, with 1962 given first, followed by the figure for 1961:

Canada 29,112,505, 1962; 28,460,056, 1961; United Kingdom 11,391,802, 1962; 14,764,968, 1961; South Africa 10,490,277; 1962; 8,583,110, 1961; Australia 8,083,948; 1962; 4,641,072, 1961; Hong Kong 6,941,983; 1962; 4,290,816, 1961; Sweden 6,540,627; 1962; 6,206,033, 1961; West Germany 6,275,290; 1962; 4926,807, 1961; Switzerland 5,742,475; 1962; 3,714,236, 1961; Belgium 5,631,672; 1962; 10,755,066, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, the National Cotton Council has also sounded a warning that synthetic fibers constitute a serious threat to the future of cotton agriculture in this country. No other organization in the Nation has been so fully dedicated to the cause of the promotion of cotton and all facets of the cotton economy as has the council. In testimony before the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives the council made a strong case for the preservation of our domestic cotton economy in all of its facets by the elimination of the inequitable two-price cotton system.

Had the Department of Agriculture heeded the warning of the experts from the National Cotton Council and the industry, as they testified upon the legislative proposal to eliminate the two-price cotton inequity, I believe that we would today have had legislative relief. Unfortunately, the Department officials did not accept the superior knowledge of those who sought to give them guidance through their testimony and recommendations.

The reversal of form which surprisingly occurred during the course of the hearings before the House Agriculture Cotton Subcommittee came as a tremendous shock to all of us who had been dealing with that Department in connection with the section 22 application which the Department had filed with the Tariff Commission. In that application the Department made out an excellent case for an 8½-cent offset fee to be imposed upon all foreign-made cotton textiles coming into this country. The sudden and indefensible shift of position in testimony at the Cotton Subcommittee hearings constituted the first public contention by Department officials that equality could be obtained at a lesser figure than 8½ cents per pound. If it had been the thought of the spokesmen of the USDA that less than 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 a bale, would constitute equality in the pricing of cotton as between our domestic industry and foreign industry this was the first expression of that thought. This, however, was not the last jolt to be administered to domestic textile people by the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture thereafter fixed the support price for cotton at 32.47 cents per pound, thereby holding the support price at the level of the previous year. This meant that notwithstanding previous testimony by the Department spokesmen that less than 8½ cents per pound might bring about equality in pricing as far as industry was concerned that they were not going to reduce the differential by lowering the support price for the current crop. Whether this support price was proper or necessary when considering the welfare of the cotton farmer is not relevant to this discussion. Whether the support price was fixed at a proper or improper level, the fact remains that there was no reduction of the differential which existed last year with the price paid for American-grown cotton by our domestic textile industry as compared to the price paid by the foreigner.

So, we see that the Department was not willing to reduce the differential through the means of a lower price support. But this was not all that the Department did to further confound and disturb the American people who depend upon the textile industry for their jobs and their livelihood.

On March 29, 1963, the Department of Agriculture announced a cotton sales-for-export program. At this point I make the news release issued by the Department of Agriculture on March 29 a part of my remarks:

[Released by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mar. 29, 1963]

UPLAND COTTON EXPORT SALES PROGRAM ANNOUNCED

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced a cotton sales-for-export program. Cotton purchased under the new program must be exported during the 1963–64 marketing year (August 1, 1963–July 31, 1964). Because of the relatively high proportion of cotton stocks now in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory and under price support loans, a new export sales program is deemed necessary to assure that adequate stocks of American cotton of all different grades and staples will be available for export, U.S. Department of Agriculture officials said.

Under the cotton export sales program announced today, stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton in inventory will be offered for sale periodically on a competitive bid basis. Final settlement for the cotton will be subject to adjustments based on the reclassification of cotton by boards of cotton examiners and the reweights of the cotton. Substitution will be permitted. A quantity of cotton equal to that purchased from Commodity Credit Corporation under the new program must be exported without any export equalization payment.

Cotton covered by offers accepted on and after August 1, 1963, will be delivered to the purchaser as soon after acceptance as possible. Cotton covered by offers accepted prior to August 1, 1963, will, upon the purchaser's request, be delivered to him as soon after June 30, 1963, as possible.

The Department also announced that the payment-in-kind export program will be continued during the 1963–64 marketing year. The payment-in-kind rate will be established periodically at a level calculated to make such program supplement the cotton sales-for-export program. The initial rate of payment under the 1963–64 payment-in-kind cotton export program will be 8½ cents per pound. This rate will apply to sales made under such program on and after date of this release and registered with Commodity Credit Corporation in accordance with the provisions of such program. The rate of payment will be subject to change without prior notice.

Under the export sales program, the cotton will be sold and exported under the terms and conditions of Announcement Nos. NO-C-22 and CN-EX-18, respectively. These announcements together with the payment-in-kind program announcement are currently being developed and should be available for distribution within the next few days.

The ASCS Commodity Office, New Orleans, La., will distribute copies of the announcements to all persons on its mailing list, and copies of the catalog listing cotton available for sale to its catalog subscribers as soon as they are available. Others desiring copies of the announcements and catalog may obtain them from the New Orleans office.

Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the issuance of the news release spokesmen for the domestic textile industry again expressed well-founded alarm at the attitude of the Department toward the preservation of the domestic textile industry. I have talked to a great number of knowledgeable textile leaders since this announcement was made by Secretary Freeman's office. Without exception they tell me that this announcement came to them as a complete surprise, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of the industry had been in constant contact with the Department of Agriculture in an effort to bring order out of the chaotic cotton economy situation. As far as we have been able to ascertain, no representative of the textile industry had any indication that the Department of Agriculture was about to make such a move.

This auction plan offered by the Department, in the judgment of textile people with whom I have talked, merely serves to give foreign cotton buyers an added bonus on the purchase of American cotton. The present export subsidy of 8½ cents, plus carrying charges, has been sufficiently severe upon our domestic industry, but this new brainchild of the Department of Agriculture will seem to make the differential from 9¾ cents to 10 cents per pound, since carrying charges on the cotton would be wiped out. There is a probability that the net effect of this unfortunate decision may be a subsidy equaling 11 cents to 12 cents per pound to the foreign competitor of American mills.

This new program could have the effect of inducing a greater wave of exports of cotton textiles from foreign mills into the United States.

Another possible result of this surprise program could be a charge by cotton-producing nations in other parts of the world that the United States is engaging in a dumping operation in unloading American cotton on the world market in a precipitous manner. This, obviously, could result in a further reduction in the world price of cotton as foreign cottongrowers seek to preserve their markets in the textile-producing countries outside of the United States. This, in turn, could result in the necessity of a further reduction of the price of American cotton on the world market in such a way as to broaden the subsidy enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in their competitive pursuits with the domestic textile industry.

A very interesting newspaper article dealing with this export sales program appeared in the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent on Sunday, March 31, 1963. Since this article points out clearly some of the results of the new decision by the Department of Agriculture, I make it a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

FOREIGN MILLS' COTTON PRICE ADVANTAGE WIDENED

(By Bill Workman)

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has dumped American cotton on the world market at prices foreign mills are willing to pay for it. He calls it a competitive bid basis. It is really an auction.

This action, which caught the domestic cotton and textile industries completely by surprise, made it apparent that the Department of Agriculture had panicked under the combination of declining exports of cotton and the diminishing domestic consumption of cotton. Since 1961, the Government's stockpile of cotton has increased from 1.5 million bales to 10 million bales. It will be an estimated 8.5 million bales by the end of this cotton year next August. The storage cost has climbed from $17 million in 1961 to $70 million this year.

The immediate effect of Freeman's action is the widening of the price advantage foreign mills have over U.S. mills in the purchase of American cotton. This difference has been 8½ cents a pound; there is no telling what the margin will be now, but informed sources are guessing it will be in the neighborhood of 10 cents. The availability of this cotton at competitive prices is certain to affect the world market price.

This action may also increase the cost of the export subsidy from $200 million to $240 million. This cost is borne by American taxpayers. The Agriculture Department sets the subsidy rate at a figure designed to make up the difference between the world cotton price and the U.S. support price.

Secretary Freeman took this costly step during the weekend in spite of the fact he recently requested—and got—$508 million to buy and carry the excess cotton in the Government's stockpile.

At the same time Secretary Freeman was getting that $508 million, he was turning down a proposition by American mills that he sell American cotton to them for $600 million to help maintain employment in the textile plants and to give farmers a chance to plant more acres in cotton. The mills' proposal would have meant that $600 million would have been pumped into the U.S. Treasury instead of $508 million being taken out to finance the further building of the stockpile. This would have meant a real saving of more than $1 billion to taxpayers.

It had been a foregone conclusion that panic would eventually hit the Agriculture Department, because of the steady buildup of the cotton stockpile.

Last year, the Agriculture Department's export program supplied one bale out of eight that was consumed in the world cotton market outside the United States. This year, the United States is supplying 1 bale out of 20 needed in the world market. Historically, the United States should supply one bale out of every five the world market needs; it should export about 20 percent of world needs.

Even while exports of American cotton were dropping sharply and the Government's stockpile was increasing at a frightening rate, the Agriculture Department torpedoed every approach to make American cotton available to American mills at the same prices that foreign mills purchase the same cotton. Officials have claimed repeatedly the cost of this one-price system for cotton would be too great. However, the Government has given away, this year, $75 million worth of cotton to foreign countries under Public Law 480 and has shipped an additional $50 million worth of cotton to foreign lands under long-term credit or barter conditions (it is doubtful this cotton will ever be paid for).

This action by the Secretary of Agriculture was announced late Friday afternoon in face of a conference called by the Department for Monday to consider American mills' request for a one-price system for cotton.

Also, this action follows the Department of Agriculture pattern of torpedoing President Kennedy's statement of September 1962 that the inequity of the two-price system for cotton should be removed.

On more than one occasion, when it appeared there might be some possibility of putting the President's statement into action, the Secretary of Agriculture has taken precipitate action, without notice to the trade, which has made more difficult every approach to solution of textile problems.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that a bewildered domestic textile industry is having difficulty understanding the gyrations of the Department of Agriculture at a time when all persons seem to agree that simple justice requires that the American textile worker and his employer are entitled to a fairer treatment at the hands of our Government?

The President of the United States has often taken note of the absolute necessity that something be done to equalize the situation existing in the world textile picture if we are to preserve our domestic industry. Certainly, the Department of Agriculture, as a branch of the Executive Department of our Government, has a duty and obligation to discontinue policies which are contrary to the expressed desire of the Chief Executive about a solution of this vexatious problem.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of a great industry and the thousands who work in that industry are crying out for fairness and equity. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that that plea is heard and acted upon. I urge my colleagues to join me in demanding that the two-price cotton system be eliminated without further delay or debate.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I want to commend the gentleman very much for his again bringing to the attention of the House in a very thoughtful manner the situation in regard to the two-price cotton system.

I also want to commend the gentleman for his vigilance and the frank and heroic manner in which he has fought and is now fighting to see that something is done about this most inequitable situation.

Recently I have received in the mail several letters from constituents. I would like at this time to read two of them to you. Here is one that was sent to me on March 21, 1963.

March 21, 1963.

Congressman Horace Kornegay,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am an employee of Pickett Cotton Mill and have been since June 9, 1941.

We have been on short time since the last of August 1962 in our opinion. Our short-time operation is a direct result of the flood of unfair foreign imports of cotton textiles into this country. The cotton textiles that are entering this country in 1 year would run Pickett Cotton Mill at least 50 years full time.

It is impossible for us to feed, clothe, and educate our children on 3 days a week—24-hour pay amounts to $27 after tax deduction.

Sir, if there is anything on your part that you can do to help this matter, it would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is another letter, a thought-provoking letter, Mr. Speaker, which I received on March 28, 1963.

It reads:

Dear Sir: We are running short time and according to what I read in the papers and hear on radio and television it is mostly because the mills have to pay 8½ cents a pound extra for their cotton.

This doesn't seem right to me. Looks like to me I have to pay too much for shirts and socks and also underwear because of this.

I don't see any reason why we should have to pay more for our own cotton than anybody else in the world. Looks silly to me.

Please stand up and be counted real loud for correcting this mess. We ought to pay the same price as anybody else for our own cotton—if not a little less.

And also the other countries don't pay wages as high as ours. Looks like our tariffs might go up a little to help even up that score.

Please help get it all straightened out.

These two letters, Mr. Speaker, come from people who work in the cotton mills. They ask thought-provoking questions.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other letter that I would like to call to the attention of the House. This does not come from one who actually works in the mill, but from one of the officials of a mill in my area.

He says:

Dear Congressman Kornegay: What should I tell our employees when they ask me why the Japs can buy cotton raised here in North Carolina for less money than North Carolina textile manufacturers? If the two-price cotton system costs them their jobs, how do we justify it? We have a feeling of frustration.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman has a feeling of frustration just as I have and just as many others who have been greatly concerned over this problem. I would like to do as I have done on many occasions before, and taking the admonition from the lady who wrote me saying that she worked in the cotton mill, to speak out loud and, I hope, clearly in protest against this inequitable system of two-price cotton.

The other day I received a picture in the mail showing a bale of cotton in the lobby of the bank in my hometown. I only wish that this picture could be reproduced in the Congressional Record, but of course we have no pictures in the Record. This picture shows a big bale of cotton with a sign on it that says:

This bale of U.S.-grown cotton costs a local mill	$182.50
This same bale can be bought by a foreign mill for	140.00
You, the American taxpayer, pay that difference of	42.50

Is this fair to: A million textile people? Every American taxpayer? You?

Of course it is not fair, and it is about this unfairness that my colleague from North Carolina, and on certain occasions myself associating with him, have risen on the floor of this House to urge upon the President, the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, and many other agencies of our Government to do something about it.

We now have legislation pending before the Agriculture Committee of the House. There have been hearings held, and it is certainly my hope and earnest belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Agriculture Committee backed up by the appropriate agencies of the Government will come forth as soon as possible with some solution to correct this highly unfair and inequitable situation which now exists, in order that we may have a clear and loud answer to these people who are losing their jobs, whose hours are being cut back.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me and again congratulate him on making this presentation.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] for his usual fine contribution to this discussion. I may say to the gentleman that I, too, have received a great number of letters similar to those which the gentleman read. Our people in North Carolina who work in the textile industry are gravely concerned about the inequitable situation with reference to domestic mills buying cotton, and I know that if we can get the message to the Nation as to the unfairness of the situation, that the basic sense of fair play and justice which all Americans have will demand that something be done immediately to eliminate this inequity.

Were I in the district of the gentleman who has just spoken I should say to the ladies and to the other people who have written to him that I could give personal testimony of the effective contribution that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] has made and is making in this battle for North Carolina and American jobs.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield.

Mr. KORNEGAY. As to the point that the gentleman from North Carolina has so ably made about the effect of two-priced cotton on the cotton producers, I would simply like to say that 30 years ago—and I am quoting this from an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star today written by John Bacon, staff writer:

Thirty years ago cotton had about 93 percent of the total fiber market. Today it has about 67 percent. In the past 12 years the consumption of cotton per person in the United States has dropped from 30 to 22 pounds.

A most significant fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, I again thank the gentleman for his contribution and say to him that I have already today asked that the article by Mr. Bacon which appeared in today's Washington Evening Star be made part of the Congressional Record of this date. I know that it will be read with great interest by many of our colleagues and many others who read the Record.

Candor compels me to state, however, as I have already stated in the body of the remarks heretofore made, that I fear that Mr. Bacon in writing his article was not aware of the unfortunate experience which we have had with the Department of Agriculture in recent days, as I have indicated heretofore the Department's variance occurring when they testified before the Committee on Agriculture that less than 8½ cents would be an equalization of the cotton pricing situation. Then that was followed by fixing price support of cotton at the same level as last year, 32.47 cents per pound. This action, as I have already said, whether we think it was to the best interests of the farmer or not, certainly indicated that the textile manufacturer and the folks working in the mills were still going to be faced with at least an 8½ cents disadvantage in their competition with foreign markets.

Then this was followed on March 29 by the order which I have already referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture setting up the so-called export sales program which certainly holds out no promise of a reduction in the differential in the cotton price paid by our domestic people, as compared to the foreign manufacturers. So this, I think, is something that Mr. Bacon has overlooked, but it was not overlooked by the author of the article in the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent, which I made a part of my remarks earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, I could only say again to the gentleman and to my colleagues that this is a matter of great interest in the State of North Carolina. But even more so it is one which is of great interest to all the people who are familiar with it.

Just last Sunday Mr. John Knight, publisher of the Knight Newspapers, in his weekly letter which is carried by the Charlotte Observer and other newspapers owned by the Knight organization, said in effect that it seemed to him to be just elementary that the textile people should be given what they have asked for when they say that we are only asking for an opportunity to buy cotton grown in America at the same price that our Government sells it to foreign manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] and say to the gentleman that I welcome him and all the others into this battle which seems to be a continuing one, but which we hope will result in a victory for the American people in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANDREW JACKSON, SOUTH CAROLINIAN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. O'Brien of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I feel most fortunate in the fact that accurate historians record the birth of Andrew Jackson as having taken place in my district. I am sure that I exhibit here the understandable pride that any Congressman would have in having a man, so near and so dear to the people of his generation and those of succeeding generations, claim birthplace in his congressional district. I am sure that North Carolina would prefer to continue the abortive claim that Andrew Jackson was born in North Carolina but such is not the fact, and we cannot afford to rely upon false claims of such an important event.

On Friday, March 15, 1963, the author of a new and intriguing book entitled "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian," made a significant and timely presentation of his new book at Lancaster, S.C., under the auspices of the Lancaster County, S.C., Historical Association. The occasion was a day honoring the 196th anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson in Lancaster County, S.C.

At the same time, Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina, delivered an address at the birthday celebration at Lancaster. His speech emphasized the participation of President Jackson in the nullification crises of another day. I pause to remind you that Dr. Hollis is a native of my district, and succeeding generations will accord him praise of permanent and significant accolade because of his magnificent effort to research and record the history of South Carolina, of its sons, its daughters, and its contributions to the growth and permanence of a great Nation.

I had hoped to be present at the celebration but was unable to leave Washington in time to attend the various events which the patriotic citizens of Lancaster County had scheduled. I was able to get from the papers some of the stories which I think are significant. Of particular interest is the story of the apathy of North Carolina on the occasion of the anniversary birthday.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the newspaper accounts as follows: From the Columbia (S.C.) State of March 15, 1963; from the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer of March 16, 1963; from the State, Columbia, S.C., of March 16, 1963; from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C.; from the March 16 edition of the State, Columbia, S.C.; from the Lancaster News, March 14, 1963; from the Kershaw News-Era, Kershaw, S.C.

Not only do I commend Author E. Don Herd for a magnificent contribution to the literature and history of my own native State, but I salute those fine citizens of Lancaster County who gave of their time and efforts to make this birthday anniversary a significant recording of the history of our great President.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 15, 1963]

Celebration Set Today—State Has Solid Claim on Jackson—Senate Committee Has Jackson Holiday Bill

(Note—A bill which would make Andrew Jackson's birthday, today, a legal South Carolina holiday, is being considered by a senate committee. The measure is now in the senate judiciary committee for study. The bill was introduced by Senator Frank L. Roddey, of Lancaster.)

(By Ron Wenzell)

Lancaster.—The author of a new book entitled, "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian," is convinced beyond all doubts that the seventh President of the United States was born in Lancaster County, S.C.

The book by E. Don Herd, director of the University of South Carolina at Lancaster, goes on sale Friday in conjunction with the celebration of Jackson's 196th birthday at Andrew Jackson State Park in Lancaster County.

EIGHT MONTHS' WORK

Herd spent 8 months gathering information and writing the 70-page defense of South Carolina's claim to the fabled Revolutionary War hero and Chief Executive known affectionately as "Old Hickory."

"I took every claim to Jackson, and there are several, and tested them against the facts surrounding his birth," Herd told the State Thursday, "and there is no doubt in my mind that South Carolina has the only valid claim."

Contrary to popular belief, South and North Carolina aren't the only States at odds over where Jackson was born.

According to Herd, Virginia and West Virginia have filed claims to the hero of the Battle of New Orleans and even more surprising, Scotland, England and Ireland have at one time or another claimed to be Jackson's birthplace.

OFF THE COAST?

"One of the strongest hearsay claims has Jackson born at sea off the coast of North America," Herd said.

Herd dismisses North Carolina's claim to Jackson as one of the easiest to "disprove."

"None of North Carolina's affidavits will stand up because none of them are signed by an eyewitness to Jackson's birth. They are all secondhand accounts," he said.

The author also sheds some light on what he terms "important errors in North Carolina's claims to Jackson and the Tar Heels have made three separate claims."

The hard-bound editions of the book, which is being limited to 500 printings, includes pictures. There is also a paperback printing.

OVERWHELMING

"The evidence is overwhelming for South Carolina in the controversy," Herd said, "and some of the most conclusive evidence I present in my book are 16 letters written by Jackson in which he refers to Lancaster County, S.C., as his place of birth."

Both the hardback and the paperback editions of Herd's book will be on sale Friday at the State park. The hardback sells for $3, the paperback for $1.50.

An autograph party will be held from 2 to 4 p.m. at the Lancaster branch of the University of South Carolina.

The Jackson celebration at the State park begins at 10 Friday morning with Dr. Daniel Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina, the main speaker. Hollis' topic is "Andrew Jackson and the Nullification Crisis."

The program is under the direction of the Lancaster city schools, the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

LARGE CROWD

One of the largest crowds ever is expected for the annual event with thousands of South Carolinians anticipated and hundreds of tourists from other States.

In honor of Jackson's birthday, the Carolina Museum at Lancaster will be open from 2 to 6 p.m. Friday and will feature exhibits of the Jacksonian period.

The festivities end Friday night with a concert by world-famous David Rubinoff at the Lancaster Senior High auditorium beginning at 8:15. The concert is being sponsored by the Lancaster Rotary.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 16, 1963]

Tar Heels Ignore Their Andy but That Fellow Born in South Carolina Gets a Rousing Birthday Party

(By Dwayne Walls)

Lancaster, S.C.—South Carolina ended a week of historical billing and cooing over

President Andrew Jackson Friday on Jackson's 196th birthday.

A couple of hundred history buffs and another 800 school pupils attended an hour long birthday ceremony in Andrew Jackson State Park 10 miles north of here.

Later there was a luncheon and autographing party for Don Herd of Lancaster, author of a new book proving again that Jackson was born in South Carolina.

The birthday ceremony was held at the site of Jackson's disputed South Carolina birthplace—a windswept hilltop hard by the North Carolina State line.

A couple of miles away, at Jackson's equally disputed North Carolina birthplace, there was no celebration and only one visitor to the stone monument.

The lone visitor snaked over rough unpaved roads from Waxhaw into South Carolina and back into North Carolina to make sure the Jackson monument was still standing.

It was. The visitor also reported that he found a lot of tall weeds, one rusty beer can and two sardine cans gracing the monument grounds.

Obviously that is one reason the South Carolinans are proud as peacocks of their 360 acres of Jacksoniana, which includes a picnic area and a two-story museum built 8 years ago and stocked with historic oddments.

One of the speakers at Friday's ceremony apologized for the fact that the lawn was wet and muddy in places.

He blamed it on a bad weather front that swooped down from North Carolina—one of several polite hee-haws the crowd got off at the expense of the Tar Heels.

University of South Carolina history Prof. Daniel W. Hollis noted in a speech that Jackson threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Jackson's political views were so unpopular with South Carolinians, Hollis said, that the State refused to support him in his bid for reelection in 1832.

Now, however, the State has laid out upward of $50,000 to build a Jackson shrine. Lancaster County schools have been observing his birthday all week, and the South Carolina General Assembly is considering a bill to make Jackson's birthday a legal State holiday.

The Carolinas have been feuding with one another for more than a century over Jackson's birthplace.

The North Carolina version has it that Jackson was born at the home of a sister, Mrs. George McCamine on Waxhaw Creek in North Carolina, while Jackson's mother was traveling to the home of another sister, Mrs. James Crawford.

South Carolinians claim that Mrs. Jackson continued on to the Crawford home a couple of miles away before delivering.

The controversy will be around for several years yet.

Meanwhile one wag suggested another interesting possibility Friday.

"It's obvious," he said, "Ole Andy was twins."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

Dr. Hollis Speaks on Seventh President's Term—Andrew Jackson's Birthday Is Celebrated at Lancaster

Lancaster.—An audience that came to honor Andrew Jackson on the 196th anniversary of his birth Friday heard how the controversial President threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis of the University of South Carolina told the assembly in Andrew Jackson Historical State Park how Jackson's support of protective tariffs and strong Central Government and his uncompromising opposition to nullification made him so unpopular that South Carolinians withheld their support from "Old Hickory" in the presidential election of 1832.

The Andrew Jackson celebration had the three-way sponsorship of the Lancaster City Schools, S.C. Commission of Forestry, and Lancaster County Historical Commission.

C. West Jacocks, director of State parks, presided at the patriotic and historical ceremony.

SHARP CONTRAST

Dr. Hollis' discourse on Jackson and nullification provided a sharp contrast in South Carolina attitudes toward the pre-Civil War President—then a Unionist who outraged his fellow South Carolinians now a revered memory as one of the Nation's all-time great statesmen and soldiers.

The University of South Carolina history professor explained the enigma of Andrew Jackson by quoting James Parton, first biographer of the general and President, who said he was both "a patriot and a traitor * * * one of the greatest of generals and wholly ignorant of the art of war," a brilliant and "elegant" writer who couldn't set down a correct sentence or spell four-syllable words.

There was more to the Parton list of Jacksonian contradictions, but History Professor Hollis turned to later evaluations:

"Historians were long similarly divided in their interpretations of Jackson. Depending upon whether they had an anti-Jackson Whig bias—as did Richard Hildreth—or a pro-Jackson Democratic bias like George Bancroft.

"In later years, however, they have agreed in ranking Jackson high among American Presidents."

GREAT PRESIDENT

Dr. Hollis said a 1948 survey of "75 distinguished historians" placed Jackson in the category of "great presidents" with Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

But a similar survey last year dropped Jackson a notch to "near-great." Nevertheless, his name appeared among the seven leading presidents of the United States, Dr. Hollis said.

In the South Carolina of his day, Jackson first disappointed the majority by failing to carry the banner for low tariffs, then drew the wrath of Palmetto leaders and voters by his Proclamation of December 1832, which rejected nullification and warned the "deceived and deluded" South Carolinians that the nullification road would lead to "ruin and disgrace."

Jackson's native Lancaster District—along with Greenville, Spartanburg, Chesterfield and other districts—was unionist in sentiment, but this "strong minority" was faced by the larger contingent composed of nullifiers led by Calhoun and Hayne.

ANTI-JACKSON FEELING

In 1832 the voters showed their anti-Jackson feeling at the polls when the South Carolina elector choice was John Floyd of Virginia in what Dr. Hollis called a "futile protest" against candidates Jackson, the Democrat, and Henry Clay, the Whig.

Dr. Hollis finds it "interesting to note" that although U.S. Senators Calhoun and Hayne of South Carolina bitterly protested the high import duties of 1828 and 1832, the State's present Senators, Johnston and Thurmond, are asking for higher tariffs.

The difference in viewpoint is attributable to the State's transition from an economy based almost entirely upon farming to one in which industrialization has grown in importance.

Where once South Carolina had a "cotton economy" that could profit from a low-tariff policy, it now has a textile industry that seeks higher tariffs as protection against low-wage foreign competition.

JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY

"Andrew Jackson is remembered today chiefly because of his association with the movement known as 'Jacksonian Democracy,' for his destruction of the second U.S. Bank, and for his stanch advocacy of the Union in the Nullification Crisis," Dr. Hollis said.

"His name is linked to other issues such as the Mayesville Road veto, the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi, and the liberalization of Federal land policies.

"Yet, in each of these his role is not altogether clear, and many historians assert that Jackson came to office in 1829 with no program whatsoever."

Whether or not Jackson had a program, Dr. Hollis made it clear that Old Hickory could hardly have made himself more unpopular in his native South Carolina if he had preplanned every move—particularly his indifference toward tariffs, opposition to Nullification and threatened use of Federal troops in this State to enforce the high tariff of 1828.

CELEBRATION MUSIC

Music for the Jackson celebration was provided by the Lancaster Senior High School Band directed by Ben L. Watkins and the school's Sextet directed by Mrs. Esther M. Graves.

Lancaster National Guard units performed the flag-raising ceremony; Eagle Scout Robert H. Mobley, Jr., of South Junior High School, led the Pledge of Allegiance; Superintendent G. T. Myers of the Lancaster schools and Chairman Joe H. Croxton of the Lancaster County Historical Commission welcomed the audience; Miss Nancy Crockett, principal of H. R. Rich Elementary School, introduced Dr. Hollis; and ushers were Chris Benton, Emil Emanuel, Dixie Faulkenberry, Laurie Gardner, Sue McCaskill, Lee Montgomery, Bobbie Revels, and Iris Rutledge.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

Jackson Had Saber Scar From War

Lancaster.—Andrew Jackson got an early start in learning about the facts of war and life.

Throughout his adult life he bore a scar on his cheek which he received during the Revolutionary War from the saber of a British officer.

Viola C. Floyd writes in "Lancaster County South Carolina Tours:"

"As a lad of 13 Andrew Jackson took up arms in the Revolutionary War in defense of his own country. He was permitted to accompany his kinsmen to the Battle of Hanging Rock where he said he took part in the fighting.

"He helped his mother nurse the wounded soldiers who were carried to Old Waxhaw Church. He was captured following the skirmish at Waxhaw Church and was carried by the British to Camden.

"There he was thrown in prison where he received scant attention even though he had a saber cut across his face as the result of an argument with a British officer. Jackson had refused to polish the officer's boots.

"He contracted smallpox while in prison and was finally returned to his family in an exchange of prisoners."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 15, 1963]

Twenty North Carolina Schoolchildren Visit Jackson Celebration—Join 1,000 Others

(By Ron Wenzell)

Lancaster.—Some 20 elementary children from North Carolina crossed over into South Carolina Friday to help Lancaster County celebrate the 196th anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson.

The youngsters were from Jackson Elementary School in Jackson Township, just inside the North Carolina State line, and their visit to Andrew Jackson State Park, where more than 1,000 South Carolinians gathered Friday to commemorate the birth of Jackson in 1767 in Lancaster County, came as something of a surprise since North Carolina has disputed the Palmetto State's claim to the seventh President of the United States in a controversy that dates back more than 100 years.

"North Carolina schools teach that Jackson was born in North Carolina, but I thought our students would enjoy South Carolina's celebration," School Principal J. R. Taylor, who chaperoned the group, told the State.

Asked how he personally handled the controversy surrounding Jackson's birthplace when teaching history to pupils in a border community, Taylor said:

"I try not to make an issue of it. I tell the boys and girls that it's not too important whether President Jackson was born on this hill or that one, but most historians agree he came from around these parts."

While some North Carolinians still contend that Jackson was born near Waxhaw, N.C., no formal observance of his birth date was held in the Tarheel State and the vast majority of historians now accept South Carolina as Jackson's birthplace.

Some 770 students from Lancaster's South Junior High School attended the ceremonies as well as students from the senior high and other schools around the State.

Also in attendance were Lancaster State Senator Frank L. Roddey, Representatives Garrett Mobley and Tom Mangum and officials from the State forestry commission.

The program was sponsored by Lancaster city schools, the forestry commission and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News]

One Hundred Ninety-Sixth Anniversary—Andy's Birthday Celebration Bigger and Better Than Ever—Enthusiastic Crowd Honors Native Son

Red, white and blue, green, pink and gold, band music, blue skies, the precise order of National Guardsmen in flag-raising ceremonies, solid ranks of pink-cheeked school students, sung prayers, relaxed dignitaries, pleasant adults. These formed the background and set the mood for the 1963 celebration of Andrew Jackson's birthday, held at the site of his birthplace in Andrew Jackson State Park near Lancaster.

But the celebration was compounded of more than sound and music and color. It was a ceremony of loyalty that stems from the hearts of people who play an important role in keeping the name of Andrew Jackson ringing down through history.

Although the announcement was not made in so many words, officials indicated that the stiff breeze which swept the hillside was an ill wind blowing from across the North Carolina border where discomfited diehards were fuming while the celebration at Jackson's birth site was in progress.

Welcome visitors from North Carolina, however, were some 20 students from Jackson Elementary School in Jackson Township, just across the North Carolina State line, and their chaperon, the school's principal J. R. Taylor, who doesn't make an issue of the seventh President's birthplace.

The audience that came to honor Andrew Jackson on the 196th anniversary of his birth, Friday, March 15, heard how the controversial President threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, of the University of South Carolina, told the assembly how Jackson's support of protective tariffs and strong Central Government and his uncompromising opposition to nullification made him so unpopular that South Carolinians withheld their support from "Old Hickory" in the presidential election of 1832.

The celebration Friday was sponsored by the Lancaster city schools, the South Carolina Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission, and climaxed a period of special commemorative programs produced by the Lancaster city schools. High praise is heard for these programs, arranged by teachers and historians, with special music and scripts.

Providing spirited music for the celebration was the Lancaster Senior High School Band, under the direction of Ben L. Watkins. The invocation and the benediction were sung by the Lancaster Senior High School Sextet, directed by Mrs. Esther Graves.

Lending added color in their pioneer costumes were the ushers, Chris Benton, Emil Emanuel, Dixie Faulkenberry, Laurie Gardner, Sue McCaskill, Lee Montgomery, Bobbie Revels, and Iris Rutledge.

Lancaster National Guard units performed the flag raising ceremony and Eagle Scout Robert H. Mobley, Jr., of South Junior High School led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. West Jacocks, State park director, presided at the patriotic and historic ceremonies. Dr. G. T. Myers, superintendent of the Lancaster city schools and Joseph H. Croxton, chairman of the Lancaster County Historical Commission, welcomed the assembly. Miss Nancy Crocket, principal of H. R. Rice Elementary School, introduced Dr. Hollis.

Dr. Hollis' discourse on Jackson and nullification provided a sharp contrast in South Carolina attitudes toward the pre-Civil War President * * * then a Unionist who outraged his fellow South Carolinians * * * now a revered memory as one of the Nation's all-time great statesmen and soldiers.

ENIGMA

The University of South Carolina history professor explained the enigma of Andrew Jackson by quoting James Parton, first biographer of the general and President, who said he was both a patriot and a traitor * * * one of the greatest of generals and wholly ignorant of the art of war, a brilliant and elegant writer who couldn't set down a correct sentence or spell four-syllable words.

There was more to the Parton list of Jacksonian contradictions, but history Professor Hollis turned to later evaluations:

"Historians were long similarly divided in their interpretations of Jackson. Depending upon whether they had an anti-Jackson Whig bias—as did Richard Hildreth—or a pro-Jackson Democratic bias like George Bancroft.

"In later years, however, they have agreed in ranking Jackson high among American Presidents."

Dr. Hollis said a 1948 survey of 75 distinguished historians placed Jackson in the category of great Presidents with Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

But a similar survey last year dropped Jackson a notch to near great. Nevertheless, his name appeared among the seven leading presidents of the United States, Dr. Hollis said.

In the South Carolina of his day, Jackson first disappointed the majority by failing to carry the banner for low tariffs, then drew the wrath of Palmetto leaders and voters by his Proclamation of December 1832, which rejected nullification and warned the deceived and deluded South Carolinians that the nullification road would lead to ruin and disgrace.

Jackson's native Lancaster District—along with Greenville, Spartanburg, Chesterfield, and other districts—was unionist in sentiment, but this strong minority was faced by the larger contingent composed of nullifiers led by Calhoun and Hayne.

ANTI-JACKSON

In 1832 the voters showed their anti-Jackson feeling at the polls when the South Carolina elector choice was John Floyd of Virginia in what Dr. Hollis called a "futile protest" against candidates Jackson, the Democrat, and Henry Clay, the Whig.

Dr. Hollis finds it interesting to note that although U.S. Senators Calhoun and Hayne of South Carolina bitterly protested the high import duties of 1828 and 1832, the State's present Senators, Johnston and Thurmond, are asking for higher tariffs.

The difference in viewpoint is attributable to the State's transition from an economy based almost entirely upon farming to one in which industrialization has grown in importance.

Where once South Carolina had a cotton economy that could profit from a low-tariff policy, it now has a textile industry that seeks higher tariffs as protection against low-wage foreign competition.

"Andrew Jackson is remembered today chiefly because of his association with the movement known as Jacksonian Democracy, for his destruction of the second U.S. Bank, and for his stanch advocacy of the Union in the nullification crisis," Dr. Hollis said.

"His name is linked to other issues such as the Mayesville Road veto, the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi, and the liberalization of Federal land policies.

"Yet, in each of these his role is not altogether clear, and many historians assert that Jackson came to office in 1829 with no program whatsoever."

Whether or not Jackson had a program, Dr. Hollis made clear that Old Hickory could hardly have made himself more unpopular in his native South Carolina if he had preplanned every move—particularly his indifference toward tariffs, opposition to Nullification, and threatened use of Federal troops in this State to enforce the high tariff of 1828.

ATTENDANT EVENTS

Following the park ceremonies, out-of-town guests and dignitaries were entertained at a luncheon at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Croxton, and from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. the public was invited to an Autograph Party at the Lancaster Center, University of South Carolina honoring Elmer Don Herd, Jr., author of the important new book "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian."

Members of the Waxhaws chapter, DAR, Mrs. P. H. Emanuel, regent, were hostesses for the party which attracted a number of guests both from Lancaster and from out of town.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

Nullification Crisis Created Friction—Jackson Once Unpopular in South Carolina?

(By Ron Wenzell)

Lancaster.—While South Carolina is vigorously defending its claim to Andrew Jackson as a native son now, the Palmetto State hasn't always been so anxious to have its brand on the seventh President of the United States.

According to Daniel W. Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina: "There was a time back in 1832 and 1833 when President Jackson was as unpopular with most South Carolinians as President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now."

Hollis drew the parallel between the two Democratic Chief Executives during his remarks Friday at a celebration in honor of Jackson's 196th birthday at Andrew Jackson State Park in Lancaster County.

"The position taken by President Jackson in the nullification crisis of 1832 and 1833 was directly opposed to the stand taken by the majority of South Carolinians," Hollis, said, "and Jackson and John C. Calhoun engaged in a bitter personal controversy on the issue of whether the States had a right to nullify acts of the Federal Government.

"Despite the nullification crisis, however, South Carolina never completely forgot its pride in Jackson nor did he ever lose his love for his native State," Hollis said.

Hollis described Jackson as a "strong President, one who supported the Union on most issues, but did at times strike a blow for States rights."

By way of poking fun at North Carolina's claim to the man, Hollis told the more than 1,000 persons gathered at the State park, "It's not much of a controversy any longer. I think South Carolina has pretty much repelled North Carolina imperialism," he chided good naturedly.

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News, Mar. 14, 1963]

Andrew Jackson: Orphan of the Revolution—The War for Independence Left Indelible Marks on the Personality of the Great, and Controversial, South Carolinian—Andrew Jackson

(By Willie Llew Griffin)

(Editor's Note.—This story, "Orphan of the Revolution," by Willie Llew Griffin, appeared in the Sunday, March 10, issue of the News & Courier, Charleston. It is used by the Lancaster News through the courtesy of the News & Courier.)

Andrew Jackson, even today, remains one of the most controversial figures in American history. One historian, writing of Jackson more than a hundred years ago, when many who knew him were still alive, stated that after years of research in Washington, the Carolinas, and Tennessee, he was bewildered at the conflicting mass of reports. Jackson was pictured as a patriot; a brilliant writer who could not spell a four-syllable word; a democratic autocrat; the greatest of generals and as a man totally ignorant of the art of war.

That he was ignorant of the art of war is to be questioned, for war came at an early age to Andrew Jackson. Nine years old when the Declaration of Independence was signed, he was 13 when the war reached to Waxhaw settlement in South Carolina where he lived. To this community the war brought hardships and terror and left a path of desolation in its wake. Before he was 16, Andrew Jackson was a hopeless orphan of the Revolution.

Hugh Jackson, Andrew's older brother, had joined Col. William Richardson Davie before the war reached Waxhaw and died after the battle of Stono. Robert Jackson, another brother, died of smallpox contracted while a British prisoner in Waxhaw stockade. His mother died after a mission of mercy to help the suffering prisoners confined in the British prison ships in Charleston.

Andrew Jackson survived but the years spent in this war-charged atmosphere molded the boy into the man he was to become.

Jackson's first war service was helping care for the wounded after Tarleton's massacre at Waxhaw in 1780. One hundred and thirteen patriots were killed here and 150 wounded and left to be cared for. The old Waxhaw meetinghouse was converted into a hospital and here Andrew and his brother Robert helped their mother care for the wounded. High-spirited Andrew, it is said, worked more in anger than in pity, burning with fury and vowing vengeance for the wounded and for the death of his brother Hugh. Tarleton had surprised a detachment of militia in the Waxhaw settlement and his ruthless attack kindled the flames of war in that region of the Carolinas.

When Sumter made his gallant attack on the British post of Hanging Rock, near Waxhaw, both Andrew and his brother were present. This attack which began so favorably was later lost when the patriots unfortunately captured a supply of rum which they consumed too early, thereby losing the engagement. In this engagement the Jackson boys were led by Colonel Davie, the same colonel who commanded the troops to which Hugh Jackson had belonged at Stono. With the rest of Davie's men, the Jackson brothers retreated before the British force.

Being only 13 at the Battle of Hanging Rock, it is doubtful if young Andy was actually a member of the company. More probably he just went along to observe. Attached to the company or not, it is generally conceded that being with the troops and hearing their discussions and comments on war he received a firsthand lesson in the art of war. It is said that Colonel Davie always remained General Jackson's ideal of a model soldier.

After the Battle of Hanging Rock the boys returned to Waxhaw. When General Cornwallis moved toward Waxhaw after General Gates' defeat in August 1780, the Jacksons were forced to move north out of the path of war. There seems to be no information on how Robert and his mother made the journey, but, according to an eyewitness, on a hot September afternoon 5 miles below Charlotte, N.C., Andrew passed, riding on a grass or swamp pony, long legs dangling, covered with dust and with a big, worn hat flapping over his face. The story is told that years later when the fame of Andrew Jackson reached the little town of Charlotte, it was hard for this witness to reconcile the gangling apparition to whom she had talked that September day with the hero Andrew Jackson.

In 1781 the Jackson family and many of their neighbors returned to their ravaged homes in Waxhaw. A small fierce warfare of Whig against Tory continued—brother against brother and father against son. In this charged atmosphere Andrew Jackson and his family lived during the formative years of his life. Andrew and his brother now began in earnest to become a part of the small parties of militia that went out on many reprisal engagements.

Lord Rawdon, whom Cornwallis had left in command, hearing of the activities of the Waxhaw Whigs, sent a body of dragoons to the neighborhood. The Waxhaw settlers, hearing of this hostile force, decided to meet them in open fight. Forty armed and mounted Whigs, among them Andrew and Robert, assembled at the old Waxhaw meetinghouse to await reinforcements of neighbors. The British were apprised of their move by a traitor and surprised the gallant band before help could arrive. Eleven of the patriots were taken prisoners and the rest escaped. Andrew and Robert escaped to the home of a Lieutenant Crawford, a cousin but, again, a traitor hearing of their presence set a party of dragoons on their trail. The house was surrounded and Andrew and Robert were taken prisoners. Mrs. Crawford and her small children were completely helpless but in spite of this the soldiers destroyed the entire contents of the house, even the clothes of the family.

It was in this house that occurred the incident that left Andrew with scars that he carried to his grave and a wound to Robert from which he never recovered.

The British officer ordered young Andrew to clean his boots, but Andrew refused, saying that he was a prisoner of war and expected to be treated as such. The officer slashed at his head with his saber. Seeking to ward off the blow with his left hand, Andrew received severe wounds on both his head and hand. Robert also refused to clean the officer's boots and also was disabled with a sword blow on his head.

All prisoners captured at Waxhaw were taken to the British depot at Camden. Although only 40 miles distant, accounts of brutality to the miserable prisoners on the march and the wretchedness of the prison at Camden form a revolting chapter of history at that time. Two hundred and fifty prisoners were confined in a small enclosure with no beds. No medicine or medical attention was provided, and a small amount of stale bread was their only food. Here, Parton says in his "Life of Andrew Jackson," Andrew spent some of the most wretched days of his life. Smallpox broke out among the prisoners and only the dead were not miserable among the sick and the well and the dying.

Andrew Jackson's second lesson in the art of war came when he watched the engagement of General Greene's brave little army attempting to rescue them and Lord Rawdon's forces on Hobkirk's Hill. Knowing that there would be an engagement the next day, young Andy had carved out a knothole in the prison fence with a razor during the night so that he and the other prisoners could witness the conflict. When General Greene's forces were routed and put in full retreat, the prisoners despaired.

Andrew Jackson, soon after the Hobkirk's Hill disaster, came down with smallpox. Soon Robert also showed symptoms of the dread disease. Mrs. Jackson, on hearing of the condition of the prisoners, journeyed to Camden, and here the heroic mother succeeded in effecting an exchange of prisoners: the Whigs gave up 13 captives for the Jackson brothers and five neighbors. By now Robert and Andrew were wasted with disease and near death. Andrew dragged himself home barefooted and with his garments filthy and torn. Robert rode one of the two horses, supported by the other prisoners. Mrs. Jackson rode the other horse.

Robert died 2 days after reaching home and only Mrs. Jackson's medical skill and nursing saved Andrew from a similar fate.

In the summer of 1781 a cry of despair came from the Charleston prison ships where some of Mrs. Jackson's kin and neighbors were prisoners. Again this good woman set out on a mission of mercy, one from which she never returned. Andrew was now out of danger and Mrs. Jackson set out on the 160-mile journey. General Jackson, it is said, always thought that his mother and two companions made the trip on horseback, but according to neighborhood tradition, the three women were supposed to have walked. It is known, however, that they did reach Charleston safely and brought much joy to the prisoners. She died shortly thereafter with "ship fever" at the home of a relative near Charleston and was buried nearby.

In 1782, when peace was restored, those of the Waxhaw settlers who had survived, among them Andrew Jackson, returned to their homes. Young Andrew had now completely recovered in health and his high spirits and love of life returned in spite of the fact that he mourned the loss of his heroic mother and his brothers.

An orphan at 16, he had lived years of war, had all but given his life and his sanity for the cause of freedom—all this even before becoming of age to be a soldier. While still in his teens he had seen and endured more suffering and hardships than most men experience in a lifetime.

[From the Kershaw (S.C.) News-Era]

Original Andrew Jackson Day Program at Flat Creek Schools

Weeks of preparation in memorizing speeches and choral music went into the presentation of an impressive assembly program by the seventh grade at the Flat Creek Elementary School, March 15, under the guidance of Mr. John Bunyan Faile, the seventh grade teacher, and Mr. Mack Israel, choral director. The theme of the program was "Andrew Jackson Day."

The stage was decorated by the students with native cedar and wild magnolia foliage. The auditorium was darkened and as the program began, the stage lights were turned on and the curtains opened slowly to the singing of an early American frontier religious song, "The Promised Land." This was followed by the Lord's Prayer led by Della Jane Sims, the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States led by Marvin Starnes, and the Flat Creek Schools alma mater sung by the entire elementary student body.

Della Jane Sims spoke on "South Carolina Files New Claim to Andy" and Stanley Hinson presented a long and well-memorized biographical sketch entitled "Life and Boyhood of Jackson." These speeches were followed by the patriotic song, "This Land Is Your Land."

Next on program was Joanna Kennington who spoke on the topic "Andrew Jackson's Family" and Wanda Catoe who spoke on the topic "Analysis of Jackson." These interesting historical sketches were followed by an original poem, written by Mrs. Oleen T. Hinson, mother of seventh grader Ann Hinson. The poem "The Great Patriot" was recited by Ann Hinson and Linda Robinson as Della Jane Sims played a soft piano accompaniment of "The Star Spangled Banner."

The poem, in recitation included, "There are conflicts, some great, some small; About who claims good, old Andrew Jackson, or his birthplace, least of all, North Carolina claims him, South Carolina gives proof of clues; As if Andrew Jackson had a chance to choose.

"As to where he would be born, in Carolina, North or South; could it be one State is jealous? They want no historic doubt. There's one thing for certain, he was a patriot true-blue; so, as for me, I'll make a choice and say, 'Andy, here's South Carolina for you.'"

Following the poem, the seventh grade sang "Land of Hope and Glory."

In conclusion, Brenda Payne delivered "The Political and Public Activities of Jackson" and Dianna Kennington, "Andrew Jackson as President." The seventh grade sang "America" and the Flat Creek schools' fight-song, "Cheer, Cheer for Old Flat Creek High," paraphrasing the "Notre Dame Victory March."

Morris MacDowell, principal, congratulated the seventh grade on a job well-done before dismissing the students.

EXPENDITURE REFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy that the Democratic leadership and many of the Members of the House on the Democratic side have taken seriously the question of expenditure reforms. I am going to read with a great deal of interest all the material that has been placed in the RECORD so that we can get an orderly story as to what they say is going on. I wish that we had been notified on our side of the aisle that this endeavor was going to be undertaken. I am sure more of the Members on our side would have been present to participate.

Mr. Speaker, the primary comment that I think needs to be made at this time, even without the complete record, on the basis of what was said that not once was the point of the revenue side of the budget mentioned; not once was there any attention directed to the limitation of our taxing power and our ability to gather revenue. Not once was there any mention of the Federal debt.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and he pointed out that in the last Congress many bills were passed, appropriation bills, and they would expect, of course, the Congress would expect the administration and the executive branch to carry out these expenditures and, would we not? As a matter of fact, this is exactly the issue I presented to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, when he testified before the Committee on Ways and Means about 4 or 5 weeks ago at which time he told us that in November 1962 on their semiannual review the executive department found that their revenue estimates had fallen $7.5 billion short of what they had anticipated when they sent the budget for fiscal year 1963 to the Congress.

I said, "Mr. Secretary, what did the President do when he found out that his revenue estimates were $7.5 billion short?" And the answer is, "Nothing was done—nothing was done."

In fact, the Secretary gave the same answer that the gentleman from Oklahoma presented; "Well, after all," he said, "Congress voted these appropriations."

And I said, "But, Mr. Secretary, the Congress did not have this knowledge that your revenues were falling $7.5 billion short." As a matter of fact the Congress had been presented with a balanced budget and when they passed these appropriation and authorization bills they did so in the context of a balanced budget which was presented to us last year. I am satisfied that had the Congress realized that the budget was out of balance and that the revenue estimates were $7.5 billion short, a great deal more care would have been taken on the expenditure side of the ledger. It is this issue that has been completely neglected in the presentation by the Democratic leadership, this issue of revenues, because when we do not collect the taxes there is only one thing we can do and that is to try to sell more U.S. Bonds. And when we go to marketing additional Federal bonds we run into serious difficulties. The problems involved in debt management from the standpoint of inflation, in context with our balance-of-payments picture today and the gold flow situation, are such that it behooves us all to view this situation with considerable concern and I would say considerable alarm.

It just passes belief that a responsible political party would spend 2 hours, with all these statements discussing the expenditure side of the ledger without any reference at all to what our income might be. Yes, indeed, there seems to be an issue for the people of this country to consider; the puritan ethic, whether or not it is important for Government as well as individuals, corporations, businesses, to live within their budget and what are the consequences when you continually overspend and overspend.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think that politics in the worst connotation of that term and the use of that word had anything to do with the delayed announcement of the unexpected budget deficit of the last Congress, recalling the time that that announcement came after the November 6 election?

Mr. CURTIS. This question was raised and the Secretary of the Treasury assured us that this was a coincidence, that they had discovered this on November 15, after the election. I do note, though, that in a previous November, in 1961, this was after the same semiannual review, the President with a great deal of publicity announced that he had called his Cabinet together and told them that they had to exercise economy. I asked Secretary Dillon about this. I said, "What was the result?" He said, "Well, we were able to cut $1 billion back in our expenditure rate."

But I would note this, that this semiannual review is for the end of October and knowing enough, as I do, about how one collects these statistics, I am certain that the knowledge was well within the purview of the executive branch of the Government before election day in November last year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. It is true that in the past 8 plush years there has been a majority on the Democratic side of the House and I like to exercise the thought that the timing of the Cuban quarantine and the announcement of the $500,000 that was expected up to the time of the election as a $7.8 billion deficit after the election, and the reversal of those two might have had a great effect on the majority side of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. It could be. However, I think we have got enough here for the future for the public to consider in this matter of fiscal responsibility.

I want to go on and point out that here is a political party, that is advocating a tax cut at this time without any concern, apparently, and I say that in the light of what has gone on here this afternoon, with the imbalance between expenditures and revenues. In light of this, the administration, and backed apparently by its leadership in the House, is willing to go along and create further deficits, which I might point out are not just for fiscal 1964. Even under the administration's own theory the budget will not be balanced under this fiscal program until 1967, and under better estimates, I might state, those that are based upon the increased expenditure rate that has occurred under this administration, and projecting it out instead of cutting it off, as the administration does, instead of getting that balance in 1967 the budget will not be balanced until 1972. The additional deficit will be $75 billion at the most conservative estimate. Others estimate it at over $100 billion. Yet to this very minute neither the President nor his Council of Economic Advisers nor any one of the leaders in the Democratic Party have discussed the implications involved in the management of the debt and the consequences to the country in the light of the gold flow.

Just last week the Secretary of the Treasury came before the Committee on Ways and Means requesting that we amend or repeal the Silver Act of 1934. What is the significance of this? In repealing the Silver Act of 1934 we are going to release $2 billion of silver bullion, which is the reserve behind $2 billion of silver paper certificates, leaving our gold, which is already a reserve for the currency we have outstanding, to be the sole reserve for an additional $2 billion of the currency. In other words, we are withdrawing from the metallic base, the precious metal base that backs up our currency, $2 billion.

I regret to say that the fiscal situation of this country is such that there is no other course but to do this, but the implications are quite clear that this is the first step that is necessary in order to devalue the dollar, which some people close to the President are already saying must come about. I must say this, whether we devalue it officially or not, if we pursue this kind of economic and fiscal policy that has been so clearly demonstrated by the majority here on the floor this afternoon that is the only course that will follow, and we will then be one other has-been Nation that at one time had its preeminence and its place in the sun.

This is why those on our side of the aisle have said that expenditure reform is so badly needed. You can see from this demonstration on the floor today why we regard carefully our itemization of where these cuts are going to come. The display, if I may use such a word, and I think I can back it up, of demagogery, saying we were trifling with the lives of people if we were going to cut here, here, or here, wherever it might be proposed, if we were going to cut out the school lunch program, one could immediately get the picture that was in the minds of the democratic leadership to immediately stir up every pressure group in the United States so that they would be asking what this country can do for them, not what they can do for this country.

Yes, that is what would happen in the process of trying to get on top of our expenditures and bring this thing into line.

But let me now relate this a bit to expenditures, because there is a lot of confusion in the public's mind, and I can tell confusion exists in the minds of some of the Democratic Congressmen who were speaking. When we talk about cutting the budget, we are talking about fiscal 1964, we are talking about the $108 billion new obligational authority. Now that is not obligational authority even if approved, which would be spent in fiscal 1964. A good bit of it will be, but much of it will be spent in fiscal 1965 and some of it in fiscal 1966 and some of it in fiscal 1967. This is a new authority to spend. On June 30, 1963, the administration will have $87 billion of previous obligational authority to spend that has not been used, and that will be added to the $108 billion, if it were granted to them to make a total of $195 billion authority to spend in fiscal year 1964. It is only the President who says his expenditure rate would be $99 billion. Note the big difference. The expenditure rate for fiscal 1964 is presumed to be $99 billion. The request for new obligational authority which tells us where we are going to go on in the future is $108 billion. The $10 billion to $15 billion cut that has been talked about relates to the $108 billion, and if we did cut it by what I happen to think is the right figure, about $13 billion, this would cut back the expenditure rate of fiscal 1964 by about $4 or $5 billion to hold to the expenditure level of fiscal 1963.

Incidentally, there is a good way to look to see where we can trim because this is not blocking out items from various programs or chopping it out, as has been described. This is taking a look at the way these programs have grown and the way they are predicted to continue to grow. But I again point to the figures: $81 billion was our expenditure rate the last year in which Eisenhower was President.

The first year in which President Kennedy took over was $87 billion. Next year which ends June of this fiscal year is $94 billion, and for the next year is $99 billion, an increase of $18 billion in the expenditure rate in the period of 3 years contrasted to an increase of about $13 billion the previous 6 years. Now this is what is alarming—it is this increased rate of expenditure. Let me say this, and I put this in the minority views of the Republicans of the Joint Economic Committee. These increases in expenditures have not been in defense primarily. The tables that I put in there for 1961, 1962, and 1963 show a total increase of Federal expenditures of 15 percent while defense showed an increase of only 8 percent. HEW was an increase of 38 percent, as I recall the figures. Agriculture was an increase of around 30 percent. And, yet, the public is being hoodwinked into thinking that these increases that have occurred under the Kennedy administration have been in the defense area. This just does not happen to be the case, any more than the statement of the majority whip that the years under President Kennedy particularly last year had shown the greatest price stability of any period in our history since World War II. The record is there for anyone to see in the President's Council of Economic Advisers own statistics.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and an outstanding member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate. He has pointed out beautifully here the difference between legislative authority and the actual act of appropriation; the problem of gold flow and remonetization and of the spending rate as differentiated from the obligational authority to spend. I think we have pretty well established that we do not have a meat ax approach or a shotgun approach, but in fact we have a rifle pointing at this, and we are just holding our ammunition until we see the whites of the eyes.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman what he thinks, No. 1: About whether or not maybe this is not why the leadership is holding up this legislation to the point where we have been dubbed as a do-nothing Congress as well as that side of the aisle being more interested in physical conditions than in the fiscal condition? And, No. 2: I would like to ask, What about this debt ceiling and the legality of it, if the gentleman cares to comment on that?

Mr. CURTIS. I will take the second point first, for I do not know that I can answer why there has been a holdup in these bills other than to say that we saw this afternoon in our first appropriation bill the details of where cuts can occur, and no one was advocating a straight percentage cut across the board. I simply was pointing out that here there was a 10-percent cut, and this carried across the board would mean $11 billion.

There is another bill I happen to know about, carrying much larger sums than the billion we dealt with today, because it deals with several billions, where the cut is going to be around 25 to 30 percent. Some of them will be below 10 percent, because this is not a meat-ax approach. But, here is a very interesting thing. With all the Democrats here on the floor today we did not hear from the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee where the responsibility lies to raise the revenue. I did not hear them speak out here because they know where the pinch is; and the administration, I am happy to say, knows that there is a pinch, because about 6 weeks ago they came before the Ways and Means Committee and asked them to continue the debt ceiling at $308 billion. After public testimony—and I talked about some of it—even Secretary Dillon pointed out that they find out they are 7.5 billion short of their anticipated revenues, and after public hearings the Ways and Means Committee in its wisdom refused to go along with the administration, and on yesterday the debt ceiling went down to $305 billion. I have always said that the debt ceiling is a very cumbersome way in which to exercise discipline in expenditures by the Congress because we have already appropriated the money and have given the President the authority to spend it. However, the Executive does have considerable flexibility. As has been pointed out, he will have $195 billion if he gets his $108 billion, which I do not think he will, but if he were to have it in fiscal 1964 he himself has anticipated only a $99 billion expenditure rate. Every Executive has cut back on programs, held them down, accelerated some more than others, just as the President said he did in November of 1961, that he held down expenditures by $1 billion.

This is bringing about discipline in the White House right now, the $305 billion ceiling, and this is going to be with us for the month of April and the month of May, and I think the administration realizes that there is a will on the part of the Congress to do something about expenditures. I know there are many members of the Democratic Party who feel just as strongly as I do on this business of the need for fiscal responsibility. But they were not party to this operation that the administration requested the administration congressional leaders be put on here because they understand that we have to have the revenues to make expenditures.

If the gentleman will permit me one other line of thought, because I do want to get this across.

A lot of mockery was made of those who are trying to cut the budget. A Wall Street Journal article, by Mr. Otten, was mentioned. I thought this was one of the most unfair and poorly timed articles I have read, although I do have a high respect for Mr. Otten. I was sort of pleased in a way to see him needle the "economy but" boys. That is, when it comes to something in a Member's district, they want to run away. Here is why I say the article was unfair and why the comments on the other side of the aisle about these men who are in the forefront in trying to bring about expenditure reform were unfair. Of course, we all have public works projects in our districts, we all have post offices and other expenditures that are legitimate. We are not talking just solely about programs *which are wasteful and foolish.* Many of the programs we feel we have to cut back on are good programs. It is a question of establishing priorities. How much can we afford in this particular year, how much can we afford next year? We have always done that in public works and in post offices. We scheduled them as we can build them so that we get them within our revenues. We have established, over a period of years, established lines of procedure whereby we get our programs authorized.

Mr. Otten did not mention the fact that most of these proposals of the Congressmen he was talking about were adhering to the regular lines of procedure, taking their turn, as it were, and that these economy-minded Congressmen would subject the projects in their districts to the same kind of discipline that we seek to subject all of the projects.

This business of cutting the budget is difficult because every program has its sponsors: sincere people. Many of these are good programs. You could say if we have the money they certainly would be desirable to be pushed forward. But there is only one way to go forward in this business of getting discipline into expenditures and that is to set the standards and apply them to all Members of Congress, all communities, all kinds of projects, then just recognize the fact that we must confine our total expenditures to our anticipated revenues.

Yes, we can talk about how our country could use these things and where our defense would be. And when we might get on the moon. But I remind all of you of what Lenin and other Communist leaders have said, that they are not going to defeat America on the battlefield. We will get America to spend itself to death.

And, indeed, if they succeed we will then go down the same trail of oblivion so many other nations in history have gone. We will not go out in a blaze of glory but in a whimper.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman has demonstrated beautifully that the Republicans do in fact have real muscle and the rifle approach rather than a meat-ax or shotgun approach. I say he has demonstrated there is sense in the budget, not from a biased point of view, and that the fishing expedition has been fruitless.

A FISHY CASE OF "PAID AID"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel a little like I should have on my hip-boots and Ozark fishing hat, as I stand here today. You see, I am here to cast out another episode in the "piscatorial paddy mystery."

I think my investigation now has hooked all the details about this project which the United Nations calls aid to the United States.

I have learned that U.S. taxpayers paid a Chinese expert exactly $5,663.26 for 3 months during which the expert advised the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Arkansas rice farmers about how to grow fish in rice paddies. The U.S. payment went to the United Nations associated agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO. The payment included salary, transportation, and expenses.

This is the same Food and Agriculture Organization that receives about one-third of its financial support from American taxpayers.

As my colleagues know, I have spent a month reeling in slippery details about this project because U.N. officials cited it to me as a prime example of how the United States of America has received U.N. aid.

In fact, U.S. taxpayers paid for that aid.

But the U.N. does not mention that. *And, I am sorry to say that our own* bureaucracy liked the arrangement so well, it wants to venture yet again into the same deep waters.

The Department of Interior tells me it is now exploring the possibility of hiring the expert again this summer. The U.N. probably will call that aid to America, too.

The Department of State has told me that it feels it is "not appropriate for the United States to take U.N. aid since we are not an underdeveloped country." The merit of that policy is for U.S. taxpayers to decide.

They are the ones who pay 40 or more percent of most U.N. expenses. But I, for one, insist that the United Nations must immediately cease its citing of this paddy project as aid to the United States—unless the U.N. wants to clearly and carefully point out that the loaning of the expert was only a favor for which Americans paid a high price.

I finally have been able to obtain information about the expert—a Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, of Formosa. I have asked for unanimous consent to include a biography of Dr. Ling in the RECORD.

And, I have landed these details about the hitherto mysterious and mislaid project:

Dr. Ling conducted a field study in Southern States for 3 months in early 1959. His advice was utilized by the Fish and Wildlife Service at a research station at Stuttgart, Ark., and led to construction of a substation at Kelso, Ark.

My colleagues, so that this piscatorial project will not slip back beneath the murky paddy waters, I have asked for unanimous consent to fully document it for history in the RECORD. I direct your attention to these supporting documents:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Whereas the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter designated FAO) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior (hereinafter designated the Service) have common objectives in the development of scientific fish husbandry and the increased production of animal protein food for a growing population; and

Whereas Public Law 85–342 of the United States directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program of research and experimentation to develop methods for the production of fish on flooded rice acreage in rotation with ricefield crops; and

Whereas FAO has on its staff recognized experts in the field of scientific fish husbandry; and

Whereas the Service has need for consultation with such an expert in the development of the facilities and program contemplated by Public Law 85–342:

Now, therefore, the parties to this memorandum agree, as follows:

1. Beginning on or about February 1, 1959, FAO will, in accordance with its own applicable rules, regulations, and procedures, send its fishery expert, Dr. Shao Wen Ling, to headquarters of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at Washington, D.C., and such other points in the United States as may be necessary to give technical assistance and consultation on establishment of a fish husbandry laboratory. The period of the detail shall not exceed 3 months, including travel time between Dr. Ling's headquarters and Washington, D.C., provided such travel is by air.

2. The Service agrees to reimburse FAO for all direct costs of Dr. Ling's assignment, including salary, transportation, subsistence costs en route and while in the United States, and incidental and miscellaneous costs incurred as a result of the assignment.

3. FAO agrees to such post-assignment consultative correspondence between Dr. Ling and representatives of the Service as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

4. The Service agrees to provide FAO with periodical reports of progress on the fish husbandry research.

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. SHAO-WEN LING

Dr. Ling was born in Changchow, China, in 1907. He gained his bachelor's and master's degrees in biology at Yenching University, Peiping, in 1928 and 1930. In 1933 he gained a Ph. D. in limnology (the science of freshwater biology) at Cornell University in the United States. He then returned to China as assistant professor of biology at the University of Amoy. In 1935 he moved to the University of Shantung, in Tsingtao, as professor and head of the department of biology.

The Japanese invasion in April of 1937 led to his evacuation and the following year he was one of the founders of the National Medical College at Kweiyang, where he served as head of the department of biomorphics (developmental biology). In 1939, the Hong Kong Government invited him to join its fisheries research institute as fisheries biologist. He also served concurrently as guest lecturer at the University of Hong Kong.

When Hong Kong was occupied by the Japanese, Dr. Ling returned to Kweiyang and joined the medical training center of the ministry of national defense. He also was director of the Kweiyang Provincial Science Institute.

With the coming of V–J Day, he was asked by the Ministry of Agriculture to organize a national fisheries research institute in Shanghai, and served as its director.

Dr. Ling joined the staff of FAO in the spring of 1949, and was assigned to the FAO Far Eastern regional office in Bangkok. While in Thailand he was instrumental in interesting His Majesty King Phumiphon Aduldej in fish farming—so much so that the latter converted an abandoned swimming pool on his palace ground for the purpose of raising Tilapia, which were then distributed to the Thai farmers. The interest shown by His Majesty gave a great impetus to fish farming in Thailand, resulting in the creation of a new industry in that country.

Dr. Ling has recently completed an assignment in Ceylon assisting in the development of inland fisheries in that country. He will shortly go to Malaya to help that country with its inland fisheries problems.

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United Nations,
New York, N.Y., June 1959.

Fish Farming Could Be Big U.S. Industry, Says FAO Expert

A world authority on fish culture recently told correspondents at United Nations Headquarters, in New York, that there were very great possibilities for fish farming in ricegrowing areas of the United States.

He was Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, who had been assigned for 3 months to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). He had been advising on the establishment of a research station which is to be established in Arkansas to investigate fish farming problems in the United States.

Dr. Ling said the United States was a food surplus country, but consumption of fish was very low; an average of about 11 pounds per head per year. With some increase in fish consumption levels and with the population increase expected in the next few decades the country would need to increase food production and would find it worthwhile to look to inland water areas for more fish and to scientific fish culture for the most efficient production of this protein food.

Already, said Dr. Ling, a number of Arkansas rice farmers were experimenting with fish farming. They were using farm reservoirs and unplanted fields to raise fish to edible size. But their experiments were haphazard and yielding results which were mostly disappointing. To make a commercial success of these experiments the whole operation would have to be lifted on to a more systematic and scientific plane.

For successful and profitable fish farming, Dr. Ling said, a suitable combination of fish would have to be worked out which would have complementary food habits so that some would live on aquatic weeds, some on the minute organisms in the water, and others off the sediment on the bottom. Thus they would utilize fully all the nutritional substances found in the pool and grow to edible size without eating one another. There was need for research to determine kinds and quantities of fertilizers which should be added to the ponds to encourage the production of fishfood and what supplementary foods, like corn and soya bean brans, should be added to round out the range of nutrients available to the fish. There were also problems of health to be considered. Fish raised under the crowded conditions of fish culture were susceptible to infectious diseases and attacks by parasites and health measures would have to be planned. On top of these came harvesting, processing, and marketing problems.

And when all these preliminary problems were solved, provision would have to be made to supply the tens of millions of tiny fish which the new industry would require. A big problem was how to induce fish to spawn in captivity, said Dr. Ling. "In their wild state they only spawn when they are happy," he said. "Our problem is how to make them happy in captivity. We might have to feed them special vitamins, make sure they get their calories and even give them hormone injections to make them more peppy."

Dr. Ling said the U.S. Congress had passed a bill authorizing establishment of a research and experimental station to investigate all these problems. He had been assigned by FAO, at the request of the U.S. Government, to advise on the selection of a site and on the layout of the new station now being drawn up. Dr. Ling said there was no shortage of American workers in the various biological sciences connected with fish culture but there was a shortage of experience in the coordination of these various sciences in the unified field of fish culture and there would be a growing need for training even more scientists to carry on extension service as the program developed.

Dr. Ling said fish farming in the United States could produce not only considerable quantities of food fish, like catfish and buffalo fish, but also game fish like bass. The Soil Conservation Service in Arkansas had calculated that more than half a million acres in ricegrowing areas would be suitable for the industry, he said. He had met many farmers during a 6-week field trip who were ready to invest heavily in the industry when it was put on a scientific basis.

Department of the Interior,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
February 14, 1959.

FAO Loans Fish Farming Expert to FWS

Upon request of the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has assigned Dr. Shaowen Ling, one of the world's leading pond-fish culturists, to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for a 3-month period.

Dr. Ling, who has his doctor's degree in limnology from Cornell University, is a native of China. He will act as consultant for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on the establishment of a research laboratory and experimental station which is to be built in Arkansas to study fish propagation problems in rice-growing areas.

His main task will be to visit possible experimental sites, recommend pond layouts and develop plans for research in the fields of warm-water fish diseases and parasites, genetics, selective breeding, nutrition and other physiological requirements, and to make recommendations on fish-crop rotations.

Before beginning his assignment in the rice-growing area, Dr. Ling will survey research stations and warm-water fish hatcheries in the South and will consult with one of America's leading fish culturists, Dr. H. S. Swingle of Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn.

In spite of the widespread practice of fish culture in foreign countries, the idea never took hold in the United States until in recent years when the rice farmers of Arkansas became interested in fish-farming almost by accident. In bringing new rice acreage into production it was customary to build levees around a tract of land, filling the resulting reservoir with water and letting it stand for a couple of years until the timber died and the decaying vegetation enriched the soil.

Following the procedure, farmers soon found that the water in the reservoirs always contained abundant supplies of the local species of fish. Presently the question arose as to whether better breeds of fish might be raised to bring a greater yield and a more lucrative cash crop to the farmer.

To find the answer to this question, the Congress has authorized the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish a laboratory and experiment station.

Dr. Ling has just completed an assignment in Ceylon assisting the Government of that country in the development of its inland fisheries. When he completes his task in America he will go to Malaya to help that newly created independent nation with its fishery problems.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. Durward G. Hall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hall: Your understanding as stated in your letter of March 15, is correct; the Fish and Wildlife Service did request and receive for a period of about 3 months in early 1959 the services of Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, under the terms of a memorandum of agreement with the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. As indicated in this agreement (copy enclosed), Dr. Ling's expert assistance was solicited in planning the research program and experimental facilities authorized by Public Law 85–342 to develop methods for the production of fish as a supplementary or rotation crop in the reservoirs and flooded lands primarily used for rice and other agricultural crops in several Southern States.

Dr. Ling conducted a field study in Southern States and his analysis of the problems and his recommendations were very valuable in the design of our research laboratory, experimental ponds and program. The research station is located at Stuttgart, Ark., with a substation now under construction at Kelso, Ark. In our opinion, the investment in Dr. Ling's services (we reimbursed FAO in the amount of $5,663.26) has been highly profitable.

We have recently heard that Dr. Ling plans to be in this country on leave this summer. The possibility of again obtaining his aid is being explored. He could be most helpful as a participant in a tentatively scheduled review of the "fish farming" programs and objectives. We would be pleased to reimburse FAO for Dr. Ling's salary and expenses within the United States for a period of perhaps 2 weeks if this second use of his exceptional talents can be arranged.

We appreciate this opportunity of explaining our activities and hope that this letter, together with Commissioner Pautzke's letter to you dated March 18, is fully responsive to your interest.

Sincerely yours,
Robert M. Paul,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

FRANK WOLFE LOSES HIS JOB BUT KEEPS HIS SELF-RESPECT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. Michel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MICHEL**. Mr. Speaker, "I know they'll get me for not going along. But all I've got to lose is a job. I'm not going to lose my self-respect."

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of Frank E. Wolfe, formerly an electrician at the Dixon State School, Dixon, Ill., when he rebelled at a blackmail attempt by E. M. Sullivan, Democratic chairman of Lee County in my district, prior to the elections last fall. I reported in a speech on the floor on August 2, 1962, that Mr. Sullivan had ordered all patronage jobholders in the county to contribute 2 percent of their salaries to the party under threat of losing their jobs.

Mr. Wolfe was the spokesman for the group of about six employees who decided to fight the Sullivan order. Mr. Wolfe reported that the blackmail payments would amount to $13 a month in contributions in addition to $184 in retroactive payments. The protesting employees charged that Sullivan threatened there were 150 more Democrats just waiting for the jobs of noncontributors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see that Mr. Wolfe's prediction was accurate—they finally got him. He was fired March 22, 1963. My colleagues will recall in my speech last August I quoted Mr. Wolfe as saying that although he had been a Democrat since the days of Al Smith and he intended to make voluntary contributions to the party, "I don't like someone to point a gun at me."

I was moved by the fighting statement of this honest man to investigate further into the matter. I found that the Dixon State School was a regular recipient of Federal research grants and would continue to receive Federal funds. Since the Federal Government was, and to my way of thinking, still is involved, one would assume that the Department of Justice would investigate in order that justice might be upheld. Mr. Robert Kennedy has always indicated a great interest in this sort of thing.

I wrote to the Attorney General on August 6, 1962, indicating that in my opinion Federal law had been violated and that section 600, just to mention one, of title 18, United States Code, was germane to the instant case.

Mr. Speaker, sections 600 and 601 of the aforementioned title of the United States Code are very explicit in the punishment to be inflicted on those involved with the promise or deprivation of employment or other benefit for political activity.

On August 17, 1962, Mr. Burke Marshall, assistant attorney general for civil rights, wrote to me the following letter which I will include at this point:

Hon. Robert H. Michel,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Michel: This refers to your letter to the Attorney General of August 6, 1962. With your letter you enclosed an excerpt from the Congressional Record of August 2, 1962, with your remarks under the title, "Kickback From Patronage Jobholders." Your comments concern a chairman of a county political organization who allegedly threatened local patronage jobholders, including an electrician at a State school which receives some Federal funds, with loss of their jobs unless they contributed a percentage of their salaries to the organization.

Based upon this information, 18 United States Code 600 would not be applicable. You express the view that there are "any number of other Federal provisions" which would apply. Though some States might have statutes which would apply to the alleged activity, we know of no Federal law which does.

Sincerely,

Burke Marshall,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

Mr. Speaker, the nonchalance with which the Department of Justice approaches civil rights matters of this nature is appalling. Section 601 states in part:

> Whoever * * * threatens to deprive any person of any employment * * * made possible by any act of Congress * * * on account of support to any candidate or any political party in any election, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

I do not think there is any doubt as to the intent of Congress in this or similar sections dealing with elections and politicial activities.

In Mr. Marshall's letter he indicated that Mr. Wolfe was "allegedly threatened" and I am wondering what he will say in his next letter now that Mr. Sullivan's threat to get Mr. Wolfe's job has become a reality. I intend to write the Attorney General and request that another attempt be made to initiate an investigation. I assume that I will hear from Mr. Marshall in about 2 weeks, as was the case last year, but I hope in that time he will have read through the aforementioned sections and will indicate that he is now cognizant of the intent of Congress in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, if the reply from the Department of Justice is identical to one which I received last year, Mr. Kennedy surely will have "pulled the trigger" on Mr. Wolfe, and in order to prevent this from happening again, the Congress will have to spell out in new legislation, language that the Department of Justice can understand.

TAX CUT HAS ONLY MINOR EFFECT ON NATION'S GROWTH RATE

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. Speaker, in the dispute between the two schools of economics both advocating Federal income tax reform, the press has tended to emphasize the agreement and to neglect the disagreement. Ironically, this can bring about no tax reform because the areas of disagreement will not have been resolved.

The disagreement about Federal expenditures has received only a modicum of exposure. The public is aware that one school states there must be expenditure reform before there is tax reform. However, the rationale of the expenditure reformers has been reported mostly through the mouths of those who oppose it. And, therefore, it has not had the proper emphasis or accuracy. It is time the press began reporting directly not vicariously what the opponents of President Kennedy's fiscal policies based upon a tax cut have been saying.

Another area of basic disagreement, however, has hardly been mentioned. President Kennedy's statement that a tax cut is the most important step that can be taken by the Federal Government to stimulate the economy is contradicted. The opposition says that a tax cut based upon expenditure reform or not based upon it, will have little impact by itself upon economic growth. Other economic factors are more important and more basic.

The press has pictured the tax cut debate as a struggle between those who want the tax reduction to go to beef up consumer demand and those who want it to beef up investment funds. This is what the Kennedy spokesmen say is the point of dispute. The opposition says this is relatively minor. The economic facts are that both consumer purchasing power and investment liquidity are relatively high today. Putting more money into either category will only increase an already fairly liquid condition.

Tax reform is needed because of its long-range impact, not its short-range impact. Its impact upon incentive to invest and incentive for the consumer to spend is the key. In our present liquid situation as far as the consumer is concerned the $100 a year to each Federal income taxpayer which the administration tax cutting bill proposes will do little to his incentive to purchase. The same is true about the incentive to invest whatever money might be released to increase investment dollars.

Incentive will be helped only by the permanency of the reform and in context and in conformity with other reforms. The immediate impact should be designed primarily to give our people reassurance that the administration believes in, understands, and wishes to promote the private enterprise system. To put it bluntly the people need to know whether the administration believes in the morality and efficacy of profits. Right now there is a question in every businessman's mind as to whether this is an accepted ethic of our society in the eyes of the Kennedy administration.

Consumer purchasing power is helped by getting an unemployed person a job more than by a tax cut. One job puts about $5,000 into consumer purchasing power annually in contrast to a $100 tax cut. Provide the proper incentives to create new jobs and unemployment can be reduced from 4,200,000 to 3 million thus adding $6 billion to consumer purchasing power, plus cutting Federal expenditures in welfare and increased Federal revenues.

Incentive to invest is helped by increasing the rate of return on capital invested. We have been in a profits squeeze for some time. Taxes, important as they are, remain a minor item in the cost-price squeeze. Annual rate of profit after taxes on stockholder equity dropped from an average of 14.2 percent in 1947–51 to a 9.4 percent in the 1957–61 period. Tax reductions will help this picture in tenths of percentage points, labor costs, governmental penalties and subsidies, foreign and domestic, and other economic forces deal in full percentage points. It is the areas other than taxes which must receive much of our attention.

Today it requires around $20,000 of new capital investment to create one new job. The money is there ready to invest. The new and better goods and services have been invented and are ready to be offered to the public. Why then is not the money risked to produce and market these goods and services so that these new jobs are created, so that $5,000 units not $100 units are injected into the aggregate of consumer purchasing power?

The problem is not easy. President Kennedy is talking off the top of his head when he says that tax reform will either make or break this country's prosperity in the ensuing months. He is hiding the real economic problems facing our people with this kind of distraction.

PATRONAGE AND DEFENSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record an excellent editorial appearing recently in the St. Louis Globe Democrat entitled: "Patronage and Defense."

I do not know the merits of the specific case at point, the TFX fighter plane contract awarded to the General Dynamics Corp. I do know that the Kennedy administration has been inviting just this kind of blowup by the cynical approach it has taken at the highest level toward the handling of all Government business, not just defense.

I have pointed out in public speeches the dangerousness of permitting Congressmen to announce executive department awards of governmental contracts, projects, appointments, personnel moves, and so forth to the people. What, indeed, are the people supposed to think other than that political influence helped to bring about the Government action, rather than the merits involved? This kind of operation encourages the improper procedure of going to the legislative representatives instead of directly to the governmental agency which has the responsibility for making the decisions. It creates a disrespect for law, Government, and politics.

Recent political campaigns have been conducted brazenly on the innuendo of subverting the orderly process of Government by law with Government by influence.

The Kennedy administration for 2 years now consistently has sought to obtain congressional votes by threats and promises involving Government contracts, appointments, and installations.

Last year the techniques became so outrageous that several of us took the floor of the House to protest against them. In this instance high officials in the Defense Department threatened to withdraw contracts from businesses in certain congressional areas if the Congressmen representing those districts did not vote to increase the debt ceiling to $308 billion.

We have always had a modicum of government by men not by law; indeed history reveals that the graveyards of nations are filled because of the virulence of this disease. The real difference in the United States today in contrast to the past when we had open spoils politics is that this kind of activity is receiving a strange sort of smug and cynical accolade instead of censure by people in high places upon whom we formerly could rely to help set our moral tone. President Kennedy is being praised for his astuteness as a practical politician but the kind of astuteness for which he is praised was nothing new even in Machiavelli's times. Many Republicans and Democrats, regardless of our differing views on other matters, are dedicated to fight against this kind of astuteness. It is the simple issue of corrupt government against good government.

We are seeing in Washington today what I saw in Missouri as a young man under the regime of "Boss" Pendergast and what Time magazine cynically praised last week in Mayor Daly's operations in Chicago.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 13, 1963]

Patronage and Defense

The administration, specifically the Defense Department, is under the gun and yelling "foul" as Senator McClellan's investigating committee probes the $6,500 million TFX fighter plane award to the General Dynamics Corp..

The award was made despite the fact the Boeing Co. submitted a bid some $100 million less and offered a craft the Air Force and Navy military chiefs recommended as better.

The deal has aroused loud cries of favoritism from Democrats and Republicans. It has been layered with a thick suspicion that defense politics has been played in the grant of this huge contract.

With a $52 billion annual defense budget to disburse, obviously the opportunity for solid-gold patronage cannot be ignored. Dwight Eisenhower warned against "unwarranted influence of the military-industrial complex" when he left the Presidency. Political largesse in billions has been a suspicion in Capitol corridors for years.

Now it is out in the open.

Senator Henry F. Jackson, a pro-Kennedy Democrat called the contract "an amazing operation in unrealism." Boeing is in Seattle, Wash., the Senator's State, and Mr. Jackson is riled.

Republican Congressman K. W. Stinson of Washington State flatly hollered "politics." He said it would be more apt to call the plane LBJ instead of TFX. He referred to Vice President Lyndon Johnson, of Texas. The General Dynamics plant is in Fort Worth.

Secretary of Defense McNamara released a letter yesterday to Chairman McClellan of the Senate committee asserting the selection of General Dynamics to build the TFX was proper and in the public interest.

And he leveled a blast at the investigation committee which he charged was undermining public confidence "in the integrity and judgment of the highest officials in the Department of Defense." These "highest officials," all civilians, rode roughshod over the advice of Navy and Air Force experts, who will be responsible for use of the powerful new plane.

Mr. McNamara's outburst came on the heels of an apology by a Defense Department spokesman, Arthur Sylvester, for his comment questioning the fairness of the McClellan committee, which has a top-flight reputation for integrity.

The Nation has every confidence in Senator McClellan. He should probe this contract—perhaps others by the Pentagon—with exhaustive vigor. Complete scrutiny is impressively due.

Rumors, now open charges of political manipulation in defense contracts, have been rife for so long, only the naive in Washington think there is no truth in the reports.

Campaigning Kennedys, as well as other politicians of both parties, have implied or actually promised their election would reap more defense industry for particular areas. John F. Kennedy made precisely such pledges in stumping West Virginia. After he became President, new contracts went to West Virginia.

When Gov. Pat Brown was beating the hustings in California against Richard M. Nixon he boldly asked, "How could the State expect a GOP Governor to get as many contracts and projects for California as a Democratic intimate of the Kennedy administration?"

Senator Case of New Jersey recently asked from the Senate floor, "Is national interest the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts?"

Washington rumor is that certain Congressmen are seeking to trade votes for major administration legislation—in return for defense or other jobs in their bailiwicks.

Secretary McNamara will testify before the Senate committee later. Perhaps he can justify the highly controversial TFX contract. He certainly will have full opportunity. His explanation should be bared to the Nation.

No one wants arbitrarily or in partisan spleen to sap "the integrity" of Mr. McNamara and discredit the administration. But it has become too pat a gambit of the New Frontier whenever criticism or policy dispute arises, to wrap itself in a mantle of righteousness and howl persecution.

The country has a perfect right to know whether the administration is playing political touch football with multi-billion-dollar defense funds.

WOOL IMPORT THREAT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the entire New England delegation was saddened by an announcement that the Marland Plant of the J. P. Stevens Co. in Andover, Mass., was closing down operations. Over 453 persons will lose their jobs. The New England delegation to Congress has repeatedly asked President

Kennedy to take action to help New England's wool business.

We have sent him telegrams.

We have written letters.

We have made telephone calls.

On February 20, I wrote President Kennedy asking him to take immediate action to save our wool business.

HE HAS DONE NOTHING

I urged him to immediately impose quantitative restrictions on the importation of woolen goods to the country. He has done nothing.

President Kennedy's replies have become increasingly vague. As things stand now, no one in Washington knows whether or not President Kennedy intends to help the wool business.

Here in Congress, we have been besieged by Presidential message. The problems that have concerned the President have ranged from the purely local to State, national, international, and, indeed, outer space. What I want to know and what the Nation wants to know, is when the Presidential concern is going to evidence itself with some tangible and practical action.

COMMUNITIES ARE SUFFERING

People are losing their jobs and their livelihood. Whole communities are suffering. The Kennedy administration has repeatedly promised to help the wool manufacturing industry just as it did for cotton. Equal treatment, fairplay, and the keeping of promises is all the wool industry is asking. Is this too much to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to the reason for the closing of the Marland plant. Fabrics coming in from Japan, similar to those made at the Marland plant, are being offered for sale at 40 cents per yard under the Marland plant's actual cost.

Someone will probably suggest that the Marland plant has gone out of business because it is marginal. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The J. P. Stevens Co. has spent $1,550,000 to improve the Marland plant since the Korean crisis. By international standards, it is a modern plant.

During the Korean war, this plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces. Should we face another Korean-type war, we would have to look to foreign countries to provide the material formerly produced by the Marland plant.

Andover is losing a large payroll. This loss will affect other areas of our great country which supply consumer goods to Andover. When a plant in New England goes out of business, inevitably all sections of our country are affected. On March 27, 1963, Mr. John P. Baum, vice president of the J. P. Stevens Co., made the following statement about the closing of the Marland plant. It says:

> TEXT OF MARCH 27, 1963, ANNOUNCEMENT BY COL. JOHN P. BAUM, OF J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC.
>
> After many months of painstaking appraisal and after exhausting all other alternatives, we have reluctantly reached the conclusion that we must discontinue operations at our Marland plant in Andover, Mass. Work now in process there will be run out and the plant will then be closed down. It is with the deepest regret that we have reached this decision, as it affects the current employment of 453 people.
>
> This decision is unavoidable in view of the losses which the Marland plant has sustained over the last several years due to the disastrous effect of imports from low-wage countries. As an illustration, fabrics from Japan similar to those made in the Marland plant were offered freely in the domestic market at prices approximately 40 cents per yard under our actual cost.
>
> The losses of the Marland plant have occurred despite the fact that the machinery and equipment is thoroughly modern. Capital expenditures of $1,450,000 have been made in the Marland plant since the Korean crisis.
>
> The closing of the Marland plant with the resultant loss of textile employment is another example of the excessive burden of foreign imports on the American textile industry and its employees. This steadily increasing volume of imports of woolen products reached an all-time high during 1962, when imports were approximately 20 percent of domestic consumption. We, as well as others in the American woolen and worsted textile industry, have hoped for some time that positive action would be taken to correct these inequitable foreign trade problems. To date no such action has been taken.
>
> This action constitutes a further erosion of the textile industry's capability to supply the Armed Forces in the event of an all-out national emergency—for example, during World War II and the Korean crisis, the Marland plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces.
>
> It is hoped that responsible Federal Government officials will take the necessary corrective action to solve the woolen and worsted import problem before additional American mills are forced to close.
>
> It is our intention to exert our maximum effort and to utilize our fullest resources to maintain full operations in all of our remaining plants.

The closing of the Marland plant is just the beginning. As sure as night follows day, we can expect other plant closings.

In 1960, Candidate Kennedy did a lot of talking about "getting this country moving again." The people of New England are getting fed up with President Kennedy's brand of "moving" that means closing plants and increased unemployment.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the United States has always had particular pride in its tradition of political asylum. Right now we are sheltering over 100,000 refugees from Castro's Communist rule, and rightly so. Even though the guests whom we have sheltered have not always been of our choice, we have consistently maintained this right of sanctuary. It has been an inviolable part of the American tradition.

In the whole history of the United States, there is no instance of a refugee President or ruler of a foreign country whom we have sent back to his political enemies to be butchered.

Unhappily there are indications that we are about to break this tradition.

Responding to some imperative of the New Frontier foreign policy, there are unmistakable signs that the administration is contemplating the turning over of former President Perez Jimenez of Venezuela to vengeance and probable death at the hands of Romulo Betancourt. The fact that Betancourt and Perez Jimenez are bitter political enemies and that it was Perez Jimenez who upset Betancourt's leftists' timetable by 10 years, by turning him out of the Venezuelan Government in 1948, does not give pause to those in high places who are clamoring for the former President's deportation. The fact that Perez Jimenez, while President, was decorated by President Eisenhower for his stanch support of the United States and for his leadership in the hemispheric fight against communism is disregarded. The demand of the hour is to please Betancourt. And the price which Betancourt has demanded is the life of Perez Jimenez.

The long legal case for Perez Jimenez' extradition, which was initiated immediately after Betancourt came to power, is now entering its last lap. The former President's lawyers have filed papers with the U.S. Supreme Court, for the final legal recourse, an appeal to the Supreme Court. Within 30 days, the answer will come. If it is adverse, Perez Jimenez will be turned over to the State Department for deportation. Only President Kennedy's intervention can save him. And President Kennedy is the man who told Betancourt on February 19 that: "You are the kind of President whom the United States wants to have in Latin America."

What is behind this case? Certainly there is more than meets the eye in this vengeful determination of those high in this administration to destroy Perez Jimenez. It has been brought out that Betancourt's lawyer in this country, who has been permitted to conduct the legal extradition proceedings against Perez Jimenez, is the firm of Covington and Burling, of which Dean Acheson is the senior partner. But there are other influences.

First of all, let us be honest with ourselves. Perez Jimenez is not in danger of extradition because he has embezzled money, the technical charge. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Latin America knows that the corruption-in-office charge against his predecessor is routine procedure by every successful revolutionary newcomer to discredit his opponents. Perez Jimenez used this leverage against Betancourt himself, and with some justification, when he deposed him in the coup of 1948. We may disregard this charge as only a convenient pretext. If it had not been embezzlement, it would have been something else.

I have in my possession a copy of an affidavit by Miguel Silvio Sanz Anez, now a prisoner—if he is still alive—in the Venezuelan political prison, San Juan de los Morros. It was smuggled out of the prison and witnessed by his lawyer, Dr. Benjamin Nunez Escobar. It is dated February 8, 1963.

Mr. Sanz Anez was a section chief of the Ministry of Interior under Perez Jimenez. Imprisoned in 1958, he is still waiting for trial. In his affidavit he makes the following illuminating statement:

> The same judge of arraignment who had issued the warrant of arrest to obtain my deliverance from the Embassy of Colombia had me transferred at midnight one day to the Department of Indicted Military Personnel and told me that the Government had authorized him to make the following proposal: If I signed a statement accusing ex-President General Perez Jimenez of ordering the death of several political leaders of the opposition, I would be given a substantial sum of money and would be released and taken to the neighboring island of Curacao, Dutch territory, acquitted of all accusations. Upon my negative answer, I was ordered to be secluded in a place of disciplinary punishment called the "tank."

Since Mr. Sanz Anez risked his life, and that of his lawyer, to make this statement, it is certainly reasonable to believe that he told the truth. The affidavit throws a flood of light upon the way in which the Betancourt government has whipped up its extradition case against Perez Jimenez. When it was unable to get a witness who would perjure himself by charging murder, the government settled for the milder charge of embezzlement. The important thing was to get Perez Jimenez back to Venezuela to one of the notorious Betancourt political prisons.

Of the possibility of a fair trial for Perez Jimenez, once the United States turns him over to Betancourt, Mr. Sanz Anez makes a significant comment. He is to be believed because he has spent 5 years in Betancourt's political prisons and knows the score:

> If this is the treatment and nature of proceedings accorded me and those mentioned, what treatment would be accorded to Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez and what would be the nature of the proceedings against him should his extradition be granted and he be delivered to Venezuelan authorities? It is evident that there would be no guarantee for his defense, that the proceedings would be surrounded by all kinds of irregularities and violations of the law that would permit its delay and indefinite paralyzation, that there would not be an impartial and just trial and that his life would be in jeopardy and the danger of death would hover about his head. And if his murder is consummated, it will be disguised in such a form as to permit Venezuelan authorities to excuse themselves and show the U.S. Government that it was all an accident.

If this warning that Perez Jimenez would not receive a fair trial if returned to Venezuela seems unconvincing, the surmise has had grim confirmation in the last 2 months. To test the fairness of Betancourt's Venezuela courts, the lawyers for Perez Jimenez, on February 13, 1963, filed an action with the Supreme Court of Venezuela to annul the embezzlement charge on the ground that the proceedings had not conformed to Venezuelan law.

What was the answer?

Instead of handing down a ruling in the annulment plea which had been entered, the court declared that, inasmuch as Perez Jimenez had not been arrested in Venezuela, he had no right to file or participate in any legal proceedings in Venezuela.

This was a barefaced and naked violation of Venezuela law.

It happens that in 1928 Venezuela was one of the nations which signed the "Code of Bustamente" on extradition at the Sixth Congress of American States at Havana. This code specifically states—article 369—that:

> The person detained may also thereafter use the legal remedies which are considered proper in the state which requests the extradition against the qualifications and resolutions upon which the latter is founded.

In other words, the code which Venezuela has signed specifically covers the situation in which Perez Jimenez now finds himself, and gives him the right to sue in the courts of Venezuela.

In refusing to accept the suit, Betancourt's supreme court plainly shows that it proposes to conduct the trial of Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, without regard to the law of Venezuela. If he goes back, he returns to be tried in a kangaroo court. His fate is certain.

Can the United States afford to be a party to any such proceedings? Have we sunk so low that we have accepted the role of hangman for Romulo Betancourt? I cannot believe that, upon sober second thought, President Kennedy wants to have such a blot upon his administration.

The United States has gone far in its abject pursuit of the good will of Betancourt's leftist government in Venezuela. Many Americans believe that we have made a major mistake in placing all our Latin American eggs in the Betancourt basket. Many informed people believe that Betancourt, with the help of such leftist and crypto-Communist allies as Haya de la Torre, Arevalo, Bosch, and Paz Estenssoro, is erecting a third force of untrustworthy leftist nations in this hemisphere which will someday be even more dangerous to America's future than is Fidel Castro himself.

Let there be no illusions. Gen. Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, will have been liquidated because Betancourt regards him as the only Venezuelan of sufficient prestige to rally the conservatives of Venezuela into a dangerous opposition to his permanent rule in that unhappy nation.

His extradition case is a specious political plot. The United States must not play the jackal role for Betancourt in these proceedings.

CUBA AND THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the problems of Cuba and the Atlantic alliance, we must never let our attention drift too far from the brave peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. These gallant souls have been subjected to Communist domination without free elections, without any of the legal processes of a democratic system. Overwhelmingly anti-Communist, these nations deserve a chance to choose their own form of government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a concurrent resolution asking the President to raise the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union to withdraw their troops and agents from the three nations, to return the Baltic exiles from Soviet exile and slave-labor camps. The United Nations should then conduct free elections in these three nations.

MINUTEMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud of the part it played in the struggle of our Nation for independence. Many of the communities that are a part of what is now the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, witnessed the first Revolutionary battles.

In order that the battle sites might be preserved, the Minuteman National Historical Park has been established in Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln, Mass.

The National Park Service has recommended an appropriation of $500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for land acquisition within the park and I am pleased to note that my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee recognize the historical significance of the area and have approved the appropriation request for the bill which is before us today.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support this program. Approval of the appropriation request will allow the Service to preserve the proper facilities for the visiting public in accord with Mission 66 launched in 1956. As you know, this is the Service's long-range comprehensive national park protection and use program scheduled for completion in 1966, the golden anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service.

The Service, with the help of Congress, will be allowed to continue to make headway in preserving our Nation's great past.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COIN CLUB REQUESTS RECOINAGE OF SILVER DOLLAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of my home town of Butte, Mont., is the first, I believe, organized coin club in the United States to request recoinage of our de facto domestic unit of value, the standard silver dollar. Following is a resolution submitted by the above mentioned club:

> Whereas we are U.S. citizens and members in good standing of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of Butte, Mont., and are students of coins and currencies of other nations as well as our own and standard silver dollars are a prerequisite as media of exchange in our daily trade; and
>
> Whereas the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains, 900 fine or 371¼ grains of pure silver, has not been struck since October 1935 nor has a new design been issued since the December 1921 Peace Dollar and average of major periods for not coining the silver dollar since 1794 has been 26 years and average between new designs has been 42 years; and
>
> Whereas over 60 million standard silver dollars have been withdrawn as uncurrent during last 20 years for an 11 percent reduction of total stock without replacement, nor has there been any allowance made for a 50 percent population increase during last three decades even though standard silver dollars in circulation have risen 1,275 percent to an alltime high; and
>
> Whereas end of December 1962 there were over $2 billion in bullion on deposit with our custodian in the Treasury of the United States which are now securing working representative certificates, redeemable on demand, with only 76.3 million silver dollars acting as certificate security for one of the smallest coverages of representative paper since 1883, and over 38.5 million silver dollars were reclaimed during year for the largest total redemption in the history of that coin; and
>
> Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has been authorized by the Congress under section 5 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 to coin the standard silver dollar and no further authority is required for recoinage nor for a new design as 25 year waiting period between new designs has elapsed; and
>
> Whereas section 4(b) of the act of July 6, 1939 makes standard silver dollar coinage mandatory on all newly acquired domestic silver under that act, excepting seigniorage bullion, and there are over $80.6 million in representative silver purchase certificates secured by unstruck bullion, so acquired, and delivery of standard silver dollars in that amount is mandatory to owners, who are certificate holders: Be it therefore
>
> *Resolved,* That we, the members of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club in our regular monthly meeting assembled, do hereby respectfully and unanimously request the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America to resume immediate coinage of our legal standard silver dollar from bullion now on hand using the Peace Dollar design to be followed as soon as practical by a new design reflecting the period and times we are living in such as the space age.

UNITED STATES SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT ITS POLICY IN RESTRICTING EXILES WHO PARTICIPATE IN RAIDS ON COMMUNIST CUBA IS NO GUARANTEE OF PROTECTION FOR CASTRO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States should not interfere with foreign based operations against Communist Cuba. While enforcing our neutrality laws we should not deny Cubans the right to leave the United States for any other country of their choice. The United States should support the desire of Cubans to restore Cuba to a democratic society by recognizing a provisional government of free Cuba.

ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely interested in the remarks of my able and hardworking colleague from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] concerning a report from the General Accounting Office "on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center." I believe that steps should be taken to correct the conditions described in the GAO report and pledge my support to the gentleman from Delaware in an effort to do so.

The GAO report indicates that ineffective repair parts support results from the failure of the Army Tank-Automotive Center to follow certain parts procurement and reordering procedures which GAO believes would be more conducive to efficient operations.

The Army Tank-Automotive Center is located in Metropolitan Detroit. It is a successor to the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command which was likewise based at Detroit. This Army Ordnance unit has been located in the Detroit area for many years. To the best of my knowledge it was never located in any other place.

During 1961 the Army undertook to dispose of underutilized Government-owned production facilities. As part of that program the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., was closed and declared surplus to Army needs. The production that had been performed at Lenape Ordnance Modification Center which had been under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command was transferred to other points but was still under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command. There is no indication in the report of the General Accounting Office or elsewhere, that the closing of the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center or production of the M-60 tank at the Detroit tank plant had anything to do with the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of ATAC's repair parts support function.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Curtis, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Hall, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lindsay (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

Mr. Ford (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Saylor and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Philbin.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morse.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Willis in two instances.

Mr. Shelley in two instances.

Mrs. Hansen to revise and extend her remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1089. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 1, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

629. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that two appropriations to the executive branch agencies for the fiscal year 1963 have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting the 15th Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

631. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize certain amounts received by way of reimbursement for medical supplies and equipment to be used to purchase other medical supplies and equipment"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

632. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

633. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the overpricing of target seeking systems under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)–38098 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for the production of Bomarc missiles and related spare parts and support equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

634. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to submitting a draft of a contract relating to proposed drainage work exceeding a total cost of $200,000 on the Crooked River project, Oregon, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

635. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

637. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the first annual report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, pursuant to Public Law 87–256 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

639. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program; with amendments (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 5367. A bill to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5368. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5369. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5370. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5371. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 5372. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt silverplated hollowware from the retailers excise tax if sold for use in the purchaser's trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 5374. A bill to provide for the appointment of certain qualified substitutes of record to positions of regular carrier on vacant rural routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5375. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5376. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 5378. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the income limitations and rates of pension for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5379. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5380. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5381. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay for combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5382. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1960 to provide old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage for certain additional hospital employees in the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5383. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5384. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5385. A bill to bring certain holders of star route and other contracts for the carrying of mail within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5386. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37 of the United States Code, to provide for payment for the costs of commercial transportation of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by members of the Armed Forces on the same basis as now authorized by law in the case of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by civilian Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5388. A bill to amend section 202(i) of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of lump sum death benefits where the deceased individual had six or more quarters of coverage at the time of his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5389. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 5390. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the municipal government of the District of Columbia of amounts due such government in the adjudication of claims under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments made and expenses incurred in providing or securing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend section 302 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay for optometrists on the same basis as such pay is provided for medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5393. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Johnstown flood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance for coal and lignite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5396. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5397. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5398. A bill to assist States in combating mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual may qualify for the disability "freeze" and for disability insurance benefits with 20 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters occurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 5400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the highway use tax motor vehicles used by certain nonprofit organizations for disaster relief work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5401. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5402. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to authorize the issuance of subpenas by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in connection with hearings under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the applicability of benefits under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5405. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5406. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim October 6, 1963, as German Shepherd Dog Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be requested to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, under its supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Res. 303. Resolution relating to a salary increase for the Superintendent of the House Folding Room, Office of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 304. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that introduced bills include an estimate of cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER: Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of the Texas State Legislature requesting prompt review of the present Federal two-price-support program on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent by legislation, the curtailment, by departmental regulation, of the acquisition of rights-of-way across Federal lands in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas memorializing the Congress of the United States to promptly review the present Federal two-price-support program with a view to providing the same assistance through a subsidy or otherwise to American cotton mills, as foreign mills now enjoy, it being our opinion that this action would bring domestic cotton to a competitive price level on world markets and also to a competitive price level with synthetics in the home market, thereby avoiding the prospect of a situation that would ultimately, seriously, and perhaps permanently impair the whole economic structure of our country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation authorizing flood control appropriations to the Yuba County Water Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking necessary steps to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock to the broad based livestock industry in Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions, their dedication to the security of the Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency, and economy unmatched elsewhere in these United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5407. A bill for the relief of Mary Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 5408. A bill for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 5409. A bill for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 5410. A bill for the relief of Elias Lambrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5411. A bill for the relief of Edward Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5412. A bill for the relief of Lee Jung Ae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5413. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Drake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Delfina Sanz-Marinas and Antonia Sanz-Marinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5415. A bill for the relief of Dante Giovanni Nomellini, his wife, Lina Nomellini, and their minor children, Adolfo Nomellini and Rosella Nomellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5416. A bill for the relief of Irene N. Halkias and Constantine N. Halkias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5417. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5418. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Albert A. Matson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5419. A bill for the relief of Calogero Calco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Mauro Vescovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Jose Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5422. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Sgt. John D. Savercool against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5423. A bill for the relief of Mr. Antonio Balardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Youssef Michael Ayoub, his wife, Yvette Maria Michaela Ayoub, and their minor children, Cherif Youssef and Wafih Youssef Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5425. A bill for the relief of Andrew Angelopoulos Karas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5426. A bill for the relief of Mario Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5427. A bill for the relief of Henry Armstrong, administrator of the estate of Ella Armstrong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 5428. A bill for the relief of Theophilos Bougias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

79. Mr. HANNA presented a petition of the board of directors of Associated Chambers of Commerce of Orange County, Calif., and Orange Typographical Union No. 579, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Gordon H. Scherer and Hon. Morgan Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recently released 1962 Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities contains a resolution of commendation for the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer and the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder, both of whom retired at the end of the 87th Congress after serving in an outstanding manner for a decade or more as Members of the House and of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

At an executive meeting of the committee on September 26, 1962, this resolution was unanimously adopted by their colleagues who expressed the desire not only that it be included in the committee's annual report, but also that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of the House and the public as well would know the esteem in which Mr. Scherer and Mr. Moulder were held by their colleagues. It is a pleasure for me to place this resolution in the RECORD:

Whereas the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer has announced his intention to retire from the House of Representatives of the United States after serving the First Congressional District of Ohio with distinction for 10 years; and

Whereas he is the able and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on which he has served faithfully and well during his entire tenure in the Congress; and

Whereas he has at all times revered, defended from all enemies and tirelessly promoted those characteristics of freedom which have given this Nation the most cherished and lasting independence the world has ever known; and

Whereas his indomitable spirit and wise counsel will be sorely missed by the 88th Congress; and

Whereas the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder declined to seek reelection to the House of Representatives after serving the 11th District of Missouri with distinction for 14 years; and

Whereas he brought to the committee valuable experience gained by years of work as a judge and also a keen insight into the aims of the Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas his loss to the committee will be keenly felt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities extend their deep appreciation to Gordon H. Scherer and Morgan M. Moulder for their many years of truly outstanding service to this committee and wish them a most rewarding future in all endeavors they may pursue.

Vice President Tells of Need for Big Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few nights ago many of the Members of this body and our colleagues in the House, attended an affair at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington. The event was the Big Brother dinner, and it is the dream come true of our friend, the renowned columnist, author, and newscaster, Drew Pearson.

Mr. Pearson has done our country a great service in calling to our attention, the need for us to adopt a young boy and to him become a big brother.

The guest speaker at the Big Brother dinner was the Vice President of the United States LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who, in his remarks, illustrated how he, as a big brother to his own brother and sisters, helped them to become useful citizens. But more than that, Vice President JOHNSON made other comments with the great humility which he possesses, that are deserving of the attention of us all.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Vice President at the Big Brother dinner be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON AT THE BIG BROTHER DINNER, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1963

If a fellow could choose his own big brother, I think most would choose one just about the size of Sonny Liston.

Sonny was doing fine in the world until he took up the Republican game of golf. While we all regret what happened to the champion's leg when he swung at the golf ball in Florida and missed, I can't help thinking how much better that golf ball must feel.

I am grateful to Drew Pearson for asking me to come here tonight. The Big Brother program is one of the finest activities of its kind in America, and I think the work he is doing with this program shows the real character of our friend, Drew Pearson.

I feel a strong personal attachment to the concept of this program because in my childhood, I was the big brother for a large family, a family that was both large and poor. There were times when I had to do some of the scrapping to take care of my younger brother and sisters. There were also many times when, as the big brother, I had to sit with my father and mother and talk about the things I could help do to make sure that my younger brother and sisters had the shoes they needed, the clothes they needed, and the food on the table that the whole family needed.

Many years, many miles, and many events have passed since those days. But I never forget them. I never forget that a boy born and raised in such circumstances—working as a bootblack, a goatherder, a highway construction gang laborer—could, under our system, rise to the second highest office of public trust in the strongest and most powerful nation of the world.

Remembering the great distance that has been spanned by my own career, and remembering how great the odds seemed against any opportunity at all when I was a boy in grade school and high school, I live with constant thanksgiving and gratitude that I am an American. I hope that through programs like these we can help many young Americans in our cities and on our farms, to keep the hope they ought to have for their own future and keep the faith they must have in the justice and greatness of our country and our system.

Nowhere else in the world does the circumstances of a boy's birth, who his parents are, where he was born, what his religion is, or any other such factor matter less to determining what he should be in life than here in America. Opportunity must be open to all, and to all alike. Every day we are swinging those doors of opportunity a little wider. We are approaching the reality of equal opportunity a little more each passing year. The key to success for every young American is education and faith and determination.

I would say to each of the young guests tonight stay in school, because that is where your country needs you. Keep your faith, because you need that. Set your goals high, because you cannot afford to set them lower. Remember that if you may not entirely fulfill every aspiration in your heart, your own determined effort to reach your highest goals will make it easier for your sons and your daughters to enjoy after you a better childhood and a better life than you have known.

Crime in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., has printed an editorial which I feel is particularly appropriate for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it is concerned with the need for curbing the crime rate in the District of Columbia. This editorial entitled "Marine Help for District of Columbia Police?" was printed in the March 29, 1963, issue of the Greenville News. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD, together with my newsletter for April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINE HELP FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE?

A Member of Congress has suggested in a speech that the Federal Government should bring in two companies of Marines to augment the Metropolitan and Capitol Police forces in an effort to control at least a little, if not stamp out, the rampant crime in the Nation's Capital.

And the blindest New Frontiersman should be able to see the need even through the rose-tinted glasses used in viewing every act of the administration and projecting the image to the public.

Washington, D.C., has become the most lawless city outside of the remotest jungles. Robbery, mugging, beating people up just for kicks, aggravated assault, stabbings, shootings, criminal assaults, and just plain rape are commonplace, even in broad daylight and within shouting distance of the Capitol itself.

It isn't safe for individuals, with or without an escort, or for parties to visit the national monuments which abound the Capital.

It is bound to be more than mere coincidence that the crime rate has gone up proportionately, or at a higher rate, with the increase in the Negro population of the District. The whites are fleeing to outlying communities not only to escape integration but seeking safety for their persons and their property.

The number of crimes charged to Negroes is far out of proportion to their number among the population and a high percentage of the crimes are committed by Negroes against whites.

Perhaps two companies of marines as suggested by the Congressman might be enough, or two companies of any other group of the Nation's elite combat troops. But only if they were well commanded, given a free hand to be as tough as necessary to make arrests and to defend themselves from mobs of cophaters.

And the courts would have to learn to deal realistically enough with the accused criminals, especially the repeated offenders, to enable the supplemented police force to obtain convictions and make them stick on the inevitable appeals.

Even so, there is something ironical about the fact that a Congressman has suggested only two companies of troops to cope with the Washington violence problem, while the administration sent more than 20,000 troops (something like 10 combat companies with supporting troops) and hundreds of U.S. marshals to Oxford, Miss., last fall.

Perhaps what Washington really needs is a period of outright martial law with the authorities using, instead of regular troops, a few detachments of guerrilla warfare specialists who could beat the muggers and the attackers at their own game of stealth, the sudden and unexpected attack, silent mayhem and, in self-defense, a quick and clean job of legal killing.

That last phrase may shock our liberal friends, but whose life is more precious, that of the vicious attackers and killers or those of the innocent victim and her or his protector? And the choice all too often boils down to just that.

THE NATION'S PILOT MODEL

The Nation's Capital City, once described as the "pilot model for the Nation" and as "integration's show window," has become a cesspool of conflict, corruption, and crime within the past decade. For several years all evidence that the "show window" was falling apart was well suppressed. Attempts to point up Washington's troubles, such as the 1956 investigation of the District of Columbia school system by the House District Committee, were scoffed at and played down. In the past 2 years, however, the evidence has been bursting out at the seams.

Crime statistics, especially street crimes such as yokings, rape, and robberies continue to soar and highlight national crime statistics. Last year Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, a liberal and a friend of the District, conducted an investigation of the administration of the District's public welfare program. The Senator found in a fair investigation of 236 cases selected at random that approximately 60 percent of those receiving aid were not even eligible.

Then, the boiling undercurrent of an atmosphere of lawlessness in the public schools—where "fear rages through many school buildings" and there are acts of "violence, assaults, disrespect of teachers"—burst into the open in the Thanksgiving Day race riot at District of Columbia Stadium. The facts on the riot were brought out by a biracial citizens committee. It showed that hundreds of white persons were attacked—as were some Negroes who sought to defend the whites—after a high school football game. The investigation uncovered the problems teachers have been having since the District of Columbia school system was suddenly desegregated to serve as the "pilot model for the Nation." Many of the committee's recommendations and findings were very similar to the ignored 1956 House investigation. In one recommendation, the committee suggested that the schools be given a code of conduct "to allow teachers to return again to the field of teaching instead of fulfilling the role of policemen."

The continuous increases in criminal acts, which the Attorney General now describes as explosive, certainly cannot be attributed to a lax police effort or capability. The Washington police force's record for solving crimes is among the Nation's best. Chief Robert Murray attributes the crime statistics to court decisions which protect and pamper criminals. He has said: "Our convictions are constantly being reversed by 5-to-4 decisions in the U.S. Court of Appeals on technicalities—not on the evidence. The criminal is being afforded more protection than the ordinary citizen."

District of Columbia police have been greatly hampered in their work by the court rulings which limit drastically the time a suspect can be held for questioning, which require proof that the defendant is free of mental disease or defect, and which prohibit investigative arrests. Then there is the large number of cases which are never prosecuted because of pressure from the NAACP, CORE, and other Negro groups. In fact, politics is the key to the entire mess in which the District finds itself today—it is the play for the Negro bloc vote, and this has been going on under the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.

Political pressures and the national policy of creating a welfare state are responsible for the public welfare cheating by the recipients and the overly generous administration of the program. Beyond any doubt, the pellmell rush to desegregate Washington schools has been responsible for many of the District's school problems. In fact, desegregation has now brought on resegregation, not only in the schools, but in residential Washington as well. In 1953, the year before the desegregation decision, the District of Columbia schools were 57 percent Negro. Now they are almost 84 percent, as whites continue to move to the suburbs.

National administrations have demonstrated that they will not face up to the basic causes of Washington's problems. The play for the 18 million Negro votes will not permit this, no matter what the facts show. So, the Congress must act, under its constitutional authority and responsibility to get at the root causes of District of Columbia problems by investigations void of political overtones and approval of legislative proposals which can extricate our National Capital City from the blackboard jungle into which it has been permitted to sink.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Congressman Clyde Doyle's Message to Mr. Bart Lytton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of our colleagues one of the last letters written by our fellow Congressman, and my fellow Californian, Clyde Doyle. I wish to insert his letter in the RECORD for it conveys the warm, friendly, and genuineness that were so truly the marks of Clyde Doyle. In reading this letter addressed to Mr. Bart Lytton we can only be but reminded that the death of Clyde Doyle spelled sad days not only for California, but for the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, in a real sense, his 16 years of congressional service was a career which served as a continuing source of betterment of our land. Those back in his home district, and for that matter those across the Nation who were fortunate enough to have known Clyde—and all who knew him were his friends—will recognize in this letter the qualities that so well mark the quality of his character: humility, gentleness, and honor.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.
Mr. BART LYTTON,
Dinner Chairman, Seventh Annual F.D.R. Dinner, Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR FRIEND BART: I would surely love to be able to have the great joy and inspiration, which it certainly would be to me, to be present on the evening of March 14 when you friends have the seventh annual F.D.R. dinner and honor Gov. Edmund G. Brown for his recent gubernatorial victory, but of course, friend Bart, I cannot make it.

I will have to be right here on the job in the Nation's Capitol, but I do want to express my appreciation to you and all the people of the great 23d District for the support you gave to the reelection of our great Governor.

With best wishes, I remain,
Cordially,
CLYDE DOYLE.

Rising Shoe Imports—A Great Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the New England Shoe & Leather Association has been in touch with me concerning the impact of shoe imports on the Massachusetts shoe industry.

It is pointed out that in 1962, Massachusetts production was 14.8 percent of the U.S. total production, and that the shoe industry is the second largest manufacturing employer in Massachusetts with a total employment in 1962 of 37,625 people. It paid to all employees about $124,100,000.

However, it is stated that total imports of leather type footwear for the year amounted to 55,057,457 pairs valued at $80,263,816 in 1962, and that total 1962 U.S. shoe imports equaled 8.9 percent of U.S. shoe production, as against 6.2 percent in 1961.

These figures standing by themselves show clearly what is happening to the Massachusetts and American shoe industry.

It is being overwhelmed with cheap foreign imports and its markets abroad are suffering the same fate.

Obviously, if this trend continues, the time is not far distant when the American shoe industry may be facing extinction.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the President urging that early consideration be given to remedial action to check the dangerous trend of shoe imports which is causing such a dire threat to the U.S. shoe industry.

If this appalling situation is not soon remedied, the great American shoe industry will be prostrate at a relatively early date and its faithful workers will be placed on unemployment rolls. It is high time for corrective measures.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Vice President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, Saturday, March 30, 1963, was an outstanding day for North Carolina and the Democratic Party everywhere.

On that date, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON delivered one of the most inspiring speeches I have ever heard. The occasion was the annual North Carolina Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

I think it is most significant that more people turned out to hear Vice President JOHNSON than have ever before turned out for a Jefferson-Jackson dinner in our State, and the tremendous speech the Vice President delivered gave all of us not only new faith in the Democratic Party but also new faith in our State and in our Nation.

I hope that those who are entertaining any thoughts that our part of the country is going to be easy pickings for the opposition will take the time to read the newspaper accounts of last Saturday's activities, of the thousands of Democrats who came hundreds of miles, and of the enthusiasm with which the Vice President's speech was acclaimed throughout the State. They will find that the Democratic Party is not going to be cut up into pieces like a pie and passed around the table for those who would divide and conquer us.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, RALEIGH, N.C., SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1963

When I come to North Carolina, I never come as a visitor. I am just "back home," because many of my ancestors came from your State.

Some of my forebears first settled in the Albemarle Sound section. Others lived in Rowan County in the Piedmont. Eventually, they grew restless and began moving westward. As my father told me, they went two directions, some of them went up in the world, the others went to Texas.

If I can't claim close relatives in North Carolina now, I do claim as some of my closest friends the wonderful North Carolinians, past and present, whom you have sent to Washington.

There are no men I have met in public life whom I respect more, or whose friendship I value more highly, than Luther Hodges, Sam Ervin, and Everett Jordan. I am privileged to work closely on the space program with one of the ablest administrators in the Nation, another North Carolinian, James E. Webb. Two of the most valuable Members of the House of Representatives are your distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, HAROLD COOLEY, and the Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT BONNER.

These fine Americans serve your State and the Nation today in the outstanding tradition of such great North Carolina public servants as O. Max Gardner, Uncle Bob Doughton, Clyde Hoey, Josiah Bailey, Frank Graham, Melville Broughton, Kerr Scott, and many others.

I must say, also, that I am especially fond of, and highly privileged to know as a friend, the man whose outstanding service is winning new respect throughout the Nation, your Governor, Terry Sanford.

For many generations, North Carolina has stood, as it stands today, tall among the States. The respect you enjoy is respect won by the quality of leadership, progressiveness, and integrity so long offered by men and women of North Carolina who have been proud to call themselves Democrats.

Some years ago, I asked a North Carolina friend what the Latin motto of your State means. He told me that it means, "to be rather than to seem." I think that motto captures not only the spirit of North Carolina but the spirit of your national leadership in the United States today. If I may, I would like to borrow that motto as the theme for my remarks tonight.

Since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the people of the United States have, in every period of great national challenge and peril, entrusted the national leadership to the Democratic Party.

That was true under Cleveland and Wilson. It was true under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. It became true again 2 years ago under John F. Kennedy.

Why? Why, at the great and decisive moments in the history of our land, has the Nation's leadership most often been entrusted by the people to Democratic hands?

I believe the answer lies in the spirit of the words of your own State motto, that it is better "to be rather than to seem."

America is young. America is strong. America is not an old and aging country. The cause of America is not a worn and fading cause. America is not on the downhill side of greatness, staring disaster or ruin or oblivion in the face.

America is a nation still climbing upward toward the summit of its destiny. America is a nation of hopeful and resourceful and confident men and women. When there is a time of trial, when there is a time of testing, when there is a challenge to be met, the people want leadership of hope and resourcefulness and confidence—leadership which expresses the true strength of America. That quality of leadership Americans have found for 163 years in the party of all the people, the Democratic Party.

The leadership afforded by great Democrats is leadership which expresses the real America, America as it is, not merely America as some would have it seem. This is the kind of leadership America needs now, and it is the kind of leadership America is getting.

America is getting courageous leadership. When the Communist tyranny attempted to plant its weapons of destruction in the Western Hemisphere, the Communists found themselves face to face with resolute, decisive and unhesitating American leadership which left no doubt about the will or the ability of this Nation to eradicate that threat to the peace of the world. The result as all the world knows was one of the historic turning points of the cold war and one of the most decisive victories in history over armed aggression.

America is getting confident leadership. Even as the military strength of a prepared and vigilant nation has been and is being kept at the ready, American leadership has displayed the confidence to continue pressing in the forums of the world for agreements which will bring peace to all nations. Through such confidence, American leadership has demonstrated that this generation of Americans is not afraid to stand against aggressors nor is it afraid to stand up and be counted for the cause of peace.

America is getting resourceful leadership. While our responsibilities to freedom have required continuous attention to the great and grave questions of world security and peace, America's leadership at home has been both able and willing to give the attention needed to overhauling outmoded and burdensome tax structures. It has been able and willing to give attention to those things necessary for strengthening American economy, to improving the life for all our people at home, young and old.

As this American leadership has shown courage against our enemies abroad, it has not failed to show compassion for America's needs at home.

In saying these things, I realize that I speak to a partisan assembly. I realize that it is expected that I should, or any speaker should, use this occasion to make claims of partisan success. But that is neither the spirit nor the purpose of my remarks tonight.

The problems confronting your national leadership at this time are not partisan problems. There is not a Democratic side or a Republican side to the threat of Cuba, to the hopes for world peace, or to the urgent necessity of domestic tax reform and economic growth. There is only an American side.

Today, in our Nation and in our individual States, we need to remember that example. We need to remember that party does not come first. We need to remember that the problems we face as a nation are not created for us by our parties, and we will neither solve those problems nor make them go away by switching allegiance and support from one party to another.

At this particular moment in our Nation's history, and in our destinv as leaders of the free world, we must not allow ourselves to be persuaded that partisanship is patriotism.

Our system would soon cease to function at all if the debate between our two parties were permitted to degenerate into a dispute over which party is the more patriotic. Individual parties may "seem" bolder, may "seem" more wise, may "seem" to be many things. What matters, all that matters, is what our Government actually is, not what our parties appear to be.

In our Nation today, many more Americans are preoccupied with politics than are occupied with government. In every State where I go, I find Democrats and Republicans, and even, once in a while, members of the press, asking questions about the nominees and the elections of 1964 and 1968. Yet, the real question always is not who is going to occupy what office, Federal, State or local, but, rather, what are we, the people, going to do together about the problems and challenges with which we are faced.

Politics, in the highest sense of that term, is never a spectator sport. We are not going to get the kind of politics or the kind of government these times require by sitting on the sidelines and watching with fascinated amusement and detachment to see who emerges as winners of political free-for-alls. The test of our parties, the test of our own partisanship, is not the public show we stage politically but the accomplishments we make together in serving the people's needs.

Here in North Carolina your State has made remarkable progress. The Tar Heel State, where the weak grow strong and the strong grow great, has been a leader of a vital region of America because you have never allowed partisan politics to obstruct nonpartisan good government. You have held to your motto.

You have shown the world that deeds speak louder than words. You have used your resources prudently and progressively to support education and agriculture and industry.

You have invested in your youth. You have built outstanding State universities. You can be very proud of the fact that last year the largest single source of scientists and engineers hired for the national space program by NASA was North Carolina State College.

In agriculture, where once your total farm income was limited to tobacco and cotton, today no State has a more diversified range of farm commodities, from apples to soybeans, bringing in $1¼ billion in cash income annually.

While North Carolina is still, as it has long been, the Nation's No. 1 textile producer, your growing industrial complex now turns out everything from processed chickens to chainsaws and you are building major basic industries in chemicals, electronic equipment, and paper products.

The quality of governmental leadership you have had, and have now, in North Carolina, has made this progress possible because partisanship and politics have not come ahead of service to all the people, all the time.

Democrats and the Democratic Party have meant good government in North Carolina, at the State level and the local level.

Through the Democratic Party, North Carolina has won respect and influence at the national level. Few other States can claim three major committee chairmanships in the Senate and House today or the influence in the Cabinet and the executive agencies that is held by North Carolinians.

We say these things with justified pride. But we never claim that the past holds a mortgage on the present. Democrats are never Democrats by inheritance, they are Democrats by conviction.

We of the Democratic Party hold the conviction that our national interest and the interest of each of our regions is served by maintaining a responsible, united and effective national party which truly represents the diversity of America. America is stronger when there is a party which speaks for the farmer and the businessman, for the wage earner and the professional people, for the producer and the consumer, for the northerner and for the southerner, for the easterner and the westerner.

In the past and in the present only the Democratic Party fills this role. Together we are strong. Divided we are weak. Always there are those who would take strength away from all of us by false and fleeting promises of special strength for some of us.

In politics as in any other endeavor which involves the concept of contest—there are two ways in which a victory may be won.

The first is to render service to the people and attract to the banner of the party such overwhelming numbers that success is assured.

The second is to provoke quarrels among the opposition in the sure knowledge that if such quarrels are allowed to spread, the opposition forces will be divided, permitting a minority to work its will.

Looking at the days that lie ahead of us, I can predict that we, as Democrats, are going to be subjected to the second type of campaign. A certain political party, and I see no reason to dignify it by giving it a name, realizes full well that it cannot possibly attract the majority that is necessary to win an election. But at least some of its leaders hope that we Democrats will be sufficiently softheaded to succumb to a strategy as old as the Roman empire, divide and conquer.

I suspect that we will hear a great deal of conversation from members of another party seeking to pit one Democrat against another.

I suspect we will be subjected to charge after charge that one branch of the Democratic Party is seeking to drive another branch out of the fold.

I suspect that very loose language will be thrown around concerning the ambitions of individual Democrats and the desires of some to dominate others.

I suspect that as election day draws near and desperation mounts, some mud will be hurled in the hope that it will stick.

I just want you to remember one thing. The source of the charges and the accusations is not one which can be considered either objective or friendly. And if we Democrats make the mistake of paying attention to the partisan charges of the opposition, we will snatch defeat out of the jaws of victory.

I do not believe that we Democrats can be defeated unless we defeat ourselves.

As Americans first, and as Democrats second, we must demand that those who would sway us from tested loyalties offer performance instead of promises. The southerner is proud to be a southerner, as are residents of each of the great regions of our land. But regional pride does not equal—and certainly does not excel, the greater pride of being an American.

Our country's interest is not served by those who indulge in special appeals to divisive regional interests. Partisans who obstruct or resist or delay the solution of national problems for the sake of their partisanship are not likely to bring solutions to our problems of regional or State concern. Certainly, we of the Democratic Party welcome the contention of other parties in every region and every State. There are no one-party regions in America. But there are regions where one party has served the people and won their trust while the other party failed to serve and did not deserve the trust.

Let those who would make special appeals to the South understand one thing. Nobody lives in these States and in this historic region but Americans.

The appeal which is most persuasive to southerners or westerners or easterners or northerners is the appeal of effective service to build our Nation's strength and unity and success in the world and at home.

In Cuba, communism has established a showcase of failure within the Western Hemisphere. Communism has proved in Castro's Cuba that it does not have the answer to the problems of the New World. No small part of that failure of communism off our shores is the result of the unity of the Republics of this Hemisphere. The Americas united are causing communism to fail without plunging the world into nuclear devastation.

This is only another example of the convincing evidence of history that the greatest strength of freedom lies in the unity of free men. In our own country, we must not permit partisanship to deny us that same unity which will make our strength, our resources, our abilities more forceful and more effective in answering the challenges we face.

As we would not tolerate partisanship seeking to exploit religious and racial histories in a divisive way, so we must not permit partisanship to exploit regional histories against the essential unity of our land. Our parties

> must be instruments of service, as the Democratic Party has been in North Carolina and in the Nation. Our parties must not be instruments of division, bias or prejudice. As responsible partisans ourselves, let us at home as in Washington put service to the people first. If we do, the people will, in the future as in the past, put the Democratic Party first at the polls.

The Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest in the March 18 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of an annual opinion poll conducted among her constituents by the distinguished gentlewoman from the 22d Congressional District of Ohio. The tabulated replies to Mrs. BOLTON's questionnaire should be especially meaningful to Members on both sides of the aisle, because the registered Democrats and registered Republicans in her district are approximately equal in number.

It was particularly gratifying for me to observe that 73 percent of the more than 16,000 replies favored continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am proud to be a member. Only 14 percent opposed its continuation, while 13 percent expressed no opinion. In short, 84 percent of those who expressed an opinion on this question gave their complete support to the committee.

Numerous other Members of the House poll their constituents from time to time on matters of national and international importance. Over the years I have noted that whenever a question about the Committee on Un-American Activities is included in these polls, the answers reflect overwhelming support for the committee and its operations in the grass roots of America, and that this is true no matter what section of the country is represented in the poll.

Thus, it is evident that what many people mistakenly believe to be a "controversial" committee enjoys overwhelming popular support and is really not so controversial at all. It is also apparent from these polls that the drive to abolish the committee, though powerful and well organized, is a distinctly minority movement, albeit a loud and frenzied one. In this light, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following statement which appeared in a column by attorney and author George N. Crocker, published in the San Francisco Examiner, of March 10, 1963:

> One of the noisiest, most phrenetic, and most hopeless demonstrations of sheer doggedness on the American political scene for 25 years has been the opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which investigates the Communist apparatus of subversion and espionage in this country. "Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee" has been scrawled on so many signs hoisted above picket lines and marches, and appeared in so many paid advertisements, that many people believe the committee holds a precarious tenure.
>
> This is a delusion, fostered by experts in the techniques of mass agitation. The clamor has been like that of barking dogs in a tunnel; the crescendo of echo upon echo raises a tumult far out of proportion to the source.
>
> Whenever abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee has had to meet the test of a practical issue, it has fizzled out. Congress has never seriously thought of abdicating its duty to investigate. The American people would not tolerate it.

Twice in this Congress, the move to abolish the committee has, to use Mr. Crocker's words, "had to meet the test of a practical issue"; and in each case, again to use Mr. Crocker's words, "it has fizzled out."

The Rules Committee carefully considered a resolution to transfer the Committee on Un-American Activities' functions to the Judiciary Committee and rejected the proposal by a vote of 12 to 1.

The House gave equally careful consideration to the committee's appropriation request for the year 1962 and approved the appropriation by a vote of 385 to 20.

Rights-of-Way Over Federal Lands for Electric Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of January 1963 I learned that the Secretary of the Interior had inserted in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, a set of proposed new regulations relative to the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands under the jurisdiction of his Department.

I was astounded by the arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions in the proposed regulations. I also questioned the constitutional authority of the Secretary to place such restrictions in the proposed regulations.

On February 5, 1963, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives, asking that he schedule public hearings on the matter at the earliest possible time.

Much to my surprise, I received a letter of reply 10 days later which not only denied the request for a public hearing but which indicated support for the Department's proposal, with such a play on semantics that one might well believe the letter had been prepared by the Department itself.

Apparently part of the reason advanced by the chairman for not having hearings by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee relate to his statement that, after all, these proposed regulations just reinstated procedures which were in effect from 1949 to 1954 and which were changed on August 11, 1954, without notice to the public and without any opportunity for interested groups or individuals to express their views.

What the chairman failed to point out in his letter was the fact that the 1954 change in the regulations relative to right-of-way permits over Federal lands resulted from an opinion of the Interior Department's Solicitor that many of the regulations in effect from 1949 to 1954 were "beyond the legitimate power of the Secretary to issue."

The chairman's letter to me of February 15, 1963, points out that:

> Interested persons and groups are being given an opportunity to present their views to the Department on the proposed reinstatement of the language and the period for accepting such views has now been extended to March 15.

It is fully evident that this extension of time was merely a sop to dull the opposition to the proposed regulations, which were put into effect on March 23, 1963, through publication in the Federal Register.

The regulations as promulgated are, with very minor exception, identical to those proposed on December 29, 1962. These minor changes, if anything, make the regulations worse.

As I have so forcibly pointed out before, these regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the similar regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture relative to Federal lands under their jurisdiction, are ambiguous, capricious, and confiscatory and without authority in law. Of course, it is not the first time the New Frontier has assumed power way beyond those granted by the Congress and the Constitution. However, the time has come, for those of us who believe in the Constitution of the United States, to protest these attempts by the executive to take unto itself powers not delegated to it by the Constitution or the Congress.

The matter should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress and action taken to curtail this unwarranted assumption of power by the executive bureaucracy. The matter should also be taken to the Federal courts if the Secretaries involved attempt to enforce these patently illegal assumptions of power.

My letter of February 5, 1963, and the chairman's reply of February 15, 1963, follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary of the Interior placed in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, proposed new regulations relative to the granting of rights-of-way over Federal lands under his jurisdiction.

These proposed regulations astonish me no end. I cannot understand how any fair-minded American would dare issue such arbitrary and unreasonable restriction on the granting of rights-of-way over Federal lands.

These proposed regulations and restrictions are ambiguous, capricious, and confiscatory, and without authority in law. Certainly, by no stretch of the imagination, can anyone read into the laws, which the

Secretary claims as his authority, a congressional intent to grant him or any other Secretary of the Interior the unbridled power he is now attempting to assume. I believe further, that certain of the actions which he could take under the regulation or restriction proposed would be completely unconstitutional in character. It is noted that the proposed regulations would apply equally to both public and private non-Federal electric utilities.

I again say I am astonished that he would propose such an unconstitutional assumption of power unto himself. One illustration of such power is the provision for denying a right-of-way permit for a non-Federal transmission line if he considered such a line was not consistent with the Federal power marketing program as determined by him. I cannot believe that Congress ever intended such a grant of power or that it could grant such power under the Constitution.

Another illustration would be an application for a right-of-way permit over a strip of Federal land of less than a mile wide, where the total length of the proposed transmission line would be 200 miles. Under the proposed regulations, the applicant could be required to agree to permit Federal use of any surplus capacity that might be available initially, and/or permit the Interior Department to reconstruct and enlarge the applicant's transmission lines and related facilities, not only on that portion of the line which would be on Federal land but also on the 99½ percent of the line not on Federal lands.

A third illustration is the provision in the proposed regulation under which the Secretary could require the applicant for a right-of-way permit over Federal lands to agree to the transmission of electric power to serve non-Federal public utility loads and Federal loads now being served by the applicant. Certainly this would constitute a destruction of non-Federal assets without due process of law. No good man should want and no bad man should have such unlimited and unwarranted power to destroy segments of the free enterprise system under which this Nation has prospered.

It seems to me that these new regulations proposed by the Secretary of the Interior and the similar proposal by the Secretary of Agriculture covering the Federal lands under his jurisdiction, are part and parcel of a continuing attempt to socialize the entire electric utility industry of the Nation.

In view of the indicated lack of congressional authority and constitutionality, I ask that you schedule a public hearing on the matter at the earliest possible time. Not only should the Secretary be heard on the matter, but all other interested parties should be given an opportunity to testify on these regulations.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This will acknowledge your letter of February 5 regarding the proposed changes in regulations covering rights-of-way for transmission lines across Federal lands.

I do not agree with your analysis of the proposed changes or share your concern as to what will happen if the proposed changes are put into effect. While the revised regulations would require applicants for new rights-of-way permits to agree to allow the Federal Government to utilize excess capacity in their lines, any such capacity that was used by the Federal Government would be returned to the permit holder upon request. The revised regulations would also permit the denying of a permit if the proposed non-Federal line is determined to be in conflict with the Federal power marketing program. To me, this is different from your phrase, "not consistent with," and I believe its purpose is to protect the Federal power system and the Federal investment therein. We must remember that the Federal Government is itself a large supplier of electric power and the Congress has authorized a large network of transmission lines for the marketing of this power.

I view these proposed changes as involving the administration of both the public land laws and the Federal power marketing program. I believe that the decision as to whether to put them into effect will be made on the basis of what is determined to be in the best interest of the United States. It is my understanding that, in addition to providing the means for protecting the Federal power system and the Federal investment therein, the provision for possible Federal use of excess capacity in a non-Federal line might effect some economies in the marketing of Federal power.

The proposed changes in the regulations would reinstate procedures which were in effect in the Department of the Interior from 1948 to 1954 and which were changed on August 11, 1954, without notice to the public and without any opportunity for interested groups or individuals to express their views. All interested persons and groups are being given an opportunity to present their views to the Department on the proposed reinstatement of the language and the period for accepting such views has now been extended to March 15. At the present time it is my view that, in order to assist the Secretary of the Interior in making his decision, it is he who should receive the views and comments of interested parties and not our committee.

I do not know whether these proposed changes in the regulations will be put into effect or not, but, if they are, I do not want to try to prejudge their administration. I have no reason to believe that the administration of the regulations, if they are revised, will not be in the best interest of the United States, or will not be entirely fair and equitable from the standpoint of the non-Federal electric utilities seeking permits over public lands.

On the basis of the above expressed views, I do not believe it would be appropriate for the committee to hold hearings on this matter at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

A Living Memorial to the Men Who Died Aboard the U.S.S. "San Francisco"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a remarkable project that is now underway in my home city of San Francisco. The project was started and organized by the men of the Naval Reserve unit at Treasure Island. In cooperation with them, the mayor of San Francisco has proclaimed the months of February, March, April, and May 1963 as U.S.S. *San Francisco* Months. During this period the reservists will create a living memorial to the men who died in action in World War II aboard the great fighting cruiser, the U.S.S. *San Francisco.* A total of 218 men lost their lives, most of them in the battle of Guadalcanal, and the naval reservists intend to recruit one new man for every one who made the ultimate sacrifice for his Nation.

At the end of the recruiting period the names of the men who make up the living memorial will be placed on the battle-scarred bridge of the U.S.S. *San Francisco,* which was preserved as a permanent monument and placed at Lands End, a point of land outside the Golden Gate overlooking the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, a plaque bearing the names of the new men will remain on the bridge until November 13—the 21st anniversary of one of the most ferocious battles in the history of naval warfare. Some of the men who have already responded by joining the Reserve unit actually served during World War II in the South Pacific. Some of the others who are joining the living memorial had not been born when the U.S.S. *San Francisco* went into action on that fateful night of Friday the 13th, November 1942.

This was a crucial battle in the Pacific war. American ground forces had a precarious foothold on one end of Guadalcanal Island and were under constant enemy ground and air attack. The Japanese decided on a major counterattack to recapture all of the island and sent a powerful fleet of 18 to 20 ships to bombard the American transports, ground positions, and airfield.

An American task force of 13 ships under the command of Rear Adm. Daniel J. Callaghan went straight into the enemy fleet in a single line, making contact at 1:48 a.m. of a black, moonless night. Admiral Callaghan, a native of San Francisco and a graduate of St. Ignatius High School there, was aboard the U.S.S. *San Francisco,* which was second in line and commanded by Capt. Cassin Young. In the furious give and take of big guns, the Japanese fleet was stopped and had to abandon its mission in order to deal with the outgunned American task force.

It was during this battle that Admiral Callaghan issued one of history's most famous combat command orders, "get the big ones first." This statement ranks high among notable orders issued by a naval officer throughout recorded naval history.

In 34 minutes the engagement was over and the enemy was in retreat. The cost was high. Five American ships had been sunk and the other eight were badly damaged, including the U.S.S. *San Francisco,* which at one time had to fight it out on both sides with a battleship, a cruiser, and a destroyer. Admiral Callaghan was killed in the first 15 minutes and Captain Young was mortally wounded when an enemy salvo crashed into the bridge. When it was over the ship had been riddled by shell fire, 25 separate fires were burning, and the sick bay had been knocked out.

But the U.S.S. *San Francisco* stayed in the war and saw more action before receiving a hero's welcome on returning to her home city. The citizens of San Francisco are justly proud of this great record, and the reserve unit at Treasure Island is making a fine constructive effort in memory of the 218 men who spent their last days on the U.S.S. *San Francisco*. Lt. (jg.) Arthur Hodgdon, himself a veteran of Solomons naval action, is to be commended for spearheading this living memorial project in his role as Reserve recruiting officer at Treasure Island Naval Base.

Having been a personal friend of the late Admiral Callaghan, his distinguished brother Vice Adm. William Callaghan, retired, and Judd Callaghan, it is my great pleasure to bring this program to the attention of our colleagues.

American Agriculture: Our No. 1 Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 22 I spoke in Moorhead, Minn., on the occasion of Greater Moorhead Days. Moorhead is located in the heart of the Minnesota-North Dakota Red River Valley.

Much of my talk dealt with what the farmers of America have done and are continuing to do for the people of our country and those in other nations throughout the world. Among other things, I pointed out that the 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all the recorded history of man.

I also emphasized that the $6.5 billion budget estimate for the Department of Agriculture is not a farmer's budget, but a budget for all Americans. Nearly three-fifths of the expenditures proposed for fiscal year 1964, about $4 billion of the $6.5, will go for programs which clearly benefit consumers, business, industry, our foreign policy and national defense, and the general public.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues this speech and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER MOORHEAD DAYS, MOORHEAD, MINN.—SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I tired a long time ago of those who make critical comments and talk at length about what the country is doing for farmers.

The truly great story of our time is a factual report on what farm families have done and are doing for our country.

The 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all the recorded history of man.

The hunger which haunted civilization since its beginning has been driven from the land. This doesn't mean everyone is getting enough to eat every day, but it means when hunger does exist it is due to failure to distribute production; not lack of production.

In the last 2 years the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has dropped to the lowest ratio in history, 19 percent of take-home pay.

If Washington, D.C., has room for one more statue, it should be one that expresses a nation's gratitude to the men, women, and children who live and work on the Nation's family farms.

While producing more and better foods, farm families have been sending workers from the land into other areas of the Nation's economy, in manufacturing, transportation, business, and the professions and services.

Americans are familiar with the growth in industrial productivity.

A fact too often overlooked is that it hasn't nearly kept pace with agricultural productivity.

In the last decade, production per man-hour in agriculture increased by 77 percent, as compared with a 32-percent increase in manufacturing.

A century ago one worker on the farm supplied food and fiber for less than five persons. By 1940 the figure had risen to only 10. Now, just 23 years later, each farmworker supplies food and fiber for 30 persons.

Unfortunately, those who feed us so well do not themselves live "too high on the hog." It is true that farm incomes have improved substantially the past 2 years, but they still average only 60 percent of nonfarm incomes. The farmer is subsidizing consumers.

There are fewer than 15 million people living on our farms, only about 8 percent of the country's population. The population of the State of California exceeds our total national farm population.

Yet farmers create millions of jobs for fellow Americans. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Six million have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. Thousands in rural communities across the land make their living providing services required by farmers.

The investment in agriculture exceeds $200 billion. That figure is comparable to about three-fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It represents three-fifths of the value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

The investment in agriculture represents $21,300 for each farmworker as compared with a manufacturing investment of $16,000 for each worker.

In 1961, when our farmers had a gross income of nearly $40 billion, they spent over $27 billion to operate their businesses.

Farmers spend over $2 billion a year for trucks, tractors, machines, and other equipment.

Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry, more than $3 billion is spent by farmers each year for fuel, lubricants, and equipment maintenance.

You could provide Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, San Diego, and Chicago with electricity for a year and the kilowatt consumption would be about the same as the total needed to keep our farms going.

The next time someone starts to tell you what the country is doing for agriculture, just ask what would happen if this Nation lost three-fourths of the assets of all corporations, or three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Exchange, or more than 16 million nonfarm jobs.

The answers to these questions are, in part, the answers to what farm families do for the country.

American agriculture also is exerting an influence felt throughout the world.

Our productive capacity supplements the efforts of farmers in countries which pay cash for our food, and in the underdeveloped countries where food for peace not only combats hunger but strengthens our foreign economic development efforts.

Another major export is the know-how developed by our farm families, through informational and technical assistance programs.

Likewise, events abroad affect U.S. agriculture.

In fiscal year 1953, exports of farm products from the United States amounted to $2.8 billion. By fiscal year 1962 the export figure had jumped to a record $5.1 billion. That year we harvested 305 million acres of cropland and the products of 63 million of those acres were shipped abroad.

The $5.1 billion worth of farm products went to two general types of destinations. About $1.6 billion worth of our food and fiber, 30 percent of our total agricultural exports, went to underdeveloped countries under the food-for-peace program.

The big share of the food and fiber exports, some $3.5 billion worth, or 70 percent of the total, was sold for dollars. Most of these shipments went to the industrialized nations such as the United Kingdom, the European Common Market, and other Western European countries, and Canada and Japan.

In recent months the European Common Market has been receiving increased attention in the agricultural export area. This is understandable, because the Common Market is our largest single foreign outlet for farm production.

In fiscal year 1962, U.S. exports to the Common Market had a value of $1.2 billion, representing about a fourth of total agricultural shipments and over a third of the volume sold for dollars.

We are uneasy about the development of tariff protectionist patterns in the Common Market. It represents the largest economic merger ever attempted.

Suppose high fences separated Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and North and South Dakota. Suppose these fences had gates so small they limited movement of goods, services, and labor among the five States.

Now, tear down the fences between these States, but leave the outer fence separating them from the other States of the Union.

That, in effect, is what the Common Market is; the fences are being torn down between France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, but the outer fence that separates this merged area from other countries still stands.

Because of the resulting free movement of goods, services, and labor between the six countries, spectacular economic growth has occurred. Employment, wages, and purchasing power are at record highs.

When agriculture in the Common Market countries saw what economic merger had brought to the industrial sector, it started pushing for development of a common agricultural policy. In January of last year the Common Market announced agreement of these six points:

1. Control of farm products through common marketing authorities.
2. Establishment of common prices and abolition of trade barriers within the area during a transition period.
3. Control of imports from outside countries through variable levies, fees, minimum prices, and, in some instances, quantitative restrictions.
4. Use of funds to finance market operations and subsidize exports.
5. Establishment of quality standards.
6. Harmonization of veterinary, plant health, and similar regulations.

Implementation of these points has had some favorable and some unfavorable results for U.S. agriculture.

We can be optimistic about future export prospects for commodities the Common Market does not produce at all or produces in small volume, commodities like cotton, soybeans, protein meal, tallow, hides and skins, and certain fruits and vegetables. These products had a value of $578 million in fiscal year 1962 and made up about 50 percent of that year's shipments.

We did not do as well on tariffs negotiated for tobacco and vegetable oils. Common Market tariffs on these products, value of which accounted for $123 million or 10 percent of our fiscal year 1962 exports, are too high.

We didn't do well at all in keeping access to Common Market countries for those products Common Market farmers want to produce more of—wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, poultry, and rice. The Common Market is developing for these commodities a protective system based primarily on variable import levies. The variable levy always keeps the cost of imported commodities to at least the level of Common Market-produced commodities. Because price competition is canceled, traditional importers tend to do their buying locally. In the case of poultry, the variable levy is already in operation. Altogether, wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, poultry, rice, and a few other products in that category had a value of $483 million in fiscal year 1962, representing 40 percent of our exports to the Common Market that year.

The United States has vigorously protested the decisions that are taking the Common Market in the direction of restrictive trade policies. The Common Market has agreed to reconsider tariff decisions on wheat, corn, sorghum grain, rice, and poultry. These will represent a takeoff point for the United States during the next bargaining rounds.

The Common Market's agricultural exports to the United States are relatively small, but it has been shipping us a sizable volume of industrial goods and would like to sell us more. We can use them, and the Common Market can use more of our farm products.

We must keep in mind, however, that all of our agricultural export future isn't wrapped up in the Common Market. Those countries have been taking only about a third of the farm products we export for dollars.

The other two-thirds of our sales are outside that area. In fiscal year 1962, our sales to the EFTA countries, including the United Kingdom, amounted to $719 million; to Japan, $485 million; and to Canada, $430 million. Japan could use more of our feed grains and soybeans. Canada could use more of our poultry; the United Kingdom more of our citrus fruits and feed grains.

A glowing potential for future cash sales of U.S. farm products abroad rests with the so-called underdeveloped countries that we are now assisting through our food-for-peace program. As our food helps improve their economic and social structures, we are also utilizing useful outlets for our agricultural abundance and providing additional income for our farmers.

Since 1955, food-for-peace exports have amounted to about $12.5 billion. Feeding the hungry is sufficient reason for these contributions to human health and happiness. Yet we are realizing substantial economic and national security benefits. Our foreign policy is strengthened. People who have to make a choice between the free world philosophy and that of the Communist world are given a graphic comparison of the efficiency of the family-owned farm under a free enterprise system with the inefficiency of the state-owned farm under a totalitarian system.

The friends we are making now can well be friendly cash customers for American farmers in the future.

Earlier this month, when the Senate was considering an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, I repeated a plea I had made many times before, a request that the Department of Agriculture budget accurately reflect farm and nonfarm expenditures.

When the President's budget estimate for this coming fiscal year included $6.5 billion for the Department of Agriculture, the old cry that farm programs cost too much money was again heard across the land. This is not a farmer's budget. It is a budget for all Americans.

Nearly three-fifths of the expenditures proposed for fiscal year 1964, about $4 billion of the $6.5 billion, will go for programs which clearly benefit consumers, business, industry, our foreign policy and national defense, and the general public.

More than $2 billion, or 31 percent of the total, will go to programs vital to our foreign relations and national defense. Most of this will be spent on food-for-peace activities. As an instrument of peace, this program is a significant part of American foreign policy, not just farmer foreign policy.

Another $499 million, 8 percent of the total budget, is to be spent for domestic food distribution programs for our needy at home.

About $994 million, around 15 percent, will go for long-range programs for disease and pest control, meat inspection, protection of soil and water resources, forest and public land management, and market development and services. These activities benefit every one of our citizens.

Then there is a budget item of $448 million for Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration loans for which the repayment record by cooperatives and farmers is excellent. This is sound business.

Right down at the bottom of the proposed budget expenditures is an item of about $2.5 billion for the support of programs directed primarily to the farm economy, price-support activities including those for feed grains and wheat, agricultural conservation, the conservation reserve, and the sugar and wool programs.

Realistically, the Department of Agriculture budget should show $2.5 billion for farm programs and $4 billion for foreign aid, for food distribution, for public welfare and health services, for the maintenance of our forests and public outdoor recreation facilities, and for research carrying major benefits to business and industry.

Triggered by the feed-grains program, which was the first major farm legislation offered by the Kennedy administration, farm income has risen substantially the last 2 years.

Net farm income in 1961 was $12.7 billion, a rise of a billion dollars over the figure recorded for 1960.

Net farm income in 1962 moved up to $12.9 billion. While these figures do not represent the fair share of national income farm families earn and should have, a billion dollar improvement is a welcome step in the right direction.

The benefits of the feed grains and wheat programs have not all moved into the farm sector. Taxpayers are major beneficiaries, too. Like farmers, they haven't been happy about having unneeded, unwanted supplies in storage that put an unnecessary drain on the Federal treasury.

Government holdings of wheat and feed grains were better than a billion bushels less on February 15 of this year than the peak quantities held in 1961 before new programs became effective. Total stocks at the end of the 1963 marketing year will be 2.5 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

The fact that Government doesn't now own the billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is saving the taxpayers $770 thousand a day in carrying charges, $280 million a year.

The 1964 Federal budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million, or $2.2 million a day, less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

The 1961 and 1962 feed grains programs have been successful. The 1963 program, which contains the new feature of a direct payment to cooperators, is an improvement. I suggested this revision for the 1963 crop year and it is this type of program, a permanent, voluntary, direct payment program, that I will propose and support for the 1964 and subsequent crop years.

The Nation's wheat farmers, in the wheat referendum will go to polling places to make a significant decision.

They will be voting on more than approving, or rejecting, a wheat program developed in the last session of the Congress.

They will be deciding, in substantial measure, the future of farm legislation. They will be deciding between a wheat price of around $1 a bushel or $2 a bushel. They will be deciding on how effectively we can negotiate in the European Common Market.

The 1964 wheat program carries these potentials for farm families if approved by more than two-thirds of those voting in the referendum: Farmers will receive $2 a bushel or more for nearly all of their 1964 wheat marketings.

Prices will be stable and predictable. Consumer prices, as they reflect the cost of wheat, will be the same as in 1962.

The total value of wheat production and the farm value of wheat production will be more than $2.3 billion.

World markets, influenced by the International Wheat Agreement, will be stable. Negotiations leading to satisfactory trade agreements can proceed without the uncertainties attached to unstable U.S. wheat prices.

Wheat surpluses will be reduced, and the cost to the taxpayer will be cut in comparison with recent years.

Should our wheat farmers reject the proposed 1964 wheat program we can expect:

A drastic reduction in the market price for wheat; a sharp reduction in farm income despite a rise in wheat acreage; an unfavorable impact on the total economy as wheat farmers necessarily reduce expenditures for goods and services.

The Congress of the United States, to which rural voters elect a distinct minority of the Members, is keeping a sharp eye on the wheat referendum.

The wheat referendum result will doubtless play a part in determining congressional attitudes toward a 1964 feed grains program, and in the succeess of efforts to modernize the cotton program in a way that will maintain producer income while facing realistically the relationship of domestic and world markets.

Yes, the wheat referendum decision will have impact far beyond the wheat acres.

The American Host Program Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the American Host program is a nonprofit, people-to-people type project which makes it possible for teachers from the free nations of Europe to spend a month in the United States living as the guests of American families in order to gain a true understanding of our way of life.

Each of us who has traveled in any foreign country is well aware of the false and distorted image of our Nation which is prevalent in most foreign countries. Movies such as "The Blackboard Jungle," novels dealing with the problems of our society, and the usual sensational press items carried in the international press have given European teachers, and others, a very false and distorted picture of the United States.

In addition, each year millions of dollars are spent to print and distribute Communist inspired anti-American propaganda in Europe.

The American Host program was started in order to give our European teacher friends an opportunity to visit with us and to see for themselves the true meaning of the American way of life by spending their time with American families in typical American communities.

Hundreds of American families from every walk of life have opened their homes to act as host families for the visiting teachers. Doctors, businessmen, educators, mechanics, truck drivers, lawyers, all having in common a concern for the future of the free world, have become a part of this dynamic program.

The program is administered by The American Host Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit foundation which is supported by contributions from individuals who are interested in the success of the program. No Government funds have been expended nor solicited for this program.

The mechanics of the program are not complex. Teachers in the free nations of Europe are contacted through their teachers associations and informed about the American Host program. Those teachers who are interested in taking part in the program then make application to do so, specifying if there is a particular area of the United States which they would like to visit. Host families are then matched with teachers as well as possible. Once host families and teachers have been matched, they are given each other's name and address so that they may correspond prior to the visit.

The European teachers travel together from Europe to New York City by aircraft. After 3 days in New York City, each teacher proceeds to the city of his or her host family. During the next 4 weeks, the visiting teacher spends his or her time with at least two different host families in the same general geographic area. At the end of the 4-week period, the teachers reassemble in New York and return to Europe by air.

In addition, a host family is expected to meet the visiting teacher when he or she arrives in the city of the host family; provide a room and meals for the visitor while he or she is with the family; treat the visitor as one would any other guest in one's home—a host family is not expected to entertain the visitor 24 hours a day; see that the guest has an opportunity to meet friends and neighbors of the host family; and arrange for the guest to be taken to the train, bus station or airport when he or she is ready to leave the city.

Host family accommodations are usually for 1 or 2 weeks' duration; only in unusual circumstances are the visiting teachers scheduled to spend longer than 2 weeks with the same host family.

The part being played by the American Host program in correcting the many false and distorted impressions of our Nation which are held by many in foreign lands is indeed worthy of commendation. What could be better for our Nation than to have an ever increasing number of teachers in foreign lands who are armed, able and anxious to refute the falsehoods and misconceptions being spread about the United States?

The total cost to the participating European teacher is less than $400, and in some cases, up to 50 percent of this amount is paid by sponsoring groups here in the United States.

The responsibilities of a host family are not extensive; the main qualification is a desire to further the primary objective of the program—to increase understanding between ourselves and our European friends.

The program was founded by a Garden Grove, Calif., teacher, Tom Murphy, and his wife, Frances. I commend them for their tireless efforts in making their wonderful plan a reality.

I considered it a great honor to be named to the board of directors of this fine organization, and to have its national headquarters located in the district I represent.

Strip Mining on National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following correspondence was sent to the President, with an information copy to the Secretary of Agriculture:

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to stop any further development of plans for strip mining national forests in Pennsylvania.

It appears that my State is being selected for a guinea pig experiment on strip mining by the Department.

Mr. President, Pennsylvania has had many years of experimentation in this field. Some has been good, but a lot has been bad.

We do not need more experiments; we need cooperation from the Federal Government in helping us to take the bad features out of strip mining by leaving us alone while the issue is being debated in the general assembly of our State.

Right this moment the question of strip mining is the number one issue before the general assembly. For the Department of Agriculture to interfere in this debate by announcing a contract to strip 60 acres atop a knob in the Allegheny National Forest near Kane, Pa., is poor timing if indeed not poor judgment.

Allow our legislators to come up with controls that will guarantee our State against damages in the future and then if coal is needed in excess of supply, there will be time enough for the Federal Government to start ripping open national forest lands.

From my knowledge of the coal industry, I would hazard a guess that coal removed from Federal parks and forests would further depreciate the already overproduced coal supply.

I especially request consideration for this resolution before the reported contract between the Department of Agriculture and Westmore Coal & Construction Co. can be consummated.

The following news items show the feelings of our Pennsylvania conservationists and sportsmen as well as the citizens in general.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

H. J. RES. 363

Joint resolution to prohibit the strip mining of coal in the Allegheny and other national forests.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all strip mining of coal being carried on in the Allegheny National Forest, or in any other national forest, on the day this joint resolution becomes effective shall be terminated forthwith. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not hereafter enter into any contract for, or otherwise authorize, the strip mining of coal in any national forest.

[From the News-Herald, Franklin and Oil City, Pa., Mar. 4, 1963]

DON'T TRUST THEM

A new business venture was launched in the great Allegheny National Forest, a few miles west of Kane, this year.

It was given about the same kind of fanfare demanded by an international jewel thief about to move into a new territory.

The Wetmore Coal & Construction Co. was authorized by the U.S. Forest Service to conduct an experimental strip mine operation on an inconsequential 60-acre tract.

W. W. Wentz, supervisor of the vast 700,000-acre public forest, is a bit miffed at the number of complaints he has been receiving from sportsmen, conservationists and others denouncing the project.

"This is a little odd," Mr. Wentz observed last week in a Pittsburgh Press news article, particularly since it is just these people we are trying to help and protect.

"We want to prove, once and for all," the stern Mr. Wentz states, "that strip mining doesn't have to pollute streams, that the land doesn't have to be turned into a desolate wasteland, and that strip mined areas can be restored economically."

It strikes us that this is something Mr. Wentz and the U.S. Forest Service do not have to prove.

We believe the burden of proof is on the strip miner—not the taxpayer. We also believe these experiments can just as well be conducted on land already under lease to the coal companies in areas outside the public domain.

Forest Service officials admit coal stripping interests have made repeated attempts to invade national forest lands, particularly in West Virginia and Kentucky.

They have bravely stated they will fight any attempt to expand the experimental strip mine in Allegheny National Forest.

That is like inviting termites onto your back porch and then threatening them to go no further.

It is well to note this tiny, insignificant operation near Kane is expected to yield 350,000 tons of coal with a current market value of well over a million dollars.

A million dollars from a worthless 60-acre slice of a 700,000-acre forest. Now there is a real argument.

Make no mistake about it. This is not a penny ante game. The stakes are high for both coal stripper and the public.

All the coal interests need is a "model case" to show the mineral can be extracted without water pollution and that the land can be reasonably restored.

Once the wraps are off, larger and larger slices of public land can be opened up to bigger operations. Mistakes can happen, rules can always be changed, fines can be paid. The foot in the door is the important thing.

There is no indication the extraction of this coal is imperative to the safety or economy of this country, or even this section of the State.

There is every indication this operation will provide a dangerous loophole for ravaging what few acres of untouched land we still possess.

We grant strip mining its position as a fairly important Pennsylvania industry. It will not, however, last as long as its scars and can certainly not compete with the timeless value of clean streams and wooded hills.

[From the News-Herald, Franklin, Pa., Feb. 28, 1963]

Stripping Allegheny Forest

(By Steve Szalewicz)

Many local sportsmen are not holding their tongue or bearing with tolerance a recent announcement by the U.S. Forest Service at Warren that Wetmore Coal & Construction Co. will soon strip a 60-acre knob in the forest as a "test." They have thought forest lands to be the last verdant forts, unassailable by land and water despoilers.

The test on public land, according to Forest Supervisor W. W. Wentz will provide "full safeguards for soil and water resources." Furthermore, says Wentz, this rip-out of trees and terrain will be watched with "utmost care and responsibility." He adds, "a daily analysis of water quality of runoff will give immediate indication of changing conditions and permit corrective action to be taken before damage can occur."

Local, vocal conservationists can't buy those definite promises easily when they look around at dead Scrubgrass, East Sandy, and Hemlock Creeks. Beautiful streams they are, flowing through scenic gorges of hemlock, but floating nauseating water. Their purity was once assured by definite State laws. While they may agree that test projects involving strip mining may be desirable and progressive, why in the frying fires of torture conduct them on land that has, more or less, been enshrined and endowed as America's future playground? And besides, private, responsible operators have already proved abundantly that stripping for coal can be done economically and with a result that returns land to production, play, and pro rata.

A POISONED POOL AT KINZUA?

What local conservationists dread basically is the added load on the Allegheny River, which at Warren has already in recent times tested "acid." Could it be that stripping, if continued on private lands and encouraged in the forest draining into the Allegheny above the Kinzua Reservoir will ruin that impatiently awaited playwater before the pool fills? Such a fisherman-thwarting fate once befell Pennsylvanians at the Johnsonburg Reservoir, according to reports.

But it does little good to carp and cluck about this experiment in mixing morals and methods, unless the complainants contribute imaginative and hopeful alternatives. Perhaps the least hackneyed and most tolerant from the outdoorsman's approach is put forward by Roy Frank of Deep Hollow Road, Venango County's conscientious watchdog of western Pennsylvania's natural resources, and by Representative Harry Gramlich, of Franklin, equally interested in a solution least painful to operators and coal owners and pleasing to outdoorsmen.

CREATE A COAL RESERVE

Frank suggests that since coal is already overproduced and both Federal and State Governments are allocating funds with which to study other possible uses for the unrestrained abundance, why not have coal deposits bought up by Government agencies as reserves? This should be done where it is determined the strip mining would ruin water supplies or bring on local destitution. If governments can reserve forests, seashores, and sand dunes, swamps and moraines, and oil deposits, why not coal?

The "reserves" proposition is the one solution which could stop experiments which imperil our soils and our cold, clear springs which feed the few remaining good fishing streams in Pennsylvania. There is no doubt that with the Forest Service as watchdogs, the stripping in McKean County will be conducted with regardful responsibility. And while it is uncomforting to know it's being tried at all, let's hope, to use the President's recent words, it turns out to be a "milestone of conservation progress."

SPORTSMEN POLLED ON STRIP MINING

What do outdoorsmen think of the proposal to strip 60 acres of hilltop in the Allegheny National Forest near Kane as a test project to determine how open pit mining can be conducted so as to conserve both land and water?

Six delegates to a meeting of the Northwest Division, Pennsylvania Sportsmen's Clubs, when polled Sunday replied:

"Man cuts timber for lumber. He takes the sand and gravel from the shores. He pumps oil, gas and water, mines ore, gold, silver and coal. All these things he takes from the earth and then uses them to cover the earth with wide bands of concrete and steel. Man returns nothing for all that he takes. He only does more damage. Man must be stopped. Someday nature will revolt. Perhaps we can prolong the time till nature revolts by stopping unnecessary waste and unnecessary scars upon the earth. No one will freeze next winter if these 60 acres are left to nature," James F. Donahue, secretary of Erie County Council of Sportsmen Clubs.

"I do not think public land should be open to strip mining," Mrs. Eleanor Donahue, past Secretary, Gem City Outdoorsmen Club of Erie.

"I am not in favor of the stripping in the American national forests. I feel that past practices of some of the more conscientious strip miners have proven that restoration can be accomplished reasonably. Further tests are not needed," George H. Land, Sr., clean streams chairman, Crawford County.

"I am not in favor of any commercial interests destroying our natural resources. Everyone knows that coal can be stripped in most locations and the land restored, but no one wants to do it. I am sure that the Federal and State Governments can stop this if enough interest is shown by the majority of people," William A. Adams, president, Springfield Sportsmen Club.

"The national forest should be conserved as is. Strip mining should be contained for private acres," Robert Wank, secretary, Corry Rod & Gun Club.

"I think that is an opening wedge to subject our national forest to an additional onslaught of strip mining. In the case of Wetmore Coal & Construction Co., Inc., these lands were sold under the Weeks law, and in this case were subject to a mineral reservation which did not permit removal by strip mine operations. Why strip that property?" Roy Frank, Venango County delegate to Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.

Potential for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, I was privileged to attend one of the most outstanding civic events in which I have ever participated. Six hundred men and women of my home city assembled at the fourth annual dinner of the Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce. An inspiring program, directed by Chairman Arthur C. Antonopoulas, was focused on the theme of Greater Lowell's "Potential for Progress."

Following the national anthem and a solemn invocation by Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, pastor of St. Margaret's Church, the immediate past president of the chamber, Mr. Thomas J. Hickey of Chelmsford, reported on his stewardship. The newly installed president, Mr. Walter C. Wilson, Jr., of Tewksbury, then delivered a short but inspiring inaugural message.

High point of the evening was the superb address delivered by a distinguished Member of the other body, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. The illuminating and timely remarks of Senator RANDOLPH, calling for greater citizen participation in public affairs, deserves wide circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that his splendid message be included in the RECORD.

The evening closed with benediction by Rev. Victor F. Scalise, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church.

The entire affair, directed by the capable general manager of the Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce, Donald A. Cook, provided solid evidence of the fact that Greater Lowell is indeed on the march, that it in truth has a great "potential for progress."

Mr. Frank Makarewicz of the Lowell Sun provided a superb description of the event in the March 28 issue of that newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Makarewicz's story be included in the RECORD following Senator RANDOLPH's inspiring address.

The address and article follow:

The Businessman and His Government

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell, Lowell, Mass., March 27, 1963)

In meeting with numerous and varied professional and business groups, I have detected a common denominator in a new note of seriousness and gravity of purpose. It is doubtless related to some extent to the generally sombre atmosphere of world affairs and the crossroads at which we find ourselves today.

Yet this feeling is not solely in response to any temporary emergency condition. Rather, it stems from the growing awareness of the need for reappraisal in all sectors of our society. It is as though we know that we are approaching, or have already reached, one of the great watersheds of history and that it is now time for us to take stock of ourselves, to reexamine our basic assumptions, and clearly to define our individual and national goals.

Let us then discuss the role of the businessman in public affairs.

This is a subject which has long been of interest and personal concern because I have been a businessman as well as one professionally interested in public affairs.

During the 1960 political campaign an incident occurred which highlights an aspect of our thinking. As I was walking along the street in my home community of Elkins, W. Va., talking with the voters and outlining the issues, I was stopped by a citizen who directed me into a doorway to discuss the election. After finishing our conversation, I asked him why he had drawn me off the street and into such privacy. He replied: "You know I am in business and I must be very careful of what I do and say."

Though this man may have dramatized his fears somewhat, he does not represent an isolated state of mind. The rule of prudence, the precautionary attitude against speaking one's mind on controversial problems, has taken seed among too many of us. It is a measure of the failure of the democratic process when anyone, whether he be businessman, farmer, professional man, or teacher, fears to participate in the political dialogue.

It is appropriate to refer also to our national attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Russia seems at one and the same time to have become our national demon and gage by which we measure our own progress. We are too frequently confronted with such questions as these:

Are we behind the Soviets in space exploration?

Are American schools as advanced as those of Russia?

Do we offer enough support for basic research in science and technology compared with our adversary?

Thus, in recent years, we have too frequently approached our problems not in terms of finding the best possible solutions, but in terms of the cold war with Russia and communism in general. This is unfortunate because the solution to any problem is determined, in large degree, by the questions which one addresses to the problem.

I devoutly hope, therefore, that the political actions of men in private enterprise will not be restricted, that they will ask questions not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe this or that power, but, rather, whether it is in the best national interest as well as their own legitimate self-interests.

This is only an instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourses, and hence the solution to political questions, is too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms, liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist.

We are all familiar with the old platitude: "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarization of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of political life. There are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible, the serious effort of compromise and conciliation. We reach consent by mutual concessions. This understanding offers us a clue as to how the citizen can make one of his chief contributions in the arena of public affairs. We know that the life of business and commerce is, in large measure, a life of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a mixture of interests whereby each party gains some satisfaction.

Wise decisions in business require not only a knowledge of how to conduct a commercial transaction, but, also, knowledge of personnel relations, of community relations, and of the whole process of communication. From this point of view, therefore, a businessman, the modern businessman, is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs. He must be willing to commit himself beyond the confines of the immediate community, and cause his voice to be heard in the broader arena of representative government.

In this regard, he acquires new responsibility. As a respected and successful member of society he is an opinion maker, one whose words and thoughts are heard and heeded. It follows then, that his must be an educated, informed, and sincere voice; one whose convictions are the product of study and thought, and one thoroughly familiar with the institutions and processes of government. In short, the businessman must know his government. This knowledge must cover not only areas which bear on his own economic interest, but must include a familiarity with the entire progression through which proposed legislation moves before becoming law. Unless he is conversant with the dynamics of the legislative system he cannot hope to serve effectively in formulating public opinion; he cannot generate and stimulate informed opposition or intelligent support for a given measure.

An experienced Washington correspondent for a leading weekly news magazine has expressed to me strong personal concern over the lack of familiarity with the processes of government which is found among average citizens. He has noted a widespread and appalling ignorance of governmental operations among those citizens who are generally accepted as educated and well informed.

This newsman reports that shortly before the congressional elections of 1962 a researcher for one of the large broadcasting networks telephoned a campaign office and asked, "How many Members of the House are up for election this November?"

This question despite the fact that for 174 years a constitutional requirement has been that the entire membership of the House of Representatives seek election every 2 years. A fundamental and elementary fact of our electoral process had escaped this researcher entirely.

Another example is this:

I recently heard of a $14,000 a year correspondent with a national publication who had insisted that no law passed by Congress can go into effect until it is first ruled on by the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, these incidents are hardly exceptions.

Our first task is therefore to seek a thorough understanding of Government, and then to strive to make ourselves heard on issues in which we have special knowledge.

In this regard, I would offer comment on the relations of businessmen with Congress, and these observations apply as well to all individuals and professional and trade associations. The legislative process is an involved and intricate one, and the drafting and enactment of any bill of national significance requires the reconciliation of many interests and often many conflicting points of view.

It is vital that all legitimate interests be represented and all important opinions be expressed early in the legislative process. Your Representative or Senator receives little assistance or guidance from a last minute telegram requesting a "yes" or "no" vote at the time a bill reaches the floor. By then, if it is a proposal with which he has been personally identified, he has participated in the hearings or read the testimony, he has examined the committee report and conferred with staff members and his colleagues. And he has usually made his decision before the day the measure comes to a vote.

Therefore, if you desire your conviction to count in the legislative process, on matters affecting your own enterprise or in other areas, I urge you to initiate early and maintain continuing contact with your Representative and your Senator. I assure you that constituent conviction is a powerful influence in the halls of Congress. But it is best offered in a manner and at a time when such counsel is of value. None of us gives the weight to a deluge of last minute form letters or telegrams that we give to the correspondence that clearly reflects independent thought and considered evaluation of governmental problems. If these suggestions are followed, the citizen-businessman can become a very valued counselor to his Congressman.

An editorial in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette included a thought-provoking paragraph. Its central theme was this: In a democratic nation it is fair to assert that the people get in their government—local, State, and national—precisely what they themselves represent. If, in their own personal lives, our people are wasteful (and most Americans are); if they tend to be arbitrary (which is another American trait); and if they are relatively undisciplined in private affairs, then their government is certain to demonstrate to a marked degree exactly the same traits.

I feel that I have a duty and responsibility in a discussion of this nature to express the admonition that organizations such as yours have an obligation to help develop and promote the best possible understanding between government and business, between government and the financial community.

It has been appropriately said by an authoritative observer and commentator that the business outlook today would be much better than it is if the gap in relations between government and business could be closed or so substantially narrowed that there might develop a cooperative and constructive team effort.

The American economy, during significant periods, has shown a capacity to grow at an average annual rate between 4 and 5 percent without inflationary strain during periods other than depression or war. This growth rate is measured by changes in total national production, stated in uniform dollars.

But during the period 1953–61, the average annual growth rate was only 2.5 percent, or hardly better than half the rate required, in view of the ever-accelerating technology, to absorb increases in the labor force and in productivity per man-hour.

This deficient record has been compounded of a fairly rhythmic succession of booms, periods of stagnation, recessions, and inadequate recoveries.

The deficient growth rate has led to a chronically rising level of unemployed manpower. Indeed, the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. I assure you that the facts reaching us demonstrate very clearly that unemployment, far from being concentrated in a few, has become very generally distributed throughout most of the important sectors of the economy. And we find, too, that very large and consistent increases in the chronic level of idle plant capacity have accompanied the chronic increases in idle manpower.

For the period 1953–61 as a whole, the aggregate forfeiture of total national production, resulting from the low growth rate, is estimated at about $344 billion, measured in uniform 1960 dollars. The forfeiture of employment opportunity aggregated almost 22½ million man-years. Practically all types of income earners and all major types of business activity suffered accordingly.

President Kennedy has correctly indicated that chronic unemployment is the country's No. 1 economic problem and has expressed regret that there does not seem to be the sense of urgency and awareness that there should be on this subject. In February some 4,918,000 men and women were unemployed, 6.1 percent of the total work force, seasonally adjusted. And, projected annually, this unemployment represents a loss in potential American production of between $30 and $40 billion in goods and services; goods and services that our Nation will never see.

How serious is this economic waste? Need we be alarmed? Economist Gunnar Myrdal, former Swedish Minister of Health, has been quoted as saying:

"I am inclined to believe that the most important problem in the world today is how to get America out of the automatism of relative economic stagnation. A continuation of the present trend means frustration in its foreign relations as well as in its internal life, which, because of the size and weight of America and the role it has to play is extremely dangerous."

The challenge cannot be ignored. By 1975 our total work force will increase from its present level of approximately 75 million to a staggering 93 million, a growth which will be far more rapid than in any other 15-year period in our history. Economic acceleration must therefore include a speedup of the rate in which jobs are created.

Since World War II, 10 million jobs have been opened in the United States, and throughout 1962 total employment hit new highs month after month. The gain in jobs from 1947 through 1962 was 17 percent, but the corresponding growth in the labor force amounted to 22 percent, hence unemployment.

Business volume as a whole is breaking records. Profits and incomes are up, though the rise has recently slowed, and yet the unemployment problem persists. It becomes obvious that if we are to open more jobs we must inject new life into our economic structure, we must speed the rate of business expansion.

Responsible and experienced leaders of the administration are convinced that a cut in taxes, to release new billions for spending, is the most effective way. Such a cut in taxation, however, cannot be regarded as a panacea which will automatically cure the financial ills of the Nation, and bring prosperity to its poorer citizens. It can be but a step, albeit an important one, toward achieving a healthier financial climate throughout most segments of our society.

Income taxes at their present level appear to act as an automatic brake on business upturns. As activity rises, taxes siphon off so large a share of the rising incomes that demand for goods fails to reach the level at which industry could produce profitably.

Surplus capacity discourages business investment, a major ingredient in any strong rise in economic activity. Recovery slows down, and the groundwork is laid for another recession. Through a reduction in taxes, new impetus can be injected into demand and investment, and stepped-up growth thereby stimulated.

This effort to induce expansion is not the sole responsibility of government. The private sector of the economy cannot be content to assess blame while waiting calmly for "someone to do something" All can take part. Specifically, business and organized labor must exercise self-discipline in order to prevent an evaporation of those benefits gained through a tax cut. Increased prices or wages would necessarily divert funds made available through tax reduction, and would tend to counteract beneficial effects on unemployment levels. Restraint is essential to insure that the desired results are achieved.

And, as we face current economic challenges we must maintain a flexibility and a willingness to meet change with change. Experience is said to be the best teacher, and yet our experiences of the past may not necessarily provide clear indications of the path we must follow, or the steps we must take.

For example, we are just beginning to feel the impact of automation. Until now, our belief has been that technological advances create a sufficiency in new jobs, perhaps at some other area or level of production. By and large this was true when rapid restructuring was taking place in isolated segments of the economy, and where changes brought on price reductions or increases in quality naturally resulting in increased demand.

Today, however, we are facing technological change of a rapidity and scope never before encountered. Throughout the entire spectrum of our industry the effects of automation are being felt. Change is now moving in geometrical rather than arithmetical progression, and imaginatve and resourceful responses must be found. You, as informed and responsible citizens, will be called on to participate in the search for answers to these, and other questions. I am confident that your response will be one of intelligent inquiry and dedication in the building of a better America.

Yes, the role of the individual businessman in public affairs is a significant one. His primary obligations are those which square with the general responsibilities of all citizens, namely, those of keeping informed, participating in determinations on vital issues, and voting in elections at all levels of government.

Inasmuch as viable democracy depends on an informed electorate, the businessman should function as a source of information on matters which affect his livelihood and on which he is especially knowledgeable. The Congress and the executive branch need your reasoned counsel. Do not withhold it.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Mar. 28, 1962]

CALLS FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

(By Frank Makarewicz)

LOWELL.—Nearly 600 persons of all walks of life in the Greater Lowell community turned out to attend the 4th annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell at the Memorial Auditorium last night and to hear a U.S. Senator sound a call to citizen participation in government.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, who is on the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Employment, Welfare, and a Special Committee on Aging, warned his listeners that there must be a greater urgency to solve the growing unemployment problem in the country. He also warned of the serious consequences of a lack of interest in government by the people.

"We will not be driven into dictatorship, but we can drift into it," Senator RANDOLPH declared. Lack of a thorough understanding of government is a serious handicap, he said, because issues require compromise and conciliation often that must include ideas from a wide range of thought, not only from the extremes.

"The modern businessman is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs," he said. "He must be willing to commit himself beyond the confines of the immediate community, and cause his voice to be heard in the broader area of representative government. He must be an educated, informed, and sincere voice whose convictions are the product of study and thought."

Urging the public to accept a greater responsibility in giving counsel to its governmental representatives, the Senator said, "It is incumbent on individuals and professional and trade associations to express your convictions. It is vital that all legitimate interests be represented and all important opinions be expressed early in the legislative process."

"The national interest is composed of special interests," he said.

The speaker then discussed with emphasis, the growing and serious problem of unemployment. He said that while there were more people working today there was also greater unemployment, due in part to automation. Senator RANDOLPH predicted the situation would worsen unless steps were taken to find ways to accelerate the economy by creating new jobs.

"By 1975," he said, "our total work force will increase from its present level of approximately 75 million to a staggering 93 million, a growth which will be far more rapid than in any other 15-year period in our history."

He told his audience that they as business people will be called on to participate in the search for answers to the problems facing the country, and said that by being informed and by participating in the determinations of vital issues and voting in elections at all levels of government they will be assuming the responsibilities of citizenship.

The Senator was introduced by Lowell's Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE who spoke of Senator RANDOLPH's many achievements in diversified careers. He noted that RANDOLPH had been a college professor, a dean, an industrial executive, and an editor and publisher as well as an author and had served as a Congressman from 1933 to 1947.

MORSE listed the many Senate committees and subcommittees RANDOLPH is working with and pointed out that he was the coauthor of the Randolph-Sheppard Act which established small business stands operated by the blind.

The program for the dinner opened at 7 p.m. with the playing of the national anthem and an invocation by Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, pastor of St. Margaret's Church.

Arthur C. Antonopoulos, who presided as toastmaster, introduced the guests at the head table, who included Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Tellier, Rev. and Mrs. Victor F. Scalise, Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Cook, Mr. and Mrs. Walter C. Wilson, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Hickey, Mayor Joseph M. Downes, Mrs. Antonopoulos, Congressman MORSE and Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Lamson were unable to attend.

In addition to offering the official greetings of the city, Mayor Downes made a few remarks as the first speaker.

Thomas J. Hickey, retiring president of the chamber, who was introduced and praised by the dinner chairman as a distinguished leader of the community and the chamber, offered the president's report before turning over his gavel of office to the newly elected president of the organization, Walter C. Wilson, Jr.

In accepting the token, Wilson promised to continue efforts to bring to a fact Lowell's "Potential for Progress," the theme of the chamber's program. His remarks were followed by the presentation to the retiring president of a plaque for distinguished service. Besides the plaque presented to Hickey, two retiring board members, who were unable to be present, Matthew J. Brown and

Walter B. Reilly, Jr., were awarded certificates for their service to the organization and the community.

The next speaker who was introduced was Donald A. Cook, general manager of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell. Cook praised the members and officers for their support and participation in the activities of the chamber which, he said, made progress possible.

Cook named, in special appreciation, the officers who include Edward N. Lamson, vice president, James P. Curran, vice president, Eugene Tellier, treasurer, and Arthur C. Antonopoulos, immediate past president. He also praised the members of the board of directors who include Sheppard Bartlett, of A. G. Pollard Co.; Matthew J. Brown, of Scott Jewelry Co.; Donald A. Caswell, of Bon Marche, Inc.; David F. Connors, of Lowell Sun Publishing Co.; James F. Conway, Jr., of the Courier-Citizen Co.; Albert P. Gaumont, of Gaumont Bros., Inc.; J. Russell Havey, of Educator Biscuit Co.; Dr. Brendan D. Leahey; Allan L. Levine, of Towers Motor Parts; Harry J. Patterson, of the Lowell Gas Co.; Walter B. Reilly, Jr., of the Courier-Citizen Co.; Daniel E. Walker, of the Union National Bank; Harold E. Wright, Sr., of Wright Trucking Co., as well as the retiring and the new president.

The general manager also singled out for praise Errington A. Brigham and Henry Gaumont who headed the retail division. He also presented to newly elected board members, Joseph Alyibrandi and Michael DeMoulas, and recognized the services of several committee chairmen who include John F. Gleason, Richard R. Flood, Robert H. Goldman, Dr. Costas Kokinos, Kenneth Harkins, Vincent P. Morton, Jr., Raymond E. Noiseux and Harold Hirsch who was not able to be present because of illness.

At the conclusion of Senator RANDOLPH's address, Rev. Victor F. Scalise, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church delivered the benediction to conclude the meeting.

Dinner committee chairmen included Edward F. O'Dea, attendance; David F. Connors, publicity; Joseph Sullivan, Jr., program; Hans H. Schliebus, banquet; John H. Gardiner, hall; James C. Shannon, Jr., decorations; Joseph M. McDonough and Cortlandt J. Burkinshaw, reception.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 14: 19: *Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace.*

Almighty God, as we daily pray and labor for world peace, may we be eager to extend the overtures of friendship and good will to all freedom-loving nations who are now being drawn together by a common peril and common ideals.

Grant that we may see clearly that our thinking and acting in terms of all humanity and right relations between the members of the human family are matters of life and death for our world of today.

May we understand that the democracy which we are seeking to establish, and its freedom which we believe is inevitable for all mankind, is one that must be coordinated with discipline and a sense of interdependence, but above all one that has spiritual significance and is ruled by love for God and man.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to make correction in the enrollment of S. 1035.

THE CONFUSING WORLDWIDE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no program that is any more complex and confusing than the worldwide foreign aid program.

It is estimated that on June 30 there will be on hand, unexpended, but obligated, far in excess of $7 billion. This is sufficient to meet every legal obligation that we have outstanding to other nations with respect to foreign aid.

If the Congress, in its wisdom, refused to appropriate another dollar for the foreign aid program, remember, every purely legal obligation we have made will have been met, unless it is assumed that the Executive can obligate money without the prior approval of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll shows that 58 percent of the people approve foreign aid. The Passman poll shows that 98 percent of the people oppose foreign aid. What a contrast. Evidently Mr. Gallup had a carefully worded question that did not deal with the program as it really is.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1963.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is the ninth year it has been my privilege to provide you with a recapitulation of foreign aid funds available to the mutual security program. This report covers funds available for fiscal 1963 and covers only the amount of the aid program handled by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. Other types of foreign assistance are available under eight other statutes.

The amounts listed on the attached sheet have been verified. These funds are available for obligation and expenditure in the present fiscal year. Funds not disbursed during fiscal 1963 will remain available in either an obligated or reserved status, or as we often say, in the pipeline.

Is it really the desire of Congress to permit AID to continue pyramiding funds and fund programs years in advance of the actual expenditure? This practice accounts for the annual increase in unexpended funds. The certified information presented below indicates there is something wrong with the present system of pyramiding aid funds. Certainly the actual annual expenditures do not justify this practice.

The three brackets of figures cover (a) funds available covering 4 fiscal years—observe the annual increase, (b) actual expenditures for 3 years—fiscal 1963 not yet available, and (c) unexpended funds on hand at the end of the last 3 fiscal years—1963 not yet available:

(A) Total available for expenditure:	
1. Fiscal year 1960	$8,111,521,750
2. Fiscal year 1961	8,551,215,000
3. Fiscal year 1962	10,078,319,114
4. Fiscal year 1963	11,141,987,000
(B) Actual expenditures:	
1. Fiscal year 1960	3,265,400,000
2. Fiscal year 1961	3,276,600,000
3. Fiscal year 1962	3,198,100,000
(C) Unexpended funds:	
1. Unexpended funds June 30, 1960	$4,830,549,000
2. Unexpended funds June 30, 1961	5,975,397,000
3. Unexpended funds June 30, 1962	6,889,186,000

I hope the information contained in this letter and the attached sheet will be of some service to you. It is a pleasure to furnish you the information developed by the subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be chairman. Personally, I am concerned about the ever-increasing cost of this program.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

(Enclosure.)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

OTTO E. PASSMAN, chairman

Foreign aid funds by program and amount (available for expenditure in fiscal 1963)

1. Military assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	$2,784,637,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	1,325,000,000
New funds, other	39,985,000
Subtotal	4,149,622,000
2. Development loans:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	2,127,005,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	975,000,000
New funds, other	920,000
Subtotal	3,102,925,000
3. Development grants:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	430,252,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	225,000,000
Subtotal	655,252,000
4. Development grants, special programs: New funds, fiscal 1963	2,800,000
5. Surveys of investment opportunities: Unexpended, June 30, 1962	1,500,000
6. Investment guarantees:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	235,659,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	30,000,000
Subtotal	265,659,000
7. International organization and programs:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	79,009,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	148,900,000
Subtotal	227,909,000
8. Supporting assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	452,374,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	395,000,000
Subtotal	847,374,000
9. Contingency fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	223,438,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	250,000,000
Subtotal	473,438,000
10. Alliance for Progress:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	519,445,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	525,000,000
Subtotal	1,044,445,000

Foreign aid funds by program and amount (available for expenditure in fiscal 1963)—Continued

11. Administrative expenses, AID:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	$11,233,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	49,500,000
New funds, other	8,383,000
Subtotal	69,116,000
12. Administrative expenses, State:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	87,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	2,700,000
Subtotal	2,787,000
13. Other: Unexpended, June 30, 1962	5,500,000
Subtotal, funds available for expenditure for foreign assistance program	10,848,327,000
14. Peace Corps:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	10,815,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	59,000,000
Subtotal	69,815,000
15. Ryukyu Islands:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	3,044,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	8,900,000
Subtotal	11,944,000
16. Cuban refugee program:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	2,687,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	70,110,000
Subtotal	72,797,000
17. Migrants and refugees:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	2,501,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	14,947,000
Subtotal	17,448,000
18. Inter-American Development Bank:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	(1)
New funds, fiscal 1963	60,000,000
Subtotal	60,000,000
19. International Development Association:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	(1)
New funds, fiscal 1963	61,656,000
Subtotal	61,656,000
Subtotal, funds available for other foreign assistance	293,660,000
Grand total, funds available for expenditure in fiscal year 1963	11,141,987,000

RECAPITULATION

1. Unexpended funds (from prior fiscal years), June 30, 1962	$6,889,186,000
2. New funds (appropriated), fiscal 1963	4,203,513,000
3. New funds (reimbursements, sales receipts, etc.), fiscal 1963	49,288,000
Total funds available for expenditure	11,141,987,000

[1] $513,500,000 unexpended funds for IDB and IDA not included in above totals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1963.

To Whom It May Concern:

Gold holdings (free world countries):	
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	$23,252,000,000
U.S. gold outflow to foreign countries, 1952 through 1962	−7,195,000,000
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, reduced to	16,057,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries,[1] Dec. 31, 1952	13,028,000,000
Gold holdings, increase, other countries, 1952 through 1962	+11,630,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,658,000,000
U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries (free world):	
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	10,546,100,000
Increase in foreign dollar holdings, 1952 through 1962	+14,437,900,000
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,984,000,000

[1] Does not include Sino-Soviet bloc.

U.S. balance of payments position:	
1950 net deficit	−$1,912,000,000
1951 net deficit	−578,000,000
1952 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1953 net deficit	−2,100,000,000
1954 net deficit	−1,500,000,000
1955 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1956 net deficit	−1,000,000,000
1957 (only credit in 13 years)	+500,000,000
1958 net deficit	−3,400,000,000
1959 net deficit	−3,700,000,000
1960 net deficit	−3,800,000,000
1961 net deficit	−2,400,000,000
1962 net deficit	−2,200,000,000
U.S. deficit, 1950 through 1962, inclusive	−24,290,000,000
Gross public debts:	
U.S. public debt on Dec. 31, 1962	303,470,080,489
Other free world countries (latest available figures)	201,500,000,000
U.S. debt exceeds debts of other free world countries by	101,970,080,489
U.S. debt exceeds all other countries of world by	24,000,500,000

The above indicates clearly what the foreign aid program is doing to our gold reserves and our balance of payments position (trade).

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

SUNDAY TELEPHONE RATES SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO SATURDAYS AS WELL

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, at midnight tonight anyone will be able to place a telephone call to any part of the country, station to station, for the sum of $1 for the first 3 minutes. This is a very fine move. I would, however, suggest an additional step which should be taken. Now would be a good time to extend the evening and Sunday rates on telephone calls to Saturdays as well as Sundays. A great many businesses are closed on Saturdays and millions of people all over the country would benefit by this reduction of rates and the extension of the Sunday and evening rates to Saturdays.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I may be able to generate some sentiment on Capitol Hill and throughout the country for this move.

ALLIANCE FOR VIOLENCE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, issued a report on "Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere."

In the March 30, 1963, edition of the Washington Evening Star there appeared the following editorial on the subcommittee's hearings and report:

ALLIANCE FOR VIOLENCE

In its excellent report on Fidel Castro's captive Cuba, the House Subcommitee on Inter-American Affairs has made a number of somber points about how Moscow and Havana are organizing an alliance for violence against the free Americas. One of the most significant of the report's observations is the following:

"Communist Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete. The Castro Communist movement, although claiming to represent indigenous Latin American interests and aspirations, is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union must be held accountable for * * * subversive aggression in the Americas. * * *

"Castro communism is the instrument of Soviet aspirations for the Americas. Thus subversive aggression emanating from Cuba is Soviet directed and represents (in the words of CIA Director McCone) a 'far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly' effort than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids conducted by the Castroites during the early months of the regime.

"International Soviet agents, experts in the field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist tactics, and guerrilla warfare, are operating schools for violence in Cuba, training and indoctrinating Latin American subversives. The Soviet Union as well as its Cuban puppet regime must bear the responsibility and consequences for subversive attacks on nations of the Western Hemisphere."

This is but one of the many sobering findings of the House subcommittee. The report of the group—a unanimous one, which is relatively rare—is greatly oversimplified in these paragraphs. The full text well deserves the attention and study not only of the Kremlin but of every American, including the President, interested in hemispheric security and the alliance for violence against it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, in his syndicated column of March 19, 1963, also commented on the subcommittee's report.

Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1963]

CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TO STALL REDS—REALISTIC VIEW OF HEMISPHERIC THREAT SEEN IN HOUSE GROUP'S ACTION PROPOSAL

(By David Lawrence)

Members of Congress of both parties have for months expressed serious concern over the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against the nations of this hemisphere. A realistic appraisal of the present situation and a recommendation as to what should be done have just come in a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. All nine members of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs—both Republicans and Democrats—signed the report.

The committee findings are that, even though the Castro Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of successfully mounting an offensive blow, this "does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security." The committee then says bluntly that "no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect" by the countries of the hemisphere.

The report points out that, because no clear and unified hemispheric policy dealing with the Castro Communist subversive aggression has been developed, some of the members of the Organization of American States "have not devised effective internal methods of controlling subversive traffic in and through their territories."

It is asserted emphatically that Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete and that the regime "is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc." The House subcommittee report states flatly that "the Soviet Union must be held accountable for such subversive aggression in the Americas."

It adds that the "violent overthrow of existing governments remains the unified aim of Communist forces in Latin America," which include both the "Soviet and Chinese branches of international communism."

But what to do about it? The subcommittee makes four principal recommendations, as follows:

"1. In accord with the joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, section (A), immediate steps should be taken by the United States 'to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere.'

"2. The United States should be prepared to act with military force, if needed, in response to the request for help and assistance of any nation of the hemisphere in danger of being overthrown by Castro Communist subversive aggression. This recommendation is in no way to be considered as a substitute for or a bar to unilateral action by the United States in defense of its own security.

"3. Every effort must be made by the United States to assure collective action by the Organization of American States, and by OAS member states individually, toward the curbing of Castro Communist subversive activities and traffic in the hemisphere.

"4. The United States should seek the complete diplomatic and economic quarantine of Communist Cuba by other nations of the hemisphere."

Recommendations of a House committee are influential but do not necessarily mean concurrence by the executive branch of the Government. But it is significant that Members of Congress are setting forth explicity what they think should be done in Latin America. They have, in fact, stated in much more vigorous terms what American policy should be than has either the White House or the State Department.

The report shows a sympathetic attitude by the committee's members toward economic aid for Latin America, but it is clear they feel that this will not solve the problems of the hemisphere unless stern measures are taken to eliminate the threat of Cuban-based subversive aggression.

There are indications that the Latin-American governments themselves are under heavy internal pressure from radical groups, some of which are not unsympathetic to the Communists, and that this is complicating the whole problem of collective action in the hemisphere. The Soviets have spent hundreds of millions of dollars not only to supply funds, guidance, and technical assistance to train guerrillas and terrorists brought into Cuba from throughout Latin America, but to infiltrate organizations in various countries. They are leaving no stone unturned to gain a political following inside the countries of the hemisphere. Many organizations are infiltrated by Communists, and the majority of the members are not aware of this underground activity.

The whole Latin-American problem is becoming more and more complicated, largely because the United States has not acted decisively and forcefully in dealing with the Communist base established under the Castro regime in Cuba.

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, to note that one of America's most respected journalists, Mr. David Lawrence, has come to the defense of the Cuban exiles, who are attempting to regain their homeland and rid that island, just 90 miles from our shores, of the Communist menace. As you all know, these efforts are now being thwarted by the latest action of the administration and Great Britain by the enforcement of a blockade around that Communist-infested island, and, which for all practical purposes, would seem to be a protective measure for the welfare of Castro.

I want all of my colleagues to have the benefit of Mr. Lawrence's sound judgment in this matter, and for this reason, I am inserting into the Congressional Record his article entitled "Policy of Inaction Against Cuba," which appeared in the April 2 edition of the Evening Star:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

Policy of Inaction Against Cuba—U.S. Efforts Against Anti-Castro Attacks Described as Result of Confusion

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort by the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuba territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous presure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's Navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommitee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke neutrality laws against the only individuals who wish to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

BACK-DOOR FINANCING

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago we learned the Democratic leadership was conducting a secret poll to see if its majority membership would support the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee in reporting out a bill authorizing a $2 billion increase in lending authorization for the Export-Import Bank with such increase to be financed on a back-door financing basis.

I commend to the attention of the Democratic leadership another poll, an open poll, taken yesterday on the floor of the Senate on the question of back-door financing. The newspaper report in the April 2 Evening Star, over a three-column headline, reports "Transit Bill Is Stripped of Back-Door Financing." The article reports the Senate yesterday, by unanimous action, struck out the back-door financing provision in the reported mass transit bill and substituted therefor the financing of the program under the regular appropriation process. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this should make clear to the Democratic leadership on this side that back-door financing is a "dead duck" in programs to be considered by this Congress.

When the Export-Import Bank bill was considered by our committee in executive session I offered an amendment to place the additional $2 billion of lending authority under an appropriation process similar to that adopted by the House last year with respect to the $2 billion increase in authorization for the International Monetary Fund. This amendment was defeated on a straight party vote and the bill was reported with the financing on a back-door basis.

When the Export-Import Bank bill is brought to the floor of the House I shall again offer my amendment to knock out the back-door financing for the increased authorization and subject it to the regular appropriation process. I full well realize, Mr. Speaker, that I may be denied the opportunity of offering this amendment purely because under parliamentary procedure a member of the majority may be recognized to offer the amendment. However that may be, I predict that when the House acts on the Export-Import Bank bill an overwhelming majority of this body will vote to strike the back-door financing provision from the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the language of my amendment, which is the Republican position, to place the financing of the increased lending authorization under the regular appropriation process.

DEMOCRATIC BUGABOOS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday was April Fools' Day, but to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, one might think Halloween somehow had already arrived on April 2.

Certainly the Democrat leader on the other side of the aisle paraded the weirdest assortment of ghosts, goblins, and horror stories within my memory.

The purpose was obvious: to scare the daylights out of the country with trumped-up threats of what will happen if we in the Congress are successful in bringing some semblance of sanity into the Kennedy administration's spending proposals.

Fortunately, there was no more substance to this witch's brew of speculation on what we have in mind in the way of budget cuts than there is in a spook.

And I might add that the timing for this presentation was just about as far off as Halloween itself.

This body had just demonstrated that our position on budget cutting is sound and responsible by chopping something in the neighborhood of $100 million from the budget of the Department of Interior and related agencies. This figure substantially vindicated the Republican task force projection of this bill, the first we have considered in the current session.

Moreover, President Kennedy had just sent the Congress a message on foreign assistance in which he backed down $400 million from his original proposal.

I cannot help but wonder what terrifying results our friends on the other side imagine the President's reduction in this program may have on our economy and our foreign relations.

Or does it make a difference just who suggests economy?

Let me again assure my colleagues from the other side of the aisle: We are not going to be frightened off by bugaboos—and I do not think the American people are going to panic, either.

Quite obviously, the administration has been getting a taste of unfavorable public reaction to the idea of planned deficit spending and is responding with some moves of its own in the direction of economy.

This we applaud as at least a step—however reluctantly it may be taken—in the right direction.

As Republicans we do not care who cuts down on excessive spending, just so it is cut.

Meanwhile, we intend to stick by our guns and fight, item by item, for appropriations levels that meet the needs of our economy and our military security and against appropriations levels for which no real justification can be established.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask my friend if he will not please take the Members of the House and the American people into his confidence and tell them just where these $15 billion in cuts can be made?

Mr. HALLECK. In due time you will find out. Our projection on the first proposals we had for reduction in the Interior Department appropriation was a little over $100 million. That projection was proved substantially correct, and I hope it will be proved correct as we go along.

I cannot quite understand the concern of my very beloved friend, the majority leader, who, with a 3-to-2 majority, is so concerned about what we in the minority are going to do in respect to saving money, but we have kept this on a bipartisan basis and we want it kept that way. I must say that, from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, the folks downtown must have been working nights conjuring up some of those hair-raising yarns.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman think the American people ought to know and want to know what kind of operation my friends are going to try to perform on the budget?

Mr. HALLECK. We have said we are going to do our best to cut this budget. We obviously cannot do it unless we get some help from the gentleman's side of the aisle, but I am inclined to believe that a lot of people around here, including some folks downtown, are hearing from the country. Beyond that, as I say, we will be responsible in our efforts. I just hope that the people of the country reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, where you have listed the projects that will be gone and the jobs that will be lost and the contractors who will be thus affected—I trust these readers realize that you have already projected these things to come, so we will just go along and prove that projection was far wide of the mark.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], has estimated that our committee has reduced the new obligational authority by some $10 billion. Our committee is not putting out the exact figures on the House Appropriation bills in advance. Those committee reports will be released after action by the House Appropriations Committee. I think it would not be wise even for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to release item by item his breakdown before the committee actually takes action. I would hope that the gentleman from Indiana would not release any information until the House Appropriations Committee has had an opportunity to act on each individual bill in executive session.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that was indicated by the chairman of the task force sometime ago.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask the gentleman one more question: Does not the gentleman feel that the American people are entitled to have the gentleman take them into his confidence?

Mr. HALLECK. I happen to believe that the American people have a little confidence in their Representatives. The people out in the Second District of Indiana have indicated they have. I would certainly hope the people have some confidence in the Congress of the

United States as holder of the purse strings of the Nation as to how we go about achieving the end that I think is desirable, the consideration of our business. I do not think there is any lack of confidence on the part of the American people. I know why hearings of the Appropriations Committee are held in executive session, and they do not have people in there to hear the testimony. They do not have them in there as they are marking up the bills. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows as well as I do why that is, and I do not need to draw any blueprint.

COURTBOUILLON A LA U.N.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the House at its last meeting that U.S. officials are anxious to pay the U.N. again this summer—for more aid from that Chinese "piscatorial-paddy" expert.

I am glad to report there are some Americans who do not think that will be necessary, and I invite your attention to an editorial in the Shreveport, La., Times of March 25, 1963.

Now, these good folk of Caddo Parish consider that they know a little something about fish in their ricefields—they have had fish there for years. They seem to doubt that the U.N.'s Chinese expert can make their fish any happier than they already are.

But, they do suggest that they can teach the U.N. a thing or two about getting some good edible use out of the fish.

I commend this witty but pithy editorial to my colleagues attention; and under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the Record.

Our Own U.N. Project

There's a story going around that a Congressman, angered by U.N. grants to Cuba, wanted to know why the United States was never eligible for aid. He was told very gravely by the U.N. that we are and that there's an actual U.N. project underway in this country.

It turned out to be a lone Chinese (this is no joke) who somewhere in this broad land is teaching someone how to grow fish in rice paddies. The search has been narrowed down to Louisiana, and the Congressman is asking mystery lovers please to spot this (presumably non-Red) Chinese and find out where his project is and how it's coming.

Whether or not this U.N. emissary really has got to Louisiana or does intend ultimately to come, we have news for him: We already know how to grow fish in our rice fields. We don't call them paddies, though—probably because Irish are scarce in the rice-growing areas—but come to think of it they aren't called pierres either; so maybe race hasn't anything to do with it.

But, anyway, about those fish: Louisiana rice fields are full of carp and buffalo after the fields are flooded. It happens in this wise: The fields are flooded from canals which are equipped with floodgates. The canals themselves draw their water from the bayous. The bayous abound in fish. When the floodgates are opened, the canal water comes into the fields bringing the fish with it.

In the shallow water, the scales of the buffalo and carp sometimes turn red. It's a pretty sight, but carp and buffalo are coarse fish and are good only for a Cajun delicacy called courtbouillon (meaning short soup, probably because it's short on meat).

We are willing to admit that carp came originally from China, which they did, and we suppose they came here via England which used to have a rhyme saying, "Carp, turkeys, and beer came into England all in a year." That was sometime in the 17th century.

Since we already know how to grow fish in our rice fields, we think it only fair that some sort of grant be made to enable a Cajun or two to show this Chinese when he shows up how to make courtbouillon. Even if we sold the recipe for $5, we'd be getting something back for all those U.N. grants that other countries are getting out of U.S. money.

FOREIGN AID AND THE CLAY REPORT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid, the huge temporary program which has ballooned into a tremendous and seemingly permanent burden for the American people, is in the center of the Washington stage with the publication of the Clay Committee report. The unbiased look at the huge program, requested by the President, will be discussed for some time. Its conclusions that the $100 billion program has been wasteful and often lacking in focus and direction confirms what, I believe, a vast majority of the American people have thought for some years.

Clearly, a program geared to real objectives of mutual security for the free world is not the root of the argument. Spendthrift schemes sprawling all over the world costing billions are the issue. There is a limit to pure generosity which adds little or nothing to our national interests or to the fight against Communist penetration, and there have been too many instances of this kind of operations. The Clay report is not binding upon the aid program. However, its conclusions that "we are indeed attempting too much for too many"; that "a higher quality and reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could accomplish more"; and we cannot believe "that our national interest is served by indefinitely continuing commitments at the present rate to the 95 countries which are now receiving our economic and/or military aid" have long needed to be said forcefully in our high councils of government. Congress will surely take its most stern look in many years at this program, and this look will be overdue and by popular demand.

The Clay Committee report reserves special comment for Indonesia, saying:

> We do not see how external assistance can be granted to this nation by free world countries unless it puts its internal house in order, provides fair treatment to foreign creditors and enterprises, and refrains from international adventures.

This is a good example of a situation where we have poured in scores of millions of dollars with very questionable results. Following a zigzag course promising little stability in the battle against Communist expansion in southeast Asia, Indonesia's leadership takes on the look of an international troublemaker. In 1958, when Western nations refused to provide military equipment, the Indonesians wandered off to Moscow, which set up a crash program to furnish naval equipment, jet fighters, and the most modern arms. The obvious purpose was to build a war machine so that Indonesia could bully its way into Dutch New Guinea. By last summer, a thousand Soviet military technicians were on hand to instruct in the use of the billion dollars worth of military equipment. With the New Guinea campaign over and essentially won, Indonesia seems to find territory in Borneo intended to be part of the new country of Malaysia very attractive. For several months it has been threatening to send "volunteers" into this territory to keep it from becoming part of Malaysia.

In view of these events, and the official support our Government has given to the formation of Malaysia, it was a shock to read an Army press release that Indonesian officers had been invited to observe "Operation Water Moccasin," our big military maneuver in Georgia several weeks ago testing the latest in guerrilla warfare tactics and operations. Why the Indonesians were invited in the first place I am now trying to find out, but there is no doubt that this instruction in advanced jungle warfare could add up to real trouble if the Indonesians decide on new military adventures to put their Soviet-made weapons to work against their neighbors.

The activities of the Indonesian Government are receiving well-deserved attention for its efforts to obtain aid from both sides in the cold war. The Daily Independent of Kannapolis, N.C., commented on this situation recently and I wish to recommend to the Congress the following thoughtful editorial which appeared in the newspaper on March 13, 1963:

Beggars Don't Rate Cadillacs

Do you know of any banks or loan agencies that would lend $5,000 to an individual for the purchase of an automobile if that individual's family were short of food and clothing and he was already in debt up to his ears?

If there is such a bank or loan company, it is a pretty safe bet that it will not be in business long. Yet, one of the nations to which the United States is lending money is in a condition comparable to a tattered beggar buying a Cadillac.

Indonesia, short of food and clothing, is buying three luxury jet airliners for its profitless passenger service. The cost will be $3 million more than the $17 million it is borrowing from the United States to shore up its crippled economy. At the same time it is threatening American oil companies with confiscation of their properties. And Indonesians in this country are discussing with the International Monetary Fund a stabilization program to ease their nation's staggering foreign debt.

Under President Sukarno, Indonesia is showing a remarkable knack for living in the best of two worlds. She has managed to become a client of both the Soviet Union and the United States. A cold war neutral, Indonesia has built up an army of 400,000 men. After much muscleflexing, Indonesia, with U.S. aid negotiated a United Nations agreement last year to gain control of West New Guinea. Sukarno now is threatening the British scheme for a Malaysia Federation, but it is not believed that he's about to risk a military showdown with a major power.

Bung Karno, as he likes to be called—the "Bung" is for brother—has used the army to distract popular attention from gnawing poverty and, in west Java, actual starvation. In his flight from fiscal reality the Indonesian President has indulged in other costly toys, including a $40 million stadium for the Asian games in Jakarta last August.

Indonesia is in hock to the Soviet Union for about $1 billion, of which more than half was spent for military equipment. Aside from the new loan agreement, U.S. aid since 1949 comes to about $773 million, about $402 million of this in loans.

The Indonesian economy has deteriorated steadily since the Dutch left in 1949, as the Dutch and almost everybody else except the featherbrained striped pants wearers in the U.S. State Department predicted it would. Exports last year were off about 15 percent from 1961. Of the $570 million total, $90 million came from three Western oil companies that Indonesia is now threatening to confiscate.

If she does, the United States might treat her pretty rough—by our State Department standards. Section 620 of last year's Foreign Assistance Act says that recipients of U.S. foreign aid have only 6 months after expropriating American private property to take "appropriate steps" to compensate the owners or face loss of aid funds.

Real tough, isn't it?

This seems like another example of the cross-purposes that are so familiar in Washington—the kind we have also seen in the two-price cotton program—where one policy contradicts another. The contradictions abound often in details. Another could be seen in our allowing top officers of the Yugoslav Army to attend the Army's crack Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Still another is the permission we have granted for several millions of dollars worth of heavy industrial equipment to go to Yugoslavia at the same time the Yugoslavians are furnishing strategic goods to Russia. As in the case of foreign aid, there is much tightening of projects and policies to be done in this colossus on the Potomac.

KATYN FOREST ATROCITY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is at this time of the year that we remember with great sorrow the infamous blood bath of Katyn Forest. As I have on numerous occasions, I again remind this House that this is one of the most atrocious examples of Communist bestiality. I am revolted, Mr. Speaker, whenever I think about this tragic occurrence to the Polish people. You will remember that 10,000 Polish officers were murdered at Katyn Forest, and I repeat that this ranks with some of the world's worst atrocities. It was a frightening example of "man's inhumanity to man." I think it is fitting at this time that we pause and pay tribute to these Polish officers. We should keep before us at all times the memory of these men and remember how vicious the Communist cancer can be. Let us also never forget that we cannot, indeed must not, ever allow a similar occurrence.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION SHOULD NOT BE CUT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I first learned of the proposed appropriation for the Post Office Department. I must say I am gravely concerned. The appropriation was cut some $91 million from the Department budget, and $69 million of that cut is in operations. I think all of my colleagues should know that this is a really grave problem for every one of us. It is not the Post Office Department that determines the program of the Post Office and it is not the Congress that determines the program. The program is determined by the citizens of the United States—the people who use the mails. The business people and the housewives and all others who use the mails are the ones who determine the program of the Post Office Department. They determine the volume of the mail. The entire population of the country and the business of the country determine the program of the Post Office Department.

Sixty-nine million dollars in operations applies to personnel—to postal clerks, to letter carriers, letter carriers who by law are not to carry more than 35 pounds of mail at any one time. Therefore, there will not be enough postal clerks and letter carriers to go around, to handle and to deliver the mail in the manner, and to give the service that the people have come to enjoy and to expect of our Post Office Establishment. I want to give notice now, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow there are several of us who are going to sponsor amendments to the proposed appropriation of the Post Office Department and we are going to attempt in every way that we can to bring to you the facts so that you, too, will join with us and restore these cuts.

NEW YORK—THE NATION'S NO. 2 DAIRY STATE—AGREES ON A 1963 DAIRY LEGISLATIVE PACKAGE PROGRAM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, Congress probably will enact dairy legislation this year. The President has requested it in his farm message, and the Agriculture Committees of both the House and the Senate have begun hearings on several bills pending before them.

As a Congressman from New York, in fact as the one member of our delegation who, so I have been advised, has the honor to represent more New York dairy farmers than anyone else, I have been deeply concerned that any dairy legislation we enact here this year should certainly be tailored to the needs and wishes of our New York State dairymen.

After all, Mr. Speaker, New York State is the second largest dairy State in the entire Nation, and our delegation in Congress—41 Representatives and 2 Senators—is the largest single bloc in the Congress.

Surely we New Yorkers have every right to be heard. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have not always had an impact in the shaping of Federal dairy legislation commensurate with our position. Perhaps part of this is because New York is not usually regarded as an agricultural center, but rather as an urban and an industrial area. And perhaps it is also partly because our dairy farmers and our dairy farm organizations in New York State have all too rarely agreed on their own approach to national legislation. When New York's dairy voice was divided the trumpet gave forth an uncertain sound, and hence New York's impact on Federal dairy legislation was correspondingly diminished.

Why only the other day, Mr. Speaker, when I was testifying before the Committee on Agriculture of the other body, the distinguished chairman of that committee reasserted his conviction that New York State farmers could not get together on Federal dairy legislation and he indicated that the committee would therefore have to go ahead with its deliberations without much regard for New York State.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to advise the House today that this kind of division and disagreement on Federal dairy legislation among New York State dairy farmers is no longer the order of the day. Last Friday afternoon in Syracuse I met with leaders of seven major dairy cooperatives and farm organizations in New York State in an effort to see whether we could in fact work out some area of real agreement on dairy legislation. And I am happy to advise this House that as a result of that meeting five of these seven organizations—including three of the four major dairy cooperatives in New York—reached a very substantial measure of agreement on a dairy package legislative program.

This package—which can now expect support as legislation reflecting the wishes and interests of New York State dairy farmers—includes, first, legislation to create a so-called two-price plan for milk, such as is contained in H.R. 3552, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], **H.R. 963, by the gentleman** from Washington [Mr. Westland], and in the other body, **S. 900**, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], and S. 953, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart].

The second part of this package is H.R. 4745, which I had the honor to introduce in this House the other day, an emergency milk surplus reduction bill under which dairy farmers would receive incentive payments for reducing their milk production below their 1962 figures. This bill would be a purely temporary measure, lasting for a year, and, as envisioned by the Syracuse agreement, would provide a transition from the present situation to the actual operation of the new two-price plan arrangement.

Together these two bills, therefore, do meet the needs and wishes of an overwhelming majority of our New York State dairy farmers. So if our great delegation in this Congress is to serve these farmers it would seem to be our job to support this package program actively in both the House and the Senate.

After all, we in New York are still the largest single bloc in Congress. If we vote and work together we can certainly guarantee that New York interests will no longer be ignored when a 1963 dairy bill is considered. For years it has been generally assumed here in Washington that New York State's interests in connection with farm legislation could be safely ignored simply because of the popular myth that New York State farmers and farm groups could never agree on any specific legislative proposals. Accordingly, when it came to dairy legislation, New York State, although the Nation's second greatest dairy State, has let the leadership go elsewhere simply by default.

Now as a result of the remarkable measure of agreement we achieved in Syracuse last Friday, this particular myth has been knocked into a cocked hat. When their interests and indeed their very survival is at stake New York dairymen can and will pull together. Now it is up to us who have the honor to represent these dairymen in the House and the Senate to see that their wishes are vigorously and effectively pushed in this Congress.

Within the near future, Mr. Speaker, I propose to invite these New York State farm leaders to come to Washington to meet with our full delegation. In this way the agreement which we reached last Friday in Syracuse can be passed along to each Member of the House and Senate from New York.

And to this meeting, Mr. Speaker, I also propose to invite Members of this body and of the other body who represent States or districts which include dairy farmers who regularly sell their milk in the New York milkshed area—which would mean chiefly New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Their interests, within this common milkshed, would seem to parallel ours in New York State.

Mr. Speaker, this Syracuse dairy agreement represents, in my judgment, a significant milestone in our New York State dairy history. The myth that New York State dairy farmers can never get together on Federal dairy legislation has now been effectively shattered. Our great State of New York, as the Nation's second greatest dairy State, will from here out most certainly be heard and listened to in the development of any future national dairy legislation.

Enactment of this New York State package dairy program by this Congress this year will ease the plight of our New York dairy farmers and will open up the opportunity for a stable and more equitable income for them. This must be our goal, and in its pursuit New Yorkers can no longer lag behind or let the leadership slip by default into other hands. We must lead the fight ourselves in these legislative halls, working effectively together without regard for partisan lines.

THE COLD WAR AND CHILDREN

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that Dr. Benjamin Spock, upon whose advice many of our Nation's children have been raised, has written a vitally important article entitled "The Cold War and Children." The article incisively discusses the effects of nuclear testing on the physical health of our children and the effect of the cold war on the mental health of our children. Dr. Spock, professor of child development at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, has devoted a great deal of study to the impact of our military situation on child development. It is encouraging to see such an illustrious member of the medical profession actively concerned with the pressing problems of peace. It is hoped that his example will be followed by many others in the medical and other professions. I highly recommend the following article to all my colleagues:

The Cold War and Children

(By Benjamin Spock, M.D.)

Two aspects of the cold war are having a harmful effect on our children, one physical, the other emotional.

The testing of nuclear weapons creates about two dozen radioactive substances which fall from the air, contaminating the foods we eat and subjecting us—particularly our children—to what is called low level radiation. No one knows for sure how dangerous it is. We know definitely that high level radiation such as was produced by excessive X-raying in former times has fairly frequently produced cancer of the skin and thyroid, for instance, and has caused babies to be born with physical abnormalities or mental deficiency. At these high levels there is a direct relationship between the dosage of radiation and the percentage of those people exposed to it who will be harmed. So we have to assume that low levels will cause damage to at least small percentages of those exposed. But all the estimates of danger from low level radiation are derived by arithmetic from the results of high level radiation. Three substances often discussed are strontium 90, carbon 14, iodine 131.

Strontium 90 is deposited in the actively growing areas in bones, just as calcium is, so it will be much more concentrated in these particular areas in babies and children than it would be in adults. Here the radiation will persist actively for life. In mice high level radiation causes bone cancer and also leukemia, a disease which starts in the bone marrow. So there is the danger that a sufficient accumulation of low level radiation will cause these diseases in some susceptible children.

Carbon 14 is one of the radioactive materials that is distributed evenly through the body. So it may, in sufficient concentration, cause harmful mutations (changes) in germ cells in the testicles and ovaries. When a sperm and an ovum with similar mutations combine, an abnormality is produced. It may be an insignificant one or it may be a serious physical or mental defect. It may be sufficient to cause the death of the embryo or the newborn baby. So we must go on the assumption that abnormalities will appear in some of the children of the children who are being exposed to fallout.

Iodine 131 is concentrated in the thyroid gland, particularly in babies and children. High level radiation of the thyroid may cause cancer so it is believed that low levels can be dangerous to at least a small percentage of those sufficiently exposed. Iodine 131 loses its radioactivity in a few weeks. But in periods of frequent nuclear testing such as 1961–62 it reached concentration in cows' milk—for several months at a time in parts of the Midwest—which the Federal Radiation Council had previously designated as calling for control measures. Unfortunately the Council had established no national system of countermeasures, and quibbled about the need for them in 1961–62.

What kind of estimates have been made about the damage from fallout? A United Nations Scientific Committee in 1958 calculated, for example, that if tests were continued for a prolonged period they would eventually be producing somewhere between 5,000 and 60,000 cases of leukemia per year around the world. A U.S. Atomic Energy Commission report estimated the total future effects from carbon 14 from the tests carried out before 1958 as 100,000 serious birth defects and the death of a million embryos and newborn babies. Those who believe that continued testing is justified for national defense can point out that these figures are not large compared to worldwide deaths from other diseases. But these cases will be tragedies in the families in which they occur. A test ban treaty would prevent a further increase in these numbers.

Several recent studies have shown that many of our children have become anxious about the cold war—between a quarter and a half of them, depending on age and other factors. The younger ones worry about poisoning by fallout, about being separated from their parents in a disaster, about the death or injury of members of their families. Adolescents speak with some bitterness about the possibility there will be no future for them or that they may give birth to deformed children. Some of them ask what is the use of studying hard. Perhaps more unhealthy in the long run is the development of exaggerated suspiciousness. A group of fifth graders, for instance, were looking at pictures of the Russian countryside, one of which showed a tree-lined road. A child ask what the trees were for and two other children immediately suggested, "So that people won't know what's going on beyond the road" and "It's to make work for the prisoners."

In the past we Americans have thought of ourselves as indomitable. With the help of great natural resources and a population drawn from all over the globe we built the strongest and more resourceful nation. Our influence on the rest of the world steadily increased up through World War II and the rehabilitation of Western Europe with the Marshall plan. But in recent years we have run into a series of conflicts with the Soviet Union in which we had to be satisfied with stalemates. We have reacted in an unhealthy way to these setbacks. Instead of calmly pursuing a course that would advance our own long-term interests many of us have become obsessed with the fear of what the Communists would do to us.

In past generations we have imbued our children with optimism. We have brought them up with the conviction that they could cope with almost any problem that confronted them; consequently they have usually been able to do so. We have encouraged them to trust people and to trust their ability to deal with people; as a result, they've impressed the world with their self-assurance and their friendliness.

But to the degree that we adults succumb to passive attitudes of fearfulness and suspicion we pass these on to our children, in whom they become accentuated in the process of growing up. When children learn to be afraid of other people it impairs their own personalities. This is why intelligent parents no longer try to control a child with a fear of bogeymen or policemen. If an older youth is taught that members of another ethnic or religious group might get the better of him—scholastically or occupationally or physically—it will impair his ability to make his own way, even if he thinks he's superior to the other group.

If we bring up our children half convinced that the Communists are going to outwit them, or outstrip them, or bomb them, this will seriously impair their future resourcefulness and self-confidence as adults. Furthermore, an unstable future leader will be able to push them into war or to arouse in them a wholesale suspicion of fellow Americans far more disastrous than what occurred during the McCarthy period.

In order to raise our children with a healthy attitude toward the world I think we must offer them at least the hope of something beyond an endless balance of terror. One solution would be progressive nuclear disarmament, starting with a test ban. We see how difficult it is for East and West to overcome their mutual suspicion enough to make even the first small step, and what resistance there is in the armed services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and certain Members of the Senate and the House to putting the slightest limitation on the armament spiral. It will probably be the ordinary citizens who will decide this issue, if they express their opinions about the relative risks of proceeding with or without control of weapons.

But even disarmament would be somewhat lacking as a total program because it is only negative. More effective in changing the spirit of this country would be a vigorous positive campaign to solve on the one hand our own problems of unemployment, poor housing, the demoralization of the slum population, and, on the other hand, the ever-deepening poverty of the underdeveloped world. We could tackle these challenges by utilizing our idle productive capacity and the savings from a cut in our $50 billion arms budget.

If we could find the way to lead in a bold movement for world betterment we would force the Communist countries to follow suit, just as they had to follow in developing nuclear arms. And competition in aid, unlike competition in arms, could be accompanied by a gradual building of mutual trust.

It's my belief that if there is to be a better future for our children—or perhaps any future at all—it must come somehow through decreasing the hostility and increasing the good will in the world.

THE CONTINUING AND UNSOLVED PROBLEMS OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to speak on a subject of which I have spoken on many occasions here, the continuing and unsolved problems of the textile industry of the United States of America.

On yesterday my distinguished and beloved colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and his dedicated associate, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], placed in the RECORD verbally what I consider to be significant statements concerning the continuing problems of the textile industry, arising from the two-price cotton system as presently practiced by the United States of America. They evidenced the growing concern not only of the working people of their areas which are predominantly textile—not only this segment—but of all of the people in the industry, manufacturers, investors, and the people whose livelihood is dependent upon that industry.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as I speak today there is concern throughout every textile area of this country. What is going to happen to the cotton textile manufacturing institutions, the people who work there, and to the related businesses which are dependent upon the prosperity of that industry for their livelihood? We have been talking about this problem for many years, but there has been no relief as yet. Every month we have some new hope, every year we seem to have some new promises that something is going to be done in a realistic way and in a significant way to relieve the textile industry of the horrors and inequities of the two-price cotton system.

On yesterday, in the Washington Evening Star—and I want to compliment that newspaper for its treatment of the news—I read with a great deal of interest on page A-23 an article entitled "Cotton Mills Seek Equality in Subsidy." At the top of that particular article in a subheadline I found this to be written: "Congress Due To Act."

Congress is due to act, and I think Congress is going to have to act. As I said here on the floor of the House in discussing this problem with my colleagues, I have introduced two pieces of legislation, one to do away with the two-price cotton system. Someone said that is not going to be acted on. I do not know whether it is or not.

I have also introduced legislation to provide an import fee, such as was refused us by the Tariff Commission decision, which decision has been discussed heretofore.

What is the condition today? Unfortunately I must tell you that the condition has not only not improved but the prosperity of the textile producing areas of the country, as well as the producers of synthetics, is being dissipated. There has been a rise in imports; there has been a slump in the use of cotton; there has been a loss of confidence in the people of the Government of this country to do something for the textile industry of the United States. Synthetics have been affected. Mill after mill has announced either it is going to cut its production or it has changed its operation to include synthetic production in part, or that in its long-range look at the future it finds it not only necessary but profitable to turn to synthetics, thereby reducing costs, to go to the manufacture of synthetics.

I have no quarrel with synthetics. Certainly they have a great and useful place in the textile picture, certainly they are to be commended for the fine American fibers that they have produced and which go into the garments of the finest people in the world, the American people. But when we are talking about textiles, we are talking not only about the people who work in the textile mills, management and investors, but we are talking about the farmers who are getting ready now to suffer, if they have not already suffered, from the two-price system.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, and I want to compliment him on his continued and dedicated interest in these problems.

Mr. WHITENER. I commend the gentleman for again bringing this important problem to the attention of our colleagues, particularly those of our colleagues who are interested in the welfare of the farmer.

Yesterday afternoon, during a colloquy here between Members of the House with reference to the course we are taking in our Government, a great deal was said about the budget and its relationship to the welfare of the farm people of the country. What the gentleman is saying about the situation of the cotton farmer is accurate. I think it is so accurate that some of the contention about the budget and its relationship to the welfare of the farmer may become of less importance as time goes on.

Certainly, we are all interested in preserving the economic stability of our agricultural economy, but as the gentleman from South Carolina has suggested, we may well be entering into an era in which money will not solve the problem of the cotton farmer of this country.

I join the gentleman in saying that the remarks which he and I have made from time to time have not been made for the purpose of criticizing that great segment of the textile industry and its suppliers who are producing and processing synthetic fibers. Many of the mills in the textile areas can produce textile products out of synthetic fibers and stay in business in the future. The farmer, however, cannot stay in business unless the textile plants are running cotton on their machines. This, I think, is the thing that so many people are overlooking. The figures which are available to anyone in the hearings before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture given by experts from the National Cotton Council shows clearly that the per capita use of cotton in America is falling very rapidly. This, to me, is a red flag or should be a red flag to all of us who represent not only textile-producing areas but cotton-producing areas.

The gentleman from South Carolina, in his district, has many splendid cotton farmers. I have in my district the second largest cotton-producing county in North Carolina. So, it cannot be said that we do not have an abiding interest in the welfare of the farmer.

Now, if the gentleman will permit me to suggest this to him, I believe that it would be well for us to again today, as we did yesterday, discuss this recent sales-for-export program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

On yesterday, when I was discussing this matter, I put into the Record a very splendid article written by Mr. Bill Workman, a staff reporter for the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent. A few moments ago I read in the Charlotte, N.C., News of Tuesday, April 2, a splendid article on the same subject written by Lamar Gunter, staff writer for the Charlotte News, which I ask be made a part of the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

Textile Picture Darkened by Cotton Dumping Action

(By Lamar Gunter)

Textile leaders who had hoped that the industry was at least moving in the direction of a one-price cotton system, now feel that recent action by the Agriculture Department has brought about a reversal that may be disastrous for the industry.

Members of the cotton policy committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute will be in Washington tomorrow to discuss the bleak industry picture which has been further darkened by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's action designed to sell Government-owned cotton on a bid basis.

Industry spokesmen have said vehemently in private that the secretary's action amounts to dumping American cotton on the world market since the present export of 24 cents a pound is not low enough to sell all the export supplies.

The spokesman said that selling the cotton on a bid basis means it will most certainly go for less than 24 cents a pound and this price is already 8½ cents less than American mills can purchase American cotton.

Industry leaders have charged in private since Freeman's action Friday that the Agriculture Department has panicked, but are reluctant to talk publicly before the Cotton Policy Committee has a chance tomorrow to see what can be done about the situation.

One industry leader said that the State Department would probably be tossed into turmoil since foreign countries will protest the action as dumping. He said that Freeman's action looked like another case of poor coordination between Government agencies concerned with the problem and that this situation already has plagued the industry's efforts to obtain a one-price cotton system.

He explained that President Kennedy had asked publicly that the inequity of the two-price system be corrected, but that the Agriculture Department had taken the position that partial solutions such as equalization payments of 5 cents a pound were the solution.

Industry leaders speculate that the department's latest action will have the effect of increasing the spread between what the foreign mills pay and what American mills pay to 10 or more cents a pound.

The industry has contended all along that it wants nothing more than to achieve Mr. Kennedy's stated objective—elimination of the inequity of the two-price cotton system.

Mr. WHITENER. Now I call to the attention of my friend that this article points out that today, in Washington, the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute is meeting to discuss this recent order. This news article says that they are here for the purpose of discussing this new program as it affects the industry. Now, in the article it is referred to in this manner:

> Members of the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute will be in Washington tomorrow to discuss the bleak industry picture which has been further darkened by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's action designed to sell Government-owned cotton on a bid basis.

Madam Speaker, the program announced by the Secretary may be construed by some as a dumping operation and many of us are apprehensive that this new program comes about by reason of panic on the part of some in the Department of Agriculture. Certainly, we see that what happened with last year's crop has shocked the country with the cost to the Government. As I remember the figure, there is $1,079 million being spent in the stabilization program or in the Commodity Credit Corporation program on cotton alone. This would indicate that perhaps one can pardon them for their panic.

I believe all of us who have been faced with this 8.5-cent-per-pound differential which the foreign manufacturer enjoys on the price of his cotton as compared to the price paid by American textile people for American cotton, would agree that this new program can bring about a wider differential. If the industry people are correct in their prediction that, as a result of this unloading operation, the world price on cotton may fall to such an extent that in order to compete on the world market we will have to sell our American cotton at as much as 11 to 12 cents per pound cheaper to the foreign manufacturer, it would seem to me that rather than solving our problem the Department of Agriculture is taking us down the other side of the hill.

Madam Speaker, this is a serious matter to many, many thousands of people who work in the industry which furnishes employment to the second largest number of people in any industry in America.

Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman. I apologize for having taken so much of the gentleman's time. However, this subject is so important to the gentleman and to his district and to the district which I am privileged to represent, as well as to the people of America, I feel we cannot overspeak ourselves on the subject.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to say to the gentleman that I welcome the gentleman's colloquy and I want to thank the gentleman for his significant analysis of what is happening and what is going to take place. I also want to tell the gentleman again that I had hoped to be with him on yesterday when he gave the Congress and thus to the Nation significant figures on imports, and other significant statistics in connection with the cotton textile program. I say to the gentleman that I agree with him and I hope he will continue to participate from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, because it is significant, I would like to put into the Record an article from the State newspaper of Thursday, March 14, 1963, which is entitled "Two-Price Cotton Program Seen Detriment to Farmers."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Two-Price Cotton Program Seen Detriment to Farmers

New Orleans.—America's present two-price cotton system may be more detrimental to farmers than to the textile industry, the president of a major textile chain's cotton buying operation said here at the annual meeting of personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's cotton division.

Robert W. Smith, of Anderson, S.C., president of Lowenstein Cotton and Storage Corp., pointed out that the Government's two-price policy requires U.S. mills to pay $42.50 more per bale than foreign buyers pay for American-grown cotton.

"It is inconceivable to me that the textile industry will continue to try to operate in the face of such a staggering inequity as two-price cotton," he said. "The end effect, I believe, will not be so much of a question of what the textile industry will do, as what the farmers will do," Mr. Smith added.

Textile mills, Mr. Smith said are "switching to manmade fibers on an increasingly broad basis, and the effect has been dynamic for some of the manmade fibers. Rayon has been revived in the past 5 years and is booming along at record levels—and at prices from 8 to 11 cents cheaper than cotton. Nylon has been similarly revived and is in the midst of a striking boom, with its low-waste characteristic offsetting a slightly higher price. Other manmade fibers are prospering."

On the other hand, he added, cotton's domestic market is deteriorating and its export market is disappearing.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is becoming more and more the real 'market' for U.S. cotton," he said. "A distressingly large proportion of our crop is going into Government warehouses, where it is of absolutely no value to anyone. Cotton is good for only one thing, and that is to be processed into a textile product."

Mr. Smith also called for stricter classing of cotton to conform more closely with the fiber's spinning characteristics. He said inconsistent classing practices affect the price of cotton by failing to reflect spinning values and, also, by varying basic loan values.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to point out to the gentleman that on last Saturday at Raleigh, N.C., the distinguished Vice President of this Nation at a meeting with people from all segments of industry from over the State of North Carolina very graciously and generously suggested to the group that they submit to him questions and at this luncheon gathering he would undertake to answer those questions. As we had our meal, the various guests were writing questions. As the Vice President read those questions and answered them very fairly and very frankly, about 80 percent of them I would estimate related to this question of the two-price cotton.

Madam Speaker, the President of the United States has on numerous occasions expressed an understanding of this problem and has expressed the intention of bringing corrective action to it.

I know all of us in the textile area are appreciative of those splendid things which have been done both by the President and by the Congress.

My apprehension now is that there are those subordinate to the President who have not gotten the message; there are those who are making decisions which they feel are to the best interests of the farmer which in my judgment are going to ruin the cotton farmer. That was the thing that concerned me about this recent decision.

Now we have recently had another decision by the Department of Agriculture, and that was to support the price of cotton at the level at which it was supported during the past year, 32.47 cents per pound. This, of course, looks good for the farmer, and I am sure that those who made that decision were conscientious in trying to make a decision which they thought was in the best interests of the farmer. But we know from experience that at that price support level we cannot compete in the foreign market if we cannot furnish our people in this country American cotton at the same price that we furnish it to the foreigner.

And so this web we are in is one which I think is not understood by some of those who are conscientious about the matter. They are just lacking in understanding of the net effect of the action which they take. I hope that through the efforts of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] and others, in the executive department, in the legislative department and in industry at all levels, we can bring some ray of understanding to these people who have authority to make these decisions.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina again and assure him that except for the fact that I had some people from my district to whom I was extending hospitality on yesterday, I would have joined him then.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from the Second District of South Carolina. I welcome him to the battle lines of the textile industry on this vital matter.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend my senior colleague from South Carolina for his continuing effort in behalf of the cotton farmer and the cotton manufacturer.

Perhaps there are some Members of Congress, as is evidenced by the lack of attendance at this moment, who are not sufficiently aware of the vital importance of the textile industry. I want to associate myself with the gentleman from South Carolina in his effort, because I am sure that not only the people of South Carolina, one of the leading textile States, but the people, indeed, of the South and of the Nation are grateful to him and to others who have been leading the fight in this particular matter.

I notice the gentleman said just a moment ago that there is a tremendous increase in the use or in the development of synthetic products which, indeed, impairs the use of cotton fiber. May I ask the gentleman whether it is his judgment that the elimination of the two-price cotton system in accordance with the bill which he has introduced, and which I wholeheartedly support, would make cotton more competitive—that is, natural fiber cotton—and would encourage the mills actually to decrease their research, which they are presently carrying on, in the use of synthetics?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I certainly do. Also I want to say to the gentleman that not only will the consumer be able to get our goods cheaper and the mills keep running in competition, but that we could turn, as we are going to have to turn, to the problem of the import of synthetics, because this is what we find.

As our mills turn to synthetics more and more to try to compete, the Japanese and others turn to synthetics. The imports of synthetics into this country have risen just as the imports of cotton textiles have risen. Correspondingly, there has been a decline in the export of synthetics and a decline in the export of cotton textiles. So it is the picture of a whole industry. We are concentrating today on the two-price cotton system only because that is the most significant problem which we think can be solved by legislation or could have been solved by the Tariff Commission. This does give us a better chance to keep our mills and our cottons and our synthetics and our combinations running and our people working.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. Did I correctly understand earlier that instead of there being a reduction in the volume of textile imports from foreign countries there has actually been an increase in the volume of imports?

Mr. HEMPHILL. There has been a constant increase not only of cotton imports, but of other textiles, both cotton and synthetic textiles.

Mr. WATSON. I find it difficult to reconcile in my mind where we are going to allow the increase of exports from these various countries, many of them former enemy countries. As a result of the increase in the volume of these cheap imports we are having men in South Carolina and other places losing their jobs. I suggest to this House that it is inconceivable to me that those in positions of responsibility do not place equal, if not more importance, on our situation; that many of our textile workers in South Carolina who actually faced the enemy in battle now are threatened with loss of their jobs in the textile industry because this Nation refuses to do anything in curtailment of the cheap imports from former enemies such as Japan and other countries. Again I want to underscore my support of the continuing efforts of my distinguished senior colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

I might say to the gentleman and to the Congress that someone said to me on one occasion, "Aren't you textile people crying 'Wolf'? Aren't you textile people crying 'Wolf' when the wolf is not at the door?" I wish that were so. I wish that the truth of the matter were that they were not suffering. But I have seen mill after mill go out of business. We have statistics on the bankruptcies. Just recently, in the 28th of March issue of the Charlotte, N.C., Observer, in the "Business World" section there appeared an article which explains in detail just the kind of problem we are faced with constantly. This article is as follows:

WHY IS TEXTILE INDUSTRY CRYING WOLF?—THESE ITEMS MAY EXPLAIN

(By Harry Snook)

If anyone still thinks the textile industry is crying "wolf" without reason over two-price cotton and import competition, here are two items that help translate the fight into terms of dollars and jobs:

Kimberly Yarn Mills, Inc., of Mount Holly, which went into operation in 1960 as one of the most modern in the world, has proven less than a success despite special efforts by more than 100 employes.

We learned Wednesday that the mill had been sold to a big textile concern, unidentified as yet, that makes and uses its own yarn in a consumer product enjoying some tariff protection against imports in the domestic market.

President P. J. Baugh, in a letter of gratitude to employees, explained why the mill was sold.

During the past 2 years, he said, government-regulated cotton prices had gone up as much as 5 cents per pound, "which represented a weekly cost increase of $5,000 for us."

"Foreign mills, buying U.S. cotton for about one-fourth less than the price paid by domestic mills, increased shipments into this country to the point that the average sales price of our yarn has dropped from 66 to 61 cents, and in some cases to 60 cents," Baugh said. "This is a drop of $5,000 to $6,000 per week for our product.

"This decision in the market price of our product plus the increase of our cotton cost has made us labor under a $10,000 to $11,000 per week differential since 1960," he added. "This is a total of $500,000 to $550,000 per year."

The other item: An announcement by Cone Mills of Greensboro that certain "unprofitable activities" probably will be liquidated this year.

In the annual report for 1962, Cone Mills showed an increase in net sales from $214.4 to $219.7 million, and an increase in earnings per share from 73 to 81 cents,

But, said President Ceasar Cone and Chairman Benjamin Cone, elimination of unprofitable operations for the year would have increased earnings 25 percent while reducing sales 25 percent.

Cone Mills is known as a big producer of coarse gray goods, such as denims, which have a high cotton content. The higher the cotton content, the greater the effect of the 8½-cent-a-pound advantage enjoyed by foreign mills selling in the American market.

The proposed liquidations will be made "as it becomes evident that these particular products will be unable to show a profit under the legislation and governmental policies (particularly in cotton) now in effect," the Cones said.

They declined to predict what the liquidations would mean in number of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I never like to turn back the clock. I like to look forward. But unless you look back to see where you have been, sometimes you do not have the capacity to see where you are going.

Now, turn back to October of 1960, at which time I was engaged in campaigning for the Democratic Party and actively interested in the textile industry.

During that time I found in the Lancaster News of Lancaster, S.C., of Thursday, October 27, 1960, some significant statements. The first statement that I will refer to is a statement on page 2 which I include in the Record at this point under consent previously granted.

The article is as follows:

Foreign Textiles Made Under Conditions Which Would Be Illegal in This Country

The 26th annual meeting of the southern Governors, held last September at Hot Springs, Ark., adopted a resolution asking that quotas be established promptly by the United States to control imports of textiles, apparel and other products now damaging the domestic economy.

The action of the Governors' conference followed a statement on the effect of imports by W. C. Daniel, vice chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and assistant to the president of Dan River Mills.

"For our part," said Mr. Daniel in the course of his statement, "we are perfectly willing to compete with off-shore manufacturers on a basis of production efficiency, on quality, durability, style, design or any other criteria of manufacturing and management performance.

"But if basic textile fabrics and garments made from these fabrics are imported and sold on the U.S. market only because they are cheaper and cheaper only because they are manufactured under conditions that are illegal in this country, our position is that we are being subjected to unfair treatment under unwise foreign trade policies."

Mr. Daniel cited trends in the textile industry pointing up the need for a drastic revision of U.S. trade policies. These included:

"The United States is no longer a large net exporter of textiles but a large net importer.

"Cotton yarn imports are currently running at an annual rate of about 15 times greater than they did in 1959.

"Wool woven fabric imports also are running at levels far above 1959 and 1958 marks.

"Manmade fiber fabric imports are currently behind the 1959 mark but almost double the 1958 level.

"Cotton cloth imports presently are running at a rate more than double the 1959 figure which was up sharply from 1958.

"And apparel items are coming into this country at a rate estimated at $198.4 million.

"It is our conclusion that the present structure of U.S. laws, policies, and programs dealing with world commerce is in dire need of being remodeled and brought up to date."

Mr. HEMPHILL. The reason I have referred to the above article is that the two-price cotton system is not the only problem. The fact is that we are allowing to be imported into this country cotton textiles, synthetic textiles, woolen textiles or other combinations which are made by people whose wages are insignificant when compared to our wages and whose wages are totally insufficient to keep an American man, woman, or child alive to say nothing of keeping a family alive.

On the front page of the October 27, 1960, issue of the Lancaster News is an article entitled "Let's Face the Facts: We Need the United States on Our Side."

Let's Face the Facts: We Need the United States on Our Side

Continuing its policy of growth in spite of unsettled market conditions and a cloudy international picture, the Springs Cotton Mills is in the midst of another $5 million expansion. White Plant's $2 million addition will be completed in January. We hope for a similar addition to follow shortly in Chester.

We have just spent $400,000 for new Roberts Arrow spinning frames for White Plant and we are about to take delivery on 115 wide Draper XP–2 looms costing in excess of $300,000.

These new buildings and their machinery will mean more jobs and larger payrolls. They should bring more prosperity to the hometowns in which Springs plants are located. They will mean more taxes for local, State, and Federal Governments.

These are the benefits of growth. We will continue to grow unless the trade concessions granted foreign nations by the United States make it impossible for the Springs organization to earn enough profits to pay its bills.

Much has been said and written on this subject. It is discussed again in this special issue of the Springs Bulletin because we must plan for improvements in our jobs and in our communities. We are compelled to recognize the dangers of tomorrow and to find some way of meeting them.

Of immediate importance is our national presidential election. On pages 4 and 5 of this section appear the statements and promises of the two candidates on the subject of textile imports as they affect the American textile industry. Take your pick.

In the meantime and without letup after the election, all of us must constantly remind our Senators and Representatives in Washington of the perils facing the textile industry from uncontrolled imports. We must use our best efforts to persuade them to action.

In the American tradition of free enterprise, we must be allowed to compete fairly for our share of the textile markets.

The Springs Cotton Mills has grown steadily for more than 60 years. Today we stand at the top of the industry in quality and efficiency of operations. We have worked hard as a team to create profits which could be put back into more buildings, machinery, and jobs.

This reinvestment of profits has built prosperous communities and has helped all of us to healthier, happier lives. It has benefited South Carolina and, in some measure, the whole United States.

Profits are necessary under a free enterprise system; they are the muscles of growth. But nothing will take away profits faster than uncontrolled competition with low-wage foreign manufacturers. When our leaders in Government forget this, we are in trouble.

The Springs Cotton Mills can meet any challenge from within the industry. But we can't compete with giveaway programs. We can't lick the U.S. Government.

What we need for healthy, competitive operations is the United States on the side of the American textile industry.

Is it not a terrible thing when people have such a lack of confidence and such a loss of hope that they have to blazen in headlines in a southern paper, in a community where so many people volunteered that they hardly had any draft call, where tombstones in the graveyards bear the names of heroes from the Revolution down to the present day cold war; in a place whose people are descendents of the people who formed some of the original colonies; in a place where generation after generation has worked in the textile plants and generation after generation has sent their sons and daughters to war to save this country and to save the industries and homes of the entire country? Is it not a horrifying thing that they have to say "We need the United States on our side"? This article is written by the president of the Springs Cotton Mills, a plant that employs 15,000 people in my district and which has the best profit sharing system in the Nation, and which I do not think is second to any, and an industry which has recently built in the garment district of New York a magnificent building as evidence of its hope and its confidence in the America of the future.

The article is as follows, and I include it at this point in the Record:

Senate Group Recommends Limit on Textile Imports

The report and recommendations of the Pastore committee to the U.S. Senate in February 1959, represent the most important effort made in the postwar years to save the American textile industry from being sacrificed to political expediency.

In their discussion of textile industry problems, both Senator John F. Kennedy and Vice President Richard M. Nixon have referred to this report and quoted from the recommendations. The next administration may be guided by it in tariff and trade negotiations.

What was the Pastore committee and what, actually, did it recommend?

In an effort to find out what was ailing the American textile industry, the U.S. Senate in 1958 authorized a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to make an investigation.

Senator John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island, was chairman. Members included Senators Alan Bible, of Nevada, Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, William Purtell, of Connecticut, Frederick G. Payne, of Maine, and Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire.

More than 200 textilists, union representatives, Government officials, and trade experts were called before the committee in a series of hearings lasting from July 8 to December 2, 1958. The committee report was made to the Senate in February 1959.

The important points of the 16,000-word report were these: Textile employment in the 10 years from 1947 to 1957 declined from 1,325,000 to 1 million workers, an overall decline of 24 percent. In the yarn and thread mills this decline was 34 percent, and in broadwoven fabrics this decline was 30 percent. From February 1951 to April 1958, there was a loss of 438,000 textile jobs in the United States.

During this same period the average price of cotton cloth, based on 17 constructions, declined 31 percent while the price of raw cotton rose more than one-quarter of a cent per pound.

From 1946 to 1957 exports of cotton cloth declined 29 percent while imports went up 175 percent. Since 1957 this import figure has doubled and redoubled.

Between 1947 and 1958 expenditures for new textile plant and equipment declined from $510 to $252 million, a drop of 50.6 percent, creating, in the words of the report, "a serious problem of obsolescence in the textile industry."

This was taking place in an industry which had been ranked second only to steel in terms of military essentiality during World War II.

The effect of the decline in textiles has spread to other sectors of American economy. The cumulative effects are greater than the statistics relating to textile production and employment alone would suggest.

The efficiency of American mills is not questioned. They can outproduce foreign competitors but they cannot undersell products from countries where wages are one-half to one-tenth those paid in American mills.

"It is our view," said the committee report, "that the impact of the decline of textiles upon the domestic economy is a sufficient reason for the Congress and the administration to carefully review all public policies which have contributed to this decline."

The policy which our Government expects to follow has been spelled out in the Trade Agreements Act. But we urge that Government agencies administering this policy recognize that the problem of declining employment in the domestic textile industry has been aggravated by rising imports and the loss of export markets.

"We recognize that tariff adjustments cannot be used to regulate the flow of textile products into this country. Therefore, we recommend that quotas be established which will permit foreign producers of textile products to sell in our markets within limits which will not further endanger our existing textile capacity."

Other recommendations included interagency and watchdog committees to keep close check on textile affairs; improved reports and statistical data; a study of world textile capacity; more realistic interpretation of peril-point provisions of tariff and trade agreements; an expanded research program for the textile industry; more realistic depreciation of textile machinery for tax purposes; and the elimination of the two-price cotton subsidy program.

In that particular issue, they gave certain tariff facts and figures which caused them to say that, and I want to quote them:

(1) Since 1934 American tariffs have been reduced 75 percent.

(2) U.S. tariffs average 5 percent.

(3) Average British tariffs are six times those of the United States.

(4) The United States admits more than 50 percent of all imports duty free.

(5) Among the 36 leading trading nations of the world, 28 have higher tariffs than the United States.

(6) On the basis of the first 6 months, value of Japanese imports admitted into the United States in 1960 would exceed $1 billion.

(7) The U.S. tariff on foreign cars sold in this country is only 8½ percent.

(8) The British tariff on American cars admitted to this country is 30 percent.

(9) Approximately 75 percent of all watches sold in the United States are imported.

(10) Average hourly wages in manufactures in the United States exceed average hourly European wages by 400 percent.

If we are going to compete and we must compete if we are going to survive, then either the Congress or the Executive is going to have to give some relief.

I want to include at this point the statements by the leading candidates for the President of the United States, at that time Senator Kennedy and then Vice President Nixon. These articles show that this is not a partisan problem. They show that this is a national problem.

The articles are as follows:

TEXTILE IMPORTS SHOULD BE LIMITED, SAYS SENATOR KENNEDY

COLUMBIA.—In a letter to Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, of South Carolina, on August 31, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy, the presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, recognized the danger of foreign imports to the American textile and apparel industries.

"Imports of textile products, including apparel," he wrote, "should be held within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment and which will permit the growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy.

"There are now 400,000 less jobs in the industry than there were 10 years ago," he continued. "It is no longer possible to depend on makeshift policies and piecemeal remedies to solve the problems which the industry faces."

The presidential nominee pointed out that he had supported the Pastore Special Senate Subcommittee for the Textile Industry and felt the report of this group outlined a remedy for the ills of the industry.

"The Office of the Presidency carries with it the authority and the influence to explore and work out solutions within the framework of our foreign trade policies for the problems peculiar to our textile and apparel industry. Because of the broad ramifications of any action and because of the necessity of approaching a solution in terms of the total needs of the textile industry, this is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge.

"I can assure you that the next Democratic administration will regard this as a high priority objective.

"Additionally, we shall make vigorous use of the procedures provided by Congress, such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the escape clause in accordance with the intention of Congress in enacting these laws.

"Lastly, I assure you that should further authority be necessary to enable the President to carry out these objectives, I shall request such authorization from Congress."

AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY NOT EXPENDABLE, SAYS NIXON

CHARLOTTE.—Vice President Richard M. Nixon conferred with a group of American textile leaders in this city on October 3, 1960, and told them unrestricted imports of textile products into this country had created a situation requiring "high priority attention" in Washington.

The nominee of the Republican Party for the Presidency said, "This pressure from competing textile industries in countries where wage scales and other economic standards are far below ours is a matter of concern, not only to an important industry, but to the health of our economy as a whole."

The Vice President pointed out that America was the world's largest exporter and importer and must have strong trade relations with the rest of the free world.

"But I emphatically do not believe," he continued, "that this national trade policy means marking certain industries, such as the textile and garment industries, as expendable. It doesn't make sense to me to require one or a few industries to bear the whole burden that foreign policy decisions may require. Nor does it make sense to me that an industry like cotton textiles bear an inequitable burden as a result of efforts to adjust wartime agricultural policies to peacetime needs.

"To the end of assisting the textile and garment industries and their workers to meet the problems ahead, I am determined to explore every constructive line of action.

"I strongly support the platform of my party which calls for 'effective administration' of the escape clause and the peril point provisions of our trade legislation 'to safeguard American jobs and domestic industries against serious injury.'

"I favor more vigorous and imaginative efforts through diplomatic channels to make greater and more effective use of voluntary limitation of shipments by other countries whose penetration of the American market is proceeding at a pace which threatens the orderly development of those markets by domestic producers.

"I regard the plight of these industries as a special situation requiring high priority attention," he concluded.

We have had some discouraging days in our effort to do away with the two-price cotton system, and the industry has reflected that. I include here an article—with which I do not agree—from the Textile Reporter of March 17, 1963, saying it is time for the textile industry to abandon its efforts in behalf of a one-price cotton system. I do not believe that, for some of us will still be on the frontlines struggling for many months, and if we do no more than sound our voices to let the world know our problem, certainly we will at least keep the country aware of what is happening to our textile industry.

The article referred to follows:

It's time for the textile industry to abandon its efforts in behalf of a "one-price cotton" bill and to concentrate instead on legislation imposing an "equalization fee" on cotton textile imports.

Even among those who believe that "one-price cotton" legislation is the salvation of the industry, it should be obvious by now that the administration has no intention of meeting demands for an 8.5-cent-a-pound subsidy. It should be equally clear it sees no need to compromise above its 5-cent-a-pound offer.

At the risk of being wrong, we interpret House Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD COOLEY'S, Democrat, of North Carolina, statement that he is pessimistic about prospects for new cotton legislation this year as meaning there will be no "one-price cotton" legislation this session.

After discussing the cotton situation with Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman for 2 hours, Mr. COOLEY told newsmen: "At the moment, it looks as if there will be no cotton legislation at this session."

The North Carolina Democrat said the cotton industry and the Kennedy administration are as far apart as ever on the size of the payment the Government should offer to make cotton available to domestic mills as cheaply as foreign mills are able to buy it. He said the administration refuses to offer a payment of more than 5 cents a pound. The cotton industry, he said, insists on 8.5 cents a pound.

Obviously, the North Carolina Democrat did not say there is absolutely no hope for a compromise this session. He qualified his "pessimism" with the phrase, "at this moment."

But we believe it is time for the industry to abandon its "hopes" and face the political reality that there is no compromise. Anything less than a full 8.5-cent-a-pound subsidy would be cheating American mills. It matters not that foreign buyers must pay shipping and other additional charges. American mills should have the right to buy American cotton at the same price as foreign competitors. On a free market, this would be accepted as a "fact of life."

But cotton is a political rather than a free market, and this should be accepted as a fact of life. As a political commodity, its value must be judged in political terms. Right now, it has very little political worth.

Last year, when the President's Trade Expansion Act was pending in Congress, cotton had political value. Then, the two-price cotton problem was being studied by the Tariff Commission and hopes were high that it would recommend an import fee to offset the raw cotton export subsidy. But when it was clear the bill would pass anyway, the Commission vetoed the appeal for help.

It would be a simple thing to criticize the Commission for its decision. But the basic fault lies with the law which it is asked to enforce. A clear discrimination against Americans, such as exist under the two-price cotton system, should easily be remedied under whatever trade law—liberal or protectionist—is in force.

Aside from complete elimination of the cotton price support program, which obviously is impractical or, at least, impolitical, the only right solution to the two-price cotton problem is an import fee which would require foreign manufacturers to compete fairly in the U.S. market. This, at a minimum, would have the virtue of equalizing the cotton costs of all competitors.

It will be argued forcefully that an equalization fee bill has little chance of passing Congress. Undoubtedly, it would be a struggle to get such a bill past the many liberal trade hurdles in the House and the Senate. But would it be any more difficult than enacting the two-price cotton bill which so far is stuck on dead-center in the House?

The price of a political commodity is political coin. In this case, it is a demand by the industry for redemption of the pledge made early in the Kennedy administration for elimination of the two-price cotton burden. If it cannot be redeemed by a subsidy, there should be no objection to a money-raising tariff increase.

However, it would be a fatal mistake to use this as a strategy ploy to win the 8.5 cents subsidy. Even if offered as a compromise, the industry should insist on the equalization fee. Actually, the offsetting fee is the only equitable solution to the problem since it would affect all manufacturers—domestic and foreign—alike.

I have previously included in remarks made here the first of a three-part article in the Textile Reporter entitled "Cotton Textiles—A Square Industry in a Round Economy?". I do not believe that to be the fact, but I believe that the advocates of any interest should be fair and present all sides of an issue. Therefore I include part 2 and part 3 of this article in my remarks:

COTTON TEXTILES—A SQUARE INDUSTRY IN A ROUND ECONOMY?

(This is pt. 2 of a three-part article by Peter M. Strang. The first part appeared in last week's issue of the Reporter, Feb. 28, 1963.)

LESSONS FROM WORLD WAR II

When the United States entered World War II the Norden bombsight, developed by the Navy, was this country's most cherished secret weapon and its production in quantities of great national concern. The original bombsights were equipped with ball bearings from an American subsidiary whose parent company in a neutral nation also had factories in Germany. As some of the bearings for this delicate mechanism were of intricate design, the Navy was disturbed to find that the parent company required copies of the drawings and specifications of all special bearings made by a subsidiary to be filed in the home office. (Ultimately a member of the War Production Board was appointed managing trustee of the American branch which thus became an independent bearing producer for the duration of the war.)

Under a high priority rating the Navy then organized its own bombsight bearing facility, the Barden Corp., to reduce the possibility of espionage and to assure a constant supply. The Nation's large bearing manufacturers hesitated to tie up equipment for the extended time necessary to obtain the precision required in the sight. At that time Danbury, Conn., was a depressed industrial area. This town, the center for hatmaking, was in the doldrums, because many men in civilian life had begun to go hatless and many others had entered the Armed Services. Since the War Production Board had restricted new factory construction, the Barden Corp., converted a hatband factory into a precision ball-bearing facility. Before production could commence, unskilled workers were trained at Government expense to staff this company which within 18 months was supplying the major part of the specialty bearings for the sight.

The Barden Corp. has continued in business since the war but a recent article in the New York Times magazine (May 27, 1962) shows that the officials of this company and the citizens of Danbury are worried about the future for the same reasons that plague the textile industry. If the GATT agreements should cause the demise of the Barden Corp., as it has already caused the liquidation of several cotton mills, for what trade are the displaced workers to be trained? It would be just as ridiculous to teach displaced Barden workers to become spinners and weavers as it would be to teach displaced textile workers in a mill town how to make precision ball bearings or to become hatters. However, as a practical matter this Nation needs factories which manufacture precision ball bearings as well as mills which produce cotton textiles.

Programs relating to the production and supply of ball bearings revealed both positive and negative results when appraised after the war. Some findings are mentioned which may have significance today. The Navy and the War Production Board, approaching their problem in a businesslike manner, had successfully established a new industry in a depressed area of the country, an industry which became an asset to the community after the war. An attempt to curtail the supply of ball-bearings to the Nazis by the preemptive purchase of the production of companies in neutral countries, although good in theory, was unsuccessful. These foreign manufacturers proved more interested in making money than in aiding the allied cause and extended their plant capacity sufficiently to supply both contestants. The mass bombing attacks upon enemy ball bearing factories were discovered to have been far less destructive than had been estimated. It was found that men and machines were unable to function in combat with the precision demanded by statistical theory.

ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

These findings warrant careful study today because statistics are termed the "lifeblood" of economics and economists appear to hold influence in the Government. Because young men have made great advances in the physical sciences by means of modern mathematics and rigorous statistical analyses, others in the same age group assume they can achieve similar advances in a social science by using the same techniques. Forgotten are the vast differences between the two types of science; namely, that the physical sciences deal with inanimate objects and forces whereas the social sciences deal with living people.

On the one hand, the statistics used in the physical sciences are accumulated from observations or measurements made under controlled conditions upon material objects which are without life and behave accordingly. On the other hand, the statistics available to economists summarize accomplishments or conditions involving the beliefs, surroundings, and actions of people at a time in the past. Since living people can, may, and do change their minds, alter their surroundings, and modify their customs, unmeasurable factors are always present which cast doubts upon the value of rigorous statistical analyses of these data. Bias between scientists who perform similar experiments on similar apparatus may be determined from statistical comparisons of their data but no valid judgment of this type may be made about economists who may draw differing conclusions by mathematically juggling the same data.

Statistics is a science of more recent origin than economics, and statistical mechanics has become a valuable tool for physical scientists and engineers. However, statisticians who have applied their techniques indiscriminately to forecast the outcome of questions dealing with the public have records for being wrong which equal those of economists. No man over 40 will ever forget the Literary Digest's prediction of the election of Landon to the Presidency in 1936 or the defeat forecast by pollsters for Truman when he ran against Dewey in 1948. Consequently, when young economists and young statisticians join forces to solve the Nation's ills, older conservatives have forebodings.

MEASURING THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Gross national product, national income, and economic growth are concepts which have been developed to indicate the status of the Nation's economy by economists and statisticians through the clever adaptation of accounting and double entry bookkeeping to the country's overall business and have become fetishes which politicians and commentators discuss glibly in diagnosing the ailments of business and in prescribing remedies for its improvement. Gross national product, by definition,[1] represents the value of all goods and services produced in the Nation in a year. National income represents the amounts which pass through the hands of the Government, business firms, and individuals after deductions have been made for such items as deficits, indirect taxes, depreciation, etc. To eliminate fluctuations in the value of the dollar, the Department of Commerce now presents the gross national product and national income in "current dollars" and in "constant 1954 dollars." Economic growth is considered as the yearly increase in gross national product and is frequently expressed as a percentage of the gross national product for the preceding year. Economic growth is a mystical agglomerate which supposedly includes the development of new industries, technological improvements in manufacture, new products, added production required to meet the demands of the growing population, the value of more and better services, etc.

---

[1] "Statistical Abstract of the United States—1962," p. 310.

In theory the gross national product and the national income are obtained by procedures which parallel those of large corporations in making annual statements. However, corporate statements are audited and cost accounting systems afford many cross-checks. Auditing and cross-checking are not possible in compiling the gross national product or national income because of the magnitude of the task and because in addition to the Government. unrelated independent sources furnish data. The data from each independent source have been collected to meet the needs of a specific group. It is evident that the current indicators of national economy have limitations.

Kuznets,[2] one of the pioneers in national accounting, realized the limitations by stating:

"The treatment of margins of error is most difficult for the national income and product statistics. The totals are the composite of a great variety of data, which differ in reliability from sector to sector of the economy, and within any one sector from year to year. The margin of error in the composite totals is thus an amalgam of errors in the parts whose magnitude is not easily determined."

Realization that there are numerous undetermined errors of statistical nature in the basic compilation creates suspicion as to the validity of the concept that an annual 2.5 percent increase in the gross national product signifies economic growth. While a statistical error plus or minus 2.5 percent would not be large in this huge computation, such an error if negative could nullify the desired growth or if positive could indicate excessive growth especially since the statistical error may vary from year to year.

There are other factors which make a small annual percentage increase in the gross national product a dubious measure of economic growth. In official reports the classification, "services," has comprised about one-fourth of the gross national product in "current dollars" and about one-third in "consent 1954 dollars" for the last decade. Receipts from "barbershops" constitute a small part of total "services." Estimates indicate that haircutting for men produces around 90 percent of the income of barbers. Today in Boston, the same barber, using the same tools with the same skill in the same length of time—approximately 15 minutes—receives $2 for cutting a man's hair, a service which cost 50 cents in 1940. A tabulation shows how the price changes for this service have been included in the gross national product in both "current and constant dollars" and also what the price would have been to accord with Consumer Price Index of the Department of Labor.

TABLE 1.—*Relationship of cost of a man's haircut in Boston to the GNP and to the cost of living*

Year	Price [1] (current dollars)	Price (constant 1954 dollars)	1940 price [2] (adjusted to cost of living in current dollars)
1940	$0.50	$1.02	$0.50
1947	.85	1.02	.80
1948	1.00	1.13	.86
1950	1.15	1.29	.86
1952	1.25	1.28	.95
1955	1.50	1.49	.95
1959	1.75	1.97	1.04
1962	2.00	------------	1.07

[1] Price data furnished by E. Moscardelli, proprietor, Parker House Barber Shop, Boston, Mass.

[2] Based on Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Indexes.

Since there has been no change in technology or in output per man-hour it is difficult to rationalize that quadrupling the price of a haircut has aided the Nation's economic growth although each increase has added to the gross national product. Due to the present high price fewer customers have a weekly haircut and in addition do-it-yourself kits used at home have greatly reduced the patronage, especially of children. In spite of the exploding population business has dwindled. Of course higher rents, more expensive supplies, higher wages, shorter working hours, and difficulty in obtaining help have made increases in price inevitable, but there seems to be a large amount of inflation included in the present price. This industry is in the precarious position of gradually pricing itself out of business. As wages and fringe benefits rise at regular intervals to keep abreast of those in other trades, prices must continue to rise. As prices increase, business will decrease further, and simultaneously innovators will find it profitable to produce better do-it-yourself kits.

Since "services" measured in "constant dollars," were 23.2 percent of the gross national product in 1955 and 26.8 percent in 1961, the question arises. "Does similar inflation exist in other trades and professions?" It is evident that the trend for annual price or wage increases in the service industries may add to the gross national products although no technological change or improvement in quality may have occurred in a service.

The gross national product can grow in other devious ways. The Federal Government is able to add $500 million to the gross national product merely by raising the salary of each of its employees $200 a year. A recent congressional investigation exposed conspiracy and corruption in the Federal aid highway program. Parcels of land on a new right-of-way rocketed in value through fictitious appraisals and members of the committee stated that irregularities in land taking did not scratch the surface of the total fraud and dishonesty. This program operates with an annual budget of $3,500 million so that if its costs have been inflated only 10 percent, through fraudulent manipulation, the gross national product will contain an unwarranted increment of $350 million. Inefficient, spendthrift government is encouraged if economic growth is to be gained merely because higher salaries and greater costs in Federal, State, and local governments have increased the gross national product.

According to old-fashioned ideas, economic growth may take place without adding to the gross national product. Manufacturers and engineers believe they strengthen the Nation's economy when they make a better product to sell profitably at the same or lower price. The attempts of the railroads to eliminate featherbedding practices exemplifies this point. Although better service should accrue to the public at no increase in price and the financial status of the roads should improve, the gross national product will decrease by an amount equal to the salaries and wages of the superfluous employees.

Since national accounting theoretically copies the procedures of huge corporations, it may be advantageous to apply other corporate practices to national accounting. Corporations use accounting to weed out inefficient branches, to find unprofitable products, and to determine policies which will best serve the interests of the whole organization. Therefore it should be possible for the Government to weigh its policies and the relative merits of industries by means of national accounting.

To illustrate this possibility, national income statements are given for "Cotton manufacturers and cottongrowers for the year 1959" in table 2. Admittedly there were difficulties in obtaining suitable data for this rough comparison which has been made from statistics gleaned from various Government publications and in some cases adjusted on a reasonable but arbitrary basis. However, it is doubtful that more precise data would materially alter the situation depicted.

TABLE 2.—*National income statement for cotton manufacturers and cotton growers, 1959*

(Showing value of product with deductions for direct subsidies)

[In millions]

Cotton manufacturers:	
Value of product [1]	$4,406
Total value	4,406
Less direct subsidies:	
Export payments made on cotton grown and processed in the United States	1
Total of subsidies listed	1
Net gain to Nation	4,405
Cotton growers:	
Value of cotton	2,120
Value of cottonseed	222
Total value	2,342
Less direct subsidies:	
Price support CCC loss	169
Export 7.39 million bales at 6 cents per pound	222
Conservation [2]	43
Rural electrification [2]	28
Marketing service and research [2]	4
Total *of subsidies listed*	466
Net gain to Nation	1,876

[1] Estimated from 1958 Census of Manufacture.

[2] Estimated 1959 Census of Agriculture which showed cotton growers to be 13.5 percent of all farmers.

Indications are that policies of the Government threaten the existence of cotton manufacturing, which added $4,406 million to the economy in 1959 at a cost of $1 million in direct subsidies, in order to salvage another industry, cotton growing, which added $2,342 million to the economy at a cost of $466 million in direct subsidies. Each group also has an indirect subsidy from tariff protection and although that of the manufacturers may be the greater, allowances for tariffs will not radically change the relationship shown. Paradoxically without the manufacturers, the Nation would have had to find new consumers for $1,358 million worth of cotton or would have had to increase the subsidy to growers by that amount for them to have received the same income. The combined output of the manufacturers and the growers is a very small part of a 520,000 million gross national product, but when the present unemployment rolls may be increased by 343,000 directly employed plus many others indirectly employed by cotton manufacturers, the problem warrants national attention.

All manufacturers, including cotton manufacturers, in the United States contribute 30 percent of the gross national product, employ 16 million workers, and are supervised by the Department of Commerce which operates with an annual budget of $511 million and a staff of 32,224; whereas the agricultural interests contribute only 4 percent of the gross national product, furnish employment to about 5 million, including both owners and hired men, and are supervised by the Department of Agriculture which operates with an annual budget of $5,739 million and a staff of 97,920. Would a successful corporation allow policies to continue which create such disparities?

---

[2] Kuznets, S., "National Income, a New Version," The Review of Economics and Statistics, August 1948, p. 176.

Textile men engaged in research and development soon find that rarely are they able to organize a test to completely satisfy the requirements of a theoretical statistician. They also learn that judgment tempered by textile experience is of great importance in drawing conclusions even when elaborate statistical analyses are available.

Without doubt limitations in the use of statistics have been found in other industries. A practical background gained in this manner makes men skeptical when they see mathematics and statistics applied willynilly to economic problems and places them in complete agreement with the statement of John Kenneth Galbraith,[3] U.S. Ambassador to India and an economist with international repute.

"The recent discussion of development has also differed from the earlier in being remarkably more sophisticated. We now have growth models—hypotheses as to the nature of economic growth—some of considerable mathematical refinement and a few that are wholly incomprehensible. * * * Yet it would be a mistake to identify complexity with completeness and sophistication with wisdom. There are some serious shortcomings in the modern discussion."

Due to the advances in mathematics and the ease with which modern machines make complicated computations, there seems to be a vogue of constructing models to demonstrate economic growth. A model may consist of a group of equations which depict development according to the hypotheses and assumptions of the builders. Nevertheless there have been no radical changes in the characteristics of the human race, which is the main component in all social sciences, in spite of the great advances in the physical sciences.

In a recent text, W. J. Baumol,[4] a professor of economics at Princeton, points out the difficulties and shortcomings of model building.

"Any situation in the business world is compounded of a bewildering variety of major and minor elements, and unless, important features are erased, rigorous analysis becomes hopelessly complicated or impossible. The decision to omit an element from a model must therefore be a matter of balancing off the loss of realism against the gain in reduced computation difficulty. In any event, the model builder must be aware that what is left out is often as important as what is put in. Moreover, he must remember that there is no magic in mathematics. The results of the mathematical computations cannot be expected to be any better than the model on which they are based.

"He should therefore never allow himself to be misled by the aura of mathematical rigor which surrounds the calculations of operations analysis."

NEW CONCEPTS ARE NEEDED

When ranking economists question current discussions of development and indicate limitations both in the construction of mathematical models and in the interpretation of the calculations derived from models, the Nation should begin to examine economic growth with wider perspective from several different angles. Just as the democracies, during World War I, reaffirmed Talleyrand's opinion, "War is too serious a thing to be left to military men," they may discover today that economic development is too serious a thing to be left to economists and statisticians. Just as nations have had to broaden their concepts of war to include studies of their own capabilities and limitations in planning campaigns with the smallest expenditure of men and material, this Nation must attack the problem of economic growth with practical as well as theoretical concepts. Some ideas about development which have popular acceptance may have to be revised to accord with facts. Ingredients for growth can be observed from the prodigious development of the United States in the past while factors now can be seen which hamper growth.

This country has been developed by men with pioneering traits who had the will to work and who gained satisfaction in their ability to produce tangible objects for the benefit of themselves and their communities. Personal aggrandizement and security were not the prime motivating influences for men such as Bell, the Wright brothers, Edison, Henry Ford, and many others who have made major contributions to this Nation's growth.

When economic growth is measured as the yearly increment of the gross national product, the need for a will to work is completely overlooked. The phenomenal increase in the gross national product of West Germany in spite of its devastation during World War II has received no explanation which meets general acceptance among theorists. Other countries obtained as much aid as Germany under the Marshall plan without achieving equal progress. According to one explanation, which seems very reasonable, the Germans possessed little of value after the war except the will to work and consequently they made full use of each assistance dollar. Evidently the will to work to produce things of value to the community, things in which the workers and the community take pride, is an important ingredient of growth.

COTTON TEXTILES—A SQUARE INDUSTRY IN A ROUND ECONOMY?

(This is the third and final part of a three-part article by Peter M. Strang. The first part appeared in the February 28 issue, and the second part was published last week, March 7. Reprints are available upon request.)

BACKWASH FROM GOVERNMENTAL SPENDING

The large annual expenditures for defense and space projects may be partially responsible for the constant demand for higher wages throughout the country. In matters of defense the Government is the sole purchaser and developer of new weapons and there are no market criteria by which to gage production costs. Similar conditions exist for the space program.

A Senate Investigating Committee[1] found that strikes had been arranged to delay the progress of missile installations so that overtime at double and even triple rates became necessary. In one instance an apprentice electrician was paid $748 for a week's work which consisted of 4 hours straight time and 80 hours overtime. Even though competition may impose restrictions upon the amount which can be paid for their work, experienced mechanics in other trades quite naturally conclude that they are being underpaid when they hear that an apprentice has drawn these wages on a Government contract.

Most workers in the United States have the will to work but many are having this will blunted partly from faulty indoctrination and partly from the belief that annual wage increases and additional fringe benefits should be gained without compensating improvements in the quantity or quality of their own production or the need to keep manufacturing costs at a competitive level. Of course higher wages each year will add to the gross national product as long as the volume of production does not decrease.

Government spending is causing a like situation to develop among the Nation's scientists and engineers. Contractors engaged in defense and space projects, in their quest for qualified men, offer enticing inducements. As a result, commonplace manufacturers must increase their costs by giving higher salaries and other benefits to retain employees in these categories.

These conditions have side effects which hamper growth. When wage rates increase at regular intervals without a corresponding increment in either the quantity or quality of production, costs reach the point at which manufacturers are compelled to reduce their payrolls in order to remain in business. Automation is their one solution. The creative efforts of these manufacturers and their suppliers are then concentrated on the development of laborsaving machines.

Dr. James Killian, chairman of the Corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has stated that between 60 and 70 percent of the Nation's scientists and engineers are engaged directly or indirectly on Government projects. Many of the remaining 30 to 40 percent must be striving to reduce manufacturing costs by means of labor-saving devices. Although automation does create some new jobs, the overall employment opportunities will never meet the needs of an exploding population if industries, in order to survive, are forced to devote their research and development activities to labor-saving devices rather than to new processes and new products. While new processes and new products may lead to expanded trade both at home and abroad, the chief market for labor-saving machines will be in the United States. When wage rates and fringe benefits are about 40 percent of those in this country, a foreign manufacturer has less incentive to adopt automation, and labor-saving machines would require a much longer time to pay for themselves. In addition foreign producers may be able to lower their costs without automation merely by adopting other American management techniques.

It should be emphasized that, when the termination of a defense or space project frees engineers and scientists for other research, these men may have to spend several years acquiring knowledge and experience in an unfamiliar industry before they can contribute much toward its advancement. They may find that industrial research demands less specialization and greater application of cross field engineering than in their previous assignments. Futher complications also arise when American concerns parcel research abroad because of the growing costs and the scarcity of qualified men here.

INGREDIENTS FOR GROWTH

Study of economic growth in the United States during the last century reveals that industries such as the telephone, automotive, aviation, radio, and television, to mention a few, grew gradually and in the course of time gave employment to more and more people. These industries did not materialize overnight but took from 10 to 20 years to reach maturity. They usually germinated from the efforts of one man or a small group of men, original thinkers with creative minds, in whom an urge to explore the unknown and to produce something of value for the community, kindled persistent, unflinching drudgery to complete a self-assigned task in spite of difficulties and discouragements. They were dedicated industrial pioneers who would risk everything—even their lives—to attain their goal. The acquisition of wealth was not their chief objective in life, but, being human, they fully appreciated the advantages that money could provide. These innovators often lacked resources and teamed up with other adventurous spirits who were pioneers with capital. Frequently the man who furnished the money for a project also supplied the business acumen to carry the enterprise to a profitable conclusion.

---

[3] Gailbraith, J. K., "Economic Development," Harvard University Press, 1962, pp. 2, 3.

[4] Baumol, W. J., "Economic Theory and Operations Analysis," Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961, p. 413.

[1] McClellan, Senator J. L., "Crime Without Punishment," Duell, Sloan, and Pierce, 1961, p. 261.

The entrepreneurs who sparked the early progress of this country possessed characteristics and training rarely found in a single person. Original thinkers with creative minds, they were courageous, independent, diligent craftsmen often with attributes of the virtuoso. They had little patience with bluffers, pettyfoggers, or officiousness. An incident in the career of the electrical wizard Steinmetz is typical.

When a newly appointed official preemptorily issued a "No smoking or else" order, Steinmetz reportedly picked up his hat and went home with the comment, "No cigar, no Steinmetz." Needless to say the order was changed with alacrity. The men with capital who financed the new ventures also had unusual characteristics. They had the vision to see great opportunities in a nebulous mist and they had the courage to risk funds, for which they could have received a regular income from a safe investment, for the dual purpose of producing something new of value to the community and of gaining a sizable profit at a future date. The risk involved may be judged from the statement of an elderly financial pioneer in the 1920's to the effect that only 4 percent of the good projects he had handled were very successful. It must be admitted that there were times when the capitalist took everything and froze out the inventor.

Do conditions in the United States foster the characteristics found in the older industrial pioneers? Educators teach children the blessings of adaptability and conformity. In business many modern managers lay emphasis on these traits in making promotions. Labor unions keep their members in turmoil with demands for annual increases in wage rates and fringe benefits without consideration of production costs. To many in all walks of life, security and the acquisition of a "fast buck" appear primary goals.

Sir Oliver Franks,[2] when retiring from Lloyd's Bank in 1961, made this challenging observation:

"Distributive justice is a vital part of social morality. But to ensure the life of the community it is equally important to recognize that world trade is not a handicap event: in export markets, payment is strictly by results.

"When we separate ethics from economics and desire to do the decent thing without at the same time thinking what is the efficient thing, this produces static policies designed to impede change when only by change and adaptation can we hope to live. There has been too general an acceptance of the idea that the economic system exists to produce jobs rather than goods."

GROWTH FACTORS

A reappraisal of the factors necessary for growth is imperative. What advantage will be gained by cotton manufacturers in modernizing their buildings and machinery even with the aid of larger depreciation allowances, when foreign competitors can acquire equal facilities to produce the same goods at wage rates less than 50 percent of those in the United States and from cotton 25-percent cheaper in price?

However new construction at a fairly constant rate is essential to maintain the building trades and the suppliers of construction materials at full employment. New construction adds to the gross national product and every project creates jobs. In each case the number of jobs and their duration depend upon the size of the project and the required completion date. Again there is the old bugaboo of costs. The adage, attributed to Henry Ford, "Buildings alone do not make money," is applicable today. The manufacturers and the producers of services, who occupy the buildings, furnish the jobs which are permanent. When an old concern builds a new plant, the move is usually made to reduce costs by streamlining operations, by eliminating excess labor, and by lowering upkeep charges.

In new buildings high construction costs mean high rents so that new enterprises, which have to watch every penny closely, are apt to locate in older low-rent buildings. Because of the high wage rates in the building trades, many home owners are making their own home improvements and repairs, thus drying up a secondary source of jobs for construction workers. If the Nation should start a crash program to build fallout shelters, unemployment would decrease, especially in the building trades, and the gross national product would grow but upon completion of the program, unemployment would increase with a vengeance and few new permanent jobs would have been created. Those interested in the economy of the future could profitably study the experience of the textile industry in the 1930's when the operating time was restricted by the NRA in order to give jobs to more workers.

Research is often considered to be the salvation of the Nation. Although huge expenditures for defense are necessary and it may be imperative to be the first to land on the moon, the priorities assigned to these programs already are affecting this country's present and future research. Not only have research costs climbed because of competition for personnel and facilities but many engaged in the profession appear to have lost their perspective. With the Government footing the bills, costs are forgotten. As a result contact with reality is lost. In industry projects must be selected with care, having in mind the costs, the money available, the men and facilities required, and the prospects of ultimate success. The prevalent idea that anyone with an advanced degree is qualified for research should be modified. Just as medical men must serve a long internship before they begin medical practice, research men, regardless of their previous formal education, must gain experience and knowledge in an industry before they can contribute much of value to that industry.

Future industrial research is also being handicapped by the manner in which the faculties and facilities of educational institutions have become absorbed with Federal projects and the tendency for native students to enroll in courses leading to the more lucrative positions offered by defense and space programs in government and industry. In some courses oriented to the less spectacular industries foreign students predominate. Professor Backer of the Textile Division of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has found that during the last 5 years 77 percent of his graduate students working for advanced degrees have come from abroad. As a result, unspectacular but necessary home industries may find themselves plodding along in the same gait 10 years from now while their foreign competitors may have made great progress on the basis of the present advanced American know-how. At a textile exhibition last fall, some machines from Japan attracted more attention than did competing equipment made in the United States. After World War II, Japanese scientists and engineers devoted themselves to rebuilding their textile industry with noticeable results. Is it not possible to gain a Pyrrhic victory if the United States reaches the moon first but fails to develop new industries and sacrifices old industries through neglect and too much altruism both at home and abroad?

There are many reasons why research conducted by the Government fails to aid industry. Civil service regulations tend to dampen the enthusiasm of creative thinkers. Although the Department of Agriculture has been successful in research concerned with farm production, thus benefiting the farmers, some of its programs have added to the difficulties of the cotton manufacturers.

Is a small percentage of inflation needed each year to obtain growth? There are economists who advocate this course. The question may be important when comparisons are made concerning growth in Russia and in the United States. It is doubtful that the gross national product in Russia is augmented each year by inflation or spiraling wages. When comparisons are made of the gross national product in various countries or plans are devised to assist the growth of an undeveloped nation, differences in national characteristics present obstacles which are difficult to evaluate. The fact that there are people who do not want the advantages of Western industrial civilization thrust upon them suddenly, is being currently illustrated. By an overwhelming majority, the people rescued from the volcanic island, Tristan da Cunha in the South Atlantic, voted to return to their devastated island rather than to remain in England.

THE FUTURE

While careful attention should be paid to the thoughtful opinions of men who have dedicated their lives to the sicence of economics, contemporary history should teach Americans that too great credence should not be placed on the plans and precepts of young theorists with reference to the immediate economic future. The rulers of Russia, where individual freedom is greatly curtailed, claim to adhere to the doctrines of Marx and Lenin. Yet Djilas,[3] a former Communist leader in Yugoslavia who now languishes in jail because of his revisionism, has written:

"The Communist leaders really believe that they know economic laws and that they can administer production with scientific accuracy. The truth is that the only thing they know how to do is to seize control of the economy. Their ability to do this, just like their victory in the revolution, has created the illusion in their minds that they succeeded because of their exceptional ability.

"Convinced of the accuracy of their theories, they administer the economy largely according to these theories. It is a standard joke that the Communists first equate an economic measure to a Marxist idea and then proceed to carry out the measure."

Will the United States avoid the examples set by the doctrinaire economists of Russia? Can the United States profit from the experiences of its cotton manufacturers and cottongrowers? Is it too late to establish practical goals for industrial development in the United States without too great a sacrifice in the present in order to attain an anticipated ideal situation sometimes in the indefinite future?

SAYS JAPANESE USE "ECONOMIC BLACKMAIL"

Japan's bid for international support of its stand against U.S. import restrictions constitutes "economic blackmail," South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association President Robert S. Small declares. Mr. Small, president of Dan River Mills' Woodside unit, Greenville, S.C., cites reports that Japanese manufacturers have asked, in a "confidential" memorandum, for backing from participants in the international cotton textile agreement when that country asks the GATT Textile Committee to investigate so-called "unilateral and arbitrary" restraint actions proposed by the United States. He asserts the Japanese were caught offguard by the fact that the United States "has made them live up to an agreement for the first time." Japan is "simply not satisfied with her quotas and this move is just political pressure designed to blow up the long-term agreements," Mr. Small charges. He sees Japan's move as an effort to force the United States to increase that country's imports quota.

---

[2] Franks, Sir Oliver, "Lloyd's Bank, Ltd., 1961 Report and Accounts," p. 16.

[3] Djilas, M., "The New Class," Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1956, pp. 103, 104.

Now we have here an article in which a very wonderful friend of mine in my home town of Chester made a significant statement. He is dean of textiles in Clemson College, and he is a leader in the education of young men for the textile industry, and throughout this Nation men trained at that marvelous institute, and in that department, are dependent on the textile industry for their livelihood. They give their time and their talent to the upbuilding of the industry.

I include here an article written by this gentleman entitled "Clemson Dean Says Textile Industry in South Carolina Is Very Much Alive."

The article referred to follows:

CLEMSON DEAN SAYS TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN SOUTH CAROLINA VERY MUCH ALIVE

CLEMSON.—The textile industry in South Carolina is far from dying.

So says Dean Gaston Gage of Clemson College's School of Industrial Management and Textile Science.

Dean Gage cites these facts:

The Stevens Co. is doubling the capacity of Delta Finishing and expanding Utica Mohawk to more than 20 acres of floor space; Chemstrand is building and expending at Greenwood.

Also, Woodside Mill is starting to build a $12 million plant at Fountain Inn; Graniteville Manufacturing, a $7½ million plant at Graniteville; Inman Mills is completing a new plant at Inman; Greenwood, two new plants at Ninety Six; Allied Chemical, a nylon plant at Irmo.

Springs is building two plants and a tremendous warehouse at Fort Lawn. "And," adds the Clemson dean, "everybody was buying new equipment."

Pacolet Industries, Inc., a group of Milliken Mills, incorporated recently. Of the seven officers, four—including the president—are Clemson graduates.

South Carolina has nearly 40 percent of the spindles in the United States and about half the finishing capacity. Often overlooked is the production of manmade fiber. Its crop, in the raw state alone, is valued at about 5 times the cotton crop and about 80 percent of the sale value of all agricultural crops—peaches, cotton, tobacco, lumber, livestock.

The textile industry, Gage says these facts show, is alive, in good health, and still growing. Textile schools can, but don't, turn out enough graduates. They have the means—but not the students.

"What the textile industry needs today," says one top drawer representative, "is a new generation of young men with enough vision to realize that it takes more than cutting a price or underbidding a competitor to gain stability and profitability for textiles.

Ralph J. Bachenheimer, chairman, textile section, New York Board of Trade, is a guest contributor to the winter edition of "Bobbin and Beeker," student publication of the Clemson School of Industrial Management and Textile Science. He writes:

"Few industries as large and as basic as ours have consistently shown returns on an investment as poor as the textile industry. Textiles today are selling at levels below those of 10 years ago, while the rest of our economy has undergone a continued period of inflationary price increases.

"What we need, and need badly and quickly, is a new approach—stop apologizing for our products; go out and promote forcibly the many new fabrics produced in our mills. Bold and imaginative selling, and a willingness to attract a larger share of the consumer dollar from other industries," invites Bachenheimer "can easily change the mistakes of the past."

Last spring, the time when young men were choosing college careers, however, headlines heralded the two-price cotton and import problems.

Enrollment in textile curriculums of the Clemson school this fall increased nervously, by 11. The recruiting season is here again and Dean Gage has a crisp message for both mill executives and high school seniors, especially those interested in staying in South Carolina among the home folks: "Help yourself by helping us."

We have had difficulties but we are very much alive. I do not know that our health is as good as we would like to have it in the textile industry, but I do know that we are still alive.

What do we want? We want an increase in the production and consumption of cottons, synthetics, wool, and combination textiles in this country. What will that mean? It will mean lower prices for the consumer, and certainly every Congressman who has problems of employment and other industrial problems as unemployment and his responsibility knows that one of the problems of the industrial consumer is the problem of getting the best possible product for the lowest possible price. If legislation is the avenue of approach, let us have the necessary legislation.

We want also to help the cotton producer. The American people are gathered here in representation. The American people can voice their wishes at the ballot boxes of this Nation. We are going to have to stop the stockpiling of cotton and the sale of cotton in the manner in which it is being done now. These problems will continue as we continue into the mechanization of agriculture. These problems will grow. The producing farmer must be able to make long-range plans, must be able to get credit. Markets must be open to him to save the present and insure the future.

I could talk about cotton and what it means to people who are dependent upon it in the various phases of its production, processing, and sale. I could talk about the decline in exports and the rise in imports, for we recognize all the facets we must face. But what we want to do is to revitalize the textile part of the industry of this Nation. The textile industry is a great industry. Its problems continue, their gravity continues to grow; but we intend to survive and we invite the help of the administration in solving these problems, the worst of which is the two-price cotton system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

UNFAIR PENALTIES FOR ACCIDENTS WHILE ON OFFICIAL DUTY

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House of a bill which I have introduced that will remedy, in my opinion, a most unfortunate and shocking situation.

At the present time the Department of Defense including the Army, and I believe the Air Force also, have a system whereby they dock the pay of a serviceman for damages to property that happens to be in his possession. If a serviceman gets involved in an accident with a jeep, for instance, without any trial or without counsel, his salary can be docked for the damage.

I had called to my attention the following set of facts: A serviceman was a passenger in a truck in Germany. He was on official business for the U.S. Army. Due to an accident, this truck overturned and the young man suffered a fractured skull and a laceration of the brain. As the result of this accident, he has practically no vision in his right eye, he has a plate in his skull, and a very severe neurological condition. He was awarded a 70-percent disability rate by the VA. He went back home, and much to his chagrin, he subsequently received a letter telling him that he was responsible to the U.S. Government to the tune of $1,600 for damage to this truck in the accident.

Very frankly, I thought this was an error, an administrative mistake. I wrote to the Department of Defense and asked how possibly could this young man be held pecuniarily liable for damage to the truck when he was only a passenger.

I received a letter back from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense saying that this was not a mistake. This was a policy of the Government.

I was informed that if a passenger in a vehicle was senior to the driver it was his duty to see that the driver exercised due care.

Therefore, $1,600 was charged to this young man.

I know that we have to economize, but I can think of dozens and dozens, I may say hundreds, of places in the $50 billion that the Department of Defense got in fiscal 1963 where better economy could be practiced than in the case of these young people who are least able to afford it.

Of course it is ridiculous to charge a passenger for lack of care on the part of the driver. I will say it is very wrong for us to charge the driver, even, unless his negligence was willful or wanton.

My bill provides that if the damage to the vehicle was caused by the willful or wanton negligence of the serviceman, he can then be held pecuniarily liable, but even in that case I would insist on a hearing or trial and the assignment of counsel to the serviceman.

Servicemen have no control over their assignments. They must work on equipment as directed. Why then should they be charged for damage which is not willfully or recklessly caused. Most employees in private industry are not so charged. Why take it out on the serviceman?

ON NOT RAISING HOGS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] very kindly sent me a copy of a letter from one of his constituents, Mr. J. B. Lee, Jr.

I think this letter will interest a number of my colleagues. It is a devastating commentary on our present system of farm subsidies. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy, and I include Mr. Lee's letter in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 20, 1963.

The Honorable ED FOREMAN,
House of Representatives
Congressional District No. 16,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My friend over in Terrebonne Parish received a $1,000 check from the Government this year for not raising hogs. So I am going into the not-raising-hogs business next year.

What I want to know is, in your opinion, What is the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on and the best kind of hogs not to raise? I would prefer not to raise razorbacks, but if that is not a good breed not to raise, I will just as gladly not raise any Berkshires or Durocs.

The hardest work in this business is going to be in keeping an inventory of how many hogs I haven't raised.

My friend is very joyful about the future of his business. He has been raising hogs for more than 20 years and the best he ever made was $400, until this year, when he got $1,000 for not raising hogs.

If I can get $1,000 for not raising 50 hogs, then will I get $2,000 for not raising 100 hogs? I plan to operate on a small scale at first, holding myself down to 4,000 hogs which means I will have $80,000 coming from the Government.

Now, another thing: these hogs I will not raise will not eat 100,000 bushels of corn. I understand that you also pay farmers for not raising corn. So will you pay me anything for not raising 100,000 bushels of corn not to feed the hogs I am not raising?

I want to get started as soon as possible as this seems to be a good time of the year for not raising hogs.

One thing more, can I raise 10 or 12 hogs on the side while I am in the not-raising-hog business just enough to get a few sides of bacon to eat?

Very truly yours,

J. B. LEE, Jr.,
Potential Hog Raiser.

PROCUREMENT PRACTICES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ASSIST CONTRACTORS IN PADDING COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in 1959 and 1960 the Department of the Army awarded three fixed-price contracts to Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich., for spare electronic parts.

In its review of these contracts, the General Accounting Office disclosed that the Government incurred unnecessary costs of about $556,000.

The Comptroller General, in his report to the Congress, cited the Burroughs Corp. for charging the Government for labor costs far in excess of those which would have been justified under the circumstances. In addition, the GAO disclosed that the U.S. Army Procurement Office, Fort Meade, Md., failed to adequately review Burroughs' proposed labor cost estimates before accepting them.

In such fixed-price contracts, the contractor charges the Government for anticipated labor costs, which are estimated on the basis of the number of hours each specific job should require according to engineering studies.

On the three contracts in question, Burroughs charged the Government for 111,789 hours. Based on available information and performance data reviewed by the GAO, proper chargeable labor hours would have been 53,818. Burroughs charged the Government, then, a total of 57,791 excess labor hours.

The excess cost to the Government, including overhead and profit, was $556,150.

On the most recent of the three contracts, the contractor wrongfully certified to the Government that it had considered and made known to the contracting officer all available cost data in preparing its proposal. Despite this certification, however, Burroughs neither disclosed to the Government the existence of lower and more current labor cost data nor justified to the Government its failure to use this data in its estimate of labor costs.

The Comptroller General repeatedly discovered items upon which the Burroughs Corp. had padded its labor costs.

The Comptroller General pointed out that the failure of the U.S. Army Procurement Office to adequately review the contractors' labor cost estimates contributed materially to these deficits. The GAO further disclosed that:

First. The U.S. Army Procurement Office personnel, in evaluating total estimated labor hours for spare electronic parts, failed to consider the higher labor efficiencies in similar contracts.

Second. The U.S. Army Procurement Office failed to request the services of an available audit agency to review the contractors' charges.

The Comptroller General made the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the Department of the Army, if it is unable to recover substantially all the overstated costs identified in this report, refer the case to the Department of Justice for appropriate action to assure maximum recovery by the Government.

2. The Department of the Army should bring to the attention of its contracting officers the need to obtain pricing certifications from contractors on all contracts.

Mr. Speaker, this contract was an unconscionable extraction of Federal funds by the contractor. It was a willful, fraudulent misrepresentation by the contractor.

I trust that the Department of the Army and the Department of Justice will thoroughly examine into and investigate this transaction for possible criminal violations.

The U.S. Army should fix responsibility for this loss and for this disgraceful betrayal of trust. Appropriate disciplinary action should be taken immediately against the responsible procurement officers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to highly commend the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, and his staff for their outstanding public service in uncovering the wastages and quasi-criminal malfeasance that exist in many areas of our Federal Government.

REELECTION OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY OF CHICAGO

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had our mayoralty election in the city of Chicago. It was a beautiful day with a record temperature of 83; clear skies. We registered a 73-percent turnout of voters, which is certainly a very large vote for an off-year municipal election. And, I am very happy to advise my colleagues in the House on both sides that under these ideal weather conditions, Mayor Richard J. Daley was reelected yesterday to a third term by an impressive majority of 150,000 votes. Mayor Daley has certainly written an outstanding record in the last 8 years of his administration. He is today hailed not only throughout the United States but throughout the world as one of the outstanding administrators of a large city government. Mayor Daley has brought to the people of Chicago a new dimension of leadership which yesterday was certainly rewarded by this spectacular reelection. I daresay that the overwhelming victory experienced by Mayor Daley in Chicago yesterday, carrying with him his running mates, John C. Marcin, city clerk, and William Milota, city treasurer, reflects the high regard that the people of our community had for the record that the mayor has written and, I think, also reflects the high regard our people have for President Kennedy who was a visitor on an official visit to Chicago a week earlier when he participated in the dedication of the terminal facilities at O'Hare Field. President Kennedy could not help but take advantage of the opportunity to say some very inspiring words about Mayor Daley's impressive record. In reelecting Mayor Daley yesterday by this very sizable majority of 150,000 votes, I believe the people of Chicago at the same time registered what high respect they have for President Kennedy who supported the mayor.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Illinois delegation, it gives me great pride to be able to join today in this tribute to Mayor Richard J. Daley.

I have known Mayor Daley since he was a very young man, and have watched him rise to the very important position which he now holds as chief executive of America's second largest city. Through all of his years in public office, Richard J. Daley has always maintained the highest respect of the community for his dedication to public service, his devotion to Chicago, and his profound integrity.

During the last 8 years, he has given Chicago a completely new look, and I am not surprised that municipal administrators all over the world are pointing to Mayor Daley and his administration as a model of good government.

I am proud of the people of Chicago in this exciting demonstration of good judgment which they registered yesterday when they elected Mayor Daley to a third term. His reelection is the best assurance that the people of my city could have of continued growth and progress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am happy that the gentleman has taken this time on this subject. I want to personally join him in extending congratulations to the distinguished mayor and other officials of the city of Chicago and to congratulate the city of Chicago on the type of leadership it has had.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to join our colleagues in commending the people of the great city of Chicago for their wisdom as displayed yesterday. It has been my good fortune over the years to have had the pleasure to meet with and talk to the great mayor of that city, Richard J. Daley. Anyone visiting Chicago can readily see the great improvements and changes that have taken place during his administration. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished mayor of Chicago is indeed a real political leader of America, and that is a tribute that I am proud to attach to one, for I become increasingly impatient with people who think you can take politics out of politics, that you can take government out of government. The tribute that was paid to the mayor of the city of Chicago is well deserved, well merited, and justified, and the people are to be congratulated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy to join my colleagues in conveying to Mayor Daley my hearty congratulations on his reelection and on the splendid vote that he received, showing the confidence that the people of Chicago have in him. Mayor Daley is one of the outstanding Americans of this era. He is one of the great students of the art and science of government. He is a man whose leadership has made a profound impression not only on the people of Chicago but upon the people throughout the country. Chicago is a great city. I like Chicago. I think it is one of the great cities of our country. I also think that the problems of city government are very challenging.

It is my opinion that no one in public life has more challenging problems, except the President of the United States, on the domestic level than the mayor of a city, particularly the mayor of a great metropolitan city.

Mayor Daley has given to the people of Chicago outstanding leadership, evidencing not only great ability and vision but extraordinary courage.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the people of Chicago on the election of Mayor Daley, and I wish for him every success and happiness during his next administration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely grateful to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], and others who have joined in this tribute to Mayor Daley, including our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], and the dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. O'Brien].

I would make this observation. The Speaker has certainly touched upon one very important aspect in his remarks. In yesterday's tremendous victory for Mayor Daley there was, of course, an affirmation of the splendid record he has made in his 8 years as mayor of Chicago, and there was an expression of confidence that under his leadership in the next 4 years we will resolve some of the problems that have been besetting the large cities. However, in this election one cannot help but detect the fact that the people of a large urban community such as Chicago are becoming increasingly aware of these problems and particularly of the cost to local governments to meet these problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we shall be able in this Congress to pass some of the legislation which has been proposed by President Kennedy to help the large cities of America meet their mounting problems. Our great problem in America today is the tremendous inmigration of American citizens from the rural communities of the Nation into large cities. Today 78 percent of the population of this entire Nation resides in metropolitan areas of America. The problems of these areas are mounting. It is my opinion that many of the programs which have been proposed by the President would reflect the deep concern that the President has for the problems that are being created in these large cities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that this Congress, certainly before we adjourn in this first session, will be able to marshal enough support to help the large cities. I have been one who has supported agricultural legislation. However, I think the time has come when our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have to recognize that we have some deep-rooted problems in our urban areas. Mayor Daley during his campaign has spoken out frankly in support of legislation which is designed to assist in the correction of some of these problems facing large cities. It is my opinion that one reason why he won the election so handily yesterday, besides the great record he has made, is the fact that he has come out for the legislative program proposed by President Kennedy, a program designed not only to help the large cities but to help America. Certainly, as we have said many times on the floor of the House, when we approve farm legislation to help the farmers of America, we are helping the entire country. We are not only helping the scant 22 percent of the rural communities but the entire American population. The same argument applies to our large cities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that in this Congress we will receive sympathy and understanding from our colleagues, particularly those of our colleagues who come from the rural areas. Today the pendulum has almost swung and today we have some real serious problems in the large cities of America which cannot be resolved with their own resources. We must have some assistance from the Central Government.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute today to a greater mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, on his reelection, we have had an opportunity to discuss the problems of the large cities. With guidance from men such as Mayor Daley, I am confident we can find solutions to many of these problems.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on his presentation and to add that I see on the floor of the House at the present time one of the most influential, one of the most beloved men ever to sit in this Congress. The man who has been at the side of Mayor Daley during his great rise in Chicago politics and government, our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Tom O'Brien], is one of the greatest men this Nation has ever produced. We love him and are happy to have him back with us.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I share the high sentiments of the gentleman from Oklahoma about the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien].

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pat-

MAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 5389.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 36.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts, to make the following correction, viz: On line 4, change "76 Stat." to "75 Stat."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ATTACK ON REPUBLICAN OBJECTIVE OF BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, after the vote yesterday on the Interior appropriations bill, when almost all of the Members of this House from this side of the aisle had returned to their offices, a few Members from the other side of the aisle, quite evidently by prearrangement, engaged in an attack on the Republican objective of a balanced budget.

Their proposition was, to quote the majority leader, that "the only way a $15-billion cut could be made is to cut into the real muscle of indispensable functions of Government."

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] then proceeded to take up some 20 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to propagandize against a balanced budget by describing in detail just what would be the impact of a $15 billion cut in the overall budget on the functions of each department and each agency.

Everything calculated to arouse public interest, State by State, to fan the fires of personal prejudice and individual greed was set forth in depth, with the usual dire predictions of disaster to flow from such cuts. State by State, community by community, function by function, it was suggested by the gentleman from the other side of the aisle that pet projects would be lost if the budget was to be balanced. Ranging from the abandonment of Weather Bureau stations to discontinuance of air safety measures, to wholesale job reductions and rising unemployment, the administration's propagandists continued to distort and misrepresent.

Mr. Speaker, what has been done here by the administration spokesmen is a gross and palpable disservice to the public interest. By creating a bogeyman of a mythical meat-ax they have then proceeded to attempt to agitate our people in favor of further deficit spending by picking out of the departments the most controversial popular projects and the impact of appropriations reductions. Yet, all the time they must do this with tongue in cheek, for they know that it is within the power of the Appropriations Committee itself to specify where the cuts shall be made. If this is done by the Appropriations Committee all of the propaganda figures of yesterday's harangues disappear into the vacuum of hot air that they belong in to start with.

But beyond the slyness of the propaganda is the suggestion that to balance the budget would be to shift the country into reverse gear at a time when it needs to rush forward with—to use the President's pet phrase—"vigor." Our people should realize that the Democrat administration seeks to rush us forward into bankruptcy.

The majority leader has also implied that the cuts that must be made in defense to keep the budget in balance will ruin our defense posture. He seeks to charge those who would do this with responsibility for letting the Russians get ahead of us.

This is the same old bucket of tripe that we have heard for years.

Mr. Speaker, the worst thing that can happen to this country is to undermine its currency to a point where we cannot meet our obligations. As a favorite of the President, the famous economist, Keynes, has so well stated, the surest way to ruin a country is to debauch its currency.

I am convinced that the welfare and strength of this Nation and its people require that in the coming fiscal year Government spending be confined to Government receipts. To do this is going to mean that there will have to be cuts in defense and cuts in space. I am satisfied that both of these agencies, were they to be completely candid in the backroom, would admit that they can absorb the necessary cut to produce budgetary balance without wrecking the defense or space posture.

Because of the extremity of the remarks and the positions taken by the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle yesterday in my absence, I am anxious that the record should show that this is one member of the Appropriations Committee who will not vote further deficit financing for this country, even if it means substantial reductions in defense and space spending. I am particularly anxious in view of the somewhat hysterical propaganda of yesterday's administration spokesmen that it be very clear upon this record that the reason that I shall so vote is because I am convinced that in the long run the surest way to wreck the United States is to destroy confidence in its currency, to undermine the savings, earnings and incentive of its citizens, and to weaken its capacity for any sustained retaliatory effort in the event of a national emergency.

The siren song of the false appeal of the materialist pork barrel which this administration sang loud and clear yesterday is still the road to ruin for America because, if followed, it is the road to bankruptcy.

We cannot have everything now, leaving nothing for tomorrow in the bank. Just because the shadows of the horrors of atomic destruction lurk in the background of an uneasy and unsettled future is no reason for us to allow the executive branch to recklessly squander America's inheritance by profligacy and waste.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have courage. They have strength. They have determination. When they are challenged they have got it. We are challenged now and we know it. The sop offered in the name of a continuation of critical governmental functions is in fact and theory further evidence of weakness and dry rot within America's leadership. This Nation deserves better than such a diet. The country will rally behind a Congress that, not niggardly but reasonably and firmly, cuts out the frills, puts our fiscal house in order, holds this budget in balance and makes a token payment on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last thing the Communists want because if this is done it is evidence of the resurgence of American character and determination that spells the beginning of the end for communism throughout the world.

I hope and trust that Americans everywhere will understand the truth of what I have said here today. I hope that as they understand it their youngsters will be looking over their shoulder realizing as they do that it is their legacy and their future that the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle would fritter away just to stay in office a little while longer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is not suggesting that the Committee on Appropriations is the final word on cuts in the budget?

Mr. WYMAN. Not at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The House itself will work its will on these items just as it did yesterday in cutting below the

Appropriations Committee report on several items.

Mr. WYMAN. I hope so.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So the gentleman is misleading and distorting rather than the gentleman who spoke yesterday.

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman is not misleading and distorting. The Appropriations Committee makes selected cuts. Thus the harangues made yesterday were absolutely inaccurate because it is then up to the House to decide whether the cuts are applicable or not. The gentleman's party is in control, so he and they are then in a position to vote for or against exactly the same things his party leaders objected to yesterday on this floor.

Being in control both of the executive branch and of this House it becomes obvious that the list of projects and Federal services to be cut out if appropriations are reduced is in reality at the discretion first of this House and second of the Departments themselves if Congress does not select. So it is the barest of flim-flam to list these as the majority leader did yesterday.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. I congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. I join with him in his thoughts as far as expenditure of public money is concerned and the necessity of making reductions in the proposed expenditures. In checking over this list, and I might say I left the floor before the colloquy took place yesterday, I am a little surprised by the number of so-called projects included in that list, which is in the RECORD following the statement that if a budget cut was made these projects would either be put off or eliminated. Under insert No. 5, on page 5507 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it says that these are Interior projects that would be blocked by the proposed budget reduction of $153 million. The Interior Department and related agencies appropriation bill was passed by the House yesterday. The original request of the Department was $1,028 million, which was a 14½-percent increase over the 1963 budget. This was cut $99 million through the action on a bipartisan basis of the committee and by the House of Representatives. At no time was it ever suggested nor was any attempt made to cut $153 million from the Department of the Interior budget either by the committee or here on the floor of the House. I might say these projects listed by States cover practically two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and give no indication of the status of the projects listed—whether they have been authorized or whether any money has been appropriated for them or what their present status is as far as completion is concerned. Nor does the list of projects say whether they have been authorized or if any money was asked in the budget this year for that particular project.

I think if it is checked out very carefully, you will find that many of these projects and when I say many I mean by far the greater proportion of them, were not even mentioned in the budget request of the Department of the Interior for the 1964 budget. Therefore, to have these projects in the record, leaving the impression that our committee deliberately cut money out of these listed projects, is completely unfair and completely erroneous. I think the record shall be cleared up to show exactly what projects would be hurt if any are hurt and what projects the committee actually turned down and what money has been eliminated for the use of any particular project. I think to have a record such as this without pinpointing the details is completely unfair and certainly does not present a true picture of the situation at the present time without doubt is intended to mislead the general public as to what the House of Representatives is doing.

Mr. WYMAN. I am glad the gentleman from Wyoming, who is also a member of the Appropriations Committee, has pointed out that, as far as Interior is concerned, and I might say that the projects to which he has referred are extended all the way through to page 5520 of the RECORD in which the very blatant attempt has been made to influence and mislead the American people by telling them they would lose their jobs or projects will be withheld if there is a balanced budget.

What has been done here is the same old propaganda trick, a snow job, to justify the spending of our money at continued deficit levels, something that has been going on for too many years now. It is high time that some of us in this House stood on our feet and pointed out to the American people some of the savings that need to be and can safely be made so that we can continue to have a strong country and a future for our children.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Am I correct, may I ask my friend from New Hampshire, that several weeks ago the President of the United States characterized his 1964 budget as an austere budget?

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MacGREGOR. And did not the President of the United States make recommendations to us yesterday in the field of foreign aid which would cut $400 million from the original budget estimate for fiscal year 1964?

Mr. WYMAN. I think the President has seen economic light to that extent.

Mr. MacGREGOR. And may I ask further of my friend from New Hampshire if it is not true that since the budget was submitted to the Congress in January the President of the United States has cut almost $200 million, in areas other than foreign aid, from what was described as an austere or uncuttable budget?

Mr. WYMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I am not aware of the exact amounts, but what has been done is further evidence of the need for reexamination. The people of the United States are looking to this Congress to do this for them. This is what we are here to do—and the gentlemen from across the aisle are putting up smokescreens.

Mr. MacGREGOR. One concluding question, if the gentleman will permit. The gentleman is correct, that the people of the United States of America must look to the Congress of the United States, not to the executive branch, for such cuts as can be reasonably made in this budget before we finish our work this year.

Mr. WYMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I resent the implications from the other side of the aisle that Congress is injuring the economy by an examination into Democrat policies, suggesting that we Republicans are taking the country back to an 1892 economy by standing firm for a strong currency. As a matter of fact, the truth is that the present administration is taking us on the road to bankruptcy by piling up deficits and at the same time proposing reduced tax revenues by a tax reduction without a corresponding reduction of Government expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE BUDGET

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are just two points I think should be mentioned by way of refutation of the remarks just made on the floor. In the first place, the suggestion that the administration has been irresponsible in its budgeting may be supported in the mind of the gentleman, but I do not think it can be supported by the record. A single illustration, of course, is what happened in terms of the military authorization in which this Congress, at least the House, voted to increase very substantially the recommendations of the administration in the field of military authorization.

The second point is the big snow job, the big propaganda job the gentleman says has been done, was certainly not done by our majority leader on the floor of the House yesterday. The real snow job has been done over a period of some weeks on the other side of the aisle and by the spokesmen of the members of the party who sit on the other side of the aisle when they talk in terms of $10, $12, or $15 billion in budget cuts, without being specific as to where it can be accomplished. The effort yesterday to smoke them out and to get them to be specific about some area where they would actually advocate cuts was, I think, a bona fide effort and an entirely justifiable effort by the majority leader.

If there was someone who did not know about that, someone who did not respond, it is the responsibility of every Member to be on the floor of the House when it is in session. It is not the obligation of any Member to send individual notes to other Members to be on the floor because "I am going to make a speech tomorrow." This falls on very empty ears, as far as the general practices of the House are concerned.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. In connection with the vote in the U.S. House of Representatives—this body—on the military authorization bill, I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether it is not true that of the 33 votes which sustained the President's position and that of the Defense Department, all of those votes except 1 were Republican votes?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman may be accurate about that. I think the Republicans got 15 percent of their membership to stand up for economy when it came to an actual showdown, but so far as the great majority of the other side were concerned, you did not have any more of a consistent economy position on that than had the folks on this side. It is proper for us to exercise our judgment on what should be done. I do not yield to anyone in an honest desire to get the best defenses we can get. I am just saying it is one thing to talk about a $15 billion cut, it is another thing to vote for specific cuts. Certainly the other side has a very sad record on that score when we talk about military authorizations.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he, being a Member of the majority party, certainly should be in a very excellent position, in fact even more so than the minority party, in finding spots in governmental operations and in the budget where specific cuts can be made and where they should be made. It would seem to me that rather than criticize the minority party for its efforts, which I believe are very fair, very fine, and follow the desires of the people of this country, it would be far better for the gentlemen on the other side to make an effort themselves to find where these budgets can be cut, because surely they can come up with specific instances. If they cannot and we do, they should not criticize us for our efforts.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman was here yesterday when the Interior Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee brought in a bill which was approximately 9 percent below the budgetary recommendations of the administration. Those cuts were brought in by a committee which was dominated by Democrats, as the gentleman well knows. This is an example of responsible legislation in an area where the committee found that cuts could be made without getting into the muscle field and without getting into the meat-ax approach. They have recommended these cuts. I think the House acted wisely in following their lead in this regard. But if you are going to talk about a $15 billion cut, let us see where it is going to be. Let us see some facts, let us see some particulars.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the gentleman is in a far better position than I am to pick out these spots. I am a member of that subcommittee, and I want to say it was a nonpartisan effort on the part of our committee in making those reductions, an effort supported by the minority members of the subcommittee, because if we had not made the cuts, and I am happy that the majority members of the committee went along, you would have had a minority report on that bill, because I would have filed one myself. But, because they were openminded and very fine people and believed that there should be cuts and they were justified, we came in with a unanimous report. And, that is the way it should be. I hope that in the days to come Members on both sides of the aisle will join in a program to try to get this country of ours back on a sound financial basis and quit deficit spending, because we cannot go on forever improverishing the American people. And, it is your responsibility just as much as it is on this side of the aisle to pick out spots in the recommended budgets of the departments to see where they can be reduced, because it is, after all, the responsibility of this Congress to see how much money shall be spent and how much money shall be appropriated, and we have no right to put that responsibility on anybody else's shoulder but our own.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a line-by-line proposal for budget cuts by a member of the Democrat Party. This was issued as recently as Friday, March 29, 1963.

To break this down in broad categories: Foreign aid, $3.3 billion; Federal-civilian payroll cost, $1.9 billion; proposed new construction, $2.2 billion; waste, extravagance, inefficiency, and so forth, $5.1 billion. So, there are individuals on both sides of the aisle that are interested in cutting this fantastic budget that has been proposed, so I would suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he check with members of his own party that have made suggestions for cutting the budget. Also, here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7 is another budget-cutting proposal by another member from the gentleman from Oklahoma's party. So, there are people on both sides of the aisle in the Congress that are still responsible individuals and would be very interested in seeing that the budget is brought down to a reasonable level.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. When the gentleman from Oklahoma referred to the B-70 program the other day it had to do with increasing the authorization bill, and he raised the same false picture that is characteristic of what I just referred to. This is just what was done in this House yesterday by the majority leader and others on his side. There is all the difference in the world between authorization bills and appropriation bills. It is the practice of many people to vote for authorizations and then, in turn, vote for appropriation bills that are considerably less than the authorization. Is the gentleman familiar with that practice?

Mr. STINSON. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. When the gentleman who just took his seat will be around here a little longer, he will discover that appropriation bills follow authorization bills, and when you want to stop expenditures, the place to stop them is in authorizations, and if you do not put a stop on authorizations, you are not going to put brakes on appropriations. Furthermore, I have never made the statement on this floor that the effort to cut is a partisan effort. I do not know who picked that language up over there. I think that there are sincere people on both sides who put in an awful lot of time in committees, both authorizing and appropriating, working to keep down expenditures, and when that ceases to be a bipartisan effort, I think we have a very bad state of affairs.

Mr. STINSON. I would like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire has been around Capitol Hill here for a good many years, even though he has not been a Member of the Congress. He has had a good deal of experience working around Congress, and with appropriations, and I believe that he is very well acquainted with what is going on around Capitol Hill. I might also point out that he was so highly regarded by the Republican Party that he was the only freshman appointed to the Appropriations Committee this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations. About a week ago I offered my services. I said that each Member knows his own district the best, and I suggested that that Member advise me where we could cut in his district: Those of you who feel you are getting too excessive defense contracts, flood control projects you want discontinued, hospital grants, if the gentlemen will let me know, I will be glad to pass them on to the chairman.

I would like to get an answer.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. If I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey, you will have to look on your own side of the aisle rather than over here. With the propensity for the political distribution of public funds which has been shown by this administration in terms of these Federal programs, as was demonstrated in the food-stamp program, I think that on the other side of the aisle lies the opportunity for the saving of substantial amounts of money.

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am looking at both sides of the aisle, and I have not gotten any answers from anyone on either side of the aisle.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the point I was trying to make is this: Reference was made yesterday to the effect that cuts proposed by Members on this side of the aisle were going to wreck the economy, throw people out of work, and put the country in a bad situation. The point I was trying to make is that here we have Members from the other side of the aisle who have proposed very substantial cuts in the Federal budget.

Would the gentleman suggest that perhaps the Members of his own party are irresponsible and are trying to throw the country into a state of chaos and cause unemployment as a result of these proposals to cut the budget?

Mr. JOELSON. No; I do not suggest that to those on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to contribute this: It seems to me that there is a popular misconception, especially on the other side of the aisle, with regard to the respective functions of the legislative and executive branches with regard to this subject of the budget. We know that the Bureau of the Budget is in the executive department and that the budget is prepared by the executive department, a department which has 450 employees.

I think the function of the legislative branch is not to write the budget and not rewrite the budget, but to maintain control of the purse strings, to determine how much money shall be appropriated, how much in taxes shall be raised. Those are the things which we must inform the Executive about. Then the function becomes that of the Executive to determine in what manner in the conduct of the executive branch he wants to expend the money.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not the legislative branch's responsibility to determine the number of employees in each executive department of the Government. It is my opinion that we must and should specify the amount of money which the Government shall spend and then determine the amount of revenue which shall be provided in order to take care of those expenditures. If we do not now have the machinery for performing this necessary legislative function, and I do not believe we now have it, we should proceed at once to provide the machinery.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of making one final observation. The gentleman from Illinois has just pointed out so well the entire thesis of my remarks of a few moments ago in regard to what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have said in the way of dire predictions of what will happen in these various governmental departments and what will happen all around the country with respect to the loss of jobs and facilities if we confine Government expenditures to receipts. This is crying wolf with a vengeance. It is a blatant propaganda gesture in an effort to increase these appropriation bills. That is all it is. It is a misrepresentation to scare the Members of this House to put appropriations back into these bills. It is important that not only Republicans be concerned about this but responsible Members on the other side of the aisle also in order to alert our people to just what is going on. This has happened before and it will happen again unless we alert our people to the greater danger that exists today from these years of overspending.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER, for 1 hour, on April 10, 1963.

Mr. WYMAN, for 15 minutes, on April 3, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BURKHALTER and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. MORSE.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week,' and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

640. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the first segment of the report of the special study of securities markets, relating to the adequacy of investor protection in the securities markets, pursuant to section 19(d) (Public Law 87-196) (H. Doc. No. 95) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4549. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 5389. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1492. A bill to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart; with amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 5429. A bill to amend section 104(s) of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, to require that 5 percent of the foreign currencies hereafter acquired by the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities be set aside for the sale of dollars to American tourists abroad; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5430. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5431. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, or widower, or parent shall not prevent the payment of benefits if such remarriage is annulled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5432. A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5433. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949, 63 Stat. 759, ch. 672 (32 D.C.C. 417) to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5434. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 5435. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 5436. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5437. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to the compensation of hearing examiners and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5438. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to replace the existing retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage, etc., with equivalent manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5441. A bill to require an annual audit of each bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5442. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to branches of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5443. A bill to require that 90 percent of the net earnings of Federal Reserve banks be paid into the Treasury, and that the financial transactions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks be audited by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 5444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development of precision equipment and systems for utilizing radio signals from space satellites to improve navigation of nonmilitary vessels at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5445. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to permit freight forwarders to acquire other carriers subject to such act, to place such transactions under the provisions of section 5 of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 370. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to present before the United Nations the question of the enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia with a view to obtaining their independence and the return of their peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the U.S. Congress to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Senate Resolution No. 3, of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, commending Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and all members of the Alabama congressional delegation for their concern for the cotton economy of Alabama by endorsing the 1963 cotton price support program and making recommendations toward ending the inequities of the two-price structure on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, House Joint Resolution No. 13, of the State of Alabama House of Representatives, petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention to consider an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to establish a Court of the Union, which would sit upon demand of five States, not having any common boundary, the proposed court's sole function being the determination of whether power exercised by the United States is granted to it under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 5446. A bill for the relief of Brian Richard Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5447. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Wiswell, E. G. Haberman, Willard S. Bacon, and Robert L. Geisler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5448. A bill for the relief of Maria Josefa Pariente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Halina J. Admaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5450. A bill for the relif of Evadna Lai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5451. A bill for the relief of the E.L.K. Oil Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 5452. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Italia William and Mario Alfano Felice William; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 372. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. E. Bream and others, Pittsburgh, Pa. Petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taking whatever steps are necessary to withdraw from the United Nations for 24 important reasons set forth in their petition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

81. Also, petition of Fred Chiles and others, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren and others in the Supreme Court for a recent decision in outlawing the name of "God" in public institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in these awakening days of leaf and bud and flower, thrilling and throbbing with the vernal loveliness of April, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses drink as we bend in wonder to the petaled cups held up by bushes aflame with Thee.

May the new glory of the arousing earth be but a parable of the things that are excellent, blooming in our risen lives as by the alchemy of Thy grace they become the gardens of the Lord.

Steady us, we pray, with the realization that beneath all the ugliness which hides the truth and beneath all the dark tragedy now plaguing the world, which could be so fair, there is the permanent good of Thy redemptive purpose for all mankind, to which we must be loyal if, at last, life is to be saved from frustration.

Whatever the future holds, may we face it calmly and in confidence, with the assurance that there lives the beauty that man cannot kill. May we hold that faith, and hold it fast. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 2, 1963, was dispensed with.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of yesterday, the question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed on yesterday by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to the so-called Magnuson substitute for Senate bill 6, the Urban Transportation Act of 1963, beginning on page 26, in line 17, after the word "rights", to insert "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law."

On the question of agreeing to this amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if it is in order, I now ask unanimous consent, despite the agreement of yesterday, that I be allowed to suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the roll be called in that connection, with the rollcall to be concluded at the end of 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the quorum call will now be terminated.

Under the order entered yesterday, the question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to the so-called Magnuson substitute for Senate bill 6, on page 26, in line 17, to insert, after "rights", the words "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law."

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 30 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—56

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—3

Hickenlooper
Moss
Smathers

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REQUESTS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet today during the session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I believe there are presently pending about six requests for committee meetings today. I have received several objections to some committee meetings. In consequence, I cannot make fish of one and fowl of another; and therefore I am constrained to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to make the observation that this committee is working hard and diligently on a most serious undertaking, with a most serious responsibility. The request has been made to expedite the committee's work. The committee is attempting to expedite its work. Under the circumstances, we shall have no alternative except to obey the declination of the Senate to grant us our request to proceed. We inevitably, I assume, and unavoidably, will be delayed with respect to progress we had hoped to make.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the same observation can be made with respect to the work of the entire Senate. The Senate is being taken to task editorially for the slowness of the Senate and the failure to accomplish something. That can be done only if Senators are in the Chamber. In consequence, I am distressed about it, but I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I feel that, despite the objection which has been made by the distinguished minority leader to the request made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I must, perforce, ask unanimous consent that the following subcommittees be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on the insurance industry.

The Subcommittees on Labor and Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must object to every request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators.

A number of Senators—proud fathers, may I say, in most instances—find that duties appropriate to the season will necessitate their absence from the Chamber this morning. At the same time, they are anxious to make progress on the pending bill.

Therefore, it seems wise to the leadership to proceed with debate on amendments to the bill, while postponing rollcall votes until later in the day.

Therefore, with the concurrence of my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes which may be ordered on amendments be postponed until not earlier than 2 o'clock, with the understanding that debate on the amendments may proceed from now until that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask my friend, the distinguished minority leader, in what way it would hurt the Senate if the Committee on Government Operations, now working on a matter I know we all want to see expedited, should meet this morning? Senators could come to the Chamber to vote after the bells ring and when the votes were taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how could I very well concur in that request and then say "No" to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] with respect to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee hearing; to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] with respect to the Subcommittee on Public Lands; and to the interested Senators with respect to the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia and other subcommittees?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order.

The Senator from Montana yields 3 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who is in charge of the bill, yields 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to conclude the observation, I cannot very well object in behalf of Senators who register objection with me as to some committees and subcommittees, and let other committees and subcommittees meet.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the work of the Senate builds up, does the able minority leader believe we shall not be allowed to have committee hearings at the same time the Senate is meeting at an hour earlier than noon. If this is going to be the practice it will create grave problems for Senators as to scheduling of their time. I do not see how we can do committee work and Senate work at the same time under such a policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not generalize the matter. We are trying to complete consideration of the pending bill today. I think it can be completed today. I am not going to subject Senators to having to trot back and forth from the Chamber to the New Senate Office Building and to the Old Senate Office Building on rollcall votes, and that sort of thing. In addition, Senators do wish to be present, I am sure, to hear some of the discussion on the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendments are to be disposed of today. I think it is in the interest of the committees and in the interest of the Senate that they be disposed of. If, for any reason, the majority leader feels the Senate can go over a day, Senators will have an entire day in which to catch up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an unusual circumstance, as the Senator understands. He knows it is not normal policy for the Senate to operate on this basis, except in an unusual situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I say, with great respect to the majority leader, that I have known of many cases in recent years when it became the practice, for various reasons, for one or more Senators not to want committee meetings when the Senate was in session. It seems to me we get hoisted by our own petard under such procedure, if the premise is we want to expedite the business of the Senate.

The first year I was in the Senate, 1953, we voted some 10 times in one afternoon on the tidelands oil bill, walking over from committee to vote. It seems to me that this action, especially when we have a matter as important as that currently before the Government Operations Committee, means we are all cooperating to hinder the work of the Senate. I say this with great respect to the majority leader and the minority leader; but that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has a point there. It happens now and then, but it is not the normal procedure most of the time. I point out further that any Senator can at any time object to any regular committee meeting during the session of the Senate, except, I believe, the Appropriations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may have 1 more minute.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend the Senator from Missouri whether the colloquy we have just had does not convince him, as it has convinced me again, that we had better change the Senate rule which permits one Senator to prohibit committees from meeting when the Senate is in session, if we are to proceed with the pending measure and other business of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to commit myself by a general statement on the rules this morning, but, under the circumstances now existing, especially inasmuch as the primary reason for pushing this bill through today was that certain Senators had dates out of town, I feel we are all cooperating in hindering the work of the Senate by not allowing committees to meet. That is my point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there an amendment at the desk? I believe the Senator from Colorado has an amendment at the desk, and I think it ought to be brought up and stated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk numbered 29.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to amend section 13, subsection (c), on page 17, as follows:

> Starting with the word "Thereafter" on line 13, page 17, strike all through line 21, page 17.

Mr. DOMINICK obtained the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just 30 seconds.

Mr. DOMINICK. Thirty seconds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senate will be in order, I would like to clarify my position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. Time will not run until the Senate is in order. Senators who desire to converse will please retire to the cloak rooms.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senate rules provide that any Senator can object to a committee meeting while the Senate is in session. If this body wants to change the rules, that is perfectly all right with me. I am entirely within the rules, and when Members on this side file objections, I shall honor the objections and assert them on the Senate floor. It is that simple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 30 seconds yielded to the Senator from Illinois have expired.

THE MYTHOLOGY OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—LECTURE BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] for 30 seconds.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have read with great interest a lecture by David E. Lilienthal on "The Mythology of Nuclear Disarmament." The author, who was the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and formerly Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, is now chairman of the board, Development & Resources Corp., New York City. I commend this lecture to all my colleagues as a realistic analysis and major contribution to the discussion of current arms control and disarmament issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lecture be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYTHOLOGY OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

(By David E. Lilienthal)

Spring comes early in Washington. The 15th of February in 1950 was a warm, shirt-sleeve day; the green that touched the willow trees told you spring had come. I walked out of my office, the office of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, down the marble stairs, handed my security badge to the officer at the door for the last time, and went out into the late afternoon sunshine. For the first time in years, the atom was off my shoulders. I said to myself: "Now I've left the atom behind, for someone else to worry about."

But I soon found that I couldn't leave the atom behind; the atom stayed right with me. It is a part of my life, as a private individual, as it is part of your life, of everyone else's life.

And so, in these lectures—a kind of "atom revisited"—I shall try to look at the atom as a part, an integral part, of the life of men on earth today.

To examine the place of the atom as a part of the way men order their lives in the world of 1963 we need first of all to take a broad look at what is bigger than the atom and of which the atom is an important part, but only a part: the world we live in today, the world of men and nations of 1963.

What kind of a world is it, this world of 1963?

Certainly it is a world of swift, radical change—change at an unprecedented tempo. It is a world of creativity, of new ideas, new ambitions, new projects, new cruelties, and new compassion; a world where outworn ideas are being discarded. A world in transformation. It is a world of men who are uniting, quarreling, fighting, rebelling, building, but constantly on the move toward something different. A world that is fluid and exciting. Of evil and violence there is plenty; of standing still there is little. Movement and change of a scale and intensity never before known are the keynote of the world of 1963.

I have seen or sensed these changes out of my personal observation and experience, as each of you have out of yours. Since the day 13 years ago that I once again became a private citizen I have observed or been a part of change in the course of my work. In Latin America and Asia I have seen evidence of perhaps the greatest migration of human beings in history, the tidal movement from the land to the cities. I have seen the ancient power of the great landlords weakened beyond restoration in the south of Italy, in many parts of Asia and South America. I have seen vast physical changes, ancient deserts made green, great rivers put in harness, mountains moved. I have seen Africans, now rulers of tiny new republics, feted and honored by General de Gaulle in Paris and the President in Washington, not as wards but as equals, as heads of state. As a layman I have caught the excitement in the community of scientists of new concepts and discoveries in physics, in biology, in medicine, in mathematics. And in the area of political alinements, tremendous change. The little island of Cuba a threat to the Western Hemisphere. Stalin gone. India freed of Britain, her freedom now endangered not by Britain but by her ancient brothers, other Asians. Most impressive and far-reaching of all changes, within hardly more than a decade you and I have witnessed the building of a European community, and despite all setbacks we have seen the evidence of growing awareness of interdependence among the peoples of the world.

And yet, over this picture of a world in motion, confident, restless, there hangs the dark cloud of the atom; what the President has called the "nuclear sword of Damocles."

This part of the world of today—the atom—is what most troubles men's minds. It is this part of the world of 1963 I propose to discuss first in these lectures, but in the context of a world in motion.

Everyone recognizes what a terrible disaster the use of nuclear weapons can bring to the whole world. Here there are no important differences of opinion. The area of difference of opinion lies in answers to the question: What can be done about this threat of disaster, and how?

There are at least three different points of view among us:

First, there are those who find that the answer lies in the question itself: First we get rid of the weapons. Universal disarmament, not unilaterally but by the process of negotiated treaty with the Soviet Union, is a life-and-death imperative. Press the negotiations at Geneva as a primary and urgent and overriding objective. We are told on high authority that disarmament is "the most seriously pressed proposal for the achievement of peace"; our President has admonished the world that, "The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us."

The classic pronouncement of the view of the primacy of disarmament is that of an eminent man of letters, a scientist and expositor of science as a culture, Sir Charles Snow. In an address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science on December 27, 1960, Sir Charles said: "We are faced with an 'either-or' and we haven't much time. Either we accept a restriction of nuclear armaments," and he adds that such a course involves risks, "or the nuclear arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R. not only continues but accelerates * * * within at the most 10 years, some of these bombs are going off * * * on the one side, therefore, we have a finite risk. On the other side we have a certainty of disaster. Between a risk and a certainty, a sane man does not hesitate. It is the plain duty of scientists to explain this 'either-or.' It is a duty which seems to me to come from the moral nature of the scientific activity itself."

With Sir Charles' concept of absolutes in human affairs—"either-or"—I profoundly disagree. In these lectures I shall seek to make plain some of the reasons, both philosophical and practical, why I disagree with such an "either-or" approach. Great as are the hazards of nuclear weapons, I do not believe this fact can materially alter the way by which from time immemorial mankind has confronted and adjusted to change.

Second, the second course to avoid nuclear disaster embraced by many can be summarized in this way: Give the negotiation of a disarmament agreement the top priority, even while recognizing that the prospects of complete agreement immediately are not bright. But concurrently seek other ways as well by which tensions and animosities between the great powers can be reduced and relieved.

This is far from an unreasonable view, but it is not one which I can share. In my opinion this course does not give proper weight to the dangers to peace that lie in the very process of negotiating disarmament, in the present state of animosity between the great powers. Moreover, this course, I fear, does not adequately recognize that such a preoccupation with disarmament distracts and dilutes our faith, our energies, and our spiritual and physical resources in pursuing other more hopeful and realistic roads toward peace, outside the area of disarmament.

I ask you to consider with me still another concept, one that represents my own conviction, reached after a painful reassessment of my earlier views of the road to peace in an age of nuclear weapons.

My view of the best course is founded on my belief that in human affairs the only thing that is inevitable is change: that there is no single great dramatic step, neither disarmament nor sole and increased reliance on weapons, that will or can solve the problem of nuclear weapons. I find the great hope for peace to lie not in a single panacea but in diversity, in pursuing the ends of peace in thousands of areas of human life, a theme upon which I shall enlarge in my second lecture.

Tonight I invite you to consider with me the hazards to the very peace we seek that lie in the disarmament negotiating process under present conditions.

I believe it to be fundamental that it is the causes of war that must first be ameliorated before we can safely make progress toward eliminating or even limiting substantially these terrible weapons of war. The reason nuclear weapons are a threat to the world lies not primarily in the inanimate weapons themselves, but in the animosities, the suspicions, the conflicting drives and ambitions and ideologies of the nations who possess the weapons: that while the very existence of such awesome weapons increases tensions, it is more than futile, I believe it is courting disaster to negotiate for general disarmament in the present atmosphere of distrust and hatred.

With this as a summary of what I ask you to consider, let me proceed to an outline of the thesis upon which my views rest.

Atomic energy was the creative product of many different kinds of specialized knowledge. This achievement represents a very high order of imagination and creativity indeed. But this achievement is also a high point in the fragmentation of knowledge and of responsibility for knowledge. So complex an achievement as atomic energy, with so many ramifications, coming so suddenly, required a high degree of compartmentalization. The scientific, the technological, the military, the diplomatic, the political—even the grave ethical implications were customarily often dealt with as a separate kind of expertise. The technicians and experts and specialists took over the atom. They took it over in pieces, not as a whole. To this day no one has ever been able—or tried very hard, I think—to put the pieces together in an overall way. There has been too little effort to understand the whole, to see the whole, meaning, the values involved, and their place in our scheme of values. The preoccupation has been with bits and pieces. In such a circumstance the alienation from the fabric of the rest of life today was inevitable. That alienation now is almost complete.

The place of the atom in the life of the world cannot be understood, much less dealt with creatively in its military as well as its nonmilitary aspects so long as we continue to think of it as the exclusive domain of the experts, fragmented and compartmentalized into a score or more fields of expertise.

The theme of what I shall say throughout these lectures then is this: that a basis for understanding atomic energy in the life of mankind is not the mastery of physics or abstract mathematics or diplomacy or military science or the exotic nuances of some of the disarmament expertise. To understand the atom we must reassert what through the ages wise men have come painfully to know of the condition of men in a changing world, how human affairs are conducted—and misconducted.

The majestic scientific discoveries that—in a kind of shorthand—I have simply called the atom have not changed the inner springs of man's life. Man's emotions, his fears, his hopes, his motivations, good and evil—these basics of the very nature of man himself are still decisive in the shaping of events growing out of the atom, as they continue to be in the rest of that world we live in, of which, sooner or later, we must come to see the atom is an integral part.

Man is not obsolete. Neither the atom nor any other scientific or military or diplomatic development can make him obsolete. Man is the center, the motive force, as he was before the atomic revelations, as he will be when we get the atom fitted into the ways of men and nations, making the worst or the most of the miracle of life itself.

We must apply to our fears and hopes and plans and policies about the atom what we have learned over the centuries about the affairs of man. The recesses of man's heart, his passions, his emotions, ugly and mean, sublime and noble, are the source and the driving force of all change: physical changes such as the blooming of the once-arid Persian Desert; political changes, such as that now sweeping a uniting Europe, or the revolution moving across the landlord-dominated countries; cultural changes that are permeating our own society and that of the Soviet Union. The decisive "winds of change" have their origins in the emotions and inner drives of men.

Boundless change, individual restlessness and movement and creativity, the surge of new ideas and new energies—this then is the picture of the world of 1963. Yet in that part of the world scene which we call the atom the dominant mood is not of daring, not affirmation, not change and challenge. The dominant mood is negative: fear, anxiety, a monumental sense of frustration in which the hope is a negative static one, a hope of sheer survival.

The reason I have made a point of stressing what we all know, namely, that man is the source of change is this: many people act as if the ordinary rules of life can be suspended as far as the atom is concerned, as if the problem—the overriding problem—of the atom can somehow be dealt with on a basis contrary to other human experience—in short, the short-cut "either-or" approach, which we would reject as unrealistic in any other area of human affairs, somehow can be made to apply with success to the atom.

In effect, haven't we given the atom a separate status—or, rather, tried to? We have placed the atom outside of the current of human affairs. Is it any wonder, then, that we have been frustrated? Is it any wonder, then, that the current of change and movement which you and I have seen transforming all other human affairs has seemed not to have touched the atom at all?

With the atom, time is suspended. The bombs have grown bigger and far more numerous, and the daily confrontation of antagonist nuclear forces therefore more terrifying. But I do not see that there has been any essential change in thinking about the atom since the end of World War II—change of the kind that—for good or bad—has revolutionized so many other areas of human activity.

First we had the bomb, and then—rather quickly—the Russians had it, too. And so we produced a superbomb, a thermonuclear bomb: the Russians were not slow to respond with their own superbombs. As E. B. White, our greatest essayist, puts it: "Bomb begets bomb. A begets H. Anything you can build I can build bigger." And so the story has gone.

The story of nuclear weapons is not one of change in a world of change, but essentially one of repetition—a circle in which we and the Russians have gone round and round, chasing each other's tails, year after year after year. This is the source of our despair, of our frustration, of our fear. We seem to remain locked in the same cell of circumstance—the Russians and ourselves together—with only a remote hope of emerging ever.

Now, of course, I do not pretend to have any final answers or solutions to the terrible frustrating question that the explosive atom poses for all civilization. Indeed, I do not believe that there are any such satisfying and complete answers. What I am going to try to do in these discussions, essentially, is to suggest that there is hope—but we have been looking for it in the wrong places.

I propose with you to examine our basic outlook and policies, and if we find we are clinging to what is irrelevant in 1963—in short, rubbish of another time and world—I say we should face up to that fact. A new approach, a new perspective fitted to the world as it is, is sorely needed. And one of the first steps, surely, toward such a new outlook is for the world to begin to own up to its failures, to jettison its outmoded ideas.

As to most of our atomic ideas, inherited almost intact and unchanged from another epoch, the words of President Kennedy at Yale last spring have a terrible relevance: "Mythology distracts us everywhere * * * we must move on," he said—about economics, but with even greater pertinence to our outlook on the atom. "We must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult but essential confrontation with reality."

Let us then try to confront the realities of the atom. Let us question our basic assumptions about nuclear weapons and peace.

In such confrontation we shall find, as I shall seek to show later, that a whole series of the basic premises that only a few years ago were considered beyond challenge or question have already been abandoned; that they are now part of the mythology of the atom which only serves to distract us from the realities. I propose that we also examine and challenge our current assumptions and premises, to see if some of them, too, should not be relegated to the limbo of outmoded or unsound ideas.

Now is the time—perhaps the first time for more than a decade—when it is possible to undertake such a reexamination in an atmosphere in which fundamental questions can be asked with a fair chance that they will be treated with an open mind. Why do I say this? Because the cocksureness has gone out of most of us. Our mounting frustration with the course we have taken and the assumptions on which it is based makes us now ready, even eager to reconsider and think afresh. Whether this may not also be true of the Russian leaders I have of course no way of knowing, but it is always a possibility.

The basic atomic weapons policy of the United States almost from the beginning days of Hiroshima has been based upon a fundamental but quite understandable misapprehension.

What is the essence of this great misapprehension? It is this: that because the Atom is such a uniquely powerful force for destruction, a revolutionary kind of destructive power, that in dealing with it we must divorce it, set it apart from everything the human race had previously learned about man's behavior, about war and peace, about our institutions, about foreign policy, about military matters, about science. This simply isn't so. Bit by bit, and case by case, as I shall remind you later in these lectures, we have already learned, the hard way, that it isn't so. But being misled by this belief in the special status of the powerful Atom we have increasingly brought upon ourselves frustration after frustration.

Why did this misapprehension take so firm a hold of us? Perhaps it was the dramatic, destructive, sudden way in which we first learned of this new force. We know that the more gradual advent of electricity revolutionized our entire way of life; that the automotive engine has brought a revolution in our way of living; that the electron revolutionized our whole scheme of communication, and with it our culture. And yet in these and similar cases these new discoveries were not divorced from all previous experience. They were somehow adapted and incorporated into the whole fabric of the life of man. Not so the atom.

The fantastic destructive power of the atom is a reality. The conclusions drawn from this fact are myths.

Those myths are still at the foundation of our policies and our outlook.

It is time to challenge our basic premises and the corollaries which flow from them. I want specifically to challenge the premise which has become common to our policy of the ways to avoid and avert nuclear war.

I would state that underlying policy in this way: That the chief and indeed the only solution to the problems raised by nuclear weapons lies within the field of nuclear weapons.

How badly this has worked out we know only too well. First we placed our faith in our U.S. monopoly of the A-bomb.

Then, when the monopoly vanished—and vanish it did all too soon—and the hope of international control became ever more remote, we still put our faith in bombs, but they had to be bigger and bigger: the H-bomb. Then this reliance upon even bigger bombs failed us when the Russians duplicated our H-bombs. Weapons proved a source of frustration, not an answer, a stopgap, perhaps, but not the once fervently embraced "solution" of an American pax atomica.

All these positions, I think, had essentially the same foundation—a preoccupation with atomic weapons themselves as the key to world peace, to world government, to the containment of communism, or to the maintenance, if not of peace, or peace of mind, to a kind of world stability.

Let us take a look at our present policies. They are also founded on that same major premise: That the primary answer to the dangers of nuclear warfare are to be found almost exclusively within the area of nuclear weapons.

The first of these current premises is this: We must maintain a powerful nuclear force; this should be combined with a strengthening of overall conventional military forces, but with the predominant emphasis by all odds upon nuclear weapons. This includes weapons in large numbers, and of very great power (although here the H-bomb euphoria of 1950 about the virtues of increasing the destructive power of individual weapons seems to be declining). It now certainly emphasizes delivery systems capable of putting these weapons on targets and keeping them as nearly invulnerable to enemy attack as possible.

A nuclear shield does not by any manner of means provide a complete answer, for security or peace. But it is the only military alternative that, at the present, is open to us.

Our present thinking lays great stress on the idea of mutual deterrent; that is, that peace can be kept by nuclear weapons where each of the antagonists is strong enough in these weapons to destroy the other. To put it more explicitly, the argument is that nuclear weapons are a step toward peace if the United States and the Soviet Union are both so strongly armed that it is too hazardous to their objectives for either side to make use of them. Under this doctrine neither antagonist can allow the other to outdistance him in nuclear weapons; otherwise the deterrent or stalemate may not be effective.

There would seem to be something of an anomaly here; namely, that vast effort should be put into the development and production of weapons so powerful that they can never be used. Anomalous or not, I myself see no present alternative to maintaining our nuclear shield. In any case the premise of building up nuclear arms so great as to be unusable as an instrument for the waging of war is basic in the West, and it would appear one equally firmly held by the Soviet Union.

Here again the premise is that we avoid nuclear war by what we do with nuclear weapons.

The second basic premise upon which we now erect our hopes for peace moves in what would appear to be the opposite direction, though paradoxically parallel and concurrent to the first premise or policy. It too is preoccupied and centered upon nuclear weapons.

The best hope, so this premise states, of preventing worldwide nuclear war is by putting an end to the arms competition, through a negotiated program of disarmament with the U.S.S.R. The current proposals by both the United States and the Soviet Union have been couched in language of a program of general and total disarmament, but the crucial phase deals with nuclear weapons.

Eliminating nuclear weapons and the means to carry them is now held out as the great last chance.

Giving higher priority to disarmament through negotiation rather than priority to the diverse multiple means of ameliorating the causes of distrust and animosity is a doctrine that I feel is not only quite unrealistic but dangerous to the goals disarmament negotiations seek to reach. It is a doctrine that rests upon the mistaken premise of the isolation of the explosive atom from the rest of human affairs, its elevation to some almost mystical special status. This separation of the atom from the whole range of human affairs has resulted in a narrowing of our outlook, so that we do not clearly see the broad spectrum of rapid human change going on in the world. A world of change is a world of hope, if we do not allow our preoccupation with nuclear weapons to chill our creativeness and weaken our will in other areas outside weapons.

The road to eliminating war using nuclear weapons then is said to be disarmament.

I say "said to be" because this is the official verbal position of the great powers, and the great tranquilizer for the anxious lay citizen, on our side and perhaps both sides of the curtain of iron. Draft treaties by the United States and the U.S.S.R. calling for such general disarmament lie before the negotiators at Geneva; in this country dozens of technical studies to support our proposal are underway.

The Russians for years have lost no opportunity to propose in general terms the early goal of general disarmament, as years ago they initiated the transparently unacceptable ban-the-bomb cure for world tensions. The United States, following this lead, has also put forward a proposal for step-by-step general disarmament. A special agency in our Government on disarmament is in existence. For several years the Russians and ourselves (as chief parties) have been at the conference table at Geneva on what is described as a first step in disarmament, that is, an attempt to agree not to test nuclear weapons.

It is not decisive—and not a bit surprising—that these disarmament efforts have not thus far produced agreement, though it is possible that some form of agreement on testing—or a de facto suspension—may be within reach. What is more significant, I suggest, is that the discussions themselves have increased, and are likely to continue to increase rather than diminish ill will and distrust. Our willingness to negotiate (and to make one concession after another, as we have) has not increased the Russians' confidence in us. It has certainly not increased our confidence in their intentions. Our representatives have been forced openly and explicitly to say that the Russians are using disarmament talks to gain time for military advantage, and we say much the same thing about their good faith and aggressive intentions.

From time to time—as in the past—Chairman Khrushchev will make some dramatic disarmament move, couched in conciliatory terms. This will, if the past is any measure, encourage a belief among many people that disarmament is in truth a real hope. As a consequence, there will once more be a diminution of vigor and faith and public interest in those more prosaic measures for peace that lie outside the area of weapons. The Russians have done this more than once before, Chairman Khrushchev coming to the United States at one time for that purpose. It is bound to happen again in a somewhat different form, perhaps at Geneva and possibly soon.

But it is my opinion that, whatever the motive, such proffers, while they will stir hopes in an anxious world, will prove to be another source of disillusion, another diversion and dilution of the priority that should go to other means of bringing peace, and a cause of added frustration and anger. The underlying animosities will not be diminished thereby; on the contrary. The negotiations at Geneva, although conducted by able and patient men, have not, in my opinion, improved the prospects for avoiding nuclear disaster, but have subtracted from the prospects of peace.

Why should we continue the official rhetoric that the U.S.S.R. or the United States seriously expects major disarmament in the near future? The acts of rearmament of both our governments look the other way. We were never farther from a peaceful mood than in the midst of this disarmament rhetoric, on both sides. This is not necessarily for lack of sincerity as to goals. Certainly neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. wants war or wants to go on spending vast sums on armament. But in any case the formal position of both governments places serious steps in disarmament highest on their officially stated priorities, so we must consider it a major premise.

But there are other reasons why we must consider the current negotiations for disarmament with the utmost seriousness, and question them if we feel, as I do, that they should be challenged. For whether the negotiators believe there will be consequential affirmative results of their efforts or not, they are necessarily prisoners of a commitment, an emotional commitment to their premise which I regard as a mirage, a myth, the myth that hope for eliminating war lies chiefly or solely in eliminating weapons of war. This premise may sooner or later pervade American public opinion and reach the minds of average men and women who are, as compared to the disarmament negotiators and experts, uninformed and unsophisticated in the realities of his issue. (That the Russians may be counting on this very gambit can be reasonably drawn from a reading of the views of a man long familiar with Soviet military thinking, Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, in a recent issue of Harper's Magazine.)

The average American may regard Geneva and the endless meetings as a necessary propaganda fix we are in, since we cannot allow the Russians to say that we do not want disarmament and that, therefore, we do not want peace. The average man and the conscientious realistic public servant may fully realize that the negotiations at the time are futile. Yet the feeling is widespread, I would judge, among very well-motivated people that such negotiations are the only hope, so must be continued, however slender the prospects. But here, I fear, is the heart of the danger. That adherence to the myth that the only hope is disarmament (or "arms control" as it is sometimes called) becomes such an emotional fixation as to blind us to what other things there are to do that are do-able.

We got into this negotiating fix about arms I suggest, because of our adherence to the basic premise that cause the confusion and frustration, the premise that the roots of the problem of war are the weapons of war, that to eliminate them is the primary road to peace.

I know of nothing in modern experience and history that supports the thesis that disarmament in itself brings peace. Nor do I believe that it is "inevitable" that a continuance of the arms race must lead to nuclear war. This is a kind of "either-or" outlook that to me is at odds with everything we know or ought to know about human affairs. In this world nothing seems inevitable—good or bad—except the process of change. And, more affirmatively, I ask you to consider whether the prospects for changes that will make nuclear armaments less relevant, that will minimize the risk that they will be used, or any arms used, is not far greater if we give the highest priorities of statesmanship and public attention to those changes which further the slow, but I believe, sure growth of community among men, for here is the true disarmament.

I repeat, it is not the nuclear weapons that are at the center of our problems. It is man. Nuclear weapons in Canada, say, are no threat to us; the same weapons at the same distance, in Cuba, are a desperate threat. The difference is not in the presence of weapons but the purposes of the men behind them—their motives, their grievances, the desperation of their leaders because of internal pressures, the poverty of their people, and so on—in short the whole bundle of human emotional combustibles which cause war.

I have a deep confidence that in time the world will find ways of composing most differences and conflicts without war. But conflicts and competition and struggle and the impulse to use force we shall always have to contend with: they are built into the nature of man himself. Even the followers of Ghandi are forced to see this. After the Chinese invasion, Prime Minister Nehru is reported to have said of the Indians: "We were getting out of touch with realities in the modern world. We were living in an atmosphere of our own creation and we have been shaken out of it." But built into the nature of man himself are also God-like qualities of reason, of compassion, of compromise and of love, not only for his own family but for the family of men.

The crucial question is not whether we are for or against disarmament, for or against peace. What we must ask ourselves carefully and critically is whether negotiation about disarmament at this time is for or is against the interests of peace, for or against the ultimate prospects of true disarmament.

There are four chief concerns I have about continuation or resumption of general or nuclear disarmament negotiations at this time with the Soviet Union; they can be summarized in this way:

First. High priority given to negotiations for disarmament treaties at this time, such as those pending in Geneva add to the risks of disaster. For they provide the tinder for an increase rather than a decrease in acute animosities, distrust, tensions, and confrontations, at almost the worst possible time, with no likelihood of an offsetting gain for peace to balance against the taking of such added risks.

Second. A disarmament treaty, now, between the Soviet Union and the United States and the West would leave the warlike Chinese in a position of power dangerous to world peace; even a serious prospect that both the great powers might disarm could be disturbing to peace-loving peoples in Asia, under the shadow of China.

Third. Disarmament negotiations, that is a preoccupation with weapons, distract and dilute our energies and attention from those multiple, diverse ways and means of strengthening bit by bit the sense of community and commonalty of interest in the world in which lies the real hope of making weapons less relevant. This is a concern I shall address myself to more fully in the second lecture.

Fourth. If negotiations for disarmament are undertaken seriously under current conditions they are unrealistic. Therefore, they have the infirmities and dangers of any escape from reality in a tough and changing world. And if they are not undertaken seriously, but as propaganda moves, they have the risk of any transparent maneuver: little hope of gain for peace, and real danger of moral injury.

A few comments on my first stated concern: That negotiations now, at the wrong time and under the wrong circumstances, can and do increase the very anxieties, tensions, and animosities they are designed to diminish.

No need to get into the technicalities of the months and years of the negotiations. Take one instance only. Ironically, this instance arises out of the sole issue of principle on which the United States and the U.S.S.R. have reached verbal agreement.

In September 1961 Ambassadors McCloy and Zorin agreed for their Governments—and I quote a portion of the central clause—that "all measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or groups of states gain military advantage," as a consequence of disarmament measures.

How can these bitter antagonists discuss a balance of military force, as between them, so that the discussion will make any sense at all, without disclosing to the other what is the state of their arms at the time of the balancing process? And information, in sufficiently revealing detail to mean anything, about the state of their arms, inevitably discloses to knowledgeable men their war plans and military policies. War policies and plans are a nation's most sensitive area, making the controversial "on-site" inspection of underground tests seem innocuous indeed by comparison. And how can discussion of balance make any sense unless the disclosures and representations of the two parties of their present arms are subjected to verification by the other side? The incentive for lying, or saber-rattling to impress the other side, would be brought to a new high point if such a discussion got very far. What a bagful of furies the specific discussion of such propositions might unleash. What acute anxieties it would stir. How much nearer this could bring us to the point of no return.

There are more than a few instances growing out of the negotiations of disarmament and of the test ban that have led to, and will continue to lead to, provocative and dangerous charges of bad faith, on both sides. These are directed not just against the negotiators, but inevitably challenge the honor and intentions of the heads of state and their chief civilian and military officers. Repeatedly calling into question the honesty and intentions of a great power, in the ugly temper of the present, inflicts wounds that fester. When the dispute in negotiation is fishery rights, say, that is one thing. But where the questions are those of life and death that are involved in disarmament discussions, that is quite another matter; for, while these talks go on, the very subjects of discussion—their nuclear missiles, and ours—are pointed toward each other night and day. Under these conditions an accusation that impugns an antagonist's basic intentions about those very weapons increases the risk that the trigger will be pulled by design or in panic, since such an accusation may well be construed as the signal for attack, forcing what a military man might readily justify as anticipatory retaliation.

Thus the very discussions intended by both sides to diminish distrust and promote better relations can produce mutual crises of confidence—grave, acute, and even explosive.

Turning to a discussion of my second stated concern, the absence of China from the conference table.

The discussions about disarmament have assumed two antagonists. A commitment, therefore, on the part of the Soviet Union for disarmament is presumed, under this doctrine, to encompass wholly one side of the balance of power, and the same is to be said of the West. But the fluidity of the world is such that the Soviet Union may not even now be able to speak for the countries that are or may be major threats to peace. It is almost certain today that the Soviet Union would be unable to commit China to disarmament. With the West and the Soviet disarmed the Chinese could make a mockery of the very objective of disarmament: peace in the world. If the Soviet did in fact disarm, and China did not, would the peace-loving Indians regard this as a step toward peace? Of course not.

If any further evidence of the unreality of Geneva were needed, the absence of China would supply it. Can one conceive of the U.S.S.R. disarming, except as a token, without China included? Can anyone expect us to do that, either? Of course not. Would any person now want the United States and U.S.S.R. to disarm, with the warlike Chinese on the move?

On the other side (but to a lesser degree) it is far from clear that the United Kingdom and the United States could now speak for the Republic of France on a disarmament program, perhaps even on a test ban, certainly not until France fully establishes herself as a nuclear power.

Disarmament now, as a principal reliance for peace, has the inherent defect: that unless it is well-nigh universal it increases the power for mischief of those who are unwilling to disarm, or who change sides, from being friends to being enemies. In our own time we have seen almost overnight, shifts in who is enemy and who is friend. On one day the strongest military nation in Europe, the German Reich, was on the friendliest terms with Russia, and on the following day, waging war with her. For hundreds of years the people of China and the people of India regarded themselves as brothers. As I speak to you, they are engaged in war. Ten years ago we, the United States, insisted on a provision in the Japanese constitution against a Japanese military establishment. It was not long thereafter that we were complaining bitterly that the Japanese were slow in rearming themselves.

If the pieces on the armament chessboard are moving with such unpredictable rapidity, is this not a dangerous time to engage in serious negotiations with the Soviet Union about complete and total disarmament; is this a time when anything but continued futility, frustration, and increased hostility can come out of such negotiations?

My third category of concern I have reserved for the succeeding lecture on change and hope.

My fourth concern is that negotiation is unrealistic, if it is founded on the belief, on either side, that general and total disarmament, or even major reduction in arms can come out of negotiations at this time.

Suppose it is clearly futile; what harm does it do, one is asked, to negotiate with the Soviet on their offer of peaceful coexistence and their offer to negotiate for an immediate general and total disarmament?

The chief harm is that this preoccupation with getting rid of weapons, as I have said, is a basically wrong premise. But there is the harm that inheres in the fact, as I believe, that disarmament now is not realistic.

We have been through just such periods of unreality and wishful thinking in recent years—the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of Camp David, the illusions of the summit meeting formula for peace. The spring of 1960 we had just been through 2 years of this fantasy. What I wrote at that time, unchanged, expresses as well as I can today the risks of unrealism.

In an article in the New York Times for May 15, 1960, I said: "The sure road to war is to live in fantasy, in a world that does not exist * * *. It is through such a dream world that the West has been passing. During this incredible period, however, the hard-bitten, realistic and aggressive Communists were softening up our American resolution—their prime target.

"They flooded us with horror stories of mutual suicide by atomic warfare and alluring but empty offers of peaceful coexistence, total disarmament and an end to nuclear weapons.

"There is a wealth of impressive evidence that the American people can face hard, cruel, and disappointing facts, and can act with vigor, toughness, tenacity, and firmness.

"It was American firmness and readiness to face up to facts that helped get the Red Army out of Iran, that rebuilt our Armed Forces and thereby kept the Chinese out of South Korea, that saved Greece and Turkey, that helped produce a peace treaty for Austria, that saved Berlin by amazing airlift. On almost any of these acts of resolution the Soviet might have gone to war. They didn't."

If I were writing this today rather than May 1960 I would not change this language except to add the crises of Cuba to the list.

Resuming: "A peace that is no peace, a thaw that is no warming up * * *, this is not the road to peace. On the contrary, it is the road to disaster."

And then this final paragraph of that article. "There is as yet no evidence that facing up to reality in dealing with the Soviet adds to the risks that already exist. My own opinion is that the greatest risk of all would be to continue to nurse the illusion that international tension is relaxed because we ourselves have been relaxing."

I find that there are not a few thoughtful people who say to justify futile and ill-timed negotiations: "While you are talking you're not shooting."

I wonder. I recall that the Japanese emissaries were still talking to Secretary Hull while their bombardiers were blasting our fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Or take a very recent case. On October 30, 1962, the Indian Ambassador to the United States issued a statement to his countrymen here concerning China's attack on India. "From the very beginning of this (border) dispute we had never stinted any effort to arrive at a peaceful solution through negotiation. While talking of negotiations China has prepared for aggression and has now launched a totally unprovoked massive armed invasion against us."

Talking is not always synonymous with not shooting, by any means.

Talking around a conference table unless the parties have something specific to say, something that is feasible and that will be supported by their people back home has little to commend it.

Suppose there were agreement with my thesis that general disarmament negotiations now cannot produce a treaty, and that to continue them is to incur risks with no direct offsetting gains. Still the question remains, can we withdraw from these negotiations without giving the Soviets a propaganda victory? Aren't we stuck with these negotiations indefinitely, however futile, however risky, because there is no way to get out? Wouldn't our withdrawal adversely affect our status with the so-called neutral or inbetween nations and peoples?

These are questions that only the President and the Secretary of State can competently judge, looking at the scales upon which all the factors have been weighed.

The critical question, as I see it, is not immediate withdrawal, or an indefinite recess of the Geneva Conferences. What is crucial, I believe, is that we should not allow our participation in disarmament discussions to become such a deep preoccupation, such a strong emotional commitment, that it blinds or beguiles the average man so he cannot face the facts of how utterly remote and dangerous these negotiations are at this time. What is of central importance is that whether these talks continue or not, they do not distract our attention and dilute our energies away from the less dramatic, the multiple, diverse and far more realistic roads to peace, which have nothing directly to do with disarmament.

We should guard against the not inconsiderable risk that we shall be wedded to a disarmament doctrine evolved by technical experts whose deserved prestige as technical men obscures the underlying issues, which are not technical. Laymen are too readily impressed and feel inferior in the presence of specialists whose concepts and even whose words we cannot comprehend. A scientist, reviewing a book by a high priest of the emerging cult of disarmament technical experts recently reminded his readers, "That Department of Defense consultants back to the Delphic Oracle and before have consciously or unconsciously commanded respect by emphasizing the subtlety of their expertise and the dignity of their research organizations."

At the close of the Second World War in complete good faith we occupied ourselves with programs for the nuclear disarmament of the victorious alliance, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the U.S.S.R. How adversely this preoccupation with weapons—continued since that time—eroded the relations between the members of that alliance no man can yet assess. But we can say that the disarmament movement after the First World War did produce disastrous results. One of the brilliant apostles of disarmament after World War I was the man who is now America's most respected political analyst, Mr. Walter Lippman. In a book written in 1943[1] he explained why he had been wrong in crusading for disarmament. I ask you to ponder Mr. Lippman's words and decide for yourselves whether or not they are relevant to the problem we have faced ever since the end of World War II:

"In the interval between the two Great Wars the United States sought to promote peace by denouncing war, even by outlawing it, and by disarming itself, Great Britain and France * * * the disinterested and idealistic theory of disarmament was that if everyone had less capacity to wage war, there would be a smaller likelihood of war. Big warships meant big wars. Smaller warships meant smaller wars. No warships might eventually mean no wars * * *. On the theory that disarmament could promote peace, laborious negotiations and elaborate diplomacy and splendid international conferences were promoted in Washington, Geneva, and London. * * * It soon transpired that though the premise of these conferences was that smaller armaments would banish war, the working premise of all the Governments was that each of the former allies was now the rival, and therefore the potential enemy, of all the others. The disarmament movement was, as the event has shown, tragically successful in disarming the nations that believed in disarmament. The net effect was to dissolve the alliance among the victors of the First World War, and to reduce them to almost disastrous impotence."

We must deal with the world as it is, we must begin from there, and thence move toward the noble goals of peace to which we all aspire. Competition, passion, hate, love, imagination—all the factors that make up everyday living—are among the essential components of the most sensitive human problem man has ever sought to solve.

What I have to say about the dangers and risks of disarmament, highly controversial I know, are necessary to weigh before we can think clearly about an affirmative alternative to these current risks of negotiations toward disarmament. It is only then we will be ready to think in new terms and new dimensions.

Therefore, even if I had no affirmative suggestions to offer, I would hope that calling attention to the mythology of disarmament negotiations serves a useful purpose.

I have said that our chief hope for peace is not in an attack on weapons but in other areas of life in the fluid world of 1963. To an elaboration of the basis of this thesis I shall return in the succeeding lecture.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One minute will be sufficient.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to reinforce what the distinguished minority leader has said. Any Member can object to any committee's meeting during the session of the Senate with the exception of the Appropriations Committee. I would do exactly the same thing on this side, if I were requested by Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, as he has done in compliance with the request made by the Members on his side of the aisle.

In view of the situation which arose prior to the end of the debate on yesterday on the pending bill, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Dominick amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in my opinion, the amendment I am presenting today, which deals with a subject different from the ones discussed yesterday and voted on this morning and on yesterday, is probably as important as any single provision in the bill. As the bill is now written, as it came out of the Commerce Committee, it contains a provision in subsection (c), on page 17, which states that before a grant may be given to a transit company, the schedule of rates to be approved by the Administrator must be submitted and agreed to. This is fine. There is no objection to this, I am sure, by most of the membership here.

The language then provides that if the rates are thereafter changed and the Administrator in his own discretion determines that is going to be adverse to repayment of the loan or grant or revenues that may be involved in the transit company, he has the right to notify the body that has put the rates into existence and cut off all further loans to this particular body, or grants, as it may be—but not only to cut them off on the transit authority, but cut off further commitments under the Housing and Home Finance Agency within the particular area so affected.

I think every Senator ought to know what it means. This means that one man, the Administrator, could cut off all urban planning grants, urban studies, housing research, transportation activities which are involved in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, urban transportation assistance, open space land grants, low income housing demonstration programs, farm housing research, public facilities loans, public works planning, urban renewal funds, community disposal operations, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and all the operations which it conducts, the Federal Housing Administration and all the operations it conducts, and the Public Housing Administration.

So, in effect, if this bill is permitted to remain in its present form, it makes the Administrator in the mass transit program the complete arbiter of all other Federal programs in the area where a grant has been made and where rates may thereafter be changed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator be good enough to state what his amendment does, and then permit me to make further comment?

Mr. DOMINICK. My amendment would strike out, on page 17, the last sentence of subsection (c), which would eliminate the power of the Administrator, but which would still let him appear in any public utility hearing there might be on a rate change in order to present his viewpoint and what the rate change might involve so far as a future loan or grant to this agency is concerned.

---

[1] "U.S. Foreign Policy," Little Brown & Co., 1943.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that, as a member of the Commerce Committee, I voted against the amendment in the bill, as did one other member of the committee on this side of the aisle, who is not at the moment present on the floor, because I felt, as the Senator did, that the language of the amendment that was adopted in committee virtually makes a czar of the Administrator, and permits him to have penal power, in effect, far beyond what is necessary or relevant to the particular measure now pending. I did support other amendments in committee, such as the one which forbids back-door financing, and sends the bill through the normal process of authorization and appropriation.

I would rather see the entire amendment stricken from the bill. What I am not entirely clear about is how far the amendment of the Senator from Colorado goes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. What I would strike out is the last sentence which reads as follows:

> Thereafter the Administrator shall not extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency—

And so forth, down to the end of that sentence.

Therefore, what I am trying to do, and what would be accomplished if the amendment were adopted, is, in effect, to eliminate the power that is given to the Administrator by the Commerce Committee amendment to cut off all other programs in the area.

Mr. SCOTT. I would go even further; but I approve of what the Senator seeks to do, and I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand the language as it now exists in the bill, the Administrator has one sanction, the sanction not to provide funds if the rates are changed. The sanction against which the Senator's amendment is directed is the sanction which to me seems to be quite coercive, and which is a coercive power the Administrator could exercise against a municipality with respect to any decision he might make about the adequacy or appropriateness of rates.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct in part. However, if my amendment is adopted, it would also remove his right to completely cut off any future grants to a transit company merely because of a rate change.

Mr. COOPER. I support the Senator's amendment, because the present language gives the Administrator a power which does not seem to be related in any way to the program, and a power which I believe is coercive.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. I believe it is a little bit like killing a mosquito with a meat ax, if we leave the language in the bill.

There is one other point, which I discussed with the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] on the floor the other day, that this section, if the last sentence of it is left in the bill, in effect gives to the Administrator an indirect veto right over the public utilities commissions of the various States.

Any proposed rate change of a transit body that I know of must go before the public utilities commission of the State affected. All the financial conditions of the public transit authority are gone into by the public utilities commission of that State, and the commission determines whether the proposed new rates will be adequate. These facts would include the provisions for the repayment of any loan or any future subsidies it felt it could get from the Government. All these facts would be presented to the commission. If the commission rendered a decision to the effect that the proposed rate schedule was acceptable, it does not seem to me that thereafter if the transit authority should go to the Administrator he should have the power to say that the public utilities commission of that State was wrong in making the determination that the commission made in the case being considered, and that he should have the right to say, "We will not only cut off future grants to this transit authority, but also all future grants coming under the HHFA in connection with all the other programs involved in that area."

As I understand, what the Commerce Committee was trying to do in its wisdom was to give a weapon to the Administrator to try to make sure that once a grant had been given, the rates would not be changed so as to put the company in the same bad financial position it was in at the beginning.

However, the language in the bill, in this section, goes far beyond the aims and purposes of what was in the mind of the committee, I am sure. This creates a czar with power not only over transit but also over public housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, farm housing, low cost housing demonstration programs, and everything else under the jurisdiction of the HHFA Administrator, because the language provides that the Administrator "shall not extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sympathetic toward the Senator's amendment insofar as it seeks to restrict the ambit of the Administrator's authority to qualify assistance to public mass transit systems. I would support the Senator's amendment if it were limited to eliminating the coercive power of the Administrator over housing and other grants and loans. I am concerned about an inability to do anything about a diminution of security for a loan. The rate schedule represents the dollars and cents basis upon which a loan or grant is made. If this is swept away through action of a State or municipal agency, how do we protect what seems to be the honest and best judgment in these situations?

Mr. DOMINICK. This language applies to grants, not to loans. What it does now is to say to the Administrator that he cannot give any further assistance if they have made a change in their rates so that in the opinion of the Administrator the company will not be able to operate properly in the future. This would mean that the transit company, if it came back to the Administrator and said, "We want further grants, because we have not received all we want," he could say, "No, we will not give it to you."

What it does is to say that the transit company is required to abide by the judgment of the Administrator regardless of what the PUC of the State has done, if they want to get any further assistance after they put into effect a rate schedule which has been approved by the State agency.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that the Senator has described the classic case. I believe the classic case would be an agreement by the Administrator to give annual grants to enable a mass transportation system to function. Let us assume that one grant had been made for the year 1963. Let us assume that the rate schedule was changed by the Public Utilities Commission for the year 1964, and that a contractual obligation exists for the Administrator to make a grant in 1964, which contractual obligation he undertook based upon a previous rate schedule.

Would the Senator's amendment prevent the Administrator from denying the additional advance because the contract for the rate schedule was changed to the detriment of the operation of the whole system?

Mr. DOMINICK. As I interpret this language, it would not make any difference whether my amendment were adopted or not, because if a firm commitment had been made, the Administrator could not cut it off.

What I am trying to do by eliminating the last sentence is to provide that the Administrator may not overrule the decision of the PUC; nor can he say that he is the determinator of whether wholly different programs will go into effect in the area involved.

Mr. JAVITS. Then what does the Senator construe this section to mean? Does he construe it to mean that it gives the Administrator punitive power, even though he is not committed to make any loan or advance anyhow?

Mr. DOMINICK. It gives him punitive power because of the power of the Federal dollar. The Senator from New York knows, I know, and the rest of us know, that a large number of programs are now in the planning stage. If the Administrator can say, "Unless the transit body changes its rate schedule to fit my particular ideas—I being the Administrator—the community will not get any programs or any type of help, such as urban renewal or slum clearance," then, in effect, we shall have given to the Administrator power far beyond what I understand the bill originally intended.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator will reserve enough time so that when the explanation is made by the Senators in charge of the bill, he may be able to comment upon the contingencies which they will allegedly be trying to set forth.

I thank the Senator for his answers.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I do not know how much time I have remaining, but I should like to reserve the rest of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I understood the Senator to say that in the event the bill were passed in its present form and the Administrator made a determination as specified in the part which the Senator would omit, then every other commitment that might be made under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any law administered thereunder, could be cut off.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I did, I misspoke. I certainly did not intend to say that. I intended to say that if the Administrator made a determination that a new rate schedule was adverse, he could then say to the city or area involved, "You will not get any future assistance for any program in this area unless you help us to require the transit body to change its rate schedules."

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Colorado is correct. I am glad he has corrected the record to show that the proposal would not cut off any other commitment; because, if commitments have been made, they are specifically excluded.

Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that this section would prohibit any other relief being granted under the farm housing program?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is one of the laws administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. CANNON. Did the Senator also say that the section would preclude any further assistance under the FNMA program and the Federal housing program?

Mr. DOMINICK. No, I do not believe I said that.

Mr. CANNON. The record discloses that those three programs were in the list enumerated by the Senator. I should like to ask him if it is his understanding that assistance would be discontinued under the farm housing program, the FNMA program, and the Federal housing program, if the bill in its present form were passed?

Mr. DOMINICK. The farm housing research program, as I understand; the low-rent housing program; the Federal Housing Administration; and the special assistance functions fund under the Federal National Mortgage Association. I have before me a list of the new obligational authority for expenditures by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It does not give in detail, to the extent I should like to have it indicate, the actual laws which are administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is my understanding of the laws to be covered by the provision I am seeking to strike.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask if the Senator has in mind making the record clear that this would not include programs not referred to as area programs involving local governments or agencies thereof?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, perhaps the distinguished Senator from Nevada should use his own time. Then I could ask him some questions, and we would not run out of time so fast.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado yield the floor?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield the floor, but I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. By way of explanation, the section recommended by the Committee on Commerce is, in effect, a control measure to insure that a local public body which comes before the Federal Government for assistance does not make a project recommendation and then go back and renege on its representation to the Federal Government. That is purely and simply what the provision states, as we have drafted it in subsection (c). If the amendment of the Senator from Colorado were adopted, there would be no control of the local public body once they had got their grant on notification by the Administrator, if the local public body should renege on the program they had presented.

We feel that this is the minimum that could be required. In the explanation as set forth in the report of the Committee on Commerce, page 10, we state:

> This is a new section which would require the local governing bodies to adhere to the project justification which they presented to the Administrator, and on the basis of which a grant was authorized.

If the transit authority does not ask for a Federal grant and represent that it is going to do certain things, this section would not apply to it at all:

> The applicant would have to include in its justification a proposed schedule of fares, under which the transit system would be able to continue to operate on a sound economic basis.

The Senator's amendment simply provides that if a plan is presented which shows that their schedule of fares would not permit them to operate on a sound economic basis, but on that basis a grant was made to the local body, and it then cut back and said, "We are not going to follow this schedule of fares which we have presented to the Federal Government, and on which our grant was based," the Administrator would notify it that it was proceeding on an uneconomic basis. If this were factually determined, and were not a finding at the whim of the Administrator, as some have indicated, thereafter, unless the Administrator had notified the local public body that it had been granted compensatory relief, the local public body might elect to lower the fares and grant a direct subsidy, which could be done under the bill, which would not justify the Administrator in withholding further action.

The report is clear in that it states:

> If corrective action (which might involve various forms of relief including a direct local subsidy) is not taken, the Administrator shall cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA (except pursuant to prior commitments) for projects in the area involved.

I note that exception specifically because of the question which was raised by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

If continued, I submit that this would not authorize the Administrator to discontinue any commitment that had heretofore been entered into on a contractual basis or any other basis.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As the Senator knows, I favor the bill. I have fought to help to bring it out of committee. I must say that I am not very happy about the punitive aspects of the bill.

As the Senator has said, "Thereafter, the Administrator shall not extend any assistance" under the act "to finance in whole or in part" such projects. I think that is entirely justifiable. I would be with the Senator on that point.

But I must say that the idea of extending the ambit of punishment to the laws with respect to housing and community facilities and other matters is a little unusual, under our law. I think it places a strain upon the bill which is really more than it ought to bear.

For instance, on the next page of the bill, there is provided a possibility to qualify for additional grants after 3 years. That is the kind of thing I would want to cut off. But I am very much concerned about extending the ambit of this power to other laws because they happen to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. We might just as well include any other Administrator; they are all under the same Federal Government.

Can the Senator tell us what was the rationale in extending the provision and going so far afield?

Mr. CANNON. I am advised that the HHFA does exactly this at the present time when it is a matter of administrative determination rather than a matter of law.

We are attempting to write the practice into law. If an applicant comes before the HHFA and makes a representation and then does not follow out the representation, and then comes in under another law administered by HHFA, the first thing the HHFA will do will be to check to see if the local public body is living up to the agreements it made in the first instance. If it is not, I am advised that the HHFA at present would withhold further assistance.

But we felt that as an insuring provision, this should be written in, as a matter of law, in order to put the local public bodies on notice, so they would not say, "We are going to represent that this is our project plan, and we will carry out the plan until we get the money. But once we get the money, if we then decide, for any reason, that we want to reduce the fares, we will do that, even though it makes our operation uneconomical, and even though we may not take other compensatory action."

If they took other compensatory action—for example, such as a direct grant—then, as I have indicated, the Administrator would have no concern, because we would wish to be sure the operation was economically sound. But that responsibility would be imposed on them before the grant was made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Administrator has that authority now, on an administrative basis, this measure would be changing it, because it would be making it mandatory. The Senator from Nevada is well aware of the legal maxim, "Special cases make bad law." In short, I think the fact that the Administrator now has that flexibility is good, rather than bad; and I would hate to see the Administrator straitjacketed in such a way that he would have to deny all forms of relief, even if justified in a particular case.

Mr. CANNON. This matter has been tested, from the point of view of whether the Administrator of the HHFA now has that legal authority; and he is doing this.

Mr. JAVITS. But this provision would be improved by using the word "may," instead of the word "shall." The use of the word "shall" would be a mandate; and I must say that I cannot agree as to that.

Mr. CANNON. Would the use of the word "may" remove the Senator's objection? We are not particularly wedded to the use of this language. But I would be unalterably opposed to removing all limitations from the local public bodies, once they obtained the grants, and thus let them use the Federal funds in a fashion which might not be economically sound.

If the Senator from New York would accept the word "may," rather than the word "shall," I would be inclined to give that consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to consider that for a few minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask several questions.

We have been assuming that the grant will have been given under representations made by the local public body. Then the provision reads as follows:

> If, at any time after the making of such grant with respect to such project, a change is effected in such schedule—

And so forth.

How long will that remain in effect? How long will the Administrator have the right to say, "This is a frozen schedule, and any change you make will be adverse, in my opinion, to the original plan."

Mr. CANNON. It would remain in effect for the period of the justification which had been presented by the local public body in applying for the grant.

Mr. DOMINICK. Could that be 20 years?

Mr. CANNON. If the local body said so in applying for the justification, it could be 20 years.

Mr. DOMINICK. But if the Administrator does not like it——

Mr. CANNON. That is not the way this provision reads. It states that if the schedule of fares is so altered, after the grant has been received, that the Administrator finds, as a matter of fact, that the transit system will not thereafter be able to operate on a sound and economic basis, then he will give the notification. In other words, the basis throughout is that if the local public body takes action which is not economically sound, then it will be jeopardizing further grants under the HHFA. If it takes action that is financially or economically sound, it will have no problem. If it reduced the rates because, it said, "we can operate on a financially sound basis with a lower rate in effect," that would be fine, and it would not jeopardize the program or its economic soundness.

This is a very clear limitation. It is dependent on economic soundness or unsoundness, which is a matter of fact; and the public bodies determine that fact every day.

Speaking of the public bodies, the Senator said this is an attempt to supersede the public utility commissions of the various States. However, it is not such a provision; and in my opinion it would not affect them one iota. I say that for the reason that many States do not require the local transit bodies to go before the State public service commissions in connection with rate matters; second, this envisions an operation of a local public body, and most of the local public bodies are specifically exempt from having to make application to State public service commissions or public utility commissions in connection with rate matters.

Again I say to the Senator that certainly in carrying out a program, if a local body or a city had to apply to the public service commission, I presume it would submit to the Administrator a schedule of proposed rates, and would say, "We think this is economically sound," because I have never seen a public service commission which would permit rates to be put into effect if it thought them not economically sound. Therefore, we are talking about two roads to the same thing.

Mr. President, for the moment, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to make a few other points because I believe this matter is extremely important.

First of all, the discretion to be given to the Administrator is not limited at all by the wording used. It states:

> If, at any time after the making of such grant with respect to such project, a change is effected in such schedule which the Administrator determines will substantially reduce revenues from the project and lessen the chances for an economically sound operation—

Then these things will go into effect.

Let us consider the words "If, at any time." That could mean, as the wording now stands, that indefinitely in the future the Administrator would have the question of the control over the public assistance would be given to that entire area under any law administered by the HHFA.

Second, I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada as to the question of the control over the public utility commissions. I, myself, do not happen to know of any State which does not regulate the rates of transit companies, particularly intrastate companies. Based on my experience, it seems to me that most of the States do this. The Senator from Nevada may have in mind some specific examples about which I do not know.

But if a public utility commission has said that in its judgment the particular schedule of rates will be sufficient to create a reasonable return on the transit operation which is then in effect, it does not seem to me proper to put the pressure on the mass transit body—the local agency which is running it—and on the public utility commission to deny the schedule of rates solely because of what will happen to other programs in the area served by the transit body.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In listening to this debate, I thought perhaps the idea advanced by my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] should be pursued, and that perhaps that would be a solution of the problem and would be acceptable to all sides; namely, to limit the application of this sentence to assistance under this act, rather than assistance under any law administered by the HHFA.

First, of course, it would be necessary for the sponsor of the amendment to approve of that change; but I wonder what would be the attitude of the floor manager of the bill. Would not the inclusion of these words satisfy the objective the Senator is seeking to attain?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yielded to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have asked the question with some deference because the bill was not reported from my committee. All I know about it is what I have heard while listening to the debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I shall be happy to answer the question.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Nevada so that he may answer.

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to answer the question. The proposed language would not be acceptable for two reasons. First, the aid would already have been granted under the act at the time application of the penal provision—if we can describe it as such—was put into effect. Second, the Administrator exercises that authority now. By use of the proposed language, I would not desire to have it appear that we were limiting his authority specifically, because he exercises broader authority now in his administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency Act. As I have indicated earlier, so far as I know, that authority has not been tested. But we would not want to make it appear that we were placing any such limit on his authority. Therefore that language would not be acceptable. It was considered by the committee in that context, and the committee was not willing to accept it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It seems to me that the funds proposed in the bill would be protected because, as the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, the Administrator possesses discretionary power to deny assistance under the terms of the act. But I do not think we should give him a huge bludgeon to use on local transit authorities who may be seeking to revise their rates in an effort to stimulate more traffic. In the case of an increase in rates to produce more revenue, he might feel that such a raise in rates would result in reduced traffic to the extent that there would be less revenue. I do not believe we should give him a big bludgeon to use on communities which are trying to devise transportation plans.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I should like to point out one other feature of the bill. Under the "bond" section of the bill, on page 15, there appears a specific section which provides:

> That no provisions of this act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to regulate in any manner the mode of operation of any mass rapid transit system or the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed by any State, local public body, or agency thereof.

That is in a wholly different section.

On page 13 of the bill there is exactly the opposite provision. In the next section the Administrator would be authorized, not actually to fix fees, but to use indirect pressure to arrive at the same result. That is a point we failed to recognize when that provision was originally inserted. So there is a conflict within the bill itself. I do not know what the eventual court interpretation of a provision of that kind might be. In any event, it seems to me that an amendment which would merely strike out the sentence on page 17 would be inadequate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was about to suggest that we be allotted a few minutes on the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would appreciate it if the Senator in charge of the bill would hear me on this point. I ask him to consider the following proposed amendment:

> Thereafter, the Administrator may in his discretion refuse to extend any assistance under this or any other law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to such notice) to finance in whole or in part any project to further the purposes of this Act to be undertaken in such area—

I should like to explain very briefly my reason for that proposal. What I am seeking to do is to limit the discretion of the Administrator to housing or any other project which has a relationship to the development of the mass transportation system. That is not a light matter, because a great portion of community facilities, housing, and so forth, could very well be tied in with the effort to create a viable mass transportation system. My aim would then be to give him the maximum latitude possible consistent with what he has a right to do, that is, with the assistance which is contemplated under his act. To leave it so that an Administrator could select a low-cost housing project perhaps 10 miles away, and say, "I am going to deny funds to that project because of the rate schedule," would offend my sense of the balance of statutory law and the kind of authority that we want to have administered. I make that suggestion only because the Senator invited me to see what I could suggest.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to have the Senator in charge of the bill answer the proposal on his own time. However, I should like to make some comments to the distinguished Senator from New York on the proposal. The proposal, as he said, would be a compromise, but still it would not eliminate the basic evil of the section, which is the indirect power which the existence of Federal spending programs in those areas would give to a person who would be about to determine whether or not assistance should or should not be given in that area.

The Administrator might retain power of the kind proposed for a period of 20 or 50 years, or whatever time it may be, or for as long as the project was conceived in its original form when the grant was given. Then, in effect, we would further federalize the country and put additional power into the hands of an Administrator to determine the future course of what is essentially local enterprise. I do not think the amendment of the Senator from New York would solve that particular problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the amendment would confine the authority which would be given to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and would further the purposes of the act. The act has a rather limited life. Projects under it similarly have a limited life. Therefore it would meet the valid objection that power in perpetuity should not be granted. I think it is an effort to give some sanction, without giving a sanction which is out of reason.

Mr. DOMINICK. I know that the Senator from New York is far too intelligent to believe that the measure would have a limited life if it were passed. We still have in effect emergency taxes enacted at the time of World War I. If the bill is passed, we know it would be in effect for many years to come.

Mr. JAVITS. It may or it may not. But at any rate, we could reach the provision again and could remove it if we so desired. If we should decide to continue the program, we would have the option to deal with that provision if, as, and when we decided to extend the measure and the punitive provision beyond the ambit of the act.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to ask one procedural question. If I leave the floor of the Senate now and the debate is concluded, at the time a vote is reached at 2 o'clock, will there be an opportunity to refresh the memories of Senators who will then be ready to vote on the pending question?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado time on the bill for that purpose prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado now has left 4 minutes of the 10 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from Texas on the bill. That 4 minutes could be used by the Senator from Colorado at 2 o'clock. Otherwise, the question of available time would depend upon whether the Senator from Texas would yield additional time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Then, if I may, I shall reserve the 4 minutes until 2 o'clock.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado whatever time he needs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado as well as the Senator from Nevada. I wish very much that we could bring the debate on all the amendments to a conclusion so that we shall not open the debate again at 2 o'clock, or immediately prior to 2 o'clock, if that is possible. I was hopeful that whatever time remained when we finish the debate might be yielded back so that the vote would be the next step effective at 2 o'clock.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it occurs to me that perhaps the Senator from Colorado could use his time immediately before 2 o'clock—say at 1:45 or 1:50.

It is a very difficult situation when Senators must come in to vote, one after another, without really getting an understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it leaves the situation rather ragged to have amendments pending and not completed. However, I shall not raise any further question.

Mr. TOWER. I think raggedness is inherent in the situation when we debate this morning and vote this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree. I shall not insist upon that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield myself 4 minutes at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I listened to the exchange between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with reference to changing the word "shall" to "may." I had to leave the Chamber for a few minutes, and I am not sure that that change was agreed upon.

I should like to have the Senator from New York listen to a suggestion. Instead of merely changing the word "shall" to "may", since it reads "shall not extend any assistance" or something to that effect—we might make a little change such as "may deny assistance to."

Mr. JAVITS. In his discretion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. It would have the same effect, but be smoother language.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been thinking through my own vote on this question. I believe I shall vote for the Dominick amendment; and I will tell Senators why. If we should strike out the language, we would leave Mr. Weaver with the discretion which he is now asserting. That is the way he is asserting it. I can vote for the Dominick amendment, instead of tinkering further with the language, and that will be the end of it.

I think there is something inimical to the spirit in which we generally write these bills. If the Administrator is asserting the authority, at least we can beat him over the head if he abuses his discretion. I think perhaps we should not write into the bill a discretion which the Administrator is now asserting, so I shall support the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes from the 19 minutes remaining.

I was about to answer by saying that I could not accept the suggestion made by the Senator from New York, because of the language with respect to furthering the purposes of the act, shown on page 2 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute. That proposal would limit the discretionary authority specifically to the provisions of the act.

As a part of the overall bill the Congress is making certain determinations, "Findings and Purposes," as set forth in section 2. As our justification for enacting any legislation of this type we are saying, in section 2:

> That the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities and services, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning on a comprehensive and continuing basis.

This brings all these programs together as a part of the determination of the Congress as to the reason why we need to provide assistance. We should not turn around and say, "We are going to bring them all together—we are going to use a bad situation which may exist in these areas as a justification for passing the bill—but, when anyone presents a plan under the bill, if we should approve it and grant money, if the plan is not followed, and rates are reduced so as to produce an economically unsound operation, in the determination of the Administrator, we are not going to penalize him."

I cannot go along with that philosophy. That is exactly what the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would make possible. It would allow a public body to change the situation, after the Congress had made a specific determination that aid should be granted on the basis of a local public body needing the help, because of the justification which had been set forth—that certain rates would be charged which would be economically sound. Then, if they did not follow the purpose of having a plan which was economically sound, they could still get help and we would permit them to engage in an unsound operation, under the proposed change.

This language would provide some insurance. I point out that many of the local public transit bodies are governed, insofar as rate structures are concerned, by local commissioners or local city boards. Then it becomes a political matter. We would not wish to see a local governing body reduce rates for political or other reasons, if it would result in an economically unsound operation. We are trying to insure against that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The testimony given dealing with the purposes which are embraced in the introduction of the bill was rather uniform that inasmuch as the Federal Government went into metropolitan communities with housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs, and created a condition of congestion and trouble, it now ought to help solve the problem which it created by the granting of financial aid in connection with what is called mass transportation. The reason for giving aid, if there is any reason, is that the Federal Government created the problem and the Federal Government ought to cure it.

The language as it is now written in the bill contemplates insuring that there will not be looseness in the management and operation of transit sytems. It proposes that when the guarantee is made the Administrator shall not make the grant unless there is some assurance that the transit system will operate on a sound fiscal basis. The entire committee felt that that was essential.

We should not allow the Administrator in his discretion to say, "You may reduce fares, you may endanger the fiscal structure of the transit company, and though we will reprimand you, you will in no way be punished."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes, please?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the bill as now written grants the Administrator powers too great. The bill now constitutes an abdication of congressional direction and action. To insert the word "may" or to strike this language from the bill would mean that the Administrator, whoever he might be, would become a czar. He could do whatever his mind told him to do.

I cannot subscribe to that policy. I think the language ought to remain in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. COOPER. Only a minute.

Mr. CANNON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I wish it to be clear at the beginning, so that my position will be known, that I do not intend to vote for the bill, but I wish to raise a question which might shed some light on the issue which is now before the Senate.

I believe that to provide a sanction against programs which are not connected with the transit program sets forth a wrong principle for any kind of legislation. I suggest that in section 13(a) the Administrator does not have a remedy. It provides that grants shall be made to meet deficits which cannot be reasonably financed from revenue.

I ask whether, under that section, it would be possible, if a rate were established which enlarged the deficit, for the Administrator to say, "I will not pay to you any larger grant than would be necessary under a proper rate structure"?

Would not that have the effect—and properly so—of inducing the transit company to provide proper rates? That seems to me to be the legal and proper and judicious way to approach the problem, under a contract relating to the mass transit program itself, and which would not reach out into other areas. I think the principle is bad.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. How much time remains to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes left.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky, in reply, that section 13(a) now requires the local body to make a presentation of how much it can finance out of the fare box. The rest of the cost is called net project cost, which represents the portion which cannot be financed from revenues.

Those bodies may say, "This is what we propose to do." Then grants are made on the basis of the determination of what can be financed out of the fare box and what will be the net project cost.

By subsection (c) we are saying as follows: If those bodies started today as they had represented they would, and then reduced rates so that the project was not economically sound, so that they could not get the correct proportionate part of the cost out of the fare box that they represented they would get, the Government would withhold assistance under the HHFA, so far as those public bodies are concerned, until corrective action was taken. That, in a nutshell, is what the provision does.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the yeas and nays having been ordered on this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken at 2 p.m. I have consulted the majority and minority leaders with relation to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I ask whether or not the Senator from Texas would include as a part of his request that I may use the 10 minutes I have remaining immediately prior to 2 p.m., starting at 1:50 p.m.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have no objection. I do not think any consent agreement is necessary for that.

I am sure that the Senator in charge of the bill, and I as manager of the opposition, will be glad to cooperate with the Senator in seeking recognition immediately prior to 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is not necessary. The only unanimous-consent request is that no vote take place before 2 o'clock. Whatever transpires before 2 o'clock depends on how much time remains to Senators controlling the time on the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I will cooperate with Senators who wish to continue the debate prior to 2 o'clock.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I will join in that cooperation.

Mr. TOWER. The unanimous-consent request I have propounded is that the vote be set for 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas realize that the time to be taken in having a quorum call will come out of his time?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged against my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain technical amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendments will be stated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be not read, but that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The proposed amendments are as follows:

On page 25, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(g) The first sentence of section 814 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1434), is amended by—

"(1) inserting after 'grant,', the first place it appears, the following: 'guaranteed revenue bond issue,';

"(2) inserting after 'grant,', the second place it appears, the following: 'guaranteed revenue bond issue (including the revenues from which the bonded indebtedness is to be repaid),'; and

"(3) inserting after 'grant,', the third place it appears, the following: 'guaranteed revenue bond issue,'."

On page 9, line 3, after "contracts" insert "of guarantee".

On page 14, line 20, after "Act" insert "relating to the guarantee of revenue bonds".

On page 15, line 1, after "with" insert "the guarantee of revenue bonds under".

On page 22, line 17, strike out "Funds" and insert "Subject to the provisions of section 10, funds".

On page 4, line 22, insert "(b)" before "No".

On page 5, lines 24 and 25, strike out "grant or loan shall be made under this section" and insert "Federal assistance shall be extended under this Act".

On page 6, line 12, strike out "7(b)" and insert "16(b)".

On page 7, line 4, strike out "3(c)" and insert "3(d)".

On page 16, line 25, strike out "364B of the Revised Statutes" and insert "3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529)".

On page 17, line 9, strike out "with respect to such project" and insert "while any revenue obligations issued to finance the project are outstanding".

On page 18, line 3, strike out "4(a)" and insert "4".

On page 18, line 11, strike out "4(a)" and insert "4".

On page 22, line 24, strike out "or grant" and insert "grant, or guarantee".

On page 24, line 15, strike out "7(b)" and insert "16(b)".

On page 24, line 20, strike out "4(b)" and insert "13(b)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I understand these are technical amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. These are the purely technical amendments; yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 3, line 12, insert the following:

"ESTABLISHMENT OF DIVISION OF URBAN TRANSPORTATION

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation a Division of Urban Transportation.

"(b) The Under Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Division of Urban Transportation, shall—

"(1) assist in the development of overall policy recommendations with respect to Federal urban transportation programs and activities;

"(2) assist in the development of means for achieving a greater coordination in the administration of Federal urban transportation programs and activities;

"(3) undertake a program of continuing research and planning, in cooperation with private industry, the National Academy of Sciences, and other research organizations, for the development of urban transportation equipment and systems to meet present and future needs, such research to include studies relating to the financial, legal, employment, and social problems, as well as the technical aspects, of urban transportation matters; and

"(4) perform such other functions relating to urban transportation as the Secretary of Commerce may, from time to time, prescribe.

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Commerce all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, (1) under section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to the mass transportation demonstration grant program, and (2) under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 with respect to the mass transportation loan program.

"(b) All assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds held, used, arising from, or available or to be made available in connection with, the functions, powers, and duties transferred by this section are hereby transferred with such functions, powers, and duties.

"EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of Commerce shall, in undertaking the functions, powers, and duties transferred to him by section 102, evaluate (1) the results of any project approved for assistance prior to such transfer under the mass transportation demonstration grant program, and (2) the effectiveness of the mass transportation loan program as it exists on the date of such transfer. The Secretary shall submit his findings to the Congress, together with his recommendations with respect to the expansion or discontinuance of such programs, at the earliest practicable date."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment, if adopted, would transfer the administration of the business contemplated by S. 6 from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the Department of Commerce.

Under the existing situation, the Department of Commerce has the primary responsibility in administering the Federal highway program. In 1950 Congress enacted a law directing the Secretary of Commerce, through the Division of Highways, to make a study of urban transportation in cities having a population of more than 50,000. That law is now on the books. I assume that the Secretary of Commerce is performing his duty in making that study.

We now have the very injudicious situation of two departments of Government dealing with highways and transportation in cities, namely, HHFA and the Department of Commerce.

Through the years the Department of Commerce has been in charge of Federal activities dealing with highways. In the approximately 18 years that I have been connected with city, State, and Federal governments, I have heard the argument made about the duplication of work and the unjustified expense involved. In this situation there is definitely a duplication of work. Under existing law, directions are given to the Department of Commerce and to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to coordinate their efforts. I have been in the Government long enough to know that there is always the jealous purpose in every branch, division, and department to preserve for itself what has been initially assigned to it. I believe that leads to expense, and that it ought not to be countenanced when, by the simple enactment of a law, all the activities dealing with one subject can be placed in one centralized division.

Mr. President, I shall not speak further on my amendment, but will make some remarks dealing with the bill now pending before us. I shall want to discuss the genealogy of the bill, its inception, its birth, its subsequent mutations, and the form in which it comes before the Senate today.

The initial thought about subsidized railroads came to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1958, when studies were made of the plight of the railroads. That study cost more than $350,000. It was conducted for a protracted period of time. Labor leaders, railroad presidents, and shippers came before the committee and gave their testimony about the difficulties that the railroads were having in surviving and competing with truckers, inland water carriers, and airplanes, industries which were subsidized.

The railroad operators uniformly objected to subsidies. Two of them argued that subsidies ought to be given to the railroads. One was the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Mr. Symes; the other was the then president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

At the conclusion of those hearings, held in 1958, the decision was unanimous that the Government should not enter into the subsidy program of the railroad system. It was at that hearing that this thought was conceived, and the question of how the railroads might be helped was considered in various forms.

In 1959 the Interstate Commerce Commission had a case pending before it in which it had to make a recommendation as to how the railroads of our country might be given aid. I read from page 4 of the opinion filed on May 18, 1959, by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It recommended, first, that the 10 percent Federal excise tax on passenger fares be repealed. That has been done.

Second, that Federal tax laws be amended to encourage local and State relief, at least to the extent of disregarding State and locally provided pretax net income for Federal tax purposes.

Third, that State and local governments take such steps as may be required to effect a greater degree of equity with respect to tax burdens on railroad property in relation to taxpayers generally, and consistent with the desire of their communities for retention of commuter and other passenger train service.

Fourth, that where the railroads were unable to operate a particular local or commuter service at a profit, and where such service is essential to the community or community served, steps be taken by State or local authorities, or both, to provide this service, paying the carrier the cost plus a reasonable profit.

That was in 1959. I shall later discuss how and to what extent that program was implemented.

On January 20, 1961, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce likewise conducted a study of the problem of mass transportation in the large communities. On page 6 of the report, known as "Commuter Transportation," these recommendations were made:

> The Federal Government should make available at the lowest possible interest the capital funds necessary to save and improve commuter rail service. This would be less burden on the taxpayer than providing alternative commuter facilities. The investment should be used as a lever to move the railroads toward a modern and efficient commuter rail system.

Another recommendation, identified as recommendation No. 25, states:

> Should the state and local governments grant tax concessions to the railroads, recommended below, the Federal Government should not dilute the concessions by maintaining full income taxes on the railroad corporations.

Recommendation No. 27 stated:

> State and local governments have already demonstrated their recognition that they have a stake in maintaining service on the commuter rail lines. It should be their responsibility to recommend the level of fares, to set standards of frequency of service, to determine the type and location of passenger stations, and to make up any operating deficits. The railroads should be relieved of real property taxes on commuter service.

Subsequent to that study and those recommendations, there was created by the Senate a Committee on Special Study of Transportation Policies in the United States. The report filed with that committee was known as the Doyle report. It was filed on December 29, 1960. It studied and dealt with commuter service. It did not recommend subsidies.

Thus, until December 29, 1960, four studies were made and completed, not one of them recommending subsidies either to the mass transportation systems or to the railroads.

On February 16, 1960, the following persons came to Washington in a body: Hon. Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of St. Louis, Mo.; Hon. Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia, Pa.; Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York; Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Anthony Celebrezze, mayor of Cleveland; Mr. James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; and Mr. George Alpert, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

I shall read what was said by those men in their appearance before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Tucker initiated the discussion. After telling of the supposed plight of the railroads, he made this statement, speaking for the mayors of the United States:

> We have a program consisting of four points, and they are: First, that a national policy should be established by the Congress for a balanced, coordinated transportation system.
>
> Second, that Federal, State, and local governments be asked to develop rational tax policies for the railroads.
>
> Third, that Federal loans be made available, where necessary, to municipalities or publicly constituted bodies for new commuter equipment and improved facilities, and for the improvement of intracity mass passenger transportation facilities, these to be long-term, low-interest loans.
>
> Fourth, that a study be made of grants-in-aid by the Federal Government to the communities or duly constituted public bodies which have a sound plan for the permanent improvement of commuter or other intracity transportational facilities, this to be modeled on the present urban renewal program.

Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze, then the mayor of Cleveland, now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified as follows:

> We are not coming here asking for direct subsidies. All we are saying under the bill that we propose or will present is to set up some sort of lending agency where we can borrow money over long terms to maintain commuters to extend the present transit facilities.

Also testifying, as I indicated yesterday, was Mr. George Alpert, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. In my judgment, Mr. Alpert gave some amazing testimony dealing with the unwillingness of local governments to try to help to solve their own difficulties. He testified:

> The municipalities find it difficult, some of them, to do a great deal for us. Take taxation, for example. The city of Boston taxes us to the queen's taste. Our south station, one of the two terminals in Boston, is assessed at $12,200,000. It was built in 1897 for about $15 million; and here, 60 years later, it is still assessed for $12,200,000, which is supposed to be its fair value.
>
> The fact that we have been trying for 3 years to get somebody to buy it for $4 million does not seem to be relevant. But it is assessed for $12,200,000.
>
> This is a statement that I know you will find hard to believe: Our tax rate in Boston is $101.20 per thousand dollars.
>
> So on an assessment of 300 percent of value, at the rate of $101 a thousand, this is confiscatory. We are spending so much money on taxes that we have to make a loan,

> and most of that is used for commuter services. If Boston were not in such deplorable condition, we might apply to Boston for help on taxes. As a matter of fact, I have applied to Boston, and I have received no satisfaction at all. I received a little satisfaction from the New York mayor, but not an awful lot.

Mr. President, these are the five documents that constitute the preliminary to the adoption of the program in 1961. What was that program? $12,500,000 to make studies of mass transportation; $30 million to make loans. Both of these provisions were in conformity with the recommendations made by the mayors, by the Governor of Pennsylvania, and by Mr. Symes and by Mr. Alpert. The $30 million available for loans has been available for about 2 years. $11 million has been borrowed under that authority; $19 million has been unused; and we have the interesting spectacle—which I described yesterday—of communities not wanting to borrow, because word came from Washington, "Instead of borrowing, wait, and we will give you the money for nothing."

Two instances referred to in the testimony show that minds were changed, that delaying tactics were adopted against borrowing, because they were waiting to see what Congress would do on the grant program.

In the city of Cleveland, they were ready to extend the rapid transit system a distance of about 5 miles, I believe. They adopted the resolution to proceed. The taxpayers voted certain assessments and authorized certain highway changes for the rapid transit. The initial vote was 3 to 2 in favor of having Cleveland do that on its own. Then came the word that the money would come from Washington, as a gift. So a meeting was called and the vote was changed—this time, 3 to 2 not to go forward with the project. One of the members of the board said, "If we can get this money for nothing, why should we spend our own?"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Senator's point is that it is essential to maintain local initiative and local enterprise, in order to make this improvement; and that if there is a straight Federal grant, local enterprise will wait for the grant to be made. Do I correctly understand the point the Senator is making?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, that is exactly what I have in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I further understand that the Senator from Ohio is addressing his remarks to the amendment to change the administration from the HHFA to the Department of Commerce. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also understand that the Senator from Ohio favors that because the Maritime Administration and the Bureau of Roads are under the Department of Commerce, and because he believes this to be really a Department of Commerce matter, rather than a Housing Administration matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, definitely.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And, further, that if it is handled under the Department of Commerce, its various agencies and commissions will be working on this whole transportation problem, rather than to use an outside agency.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the other point the Senator from Ohio is making is that local initiative must be retained if local transportation is to be kept moving.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I understand that the bill as approved by the Commerce Committee requires that before any grant or loan is made, the application must be considered under the guarantee provisions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. And that the loan or grant would be made only if a guarantee is not possible under this legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I respect the Senator's judgment as to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have asked that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I know the language that is used in the bill; but it is written so loosely that the net result would be grants, and only grants. I shall be glad to discuss this point when we reach the major part of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a further question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is not the guarantee program proposed by the Commerce Committee tailored after the one proposed by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, substantially.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I trust that that is not the part the Senator from Ohio suggests is loosely drawn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not participate in its preparation. The provision that he shall require the doing of certain things compatible with the fiscal ability of the local government means nothing. I shall discuss that later. Those are mere words; they are balderdash.

Mr. President, to proceed with my argument, let me say that in the HHFA is a Mr. Cole, the Deputy Administrator. In dealing with the loan program, I questioned him. I asked him, "Was $30 million appropriated for loans?"

He replied, "Yes."

Then I asked how much of the $30 million had been borrowed.

He mentioned two loans, aggregating $11 million, leaving $19 million unused.

I said, "Did you have any other applications?"

I believe he answered, "Thirteen. A number of them were ineligible."

I said, "What has happened to those that were possibly eligible?" He said, "They are lying dead." I said, "Why?"

His answer was that when the grant program was mentioned, all applications came to an end.

I regret to say that our dignified U.S. Congress, in whose Chambers have stood heroes who have spoken for their country, is more and more—and tragically—being used in such a manner as to corrupt the morals of the people of our Nation.

The willingness of people to be self-sustaining, independent, and desirous of solving their own problems back home will be destroyed. I wonder how strong our country will be, regardless of our military posture, if, as a result of what we do in Washington, the character of the people is bereft of those attributes which made our ancestors strong and vigorous, willing to fight and willing to take care of themselves.

I want to be elected. But I do not wish to be elected on the basis of buying votes. The present proposal is nothing more than a vote-buying device.

Later I shall discuss the source of the pressure and the urging that has been applied to procure adoption of the proposed subsidy program. If Senators will read the evidence taken before the Committee on Banking and Currency, they will observe that those who testified are the ones who would profit by the bill. They include the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad.

Labor leaders opposed the measure until they were yielded what they desired. Nowhere in the bill is there assurance that the rank and file of the Nation desire the bill passed.

A rather astounding situation exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The Chair has been advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Ohio has utilized his available time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 10 minutes on the bill?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Much has been said about the many communities throughout the United States which, in the past 5 years, have lost their transportation service. Ohio is identified as a State in which communities have been denied service. A very strange situation exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for one question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator take the position that if these grants are made, ultimately the Federal Government, through the Commerce Department or through the Housing Agency, will determine how railroads shall be operated, and ultimately the direction will lead to Government ownership of the various commuting lines? Does he go that far?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I predict that the bill is the beginning of the nationalization of the railroads. If we start subsidizing, we shall have gone a considerable distance in the direction of final nationalization. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to the grant. I have heard words spoken by the leaders of the railroad unions to the effect that unless certain things are done, nationalization will be urged.

When that occurs, we had better quit talking about the glory of the flag that flies over our country and the heroics of our men who made possible the life that we now enjoy.

Returning to my previous point, two of the systems that have been abandoned were in Cleveland. It was said that 497 systems had been abandoned. I looked up the Ohio situation. There may be three; there are at least two. Those systems were purchased by the Cleveland Metropolitan Transit System. As the hearings state, they were sold and closed down. In Lakewood and in Parma the bus operators sold to the city of Cleveland. The system in Marion, Ohio, is mentioned as having been sold, but it is operating.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder if the Senator can tell us why the private operators sold their companies to public authority?

Mr. LAUSCHE. They sold their system to the public authority. I cannot answer why, but I will say that they could not operate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Why?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Automobiles have come into existence. With due respect to the Senator from New Jersey, neither he nor I nor the Congress will change the habits of the people.

I use my automobile. Countless thousands of others use their automobiles. In Chicago, the Northwestern Railroad spent millions of dollars to install modern equipment. It attracted passengers. Then the State built a parallel highway, and with the same speed that motorists left the highways and went to the trains, they left the trains and went back to the highways.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to observe that Mr. Robert Jenney of the Jenney Oil Co., testifying on the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency, is a man whose livelihood is bound up with gasoline and automobiles. He said, "The automobile will take care of itself. We have to have balance in transportation. We need the bill to improve mass transportation."

Mr. LAUSCHE. My favorite answer to that statement is, Why should the Federal Government subsidize mass transportation? Do we not already have a backbreaking responsibility in doing the things which the Federal Government must do in the maintenance of our national defense?

What makes these men in the Senate, supposedly of infinite wisdom, think that the Federal Treasury can do the financing and that therefore the local governments and State governments ought to be spared the responsibility?

At the risk of being a bit harsh, I wish to say that is another one of the deceptions which is being practiced. We are asked to tell the people of this Nation, "The Federal Government has no financial responsibilities. It has the money which is needed."

That is not true, Mr. President. State after State is in a better position financially to do the job than the Federal Government. Yet, putting a blindfold on the eyes of the people, we are asked to say to them, "Come to us. We will give you the money. You will not have to pay any taxes. We will deal with you with abundance and generosity."

Mr. President, subsequently, with respect to other amendments, I shall speak at greater length on this subject. In closing this thought, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what was done in Canada on an underground railroad which is now being built. Bonds were issued, in a multimillion-dollar project, and those bonds were guaranteed by the local government.

I am willing to go along on a bond guarantee program in the Senate. I am not willing to go along on the gift proposition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's last statement is based on the fact that he believes a grant would destroy local initiative and local undertaking to such a degree that the grant itself would turn the operation of the railroad over to the Federal Government, ultimately.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Massachusetts is completely correct in his interpretation of my understanding of what would happen. Local people, private companies, governmentally operated companies would quit trying to solve their own problems and would depend upon Washington to do so. I think that is wrong. I am quite certain the Senator from Massachusetts, since I know his thinking, will agree with me on that subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have one other question. If the bill does pass—whether a guarantee bill or a grant bill—the purpose of the amendment which the Senator has offered is to make the Federal Government carry out its obligations more efficiently, is it?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the Senator's understanding of the grant program under the bill and the amount of local contribution which would have to be made before there would be a Federal grant?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill provides for a study as to what extent the local people can finance the project. Then I think that part which they could not finance would be known as the net project cost, which would become eligible for a grant at the rate of 2 to 1, $2 of Federal money for $1 of local money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. To the net project cost there would be a one-third local contribution, and in addition there would be a fare-box contribution. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I understand the guarantee provision as it appears in the substitute, the guarantee would run to 75 percent of the loan, and 25 percent would have to be taken care of locally, through local initiative.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator refer to the committee bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. To the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator tell me what that would be in his guarantee proposal?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is to be a full guarantee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. A full guarantee, with no local contribution?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES MARKETS

During the delivery of Mr. LAUSCHE's speech:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair) laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a preliminary report of a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Cora M. Smith to be postmaster at Lost Creek, W. Va., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1230. An act for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend section 2 of Private Law 87-673;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1230. An act for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend section 2 of Private Law 87-673; and

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass; and

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from New Jersey would like to make some response to the Senator from Ohio, after which time I will call up my amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to suggest to the Senator that I have a matter of interpretation of the bill. We are waiting to hear from the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If we do hear from him, I wonder whether the Senator would accommodate me before we get into the vote at 2 o'clock, at some time before then.

Mr. TOWER. I am sure that can be arranged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Lausche amendment No. 17.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the time situation with respect to that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponent of the amendment has used all his time. The opposition has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. How much time has been used under the 4-hour limitation on the the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents of the bill have used 4 minutes; the opponents have used 14 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder if I could inquire of the Senator from Ohio whether it is his intention to remain on the floor for the next few minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wish to speak briefly now to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, amendment No. 17, which, as I understand, would create in the Department of Commerce a Division of Urban Transportation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The measure speaks for itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The amendment provides:

> There is hereby established in the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation a Division of Urban Transportation.

I do inquire of the Senator, as the author of the amendment and as the proponent of the establishment of a Division of Urban Transportation, what he envisions in terms of the bureaucracy that would be set up and how large a Division of Transportation would be set up, and how many new employees would be required to man the division, and how big this part of Government would have to be to undertake the broad purposes of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the Department of Commerce there is already a Division dealing with transportation. The fact is that in the Department of Commerce there are divisions dealing with every one of the modes of transportation; that is, pipeline, truck line, railroad, rail line, inland waterway, and so forth. This Division would be established in the Department, and most of the personnel which it now has could be coordinated into doing this one job. We could definitely, in my opinion, streamline this matter better by having all of the functions in one department than by having them in two departments.

Let us see what I have in mind. The 1962 measure directing the Department of Commerce to make a study of mass transportation in cities of 50,000 or more demonstrates that the general intent of the Senate is that that ought to be in the Department of Commerce. I cannot agree with the Senator from New Jersey that by keeping it in HHFA we would economize. It would be better to put all of the Department of Commerce in HHFA, or all of HHFA activities on transportation into Commerce. One or the other ought to be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the Senator suggesting that the present staff, the personnel, now employed by the Department of Commerce would be adequate to staff the newly proposed provision of urban transportation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot answer that question, any more than the Senator from New Jersey can say that HHFA would not need additional employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to deal with that. We have now existing a mass transportation program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Agency administering this existing program has been able to capably administer the existing program, with not a division, not a battalion, not a regiment, but an office of transportation. It is my understanding that there are employees there, perhaps 20, but I believe less than 20. I would suggest to my friend, who is so admirably prudent with the taxpayer's dollar, that I believe we can approach this really national problem far better than he suggests with a new Division of Urban Transportation in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that the Secretary of Commerce Mr. Hodges, if he is given a free hand, and if he will exercise his authority, will do the job with less money than it will be done with by HHFA. For myself I say to the Senator that if I were in charge, we would not have added 170,000 more employees to the payroll in the last 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is not talking about HHFA now, is he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is talking about the entire Federal establishment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is not germane to our issue here. Let me ask the able Senator from Ohio whether he would not agree that an agency that has spent the money and time and the effort and has recruited a staff, and whose staff has spent its energies and time in acquainting itself with the problem, and has coordinated experience in the problems we are dealing with here should not be told that we will scrap all that experience and all that time which represents so much energy and money. The Senator would not advocate such a course, would he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is the experience? I can enumerate the transactions they have had. They have loaned $7 million to one institution, and $3½ million to another, and they have engaged, I believe, in five studies. Where is the experience that HHFA has had on this transportation problem?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Let me advise the Senator that since we enacted the program in 1961, there have been in this transportation area 250 applications or serious inquiries made of the agency, and 44 States are represented in these 250 applications. They have had to look at these and evaluate them and study them. I would call dealing with 44 applications, experience.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to identify what they have done by way of work. They have engaged, since March 29, 1962, five agencies to make studies: the City of Detroit, the University of Washington, the Mass Transportation Commission of the State of Massachusetts, the Southeasterly Compact in Pennsylvania, the City of Memphis, and tristate transportation—New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

In addition to that, they have made two loans, one of $7 million and one of $3½ million. They have received 280 letters asking when the money would be available.

Humbly I say that I employ in my office two girls who could answer all those letters in 3 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator would be the first to condemn the agency if it did not carefully evaluate the programs and applications submitted to it, and also to make a record, perhaps, of the accomplishments, for Congress to consider, willy-nilly, the number of applications.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bureau in the Department of Commerce which deals with highways has been in existence for many years. It has dealt with townships, counties, cities, and States. It is their job to deal with transportation. This is a new undertaking in the HHFA—completely new, less than 2 years old.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Whitten, the Administrator of the public highway program, testified in favor of the urban transportation bill. I know the Senator from Ohio desires to see greater coordination in transportation. Both Dr. Weaver and Mr. Whitten testified that they now have achieved the closest working relationship.

I believe the Senator would have to agree that not only must coordination be within the area of transportation, but that mass transportation must be coordinated with all the other programs in the urban area of which the Federal Government is a sponsor and makes a large measure of contribution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator has answered that question, because Mr. Whitten has made that statement. He testified, and there was a close examination of his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is a member, and before the Committee on Commerce. He at least implied that before we begin to spend any new tax money on mass transportation, we ought to wait until the highway program is completed. He pointed out that a meager percentage of the city highway program has been completed; therefore, we do not know to what extent the transportation problem will be solved.

I have the highest regard for Mr. Whitten. I venture to say that if he were asked in private, he would say confidentially that the programs ought to be handled together, not in separate departments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should think that if a man testifies at a hearing before Congress and says one thing, it is really treading on thin ice to suggest that he is thinking something else. I suggest that I do not see how the Senator can ascribe to a man thoughts which are different from those which he expresses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has seen it happen; I have seen it happen. It is happening every day.

I am aware of one man who appeared before our committee 2 weeks ago and testified that after a decision was made, he was asked to subscribe his name to the document approving the decision, and he regretted that he did so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That has nothing to do with the bill under consideration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The principle is involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the point of creating a new bureau in the Department of Commerce and taking the present program away from experienced personnel in the HHFA and transferring them to the Department of Commerce, or from the Agency that can relate transportation in the urban areas to community facilities, to urban renewal, to the Federal housing, to public housing, and all the other housing programs, it seems to me that to do so would be unwise, indeed. Not only would it be uneconomical, it would be administratively dividing what is one; and the oneness of this is that in urban areas all Federal programs have a relationship one to the other.

If these programs are now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as they are, it would be a desperate mistake to take from them the opportunity to weave the circulatory system of transportation system into other urban areas concerned.

Mr. President, so that we will be on a parity in terms of time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Lausche amendment be postponed until a time subsequent to the vote on the Dominick amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1035

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I submit a concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 1035, relating to dual rate contracts, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts, to make the following correction: viz on line 4, change "76 Stat." to "75 Stat.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was agreed to.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 15 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (4) the term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census; and

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that the whole bill is loosely drawn. One of the most ambiguous aspects of it is the section which defines terms. I have always been very much opposed to leaving too much to the arbitrary will, whim, and discretion of one man. We should state our definitions as comprehensibly and precisely as possible, so that the intent of Congress will be clear.

Under the terms of the bill—and I am reading directly from the bill—

> The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

To me, that sounds vague and ambiguous. Under that language, the administrator could declare almost anything to be an urban area. I am really intrigued by the term "built-up place." If that is not a jerry-built word, I have never heard one. What is a "built-up place"?

If one has visited the King Ranch, in my State, he has seen the ranch headquarters, which comprise a cluster of buildings, houses, barns, and other structures. That is a built-up place. However, I do not believe the owners of the King Ranch desire to qualify under the terms of the bill for mass transportation aid. In any case, any crossroads could be determined to be an urban area for the purpose of qualifying as an applicant for assistance under the terms of the bill.

My amendment is a simple one. It prescribes a definition:

> The term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census.

The Bureau of the Census is a Federal bureau. It has been in the business of defining terms for a long time. I know that a number of Senators have been somewhat curious as to why these blue-covered publications have been placed on their desks. The one I hold in my hand, entitled "U.S. Census of Population," relates to Texas. As I entered the Chamber the other day, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] asked, "What do I want with this booklet? I know what the population of Arizona is."

However, I thought perhaps the Senator from Arizona might not know the definition of "urbanized area," so I suggested that he avail himself of the document on his desk and examine it.

They are published for every State, and each Senator has on his desk one pertaining to his State.

From page vii of this fine document, I should like to read the portion under the heading "Urbanized Areas," as follows:

> Urbanized areas: The major objective of the Bureau of the Census in delineating urbanized areas was to provide a better separation of urban and rural population in the vicinity of the larger cities, but individual urbanized areas have proved to be useful statistical areas. They correspond to what are called "conurbations" in some other countries. An urbanized area contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more in 1960,[1] as well as the surrounding closely settled incorporated places and unincorporated areas that meet the criteria listed below. All persons residing in an urbanized area are included in the urban population.
>
> It appeared desirable to delineate the urbanized areas in terms of the 1960 census results rather than prior to the census as was done in 1950. For this purpose a peripheral zone around each 1950 urbanized area and around cities that were presumably approaching a population of 50,000 was recognized. With the unincorporated parts of this zone small enumeration districts were planned,[2] usually including no more than 1 square mile of land area and no more than 75 housing units.
>
> Arrangements were made to include within the urbanized area those enumeration districts meeting specified criteria of population density as well as adjacent incorporated places. Since the urbanized area outside of incorporated places was defined in terms of enumeration districts, the boundaries for the most part follow such features as roads, streets, railroads, streams, and other clearly defined lines which may be easily identified by census enumerators in the field and often do not conform to the boundaries of political units.
>
> In addition to its central city or cities, an urbanized area also contains the following types of contiguous areas, which together constitute its urban fringe:
>
> 1. Incorporated places with 2,500 inhabitants or more
> 2. Incorporated places with less than 2,500 inhabitants, provided each has a closely settled area of 100 dwelling units or more
> 3. Towns in the New England States, townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and counties elsewhere which are classified as urban
> 4. Enumeration districts in unincorporated territory with a population density of 1,000 inhabitants or more per square mile (The area of large nonresidential tracts devoted to such urban land uses as railroad yards, factories, and cemeteries, was excluded in computing the population density of an enumeration district.)
> 5. Other enumeration districts in unincorporated territory with lower population density provided that they served one of the following purposes:
>   (a) To eliminate enclaves
>   (b) To close indentations in the urbanized area of 1 mile or less across the open end
>   (c) To link outlying numeration districts of qualifying density that were no more than 1½ miles from the main body of the urbanized area.
>
> Contiguous urbanized areas with central cities in the same standard metropolitan statistical area are combined. Urbanized areas with central cities in different standard metropolitan statistical areas are not combined, except that a single urbanized area was established in the New York-northeastern New Jersey standard consolidated area, and in the Chicago-northwestern Indiana standard consolidated area.
>
> The boundaries of the urbanized areas for 1960 will not conform to those for 1950, partly because of actual changes in land use and density of settlement, and partly because of relatively minor changes in the rules used to define the boundaries. The changes in the rules include the following:
>
> 1. The use of enumeration districts to construct the urbanized areas in 1960 resulted in a less precise definition than in 1950 when the limits were selected in the field using individual blocks as the unit of area added. On the other hand, the 1960 procedures produced an urbanized area based on the census results rather than an area defined about a year before the census, as in 1950.
> 2. Unincorporated territory was included in the 1950 urbanized area if it contained at least 500 dwelling units per square mile, which is a somewhat different criterion than the 1,000 persons or more per square mile of the included 1960 unincorporated areas.
> 3. The 1960 areas include those entire towns in New England, townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and counties that are classified as urban in accordance with the criteria listed in the section on urban-rural residence. The 1950 criteria permitted the exclusion of portions of these particular minor civil divisions.
>
> In general, however, the urbanized areas of 1950 and 1960 are based on essentially the same concept, and the figures for a given urbanized area may be used to measure the population growth of that area.
>
> An urbanized area may be thought of as divided into the central city, or cities, and the remainder of the area, or the urban fringe. Any city in an urbanized area which is a central city of a standard metropolitan statistical area is also a central city of the urbanized area. With but two exceptions, the names of the central cities appear in the titles of the areas. The central cities of the New York-northwestern New Jersey area are the central cities of the New York, Newark, Jersey City, and Paterson-Clifton-Passaic standard metropolitan statistical areas. Likewise, the central cities of the Chicago-northwestern Indiana area are the central cities of the Chicago and Gary-Hammond-East Chicago standard metropolitan statistical areas.
>
> Data for the entire urbanized area are shown in this report in table 10 for each State in which a central city of the area is located. If that part of an urbanized area that extends into another State does not include a central city, data are shown only for that part within the State.

I think that is very excellent. I also think that in the event we do not reach a vote on the measure today, each Senator will have an opportunity to see that this is an adequate definition, one which is specific and precise; and certainly it is more satisfactory than the nebulous thing in the bill.

As was pointed out by the Senator from Ohio, I think there is too much of a tendency for Congress to abdicate its responsibilities. I do not see why we cannot assume the responsibility to do such a little thing as define an urban area. But, instead, we think we have to vest this authority in an administrator, as a way of washing our hands of the matter. We want to establish broad policy lines; but we do not want to spell out the legislative intent, which I think we should do and must do if we are to fulfill our responsibilities as representatives in a representative democracy.

So I do not see why we cannot adopt a specific definition—rather than give this broad, discretionary power to the administrator—to show that we are facing up to our responsibilities and that we are not afraid to legislate in some detail if that is necessary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How does the Senator from Texas propose to change the definition of "urban area"?

Mr. TOWER. As stated in my amendment:

> (4) the term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census;

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that it must have at least one central city with a population of at least 50,000?

Mr. TOWER. Yes; at least 50,000. And, of course, several criteria are established by the schedule for the determination of what is an urban area, figuring the population density, and so forth, and determining parts of unincorporated areas as being parts of urban areas, or incorporated places of 2,500 or more or 2,500 or less. All these factors are taken into consideration. A very complicated set of criteria are used by the Bureau to determine what an urban area is.

---

[1] There are a few urbanized areas where there are "twin central cities" that have a combined population of at least 50,000. See the section below on "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" for further discussion of twin central cities, neither of which has a population of 50,000 or more.

[2] An enumeration district (ED) is a small area assigned to an enumerator which must be canvassed and reported separately. In most cases an ED contains approximately 250 housing units.

Yesterday I distributed these Bureau of the Census booklets to the desks of Senators, in order that they could see what the urban areas of their States are, as defined in these booklets.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me point out that I said that in 1962, Congress gave the Department of Commerce the direction and authority to study transportation problems in cities with a population of 50,000 or more; and in a measure that act corroborates the argument the Senator from Texas is making.

My own interpretation of the language of this bill defining an urban area is that it means any community, practically anywhere.

Mr. TOWER. I call the attention of the Senator to this language in the bill:

> (4) The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place.

Would the Senator from Ohio care to give me his interpretation of the words "built-up place"?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of course I could not do that.

Mr. TOWER. And I do not imagine that anyone could.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As to the matter of municipalities, I have on my desk a letter from the municipal association. In the letter it states that it represents 15,000 municipalities. Does that language of the bill mean that each of them would be allowed to request money with which to purchase buses, parking lots, and terminal stations?

Mr. TOWER. Well, will the Senator from Ohio try, in his imagination, to place himself in the position of the Administrator, and will he imagine that a delegation came, hat in hand, from a very small community, and became very emotional, and gave him a good sob story?

I know that the Senator from Ohio, being a very softhearted man, would, out of the kindness of his heart, declare the people of that little crossroads community to be a part of an urban area and municipality or other built-up place, and would probably hand them a great deal of money that would not go to New York, New Jersey, or such places, that really need the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not know why the Senator always stops, in reading the definition, after the words "built-up place," because that is not the end of the sentence. It is not the end of the definition. The remainder of the sentence reads—

> Which is appropriate in the judgment of the Administrator for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality, taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

Mr. TOWER. I know that the Senator from New Jersey has always been opposed to the inclusion of redundant language in legislation. I point out that because of the language "to serve commuters or others in the locality, taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth," it could be assumed from the very nature of the bill that that was what was intended. Of course, it does provide "in the judgment of the Administrator." It leaves it to the arbitrary will and discretion of the Administrator. Does the Senator have any other construction of the term "in the judgment of the Administrator"?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Can the Senator suggest some other individual or group of individuals who ought to make the judgment? The Administrator is the individual who administers the program and makes the final decision as to what applications shall be accepted. Does the Senator desire a committee of Congress to sit with him?

Mr. TOWER. Why not accept an established definition, that set forth by the Bureau of the Census, which is a Federal agency?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are many good reasons. I know that many Senators feel very bad because under the provisions of the bill rural or less populated, poorer parts of our country would be contributing taxes to the large rich cities. I am merely saying that there is opportunity in the bill for the poorer and smaller cities to receive consideration; and to cut off a city because the population of that city had not reached 50,000 would be most unjust.

Wherever there is an urban transportation problem, the people of the particular area should be in a position to be assisted under the bill if they can meet all the other qualifications. Why say that a city whose population is 49,000 cannot obtain the benefits, but must wait until the population reaches 50,000?

Mr. TOWER. I point out to the Senator that the criterion established is 50,000 or approaching 50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The word "approaching" is a great one. When does a city start approaching a population of 50,000?

Mr. TOWER. I should say that 49,000 is approaching it rather rapidly. I note also, that included in the urban areas would be very small incorporated towns, and even unincorporated areas. The provision does not mean that only cities of 50,000 or more population would benefit. It means that satellite towns would also benefit. They are included as a part of the urban areas under the census definition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to have the Senator's judgment as to whether Garland, Tex., with a population of 38,501 people, perhaps there are a few more people there now, since that was the population in 1960, is approaching 50,000.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator know where Garland, Tex., is located?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have no idea.

Mr. TOWER. It is located in Dallas County, a metropolitan area. Garland City is a dormitory and satellite town. It is not really a satellite town. Garland was there, I believe, when Dallas was not. At any rate, it has grown in a period of time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator has said that Garland is a dormitory town. I cannot speak with authority in relation to mass transportation in Garland, Tex.

Mr. TOWER. The people of Garland have a very fine expressway to get them to and from downtown Dallas in a very short period of time.

As I stated the other day, there are skyscraper apartments with facilities to accommodate automobiles. There are traffic problems, but those problems would not be solved by obtaining money under a mass transportation bill.

Proponents of the bill have been talking about the jurisdiction of the cities. The cities are choking and strangling. If it is primarily the intent of the bill to help solve the transportation difficulties of cities in the large urban areas, why do we not spell it out in the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is that question addressed to me?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the purposes are to serve or to meet the most critical problems in urban transportation, there must be priorities, I am sure, because of the limitation on the funds available, although with the guarantee provision added, the opportunity of meeting the problem is broadened. Particularly with a guarantee provision which is most feasible for cities with bus transportation, I feel that we can reach cities in the 25,000, 30,000, and 35,000 population range that have critical problems.

For example, consider the city of Pensacola, Fla., which might be termed a bus city. I am not sure of the population of that city. Bus operators came to us from that city and said they were losing money at an anual rate of $8,000 a year. They felt that with 15 new and improved buses, less maintenance and repair, they could improve their service. Their operating expenses relatively would decline, and they could make money. I do not know whether Pensacola meets the urbanized area definition or not.

The same situation exists in Hattiesburg, Miss., which is about to lose its transit service. Hattiesburg, Miss., is a city of 34,000 population.

Consider Laurel, Miss. The mayor of Laurel City, whose population is between 27,000 and 30,000 people, came before the House committee last year and said,

> We have no mass transportation. We need it. I will tell you why. Three companies have come to me looking for properties so that they could locate within Laurel, Miss. When they discovered that there was no mass transportation, they did not come into the city.

Those are cities that we must think of, as well as Dallas, Houston, and other large cities.

Mr. TOWER. I say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am not anti-small-towns. Although I was born in Houston, I have grown up in small towns. I really prefer small towns to large cities. But we are considering an urban bill. It is designed to help urban people. We have estimated a $10 billion need over a period of a few years. The amount of money will be spread pretty thin, anyway.

It seems to me that the bill would actually be improved and made more effective if we could tighten up the definition of an urban area. Then the gravy would not be spread quite so thin. Taking into consideration also the number of small towns in the United States, if many of them are encouraged to apply under the terms of the bill, funds that ought to go to the big urban areas will be sapped, or the money will be spread out so thin over the country than no area will be greatly benefited by it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I might be inclined in some measure to agree with the Senator if the bill provided merely a grant program and the funds were small, indeed. They are very modest. But with the guarantee provisions added——

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a statement at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. I did not mean to imply that the appropriation authorized is a modest one. I am thinking of it in terms of relationship to the total need. I would never imply that the bill is a cheap one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is modest for the need.

Mr. TOWER. A great deal of money is involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. With a guarantee provision, why should not a town have its bonds guaranteed even if its population has not reached 50,000? I do not understand why we should say that Hattiesburg, Miss., cannot obtain a guarantee of its bonds because there are not enough people in Hattiesburg.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I did not raise the urban versus rural argument in this body. That was raised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] in his very eloquent and closely reasoned presentation. I do not regard this as an urban-rural argument.

As a matter of fact, I think more cities are opposed to the bill than are for it. At least, that is the indication given by the testimony by representatives of the National Chamber of Commerce.

Will not the Senator concede that the aim of the bill primarily is to aid in the congested strangulation of the big cities? Most of the testimony has been by people from these big city areas, has it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I cannot agree to that. Where there are concentrations of people, where there are areas so large that a person cannot walk to all his missions—to work, to church, to school, and all the rest—transportation is needed. Perhaps 40 percent of our people are not automobile drivers, yet they live in areas where they have to move farther than walking distance. What are they to do? Youngsters cannot drive cars. Older people cannot drive cars. Those who are poor often do not have cars. Some people are disabled. Some people are afraid to drive a car. Why should all of the people not have an opportunity to be more than hermits in homes?

Mr. TOWER. Why should not the people who are 64 years old have an opportunity to collect social security?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Some can.

Mr. TOWER. Some can, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If totally disabled.

Mr. TOWER. Some small towns, under my definition, would be able to qualify for aid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Only if they are like Garland and happily situated within the shadow of Dallas.

Hattiesburg, Miss., would not qualify.

Anderson, Ind., with 49,060 people, would not qualify.

Hagerstown, Md., with 36,000 people, would not qualify.

Cumberland, Md., with 33,000 people, would not qualify.

Bangor, Maine, with 38,000 people, would not qualify.

Lawrence, Kans., with 32,000 people, would not qualify.

New Castle, Pa., with 44,000 people, would not qualify.

All of these cities have transit troubles. The companies are almost on the rocks.

Mr. TOWER. Have all of those cities evidenced some support for the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If they are part of the U.S. Conference of Mayors or the American Municipal Association they have, through representative action, come to us every year in support of the mass transit bill. The American Municipal Association speaks for 13,000 cities and towns in this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. An enumeration has been made of cities which are in distress. If the Senator from Texas will look at page 268 of the transcript of the testimony for 1963——

Mr. TOWER. The hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, or before the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Arizona is listed as having within it Phoenix, with transportation problems. In Phoenix the lines were sold; one in 1955 and the other in 1959. So when one looks at that book one would assume that Phoenix has not solved its problem.

The mayor of Phoenix appeared before the Commerce Committee and told about the transportation services there. He opposed the bill. Yet if one looks into this tabulation one would say, "Phoenix is in distress."

I invite the Senator's attention to Kansas. Wichita is mentioned as being in trouble. It is said that it was necessary to dispose of their system. The owner of the Wichita transportation system appeared before the Commerce Committee and said that their problem has been solved.

I refer to Cleveland, Ohio. Under Ohio, Cleveland is mentioned. It is shown that the Broadview Bus Line on July 1, 1961, was transferred. Yes, it was transferred to the Cleveland transit system.

Going further down, to Lakewood, Ohio, it is shown that Lakewood is in trouble. The Lakewood system was taken over by the Cleveland transit system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Where does it show that Lakewood is in trouble?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is listed. Four hundred and sixty-seven transit systems, it is pointed out, had to be abandoned or transferred.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We did not use the word "trouble." We said that in most cases there has been a diminution of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from New Jersey?

The time on my side has expired. May we use time from the Senator's side?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. A full hour has been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 30 minutes allotted to the Senator from Texas have been used. There are 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would be less than generous if I did not allow some time, having used so much of the time of the Senator from Texas.

I will yield, from time to time, as much time as is needed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to his own State. Houston is listed. The Houston operator appeared and told about making money in Houston. He is now in charge of this system.

The Senator from Texas will remember that in the hearings I was asked by the Senator from New Jersey about Upper Arlington and Findlay, Ohio. Those are communities in which families normally have two cars. That is true practically everywhere in the area. Certainly they do not have a bus system, and they will not have one.

I merely point that out to show how fallacious is this report, when one looks at it and concludes that these places are in distress and are going to need the money they will receive to run their systems.

Why should the Federal Government buy buses and subsidize local transportation systems for the people of those areas, for the young people, for those of medium age, and for those who are old? Since when has that become a responsibility of the Federal Government?

If we go into this field, how many fields will we stay out of?

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at this point I wish to say that under the proposed legislation there is to be no grant of Federal money, of course, until the applying local governing authority has found that it cannot feasibly use a local guarantee to borrow the money and pay it back. The grant will follow only the most rigorous series of qualifying hurdles.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is a weakness in that answer. There are 13,000 municipalities in the country. Some of them have tried to solve their own problems. Others have done nothing. The ones which have done the least are the ones crying the most for help.

There are different tax rates in the various States.

In some places subsidies are given. Those which are operating successfully, because of their efforts to solve the problem, will get nothing.

Those that have done the least will be in the most formidable position to apply for aid; and I say that in spite of the language that has been quoted by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe most of the observation I wanted to make on the limitation of the legislation to apply only to cities of at least 50,000 population have been made. I think it is one that is most unjust, because we know there can be a critical problem in transportation in a city of 30,000 or 35,000 as easily as in a city of 50,001 persons.

To ask all the country, large cities and small cities, to raise the money from taxation for this program, and then to arbitrarily deny these benefits to people, even though they can demonstrate they have a problem, is cruel indeed.

I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on my amendment be postponed until subsequent to the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, line 2, to delete the words "its operations" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the operations of such public mass transportation company".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present this amendment only because there seems to be in some quarters some question as to what is meant by the language at the top of page 6 of the revised bill as submitted by the Commerce Committee, which this amendment would affect.

The word "its" in line 2 of page 6, refers to the public mass transportation company or any division or segment thereof which is operating profitably. This is the general theory that I am seeking to reach.

I have specifically in mind the Port Authority of New York, which is operating in many areas, and the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority in New York, which is also operating in many ways. For instance, the port authority operates parking garages, bridges, tunnels, airports, and may very well take under its wing a trade center, as well as a transportation system, to wit, the particular system we call the Hudson Tubes, the Hudson & Manhattan Railway. The Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority operates bridges, as well as a coliseum which is a great show place for trade shows, as well as an office building.

As I understand the intent of this section, and I have discussed this matter with the aides of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], it is to prevent a public body which operates in the mass public transportation field from starving one of its entities which may seek aid from the Government, while at the same time it is making money from its other entities.

The reason why I have submitted the amendment is to sharpen the discussion on the question. I understand what I have in mind and what the Senators in charge of the bill have in mind, and I do not think the amendment is needed, but, in order to highlight this point, I thought it was necessary to have this discussion in order to understand what was intended.

As I understand the situation, it comes down to this: Where a public body operates many facilities, and some of them make money, and there is a transportation system that it wishes to get qualified under this bill, which company is not making money, that company is not automatically disqualified from coming in under the bill, but the Administrator, under the bill, has a perfect right to give them money for the elements they do operate which he thinks properly belong in a mass public transportation system.

In short, I want to be sure such a public body is not ipso facto, as we lawyers say, by some strained construction of the language, excluded from the provisions of the bill because some elements of its operations make money.

As I understand the intent, the Administrator could say to the Port Authority of New York, "I do not care whether the Hudson and Manhattan does or does not make money. A public mass transportation system which would command my interest so that I would give you money under this bill has got to include other things, such as A, B, and C."

I would not want, on the face of the bill itself, to bar that public authority from coming under the bill because it happened to have some operations, which might be completely unrelated to a mass public transportation system, which made money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield, of course this part of the bill was brought to us from the Commerce Committee. Of course, the Senator from New York and I, sitting in the Banking and Currency Committee, wrote the other part of the bill; but it seems to me the clear, plain meaning of the language is that only the mass transportation activities of an authority would be considered, in this connection, in what is profitable and what is not profitable.

Mr. JAVITS. That is, what the Administrator would insist should go into the mass public transportation operation to qualify for a grant or whatever aid he wished to give. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In my judgment, that is the plainest, clearest, and most manifest meaning of the language of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey will join me in the mode of procedure I shall now suggest. I would like to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] to read this colloquy and if, when he returns, he agrees with it, I will be prepared to withdraw the amendment. I do not think it is at all needed, but I think, in view of the fact that some persons believe there is some ambiguity in the language—although I do not—that question ought to be resolved now while we are discussing the question. So I am prepared to reserve any time I have left so that, when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] returns, if he agrees with this interpretation, I shall be prepared to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before that?

Mr. TOWER. I yield the Senator from Kansas 5 minutes.

THE ARMS CONTRAL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the last session of Congress approved legislation which established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This legislation was enacted after extensive hearings in both the House and Senate committees and after general debate in both bodies. The legislation was approved by a vote of 290 to 54 in the House of Representatives and a vote of 73 to 14 in the Senate.

Congress established the Agency to explore, develop, recommend and, if approved by the President, negotiate possible alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our national security. A strong military establishment, of course, remains essential. But as the President has said, "in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase."

In today's world a strong military establishment is essential. It does not follow, however, that our security can be maintained indefinitely by continuing the present arms race. Our defense budget is so large and modern weapons of war are so devastating that safeguarded alternatives must be explored.

Realizing this, Congress charged the Agency with carrying out an extensive research program in the field of arms control and disarmament and using the results as a basis for informed negotiations in this field.

Most people will recognize that if a safeguarded international disarmament treaty could be effected—if the war-making capabilities of all nations could be eliminated and effective machinery could be set up to keep the peace, this would certainly be in our national interest.

If this is true, it follows that somebody or some group should work out disarmament proposals for appropriate consideration by the executive branch and by Congress. This is what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was set up to do.

The major proposal on disarmament worked out by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and the one that has been the subject of so much misunderstanding—is the "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This outline has not even reached the stage of a draft treaty, but it represents the most comprehensive and thoroughgoing series of proposals ever made on disarmament by this or any other country.

The overall goal is defined as the establishment of a "free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law."

It is claimed that we could never negotiate such an agreement with the Communists because their goal is world domination and they cannot be trusted. Maybe we cannot conclude an agreement under present circumstances, but it should be kept in mind that there are other alternatives to war which the Communists may believe they can use to achieve their objectives, such as political and economic means.

Anyone who has met a dedicated Communist knows that he exhibits a fanatical belief in the ultimate success of the Communist ideology. We would show a surprising lack of faith in our own system if we did not believe we could meet the Communists successfully in the political and economic fields.

It should also be kept in mind that we would not accept anything less than a treaty which would safeguard our national security precisely because we realize the Communists cannot be trusted—that is why we would insist upon adequate means to verify that they were complying with any agreement.

The U.S. program does not, of course, call for unilateral disarmament only by this country; it specifically requires that the arms and armed forces of all parties to the agreement be reduced "in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any State," and it proposes an effective system to verify compliance.

It also contemplates appropriate changes in our economy so that all of the billions of dollars now being spent on defense could be utilized in other ways. Continuing studies are being sponsored by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on the economic impacts of disarmament and the alternate utilization of human resources for those now employed in the defense effort.

Congress provided for cooperation in arms control and disarmament policy formulation among all interested agencies. Test ban or disarmament recommendations of this Agency are considered by the Departments of Defense and State, and where appropriate, by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other agencies. Negotiations are never undertaken on an important measure until the President has consulted with his key national security advisers and given his approval.

Congress also provided that no action could be taken that would obligate the United States to disarm without the prior approval of Congress.

The President, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have all said that a test ban agreement would be submitted in the form of a treaty to the Senate for the traditional two-thirds vote.

Under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, a disarmament agreement must either be approved in this fashion or by a majority in both Houses. The American people are thus assured that no disarmament agreement could be put into effect without the approval of their elected representatives.

Finally, the executive branch could not—as some people assert—operate independently in this area through the United Nations by putting us under a United Nations military dictatorship and destroying our national sovereignty. The executive branch disclaims any intention of doing this either through a disarmament treaty or under the United Nations Charter, but even given the impossible assumption that it wanted to, the United Nations Charter is a treaty and it cannot be changed in any way affecting the United States without undergoing the treaty procedures set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

In other words, our relationship to the United Nations under the United Nations Charter could not be altered unless the U.S. Senate approved of such a change.

I hope, Mr. President, that these few observations will help to clarify some of the more glaring misconceptions that have arisen over the activities of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. If I have the time I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have some time on my amendment. I am glad to yield a minute to the Senator if he needs it.

I wish to congratulate the Senator on the statement he has made. He is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is considered a man of reasonably middle-of-the-road and perhaps even somewhat conservative views. A statement of this character by him is of the greatest importance at this time, when so much obfuscation exists on the question of disarmament, so dear to the hearts of the people.

I found myself in a somewhat similar situation in my last campaign, and made a statement which the Senator and I might have written together.

The important point the Senator has emphasized is that in no case is there the remotest chance that the Senate will not pass on any disarmament treaty. There is no misconception, in my view, and I am sure the Senator agrees with me in this respect, and the whole world knows by now that the Senate is not bound merely because the President or his negotiators have agreed, but that our hands are perfectly free. This represents the ultimate sanction to the people. They have no reason to fear that something will be done in the dark. I am delighted to hear the Senator say that. I again congratulate him.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate what the Senator from New York has said. He has spent a great deal of time in this field. I made the statement today for the reason that the Senator has mentioned; namely, the concern that some people have in connection with this matter. The final vote will be determined by Congress, or by the Senate, because it is a treaty. I thank the Senator.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call may not be taken out of the time controlled by either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado has 4 minutes remaining on his amendment. The Senator from Alabama has 9 minutes remaining in opposition.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to review again the terms of the proposed amendment, so that the Senators who are here may keep it in mind. There was some discussion this morning between myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] as to what programs would or would not be covered by the language which is now in the proposed Commerce Committee bill, particularly with respect to the program which would be subject to being cut off in the event my amendment should fail of adoption and the language which is now in the bill should remain in it.

For the purposes of the record I should like to outline again—and I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nevada the fact what I am about to outline—the programs that will be involved and in jeopardy unless my language is adopted. These are, under the Office of the Administrator of HHFA, urban planning grants, urban studies, and housing research, mass transportation demonstration grants, urban transportation assistance, open space land grants, low income housing demonstration grants, college housing programs, public facility loans, public works planning, urban renewal programs, housing for the elderly program. In addition, if the words "assistance to finance" any project administered by the HHFA should be broadly interpreted by any court, it could also very easily mean insurance under the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, and the programs financed under the Federal National Mortgage Association. In addition, the Federal Housing Administration is within the HHFA compound, and it would include all financing and insurance programs under that administration.

It would also include the low-rent public housing program under the Public Housing Administration.

The point I have tried to make is that what we are trying to do is to give the Administrator some power, but it does not seem to me that we ought to give him a meat ax in order to kill a mosquito.

If we provide that, because he does not like a new rate schedule which has gone into effect, no area which is involved in the mass transit program can any longer receive assistance for financing any of the programs as outlined in that list, it seems to me we have gone awfully far in the way of giving control to this Federal Administrator.

There is one more point that I wish to make very clear. As it is now written, not only does the bill give the Administrator discretion within a stated area over a short space of time; but the discretion will continue so long as any project to which a Federal grant has been given is still in the process of proving or disproving itself.

For example, if the grant were a part of a local matching program, under which the municipality was to raise one-third of the funds over a period of 20 or 50 years, the power would remain in the hands of the Administrator for that length of time. It does not seem to me that the Senate should be giving to any person the degree of power which is implicit in the language now in the bill. That is the reason why I have offered my amendment to strike the last sentence of subsection (c) on page 17 of the Magnuson substitute for the original bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. **CANNON.** Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Nevada has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. **CANNON.** Mr. President, it seems anomalous to me that those who have favored the granting of funds by the Federal Government to aid in this particular problem are those who are now supporting this type of amendment, which would remove any restrictions, and which provides, in effect, that if the money is to be given, let it be given to permit inefficient operation. The amendment would permit inefficient operation with no type of Government control over the funds. The opponents of S. 6 call it a "giveaway," which it certainly is not at this time; but when you cut off all the controls, then you make it a "giveaway." That is the anomaly.

All the bill seeks to do is to tighten the control, so that if a municipality or other local governing body applies to the Administrator and submits a plan which the Administrator believes is sound and feasible, and has several facets to it, one of them calling for the financing of the plan from the fare box, the Administrator may make the grant from the Federal Government.

The Administrator would review the plan and the proposed schedule of rates. He would ascertain the amount of revenue the proposal would bring in. That would be done on the basis of the representations of the applicant, not on the basis of any decision by the Administrator.

The Administrator would then determine the net project cost, of which amount the Government would finance two-thirds by way of a grant, and the local body would finance one-third by way of a grant. Why? Because the rates proposed to be put into effect would not finance the whole project. Unless the applicant made that representation, it could not qualify at all. Once they made that representation, they could secure the approval of the Administrator and get a grant.

But the supporters of the amendment are in effect saying, "Once the applicant gets the grant, we propose that the Administrator keep his hands off. If the applicant wishes to reduce the fares below what it has represented are needed to be charged for an economic operation, and if the operation is thus made uneconomic, the Administrator will have no control over it. It is tough, but the Administrator approved the grant of money, and that is it."

I say again that the bill simply provides an insurance policy for the Federal Government. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] said this would be a never-ending problem; it could continue ad infinitum or indefinitely. I say it would continue only so long as the project for which the applicant made a request to the Federal Government for assistance was economically sound. Their determination would affect their application, not the Administrator's. The applicant itself would present the schedule of fares or rates, not the Administrator. Once that were done, it is felt that it would be only fair and right to assume that they had committed themselves, and on the basis of that representation had committed the Federal Government to a course of conduct.

If thereafter they took action which resulted in an uneconomic operation—which would be a question of fact—then the Administrator would have the authority to say that further aid would not be given under programs administered by the HHFA, because the applicant had violated the plan or had not followed the plan presented to the Administrator.

If Congress passes the bill, it will have determined certain practices as a matter of public policy, so far as findings of purposes are concerned. Those findings will specifically include that the only reason relief can be granted in the first instance is that the program is an overall program to assist in the various areas which are administered by the HHFA.

Private aspects have been eliminated; as a matter of fact, they were never in the bill. The areas which would be involved are Federal National Mortgage Association loans, Federal Housing Administration loans, and Farm Housing loans. Those are individual applications; they are not projects in the nature of public projects which are administered by local governing bodies.

Those who wish to insure some responsibility in the use of funds at the local level should vote against the Dominick amendment. Those who wish to grant funds to a public body on the basis of representations made, and who then say that if the applicant changes its mind, the Federal Government will have no control over it, and the applicant can do as he will with the money, should support the position of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. **TOWER.** Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

I urge the Senate to support the eminently sound amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. It remedies a flaw in the bill which was not discovered until the Senator from Colorado sought to correct it by his amendment. He has rendered a worthwhile service. I hope the Senate will support his amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Lausche amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. **TOWER.** Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, before the roll is called, let me state that I have an amendment pending, but I intend to withdraw it. It is now at the desk. On the basis of colloquy with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I intend to withdraw the amendment; and I should like to do so now, so that the only amendments which will be before us will be those on which we shall actually vote. So, if it is agreeable, I shall now withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe it would be better for the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] to be taken now.

Mr. JAVITS. However, on the basis of colloquy with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I intend to withdraw my amendment, rather than have it voted on.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, let me point out that in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senate is to vote at 2 o'clock on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. JAVITS. In that event, Mr. President, I shall wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is detained on official business and, on this vote, is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kefauver
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—3

Allott
Moss
Smathers

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on amendment No. 17 of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CANNON. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 17 of the Senator from Ohio. On the amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is detained on official business. On this vote, he is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 32 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—62

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—5

Allott
Engle
Hart
Moss
Smathers

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement, the question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment before we have the rollcall?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 23, to strike out lines 20 to 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (4) the term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census; and.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is detained on official business, and on this vote, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower

NAYS—68

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf

Monroney
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—5

Allott
Engle
Hart
Moss
Smathers

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 10 minutes. We debated this amendment previously in the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon]. I am sure the Senator has read it.

The amendment relates to the definition of terms which are used in subsection (c) of section 3 at pages 5 and 6 of the bill as it is brought to us by the Commerce Committee. I hope very much that the meaning of the section is so clear as not to need an amendment. However, I believe the question of interpretation would best be raised by my proposing an amendment.

The meaning of the section, as I understand it, whatever may be its worth—and I will come to that in a moment—is that a public body which has as one of its activities a public mass transportation company or system may nonetheless qualify under the pending bill, if it becomes law, in the sense that it will be able to make an application, notwithstanding the fact that it may be engaged in operations related to something outside of a public mass transportation system.

For example, we could point to the storage of grain, or the operation of an office building, or the operation of a public body like the Coliseum in New York, which is a place where exhibitions and trade shows are held. In other words, notwithstanding the fact that it does have some other operations which make money, it nonetheless will qualify under this law even if this public mass transportation operation does not make money.

The entity to which I have specific reference is the Port of New York Authority. All we are trying to do is to provide that that entity will qualify. That does not mean that it will get a grant or any other assistance; it means merely that it may seek funds, and will not be disqualified from so doing.

On the other hand, the Administrator may determine, and, indeed, it would be his duty, to determine what he considers to be a public mass transportation system, and he may very well turn to this public body and say, "I do not agree with you as to what you are putting into the mass transportation system. I think you could put in there A, B, C, or D."

I wish to be sure that such a company, notwithstanding the fact that it has some operations which make money, is nonetheless considered a proper applicant, whatever the result of its application may be, or whatever may be the conditions which are set by the Administrator before he will give it any aid under this bill, if it is enacted into law.

The word "its" in line 2 on page 6 refers, in my judgment to the term "public mass transportation company." If it does, then my interpretation of the meaning of the section is, in my opinion, correct. Therefore I have offered the amendment really to spell out these words that I have sent to the desk by way of amendment with respect to the word "its." I have offered the amendment to make clear what I consider to be the interpretation of this section as it was drafted and as it comes to us from the Commerce Committee.

I would greatly appreciate it if we could have an expression of view from the Senator who is in charge of the Commerce Committee.

I hope that the amendment will not be necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that his amendment is not necessary. The understanding he has of the word "its" is the understanding the committee had; namely, that it refers to a public mass transportation company. Certainly an applicant would be qualified to apply as an applicant even though there might be other segments that were operating independently from that mass transit company. I therefore assure the Senator from New York that his interpretation is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I withdraw the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn. All time on the amendment is yielded back.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 16, in lines 18, 19, and 20 it is proposed to strike out "$100,000,000 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964; $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1965; and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1966," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$75,000,000 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964; $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1965; and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1966".

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment cuts $25 million from the years 1963 and 1964 with respect to the grants. It cuts $50 million from the year 1965, and $50 million from the year 1966. Therefore, it is a cut from $500 million for the total period of the grants to $375 million.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks for the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is desired to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, is it in order to offer it after the yea-and-nay vote has been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the mass transit bill will help many cities, including some in my own State; but I believe that as a nation, we are running into increasing fiscal problems.

The Federal debt is now over $300 billion.

The planned Federal budget for this fiscal year is $98.8 billion.

To stimulate the economy, the administration is now asking for a heavy reduction in taxes; and estimates the Federal deficit will be $11.9 billion. Some say it will be more.

More worrisome to me than any of these considerations, however, and even though this is not entirely relevant to the bill in question, is the problem of balance of payments—the steady loss of gold from this country. In the last 14 years, or thereabouts, we have lost $8,737 million in gold, over 35 percent of our total; and it is still running out.

I believe in the principles of this transportation bill, and am anxious to support an effort to alleviate this growing problem characteristic of many of our towns and cities. But based on the aforementioned fiscal facts, I also believe there must be some retrenchment in our Federal expenditures.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. So far as the operation of the bill is concerned, would the bill in any way affect the overall operation of the program as to the amount of money which would be utilized for grants?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would not. The amendment simply provides a reduction in the $500 million for grants provided in the bill. It does not affect the guaranteeing of the $500 million.

Mr. HARTKE. So far as the overall concept of trying to alleviate the very serious problem of mass transportation is concerned, the offering of the amendment is not intended to detract in any way from the merits of the bill itself?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not at all. It does not take away from the principle. It would simply reduce the amount of money that would be made available in this new field.

Mr. HARTKE. The whole concept of the bill is a recognition of the need for a new approach; but instead of approaching it to the tune of $500 million, the amount would be reduced to $375 million. If the amendment shall be agreed to, that is well and good. It will be possible at a later date to come forward with a request for additional funds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that would be a fair interpretation of the intent of my amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. I desire the Senator to know that I support his amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Indiana for his contribution and his support.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, and it actually turned out to be the fact, either during the periods of 1964 or 1965, that the amount of money authorized in the bill was insufficient, would it be permissive or proper for Congress to take action at that time to provide additional authorization, if the need were actually determined?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would think so, if I follow the thinking of the able Senator from Nevada. That is the reason I reduced the amount originally scheduled for the first 2 years.

Mr. CANNON. Personally, I think this is a good amendment. When the bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce after it had been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the figure $500 million was in the bill. But since that time, as the Senator knows, the Committee on Commerce added the guarantee loan provision, so perhaps that would reduce the need somewhat. Perhaps even the guarantee loan provision may be high for the first few years of operation, because it will take some time to get the program underway and actually determine who can qualify.

I agree with the Senator that we should take every step possible not to authorize or not to appropriate more funds than are actually needed for a particular program. In view of the fact that this is a new program and that the action proposed by the Senator from Missouri would not preclude a return to Congress if the need were actually demonstrated over the period authorized in the bill, I join in support of the recommendation of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am especially grateful to the Senator from Nevada, because he studied the bill carefully and he and his committee suggested many constructive amendments—five to be exact—in the recent debate. I appreciate his support.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished assistant minority leader.

Mr. KUCHEL. At what amount would the loan or grant provision be diminished?

Mr. SYMINGTON. For the first 2 fiscal years—1963 and 1964—the first of which has almost been concluded, the reduction would be $25 million. For the next 2 years, the reduction per year would be $50 million. Therefore, the total grant request in the bill—$500 million over the period in question—would be reduced from $500 million to $375 million.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama wish to have me yield time to him?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall speak in my own time.

Mr. President, I am in accord with the proposal of the Senator from Missouri. Since the Committee on Commerce has added the loan guarantee provision, there certainly should not be much requirement for grants. Therefore, I think it is entirely reasonable—and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that I have had this feeling all along—that the amount provided in his amendment as a loan guarantee was too high, and that the figure should be reduced somewhat along the same line as that proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. When I originally proposed the loan guarantee provision in the Committee on Commerce, I proposed it in the amount of $100 million rather than $500 million. The $500 million was included by reason of a recommendation of another member of the committee. I am hopeful that a reduction in that amount could be considered because I hold no brief for the $500 million figure.

On the other hand, I agreed that so long as the loan guarantee provision is only a limitation on the authorization of guarantees and does not mean that there will be the expenditure of that amount of money over the original period, I did not oppose the inclusion of that amount. It was simply for the purpose of fixing the maximum period of the loan guarantee authorization rather than the prospective spending of that amount.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me that, standing alone, the high figure for either the grant program or the loan guarantee program would be justified. But when both are included in the same bill, then I think both items can stand a reduction. For that reason, I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the chairman of our subcommittee. With the addition of the loan guarantee program, there is not the need for an extended grant program. I know that in both the committees and on the floor there has been a very large measure of accommodation by Senators to the efforts of the members of the committees on the bill. There have been earnest reservations about budgetary situations. Therefore, I, too, am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. I ask that the substitute amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair inquire whether the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama yield back the remainder of the time available to them, in order that the substitute may be in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the Symington amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me state that in case I do not favor the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I presume I shall have time to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time in opposition will be in the control of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the majority leader tells me that if I yield back the remainder of the time available to me, I shall be able to obtain some time on the bill. Therefore, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The remaining time available on the amendment is yielded back by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama; and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is my amendment in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; and it will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out, after the word "bonds," all of the provision down to and including the word "otherwise," in line 13.

And on page——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the amendment is not in order, because it is drafted as a substitute for another part of the bill.

Will the Senator from Ohio be willing to have the Symington amendment disposed of, and to offer his amendment later?

The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the amendment is not in order as a substitute for the Symington amendment; but after the Symington amendment is disposed of, the Senator from Ohio can offer his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then does the Senator from Ohio wish to redraft the amendment, so it will have that effect?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Two bills are before us; both are identified as S. 6. One is a substitute, and the other is the original bill. That situation is somewhat confusing. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio drafted his amendment as an amendment to the other bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Ohio either redraft his amendment or consent to the taking of the vote on the Symington amendment, and then offer his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, Mr. President, I should like to have time to speak on the Symington amendment, inasmuch as the Chair has ruled that my amendment is now out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian makes it abundantly clear that the amendment, as drafted, is not in order, because it is not an amendment to the Symington amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the event the Symington amendment is agreed to, will an amendment to strike from the bill all the provisions dealing with grants then be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Case
Clark
Dodd
Ellender
Kefauver
Kennedy
McCarthy
Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—3

Engle
Moss
Smathers

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 22, after line 21, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (b)—and to reletter succeeding subsections—as follows:

> (b) To insure that small business concerns are given an equitable opportunity to share in all procurement aspects of any project for which a loan or grant is made under this Act, the Administrator shall cooperatively develop with the Small Business Administration within four months after the effective date of this paragraph a small business contracting program to be applicable to all such projects. The program shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to (1) enable small business concerns to have an equitable opportunity to compete, either directly or as subcontractors, for contracts and procurements for property and services awarded in the implementation and effectuation of the purposes of this Act, and (2) enable the Small Business Administration to obtain from the local public bodies and mass transportation companies such reasonably obtainable information concerning contracts and procurement, including subcontracts thereunder, awarded in the implementation and effectuation of the purposes of this Act.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my amendment would provide that the Small Business Administrator, jointly with the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, would promulgate regulations for the purpose of assuring a fair and equitable opportunity for small concerns to compete for contracts awarded under the program which this bill establishes. The proposed Mass Transportation Act provides for a worthwhile and needed program in helping the urban communities of this Nation to meet their transit problems. I am confident that this program will be helpful. We are hopeful that the program will stimulate increased private investment in transportation facilities in our urban communities. I believe that it will.

If this is the case, we can expect a dramatic increase in procurement activity with respect to these facilities and research and development directed towards the improvement of existing facilities. Indeed, we may be opening new opportunities for the business community by means of this Federal program. I believe that the small and independent business community of this Nation should have an opportunity to participate. It is patterned after a similar program which the Congress approved in 1961 to assure small concerns an equitable opportunity to compete as subcontractors in Government procurement. This was Public Law 87-305, the subcontracting amendment to the Small Business Act. In addition, legislation is pending in the Senate with strong bipartisan support to establish a similar program as a part of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

Mr. President, for these reasons I strongly recommend the adoption of my amendment.

I have advised the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] of the nature of the amendment. I understand he has no objection to it. It is quite similar to an amendment which the Senator himself offered in connection with another bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have read the Senator's amendment. My understanding is that it is the usual form already provided in the law with reference to Government procurement and Government contracts.

Mr. SCOTT. Substantially so. It would merely provide for consultation to alert the Administrators who have responsibility to the necessity for recognizing the plight of small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it is a good amendment. I am glad to accept it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I, too, support his amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Alabama has accepted the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire recognition?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] yield to me for a question, from the time on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had not intended to offer an amendment for the time being. I shall call up an amendment in a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator, from the time on the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 26 and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 16, after "(c)(2)" it is proposed to insert the following: ", (c)(7),".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall probably withdraw the amendment, but I wish to make some legislative history with respect to the bill.

On page 45 of the hearings—and I invite the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to that page—in the next to the final paragraph of the letter written by the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, Mr. Campbell said:

> We believe that the insurance provision should not be incorporated in the bill because the Government usually has followed the policy of self-insuring its properties.

The amendment would provide for bringing the bill into accord with the recommendation made by the Comptroller General, to give the Administrator discretion. If he should feel that self-insurance was the economical way to proceed, he could act in such a way that self-insurance would be secured.

It is my understanding that the committee report expresses the same intention. From my conversations earlier with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is my understanding that the bill now provides discretion for the Administrator to provide for self-insurance if this, in his judgment, is the most economical way to proceed.

Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct. This language appears on page 30 of the committee report:

> The Administrator will review the adequacy of the provision for insurance, or self-insurance, as a part of the review of the application for assistance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with that in mind I withdraw my amendment No. 26, and call up my amendment No. 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The new amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 15, after the period it is proposed to insert the following:

> No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that (1) there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and (2) the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment is in accord with the recommendation made by the Comptroller General, as it appears on page 43 of the hearings. I quote the one sentence which requests the chairman of the committee to include this kind of provision in the bill.

> We believe also that the bill should contain provisions to require (1) legally enforceable commitments to the Administrator for local grant contributions, and (2) appropriate controls to protect the Federal Governments' interest in the event of default or failure to complete a project.

It is true that in the committee report, on page 22, there is vague and general language to try to achieve the same end, but it seems to me that the clear suggestion of the Comptroller General is not really provided for anywhere in the bill, or even in the committee report.

The bill would provide, after adoption of the Symington amendment, for $375 million of Federal grant money. This is a new program. It is a program which has never been tried in this way before. Under these conditions the recommendations of the Comptroller General, it seems to me, should be given real consideration. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved.

Why should anyone object to this kind of requirement? In view of the clear language of the Comptroller General and the reasonableness of specifying that there should be legally enforceable commitments for local grant contributions, to protect the public money, and considering the recognition by all of us that there will be a great demand for the $375 million, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to. I have talked with a very considerable number of Senators who have told me that they expect the cities in their own States to qualify for the $25 million maximum amount. It seems to me that the bill should safeguard the Federal Government, so that it can be sure these provisions will be carried through.

Therefore, without taking any further time, unless the opposition wishes to take time, I express the hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I hope that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] will give consideration to accepting this amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question.

Mr. MILLER. The question is asked with a view of trying to clear up the meaning of the language, and possibly to help clarify the legislative history of this proposal.

I should like to ask the Senator what he has in mind by the words "adequately protected"? Is it envisioned that there will be a bonding arrangement of some kind, or will there be some kind of formula according to the amount of property or the fair market value of the property which is perhaps to be subject to lien, in favor of the Federal Government? I was wondering if any recommendations were made by the Comptroller General on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. The Comptroller General's language, as I read it, was explicit, but limited.

It seems to me that both the suggestions made by the Senator from Iowa are sensible and appropriate. They would not be the only ones to be made. There might well be other ways in which the Government interest could be protected. Those certainly would be two sensible ways in which that could be accomplished.

Mr. MILLER. May I say that I feel the two suggestions I have made would preserve the Government's interests satisfactorily, but I would be very hesitant to give the Administrator discretion to use something that would not stand up in the ordinary business type transaction, let us say. It has been my experience that the Federal Government, when it is interested in preserving its rights in property covered by tax liens, for example, uses a certain formula to make sure the Government's tax interests will be maintained.

Might we say that it would be the intention of the proponent of this amendment that the Administrator, in carrying out this provision, would follow the standards used by the Treasury Department, let us say, which have been of long standing, in making sure the Government's interest is protected?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. I think that statement is an excellent contribution. I think it makes very useful legislative history.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Let me say, first, that this suggestion of the General Accounting Office was one of many that were made last year. Again, it was suggested to our committee this year. We thoroughly considered this proposition last year and this year, and while we did not use the language suggested by the General Accounting Office, the Senator will see in the committee report, on page 22, that the committee's attention was drawn to the question of enforcement. The Senator will find that reference at the bottom of the page.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. I called attention to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We feel this meets the hope of the Senator from Wisconsin. I will say that to use the language as he does in the amendment would create administrative legal questions of great complexity back at the community and urban level.

Hypothetically, a city wants to get into the program. It has a 5-year construction program. Part of the money is being taken from the city treasury by vote of the mayor and the common council. To use this language would straitjacket any council. It would require it to bind its suggestions down the line. It would be just as if we in this Congress tried to bind the 89th Congress. We do not do that. We not only have the question of enforcement spelled out but, as was developed in the debate on the Dominick amendments, we know that where there is a default the Administrator of the program knows of the agency's other obligations.

I hope the Senator will not press his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I feel I must press it, because this is a new program. We have not had experience under the program before. The language in the committee report is as follows, and I read this one short paragraph:

> The committee further believes that no loan or grant should be provided under this section unless the Administrator, at or prior to the time the loan or grant contract is executed, shall have obtained reasonable assurance of performance under the contract by the applicant, including assurances of timely repayment of loans, continuing construction as a condition of eligibility for grants, and such other items as may be necessary to safeguard the interests of the Federal Government.

I submit that is extremely loose and nonspecific language. It would seem to me, in view of the recommendations by the Comptroller General in a field in which he is expert, in which his competence has been demonstrated again and again, that we would have nothing to lose by adopting this language.

The Senator from New Jersey spoke of city councils who would have to bind their successors. It seems to me when we put this much of the Federal Government's money into a program, that is something we should insist upon. After all, the Federal Government is making a grant or gift under this program, and it seems reasonable to me that the very least we should expect is that we have this kind of legally enforceable requirement.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. In connection with the Senator's statement that the Comptroller General had made a recommendation, I point out to the Senator that on page 22 of the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency on this very bill is the following statement:

> The committee further believes that no loan or grant——

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I just read that language. My argument on that point is that while that is reassuring and nice language, it is extraordinarily general and vague, and there is nothing in the bill itself to provide any kind of legal protection for the Federal Government under this subsection.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that. The point is that if this is the intention of the committee, there should not be any objection to writing it down on a piece of paper for all to see.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator's logic is irresistible.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot see any objection to it. I would say the failure to write it into the language of the bill might lead one to doubt whether that is the intention of the committee. They have a chance to put it in the bill. The Senator from Wisconsin is giving them that opportunity, and we trust that they will accept it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, could the Senator from Wisconsin indicate to us any problems which now exist in that area, where there have been community defaults on Federal programs? I wonder whether we are imagining something or whether he has evidence of such defaults.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator has brought up a very good point. What is this program? This is a program to help out an area of our economy which, on the basis of testimony lasting over a period of years, is in trouble, and the funds for projects are provided primarily where they cannot finance the operations out of the fare box. We have been told again and again on the floor of the Senate that there is a crisis and that they need this assistance. It seems to me, under economic circumstances with transit companies going broke, there should be safeguards written in the bill.

I would say the testimony we have had in the hearings this year and last year suggests that in community after community there is real difficulty and there are going to be situations where they could easily become overextended and the Federal Government could lose millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As the language appears now in the amendment, I earnestly suggest again its first effect will be to afford employment for lawyers all over the country in trying to figure out ways by which they can advise their city governments to do something they cannot do now; namely, commit them over a period of years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New Jersey is telling the Senator from Wisconsin that the language on page 22 of the report does not really mean very much. He is telling me, I believe, that the Administrator is not going to be able to provide any legal enforcement which is going to require payment and that under this program we can expect, where the communities or transit systems are in trouble, the Federal Government to lose money and have no legal recourse.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, without burdening the city treasuries with lawyers' fees to figure out the Senator's amendment, perhaps it could be altered, to strengthen the assurance of honoring the legal obligation, by, in part 1, saying that there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and in the second part to provide that the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under that commitment; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator accept the amendment as I suggest it be modified?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As modified; yes.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly, and I move its adoption.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may we have the modification read?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa requests that I read the amendment as modified. I shall do so.

On page 16, in line 15, after the period, I would insert the following:

> No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that (1) there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and (2) the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 27.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The amendment will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 16, line 15, after the period insert the following:

> In determining net project cost for any project to be assisted under section 3, any estimate of revenues shall not be reduced by any amount to be allocated as a reserve for replacement of equipment or facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment is also offered to carry out the recommendations of the Comptroller General. I am convinced that if the amendment is not adopted, the bill's enactment will result either in a substantial enhancement of the net worth of a number of transit companies around the country, an enhancement which Congress does not intend, or it could result in an artificial subsidy of low fares on the basis of the result of this particular provision in the bill which my amendment would correct.

The Comptroller General at page 41 of the hearings, in the next to the last paragraph, states:

> With regard to the term "net revenues," we understand from HHFA officials that it is their intention that a fund for replacement of equipment shall be derived from "fare box revenues." In such a case, the Federal Government would, in effect, be paying for a significant portion of this fund because such an accumulation would increase net project cost, two-thirds of which is to be borne by the Federal Government.

Then on page 42, in one sentence, the Comptroller General says:

> If the reserve for replacement is not allowed as a deduction from revenues, the cost to the Federal Government would be decreased.

This is exactly what the amendment would do. It would disallow the depreciation cost as a deduction from the net project cost. Of course, this is technical, and it is difficult to understand, but I believe anyone who follows this matter closely can see how unfair this bill is going to be, if enacted without this provision to the Federal taxpayer.

Let me give an example. Let us assume there is a particular proposal for a $10 million project for buses and street railways, and so forth. Let us assume that this money is going to be spent primarily for depreciable property, instead of rights-of-way. Let us assume also that the reserve for replacement of this property would be about a million dollars a year. It would depreciate over a 10-year period. Let us make one other assumption, namely, that the net revenues available, if we exclude depreciation, would be a million dollars. The fact is that if the Senate adopts my amendment, it will be possible for the community to finance the $10 million project out of fare box revenues without any assistance from the Federal Government, because it would have a million dollars a year, enough to finance a $10 million project. They could do that.

However, if my amendment is not adopted, then the depreciation costs would be deducted from the operating revenues, and we would arrive at a situation in which there would be no net funds available with which to finance a program.

Under those circumstances the community could come to the Federal Government and get a grant of $6⅔ million.

It seems to me that the depreciation cost should not be deducted. If my amendment is adopted after the $10 million loan has been amortized and serviced over a period of 10 years, the transit company is in the position of having its stock completely depreciated and the loan paid off. It will then be in precisely the same position it is in today. It can then finance an additional $10 million purchase with its million dollar annual net income.

But if my amendment is not adopted, the transit operation receives in effect a $6⅔ million gift from the Federal Government of depreciable property. It depreciates this property with a cash reserve and ends up with a multimillion dollar enhancement of its net worth.

It seems to me that we should heed the recommendations of the Attorney General, who recognized this loophole in the bill and recognized the fact that the computation of the net project cost to include depreciation deductions would result in enhancing the worth of a transit company; or, if it were regulated closely, would result in a reduction of fares, subsidized by the taxpayer.

This is a completely valid objection. I hope the distinguished Senator from New Jersey will recognize its validity. If not, I should like to hear why it is not a valid objection.

I apologize for the complications of this subject. It is a complicated accounting problem.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, surprises me most of the series of amendments he is offering. I say that quite frankly, because it comes from a Senator who, of course, is a man of unusual acumen in business and finance. What a prudent management accomplishes or attempts to accomplish with annual setting aside of reserves, of funds for later equipment needs, is one of the best business practices.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I approve of it 100 percent. My amendment would not prevent management from doing that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It would not prevent it, but it would discourage it to the point where it might find it difficult to put away money in reserves for equipment needs later on.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out to the Senator that my amendment provides for that. In other words, if they have the income available, it seems to me that they must set it aside in computing their net project cost.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would the Senator say that if that is done, the local share would be larger by way of contribution to the net project cost, and that the Federal share would be smaller?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; that is what the Comptroller General clearly states.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is what I am saying; that the money will have to be taken out of reserves, to be applied to the project, and that to that extent the reserve fund of a prudently run company will be reduced.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the Senator can argue that; however, I believe that the Federal Government should not finance operating costs, the costs of wages and salaries, and so forth, or depreciation of equipment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. While a lower Federal contribution and a higher local contribution would occur at the inception of a program, down the road if these prudently run companies cannot put away reserves, then the Federal contribution will be increased, because the companies will not have been able to reserve money for equipment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If that is the situation. However, if the Senate does not adopt my amendment, the fact is that the transit company will enhance its net worth at the cost of the Federal taxpayer; or, if the regulatory body prevents excessive profits, the fares will be reduced at the cost of the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I have been following the colloquy with much interest. I would appreciate having the Senator from Wisconsin point out how a transit company would have increased its net worth to an undue degree without his amendment. It seems to me that depreciation is a proper business expense, going to diminish the value of equipment, so that after 10 years it will be down to zero value. That would not add to net worth, so far as I can see, and it would be offset exactly by the $10 million reserve of money in the bank, which balances out. So it appears to me the company would be right where it started.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, this is the way it operates. Under the bill, if my amendment is not adopted, it would be possible for a transit company to set aside a million dollars a year out of its income and build up, over a period of 10 years—the example I gave—a $10 million reserve. At the same time, the reserve is against equipment which was to the extent of two-thirds a gift of the Federal Government. So what has happened is that there is a reserve on the asset side of the balance sheet which is built up, on a Federal gift. The net effect on the bookkeeping is that the net worth of the transit company would be enhanced unless fares were reduced.

Mr. MILLER. But what the Senator forgets in that computation is that while the company is paying off the loan, and is therefore reducing its liability, it has an offsetting reduction in the value of its equipment in the amount of the depreciation reserve. They balance out. So I cannot see how the net worth has increased, according to the example which the Senator gave, which was $1 million a year revenue, exactly equal to the depreciation amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Our difficulty is that we have to decide whether or not we should require transit operations to buy their own equipment when the fare box in fact provides them with enough income after operating costs to do so. If we do not require this, we make a Federal gift that enhances net worth.

Mr. MILLER. When we talk about net worth, we are talking about true assets and liabilities; and the depreciation reserve can be a fiction unless it is supported by money in the bank. The Senator said the money would not go into the bank but would go into the repayment of the loan. So there would not be any money in the bank to back up the depreciation reserve, but there would be a diminution in the loan. That would balance out with the diminution in the value of the rolling stock. Based on the facts which the Senator has given us, I believe the net worth would not be enhanced at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The description which the Senator gave would apply to the bill as the Senator from Wisconsin would amend it. But the bill under the present circumstances would provide a grant from the Federal Government. The grant would be a gift, and the transit company would not be under any obligation to reduce or pay back to the Federal Government the amount of that gift. Therefore, there is a situation in which, on the liability side, there is no obligation which has to be repaid.

Mr. MILLER. Then, does the Senator's argument come down to this, that his amendment would, in effect, result in a smaller grant?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. In the form of depreciation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct; that is exactly what the Comptroller General says in his letter.

Mr. MILLER. If that is the true impact of the Senator's amendment, it is something which I think merits much careful consideration. I am sorry I have not had a chance to think this proposal through; but I believe the Senator has a point.

I believe that what he is trying to do is to avoid having one community obtain discriminatory treatment, more favorable treatment, in the form of a better grant from the Government merely because it happens to use a higher depreciation rate than another community which is operating in the same circumstances. If that is so, it may be that the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Jersey can be brought together by providing a uniform depreciation rate which will be taken into account. Otherwise, there will be discrimination between communities. Community A and Community B might have identical problems, but Community A, in coming before the Administrator to compute a project cost, might use a 10-percent depreciation rate, while Community B would use a 20-percent depreciation rate. One would obtain a better deal and a better grant than the other. If I may ask him the question, how does the Senator from New Jersey propose to cover that situation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Iowa has a proposal for uniform depreciation, and I would support it if it were in the form of an amendment; but I prefer to speak to my amendment, which is already so complicated that we are having considerable difficulty with it.

Let me see if I can persuade the Senator from New Jersey along this line: I recognize that the problem is extremely difficult. The Comptroller General sincerely proposed this plan on the basis of a very careful analysis. I have gone over it. I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that he might be willing to take the amendment to conference, so that there will be a period in which to study it over a couple of weeks, then decide, on the basis of careful study, whether it is not true that there is a situation in which there would be an unintended benefit either to the transit company or to the fare riders, based on the fact that the depreciation should not be deducted before arriving at the funds available for the project cost.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe the problem is quite so complicated as the Senator from Wisconsin fears it to be. The Senator from New Jersey or the conference committee could submit an amendment comparable to what the Senator's amendment calls for, namely, that in computing the project cost, a cost of depreciation not in excess of a certain rate shall be taken into account. I think that would bring the two Senators together. I urge the Senator from New Jersey to let this amendment go to conference, because I believe there could be discriminatory action and treatment between communities having identical problems, and in very large amounts, because the depreciation on transit equipment runs into millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I may say to both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Iowa that I did very poorly in accounting in college; but on my personal balance sheet the good will for each Senator is carried at a very significant figure. Perhaps it is bad accounting practice, but I feel that way. Just as the last amendment, or the amendment before it, would make hundreds of man-hours for lawyers, so this amendment, I daresay, would make hundreds of man-hours for accountants.

I really would be reluctant to accept an amendment which is so complex and which has not been heard and about which we do not truly know much.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my view that although the subject is complicated to explain, because accounting procedure can be complex, this proposal would not complicate the bill and would not complicate the administration of the act. It is a very simple provision that in computing the project cost, the depreciation cost shall not be included. It seems to me that that can be applied.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Do both Senators agree that if this were done, then back home the local transit companies would be discouraged from following one of the best business practices with which I am familiar; namely, the prudence to reserve money as they go along, so that there will be a fund for replacement when the equipment has to be replaced?

Mr. MILLER. The point made by the Senator from Wisconsin about discrimination between communities, relating to depreciation, is well taken. The point made by the Senator from New Jersey, that the impact should not be quite so severe as the Senator from Wisconsin would have it, because this is good business practice, is a point well taken. It is not a difficult problem at all. All that would have to be done would be to provide for uniform treatment in accordance with Bulletin F of the Treasury Department, which sets forth standards of depreciation rates on transit equipment.

I do not believe this is the time to make a decision on this question. I suggest that the committee of conference, with the assistance of its staff, in the interim, can reach a conclusion which will be simple and readily enforceable, without getting into many complexities.

As I recall, Bulletin F of the Treasury Department, which contains new depreciation rates, provides about 10 percent as the standard depreciation rate on transit equipment. I do not think we have any accounting problems. We could follow the uniform standard of the Treasury Department.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator is making a good point. However, I am not the floor manager of the bill. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is the floor manager of the bill, and he has been following very closely the statements of the Senator. Perhaps we can have a moment to confer.

Mr. President, from the time available to me on this amendment, I yield such time as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee needs. He is in charge of the bill, and has done an admirable job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the presentation which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I know he has given a great deal of time and attention to this matter, as well as to others.

We received from the Comptroller General a letter practically identical with the letter we received last year. In the 1962 letter from the Comptroller, 26 points were made. The committee made nine changes in the bill itself. Seven of the points were recognized by changes in the report. After due consideration, six of the points were considered to be invalid. The committee felt that the four remaining points did not come within the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office.

We have given this matter considerable consideration, and a whole page of the report is devoted to it.

The Senator from Wisconsin has another amendment, which is pending. I should like very much to have him agree not to offer the third amendment, which I think is already covered by the Renegotiation Act. In fact, the amendment pertains to a subject which comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, not our committee; namely, renegotiation.

So if the Senator from Wisconsin will withhold his last amendment—the one relating to renegotiation, I shall be willing to take this amendment to conference, because I think the Senator from Wisconsin has made a convincing presentation. Frankly, at first I was rather negative to the idea he has presented.

So I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference; but in the interest of time, and also because I do not believe we should consider the third amendment, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin to withhold his third amendment. On that basis, I shall be willing to recommend that we take this amendment to conference.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulty, particularly in view of the lack of time and the desirability of taking final action soon on this bill. So I think the Senator from Alabama has made an excellent case, and I would be willing to agree to what he proposes.

However, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Comptroller General stated:

> We suggest that section 10 be amended so as to require all such contracts to contain a clause providing for periodic renegotiation in the event any residual profits are earned.

I also point out that in these cases there can very well be very large amounts of residual profits, and great loss to the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I believe the Senator from Wisconsin will agree with me that renegotiation matters come within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. So if this matter is not already covered by the Renegotiation Act—although I believe it is already covered by it—it is clear that this matter should be considered, not by the Banking and Currency Committee or by the Commerce Committee, but by the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Wisconsin is a member.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand; and, therefore, I shall not press for Senate action on the amendment, even though it is, in my opinion, a sound and sensible proposal.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to vote on my amendment numbered 27.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well, Mr. President; in that event we are willing to accept this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Is the remaining time yielded back?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remaining time under my control.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remaining time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 3, line 9, strike out all after the word "bonds" down to and including the word "otherwise" in line 13.

On page 4, line 5, strike out "bonds, grant or loan" and insert "bonds".

On page 4, line 22, strike out "bonds, grant or loan" and insert "bonds".

On page 5, line 5, strike out "bonds, grant or loan" and insert "bonds".

On page 6 strike out all in lines 9 through line 10 on page 7.

On pages 16 through 19 strike out all of section 13, section 14, and section 15.

On page 20, lines 15, 16, strike out the word "grants" and insert "guaranteed revenue bonds".

On page 22, line 24, strike out "loan or grant" and insert "guarantee".

On pages 24 and 25, strike out subsection (e).

On pages 25 and 26, strike out section 16 (a) and 16(b).

Renumber sections accordingly and make technical conforming changes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of these amendments en bloc? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendments contemplate striking from the bill all the provisions which deal with grants. In addition, the amendments direct changing the parts of the bill which must be changed in order to conform to my principal amendment.

I propose that the grant provisions be stricken out—for two reasons: First, because an adequate study has not been made as to how the mass transit problem can be solved in the various metropolitan communities; second, because the Federal Government should not enter into a program of subsidizing local mass transportation.

In 1961, we passed the original bill on this subject; and $12,500,000 was appropriated for the purpose of making studies and tests in regard to how to solve the local problems.

In 1962, six studies were made. Two of them have been completed, but no tests were connected with them.

The first study which was completed dealt with the city of Detroit. It involved a total expenditure of $366,000, with two-thirds being posted by the Federal Government, and one-third by the city of Detroit.

In June 1962, the University of Washington was engaged to make a study—at a cost of $15,000—of the Seattle monorail. That study has been completed.

But now we come to the significant ones which are still pending: The Mass Transportation Commission of the State of Massachusetts was engaged on October 6, 1962, to make a series of experiments in the urban areas of Boston, Fitchburg, Worcester, and Pittsfield, with the project to last for a period of 18 months.

While the contract was made on October 6, work was not begun until December of 1962. The Federal Government has posted $3,600,000 on that project, and the Massachusetts Transportation Commission has posted $1,800,000, making a total of $5,400,000 to be used in paying to the Boston & Maine Railroad $2,200,000 in 1 year to subsidize the railroad to counterbalance the reduction of fares that it charges. That test has proceeded. The test shows that, by reducing fares from $1.99 to $1.10—a reduction of 89 cents per passenger—the Boston & Maine has attracted about 7,000 passengers a day. But the cost to the taxpayers has been $1 a day per passenger. The Boston & Maine is receiving $7,000 a day to reduce passenger fares from $1.99 to $1.10. The study on the Boston & Maine has been in progress for about 3 months, and has 15 more months to go. The result will not be known until 18 months expire.

Another important study that is in progress is in the city of Memphis. The contract was made on December 11, 1962. The study contemplates a determination of the pattern and volume of ridership in the area by establishing full scale mass transit service. The duration of the project is 2 years. Only 3 months of the experiment have been completed. Twenty-one more months must pass before the result of the study and test is determined.

On December 22, 1962, another engagement was entered into with the tristate transportation committee, which includes New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. That study contemplates an expenditure of about $256,000. Its purpose is to find out whether people will ride commuter trains if a suburban station is located outside of the central business district, it is easily accessible, and has ample parking facilities. A new station will be built for the Pennsylvania Railroad in New Brunswick, New Jersey, and it will be determined whether, by building the terminal away from the downtown area, passengers will be taken off the highways and put on the Pennsylvania Railroad.

I submit to Senators that when, in 1961, the $12½ million bill was passed to make tests and studies, there was no purpose to enter into a subsidized program until those tests and studies indicated what should be done.

I should like to repeat the status of those studies. The three main contracts were entered into on October 26, 1962, December 11, 1962, and December 22, 1962. No adequate test has been made. No one can tell whether those reductions in fares will take passengers off the highways and put them on the railroad trains.

Mr. President, in connection with those studies, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a study made by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Illinois which was concluded in November 1962.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Appraisal of the Urban Transit Situation

(By Robert L. Rivers)

In the past few years, the urban transit question has been the focus of many studies and reports pertaining to the problems of the industry and the related problems of urban traffic congestion. Federal funds are now being made available through the Federal Housing Administration for improvements in urban transit systems. It is felt in some circles that a thoroughgoing rehabilitation and modernization of transit facilities is mandatory in order to resolve urban transportation difficulties and to provide for balanced transportation systems in urban areas.

The purpose of this inquiry is to present an analysis of metropolitan transportation with reference to those factors which have contributed to the growth and decline of mass transit. Since there is much agitation on the part of planners to try to restore public mass transit to its former status as a major passenger carrier in metropolitan areas, an appraisal of the trends over the past decade is made in order to determine the future prospects for mass transportation.

THE TRANSIT FUNCTION

Metropolitan transit, as the term is ordinarily used, is the conveyance of people within a metropolitan area with a regularity of frequency between readily identifiable points. This function can be accomplished by any means of transportation available. In the past it was most commonly accomplished by street railway and rapid transit. However, as new means of transportation became available, substitutions by the motor vehicle with expressways, and more recently, air commuter service has broadened the modes of transit available to the individual. Hence, the transit function can be performed by mass transportation facilities, the private automobile, and more recently by the airplane.

FACTORS OF URBAN CONCENTRATION

Before the appearance of the motor vehicle, street railways and commuter railroads were the primary means of mobility in urban areas. In their capacities as concentrators of traffic, they carried people to points of economic agglomeration, such as civic, retail, financial, wholesale, administrative, manufacturing, and recreational centers. As traffic distributors they performed their functions equally well in returning people to their points of origin. Even though much of the routing was indirect as a result of the general practice of having routes converge on the central business district, urban transit provided the highest known degree of efficiency for the movement of people from one place to another.

The agglomeration of economic functions operated as a centripetal force in attracting new business and in the expansion of existing ones. As land values increased in these areas, the land became more intensively utilized, and the less productive users relocated on less expensive land away from the core area, but usually on or close to transit routes in order to retain the greatest degree of accessibility. In like manner, people considered the availability of public transportation in choosing their dwelling sites. Hence, transit route patterns were sharply oriented toward the city core areas. These elements, along with many others, resulted in a high degree of concentration of people along transit routes, which provided the required density of traffic per mile of route for profitable operations.

Under the stimulus of economic concentration in urban areas, the demand for efficient public transportation increased. Expansion of transit facilities occurred rapidly to meet the increased demand, in many cases to the point of oversupply. As equipment and operating techniques improved, street railways and commuter railroads provided a quality of service which could not be equaled or surpassed by any other form of transportation. Since there were no adequate substitutes, people had no alternative but to use them; hence, they possessed a virtual monopoly on local passenger movements.

THE DECONCENTRATION MOVEMENT

Transit traffic peaked in 1926 at slightly over 17 billion passengers where it hovered until 1929 when it began a progressive decline.[1] Because of wartime restrictions on the use of the automobile, transit travel revived and reached its highest peak in 1946 when more than 23 billion passengers were carried.[2] Following the resumption of motor vehicle production in 1946, transit traffic began a second decline which has continued to the present day. Although the automobile may be regarded as the primary cause of transit difficulties, there are other factors of technical, social, and economic change which have exerted and are continuing to exert strong pressures in molding the nature of future urban transportation patterns. These factors include, among others, industrial location and relocation, urban deconcentration, changing patterns of land use, urban redevelopment programs, and the trend to the suburbs.

THE RISE OF THE AUTOMOBILE

Local transit operators felt the influence of the automobile at about the same time that the railroads began to sense the impact of the motor truck. The high degree of convenience and flexibility of operation of the motor vehicle permitted a reorganization of personal transport functions to best suit the origin and destination needs of the individual and no longer required conformance to rigid route patterns and schedules. In terms of service, the competitive efficiency of the automobile as compared with local transit was felt fairly quickly by the public carriers.

From somewhat humble beginnings in the late 19th century, automobiles increased rapidly in numbers, as indicated by registration data. In 1900, only 8,000 motor vehicles were registered in the United States. The number of registrations rose in succeeding years until just before World War II when 29.5 million private passenger cars were registered. Following the war, automobile production resumed and the total number of privately owned passenger cars more than doubled by 1960.[3]

The period of postwar prosperity along with generous credit terms stimulated much automobile buying, and riding on public transit systems dropped. As people moved beyond the range of transit and commuter lines, the automobile became an almost indispensable accessory to human living. In fact, in many places the automobile is a basic necessity because of the lack of any public transportation.

With the increasing number of motor vehicles, improved and new highways to and from the cities were sought in order to facilitate contact with jobs and other social and economic functions. The shift of much freight tonnage from railroads to trucks added additional pressure to the demand for an expanded and improved system of streets and highways.[4] After much study Congress came to grips with this problem in 1956 when it passed the Interstate Highway Act, which provides for a system of limited access highways and their urban extensions. The cities have benefited most from the urban extension provisions, inasmuch as the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of constructing expressways through urban areas.

INDUSTRIAL RELOCATIONS

The increased technical efficiency of the motor truck and improvements and expansion of the highway system have reduced industry dependence on the railroads to serve a large portion of their transportation requirements. The ubiquitous motor truck has made possible the location of industrial activity at less congested locations, especially along newly built limited-access highways. In many cases, moreover, the problem of gathering together at existing sites a sufficient number of land parcels whose titles rest with a number of owners has discouraged expansion in the central city. The difficulty is further compounded since the land is usually broken up by a pattern of city streets, and the problem involved in obtaining closings and titles is at best a costly and long-drawn-out process.[5] In addition there are the factors of technological improvement in industrial processes where heavier machinery and modern materials-handling equipment have been installed, which, because of increased weight and operating considerations, require the use of monitor-type buildings in lieu of older multistory structures. Hence, a company can expand or relocate at less cost on a parcel of vacant land, which is ordinarily not available in sufficient size within the central city. In one recent year more than one-half of the factories, over two-fifths of the retail stores, and one-fourth of the office buildings were built in the suburbs.[6] Between 1929 and 1954 the number of manufacturing jobs in urban areas dropped from 67 percent to 57 percent of the total jobs, and the number of retail jobs dropped from 78 percent to 63 percent.[7]

People will tend to go where the jobs are, and the retail trade will follow the population. Hence, new housing developments arise in the suburbs, followed in turn by the construction of shopping centers. These shopping centers have a tendency to generate more shopping traffic and to create a practically new downtown district. One common denominator present in these business locations and relocations outside of the core area is the emphasis on the provision of adequate parking spaces for both customers and employees.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

One purpose of urban redevelopment is the clearing of areas containing slum housing and of abandoned or marginal industrial plants and reclaiming the land for public low-cost housing or for industrial parks. The land may also be taken over for the construction of an expressway. In appraising urban redevelopment programs two factors stand out: (1) there is less intensive utilization of the land, thereby tending to foster deconcentration; and (2) emphasis is placed upon access by motor vehicles.

THE TREND TO THE SUBURBS

In the postwar years the suburban trek has accelerated at a rapid pace. Vacant lands at the peripheries of and just beyond the city limits have been converted into housing developments, characterized chiefly by single-family homes with land plots ranging, on the average, from about one-fourth to one-half acre in size. The result is a low-density sprawl. The desirability and success of these developments is primarily dependent upon their being accessible by automobile. Attempts to extend metropolitan transit lines to these areas have met with little success because of the low traffic density and the fact that the automobile had already preempted this transport function. It is in these areas where the majority of the two-car families are to be found.[8]

The trend to the suburbs has depleted central city populations. Census reports indicate that many cities have lost a number of inhabitants over the past decade.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in population of central cities and their suburban areas, 1950–60*

Locality	Population (in thousands)		Percentage change
	1950	1960	
Boston:			
Central city	802	697	−13.1
Suburbs	2,043	2,412	+16.4
New York City:			
Central city	7,892	7,782	−1.4
Suburbs	5,526	7,631	+38.1
San Francisco-Oakland:			
Central cities	1,160	1,110	−4.3
Suburbs	1,347	1,673	+24.2
Pittsburgh:			
Central city	678	604	−10.9
Suburbs	1,443	1,801	+24.8
Baltimore:			
Central city	949	939	−1.1
Suburbs	388	699	+80.2
Washington, D.C.:			
Central city	802	764	−4.7
Suburbs	657	1,238	+88.4
Minneapolis-St. Paul:			
Central cities	833	796	−4.4
Suburbs	284	633	+122.9
St. Louis-East St. Louis:			
Central cities	940	832	−11.5
Suburbs	742	1,162	+56.6
Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.:			
Central cities	415	405	−2.4
Suburbs	289	417	+44.3
Cleveland:			
Central city	914	876	−4.2
Suburbs	551	921	+67.1

Source: Computed from standard metropolitan area tables in Donald J. Bogue and Calvin L. Beale, "Economic Areas of the United States" (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961).

Table 1 shows the effects of population shifts on 10 central cities in the United States. Over the period from 1950 to 1960, the central city populations declined 1 to 13 percent, whereas their suburbs increased 8 to 123 percent.

Although there are some indications of a return to the cities, the evidence is currently fragmentary and inconclusive. The Wall Street Journal has reported that owners of new office buildings are finding it harder to attract tenants. Concessions are being offered in the form of free rent for 3 months, free carpeting, and the payment of moving expenses.[9] A similar situation prevails in the case of new apartment buildings and similar concessions are being made. The vacancy rate has increased from 5 to 20 percent in the past year, and rents are being reduced.[10] This is in sharp contrast to the situation which prevailed a year or two ago when new apartment buildings under construction in the cities were fully rented prior to completion. It should be noted that these new structures provided for the storage of the occupants' automobiles.

---

[1] "Transit Fact Book," 1944 (New York: American Transit Association), p. 15.

[2] "Transit Fact Book," 1951, p. 15.

[3] "Automobile Facts and Figures, 1961" (Detroit: Automobile Manufacturers' Association), p. 18.

[4] From 1947 to 1961, the share of railroad ton-miles of freight declined from 66 percent of the total to 43.3 percent, whereas that of motor trucks, over the same period, increased from 10.1 percent to 22.6 percent of total ton-miles. "Yearbook of Railroad Information," 1961 and 1962 editions (New York: Eastern Railroads Presidents Conference), p. 4.

[5] These and other problems faced by urban businesses are discussed by Raymond Vernon in "What Is the Business of Cities?" Ch. 2. of "The Little Economies: Problems of U.S. Area Development" (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1958), p. 14.

[6] John Christie and Melvin J. Goldberg, "The Crisis of Cities: Industry Heads for the Open," Dun's Review, February 1960, p. 36.

[7] Raymond Vernon, loc. cit., pp. 14–15.

[8] Automobile Facts and Figures, 1962, states that 40 percent of the households with two or more cars are in the suburban areas. P. 35.

EFFECTS ON TRANSIT OPERATIONS

The pressure of increasing numbers of motor vehicles, parking facilities, and expressways, along with other centrifugal forces exerted upon central cities, has had a strong adverse effect upon transit operations. Table 2 indicates a 10-year trend in revenue passenger-miles for rapid transit and for surface operations. There was a continued decline in rapid transit riding from 1950 to 1958 of 32.6 percent; however, between 1958 and 1960 there was a slight recovery in rapid transit riding which increased revenue passenger-mile by a little more than 3 percent.

TABLE 2.—*Trends in revenue passenger miles, 1950–60*

Year	Revenue passengers (millions)	Vehicle miles (millions)	Revenue passenger-miles (millions)
RAPID TRANSIT			
1950	2,113	443.4	936,904
1951	2,041	424.0	865,384
1952	1,982	400.4	793,593
1953	1,903	391.1	744,263
1954	1,781	376.3	670,180
1955	1,741	382.8	666,455
1956	1,749	387.1	676.038
1957	1,706	388.0	661,928
1958	1,635	386.5	632,928
1959	1,647	388.7	640,189
1960	1,670	390.9	652,803
SURFACE LINES			
1950	11,732	2,564.2	30,083,194
1951	10,840	2,480.4	26,985,096
1952	10,040	2,414.1	25,106,640
1953	9,133	2,304.4	21,046,085
1954	8,077	2,172.5	17,547,283
1955	7,448	2,064.7	15,377,886
1956	7,007	1,979.5	13,870,357
1957	6,632	1,901.5	12,610,748
1958	6,143	1,814.5	11,146,474
1959	6,003	1,770.2	10,626,511
1960	5,851	1,751.9	10,250,370

Source: Computed from "Transit Fact Book," 1951 and 1961 editions (New York: American Transit Association).

For surface operations, revenue passenger-miles decreased by 65.9 percent over the 11-year period. This figure is subject to qualification because it includes operations in small cities as well as large and reflects service abandonments; both factors would tend to accentuate the decline percentagewise. If transit operations are broken down according to population groups (table 3), it may be noted that the attrition in numbers of passengers in surface operations has been highest in cities under 500,000 population. In contrast to rapid transit operations, the figures do not indicate any recovery in traffic for any population group between 1958 and 1960. However, the decline has been smallest for cities of over 500,000 population.

TABLE 3.—*Percentage change in revenue passengers by population groups, 1950–60*

Population group	Revenue passengers (millions)		Percentage change
	1950	1960	
Over 500,000	5,207	2,977	−42.8
250,000 to 500,000	2,007	911	−54.6
100,000 to 250,000	1,585	691	−56.4
50,000 to 100,000	1,323	554	−58.1
Less than 50,000	728	230	−68.4

Source: "Transit Fact Book," 1951 and 1961 editions (New York: American Transit Association).

Another aspect of the current transit situation is gleaned from the statistics on the number of companies which have abandoned service. From January, 1954, to April, 1960, 288 transit companies abandoned all or part of their operations. Of these, 17 were engaged in suburban service. As a result, about 65 cities and towns were left without any transit service. These abandonments of service occurred in centers of less than 25,000 population. In 19 cases, the service was resumed by a local governmental agency; in the remainder, new private operators instituted service or existing companies expanded their operations to fill the void.[11]

In appraising the prospects of the transit industry, expected developments must be considered. The trend of automobile ownership will not be reversed. Metropolitan areas will tend to become increasingly important and their suburban areas are likely to continue to grow. If the centripetal forces exerted by the central city are strong enough, there will be substantial movements of people in and out of the core areas. Whether or not transit service will be justified will depend largely on the circumstances peculiar to each area.

SOME THEORETICAL LIMITS TO DECONCENTRATION

It would be erroneous to assume that the process of deconcentration will continue indefinitely. There are practical and possible theoretical factors which may operate to circumscribe this tendency, and consequently permit the operation of transit services in certain cities for some time in the future. Some of these factors are advantages of location, social and economic costs, and other strong centripetal forces.

Some cities, such as New York and San Francisco, have experienced a low rate of deconcentration (table 1). These cities are important gateways for commerce. Their strong economic advantages of location, good harbor, well-developed land transportation, and the presence of financial and other important services provide strong centripetal forces for these cities.[12]

Social and economic costs may tend to check the rate of deconcentration. Travel time between the central city and the suburbs will place effective limits on both population and business deconcentration. If a business moves too far out in the suburbs, the increased travel time for some employees may cause them to seek alternative sources of employment. Too, no business unit is completely self-sufficient. It must depend often upon the efficiency of contact for the products and services of other companies in order to operate effectively. It should be observed that these limitations to deconcentration are relevant to the present state of the arts. Improvements in the technology of transportation and communication, on the other hand, would permit a greater degree of decentralization.

There are other centripetal forces which will act to retard decentralization and which exhibit concentration tendencies. Studies indicate that cities with a high degree of office-oriented employment are a significant factor in the flow of commuters in and out of central cities. This type of activity appears to be resistant to the forces of decentralization.[13] For the most part, these workers live in the suburbs and commute to and from work. Further evidence of this fact may be found in a study by the Civil Defense Administration in 1955 which compares the daytime versus resident populations of selected cities. Although more recent figures are unavailable, these data indicate the degree of strain which is placed upon transport facilities during the commutation periods. The continued decrease in transit passengers and the increasing rate of motor vehicle registrations show the strain to be most severe on the highway system.

Generally speaking, central cities with low rates of deconcentration and with strong centripetal forces are likely to suffer from increased traffic congestion and to find that the problem becomes increasingly difficult to solve. Certain assumptions may be made on the basis of the figures in table 1. Some cities may have lost population in the 1950–60 period because they were overconcentrated. The centrifugal forces may have been responsible, or the city (and even the entire area) may have lost some of the economic advantages which it had at one time. However, where a city shows a low rate of population decline but a high rate of suburban growth, it may be assumed that this peripheral cluster of economic activity has a significant economic relation to the central city and, therefore, is strongly oriented toward it. If such is the case, the amount of commuter traffic in and out of the central city will be increasing sharply. Under such circumstances, depending upon the nature and characteristics of the city involved, economically feasible mass transit operations may be possible.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of daytime and resident populations in selected cities*[1]

City	Resident population	Daytime population	Percentage increase
Baltimore	949,708	1,071,104	13
Boston	801,444	1,075,107	34
Cleveland	914,808	1,085,830	19
Minneapolis	521,718	593,477	14
St. Paul	311,349	346,267	11
Pittsburgh	676,806	1,011,618	49
New York	7,891,957	8,201,842	4
Portland, Oreg	373,628	468,699	25
St. Louis	841,000	1,002,200	19
San Francisco	775,357	1,012,145	31
Oakland	384,575	491,670	28
Washington	859,000	980,100	14

[1] Based on 1950 census.

Source: Federal Civil Defense Administration, Annual Report, 1956 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957), pp. 13–15.

TENDENCY TOWARD A NEW EQUILIBRIUM

It is evident that there are two sets of forces at work which are shaping future city patterns: one is centrifugal in nature, and the other is centripetal. The centrifugal forces are exemplified by the requirements of the motor vehicle for space for movement and parking facilities (frequently causing displacement of land from other uses), relocations of industry, the population movement to the suburbs, and the rise of shopping centers away from the core areas.

Centripetal forces are characterized by urban renewal programs for housing and industrial parks, new luxury apartment house construction, and urban shopping centers.

---

[9] "Business Bulletin," Wall Street Journal, July 12, 1962, p. 1.

[10] "Business Bulletin," Wall Street Journal, June 28, 1962, p. 1.

[11] Data furnished by courtesy of the American Transit Association.

[12] For a good generalized coverage of this area, see Jean Gottman, Megalopolis (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1961), ch. 1.

[13] Ibid., p. 639.

The interactions of the centripetal and centrifugal forces are exerting strong influences which are remolding the physical and economic structures of central cities. These forces will continue to operate until a new equilibrium in population density and in economic activity is reached. The new equilibrium is likely to be conditioned to a considerable degree by the number of motor vehicles in urban areas. It is estimated that by 1972, the United States will have 101 million registered motor vehicles of all types, and that 70 percent of these will be concentrated in urban areas.[14] Thus, it appears at the present time that the centrifugal forces are the stronger ones and that for some time to come most central cities will continue to deconcentrate. Measured against the prospective needs of this new equilibrium, it appears that an imbalance of transportation facilities exists at present, namely, an oversupply of mass transit facilities brought about by a shift in preference for the automobile, while on the other hand, there exists a shortage of facilities to handle motor vehicle requirements.[15]

In the determination of the new equilibrium for cities, it is at this point that the work of planners is most critical. Account must be taken of both the centrifugal and centripetal forces in planning future land uses, especially in redevelopment projects, utilization of vacant lands, and the provision of adequate transportation facilities in order to maximize the productivity of urban lands.

NEW MASS TRANSIT PROPOSALS

Proposals have been advanced for the construction of new rapid transist systems for Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, and Miami, and for extensions and improvements to existing systems in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. The proponents of these programs have received encouragement from President Kennedy's $500 million program of Federal aid for establishing new rapid transit systems and improving existing facilities. A bill to carry out these recommendations failed to pass the 87th Congress in the closing days of the session. It is expected that a revised bill for Federal aid to rapid transit will be introduced at the next session. However, two of the above proposals for new transit systems were submitted to the voters in San Francisco and Atlanta. In San Francisco the proposal passed by a margin of 0.7 percent of the required 60 percent affirmative vote; in Atlanta the electorate voted against the rapid transit proposal.

Advocates of rapid transit urge that such facilities are necessary for the preservation of the central city and the relief of traffic congestion, and that such transport systems are more efficient in terms of land utilization, are less expensive to construct than expressways or freeways, and will reduce the necessity for the construction of such a large number of the latter facilities.[16]

Although the claims in support of new rapid transit may be meritorious, they are subject to criticism. In the first place, transit will not necessarily help to preserve the central city, since transit is no longer the prime mover of people but is now a supplemental and specialized form of transportation. Furthermore, there is no valid reason for the preservation of an outmoded and inefficient central city core area any more than there is for the perpetuation of an antiquated and high-cost manufacturing plant. It is reasonable to assume that cities must modernize and improve along with social and technological progress. Secondly, even if rapid transit facilities are constructed, it is not likely that they will have a very high degree of utilization. The forces of deconcentration have caused the relocation of much business activity and personal services outside the core area, and in many cases outside the central city. Travel patterns now take on a pattern of multiple lateral movements rather than a concentrated focus upon the central city. Hence, origin and destination patterns have become scattered, with the result that there has been a deterioration of the traffic density necessary for successful transit operation. All that is left at present is largely the journey-to-work movement which results in a very low degree of utilization of the facilities.

In the final analysis, it may be said that costs are relative to the general level of income. Even though automobile transportation is more costly, in all respects, than public transit, the average American has found these costs to be bearable and he has become accustomed to them. He will use his automobile in preference to public transit, and he is willing to pay additional amounts in the form of taxes and tolls for new facilities in order to ease his travel problems.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Central cities are tending toward a new equilibrium in terms of density of population and density of business activity. As a result, central cities are showing varying rates of deconcentration, but the growing suburbs are not exhibiting a tendency toward a high degree of concentration which was characteristic of the central cities more than a decade ago.

2. The present rate of urban deconcentration places mass transit operations in a transitional stage. The increasing rate of automobile ownership gives more emphasis to this means of transportation and less to public transit.

3. As a result of increased motor vehicle utilization in urban areas, the existing supply of streets and parking spaces has become inadequate. The basic problem is a shortage of necessary expressways and parking facilities to expedite motor vehicle operation. Until these facilities are provided and properly coordinated with the existing street system there will continue to be a high degree of urban traffic congestion which will impair the operation of all forms of urban transport.

4. The tendencies to deconcentration and the increases in the number of motor vehicles in the number of motor vehicles and their rate of use have raised the operating costs of all forms of urban transport, especially surface mass transit. Congestion restricts movements and results in an increase in running time and in the utilization of an additional number of vehicles to maintain established headways. Furthermore, the movement to the suburbs has not only depleted the traffic base in the central city, but has created many lateral movements for which mass transit is not adapted. Since most fixed-rail rapid transit facilities are generally core oriented, they do not provide for these lateral movements. It is in this area that the automobile has demonstrated superiority. Also, the construction of expressways, both of a lateral and of a direct type, has facilitated direct movements to destination by automobile rather than inducing transfer at some point to a rapid transit line.

5. As a result, the number of motor vehicles in metropolitan areas has continued to increase. Strong proposals in favor of constructing elaborate rapid transit systems are being presented as a solution to the congestion problem. New rapid transit facilities or additions and improvements to existing systems may be justifiable if the economic and social benefits to be gained thereby are in excess of the costs of providing them. These benefits, however, are incapable of objective measurement.

Any proposals for new or expanded rapid transit should be able to demonstrate that (a) the central city has strong or increasing centripetal forces; (b) there are significant points of concentration at both origin and destination points which can generate a substantial volume of traffic, and that there are readily identifiable movements between these points; (c) social costs can be reduced, such as a cut in travel time to work; (d) the system can cover its direct operating expenses; and (e) the transit system will enable the present level of economic activity of the area to be maintained or increased.

6. In the overall picture, expressways have reduced the travel time from the suburbs to the central city; but it is the distribution of the motor vehicles in the core area which is the current problem. Depending upon the city in question, the problem may be solved through the construction of additional motor vehicle distribution facilities to maximize and to ease internal circulation, and thereby to stimulate the economic activity of the area by making it more easily accessible. In other cities, such procedures might result in the disassembly of efficient economic operating areas and bring losses to the entire community, possibly to the point of destroying its economic advantage of location. In such cases, the provision of adequate rapid transit would forestall this result and would provide for a balanced transportation system in the area. Each city presents a separate problem involving varying considerations.

7. No elaborate fixed-rail rapid transit system for a metropolitan area should be contemplated without regard to the utilization of existing and less expensive alternatives, such as the operation of express buses over present and proposed freeways or expressways. In this case, relatively inexpensive rapid transit is readily available since these roads are constructed between known population densities with known travel desires. Inexpensive modifications can be made for the expeditious transfer of passengers at important junction points.

8. Prior to making financial commitments for rapid transit facilities, many cities are in an enviable position to test the feasibility of a rapid transit system at a minimum cost. Existing railroad lines within the metropolitan area may be used with self-propelled equipment on a trial basis in order to evaluate the future prospects of such an operation. Temporary platforms may be constructed for passenger handling at selected locations. The financial arrangements could be handled in a manner similar to those in existence with the Passenger Service Improvement Corp. in Philadelphia. The results of such operations after a trial period could be used as a yardstick to determine whether the arrangement for a limited rapid transit service would be adequate and satisfactory, or whether a more elaborate rapid transit system is required, or whether no rapid transit at all is required for that particular city. The experimental costs would be small in comparison with a large

---

[14] "25 Million More Cars Coming," U.S. News & World Report, July 30, 1962, p. 40.

[15] For a different, but interesting approach to the equilibrium distribution of commuter traffic with relation to highways and expressways, surface transit, and rapid transit, see Anthony Downs, "The Law of Peak-Hour Expressway Congestion," Traffic Quarterly, July 1962, pp. 393 ff.

[16] The various arguments in support of construction and extension of rapid transit facilities are presented in detail in the hearings of the House and Senate in 1961 on urban mass transportation. See U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Banking and Currency, hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, on H.R. 7787, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); and U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, hearings on S. 345, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961).

capital investment which would tend to be unutilized.

9. Rapid transit facilities are not the ultimate answer to urban traffic congestion. Even in cities such as New York, where substantial investments are being made to improve rapid transit, the number of motor vehicles in the core areas is increasing rapidly. The number of motor vehicles entering midtown Manhattan on business days has increased from 382,000 in 1948 to 519,000 in 1956.[17] At the same time, rapid transit passengers have increased by more than 40 million from the 1958 low.[18]

In order to achieve a balanced urban transportation system in some cities, additional rapid transit facilities may be required; but also, as in the case of New York, additional facilities for the expeditious handling of motor vehicles are almost imperative.[19]

10. Urban transportation plans must be carefully formulated.

Transportation studies and plans must indicate in detail the need for facilities and their type, location, size, and cost * * * [They] must give consideration to all transportation media, both public and private, existing and proposed, if the most effective and economic overall system is to be obtained. Transportation systems will make provision for substantial automobile commuting and will also utilize railroad and other transit facilities if total transportation needs in most large cities are to be met successfully.[20]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the person in charge of that study was Robert L. Rivers. The study covers completely the development of automobile usage from 1900 to 1962. It shows the evolution of use. In 1900, 8,000 automobiles were used. There are now probably 60 million automobiles on the highways. The humblest family feels it can use an automobile. It will not use a streetcar or railroad. A family desires an automobile because of its flexibility.

Each morning when I come to the Capitol I go by the Army Map Service Building of the U.S. Government on MacArthur Boulevard. Automobile after automobile moves into those buildings, and each contains only one person. It is expensive travel, but the employees will not ride the buses. They desire their automobiles so that they can step out of their houses, into the machines, drive to their place of business, leave it, step into their machines, and return home.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield in one moment. The study of Professor Rivers concludes with the statement that adequate knowledge upon which to establish a permanent program is not available.

At this point I also desire to call to the attention of Senators a study and report made by Dr. Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee of the Department of Economics of the University of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the comments relating to the Urban Transit Development Act of 1963, and the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, by Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, of the Department of Economics, University of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS RELATING TO THE URBAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1963 AND THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

(By Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota)

The proposed Urban Transit Development Act and the Urban Mass Transportation Act raise three very important questions: (1) Are subsidies to urban transportation activities desirable? If so, (2) what role should the Federal Government play in providing these subsidies and what form should they take? (3) What agency of the Federal Government should administer whatever programs dealing with this subject may be adopted?

To state our position on these questions briefly, a decline in patronage, particularly during periods other than morning and afternoon rush hours, has brought about marked deteriorations in the financial positions of many mass transit systems. Taken by itself, this financial deterioration does not, in our view, justify any type of temporary subsidy program. Even if transit subsidies were deemed desirable, the effects of a temporary program probably would not be lasting. In large measure, the decline in public transit patronage reflects a basic shift in consumer tastes—a shift that is likely to continue in the absence of permanent countervailing action. The very serious inadequacies that presently do and perhaps inevitably must exist in transportation pricing procedures—might provide a sound economic basis for a permanent subsidy program. Even if an economic justification for transit subsidies could be found, however, it would seem preferable to have local rather than Federal Government agencies assume responsibility. Communities can reasonably be expected to be less profligate in their use of dollars that cost them a dollar each than of dollars which, as is the case with the Urban Mass Transportation Act, would have a direct cost to them of only 33 cents. Furthermore, the residents of say, Houston, have little interest in the transit system of New York and vice versa.

Any Federal action as may be taken in support of mass transportation should, we feel, not be taken in isolation but rather within the broader framework of metropolitan transportation as a whole. The specific agency that should be made responsible is not a matter that we feel ourselves competent to judge.

To elaborate, greatly increased real incomes and technological improvements have combined during the last half century to change the automobile from an expensive toy into a convenience well within the reach of the great majority of American families. For a growing proportion of the population, the convenience and time savings associated with automobile transportation have more than made up for its higher dollar costs. As a result, mass transportation patronage has declined.

Two further ramifications of the increase in auto ownership have been detrimental to mass transit service, patronage, and financing. First, the automobile has led to profound changes in the structure of urban areas. Residential population densities have diminished—the much commented upon phenomenon of suburban sprawl. In relative if not absolute terms, commercial and industrial activity has become decentralized. As a result of these changes in urban structure, the demand for service along individual mass transit routes has diminished. Service frequencies have therefore declined. Further shifts from mass to private transportation have therefore inevitably resulted.

Second, the financial problems of mass transportation systems have been compounded by the uneven character of the shift from public to private transportation. Indeed, there is good reason to argue that the financial crisis currently besetting mass transportation systems stems not so much from a decline in patronage per se as from a decline in patronage at the wrong time of day. On most transit systems, the loss in patronage has been concentrated mainly during offpeak hours. Indeed, on many systems, patronage during morning and afternoon rush hours has experienced little if any decline. As a result, the average load factor on mass transit vehicles has declined steadily—a growing proportion of the capacity necessary to meet peakload demands goes unutilized during the remainder of the day.

Clearly, a substantial permanent subsidy program would eliminate the financial plight of public transportation systems. Indeed, by enabling provision of more frequent service at lower prices, subsidies might serve to halt and perhaps even to reverse the decline in mass transit patronage. A substantial research effort might succeed in devising vehicles that could provide rapid, frequent service on low density routes at low cost. Barring this seemingly unlikely possibility, however, it seems doubtful that the effects of a temporary subsidy program would prove lasting. After all, the mass transit crisis is not of recent origin, but has been developing for the better part of half a century. It seems likely that the conditions responsible for this crisis could be reversed, if at all, only by committing substantial resources to the task over a substantial period of time.

Furthermore, even if there were some way of assuring that these conditions could be reversed, there is serious doubt in our minds that doing so would be socially desirable, for the source of the crisis is the various ramifications of an apparently growing preference for the speed and convenience—flexibility—afforded by private passenger vehicles. Consumers are willing to pay for such flexibility.

There is, however, one attribute of metropolitan transportation and, indeed, transportation in general, the ramifications of which might serve to justify permanent subsidies to mass transit systems. This attribute is the fact that both presently employed and, very likely, feasible alternative means of charging for the use of transportation facilities do not adequately reflect the costs of providing these facilities. The capacity requirements for transportation facilities in urban areas are determined by morning and afternoon rush-hour demands. If these two peaks did not exist, capacity requirements and hence the costs of providing transportation facilities would be substantially lower than is presently the case. For this reason, if each traveler were to be charged the costs incurred in serving him—the costs that would be saved if his trip were not made—peak hour travelers would pay substantially higher prices for trips than would offpeak travelers. Clearly our present system of transportation-user charges does not possess this seemingly desirable characteristic. Public transportation fares typically do not differentiate between peak and offpeak loads. Similarly, the level of such highway user charges as gasoline taxes and license fees is not appreciably affected by the time at which private passenger vehicle operators make trips.

---

[17] Jean Gottman, op. cit., p. 634.

[18] The New York City Transit Authority reported riding as follows: 1958, 1,319 million passengers; 1959, 1,324 million passengers; 1960, 1,345 million passengers; 1961, 1,363 million passengers.

[19] For a discussion of the necessity of providing adequate motor vehicle facilities in large cities, see Eugene Maier, "Urban Transportation Planning Can Succeed," Traffic Quarterly, July 1962, p. 325.

[20] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Banking and Currency, hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, statement by Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, 87th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4.

The imposition of higher peak than off-peak transit fares and highway user charges would very likely make a substantial contribution toward alleviating the present crisis in mass transit financing. Also, by discouraging nonwork trips at peak hours and encouraging car pools and perhaps the staggering of business opening and closing hours, such a pricing system would reduce the highway expenditures required to alleviate peak-hour congestion problems.

Charging peak-hour mass transit patrons approximately the cost of providing them with service would be a comparatively easy task. Levying cost-based user tolls on private passenger vehicle operators would be considerably more difficult, however. A very imperfect approximation to cost-based charges is perhaps the most that could be hoped for. If this is in fact the case, a permanent mass transit subsidy program might well prove economically justifiable. That is, a permanent subsidy for peak-hour mass transit service might be required to minimize the money and time costs of metropolitan transportation. Unfortunately, the word "might" must be emphasized. To our knowledge, no one has as yet undertaken the substantial research effort required to determine the nature of optimum metropolitan transportation systems and user charges on these systems when cost-based tolls cannot be levied.

Whether the organization responsible for administering the research and other programs that may develop out of these acts should be the HHFA, the Department of Commerce, or yet a third agency is not a matter about which we feel competent to make recommendations. We do, however, strongly recommend that the agency given responsibility for these programs be authorized to deal with urban transportation as an integrated whole rather than exclusively with public transportation. In dealing with any problem, an integrated rather than a piecemeal approach seems preferable. In this case, the desirability of an integrated approach is reinforced by the great difficulties involved in establishing a genuinely cost-based system of user charges.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Both those men state that we should not enter into a program of subsidies with the meager knowledge at our command.

First, as I have said, we have not had enough experience.

Second, I come to the question of the wisdom of the Federal Government entering into a program of financing local mass transportation. An effort was made to salve the consciences of Senators. Bravely they rose in defense of the taxpayers and voted for the reduction of the subsidy bill from $500 million to $350 million in 3 years.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to conclude my statement. If Senators wish to adopt an economic program and act frugally and prudently on the measure, I ask that they reawaken the remorse which they had within themselves and join me in an amendment that would really result in an economy move.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to have printed a table showing the status of mass transportation demonstration grant program as of January 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of mass transportation demonstration grant program as of January 1963

[Authorized by the Housing Act of 1961]

A. Total amount of funds authorized for this program: $25 million.
B. Total funds appropriated: $12.5 million.
C. Grants approved by HHFA during 1962:

Date	Recipient	Purpose	Federal grant	Local contribution	Total cost of project
(1) Mar. 29	City of Detroit, Mich	Increasing bus service to determine effect on traffic, and transit use. Project duration: 2 months.	$224,400	$112,200	$366,600
(2) June 29	University of Washington, Seattle	Study of monorail system at Seattle's World Fair. Project duration: 5 months.	10,000	5,000	15,000
(3) Oct. 6	Mass Transportation Commission, State of Massachusetts.	Series of experiments in urban areas of Boston, Fitchburg, Worcester, and Pittsfield. Project duration: 18 months.	3,600,000	1,800,000	5,400,000
(4) Oct. 26	Southeastern transportation compact (SEPACT) made up of Bucks, Chester, and Montgomery Counties in Pennsylvania.	Increase and improve train service (at lower fares); improve parking facilities at stations; initiate feeder-bus service to stations. Project duration: Not determined.	3,116,000	1,558,000	4,674,000
(5) Dec. 11	City of Memphis, Tenn	To determine pattern andvolume of ridership in area by establishing full scale mass transit service. Project duration: 2 years.	104,950	----------	----------
(6) Dec. 22	Tri-State Transportation Committee, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.	To find out if people will ride commuter trains if the suburban station is located outside central business district, easily accessible, and having ample parking. New station will be built for the Pennsylvania Railroad in New Brunswick, N.J. Project duration: 22 to 24 months.	170,790	85,395	256,185

D. Total Federal funds officially expended on mass transportation demonstration grant program as of Jan. 15, 1963: $7,316,140.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. My question is: Did not the Senator take a little encouragement from the reduction in the amount of the appropriation on the theory that it reflected something of an inclination to save a part of the deficit for later appropriation to other worthy causes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I found some comfort in it. But, to repeat, I could see standing out within the consciences of my colleagues a remorse and feeling that we must send back home the word that we tried to economize. We reduced the amount authorized in the bill from $500 million to $350 million.

It was a facade. There was no essence to it. In substance it was deceit.

I suppose the newspapers at home will say, "$150 million cut," but what will that mean when we are opening the doorway, establishing the precedent, and setting in motion the train of extravagance which will finally cost the taxpayers in subsidies at least $6 billion and, *in all probability, $10 billion?*

I have been with this subject for the past 3 weeks, and I have studied it. The mayor of Boston, when he was told that the study showed that the estimated cost would be $9.6 billion said, "That is not so. Who came forth with those figures?" The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] said they were officially prepared by the Government, which is sponsoring the bill. The estimated cost is $9.6 billion. Two-thirds of that would be $6.4 billion, and that is what Mr. Weaver, the Administrator, said might be the cost, but he brought it down to possibly $4 billion.

If it was estimated to cost $9.6 billion 3 years ago, I think we can safely say that if it were estimated today the cost would be up to $11 or $12 billion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the Senator prepared to yield now?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield for one question to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. No, Mr. President. I will wait and obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Since the Senator from Pennsylvania wants the floor I shall *give him an opportunity to answer.*

I have read the RECORD. The proponents of the bill are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and, in a measure, Connecticut. Those are the States asking for it. The thought was initiated by Mr. Symes of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and by Mr. Alpert, of the New York, New Haven & Hartford.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Twenty-three Senators are cosponsors of the bill, and they represent almost every geographical region of the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that there are 23 sponsors. I heard the argument made yesterday by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. He said, "We will give to the Mountain States so that they can impound waters. We will give to the Southern States so that their cotton can be subsidized. But give something to us in return for what we are giving to you."

That is not the method used by the Senator from Ohio in performing his duty. Someone can scratch my back *with all the pleasantness and generosity* he can find, but that will not induce me to scratch his back, when it is wrong.

Let us take a look at the fiscal situation prevailing. While I am on my feet I wish to state that although the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is now carrying the ball, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] initially sponsored this movement. He has been in it for the past 4 years, and I think he was present when President Symes came in, for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and asked for these subsidies.

We shall be asked to raise the ceiling on the national debt to $320 billion before we conclude this session. The purchasing power of the dollar is down to 45 cents, compared to what it was in 1941. Since World War II the national debt has increased $35 billion.

After former wars we paid off the debts in the course of two decades. Nineteen years have now passed, and instead of the debt being paid off, it is larger than it was.

American gold is fleeing to foreign nations. Citizens of the United States are taking their money into Switzerland. They are taking it there because they do not know what is going to happen in our country with respect to the dollar.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question about economics?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been reading what Dr. Heller has had to say, but I read something the other day on economics which I think is far sounder than what Dr. Heller has to say on the subject, and I wonder if the Senator from Ohio agrees with me.

I read that "one has a deficit when what he has is less than he had when he had nothing."

Does the Senator agree with me on that improbable definition?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The Senator speaks of Dr. Heller, who, with derision, spoke about the puritanical attributes of the modern American. I looked up the meaning of the word "puritanical." It describes a person who adheres to rigid morality. But that is a vice, according to Dr. Heller. That is a course which should not be followed. One should adapt himself to the expediency of the time, even though it is in discord with what a genuine conscience tells an individual to do.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I believe the Senator knows that I concur strongly in what he has been saying. I recall that yesterday the Senator pointed out how incongruous it is for us to be legislating a new, very costly program while at the same time we are holding out to the American people the thought of a tax cut.

I came across an article yesterday which might provide a possible answer for the Senator. I detect from this article, and from other things I have been hearing lately, that the effort toward a tax cut may be diminishing.

For more than 2 years we have been striving to get the economy moving again by spending more than we have been taking in. That policy having failed, the thought was to try for a tax cut, but the tax cut idea is not catching on, because too many people recognize that a $2.7 billion tax cut for fiscal year 1964 would be eaten up by at least that much inflation—though probably greatly in excess—resulting from the $12 billion deficit in the same time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I limited my other yieldings to questions. I shall have to limit the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. May I finish one observation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. This proposal will not do the job.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 2, 1963]

SPENDING DRIVE: DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SEEK BIG PUBLIC WORKS OUTLAYS TO AID ECONOMY—MOVE TO COLLIDE WITH GOP ECONOMY EFFORTS—KENNEDY FEARS SWELLING OF DEFICIT—TAX CUT: TOO LITTLE, LATE?

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—Democratic leaders in Congress, fearing tax cuts will be too little and too late, are quietly starting a campaign to fuel the economy with a big extra shot of public works spending.

Their push will collide head-on with Republican economy drives, and it also will clash with White House reluctance to support new deficit-deepening outlays at this time. But the effort could gain enough steam to succeed anyway.

Such leading Democrats as Senate Majority Whip HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and House Majority Leader ALBERT, of Oklahoma, are helping lead the campaign. House Majority Whip BOGGS, of Louisiana, indicated to a home-State AFL–CIO convention yesterday that the Democrats would seek extra funds beyond the $900 million authorized last year for special employment-boosting public works projects during the following 2 years or so; President Kennedy's budget makes no such provision.

Bills already have been introduced in both House and Senate to double, even triple the $900 million ceiling. And the House Public Works Committee is set to launch public hearings after Easter to generate support for expansion of this seemingly popular program.

FEAR OF DISGRUNTLED VOTERS

These plans mirror the deep-seated fears of many Democrats that the Kennedy administration's tax-cutting program won't do enough to reduce unemployment before the 1964 elections. A cut of the size and timing now expected, they complain, will put only mild zip into the economy by then. If the jobless rolls remain high, they fear many voters may turn against the Democrats in next year's voting.

"I just don't think a tax cut is going to give enough jobs to people in my district to do much good any time soon," is the plaint of a northern House Member from one high-unemployment area.

Hence, Democratic chieftains now contend it's essential to adopt new antiunemployment spending measures this year. Their No. 1 preference is an enlargement of the "temporary" 1962 program whereby Federal funds are channeled into surplus labor areas for park and recreational improvements, water and sewer projects, and the building of local fire stations, libraries, jails, civic centers, and hospitals.

Unlike large public works requiring lengthy advance planning, these lesser projects can swing into job-creating action quickly. Hundreds of communities are eligible to get in on the program, and dozens of Congressmen of both parties have been turning the heat on its managers to win a share for their districts. Though the program began only 5 months ago, the first installment of $400 million appropriated by Congress has been completely allocated and pending applications total about $1.5 billion. The all-important House Appropriations Committee is expected to OK second installment funds this week; as a gesture to economizers it may approve only $450 million instead of a possible $500 million, but the cut would be subject to reversal on the House floor.

GOP CRITICISMS

Despite the program's wide appeal, the attempt to increase the $900 million ceiling is certain to provoke a superheated battle. Republican leaders, who fought the original bill as a "budget buster," will be even more opposed on this go-around. They can hardly look with favor on another big boost in spending at a time when they are shouting for multibillion-dollar reductions in administration fund requests.

Apart from budget considerations, many Republicans contend these public works allotments are little more than sops to troubled areas and really don't get at underlying causes of unemployment. False hopes raised by the program's advocates, say the GOP critics, create tremendous pressures to perpetuate the outlays. In the end, they argue, a permanent depression-days WPA-type program will be spawned if the current program is permitted to continue and expand.

The White House has qualms of a different sort. Mr. Kennedy is hesitant about pushing any plan that might swell by $1 billion or more the $11.9 billion deficit predicted for the fiscal year starting in July. Besides, the administration already is plumping for a $456 million increase, from this year's planned $394 million, in the affiliated program for longer term aid to bring new industry into chronically depressed areas; Commerce Secretary Hodges laid this request before the House Banking Committee yesterday.

An added administration concern is the damaging impact a new public works drive might have on congressional chances for the tax program. If Mr. Kennedy should give the spending push a rousing endorsement, he might suddenly find some of the support for lower levies withering away. And the tax bill still leads the administration's list of most wanted 1963 legislation.

But the White House can scarcely throw cold water on the public works drive. For one thing, many proadministration stalwarts are in the van of the movement. Mr. ALBERT, for example, has personally appealed to the President to go along with the drive; in his southeast Oklahoma district, 12 of the 13 counties are classified as depressed, with 6 percent or more of the labor force jobless.

SENSITIVE TO REPUBLICAN TAUNTS

Furthermore, the administration is sensitive to Republican taunts that it has failed to make an appreciable dent in unemployment. Although Mr. Kennedy has set a goal of reducing joblessness to 4 percent of the labor force, it has dropped only from 6.7 percent to 6.1 percent since he took over in early 1961. Among other barbs, Republican Representative MCDADE, a freshman from Pennsylvania, has taken to sending the White House monthly statements on mining unemployment in his Lackawanna County district and lambasting the administration for "doing nothing to solve this unconscionable problem."

Faced with these political realities, the White House is inclined to assume a standoffish stance toward the public works drive. The present indication is that it will neither encourage nor discourage the effort to increase outlays. At the coming House hearings, administration witnesses probably will support the expansion proposals, but in a way that will leave the initiative entirely in the hands of congressional Democrats.

"They'll take the money if we give it to them but they aren't going to fight for it," concludes one Democratic strategist.

Even if administration support is lukewarm, the extra spending plans will have powerful backing from other directions. Labor unions, mayors, conservation groups, and others are certain to rally behind the campaign. With State and localities confronted with an estimated 160 billion backlog of various public projects, many communities view Uncle Sam's help as a convenient means for easing their financial loads. The program's backers claim the $900 million already authorized will directly generate 110,000 man-years of work (the equivalent of employing 110,000 men for one year), plus an equal additional amount of off-site work needed to supply building materials and other essentials for the projects; extra funds could presumably yield similar stimulus.

The program's extensive potential has gained it lots of boosters. Some 1,200 towns, cities and counties covering about one-third of the Nation's land area are eligible for assistance. Any locality with a prolonged unemployment rate of 6 percent or more may receive grants totaling up to 75 percent of a project's cost so long as the bulk of the work occurs in the first 12 months and new job opportunities are created.

The 3,756 projects approved thus far have covered all 50 States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; men are actually at work on some 1,300 of these projects now. Moreover, program administrators deliberately have spread around the initial allocation of $400 million in an effort to refute last year's accusations that a political slush fund was being set up to help the administration and friendly Democrats.

While most awards have gone to such problem States as Pennsylvania, Michigan and Kentucky, every State has benefited and nearly every Congressman has received one or more allocations for his district.

One of the first Indiana awards was a $282,922 grant toward construction of a $1.7 million new Jasper County hospital in the district of House Republican Leader HALLECK, who's an avowed opponent of the program. Some $3 million in forestry, road building, sewer, and other construction funds have been funneled into the northern Wisconsin district of GOP Representative O'KONSKI. A total of $1.4 million has been set aside for access roads and other improvements to the Ottawa National Forest, in the district of Michigan's Republican Representative BENNETT, an area of serious mining unemployment.

Nor have conservative Southern Democrats been overlooked. A $600,000 grant for a bridge at Gulfport went to the district of Congressman COLMER, of Mississippi, a fervent anti-Kennedy Democrat. Other anti-administration Democrats in South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Texas have gotten grants for their districts.

But undoubtedly the most influential factor in rallying support will be the nearly 6,000 applications now awaiting action. Even States with below-average unemployment have been pouring in petitions. One example: Louisiana, which has been allocated $12 million in grants thus far, has submitted requests for an additional $108 million.

"We've got seven people doing nothing but answering phone calls and replying to letters asking about the status of the applications," reports an aid to Program Administrator William Batt.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this is an article from yesterday's Wall Street Journal entitled "Democrats in Congress Seek Big Public Works Outlays To Aid Economy."

I ask the Senator from Ohio if this program does not fit into that pattern. Is not the spending of $350 million in grants for a new program in the same pattern of spending to try to get the economy moving again, which we have been going through for the past 2 years?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with what the Senator has said.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator from Ohio has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time does the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] wish?

Mr. COTTON. I would rather reserve a few minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be adopted, because in my opinion it is a very crucial amendment. First, it will test what is going to happen to this bill. All Senators who vote against cutting the amount of money provided in the bill are going to vote for the bill. It is as simple as that. If Senators vote for this amendment, they will have protected the budget from new spending and perhaps it will be a little easier for us later in the session to vote for a tax cut. They cannot vote for new, unnecessary spending, running into a deficit of perhaps $12 billion, and then put a tax cut on top of that.

The second test of this vote is, Do we mean economy when we continue to talk about economy, or are we going to postpone it to some future date? The forthcoming vote will put every Member of the Senate on record for or against economy. A vote for this amendment is a vote for economy, and a vote against it is a vote against economy. The issue is that simple.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will close now. The argument is made that we should serve the people of the country and enter into the proposed new subsidy program. My answer to that argument is that, if the Congress wants to serve the people of this country, it should recognize that the Federal Government's fiscal problems are heavy. They are far heavier than is generally understood. If this were a $350 million program and it was to come to an end, I would not be so concerned, but it is a $6 billion program. When the President submitted the budget about 2 months ago, he made the statement that there are items in the budget which cannot be cut, such as an item of $10 billion for interest. This program would increase the interest obligation. It would increase the national debt. When are we going to build up a reserve, so that if we do get into trouble we will have some "fat" to draw upon? It will not be by this type of program.

I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I ask how much time is left to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I had 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that there are 6 minutes left.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time was assigned to me? I had 45 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe under the consent agreement the Senator had 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to this precise amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire was seeking recognition to offer an amendment, sometime before the Senator from Missouri offered his, which was adopted.

The pending amendment is crucial. In the first place, remember that when the bill came from the Banking and Currency Committee—and it was the President's bill—it was a $500 million bill. When it came to the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, I am sorry to say the Committee on Commerce added $500 million in guaranteed loans, making it a $1 billion bill.

It has been the purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire for the past few days, at the proper time in this contest, to let the Senate go on record, and have every Member of the Senate go on record, as to whether we shall cut out all of the $500 million grants and keep in the bill only the $500 million guaranteed loans.

Do not misunderstand me. I am still against the bill, because it is a foot in the door for a long, weary course of spending; but if this amendment is adopted, the bill will go back to the amount the President first called for.

Mr. President, I ask for some time on the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The bill would go back to the $500 million that the President first called for, but it is a better bill because that $500 million is in guaranteed loans. Senators will remember that the Commerce Committee's version, which is now in the bill, provides that an additional one-fourth of 1 percent shall be paid as interest by the grantees, the cities, the communities, the recipients, which shall be used for administration of the program, and such part of the money as is left over shall be used to indemnify the United States for any loans that are defaulted by the recipients. In other words, it minimizes the impact of the bill. I grant that I dislike building up the contingent liabilities of the Nation, but it removes the impact on the current budget that we are going to adopt in this session of Congress.

Of course, a gesture was made—I am sure, with great sincerity—by our friends who reduced the amount by $125 million, but it leaves $375 million in grants and $500 million in contingent loans. The attitude of most Senators on both sides of the aisle this afternoon indicates that they are equally conscious of the fact that we are fast approaching a showdown in the 88th Congress as to whether we can be firm, ruthless, and courageous, in cutting the budget, and holding back new programs, in order that the President's recommendation for a tax cut as a stimulant to the economy of the country may be something we can do practically and successfully.

The vote on the pending amendment is the first battle to decide that question. This amendment is crucial, because it brings the bill back to something like its original size, and it removes the impact on this year's budget and still gives us a chance to reduce it.

Bear in mind that, even with the adoption of the amendment, I must still oppose the bill because of what it opens up and what it leads to, but when the roll is called on this amendment we shall come pretty near knowing whether there is prudence left in the country today or whether we still think we can have our cake and eat it too; increase our expenditures, and at the same time reduce taxes, and by some magic formula succeed in keeping the Nation solvent. At least if the amendment is adopted we will not be adding a single dollar to the budget. If it is not adopted, we will be taking the first step toward busting the budget wide open. That is why this is a crucial vote, and our votes will indicate whether we are willing to go the whole way in holding the line on the budget.

I hope, on this crucial vote, that the Senate will vote a real, bona fide reduction in the bill, rather than one that just salves our consciences and gives us something to talk about when we go home.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my plan to speak very briefly on the subject. As a matter of fact, I strongly urge that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] not be agreed to, because it would strike out a great part of the heart of the bill.

Let us remember that as the bill now stands, assuming that the amendments offered by the Commerce Committee are agreed to, there is a duplicate plan of financing. One is a provision for grants, and that amount has been cut now from $500 million to $375 million over a period of 3 years. The other is the loan guarantee program.

I am sorry that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is not on the floor at the present time, because I wish to point out that the Senator from Ohio offered a bill for mass transportation that did have in it the loan guarantee program. The Commerce Committee has added it to the pending bill. We have agreed to accept it. That supplements the grant program that was provided in our bill.

I stated earlier in the day that I thought, due to the fact that we do have the two-headed method of financing, we could very well cut the amount authorized in the bill for the loan guarantee program, although, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] has pointed out, it is not too important that we do so, because it is merely an authorization to use that much for guaranteeing the loans, and does not necessarily call for the appropriation of the full amount.

I regret that the Senator from Ohio made some of the statements that he made relating to the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the vote by the Senators on that particular amendment. First of all, I do not impugn the motive of any Senator at any time on any vote he casts. I believe his motive is something for him to understand himself. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio used the term "deceit," or that there was an element of deceit in connection with the almost unanimous vote of the Senate in favor of that cut. I believe the cut was justified. As a matter of fact, I had it in mind from the beginning of the debate on the bill, after it appeared that the loan guarantee provision was going to be put into the bill. It is simply a matter of some amount not being needed for the grant program. I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], was a wise amendment. I believe that the heavy vote in favor of it was a good vote, and well considered, and that no one need explain or apologize for his vote. Certainly I cannot believe that the Senator from Ohio, had he reflected upon the matter a little further, would have implied that there was an element of deceit in connection with the vote.

I believe that the two-headed system of financing that we have in the bill now strikes a very good balance. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio should be defeated. I hope it will be.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio. As the Senator from Alabama has stated, we now have a two-method approach. I should like further to point out that it is not one or the other approach, but it is an approach which requires an applicant first to apply under the guarantee loan provision. If he can qualify under the guarantee loan provision, he would not be eligible for a grant.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is rather absurd to argue that this is a giveaway type of program, that it is a grant program where grants are not needed. If a grant is not needed an applicant cannot qualify for the grant in the first instance. An applicant must first make application for a guaranteed loan. The Administrator must determine whether the plan is economically feasible, so that it can be financed under the guarantee loan provision. If it can be so financed, that type of assistance will be given.

In committee it was determined that a serious problem exists in this area and that something must be done to relieve it.

Criticism was made that the local governmental agencies have not done all they should at the local level. That is perhaps true. We know it is true in some instances. However, we have inserted a provision in the bill which requires that these steps be taken before an applicant is eligible for either a guaranteed loan or a grant.

Therefore we have tried to write into the bill a safeguard, to make sure, first, that there is a need and, second, that an applicant exhausts every possible method at the local level and tries to solve the problem at the local level and, third, that he tries to get a guaranteed loan first, if he can qualify the project through the guaranteed loan provision. If he cannot, he would be eligible for a grant. Therefore, I wish to assure Senators that this is a bill which does not permit an indiscriminate use of the grant program. It may be used only when the tests are adequately met. It is a good bill which will attempt to meet the needs which certainly are pressing many of the municipalities throughout the country. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be defeated.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, whether or not the pending bill has the so-called two-way stretch to which the Senator from Nevada refers lies wholly within the volition and the discretion of the Administrator. It is he who determines whether or not there is a qualification for a loan. If he decides that it merits a grant, it is going to get a grant.

Insofar as I have seen bureaucratic liberality with grant money, there is not any question as to whether this grant money is going to be used.

I had hoped that this general economy feeling which is now surging in the Nation's Capital and in the country would catch on and go further and further.

First of all, the distinguished President himself has set the pattern. A week ago he submitted a little over $125 million in cuts in the fiscal 1964 budget. The day before yesterday he sent us a foreign-aid message, and there he said he thought the aid program could be cut back, not by $120 million or by $200 million, but by $400 million.

The President is aware of the mood of the people today. We ought to take counsel from what he was doing to his own budget before we even pass upon the items.

The Senate suddenly succumbed, modestly, I would say, to the urge that is beginning to manifest itself, because the monitor of the bill accepted the amendment offered by the frugally minded—and I say this reverently—Senator from Missouri, when he suggested that there be a $125 million cut in the bill, $25 million during the years 1963 and 1964, $50 million in 1965, and $50 million in 1966. That is a start, but it is a modest start.

As the Chinese say, the longest journey begins with a single step. We took a modest step this afternoon. The President has taken a modest step. I am glad that he is embracing the doctrine and the philosophy that we have been tirelessly belaboring for quite some time. We have been hearing from the country. There is even a more impelling reason than that, and that is the solvency of this country. We keep talking about a $99 billion budget. We ought to stop it. It is not a $99 billion budget. It is a $108 billion budget.

The bill provides $9.2 billion of new obligational authority, and $100 million for fiscal 1964 as a part of the new obligational authority. It is a new step for a new expenditure which, in the belief of the Administrator himself as he testified before the committee, will require more than $9 billion to do the job. He was very sanguine about it. Everyone might know that inflation is in the air. It is going to be there. Just as we know it costs much more today to accomplish a job than it did 5, 10, or 15 years ago, we can go right on through the lesson book and look down the future to other fiscal years, where we will find that the job cannot be done with $9 billion. I should say, conservatively, that before we get through, knowing the avidity for free money, we had better start talking about $20 billion.

I am not unmindful that the country grows and that the budget has to grow to some extent; but it does not have to grow to insane proportions and jeopardize the very solvency of our country. If we do not manage the budget, I do not know how we will stir confidence in the banking world abroad, which holds more that $20 billion of our obligations which can be converted into gold, if it wishes to do so. I do not know how we can stir confidence at home and constantly try to invite private capital to do a job and assume responsibilities, if we put power into the hands of a Federal agency which can only destroy that confidence.

The amendment ought to be adopted in the interest of fiscal sanity for this country.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. **SPARKMAN.** I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—57

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—2

Moss
Smathers

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. **CANNON.** Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 9, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$500,000,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "$375,000,000".

Mr. **CANNON.** Mr. President, I shall make a brief explanation of the amendment.

The Senate has already taken action to reduce the provision for grants from $500 million to $375 million. In adding the amendment covering the guarantee loan provision, the Commerce Committee established a limit of $500 million for which the Government could guarantee the payment of bonds. My amendment would reduce that figure of $500 million to $375 million and would make the amount consistent with the amount provided in the direct grant provision. I again point out, as I pointed out earlier, that this is only a maximum guarantee. It would not require the appropriation of funds at this time, and would mean only a limit on the contingent liability for which the Government might commit itself.

Mr. **MUSKIE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CANNON.** I yield.

Mr. **MUSKIE.** I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Nevada in sponsoring the amendment. That particular provision of the bill was not in the bill when it was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member. As the Senator has suggested, it would create a contingent liability and not a direct burden upon the Treasury. But it would create the liability in an area in which we have had little or no experience. So there would be danger of default, which could create a direct liability upon the Government. It would be appropriate to reduce the provision of the bill so that it would be consistent with the cut which has already been made in the grant program. So I am happy to join the Senator.

Mr. **SYMINGTON.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CANNON.** I yield.

Mr. **SYMINGTON.** I was much impressed with the amendments which the Senator from Nevada presented to the Senate as a representative of the great Committee on Commerce. For the reasons that I have already presented briefly in the RECORD today for reducing the grant from $500 million to $375 million, I commend the Senator for the proposed amendment. I intend to support it.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CANNON.** I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. There has been the highest degree of cooperation and accommodation between the two committees that brought the measure to the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that with the guarantees added, we have a well-balanced program; and that the grants together with the guarantees at the proposed level are realistic in meeting the needs of transportation.

Speaking for the Senator in charge of the bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency will accept the amendment.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield about 2 minutes to me?

Mr. **CANNON.** I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. **LAUSCHE.** I subscribe to the proposed reduction. That is obvious on the basis of what I have said in the past 3 days. However, I feel that the Senate ought to learn how the matter was handled in the Committee on Commerce. My measure provided for a $50 million guarantee loan fund. Some Senator said, "Make it $100 million." Another voice said, "Make it $500 million." Those were not the words, but it sounded like an auction to me. I decided that I was lucky to get off with a $500 million provision.

Mr. **CANNON.** Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio has said, there was no provision requiring a contribution at the local level. We require a contribution of 25 percent. We have removed the tax-exempt provision relating to the bonds. In my opinion, that action removed many of the objections to the guarantee loan provision.

Mr. **LONG** of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **CANNON.** I yield.

Mr. **LONG** of Missouri. The Senator mentioned a tax-exempt provision. I understand that there is no question that this is not an opening wedge to do away with the tax-exempt provision on State and municipal bonds.

Mr. **CANNON.** The Senator is absolutely correct. It is specifically provided that there will be no attempt to invade the field of tax-exempt municipal bonds. This is an area in which the Federal Government is asked to guarantee the bonds, and in so doing, one of the conditions is that the local body, in making application, would waive its right to the tax-exempt provision.

Mr. **LONG** of Missouri. Mr. President, the guaranteed bond program recommended by the Commerce Committee should provide a sound method to help some local communities in the development of mass transportation systems. However, there is one feature of this program which causes me grave concern.

The proposal requires the State, local public body, or agency thereof, to waive the income tax exemption normally enjoyed by such revenue bonds as a condition for the bonds to qualify under the program.

Some of our tax experts have been trying for a long time to destroy the income tax exemption enjoyed by municipal bonds. I am concerned that someone may attempt to use this bill as a precedent to attack the exemption of municipal bonds generally. Therefore, I believe the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Nevada relating to this matter should be reprinted in the debate today to emphasize the point that this bill should not be considered a precedent.

The exemption of the interest on municipal bonds from the Federal income tax has enhanced the marketability of such bonds. Thus, this exemption has contributed substantially to the ability of local communities to cope with some of the complex problems facing them. It should be clearly understood that the waiver of exemption required by this bill in no way reflects on the soundness of the exemption as a general rule.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the appropriate part of the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey, who has worked so diligently for adequate legislation in this field, and the Senator from Nevada, who presented the Commerce Committee amendments, be printed at this point in the Record. The colloquy originally appeared on page 5336 of the Congressional Record for April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mr. Williams of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator for his amplifications and observations. In connection with the provision that the bonds would not carry a tax exemption there might be fear that a precedent would be established that would cut deeply into the historical pattern of financing at the local level. I know that such is not the intention or expectation of the Senator, and that he sees the situation as a case sun generis.
>
> Mr. Cannon. I thank the Senator for bringing up that point. I had not completed my explanation. I intended to cover that one particular provision. One of the other features of the guaranteed bond proposal is a provision that they would not be tax exempt. That provision departs from the usual and customary theory of tax exemption in dealing with municipal bonds. That is in nowise intended to be a precedent for the taxation of municipal bonds, and I, for one, would oppose entering into the field of taxation of municipal bonds generally.
>
> That is a different area entirely. The Federal Government would be asked to guarantee the bonds of the local transportation authority. They might therefore be able to market their bonds at a lesser interest rate than would be possible on the open market today. In my opinion, the private investment segment of our country would be induced to come in under that type of proposal. Such participation is necessary if we are to solve the overall problem, because of its magnitude. But again I say that that is nowise intended to be a precedent. It is intended to be exactly the opposite. A non-tax-exempt provision would be established solely by reason of the fact that the Federal Government would be coming into the picture as a guarantor, just as the Federal Government enters into the picture in FHA and VA guarantee provisions. In both those situations, interest is not exempt from taxation. That is the specific reason why we are trying not to get into that area in the present case.
>
> Also, if a guarantee provision were allowed on tax-exempt bonds, in effect it would place the bonds in a better position from the standpoint of salability than those of the Federal Government.
>
> That, of course, would place the local agencies in an unfair competitive position insofar as the sale of Government securities is concerned.
>
> Mr. Williams of New Jersey. If they were tax exempt?
>
> Mr. Cannon. If they were tax exempt.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I commend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] for the amendment. I should like to ask the Senator whether he intends to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I had not particularly intended to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I support the Senator from Wyoming in that request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is an occasion when at least a word ought to be interposed with respect to the amendment now before the Senate and certain other amendments. As the bill came from the Committee on Banking and Currency, it provided $500 million in grants. As the bill came from the Committee on Commerce, it contained grant and loan provisions. The version of the Committee on Commerce was accepted on the floor of the Senate.

The spirit of frugality then began to hover over this great body. This afternoon the grant money authorized was reduced by $125 million. So at this good hour, with the cherry blossom princesses waiting for everyone, the grant money authorized has been reduced by $125 million.

Salvation, it seems to me, is coming. But it comes so slowly. I remember that old spiritual—

> I am inching along, I am inching along,
> I am inching along, my Lord.

We are inching along, but progress is extremely slow.

Why did not the Senate "go the whole hog" and knock out all the grant money and place the measure on the beam and the frequency to which we can tune and hear the voice of the country? I commend the Senate for cutting out $125 million in guaranteed loans. But the amount is not enough for fiscal salvation.

We will vote for the amendment. We only hope and wish that we could embrace all salvation and cut it all out.

Mr. CANNON. We are very happy that the distinguished Senator from Illinois sees at least in part the error of his ways, and we shall be happy to have him with us on the forthcoming vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it still will not save me.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Am I correct in my assumption that one of the prices for obtaining a guaranteed loan provision in the bill would be that the local subdivision of government must waive its exemption from taxation?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is not correct in that respect. Under one section of the bill, in order to obtain the advantage of the guaranteed bond provision, the local body would have to waive any rights it might have to claim that the bonds which the Government guarantees are tax exempt. Those bonds and those only, would be affected. The amendment would affect no other municipal bonds in any way. The amendment relates only to municipal bonds which the Federal Government would guarantee.

Mr. ERVIN. In order to obtain the benefit of the proposed largesse from the Federal Government, would not the local governmental subdivision be required to waive any exemption from taxation on the bonds that would be covered by the guarantee?

Mr. CANNON. On the revenue of the bonds covered by the guarantee. If they failed to do so, bonds issued under those conditions would be given a preferred position over general obligations of the Treasury.

Mr. ERVIN. I was hoping that I could vote for the amendment, but to me the proposal would put the camel's nose under the tent, and, pro tanto, would require the surrender of what has been conceived to be a constitutional right in part. For that reason, although I should like to protect to some extent the unborn generations of our taxpayers from the obligations they will have to pay under the bill, I cannot vote for that provision.

Mr. CANNON. I say to the Senator that the amendment would only reduce the amount. The amendment would not change the tax-exempt provision at all. The amendment now before the Senate would merely reduce from $500 million to $375 million the amount authorized for guarantees.

The provision to which the Senator referred is in the bill, as the amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 6 has been agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. With that assurance from the Senator I can vote for the proposed reduction in the amount of the guarantee, because an affirmative vote would manifest some willingness of the Senate to at least temporarily withhold an imposition of an obligation of $125 million on yet unborn generations of American taxpayers. I think that is very nice.

Mr. CANNON. I would certainly help the Senator to keep the camel's nose out from under the tent. I, for one, would oppose any attempt to get into the area of tax exemption with respect to bonds now granted to municipalities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think there is some misunderstanding in the Senate. We would not touch the right of any city or State to issue all the bonds it wished to issue, tax exempt. The city of Cleveland could issue a billion dollars worth of bonds, tax exempt, and use them for transit purposes, if it wished to do so.

All we would say would be, "If you are going to issue some revenue bonds for transit purposes and if we are to guarantee them, we will ask you to forgo any privilege you might have for tax exemption."

Senators have talked about people to be born in the future who will have to pay the bill. The reason the Committee on Commerce did exactly what it did with respect to the bonds is that the committee did not anticipate that taxpayers in the future, with respect to the bonds, would have to pay anything, unless some city should default. I do not think that is going to happen.

We provided for a revolving fund which would adequately take care of any risk the Government might encounter.

If we wanted to put everybody in this country into the transit business—every bank and every investment house—all we would have to do would be to guarantee the bonds and make them tax exempt. Then the Treasury would not be able to sell any other bonds. We thought that would involve a little fiscal irresponsibility, too.

We could sell billions of dollars worth of those bonds now, if they were tax exempt and also guaranteed.

Any city can proceed as it wishes. Any urban center, any State or county, any transit authority, can issue all the bonds it desires to issue, tax exempt, but if we are to guarantee them we will say, "You must forgo that privilege."

We think that is a sound approach.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have great faith in the prophetic powers of my good friend from Washington, and I hope his prophecy will come true. Notwithstanding my great faith in the distinguished Senator from Washington, I have more faith in the declaration in the Scriptures to the effect that:

> He that is surety for a stranger shall smart for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that has not been the case in respect to many programs of this nature. It would not be, unless the country itself should turn out to be economically unsound. We do not anticipate that such will happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of the day and what he expects for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I express the hope that within the next minute or two the Senate can get to the yea-and-nay vote which has been ordered on the Cannon-Muskie amendment.

After that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] will offer an amendment, on which he will ask for the yeas and nays, but the Senator is willing to limit the debate to 10 minutes, to be divided 5 minutes to each side.

After the yea-and-nay vote is taken on the Tower amendment, I understand the next amendment to be offered will be one by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], but the vote to be taken on the Tower amendment would be the end of voting for today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce, with the concurrence of the minority leader, that there will be no objection to committee meetings tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will our committee be free to meet tomorrow morning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent now that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may meet tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if he will include me as a cosponsor of the amendment. I am running for election next year, too.

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Cannon-Muskie-Goldwater amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—5

Clark
Dodd
Kefauver
Kennedy
Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—7

Hartke
Miller
Moss
Robertson
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the Muskie-Cannon-Goldwater amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 13 and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 16, line 9, to strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one".

On page 16, line 10, to strike out "third" and insert in lieu thereof "half".

On page 18, line 10, to strike out "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof "one-third".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on these amendments be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to a side, 5 minutes to be controlled by the Senator handling the bill [Mr. SPARKMAN] and 5 minutes by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to make a brief announcement. For the information of Senators, I reiterate that the vote on the Tower amendment will be the last vote today.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am delighted to note that the pending bill has now been reduced from a $1 billion bill to a three-quarter billion dollar bill. However, I associate myself with the distinguished minority leader who said that this is far from enough.

In light of this circumstance, since we have reduced the total authorization, I believe there should be a reduction of the Federal participation. My amendment would reduce that Federal participation.

I believe we should reduce the Federal participation in the grant program from two-thirds of the net project cost to one-half of the net project cost, and in the emergency program from one-half of the project cost to one-third of the project cost.

The net project cost is arrived at by figuring the total cost of the project and then deducting the amount expected to be applied on the amortization of the project cost by farebox and other revenues.

If farebox revenues in some situations go merely to pay the operating cost, there are no farebox revenues remaining to apply to the net project cost, and it could result in two-thirds of the total project cost being paid.

Therefore, I believe it is proper to reduce the Federal participation to one-half of the net project cost. For one thing, I believe it would provide a greater incentive to local communities to exercise their own initiative and responsibility in raising the money. I therefore urge the adopton of my amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the purpose of the amendment is to stimulate the initiative of the local people in their own projects and to persuade them to do something to reduce their reliance on Washington. Is that correct?

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator for his statement. He has stated exactly the purpose of my amendment; namely, to stimulate local initiative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe just as strongly as do the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Massachusetts in stimulating local interest and initiative. I believe that the formula under which this bill is drafted will do just that. I admit that 50-50 sounds good, and it is good. However, I call attention to the fact that ever since 1949 we have been operating in urban renewal and slum clearance programs under this same formula. There are a great many local costs that a locality must figure on meeting, and which are not deducted when they come to figuring the net project cost. We have learned from experience in urban renewal that under the two-thirds formula, when all accounts are settled, it is approximately 50 percent; it breaks just about half and half. We have had testimony many times in our committee in which the representatives of the cities told us about the large part of the total cost borne by the cities.

This formula has worked well in urban renewal. It has been well tested over the 13 years it has been operating. We merely propose to apply here to another similar program. The formula is not two-thirds of the gross cost. It is two-thirds of the net project cost. The city makes an estimate of the income from the farebox, and after the operating expenses have been computed, the net project cost is arrived at, and that cost is then divided, two-thirds Federal and one-third local. As I say, many local costs are not taken into consideration in the net project cost.

Mr. TOWER. The net project cost might prove to be the total cost. All we are doing is anticipating the part of the total project cost which would be amortized by revenues. It is possible that there would not be sufficient revenues to amortize that portion of the total cost; therefore the project cost and the total cost might in some instances be the same figure.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Bennett
Hartke
Kefauver
Magnuson
Miller
Moss
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. TOWER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed. I understand that it will be taken up tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4 beginning with line 22, strike out all through line 14 on page 5, and insert the following:

"(b) (1) No financial assistance shall be made available under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly, or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of a private mass transportation company, or for the purpose of constructing, improving, or reconstructing any facilities or other property acquired, after the effective date of this Act, from any such company; unless (A) such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (B) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for the acquisition of mass transportation facilities or property which are supplementary to the service provided by an existing publicly owned or operated mass transportation system, and (C) in either situation under A or B, the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that the project to be assisted complies with the requirements set forth therein.

"(b) (2) No financial assistance shall be made available under this act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company unless (A) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (B) the Administrator finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, and (C) the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that such program complies with the requirements set forth therein."

On page 26, strike out lines 6 through 23 and insert the following:

"(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined jointly by the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including the continuation of pension rights and benefits of all beneficiaries) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities, and priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend the proposed amendment offered by Senator Morse by striking "company." at the end of subparagraph (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "company; unless such company has, prior to the acquisition, been adjudged bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time remains available on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 109 minutes remaining; the minority leader has 94 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair.

INCORPORATION OF THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily set aside so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of a measure of some urgency, which will take but a moment. The time which is under control on the mass transit bill will not be affected.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 87, H.R. 4715.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending business will be temporarily laid aside. Calendar No. 87, H.R. 4715, will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 23, after the word "Foundation", to strike out the comma and "Incorporated"; on page 3, line 17, after the word "welfare", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "health", to insert a semicolon and "and the furtherance of international good will"; on page 4, after line 8, to strike out:

(5) to solicit, prior to January 1, 1965, and to accept, receive, hold, invest, reinvest, and to use, administer, expend and otherwise dispose of, in the sole and absolute discretion of the board of trustees, gifts, legacies, bequests, devices, grants, funds, money and property of every kind and description, and to apply the income and principal thereof exclusively for the purposes of the corporation by such agencies and means as shall, from time to time, be found appropriate therefor, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limited or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

And on page 11, line 4, after the word "Foundation", to strike out the comma and "Incorporated".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments to the bill. All of them are certainly desirable. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, since the bill is not controversial. It provides for incorporation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this matter was considered by the Judiciary Committee. The bill has already been passed by the House. Those who are directing the Roosevelt Foundation have suggested various amendments which the committee thinks are desirable and necessary; and the amendments also keep the measure in line as regards the issuance of a Federal charter. Therefore, there is agreement by the committee with the purpose of the charterers.

Therefore the bill comes to us with the agreement of the committee; and I am glad to support the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report on the bill. The excerpt deals with the amendments and with the purpose of the amendments and the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 105) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENTS

Amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 1, strike the comma and the word "Incorporated".

Amendment No. 2: On page 3, line 18, strike the word "and".

Amendment No. 3: On page 3, line 18, after the word "health" change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "and the furtherance of international good will."

Amendment No. 4: On page 4, commencing on line 9, strike all down to and including the word "State;" on line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;"

Amendment No. 5: On page 10, line 11, after the word "Foundation" strike the comma and the word "Incorporated".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation".

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of amendments No. 1 and No. 5 is to remove the word "Incorporated" from the title of the foundation inasmuch as the committee was advised that in the judgment of officials of the Roosevelt Foundation the word "incorporated" is not appropriate in the name of the foundation.

The purpose of amendments No. 2 and No. 3 is to add to the objects and purposes of the foundation the furtherance of international good will.

The purpose of amendment No. 4 is to conform the section relating to acceptance and disposition of property and realty to the standards in all charter bills.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to confer a Federal charter on the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

STATEMENT

The Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation is to be a charitable and educational foundation. The foundation is to devote itself to continuing certain major interests with which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was deeply concerned, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged, the promotion of economic welfare and of public health. The foundation is to be financed from private sources.

The committee is advised and notes the fact that the foundation will limit any solicitation of funds from the public at large to a single campaign and that such campaign will terminate no later than November 7, 1965, the third anniversary of Mrs. Roosevelt's death.

The committee is of the opinion that the creation of this foundation is a worthy tribute to a woman of tireless energy and devotion to her principles and to humanity. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 4715, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation."

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, routine business was transacted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) to make correction in the enrollment of S. 1035.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual-rate contracts, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 119); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for obligations incurred during the 87th Congress, $300 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 106)

Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "National Penitentiaries," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 107)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 267, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 108)

Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 256, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Administrative Practice and Procedure," which was ordered to be printed.

WILDERNESS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 109)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am advised that the minority report on S. 4, the wilderness bill, is not yet ready. Earlier today, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on my behalf, filed the majority report, and obtained permission for publication of the report, together with minority views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to delay the printing of the report on S. 4 a day to permit the minority to complete their statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1261. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1263. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1264. A bill to amend title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1265. A bill to amend section 453 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status thereunder of certain types of installment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1266. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; and

S. 1267. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $80,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in Utah connecting the national parks and monuments in the southwestern part of Utah and northwestern part of Arizona with the national monuments and recreation areas in the south-central and southeastern parts of Utah and southwestern part of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BENNETT subsequently said: Mr. President, today I introduced Senate bill 1266 and Senate bill 1267. At this time I ask that the bills be held at the desk until the close of the first day of business of the Senate next week, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CHANGE IN THE ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1035

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 1035, relating to dual rate contracts, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for Mr. MAGNUSON), which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 119) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN VESSEL CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for reimbursement to certain U.S. shipping lines of all additional costs incurred by the lines by reason of the allocation by the Secretary of Commerce, as a matter of public policy, of construction contracts on their vessels to shipyards other than that of the lowest responsible bidder.

This proposed legislation, in somewhat different form, was considered and reported favorably by both Senate and House committees during the 87th Congress, but too late in the closing session for final action.

Present law provides that in the event of such allocation of vessel construction, if the contract made with the nonlow-bid shipyard provides for a price in excess of the lowest responsible bid which otherwise would have been accepted, that excess cost shall be borne by Government as part of the cost of national defense. However, this provision, as interpreted by the Secretary of Commerce, does not apply to expenses incurred by the shipowner for inspection and supervision of the vessel during construction, and for delivery of the vessel, in excess of the estimated expenses for the same services that he would have incurred if the vessel had been constructed by the lowest responsible bidder. The proposed bill would make clear that such additional costs should not devolve upon the shipowner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1263) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPROVEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STUDIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to broaden the National Defense Education Act to provide for training of students and teachers for work in international affairs at home and abroad.

This amendment is required to meet the growing national need for expertise in international affairs. The bill is an outgrowth of a Library of Congress survey of 32 universities and colleges in the United States, conducted at my request, which emphasized the need for expanding and improving programs in international affairs studies.

The amendment would, first, provide grants to colleges and universities to help in the establishment and operation of international affairs programs to train individuals for oversea business or government work, for work in the U.S. in international affairs, or for teaching or research work in international affairs; second, provide stipends for students undergoing advanced training in order to reach international affairs in colleges; and third, provide grants to colleges to help in the establishment of short-term institutes on international affairs for high school teachers, with stipends for those participating in the program.

The bill would add less than $3½ million to the $229 million appropriation request for the National Defense Education Act in fiscal 1964.

A greater number of students, teachers, businessmen, professional people and government officials must be better prepared to deal with the growing challenges and opportunities in the international field. The increasing responsibilities inherent in U.S. free world leadership require additional efforts to improve the quality and expand the scope of international affairs studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1264) to amend title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF INSTALLMENT LOANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is presently a practice in retail selling to installment sales which has been accepted by Internal Revenue in connection with tax liability. The seller prorates in a tax year that portion of the gross profit on an item which is in direct ratio to the relationship between amount paid in that year and total contract price.

This bill would simply define installment sale for the purpose of this section of the Internal Revenue Code, and I now introduce it for appropriate reference, and ask that the bill be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1265) to amend section 453(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status thereunder of certain types of installment plans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two bills that would make certain adjustments in the disability insurance cash benefits of title II of the Social Security Act of 1935. The objective of both bills is to provide a more adequate floor of financial security for our blind fellow citizens.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] have joined with me as cosponsors of these bills.

Several years ago I had the privilege of attending a convention of sightless men and women in Minnesota. Through such meetings and personal friendships with sightless men and women, I have gained much deeper insight about the nature and condition of blindness.

I have learned that blindness is a physical loss, a loss of the physical ability of a person to see. Severe as this loss is, it should be accepted as this. But I have learned that it is much more.

Unfortunately blind persons are still confronted by barriers of prejudice, misinformation, and misconceptions about their loss and its effects on their lives. These barriers, unreasoned, and reasonable, deny to the blind the opportunity to compete on the basis of equality with their sighted fellows, even though many are able, qualified, and desirous of doing so.

The greatest loss resulting from the occurrence of blindness is an economic loss. My bills are designed to minimize the disastrous economic and social consequences which follow the occurrence of blindness. They are designed to assure a blind person a degree of minimum financial security to free him from the severe pressure of unpaid bills and necessities of life.

The bills I have introduced would include in the Federal disability insurance program the generally recognized, a commonly accepted and used definition of blindness; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of

vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°.

My first bill would provide that those who meet this definition of visual loss and who have been employed in covered employment for a year and a half—six quarters—would be entitled to collect disability insurance cash benefits, and their entitlement to draw such cash benefits would continue so long as such individual remains disabled by blindness.

To make cash payments available to the blind after working for six quarters in covered employment is to recognize that the usual kinds of jobs they are able to secure are such that reducing the number of quarters of work required to establish a right to claim benefits is fair and reasonable.

Allowing blind persons to continue to draw cash benefits so long as they remain blind, even though they may be employed, is to place entitlement to receive benefits where it belongs, upon the existence and the continuing existence of a physical disability, the very existence of which results in a sustained economic loss.

To base entitlement to receive benefits upon the disability of blindness is to recognize that extra expenses are incurred when people without sight live in a sighted environment, when they must function in a society run by and for those with vision.

I have offered this proposal in two previous Congresses. I am most hopeful that this bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

However, Mr. President, if Congress is not willing to make such a reduction in the number of quarters from the presently required 20 to 6, that is, if it is not willing to lessen the length of time required for entitlement to receive cash benefits, I reluctantly introduce an alternative bill providing that a person who meets the generally accepted definition of blindness and who has worked for the presently required 20 quarters be allowed to qualify for payment of cash disability benefits so long as he remains blind.

Both of my bills do nothing more than make the disability insurance program under social security in fact a program providing financial protection against the economic hardships, yes, the economic inequities, resulting from blindness.

I believe that those who are blind should be permitted to draw cash benefits so long as they remain blind even though they may be working and earning, for they must meet additional costs to offset the handicapping consequences of their disability—they must pay certain "equalizing" costs when they would live and compete with men with sight, when they would function without sight in a sighted economy.

Mr. President, another provision which is identical in both of my bills would delete the present requirement that an applicant for or recipient of disability insurance cash benefits must accept vocational rehabilitation services or forfeit his cash payments.

This provision of Federal law, I think, is a refutation of the disability insurance program as social insurance, offering protection to participants against the economic consequences of a physical or mental disability. Rehabilitation results from aroused desire, awakened hope, stimulated ambition, it does not, nor can it, result from threats or coercion. The provision of law which would require rehabilitation "under the gun" is retrogressive and a contradiction of the very meaning of the term "rehabilitation."

This provision should be deleted from the existing law.

Mr. President, passage of either bill would diminish the serious economic disadvantage resulting from loss of sight. With this floor of financial security, sightless Americans will be better able to use and develop their talents and abilities for the benefit of the entire Nation.

As each person functions fully in our democratic society, as each contributes in accordance with his true capacities, the entire Nation is the ultimate beneficiary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both bills be printed in the Record at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the bills remain at the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record, and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and Senators Randolph and Javits) were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) (1) section 223 (a) (1) (B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c) (2)), has not attained the age of sixty-five,".

(2) Subsection (a) (1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c) (2), the month in which he attains age sixty-five".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and (in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c) (2)) as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2))" after "An individual"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than six quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs.".

(2) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness. The term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of twenty/two hundred or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than twenty/two hundred if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees".

(c) (1) The first sentence of section 216(i) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 223(c) (2))."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i) (1) is hereby repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223(c) (2))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) section 223(a) (1) (B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c) (2)), has not attained the age of sixty-five,".

(2) Subsection (a) (1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c) (2)), the month in which he attains age sixty-five".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and (in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c) (2)) as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2))" after "An individual"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than twenty quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs.".

(2) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in

lieu thereof the following: "The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness. The term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees.".

(c) (1) The first sentence of section 216 (i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 233(c)(2))."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i)(1) is hereby repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223 (c)(2))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the amendment proposed by Mr. Morse to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 3, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement entitled "A Message for Our Senior Citizens."

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Article entitled "The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports," written by Senator Mundt and published in the Aberdeen American News, Aberdeen, S. Dak., on March 24, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO HORACE M. ALBRIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. Fred J. Martin, of the Park County News in Livingston, Mont., has called my attention to an article in the March issue of Fortune magazine entitled "Businessmen Who Love the Land." It summarizes the outstanding work which businessmen are doing to preserve our great natural and irreplaceable heritage of wood, water, coast, and wildlife.

My attention was drawn particularly to the contribution of Horace M. Albright, the retired president of the U.S. Potash Co., who is listed as the "Dean of American Conservationists," and who simultaneously led two great conservation fights, one for the redwoods in the West, and the other for the Hudson River palisades in the East. This type of quiet service to present and future generations of Americans warrants national recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that the brief description of Mr. Horace M. Albright's life and work which is contained in Fortune magazine be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Horace M. Albright, retired president of U.S. Potash Co. (a predecessor of U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp.), might be called dean of American conservationists. Born in the shadow of California's High Sierra, he joined the legal staff of the Secretary of the Interior in 1913, and helped draft the legislation that created the National Park Service. He became Assistant Director of the Service, Superintendent of Yellowstone, and finally Park Service Director in 1929. Though he had his hands full as vice president and general manager of U.S. Potash after 1933, he raised funds for California's save-the-redwoods movement on one coast while serving as a member of the New York-New Jersey Palisades Interstate Park Commission on the other. He advised on the 1962 ORRRC report. Albright is pictured in a favorite natural setting, a grove of California redwoods named for Naturalist John Muir.

WEST VIRGINIANS PRESENT AS VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS HOLD ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BANQUET—LEWIS BREWER REPRESENTS STATE IN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST—SENATE VETERANS COMMITTEE ADVOCATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 2, the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual banquet honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. With other of my colleagues, and members of the West Virginia delegation, I was privileged to be a guest of our State's servicemen at the event attended by national officials, local VFW delegates, and respected persons who are active in veterans' programs.

Representing West Virginia on this significant occasion were: Departmental Commander James R. Fawcett, of Grafton, W. Va.; Leo C. Shuck, senior vice commander, from Keyser; John L. Frazier, State junior vice commander, of Morgantown; and Ralph Stump, quartermaster-adjutant, from St. Albans.

Other delegates from the Mountain State were: E. Nelson Berd, Martinsburg; C. S. Collier, Jr., Charleston; Leonard E. DeWitt, Wellsburg; Charles Dodson, Martinsburg; Wayne Feist, Sistersville; Claude W. Hedges, Martinsburg; Joseph C. Hess, Martinsburg; Richard Homan, Sugar Grove; Ralph Honaker, Huntington; Kelton E. Houghton, Huntington; Roland Lex, Grafton; Mel Linton, Huntington; Lonzo Lockard, Martinsburg; Dave Lowery, Weirton; Don S. Maupin, Moundsville; Lee McDonald, Martinsburg; and Richard Weidlich, Weston.

Also at this gathering was Maj. Harry T. Chapin, formerly of Charleston, and now residing in Virginia, who has been an active VFW member for 50 years. When introduced, Mr. Chapin was given a lusty cheer. He is now 89 years young, served as West Virginia Departmental Commander during 1930–31. For 30 years he lived in our State, and was connected with the U.S. Naval Ordnance Works in the Kanawha Valley.

One highlight of this inspiring and entertaining evening was the presentation of scholarship awards to the high school students adjudged winners in the National Voice of Democracy essay contest, sponsored annually by VFW. I was gratified that Lewis Brewer, of Mannington High School, was present to receive his scholarship, and the congratulations of those assembled. This lad was one of 2,000 young men and women who entered the contest in West Virginia, and after being selected as 1 of the 10 district finalists, his essay was chosen as the outstanding one from our State. He is a junior, and an "A" student interested in chemistry, and a future leader who will doubtless continue to bring credit to himself and his family, his community, and to his native State.

Mr. President, the event of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was especially meaningful to me because it provided an excellent opportunity to confer with knowledgeable Americans on certain of the problems which today confront veterans. Earlier in the day these citizens had visited the offices of many of the Members of Congress, including my own, to talk over particular areas of legislative interest.

Among those proposals discussed and which has elicited wide support throughout the country was Senate Resolution 48, a bill to amend the Rules of the Senate to provide for a permanent Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a cosponsor of this measure, along with several other Members, I am convinced that the magnitude and scope of problems and interests now facing veterans requires the establishment of a full-time and qualified Senate committee to administer to their needs. Likewise, I am confident that after thorough examination of the situation as it exists today, my colleagues will be moved to agree, and we will proceed to expeditious and favorable action on Senate Resolution 48.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the greatest blessing we have as Americans is the wonderful gift of personal freedom which is denied over half the world.

A senior at the high school in Lander, Wyo., Miss Valerie Goss, expressed in beautiful and compelling prose the meaning of freedom in an essay that won for her State honors in the Voice of Democracy contest.

Freedom is—as Miss Goss so accurately describes it—an intensely personal thing that all of us as Americans possess at birth. We will pass it on to our children only as long as we dedicate ourselves to preserving it.

With the consent of the Senate I should like to place Miss Goss' award-winning essay, "What Freedom Means to Me," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

An intensely personal thing, freedom.

I'm not going to tell you what freedom isn't.

With my own eyes I see freedom around me. It is a quiet thing generally. Young people in a library, or listening attentively to a teacher lecture. It can be as beautifully silent as people praying in a church, or as noisy as political campaigns with brass blaring, cheering and fiery oratory.

Freedom is security—not stocks, bonds, dividends and interest, but security. The right to wake up in the morning and feel alive. The right to experience and feel all the wonders and sorrows of living. I said that freedom is an intensely personal thing, and it is.

Freedom is as small a thing as being able to leave your home in the morning. It grows as the morning grows. A person gets into a car and drives away on a trip crossing State lines and boundaries uninterrupted by police inspection or a demand for identification. Certainly, this is freedom.

I work—have worked. I have had a number of jobs. I quit one when school started and was able to choose another that interested me. The freedom to work as one wants to work. When I collect my pay I am free to spend it on the ample bounty that freedom provides. When I pay for a thing, it is mine. I own it. The thing becomes a part of the meaning of me.

There, that's it—the meaning of me. The meaning of me and freedom are so closely allied that it becomes impossible to separate the identities. Most of all, I think that freedom is me. I live in a state of unhampered abundance of myself and my mind. No, not in any conceited or egotistical way, but in a manner that permits me to become, if I accept the responsibility, a fully developed and knowledgeable person.

Laws are made, have been made giving me the right to be myself. I can get angry and criticize the police, the Government—there will be no reprisals, no violence done to me. Sometimes I tend to abuse this privilege and forget the enormous responsibility which accompanies it. If I have this right, then those whom I criticize also have the same right. Their opinions and beliefs are to be respected—by me. I tend to forget it in the complete security that freedom becomes.

And when I realize this, I realize that perhaps the greatest threat to freedom is selfishness.

It is a sobering thought. The kind of a thought that makes me wonder if I have been damaging freedom, my own freedom and sense of security in other ways. I must ask myself, what other freedoms do I enjoy?

I have beliefs. I am entitled to them.

I have ambitions. I am obligated to them.

I have needs and desires, fears, and worries. Yet I am positive that my life will find a way to fulfill and overcome them.

What are the instruments of freedom that allow this? I am safeguarded by law. Laws which are closely and carefully scrutinized for their fairness, for their complete consideration of the individual living the law. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. What a perfect, yet simple and sensible thing is the law. Despite its complexity, it can be reduced to a statement of principles. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. Even those small and annoying representatives of the law, such as stoplights, are there to prevent me from infringement of the security of others' freedom. They, in turn, are respecting me and my rights in such a small thing as stopping for a traffic signal.

When I study at the library on week nights, I often get a great impression of the stacks of books—sentinels of knowledge. Knowledge guarding me and my rights. I have a sense of heritage before so much knowledge. The more I study it, the greater is my sense that all knowledge seems to reaffirm and convince that freedom is the inevitable course of good and right.

I think one of the places most Americans stop and get a sense of freedom is in our massive accomplishments, cities with skyscrapers, gigantic dams, and hydraulic stations—on Mount Rushmore with those serene faces. It takes something massive and big to commemorate the vastness and amplitude of freedom.

And yet, it is so completely a personal thing. Quiet, noisy, small, in any size—freedom is the person who is free. Freedom is the guarantee of the person. To someone like me who is in the process of becoming an adult citizen—freedom is thoroughly linked with the process of maturation of personality.

Yes, freedom is such an intensely personal thing.

CUBA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in the face of the administration's utterances on behalf of the cause of Cuban freedom the weekend action in restricting Cuban exile leaders, together with announcement of the U.S. role in the capture of an exile ship in the Caribbean must make pretty frustrating and unsavory fare for the American public.

The Justice Department has invoked the Neutrality Act to justify a halt to refugee attempts to encourage guerrilla activity in Cuba by showing that there still exists an anti-Castro resistance effort.

It is not hard to imagine the frustration of the quarter million exiles as they watch their nation being raped and ravaged by a Communist regime dominated by European communism, in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine and every moral tenet to which this Nation has ever subscribed.

The Cubans watched the United States ramrod the half-planned Bay of Pigs invasion and then refuse even to pick the wounded off the beaches. They watched the United States vacillate, and make indecisiveness the cornerstone of its Cuban policy, and last month they saw the issue of Communist Cuba quietly brushed under the rug at Costa Rica.

It now seems to those Cubans—who owe much of their misfortune to the ineptitudes of this Government—that we have done an about-face in even the simple concept of right and wrong.

The blockade of which the White House is in such fear has again been imposed, only this time it is a blockade around the exiles themselves while the bearded dictator of Cuba languishes in the safety of our protective coexistence policy.

A realization of the admissions inherent in the administration's antiexile action was not long in coming. The restrictions, at first praised by both parties and the press, are now being strongly questioned.

Yesterday's press carried two excellent editorials which presented some valid political and moral arguments favoring the refugees' position and giving the United States—as the Nation which once symbolized freedom to the world's oppressed people—something to think about.

I recommend to my constituents a Washington Star editorial by publisher and columnist David Lawrence, and an article by Virginia Prewett in the Washington News, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality." The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly "neutral."

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

[From the Washington News, Apr. 2, 1963]

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA DEPLORED

(By Virginia Prewett)

The U.S. State Department spokesman who called the daring and gallant Alpha 66 raids on Cuba "irresponsible acts" that helped Castro's cause reached an alltime low in pronouncement of U.S. foreign policy.

In Biblical times, the authors of this statement would have assailed young David for going up against Goliath. They'd have said his inspiring victory of right over might "helped the Philistines." And they'd probably have taken away his slingshot.

In colonial times, these spokesmen would have condemned the Boston Tea Party as "irresponsible"—and said it helped the British.

They would have deplored the French maquis' harassment of the Nazi occupation troops while Hitler ruled Europe.

OFFICIAL

For years, U.S. cold war propaganda has failed the gallant Hungarian freedom fighters who challenged Communist power. Yet last week, the world's greatest democracy officially chided Cuba's dedicated young patriots for proving that the fortress Cuba is not invulnerable.

When the State Department calls these raids "irresponsible," by inference they repudiate every freedom fighter who takes up arms against communism.

In Vietnam, young Americans are being killed by Communists with Russia-supplied arms. Yet in Caribbean, when young Cubans harass their betrayer, Castro, and the Russian occupation, the U.S. State Department deplores it.

STANDOFF

Why? Will the nuclear set now tell us that unless we stop the Alpha 66 raids against Communist Cuba, there'll be nuclear conflict?

This will sound fairly thin, since Defense Secretary Robert McNamara himself last week told Congress that we are in a "nuclear standoff" with Russia.

The U.S. State Department knows very well that the Alpha 66 raids are part of a strategy aimed at overthrowing Castro. Every raid is followed by a burst of sabotage against the Russian occupation. Does our State Department not want this occupation harassed?

Responsible members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tell me they cannot believe the Department spoke seriously against the Cuban patriots. They believe this is an another example of our Government's use of the forked tongue—as advocated in the managed news policy. If this is true, the authors of this latest managed lie ought to be taken out of their fear-distorted environment and subjected to the influence of ordinary people who respect courage and hate tyranny.

The U.S. Information Service Chief Edward R. Murrow, last week pleaded with Congress for a 25 percent increase in his operation's budget. So long as the U.S. State Department's spokesmen are too terrified to stand behind the principle of freedom and to help our friends, as President Kennedy promised in his election pledges, then all the money spent for U.S. propaganda will be so much paper and tarnishable silver down the drain.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

NEED FOR ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the need for a fiscally sound method of financing health care in old age has become severe in the past decade. In part, the problem is due to the spectacular progress that has been made in medical technology, which has been a principal reason for the greater numbers of people who live to suffer the illnesses that accompany old age. Changing technology has also rapidly increased the cost of medical care. For the aged, the increasing cost of health care and the increasing need for it have not been matched by an adequate method of financing it.

The crux of the problem of paying for health care in old age can be summed up in a few words. The average health costs of people age 65 and over are twice as high as those of younger people while the incomes of the older group are only half as high. A look at the facts is enough to show that there can be no doubt about the magnitude of the problem.

First. Nine out of ten elderly people go to the hospital at least once between age 65 and death. Most people who reach age 65 go to a hospital two or three times before they die; an elderly couple can expect about five hospital stays during their later years.

Second. When a person aged 65 or over goes to a hospital he stays, on the average, 15 days, twice as long as does the average younger person.

Third. Only half of the couples headed by an elderly person have incomes of as much as $2,500 per year; the comparable figure for younger couples is $5,300 a year.

Fourth. Only about half of the people 65 or over who live alone have incomes of more than $1,000 a year; half of the younger people who live alone have incomes exceeding $2,500 a year.

Fifth. About one-half of the elderly have no health insurance; and much of the health insurance that the other half has is worth very little to them in the event of a serious illness.

Sixth. The cost of a day's care in a hospital more than doubled from 1951 to 1961; during those 10 years the average daily costs went up from $16.77 to $34.98. In Minnesota, hospital costs are running slightly ahead of the national average.

PRIVATE INSURANCE ALONE IS NO SOLUTION

Only about half the aged have any kind of health insurance. And much of it is inadequate. For example, many health insurance policies for older citizens pay only $10 a day for no more than 30 days of hospital room and board and even less adequate amounts toward other hospital costs. The obvious reason that more older people don't have fully adequate private insurance protection is that they cannot afford the premiums for plans that offer sufficient protection against their inordinately high hospital costs.

The national health survey shows how closely having health insurance in old age is related to the person's ability to continue working, his income and the state of his health. In 1959, for example, the survey found that only 42 percent of the nonworking aged had any kind of health insurance, and only 30 percent of the aged in poorer health had hospital insurance. In addition, the survey showed that only one-third of the aged whose family income fell below $2,000 had hospital insurance.

Not only are the aged a low-income, high-risk group, but they usually cannot buy group health insurance through a place of employment, as younger people can. Older people must ordinarily buy insurance on an individual basis. This adds greatly to the cost compared with group policies.

HIGH COST OF NEW BLUE CROSS PLANS

Last year there was a great deal of talk about the announced Blue Cross intention to offer special plans for the elderly. Such a plan has been set up in the State of Minnesota. The Minnesota plan pays for 75 percent of the costs of a hospital stay for a maximum of 70 days; if admitted to a nursing home within 3 days of discharge from the hospital, a member could have 75 percent of the cost of his nursing home care paid for on the basis of 2 days of care for each unused day of available hospital care; there are also limited provisions for payment of ancillary hospital services other than room and board and general nursing care.

The premiums for the Blue Cross plan cost $150 a year per person and $300 a year for a man and his wife. This is nearly double the premiums required under previous Minnesota Blue Cross plans.

The new premium payments amount to about one-eighth of the average aged couple's income and about one-seventh of the income of the average single person. And even with the new Minnesota Blue Cross protection, a member would still have to pay all nonhospital health costs—or purchase additional insurance to cover part of them—plus the noncovered 25 percent of their hospital bills. Comparatively few of the retired aged can afford such total outlays for major illnesses.

Private insurance carriers and Blue Cross have made most commendable efforts to meet the staggering problem of financing the health care costs of our elder citizens. Their inability to cope fully with the problem is not for lack of effort. It is a matter of simple economics.

DRAWBACKS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE METHOD

Some persons believe that the State-Federal public assistance programs should be the basis for providing the medical care which the aged need but cannot pay for themselves. But the facts also suggest that these programs do not provide the full solution to the medical problems facing the great majority of the elderly.

The problem of high health costs in old age does not only concern the very poor, for whom public assistance is intended. The problem of paying for medical care in old age hits hardest at the great majority of older people—those of average or above-average financial circumstances, who are neither rich nor very poor. Giving assistance to people who are already reduced to poverty is necessary, but of equal importance is preventing dependency among elderly who are financially independent in normal circumstances.

Furthermore, few people willingly give up their independence, privacy, and personal dignity in order to secure public health assistance. Some people have said that public welfare investigations are similar to investigations made when a person negotiates for a loan or makes a major purchase on the installment plan.

There is a significant difference. The purpose of the credit investigation is to find out whether he is financially dependable and likely to remain dependable. The purpose of the welfare investigation is to determine whether he is a financial failure who is unable to provide for himself and his family. For a person who has been financially independent all his life, such an investigation to prove his indigency can be a shattering and demoralizing experience.

Unless some new method of financing health care in old age is adopted, even the very poor aged will not be able to look to public assistance for the help they need. It is now 2½ years since the enactment of the Kerr-Mills legislation which made Federal grants available to help the States establish medical assistance programs for the so-called medically indigent. Only half of the States have established any kind of a program of medical assistance for their aged residents under this legislation. Many of the programs that have been set up do not meet the crux of the problem.

In January 1963, only 116,000 elderly people were getting help under these programs. This is a small portion of the aged who had high medical costs in that month and lacked adequate financial resources. Three-quarters of the payments were paid in three large industrial States—California, Massachusetts, and New York.

Very little has been done in the States with lowest income and greatest need. These poorer States do not have their part of the matching funds necessary to do an adequate job and in some instances not enough to do any job. The financial burden on the States, if all were to develop full-fledged MAA programs under the Kerr-Mills legislation would be enormous.

NO MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA

While my own State of Minnesota has done fairly well by its impoverished elderly residents, I regret to say that it is not one of the States that has set up a program of medical assistance for the aged provided for by the Kerr-Mills legislation. A bill that would have put such a program into effect was introduced late in the 1961 session of the State legislature. Hearings were held in both houses, but no bill was reported out of committee in either house and the session adjourned without further action. What will be accomplished during the 1963 session remains to be seen. I sincerely hope that positive action will be taken and that a good program for the medically indigent in Minnesota will go into operation.

SOCIAL SECURITY: THE ONLY SENSIBLE SOLUTION

In summary, neither public assistance nor private health insurance offers the solution to the problem of paying health costs in old age. What is needed is a mechanism whereby persons can provide in advance—when they are working and can afford to do so—for the health costs they will face in old age. Private health insurance organizations cannot sell adequate health insurance policies on this basis. Furthermore, the health cost protection should be provided in a way that is consistent with our traditional American concern for the dignity and privacy of the individual—without the extensive investigation of one's personal affairs that is built into our welfare programs.

The social security system, under which people pay during their working years toward the benefits they will receive when they retire, offers the only mechanism that satisfies both these basic conditions. Moreover, a social security hospital insurance plan would benefit from all the economies which lower the cost of group health insurance coverage. Since much of the administrative machinery already is functioning in carrying out the present social security program, social security hospital insurance could be administered at a cost of about 3 percent of benefits.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

It is with great pride that I joined with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and many other colleagues in sponsoring the President's program of hospital insurance for the elderly through the social security system (S. 880). The proposed program would benefit virtually all of the elderly—social security beneficiaries, railroad retirement annuitants, and the elderly people who have not had an opportunity to earn protection under these programs or under the health benefits plan for active and retired Federal employees.

First, hospital insurance protection would be provided for all the aged now on the social security benefit rolls, whether or not they have paid any of the additional taxes to be allocated to the hospital insurance trust fund. One of the important features of social insurance is that improvements in the program—benefit increases as well as broadened protection—can be and are provided to all those who are already beneficiaries and are no longer contributing to the program. The cost of making hospital insurance benefits available to those people who are already age 65 or over and eligible for cash social security benefits is relatively small. The employer contribution to the proposed hospital insurance program would more than meet the cost of these payments. Thus, future workers will not be hurt; in fact they will get in hospital insurance protection more than the value of their own contributions since they too will benefit from the employer payments.

In addition, hospital benefits would be made available to people who are not eligible for monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits. The provision for such people would be transitional—that is, it would take care of everyone who had been born too soon to earn full eligibility under social security. The effect of the provision would taper off; that is, eventually all persons who reach age 65 will have to be eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits in order to qualify for hospital insurance. In the future, about 95 out of 100 will be able to satisfy this requirement.

Many of those who would not qualify for the proposed hospital insurance would be people who are eligible for health insurance under programs for active and retired Federal employees. Physicians and other groups who have rejected coverage under social security would also be excluded.

The payments that would be made for people who are already old and who are outside the social security and railroad retirement systems would be paid out of the general funds of the Treasury. Neither social security nor railroad retirement funds would be involved. Thus the principle that social security benefits are reserved for contributors would be preserved.

WHAT PROPOSED PROGRAM WOULD PROVIDE

Under the President's proposal, health insurance protection would be provided against the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing facility, and visiting nursing facility, and visiting nurse and related home health services. These benefits go to the heart of the problem the aged face in meeting the cost of their health care. Payment for the costs of hospital care will provide substantial relief where health costs are highest. The illnesses that are usually the most expensive are those that involve a period of hospitalization. Skilled nursing facility benefits would be valuable to the hospitalized beneficiary who can be given satisfactory care in a skilled nursing facility after the acute stage of his illness has passed.

The payment for outpatient diagnostic services would encourage early diagnosis. Early diagnosis, as we all know, is an important way of reducing the length of an illness and of enhancing the chances of recovery. Moreover, the availability of payment for such services removes an incentive to receive such services as an inpatient with the higher cost involved.

PROGRAM WOULD BE ADEQUATELY FINANCED

The President's proposal to provide basic hospital insurance for the aged carries with it a carefully developed plan for financing. The program will be financed in an orderly manner that will be no hardship on anyone. The benefits would be financed by increasing social security contribution rates—effective with January 1965—by one-fourth of 1 percent on employers, one-fourth of 1 percent on employees, and four-tenths of 1 percent for the self-employed; also, the amount of annual earnings subject to the tax and creditable for social security monthly benefits would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200 beginning with 1965. As a result of increasing the amount of earnings creditable for benefits, the maximum monthly cash benefit for a worker would rise to $134 instead of $127 and the maximum monthly benefit for a family would rise to $268 instead of $254. Further, the increase in the earnings base would provide additional income which together with the income from the contribution rate increase would fully meet all the costs of the hospital insurance program. A separate hospital insurance trust fund would be established for the program.

THE TRADITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY APPROACH

Quite obviously, the proposal would not meet all the health insurance needs of the elderly. Nor do I think that the whole job should be done through social insurance. The program recommended by the administration is intended to be a basic program—with a complementary role for private insurance and a lesser, but nevertheless important, backup role for public assistance.

If hospital insurance for the aged is provided under social security, the effects on the voluntary health insurance effort will be comparable to the growth of private retirement insurance that occurred after passage of the social security program. This point has been made by others. For example, in a statement before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Robert A. Rennie, vice president in charge of research of the Nationwide Insurance Companies, said, referring to hospital insurance under social security:

> Some people say it will interfere with the growth of private, voluntary insurance. As indicated earlier, all of the evidence is to the contrary. A tremendous growth of private insurance has accompanied the development of social security. In our opinion, private insurance carriers would have a broader, sounder market for voluntary insurance among our older people by building on the basic provisions of social insurance legislation.

ROLE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Just as private insurance will play an important role in providing needed protection, public assistance also will need to play its historic role in meeting the extraordinary needs of the indigent aged. If the administration's proposal is adopted, the financial problems faced by the States in implementing programs of medical assistance for their aged residents will be greatly reduced. It seems reasonable to expect that States will then be able to move in the direction of a more meaningful and effective health care program for those among the aged who would need further help in meeting their health care costs. Neither social insurance, private insurance, nor public assistance can do an adequate job alone. Together they can establish a new level of health security for all our present and future senior citizens.

CONCLUSION

The proposed hospital insurance benefits would be a logical—as well as greatly needed—addition to the present social security program. As the President said in his special message on aiding our elderly citizens which he sent to the Congress on February 21:

> Health insurance for our senior citizens is the most important health proposal pending before the Congress. We urgently need this legislation—and we need it now. This is our No. 1 objective for our senior citizens.

GENERAL WILSON'S BLUEPRINT FOR WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on rare occasions a speech is made with such depth and perception that it withstands the test of time and becomes a valued document.

Last May 18, 1962, a speech was delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, on the board of which organization I serve, by Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army.

General Wilson's speech dealt with the interweaving of our water resources future, and the future of our national defense. Because it is an excellent speech on a vital subject, I ask unanimous consent that General Wilson's remarks, titled "Water Resources Development and National Defense," be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

You have dealt generously in giving me this opportunity to talk about water resources development and national defense. It is a happy occasion when a man gets a chance to expound in public on his favorite subject. National defense has been my career since entering the U.S. Military Academy and water resources have occupied a large share of my time since entering the Corps of Engineers upon graduation.

One soon learns, in the corps, that water development and defense are two sides of the same coin. The Nation's military strength is inseparable from its economic strength; its economic strength in turn depends upon the wise use of natural resources; and among natural resources, the conservation and control of water are absolutely basic.

Thus broadening and acceleration of water development of all kinds becomes a matter of primary national importance, which President Kennedy has stressed twice in his messages to the Congress during the past 2 years.

What this country needs now, and needs badly, is fuller realization of the great scope and size of the water-resources development task confronting it, and an absorbing dedication to an all-out, generation-long, water development effort.

How big is this task? I am going to cite some figures, derived in part from studies inspired by our work with the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources a couple of years ago. I shall put them forward very tentatively, because in looking far ahead as we have to do in planning large-scale construction programs—the estimates of needs must necessarily be very rough.

Resources for the Future, Inc., made a monumental study for the select committee which indicates the magnitude of the reservoir storage capacity we shall need just to keep the rivers flowing adequately to meet all demands for water. The Corps of Engineers has completed the picture by taking into account a nationwide inventory of additional needs. The outstanding conclusion reached by combining the results of the two studies is that by 1980—only 18 years from now—the Nation will need to add more than 400 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity to its existing systems. This is 2½ times the capacity of all the reservoirs the Corps of Engineers has built in the past—mainly in the last two decades. And it somewhat exceeds the aggregate capacity of all reservoirs that have been built in the United States since its beginning.

And this is only the basic part of the job necessary to provide the high degree of conservation of water and control of streamflow to assure dependable supply for such requirements as domestic and industrial use and to maintain satisfactory stream conditions generally. Add to it the navigation improvements, local flood protection works, hydroelectric power, recreation, and other related tasks of comprehensive development and the overall undertaking looms quite large.

When we in the Corps of Engineers try to size up our projected part of the task we find ourselves contemplating programs in the next two decades ranging from $1½ to $2½ billion a year for new construction alone.

Figures like these are startling. But when we look realistically at our national future, the scale of the projected development to meet water needs falls into proportion. The United States faces a big future—big in every aspect—big in strength, big in accomplishments, and therefore big in its needs.

To meet these needs, as we see them now, would require a corps program growing at a rate of about 6 percent each year. As a national goal is an annual growth rate of at least 4.5 percent for the gross national product, and as attainment of this goal depends upon prior development of basic natural resources, a growth rate of 6 percent in developmental programs appears entirely reasonable. Moreover, we have some catching up to do in the development of water resources.

We have made an analysis of how the demands projected by various authorities for the Senate select committee would, in all probability, affect those parts of the overall water resources responsibility to which the Corps of Engineers' efforts are normally directed. Our concern has been to ascertain where we have to raise our sights, how we need to sharpen our procedures, and in general, line out our work so as to make headway toward helping to meet future requirements.

I might add that we were interested in finding out where any bottlenecks might be encountered, so we might take early action in effort to avoid them.

Beginning with the reservoirs, let me pass along to you some of the facts our analysis revealed. The Senate select committee's report indicated that a total of well over 300 million acre-feet of reservoir storage space would be needed by 1980. This storage was projected just for regulation of the Nation's rivers to increase low water flows for purposes such as water supply, water quality control, power, navigation, recreation and the like. Additional storage reserves for flood control, most of which would be combined in the same reservoirs with water supply, would also be needed, making the total requirement about 400 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity.

Our estimates indicate that the Corps of Engineers should be prepared to build about three-fourths the total storage requirement, and that the cost would be something like $15 billion, figured at 1960 dollars.

Now where is the space to store this water effectively and economically to come from? In many respects, this is going to be a harder problem to solve than that of expanding the capability to build the reservoirs, or finding the money to pay for them. I think we will have the construction capacity, all right, but we will have to find many more able planning engineers to carry out programs of the magnitude indicated. I don't want to minimize the money—but if we've got to have the water, the question boils down to the hard fact that we've got to get it, through reservoir construction, and do it at the cheapest cost we can. But as to land on which to store the water, that is something else again. In some of our river basins, such as the Ohio, for example, the amount of feasible reservoir space which can be acquired without major disruption of existing development such as communities, highways, industries, railroads, and the like, is nowhere near adequate. And it is getting less every day. This is one of the aspects of the water resources job where the country is going to feel the pinch of the lack of enough highly capable and experienced planning engineers who can help give us the most water for the least sacrifice of either land or money.

Even when all these problems are solved—money, planning, capability, space and efficiency—we still will face the problem of time. If the challenge is to be met, and if construction programs of the scale we are talking about are to be carried out within only 18 years, we must start working on them much faster and quite soon.

To meet Federal flood control responsibilities properly, the multipurpose reservoir program should be supplemented by about 11,000 miles of levees, floodwalls, channel improvements, and related works costing about $2 billion. Also, some 3,000 flood-plain studies, costing about $80 million, should be undertaken to encourage local regulation in effort to minimize the flood risk and reduce the cost of building protection for property that should not be located in the flood plain.

Meanwhile, the augmented reservoir program would make feasible the installation by 1980 of about 33 million kilowatts of new power-generating capacity, costing over $5 billion.

Any forecasts must recognize the phenomenal increase in the public demand for water-based recreation. In 1961 the attendance at Corps of Engineers reservoirs alone totalled about 120 million. Fifteen years earlier it had only been about 5 million. In view of this growing demand, and in anticipation that new reservoirs will continue to be built and will be better adapted for recreation than older ones, an estimated 300 million attendance by 1980 is conservative.

We believe that State and local entities should be encouraged to develop the recreational potentialities of Federal reservoirs to the greatest possible extent. However, the Federal Government can and should acquire land for recreational development at reservoir areas and should also provide such basic facilities as access roads, picnic grounds, boat-launching ramps, sanitation, and the like. We contemplate that perhaps $700 million might be spent for such purposes at corps projects by 1980.

The national inland waterway system embraces some 20,000 miles of improved channels in commercial use. We have estimated that about 10,000 miles of these channels need improvement, and that about 1,000 miles of new waterways merit serious consideration for possible future development. The total cost of this possible future work would be about $8 billion. The urgency with which this additional construction should be carried out depends upon factors which are difficult to predict. In addition to possible modifications in national transportation policy, the main determining factors are the growth of transportation needs, and the future cost of alternative forms of transportation. At present we can only assume that needs will develop at about the same rate in the future as in the past. On this basis we should anticipate investing about $2.7 billion in the improvement or construction of waterways by 1980.

Also, construction of 14 new deep-draft harbors on the seacoasts and the Great Lakes, and improvement of 46 existing harbors are expected to become justified over the next two decades. The estimated cost of this work is about $2 billion.

The Atlantic coastal storms early this March have emphasized the need for expanded programs to protect against loss of life and property and destruction of beaches along the national shoreline. Without taking into account changes that may occur in Federal legislation and policy, we feel reasonably sure that we will be called on to undertake more shore protection, including hurricane protection projects, than has been contemplated before this year. A very rough order-of-magnitude estimate might be in the neighborhood of $1 billion by 1980.

To get the big, overall, comprehensive water resources development job done on time and economically, we shall have to accelerate river basin planning and project surveys. Increased emphasis is being placed on this activity in my own office. And, as a first step in avoiding a bottleneck, special river basin planning units have been established in each of our divisions. These units will carry on continuing studies of reservoir needs and potentialities for each river basin similar to those prepared for the Senate select committee. These studies will help provide the detailed data needed to further refine the estimates of needs set forth by the committee. They will also help the Corps of Engineers develop more dependable timetables for providing additional storage capacity, will help locate reservoir sites, and will determine the river flows needed at key points along the main rivers.

We expect our basin-study units to help us cooperate effectively with other river-basin planning agencies such as those recommended by President Kennedy. Pending completion of comprehensive basin plans, they will help us to make sure that our proposed projects will fit well into future plans and help us give proper consideration to selecting the best of alternative means of meeting resource needs.

Let me repeat that our estimates are necessarily based largely on meeting those requirements for which the Corps of Engineers has primary responsibility. But I might point out that many different water-resource programs tend to converge on those of the corps, particularly with respect to basic streamflow regulation. Our basin-study assignments, from the late 1920's to date; the nationwide scope for our programs, and our involvement not only on rivers but on lakes and seacoasts; the many contacts we have established at community level all over the United States through both our military and our civil missions—all these bring us into contact with the Nation's overall water-resource needs and problems. And I hope that by telling you candidly how big the job ahead appears to us, it may help organizations such as the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to gear up their own efforts to help get the water-resources job done well and on time.

What we are dealing with involves the total future welfare of our Nation. Water-resource development must be undertaken not merely because it is profitable, or so that we may live more comfortably. It must be undertaken to preserve our national economy, our security, and our way of life. It is one of the foundation stones of national defense and of our country's future greatness. No task is more urgent. It is a challenge to us all.

ALL AMERICA CITIES OF 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that the city of San Diego, Calif., has been selected as 1 of the 10 All America Cities of 1962.

San Diego is in the midst of solving a problem more and more cities are faced with. It is the problem of a declining downtown area. Traditionally, the downtown area has been the center of commerce, the hub of government, the seat of culture.

But an all too common 20th century disease called urban sprawl can change all that. Allowed to run its own undisciplined, unplanned course, urban sprawl saps a city's downtown, lures business away from the city's center to its fringes. The downtown becomes little more than a museum piece from an earlier day, a day when all roads did, indeed, lead to the city—not away from it.

The people of San Diego, seeing their downtown area failing to keep pace with the demands of a rapidly growing population, combined public and private forces to breathe new life into their downtown. They formulated a plan which called for a 5,000-seat convention hall, a 3,000-seat civic theater and an exhibition hall, and parking space for 1,000 cars. They raised funds. And they started building. They have launched a $75 million project. Theirs is an investment in the city and it will pay dividends to them, to their children, and to future generations.

I want to publicly extend congratulations to San Diego for winning this award.

I wish to extend congratulations, too, to the city of Pomona, Calif., which was named among 10 runnersup in this nationwide competition.

The selections were made by an All America Cities jury, consisting of Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion and former president of the National Municipal League; Mrs. Hazel Blanchard, president of the National Education Association; Albert C. Boyd, president of the American Chamber of Commerce Executives; William T. Gossett, former vice president of Ford Motor Co.; Mrs. Herbert E. Hawkes, president of the American Association of University Women; Leo Kramer, assistant to the president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO; Roy B. Martin, Jr., mayor of Norfolk, Va.; William V. Merrihue, board chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look magazine; James M. Osborn, research associate, Yale University; Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president, League of Women Voters; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of the Bureau of Government Research and Services, University of Washington.

This month Look magazine is presenting a series of articles and pictures about the All America selections. I ask unanimous consent that the lead article and the article on San Diego be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Look magazine, April 1963]

EVERY 11½ SECONDS, OUR CITIES MUST MEET THE NEEDS OF A NEW AMERICAN

A baby is born, and an American city has a new citizen—and a new problem. As this child matures, he will require schools, hospitals, police protection, and a host of other community services. His city government is nominally responsible for providing these services, but the final responsibility for maintaining a good city rests with his parents and other private citizens like them. As novelist and poet Jan Struther put it, "A city's as great as the little people that live there." Effective citizen action, not merely good government, is the basic criterion for the All-America City citations, which are awarded annually by Look and the National Municipal League. The size and wealth of a city do not matter. For instance, this year's smallest winner, Grafton, W. Va. (5,700), won because of its citizens' efforts to remedy a staggering unemployment problem.

In the years since the All America Cities contest began, over a hundred communities have received awards for such diverse achievements as getting rid of a corrupt city administration or building a school. Some problems are common to many cities: providing services for a rapidly expanding population, renewal and rehabilitation of blighted areas, changing the machinery of government as adjacent municipalities grow together to become one city, and, always a danger, citizen apathy. Cities learn from each other in solving these, and other, problems. Falls Church, Va., a 1961 winner, learned about citizen political activity from Rockville, Md., a winner in 1954 and 1961. This year's 22 finalists were selected from almost 70 applicants by a committee of experts. Last November, the finalists presented their cases to the All America Cities jury during the National Conference on Government at Washington, D.C.

[From Look magazine, April 1963]

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

San Diego, third largest metropolis on the Pacific coast, is getting a new heart: Centre City. Centre City is the local answer to downtown deterioration, a common ailment of American cities. Working closely with local officials, San Diegans, Inc., a nonprofit corporation formed by 50 community leaders, financed 4 economic studies of the downtown area. The city government, guided by these surveys, produced a plan of rehabilitation that called for downtown construction of government buildings. Centre City's Community Concourse will include a 5,000-seat convention hall, a 3,000-seat civic theater, an exhibition hall and parking space for 1,000 cars.

When the city found it would need additional funds for the Community Concourse project, volunteers raised $1,600,000 in just 6 weeks. Businessmen joined in and began construction of commercial buildings with 1,500,000 square feet of space. The Centre City plan will provide, by 1965, an efficient, modern downtown area at a cost of nearly $75 million in public and private funds. With Centre City, San Diego lives up to the new slogan: "City in Motion."

THE OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE BEAUFORT COUNTY LIBRARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Beaufort County Library has won the 1963 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award.

This award is presented to the outstanding library of the Nation as a signal recognition of achieving outstanding library facilities and services in municipal areas not exceeding 25,000 people. The Beaufort County Library won this award in competition with comparable libaries throughout the United States.

The library program in South Carolina and in each of our counties and cities is one of the most progressive in the Nation. This is not the first time a South Carolina Library has won the Fisher Award. In 1961 it was awarded the Greenwood City and County Public Library, and in 1962 the Oconee County Library.

In connection with this, the South Carolina General Assembly passed two resolutions, one commending Miss Estellene P. Walker, director of the State Public Library Association, and the other commending the Beaufort County Library board and staff for having won this $5,000 library award, which will be presented to the library on Sunday, April 21.

Mr. President, I ask that these resolutions be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION H. 1415

Concurrent resolution commending Miss Estellene P. Walker for her services as director of the State Public Library Association

(By Messrs. Addis, C. A. Mitchell, Graves, W. Brantley Harvey, Jr., and Carnell)

Whereas Miss Estellene P. Walker has served as director of the State Public Library Association for more than 16 years; and

Whereas under Miss Walker's leadership and direction the public libraries in our State, especially those in the smaller towns and rural communities, have experienced a tremendous growth both in number and quality; and

Whereas the superior quality of the public libraries in our State has been evidenced by 1961 and 1962 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Awards being won by the Greenwood City and County Public Library and by the Oconee County Library, and by the Beaufort County Library's earning of the 1963 National Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Miss Estellene P. Walker, director of the State Public Library Association, is hereby commended for her outstanding public service in promoting the extension and development of public libraries in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Miss Walker.

RESOLUTION H. 1416

Concurrent resolution to commend the Beaufort County Library Board, the county librarian and his staff, upon the Beaufort County Library's winning of the 1963 National Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award

(By Messrs. Graves, W. Brantley Harvey, Jr., Addis, C. A. Mitchell, and Carnell)

Whereas the Beaufort County Library has been chosen the national winner of the 1963 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award; and

Whereas competitors for this award were libraries recommended by the State library boards or similar agencies of 48 States; and

Whereas this award is presented annually in signal recognition of outstanding library facilities and services provided for counties or cities with municipal populations not in excess of 25,000; and

Whereas this national honor reflects with distinction not only the caliber of the library facilities of Beaufort County but of all the similar libraries throughout our State; and

Whereas the general assembly wishes to commend the Beaufort County Library Board, the county librarian, Mr. T. Ray Peppers, and his staff upon earning this highly coveted recognition of distinguished public library service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Beaufort County Library Board, the county librarian, Mr. T. Ray Peppers, and his staff are hereby commended upon the Beaufort County Library's winning of the 1963 National Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Larry J. Rogers, chairman of the Beaufort County Library Board, Hilton Head Island, S.C.

WINSTON CHURCHILL, CITIZEN OF AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I share the pleasure of the Senate at its having been able to complete action yesterday on the resolution granting honorary American citizenship to Winston Churchill. As a cosponsor of one of these resolutions, I am proud to have been associated with this fitting recognition for one of the greatest men in the world in this century. None of us who were adults at the time of World War II can ever forget what this man meant to the world in rallying the forces of democracy. It is entirely fitting that we grant him an honor that is unique, for his character and deeds have been unique. Winston Churchill, a citizen of the British Empire by birth and loyalties, is now a citizen of America by congressional action, as indeed, he is a citizen of the world by his life and deeds.

An editorial in the Washington Post of this morning well expresses the affection we feel for Sir Winston Churchill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

By its unanimous vote, the U.S. Senate has fittingly and appropriately concluded congressional action upon the resolution which directs the President to declare Winston Churchill an honorary citizen.

There is no action that this Government could take that would be more in harmony with the sentiments and feelings of the American people who will welcome with joy into the fellowship of this new and formal association one who long has been united to America and Americans by bonds that no political body could either devise nor dissolve.

This unanimous act of the Senate will gladden the hearts of all Americans. A great legislative body has as its primary duty the affirmation in the statutes of those resolves already confirmed in the minds of a free people; but it has an equal duty to affirm by solemn enactment the sentiments that stir the hearts of citizens. This is such an enactment.

It is to be hoped that it will also gladden the heart of Winston Churchill. There is reason to think it will. Like Henry V, he could always say: "I am not covetous for gold * * * but if it be a sin to covet honour, I am the most offending soul alive." Such men may have a surfeit of everything else upon this fair earth, but of honor they can never have enough. And so, there is reason to hope that his honor, heaped high although it is upon a life already filled with honor, will find the taste for more not staled by all that has befallen him, the appetite for honor undiminished. And may the savour of this honor stay sweet upon his tongue in all his days to come, comforting him in the hours of his old age and nurturing to brighter recollection the memory of his great deeds.

To construe this act as a mark of that special relation which exists between this country and England would be to underestimate the honor and overestimate that historic bond, for the special relationship out of which this action springs is that between these greatly led and those who greatly lead them. Free men everywhere shared for a while in the greatness of this man, reveled in his glorious phrases, roused to his brave sentiments, rejoiced in his bold challenges. This is the special tie that binds us all to him and him to us. It is good to have it unanimously affirmed by the U.S. Senate.

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, made a speech to the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago. In that speech he covered, with great insight, several areas of concern to both the broadcasting industry and to the viewing and listening public.

Since these networks use the public airways and since they are a potent force in shaping our society and in the education or lack of it for our children I hope that we in this body and those concerned for the future will read carefully his remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 2, 1963

Governor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, during the past few months, you may have seen some speculation in the press about my leaving the Commission. I've even received some mail as a result of these rumors. One Hollywood television producer wrote me a kind letter, and said, "Mr. Minow, you've been chairman of the FCC since 1961. Anyone in the business can tell you that 2 years in television is a long run."

The quantity of mail has also been instructive. Several months ago, one network announced it was going to drop the program "It's a Man's World" in light of, if you'll pardon the expression, low ratings. The network quickly received thousands and thousands of letters of protest. In the weeks since the rumors began about my leaving the Government, I received eight other letters concerning that possibility. Seven were from applicants for my job, and the eighth one said, "It serves you right for letting 'It's a Man's World' go off the air."

Apparently, these rumors have also stimulated some conversation in the industry. One network vice president said to his boss: "If Minow leaves, I only hope he leaves permanently, and that they're not just going to get a summer replacement for him." His boss replied: "And we don't want any reruns either."

Ladies and gentlemen, I shall make no announcements or statements today about these rumors, except to suggest to you that you continue to do business at the same old stand in our office at 12th and Pennsylvania Ave. To turn to business, I begin today with a public service announcement for another regular customer of the FCC. Many people erroneously think that the FCC is concerned only with broadcasting. Among our other modest assignments is the regulation of communications companies in the telephone and telegraph industries, including the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Through FCC action, a reduction in telephone rates goes into effect this week. For $1 or less, you will be able after 9 p.m. to make a 3-minute station-to-station call to any place in the continental United States. I hope that you will all call your mothers, wives, sweethearts, sons, and daughters at college, or your station managers at this reduced rate.

Unofficially, I've suggested that the telephone company might try commercial spot announcements—not loud ones—on radio and TV at 9 p.m. every night to promote use of this new rate. When I mentioned this to several broadcasters to show them how we were promoting their business, they were not too enthusiastic. They feared that when people heard the announcements, they would turn off their sets to rush to the phone. Perhaps the FCC can't win.

As you know, this is my third annual talk with you as FCC Chairman. Let us review together some of the more important developments of the past several years.

First, in 1961, it was predicted that international television "will be with us soon." Soon came much sooner than expected, on July 10, 1962. Less than 1 week after the celebration of our national Independence Day came the beginning of what promises to be the most vital instrument for international interdependence—the birth of a common market for the free exchange of ideas. An active communications satellite was launched through the joint efforts of Government and private initiative, with a license from the FCC.

Already we have seen, live, the Ecumenical Conference, the midnight sun in Sweden, fishermen in Sicily, night life in Paris. Europeans have glimpsed the Statue of Liberty, the United Nations, the Rio Grande, and a big league baseball game. The day was brought closer when billions of people on this planet will be linked through instantaneous sight and sound. And on July 10, because of this magic, the powers of darkness retreated while light advanced across oceans and over mountains. We were not the first nation to launch a man into space; but we were first to launch an idea into space. American science and technology built for the world, not a wall sealing in ignorance and prejudice, but a window opening toward truth and freedom.

Second, educational television. You were promised that if there is not a nationwide educational television system in this country, it will not be the fault of the FCC. A strong national educational television system is steadily developing because educational TV now is receiving more of the necessary support from leaders in education, in government, in business, and in the general community—and I'm proud to say from many of you.

Since January 1961, we have reserved 56 additional channels for educational use, and laid the basis for a number of statewide systems. Twenty-three more educational TV stations are on the air now than 2 years ago, bringing the total of today's stations on the air to 77. This is only the beginning. The educators have estimated that over 1,000 assignments could be required to serve educational needs in the next decade.

Educational television must have outlets in the major communities, with their varied resources and large populations. The transfer of channel 13 to the educational interests of New York and New Jersey benefits not only the immediate area, but the entire national educational service. And an operating station at the other end of the East-West line in Los Angeles is on the drawing boards under the leadership of distinguished, public-spirited citizens in California. We actively supported the passage of Federal legislation to help the construction of educational stations. We created a special unit in the FCC to work with the educators and other interested agencies and State officials. We have placed educational TV in the mainstream of Commission activities and it will stay there.

Third, as you were promised, renewals of broadcast licenses have not been automatic. I remind you that before the New Frontier arrived, former Attorney General Rogers recommended to President Eisenhower in 1959 that the Commission undertake "regular spot checks in depth each year (just as the Internal Revenue Service spot checks individual tax returns) of the renewal applications of a number of licensees or of the licenses in a particular community."

In the last 2 years, 14 licenses were revoked or denied a renewal; 15 more are now in the hearing process on the question of revocation or renewal; 26 licenses were granted on a short-term basis. Notices of apparent liability for fines have been issued in 21 cases. In 14 hearing cases involving license renewal or revocation, the hearing was ordered held in the station's own community.

Some hearings have also been held in the field to give the public a chance to express views on local service. These hearings have been conducted without regard to renewals of licenses. The public—your real ownership—has had an opportunity to give its views—some good, some bad—and to participate to a fuller extent in your decisions on broadcast service. I believe that with broadcasting stations as with income tax returns, the practice of making an occasional audit in depth is an effective though sometimes painful way of finding out whether the public interest is being served. I cannot understand how local expression about broadcasting service can be interpreted as governmental interference with freedom. The public's right to insist on having a voice in your decisions will be honored and maintained.

Some people in this industry, whom you so colorfully call "schlock" operators and whom we call law violators, have been finding out that when they promise public service to obtain a valuable license, they will be held to their promise. And the large majority of you, who do regard the public interest as a way of long broadcasting life instead of a quick commercial break, silently, I repeat, silently endorse our efforts.

Fourth, we have encouraged you to take positions on issues, to be unafraid of controversy, to editorialize, to help mold and lead public opinion. More and more of you are beginning to use your voices and to take a stand. The issues you examine are slowly shifting from pallid controversies about mother love and canoe safety to such adult themes as foreign aid, Cuba, civil rights, narcotics addiction, and the tax program.

Where there have been complaints, the Commission has backed you up, provided that you afforded a reasonable opportunity for the presentation of opposing views. Whether the complaints were about "Biography of a Bookie Joint" or the "Battle of Newburgh" or the much-discussed program about Mr. Nixon, we have repeatedly protected you against those who would water down your convictions through pressure group intimidation or suppress your freedom through commercial reprisals. And, I might add, that when the going gets rough on true issues of freedom of expression, many of you otherwise stanch defenders of free speech are conspicuously silent and absent from the fray.

Fifth, you were promised that we would press the FCC network study to a conclusion with useful results. This study, which began in 1955, and reached a halfway point in 1958, has now been completed. Our staff has made a report on network policies and practices, which the Congress is printing and distributing. We now have a clearer picture of the function, the power, and the problems of television network operations.

The basic issue before us can be stated quickly. The networks are an indispensable part of television. Our three networks have furnished to the people of this Nation informational and entertainment programing which could not otherwise have been achieved. Strong networks, and I hope one day there will be more than only three, are essential to successful television broadcasting. But when does strength become all-embracing dominance? Not long ago, an executive of one of the country's largest television advertisers, David J. Mahoney, of Colgate-Palmolive, said: "While the number of men who comprise the television industry may be relatively small, there is nothing small nor unimportant about the power this body wields. The networks today not only determine what gets on the air, but they own practically all of the shows. I believe there are about a dozen exceptions, but even in some of these, the networks have partial or controlling interests."

Power inevitably carries with it grave responsibility. We presently look to the stations, not the networks, while we know that it is generally the networks and not the stations which make the crucial decisions about what the public sees and hears. The responsibility for what goes out over the air cannot be left up in the air. And those who are making a buck from television must stop passing the buck.

Our problem is to maintain a free market for ideas in television, while preserving and encouraging essential services which only the networks currently provide. Frankly, I had hoped to be closer to a resolution of these issues than we are today. The ultimate solutions may rest with the Congress. Our staff's recommendations are under active study now by the Commission, and we intend to move.

Next radio. Let me once again express publicly the appreciation of your Government for the extraordinary cooperation and dedicated public service provided by you radio broadcasters at the time of the Cuban crisis last fall. Because of necessary security measures, there could be little advance notice given of President Kennedy's intention to speak to the Nation on October 22, 1962, or of the nature of his address. It was imperative that the President's message be heard by the people of Cuba.

In the hours prior to 7 p.m. on October 22, a study was made by the Voice of America and the Commission of the American stations which provided a strong signal to Cuba. Each was then asked to stand by for an important request from the White House. Between 6 and 7 o'clock, our Defense Commissioner Bob Bartley and I were with Pierre Salinger to help him reach seven broadcast stations and two short wave stations. In each case they immediately agreed to make their facilities available to carry the President's message. These stations, together with two more which volunteered their services, carried programs fed directly via land lines from Voice of America studios for several weeks thereafter. As the President has said, this unprecedented use of American private broadcast facilities effectively aided an important national defense effort. It is a remarkable demonstration of the cooperation our broadcast industry stands ready to give in times of emergency, and your Commission is proud of you and grateful to you.

Last year, we concluded that the time had come to give radio a long, hard look—to find out whether we were helping radio to make its own unique contribution to the public or whether we were stifling and warping the efforts of this oldest of our broadcast services to meet the newest of challenges. You responded promptly and constructively. In a friendly spirit, the Commission and all parts of the radio industry held a major conference. In the interim, we have imposed a freeze, declining, with few exceptions, to act on any new AM radio applications.

Where do we stand now? What have we found? And what do we propose?

Well, it's no secret that we've found a lot of people who don't find radio freezes as tasty as lime or lemon. We don't like freezes any more than they do. We're doing our best to restrict this freeze to the minimum period required. We will shortly propose some new rules for radio; rules which will tighten engineering standards. We hope to eliminate a great many unnecessary hearings which have eaten away the time, money, and energies of both the Commission and applicants for new or changed facilities, and which have created little in the long run except uncertainty, expense, delay, and exasperation.

I shall not discuss these proposals in detail today. I do assure you that the Commission views the competitive system of radio as basically sound and healthy. But it must proceed under clearly defined minimum standards of qualification and performance—standards that all know and understand and which will channel rivalry between stations into a striving for better service to the public.

Personally, I believe the Commission should adopt fundamentally different approaches to radio and television. In radio, we have abundant facilities. In a community with numerous stations on the air, I believe we should encourage more flexibility and specialization. I also believe that FM and AM should be considered together as one aural service. FM is coming into its own, and we are delighted with the splendid growth of FM stereo service and the advances of FM generally. The time to preserve FM ability to make its own unique contribution is now. There are glimmerings of a return to drama on the radio, and there are healthy increases in news coverage. Last year, more radios were purchased in the United States that ever before and we will do what we can to help, and not obstruct, radio's continuing growth and service to the public.

Finally, there are basic developments in UHF television. Our technical tests in New York are completed, and UHF passed with flying decibels. In this country, we are committed to a competitive enterprise system. We believe that the more free the competition the better the chance for growth, development, quality, and a kind of balanced productivity where there is something for everyone according to everyone's taste and pocketbook. We have a deep and committed faith in an open society, where talents are free to compete, to succeed, or even to fail. Under this system, the public is given the widest range of choice. Initially, the limitations of channels severely restricted television's opportunity to become a part of our free enterprise system. We could make available only 12 TV channels on a fully competitive basis, which meant in some communities that the channels were down to 2 or 1, or none.

However, last year, the Congress adopted legislation which over the long run will help put television back in the free enterprise picture. The all-channel receiver legislation cannot, by itself, guarantee quality; it can only guarantee the widest possible opportunity to achieve quality and to widen the viewer's choice.

More channels of opportunity open up at least four new dimensions of television service. By lighting up 82 channels instead of just 12, the country has a chance for: (1) A truly nationwide educational television system, with stations offering classroom instruction by day and broad, cultural programing in the evening; (2) a nationwide system of pay television if the public is willing to support this alternative to an advertiser-supported system; (3) a new commercial network attempting to provide more diversity for the public; (4) new stations to meet local needs in many communities without local service.

Some people sincerely believe that overall TV quality may suffer by added channels. But our free competitive system is an act of faith, and in the long run we have faith that new dimensions of television service will broaden the range of choice, will upgrade instead of degrade, will inspire instead of stultify, will liberate instead of suffocate.

As we move in this decade into the second round of UHF television's growth, we should ask ourselves some basic questions. Where do we go from here? Where do you go from here?

Not long ago, I read an extraordinary article entitled "Renewal in Societies and Men," by Dr. John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp. Poking beneath the surface and superficial, Dr. Gardner ponders the ingredients needed to keep a society alive and "relatively immune to decay." Dr. Gardner wrote: "When we talk about revitalizing a society, we tend to put exclusive emphasis on finding new ideas. But there is usually no shortage of new ideas; the problem is to get a hearing for them. And that means breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. The aging society develops elaborate defenses against new ideas—'mind-forged manacles,' in William Blake's vivid phrase."

Dr. Gardner observes that as an organization becomes older, there comes to be a rule or precedent for everything. Men become prisoners of their procedures. And, he reminds us that "the last act of a dying organization is to get out a new and enlarged edition of the rulebook."

It is time to review the ever-enlarging rulebooks to see whether, even in this exceptionally young medium and industry, we are already in danger of becoming prisoners of our own procedures. By "we," I mean not only you broadcasters, but also those of us on the regulatory side.

I would like today to make several suggestions for all of us concerned with television.

We can all agree that one of TV's basic problems is the insatiable appetite of the medium for programing material. Given the best talent, the best intent, and the best financing, it is difficult for TV to create quality programing at the fantastic rate programs are consumed. One of the tragedies of television today is that most of our great programs, just like our not-so-great, disappear after one fleeting hour or half hour, never to be seen again. The rule with some exceptions, appears to be: "See it now—or never." Unlike other media of information and entertainment, television says flatly to the viewers: "Turn the dial to our station, now, at our convenience, or miss it ever afterwards." One thoughtful observer, Father John M. Culkin, notes that arranging your schedules to see a must program is like arranging for a plane flight, except there is no second time around if you miss it.

This becomes even more regretful when we examine what the television critics had to say and when we hear word-of-mouth reaction which advises us on Tueesday what we missed Monday night. As Goodman Ace once observed: "The job of a TV critic is to write 'Don't watch that lousy program that was on last night.' "

To be serious, our critics often tell us of the fine program we missed. Our friends and neighbors tell us of the special program we could not see. And our children often miss some of your better efforts which are scheduled after their bedtime.

This is a situation which is easily rectified through new technology. Few programs are live today. Although I am among those who mourn the dearth of live TV, there is comfort in the fact that programs on film or tape are easy to repeat at other times convenient for those who missed the first telecast.

A great deal of superlative TV fare, though it cannot be matched every hour, can certainly be repeated on the new UHF channels for the public. With some imagination and enterprise, UHF in the future can, among its other useful potentials, provide the ideal second-and-third opportunity for the great hours and half hours of TV.

This possibility, I believe, makes good sense and good economics. Even the special programs which reach the largest TV audiences still leave a residue of nonviewers in every community which is at least equally large; and this audience, kept from the first viewing by other plans, or by competing TV, or by lack of foreknowledge, could tune in the next night, or week, or month, or even several hours later, if given the opportunity. The heavy cost of producing much of our top TV demands residual uses to amortize production expenses, uses over and above the some time syndication or sale of foreign rights. The present system often produces a colossal waste, of money, of talent, and dedicated work. It results in a shameful deprivation, a needless withholding of information and entertainment from what is probably the majority audience who missed the first showing.

What can UHF do to help?

Quite a bit. UHF could make it possible for the networks to have two affiliates in some communities, a first-run and a second-run affiliate. The second affiliate would be a UHF station which would have access to the network's programs on a delay or repeat basis. The public would then have a second chance to see the best the networks have to offer within a week or so for timeless drama, music, and entertainment programs, and perhaps a shorter time in the case of news or informational programs.

Consider the benefits. New, less affluent advertisers could enter television; program costs could be better amortized; participants could receive some additional income.

Even as I point out these pleasant economic consequences, I am aware that there are a lot of cloudy problems. You will wonder about competing with yourselves. What about sponsors? What about ratings? About unions? As cloudy as the problems are, equally clear is one overriding consideration: Your responsibility to the public.

That responsibility, I say with John Gardner, can be met by shaking those mind-forged manacles, and by breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. Perhaps you have some better ideas to accomplish the same purposes. How about some experiments? UHF in the future offers a rare second chance, an end to the scarcity of air time that has plagued television in the past. Let us use this exceptional opportunity to try out some new ideas. You are too young, too vigorous, too creative to be bound by this year's rule book or last year's balance sheet. The enemies of progress, the twin ghosts of fear and habit, must not imprison you in your own procedures.

The new channels also provide fresh opportunities to see programs from other lands. Fine television fare is being produced all over the world, and their producers are eager to make these programs available to the American audience. Variety shows, serious drama, documentaries of high quality are created in England, France, Italy, Canada, Japan, to name only a few countries. With UHF channels, program exchanges can be vastly increased. As TV Guide said recently: "We might see a British play one week, vaudeville turns from half a dozen countries the next week, bits of political debates, quiz shows, mysteries, science programs—the whole world of television could be our oyster.

"Foreign viewers see many American shows. Isn't it time that we had an opportunity to see some of theirs?"

That's a fair question, and I refer it to you ladies and gentlemen for a fair answer.

Another subject we should discuss is commercials, a matter of debate in broadcasting since 1922. It was in 1922 that Herbert Hoover, then responsible as Secretary of Commerce for the regulation of broadcasting, said, "It is inconceivable that we should allow so great a possibility for service, for news, for entertainment, for education, and for vital commercial purposes to be drowned in advertising chatter."

Forty-one years later, the American public is drowning, and calling for help.

A television commercial is broadcast somewhere in the United States every 1.7 seconds.

To figure out how often a radio commercial occurs would give a computer a nervous breakdown.

At the FCC, we have a policy against overcommercialization. If you ask us what that means, we would have to confess that in all its years, the FCC has never established ground rules defining it.

However, at the National Association of Broadcasters, you have a code of brodcasting practices. In the code is a specific and detailed provision for time to be devoted to commercials. The code was written by this industry and represents the thinking of responsible broadcasters about advertising practices. In your view, it establishes a fair standard under which "revenues from advertising" can support "the free, competitive American system of broadcasting" and at the same time "make available to the eyes and ears of the American people the finest programs of information, education, culture, and entertainment." Those quotations are from the preamble to the code itself.

The trouble with that code provision is that it is not complied with and is not adequately enforced. According to your own Bob Swezey, the head of your code authority, "It is virtually impossible for us to maintain industry standards in any practical sense. The public is still being victimized by the poor programing and shoddy practices of a large element of the industry which has no interest in standards and no compulsion to observe them."

The NAB itself says that only 1,750 radio stations subscribe to the code, approximately 38 percent of the radio stations on the air. In television, the figures are 405 subscribers, approximately 70 percent of the television stations.

And even those who subscribe to the code do not always adhere to its provisions.

One trade magazine summed up the situation recently by saying "As things stand now, a broadcaster can keep the code barefoot and knock it around the house as long as nobody from the National Association of Broadcasters' code authority is looking. Even if he gets caught, the neighbors aren't apt to hear of it."

Last year, I quoted the head of your own code authority, Mr. Swezey, who said to you that the time had come "to put up or shut up about self-regulation."

I submit you have succeeded in doing neither.

In another field, the Wall Street Journal recently urged greater self-regulation by the stock exchanges and observed "that the way to keep any neighborhood from crawling with policemen is for the community to insist upon good behavior all along the street."

That is sound advice. Yet, as Mr. Swezey remarked only 2 weeks ago, the interest broadcasters have "in self-regulation is * * * in direct proportion to the threat of government regulation." Self-regulation is clearly the best regulation just as self-discipline is the best discipline. Yet, though you have established reasonable standards for yourselves, you have demonstrated neither the capacity nor the will to enforce them. You can no longer have it both ways. You cannot subscribe in principle and ignore it in practice. Self-regulation cannot become self-deception.

That is why a majority of the Commission is inviting public comment on how best to solve this problem. One proposal we will consider is whether your own standards on commercials be adopted as Commission standards.

I wish I could persuade you and my colleagues to go to the Congress together to urge that broadcasting legislation follow the principles of the Securities Exchange Act. I would urge that the law require that every broadcaster belong to the National Association of Broadcasters, just as most bankers belong to the National Association of Securities Dealers. You should be professionals, a status which many in your ranks already deserve. But this demands that you maintain high standards and that you discipline those among you who repeatedly cut corners.

My friend and teacher, Bill Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, recently said this about the SEC, "This Commission is in no mood to expand, to seek growth for growth's sake. Government steps in to fill an evident public need; we urge, indeed, entreat, the industry to acknowledge this need and fulfill it." I say to you today the same things about the FCC.

I would personally urge that you have the lawful authority to enforce your own commercial standards, with an appeal to the FCC, just as is done in the securities field with the SEC. I cannot understand why you do not see the wisdom of taking such a course instead of requiring further action from the Government. Those of you who live honorably by fair rules should insist now that your competitors adhere to them too.

Again, with Dr. Gardner, this requires shaking up the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. But I believe that the long-suffering patience of the viewing and listening public has worn thin, and that in the long run, you had best shake up your own status quo before you are shook up by a fed-up public.

Finally, as we reexamine the status quo, I must confess that I have found the FCC, too, a prisoner of its own procedures. The Commission is a vast and sometimes dark forest where we seven FCC hunters are often required to spend weeks of our time shooting down mosquitoes with elephant guns. In the interest of our governmental processes, and of American communications, that forest must be thinned out and wider, better marked roads have to be cut through the jungles of red tape. Though we have made many substantial improvements in recent years, the administrative process is a never-never land which we call quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. The results are often quasi-solutions.

The recent work of the Federal Communications Bar Association in reviewing our structure, has been useful, and some of its recommendations are most constructive. Though I am probably alone at the Commission in this view, I believe deeply that the judicial and the other so-called administrative functions of the FCC should be split. I do not think it wise, or even possible, that we can be simultaneously regulator and judge. Mr. Donald C. Beelar, the president of the Federal Communications Bar Association, once said that, "It is not possible for a man to be a good judge on Monday and Tuesday, a good legislator on Wednesday and Thursday, and a good administrator on Friday." I think Mr. Beelar is right.

I have studied the report of the Hoover Commission of 1949 and the 1959 report to President Eisenhower by Mr. Louis Hector, who served as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board from 1957 to 1959. I agree basically with the views of the Hoover Commission and Mr. Hector. On this principle of separation of regulatory and judicial functions, I recognize that most of my colleagues disagree with me. I respect this majority view and recognize, of course, that I could be wrong. However, I sincerely believe that this basic reform could materially improve the effectiveness and value of the FCC to the public and to the industries under FCC regulation. On some appropriate occasion, I will spell out these views in detail.

Your annual meeting is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to many of you active in the day-to-day work of the National Association of Broadcasters, above all, to Governor Collins, a leader you, too, have grown to recognize as a man of principle, of conscience, and of wisdom. If you've seen the Broadway play, you will know what I mean when I say he is your man of all seasons. He commands respect and confidence of the public and your government. He is a man to heed, to follow, and to treasure.

There have been improvements in broadcasting. Many of you are doing a better job of serving the public than was the case several years ago. Still, in television entertainment, too many of you still take too literally the advice of H. L. Mencken when he said, "Nobody ever went broke underestimating the intelligence of the American people." With Hubbell Robinson, I hold that far too often, television entertainment reduces its audience to the ranks of the emotionally and mentally underprivileged. I hope the congressional examination of the ratings systems may encourage you to put more trust in the people, and more faith in your own judgments of the public's capacity to respond to the best that is in you.

In the area of informational programing, there are many reasons to be proud. A comparison of today's television schedules with those of 3 years ago will indicate there is now slightly more than three times as much informational programing in evening hours. And much of it is done with skill and courage.

You are helping the Nation to know more about the Supreme Court, about juvenile delinquency, about mental illness, about communism, about education, and about ourselves. You are effectively carrying on the good fight to win access for broadcasting to more public proceedings so that it can enlarge its informational service to the public. I salute your efforts, and I will continue to help to the best of my ability.

I have been urging you to see if there was not more room on television to teach, to inform, to stretch, to enlarge the capacities of our children. You have found a bit more room for some exceptional programs. Some of you may ask now in the words of the familiar political slogan, "Had enough?" The answer is positively "No." Nothing is enough, nothing is too good for the children who spend 70 million hours a day with you. You're beginning to demonstrate what television can do, but it is only a beginning. In the last year a first-rate study of television for children was completed by the Foundation for Character Education in Boston. To quote from it: "Knowing * * * about children, a writer who can resolve a plot only by killing the villain is incompetent; a producer who employs violence and brutality to attract an audience is unscrupulous; a network which encourages such material, even by default, is irresponsible; and a sponsor which accepts such said sadism if it produces sales is unethical."

Every American parent trusts you to continue your improvement. You are not merely babysitting electronically. You are molding, by the hand and the heart and the mind, America's future.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, you chose a hard life when you chose broadcasting. You volunteered for public regulation and public pressure. In return, the people have placed in your hands and hearts the greatest gift possible in a free country, the extraordinary privilege of using the public airwaves to the exclusion of others who would welcome, and indeed have fought for, that privilege. Under our broadcasting system, as I have repeated so often, your Government does not decide what goes on the air. Acting as trustees for all of us, you private citizens make the decisions. We will continute to prod your consciences, to goad your ideals, to disturb your sleep. For as Ed Murrow once said of television: "This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise, it is merely lights and wires in a box."

It is your responsibility to make certain that broadcasting is more than lights and wires in a box. As you meet that responsibility, you will remember to provide more news and public affairs programs where ideas are rubbed against other ideas into the friction of controversy. On such informational programs may rest the strengthening of an enlightened electorate, critical to the survival of freedom. But you will also remember that you need to do more than feed our minds. Broadcasting must also nourish our spirit. We need entertainment which helps us to grow in compassion and understanding.

Certainly, make us laugh, but also help up comprehend. Of course, sing us to sleep, but also awaken us to the awesome dangers of our time. Surely, divert us with mysteries, but also help us unlock the mysteries of our universe.

Above all, heed the wisdom of Judge Learned Hand who once penetrated the heart of the meaning of liberty when he wrote: "By enlightenment men gain insight into their own being, and that is what frees them."

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have indicated upon earlier occasions it is my belief that the helpful background material contained in the publication of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications" is worthy of serious consideration by every Member of this great body.

Carrying out my objective I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the chapters entitled "School Dropouts—A Major Threat," "Scope and Quality of Education," "Counting the Cost," and "Fiscal Implications" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chapters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING DEMANDS ON EDUCATION AND THEIR FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

VIII. SCHOOL DROPOUTS—A MAJOR THREAT

The amount of schooling of different individuals varies enormously. Some children do not continue in school even to the fifth grade. In succeeding grades, the attrition is higher than most people realize.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, the high school graduating class of 1954 contained only 553 of each 1,000 pupils who had reached the fifth grade 7 years earlier.

Just how long each child should continue in school is a matter of opinion. There is wide agreement, however, that the many pupils who drop out of school at 16, or at whatever earlier age the law or circumstances permit, constitute a major problem. One study concludes that school dropouts create an explosive situation and are a serious threat to our society.

School dropout rate

For example, the number of high school graduates in 1962, as a percent of eighth grade enrollment in 1957–58, varied from 92.3 percent in Wisconsin to 51.8 percent in Georgia. The median for 50 States and the District of Columbia was 70.6 percent.[1] (See table II for data on all States.) The average dropout rate between eighth grade and high school graduation is approximately 32 percent.

---

[1] National Education Association, research division. "Rankings of the States, 1963." Research report 1963–R1. Washington, D.C.: the association, 1963, table 47.

It should not be assumed that these 32 percent who quit school in the 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grades are incapable of learning. Many are the victims of inadequate schooling in one form or another.

Age of school dropouts

The greatest percentage of withdrawal occurs at about the age when attendance is no longer compulsory, which is 16 years in most States. In October of 1959, 929,000, or 17.1 percent of youths aged 16 and 17 years were not enrolled in schools.[2]

Grade reached by school dropouts

Less than 60 percent of the boys and girls who reach the fifth grade stay in school through high school. Out of every three reaching the ninth grade, one fails to get a high school diploma.[3]

The first major drop occurs between the 9th and 10th grades when many pupils are making the transition from junior to senior high school. * * * Another significant drop occurs between the 10th and 11th grades. Many of these pupils have obviously tried the secondary school and found it wanting for their needs.[4]

Current trends indicate that about 7.5 million of the young people entering the labor force during the 1960's will not have completed high school, and that 2.5 million will not have completed even the eighth grade.[5]

Reasons for dropping out of school

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, pupils who drop out from the 8th, 9th, and 10th grades most often do so for reasons closely related to their school experiences, such as grade retardation, academic difficulties, and failure to participate in pupil activities. Dropouts from the later grades, however, are chiefly accounted for by other well-defined reasons such as marriage, or the need to work.[6]

TABLE II.—*1962 high school graduates as percent of 1957–58 8th-grade enrollment*

		Percent
1.	Wisconsin	92.3
2.	Minnesota	88.2
3.	California	86.4
4.	Nebraska	84.8
5.	Illinois	84.5
6.	Washington	84.2
7.	Hawaii	80.6
8.	New Jersey	78.8
9.	Iowa	78.6
10.	Michigan	78.4
11.	Kansas	78.1
12.	South Dakota	78.1
13.	Pennsylvania	78.0
14.	Oregon	77.9
15.	Utah	77.2
16.	North Dakota	76.8
17.	Indiana	74.1
18.	New York	74.1
19.	Montana	73.3
20.	Rhode Island	73.3
21.	Connecticut	73.1
22.	Wyoming	73.1
23.	Missouri	73.0
24.	Colorado	72.9
25.	Idaho	72.5
26.	Ohio	72.4
27.	Delaware	72.0
28.	Arizona	71.1
29.	Alaska	70.1
30.	New Hampshire	69.3
31.	Massachusetts	68.2
32.	Oklahoma	67.9
33.	Maryland	67.5
34.	Nevada	63.7
35.	Florida	62.9
36.	New Mexico	62.2
37.	Maine	61.0
38.	Texas	60.6
39.	Arkansas	57.8
40.	Louisiana	57.8
41.	Mississippi	57.8
42.	North Carolina	57.4
43.	Vermont	56.4
44.	West Virginia	55.5
45.	Tennessee	55.1
46.	Alabama	55.0
47.	South Carolina	54.2
48.	Kentucky	52.6
49.	Virginia	51.9
50.	Georgia	51.8
	50 States and District of Columbia	70.6

Source: National Education Association, Research Division. Rankings of the States, 1963. Research Report 1963–R1. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1963. Table 47.

Lack of guidance counselors and courses of study to meet the widely varying capacities and goals of high school pupils today are among the major factors causing pupils to quit school. Parental and community attitudes are also influential. After visiting public schools in "two totally different neighborhoods," Conant concludes:

> One lesson to be drawn from visiting and contrasting a well-to-do suburb and a slum is all important for understanding American public education. This lesson is that to a considerable degree what a school should do and can do is determined by the status and ambitions of the families being served.[7]

Children of migrant workers

It is estimated that 400,000 migrant workers, accompanied by more than 100,000 children, travel from community to community and from State to State each year in search of agricultural employment.

Educationally, these children are the most deprived group in the Nation. Frequent moves force them to fall further and further behind in their studies. When they drop out of school for good, their average achievement is below the fourth grade level.[8] A few States are attempting to deal with this problem, but it is an extremely difficult one.

Characteristics of school dropouts

The National Education Association project on school dropouts is studying intensively the characteristics of school dropouts.[9] The following are some of the findings:

1. The average dropout is not uneducable. He does tend to score lower on IQ tests than his inschool counterpart, but a nationwide study conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor showed that 70 percent of the dropouts surveyed had registered IQ scores above 90, clearly in the educable group. An intensive 6-year study in the State of New York revealed that 13 percent of the dropouts had IQ scores above 110.[10] This rating should permit high school graduation and some post-high-school training.

2. The average dropout is at least 2 years retarded in reading ability by the time he quits school. Reading remains the fundamental educational skill; without it no student can perform adequately in school. The consequences of retardation in reading are obvious: dropouts fail 3 times as many courses as stayins, and 9 of every 10 dropouts have been retained in some grade at least 1 extra year.

3. The majority of dropouts are from lower socioeconomic families. They often come from families where the father is missing, where cultural background and horizons are limited, where education is viewed with indifference, distrust, or open resentment. Any redemptive or preventive effort of the school will have to take account of the student's total environment and will depend heavily on the school's staff of guidance counselors and school-community coordinators.

4. There is a high percentage of dropouts among minority groups. This fact was detailed as follows at the 1961 Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas: Estimates of the number of Mexican-American youth who leave school before getting to high school range as high as 50 percent in the major cities.

Today, two-thirds of all Negroes live in urban areas, one-third in urban areas outside the South.[11]

In a slum section composed almost entirely of Negroes in one of our largest cities the following situation was found. A total of 59 percent of the male youth between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed. They were roaming the streets. Of the boys who graduated from high school, 48 percent were unemployed in contrast to 63 percent of the boys who had dropped out of school.

An even worse state of affairs was found in another special study in a different city. In a slum area of 125,000 people, mostly Negroes, a sampling of the youth population shows that roughly 70 percent of the boys and girls ages 16 to 21 are out-of-school and unemployed.[12]

The problem of unemployed youth in the large cities is in no small part a Negro problem. We do not facilitate its solution by trying to find phrases to hide this fact.[13]

5. Dropouts are not entirely from minority groups. Of the four special surveys made for the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas, two dealt with racially mixed urban school districts where the majority of the dropouts interviewed were white Like the minority group dropouts, however, most of these white boys and girls belonged to lower income families who had recently arrived in the city. Theirs were families who had left subsistence farms, families said to be among the Nation's least educated, with a lack of motivation no less deadening than that of darker skinned families from depressed areas. But the problem of school dropouts is not confined to the big cities. It exists in small towns. It is particularly acute in rural areas, and the

---

[2] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. School Enrollment: October 1959. Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P–20, No. 101. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 8.

[3] Lambert, Sam M., director of research, National Education Association. Testimony before U.S. 87th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives, Committee on Education, and Labor, March 1961, p. 173.

[4] National Education Association, Research Division and Department of Classroom Teachers. High School Dropout. Discussion Pamphlet No. 3. Washington, D.C.: the association, 1959, p. 6.

[5] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. From School to Work. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 1.

[6] National Education Association, Research Division and Department of Classroom Teachers, op. cit., p. 7.

[7] Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs: "A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas," New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961, p. 1.

[8] Janson, Donald. "Migrant Pupils Miss Schooling." New York Times, July 22, 1962. Copyright by the New York Times. Reprinted by permission.

[9] Schreiber, Daniel. "School Dropouts," NEA Journal 51: 51–52; May 1962.

[10] Ibid., p. 52.

[11] National Committee for Children and Youth. Social Dynamite. Report of the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas. Washington, D.C.: the Committee, 1961, p. 16.

[12] Ibid., p. 26.

[13] Ibid., p. 32.

problems of the rural areas and the big cities are closely related.[14]

Statewide study of dropouts

A statewide study of dropouts by the Illinois Office of Public Instruction revealed the following:

"Approximately 54 percent of the students who took more than 8 years to finish elementary school became high school dropouts.

"Only 2 percent of the students who took college preparatory courses became dropouts, while 38 percent of those who studied general curriculum left high school before graduating.

"About 60 percent of the students who were absent more than 25 days out of the normal 185-day school year became dropouts.

"Over 30 percent of the dropouts occurred before the end of the freshman year; another 30 percent occurred during the sophomore year.

"High school graduates held more part-time jobs than dropouts held.

"Dropouts had more frequent access to family cars and owned more cars than did those who graduated.

"Students who finished high school engaged in more extracurricular activities than did dropouts.

"A large percentage of dropouts came from broken homes."[15]

What happens to school dropouts?

A number of studies have been made to discover what happens to young people who drop out of school. Among the more important findings are these:

1. A large percentage is unemployed. The U.S. Department of Labor in October 1960 surveyed the employment status of June 1960 graduates and pregraduation dropouts. The survey found that—"about three-fourths of the male dropouts, but almost nine-tenths of the high school graduates (those not enrolled in college), were working. About two-thirds of the unmarried female dropouts, but three-fourths of the graduates, were working. Futhermore, the unemployed dropouts had been unemployed for longer periods than the unemployed graduates.[16]

Conant stated that, "in the slums of the largest cities * * * the great need is for reduction of unemployment of male youth under 21.[17]

"The present (1960) unemployment rate nationwide is roughly 7 percent for all age brackets, but unemployment among youth under 20 years of age is about 20 percent, or nearly three times greater than the nationwide rate for all workers."[18]

A survey made in New York City in the summer of 1962 showed that 45,000 youths needed work but were unable to find it. Many of these were Puerto Ricans and Negroes, the groups which have the most difficulty in finding jobs. Many are school dropouts, and their lack of education and training further hampers them.

Ewan Clague, Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, stated at the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas that 300,000 boys and 115,000 girls between the ages 16 and 20 reported themselves out of school looking for work in October 1960.

2. Most school dropouts when employed work at unskilled jobs. Unskilled and immature, the dropout finds himself abandoned in a labor market where he has little to offer.

"Casual jobs and work requiring little in the way of skills training typify the employment activity of most 14- to 17-year-olds. Job opportunities for youth in this age group are concentrated mainly in the trade and service industries and in agriculture."[19]

The jobs available to school dropouts are usually of the lowest order. Frequently they offer irregular employment and are the least open to advancement. Also, employers are loathe to employ and to provide on-the-job training to youths in the 16-to-21 age group, since they may be subject to call for military service.

"Two-thirds of the Nation's force of service workers and operatives and laborers are former dropouts. Two-thirds of the unemployed men and women in the United States possess less than a high school education."[20]

3. Dropouts face keen competition. Because of the rapid rise in births in the 1940's and 1950's, the population reaching age 18 will shortly increase especially fast—from 2.6 million in 1960 to 3.8 million in 1965, up nearly 50 percent in only 5 years. The 1965 rate will continue through 1970. Because of this increase, the number of new workers entering the labor force will mount steadily. Altogether, 26 million young people will enter the labor force during the 1960's, almost 40 percent more than during the 1950's.[21]

The estimated 7.5 million youths who, according to recent experience, will drop out of school during the 1960's may glut the labor market, already overcrowded with unskilled workers, at a time when the number of unskilled occupations is declining.

4. The life earnings of school dropouts are low. During his lifetime, the average boy who drops out of school before high school graduation will earn much less than the average high school graduate. "The typical male high school graduate can be expected to earn over his lifetime (from age 25 to death) $72,000 more than the typical male elementary school graduate."[22]

School dropouts and delinquency

Exact numbers and percents of school dropouts who become delinquent are not known. It is claimed that they are relatively large. Out-of-school, unemployed youth are more apt to become delinquent. A youngster out of school and out of work is a potential source of trouble to himself and to the community. A youth who drops out of school and cannot find a job, which gives him a sense of belonging to the community and of purpose in life, is apt to feel at odds with society and is more likely to become delinquent.

Careful studies of juvenile delinquency show that this problem is not confined to communities and families of low socioeconomic status. It occurs in favored communities and families, although at a lower rate of incidence. Nor is juvenile delinquency a peculiar problem of the United States. It is worldwide. These facts call for fundamental study of this disturbing problem and incisive action by responsible agencies, including the schools.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Today, for most youths under 18, work should be secondary to getting education and training appropriate to their abilities and needs.

2. Lack of basic education seriously complicates the retraining of the long-term unemployed.

3. A substantial percentage on relief rolls are those who lose their jobs and lack the training for other employment.

4. Out-of-school, unemployed youths commit a disproportionately high percentage of juvenile crimes.

5. Full development of each youth's talents and abilities is the key to meeting future manpower needs. To assure such development, youths must have protection and guidance, jobs that provide productive experience, and, perhaps most important, the kind of education needed in our modern, complex, and technically oriented economy.

The above conclusions raise many questions about the adequacy of today's public elementary and secondary schools. Is the guidance program adequate? Is the curriculum or program of studies broad enough to meet the present needs of America's children and youth? Are adequate provisions made for the children of disadvantaged Americans,[23] i.e., parents with low socioeconomic status, language handicaps, lack of vocational skills with resulting unemployment, and little interest in having their children continue in school? Are the quality of teachers and their training and teaching equal to the demands of a rapidly changing society?

The powerful impacts of our dynamic economy upon all Americans hold fundamental implications for public schools. The next section identifies some of the improvements required in these schools if they are to meet changing demands.

IX. SCOPE AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Earlier parts of this report list demands that our dynamic society is making on the public schools and that are not being fully met. What changes and improvements in public education are necessary to meet these demands?

Adequate schooling for all

There should be decisive action so that no child will reach adulthood lacking the basic schooling essential for successful living in our complex and changing society. This requires that there be good schools in all communities, not just in some communities. There must be enforcement of school attendance laws. Inadequate schooling should no longer be a major cause of millions of functional illiterates who suffer the disabilities described in section VII of this report and who are the source of some of our most serious social problems.

Quality schools in every community

There should be a stepping up of the quality of instruction throughout the public schools of the United States. The facts of this report urgently demand quality schooling to meet the insistent needs of a technological society which continually requires more and better schooling.

Just what quality schooling is will be left to the vigorous and discordant voices who are now debating this question. Rather, let us look at some of the prerequisites for a quality school.

Quality Teachers

A quality school must have well-prepared teachers. Some schools do not have such teachers. There has been and is a continuing shortage of new teachers—those members of the current class of college seniors who will meet the requirements for the standard certificate in September of each year. The prospective 1962 supply from this source was approximately 106,000, while the estimated demand for all public school needs in September 1962 was 240,000.

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 17–18.

[15] Overview, "Late News." Overview 3: 22; August 1962. Copyright 1962, Buttenheim Publishing Corp.

[16] Cooper, Sophia. "Employment of June 1960 High School Graduates." Special Labor Force Report No. 15. Monthly Labor Review 84: 463–70; May 1961.

[17] Conant, op. cit., p. 35.

[18] Conant, James B. "Social Dynamite in Our Cities." Social Dynamite, p. 27.

[19] White House Regional Conferences. Young Workers Under 18. Fact Sheet. Washington, D.C.: the Conferences, 1961.

[20] Schreiber, op. cit.

[21] U.S. Department of Labor, op. cit.

[22] Lambert, op cit., p. 171.

[23] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Disadvantaged American, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962, 39 pp.

The 106,000 was not sufficient even to replace the 125,000 teachers leaving teaching service and the additional 35,000 required by the annual increase in public school population of approximately 1 million. The prospective supply also failed to meet the estimated need for 80,000 additional teachers (a) to relieve overcrowded classes and to eliminate part-time sessions, (b) to provide instruction and services not now provided, and (c) to replace teachers not fully prepared for their assignments.[24]

The conclusion of the study that released the above statistics is the following:

"The increase over the preceding year [in the supply of new teachers] is not proportional to the increased needs; the prospect for substantial relief from the chronic shortage is not in sight." [25]

Several factors account for this chronic shortage. Among them is the fact that only about 83 percent of the prospective new elementary schoolteachers and about 68 percent of the prospective new high school teachers actually seek teaching positions.[26] This is due, in part, to the fact that teachers generally receive lower salaries than are received by those with equal degrees of preparation in other professions.[27]

Accordingly, school officials cannot secure qualified teachers for all classrooms. With such funds as they have, they seek to do so. When enough fully prepared teachers are not available, the best to be found are employed, even though they fall short of what is required for quality schools.

The shortage of teachers is exaggerated by the imbalance between those preparing for elementary and secondary school posts. The most severe shortage by far is at the elementary level, where almost one-half of the new supply of teachers has to be drawn from miscellaneous sources in the general population.

At the secondary level, the problem is one of achieving a better "distribution of the newly produced supply among the teaching fields. In a few fields (such as men's physical education and the social sciences) the concentration is far beyond the possibility of employment as high school teachers." [28] At the same time there is a shortage of teachers of mathematics and physical sciences and of women's physical education and home economics.

Preparation of Teachers

Much energy has been wasted in recent years in debating about which is more important: mastery of subject matter or professional preparation concerning how best to teach it. Both are essential. The issue is one of emphasis and means.

Some would provide teachers with training in the content of the field they are to teach and then place them in classrooms as apprentice teachers or teacher aids. They would postpone or eliminate professional preparation dealing with such matters as child growth and development, the significance of wide differences in individual aptitudes of pupils, and the methods whereby motivation can facilitate learning.

A rounded point of view would seek to provide teachers who know their subject, understand their pupils, and know how best to teach them.

Physical Facilities

There is a shortage of classrooms and other physical facilities required for quality schools, due to rising school enrollments and costs of building construction. The fall 1961 report of the U.S. Office of Education described the situation thus:

"The accumulated shortage of instruction rooms from past years remains high despite the fact that in the last 6 years (1955–56 through 1960–61) an annual average of 69,100 rooms were completed.

"Although 62,700 rooms are scheduled for completion in 1961–62 only a small part of the total can be applied against the reduction of the backlog of 127,000 rooms. This is due to the fact that thousands of rooms will be needed by the fall of 1962 to provide for population shifts, the estimated annual enrollment increase of over a million pupils, and replacements of rooms abandoned during the year for various reasons." [29]

Teachers and Teaching Machines

One of the open questions regarding the number of teachers needed for quality schools concerns the use of various mechanical devices such as teaching machines. Some say that these machines can be used to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, that is, that teachers are to be replaced to a certain extent by educational television and teaching machines. Others claim that mechanical teaching devices should aid rather than replace teachers. Additional experimentation and research are needed to find answers to major questions about the role of programed instruction.[30]

Curriculums to meet needs of all groups

The public elementary and secondary schools should provide educational opportunities to meet the special needs of all groups in the widely diverse population they now enroll.

Our schools should not merely enroll all children and youths. They should also offer programs which meet the special needs of all groups. The high schools, in particular, have undergone a revolution since the turn of the century. In 1900, they enrolled a small, selected, and relatively homogenous population preparing for the higher walks of life. Now they enroll youths who represent the full range of socioeconomic status, motivation, educability, and occupational destination.

The problem is to devise curricula, types of school organization, and community cooperation that come to grips with current social and educational realities. The difficulties of achieving this transformation will be increased if some of our so-called better informed citizens continue to reveal a shocking ignorance of the social problems with which the modern school is confronted.[31]

Conant, one of the few who has taken the trouble to visit a substantial sampling of the vastly differing 21,000 high schools of the United States, defines the issue thus:

"Without an understanding of the complexities of public education resulting from the diversities of American communities, there can be no productive discussion of the shortcomings of our tax-supported schools." [32]

The immediately following pages pinpoint some of the groups that in all communities should have schooling appropriate to their capacities and life objectives.

Development of the talented

More attention should be given to the early identification and development of talented youth.

Greater effort on a broader scale should be made to identify talented youth in elementary and secondary schools as well as in college and to provide programs commensurate with their abilities. Many talented high school students today are not working to capacity. They are not sufficiently challenged by present courses to develop their talents to the maximum. The result is that too large a percentage of our brightest high school graduates do not enter college, and of those that do, too many leave before graduation.

Studies have shown that due to lack of funds or lack of incentive to attend college, a large fraction of our brightest youth are failing to get the education that would permit them to work at the levels for which they are potentially qualified. It was found that fewer than one-half of the best 25 percent of all high school grauates graduate from college. Only 6 out of 10 of the potentially most promising 5 percent of high school graduates earn college degrees.[33]

A nationwide survey of 1959–60 high school seniors showed that plans for attending college depended, to a large extent, on the following factors:

1. Fathers occupation: Of those whose fathers were white-collar workers, 66 percent were planning to go to college as compared with 37 percent whose fathers were manual or service workers and 34 percent whose fathers were farmworkers.

2. Family income: Of the 1959–60 high school seniors, 68 percent of those whose family income was $7,500 or over planned to go to college as compared with 52 percent of those whose family income was $5,000–$7,499; 40 percent, when it was $3,000–$4,999; and 23 percent when it was under $3,000.

3. Sex: More boys than girls indicated their intention to enroll in college, despite a larger number of girls than boys among high school seniors in 1959–60.[34]

4. Educational status of parents: Parents' education plays a decisive role, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census:

"The proportion of sons who attended (or completed) college increases dramatically according to the level of schooling completed by their fathers. These proportions ranged from nearly 55 percent of the sons of fathers with a high school diploma (but no college) to 70 percent of the sons of fathers with some college, and 88 percent of the sons of fathers who were college graduates. Fewer than one-fourth of the sons of fathers without a high school diploma has either graduated from college or had some college attendance."[35]

---

[24] National Education Association, Research Division. "Teacher Supply and Demand in the Public Schools, 1962." Research Report 1962–R8. Washington, D.C.: the association, 1962, pp. 5, 21.

[25] Ibid., p. 7.

[26] Ibid., p. 5.

[27] National Education Association. "Professional Salaries for Professional Teachers." Washington, D.C.; the association, 1961, p. 8.

[28] National Education Association, Research Division. "Teacher Supply and Demand in the Public Schools. National Education Association Research Bulletin 40: 95; October 1962.

[29] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. "Fall 1961 Enrollment, Teachers, and School Housing." Circular No. 676. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 6.

[30] Cronbach, Lee J. "What Research Says About Programed Instruction," National Education Association Journal 51: 45–47; December 1962.

[31] American Academy of Arts and Sciences. "Report of the Committee of the Teaching Profession." New York: American Council of Learned Societies.

[32] Conant, James B., "The Child, the Parent and the State." Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 64.

[33] Wolfle, Dael. "America's Resources of Specialized Talent." Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training. New York: Harper & Row, 1954, p. 8.

[34] "Occupational Outlook Quarterly," 6: 11–14; May 1962.

See also U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. "Educational Status, College Plans, and Occupational Status of Farm and Nonfarm Youths." Series Census–ERS P–27, No. 10, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Of the more than 1 million high school seniors in late 1959 who had no plans to attend college or were undecided, the largest number gave one or more of these reasons: money, home needs, poor grades, and no desire to continue in school.

Each year in the early 1960's, nearly 3 million young people will reach age 18. By 1965, this number will rise sharply to nearly 4 million. If present trends continue, about two-thirds of these young people will graduate from high school, and about one-half of the graduates will enter college.

It is doubtless true that the percentage of talented children correlates with such factors as family income, educational status of parents, and father's occupation. It is also probably true that a considerably larger number of youths qualified for higher education would be discovered among the socioeconomically average and below-average families if a more intensive search were made to find them.

The early identification and development of talented youth have long been a concern of educators. The Educational Policies Commission, for example, in its 1944 and 1948 reports urged that special attention be given to youth with superior intellectual capacity and to those who possess special talents.[36]

It highlighted this concern in its 1950 report, "Education of the Gifted":

"The American people must invest a larger portion of their economic resources in the education of individuals of superior talent. Such an increase in investment will result in a disproportionately large return in social dividends."[37]

The time has come when halfway measures to identify and develop talented youth will not suffice. A nationwide effort is called for.

In recent years, the National Science Foundation and other agencies have responded to the call for the full development of gifted youths, but efforts in this direction need to be increased. When considering the cost involved, perhaps heed should be given to this advice: To make money immortal, invest it in men.

Quality schools for average students

Better education for those of average ability is essential. The quality of education provided the great middle group, those of average and of slightly below and above average scholastic ability, should be improved by general education courses, suited to individual and social needs, and opportunities for training in a variety of skilled and technical fields as well as in some semiprofessional occupations.

One of the distinctive features of American public education has been its role in upgrading the occupational status of the labor force of the United States. Generally, the son, with better access to educational opportunity than his father, has qualified for a job requiring higher training and permitting higher earnings. This has both lifted the economic status of the individual worker and supplied the additional trained manpower required by a growing economy.

This highly significant role of American education can be clearly seen as it affects immigrant families. Released from the socioeconomic stratification and class structure of education in Europe, the son and grandson of the immigrant have had opportunity to secure the general and vocational education that permitted them to rise above the lower socioeconomic levels to which their forebears were chained.

There are those who would sharply restrict against mass education. They would limit educational opportunity beyond the junior high school to a selected few. This would be a reversion to a class-structured system of education, formerly characteristic of Europe, but which is now being modified toward a more democratic pattern.

The United States should not turn back educational opportunity. They inveigh the clock in education. Rather, it should continue the policy of making its schools more effective for all, at both the elementary and the secondary school levels. Several States have extended public education through grade 14 by establishing junior or community colleges. These institutions offer opportunity for continued general education and for technical training in accord with the abilities and goals of the students. Many continue in colleges and universities, and others complete their full-time school attendance at the end of grade 14.

Special programs for those of lower ability

A high priority should be the development of effective programs for those below average in scholastic ability and accomplishment.

The most neglected group in the public schools are those students, approximately 30 percent of the total enrollment, who have little aptitude for academic studies or even for courses which lead toward skilled and technical occupations. Eliminated from the lower secondary school grades or earlier, they compose the core of the unemployed and untrained school dropouts described in section VIII of this report.

If society is to deal with these youths intelligently, there must be much exploration of local, State, and National employment needs at the less-than-skilled levels. Employers, labor, and school officials, through cooperative effort, should develop the kinds of training, both in and out of school, that will permit these pupils to become responsible citizens, employed in semiskilled and service jobs.

The operatives and kindred workers group, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the 1957–75 period, is expected to decline from about 19.5 percent to about 17.5 percent of the total employment. Nevertheless, about 3 million workers will be added to the operatives group, and they will still remain the largest occupational group in our labor force.[38] In the service industries, employment will continue to grow faster than in the production industries; in fact, faster than in the labor force as a whole.[39]

Vocational education programs, as well as most education programs, have done little for the youth of low academic aptitude. The schools should accept some responsibility for making these youths competent for employment. This will require that the vocational educator be less selective as to those admitted to some type of occupational training.

Below are excerpts from one proposal concerning the kind of education that should be provided for those of below-average academic ability and achievement:

"Everyone should have an opportunity to prepare for some socially useful occupation at whatever level.

"There is no suitable universally accepted pattern for preparing high school youth for semiskilled, operative, and nonapprenticeable service occupations. As a result, we do not truly practice what we preach concerning the need for universal vocational education.

"We know the make-up of today's and tomorrow's work force, but we have not designed our educational programs according to the great opportunities available.

"A new approach to vocational/industrial education must be explored which might bring together realistic labor force requirements, individual aptitudes and needs, and the tragically high dropout rate of our schools. The compelling purpose of such an approach should be to prepare average and less-than-average pupils for a variety of semiskilled and service jobs that exist in industry.

"Much study and experimentation will be required before a thoroughly satisfactory program can be developed."[40]

All students—the gifted, the average, and the less than average—must be educated and trained to be contributing members of our American democracy. While the need for social integration of America's diverse and mobile population is large, it by no means demands a common curriculum for all. Differentiated curricula can serve both social integration and technical specialization, whereas a common curriculum cannot.

Counseling and guidance services

More extensive counseling and guidance services should be provided for each student. Guidance in the elementary school, as at all other school levels, requires knowing pupils as individuals—not merely as a group studying reading or arithmetic. Adequate counseling and guidance services should include identifying the gifted and planning work commensurate with their abilities; seeing that slow learners have a chance for success and encouraging them to get as much education as they can; discovering the special needs of children from disadvantaged homes; seeing that pupils in the lower 30 percent in ability are not merely marking time but, insofar as possible, are acquiring a basic education and are looking forward to some form of vocational training; and helping pupils who have special problems of educational, social, and emotional adjustment.

This means discovering, in their incipient stages, the causes of such problems as failure in schoolwork, inability to get along with other pupils, and more or less serious delinquency when it occurs. It means cooperation of the pupil, his teachers, and his parents in solving the difficulty. When such problems are ameliorated in elementary school, they are less apt to become deep seated by the time the pupil reaches junior and senior high school.

---

[35] Ibid., pp. 11–12.

See also U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. "School Enrollment and Education of Young Adults and Their Fathers." Series P–20, No. 110. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

[36] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. "Education for All American Youth." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1944, 402 pp.

National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. "Education for All American Children." Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1948, 292 pp.

[37] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. "Education of the Gifted." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950, p. 88.

[38] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics. "Manpower Needs and Resources of the United States, 1960–75." Preliminary report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 17.

[39] Ibid., p. 17a.

[40] Eddy, Max, and Moss, Jerry, Jr. "Out of School and Ready to Work." Overview 3: 42–44; August 1962. Copyright 1962, Buttenheim Publishing Corp.

See also Magnifico, L. X., and Doll, Eugene E. "Out of School and Self-Supporting." Overview 3: 33–34; September 1962. Copyright 1962, Buttenheim Publishing Corp.

See also Goldstein, Herbert. "The Educable Mentally Retarded Child in the Elementary School." What Research Says to the Teacher Series, No. 25. Prepared by the American Educational Research Association in cooperation with the Department of Classroom Teachers. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, May 1962, 32 pages.

Secondary school pupils need help on problems that occur during adolescence. Counselors in all high schools, especially in large comprehensive schools, play a particularly vital role. On the basis of previous academic accomplishment in the lower schools, tests of mental ability, statements of former teachers, and the student's interests and future plans, in consultation with his parents when possible, the student is helped to select his high school courses. His progress is checked at regular intervals, and adjustments are made, designed to prevent failure and dropping out of school.

High school and junior college students and college freshmen and sophomores are at critical stages in career choices. With little experience and limited backgrounds, they need facts about the occupations they are considering. Bad decisions at this point may result in serious wastes of human talent.

These are the years when the school counselor supplies the student with vocational information. On the basis of his present and past school records, work experience, aptitude tests, information from teachers who know him best, and deep-seated personal interests, the counselor confers with him regarding possible careers—training needed, personal qualities necessary for success, and possible opportunities, financial and otherwise.

With this help, the student is in a better position to understand himself—which is the central purpose of all guidance—to establish personal goals, to meet personal problems, and to tentatively choose a suitable vocation and the college or institution where he can best continue his education.

To aid in this latter choice, the school counselor supplies college catalogs, giving such information as entrance requirements, courses offered, and cost of attendance; he also gives information about major occupational requirements and trends. Counselors should ever be on the alert to discover gifted pupils who because of low socioeconomic status may not be planning to continue their education and to help them to find means to do so. A case-record file of each student and an up-to-date library of college catalogs, studies of occupations, and similar reference materials are among office needs. The counselor must also have the ability to enlist the cooperation of such groups as faculty, parents, management and labor, and social agencies.

The work of the counselor or guidance officer is of critical importance in the lives of many students. This work requires special personal qualities and graduate training.

Size of school and range of offerings

Small high schools should be consolidated to permit the offering of a wider range of courses to meet the needs of all students.

Only about 4,000 of the 21,000 senior high schools in the United States are large enough to provide adequately for a typical student body. One-third of high school seniors are attending high schools that are too small to provide, except at excessive cost, the range of offerings that should be available. Able students do not have a chance to study physics, advanced mathematics, or a third or fourth year of a modern foreign language because these courses are not offered. Nor is it practical for such schools tc offer several choices of technical courses for those of lesser ability. A few high schools must remain small. Many can be consolidated, however, under modern conditions of transportation. The movement in this direction needs to be accelerated.[41]

The foregoing pages list some of the basic improvements required in the scope and quality of public education if it is to meet changing and new demands made upon it. The proposed improvements are already being initiated in some of our better developed and better financed schools and school systems. What needs to be done is to lift the scope and quality of education in all schools to the level now found in a few of the best schools and school systems of the United States. Action to this end will require additional expenditure. The next section deals with this problem.

X. COUNTING THE COST

To capitalize the full power of education in developing our human resources will require additional funds. It will cost something to provide schools in every community able to meet the new and changing demands of a technological age. It will cost something to develop curriculums that are effective in capitalizing the widely varying talents of all youths—the gifted, the large group of average ability, and those of low scholastic aptitude. It will cost something to eliminate the inadequate schooling that is in part the cause of continuing illiteracy and the problems originating among youths who are neither in school nor employed. It will cost something to recruit and hold a sufficient number of well-qualified teachers. It will cost something to eliminate the shortage of school buildings and other necessary facilities for a mounting school population.

Money is, therefore, one of the essentials if these and other educational improvements outlined in previous sections are to be achieved.

"Money isn't everything"

In securing adequate support for public schools, opposition is often met in the statement, "Money isn't everything." This is true. But it is also true that money is something, and a very important something in obtaining quality schooling for all.

The issue is not one of the sequence of money and quality. Rather the problem is one of making additional funds count the most in buying the amount and quality of schooling demanded by the United States. The evidence now available indicates that there is substantial correlation between quality of schools and their level of expenditure.

A number of lines of research indicate that higher per pupil expenditure is a major and essential factor in achieving quality education, regardless of one's definition of quality.[42] This appears to be true even among favored school districts, all of which are well above average in financial support. Apparently, adequacy of support as a factor in increasing educational quality has not reached the point of diminishing returns among schools with the highest levels of cost.[43]

Quality and variations in school support

One who has visited schools in the United States financed at the lower levels, as compared with others financed at higher levels, will need no further evidence that money makes an enormous difference in the quality of educational output.

There is abundant evidence on this point. The first study that revealed the full range of expenditures per pupil of school districts in the United States was for the school year 1939 to 1940. It showed that the top-financed school districts were spending 60 times as much per pupil as those with lowest per pupil expenditure.[44] The social liabilities, such as illiteracy, low educational attainment, and low-earning capacity, which accompanied meager expenditures for schools in some school districts, were described to Congress and other groups many times between 1918 and 1962. It was emphasized that substantial increases in funds would be required to correct the situation.

Per pupil average expenditure in 1962 for current expenses ranged from over $500 in three States (New York, New Jersey, and Illinois) to under $250 in three States (South Carolina, Tennessee, and Mississippi). These figures are State averages; they do not reveal the full extent of unequal financial support of public schools within States. Approximately as many children in each State get a better or less well-financed schooling than these averages indicate.

Some progress has been made in closing the enormous gap in financial support between lower and higher expenditure school districts, but there are still grossly indefensible differences. These are associated with wide ranges in educational opportunity and attainment.

The States with low levels of financial support have low levels of educational attainment, high illiteracy, high rejections for military service, and other socioeconomic liabilities associated with inadequate schooling. For example, in 1960 the rejections in different States in preinduction and induction examinations for military service, based on mental tests composed largely of educational material, ranged from 4.7 percent to 56.5 percent.[45]

The correlations between levels of financial support and educational status in some States are reduced by heavy migrations from regions with low per pupil expenditure to those with high per pupil expenditure. For example, States such as California, New York, and Illinois, with comparatively well-supported schools, rank near average on such items as percent of population 14 years and older unable to read and write and rejections for military service, because of heavy migrations to these States from regions where low financial support of schools and educational attainment have long existed.

Inequality between slum and suburb

Conant has recently dramatized inequality in educational opportunity from another angle. He has pointed out shocking differences in educational opportunity in different school districts within great metropolitan areas. He concludes: "The contrast in the money spent per pupil in wealthy suburban schools and in slum schools of the large cities challenges the concept of equality of opportunity in American public education.[46]

He lists a series of improvements urgently needed in the schools of great cities, and emphasizes that "more money is needed in slum schools." [47]

The existence of slum school districts in some rural areas, those which provide inadequate or no educational opportunity for children, has been repeatedly pointed out in congressional hearings since World War I. Now Conant points out the tragic inadequacy of the financial support of schools and of the schooling provided many youth in city slums. He labels the situation prevailing there "social dynamite."

---

[41] Conant, op. cit., pp. 36–39, 173–174.

[42] Norton, John K., "Does Better Education Cost More?" Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1959, pp. 41–44.

[43] Associated Public School Systems, "Does Money Make a Difference?" New York: Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958, 16 pp.

[44] Norton, John K., and Lawler, Eugene S., "Unfinished Business in American Education." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Council on Education, 1946, p. 4.

[45] National Education Association, Research Division. "Rankings of the States, 1962." Research Report 1962–R1. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1962, p. 32.

[46] Conant, James B., "Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas," New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961, pp. 145–46.

[47] Ibid., p. 146.

The conditions in rural and in city slums are related. Many residents of festering city slums are migrants from poverty-stricken rural slums. Those who have balked every effort to provide an adequate minimum of financial support for the education of every child regardless of his residence are now having to face the much more difficult and expensive problem of dealing in our great cities with these victims of educational denial.

Changes in agricultural production and other factors are taking away even the meager wages earned by many who formerly lived in rural slum school districts. They and their children are flocking to great metropolitan areas in which their problems are multiplied by conditions they encounter there.

A recent report of the Educational Policies Commission points out that this "large scale migration" fails to improve the situation of the "disadvantaged American." The report summarizes the situation thus:

"Millions of disadvantaged Americans are congregated today in congested sections of the large cities and in the rural areas. It is valid to ask what America means to these millions of people. Certainly it has not been for them a land of equal opportunity. The schools present the best hope for overcoming their cultural handicap. This has been demonstrated repeatedly wherever the efforts of skillful educators and the support of an understanding community have combined to make schools the mighty instruments which only schools can be. If the public fully backs its schools—and only if it does—the time may come when no American is culturally disadvantaged.[48]

There are several reasons why the financial support of public schools is wholly inadequate in most school districts in the United States. One of these is the inflexibility of school expenditures as related to educational need.

Response of expenditures to demands, 1900–1958

There has been a great increase in school expenditure since the turn of the century—from $238 million to an estimated $18 billion in 1962. The significance of this rise can be appraised only when it is weighed against the demands placed upon the schools. In short, in recent years did the typical board of education in the United States have greater or less ability to provide every child in school with the kind of schooling he should have?

This is a highly complex question. It requires that account should be taken of such factors as:

1. The enormous increase in number of public school pupils, especially at the more costly high school and junior college levels.
2. The substantial lengthening of the school year throughout the United States; in some districts summer school is now also provided.
3. The great depreciation in purchasing power of the dollar since 1900.

The foregoing and other factors must be taken into account before financial ability to improve the quality of a given unit of schooling is increased. To provide for increased quality such factors as these must be considered:

1. Increase in the scope of the school program to meet new needs—general education for all and technical and vocational education for many, not merely college preparation for a few; guidance and health services; and other extensions of the school program in response to general need and demand.
2. Increase in the preparation of teachers to teach a wider range of more difficult subjects at a higher level of performance.
3. Increase in teachers' salaries to compensate for longer periods of training, to keep pace with the rapid increase in buying power of other workers, and to meet the mounting competition in the labor market for persons of ability and extended education.

Financial ability

A recent study for the Joint Economic Committee of the 86th Congress sought "to measure the cost of an education unit, so standardized that its variety and scope are held reasonably constant, and expressed in per pupil in average daily attendance terms."[49]

The result of the study was an estimate of daily per pupil expenditure in 1954 dollars. In other words, what was the purchasing power of the expenditure for the schooling of one child for one day expressed in dollars of equivalent purchasing power? The figures are given in table III.

The figures in table III are, according to the study, quite appropriate to indicate the cost of a given bundle of public primary and secondary education in constant terms. The study concludes that "costs [of public schools] in real terms exhibit amazing stability during 1900–58. For the years for which data are available, 1922 was the low year with $1.37 daily expenditure per pupil, and 1913 was the high year with $1.60. Over the 58 years in overall decline of about 3 percent was registered."[50]

It appears that boards of education had less ability to buy first-rate education for each child for every day he was in school in 1958 than they had in 1900.

TABLE III.—*Daily per pupil current expenditure for public primary and secondary education*

[Daily per pupil expenditure in 1954 dollars]

1900	1.48
1902	1.47
1910	1.48
1913	1.60
1920	1.50
1922	1.37
1930	1.43
1932	1.42
1940	1.39
1942	1.49
1946	1.44
1948	1.39
1950	1.40
1952	1.42
1954	1.41
1956	1.45
1958	1.45

Source: Hirsch, Werner Z., "Analysis of Rising Costs of Public Education," U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, Study Papers 4 and 5, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 34.

Equating expenditures and demands

The congressional study cited above dealt with the income elasticity of public primary and secondary education. Complex estimates in this regard were made on the basis of two concepts. The conclusion was that "no matter which of the two concepts is used, there can be little doubt that the income elasticity of public education is quite low."[51]

"It [income elasticity of public education] is low in comparison to income elasticities of other public services and in particular such consumer amenities as air conditioning, automobiles, golf, speedboats, etc. It is also low compared to what it must be if public education in the United States is to be improved."[52]

This study summarized the significance of its findings as to the income elasticity of expenditures for public schools as follows: "Such low income elasticity of public education must be of deep concern to all those who are convinced that improvements in education are essential if the United States is to remain a leading world power."[53]

Apparently, the financing of public education in the 1960's started from a base of expenditure that allowed little or nothing for improvements in education, essential for economic growth and for other requisites for internal progress and effective leadership in the world scene. What amounts will be required to finance the requisite improvements?

Cost estimates to meet demands

A number of responsible citizens groups have estimated the financial support necessary for the public schools to meet the rising demands being made on them.

Estimates by citizens commissions

In 1954, the finance committee of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (Beardsley Ruml, chairman, formerly head of the Federal Reserve Bank, New York City) noted the need for an unremitting effort to meet the growing deficit in equipment, in school buildings, and in teachers.[54]

The Committee for the White House Conference, sponsored by former President Eisenhower, reported in 1956 as follows: "We recommend that a new look be taken at the entire question of how much money this society should spend on education. In view of the recommendations of this Committee concerning the objectives of education, teachers, and buildings, it seems obvious that within the next decade the dollars spent on education in this Nation should be approximately doubled. Such an increase in expenditure would be an accurate reflection of the importance of education in this society. * * * Good schools are admittedly expensive, but not nearly so expensive in the long run as poor ones."[55]

The special committee dealing with the financing of education at the White House Conference emphasized that the American people want and need not only more schools, but better schools. To meet these needs we must spend more money.[56]

A 1958 estimate of the future cost of education is that of a panel of 15 prominent citizens working under the auspices of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The Committee analyzed various factors that place increasing burdens on education. They concluded: "Even allowing for considerably greater efficiency in the use of educational funds, it is likely that 10 years hence our schools and colleges will require at least double their present level of financial support to handle our growing student population. In other words, by 1967 the entire educational effort is likely to call for expenditures on the order of $30 billion, measured in today's prices." [57]

---

[48] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission, "Education and the Disadvantaged American," Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962, p. 33.

[49] Hirsch, Werner Z., "Analysis of Rising Costs of Public Education," U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, Study Papers 4 and 5, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 33.

[50] Ibid., p. 34.

[51] Ibid., p. 38.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., p. 1.

[54] National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, Public Education Finance Committee, "Financing Public Education in the Decade Ahead," New York: the Commission, 1954, foreword.

[55] Committee for the White House Conference, "A Report to the President," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956, pp. 6–7.

[56] Ibid, p. 51.

The foregoing estimate seems conservative, since the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated in August 1962 that total expenditures for education (public, private; elementary, secondary, and higher) would be $25.2 billion in 1962.[58]

Conant refers to various measures of the deficits of current expenditures per pupil. One calculation reports a deficit between educational needs and actual expenditures for 1958–59 of $8.2 billion.[59]

Another study under the auspices of the Committee for Economic Development comes to this conclusion: "The public schools have not, thus far, been engulfed by the wave of school-age children. The resources going into public education have, in fact, been increasing somewhat faster than enrollments, although clearly less than is necessary to meet widespread desire for excellence." [60]

The foregoing study stated: "We estimate that if resources per pupil were held constant, the cost of public schools, with prices in the private economy stable, would rise 31 percent from 1958–59 to 1964–65. From 1958–59 to 1969–70 the increase would be 47 percent." [61]

The conclusions of the Committee for Economic Development were not accepted by all members. William Benton, in dissent, stated:

"I feel strongly that the recommendations in this report do not match the national emergency. But I commend the C.E.D. for a report on education more courageous and forthright than any issued by an organization representing the business community. The statement is to be applauded for recognizing the acute crisis in education." [62]

Recently an estimate was made of the cost of implementing the proposals of the Commission on National Goals appointed by former President Eisenhower.[63] Education was one of the areas considered. It was estimated that an increase of $13 billion per year in public expenditures for education would be necessary to finance the higher goals set for education.[64] This estimate was based on an improvement factor in financial support per year of just under 5 percent to achieve the desired standards.

Estimates by National Education Association

The most recent study of needed current expenditures for public schools to provide for quality education was made by the National Education Association and estimates a cost (in 1959–60 prices) of $33.6 billion in 1969–70, as compared with $12.3 billion in 1959–60.[65] The basis of this estimate is summarized as follows: This cost projection sought to estimate the price of quality education in 1969–70 under the assumptions of near maximum enrollment in kindergarten through high school, of a professional staff of adequate size, and paid at the national market rate of other professional workers with equivalent training and experience.

A number of statements have given considered views concerning future responsibilities and financial needs of education. One such statement was made by Walter Lippmann, who was a member of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. He asked in 1954:

"Can it be denied that the educational effort is inadequate? I do not mean that we are doing a little too little. I mean that we are doing much too little.

"We have to do in the educational system something very like what we have done in the Military Establishment during the past 15 years. * * * We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish." [66]

The panel of prominent citizens referred to earlier reached this general conclusion concerning what it would take to achieve excellence in education:

"It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money. The Nation's need for good education is immediate, and good education is expensive. That is a fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face.

"Perhaps the greatest problem facing American education is the widely held view that all we require are a few more teachers, a few more buildings, a little more money. Such an approach will be disastrous. We are moving into the most demanding era in our history. An educational system grudgingly and tardily patched to meet the needs of the moment will be perpetually out of date. We must build for the future in education as daringly and aggressively as we have built other aspects of our national life in the past." [67]

Ability to finance quality schools

Whether one accepts the lower or the higher estimates of future public school needs and costs, they involve amounts that will not be easy to raise. Success in financing whatever level of support is decided upon for public education will depend on two major factors that are closely related: The first is the understanding and attitude of the people toward public education. The second factor is the means which the people adopt in raising the revenues for school support and for its equitable distribution among the public school systems of the United States. The next section of this report deals with these two matters.

XI. FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Basic to adequate financing of public schools in the United States is acceptance of the fact that such support is an investment that brings economic as well as other returns to our society.

Ability to finance public education

One need not credit a high percentage of the income of our affluent society to the effects of education to rate this public service as a productive investment. The gross national product of the United States, according to the latest available estimate for the middle of 1962, had reached $552 billion.[68] In the light of recent economic research it would seem a low estimate to credit 10 percent of this figure, or $52 billion, to the economic effects of education. Less than one-half of this figure, or $25 billion, is being expended this year by educational institutions, from kindergarten through university, both public and private. Total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools in 1961–62 were $18 billion—for current expenses and for school building construction and other capital outlays.

There can be no question of our economic ability, whether considered from the view of our unequaled opulence or of the significance of education as a factor in production, to pay for the amount and quality of public education necessary to meet our needs.

The Issue of Choice

The issue is one of choice. If we choose to give public education reasonably high priority among our public and private expenditures, then no child need suffer the consequences of inadequate schooling, nor will the Nation as a whole lack development of its human resources because of insufficient investment in education.

The choices involved in this process will often not be easy. Human capacity for consumption is almost limitless. The mechanisms that have been developed to increase the desire for public and private expenditure are both pervasive and powerful. Even our fabulously productive economy is not able to fulfill every fleeting desire for more and more goods and services.

But assuming that we place expenditure for public education above some of our private luxuries and take due account of its importance in budgeting public expenditure, there are still difficulties to be overcome.

Removal of fiscal obstacles

There has grown up a series of obstacles that frequently balk people's desire to pay for education. These have accumulated over the years due to (a) inaction in the face of changing conditions and (b) ill-considered action intended to keep public expenditures for schools at a scarcity level.

Local Blocks

A number of blocks to action at the local level are of especial fiscal significance since 56 percent of the cost of public schools is raised in the locality.

Most local school money comes from a tax on property. This has been a mainstay of public school support and should continue to pay a just share of school costs in the future. It is well suited for local use. It is important as a fiscal factor in continuing substantial control of schools in the locality.

However, the local property tax has its limitations as a principal source of school revenue. Some States place unduly restrictive limits on local property-taxing powers. These restrict the amount that a board of education and the people may raise from this source. The upper tax limit placed on local property may be reasonable, but this is often lowered, in effect, by assessment of property far below its real value. A tax limit of 15 mills on full value of property, when property assessments are dropped to one-third full value, is only **5 mills.**

In some States there is excessive exemption of property from taxation. This may place an undue share of the cost of public education on taxable property. Also, in many localities inequalities in assessment of property are rife. Different types of property may be assessed at widely differing rates, even though uniform assessment is required by State law. Thus, resistance to taxation is enhanced by feelings of injustice.

---

[57] Rockefeller Brothers Fund, "The Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America," panel report V of the special studies project, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1958, p. 34.

[58] The estimates of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and those of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are only approximately comparable in scope of educational activities included.

[59] Conant, James B., "The Child, the Parent and the State," Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 183.

[60] Committee for Economic Development, Research and Policy Committee, "Paying for Better Schools," New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1959, p. 14.

[61] Ibid., p. 20.

[62] Ibid., p. 6.

[63] President's Commission on National Goals, "Goals for Americans," Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960, 372 pages.

[64] Universities National Bureau, Committee for Economic Research, "Public Finances: Needs, Sources, and Utilization," Report of the National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961, 512 pages.

See also Hazard, Leland, "Can We Afford Our National Goals?" Harvard Business Review 40: 10; May–June 1962.

[65] National Education Association, special project on school finance, "Financing the Public Schools, 1960–70." Washington, D.C.: the association, 1962, p. 133.

[66] Lippmann, Walter, "Education for Leadership," "Citizens and Their Schools," New York: National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, 1954, pp. 24–25.

[67] Rockefeller Bros. Fund, op. cit., p. 33.

[68] Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve Bulletin, Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, October 1962, p. 1356.

Property valuations per pupil in local school districts vary greatly—in some States as much as 100 to 1. Some localities can provide substantial local revenue on nominal tax rates. Others could not provide such revenue even if they levied confiscatory rates on property. The result in the latter districts may be denial of adequate schooling for some if not all children.

Local Tax Reform

Reform of the local tax picture as it concerns public schools lies in such actions as correction of arbitrary limits on rates of property taxation, assessment of property at full value, avoidance of excessive exemption of property from taxation, and recognition that the financial support of schools cannot rest solely upon taxes on property. Nor can other forms of local taxation do the job, even when schools are allocated revenue from these new sources. Realization of this fact accounts for recent increased State action in financing public schools.

State Action

This action has taken a number of directions. One of the essential State actions is to correct, by appropriate State legislation, defects in the structure of local school finance such as those identified above.

Substantial amounts raised through State taxation are being allocated to the localities for school support. These State funds are raised by a broadening of the sources of tax revenue to include such State taxes as those on sales and gross receipts, individual and corporation net incomes, motor vehicle fuel and registration fees, and such various miscellaneous taxes as those on tobacco and alcoholic beverages.[69]

Currently, 40 percent of public elementary and secondary school revenue comes from the State level of government. This percentage varies widely, from as much as 81 percent in Delaware to 6 percent in New Hampshire.

State funds for public school support are distributed to the localities on several bases. Some State money is usually distributed on a flat grant basis—so much per pupil in daily attendance. Additional funds are allocated on an equalization basis, that is, the State sets a foundation or minimum level of cost per pupil to be available in every school district. The State then provides the difference between (a) what can be raised in each locality by an equitable and reasonable tax effort and (b) the amount required to finance the prescribed State minimum. Localities are permitted and encouraged to raise more than is required to receive State funds.

Bases of State Action

State action in providing public school support is based on a number of considerations: First, State constitutions make the maintenance of public schools that are open to all a responsibility of the State legislature. Second, educational opportunity is the right of every child. Third, education of all children is more than a matter of local concern. Mobility of population quickly spreads the effects of good schools as well as of poor schools. A State cannot afford to have the quality of its human capital diluted by lack of financial ability or willingness to maintain effective schools. Fourth, since communities differ so widely in ability to finance schools, State support is essential if gross inequality in the financing of public schools and inequitable tax rates, in different school districts, are to be prevented.

Limitations of the States

The State level of government has an indispensable role to play in financing public schools. However, the States have met their responsibility for providing adequate schooling for all with varying effectiveness. Several factors are responsible.

The States differ markedly in taxable capacity. This has resulted in a wide range in average expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools. In 1961–62 this average varied from $220 per pupil in the State of lowest expenditure to $615 in the State of highest expenditure. This latter average figure is much below that of well-financed schools. Also, an average expenditure hides the extremes in financial support of schools in a State, and these are usually wide. Furthermore, average expenditure per pupil in attendance takes no account of those not in attendance. Irregular attendance and early elimination from school account for much of the functional illiteracy and inadequate schooling described earlier in this report.

Federal Tax Collections

Two developments at the Federal level have had heavy impacts on the financing of public education. First, during this century, Federal taxes have risen from a minor to a major percentage of total taxes—Federal, State, and local (see figure 4). The rapid rise in Federal tax collections has increased the problem of the schools in securing sufficient financial support from the State, and especially from the locality where more than one-half of school money is raised.

Second, the impact on local and State support of public education of the rapid rise in Federal tax collections has been compounded by discrimination against the schools by the Federal Government in the allocation of funds to the States.

FIG. IV.—*Total tax revenue and percent collected by local, State, Federal Governments, 1902–60*

[Millions of dollars]

	Percent
1902, $1,372:	
Local	51.3
State	11.3
Federal	37.4
1922, $7,387:	
Local	45.5
State	12.8
Federal	45.7
1932, $7,977:	
Local	53.6
State	23.7
Federal	22.7
1942, $20,793:	
Local	22.0
State	19.0
Federal	59.0
1952, $79,066:	
Local	12.0
State	12.0
Federal	76.0
1956, $91,593:	
Local	14.2
State	14.6
Federal	71.2
1960, $113,120:	
Local	16.0
State	16.0
Federal	68.0

Sources: For tax revenue, 1902–56: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 722. For tax revenues, 1960: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 415.

Federal grants to the States for such undertakings as highway construction, housing, hospitals, relief of unemployment, and other forms of relief have been greatly increased. These Federal allocations have usually required matching appropriations by the State. This practice, regardless of merits in itself, influences the States to match the Federal allocations for the services aided.

The public schools have received comparatively small grants from the Federal Government. It has aided a scattering of special educational undertakings in the States, but Federal revenues are a small and decreasing factor in financing public schools. School revenue derived from Federal sources reached a peak of 4.6 percent of total school revenue in 1955–56 and declined to 3.7 percent in 1961–62.

One of the Federal allocations is for school support in "federally affected areas," that is, localities where undertakings of the Federal Government have been responsible for large increases in school attendance and expenditures for school buildings. The provision of $200 million for a few school districts in 1958–59 takes no account of the fact that Federal taxation has profoundly affected the ability of all areas in the United States to finance public schools.

Federal Support of Education

The proposal to provide Federal funds for general support of public education has become a perennial and controversial issue. National aid to education antedated the Constitution of the United States in the form of commitment to a policy of allocating public lands for public schools. In 1862, the Morrill Act provided for the establishment of the land-grant colleges. Other federally financed educational undertakings affecting agriculture are described in an earlier section.

The modern period of Federal interest in education began early in this century and was given great impetus by the low educational status of an alarming percentage of our young men, revealed in the examination of recruits during World War I.

The Federal Government now finances scores of special educational undertakings. These include grants for specific programs, some administered by the States and some by the Federal Government. Federal funds for these educational programs totaled $2.4 billion in 1958–59.[70]

The demand for general financial aid for public education has come up in every Congress for more than a generation. Thus far this demand has not been met. Consideration of such action has been overriden by opposition from various interest groups.

An extensive library of publications dealing with the issue of Federal support of education has accumulated over the years. Examples of some of the more comprehensive works are listed in the footnote.[71]

---

[69] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Detail of State Tax Collections in 1962," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 3.

[70] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Federal Funds for Education," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 1961. p. 29.

[71] Norton, John K., "Federal Relations to Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (edited by Chester R. Harris), third edition, New York: Macmillan Co., 1960, pp. 522–544.

U.S. 87th Congress, 1st session, House of Representatives, "Federal Aid to Schools: Hearings, Parts I and II," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Suffrin, Sidney C., "Issues in Federal Aid to Education," Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1962, 64 pp.

Quattlebaum, Charles A., "Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals," U.S. 86th Congress, 2d session, House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960. Part I, 192 pp.; part II, 372 pp.; part III, 234 pp.

Whether public education can be adquately financed without Federal funds to meet the changing and growing demands being made on it is a moot question. That Federal aid for education will continue to be an issue in future sessions of the Congress of the United States appears to be certain.

Today the Federal Government preempts the greater part of tax revenues. It has allocated substantial sums to the States to aid in financing a widening range of public services, yet nothing has been appropriated for the general support of public elementary and secondary schools. Many consider this situation the principal fiscal obstacle to the adequate financing of public education in the United States.

Conant analyzes the situation as follows: "In the next decade, one of three things seems to me inevitable. Either our State taxing machinery will have to improve drastically in many States, or Congress will have to start large annual appropriations for public schools, or public education in many States will deteriorate or, at best, stand still at the present unsatisfactory level. If education is as vital to our survival in this deeply divided world as I have portrayed it, leaders of opinion throughout the land, to my mind, should be pondering these alternatives." [72]

If it should become the policy of the Federal Government to allocate funds to the States for the general support of the public schools, we have experience to guide us in distributing these funds so as to achieve effective educational results.

Technical procedures have been developed whereby State funds can be distributed to the localities equitably and effectively to provide desired amounts for the education of each child, with a minimum of central control. This experience plus that already gained in the distribution of Federal special aid grants would be applicable to the distribution of Federal funds to the States for the general support of public schools.

DAIRY PRODUCTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, today is a great day for the dairy farmers. It has been a long time since we have been able to obtain any sort of agreement between the representatives of the dairy farmers, the administration, and the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I think today is a milestone in that connection.

Today, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles S. Murphy, came before our committee and recommended the principle of a bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], another bill introduced by me, and a third bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In addition, Mr. Murphy set forth a comprehensive program for the dairy farmers, and I think it is very, very encouraging.

In the first place, it is wholly voluntary; there is no compulsion about it.

Second, there is no cut below the 75 percent of parity which the farmers now receive, although it was feared there might be a cut below that. This is very encouraging.

Third, it will cut the Government costs. I think that all persons who understand dairy legislation realize that the result is sure to be a cut in dairy production, and, therefore, a cut in commodity credit corporation acquisitions.

Fourth—and this is most important in connection with such legislation—it will permit the producer of Class 1 milk in the milkshed area to receive an allotment for his Class 1 milk; and it also will permit producers not in the market area to have access to that fluid market. I think that is absolutely essential.

It is most important to point out that—as I have said—the farm legislation proposed by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, in behalf of the administration, is not mandatory in any sense. Quotas are out; and I think this fact in itself will help reduce the production, because I think many dairy farmers, anticipating future quotas, had been building up their production, in some cases uneconomically, feeling that they would like to have that record for the future. The announcement made today by the Under Secretary of Agriculture should put their fears to rest and should help a great deal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by the Under Secretary of Agriculture and the attached table showing what will be the consequences of his proposal.

There being no objection, the statement and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES S. MURPHY, UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, ON S. 398, S. 900, S. 953, RELATING TO THE 1963 DAIRY PROGRAM, APRIL 4, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very happy to have this opportunity to appear before your committee with respect to dairy legislation.

It is clear to all of us that the present dairy situation is unsatisfactory in two respects:

1. The income of dairy farmers is too low, and

2. Too much Government money is going into building up excessive inventories of dairy products.

We believe legislation can be enacted that will improve the present program in both of these respects. We believe the hearings you have held suggest the form this legislation might take. I will comment specifically on some of the provisions of the three bills—S. 398, S. 900, and S. 953—which are pending before your committee and on some of the proposals that have been presented to you in these hearings. First, however, I would like to review the background of the problem.

Over the past 2 years, the volume of surplus dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the existing dairy price support law has increased very substantially. In 1960, CCC purchases amounted to less than 3 percent of the butterfat in milk marketed by farmers and about 7.7 percent of the nonfat solids.

But during 1962, the CCC acquired 9 percent of the butterfat and 13 percent of the nonfat solids in all of the milk marketed by farmers. Annual CCC expenditures under the dairy price support program, which averaged less than $300 million from the beginning of the program in 1949 through the fiscal year 1960, jumped to approximately $600 million in the fiscal year 1962, and current projections indicate they will remain near, or in excess of, $500 million even with the support level at 75 percent of parity—the minimum level at which we are required to support milk prices.

The most significant factor in the rise in CCC purchases in 1961 was the decline in the consumption of both fluid milk and manufactured dairy products. While per capita consumption of many dairy products has been falling steadily in recent years, total milk consumption has still increased at the rate of about half a billion pounds a year because of our growing population. But in 1961, instead of increasing, total milk consumption declined by about 1.6 billion pounds. Milk production also began to increase late in 1960, but if milk consumption had not declined there would have been little cause for concern over the increase in production. We had anticipated some increase in the amount of surplus, and we were prepared to accelerate our use of dairy products in both foreign and domestic outlets in order to prevent stocks from accumulating. But with consumption at a lower level than expected, the CCC was forced to acquire under the price support program twice as much butter as could be utilized through available disposal outlets. This was the case even though we expanded domestic distribution through the various authorized outlets to a rate almost 50 percent greater than that of the years immediately prior to 1961. We have also offered 200 million pounds of surplus butter for foreign donations, but to date outlets have been found for only 52 million pounds.

Last summer, the amount of butter in storage approached the limit of available freezer capacity. It became necessary to ship butter to locations far removed from the production areas, resulting in additional transportation costs of from 1 to 4 cents per pound. Some butter in storage was also approaching 2 years of age—the maximum length of time butter can be stored without some danger of spoilage. To relieve this situation, 100 million pounds of butter were converted into butter oil for possible foreign distribution. This relieved some of the pressure on freezer space, because butter oil can be held in coolers at above freezing temperatures without deteriorating.

While butter purchases have declined slightly in recent months, acquisitions are still running substantially above distribution levels and adding to the quantities already in storage. The present CCC inventory of butter is about 369 million pounds and will continue to increase. While this quantity is slightly smaller than anticipated earlier, it remains a critical problem. Purchases of butter are still running at an annual rate of 350 million pounds while our distribution programs are using only about 260 million pounds.

I have noted that some observers are taking the decline of milk production during December, January, and February to be an indication that milk supplies will continue to decrease with price supports at only 75 percent of parity. I believe this judgment is a little premature. There is strong reason to believe that the recent decline is largely the result of unusual weather conditions and that production will turn up again with a return of normal weather. Last summer, the entire northeastern quarter of the country was hit by a severe drought. Pasture conditions were very poor, and milk production was down by as much as 3 percent in some of the major dairy States of the Northeast. Since recovering from the drought, however, those States have again started to increase their milk production and in recent months their output has been running as much as 4 to 6 percent above levels of a year ago.

The winter which has just ended was one of the most severe on record, particularly in the Midwest area where temperatures stayed in the below-zero range for weeks at a time. These conditions were reflected in a decline in milk production, but with the coming of spring, it is quite likely that the downtrend in production will reverse in the Midwest as it did in the Northeast.

---

[72] Conant, James B., "The Child, the Parent, and the State," Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 57.

Over the years, the most important factor affecting milk production statistics has been the rise in production per cow. During the 5 years prior to 1962, milk production per cow increased by 200 or more pounds each year. But in 1962, production per cow increased only 147 pounds. This rate of increase is 26 percent less than in previous years. The only apparent explanation for this smaller increase in productivity is the adverse weather. Assuming normal weather this coming year, it is quite possible that we will again have at least a 200-pound increase in output per cow. With lower livestock prices in prospect in the coming months, it is not likely that the rate at which farmers cull their herds will increase. Therefore, an increase in milk production which would force the CCC to maintain or even increase its current level of purchases is a definite possibility.

It is an extremely difficult task to devise legislation which will solve the problem of dairy surpluses without impairing the income of the dairy farmer. The incomes of dairy farmers are already among the lowest for any form commodity group. In 1962 net annual farm incomes on typical commercial family-operated dairy farms in important producing areas ranged from $3,118 to $6,221. These incomes are lower than the incomes on most other types of commercial family-operated farms. When allowance is made for the large capital investment on these farms by figuring a capital charge at current interest rates, returns to operator and family labor range from $667 to $2,551 per year.

Moreover, dairy farmers are faced with constantly increasing costs in the production of milk to meet the high standards of sanitation required. Expensive bulk cooling tanks and advanced types of milking equipment are becoming requirements in more and more areas. In order to fully utilize this equipment, yet keep production costs down, farmers are forced to expand their output. But when they expand output, the extra milk they produce adds to our surplus problems and further depresses milk prices. Under these circumstances, there is great need for an effective means of supporting the dairy farmer's income at reasonable levels while at the same time bringing production into balance with demand.

Our present dairy programs do not provide those means. The Agricultural Act of 1949, under which manufacturing milk prices are supported, provides no mechanism for dealing with surplus problems other than reducing the level of price support. The law requires that the Secretary of Agriculture provide price support for milk and butterfat at such level between 75 and 90 percent of parity as will provide an adequate supply. Current surplus problems have prevented maintaining price supports above 75 percent of parity. On the other hand, when price supports are held at 75 percent of parity, dairy farm income is extremely low. Yet, dairy farmers find it difficult to reduce their output because of the large investment they have in facilities which can be used only for the production of milk. It seems to me that simply to reduce the price-support level to cut the income of dairy farmers whenever surpluses increase would be inconsistent with the basic objective of price-support programs. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, under which the fluid milk marketing orders are established, is likewise limited to price cutting as the only authority available to deal with problems of oversupply.

To illustrate the injustice of the price-cutting approach, consider the case right now in most of the big fluid milk markets of New York-New Jersey. The blend prices received by farmers in these markets are presently the lowest they have been in several years because of the surplus. Yet we are required under the New York-New Jersey order to initiate proceedings before very long to review the prices in these markets and presumably consider a further reduction in prices paid to producers. This is the only recourse the law gives to us when surpluses increase.

A year ago, the Administration recommended enactment of a new dairy program which would have provided for the use of marketing allotments on a national scale to keep milk production in line with demand. This proposal was one which had been discussed within the dairy industry for 4 or 5 years and which many people agreed was an economically sound approach to our dairy farm income and surplus problems. However there was not last year—and does not appear to be now—enough support for this proposal to achieve its enactment. Recognizing that government is the art of the possible, it would appear that the most constructive course now is to concentrate on the type of legislation for which there is widespread support and which does promise to improve the present situation.

One approach, which is incorporated in one or another form in each of the bills under consideration, and which has wide support within the industry, is what is called a base-excess plan, to be applied in markets covered by milk marketing orders. Under the existing marketing orders, a producer is paid a single blend price for all of his milk sold in his market, that price being the average of the higher price paid for milk sold for fluid use and the lower price paid for "surplus" milk, which is sold for manufacturing purposes. The blend price tends to provide an incentive for increased production, since it offers the producer who expands his production the higher blend price for milk which returns only manufacturing value to the pool. The base-excess concept proposes to remove this incentive, by separating his base—or share of the fluid milk market—from his excess—which goes into manufacturing uses or into CCC storage—and pay him the fluid milk price for the former and only the surplus value for the latter. Thus, if he reduces production, he will lose not the blend price but the lower excess price; and if he increases production, he will gain not the blend price but the lower excess price. The incentive to produce surpluses would be greatly reduced.

A second approach is the one which has proved to be successful in the feed grains program—a payment to producers who voluntarily reduce their output. A payment at the proper level will compensate the producer for any loss of net income, but at the same time cost the Government less than buying and storing the entire output at the support price. At present, it costs the Government over $4 to purchase, transport, and handle 100 pounds of milk in the form of manufactured dairy products. Producers might be willing to not produce this surplus milk for a payment substantially less than this $4 cost.

We believe that a bill embodying these two approaches can go far toward achieving the following objectives:

1. Increase in the income of manufacturing milk producers.

2. Increase in the income of fluid milk producers.

3. Reduction in costs of the dairy program to the Government.

4. Reduction in excessive inventories of dairy products.

Progress toward these results can only be gradual, but we believe progress can be made—and the sooner we begin, the sooner we will get somewhere.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on some questions raised by provisions that are found in one or more of the three bills.

1. Reduction in the minimum support price for manufacturing milk: We believe that it would be wise, at least for the present, to retain the 75 percent of parity price support minimum.

2. The base-excess plan in Federal orders: As I have indicated, we favor such a plan. We believe the base should include a necessary reserve above actual fluid milk requirements.

3. Entry into the market by other producers: We believe the establishment of a marketing base plan should make it neither harder nor easier for established producers and handlers outside the market to gain entry into the market. We believe that the plans can and should contain definite provisions having that result. Special provisions will be necessary to permit entry for new producers, who had no marketings anywhere during the base period, and to take care of abnormal or hardship situations.

4. Prices below the support price: If any marketing order is to provide a return to producers for "excess" milk lower than the manufacturing support price, we believe this lower return should apply only to marketings that exceed the producer's total marketings during the base period. The difference between the manufacturing value of such milk and the price paid to the farmers should be prorated among all producers in relation to their fluid milk bases.

5. Procedure for introducing base-excess plans: We believe the law should require the Secretary to hold hearings on base-excess plans in each Federal order market where marketings are in excess of necessary reserve requirements. If such a plan, when submitted to a referendum, is defeated, the marketing order should be terminated unless the producers request the Secretary to hold further hearings under the order with a view to adjusting the class I price so as to remove incentive for excessive supplies. The Treasury of the United States also has a substantial stake in reducing, by one means or another, these excessive supplies; in view of that fact, these alternatives do not seem unreasonable.

6. Incentive payments for reducing production. We agree with the recommendations of a number of witnesses in these hearings—that the legislation should authorize payments to producers for voluntarily reducing their production. The Secretary should have authority to use such payments when and to the extent needed, and only when he estimates they will result in net savings to the Government. Since participation by producers to earn these payments will be purely voluntary, it can be assumed that they will improve producer net income if there is to be any participation. Such payments should be made available to producers both within and outside of Federal order markets. We believe such payments would reduce Government costs by speeding up the adjustment of supply to demand. It is probable that such payments would be needed for only 1 or 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, we believe legislation embodying the provisions indicated above—which would be for the most part a composite of the three bills before this committee—would provide a means for substantial improvement in the dairy situation.

It would bring supply into closer balance with demand.

It would sharply reduce the cost of dairy programs to the Government.

It would directly improve the net income of farmers producing for fluid milk markets.

It would benefit farmers producing for manufacturing milk markets, by removing from those markets much of the surplus from fluid milk markets which now finds its way into manufacturing uses. After a short time, this should result in improvement in manufacturing milk prices.

The proposed program would provide flexibility. Its provisions would be used only when and to the extent required by supply and demand relationships.

We have prepared some estimates of the results that might be achieved under such a program. These estimates indicate that net income of milk producers might be increased 6 percent at the same time Government costs are being reduced by $175 million a year. We believe these estimates are not unreasonable; and, even if the results achieved were only half that good, they would still be well worth while. These estimates are set out in more detail in the attached table.

We recommend the enactment of legislation along the lines I have indicated. We will be glad to give the committee every possible assistance in drafting the specific provisions of such a program.

Estimated 1963–64 program results of present program; composite base plan with no payments; composite base plan with $1 and $2 hundredweight payments

Item	Unit	Present program		Composite base plan [1]		
		1962–63 marketing year	1963–64 marketing year	No payment	$1 per hundredweight payment	$2 per hundredweight payment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Support level: By purchases	Hundredweight	3.11	3.14	3.14	3.14	3.14
Milk production	Billion pounds	125.5	126.5	123.1	121.8	119.8
Marketings (milk equivalent):						
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	64.0	65.0	61.6	60.6	58.3
Total	do	118.0	119.4	116.0	114.7	112.7
Commercial demand (milk equivalent):						
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	55.1	55.2	55.2	55.2	55.2
Total	do	109.1	109.6	109.6	109.6	109.6
Surplus [2]	do	8.9	9.8	6.4	5.1	3.1
CCC purchases:						
Butter	Million pounds	355	370	239	185	110
Cheese	do	140	200	140	125	80
Nonfat dry milk	do	1,270	1,300	1,065	970	740
CCC purchase price:						
Butter	Cents per pound.	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0
Cheese	do	34.6	35.6	35.6	35.6	35.6
Nonfat dry milk	do	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4
CCC net expenditures: Purchases (gross)	Million dollars	511	539	391	337	229
Reduction payments:						
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds				[3] 2.3	[3] 1.8
Rate per hundredweight	Dollars				[3] 1.00	[3] 2.00
Total	Million dollars				[3] 23	[3] 36
Retirements payments:						
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds				4.3	7.1
Rate per hundredweight	Dollars				[4] 1.00	[4] 2.00
Total	Million dollars				[3] 22	[3] 71
Total outlay	do	511	539	391	382	336
Sales proceeds	do	31	31	31	31	31
Total net expenditures	do	480	508	360	351	305
Dairy farm cash receipts:						
From marketings	do	4,760	4,854	4,654	4,605	4,586
Payments	do				45	107
Total receipts	do	4,760	4,854	4,654	4,650	4,693
Net income	do	1,123	1,145	1,098	1,132	1,189

[1] Containing features of S. 900, S. 953, S. 398, and Department provisions.
[2] Milk equivalent milkfat basis.
[3] Payment on reductions below base.
[4] Payment for six months of retired production.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the statement the Senator from Wisconsin has made. I think all of us who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who have shared the concern in recent years in regard to the need for the development of stability in the dairy industry and in the fluid milk markets, but not at the cost of the dairy farmer, take great heart in the report the Senator from Wisconsin has made.

All of us recognize that the problem is extremely difficult.

The statement made today by the Under Secretary of Agriculture demonstrates, I believe, that much progress has been achieved.

I believe we should particularly commend the spokesmen for the dairy interests, who faced up to an extremely complex problem, and have arrived at—although with much grinding of teeth, I am sure—a means of dealing adequately with it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, this proposal, the base price plan, which is the heart and soul of the proposal made by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, is based on a great deal of work done by the dairy farmer leaders in New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Washington, Utah, Florida, and many, many other States. Their leaders came to see us and to discuss this program. I think it will tend to reduce the cost to the Government; and I hope it will be considered favorably, not only by the committee, but also by the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding this time to me.

DISARMAMENT AND A NUCLEAR TEST BAN: THE NEED TO INFORM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long been disturbed by the misinformation and some downright lies that are being disseminated among the American people concerning the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and overall U.S. policy on arms control and disarmament problems. Accordingly, I have asked the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for short, simple, and direct statements designed to clarify these issues in the minds of the American public. I have already received two letters from Director William C. Foster, of the ACDA, and I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. They are admirable statements of U.S. policy in the field of disarmament and arms control. The first letter, dated March 22, 1963, is addressed to the question of the present functions and operating methods of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The second, dated April 2, explains why it is in the national interest of the United States to seek agreement on a nuclear test ban. I commend Mr. Foster's letters to the attention of all Senators and their constituents.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. *Senate.*

DEAR HUBERT: Questions are being asked: What are the present functions of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and how does it operate?

Congress established the Agency to explore, develop, recommend and, if approved by the President, negotiate possible alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our national security. A strong Military Establishment, of course, remains essential. But as the President has said, "in a spiralling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase."

Congress provided for cooperation in arms control and disarmament policy formulation among all interested agencies. Test ban or disarmament recommendations of this Agency are considered by the Departments of Defense and State, and where appropriate, by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other agencies. Negotiations are never undertaken on an important measure until the President has consulted with his key national security advisers and given his approval.

Congress also provided that no action could be taken that would obligate the United States to disarm without the prior approval of Congress. As you may know, the President, the Secretary of State and I have all said that a test ban agreement would be submitted in the form of a treaty to the Senate for the traditional two-thirds vote. Under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, a disarmament agreement must either be approved in this fashion or by a majority in both Houses. The American people are thus assured that no disarmament agreement could be put into effect without the approval of their elected representatives.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR HUBERT: A matter of concern to all Americans is whether it is in the national interest to seek agreement on a nuclear test ban.

The issue is not alone whether a test ban would involve risks but whether the risks would be substantially outweighed by the advantages. Advantages would include: (1) inhibiting the further development of nuclear capabilities by other countries, a development which would increase the chances of nuclear devastation; (2) preserving for a longer time our present nuclear superiorities; (3) eliminating radioactive fallout, and (4) slowing down the nuclear arms race. Against these advantages must be balanced two risks: (1) secret testing or "cheating" and (2) surprise abrogation of the treaty. The latter risk would be greatly minimized by our announced policy of maintaining our own readiness to test even if a treaty went into effect.

The primary concern of those objecting to a treaty has been whether the Soviets could cheat by secret underground testing of small nuclear devices. Most objections are directed at possible secret tests with a magnitude of less than one-quarter the size of our first nuclear explosion in New Mexico almost 20 years ago and less than 1/10000 the size of the largest recorded Soviet explosion. No test ban treaty could give us complete assurance of catching every possible violation. But neither could a potential violator ever be sure he would escape our detection system.

It is the view of the State Department, the Defense Department, the AEC, and this Agency that significant Soviet advances would require a series of tests; that the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means; and that such occasional small tests as might evade detection, if the Soviets were prepared to risk getting caught, would not have a damaging impact on the military balance. Weighing the advantages of a test ban treaty against its risks, both this administration and the Eisenhower administration concluded that such a treaty would be in our national interest.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3, 1963:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Leland J. Haworth, of New York, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Gerald F. Tape, of New York, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1966, vice Leland J. Haworth.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 3, 1963:

POSTMASTER

Cora M. Smith to be postmaster at Lost Creek, in the State of West Virginia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statistics "Management" or Manipulation of Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, overlooked in the discussion of news management—Government control of news—is the fact that the Federal Government itself has become the Nation's principal statistical source. This makes it easy for officials to manipulate statistics to tell the story they want. Old-fashioned bushbeating news coverage is becoming a lost art.

To win political points in agriculture, for example, Secretary Freeman used statistics unfairly to show an erroneous achievement in stockpile reduction—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4024–4033, 4570–4571. Secretary of Labor Wirtz did the same thing last fall in attempting to show employment gains which did not exist. In handling the Cuban affair, the administration even claimed the right to misinform the public.

Withholding information is one thing. Twisting facts and telling falsehoods is quite another. To an alarming degree the American people are dependent on Government interpretations for vital information.

Helen Harriman Keith, Massachusetts' Cherry Blossom Princess for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud to take part with delegations from every section of our great Nation in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival here in Washington.

I am especially delighted that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will be represented by Helen Harriman Keith, 18-year-old daughter of my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman HASTINGS KEITH and his wife.

Congressman KEITH's daughter, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has been selected by the Massachusetts Society of Washington, D.C., as the Commonwealth's cherry blossom princess for 1963. I commend the society for its good judgment. Helen is a natural and I am certain she will brighten the festival with her charm, beauty, dignity, and poise.

Helen is a freshman at the University of Vermont. The pretty, blue-eyed, brown-haired daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Keith, of West Bridgewater, Mass., is the older of two daughters. She is a graduate of the Northfield School for Girls and her interests include riding, swimming, and skiing. She hopes one day to follow her father into the field of government, and is majoring in political science at the University of Vermont, his alma mater.

Massachusetts is proud and fortunate to have such a lovely representative in this year's Cherry Blossom Festival activities.

Dr. Stafford L. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost pleasure that, as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California, I welcome to Washington a very prominent former member of the University of California's faculty at Los Angeles, Dr. Stafford L. Warren. I use the term "former" knowing full well the loss this signifies to our great university in Los Angeles. Dr. Warren resigned from his position as vice chancellor of health sciences at UCLA to accept an appointment in Washington, D.C., as special assistant to President Kennedy to aid in the development and coordination of various programs in the field of mental retardation.

Since I served on the city council in Los Angeles I am well aware of the many contributions Dr. Warren has made toward the curtailment of the smog problem, as he was instrumental in having measures enacted into local law. Through his voluntary work, the citizens of Los Angeles are rewarded by the fact that over 5,000 tons of pollutants are banned from contaminating the atmosphere of Los Angeles County every single day. In accepting the new Washington assignment, Dr. Warren also resigned from the air pollution control district's scientific advisory committee, where he will be sorely missed. This committee was largely responsible for the 64 rules and regulations concerning the control of the stationary sources of smog.

Dr. Warren also resigned as a member of the Los Angeles County Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection Committee.

In recognition of his many achievements, Dr. Warren was presented with a scroll at a local civic program. The scroll states in part, "deep appreciation for outstanding contributions to his community in the long struggle for cleaner air." The scroll also cited his long record of accomplishments since he received his doctorate in medicine at the University of California in 1922; these included his outstanding work as medical chief of the Manhattan A-bomb project and chairman for radiological safety in the Bikini nuclear tests.

A Message for Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for 1962 devoted only a paragraph or two to the operation of the Kerr-Mills Act passed by Congress in the Eisenhower administration to help our senior citizens who are in need of medical care and who are unable for financial reasons to provide such care. It is not a little astonishing that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has failed to give this program the attention it merits so that its benefits might be brought to the atttention of every senior citizen over 65 throughout the land. This statement is an endeavor in the shortest compass and in the simplest way to tell our senior citizens about medical care for the aged in the State of Illinois.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

If you are over age 65 and if your yearly income as an individual is not over $1,800, or in the case of a married couple not over $2,400, and if the value of the property of any kind, excluding your home, is not over $2,400 and if you need major medical care, you are eligible for such care under Illinois law.

HOW IT CAME ABOUT

In 1960 Congress passed what is known as the Kerr-Mills Act, named after Senator KERR of Oklahoma and Congressman MILLS of Arkansas. This act provided that if a State legislature would pass a law to provide the benefits of Kerr-Mills for the people of the State, those benefits would become available. The Illinois Legislature did pass such a law in July 1961, and hence Illinois senior citizens are entitled to the benefits of the Kerr-Mills Act. These benefits became available to Illinois residents on August 1, 1961.

BENEFITS AVAILABLE

The benefits made available by this action include first, unlimited hospital care; second, physician care in the hospital and for 30 days after leaving the hospital, the decision with respect to physicians care in Cook County to be made by the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

WHERE TO APPLY FOR BENEFITS

Any citizen can go to the Illinois Public Aid Commission office in the county where he resides, or he can write to the Illinois Public Aid Commission, Room 2000, 160 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill., and ask for information relating to benefits under this program.

THE RECORD IN ILLINOIS UP TO JANUARY 1, 1963

The State of Illinois began operations under the Kerr-Mills Act on August 1, 1961, and this record runs to January 1, 1963. More current figures will show that the record is even more impressive than this. However, as of January 1, 1963, first, the number of applications received was 10,721; second, applications disposed, 9,670; third, applications approved for payment, 5,907; fourth, applications denied or withdrawn, 3,763; fifth, applications pending for further disposition on January 1, 1962, 1,051; sixth, total amount paid, $2,429,980; and seventh, average amount paid per case, $626.

MAIN REASONS FOR REJECTION OF APPLICATION

First, the medical costs involved were estimated at less than 10 percent of income; second, relatives were able to meet these costs; third, the income or assets of the applicant exceeded the limits set out in the Illinois law; fourth, refusal to comply with Illinois Public Aid Commission policies; fifth, the applicant applied for services which were not offered; sixth, applicant died; seventh, applicant had not yet reached age 65; eighth, applicant was eligible for assistance under some other State program; ninth, the applicant's medical needs were met by insurance; tenth, applicant's needs were met in other ways.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Illinois program under the Kerr-Mills Act does provide for medical care for our senior citizens who need such care and is financed by the Federal Government and the States about half and half and is administered at the State level. Any State can avail itself of these services by having its State legislature enact the appropriate legislation. It is intended for you, the senior citizens of the country, who need medical care and who can qualify in respect of age and need. One wonders why the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington has not made a greater effort to bring all this to the attention of our citizenry.

Farmers Want Program That Will Enable Them To Compete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, our Democrat friends are fond of accusing Republicans of not being sympathetic with the economic problems of farmers. The record, of course, does not justify such a ridiculous contention and the voters in the principal farm States have indicated in the past couple of elections that they believe their economic well-being is best served by Republicans. Farmers in farm States have indicated with their votes that they do not buy the Kennedy-Freeman and company, economist-conceived supply-management idea of farm legislation. Farmers want a program that will enable them to compete in an economy that contains built-in price protection for other segments of our economy, but retains for the farmer a maximum degree of opportunity to exercise initiative and utilization of their land and management capability. This administration gives lipservice to this concept in farm legislation, but every major farm bill sponsored by this Democrat administration has provided for more strict production controls and price management.

I do not have time here, Mr. Speaker, to go into all the failures of this administration so far as farmers are concerned, but just to keep the record straight, I want to point out some recent results of Mr. Freeman's professed effort to help farmers.

The Department of Agriculture, in a release dated March 29, 1963, reveals that the parity ratio of prices received by farmers on March 15 was 77. The report says:

> The parity ratio slipped off 1 point to 77, the lowest since 1959.

This is hardly a solid achievement in the area of improving conditions for agriculture in general.

Let us look at cattle prices. The USDA report referred to above states:

> Beef cattle, at $19.60 per hundredweight were the lowest for the month since February 1960.

It is a well-known fact that fat cattle have suffered a decline in price of 7 cents per pound since December. This is a loss of $70 per head or more on every fat steer or heifer a farmer is sending to market. If this is a side effect of Mr. Freeman's management of feed grain prices, I doubt that cattle feeders are impressed with the results.

Now let us take a look at hogs. The USDA reports that at $13.70 per hundredweight hogs were lower than in any month since 1960. I am advised today hogs are selling for $13.10 at country buying points in Iowa.

This March report of the Crop Reporting Board of USDA is reporting facts as it traditionally has for many years. These facts must not be a great comfort to Kennedy, Freeman and company and we could perhaps wonder how long before the White House news management policy will be applied to the Department of Agriculture's role of providing factual statistical information for farmers.

Let us look briefly at some other direct quotations from the report:

> The commercial vegetable index dropped 8 percent during the month.
>
> The March index (for dairy products) was 3 percent below a year earlier and lowest for the month since 1956.
>
> Lower prices for eggs and commercial broilers dropped the index 1 percent during the month to 155.

I point out these instances of declining farm prices as a means of explaining the continued decline of the farmer's parity ratio and more specifically, the farmer's income. I do this for the purpose of keeping the record straight as to the real effect of the administration's farm policies.

The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record an article written by Senator Karl Mundt, for the Aberdeen American News, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Portions of the article were published in the farm edition of that paper on March 24.

The article, as written by Senator Mundt, presents a great deal of information about the operations of our Public Law 480 program and I commend it to the reading of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports by Hon. Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota

With the beginning of this session of the 88th Congress, and at the request of the leadership of the Republican Party I was advanced from the Agriculture Committee of the Senate to the Foreign Policy Committee. This has now given me an opportunity to look back to my service on the Agriculture Committee with some degree of perspective.

In my opinion the single most important piece of legislation approved during my 14 years, service on the Agriculture Committee is the Agriculture Trade and Development Act of 1954 of which I was cosponsor. I feel that the single act known all over the world as Public Law 480—or the food-for-peace program—has done more for U.S. foreign relations and for U.S. agriculture than any other single piece of agriculture legislation. It is a potent instrument in our search for a better world in which to live.

When the 83d Congress authorized, and President Eisenhower signed Public Law 480 into law not one of us could have envisioned the long list of major accomplishments of this legislation. Neither could we foresee the variety of interests this act would serve.

Among current U.S. operations are foreign currency sales under title I and other activities under Public Law 480, which represent for the United States an unusual but effective opportunity to use our bounty as food for peace. We turned to foreign currency sales when we found that many friendly countries needing and wanting our products were unable to buy them. It wasn't that the United States was short of farm products—far from it. Neither did the difficulty trace to prices, because we had reduced the export prices to the world level for our surpluses. The trouble was dollars—or, rather, a lack of them. Under laws and regulations existing prior to 1954, we could sell our excess products only for dollars. Countries lacking dollars couldn't buy.

Section 2 of Public Law 480 spelled out the policy of the Congress. It follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to expand international trade among the United States and friendly nations, to facilitate the convertibility of currency, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare, to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor. It is further the policy to use foreign currencies which accrue to the United States under this act to expand international trade, to encourage economic development, to purchase strategic materials, to pay U.S. obligations abroad, to promote collective strength, and to foster in other ways the foreign policy of the United States."

Under Public Law 480 four different means are authorized for the disposal of the bounty of our farms into useful avenues abroad. The most important in terms of volume is the sale for foreign currencies under title I to friendly countries. Title II authorizes grants of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of farm products for famine relief and other assistance, including economic development. Under title III, CCC-owned commodities are authorized for domestic and foreign donation programs and for barter for an equal value of strategic or other materials. Title IV provides for long-term sales of agricultural commodities on a long-term dollar credit basis.

This law has been amended seven times and in each case has provided for additional authorization. The most recent amendment, approved August 8, 1961, extended the legislation until December 31, 1964.

It is important to note that these foreign currency sales represent extra marketings for the United States and extra consumption for the recipient countries. That's because the bulk of the commodities sold for foreign currencies go to underdeveloped countries, which lack funds to buy in the world market. In the absence of a foreign currency sales program, the underdeveloped countries would be unable to buy as much food and fiber as at present and American farm product surpluses would be very much larger than they are now. The whole operation fits in with the food-for-peace concept.

This program is tangible recognition that availability of food and fiber are basic essentials if underdeveloped countries are to move upward to becoming economically developed. This food-for-peace program reflects our outstanding ability as the world's greatest agricultural producer. This is a field in which the Soviets cannot compete. With the fruits of our soil, climate, industry, science, and technology we are giving expression to our ability to help meet human needs and promote human development both at home and among friendly neighbors abroad.

To American farmers who are producing quantities of food and fiber in much greater quantities than can be consumed here, this program has provided additional export outlets for over $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities. More wheat has moved under this program than the combined harvests of the last 2 years. The equivalent of over 300 million bushels of soybeans has been exported in the form of vegetable oil. Exports under this law have accounted for 27 percent of total agricultural exports in the last 8 years.

Every major commodity is represented in these sales—wheat, feed grains, edible oils, cotton, tobacco, dried milk, fruits, meat, poultry, and many more. This program has been in operation in dollar-short countries having a total population of 1.4 billion persons. The biggest participant is India which has entered into agreements to purchase commodities valued at over $2 billion. Other large purchasers have been Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Spain, Poland, the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Brazil, and Indonesia.

Over the years this program has enabled countries to purchase with their own currency far more than would have been possible if payment with dollars had been necessary. These currencies have been used in many ways beneficial to both the United States and the purchasing country. The United States has used a portion of the funds to finance its expenses in these countries including military assistance, market development and research. Good use has been put to the funds in developing and expanding markets for U.S. agricultural products.

The poultry market in West Germany was developed through the initial use of sales of poultry under Public Law 480, and subsequent expenditure of funds for market development purposes. Foreign trade, fair exhibits and trade centers showing U.S. products have been utilized as a means of advertising our products.

Also, experience has indicated that countries that have begun to use and know U.S. products as a result of the foreign currency purchase, later on become good dollar customers when their foreign exchange situation makes this feasible. For example, Japan which started out as a purchaser under title I of Public Law 480 is our biggest dollar market for farm products. Soybean oil was originally purchased by Spain from the United States for pesetas. It has now become the largest dollar buyer of this commodity. Italy, similarly, has become a leading commercial outlet for U.S. Hard wheats.

This special export program enables us to help meet the food needs of the developing nations, and at the same time permits us to find a useful outlet for our abundant production. This is all to the good. Public Law 480 is such legislation. It is no discredit to the surplus disposal aspect of the law that it also meets the needs of our friends abroad. And it is no discredit to its foreign policy attributes that it also helps move our heavy inventories. That the law serves two purposes rather than one does not diminish the importance of either.

This program has helped turn our large supplies into an asset. At one time we looked upon our agricultural surpluses almost wholly as a problem. Now we can see that part of the abundance made possible by our efficient agriculture is serving us well in the area of foreign policy.

With respect to the food-for-peace program, I must conclude:

First, the program has been a success in improving the diets of millions of people living in poverty.

Second, the program has prevented an internal explosion or complete collapse of several of the farm programs as they affect certain commodities. The outstanding example of this is with respect to wheat. We all may ask ourselves with candor what the explosive impacts of an additional 2 billion bushels of wheat in Government hands would have been. What type of farm and area reorganization would have been necessary?

Third, farmers are getting higher per unit prices in the open market as a result of Public Law 480 program, and

Fourth, finally, our abundant food supply is the most potent weapon available for intelligent and constructive use among the developing nations in the cold war.

For the Nation as a whole, the equivalent of 1 acre out of every 5 harvested moved into export channels. The production from 63 million acres of U.S. cropland moved abroad in 1961–62. Exports accounted for over half the output of wheat; about 40 percent of the tallow and nonfat dry milk production; about one-third of the soybeans; one-fourth the rye, and one-fifth of the barley production.

The bounty produced by the American farmers, who are the most efficient in the world, enables us to be the world's largest exporter of farm products. By moving an average of 12 ships a day, U.S. farmers were able to export over $5.1 billion worth of farm products in 1961–62. For South Dakota, the value of exports was about $46 million. This is of great significance to the people of South Dakota.

Of the $5.1 billion of U.S. agricultural exports in 1961–62, a record of $3.5 billion were commercial sales for dollars, and $1.6 billion moved under Public Law 480 and AID programs—foreign currency sales, donations, barter, and long-term supply and dollar credit sales. Recent export gains stem mainly from dollar sales.

Our major commercial markets in fiscal year 1962 were the European Economic Community, Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom. These areas took 76 percent of all agricultural exports for dollars, while other West European countries, excluding the United Kingdom, bought another 8 percent. The Common Market countries took $1.2 billion, about one-third of all dollar sales.

For several years I have been studying the progress of the Common Market, especially as it moves toward a common agricultural policy. I am deeply concerned by the growing evidence that the EEC is leaning toward protectionist trade restrictive policy oriented toward itself. In the last tariff negotiations the EEC refused to give fixed tariff bindings on agricultural imports of many competitive products. These include wheat, wheat flour, poultry, and most meat items. These commodities comprise about 40 percent of the exports to the Common Market. Furthermore, EEC is in the process of developing a protective system based on variable import levies. In the case of poultry the variable levy is linked with minimum import or "gate" prices.

The variable levy system equalizes the value of the imported product by bringing its price up to the price of competing items produced in the Common Market. For example, a German importer may want to buy corn from an American exporter. However, the importer must pay the German Government a levy that brings the importer's total cost of imported grain to at least the level of German produced grain. Because this system cancels out any price advantage to the importer of U.S. corn, he tends to buy German grain to the extent that it is available. Under such a system there can be no price competition from imports with grain produced in the Common Market.

For an important group of U.S. farm products such as soybeans, meal, cotton, tallow, hides and skins, and fruit and vegetable products, we fared well in the negotiations. Many of the duty-free or low tariff bindings, previously existing in individual EEC countries, were carried over into the Common Market, and, for the group, the tariff levels fixed were generally satisfactory. For these items which comprise about half our exports to the Common Market last year, we can look forward to a growing volume of exports in the years ahead.

High-level internal target prices implemented by variable levies and minimum import prices give EEC producers a degree of protection which is detrimental to all. This situation is serious. The poultry regulations are illustrative of this fact. They combine excessive minimum import or gate prices with variable levies. Germany is our most important poultry customer in the Common Market. Through a combination of levies made up of the difference between the offering price and the minimum import price, and a series of other levies, there are collected total import charges which have nearly trebled the import levies. Our markets are shrinking fast.

U.S. flour millers have been adversely affected by Common Market regulations through loss of exports. Practically all U.S. flour exports to the EEC have been going to the Netherlands. This was valued at about $7 million in 1961–62. Here is what happened. First, there was set a threshhold price. Then, there was added a margin for milling plus an additional amount to protect EEC millers, less an allowance to offset returns from bran sales, minus a consumer flour subsidy. Quite a complicated formula, isn't it? What did it mean? First, the Common Market levy which had been $14 per ton was more than tripled. Second, it practically shut off this export business.

Also, I am greatly concerned about the proposed increase in import duty on crude soybean and cottonseed oil entering the Common Market. The proposed levy will double the rate from 5 percent to 10 percent ad valorem. European oilseed crushers have access to U.S. soybeans with no import duty. This provides them with a basic source of raw material which can be converted into both oil and meal. It would appear equitable that no special favors should be made for European crushers, and that soybean and cottonseed oil should enter free of duty, just as soybeans are.

The crucial elements are the internal target prices or support prices to be established for grains by the Community. These prices will give us the signal as to the direction which agricultural policies of the Community take. If these price targets are established at unreasonably high levels, then uneconomic production within the Community will be substituted for imports from friendly supplying nations. Consumer prices for animal products within the Community will be unnecessarily increased and imports of feedgrains, dairy, and livestock products will gradually disappear.

If the United States and other agricultural exporting nations are to be assured an opportunity to sell in the EEC markets, it is of major importance that these price goals be set at moderate levels.

The United States will bring a new tool in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to future negotiations with respect to trade matters with other nations. This act provides the framework for U.S. participation in trade negotiations. One of the mandates of this law is to maintain access to export markets for all our products—industrial as well as agricultural.

This Congress stated its purposes in passing the Trade Expansion Act, as follows: "Through trade agreements affording mutual trade benefits, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States and maintain and enlarge foreign markets for American products, to strengthen economic relations with foreign countries through the development of open and nondiscriminatory trading in the free world, and to prevent Communist economic penetration."

Section 252 of this act directs the President to take all feasible and appropriate steps to eliminate unjustifiable import restrictions maintained by any country against U.S. agricultural products. Such steps may include retaliatory action against imports from the country in question and withholding of concessions and most-favored-nation treatment from that country.

Fundamentally, I am opposed to an apparent increase in agricultural protectionism by the Common Market. I believe that it is essential that the EEC fully understand our determination to hold on to our traditional markets.

While the Common Market takes about a third of the farm products we sell for dollars—we should not forget that other free world countries take two-thirds. We should review and strengthen our trade ties with the rest of the free world.

In fiscal 1962, sales to the Outer Seven countries of Western Europe amounted to $719 million, including $460 million to the United Kingdom. Sales to Japan totaled $485 million, and to Canada $430 million.

There are substantial opportunities for expansion in our trade with most of these areas. Japan, for example, is a rapidly growing market for our feedgrains and soybeans. She could take more if her tariffs were cut further. Canada could take more of our poultry, especially turkeys. Recent events have emphasized the need for strengthening all our trade ties, so that our eggs are not all in one basket.

In my opinion, we must be completely realistic in our approach to Common Market trade. I think that we can obtain access to the Common Market, but it requires shrewd, tough negotiating. In my new position as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I will insist that this be done.

Greendale's Milwaukee County Development Corp. Celebrates 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, it was my distinct pleasure to be present in Greendale, Wis., for the 10th anniversary celebration of the Milwaukee County Development Corp. Milwaukee County Development Corp. is a private corporation which was established in 1953 to administer the sales of land from the previously Government-owned and operated village of Greendale, Wis.

The occasion was a fitting one on which to review the progress that has been made in that model community since Greendale was transferred from Federal to private ownership.

As the speaker for the evening, I was most pleased to be introduced by Mr. Louis Quarles who became temporary president of the civic corporation 10 years ago and has served admirably in the post ever since. Mr. Quarles' introductory statement and my remarks of the evening follow:

Statement by Mr. Louis Quarles

Ten years ago it was brought to the attention of some Milwaukee citizens that the U.S. Government was about to sell its holdings in Greendale as a single package. They got together a few people, including persons who expressed an interest in the venture, and they held their first meeting at the Allis-Chalmers clubhouse at West Allis. They formed a corporation, made a bid which was accepted by the Government. I was asked to pinch-hit as president until they could elect a permanent one—I am still pinch-hitting, much to my surprise, but I find it interesting and stimulating.

The invited guests in 1953 included the three clergymen and the members of the village board and school board, it was a relatively small group. Tonight we have the clergy with us again—which is only proper in a residential community—but the number has now grown to five. Thank you for coming tonight.

As the village problems expanded so have the various elements of government grown; so that in addition to the village board members, and members of the school board, we have the former and present members of the plan commission, the zoning board of appeals, the building board, the development commission, the village officials, and also the six candidates for the village board, thus including the officials to be.

I am not going to bother you with history. You are more familiar with developments here than I am, but to borrow a phrase from a former Governor of Wisconsin I'll try briefly "to reminisce a little bit about the future."

I want to thank the candidates for coming, and we cannot introduce them because Milwaukee County Development Corp. being a corporation can only talk about issues. But the candidates are vitally important to you and to us because they represent the future. While a 10th anniversary get together is basically historical, we in Milwaukee County Development Corp. always look ahead, and are primarily interested in continued development. Having six candidates for the three trustee positions on the village board represents citizen interest, and without constant interest by good citizens, continued good village government is not possible.

We wish the candidates well, and may the best three men be elected.

And speaking further about development, I am sure you all know that Milwaukee County Development Corp is primarily in business in Greendale—to go out of business. We want to finish what we have started and close up the company. We will fold our tents like the Arabs and silently steal away.

In planning primarily for long range development of Greendale as contrasted with a quick turnover, it may be that our group was not true to the general concept of the ordinary businessman. We were primarily interested in doing a good job for the future. It has been said: "Why should I do anything for posterity, posterity never did anything for me." We did not and do not subscribe to that point of view.

We would be less than honest with you if we claimed that neither profits nor losses are a consideration in our business, or of interest to our stockholders. When we started in Greendale 10 years ago, we intended to found neither a nonprofit nor a quick-profit institution. Our primary interest was to assure a proper and outstanding development in the community. Incidentally, we intended to fairly reward our shareholders in the long run for the risks which they assumed and their continuing efforts to improve Greendale.

The pace of development over the past 10 years shows that expansion of Greendale has built up considerable momentum during the past few years.

We believe this reflects an awakening of people throughout the Milwaukee area to the many desirable features of life in your community. Recently this momentum has leveled off, in part because of problems whose final solution awaits construction of the metropolitan interceptor sewer. Our experience since 1953 makes us very skeptical about the ability of ourselves—or the community—to turn on or shut off progress at will, and particularly to turn it on. We are concerned about preserving the momentum which has been built up. Since good planning can best be achieved under conditions of steady, organized growth, we are equally concerned that, if the stream of progress is once dammed up, disorganized conditions will surely follow once the dam has been opened.

We hope that Greendale's growth over the next several years can progress in a steady, well organized and well planned manner. We conceive it to be our job to assist, to the best of our ability, in achieving this type of growth. We earnestly solicit the help of all of you in working toward that objective.

And so with those comments about history, and Milwaukee County Development Corp., and with the progress that has been made in the past 10 years—I am sure that you all can well understand there is not likely to be a 20th anniversary dinner given by Milwaukee County Development Corp.—and perhaps not even a 15th anniversary dinner. We are looking forward to the time when our task will be completed.

So much for Milwaukee County Development Corp. and history, which easily brings me to our guest tonight—the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki, a man well known to all of you.

We asked him to be our guest to greet the past and present officials of the village of Greendale because we know that during the congressional years before 1952–53 he was very active when legislation was being enacted to determine the policy about the sale of Greendale—he has said he often felt as though he was almost the mayor of Greendale. His interest in the village and its development has been a continuous one up to the present date and I am sure will continue well into the future.

It is my pleasure to present the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki.

Mr. Zablocki. My friends, it is a distinct honor and privilege for me to be here tonight to join in the 10th anniversary banquet of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp. As one who has been vitally interested in this organization, its aims and aspirations, I feel privileged to have this opportunity to express my words of praise and commendation for the work that has been done here.

Through the efforts and cooperation of countless individuals—some of them no longer with us—Greendale has become the thriving community we know today. My efforts on behalf of this village at a time of flux and crisis over 10 years ago have been dwarfed by the accomplishments which you have made over the ensuing years. In a joint effort that bespeaks the best in our American way of life, you, as directors, with the cooperation of the householders and residents of Greendale, have maintained and improved what surely must be singled out as one of the most unusual communities in the United States.

Greendale, as I am sure you know, was one of the Greentown triplets. It was born with its sister towns, Greenbelt, Md., and Greenhills, Ohio, during a crucial decade in our Nation's history; the decade of the Great Depression. The depression was a crucial period chiefly perhaps for the vast social and political changes which were experienced in two key nations of the world. One of those nations was German. The other was our own country.

In Germany the changes took the form of Fascist totalitarianism. In that land hopelessness and despair were galvanized by a madman into one of the most horrible demonstrations of man's inhumanity to man that the world has ever seen.

In our own country the social revolution came about as our forefathers had meant it to—through the free choice of free citizens. In 1932 the people of the United States went to the polls and elected Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be their President. The country gave him a clear mandate to do what he could to cure the sickness which had stricken a once healthy nation. Franklin Roosevelt's answer was the New Deal.

No matter what our political beliefs, no matter what we think of F.D.R. and what he did or didn't do, we must admit that a social revolution was accomplished in this country. It was a sweeping revolution that came about without gunfire and without bloodshed. It was a revolution that, for better or worse, left an indelible imprint on our history and our way of life.

Although it was only 30 short years ago, somehow those New Deal days seem far away now. Perhaps it is because we have experienced so much since then. Even the names of those who engineered the New Deal have a faraway ring: Rexford Tugwell, Harold Ickes, Frances Perkins, Harry Hopkins, Robert Sherwood, Walter Borah, Hiram Johnson, George Norris.

Greendale was a child of the New Deal. It was conceived as one of innumerable projects to combat the great depression. The reasons behind its development were mainly two. First, the construction project gave work to men who otherwise would have been on the relief rolls. During the 2 years it took to build the town, an average of 2,000 men were employed per day.

Second, the homes offered low-cost housing to families with modest incomes. Rents ranged from $19 to $36 a month, averaging $29. Occupancy was restricted to families within the income range of $1,000 to $2,200 a year. In special cases individuals with less than $1,000 were accepted. Consideration also was given to large families with slightly higher incomes.

But to the technocrats who were the driving force behind the creation of this community, Greendale primarily represented planning. Greendale and its sister towns were to be planned as no other American cities had ever been. They were to be models for the future.

Greendale was the brainchild of men who believed that social evils were for the most part the result of unwholesome environment. They believed that if men put their minds to creating a healthy environment, that environment would, in turn, make healthy, happy, good people. Whatever flaws we might find in this philosophy, we cannot deny that planning was a startling concept in those days.

Not that it should have been. Many ancient cultures had consciously set out to build their cities according to a preconceived blueprint. The ancient Egyptians, the Aztec and Mayan cultures planned their cities and towns. There was, in addition, an American precedent. Washington, D.C., was a tract of swamp and forest land along the Potomac River when Charles L'Enfant first saw it and convinced President Washington that it should be the seat of the new government. L'Enfant's genius is still evident there. His planning has given us one of the world's truly beautiful cities.

But most American cities and towns, like Topsy, "jus' growed." Some, like Milwaukee, sprang up where navigable rivers flowed into larger bodies of water. Others, like Hales Corners, grew where main highways crossed. Still others were established as central points for farmers to bring their products and do their trading. A few, like West Allis, arose near industrial firms. How little planning went into the average American community is evident. Houses are piled one on top of another. There is little open space for trees and shrubs and foliage. Commercial enterprises are scattered in and among homes.

There was to be none of that in Greendale. Its planners drew their basic idea from the English garden villages. It is perhaps ironic that the English villages which appealed so much to the planners were not themselves planned. They were established according to social and practical considerations of their time that dictated that the farmers live in villages and go out each day into the surrounding fields.

The farms, gardens and wooded groves which surrounded the English villages became a "green belt" to the planners. This belt of green was to prevent unsightly developments from encroaching on the town.

Thirty years ago, the planners emulating the British concept, looked around for a suitable location for their green town. They selected the 3,400 acre tract of rolling terrain along the Root River Valley in southeastern Wisconsin, 8 miles from downtown Milwaukee. As we know, the choice of this location was a good one.

Then the planners began designing Greendale:

Each of the housing units was to be surrounded by approximately 5,000 square feet of ground providing space for gardens, trees, and shrubs.

The houses were to vary in size but were to be of similar architectural design. In addition to its own yard, each family was to have additional ground in gardens located within easy walking distance of the dwellings.

Streets and sidewalks in Greendale were planned to minimize traffic hazards. The town was to have access to three major roads, yet be situated far enough from them that traffic would go around, not through, the village. Most of the streets were to dead end in order to eliminate through traffic. The underlying principle was to promote safety. After all, the people of Greendale were expected to have families.

Greendale was to own and operate its own electrical distribution system which would be entirely underground. The subsurface wiring system was to assure a more complete continuity of service, free from interruption of storms, and eliminate the unsightliness of poles and overhead wires.

Greendale's business center, operated partly on a cooperative and partly on a privately owned basis, was to have all the services any villager could expect. Each business was to be housed in its own proper place.

Every foot of land within the area of Greendale was to be put gradually to its best possible use. The 74 farms and rural home units which were originally on the land were to be improved. Almost every building was to receive a new roof. Those without electricity were to be electrified.

A community building was to be constructed. It would house the school, but at the same time provide a place for the adult population to meet for games, meetings, and class instruction. Even Greendale's gardeners were to have the aid of a town agricultural guidance director.

Sounds like paradise doesn't it? And actually most of the plans were realized. But here and there the planners seem to have forgotten reality. In the Greendale of the Federal planners, no one's roof could ever leak or plumbing clog or furnace go on the fritz. But more particularly they sometimes seemed to have overlooked the human element.

For example, let me quote directly for a moment from a brochure on Greendale which the Public Housing Authority released about a year after the town had been occupied. A section is devoted to describing the numerous parks and play areas where children could be sent for supervised games and instruction. One sentence reads, and I quote, "Mothers send their children to these small neighborhood playgrounds where they know they will be safe and happy."

Only planners think that every child on a playground is happy. Certainly mothers don't. Or anyone who has ever had anything to do with a playground. Children cry, fight, pout, scream, and get bloody lips and black eyes on playgrounds. But to most planners, a playground is a place where the lion lies down with the lamb.

If I may find one more fault with the planners, it is that they left out of their scheme for Greendale a building which was a central point of the English village which they copied. That, of course, was a church. The Federal Government could not, of course, have financed a church for every denomination. Our Constitution forbids that. Yet the Government has successfully conducted interdenominational chapels on its military installations for years. However, the New Deal planners chose not to emulate this precedent. They were more interested in creating a paradise on earth than in suggesting that there could be one after death.

Yet, lest you think me too hard on the Government planners, let me hasten to add that I think they created a model town here in Greendale. They proved the value of planning to a community. Theirs was a tremendous achievement and a solid contribution to our society.

You will not hear from me any criticisms of Greendale as a "socialist real estate project" or "collectivist-inspired community." We have had enough of that from other quarters. But we would be remiss if we did not question Greendale as it was originally conceived.

Does the Federal Government have any business owning and running a town? Is it good for individual citizens to be dependent upon the Federal Government for their housing, schooling, for their children, recreation facilities and the like? Is individual initiative and freedom to a large extent stifled in this kind of environment?

These are serious questions, but today they are moot ones as far as Greendale is concerned. For with the end of World War II came a new political climate. The New Deal and its revolutionary fervor declined. There was growing disillusionment with Soviet Russia and its socialist experiment. This fact contributed much during the Truman administration of our country's swing back to the middle of the road. With the changes on the political scene came the determination to sell the Federal "Green" towns.

Two were sold to private developers. Greendale was not. We all know the reasons why. It has been a great source of personal pride to me to have helped in the preserving of the character of this community. In Greendale—unlike other Federal housing projects which were sold—the people had full opportunity and first chance to purchase the homes in which they were living, for a reasonable price. At the same time, the plan used in selling Greendale saved the Federal Government over $2 million. The work of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp. cannot be over estimated in this regard.

Under the guidance of this cooperative, free enterprise organization, the work of planning, begun by the Federal Government, was carried on. We can see the results around us. Residential areas have expanded into the once rural portions of Greendale. New homes have been constructed, utilities have been extended, and new roads have been built. Yet, the essential character of Greendale as a model community has been retained.

I am informed that foreign visitors and American community planners still visit Greendale. And well they might—for two reasons.

First, it has a historical significance as one of the first truly planned communities in our country. Methods which were originated for, and demonstrated in, this town have been used ever since. One thinks of the three Levittowns or Lake Park, Ill. These communities and their planners owe much to what had been done here almost 30 years ago. Near Washington, D.C., in Virginia, a new town is even now taking shape out of what was once farmland. It will be called Reston.

I recently saw represenations of what Reston will look like when it is completed and was struck with its resemblance to Greendale.

But more than being a prototype for the planned communities of this Nation, Greendale was a testing place for the underlying concepts of planning. Urban renewal, urban redevelopment, strict zoning, traffic control—all these concepts which now are so familiar to us—have been inherited, at least in part, from Greendale and its sister cities, and the men that planned them.

But there is a second good reason for modern community planners to visit Greendale. That is to witness the fine accomplishments which have taken place here since 1952.

We all know that Greendale faces problems. The rapid increase in population which the village can expect in the next few years is certain to cause problems. Moreover, if the tax base is to be expanded, some attempt must be made to attract light industrial plants and commercial enterprises. Yet these must, at the same time, conform to the essentially residential character of the village. Yes, this community has continuing problems.

It has had problems before—certainly very serious ones. However, through the cooperative effort of the citizens of Greendale, past difficulties have been successfully resolved. I am confident that the problems of the future will be met and resolved.

The New Deal planners who created Greendale are no longer with us. But their ideas remain. Planning must still be an integral part of the life of this community. Undoubtedly you will continue in the path of village planning and cooperation in the future. And so, we look forward to the 20th anniversary banquet, for we will find Greendale even more flourishing than it is today.

This is your challenge. This is your goal.